Draft Environmental Impact Report Selma Crossings Project State Clearinghouse No. 2007071008



City of Selma • May 31, 2012



Bishop Ranch 3 2633 Camino Ramon, Suite 460 San Ramon, CA 94583

DRAFT

Environmental Impact Report Selma Crossings Project City of Selma, Fresno County, California

State Clearinghouse No. 2007071008

Prepared for:



City of Selma 1710 Tucker Street Selma, CA 93662 559.891.2209

Contact: D-B Heusser, City Manager

Prepared by:

Michael Brandman Associates 2444 Main Street, Suite 150 Fresno, CA 93721 559.497.0310

Contact: Jason Brandman, Project Manager



May 31, 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acronyms and Abbreviations	xi
Section 1: Introduction	1-1
1.1 - Overview, Purpose, and Authority of the EIR	1-1
1.2 - Scope of the EIR	1-2
1.3 - Organization of the EIR	1-6
1.4 - Documents Incorporated by Reference	1-8
1.5 - Technical Studies Prepared for the Project	1-9
1.6 - Review of the Draft EIR	1-9
Section 2: Executive Summary	2-1
2.1 - Purpose	2-1
2.2 - Project Summary	2-1
2.3 - Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	2-2
2.4 - Summary of Project Alternatives	2-4
2.5 - Areas of Controversy	2-4
2.6 - Public Review of the Draft EIR	2-5
2.7 - Executive Summary Matrix	2-6
Section 3: Project Description	3-1
3.1 - Project Location and Setting	3-1
3.2 - Project Background and History	3-12
3.3 - Project Characteristics	3-21
3.4 - Project Objectives	3-31
3.5 - Intended Uses of This Draft EIR	3-32
Section 4: Environmental Impact Analysis	4-1
Organization of Issue Areas	4-1
Issues Addressed in This EIR	4-1
Level of Significance	4-1
Impact Analysis and Mitigation Measure Format	4-2
4.1 - Aesthetics, Light, and Glare	4.1-1
4.2 - Agricultural Resources	4.2-1
4.3 - Air Quality	4.3-1
4.4 - Biological Resources	4.4-1
4.5 - Cultural Resources	4.5-1
4.6 - Geology, Soils, and Seismicity	4.6-1
4.7 - Hazardous Materials	4.7-1
4.8 - Hydrology and Water Quality	4.8-1
4.9 - Land Use	4.9-1
	4.10-1
4.11 - Public Services and Utilities	4.11-1
4.12 - Transportation	
4.13 - Urban Decay	4.13-1
Section 5: Alternatives to the Proposed Project	5-1
5.1 - Introduction	5-1
5.2 - Project Objectives	5-3
5.3 - Alternative 1 – No Project/No Development Alternative	5-4
5.4 - Alternative 2 – Northeast Area Alternative	5-4
5.5 - Alternative 3 – Northeast Area and South Area Alternative	5-11
5.6 - Alternative 4 – Northwest Area Alternative	5-18
5.7 - Environmentally Superior Alternative	5-25
5.8 - Alternatives Rejected From Further Consideration	5-27

Section 6: Other CEQA Considerations6-16.1 - Significant Unavoidable Impacts6-16.2 - Growth-Inducing Impacts6-26.3 - Significant Irreversible Changes6-36.4 - Cumulative Impacts6-46.5 - Energy Conservation6-11
Section 7: Effects Found Not To Be Significant
7.2 - Effects Found Not To Be Significant7-1
Section 8: Persons and Organizations Consulted
Section 9: List of Preparers9-1
9.1 - Lead Agency
9.2 - Lead Consultant
9.3 - Technical Subconsultants
Section 10: References10-1
Appendix A: Notice of Preparation and Responses A.1 - 2007 Original Notice of Preparation A.2 - Responses to 2007 Original Notice of Preparation A.3 - 2010 Re-Revised Notice of Preparation A.4 - Responses to 2010 Re-Revised Notice of Preparation
Appendix B: Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model
Appendix C: Air Quality Modeling Data C.1 - Health Risk Assessment C.2 - Modeling Data
Appendix D: Biological Resources Assessments D.1 - Biological Reconnaissance Survey D.2 - Biological Resources Assessment
Appendix E: Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment
Appendix F: Geotechnical Feasibility Study
Appendix G: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
Appendix H: Selma Crossings Storm Drainage Master Plan

- Appendix I: Noise Modeling Data
- Appendix J: Water Supply Assessment

Appendix K: Public Services and Utilities Letters

Appendix L: Traffic Impact Study

Appendix M: Urban Decay Analysis

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1-1: NOP Comment Letters	1-3
Table 2-1: Executive Summary Matrix	2-7
Table 3-1: Project Site Existing Conditions Summary	3-1
Table 3-2: Surrounding Land Use Summary	3-11
Table 3-3: Project Site Existing Land Use Designations	3-12
Table 3-4: Original Selma Crossings Project Proposal	3-12
Table 3-5: Selma Crossings Development Summary	3-22
Table 3-6: Employment Estimate	3-26
Table 3-7: Phasing Assumptions	3-27
Table 3-8: Non-Selma Crossings Annexations	3-31
Table 4.1-1: Commercial Development Standards Summary	4.1-5
Table 4.2-1: Fresno County Agricultural Economy (2004–2009)	4.2-1
Table 4.2-2: Fresno County Agricultural Commodity Summary (2009)	4.2-1
Table 4.2-3: Fresno County Farmland Summary (2000–2008)	4.2-3
Table 4.2-4: Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model Scoring Summary	4.2-13
Table 4.3-1: 2010 Fresno County Emissions Inventory	4.3-3
Table 4.3-2: Air Quality Monitoring Summary	4.3-5
Table 4.3-3: California Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory 2000-2009	4.3-8
Table 4.3-4: Greenhouse Gases	4.3-15
Table 4.3-5: Federal and State Ambient Air Quality Standards	4.3-20
Table 4.3-6: Air Basin Attainment Status	4.3-22
Table 4.3-7: Regional Thresholds	4.3-45
Table 4.3-8: Criteria Pollutant Localized Operational Significance Threshold Summary	4.3-46
Table 4.3-9: Construction Emissions (Unmitigated)	4.3-48
Table 4.3-10: Operational Emissions (Unmitigated)	4.3-49
Table 4.3-11: Operational Emissions (Mitigated)	4.3-51
Table 4.3-12: Localized Significance Impact Summary for CO, and NO2 – Phase 1, Phase 2, and Phase 3	4.3-52
Table 4.3-13: Localized Significance Impact Summary for PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ – Phase 1, Phase 2, and Phase 3	4.3-53
Table 4.3-14: Carbon Monoxide Concentrations at Intersections	4.3-56
Table 4.3-15: Summary of Cancer Risks from Project Operations	4.3-59
Table 4.3-16: Construction Greenhouse Gas Estimates	4.3-68
Table 4.3-17: Operational Business as Usual Greenhouse Gas Estimates	4.3-69
Table 4.3-18: Greenhouse Gas Emissions (in 2020 with Project Reductions and Regulations)	4.3-73
Table 4.4-1: Special-Status Wildlife Species	4.4-3

Table 4.6-1: Fault Summary	4.6-2
Table 4.6-2: Modified Mercalli Intensity Scale	4.6-4
Table 4.6-3: Soil Properties Summary	4.6-7
Table 4.7-1: Records Search Summary	4.7-2
Table 4.7-2: Aerial Photograph Summary	4.7-4
Table 4.7-3: Topographic Map Summary	4.7-5
Table 4.7-4: Indoor Radon Sample Summary	4.7-7
Table 4.8-1: Temperature and Meteorological Data	4.8-1
Table 4.9-1: Project Site Existing Land Use Designations	4.9-4
Table 4.9-2: Surrounding Area Existing Land Use Designations	4.9-5
Table 4.9-3: Summary of Differences Between 1997 and 2035 General Plans	4.9-8
Table 4.9-4: 1997 General Plan Consistency Analysis	4.9-11
Table 4.9-5: 2035 General Plan Consistency Analysis	4.9-30
Table 4.9-6: California Government Code Section 56668 (Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000) Consistency Analysis	4.9-67
Table 4.9-7: Fresno LAFCO Standards For Annexation Consistency Analysis	4.9-78
Table 4.10-1: Existing Traffic Noise Exposure	4.10-1
Table 4.10-2: Measures of Substantial Noise Increase for Transportation Sources	4.10-8
Table 4.10-3: Project-Related Traffic Noise Impacts	4.10-11
Table 4.10-4: Typical Construction Equipment Noise Levels	4.10-16
Table 4.11-1: Fire Station Summary	4.11-1
Table 4.11-2: Landfill Summary	4.11-7
Table 4.11-3: Water Demand Rates – Commercial Land Use Activities	4.11-18
Table 4.11-4: Estimated Project Water Demand Summary	4.11-19
Table 4.11-5: Selma District Sphere of Influence Water Demand Forecast	4.11-21
Table 4.11-6: Selma Crossings Water Demand Forecast	4.11-22
Table 4.11-7: Comparison of Forecasted Demands	4.11-23
Table 4.11-8: Selma District Existing Sphere of Influence Maximum Day Water Demand Forecast	4.11-24
Table 4.11-9: Selma Forecasted Water Demand Versus Supply (Normal Hydrological Conditions	4.11-24
Table 4.11-10: Wastewater Generation Summary	4.11-30
Table 4.11-11: Estimated Construction Waste Generation	4.11-32
Table 4.11-12: Estimated Operational Waste Generation	4.11-33
Table 4.11-13: Estimated Annual Energy Consumption	4.11-35
Table 4.12-1: Level of Service Characteristics for Unsignalized Intersections	4.12-2
Table 4.12-2: Level of Service Characteristics for Signalized Intersections	4.12-2
Table 4.12-3: Level of Service Characteristics for Roadways	4.12-3

Table 4.12-4: Intersection Operations – Existing Conditions	4.12-6
Table 4.12-5: Roadway Segment Analysis – Existing Conditions	4.12-8
Table 4.12-6: Existing Grade Crossing Analysis	4.12-24
Table 4.12-7: Pending Projects	4.12-36
Table 4.12-8: Weekday Project Trip Generation: Phase I (Northeast)	4.12-37
Table 4.12-9: Weekend Project Trip Generation: Phase I (Northeast)	4.12-37
Table 4.12-10: Weekday Project Trip Generation: Phase II (South)	4.12-37
Table 4.12-11: Weekend Project Trip Generation: Phase II (South)	4.12-38
Table 4.12-12: Weekday Project Trip Generation: Phase III (Northwest)	4.12-39
Table 4.12-13: Weekend Project Trip Generation: Phase III (Northwest)	4.12-39
Table 4.12-14: Captured Trip Reductions	4.12-40
Table 4.12-15: External Project Traffic	4.12-40
Table 4.12-16: Pass By Reductions	4.12-41
Table 4.12-17: External Non-Pass-By Trips	4.12-42
Table 4.12-18: Combined External Non-Pass-By Trips	4.12-42
Table 4.12-19: Volume Thresholds for Road Segment Levels of Service – Less Than 2 Signalized Intersections Per Mile	4.12-71
Table 4.12-20: Volume Thresholds for Road Segment Levels of Service – 2.0 to 4.5 Signalized Intersections Per Mile.	4.12-71
Table 4.12-21: Existing Plus Phase I Intersection Operations	4.12-79
Table 4.12-22: Existing Plus Phase I Roadway Segment Operations	4.12-81
Table 4.12-23: Existing Plus Phase I Grade Crossing Analysis	4.12-83
Table 4.12-24: Existing Plus Phase I Intersection Operations – Mitigated	4.12-91
Table 4.12-25: Existing Plus Phase I Roadway Segment Operations – Mitigated	4.12-92
Table 4.12-26: Year 2020 Intersection Operations	4.12-107
Table 4.12-27: Year 2020 Roadway Segment Operations	4.12-109
Table 4.12-28: Year 2020 Grade Crossing Analysis	4.12-110
Table 4.12-29: Year 2020 Plus Project Intersection Operations - Mitigated	4.12-111
Table 4.12-30: Year 2020 Plus Project Roadway Segment Operations – Mitigated	4.12-114
Table 4.12-31: Year 2035 Intersection Operations	4.12-143
Table 4.12-32: Year 2035 Roadway Segment Operations	4.12-145
Table 4.12-33: Year 2035 Grade Crossing Analysis	4.12-147
Table 4.12-34: Year 2035 Plus Project Intersection Operations - Mitigated	4.12-171
Table 4.12-35: Year 2035 Plus Project Roadway Segment Operations – Mitigated	4.12-173
Table 4.13-1: Trade Area Historic Population Growth (1999–2010)	4.13-8
Table 4.13-2: Trade Area Population Projections (2010–2030)	4.13-9
Table 4.13-3: Trade Area Employment Projections (2010–2030)	4.13-10
Table 4.13-4: Selma's Share in Fresno County (2000–2009)	4.13-12

Table 4.13-5: Selma's Sales per Capita (2000–2009)	4.13-13
Table 4.13-6: Current Retail Pipeline	4.13-14
Table 4.13-7: Trade Area Sales Estimates (2009)	4.13-15
Table 4.13-8: Retail Sales Leakage in Selma (2009)	4.13-16
Table 4.13-9: Household Spending by Category Compared to State Average (2009)	4.13-18
Table 4.13-10: Selma Crossings Sales Estimate	4.13-22
Table 4.13-11: Impacts on New Retail and Sales Estimate	4.13-23
Table 4.13-12: Potential Selma Crossings Impacts Over Time	4.13-23
Table 4.13-13: Sales Per Capita for Select California Cities	4.13-25
Table 5-1: Northeast Area Alternative Development Summary	5-5
Table 5-2: Northeast Area Alternative Land Use Approvals	5-6
Table 5-3: Northeast Area Alternative Trip Generation	5-10
Table 5-4: Northeast Area Alternative Sales Estimate	5-10
Table 5-5: Northeast Area and South Area Alternative Summary	5-12
Table 5-6: Northeast Area and South Alternative Land Use Approvals	5-13
Table 5-7: Northeast Area and South Area Alternative Trip Generation	5-17
Table 5-8: Northeast Area and South Area Alternative Sales Estimate	5-18
Table 5-9: Northwest Area Alternative Development Summary	5-19
Table 5-10: Northwest Area Alternative Land Use Approvals	5-20
Table 5-11: Northwest Area Alternative Trip Generation	5-24
Table 5-12: Northwest Area Alternative Sales Estimate	5-24
Table 5-13: Summary of Alternatives	5-25
Table 5-14: Comparison of Significant Unavoidable Impacts	5-26
Table 5-15: Alternative Site Study Locations	5-28
Table 6-1: Cumulative Projects	6-5
Table 7-1: Selma Unified School District Enrollment (2006–2007 through 2009–2010)	

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit 3-1: Regional Location Map	3-3
Exhibit 3-2: Local Vicinity Map, Aerial Base	3-5
Exhibit 3-3a: Site Photographs	3-7
Exhibit 3-3b: Site Photographs	3-9
Exhibit 3-4: Fresno County Zoning Designations	3-13
Exhibit 3-5: 1997 City of Selma General Plan Land Use Designations	3-15
Exhibit 3-6: 2035 City of Selma General Plan Land Use Designations	3-17
Exhibit 3-7: Proposed Pre-Zoning Designations	3-19
Exhibit 3-8: Tentative Parcel Map	3-23
Exhibit 3-9: Non-Selma Crossings Project Annexations	3-29
Exhibit 4.2-1: Important Farmland Map	4.2-5
Exhibit 4.2-2: USDA Soils Map	4.2-7
Exhibit 4.2-3: Project Zone of Influence	4.2-9
Exhibit 4.10-1: Noise Measurement Locations	4.10-1
Exhibit 4.10-2: Measured Hourly Noise Levels	4.10-1
Exhibit 4.12-1: Study Area and Locations	4.12-11
Exhibit 4.12-2: Existing Lane Configurations and Intersection Controls	4.12-13
Exhibit 4.12-3: Existing Weekday Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes	4.12-15
Exhibit 4.12-4: Existing Saturday Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes	4.12-17
Exhibit 4.12-5: Phase 1 Project Weekday Peak-Hour Pass-By Trips	4.12-45
Exhibit 4.12-6: Phase 1 Project Saturday Peak-Hour Pass-By Trips	4.12-47
Exhibit 4.12-7: Phase 2 Project Weekday Pass-By Trips	4.12-49
Exhibit 4.12-8: Phase 2 Project Saturday Pass-By Trips	4.12-51
Exhibit 4.12-9: Phase 3 Project Weekday Pass-By Trips	4.12-53
Exhibit 4.12-10: Phase 3 Project Saturday Pass-By Trips	4.12-55
Exhibit 4.12-11: Phase 1 Project Weekday Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes	4.12-57
Exhibit 4.12-12: Phase 1 Project Saturday Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes	4.12-59
Exhibit 4.12-13: Phase 2 Project Weekday Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes	4.12-61
Exhibit 4.12-14: Phase 2 Project Saturday Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes	4.12-63
Exhibit 4.12-15: Phase 3 Project Weekday Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes	4.12-65
Exhibit 4.12-16: Phase 3 Project Saturday Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes	4.12-67
Exhibit 4.12-17: Existing Plus Project Phase 1 Lane Configurations and Intersection Control	4.12-69
Exhibit 4.12-18: Existing Plus Project Phase 1 Weekday Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes	
Exhibit 4.12-19: Existing Plus Project Phase 1 Saturday Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes	
Exhibit 4.12-20: Year 2020 No Project Weekday Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes	4.12-97

Exhibit 4.12-21: Year 2020 No Project Weekend Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes	4.12-99
Exhibit 4.12-22: Year 2020 With Project Phases 1 and 2 Lane Configurations and Intersection Control	4.12-101
Exhibit 4.12-23: Year 2020 Plus Project Phases 1 and 2 Weekday Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes	4.12-103
Exhibit 4.12-24: Year 2020 Plus Project Phases 1 and 2 Saturday Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes	4.12-105
Exhibit 4.12-25: Year 2035 No Project Weekday Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes	4.12-133
Exhibit 4.12-26: Year 2035 No Project Weekend Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes	4.12-135
Exhibit 4.12-27: Year 2035 With Project Phases 1 and 2 Lane Configurations and Intersection Control	4.12-137
Exhibit 4.12-28: Year 2035 Plus Project Weekday Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes	4.12-139
Exhibit 4.12-29: Year 2035 Plus Project Saturday Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes	4.12-141
Exhibit 4.13-1: Trade Area Boundaries	4.13-5
Exhibit 5-1: Alternative Site Study Locations	5-31

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
AM Peak	Weekday morning peak hour (7 a.m. to 9 a.m.)
AQP	Air Quality Plan
ARB	California Air Resources Board
AST	aboveground storage tank
ATCM	Airborne Toxic Control Measures
BMP	Best Management Practices
BOE	California State Board of Equalization
BVOC	biogenic volatile organic compound
С	Celsius; centigrade
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
Cal OSHA	California Occupational Health and Safety Administration
CalEPA	California Environmental Protection Agency
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CBD	Central Business District
CDFG	California Department of Fish and Game
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CESA	California Endangered Species Act
CFC	chlorofluorocarbon
CH_4	methane
CHL	California Historical Landmarks
CNDDB	California Natural Diversity Database
CNEL	Community Noise Equivalent Level
CNPS	California Native Plant Society
СО	carbon monoxide
CO ₂ e	carbon dioxide equivalent
CPHI	California Points of Historical Interest
CPUC	California Public Utilities Commission
dB	decibel
DPM	diesel particulate matter
DTSC	California Department of Toxic Substances Control
EIR	Environmental Impact Report

EMF	electromagnetic field
EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
ESA	Endangered Species Act
F	Fahrenheit
FAR	floor area ratio
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
GWh/y	gigawatt-hours per year
HCM	Highway Capacity Manual
HFC	hydrofluorocarbon
HRA	Health Risk Assessment
HRI	California Historic Resources Inventory
HVAC	heating, ventilation, and air conditioning
IPCC	United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
L _{dn}	day/night average sound level
L _{eq}	equivalent sound level
LOS	Level of Service
MBA	Michael Brandman Associates
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
mgd	million gallons per day
MMI	Modified Mercalli Intensity
mph	miles per hour
MTCO ₂ e	metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents
N_2O	nitrous oxide
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NESHAP	National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NO_2	nitrogen dioxide
NOC	Notice of Completion
NOP	Notice of Preparation
NO _x	nitrogen oxides
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
O ₃	ozone
OEHHA	California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment

PCB	polychlorinated biphenyl
pCi/l	picoCuries per liter
PFC	perfluorocarbon
PG&E	Pacific Gas and Electric Company
PM Peak	Weekday afternoon peak hour (4 p.m. to 6 p.m.)
PM _x	particulate matter
ppb	parts per billion
ppm	parts per million
PPV	peak particle velocity
PVC	polyvinyl chloride
RCRA	Federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RMP	Risk Management Plan
ROG	reactive organic gases
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SF_6	sulfur hexafluoride
SJVAPCD	San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District
SKF CSD	Selma-Kingsburg-Fowler County Sanitation District
SO_2	sulfur dioxide
SPT	Selma Pressure Treatment
SR	State Route
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TAC	toxic air contaminants
TCM	transportation control measures
TDS	total dissolved solids
Tg	teragram
therms/y	therms per year
TRU	transportation refrigeration unit
USACE	United States Army Corps of Engineers
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
UST	underground storage tank
VMT	vehicle miles traveled
WDR	Waste Discharge Requirements

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 - Overview, Purpose, and Authority of the EIR

This Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) is prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts associated with the implementation of the proposed Selma Crossings project (State Clearinghouse No. 2007071008). This document is prepared in conformance with CEQA (California Public Resources Code, Section 21000, et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000, et seq.), and City of Selma rules and regulations. This Draft EIR is intended to serve as an informational document for the public agency decision makers and the public regarding the proposed project.

1.1.1 - Overview

The proposed project consists of the phased development of approximately 3.45 million square feet of commercial retail, office, visitor-serving commercial, and residential uses on approximately 287 net acres in the City of Selma. Development and land use activities are summarized by phase:

- Northeast Area (Phase 1): 882,003 square feet of commercial retail uses on 75.75 acres.
- South Area (Phase 2): 1,431,200 square feet of commercial retail, automall, office, and visitor-serving commercial uses on 135.40 acres. This phase would include a 20-acre stormwater basin.
- Northwest Area (Phase 3): 1,136,000 square feet of commercial retail, residential, and office uses on 66.60 acres.

Project buildout would occur over a 12-year period.

The project site would be annexed into the City of Selma and the Selma-Kingsburg-Fowler County Sanitation District. Associated with these annexations, two adjacent areas (East and West Annexation Areas) would also be considered for inclusion in the Selma city limits and Selma-Kingsburg-Fowler County Sanitation District service area.

Section 3, Project Description provides a complete description of the proposed project.

1.1.2 - Purpose and Authority

This Draft EIR provides a project-level analysis of the environmental effects of the proposed Selma Crossings project. The environmental impacts of the proposed project are analyzed in the EIR to the degree of specificity appropriate, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15146. This document addresses the potentially significant adverse environmental impacts that may be associated with the planning, construction, or operation of the proposed project. It also identifies appropriate

and feasible mitigation measures and alternatives that may be adopted to significantly reduce or avoid these impacts.

CEQA requires that an EIR contain, at a minimum, certain specific elements. These elements are contained in this Draft EIR and include:

- Table of Contents
- Introduction
- Executive Summary
- Project Description
- Environmental Setting, Significant Environmental Impacts, and Mitigation Measures
- Cumulative Impacts
- Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts
- Alternatives to the Proposed Project
- Growth-Inducing Impacts
- Effects Found Not To Be Significant
- Areas of Known Controversy

1.1.3 - Lead Agency Determination

The City of Selma is designated as the lead agency for the proposed project. CEQA Guidelines Section 15367 defines the lead agency as ". . . the public agency, which has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project." Other public agencies may use this Draft EIR in the decision-making or permit process and consider the information in this Draft EIR along with other information that may be presented during the CEQA process.

This Draft EIR was prepared by Michael Brandman Associates (MBA), an environmental consultant. This Draft EIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the City of Selma as required by CEQA. Lists of organizations and persons consulted and the report preparation personnel are provided in Sections 8 and 9 of this Draft EIR, respectively.

1.2 - Scope of the EIR

This Draft EIR addresses the potential environmental effects of the proposed project. The City of Selma issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the proposed project on June 28, 2007, which circulated between June 28, 2007 and July 19, 2007 for the statutory 30-day public review period. Following release of the 2007 NOP, the project applicant amended the project application, which involved substantial changes to the project components. As such, a Re-Released NOP was issued on November 9, 2010, which circulated between November 9, 2010 and December 24, 2010. The scope of this Draft EIR includes the potential environmental impacts identified in the NOPs and issues raised by agencies and the public in response to the NOPs. The original NOP is contained in Appendix A-1 of this Draft EIR; the Re-Released NOP is contained in Appendix A.3.

Thirteen comment letters were received in response to the original NOP and 13 comment letters were received in response to the Re-Released NOP. They are listed in Table 1-1. The original NOP comments are contained in Appendix A.2 of this Draft EIR; the Re-Released NOP is contained in Appendix A.4.

NOP	Status	Affiliation	Signatory(ies)	Date	
Original NOP (June 28, 2007)	Public Agencies	Native American Heritage Commission	Dave Singleton, Program Analyst	July 6, 2007	
		County of Fresno, Department of Community Health	Glenn Allen, Environmental Health Specialist	July 10, 2007	
		San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District	David Warner, Director of Permits Services; Arnaud Marjollet, Permit Services Manager	July 12, 2007	
		Selma-Kingsburg- Fowler County Sanitation District	Veronica Cazares, Supervising Engineer	July 16, 2007	
		Fresno Local Agency Formation Commission	Rick Ballantyne, Executive Director	July 18, 2007	
		City of Selma Fire Department	Jeffrey Kestly, Fire Chief	July 23, 2007	
			Kings Canyon Unified School District	Aide Garza; Ron Hudson, Deputy Superintendent	July 23, 2007
			California Department of Fish and Game	W.E., Loudermilk, Regional Manager	July 24, 2007
		California Department of Toxic Substances Control	Tim Miles, Hazardous Substances Scientist	July 24, 2007	
			California Public Utilities Commission	Kevin Boles, Environmental Specialist	July 24, 2007
		California Department of Transportation, District 6	Michael Navarro,	July 26, 2007	
		Consolidated Irrigation District	Mark Gilkey, General Manager	August 7, 2007	
	Private Parties	Pacific Gas and Electric Company	Kyle Patten, Land Agent	July 11, 2007	

NOP	Status	Affiliation	Signatory(ies)	Date
Re-Released NOP (November 12, 2010)	Public Agencies	City of Selma Fire Department	Jeffrey Kestly, Fire Chief	November 18, 2010
		County of Fresno, Department of Community Health	Glenn Allen, Supervising Environmental Health Specialist	November 29, 2010
		California Department of Transportation, District 6	Michael Navarro,	November 30, 2010
		Selma-Kingsburg- Fowler County Sanitation District	Frank Hernandez, Engineering Technician I	November 30, 2010
		California Department of Toxic Substances Control	Sam Martinez, Jr., Hazardous Substances Engineer	December 7, 2010
		Consolidated Mosquito Abatement District	Mark Amorino, Field Supervisor	December 7, 2010
		California Department of Transportation, District 6	Michael Navarro,	December 20, 2010
		Fresno County Fire Protection District	William Ross, Law Offices of William D. Ross	December 22, 2010
		California Public Utilities Commission	Rail Corridor Safety Specialist	December 23, 2010
		City of Reedley	David, Brletic, City Planner	December 23, 2010
		Native American Heritage Commission	Dave Singleton, Program Analyst	December 24, 2010
		California Department of Conservation	Dan Otis, Program Manager, Williamson Act Program	December 28, 2010
	Private Parties	Chevron Environmental Management Company	Lee Higgins, Environmental Project Manager	November 30, 2010

Table 1-1	(cont.):	NOP	Comment	Letters
-----------	----------	-----	---------	---------

1.2.1 - Scoping Meeting

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15082(c)(1), the City of Selma held a public scoping meeting for the proposed project on Thursday, July 19, 2007 at Selma City Hall. No comments were received at this meeting.

Following release of the Re-Released NOP, the City of Selma held a public scoping meeting for the proposed project on Thursday, November 18, 2010 at Selma City Hall. No comments were received at this meeting.

1.2.2 - Environmental Issues Determined Not To Be Significant

Some environmental topical areas were determined not to be significant. An explanation of why each area is determined not to be significant is provided in Section 7, Effects Found Not To Be Significant. These topical areas are as follows:

- Mineral Resources
- Population and Housing
- Recreation

In addition, certain subjects within various topical areas were determined not to be significant and are discussed Section 7, Effects Found Not To Be Significant:

- Scenic Vistas (Section 4.1, Aesthetics Light, and Glare)
- State Scenic Highways (Section 4.1, Aesthetics Light, and Glare)
- Riparian Habitat or Sensitive Natural Communities (Section 4.4, Biological Resources)
- Federally Protected Wetlands (Section 4.4, Biological Resources)
- Local Biological Policies and Ordinances (Section 4.4, Biological Resources)
- Conservation Plans (Section 4.4, Biological Resources)
- Septic and Alternative Wastewater Disposal Systems (Section 4.6, Geology, Soils and Seismicity)
- Airports (Section 4.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials)
- Private Airstrips (Section 4.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials)
- Emergency Evacuation and Response (Section 4.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials)
- Wildland Fires (Section 4.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials)
- 100-Year Flood Hazard Areas (Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality)
- Seiche, Tsunami, or Mudflow Hazards (Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality)
- Division of an Established Community (Section 4.9, Land Use)
- Conservation Plans (Section 4.9, Land Use)
- Aviation Noise (Section 4.10, Noise)
- Schools (Section 4.11, Public Services and Utilities)
- Parks (Section 4.11, Public Services and Utilities)
- Other Public Facilities (Section 4.11, Public Services and Utilities)
- Air Traffic Patterns (Section 4.12, Transportation)

1.2.3 - Potentially Significant Environmental Issues

As set forth in the Re-Released NOP, the following topical areas may contain potentially significant environmental issues that will require further analysis in the EIR. These sections are analyzed in this DEIR and are as follows:

- Aesthetics, Light, and Glare
- Agricultural Resources
- Air Quality, including Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use
- Noise
- Public Services and Utilities
- Transportation
- Urban Decay

• Hazards and Hazardous Materials

1.3 - Organization of the EIR

This Draft EIR is organized into the following main sections:

- Section 1: Introduction. This section provides an introduction and overview describing the purpose of this Draft EIR, its scope and components, and its review and certification process.
- Section 2: Executive Summary. This section includes a summary of the proposed project and alternatives to be addressed in the Draft EIR. A brief description of the areas of controversy and issues to be resolved, and overview of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, in addition to a table that summarizes the impacts, mitigation measures, and level of significance after mitigation, are also included in this section.
- Section 3: Project Description. This section includes a detailed description of the proposed project, including its location, site, and project characteristics. A discussion of the project objectives, intended uses of the Draft EIR, responsible agencies, and approvals that are needed for the proposed project are also provided.
- Section 4: Environmental Impact Analysis. This section analyzes the environmental impacts of the proposed project. Impacts are organized into major topic areas. Each topic area includes a description of the environmental setting, methodology, significance criteria, impacts, mitigation measures, and significance after mitigation. The specific environmental topics that are addressed within Section 4 are as follows:
 - Section 4.1 Aesthetics, Light, and Glare: Addresses the potential visual impacts of development intensification and the overall increase in illumination produced by the proposed project.
 - Section 4.2 Agricultural Resources: Addresses the project's potential conversion of Important Farmland to non-agricultural use, as well as potential conflicts with Williamson Act contracts and agricultural zoning.

- Section 4.3 Air Quality: Addresses the project's potential air quality impacts associated with project implementation, including consistency with the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District's Air Quality Management Plan. In addition, the section also evaluates project emissions of greenhouse gases.
- Section 4.4 Biological Resources: Addresses the proposed project's potential impacts on habitat, vegetation, and wildlife; the potential degradation or elimination of important habitat; and impacts on listed, proposed, and candidate threatened and endangered species.
- Section 4.5 Cultural Resources: Addresses the potential impacts of project development on known historical resources and potential archaeological and paleontological resources.
- Section 4.6 Geology, Soils, and Seismicity: Addresses the potential impacts the proposed project may have on soils and assesses the effects of project development in relation to geologic and seismic conditions.
- Section 4.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials: Addresses the potential for the presence of hazardous materials or conditions on the project site and in the project area that may have the potential to impact human health.
- Section 4.8 Hydrology and Water Quality: Addresses the potential impacts of the proposed project on local hydrological conditions, including drainage areas, and changes in the flow rates.
- Section 4.9 Land Use: Addresses the potential land use impacts associated with division of an established community and consistency with the 2007 City of Selma General Plan, the 2035 City of Selma General Plan, the Selma City Code, and the Fresno County Local Agency Formation Commission annexation criteria.
- Section 4.10 Noise: Addresses the potential noise impacts during construction and at project buildout from mobile and stationary sources. The section also addresses the impact of noise generation on neighboring uses.
- Section 4.11 Public Services and Utilities: Addresses the potential impacts upon service providers, including fire protection, police protection, water supply, wastewater, solid waste, and energy providers.
- Section 4.12 Transportation: Addresses the impacts on the local and regional roadway system, public transportation, bicycle, and pedestrian access.
- Section 4.13 Urban Decay: Addresses the project's potential to cause urban decay, which is physical deterioration that is so prevalent and substantial it impairs the proper utilization of affected real estate or the health, safety and welfare of the surrounding community.
- Section 5: Alternatives to the Proposed Project. This section compares the impacts of the proposed project with three land-use project alternatives: the No Project Alternative, the Northeast Area Alternative, the Northeast Area and South Area Alternative, and the Northwest

Area Alternative. An environmentally superior alternative is identified. In addition, alternatives initially considered but rejected from further consideration are discussed.

- Section 6: Other CEQA Considerations. This section provides a summary of significant environmental impacts, including unavoidable and growth-inducing impacts. This section discusses the cumulative impacts associated with the proposed project, including the impacts of past, present, and probable future projects. In addition, the proposed project's energy demand is discussed.
- Section 7: Effects Found Not To Be Significant. This section contains analysis of the topical sections not addressed in Section 4.
- Section 8: Persons and Organizations Consulted. This section contains a full list of persons and organizations that were consulted during the preparation of this Draft EIR.
- Section 9: List of Preparers. This section lists the authors who assisted in the preparation of the Draft EIR, by name and affiliation.
- Section 10: References. This section contains a full list of references that were used in the preparation of this Draft EIR.
- **Appendices:** This section includes all notices and other procedural documents pertinent to the Draft EIR, as well as all technical material prepared to support the analysis.

1.4 - Documents Incorporated by Reference

As permitted by CEQA Guidelines Section 15150, this Draft EIR has referenced several technical studies, analyses, and previously certified environmental documentation. Information from the documents, which have been incorporated by reference, has been briefly summarized in the appropriate section(s). The relationship between the incorporated part of the referenced document and the Draft EIR has also been described. The documents and other sources that have been used in the preparation of this Draft EIR include, but are not limited to:

- City of Selma General Plan 1997 Update (2007 General Plan)
- City of Selma General Plan 2035 Update (2035 General Plan)
- Selma City Code
- City of Selma Storm Drainage Master Plan

These documents are specifically identified in Section 10, References, of this Draft EIR. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15150(b), the 2007 General Plan, the 2035 General Plan, and the Selma City Code, and the referenced documents and other sources used in the preparation of the Draft EIR are available for review at the Selma City office at the address shown in Section 1.6.

1.5 - Technical Studies Prepared for the Project

The following technical studies and analyses were prepared for the proposed project:

- Agricultural Land Conversion Model, prepared by Michael Brandman Associates (Appendix B)
- Air Quality Analysis, prepared by Michael Brandman Associates. (The analysis is wholly contained in Section 4.3, Air Quality; modeling data is provided in Appendix C.)
- Biological Reconnaissance Survey, prepared by Halstead & Associates (Appendix D-1)
- Biological Resources Assessment, prepared by Michael Brandman Associates (Appendix D-2)
- Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment, prepared by Michael Brandman Associates (Appendix E)
- Geotechnical Feasibility Study, prepared by Geomatrix (Appendix F)
- Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, prepared by Sims & Associates, LLC (Appendix G).
- Selma Crossings Draft Storm Drainage Master Plan, prepared by Blair, Church, & Flynn Consulting Engineers (Appendix H).
- Noise Analysis, prepared by Brown, Buntin Associates, Inc. (Appendix I)
- Water Supply Assessment, prepared by California Water Service Company (Appendix J)
- Traffic Impact Study, prepared by Peters Engineering (Appendix L)
- Urban Decay Analysis, prepared by Economic & Planning Systems, Inc. (Appendix M)

1.6 - Review of the Draft EIR

Upon completion of the Draft EIR, the City of Selma filed a Notice of Completion (NOC) with the State Office of Planning and Research to begin the public review period (Public Resources Code, Section 21161). Concurrent with the NOC, this Draft EIR has been distributed to responsible and trustee agencies, other affected agencies, surrounding cities, and interested parties, as well as all parties requesting a copy of the Draft EIR in accordance with Public Resources Code 21092(b)(3). During the public review period, the Draft EIR, including the technical appendices, is available for review at the City of Selma offices and the Fresno County Library, Selma Branch. The addresses for each location are provided below:

City of Selma City Clerk 1710 Tucker Street Selma, CA 93662 Hours: Monday – Thursday: 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. (Closed between 12 p.m. and 1 p.m.) Fresno County Library, Selma Branch 2200 Selma Street Selma, CA 93662 Hours: Monday – Thursday: 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. Friday and Saturday: 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. The Draft EIR is also posted in electronic format on the City of Selma's website: www.Cityofselma.com.

Agencies, organizations, and interested parties have the opportunity to comment on the Draft EIR during the 45-day public review period. Written comments on this Draft EIR should be addressed to:

City Manager City of Selma 1710 Tucker Street Selma, CA 93662 Attn: Selma Crossings EIR Phone: 559.891.2200 Fax: 559.896.1068 Email: selmacrossings@cityofselma.com

Submittal of electronic comments in Microsoft Word or Adobe PDF format is encouraged. Upon completion of the public review period, written responses to all significant environmental issues raised will be prepared and made available for review by the commenting agencies at least 10 days prior to the public hearing before the Selma City Council on the project, at which the certification of the Final EIR will be considered. Comments received and the responses to comments will be included as part of the record for consideration by decision makers for the project.

SECTION 2: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 - Purpose

This Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) is prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts associated with the implementation of Selma Crossings Project (State Clearinghouse No. 2007071008). This document is prepared in conformance with CEQA (California Public Resources Code, Section 21000, et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000, et seq.).

The purpose of this Draft EIR is to inform decision makers, representatives of affected and responsible agencies, the public, and other interested parties of the potential environmental effects that may result from implementation of the proposed project. This Draft EIR describes potential impacts relating to a wide variety of environmental issues and methods by which these impacts can be mitigated or avoided.

2.2 - Project Summary

2.2.1 - Project Location

The project site is located in the unincorporated Fresno County, California, adjacent to the Selma city limits. The project site consists of 13 parcels within three separate areas totaling 288 gross acres located generally at the State Route 99 (SR-99)/E. Mountain View Avenue interchange.

2.2.2 - Project Description

The proposed project consists of the phased development of approximately 3.45 million square feet of commercial retail, office, visitor-serving commercial, and residential uses on approximately 288 acres in the City of Selma. Development and land use activities are summarized by phase:

- Northeast Area (Phase 1): 882,003 square feet of commercial retail uses on 75.75 acres
- South Area (Phase 2): 1,431,200 square feet of commercial retail, automall, office, and visitor-serving commercial uses on 124.35 acres. This phase would include a 20-acre stormwater basin.
- Northwest Area (Phase 3): 1,136,000 square feet of commercial retail, residential, and office uses on net 66.60 acres

Project buildout would occur over a 12-year period.

The project site would be annexed into the City of Selma and the Selma-Kingsburg-Fowler County Sanitation District. Associated with these annexations, two adjacent areas ("East" and "West"

Annexation Areas) would also be considered for inclusion in the Selma city limits and Selma-Kingsburg-Fowler County Sanitation District service area.

2.2.3 - Project Objectives

The objectives of the proposed project are to:

- Promote economic growth through new capital investment, job creation, and an expanded tax base.
- Create a range of new local employment opportunities including entry-level and career positions.
- Phase new development in a logical and orderly manner that promotes land use compatibility and avoids premature conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural use.
- Provide new regional commercial retail uses that meet the current unmet demand of consumers residing within the Trade Area as well as future demand from planned population growth.
- Develop office space to attract professional employment opportunities that also increases the availability of professional services to the community.
- Develop visitor-serving lodging and recreational uses that cater to travelers on the SR-99 corridor
- Maintain and enhance Selma's status as a regional node for automotive sales on the SR-99 corridor.
- Develop attractive, high-quality commercial land uses that are unique and compatible with the local character.
- Provide mixed-use development with housing above retail to create a vibrant atmosphere that promotes pedestrian activity.
- Develop the site at an intensity that most efficiently utilizes the infrastructure available to be constructed as part of the project.

2.3 - Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

The proposed project would result in the following significant unavoidable impacts:

• **Important Farmland:** The proposed project would convert Important Farmland to nonagricultural use. Although mitigation is proposed that would require the applicant to preserve Important Farmland elsewhere in Fresno County, it would not fully mitigate the impact to a level of less than significant. Therefore, the residual significance of this impact is significant and unavoidable.

- Air Quality Plan: The proposed project would generate sources of construction and operational emissions that would exceed San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District thresholds and, thus, be in conflict with the Air Quality Plan. Mitigations are proposed requiring the implementation of emissions reduction measures; however, due to the uncertainty of the effectiveness of certain measures, the residual significance of this impact is significant and unavoidable.
- Air Quality Standards / Violations: The proposed project would generate sources of construction and operational emissions that would exceed San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District thresholds. Mitigations are proposed requiring the implementation of emissions reduction measures; however, due to the uncertainty of the effectiveness of certain measures, the residual significance of this impact is significant and unavoidable.
- Noise Levels in Excess of Standards: The proposed project would generate new vehicle trips that would expose sensitive land uses along roadways in the project vicinity to excessive noise levels. Mitigation is proposed requiring the applicant to offer to construct soundwalls or replace existing windows and doors with sound-rated assemblies; however, it would not fully mitigate the impact to a level of less than significant. Therefore, the residual significance of this impact is significant and unavoidable.
- **Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels:** The proposed project would generate new vehicle trips that would expose sensitive land uses along roadways to permanent increase in ambient noise levels. Mitigation is proposed requiring the applicant to offer to construct soundwalls or replace existing windows and doors with sound-rated assemblies; however, it would not fully mitigate the impact to a level of less than significant. Therefore, the residual significance of this impact is significant and unavoidable.
- Existing Plus Phase I Traffic Conditions: The proposed project would generate new vehicle trips that would contribute to unacceptable intersection, roadway segment, and railroad grade crossing operations under Existing Plus Phase I Traffic Conditions. Mitigation is proposed requiring the applicant to install traffic improvements or provide fair-share fees for the construction of such improvements; however, it would not fully mitigate the impact to a level of less than significant. Therefore, the residual significance of this impact is significant and unavoidable.
- Year 2020 Traffic Conditions: The proposed project would generate new vehicle trips that would contribute to unacceptable intersection, roadway segment, and railroad grade crossing operations under Year 2020 Traffic Conditions. Mitigation is proposed requiring the applicant to install traffic improvements or provide fair share fees for the construction of such improvements; however, it would not fully mitigate the impact to a level of less than significant. Therefore, the residual significance of this impact is significant and unavoidable.
- Year 2035 Traffic Conditions: The proposed project would generate new vehicle trips that would contribute to unacceptable intersection, roadway segment, and railroad grade crossing

operations under Year 2035 Traffic Conditions. Mitigation is proposed requiring the applicant to install traffic improvements or provide fair-share fees for the construction of such improvements; however, it would not fully mitigate the impact to a level of less than significant. Therefore, the residual significance of this impact is significant and unavoidable.

2.4 - Summary of Project Alternatives

Below is a summary of the alternatives to the proposed project considered in Section 5, Alternatives to the Proposed Project. In addition, alternatives that were initially considered but ultimately rejected are discussed in Section 5, Alternatives to the Proposed Project.

2.4.1 - No Project/No Development Alternative

The project site would remain in its existing condition and no new development would occur.

2.4.2 - Northeast Area Alternative

The Northeast Area, which consists of 882,003 square feet on 75.75 net acres, would be developed; the South Area and the Northwest Area would be eliminated.

2.4.3 - Northeast Area and South Area Alternative

The Northeast Area, which consists of 882,003 square feet on 75.75 net acres, and South Area, which consists of 1,431,200 square feet on 124.35 net acres would be developed; the Northwest Area would be eliminated.

2.4.4 - Northwest Area Alternative

The Northwest Area, which consists of 1,136,000 square feet on 66.60 net acres, would be developed; the Northeast Area and South Area would be eliminated. The Northwest Area Alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

2.5 - Areas of Controversy

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(b), a summary section must address areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public, and it must also address issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate the significant effects.

The City of Selma issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the proposed project on June 28, 2007, which circulated between June 28, 2007 and July 19, 2007 for the statutory 30-day public review period. Following release of the 2007 NOP, the project applicant amended the project application, which involved substantial changes to the project components. As such, a Re-Released NOP was issued on November 9, 2010, which circulated between November 9, 2010 and December 24, 2010.

Both NOPs identified the potential for significant impacts on the environment related to the following topical areas:

- Aesthetics, Light, and Glare
- Agricultural Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology, Soils, and Seismicity
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials

2.5.1 - Disagreement Among Experts

- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use
- Noise
- Public Services and Utilities
- Transportation
- Urban Decay

This Draft EIR contains substantial evidence to support all the conclusions presented herein. It is possible that there will be disagreement among various parties regarding these conclusions, although the City of Selma is not aware of any disputed conclusions at the time of this writing. Both the CEQA Guidelines and case law clearly provide the standards for treating disagreement among experts. Where evidence and opinions conflict on an issue concerning the environment, and the lead agency knows of these controversies in advance, the EIR must acknowledge the controversies, summarize the conflicting opinions of the experts, and include sufficient information to allow the public and decision makers to make an informed judgment about the environmental consequences of the proposed project.

2.5.2 - Potentially Controversial Issues

Below are a list of potentially controversial issues that may be raised during the public review and hearing process of this Draft EIR.

- Aesthetics and Visual Character
- Agricultural Land Conversion
- Biological Resources
- Criteria Pollutant Air Emissions
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hydrology and Water Quality

- Land Use
- Construction and Operational Noise
- Public Services
- Traffic Congestion
- Urban Decay
- Williamson Act Contract Cancellation

2.6 - Public Review of the Draft EIR

Upon completion of the Draft EIR, the City of Selma filed a Notice of Completion (NOC) with the State Office of Planning and Research to begin the public review period (Public Resources Code, Section 21161). Concurrent with the NOC, this Draft EIR has been distributed to responsible and trustee agencies, other affected agencies, and interested parties, as well as all parties requesting a copy of the Draft EIR in accordance with Public Resources Code 21092(b)(3). During the public

review period, the Draft EIR, including the technical appendices, is available for review at the City of Selma offices and the Fresno County Library, Selma Branch. The address for each location is provided below:

City of Selma City Clerk 1710 Tucker Street Selma, CA 93662 Hours: Monday – Thursday: 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. (Closed between 12 p.m. and 1 p.m.) Fresno County Library, Selma Branch 2200 Selma Street Selma, CA 93662 Hours: Monday – Thursday: 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. Friday and Saturday: 10 a.m. to 5 p.m.

The Draft EIR is also posted in electronic format on the City of Selma's website: www.Cityofselma.com.

Agencies, organizations, and interested parties have the opportunity to comment on the Draft EIR during the public review period. Written comments on this Draft EIR should be addressed to:

City of Selma 1710 Tucker Street Selma, CA 93662 Attn: Selma Crossings EIR Phone: (559) 891-2200 Fax: (559) 896-1068 Email: selmacrossings@cityofselma.com

Submittal of electronic comments in Microsoft Word or Adobe PDF format is encouraged. Upon completion of the public review period, written responses to all significant environmental issues raised will be prepared and made available for review by the commenting agencies at least 10 days prior to the public hearing before the Selma City Council on the project, at which the certification of the Final EIR will be considered. Comments received and the responses to comments will be included as part of the record for consideration by decision makers for the project.

2.7 - Executive Summary Matrix

Table 2-1 below summarizes the impacts, mitigation measures, and resulting level of significance after mitigation for the relevant environmental issue areas evaluated for the proposed project. The table is intended to provide an overview; narrative discussions for the issue areas are included in the corresponding section of this EIR. Table 2-1 is included in the EIR as required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(b)(1).

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Section 4.1 – Aesthetics, Light, and Glare		
Impact AES-1: The proposed project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Impact AES-2: The proposed project may create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	MM AES-2: Prior to issuance of building permits for the proposed project, the applicant shall provide a lighting plan for the City of Selma to review and approve. The plan shall include provisions to ensure that outdoor lighting is designed so that potential glare or light spillover to surrounding land uses is minimized through appropriate site design and shielding of light fixtures (e.g., full cut-off fixtures). The City will review the final site design plans to ensure that all lighting is directed downward and away from residences, and surrounding land uses. This mitigation measure does not preclude the use of small-scale decorative lighting that may be directed upward, such as wall wash lighting or spot lighting for landscaping. This type of lighting is allowed if it does not spill over onto adjacent roadways or properties.	Less than significant impact.
Section 4.2 – Agricultural Resources		
Impact AG-1: The proposed project may result in the conversion of Important Farmland to non-agricultural use.	 MM AG-1: At the time of development of each phase, the project applicant shall preserve Important Farmland acreage (i.e., Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance), as mapped by the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, within Fresno County (but outside the Selma Planning Area) at a ratio of no less than 1:1 for each acre of Important Farmland converted to non-agricultural use by the proposed project. Preserved acreage shall be of equal or higher quality than farmland converted to non-agricultural use. The preservation shall be accomplished through one of the following approaches: The applicant shall pay fees to the City of Selma equivalent to the cost of preserving Important Farmland. The City shall use the fees to fund an irrevocable instrument (e.g., deed restriction or preservation easements) to permanently preserve farmland via a Trust for Farmland Funds Disbursements. This option shall be 	Significant unavoidable impact.

Table 2-1: Executive Summary Matrix

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	 pursued if the City of Selma has a farmland preservation program in place at the time permits are sought. The applicant shall enter into a binding agreement with one or more private property owners or third-party organizations acceptable to the City of Selma (e.g., Fresno County Farm Bureau or the American Farmland Trust) to permanently preserve farmland. The agreement shall identify an irrevocable instrument that will be recorded against the preserved acreage property. This option shall be pursued if the City of Selma does not have a farmland preservation program in place at the time permits are sought. This latter approach may be implemented in conjunction with Mitigation Measure BIO 1d. 	
Impact AG-2: The proposed project may conflict with an active Williamson Act Contract.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Impact AG-3: The proposed project would not create other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Section 4.3 – Air Quality		
Impact AIR-1: The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.	Implement Mitigation Measures AIR-2a, AIR-2b, AIR-2c, TRANS-6a, TRANS-6b, and TRANS-6.	Significant unavoidable impact.
Impact AIR-2: The proposed project would violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.	 Implement Mitigation Measure TRANS-6a, TRANS-6b, TRANS-6c, and: MM AIR-2a: During construction activities involving architectural coatings, the reactive organic gases/volatile organic compounds limit shall not exceed 127 grams of ROG/VOC/liter. MM AIR-2b: Prior to issuance of building permits, the City of Selma shall verify that the following air emissions reduction measures are depicted on building plans: Provide a pedestrian-friendly and interconnected streetscape to make walking more convenient, comfortable, and safe (including appropriate signalization and signage requirements). Provide good access to/from the development for pedestrians, 	Significant unavoidable impact.

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	bicyclists, and transit users.	
	3. Provide connections to bicycle routes/lanes in the vicinity of the project.	
	4. Provide shade tree planting in parking lots to reduce evaporative emissions from parked vehicles. The landscaping design shall provide 50 percent tree coverage within 10 years of construction using low ROG-emitting, low-maintenance, native drought-resistant trees.	
	5. Use native plants that require minimal watering and are low ROG-emitting.	
	6. Provide easements or land dedications and construct bikeways and pedestrian walkways as part of roadway improvements along the project frontage.	
	7. Implement onsite circulation design elements in parking lots to reduce vehicle queuing and improve the pedestrian environment.	
	8. Provide employee lockers in buildings with a minimum of 50 employees.	
	9. Plant drought-tolerant native shade trees along southern exposures of buildings to reduce energy used to cool buildings in summer.	
	10. Provide and maintain a kiosk displaying transportation information in a prominent area accessible to employees and patrons.	
	11. Implement a Transportation Choice Program to reduce employee commute trips. The applicant shall work with Rideshare for free consulting services on how to start and maintain a program.	
	MM AIR-2c: Prior to approval of the final City discretionary approval for individual projects within Selma Crossings, the applicant shall provide the Selma Planning Department with a copy of an approved Air Impact Assessment Application as evidence of compliance with Rule 9510 Indirect Source Review.	
Impact AIR-3: The proposed project would not violate ambient carbon monoxide (CO) standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation of CO standards.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact AIR-4: The proposed project may expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	MM AIR-4: Prior to approval of site plans for Phase 3, the applicant shall identify the location of any residential units and their distance from State Route 99. If any units are proposed at a distance less than 500 feet from State Route 99, the applicant shall provide a health risk assessment to determine if any units would be exposed to risks exceeding the SJVAPCD threshold of significance of 10 in a million, and if necessary, provide mitigation measures to reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels. Such measures may include Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC) systems or use of tree species such as redwood, deodar, or live oak that can filter out particulate matter	Less than significant impact.
Impact AIR-5: The proposed project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Impact AIR-6: The proposed project would not significantly impact receptors by disturbing naturally occurring asbestos.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Impact AIR-7: The proposed project would result in an increase in greenhouse gas emissions that would significantly hinder or delay the State's ability to meet the reduction targets contained in AB 32.	 Implement Mitigation Measures AIR-2a, AIR-2b, PSU-3a, PSU-3b, and: MM AIR-7a: Prior to issuance of building permits for each building, the project applicant shall prepare and submit plans to the City of Selma that demonstrate the use of light-colored "cool" roofs. The approved plans shall be incorporated into the proposed project. MM AIR-7b: Prior to issuance of building permits for each building, the project applicant shall prepare and submit plans to the City of Selma that demonstrate the use of energy efficient lighting, (including light emitting diodes) for outdoor lighting. The approved plans shall be incorporated into the proposed project. MM AIR-7c: Prior to issuance of building permits for each building, the project applicant shall prepare and submit plans to the City of Selma that demonstrate the use of energy efficient lighting, (including light emitting diodes) for outdoor lighting. The approved plans shall be incorporated into the proposed project. MM AIR-7c: Prior to issuance of building permits for each building, the project applicant shall prepare and submit plans to the City of Selma that demonstrate that project building sexceed the latest adopted edition of the Title 24 energy efficiency standards by a minimum of 10 percent. The approved plans shall be incorporated into the proposed project. 	Significant and unavoidable impact.
Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
---	--	--
	 MM AIR-7d: Prior to issuance of building permits for each building, the project applicant shall prepare and submit plans to the City of Selma that demonstrate that building designs shall incorporate "solar ready" roofs that provide conduits for future solar installation, minimize shade obstructions, and optimize sunlight exposure. The approved plans shall be incorporated into the proposed project. MM AIR-7e: Prior to issuance of building permits for each building, the project applicant shall prepare and submit plans to the City of Selma that demonstrate that shade tree planting in parking lots can achieve 50 percent shade coverage within 15 years of planting. The approved plans shall be incorporated into the proposed project. 	
Impact AIR-8: The proposed project may be subject to significant adverse effects as a result of global climate change.	Implement Mitigation Measures PSU-3a and PSU-3b.	Less than significant impact.
Section 4.4 – Biological Resources		
Impact BIO-1: The proposed project may have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on certain species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.	MM BIO-1a: If tree or vegetation removal occurs during the nesting season (February 15 to August 31), no more than 5 days prior to any ground-disturbing activities for each phase or any further subdivision thereof, including vegetation removal or grading, the project applicant will retain a qualified biologist to conduct a nesting bird survey to determine if nests are active or occupied onsite. If passerine birds are found to be nesting, or there is evidence of nesting behavior within 250 feet of the impact area, a 250-foot buffer shall be established around the nests. For raptor species—birds of prey such as hawks and owls—this buffer shall be 500 feet, whereas for special-status raptor species (such as Swainson's hawk), the buffer shall be 0.5 mile. A qualified biologist shall monitor the nests, and construction activities may commence within the buffer area at the discretion and presence of the biological monitor. No preconstruction survey for nesting birds are required if construction activities occur outside of the nesting bird season (September 1 through February 14).	Less than significant impact.

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	biologist shall conduct a 30-day pre-construction burrowing owl survey to determine the presence or absence of this species. If burrowing owls are determined to be present, mitigation measures for potential impacts to this species shall follow the guidelines outlined by the Burrowing Owl Consortium (BOC), including passive relocation.	
	MM BIO-1c: If construction activities occur during the Swainson's hawk nesting season (March 1 through September 15), a nesting raptor survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist on the project site and within a 250-foot buffer of the project site 5 days prior to construction activities for each phase or any further subdivision thereof. Should an active nest be identified, the CDFG shall be contacted to determine avoidance and mitigation measures pursuant to the California Department of Fish and Game's Mitigation Guidelines for Swainson's Hawk.	
	MM BIO-1d: Prior to issuance of grading permits for each phase or any further subdivision thereof, the applicant shall provide documentation to the City of Selma demonstrating that Swainson's hawk foraging habitat mitigation has been obtained at a ratio of 0.75 acre for each 1.00 acre of suitable foraging habitat developed. "Suitable foraging habitat" consists of fallow fields that would be affected by construction activities. Land planted as vineyards shall not be treated as suitable foraging habitat pursuant to the guidance in the Mitigation Guidelines for Swainson's Hawk. The applicant shall mitigate for the loss of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat through (1) payment of fees for offsite preservation of foraging habitat to a resource agency or a third-party organization acceptable to a resource agency or (2) acquisition of an irrevocable instrument (e.g., deed restriction or easement) for preservation of foraging habitat on a property that provides equal or greater quality habitat. This mitigation measure may be coordinated with Mitigation Measure AG-1.	
	MM BIO-1e: Prior to ground-disturbing activities for each phase or any further subdivision thereof, a qualified biologist shall conduct a 30-day pre-construction San Joaquin kit fox survey to identify any potential kit fox species or denning locations. If kit foxes or kit fox dens are detected, a qualified biologist shall contact USFWS and implement the USFWS's Standard Recommendations for the	

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	Protection of the San Joaquin Kit Fox Prior to or During Ground Disturbance.	
Impact BIO-2: The proposed project would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Section 4.5 – Cultural Resources		
Impact CUL-1: Ground-disturbing activities associated with the proposed project may result in damage or destruction of previously undiscovered historic resources.	MM CUL-1: If a potentially significant cultural resource is encountered during subsurface excavation for the project, all construction activities within a 50-foot radius of the find shall cease until a qualified archaeologist determines whether the resource requires further study. The City shall require the project applicant to include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement. Any previously undiscovered resources found during construction shall be recorded on appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms and evaluated for significance in terms of California Environmental Quality Act criteria by a qualified archaeologist. Potentially significant cultural resources could consist of but are not limited to stone, bone, glass, ceramic, wood, or shell artifacts; fossils; or features including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites. If the resource is determined significant under CEQA, the qualified archaeologist shall prepare and implement a research design and archaeological data recovery plan that will capture those categories of data for which the site is significant. The archaeologist shall also conduct appropriate technical analyses, prepare a comprehensive report and file it with the appropriate Information Center, and provide for the permanent curation of the recovered materials"	Less than significant impact.
Impact CUL-2: Ground-disturbing activities associated with the proposed project may result in damage or destruction of previously undiscovered archaeological resources.	MM CUL-2: If deposits of prehistoric or historical archaeological materials are encountered during subsurface earthwork activities, all work within 50 feet of the resource shall cease until a qualified archaeologist can determine the significance of the find. The resource shall be evaluated for eligibility for listing on the California Register and recommendations made. The identified resource shall be avoided by project activities during evaluation. If the resource is	Less than significant impact.

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	not considered eligible, avoidance is not necessary. If the resource is considered eligible, they shall be avoided or any unavoidable adverse effects must be mitigated. Upon completion of the archaeologist's evaluation, a report shall be prepared documenting the methods and results, as well as recommendations. The report shall be submitted to the City and the Southern San Joaquin Valley Inventory Center. The recommendations of the archaeologist shall be incorporated into construction plans.	
Impact CUL-3: Ground-disturbing activities associated with the proposed project may result in damage or destruction of previously undiscovered paleontological resources.	MM CUL-3: If animal or plant fossils are encountered during subsurface earthwork activities, all work within 50 feet of the discovery shall cease until a qualified paleontologist has determined the significance of the find and provides recommendations. Project personnel shall not collect or remove any paleontological material. If the paleontological finds are found to be significant, the area shall be avoided by project activities. The recommendations of the paleontologist shall be incorporated into construction plans.	Less than significant impact.
Impact CUL-4: The proposed project would not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.	MM CUL-4: If human remains are encountered during excavations associated with this project, all work will halt, and the Fresno County Coroner will be notified (Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code). The Coroner will determine whether the remains are of forensic interest. If the coroner, with the aid of the supervising archaeologist, determines that the remains are prehistoric, he/she will contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC will be responsible for designating the most likely descendant (MLD), who will be responsible for the ultimate disposition of the remains, as required by Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code. The MLD will make his/her recommendations within 48 hours of their notification by the NAHC. This recommendation may include scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials (Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code).	Less than significant impact.

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Section 4.6 – Geology, Soils, and Seismicity		
Impact GEO-1: The development of the proposed project would not expose persons or structures to seismic hazards.	MM GEO-1: Prior to issuance of building permits for the first building in each phase, the project applicant shall submit a design- level geotechnical report to the City of Selma for review and approval. The report shall demonstrate that the proposed project's plans for that structure incorporate all applicable seismic design standards of the latest adopted edition of the California Building Standards Code. The recommendations from the approved design- level geotechnical report shall be incorporated into the project plans, and the project applicant shall adhere to these approved plans in developing the project.	Less than significant impact.
Impact GEO-2: Construction activities associated with the proposed project have the potential to create erosion and sedimentation.	Implement Mitigation Measure HYD-1a in Section 4.7, Hydrology and Water Quality.	Less than significant impact.
Impact GEO-3: The proposed project may expose persons or structures to hazards associated with unstable geologic units or soils.	Implement Mitigation Measure GEO-1.	Less than significant impact.
Impact GEO-4: The proposed project would not expose persons or structures to hazards associated with expansive soils.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Section 4.7 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials		
Impact HAZ-1: The proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Impact HAZ-2: Development of the proposed project may have the potential to expose human health and the environment to hazardous materials associated with past or present site usage.	MM HAZ-2a: Prior to issuance of grading permits within the Northwest Area, the project applicant shall consult with the United States Environmental Protection Agency and the California Department of Toxic Substances Control regarding the hexavalent chromium plume associated with the Selma Pressure Treatment Site. The consultation shall address (1) appropriate liability indemnification and (2) access agreements to the extraction system	Less than significant impact.

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	wells. Documentation shall be provided to the City of Selma reflecting the outcome of the consultation and recorded in the final map. MM HAZ-2b: Prior to issuance of grading permits within the Northeast Area, the project applicant shall retain a qualified consultant to investigate the potential presence of the Tidewater Associated Oil Company pipeline and associated residual weathered crude oil along the Golden State Boulevard frontage. The investigation shall include a field survey to determine the presence or absence of the pipeline or residual weathered crude oil. If either is encountered, the applicant shall develop an abatement plan in consultation with Chevron Environmental Management and implement it prior to earthwork activities within the affected area. The applicant shall submit documentation as part of the grading permit application demonstrating that this mitigation measure has been successfully completed.	
	MM HAZ-2c: Prior to issuance of demolition permits for any structures located on the project site, the project applicant shall retain a certified hazardous waste contractor to properly remove and dispose of all materials containing asbestos and lead paint in accordance with federal and state law. The applicant shall submit documentation to the City of Selma demonstrating that this contractor has been retained part of the demolition permit application. Upon completion of removal and disposal, the project applicant shall provide documentation to the City of Selma demonstrating that these activities were successfully completed.	
	MM HAZ-2d: Prior to issuance of grading permits for any portion of the project site that involved cultivated agricultural uses within the previous 5 years, the project applicant shall retain a qualified consultant to assess the affected soils for the presence of residual concentrations of agricultural chemicals. Soils shall be laboratory tested for organochlorine pesticides in accordance with California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) guidelines. If the laboratory testing yields concentrations in excess of acceptable limits for commercial development, the project applicant shall retain a qualified contractor to perform soil remediation in accordance with DTSC guidelines. The soil remediation activities shall be completed prior to grading activities. The applicant shall submit documentation	

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	 to the City of Selma demonstrating that soil testing was performed and any necessary remediation was completed as part of the grading permit application. MM HAZ-2e: Prior to issuance of grading permits for any of the project uses, the project applicant shall retain a qualified consultant 	
	to investigate the potential presence of aboveground storage tanks or underground storage tanks within the project site. The investigation shall include a field survey to determine the presence or absence of these vessels. If one or more vessels are encountered, the applicant shall retain a qualified contractor to remove the vessel(s) in accordance with state and federal requirements. If necessary, soil	
	testing and abatement measures shall be performed in conjunction with vessel removal. The applicant shall submit documentation to the City of Selma demonstrating that investigation was performed and any necessary remediation was completed as part of the grading permit application.	
Section 4.8 – Hydrology and Water Quality		
Impact HYD-1: Construction activities associated with the proposed project may degrade water quality in downstream water bodies.	 MM HYD-1a: Prior to the issuance of the first grading permit or building permit for each phase or any further subdivision thereof (whichever occurs first) for the project, the project applicant shall prepare and submit a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to the Central Valley RWQCB that identifies specific actions and Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent stormwater pollution during construction activities to the maximum extent practicable. The City of Selma shall confirm that the RWQCB has approved the SWPPP prior to issuance of the grading permit or building permit (whichever occurs first). The SWPPP shall identify a practical sequence for BMP implementation and maintenance, site restoration, contingency measures, responsible parties, and agency contacts. The SWPPP shall include but not be limited to the following elements: Temporary erosion control measures shall be employed for disturbed areas. No disturbed surfaces shall be left without erosion control measures in place during the winter and spring months. 	Less than significant impact.

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	• Sediment shall be retained onsite by a system of sediment basins, traps, or other appropriate measures.	
	• The construction contractor shall prepare Standard Operating Procedures for the handling of hazardous materials on the construction site to eliminate or reduce discharge of materials to storm drains.	
	• BMP performance and effectiveness shall be determined either by visual means where applicable (e.g., observation of above-normal sediment release), or by actual water sampling in cases where verification of contaminant reduction or elimination (such as inadvertent petroleum release) is required by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board to determine adequacy of the measure.	
	• In the event of significant construction delays or delays in final landscape installation, native grasses or other appropriate vegetative cover shall be established on the construction site as soon as possible after disturbance, as an interim erosion control measure throughout the wet season.	
	MM HYD-1b: Prior to the issuance of the first building permit for each phase or any further subdivision thereof, the project applicant shall submit a stormwater quality management plan to the City of Selma for review and approval. The stormwater quality management plan shall identify pollution prevention measures and practices to prevent polluted runoff from leaving the project site. Examples of stormwater pollution prevention measures and practices to be contained in the plan include but are not limited to:	
	• Strategically placed bioswales and landscaped areas that promote percolation of runoff	
	Pervious pavement	
	Roof drains that discharge to landscaped areas	
	Trash enclosures with screen walls and roofs	
	Stenciling on storm drains	
	• Curb cuts in parking areas to allow runoff to enter landscaped	
	 Rock-lined areas along landscaped areas in parking lots 	
	Catch basins	
	• Oil/water separators	

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	• Regular sweeping of parking areas and cleaning of storm drainage facilities	
	• Employee training to inform store personnel of stormwater pollution prevention measures	
	The project applicant shall also prepare and submit an Operations and Maintenance Agreement to the City of Selma for its approval identifying appropriate procedures to ensure that stormwater quality control measures work properly during operations.	
Impact HYD-2: The proposed project would not contribute to groundwater overdraft, interfere with groundwater recharge, or impair groundwater quality.	MM HYD-2a: Prior to recordation of the final map for each phase, the project applicant shall demonstrate that ongoing access for monitoring and remediation can be provided within the Northwest Area for the hexavalent chromium groundwater plume associated with the Selma Pressure Treatment site. Access shall be provided for the life of the project or until the regulatory agency(ies) with jurisdiction over the plume determine that it is no longer necessary.	Less than significant impact.
	MM HYD-2b: Prior to issuance of the first grading permits for each phase, the project applicant shall properly destroy groundwater wells in accordance with state and local regulations. All wells shall be sampled for lubricating oil prior to destruction. If oil is detected in the samples, the affected water shall be removed and disposed of in accordance with federal, state, and local regulations. The applicant shall include documentation verifying that wells were tested and properly destroyed as part of the grading permit application.	
Impact HYD-3: The proposed project would increase impervious surface coverage and may create the potential for downstream flooding.	MM HYD-3a: Prior to recordation of the final map for each phase, the project applicant shall submit the final project-specific Storm Drainage Master Plan to the City of Selma for review and approval. The final plan shall identify onsite drainage facilities that will ensure that runoff from the project site is controlled in manner equivalent to or better than the standards set forth in the latest adopted version of the City of Selma Storm Drainage Master Plan. Once City staff have determined the project-specific Storm Drainage Master Plan to be satisfactory, the City's Storm Drainage Master Plan shall be amended to reflect the relevant provisions of the approved plan into the proposed project plans.	Less than significant impact.

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	 MM HYD-3b: Prior to issuance of the first grading permits for each phase, the project applicant shall prepare a Vector Management Plan for the basin for review and approval by the City of Selma. At a minimum, the Vector Management Plan shall incorporate the Consolidated Mosquito Abatement District's recommendations listed below. The approved plan shall be incorporated into the proposed project. The basin shall be designed and managed in manner that maintains water depths at a minimum of 4 feet to preclude invasive emergent vegetation such as cattails. If water levels are subject to fluctuation during the summer months (mosquito breeding season), the basin shall be constructed to provide a low-flow/sump area to allow water to pond in this area and prevent the growth of invasive emergent vegetation. The low flow/sump area shall be a minimum of 4 feet below the elevation of the basin floor, with the balance of the basin draining to this area. A free and unencumbered roadway shall be provided around the perimeter of the basin. Basin edges shall be maintained and managed in a manner that prevents excess vegetation growth. 	
Impact HYD-4: The proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Section 4.9 – Land Use		
Impact LU-1: The proposed project would be consistent with applicable provisions of the 1997 City of Selma General Plan and the 2035 City of Selma General Plan.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Impact LU-2: The proposed project will not conflict with the applicable ordinances of the Selma City Code.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Impact LU-3: The proposed project would not conflict with any of the applicable policies established by the Fresno County Local Agency Formation Commission.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Section 4.10 – Noise		
Impact NOI-1: The proposed project may result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.	MM NOI-1a: Prior to issuance of building permits for each project use, the project applicant shall prepare and submit building plans to the City of Selma for review and approval demonstrating that appropriate noise attenuation measures have been incorporated to protect nearby sensitive receptors from excessive levels of non-transportation noise sources (mechanical equipment, solid waste and recycling facilities, truck loading areas, etc.). Such noise attenuation measures may include but are not limited to sound walls, landscaped berms, building orientation, setbacks/buffers, and other similar measures. The City of Selma as the discretion to request that the applicant provide calculations to demonstrate that sensitive receptors are protected from excessive levels of non-transportation noise sources on a case-by-case basis. The approved plans shall be incorporated into the project. MM NOI-1b: Prior to issuance of building permits for the first use of each phase, the project applicant shall contact property owners with existing residences within 75 feet of the centerline of the following roadway segments and offer to (1) construct a soundwall along their street frontage or (2) replace existing windows and doors	Significant unavoidable impact.
	 Second Street (east of SR-99 southbound offramp) 	
	 Mountain View Avenue (between McCall Avenue and Mendocino Avenue) 	
	 Dockery Avenue (north and south of Mountain View Avenue) Golden State Boulevard (north and south of Mountain View Avenue; east of Bethel Avenue) 	
	• Bethel Avenue (north of Golden State Avenue)	
	The applicant and property owner have the discretion to mutually determine the timing and cost-sharing arrangements of the sound wall or window/door installation. Property owners also have the option of declining the installation of sound walls, windows, or doors.	
	MM NOI-1c: Prior to issuance of building permits for hotels or residential uses, the project applicant shall prepare and submit building plans to the City of Selma for review and approval	

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	demonstrating compliance with the City's noise standards. Outdoor activity areas (e.g., patios, balconies) shall be exposed to noise levels no greater than 65 dBA L_{dn} and interior areas shall be exposed to noise levels no greater than 45 dBA L_{dn} .	
Impact NOI-2: The proposed project would not result in exposing persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Impact NOI-3: The proposed project may result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.	Implement Mitigation Measure TRANS-1b.	Significant unavoidable impact.
Impact NOI-4: The proposed project may result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.	 MM NOI-4: During construction activities for the proposed project, the applicant shall require its construction contractors to adhere to the following noise attenuation requirements: Construction activities shall be limited to the hours between 6 a.m. and 7 p.m. on weekdays and between 9 a.m. and 7 p.m. on weekends. The City of Selma shall have the discretion to permit construction activities to occur outside of allowable hours if compelling circumstances warrant such an exception (e.g., weather conditions necessary to pour concrete). All construction equipment shall use noise-reduction features (e.g., mufflers and engine shrouds) that are no less effective than those originally installed by the manufacturer. If no noise-reduction features were installed by the manufacturer, then the contractor shall require that at least a muffler be installed on the equipment. Construction staging and heavy equipment maintenance activities shall be performed a minimum distance of 300 feet from the nearest residence, unless safety or technical factors take precedence (e.g., an equipment breakdown). A 10-foot-high construction noise barrier shall be installed along the edge of the project site within 300 feet of any offsite residence prior to start of grading activities. The noise barrier shall either be constructed of a minimum '2-inch plywood or utilize acoustical blankets with a minimum Sound Transmission Class of 12. The 	Less than significant impact.

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	barrier shall remain in place until noise intensive aspects of construction are completed.	
Section 4.11 – Public Services and Utilities		
Impact PSU-1: The proposed project may result in a need for new or expanded fire protection facilities.	 MM PSU-1: Prior to recordation of the final map for Phase 1, the project applicant shall enter into an agreement with the City of Selma to implement one of the following fire protection options: Option A: The developer must dedicate a minimum of 1.5 acres parcel, to be used for a Fire Facility upon or before the issuance of 	Less than significant impact.
	building permits for Phase 1 of the project. Beginning with the issuance of building permits for Phase 1, the developer will contribute compensation equivalent to the cost incurred by the Fire Department to protect any and all structures within or immediately adjacent to the project area. The developer will continue to pay this contribution to the general fund, until the tax revenue generated by the project off sets the burden to the City for providing this public service to the project.	
	 Option B: Enter into an agreement with the Fresno County Fire Protection District to co-habitat Station No. 83 located at 11500 E. Mountain View Avenue as an interim measure. Under this option, two new fire personnel would need to be added to the Selma Fire Department and two existing Fresno County Fire Protection District positions would be used to augment the station staffing. Ultimately, the City may consider purchasing the station from the Fire Protection District if and when the latter agency vacates the area. Should the City or Fire Protection District deem this option unacceptable, Option A shall be pursued. If Option B is pursued, this approach would only be applicable to the Northeast Area (Phase 1). 	
	If Option B is pursued, this approach would only be applicable to the Northeast Area (Phase 1). Option A would need to be fully implemented prior to occupancy of either the South Area (Phase 2) or the Northwest Area (Phase 3).	

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact PSU-2: The proposed project may result in a need for new or expanded police protection facilities.	 MM PSU-2: Prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy for the Northeast Area (Phase 1), the project applicant shall prepare and submit plans to the City of Selma demonstrating that the following police protection facilities and security measures will be implemented: Inclusion of a storefront Police Department substation. 24-hour mobile private security patrols, including the use of golf carts or bicycles where appropriate and feasible. Video surveillance for exterior areas, including parking lot. The video surveillance system would be linked to the City's fiber optic network to allow Police Department personnel to remotely view images. 	Less than significant impact.
Impact PSU-3: The proposed project may result in a need for new water supplies and infrastructure.	 MM PSU-3a: Prior to issuance of building permits for each phase, the project applicant shall submit landscaping plans to the City of Selma for review and approval demonstrating that landscaping will comply with the Model Efficient Landscape Water Ordinance. The landscaping plans shall identify outdoor irrigation water conservation measures, such as but not limited to: Separate metering of irrigation water Drought-resistant vegetation Irrigation systems employing the following features: Drip irrigation Low-precipitation-rate sprinklers Bubbler/soaker systems Programmable irrigation controllers with automatic rain shutoff sensors and flow sensing capabilities Matched precipitation rate nozzles that maximize the uniformity of the water distribution characteristics of the irrigation system Conservative sprinkler spacings that minimize overspray onto paved surfaces Hydrozones that keep plants with similar water needs in the same irrigation zone Minimally or gently sloped landscaped areas to minimize runoff and maximize infiltration Organic topdressing mulch in non-turf areas to decrease evaporation and increase water retention 	Less than significant impact.

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	 MM PSU-3b: Prior to issuance of building permits for each phase, the project applicant shall submit building plans to the City of Selma for review and approval that identify the following indoor water conservation measures: Separate metering of domestic water Low-flow or ultra-low-flow toilets and urinals Sensor-activated, low-flow faucets 	
Impact PSU-4: The proposed project would not exceed Regional Water Quality Control Standards for the treatment of wastewater or require the provision of new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities, and the project will not exceed the capacity of existing wastewater treatment commitments.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Impact PSU-5: The proposed project may require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.	Implement Mitigation Measures HYD-3a and HYD-3b in Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality.	Less than significant impact.
Impact PSU-6: The proposed project may generate substantial amounts of solid waste that exceed the capacity for the landfill or does not comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	 MM PSU-6a: Prior to issuance of building permits for each building, the project applicant shall submit documentation to the City of Selma as part of the permit application demonstrating that construction and demolition debris recycling measures will be incorporated into the proposed project. Such activities shall include the retention of a qualified contractor to perform construction debris recycling with an objective of diverting a minimum of 50 percent of construction debris from the waste stream. MM PSU-6b: Prior to issuance of the final certificates of occupancy for each building, the project applicant shall install onsite facilities necessary to collect and store recyclable materials generated by customers and facility operations. Customer recyclable collection facilities (i.e., receptacles) shall be located in public spaces and clearly identify accepted materials. Facility operations recycling facilities (i.e., bale and pallet storage) shall be located in appropriate places and shall be enclosed for screening purposes. 	Less than significant impact.

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact PSU-7: The proposed project would not result in the inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary consumption of electricity or natural gas.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Section 4.12 – Transportation		
Impact TRANS-1: The proposed project would contribute vehicle trips to intersections, roadway segments, and railroad grade crossings that would operate at unacceptable levels under Existing Plus Phase 1 Conditions.	 `MM TRANS-1a: Prior to recordation of the final map for Phase 1, the project applicant and the City of Selma shall establish a community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism to fund transportation improvements. The City of Selma Planning Department, Selma legal counsel and the applicant must develop the financing mechanism. The financing mechanism shall include a provision allow the "pass through" of transportation-related development fees collected as part of the City of Selma's standard fee schedule to be applied to planned improvements identified by the City's development fee program. Applicants that pursue development pursuant to the final map shall contribute a fair share of the costs of necessary improvements at the time building permits are sought. MM TRANS-1b: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for interim improvements to the Mountain View Avenue/SR-99 Southbound Ramps intersection. The improvements shall consist of the installation of a "teardrop" roundabout with two lanes on the eastbound approach and one lane on the westbound approach. Caltrans shall review and approve the proposed configuration. These improvements shall be programmed into the Community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a. 	Significant unavoidable impact.

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	MM TRANS-1d: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Mountain View Avenue/Golden State Boulevard. The improvements shall consist of (1) two left-turn lanes (minimum 400 feet), two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the eastbound approach; (2) two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and two right-turn lanes on the westbound approach; (3) two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the northbound approach; (4) two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and two right- turn lanes on the southbound approach; and (5) modification of the signal operation to incorporate the pre-signal on the westbound approach required by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1h. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a. MM TRANS-1e: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Mountain View Avenue/Bethel Avenue. The improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left- turn phasing; (2) one left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn on the eastbound approach; (3) one left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn on the westbound approach; (4) one left-turn lane and one through lane with a shared right turn on the northbound approach; and (5) one left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn on the southbound approach; (4) one left-turn lane and one through lane with a shared right turn on the northbound approach; and (5) one left-turn lane and one through lane with a shared right turn on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.	
	MM TRANS-1f: Prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy for Phase 1, the project applicant shall improve the intersection of Phase 1 Site Access/Golden State Boulevard. The improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left-turn phasing; (2) two left-turn lanes and two right-turn lanes on the eastbound approach; (3) two left-turn lanes (minimum 800 feet) and two through lanes on the northbound approach; and (4) two through lanes and a right-turn lane on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be in place prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy of Phase 1.	

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	MM TRANS-1g: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to Mountain View Avenue between SR-99 to Golden State Boulevard. The improvements shall consist of widening Mountain View Avenue between the SR-99 northbound ramps and Golden State Boulevard to four lanes with a median. Transitions to the two-lane portion within the interchange may be accomplished east of the northbound ramps. In the westbound direction, one of the lanes may be trapped as a right-turn lane to northbound SR-99. Caltrans shall review and approve the proposed configuration. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a. MM TRANS-1h: Prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy for Phase I, the project applicant shall improve the Mountain View Avenue railroad grade crossing. The improvements shall consist of (1) installation of a pre-signal on the westbound approach and (2) pedestrian access and safety improvements. This mitigation measure shall be coordinated with the improvements contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1d. This mitigation measure requires approval from the California Public Utilities Commission. The project applicant shall be responsible for the full cost of the improvements.	
Impact TRANS-2: The proposed project would contribute vehicle trips to intersections, roadway segments, and railroad grade crossings that would operate at unacceptable levels under Year 2020 Conditions.	MM TRANS-2a: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Floral Avenue/Highland Avenue. The improvements shall consist of (1) two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the eastbound approach; (2) two left-turn lanes and two through lanes with a shared right turn on the westbound approach; (3) two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the northbound approach; and (4) one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and two right-turn lanes on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.	Significant unavoidable impact.

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	MM TRANS-2b: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Second Street/Whitson Street. The improvements shall consist of (1) one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the eastbound approach; (2) one left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn on the westbound approach; (3) two left-turn lanes and two through lanes with a shared right turn on the northbound approach; and (4) one left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.	
	MM TRANS-2c: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Mountain View Avenue/McCall Avenue. The improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left- turn phasing; (2) one left-turn lane and one through lane with a shared right turn on the eastbound approach; (3) one left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane on the westbound approach; (4) one left-turn lane and one through lane with a shared right turn on the northbound approach; and (5) one left-turn lane and one through lane with a shared right turn on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.	
	MM TRANS-2d: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Mountain View Avenue/Dockery Avenue. The improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left-turn phasing; (2) one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the eastbound approach; (3) two left-turn lanes (minimum 850 feet) and two through lanes with a shared right turn on the westbound approach; (4) two left-turn lanes, one through lane, and one right-turn lane on the northbound approach; and (5) one left-turn lane and one through lane with a shared right turn on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.	

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	MM TRANS-2e: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Mountain View Avenue/SR-99 Southbound Ramps. The improvements shall consist of (1) reconfiguring the intersection to have the southbound offramp and southbound onramp align with each other; (2) signalization with protected left-turn phasing; (3) widening the Mountain View Avenue overcrossing of SR-99; (4) converting Van Horn Avenue to a cul-de-sac south of Mountain View Avenue to accommodate the relocated southbound on-ramp; (5) three through lanes and one right-turn lane on the eastbound approach; (6) one left-turn lane and one two through lanes on the westbound approach; and (7) two left-turn lanes and two right-turn lanes on the southbound approach. Caltrans shall review and approve the proposed configuration. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.	
	MM TRANS-2f: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Mountain View Avenue/SR-99 Northbound Ramps. The improvements shall consist of (1) reconfiguring the intersection to have the northbound offramp and northbound onramp align with each other; (2) signalization with protected left-turn phasing; (3) widening the Mountain View Avenue overcrossing of SR-99; (4) two left-turn lanes (minimum 190 feet) and three through lanes on the eastbound approach; (5) two through lanes and one right-turn lane on the northbound approach. Caltrans shall review and approve the proposed configuration. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.	
	MM TRANS-2g: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Mountain View Avenue/Golden State Boulevard. The improvements shall consist of (1) two left-turn lanes (minimum 825 feet), three through lanes, and two right-turn lanes on the eastbound approach; (2) two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and two right-turn lanes on the westbound approach; (3) two left-turn	

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	lanes, three through lanes, and two right-turn lanes on the northbound approach; and (4) two left-turn lanes (minimum 400 feet), three through lanes, and two right-turn lanes (minimum 425 feet) on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS- 1a.	
	MM TRANS-2h: Prior to issuance of the first certificate occupancy for Phase 2, the project applicant shall improve the intersection of Phase 1 Site Access/Golden State Boulevard. The improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left-turn phasing; (2) two left-turn lanes (minimum 350 feet) and two right-turn lanes on the eastbound approach; (3) two left-turn lanes (minimum 1,125 feet) and two through lanes on the northbound approach; and (4) two through lanes and a right-turn lane on the southbound approach. In lieu of these improvements, the installation of a second signalized main access would provide acceptable levels of service and avoid concentrated northbound left turns at one location.	
	MM TRANS-2i: Prior to issuance of the first certificate occupancy for Phase 2, the project applicant shall improve the intersection of Phase 2 Site Access/Dockery Avenue. The improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left turn phasing; (2) one left-turn lane and one right-turn lane on the westbound approach; (3) one through lane and one right-turn lane on the northbound approach; and (4) two left-turn lanes (minimum 450 feet) and one through lane on the southbound approach.	
	MM TRANS-2j: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to Mountain View Avenue between McCall and Dockery Avenues. The improvements shall consist of widening Mountain View Avenue to four lanes with a median. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a. The improvements shall be accounted for in the Phase 1 and Phase 2 designs, as applicable.	
	applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to Mountain View Avenue between Dockery Avenue and SR-99. The	

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	improvements shall consist of widening Mountain View Avenue to four lanes with a median. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a. The improvements shall be accounted for in the Phase 1 and Phase 2 designs, as applicable.	
	MM TRANS-21: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to Mountain View Avenue between SR-99 and Golden State Boulevard. The improvements shall consist of widening Mountain View Avenue to six lanes with a median. Caltrans shall review and approve the proposed configuration. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS- 1a. The improvements shall be accounted for in the Phase 1 and Phase 2 designs, as applicable	
	MM TRANS-2m: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to Mountain View Avenue between Golden State Boulevard and Bethel Avenue. The improvements shall consist of widening Mountain View Avenue to six lanes with a median. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a. The improvements shall be accounted for in the Phase 1 and Phase 2 designs, as applicable	
	MM TRANS-2n: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the Floral Avenue railroad grade crossing. The improvements shall consist of (1) installation of a pre-signal and (2) pedestrian access and safety improvements. This mitigation measure shall be coordinated with the improvements contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1d. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.	

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact TRANS-3: The proposed project would contribute vehicle trips to intersections, roadway	Implement Mitigation Measures TRANS-1a through TRANS-1h, TRANS-2a through TRANS-2n, and:	Significant unavoidable impact.
segments, and railroad grade crossings that would operate at unacceptable levels under Year 2035 Conditions.	MM TRANS-3a: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Floral Avenue/Highland Avenue. The improvements shall consist of (1) two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and two right-turn lanes on the eastbound approach; (2) two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and one right-turn lane; (3) two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane; and (4) two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and two right-turn lanes. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.	
	MM TRANS-3b: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Highland Avenue/SR-99 southbound onramp. The improvements shall consist of (1) two right-turn lanes on the eastbound approach; (2) two through lanes and one right-turn lane on the northbound approach; and (3) two left-turn lanes (minimum 275 feet) and two through lanes on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.	
	MM TRANS-3c: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Highland Avenue/Nebraska Avenue. The improvements shall consist of (1) two left-turn lanes, one through lane, and one right-turn lane on the eastbound approach: (2) one left-	
	turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane on the westbound approach; (3) one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right- turn lane on the northbound approach; and (4) one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.	
	MM TRANS-3d: If the improvements identified in the City of Selma development fee program for the intersection of Nebraska Avenue/Thompson Avenue are determined not to be feasible, prior to	

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-	
	share payments for alternative improvements. The alternative improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left	
	turn phasing: (2) one left turn long and one through long with a	
	turn phasning, (2) one left-turn rane and, one unough rane with a	
	(minimum 275 foot) and one through lane with a shared right turn on	
	(infinition 275 feet) and one unough faite with a shared right turn on the westbound approach; (4) one left turn lane, one through lane, and	
	one right-turn lane on the northbound approach; and (5) one left-turn	
	lane and one through lane with a shared right turn on the southbound	
	approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the	
	community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism	
	contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a This mitigation	
	measure shall not apply if the improvements identified in the City of	
	Selma development fee program for the intersection of Nebraska	
	Avenue/Thompson Avenue are determined to be feasible.	
	MM TRANS-3e: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project	
	applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the	
	intersection of Second Street/Whitson Street. The improvements	
	shall consist of (1) two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one	
	right-turn lane on the eastbound approach; (2) two left-turn lanes,	
	two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the westbound	
	approach; (3) two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and one right-	
	turn lane on the northbound approach; and (4) one left-turn lane and	
	three through lanes with a shared right turn on the southbound	
	approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the	
	community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism	
	contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.	
	MM TRANS-3f: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project	
	applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the	
	intersection of Mountain View Avenue/Highland Avenue. The	
	improvements shall consist of (1) one left-turn lane and two through	
	lanes with a shared right turn on the eastbound approach; (2) one	
	left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn on the	
	westbound approach; (3) one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and	
	one right-turn lane on the northbound approach; and (4) one left-turn	
	lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the southbound	
	approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the	
	community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism	

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.	
	MM TRANS-3g: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project	
	applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the	
	intersection of Mountain View Avenue/Thompson Avenue. The	
	improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left-	
	turn phasing; (2) one left-turn lane and two through lanes with a	
	shared right turn on the eastbound approach; (3) one left-turn lane	
	and two through lanes with a shared right turn on the westbound	
	approach; (4) one left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared	
	right turn on the northbound approach; and (5) one left-turn lane and	
	two through lanes with a shared right turn on the southbound	
	approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the	
	contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.	
	MM TRANS-3h: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project	
	applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the	
	intersection of Mountain View Avenue/McCall Avenue. The	
	improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left-	
	turn phasing; (2) one left-turn lane and two through lanes with a	
	shared right turn on the eastbound approach; (3) one left-turn lane	
	(minimum 300 feet), two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on	
	the westbound approach; (4) one left-turn lane and two through lanes	
	with a shared right turn on the northbound approach; and (5) two	
	left-turn lanes and two through lanes with a shared right turn on the	
	southbound approach. These improvements shall be programmed	
	matching machanism contamplated by Mitigation Measure TPANS 1a	
	MM TDANS 2: Drive to issuence of building permits the preject	
	applicant shall provide foir share payments for improvements to the	
	intersection of Mountain View Avenue/Dockery Avenue. The	
	improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left-	
	turn phasing: (2) two left-turn lanes three through lanes and one	
	right-turn lane on the eastbound approach: (3) two left-turn lanes	
	(minimum 1,225 feet), three through lanes, and one right-turn lane	
	on the westbound approach; (4) two left-turn lanes (minimum 350	
	feet), one through lane, and two right-turn lanes on the northbound	
	approach; and (5) two left-turn lanes, one through lane, and one	
	right-turn lane on the southbound approach. These improvements	

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.	
	MM TRANS-3j: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the Mountain View Avenue/SR-99 interchange. The improvements shall consist of reconfiguration of the interchange to a Type L-9 as described in the Caltrans Highway Design Manual Chapter 500. The Mountain View Avenue/SR-99 southbound ramps shall provide (1) three through lanes and one right-turn lane or slip ramp to SR-99 southbound direct onramp on the eastbound approach; (2) three through lanes and one right-turn lane or slip ramp to SR-99 southbound loop onramp on the westbound approach; and (3) two left-turn lanes and three right-turn lanes on the southbound approach. The Mountain View Avenue/SR-99 northbound ramps shall provide (1) three through lanes and one right-turn lane or slip ramp to SR-99 northbound loop onramp on the eastbound approach; (2) three through lanes and one right-turn lane or slip ramp to SR-99 northbound loop onramp on the eastbound approach; (2) three through lanes and one right-turn lane or slip ramp to SR-99 northbound loop onramp on the westbound approach; (2) three through lanes and one right-turn lane or slip ramp to SR-99 northbound direct onramp on the westbound approach; (2) three through lanes and one right-turn lane or slip ramp to SR-99 northbound direct onramp on the westbound approach; (3) two left-turn lanes and one right-turn lane or slip ramp to SR-99 northbound direct onramp on the westbound approach; and (3) two left-turn lanes and one right-turn lane or slip ramp to SR-99 northbound direct onramp on the westbound approach; and (3) two left-turn lanes and one right-turn lane or slip ramp to SR-99 northbound direct onramp on the westbound approach. Caltrans shall review and approve the proposed configuration. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.	
	MM TRANS-3k: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Mountain View Avenue/Golden State Boulevard. The improvements shall consist of (1) two left-turn lanes (minimum 825 feet), three through lanes, and two right-turn lanes on the eastbound approach; (2) two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and two right-turn lanes on the westbound approach; (3) two left-turn lanes (minimum 350 feet), three through lanes, and two right-turn lanes on the northbound approach; and (4) two left-turn lanes (minimum 450 feet), three through lanes, and two right-turn lanes on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.	

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	MM TRANS-31: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Mountain View Avenue/Bethel Avenue. The improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left-turn phasing; (2) one left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn on the eastbound approach; (3) one left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn on the eastbound approach; (3) one left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn on the northbound approach; and (5) one left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.	
	MM TRANS-3m: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Mountain View Avenue/Academy Avenue. The improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left-turn phasing; (2) two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the eastbound approach; (3) one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane on the westbound approach; (4) one left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane on the southbound approach; and (5) one left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane on the southbound approach. Measure C Rural Project I contemplates several of the previously described improvements; thus, this mitigation measure is only intended to require improvements that are in addition to those scheduled to be installed. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.	
	MM TRANS-3n: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Mountain View Avenue/Mendocino Avenue. The improvements shall consist of (1) two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the eastbound approach; (2) one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane on the northbound approach; and (4) one left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane on the southbound	

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	approach. Measure C Rural Project I contemplates several of the previously described improvements; thus, this mitigation measure is intended to only require improvements that are in addition to those scheduled to be installed. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.	
	MM TRANS-30: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Golden State Boulevard/Amber Avenue. The improvements shall consist of modifying the intersection to allow right-in/right-out access only in order to prevent left turns. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.	
	MM TRANS-3p: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Bethel Avenue/Golden State Boulevard. The improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left-turn phasing; (2) two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the eastbound approach; (3) one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the southbound approach; (4) one left-turn lane on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a. This mitigation measure shall not apply to any aspect of the previously described improvements if they are not feasible because of physical constraints (right-of-way, railroad, roadway alignment, etc.)	
	MM TRANS-3q: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Bethel Avenue/Kamm Avenue. The improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left-turn phasing; (2) one through lane and one right-turn lane on the eastbound approach; (3) one left-turn lane and one through lane on the westbound approach; and (4) one left-turn lane and one right-turn lane on the northbound approach. These improvements shall be programmed	

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a. This mitigation measure shall not apply to any aspect of the previously described improvements if they are not feasible, due to physical constraints (e.g., right-of-way, railroad, roadway alignment, etc.)	
	MM TRANS-3r: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Kamm Avenue/Academy Avenue. The improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left-turn phasing; (2) one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the	
	eastbound approach; (3) one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the westbound approach; (4) one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the northbound approach; and (5) one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district	
	or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a. MM TRANS-3s: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project	
	applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Bethel Avenue/SR-99 northbound offramp. The improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left-turn phasing; (2) one left-turn lane and one right-turn lane on the	
	westbound approach; (3) one through lane on the northbound approach; and (4) one through lane on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a	
	MM TRANS-3t: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Bethel Avenue/Parkway Drive-SR-99 southbound onramp. The improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with	
	protected left-turn phasing; (2) one left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane on the eastbound approach; (3) one left-turn lane and one through lane on the northbound approach; and (4) two left-turn lanes and one through lane with a shared right turn on the	
	southbound approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing	

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.	
	MM TRANS-3u: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Phase 1 Site Access/Golden State Boulevard. The improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left-turn phasing; (2) two left-turn lanes and two right-turn lanes on the eastbound approach; (3) two left-turn lanes (minimum 525 feet) and three through lanes on the northbound approach; and (4) three through lanes and one right-turn lane on the southbound approach. In lieu of these improvements, the installation of a second signalized main access would provide acceptable levels of service and avoid concentrated northbound left turns at one location. These improvements shall be in place prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy of Phase 3. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.	
	MM TRANS-3v: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Phase 2 Site Access/Dockery Avenue. The improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left- turn phasing; (2) one left-turn lane and one right-turn lane on the westbound approach; (3) one through lane and one right-turn lane on the northbound approach; and (4) two left-turn lanes (minimum 500 feet) and one through lane on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be in place prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy of Phase 3. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.	
	MM TRANS-3w: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Phase 3 Site Access/Mountain View Avenue. The improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left-turn phasing; (2) one left-turn lane and three through lanes on the eastbound approach; (3) three through lanes and one right-turn lane (minimum 475 feet) on the westbound approach; and (4) two left-turn lanes (minimum 325 feet) and one right-turn lane on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be in place prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy of Phase 3. These	

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.	
	MM TRANS-3x: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to Mountain View Avenue between Highland Avenue and Thompson Avenue. The improvements shall consist of widening Mountain View Avenue to four lanes with a median. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.	
	MM TRANS-3y: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to Mountain View Avenue between Thompson Avenue and McCall Avenue. The improvements shall consist of widening Mountain View Avenue to four lanes with a median. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.	
	MM TRANS-3z: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to Mountain View Avenue between McCall Avenue and Dockery Avenue. The improvements shall consist of widening Mountain View Avenue to six lanes with a median. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.	
	MM TRANS-3aa: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to Mountain View Avenue between Dockery Avenue and SR-99. The improvements shall consist of widening Mountain View Avenue to six lanes with a median. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.	
	MM TRANS-3bb: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to Mountain View Avenue between SR-99 and Golden State Boulevard. The improvements shall consist of widening Mountain View Avenue to six lanes with a median. These improvements shall	

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.	
	MM TRANS-3cc: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to Mountain View Avenue between Golden State Boulevard and Bethel Avenue. The improvements shall consist of widening Mountain View Avenue to six lanes with a median. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.	
	MM TRANS-3dd: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to Mountain View Avenue between Bethel Avenue and Academy Avenue. The improvements shall consist of widening Mountain View Avenue to six lanes with a median. Measure C Rural Project I contemplates widening this roadway segment to four lanes; thus, this mitigation measure is only intended to require the two additional lanes that are in addition to those scheduled to be installed. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.	
	MM TRANS-3ee: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to Kamm Avenue between SR-99 and Academy Avenue. The improvements shall consist of widening Kamm Avenue to four lanes. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.	
	MM TRANS-3ff: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to McCall Avenue between Valley View Street and Mountain View Avenue. The improvements shall consist of widening McCall Avenue to four lanes. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.	
	MM TRANS-3gg: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to	

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	
	McCall Avenue between Mountain View Avenue and Caruthers Avenue. The improvements shall consist of widening McCall Avenue to four lanes. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.		
	MM TRANS-3hh: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to Dockery Avenue between Mountain View Avenue and Caruthers Avenue. The improvements shall consist of widening Dockery Avenue to four lanes. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.		
	MM TRANS-3ii: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the Highland Avenue at-grade railroad crossing. The improvements shall consist of installing a pre-signal. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.		
	MM TRANS-3jj: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the Second Street at-grade railroad crossing. The improvements shall consist of a raised median. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.		
	MM TRANS-3kk: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the Bethel Avenue at-grade railroad crossing. The improvements shall consist of a raised median. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.		
Impact TRANS-4: The proposed project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).	No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.	

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact TRANS-5: The proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.
Impact TRANS-6: The proposed project may not provide adequate access to public transit, bicycles, or pedestrians.	 MM TRANS-6a: Prior to approval of the final improvement plans for each phase, the project applicant shall prepare and submit plans to the City of Selma depicting appropriate public transit facilities for review and approval. Such facilities may consist of a centralized transit facility or enhanced stops that feature turnouts, shelters, seating, lighting, and other amenities, as appropriate. The approved public transit facilities shall be incorporated into the final improvement plans for each phase. MM TRANS-6b: Prior to issuance of the certificate of occupancy for each building, the project applicant shall install bicycle storage facilities in convenient locations near building entrances. Bicycle storage facilities shall consist of racks that provide spaces equivalent to 2 percent of the building's minimum parking requirement. Where appropriate, the bicycle parking requirements for multiple buildings may be consolidated into a single location. MM TRANS-6c: Prior to approval of the final improvement plans for each phase, the project applicant shall prepare and submit plans to the City of Selma depicting pedestrian facilities along all street frontages. Meandering sidewalks shall be provided along major arterial roadways. All pedestrian facilities along all street frontages shall be connected to internal pedestrian facilities within each phase. 	Less than significant impact.
Section 4.13 – Urban Decay		
Impact UD-1: Blight and urban decay of vacant storefronts are not foreseeable consequences of the proposed project.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less than significant impact.

SECTION 3: PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) analyzes the potential environmental effects of the proposed Selma Crossings Project in Selma, California.

3.1 - Project Location and Setting

3.1.1 - Location

The project site is located in unincorporated Fresno County, California adjacent to the Selma city limits (Exhibit 3-1). The project site consists of 13 parcels within three separate areas totaling 288 gross acres located generally at the State Route 99/E. Mountain View Avenue interchange (Exhibit 3-2). The project site is located on the Conejo and Selma, California, United States Geological Survey 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle maps, Township 16 South, Range 22 East, Sections 8, 16, and 17 (Latitude 36°32'47" North; Longitude 119°36'00" West).

3.1.2 - Project Site Existing Conditions

The project site is currently used for agricultural and rural residential land use activities. Table 3-1 summarizes the existing characteristics of the project site by area. Site photographs are provided in Exhibit 3-3a and Exhibit 3-3b.

Area	Gross Acres*	Assessor's Parcel No.	Current Land Use Activities
Northeast (Phase 1)	84.50	393-180-09	Cultivated agriculture (vineyards), three rural
		393-180-26	and improvements
		393-180-27s	-
		393-180-29s	
South (Phase 2)	135.40	393-102-20	Cultivated agriculture (vineyards), fallow
		393-240-27	agricultural land; seven rural residential structures; agricultural structures and
		393-102-34	improvements
		393-102-65	
		393-102-72	
		393-102-74	
		393-102-23s	

Table 3-1: Pro	iect Site	Existina	Conditions	Summarv
			••••••••	••••••

Area	Gross Acres*	Assessor's Parcel No.	Current Land Use Activities
Northwest (Phase 3)	68.10	393-180-44	Cultivated agriculture (vineyards), fallow agricultural land; two rural residential structures; agricultural structures and improvements; Williamson Act contract (No. 4369) in effect on APN No. 393-180-44 (29.83 acres).
		393-180-63	
Total	288.00		
Notes:			

Table 3-1 (cont.): Project Site Existing Conditions Summary

* Gross acres includes portions of parcels used for roadways.

Source: Precision Civil Engineering, Inc. 2010. Michael Brandman Associates, 2011.

Each area is described in further detail:

Northeast Area

The Northeast Area totals 84.50 gross acres and contains vineyards, fallow agricultural lands, and three residential structures, as well as several outbuildings. S. Van Horn Avenue, a two-lane undivided rural road, bisects the Northeast Area and provides access to two of the residences. Two co-located Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) high-voltage power lines (Kingsburg Cogen Tap and the McCall-Kingsburg No. 1) cross the southern portion of Northeast Area in a north-south direction.

South Area

The South Area totals 135.40 gross acres and contains vineyards, fallow agricultural lands, and seven residential structures, as well as several outbuildings. S. Van Horn Avenue, a two-lane undivided rural road, bisects the South Area and provides access to four of the residences. S. Dockery Avenue, also a two-lane undivided rural road, forms the western boundary of the South Area and provides access to the remaining residences. Two co-located PG&E high-voltage power lines (Kingsburg Cogen Tap and the McCall-Kingsburg No. 1) cross the eastern portion of South Area in a north-south direction.

Northwest Area

The Northwest Area totals 68.10 gross acres and contains vineyards, fallow agricultural lands, and two residential structures, as well as several outbuildings. S. Dockery Avenue, a two-lane undivided rural road, forms the eastern boundary of the Northwest Area and provides access to the two residences. A hexavalent groundwater plume that originated from the Selma Pressure Treatment site on the north side of State Route 99 (SR-99) overlaps with a subsurface portion of the Northwest Area. Extraction system wells associated with the groundwater plume are located within the Northwest Area.


31130002 • 01/2010 | 3-1_regional.mxd

CITY OF SELMA • SELMA CROSSINGS PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT



2,000

Feet

Exhibit 3-2 Local Vicinity Map Aerial Base

Michael Brandman Associates 31130002 • 06/2011 | 3-3_local_aerial.mxd

NOR

2,000

1,000

0

CITY OF SELMA • SELMA CROSSINGS PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT



Photograph 1: View of Northeast Area looking south from Golden State Boulevard.



Photograph 3: View of South Area looking east from S. Van Horn Avenue.



Photograph 2: View of Northeast Area looking northwest from S. Van Horn Avenue.



Photograph 4: View of South Area looking south from S. Van Horn Avenue.

Source: Michael Brandman Associates, 2011.



Exhibit 3-3a Site Photographs

CITY OF SELMA • SELMA CROSSING PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT



Photograph 1: View of the South Area looking southwest from Shell gas station.



Photograph 2: View of the South Area looking east from S. Dockery Avenue.



Photograph 3: View of Northwest Area looking northwest from S. Dockery Avenue.



Photograph 4: View of Northwest Area looking southwest from S. Dockery Avenue.

Source: Michael Brandman Associates, 2011.



Exhibit 3-3b Site Photographs

3.1.3 - Surrounding Land Uses

Surrounding land uses for each of the three areas and the detention basin site are summarized in Table 3-2.

Area	Direction	Land Use Activities
	West	SR-99
Northeast (Phase 1)	North	Rural residential; Heavy industrial (Selma Pressure Treatment)
	East	Golden State Boulevard; Union Pacific Railroad; Cultivated agriculture (vineyards); Rural residential
	South	E. Mountain View Avenue; Darling Oil & Tire; Abandoned multi-family residential structure; Selma Flea Market
	West	S. Dockery Avenue; Cultivated agriculture (vineyards and orchards); Rural residential
South (Phase 2)	North	E. Mountain View Avenue; Cultivated agriculture (vineyards); Valero Gas Station; Light industrial; Shell Gas Station
	East	SR-99
	South	Cultivated agriculture (vineyards); Rural residential; Stormwater Basin site
	West	Cultivated agriculture (vineyards and orchards); Rural residential
Northwest (Phase 3)	North	SR-99
	East	S. Dockery Avenue
	South	E. Mountain View Avenue
Source: Michael Brandman As	sociates, 2011.	

Table 3-2: Surrounding Land Use Summary

3.1.4 - General Plan and Zoning Designations

Table 3-3 summarizes the County of Fresno and City of Selma General Plan and Zoning designations for the project site. The existing County zoning designations are shown in Exhibit 3-4. The existing 1997 City of Selma General Plan land use designations are shown in Exhibit 3-5. The 2035 City of Selma General Plan land use designations are shown in Exhibit 3-6. The proposed pre-zoning designations are shown in Exhibit 3-7.

		County of Fresno		City of Selma			
Area	Gross Acres	General Plan	Zoning	1997 General Plan	2035 General Plan	Zoning	
Northeast (Phase 1)	84.50	Highway Commercial (~42 acres); Light Industrial (~42 acres)	AL20 – Agriculture Limited with 20 acre minimum parcel size	Highway Commercial (~42 acres); Light Industrial (~42 acres)	Regional Commercial	C-R – Regional Commercial*	
South (Phase 2)	135.40	Highway Commercial (~100 acres); Agriculture (~35 acres)	AE20 – Agriculture Exclusive 20 acre minimum parcel size; RA – Residential Agriculture	Highway Commercial (~100 acres); No Designation/ Outside of Planning Area (~35 acres)	Regional Commercial	C-R – Regional Commercial*	
Northwest (Phase 3)	68.10	Highway Commercial	AE20 – Agriculture Exclusive 20 acre minimum parcel size	Business Park	Regional Commercial	C-R – Regional Commercial*	
Total	288.00	_			_	_	
Notes: * Proposed pre-zoning designation							

Table 3-3: Project Site Existing Land Use Designations

City of Selma land use designations are non-binding until parcels are annexed into City limits.

Source: County of Fresno 2011; City of Selma, 2011.

3.2 - Project Background and History

3.2.1 - Selma Crossings

The project applicant, Selma Crossings, LLC, originally filed an application to develop the Selma Crossings Project with the City of Selma in 2007. A Notice of Preparation (NOP) was released on June 28, 2007 and circulated for public review until July 19, 2007. Table 3-4 summarizes the original Selma Crossings Project proposal.

Table 3-4	: Original	Selma	Crossings	Project	Proposal
	. Onginai	0011110	orocomigo	1 10,000	1 i opodui

Area	Acres	Square Feet	End Use(s)
Northeast	82.54	1,043,200	Commercial retail; office
South	102.22	1,198,600	Commercial retail; office; theatre
Northwest	75.75	874,800	Commercial retail; hotel
Automall	43.64		Automall
Total	304.15	3,116,600	
Source: Selma Crossings, LLC, 2007.			



Source: County of Fresno.

Image: Second second



Source: City of Selma GIS Dept. (2006), and MBA GIS (2011).



Exhibit 3-5 1997 City of Selma General Plan Land Use Designations

31130002 • 06/2011 | 3-5_city_general_plan.mxd



Source: City of Selma GIS Dept. (2006), and MBA GIS (2011).



Exhibit 3-6 2035 City of Selma General Plan Land Use Designations

31130002 • 06/2011 | 3-6_proposed_city_general_plan.mxd

CITY OF SELMA • SELMA CROSSINGS PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT



31130002 • 06/2007 | 3-7_proposed_zoning.mxd

CITY OF SELMA • SELMA CROSSINGS EIR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Following the release of the 2007 NOP, the applicant amended the project application as follows:

- Revisions to site plan, including sizes and configurations of building envelopes and parking areas.
- Addition of a 20-acre stormwater basin immediately south of the South Area.
- Addition of a water park and two hotels to the South Area.
- Addition of 250 residential mixed use units above retail in the Northwest Area.
- Overall square footage of buildings has been increased by 332,603 square feet (from 3,116,600 square feet to 3,449,203 square feet). This includes 400,000 square feet of floor space on 10 lots that comprise the automall, whereas the 2007 NOP showed only the acreage for the automall, and now it is included in the square footage total.
- The amount of retail commercial space has decreased from 2,370,000 square feet to 2,092,203 square feet.
- Total net acres of development have been reduced by approximately 17 acres (from approximately 304 acres to 287 acres).

Refer to Subsection 3.3, Project Characteristics for a complete description of the current Selma Crossings Project proposal.

3.2.2 - City of Selma General Plan Update 2035

The City of Selma General Plan Update 2035 (2035 General Plan) was adopted by the Selma City Council on October 4, 2010. However, adoption of the General Plan has been stayed pending resolution of a lawsuit filed against the General Plan EIR. Thus, at the time of this writing, the City of Selma General Plan 1997 Update (1997 General Plan) is the prevailing land use planning document for the City of Selma. As previously shown in Table 3-3, the 1997 General Plan and 2035 General Plan contemplate different land use designations for the project site. (Refer to Section 4.9, Land Use for further discussion of the differences between the 1997 and 2035 General Plans.)

By virtue of 2035 General Plan being on hold, the parcels comprising the project site remain designated under the 1997 General Plan land use map. As such, a conforming General Plan Amendment would be necessary to re-designate 287 acres of the project site to Regional Commercial use and 20 acres to Public Facilities use.

3.3 - Project Characteristics

The project applicant, Selma Crossings, LLC, is seeking to develop a mix of commercial retail, office, visitor-serving commercial, and residential uses in several phases on approximately 287 net acres. The development would occur within three areas (Northeast, South, and Northwest). The project also includes the development of a 20-acre stormwater basin to accommodate runoff from the

project. The entire project site would be annexed into the City of Selma. Table 3-5 summarizes the proposed project. The proposed tentative parcel map is depicted in Exhibit 3-8. Details about the various project components are provided after the table.

Area	End Use(s)	Value
	Retail (Anchors, Majors, Shops, and Restaurants)	882,003 square feet
Northeast (Phase 1) Acres	Subtotal	882,003 square feet
	Net Area	75.75 acres
	Retail (Anchors, Majors, Shops, Restaurants/Fuel)	606,200 square feet
	Office Park	260,000 square feet
	Automall	400,000 square feet/ 10 pads
South (Phase 2)	Hotel (2 buildings; 3 levels each)	155,000 square feet
	Waterpark	10,000 square feet
	Stormwater Basin	20 acres
	Subtotal	1,431,200 square feet
	Net Area	124.35 acres
	Retail Mixed-Use (Anchors, Majors, Shops, Lifestyle Retail, and Restaurants)	604,000 square feet
	Residential (Above Lifestyle Retail)	252,000 square feet/ 250 dwelling units
Northwest (Phase 3)	Office Park (Above Lifestyle Retail)	280,000 square feet
	Subtotal	1,136,000 square feet 250 dwelling units
	Net Area	66.60 acres
Stormwater Basin	Net Area	20.00 acres
	Grand Total	3,449,203 square feet 250 dwelling units 286.76 net acres
Notes: No specific tenants have been	identified for any of the commercial uses.	·

Table 3-5: Selma Crossings Development Summary

No specific tenants have been identified for any of the commercia

Source: Selma Crossings, LLC, 2011.

3.3.1 - Northeast Area (Phase 1)

The Northeast Area would occupy 75.75 net acres and feature commercial retail uses. A total of 28 building envelopes are proposed within this area ranging in area from 15,925 to 344,140 square feet. The larger spaces are set against the SR-99 frontage, with the smaller spaces along the Golden State Boulevard frontage. End uses would consist of anchors, majors, shops, and restaurants. No specific tenants have been identified for any of the buildings.



Source: Precision Civil Engineering



31130002 • 06/2011 | 3-8_tentative_parcel_map

Exhibit 3-8 Tentative Parcel Map

Vehicular Access and Internal Circulation

Vehicular access to the Northeast Area would be taken from several points on Golden State Boulevard. No vehicular access is proposed to or from E. Mountain View Avenue.

The existing dead-end segment of S. Van Horn Avenue that extends south from Golden State Boulevard would be abandoned and removed as part of the development of the Northeast Area.

Parking

A total of 4,476 off-street parking spaces are proposed within the Northeast Area, which translates to a ratio of 5.08 spaces per 1,000 square feet of floor area.

3.3.2 - South Area (Phase 2)

The South Area would occupy 135.40 net acres and feature commercial retail, office, automall, and visitor-serving commercial uses. A total of 42 building envelopes are proposed within this area ranging in size from 11,275 to 591,135 square feet. End uses would consist of anchors, majors, shops, restaurants, fuel, office park, automall, hotel, and waterpark. No specific tenants have been identified for any of the buildings.

The larger spaces are located on the west side of S. Van Horn Avenue, with the smaller spaces on the east side of the street abutting the SR-99 frontage. The hotel and waterpark uses would be located in the southeastern corner of the South Area, abutting the SR-99 frontage. The shops, restaurants, and fuel uses would be located along the E. Mountain View Avenue frontage. The offices and larger retail spaces would be located south of the new east-west road between S. Dockery Avenue and S. Van Horn Avenue. The automall would consist of 10 3.6-acre pads located along the new east-west loop road between S. Van Horn Avenue and SR-99.

Stormwater Basin

A 20-acre stormwater basin would be developed in conjunction with the South Area. The South Area and Northwest Area, as well as adjoining areas outside of the project boundaries, would convey runoff to this basin via underground pipelines ranging from 24 to 72 inches in diameter. (The Northeast Area would be served by the City of Selma's municipal drainage system).

The basin is proposed to be sized to retain 230 acre-feet of water, which is equivalent to the total volume generated by 6 inches of rainfall falling on the drainage area served by the basin. Statistically, a storm with a 100-year return period and having a duration of 10 days will have a total precipitation amount of 6 inches.

The southeast corner of the proposed basin site is 21 feet higher than the other areas of the basin. Because of this, 45,000 cubic yards of material from the southeast corner will have to be excavated to grade the top of the basin to the same elevation as the rest of the basin.

Vehicular Access and Internal Circulation

S. Van Horn Avenue bisects the South Area and would provide primary access to uses on either side. An east-west new road would be constructed that link S. Dockery Avenue with S. Van Horn Avenue and the commercial uses developed along the SR-99 frontage. East of S. Van Horn Avenue, the road would form a loop to serve the automall pads, hotel, and waterpark. E. Mountain View Avenue would be the primary roadway serving the small shops and restaurant. Driveway access to the various uses within the South Area would be taken from the aforementioned roadways.

Parking

A total of 5,159 off-street parking spaces are proposed within the South Area, which translates to a ratio of 3.60 spaces per 1,000 square feet of floor area.

3.3.3 - Northwest Area (Phase 3)

The Northwest Area would occupy 68.10 net acres and feature commercial retail uses. A total of 17 building envelopes are proposed within this area ranging in size from 37,110 to 632,902 square feet. The larger spaces are set against the SR-99 frontage, with the smaller spaces along the S. Dockery Avenue and E. Mountain View Avenue frontages. End uses would consist of anchors, majors, shops, lifestyle retail, restaurants, residential (above lifestyle retail) and office (above lifestyle retail). No specific tenants have been identified for any of the buildings.

Vehicular Access and Internal Circulation

Vehicular access to the Northwest Area would be taken from S. Dockery Avenue and E. Mountain View Avenue. An internal north-south roadway would link the anchors along the SR-99 frontage with E. Mountain View Avenue.

Parking

A total of 4,381 off-street parking spaces are proposed within the Northwest Area, which translates to a ratio of 3.86 spaces per 1,000 square feet of floor area.

3.3.4 - Roadway Improvements

Roadway improvements would installed along the facilities abutting each phase of the proposed project. Improvements are summarized by project component:

- Northeast Area: Half-width improvements would be installed along the Golden State Boulevard and E. Mountain View Avenue frontages. Left-turn pockets would be installed on northbound Golden State Boulevard to allow access to the proposed project.
- South Area: Half-width improvements would be installed along the E. Mountain View Avenue and S. Dockery Avenue frontages. Full-width improvements would be installed along the portion of S. Van Horn Avenue within the South Area.

• Northwest Area: Half-width improvements would be installed along the E. Mountain View Avenue and S. Dockery Avenue frontages. Left-turn pockets would be installed on eastbound E. Mountain View Avenue to allow access to the proposed project.

3.3.5 - Utilities

Potable Water

California Water Service Company would provide potable water service to the proposed project.

Wastewater

The Selma-Kingsburg-Fowler County Sanitation District would provide sewer service to the proposed project.

Energy

Pacific Gas and Electric Company would provide electricity service and the Southern California Gas Company would provide natural gas service to the proposed project.

3.3.6 - Employment

The proposed project would create full-time, part-time, and seasonal employment positions. Table 3-6 estimates project employment by end use. Employment opportunities associated with the commercial retail and waterpark would be expected to be primarily entry-level, while employment associated with the office uses would be expected to be primarily career positions. The automall and hotel uses would be expected to provide a mix of entry-level and career opportunities. Employment opportunities would be created as each component builds out.

End Use	Characteristics	Employment Rate	Employment Opportunities
Commercial Retail	2,092,203 square feet	1 employee/500 square feet	4,185
Office	540,000 square feet	1 employee/300 square feet	1,800
Automall	10 pads	47 employees/pad	470
Hotel	2 hotels	52 employees/hotel	104
Water Park	1 water park	250 employees/water park	250
Total		·	6,809

Table 3-6: Employment Estimate

Notes:

Commercial retail and office employment rates reflect industry standard estimates.

Automall employment rate based on information reported in the Autonation, Inc. 2010 10-K Annual Report Hotel employment based on information reported in the Red Lion Hotels Corp. 2010 10-K Annual Report Waterpark employment based on employment at Island Waterpark in Fresno. Source: Michael Brandman Associates, 2011.

3.3.7 - Project Implementation

The proposed project would be implemented in phases over a 12-year period, as outlined in Table 3-7. The Northeast Area (Phase 1) would be developed between 2013 and 2016; the South Area (Phase 2) would be developed between 2017 and 2020; and the Northwest Area (Phase 3) would be developed between 2021 and 2024. Because of the uncertainty surrounding future economic conditions, it was simply assumed that each phase would take four years to buildout, with one quarter of each area being developed per year. The actual rate of development will depend on market conditions; however, it would be expected that it would take at minimum of 12 years for the entire project to be completed.

		Development	(Square Feet)
Area	Year	Incremental	Cumulative
	2013	220,500	220,500
Northeast (Phase 1)	2014	220,500	441,000
Northeast (1 hase 1)	2015	220,500	661,500
	2016	220,503	882,003
	2017	357,800	1,239,803
South (Dhase 2)	2018	357,800	1,597,603
South (Fliase 2)	2019	357,800	1,955,403
	2020	357,800	2,313,203
	2021	284,000	2,597,203
Northwast (Dhasa 2)*	2022	284,000	2,881,203
Northwest (Flidse 5)	2023	284,000	3,165,203
	2024	284,000	3,449,203
Notes: * Includes 250 dwelling units Source: Selma Crossings, LLC, 2011.	·		

Table 3-7: Phasing Assumptions

Generally, it would be expected that construction activities for each increment of development would take 9 to 12 months to complete. Thus, construction of the first increment will be assumed to begin in the first quarter of 2012 and be completed by January 2013, with each subsequent increment following a similar schedule.

3.3.8 - Annexations of Selma Crossings Parcels

The entire288 gross acre Selma Crossings Project site would be annexed into the City of Selma. Because a portion of the South Area is currently outside of the Selma Sphere of Influence, this boundary would also be adjusted outward to be coterminous with the expanded city limits. In addition to annexation into the Selma city limits, the entire Selma Crossings Project site would be annexed into the Selma-Kingsburg-Fowler County Sanitation District. All of these boundary adjustments require approval of the Fresno Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO).

3.3.9 - Annexations of Non-Selma Crossings Parcels

At the request of the Fresno LAFCO, the City of Selma is evaluating annexation of two areas ("East" and "West") totaling 32.16 acres that are contiguous to the Selma Crossings project site, but not within the project boundaries. Annexation of the Selma Crossings project site would result in the exclusion of the East and West areas from the Selma city limits, a condition that would be generally inconsistent with the objective of logical and orderly jurisdictional boundaries. Additionally, it would be expected that LAFCO would request that these properties also be annexed into the Selma-Kingsburg-Fowler County Sanitation District, since they would be within the Selma city limits.

The following are summaries of each area:

- East Annexation Area: This area consists of two parcels totaling 3.15 acres located at the northwest corner of Golden State Boulevard and E. Mountain View Avenue. One of the parcels is occupied by Darling Oil & Tire and the other by an abandoned, multi-family residential structure. The annexation of these two parcels into the Selma city limits would allow for the expanded city boundaries to follow Golden State Boulevard and E. Mountain View Avenue.
- West Annexation Area: This area consists of 11 parcels comprising 29.01 acres located at the SR-99/E. Mountain View Southbound Ramps intersection. Ten of the parcels are located north of E. Mountain View Avenue and are bounded by S. Dockery Avenue (west), SR-99 (north), and the SR-99 Southbound off-ramp (east). These parcels contain developed commercial and residential properties, including a Valero gas station. The remaining parcel is located of south of E. Mountain View Avenue and contains a Shell gas station. The annexation of these parcels would prevent the creation of an approximately 30-acre "unincorporated island" within the Selma city limits, a condition discouraged by Fresno LAFCO.

The two areas are shown on Exhibit 3-9 and are summarized in Table 3-8.



 2,000
 1,000
 0
 2,000
 Exhibit 3-9

 Michael Brandman Associates
 Non-Selma Crossings Project Annexations

31130002 • 06/2011 | 3-9_project_annexations.mxd

CITY OF SELMA • SELMA CROSSINGS PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

		Land Use Designations				
		C	ounty of Fresno	City of Selma		
Area	Acres	General Plan	Zoning	1997 General Plan	2035 General Plan	Zoning
East	3.15	Highway Commercial	CM – Commercial and Light Highway Commercial Manufacturing; C-6 – General Commercial	Highway Commercial	Regional Commercial	C-R – Regional Commercial*
West	29.01	Highway Commercial	CM – Commercial and Light Manufacturing; C-6 – General Commercial; AE20 – Agriculture Exclusive 20 acre minimum parcel size	Highway Commercial	Regional Commercial	C-R – Regional Commercial*
Notes: * Prop Source:	osed pre-zo Michael Br	ning designation andman Associate	es, 2011.			

Table 3-8: Non-Selma Crossings Annexations

The proposed annexations would bring these areas into the Selma city limits and involve associated pre-zoning approvals. The annexations themselves do not confer any development rights that would allow new construction to occur on any of the affected properties. Instead, the annexations merely change jurisdictional and political boundaries (e.g., the annexation areas would be patrolled by the Selma Police Department instead of the Fresno County Sheriff's Department). Additionally, property owners would be permitted to continue existing legal conforming and legal non-conforming land use activities after annexation into the Selma city limits.

3.4 - Project Objectives

The objectives of the proposed project are to:

- Promote economic growth through new capital investment, job creation, and an expanded tax base.
- Create a range of new local employment opportunities including entry-level and career positions.
- Phase new development in a logical and orderly manner that promotes land use compatibility and avoids premature conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural use.
- Provide new regional commercial retail uses that meet the current unmet demand of consumers residing within the Trade Area as well as future demand from planned population growth.
- Develop office space to attract professional employment opportunities and that also increases the availability of professional services to the community.

- Develop visitor-serving lodging and recreational uses that cater to travelers on the SR-99 corridor
- Maintain and enhance Selma's status as a regional node for automotive sales on the SR-99 corridor.
- Develop attractive, high-quality commercial land uses that are unique and compatible with the local character
- Provide mixed-use development with housing above retail to create a vibrant atmosphere that promotes pedestrian activity.
- Develop the site at an intensity that most efficiently utilizes the infrastructure available and to be constructed as part of the project.

3.5 - Intended Uses of This Draft EIR

This Draft EIR is being prepared by the City of Selma to assess the potential environmental impacts that may arise in connection with actions related to implementation of the proposed project. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15367, the City of Selma is the lead agency for the proposed project and has discretionary authority to approve the proposed project. The Draft EIR is intended to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of the project as a whole, including all infrastructure improvements and all future development that is required to implement the proposed project.

3.5.1 - Discretionary and Ministerial Actions

Discretionary approvals, entitlements, and permits are required by the City of Selma for implementation of the proposed project, which include the following:

- Certification of the Environmental Impact Report
- General Plan Amendment (if the proposed project is approved prior to the legal challenge to the City of Selma General Plan Update 2035 being resolved)
- Prezone all parcels (Selma Crossings and non-Selma Crossings) to C-R Regional Commercial
- Tentative Parcel Map
- Conditional Use Permit
- Site Plan Review
- Development Agreement
- Williamson Act Contract Cancellation (APN 393-180-44)
- City Storm Drainage Master Plan Amendment to incorporate relevant provisions of projectspecific Storm Drainage Master Plan

- Annexation of the Selma Crossings and non-Selma Crossings parcels into Selma city limits and concurrent adjustment of Sphere of Influence to be coterminous with expanded city limits (Fresno County Local Agency Formation Commission)
- Annexation of Selma Crossings and Non-Selma Crossings parcels into Selma-Kingsburg-Fowler County Sanitation District and concurrent expansion of Sphere of Influence to be coterminous with expanded service area.

Certain additional actions would be required for the implementation of the proposed project including issuance of grading and building permits.

3.5.2 - Responsible and Trustee Agencies

A number of other agencies in addition to the City of Selma will serve as Responsible and Trustee Agencies, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15381 and Section 15386, respectively. This Draft EIR will provide environmental information to these agencies and other interested agencies, which may have approval authority over some aspect of the project or that otherwise may be involved in coordinating project implementation. These agencies may include but are not limited to the following.

- United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
- California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
- California Department of Conservation
- Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
- County of Fresno
- Fresno Local Agency Formation Commission
- San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District
- Consolidated Irrigation District

Actions that are necessary to implement the project that must be taken by other agencies include:

- Approval of Annexation and Sphere of Influence Expansion Fresno Local Agency Formation Commission (Selma city boundaries and Selma-Kingsburg-Fowler County Sanitation District service area)
- Obtain coverage under General Stormwater Permit State Water Resources Control Board Central Valley RWQCB. A Storm Water Pollution Prevent Plan must be submitted in order to obtain such coverage.
- Issuance of encroachment permits for proposed work along roadways under the jurisdiction of Caltrans or the County of Fresno
- Compliance with Air District Rule 9510 San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District

SECTION 4: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

Organization of Issue Areas

This Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) provides analysis of impacts for those environmental topics where it was determined in Notice of Preparation, or through subsequent analysis that the proposed project would result in "potentially significant impacts." Sections 4.1 through 4.13 discuss the environmental impacts that may result with approval and implementation of the proposed project.

Issues Addressed in This EIR

The following environmental issues are addressed in Section 4:

- Aesthetics, Light, and Glare
- Air Quality
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Land Use
- Public Services and Utilities
- Urban Decay

- Agricultural Resources
- Biological Resources
- Geology, Soils, and Seismicity
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Noise
- Transportation

Each environmental issue area in Sections 4.1 through 4.13 contains a description of:

- 1. The environmental setting as it relates to the specific issue.
- 2. The regulatory setting governing that issue.
- 3. The methodology used in identifying the issues.
- 4. The significance criteria.
- 5. An evaluation of the project-specific impacts and identification of mitigation measures.
- 6. A determination of the level of significance after mitigation measures are implemented.

Level of Significance

Determining the severity of project impacts is fundamental to achieving the objectives of CEQA. CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 requires that decision-makers mitigate, as completely as is feasible, the significant impacts identified in the Final EIR. If the EIR identifies any significant unmitigated impacts, CEQA Guidelines Section 15093 requires decision-makers in approving a project to adopt a statement of overriding considerations that explains why the benefits of the project outweigh the adverse environmental consequences identified in the EIR.

The level of significance for each impact examined in this Draft EIR was determined by considering the predicted magnitude of the impact against the applicable threshold. Thresholds were developed using criteria from the CEQA Guidelines and checklist; state, federal, and local regulatory schemes; local/regional plans and ordinances; accepted practice; consultation with recognized experts; and other professional opinions.

Impact Analysis and Mitigation Measure Format

The format adopted in this EIR to present the evaluation of impacts is described and illustrated below.

Summary	Heading	of	Impact
---------	---------	----	--------

Impact GEO-1:	An impact summary heading appears immediately preceding the impact description (Summary Heading of Impact in this example). The impact number identifies the section of the report (GEO for Geology, Soils, and Seismicity in this example) and the sequential order of the impact (1 in this example) within that section. To the right of the impact number is the impact statement, which identifies the potential impact.
---------------	--

Impact Analysis

A narrative analysis follows the impact statement.

Significance Before Mitigation

This section identifies the level of significance of the impact before any mitigation is proposed.

Mitigation Measures

In some cases, following the impact discussion, reference is made to state and federal regulations and agency policies that would fully or partially mitigate the impact. In addition, policies and programs from applicable local land use plans that partially or fully mitigate the impact may be cited.

Project-specific mitigation measures, beyond those contained in other documents, are set off with a summary heading and described using the format presented below:

MM GEO-1Project-specific mitigation is identified that would reduce the impact to the
lowest degree feasible. The mitigation number links the particular mitigation
to the impact it is associated with (GEO-1 in this example); mitigation
measures are numbered sequentially.

Significance After Mitigation

This section identifies the resulting level of significance of the impact following mitigation.

4.1 - Aesthetics, Light, and Glare

4.1.1 - Introduction

This section describes the existing aesthetics, light, and glare setting and potential effects from the proposed project implementation on visual resources of the site and its surroundings. Descriptions and analysis in this section are based on site reconnaissance by Michael Brandman Associates personnel, as well as review of the 2035 City of Selma General Plan. Descriptions and analysis in this section are based on existing site conditions and proposed development conditions. The analysis considers the visual quality of the site and surrounding views from and of the project site.

4.1.2 - Environmental Setting

Aesthetic Character

Regional Setting

Selma is located in the San Joaquin Valley of California. The San Joaquin Valley extends from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta in the north to the Tehachapi Mountains in the south. The California coastal mountain ranges form the western border, while the Sierra Nevada mountain ranges border the valley to the east. The San Joaquin Valley is one of the most productive agricultural regions in the world. Areas surrounding the urbanized portion of Selma are primarily agricultural land with interspersed residential and industrial areas.

Selma, population 23,395, is bisected by the Union Pacific Railroad Bakersfield Subdivision (a single-track mainline railroad), which traverses the City in a northwest-southeast direction. State Route 99 (SR-99) parallels the railroad to the west. The older Central Business District is centered around the railroad tracks, with newer development located on the west side of the freeway and at northern and eastern periphery. Commercial and industrial land uses are generally located along the railroad and freeway frontages, with residential uses further away. As with many of the communities on the SR-99 corridor, Selma experienced rapid growth during the past decade, adding close to 4,000 new residents between 2000 and 2010.

Project Site

The 288-gross-acre project site is located in unincorporated Fresno County, adjacent to the southern limits of the City of Selma. The project site contains agricultural and rural residential uses. Agricultural uses consist of vineyards and fallow land. Rural residential uses consists of approximately 12 residences, both occupied and abandoned. Photographs of the project site are provided in Exhibit 3-3a and Exhibit 3-3b. The following are summaries of the various areas that comprise the project site.

Northeast Area

The Northeast Area totals 84.50 gross acres and contains vineyards, fallow agricultural lands, and three residential structures, as well as several outbuildings. S. Van Horn Avenue, a two-lane undivided rural road, bisects the Northeast Area and provides access to two of the residences. Two

co-located Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) high-voltage power lines (Kingsburg Cogen Tap and McCall-Kingsburg No. 1) cross the southern portion of Northeast Area in a north-south direction.

South Area

The South Area totals 135.40 gross acres and contains vineyards, fallow agricultural lands, and seven residential structures, as well as several outbuildings. S. Van Horn Avenue, a two-lane undivided rural road, bisects the South Area and provides access to four of the residences. S. Dockery Avenue, also a two-lane undivided rural road, forms the western boundary of the South Area and provides access to the remaining residences. Two co-located PG&E high-voltage power lines (Kingsburg Cogen Tap and McCall-Kingsburg No. 1) cross the eastern portion of South Area in a north-south direction.

Northwest Area

The Northwest Area totals 68.10 gross acres and contains vineyards, fallow agricultural lands, and two residential structures, as well as several outbuildings. S. Dockery Avenue, a two-lane undivided rural road, forms the eastern boundary of the Northwest Area and provides access to the two residences. A hexavalent groundwater plume that originated from the Selma Pressure Treatment site on the north side of SR-99 overlaps with a portion of the Northwest Area. Extraction system wells associated with the groundwater plume are located within the Northwest Area.

Surrounding Land Uses and Views

Surrounding land uses and views are summarized by the various areas that comprise the project site:

Northeast Area

- West: SR-99
- North: Rural residential; heavy industrial (Selma Pressure Treatment)
- East: Golden State Boulevard; Union Pacific Railroad; cultivated agriculture (vineyards); rural residential
- South: E. Mountain View Avenue; Darling Oil & Tire; abandoned multi-family residential structure; Selma Flea Market

Views to and from land uses to the west and north are generally unobstructed. Views to and from land uses to the east and west are generally obstructed by vegetation along Golden State Boulevard and E. Mountain View Avenue.

South Area

- West: S. Dockery Avenue; cultivated agriculture (vineyards); rural residential
- North: E. Mountain View Avenue; cultivated agriculture (vineyards); Valero gas station; light industrial; Shell gas station
- East: SR-99
- South: Cultivated agriculture (vineyards); rural residential

Views to and from land uses to the west, north, east, and south are generally unobstructed.

Northwest Area

- West: Cultivated agriculture (vineyards); rural residential
- North: SR-99
- East: S. Dockery Avenue
- South: E. Mountain View Avenue

Views to and from land uses to the west, north, and east are generally unobstructed. Views to and from land uses to the south are generally obstructed by vegetation along E. Mountain View Avenue.

Light and Glare

Project Site

Sources of light and glare within the project site are limited to exterior light fixtures on structures and vehicle head and tail lamps. There are no streetlights along any of the roadways adjacent to or within the project site boundaries.

Surrounding Areas

Sources of light and glare from surrounding land uses include exterior lighting associated with the Shell and Valero gas stations, the Selma Flea Market, and rural residential uses. Light and glare is also emitted by vehicle head and tail lamps on SR-99, Golden State Boulevard, E. Mountain View Avenue, S. Dockery Avenue, and S. Van Horn Avenue. Additionally, light and glare is emitted by train operations on the Union Pacific Bakersfield Subdivision, including train headlamps and grade crossing gate flashers at the E. Mountain View Avenue grade crossing.

4.1.3 - Regulatory Setting

City of Selma

General Plan

Both the 1997 General Plan and 2035 General Plan set forth the following goals and policies relevant to aesthetics, light, and glare. Note that the goal/policy numbering reflects the 2035 General Plan.

- Goal 8: Provide an appropriate interface between commercial and residential land uses.
- **Policy 1.46:** A 20 foot-minimum setback shall be provided between all new developments in the Regional Commercial and Highway Commercial land use designations, and properties designated for residential uses. Half the width of streets and alleys may be counted towards this setback. The setback area shall be landscaped and not include any parking, trash, loading, storage, or similar facilities.

- **Policy 1.49:** A minimum of 20 feet of landscaping shall be required for all new commercial development adjacent to arterial streets, except in the [Central Business District] land use designation.
- **Policy 1.51:** Parking areas shall be screened from adjacent streets in all new commercial developments by either landscaped berming, dense landscaping or low height walls.
- **Policy 1.52:** All commercial outdoor storage areas shall be screened from adjacent public right-of-ways.
- **Policy 1.53:** All new commercial developments or substantially rehabilitated commercial buildings shall include trash enclosures. Within the Central Business District and in cases of substantially rehabilitated commercial buildings, the size and configuration of the enclosure may be adjusted to the scale and size of the property.
- **Goal 10:** Commercial areas adjacent to Highway 99 shall present a visually pleasing image to the traveler and potential customer to Selma businesses.
- **Policy 1.54:** All commercial areas adjacent to Highway 99 shall be designed so that truck bays, trash areas, loading docks and other similar areas are visibly screened from the freeway.
- **Policy 1.55:** If the rear or sides of new buildings or substantially remodeled buildings will be visible from Highway 99, then those building faces shall have architectural features similar to the main entrance to the building. Buildings adjacent to Highway 99 shall contain features such that flat, non-descript walls are eliminated.
- **Policy 1.56:** Visible metal exteriors on commercial buildings shall be prohibited on parcels adjacent to Highway 99, except in the Highway Commercial land use designation.

The 1997 General Plan established the following goal and policy relevant to aesthetics, light, and glare:

- **Policy 9.1:** A minimum six-foot high, grout reinforced, solid masonry wall shall be constructed between all new commercial developments and land designated for residential use. A wall taller than six feet may be allowed when required for sound reduction as identified in a noise study or as determined to be necessary for security of commercial property.
- Goal 10: Provide pleasant interfaces between commercial uses and adjacent public areas.

The 2035 General Plan established the following goal and policies relevant to aesthetics, light, and glare:

- **Policy 1.45:** A minimum six-foot high, grout reinforced, solid masonry wall shall be constructed between all new commercial developments and land designated for residential use. A wall taller than six feet may be allowed when required for sound reduction as identified in a noise study or as determined to be necessary for security of commercial property. Openings in the wall may be provided at appropriate locations to allow for pedestrian connectivity.
- **Goal 9:** Developers shall provide pleasant interfaces between commercial uses and adjacent public areas.

• **Policy 1.50:** A minimum of 10 feet of landscaping shall be required for all new commercial development adjacent to collector and local streets, except in the CBD land use designation.

Zoning Code

The City of Selma establishes commercial development standards with various restrictions for uses within the commercial zones. The City of Selma Zoning Code requires developments with commercial zoning to go through Site Plan Review. The Site Plan Review process described in Zoning Code Chapter 20.1 allows the City to ensure that site aesthetic concerns are addressed in the project design. The City has also prepared a Commercial and Industrial Development Manual that explains or illustrates City ordinances and policies as they relate to development projects. Table 4.1-1 summarizes the standards that apply to the aesthetic aspects of the proposed project.

Category	Summary of Applicable Regulations
Building Height	Maximum building height is 75 feet.
Parking Lot Lighting	A photometric lighting plan prepared by a licensed electrical engineer is required for all parking areas having 10 or more spaces. The plan shall show the projected light intensity on a 10-foot grid overlaying the site plan. A minimum of 1-foot candle-maintained, with a maximum of a 10: 1 ratio is required.
	Light fixtures shall have sharp cut-off properties at the property line.
	The maximum height for fixtures is 40 feet when more than 50 feet from residential properties. Maximum fixture height is 20 feet when within 50 feet of residential properties.
	Lighting standards should be placed in planters when possible.
Parking Lot Landscaping	Landscaping in parking areas must be carefully chosen so that it will not create unsafe conditions.
	Only street trees should be used adjacent to the circulation areas.
	Planters shall be a minimum of 6 feet wide.
	A minimum of 5 percent of the gross parking area must be landscaped.
	All trees in parking areas shall be a minimum of 1.5 inches in diameter when measured 4.5 feet above the ground.
	Drought-tolerant materials and drip irrigation is encouraged in parking area planters. Turf and spray heads should be avoided.
Trash Enclosures	Trash enclosures shall be a minimum of 20 feet from any property line that is adjacent to other residential uses or zoning. The doors of trash enclosures should be placed so that they do not face a public right-of-way. Where nearby second story windows overlook the trash enclosure, overhead cover, or screening will be provided.
	No trash enclosure will be placed where it will create a potential safety hazard.

Table 4.1-1: Commercial Development Standards Summary

Category	Summary of Applicable Regulations
Building and Wall Signs	All building or wall signs require a sign permit and most will also required a building permit. No sign can be mounted above the roof line of the building.
	Total signage cannot exceed more than 10 percent of the wall face.
	A freestanding sign is any sign that stands by itself and is not attached to a structure. The most common freestanding signs are monument signs and pole signs. Monument signs are generally low to the ground and have the same architectural features as the building they serve. Monument signs must be placed in landscape areas with a minimum size of 70 square feet. Pole signs are signs mounted on poles of less than 25 feet in height.
	A freeway sign is a sign that can be seen from the highway and is greater than 25 feet in height. No freeway sign is allowed to be more than 75 feet high.
	Signs in the Public Right-of-Way are prohibited at all times.
Walls and Fences	All walls require a fence permit from the Building Division.
	When commercial and industrial developments are adjacent to a residential use or zone, a 6-foot solid masonry wall is required along the common property lines.
	No razor wire or coiled barbed wire is permitted in the City. Up to four single strands of barbed wire on top of a fence may be used in industrial and commercial areas except where adjacent to residential areas.
Landscaping	Landscaping is required in all required setback areas. Permanent irrigation systems are also required. Landscape and irrigation plans must be submitted to the Planning Division for review Irrigation systems also require a plumbing permit from the Building Division.
	The City encourages the use of drought tolerant plant materials. The City has restrictions on the amount of turf that may be planted in commercial and industrial developments.
	The minimum size tree used in landscape areas shall be 1.5-inch diameter measured 4.5 feet above the ground.
Source: City of Selma 2011	

Table 4.1-1 (cont.): Commercial Development Standards Summary

4.1.4 - Methodology

The aesthetic analysis performed in this section is based upon reconnaissance of the Project site and surrounding land uses, photographing the site and surrounding land uses, review of aerial photographs, a review of the Selma's Zoning Ordinance, and the City of Selma General Plan. Analysis of visual quality is inherently a subjective judgment; however, there are commonly accepted standards used to evaluate the significance of such impacts including building height, building massing, color, density of placement, and vegetation. Scenic views are elements of the broader viewshed such as mountain ranges, valleys, and ridgelines. They are usually middle ground or background elements of a viewshed that can be seen from a range of viewpoints, often along a roadway or other corridor. Scenic resources are described in the CEQA Checklist as specific features of a viewshed such as trees, rock outcroppings, and historical buildings. They are specific features

that act as the focal point of a viewshed and are usually foreground elements. Adverse visual impact would also normally be expected to result from the removal of vegetation prior to construction that is intended to enhance the appearance of conditions of the setting. Analysis of light and glare impacts is less subjective and concerns the intensity, height, and shielding of lighting fixtures as they relate to degrading daytime and nighttime views.

4.1.5 - Thresholds of Significance

According to the CEQA Guidelines' Appendix G Environmental Checklist, to determine whether impacts to aesthetics are significant environmental effects, the following questions are analyzed and evaluated. Would the project:

- a.) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (Refer to Section 7, Effects Found Not To Be Significant.)
- b.) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic building within a state scenic highway? (Refer to Section 7, Effects Found Not To Be Significant.)
- c.) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?
- d.) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

4.1.6 - Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This section discusses potential impacts associated with the development of the proposed project and provides mitigation measures where appropriate.

Visual Character

Impact AES-1: The proposed project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

Impact Analysis

The proposed project consists of the phased development of approximately 3.5 million square feet of urban uses and associated infrastructure on 287 net acres within an area currently occupied by agricultural and rural residential uses. Although this project would permanently alter the visual character of this area, it should be emphasized that this area is designated for Regional Commercial and Public Facilities use by the 2035 City of Selma General Plan. Furthermore, both the 1997 City of Selma General Plan and County of Fresno General Plan contemplated Highway Commercial and Light Industrial uses being developed within 253 gross acres of the project site. Thus, the conversion of this area from agricultural and rural residential uses to urban use has been long contemplated by both the City of Selma and County of Fresno; therefore, the proposed project's land use activities are in alignment with the long-term land use vision of these planning documents.

Additionally, the proposed project would be phased over a 12-year period. Thus, the change in visual character would occur at a gradual pace over a multiyear time frame and likely occur in conjunction with other new development projects in the project vicinity. As such, by the date the project is completed, many of the surrounding land uses will have likely have been developed and annexed into the Selma city limits.

The proposed project's building design, layout, landscaping, and signage will all be subject to Site Plan Review by the Selma City Council and Planning Commission. These bodies will review relevant aesthetic aspects of the project for consistency with the General Plan, the City Code, and any other adopted plans in place. This process is intended to ensure that proposed project achieves highquality design that is compatible with its surroundings.

In summary, while the proposed project would permanently change the visual character of the project site, the contemplated end uses would be consistent with the General Plan's vision for this area and be similar in aesthetic nature to anticipated urban development in this area. Individual project components would be subject to Site Plan Review and, therefore, be evaluated for consistency with the City's design standards and policies. As such, it can reasonably be concluded that the proposed project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is necessary.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Light or Glare

Impact AES-2: The proposed project may create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Impact Analysis

The proposed project would introduce commercial retail, office, auto mall, and visitor-serving commercial uses to approximately 287 net acres of primarily vegetated or vacant land, which would create new sources of light that may potentially be intrusive, since the site does not currently generate a substantial amount of nighttime lighting. The proposed project would include freestanding lighting in parking lots and along walkways, and exterior building lighting. In addition, construction of buildings with glass windows or other reflective surfaces would introduce new sources of daytime glare and nighttime glow. These additional sources of light and glare are expected to be incremental and visible from surrounding land uses, and these sources may potentially degrade daytime and

nighttime views. Light generated by the proposed project could also be perceived as a nuisance by those traveling to, traveling from, and passing by the site. The nuisance would primarily arise from light that is excessive, improperly placed, or inadequately screened. Therefore, this is considered a potentially significant impact. Accordingly, mitigation is proposed that would require the project applicant to submit a lighting plan to the City that identifies lighting fixtures and practices to prevent excessive spillage of light and glare onto neighboring properties. With the implementation of this mitigation, the proposed project would minimize the amount of light and glare they would add to the ambient environment and, therefore, would ensure that impacts are reduced to a level of less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

MM AES-2 Prior to issuance of building permits for the proposed project, the applicant shall prepare and submit a lighting plan to the City of Selma for review and approval. The plan shall demonstrate that lighting levels from all exterior light fixtures do not exceed 2.0 foot-candles as measured at the nearest property line. Additionally, the plan shall demonstrate that all exterior light fixtures employ full cut-off fixtures; however, exceptions can be made for low-intensity decorative "uplighting" intended to illuminate signage, architectural features, landscaping, or similar items.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

4.2 - Agricultural Resources

4.2.1 - Introduction

This section describes the existing agricultural resources and potential effects from project implementation on the site and its surrounding area. Descriptions and analysis in this section are based on information contained in the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Workbook prepared by Michael Brandman Associates, included in this EIR as Appendix B.

4.2.2 - Environmental Setting

Regional Setting

Agricultural Economy

Selma is located in Fresno County, the State's largest agricultural county in terms of acreage and production value. The California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program indicated that approximately 57 percent of the County's land area was in cultivated agricultural production in 2008. Fresno County has consistently maintained its position as the largest agricultural economy in the State during the past 5 years. Between 2004 and 2009, the production value of Fresno County crops increased from \$4.60 billion to \$5.33 billion. Table 4.2-1 summarizes agricultural production in the County between 2004 and 2009.

Year	\$ Value (Billions)	Rank in State		
2009	5.33	1		
2008	5.67	1		
2007	5.34	1		
2006	4.84	1		
2005	4.64	1		
2004	4.60	1		
Source: United States Department of Agriculture, 2004–2010.				

Table 4.2-2 summarizes the top 10 agricultural commodities produced in Fresno County by dollar value in 2009. Grapes are the leading commodity, with a production value of \$668 million.

Table 4.2-2: Fresno County Agricultural Commodity Summary (2009)

Rank	Commodity	\$ Value (Millions)
1	Grapes	668
2	Tomatoes	615
3	Poultry	505

Rank	Commodity	\$ Value (Millions)			
4	Almonds	501			
5	Cattle and Calves	302			
6	Milk	298			
7	Nectarines	187			
8	Oranges	174			
9	Peaches	172			
10	Garlic	151			
Source: Fresno County Agricultural Commissioner, 2010.					

Table 4.2-2 (cont.): Fresno County Agricultural Commodity Summary (2009)

Farmland Classifications

Table 4.2-3 provides a summary of the amount and type of total acreage in Fresno County between 2000 and 2008, using the classifications of agricultural land provided by the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, as set forth on the County's Important Farmland Map and which are described more fully below and in this section's Regulatory Framework.

- **Prime Farmland:** Land with the best combination of physical and chemical features able to sustain the long-term production of agricultural crops. These lands have the soil quality, growing season, and moisture supply needed to produce sustained high yields. Prime Farmland is classified as "Important Farmland."
- Unique Farmland: Land of lesser-quality soils used for the production of the State's leading agricultural crops. This land is usually irrigated, but it may include non-irrigated orchards or vineyards, as are found in some climactic zones in California. Unique Farmland is classified as "Important Farmland."
- Farmland of Statewide Importance: Land similar to Prime Farmland, but with minor shortcomings, such as greater slopes or less ability to hold and store moisture. Farmland of Statewide Importance is classified as "Important Farmland."
- Farmland of Local Importance: Land of importance in the local agricultural economy, as determined by each county's Board of Supervisors and a local advisory committee. Farmland of Local Importance is not classified as "Important Farmland."

As shown in the following table, this acreage has remained relatively constant between 2000 and 2008, having changed only less than 1 percent in total acreage.

	Acres					
Classification	2000	2002	2004	2006	2008	
Prime Farmland	734,052	731,936	722,584	713,085	693,173	
Farmland of Statewide Importance	491,569	490,266	483,786	478,732	439,020	
Unique Farmland	104,223	102,232	100,316	98,091	94,177	
Farmland of Local Importance	70,691	74,357	84,857	95,547	149,906	
Farmland Total	1,400,535	1,398,791	1,391,543	1,385,455	1,376,276	
Source: California Department of Conservation, 2004–2008.						

Table 4.2-3: Fresno County Farmland Summary (2000–2008)

Project Site

Land Classifications

As shown in Exhibit 4.2-1, the project site is mapped as containing 185.60 acres of Prime Farmland, 23.23 acres of Farmland of Statewide Importance, and 70.38 acres of Farmland of Local Importance.

Soils

Exhibit 4.2-2 provides the soil mapping for the project site. As shown in the exhibit, the project site contains six soil types:

- Hanford fine sandy loam (176.57 acres)
- Hanford sandy loam (41.83 acres)
- Hesperia fine sandy loam (30.38 acres)
- Pollasky sandy loam, 2 to 9 percent slopes (29.16 acres)
- Tujunga sandy loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes (12.78 acres)
- Hanford sandy loam benches (3.94 acres)

Williamson Act Contracts

As further discussed in the Regulatory Framework, the California Land Conservation Act, also known as the Williamson Act, is a voluntary program that allows agricultural property owners to have their property assessed on the basis of its agricultural production rather than at the current market value.

Exhibit 4.2-3 depicts the locations of active Williamson Act contracts in the project vicinity. As shown in the exhibit, one parcel totaling 29.83 acres within the Northwest Area (Assessor's Parcel No. 393-180-44) is encumbered by an active Williamson Act Contract (No. 4369). In accordance with the procedures set forth in Government Code Section 51243.5, the City of Selma filed a protest with the Fresno County Board of Supervisors to exercise its option to not succeed to the rights, duties, and powers of the county under the Williamson Act contract because this property was within 1-mile of the Selma city limits and was contemplated for annexation at the time the contract was executed.

In addition, approximately 612 acres of agricultural lands to the west, east, and south of the project site are encumbered by active Williamson Act contracts.

Surrounding Agricultural Land Uses

Exhibit 4.2-3 identifies the Zone of Influence around the project site, which totals approximately 1,996 acres. The Zone of Influence encompasses all parcels within 0.25 mile of the project site and is intended to provide context about the surrounding land uses. As shown in Exhibit 4.2-3, Important Farmland is located on all four sides of the project site, although non-agricultural land uses abut each of the three areas that comprise the project site.

4.2.3 - Regulatory Setting

State

Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program

The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program was established in 1982 to continue farmland mapping efforts initiated in 1975 by the Soil Conservation Service (since renamed Natural Resources Conservation Service [NRCS]) of the United States Department of Agriculture. Since 1980, the State of California has assisted the NRCS with completing its mapping in the State. The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program was created within the California Department of Conservation to carry on the mapping activity on a continuing basis and with a greater level of detail.

Williamson Act

In 1965, The California Land Conservation Act, also known as the Williamson Act, was adopted. This voluntary program allows property owners to have their property assessed on the basis of its agricultural production rather than at the current market value. The property owner is thus relieved of having to pay higher property taxes, as long as the land remains in agricultural production. The purpose of the Williamson Act is to encourage property owners to continue to farm their land, and to prevent the premature conversion of farmland to urban uses.

Upon approval of an application by the Board of Supervisors, the agricultural preserve is established, and the land within the preserve is restricted to agricultural and compatible uses for at least 10 years. Williamson Act contracts are automatically renewed annually for an additional one-year period, unless the property owner applies for non-renewal or early cancellation. The Williamson Act also contains limited provisions for cancellation of contracts, and a substantial penalty for the cancellation is assessed.



Source: NAIP Fresno County, CA (2009), Ca Dept. of Conservation FMMP, 2004.



Exhibit 4.2-1 Important Farmland Map

CITY OF SELMA • SELMA CROSSINGS PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT



Source: NAIP Fresno County, CA (2009), USDA Soils Data.



Exhibit 4.2-2 USDA Soils Map



Source: NAIP Fresno County, CA (2009).



Exhibit 4.2-3 Project Zone of Influence

Local

City of Selma

General Plan

Both the 1997 General Plan and 2035 General Plan set forth the following goals and policies relevant to agricultural resources. Note that the goal/policy numbering reflects the 2035 General Plan.

- **Goal 1:** Protect adjacent and nearby agricultural lands within the City's Planning Area, while providing for logical growth of the City.
- **Policy 1.5:** Support Fresno County General Plan objectives and policies which protect agricultural lands by maintaining large agricultural parcel sizes and preventing the development of these parcels until it is appropriate to be annexed into the City for development.
- **Policy 1.7:** Require a "right to farm" covenant to be recorded for all development adjacent to productive agricultural lands, in order to provide notice to future owners and protect the farming activities.
- **Policy 1.11:** Development of peninsulas of urban development into agricultural lands shall be discouraged.
- **Policy 5.10:** Agricultural lands which currently produce, or have the potential to produce, specialty crops for which the area is uniquely suited, should be protected from encroachment by urban uses.

The 1997 General Plan established the following goals and policies relevant to agricultural resources:

- **Policy 1.1:** To the maximum extent feasible, prime agricultural lands should not be designated for urban development to preserve them as a natural resource and provide a buffer between existing and future development in the City and neighboring cities.
- **Policy 1.2:** The premature conversion of productive agricultural lands to urban uses is discouraged. Steps to curb conversion of these lands include the use of Williamson Act contracts, and "right to farm" covenants.
- Goal 1.3: Preserve prime agricultural land
- **Policy 3.5:** To the fullest degree possible, prime agricultural land shall be preserved for agricultural uses only
- **Policy 3.8:** Commercial, industrial, open space, and recreational uses should be located adjacent to prime agricultural areas to avoid conflicts between agricultural operations and present or planned residential and institutional land uses.

The 2035 General Plan established the following policies relevant to agricultural resources:

- **Policy 1.2:** In order to preserve them as a natural resource and provide a buffer between existing and future development in the City and neighboring cities, prime agricultural lands should not be designated for urban development to the extent feasible.
- **Policy 1.3:** The premature conversion of productive agricultural lands to urban uses is discouraged. Steps to curb conversion of these lands include the use of Williamson Act contracts, Farmland Security Zone contracts, agricultural zoning, purchase/transfer of development rights and "right to farm" covenants.
- **Policy 1.101:** The City shall support non-renewal processes for Williamson Act designated lands within the 40,000 population Urban Development Boundary.
- Goal 3: Conserve prime agricultural land.
- **Policy 5.8:** Prime and uniquely productive agricultural land should be conserved through orderly expansion of the City.
- **Policy 5.9:** To protect human health and safety from potential impacts due to agricultural spraying, dust, and traffic congestion, the City will encourage lower density development adjacent to land planned for long-term agricultural uses.
- **Policy 5.12:** Work with regional partners/organizations to develop an agricultural land conservancy program. Encourage the application of new agricultural land preservation and conservancy programs outside of the City's SOI.

4.2.4 - Methodology

Michael Brandman Associates evaluated the proposed project's impacts on Important Farmland through the use of the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) model issued by the California Department of Conservation. The LESA model provides analytical approach for rating the relative quality of land resources based upon specific measurable features. Factors considered by the LESA model include soils, site acreage, water availability, and surrounding land uses. The LESA model worksheets are provided in Appendix B.

Additionally, Michael Brandman Associates assessed the proposed cancellation of the Williamson Act contract with the criteria set forth in Government Code Section 51280 through 51283.

4.2.5 - Thresholds of Significance

For the purposes of this EIR, to determine whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, the following questions are analyzed and evaluated. Would the project:

- a.) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?
- b.) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

- c.) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526)? (Refer to Section 7, Effects Found Not To Be Significant.)
- d.) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? (Refer to Section 7, Effects Found Not To Be Significant.)
- e.) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

4.2.6 - Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This section discusses potential impacts associated with the development of the proposed project and provides mitigation measures where appropriate.

Convert Important Farmland to Non-Agricultural Use

Impact AG-1:	The proposed project may result in the conversion of Important Farmland to non-			
	agricultural use.			

Impact Analysis

This impact will evaluate the potential for the proposed project to convert Important Farmland to nonagricultural use.

As shown in Exhibit 4.2-1, the project site area contains 185.60 acres of Prime Farmland, 23.23 acres of Farmland of Statewide Importance, and 70.38 acres of Farmland of Local Importance. (Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance fall under the "Important Farmland" umbrella, while Farmland of Local Importance does not). The development of the proposed project would permanently convert all of the Important Farmland acreage to urban use. To assess the significance of this conversion, Michael Brandman Associates prepared a LESA model, and the results are summarized in Table 4.2-4.

Table 4.2-4: Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model Scoring Summary

Category	Factor	Points	Factor Weigh	Weighted Points	Remarks
Land Evaluation	Land Capability Class	89.48	0.25	22.37	The project site contains mostly Class I and IIe soils, which have few agricultural limitations.
	Storie Index	89.13	0.25	22.28	The project site has a high Storie Index because of the high agricultural value of the soils.
	Subt	otal	0.50	44.65	

Category	Factor	Points	Factor Weigh	Weighted Points	Remarks
Site Assessment	Project Size	100	0.15	15	The project site size rating is 100 because of the high quality of the soils.
	Water Resources Availability	80	0.15	12	The project site is assumed to have access to irrigation water, although physical and economic restrictions may limit water availability during drought years.
	Surrounding Agricultural Lands	60	0.15	9	Farmland accounts for 66.26 percent of the surrounding land uses, which translates to 60 points.
	Surrounding Protected Resource Lands	0	0.05	0	Williamson Act contracted-farmland account for 32.16 percent of surrounding acreage, which translates to zero points.
	Subtotal 0.50			36	
	ſ	Fotal	-	80.65	—
Notes: LESA scoring sheet	provided in Appendix B.				

Table 4.2-4 (cont.): Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model Scoring Summary

As shown in Table 4.2-4, the project site achieves a total score of 80.65. The LESA model indicates that scores greater than 80 points are considered significant. Therefore, this would be a potentially significant impact.

A widely accepted approach for mitigating the loss of Important Farmland is to permanently preserve existing farmland elsewhere in the region through the use of an irrevocable instrument such as a deed restriction or easement. Accordingly, Mitigation Measure AG-1 requires the applicant to pursue preservation of farmland elsewhere in Fresno County at no less than a 1:1 ratio.

However, preservation of existing farmland does not fully offset the loss of farmland converted to non-agricultural use because the net loss of farmland is not avoided. There is no feasible mitigation scheme available to create new farmland, as the agricultural viability of an individual property depends on factors outside of the control of the City of Selma or applicant (e.g., soil quality, water availability, crop prices, etc.). Therefore, the residual significance of this impact is significant and unavoidable.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

- MM AG-1 At the time of development of each phase, the project applicant shall preserve Important Farmland acreage (i.e., Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance), as mapped by the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, within Fresno County at a ratio of no less than 1:1 for each acre of Important Farmland converted to non-agricultural use by the proposed project. Preserved acreage shall be of equal or higher quality than farmland converted to non-agricultural use. The preservation shall be accomplished through one of the following approaches:
 - The applicant shall pay fees to the City of Selma equivalent to the cost of preserving Important Farmland. The City shall use the fees to fund an irrevocable instrument (e.g., deed restriction or easement) to permanently preserve farmland via a Trust for Farmland Funds Disbursements. This option shall be pursued if the City of Selma has a farmland preservation program in place at the time permits are sought.
 - The applicant shall enter into a binding agreement with one or more private property owners or third-party organizations acceptable to the City of Selma (e.g., Fresno County Farm Bureau or the American Farmland Trust) to permanently preserve farmland. The agreement shall identify an irrevocable instrument that will be recorded against the preserved acreage property. This option shall be pursued if the City of Selma does not have a farmland preservation program in place at the time permits are sought. This latter approach may be implemented in conjunction with Mitigation Measure BIO-1d.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Significant unavoidable impact.

Conflict with Agricultural Zoning or Williamson Act Contract

Impact AG-2:	The proposed project may conflict with an active Williamson Act Contract.
•	

Impact Analysis

This impact will evaluate the potential for the proposed project to conflict with existing agricultural zoning or Williamson Act contracts.

Agricultural Zoning

The parcels comprising the project site are currently located in unincorporated Fresno County and zoned either AL20 – Agriculture Limited or AE20 – Agriculture Exclusive, which are agricultural zoning designations.

The project applicant is seeking the annex the project site into the Selma city limits. As part of the annexation process, the City is proposing to pre-zone the parcels C-R – Regional Commercial, a non-agricultural designation. This pre-zoning is an entitlement that is necessary for approval of the project and, therefore, is considered a "self-mitigating" aspect of the proposed project. As such, with the approval of the pre-zoning, no conflicts with agricultural zoning would occur.

Agricultural activities would be permitted to continue on the parcels comprising the project site during the interim period between annexation and construction of the proposed project. Such activities would be considered "legal, conforming land use activities" as they pre-date annexation and, therefore, would be exempt from compliance with the City's zoning requirements.

Williamson Act Contracts

A 29.83-acre parcel (APN 393-180-044) within the Northwest Area is encumbered by a Williamson Act contract that dates to 1971. As previously noted, the City of Selma filed a protest with the Fresno County Board of Supervisors to exercise its option to not succeed to the rights, duties, and powers of the county under the Williamson Act contract because this property was within 1 mile of the Selma city limits and was contemplated for annexation at the time the contract was executed. The protest was approved by Fresno LAFCO and, therefore, the Williamson Act contract will be automatically terminated once the parcel is annexed into the Selma city limits. This action would preclude conflicts with a Williamson Act contract. Impacts would be less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is necessary.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Pressures to Convert Farmland to Non-Agricultural Use

Impact AG-3: The proposed project would not create other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use.

Impact Analysis

This impact will evaluate the potential for the proposed project to create pressures on surrounding agricultural lands, which result in their ultimate conversion to non-agricultural use.

As shown in Exhibit 4.2-3, existing agricultural land is located immediately west of the Northwest and South Areas; south of the South Area; and east of the Northeast Area. Approximately 612 acres of these surrounding agricultural uses are encumbered by active Williamson Act contracts, including almost all of the parcels abutting the west and south sides of the South Area.

The 2035 City of Selma General Plan contemplates future residential development on the parcels immediately west of the Northwest Area; regional commercial on the northern-most parcel west of the South Area; and industrial development on the parcels east of the Northeast Area. The remaining area (most of the agricultural land abutting the west and south sides of the South Area) is outside the 2035 City of Selma General Plan Planning Area and, therefore, are anticipated to remain in agricultural production in unincorporated Fresno County for the foreseeable future. Furthermore, it should be noted that there are no applications on file with the City of Selma to develop non-agricultural uses on these properties.

Therefore, to the extent that the agricultural lands within the Selma Planning Area ultimately convert to urban use, this would be consistent with the long-term land use vision set forth in the 2035 City of Selma General Plan. Note that at the time of this writing, there are no development proposals on file with the City of Selma for these properties; therefore, these parcels are expected to remain in agricultural production for the foreseeable future. It would be speculative to predict when or if these parcels would ultimately convert to non-agricultural use.

For these reasons, it can be concluded that the proposed project would not create other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. Impacts would be less than significant.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

4.3 - Air Quality

4.3.1 - Introduction

This section describes the existing air quality and potential effects from project implementation on the site and its surrounding area. Descriptions and analysis in this section are based on information contained in the air quality modeling data prepared by Michael Brandman Associates, included in this EIR as Appendix C.

4.3.2 - Environmental Setting

The project is located in the City of Selma, which is located in the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin (Air Basin). Regional and local air quality is impacted by topography, dominant airflows, atmospheric inversions, location, and season.

Regional Air Quality

Air quality is a function of both the rate and location of pollutant emissions under the influence of meteorological conditions and topographic features. Atmospheric conditions such as wind speed, wind direction, and air temperature gradients interact with the physical features of the landscape to determine the movement and dispersal and, consequently, their effect on air quality. The combination of topography and inversion layers generally prevents dispersion of air pollutants in the Air Basin.

Topography

The Air Basin is generally shaped like a bowl. It is open in the north and is surrounded by mountain ranges on all other sides. The Sierra Nevada mountains are along the eastern boundary (8,000 to 14,000 feet in elevation), the Coast Ranges are along the western boundary (3,000 feet in elevation), and the Tehachapi Mountains are along the southern boundary (6,000 to 8,000 feet in elevation). The mountains surrounding the Air Basin form natural horizontal barriers to the dispersion of air contaminants.

Climate and Meteorology

The Air Basin has an "inland Mediterranean" climate and is characterized by long, hot, dry summers and short, foggy winters. Sunlight is a catalyst in the formation of some air pollutants (such as ozone), and the Air Basin averages more than 260 sunny days per year. Temperatures in the Selma area range from an average high of 98.3 degrees Fahrenheit (°F) in July to an average low of 37.6°F in December. The average annual rainfall in the Selma area is 10.9 inches.

Dominant Airflow

Dominant airflows provide the driving mechanism for transport and dispersion of air pollution. Marine air moves into the Air Basin from the San Joaquin River Delta. The wind generally flows south-southeast through the valley, through the Tehachapi Pass and into the Mojave Desert Air Basin portion of Kern County. As the wind moves through the Air Basin, it mixes with the air pollution generated locally, generally transporting air pollutants from the north to the south in the summer and in a reverse flow in the winter.

Inversions

Inversions are also an important component of regional air quality. In general, air temperature decreases with distance from the earth's surface, creating a gradient from warmer air near the ground to cooler air at elevation. Under normal circumstances, the air close to the earth warms as it absorbs surface heat and begins to rise. Winds occur when cooler air rushes in to take the place of the rising warm air. The wind and upward movement of air causes "mixing" in the atmosphere and can carry away or dilute pollution. Inversions occur when a layer of warm air sits over cooler air, trapping the cooler air beneath. These inversions trap pollutants from dispersing vertically and the mountains surrounding the Air Basin trap the pollutants from dispersing horizontally. Strong temperature inversions occur at elevations of 2,000 to 2,500 feet above the San Joaquin Valley floor during the summer and at 500 to 1,000 feet during the winter. The result is a relatively high concentration of air pollution in the valley during inversion episodes. These inversions cause haziness, which, in addition to moisture, may include suspended dust, a variety of emissions from vehicles, particulates from wood stoves, and other pollutants.

Air Pollutant Emissions Inventory

An emissions inventory is an account of the amount of air pollution generated by various emissions sources. To estimate the sources and quantities of pollution, the California Air Resources Board (ARB), in cooperation with local air districts, other government agencies, and industry, maintains an inventory of California emission sources. Sources are subdivided into the four major emission categories: mobile, stationary, areawide, and natural sources.

Mobile sources include on-road sources and off-road mobile sources. The on-road emissions inventory, which includes automobiles, motorcycles, and trucks, is based on an estimation of population, activity, and emissions of the on-road motor vehicles used in California. The off-road emissions inventory is based on an estimate of the population, activity, and emissions of various off-road equipment, including recreational vehicles, farm and construction equipment, lawn and garden equipment, forklifts, locomotives, commercial marine ships, and marine pleasure craft.

Stationary sources are large, fixed sources of air pollution, such as power plants, refineries, and manufacturing facilities. Stationary sources also include aggregated point sources. These include many small point sources, or facilities, that are not inventoried individually but are estimated as a group and reported as a single-source category. Examples include gas stations and dry cleaners. Each of the local air districts estimates the emissions for the majority of stationary sources within its jurisdiction. Stationary source emissions are based on estimates made by facility operators and local air districts. Emissions from specific facilities can be identified by name and location.

Areawide sources include source categories associated with human activity that take place over a wide geographic area. Emissions from areawide sources may be either from small, individual sources, such as residential fireplaces, or from widely distributed sources that cannot be tied to a single location, such as consumer products, and dust from unpaved roads or farming operations (such as tilling).

Natural, or non-anthropogenic, sources include source categories with naturally occurring emissions such as geogenic (e.g., petroleum seeps), wildfires, and biogenic emissions from plants.

Fresno County Emissions Inventory

Emissions inventory information is compiled by ARB and is available on its Almanac Emission Projection Data website. Table 4.3-1 summarizes Fresno County's most recently available emissions inventory estimate emissions for the main pollutants of concern in the Air Basin. Included are reactive organic gases (ROG), carbon monoxide (CO), oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), and particulate matter (PM). Particulate matter is a general category that is further divided by the size of the particulates, into PM₁₀ for particulates 10 microns or less in diameter, and PM_{2.5} for particulates 2.5 microns or less in diameter. More information on the general sources and health effects of these pollutants is available below under the Pollutants of Concern section.

Emissions		Pollutants (tons per day)				
Classification	Emission Category	ROG	со	NOx	PM 10	PM _{2.5}
Stationary	Fuel Combustion	0.8	8.6	11.2	1.2	1.2
	Waste Disposal	1.5	0.06	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Cleaning and Surface Coatings	6.5			0.0	0.0
	Petroleum Production and Marketing	3.0	0.01	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Industrial Processes	5.3	0.25	5,2	2.9	1.7
Areawide	Solvent Evaporation	15.1				
	Miscellaneous Processes	21.3	110.3	6.8	72.3	21.6
Mobile	On-Road Motor Vehicles	15.0	154.68	55.3	2.6	2.0
	Other Mobile Sources	12.8	77.32	23.7	1.6	1.4
Natural (Non- Anthropogenic)	Biogenic Sources	62.9				
	Geogenic Sources	0.1				
	Wildfires	1.0	14.63	0.5	1.5	1.3
Fresno County Total*			344.2	102.8	82.1	29.1
Note:						

Table 4.3-1: 2010 Fresno County Emissions Inventory

* Total based on non-rounded emissions estimates.

Source: California Air Resources Board, 2011.

ROG. Natural sources contributed the majority of ROG emissions in Fresno County in 2010, generating approximately 44 percent of the total inventory. Biogenic (plant-generated) emissions constituted the majority of natural source emissions. The next largest contributor of ROG emissions came from area sources with approximately 25 percent of the total inventory. Within areawide sources, the largest single contributor of ROG emissions was farming operations, with 9 percent of the County's total areawide ROG inventory. Mobile sources accounted for approximately 19 percent of the 2010 emissions inventory.

CO. Mobile sources generated the majority of CO emissions in the County at approximately 61 percent of the total CO inventory, with on-road motor vehicles contributing approximately 39 percent. Light-duty cars and trucks are the predominant source of on-road vehicles, contributing approximately 32 percent of the County's total CO inventory.

 NO_x . Mobile sources generated the majority of NO_x emissions in the County at approximately 77 percent of the total NO_x inventory, with on-road motor vehicles contributing approximately 54 percent. Heavy-duty diesel trucks are the predominant source of NO_x from on-road vehicles, contributing 36 percent of the County's total NO_x inventory.

 PM_{10} . For PM_{10} , areawide sources contributed approximately 88 percent of the 2010 inventory. The main PM_{10} -generating, areawide sources include farming operations, fugitive windblown dust, and paved and unpaved road dust.

 $PM_{2.5}$. Areawide sources contributed approximately 74 percent of the 2010 Fresno County inventory. The main $PM_{2.5}$ -generating areawide source came from managed burning and disposal, contributing 31 percent of the County's total $PM_{2.5}$ emissions. Other major sources include farming operations and residential fuel combustion, contributing 21 percent of the total inventory. Mobile sources contributed approximately 12 percent of the County's total $PM_{2.5}$ inventory.

Local Air Quality

Existing local air quality, historical trends, and projections of air quality are best evaluated by reviewing relevant air pollutant concentrations from near the project area. The ARB and San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) operate six air monitoring stations in Fresno County. The closest monitoring station to the project site is located in Parlier, approximately 5.5 miles northeast of the project site. The Parlier monitoring station measures ozone and NO₂. The next closest monitoring station, located in Fresno on Drummond Street, measures CO, and PM₁₀, in addition to ozone and NO₂. The monitoring station nearest the project site that measures PM_{2.5} is located in Fresno on Winery Street, approximately 14 miles northwest of the project site. Table 4.3-2 summarizes 2008 through 2010 published monitoring stations. As shown in Table 4.3-2, ambient air pollution concentrations in the project area regularly exceeded the state 1-hour ozone standard and the federal 8-hour standard in the last 3 years. In the same timeframe, the project area exceeded the state

daily PM_{10} standard and the federal $PM_{2.5}$ standard. However, the project area did not exceed the federal or state CO standards, nor did the project area exceed the federal PM_{10} standard.

Pollutant	Averaging Time (Units)	2008	2009	2010
Ozone	Maximum 1 Hour (ppm) Days > State Standard (0.09 ppm)	0.157 44	0.121 66	0.127 16
	Maximum 8 Hour (ppm) Days > 2008 Federal Standard (0.075 ppm) Days > State Standard (0.07 ppm)	0.132 62 86	0.104 51 73	0.108 26 51
Nitrogen dioxide (NO ₂)	Annual Average (ppm)	0.016	0.014	0.013
	Max 1 Hour (ppm) Days > State Standard	0.070 0	0.068 0	0.077 0
Carbon monoxide (CO)	Maximum 1 Hour (ppm) ¹	3.34	2.96	2.90
	Maximum 8 Hour (ppm) Days > State Standard (9.0 ppm) Days > Federal Standard (9 ppm)	2.34 0 0	2.07 0 0	2.03 0 0
Fine particulate matter (PM_{10})	State Annual Average (20 µg/m ³)	35.1	30.9	25.9
	Maximum 24 Hour $(\mu g/m^3)^2$ Days > State Standard (50 $\mu g/m^3$) Days > Federal Standard (150 $\mu g/m^3$)	78.3 15 0	75.3 8 0	85.6 5 0
Ultra fine particulate matter (PM _{2.5})	Annual Average (µg/m ³)	17.3	15.1	13.0
	Maximum 24 Hour ($\mu g/m^3$) Est. Days > Federal Standard (35 $\mu g/m^3$)	79.5 50.9	82.3 35.8	58.3 21.7

Table 4.3-2: Air Quality Monitoring Summary

Notes:

> = exceed ppm = parts per million

Exceedances are listed in **bold.**

The ARB does not report 1-hour average CO concentrations in its database, only 8-hour CO concentrations.

Therefore, the 1-hour CO concentration was derived by dividing the 8-hour concentration by 0.7.

² From the California measurement.

Source: California Air Resources Board, 2012.

Sensitive Receptors

Certain populations, such as children, the elderly, and persons with preexisting respiratory or cardiovascular illness, are particularly sensitive to the health impacts of air pollution. For purposes of CEQA, the SJVAPCD considers a sensitive receptor to be a location that houses or attracts children, the elderly, people with illnesses, or others who are especially sensitive to the effects of air pollutants. Examples of sensitive receptors include hospitals, residences, convalescent facilities, and schools. Office workers may also be considered sensitive receptors, based on their proximity to sources of toxic air contaminants and that workers may be exposed over the duration of their employment. The nearest sensitive receptors to the project are the residential over lifestyle commercial mixed use located in Phase 3 (northwest area) and residences located along the western and southern boundaries of the project.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change

Constituent gases of the earth's atmosphere called greenhouse gases play a critical role in the earth's radiation budget by trapping infrared radiation emitted from the earth's surface, which would otherwise have escaped into space. This phenomenon, known as the "Greenhouse Effect," is responsible for maintaining a habitable climate. However, it is believed that emissions from human activities, such as electricity production and vehicle use, have elevated the concentration of these gases in the atmosphere beyond the level of naturally occurring concentrations, leading to a trend of unnatural changes to the earth's natural climate, known as global warming or climate change.

Greenhouse gases are global pollutants, unlike ozone, carbon monoxide, particulate matter, and toxic air contaminants, which are pollutants of regional and local concern.

Potential Environmental Effects

The United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has declared that worldwide, average temperatures are likely to increase by approximately 3°F to 7°F by the end of the 21st century. However, a global temperature increase does not translate to a uniform increase in temperature in all locations on the earth. Regional climate changes are dependent on multiple variables, such as topography. One region of the earth may experience increased temperature, increased incidents of drought, and similar warming effects, whereas another region may experience a relative cooling. According to the IPCC's Working Group II Report website, climate change impacts to North America may include diminishing snowpack, increasing evaporation, exacerbated shoreline erosion, exacerbated inundation from sea level rising, increased risk and frequency of wildfire, increased risk of insect outbreaks, increased experiences of heat waves, and rearrangement of ecosystems, as species and ecosystem zones shift northward and to higher elevations.

In California, as discussed in a report prepared by the California Climate Change Center in 2006 and a report by Moser et al (2009), climate change may result in consequences such as the following.

- A reduction in the quality and supply of water to the State from the Sierra snow pack. If heattrapping emissions continue unabated, more precipitation will fall as rain instead of snow, and the snow that does fall will melt earlier, reducing the Sierra Nevada spring snowpack by as much as 70 to 90 percent. This can lead to challenges in securing adequate water supplies. It can also lead to a potential reduction in hydropower.
- Increased risk of large wildfires. If precipitation increases as temperatures rise, wildfires in the grasslands and chaparral ecosystems of southern California are expected to increase by approximately 30 percent toward the end of the century because more winter rain will stimulate the growth of more plant "fuel" available to burn in the fall. In contrast, a hotter, drier climate could promote up to 90 percent more northern California fires by the end of the century by drying out and increasing the flammability of forest vegetation.

- Reductions in the quality and quantity of certain agricultural products. Crops that are likely to be hard hit include wine grapes, fruit, nuts, and milk.
- Exacerbation of air quality problems. If temperatures rise to the medium warming range, there could be 75 to 85 percent more days with weather conducive to ozone formation in Los Angeles and the San Joaquin Valley, relative to today's conditions. This is more than twice the increase expected if temperature rises are kept in the lower warming range.
- A rise in sea levels resulting in the displacement of coastal businesses and residences. During the past century, sea levels along California's coast have risen about 7 inches. If heat-trapping emissions continue unabated and temperatures rise into the higher warming range, sea level is expected to rise an additional 22 to 35 inches by the end of the century. Elevations of this magnitude would inundate coastal areas with salt water, accelerate coastal erosion, threaten vital levees and inland water systems, and disrupt wetlands and natural habitats.
- Damage to marine ecosystems and the natural environment.
- An increase in infections, disease, asthma, heat stroke/exhaustion, heart attack, stroke, and other health-related problems.
- A decrease in the health and productivity of California's forests.

Although certain environmental effects are widely accepted to be a potential hazard to certain locations, such as rising sea level for low-lying coastal areas, it is currently infeasible to predict all environmental effects of climate change on any one location.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Trends

In 2006, total worldwide greenhouse gas emissions were estimated by the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change to be 22,170 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MMTCO₂e). Emissions in the U.S. were estimated to be 7,054.4 MMTCO₂e.

California is the second-largest contributor in the U.S. of greenhouse gases and the sixteenth largest in the world. In 2009, California produced 453 MMTCO₂e, including imported electricity and excluding combustion of international fuels and carbon sinks or storage, which is approximately 7 percent of U.S. emissions. The largest source of greenhouse gases in California is transportation, contributing 38 percent of the State's total greenhouse gas emissions. Electricity generation is the second-largest source, contributing 23 percent of the State's greenhouse gas emissions. The inventory for California's greenhouse gas emissions between 2000 and 2009 is presented in Table 4.3-3.

	Emissions MMTCO ₂ e					
Main Sector ¹	2000	2003	2005	2007	2009	
Agriculture & Forestry	28.9	30.7	32.6	32.9	32.1	
Commercial	12.8	13.0	13.0	13.3	14.3	
Electricity Generation (Imports)	46.2	64.9	63.2	60.1	48.4	
Electricity Generation (In state)	61.0	49.9	47.0	56.0	56.2	
Industrial	103.8	98.7	100.2	97.3	89.3	
Not Specified	8.9	11.0	12.3	13.3	14.7	
Residential	30.1	28.3	28.1	28.6	28.6	
Transportation	171.7	179.4	186.1	187.1	172.9	
Aviation ²	3.84	3.77	4.74	5.13	4.99	
Total	463.7	476.1	482.5	488.8	453.0	

Table 4.3-3: California Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory 2000-2009

Notes:

 $MMTCO_2e = million$ metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent

¹ Excludes military sector, aviation, and international marine bunker fuel.

² Includes only intrastate aviation emissions. Aviation is a subset of the Transportation sector.

Source: California Air Resources Board, 2011.

Pollutants of Concern

For reasons described below in the Regulatory Framework section, the criteria pollutants of greatest concern for the project area are ozone, PM_{10} , and $PM_{2.5}$. Although the Air Basin is in attainment of the federal and state carbon monoxide standards, carbon monoxide is a pollutant of concern, due to the potential for localized "hotspots" to occur. Other pollutants of concern are toxic air contaminants, asbestos, and greenhouse gases. The following provides a summary of the pollutants of concern for the project area.

Ozone

Ozone is not emitted directly into the air but is formed by a photochemical reaction in the atmosphere. Ozone precursors, which include ROG and NO_x (ozone precursors are discussed below), react in the atmosphere in the presence of sunlight to form ozone. Because photochemical reaction rates depend on the intensity of ultraviolet light and air temperature, ozone is primarily a summer air pollution problem. Often, the effects of emitted ROG and NO_x are felt a distance downwind of the emission sources. Ozone is subsequently considered a regional pollutant. Ground-level ozone is a respiratory irritant and an oxidant that increases susceptibility to respiratory infections and can cause substantial damage to vegetation and other materials.

Ozone can irritate lung airways and cause inflammation much like sunburn. Other symptoms include wheezing, coughing, pain when taking a deep breath, and breathing difficulties during exercise or outdoor activities. People with respiratory problems are most vulnerable, but even healthy people

who are active outdoors can be affected when ozone levels are high. Chronic ozone exposure can induce morphological (tissue) changes throughout the respiratory tract, particularly at the junction of the conducting airways and the gas exchange zone in the deep lung. Anyone who spends time outdoors in the summer is at risk, particularly children, and other people who are more active outdoors. Even at very low levels, ground-level ozone triggers a variety of health problems, including aggravated asthma, reduced lung capacity, and increased susceptibility to respiratory illnesses like pneumonia and bronchitis.

Ozone also damages vegetation and ecosystems. It leads to reduced agricultural crop and commercial forest yields; reduced growth and survivability of tree seedlings; and increased susceptibility to diseases, pests, and other stresses such as harsh weather. In the United States alone, ozone is responsible for an estimated \$500 million in reduced crop production each year. Ozone also damages the foliage of trees and other plants, affecting the landscape of cities, national parks and forests, and recreation areas. In addition, ozone causes damage to buildings, rubber, and some plastics.

Ozone is a regional pollutant, as the reactions forming it take place over time, and it materializes downwind from the sources of the emissions. As a photochemical pollutant, ozone is formed only during daylight hours under appropriate conditions, but it is destroyed throughout the day and night. Thus, ozone concentrations vary, depending upon both the time of day and the location. Even in pristine areas, some ambient ozone forms from natural emissions that are not controllable. This is termed background ozone. The average background ozone concentrations near sea level are in the range of 0.015 to 0.035 parts per million (ppm), with a maximum of about 0.04 ppm.

Reactive Organic Gases

Reactive organic gases (ROG) are defined as any compound of carbon, excluding carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide, carbonic acid, metallic carbides or carbonates, and ammonium carbonate that participate in atmospheric photochemical reactions. ROG consist of non-methane hydrocarbons and oxygenated hydrocarbons. Hydrocarbons are organic compounds that contain only hydrogen and carbon atoms. It should be noted that there are no state or federal ambient air quality standards for ROG because they are not classified as criteria pollutants. They are regulated, however, because a reduction in ROG emissions reduces certain chemical reactions that contribute to the formulation of ozone. ROG are also transformed into organic aerosols in the atmosphere, which contribute to higher PM_{10} levels and lower visibility.

Because ROG is an ozone precursor, the health effects associated with ROG emissions are due to their role in ozone formation and, as discussed above, not to direct effects.

Nitrogen Oxides

During combustion of fossil fuels, oxygen reacts with nitrogen to produce nitrogen oxides or NO_x . This occurs primarily in motor vehicle internal combustion engines, and fossil fuel-fired electric utility facilities and industrial boilers. The pollutant NO_x is a concern because it is an ozone precursor, which means that it helps form ozone. When NO_x and ROG are released in the atmosphere, they can chemically react with one another in the presence of sunlight and heat to form ozone. NO_x can also be a precursor to PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$.

One of the most important health effects associated with NO_x emissions is related to their role in ozone formation, as discussed above. Its role in the secondary formation of ammonium nitrate results in particulate health effects described in the next section. Nitrogen dioxide (NO_2) is the largest and most important component of NO_x . NO_2 acts mainly as an irritant affecting the mucosa of the eyes, nose, throat, and respiratory tract. Extremely high-dose exposure (as in a building fire) to NO_2 may result in pulmonary edema and diffuse lung injury. Continued exposure to high NO_2 levels can contribute to the development of acute or chronic bronchitis. Low-level NO_2 exposure may cause increased bronchial reactivity in some asthmatics, decreased lung function in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, and increased risk of respiratory infections, especially in young children.

Particulate Matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5})

Particulate matter is the term for a mixture of solid particles and liquid droplets found in the air. Some particles, such as dust, dirt, soot, or smoke, are large or dark enough to be seen with the naked eye. Others are so small that they can only be detected using an electron microscope.

The size of particles is directly linked to their potential for causing health problems. Small particles less than 10 micrometers (μ m) in diameter pose the greatest problems, because they can get deep into lungs and the bloodstream. The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) health standards have been established for two categories of particulate matter:

- 1. PM_{10} "inhalable coarse particles" with diameters larger than 2.5 micrometers and smaller than 10 micrometers and
- 2. $PM_{2.5}$ "fine particles," with diameters that are 2.5 micrometers and smaller. For reference, $PM_{2.5}$ is approximately one-thirtieth the size of the average human hair.

Although the PM_{10} standard is intended to regulate "inhalable coarse particles" that ranged from 2.5 to 10 micrometers in diameter, PM_{10} measurements contain both fine and coarse particles. These particles come in many sizes and shapes and can be made up of hundreds of different chemicals. Some particles, known as primary particles, are emitted directly from a source, such as construction sites, unpaved roads, fields, smokestacks, or fires. Others form in complicated reactions in the atmosphere from chemicals such as sulfur dioxides and nitrogen oxides that are emitted from power plants, industrial activity, and automobiles. These particles, known as secondary particles, make up most of the fine particle pollution in the United States.

Particle exposure can lead to a variety of health effects. For example, numerous studies link particle levels to increased hospital admissions and emergency room visits—and even to death from heart or
lung diseases. Both long- and short-term particle exposures have been linked to health problems. Long-term exposures, such as those experienced by people living for many years in areas with high particle levels, have been associated with problems such as reduced lung function, the development of chronic bronchitis, and even premature death. Short-term exposures to particles (hours or days) can aggravate lung disease, causing asthma attacks and acute bronchitis, and may increase susceptibility to respiratory infections. In people with heart disease, short-term exposures have been linked to heart attacks and arrhythmias. Healthy children and adults have not been reported to suffer serious effects from short-term exposures, although they may experience temporary minor irritation when particle levels are elevated.

Carbon Monoxide

Carbon monoxide (CO) is a colorless, odorless gas that is formed when carbon in fuel is not burned completely. It is a component of motor vehicle exhaust, which contributes about 56 percent of all CO emissions nationwide. Other non-road engines and vehicles (such as construction equipment and boats) contribute about 22 percent of all CO emissions nationwide. Higher levels of CO generally occur in areas with heavy traffic congestion. In cities, 85 to 95 percent of all CO emissions may come from motor vehicle exhaust. Other sources of CO emissions include industrial processes (such as metals processing and chemical manufacturing), residential wood burning, and natural sources such as forest fires. Woodstoves, gas stoves, cigarette smoke, and unvented gas and kerosene space heaters are sources of CO indoors.

Motor vehicles are the dominant source of CO emissions in most areas. CO is described as having only a local influence because it dissipates quickly. High CO levels develop primarily during winter, when periods of light winds combine with the formation of ground-level temperature inversions (typically from the evening through early morning). These conditions result in reduced dispersion of vehicle emissions. Because CO is a product of incomplete combustion, motor vehicles exhibit increased CO emission rates at low air temperatures. High CO concentrations occur in areas of limited geographic size, sometimes referred to as hot spots. Since CO concentrations are strongly associated with motor vehicle emissions, high CO concentrations generally occur in the immediate vicinity of roadways with high traffic volumes and traffic congestion, active parking lots, and in automobile tunnels. Areas adjacent to heavily traveled and congested intersections are particularly susceptible to high CO concentrations.

CO is a public health concern because it combines readily with hemoglobin, reducing the amount of oxygen transported in the bloodstream. The health threat from relatively low levels of CO is most serious for those who suffer from such heart-related diseases as angina, clogged arteries, or congestive heart failure. For a person with heart disease, a single exposure to CO at low levels may cause chest pain and reduce that person's ability to exercise; repeated exposures may contribute to other cardiovascular effects. High levels of CO can affect even healthy people. People who breathe high levels of CO can develop vision problems, reduced ability to work or learn, reduced manual

dexterity, and difficulty performing complex tasks. At extremely high levels, CO is poisonous and can cause death.

Toxic Air Contaminants

A toxic air contaminant is defined as an air pollutant which may cause or contribute to an increase in mortality or serious illness, or which may pose a hazard to human health. Toxic air contaminants are usually present in minute quantities in the ambient air. However, their high toxicity or health risk may pose a threat to public health even at very low concentrations. In general, for those toxic air contaminants that may cause cancer, there is no concentration that does not present some risk. In other words, there is no threshold level below which adverse health impacts are not expected to occur. This contrasts with the criteria pollutants for which acceptable levels of exposure can be determined and for which the state and federal governments have set ambient air quality standards.

Diesel Particulate Matter

ARB identified the PM emissions from diesel-fueled engines as a toxic air contaminant in August 1998 under California's toxic air contaminant program. In California, diesel engine exhaust has been identified as a carcinogen. Most researchers believe that diesel exhaust particles contribute the majority of the risk.

Diesel particulate matter (DPM) is emitted from both mobile and stationary sources. In California, on-road, diesel-fueled vehicles contribute approximately 40 percent of the statewide total, with an additional 57 percent attributed to other mobile sources such as construction and mining equipment, agricultural equipment, and transport refrigeration units. Stationary sources, contributing about 3 percent of emissions, include shipyards, warehouses, heavy equipment repair yards, and oil and gas production operations. Emissions from these sources are from diesel-fueled internal combustion engines. Stationary sources that report DPM emissions also include heavy construction (except highway) manufacturers of asphalt, paving materials and blocks, and electrical generation.

DPM is a subset of $PM_{2.5}$ —diesel particles are typically 2.5 microns and smaller. In a document published in 2002, the EPA noted that in 1998, diesel PM made up about 6 percent of the total $PM_{2.5}$ inventory nationwide. The complex particles and gases that make up diesel exhaust have the physical properties of organic compounds that account for 80 percent of the total particulate matter mass consisting of hydrocarbons and their derivatives and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons and their derivatives. Fifteen polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons are confirmed carcinogens, a number of which are found in diesel exhaust. The chemical composition and particle sizes of DPM vary among different engine types (heavy-duty, light-duty), engine operating conditions (idling, accelerating, decelerating), expected load, engine emission controls, fuel formulations (high/low sulfur fuel), and engine year.

Some short-term (acute) health effects of diesel exhaust exposure include eye, nose, throat, and lung irritation, and exposure can cause coughs, headaches, light-headedness, and nausea. Diesel exhaust is

a major source of ambient PM pollution in urban environments. In a 2002 report from the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) titled "Health Effects of Diesel Exhaust Report," it was noted that numerous studies have linked elevated particle levels in the air to increased hospital admissions, emergency room visits, asthma attacks, and premature deaths among those suffering from respiratory problems. The National Toxicology Program asserted that more serious, long-term health effects of diesel exhaust have demonstrated an increased risk of lung cancer, although the increased risk cannot be clearly attributed to diesel exhaust exposure in its 2005 Report on Carcinogens, Eleventh Edition.

Asbestos

Asbestos is the name given to a number of naturally occurring fibrous silicate minerals that have been mined for their useful properties such as thermal insulation, chemical and thermal stability, and high tensile strength. The three most common types of asbestos are chrysotile, amosite, and crocidolite. Chrysotile, also known as white asbestos, is the most common type of asbestos found in buildings. Chrysotile makes up approximately 90 to 95 percent of all asbestos contained in buildings in the United States.

Project construction sometimes requires the demolition of existing buildings where construction occurs. Buildings often include materials containing asbestos, this project involves the demolition of existing structures where asbestos has been identified. Asbestos is also found in a natural state, known as naturally occurring asbestos. Exposure and disturbance of rock and soil that naturally contain asbestos can result in the release of fibers to the air and consequent exposure to the public. Asbestos most commonly occurs in ultramafic rock that has undergone partial or complete alteration to serpentine rock (serpentinite) and often contains chrysotile asbestos. In addition, another form of asbestos, tremolite, can be found associated with ultramafic rock, particularly near faults. Sources of asbestos emissions include unpaved roads or driveways surfaced with ultramafic rock, construction activities in ultramafic rock deposits, or rock quarrying activities where ultramafic rock is present.

Exposure to asbestos is a health threat; exposure to asbestos fibers may result in health issues such as lung cancer, mesothelioma (a rare cancer of the thin membranes lining the lungs, chest and abdominal cavity), and asbestosis (a non-cancerous lung disease which causes scarring of the lungs).

The United States Geological Survey published a pamphlet entitled, "Reported Historic Asbestos Mines, and Other Natural Occurrences of Asbestos in California" in 2011 (USGS 2011), for generally identifying areas that are likely to contain naturally occurring asbestos. According to the pamphlet, rock formations that contain naturally occurring asbestos are known to be present in 51 of California's 58 counties, including Fresno County. A review of a map also available from the USGS website identifying areas more likely to have rock formations containing naturally occurring asbestos in California indicates that the project site is not in an area that is likely to contain naturally occurring asbestos. The nearest locations of naturally occurring asbestos shown are approximately 25 miles northeast of the project site near Pine Flat Dam.

Greenhouse Gases

Gases that trap heat in the atmosphere are greenhouse gases. The effect is analogous to the way a greenhouse retains heat. Common greenhouse gases include water vapor, carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxides, chlorofluorocarbons, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, sulfur hexafluoride, ozone, and aerosols. Natural processes and human activities emit greenhouse gases. The presence of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere affects the earth's temperature. Without the natural heat-trapping effect of greenhouse gases, the earth's surface would be about 34° Centigrade cooler. However, it is believed that emissions from human activities, such as electricity production and vehicle use, have elevated the concentration of these gases in the atmosphere beyond the level of naturally occurring concentrations.

An individual project cannot generate enough greenhouse gas emissions to effect a discernible change in global climate. However, the proposed project may participate in this potential impact by its incremental contribution combined with the cumulative increase of all other sources of greenhouse gases, which when taken together constitute potential influences on global climate change. Because these changes may have serious environmental consequences, this section will evaluate the potential for the proposed project to have a significant effect upon California's environment as a result of its potential contribution to the enhanced greenhouse effect.

The global warming potential is one type of simplified index based upon radiative properties that can be used to estimate the potential future impacts of emissions of different gases upon the climate system in a relative sense. Global warming potential is based on a number of factors, including the radiative efficiency (heat-absorbing ability) of each gas relative to that of carbon dioxide, as well as the decay rate of each gas (the amount removed from the atmosphere over a given number of years) relative to that of carbon dioxide.

The EPA defines global warming potential as the "cumulative radiative forcing effects of a gas over a specified time horizon resulting from the emission of a unit mass of gas relative to a reference gas," the reference gas in this case being CO_2 .

The global warming potential of a gas is essentially a measurement of the greenhouse gas compared with the reference gas, carbon dioxide; carbon dioxide has a global warming potential of one. The greenhouse gases of concern from the project are summarized in Table 4.3-4.

Individual greenhouse gas compounds have varying global warming potential and atmospheric lifetimes. The calculation of the carbon dioxide equivalent is a consistent methodology for comparing greenhouse gas emissions since it normalizes various emissions to a consistent metric. Methane's warming potential of 21 indicates that methane has a 21 times greater warming effect than carbon dioxide on a molecule per molecule basis. A carbon dioxide equivalent is the mass emissions of an individual greenhouse gas multiplied by its global warming potential.

Greenhouse Gas	Description and Physical Properties	Sources
Water vapor	Water vapor is the most abundant, important, and variable greenhouse gas. In the atmosphere, it maintains the climate necessary for life.	Sources include evaporation from the ocean and other water bodies, sublimation of ice and snow, and transpiration from plants.
Ozone (O ₃)	Ozone is a short-lived local greenhouse gas and photochemical pollutant. Tropospheric ozone changes contribute to radiative forcing on a global scale. Global warming potential for short-lived greenhouse gases, such as ozone and aerosols, are not defined by the IPCC.	Ozone is formed from reactions of ozone precursors (nitrogen oxides $[NO_x]$ and volatile organic compounds $[VOC]$) and sunlight in the atmosphere. VOC and NO_x are emitted from automobiles, solvents, and fuel combustion.
Methane (CH ₄)	Methane is a flammable gas and is the main component of natural gas. Global warming potential = 21. Atmospheric lifetime = $12 (\pm 3)$ years	A natural source of methane is from the anaerobic decay of organic matter. Methane is extracted from geological deposits (natural gas fields). Other sources are from landfills, fermentation of manure, and cattle.
Nitrous oxide (N ₂ O)	Nitrous oxide is also known as laughing gas and is a colorless greenhouse gas. Global warming potential = 310. Atmospheric lifetime = 120 years	Microbial processes in soil and water, fuel combustion, and industrial processes.
Carbon dioxide (CO ₂)	Carbon dioxide is an odorless, colorless, natural greenhouse gas. Global warming potential = 1. Atmospheric lifetime = 50 – 200 years.	Carbon dioxide is emitted from natural and anthropogenic sources. Natural sources include decomposition of dead organic matter; respiration of bacteria, plants, animals, and fungus; evaporation from oceans; and volcanic outgassing. Anthropogenic sources are from burning coal, oil, natural gas, and wood. The concentration in 2005 was 379 ppm, which is an increase of about 1.4 ppm per year since 1960.
Chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs)	CFCs are gases formed synthetically by replacing all hydrogen atoms in methane or ethane with chlorine and/or fluorine atoms. CFCs are nontoxic, nonflammable, insoluble, and chemically unreactive in the troposphere (the level of air at the earth's surface). Global warming potentials range from 3 800 to 8 100	CFCs were first synthesized in 1928 for use as refrigerants, aerosol propellants, and cleaning solvents. They destroy stratospheric ozone; therefore, the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer stopped their production in 1987

Table 4.3-4: Greenhouse Gases

Greenhouse Gas	Description and Physical Properties	Sources
Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)	The HFCs with the largest measured atmospheric concentrations are HFC-23 and HFC-134a (10 ppt) and HFC-152a (1 ppt). Global warming potentials: HFC- 23 = 11,700, HFC-134a = 1,300, HFC- 152a = 140. HFC-23 has an atmospheric lifetime of 264 years. HFC-124a has an atmospheric lifetime of 14.6 years. HFC-152a has an atmospheric lifetime of 15 years	HFCs are synthetic chemicals that are used as a substitute for CFCs in applications such as automobile air conditioners and refrigerants.
Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)	PFCs have stable molecular structures and only break down by ultraviolet rays about 60 kilometers above Earth's surface. Because of this, PFCs have very long lifetimes, between 10,000 and 50,000 years. Global warming potentials range from 6,500 to 9,200.	Two main sources of PFCs are primary aluminum production and semiconductor manufacturing.
Sulfur hexafluoride	Sulfur hexafluoride is an inorganic, odorless, colorless, and nontoxic, nonflammable gas. Concentrations in the 1990s were about 4 ppt. It has the highest global warming potential of any gas evaluated, 23,900. The atmospheric lifetime of sulfur hexafluoride is 3,200 years.	It is man-made and used for insulation in electric power transmission equipment, in the magnesium industry, in semiconductor manufacturing, and as a tracer gas.
Note: ppm = parts per million; p	pt = parts per trillion (measure of concentration in t	he atmosphere).

Table 4.3-4 (cont.): Greenhouse Gases

Source: Michael Brandman Associates; compiled using information from a variety of sources, including Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2007.

Water Vapor

Water vapor (H₂O) is the most abundant, important, and variable greenhouse gas in the atmosphere. Water vapor is not considered a pollutant; in the atmosphere, it maintains a climate necessary for life. Changes in its concentration are primarily considered to be a result of climate feedbacks related to the warming of the atmosphere rather than a direct result of industrialization. The feedback loop in which water is involved is critically important to projecting future climate change. As the temperature of the atmosphere rises, more water is evaporated from ground storage (rivers, oceans, reservoirs, soil). Because the air is warmer, the relative humidity can be higher (in essence, the air is able to hold more water when it is warmer), leading to more water vapor in the atmosphere. The warmer atmosphere can then hold more water vapor, and so on. This is referred to as a positive feedback loop. The extent to which this positive feedback loop will continue is unknown, as there are also dynamics that hold the positive feedback loop in check. As an example, when water vapor increases in the atmosphere, more of it will eventually condense into clouds, which are more able to reflect incoming solar radiation (thus allowing less energy to reach the Earth's surface and heat it up). There are no health effects from water vapor itself; however, when some pollutants come in contact with water vapor, they can dissolve and the water vapor can then act as a pollutant-carrying agent. The main source of water vapor is evaporation from the oceans (approximately 85 percent). Other sources include evaporation from other water bodies, sublimation (change from solid to gas) from sea ice and snow, and transpiration from plant leaves.

Carbon Dioxide

Carbon dioxide (CO₂) is an odorless and colorless greenhouse gas. Outdoor levels of carbon dioxide are not high enough to result in negative health effects. Carbon dioxide is emitted from natural and man-made sources. Natural sources include the decomposition of dead organic matter; respiration of bacteria, plants, animals, and fungus; evaporation from oceans; and volcanic outgassing. Anthropogenic sources include the burning of coal, oil, natural gas, and wood. Carbon dioxide is naturally removed from the air by photosynthesis, dissolution into ocean water, transfer to soils and ice caps, and chemical weathering of carbonate rocks. Since the industrial revolution began in the mid-1700s, the sort of human activity that increases greenhouse gas emissions has increased dramatically in scale and distribution. Data from the past 50 years suggests a corollary increase in levels and concentrations. As an example, prior to the industrial revolution, CO concentrations were fairly stable at 280 ppm. Today, they are around 370 ppm, an increase of more than 30 percent. Left unchecked, the concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere is projected to increase to a minimum of 540 ppm by the year 2100 as a direct result of anthropogenic emission sources.

Methane

Methane (CH₄) is an extremely effective absorber of radiation, though its atmospheric concentration is less than carbon dioxide and its lifetime in the atmosphere is brief (10 to 12 years), compared with other greenhouse gases. No health effects are known to occur from exposure to methane. Methane has both natural and anthropogenic sources. It is released as part of the biological processes in low oxygen environments, such as in swamplands or in rice production (at the roots of the plants). Over the last 50 years, human activities such as growing rice, raising cattle, using natural gas, and mining coal have added to the atmospheric concentration of methane. Other anthropogentric sources include fossil fuel combustion and biomass burning.

Nitrous Oxide

Nitrous oxide (N_2O), also known as laughing gas, is a colorless greenhouse gas. Nitrous oxide can cause dizziness, euphoria, and sometimes slight hallucinations. In small doses, it is considered harmless. However, in some cases, heavy and extended use can cause Olney's lesions (brain damage). Concentrations of nitrous oxide also began to rise at the beginning of the industrial revolution. In 1998, the global concentration was 314 parts per billion (ppb). Nitrous oxide is produced by microbial processes in soil and water, including those reactions that occur in fertilizer containing nitrogen. In addition to agricultural sources, some industrial processes (fossil fuel-fired power plants, nylon production, nitric acid production, and vehicle emissions) also contribute to its atmospheric load. It is used as an aerosol spray propellant, for instance, in whipped cream bottles. It is also used in potato chip bags to keep chips fresh. It is used in rocket engines and in racecars.

Nitrous oxide can be transported into the stratosphere, be deposited on the earth's surface, and be converted to other compounds by chemical reaction.

Chlorofluorocarbons

Chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) are gases formed synthetically by replacing all hydrogen atoms in methane or ethane (C_2H_6) with chlorine and/or fluorine atoms. CFCs are nontoxic, nonflammable, insoluble, and chemically unreactive in the troposphere (the level of air at the earth's surface). CFCs are no longer being used; therefore, it is not likely that health effects would be experienced. Nonetheless, in confined indoor locations, working with CFC-113 or other CFCs is thought to result in death by cardiac arrhythmia (heart frequency too high or too low) or asphyxiation. CFCs have no natural source, but were first synthesized in 1928. They were used for refrigerants, aerosol propellants, and cleaning solvents. Because of the discovery that they are able to destroy stratospheric ozone, a global effort to halt their production was undertaken and was extremely successful, so much so that levels of the major CFCs are now remaining steady or declining. However, their long atmospheric lifetimes mean that some of the CFCs will remain in the atmosphere for over 100 years.

Hydrofluorocarbons

Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) are synthetic, man-made chemicals that are used as a substitute for CFCs. Of all the greenhouse gases, they are one of the three groups with the highest global warming potential. The HFCs with the largest measured atmospheric abundances are (in order), HFC-23 (CHF₃), HFC-134a (CF₃CH₂F), and HFC-152a (CH₃CHF₂). Prior to 1990, the only significant emissions were of HFC-23. The EPA estimates that concentrations of HFC-134a emissions are increasing because of its use as a refrigerant. The EPA also estimates that concentrations of HFC-152a are about 1 ppt. No health effects are known to result from exposure to HFCs, which are man-made for applications such as automobile air conditioners and refrigerants.

Perfluorocarbons

Perfluorocarbons (PFCs) have stable molecular structures and do not break down though chemical processes in the lower atmosphere. High-energy ultraviolet rays, which occur approximately 60 kilometers (37.5 miles) above Earth's surface, are able to destroy the compounds. Because of this, PFCs have very long lifetimes, between 10,000 and 50,000 years. Two common PFCs are tetrafluoromethane (CF₄) and hexafluoroethane (C₂F₆). The EPA estimates that concentrations of CF₄ in the atmosphere are over 70 ppt. No health effects are known to result from exposure to PFCs. The two main sources of PFCs are primary aluminum production and semiconductor manufacture.

Sulfur Hexafluoride

Sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆) is an inorganic, odorless, colorless, nontoxic, nonflammable gas. It also has the highest global warming potential of any gas evaluated (23,900). The EPA indicates that concentrations in the 1990s were about 4 ppt. In high concentrations in confined areas, the gas presents the hazard of suffocation because it displaces the oxygen needed for breathing. Sulfur

hexafluoride is used for insulation in electric power transmission and distribution equipment, in the magnesium industry, in semiconductor manufacturing, and as a tracer gas for leak detection.

4.3.3 - Regulatory Setting

Air pollutants are regulated at the national, state, and air basin level; each agency has a different degree of control. The EPA regulates at the national level. The ARB regulates at the state level and SJVAPCD regulates at the air basin level.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

The EPA handles global, international, national, and interstate air pollution issues and policies. The EPA sets national vehicle and stationary source emission standards, oversees approval of all State Implementation Plans, provides research and guidance in air pollution programs, and sets National Ambient Air Quality Standards, also known as federal standards. There are federal standards for six common air pollutants, called criteria air pollutants, which were identified resulting from provisions of the Clean Air Act of 1970. The six criteria pollutants are:

- Ozone
- Particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5})
- Nitrogen dioxide

- Carbon monoxide (CO)
- Lead
- Sulfur dioxide

The federal standards were set to protect public health, including that of sensitive individuals; thus, the standards continue to change as more medical research is available regarding the health effects of the criteria pollutants.

California Environmental Protection Agency Air Resources Board

The State Implementation Plan for the State of California is administered by ARB, which has overall responsibility for statewide air quality maintenance and air pollution prevention. A State Implementation Plan is prepared by each state describing existing air quality conditions and measures that will be followed to attain and maintain National Ambient Air Quality Standards. The State Implementation Plan incorporates individual federal attainment plans for regional air districts. Federal attainment plans prepared by each air district are sent to ARB to be approved and incorporated into the California State Implementation Plan. Federal attainment plans include the technical foundation for understanding air quality (e.g., emission inventories and air quality monitoring) control measures and strategies and enforcement mechanisms.

ARB also administers California Ambient Air Quality Standards for the 10 air pollutants designated in the California Clean Air Act. The 10 state air pollutants are the six criteria pollutants listed above as well as visibility reducing particulates, hydrogen sulfide, sulfates, and vinyl chloride. Visibilityreducing particles are suspended particulate matter. Visibility is the distance through the air that an object can be seen without the use of instrumental assistance. Vinyl chloride is a chlorinated hydrocarbon and a colorless gas with a mild, sweet odor. Visibility-reducing particles and vinyl chloride are not assessed in this analysis because the project would not be exposed to or generate those pollutants.

Federal and state ambient air quality standards are summarized in Table 4.3-5.

Air Pollutant	Averaging Time	California Standard	Federal Standard	
Ozone (O ₃)	1 hour	0.09 ppm		
	8 hour	0.070 ppm	0.075 ppm	
Respirable particulate	24 hour	$50 \mu g/m^3$	150 μg/m ³	
matter (PM ₁₀)	Mean	$20 \mu g/m^3$		
Fine particulate matter	24 hour	_	35 µg/m ³	
(PM _{2.5})	Mean	$12 \mu g/m^3$	15.0 μg/m ³	
Carbon monoxide (CO)	1 hour	20 ppm	35 ppm	
	8 hour	9.0 ppm	9 ppm	
Nitrogen dioxide (NO ₂)	1 hour	0.18 ppm	188 μg/m ^{3****}	
	Mean	0.030 ppm	0.053 ppm	
Sulfur dioxide (SO ₂)	1 hour	0.25 ppm		
	24 hour	0.04 ppm 0.14 ppm		
	Mean*	—	0.030 ppm	
Lead	30-day	$1.5 \mu\text{g/m}^3$		
	Rolling 3-month	—	0.15 µg/m ³ **	
	Quarter	—	$1.5 \mu g/m^3$	
Sulfates	24 hour	$25 \mu g/m^3$		
Hydrogen sulfide	1 hour	0.03 ppm		
Vinyl chloride***	24 hour	0.01 ppm	No	
Visibility-reducing particles	8 hour	Extinction coefficient of 0.23 per kilometer, visibility of 10 miles or more from particles when relative humidity is less than 70%.	Federal Standard	

Abbreviations:

ppm = parts per million $\mu g/m^3 =$ micrograms per cubic meter 30-day = 30-day average

Quarter = Calendar quarter

Mean = Annual Arithmetic Mean *

** Federal lead standard, rolling 3-month average: final rule signed October 15, 2008.

*** ARB has identified lead and vinyl chloride as toxic air contaminants with no threshold level of exposure for adverse health effects determined. These actions allow for the implementation of control measures at levels below the ambient concentrations specified for these pollutants.

**** EPA set a new one-hour standard for nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) at a level of 188 µg/m³ or 100 parts per billion (ppb) on January 25, 2010, became effective April 12, 2010.

Source: California Air Resources Board, 2012.

Applicable Toxic Air Contaminant Regulation

ARB's toxic air contaminant program traces its beginning to the criteria pollutant program in the 1960s. For many years, the criteria pollutant control program has been effective at reducing toxic air contaminants, since many volatile organic compounds and PM constituents are also toxic air contaminants. During the 1980s, the public's concern over toxic chemicals heightened. As a result, citizens demanded protection and control over the release of toxic chemicals into the air. In response to public concerns, the California legislature enacted the Toxic Air Contaminant Identification and Control Act governing the release of toxic air contaminants into the air. This law charges ARB with the responsibility for identifying substances as toxic air contaminants, setting priorities for control, adopting control strategies, and promoting alternative processes. ARB has designated almost 200 compounds as toxic air contaminants. Additionally, ARB has implemented control strategies for a number of compounds that pose high health risk and show potential for effective control.

In 2005, ARB approved an Air Toxics Control Measure (ATCM) to limit diesel-fueled commercial motor vehicle idling to reduce emissions of toxics and criteria pollutants. The driver of any vehicle subject to this section (1) shall not idle the vehicle's primary diesel engine for greater than 5 minutes at any location and (2) shall not idle a diesel-fueled auxiliary power system for more than 5 minutes to power a heater, air conditioner, or any ancillary equipment on the vehicle if it has a sleeper berth and the truck is located within 100 feet of a restricted area (homes and schools).

Naturally Occurring Asbestos Regulation

The ARB has an ATCM for construction, grading, quarrying, and surface mining operations requiring the implementation of mitigation measures to minimize emissions of asbestos-laden dust. This ATCM applies to road construction and maintenance, construction and grading operations, and quarries and surface mines when the activity occurs in an area where naturally occurring asbestos is likely to be found. Areas are subject to the regulation if they are identified on maps published by the Department of Conservation as ultramafic rock units or if the Air Pollution Control Officer or owner/operator has knowledge of the presence of ultramafic rock, serpentine, or naturally occurring asbestos on the site. The ATCM also applies if ultramafic rock, serpentine, or asbestos is discovered during any operation or activity.

ARB's Land Use Handbook

ARB adopted the Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective (Land Use Handbook) in 2005. The Land Use Handbook provides information and guidance on siting sensitive receptors in relation to sources of toxic air contaminants. The sources of toxic air contaminants identified in the Land Use Handbook are high-traffic freeways and roads, distribution centers, rail yards, ports, refineries, chrome plating facilities, dry cleaners, and large gasoline dispensing facilities. If the project involves siting a sensitive receptor or source of toxic air contaminant discussed in the Land Use Handbook, siting mitigation may be added to avoid potential land use conflicts, thereby reducing the potential for health impacts to the sensitive receptors.

San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District

The air pollution control agency for the Air Basin is the SJVAPCD. The SJVAPCD is responsible for regulating emissions primarily from stationary sources, certain areawide sources, and indirect sources. The SJVAPCD maintains air quality monitoring stations throughout the Air Basin. The SJVAPCD, in coordination with the eight countywide transportation agencies, is also responsible for developing, updating, and implementing the Air Quality Plans (AQPs) for the Air Basin. In addition, the SJVAPCD has prepared the Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts, which sets forth recommended thresholds of significance, analysis methodologies, and provides guidance on mitigating significant impacts.

Attainment Status

There are three terms used to describe whether an air basin is exceeding or meeting federal and state standards: Attainment, Nonattainment, and Unclassified. Areas are designated attainment or nonattainment on a per-pollutant basis. If an air basin exceeds the "form" of a federal or state standard, the air basin is designated as "nonattainment" for that air pollutant. An air basin is designated as "attainment" if all the standards for an air pollutant are met. If there is inadequate or inconclusive data to make a definitive attainment designation for a pollutant, the air basin is considered "unclassified." The current attainment designations for the project area that are shown in Table 4.3-6.

Federal nonattainment areas are further divided into classifications—extreme, severe, serious, or moderate—as a function of deviation from standards. As of June 15, 2005, the EPA revoked the 1-hour ozone standard in all areas except the 8-hour ozone nonattainment Early Action Compact Areas. Therefore, the federal 1-hour ozone standard is only applicable to certain areas. The SJVAPCD is not listed as an Early Action Compact area; therefore, the federal 1-hour ozone standard does not apply to the project area. However, the SJVAPCD is still subject to anti-backsliding requirements such as continuation of 1-hour ozone control strategies.

	Designation Status		
Pollutant	Federal	State	
Ozone	Nonattainment	Nonattainment	
PM ₁₀	Attainment	Nonattainment	
PM _{2.5}	Nonattainment	Nonattainment	
Carbon monoxide	Attainment/Unclassified	Attainment/Unclassified	
Nitrogen dioxide	Unclassified ¹	Attainment	
Sulfur dioxide	Attainment/Unclassified	Attainment	
Lead	Attainment	Attainment	

Table 4.3-6: Air Basin Attainment Status

	Designation Status		
Pollutant	Federal	State	
Sulfates		Attainment	
Hydrogen sulfide	No federal standards	Unclassified	
Visibility-reducing particles		Unclassified	
Note: ¹ EPA set a new one-hour standa January 25, 2010, which becam new standard, based on the exis	rd for nitrogen dioxide (NO ₂) at a level of 18 le effective April 12, 2010. EPA expects to i ting community-wide monitoring network, b	$8 \ \mu g/m^3$ or 100 parts per billion (ppb) on dentify or designate areas not meeting the by January 2012. On January 24, 2011, the	

ARB submitted a request to EPA that all California be designated attainment, with the exception of areas with

Table 4.3-6 (cont.): Air Basin Attainment Status

insufficient data which would be designated unclassified. Source: San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, 2012.

Current Air Quality Plans

As described above under Federal and State Regulatory Agencies, a State Implementation Plan is a federal requirement; each state prepares a plan to describe existing air quality conditions and measures that will be followed to attain and maintain the National Ambient Air Quality Standards. In addition, state ozone standards have planning requirements. However, state PM₁₀ standards have no attainment planning requirements, but air districts must demonstrate that all measures feasible for the area have been adopted.

Ozone Plans

The Air Basin is designated nonattainment of state and federal health-based air quality standards for ozone. To meet CAA requirements for the one-hour ozone standard, the SJVAPCD adopted an Extreme Ozone Attainment Demonstration Plan in 2004, with an attainment date of 2010. The EPA revoked the federal 1-hour ozone standard and replaced it with an 8-hour standard. Although the EPA revoked the 1-hour ozone standard effective June 15, 2005, the requirement to submit a plan for that standard remained in effect for the San Joaquin Valley. On December 11, 2009, the EPA issued final approval of San Joaquin Valley's 2004 Extreme Ozone Attainment Plan for 1-hour ozone. The plan, prepared by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, shows that the area will have in place the controls necessary to meet the 1-hour ozone standard by the area's Clean Air Act deadline of 2010. However, the SJVAB failed to attain the standard in 2010 and was subject to a \$29-million Clean Air Act penalty. The penalty is being collected through an additional \$12 motor vehicle registration surcharge for each passenger vehicle registered in the Air Basin that will be applied to pollution reduction programs in the region. The SJVAPCD also instituted a more robust ozone episodic program to reduce emissions on days with the potential to exceed the ozone standards.

The Air Basin was originally classified as serious nonattainment for the federal 8-hour ozone standard with an attainment date of 2013. On April 30, 2007, the SJVAPCD's Governing Board adopted the 2007 Ozone Plan, which contained analysis showing a 2013 attainment target to be unfeasible. The

2007 Ozone Plan details the plan for achieving attainment on schedule with an "extreme nonattainment" deadline of 2023. At its adoption of the 2007 Ozone Plan, the SJVAPCD also requested a reclassification to extreme nonattainment. ARB approved the plan in June 2007, and the EPA approved the request for reclassification to extreme nonattainment on April 15, 2010.

In December 2008, the SJVAPCD adopted the "Amendment to the 2007 Ozone Plan to Extend the Rule Adoption Schedule for Organic Waste Operations." This amendment revised a table of the 2007 plan to extend the completion date for the Composting Green Waste control measure to the fourth quarter of 2010. SJVAPCD adopted Rule 4566 – Organic Material Composting Operations on August 18, 2011.

State ozone standards do not have an attainment deadline but require implementation of all feasible measures to achieve attainment at the earliest date possible. This is achieved through compliance with the federal deadlines and control measure requirements.

Particulate Matter Plans

The Air Basin was designated nonattainment of state and federal health-based air quality standards for PM_{10} . To meet Clean Air Act requirements for the PM_{10} standard, the SJVAPCD adopted a PM_{10} Attainment Demonstration Plan (Amended 2003 PM_{10} Plan and 2006 PM_{10} Plan), which had an attainment date of 2010.

The SJVAPCD adopted the 2007 PM_{10} Maintenance Plan and Request for Redesignation (2007 PM_{10} Plan) on September 20, 2007. The 2007 PM_{10} Plan contains modeling demonstrations that show the Air Basin will not exceed the federal PM_{10} standard for 10 years after the expected EPA redesignation, monitoring, and verification measures, and a contingency plan. Even though the EPA revoked the federal annual PM_{10} standard, the 2007 PM_{10} Maintenance Plan addresses both the annual and 24-hour standards because both standards were included in the EPA-approved State Implementation Plan. EPA finalized the determination that the Air Basin attained the PM_{10} standards on October 17, 2007, effective October 30, 2007. On September 25, 2008, the EPA redesignated the Air Basin as attainment for the federal PM_{10} standard and approved the PM_{10} Maintenance Plan.

The Air Basin is also designated nonattainment for the new federal $PM_{2.5}$ annual standard. The SJVAPCD adopted the 2008 $PM_{2.5}$ Plan on April 30, 2008. The $PM_{2.5}$ Plan demonstrates that the Air Basin will attain the 1997 federal standard by 2014 and make progress toward attaining the 2006 federal 24-hour standard. Barring delays due to legal challenges, the SJVAPCD estimates that attainment plans for the federal 2006 standard will be required by 2012 or 2013 with an attainment deadline of 2020. Measures contained in the 2003 PM_{10} Plan will also help reduce $PM_{2.5}$ levels and will provide progress toward attainment until new measures are implemented for the $PM_{2.5}$ Plan, if needed.

State PM_{10} standards have no attainment planning requirements, but air districts must demonstrate that all measures feasible for the area have been adopted.

Rules Applicable to the Project

The SJVAPCD rules and regulations that apply to this project include but are not limited to the following:

- SJVAPCD Rule 2201 New and Modified Stationary Source Review.
- SJVAPCD Rule 3050 Asbestos Removal Fees. Projects filing notification of an asbestos removal project, subject to the provisions of Rule 4002 (National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants), are required to pay a nonrefundable fee based on the total area demolished or renovated that contains asbestos containing material.
- SJVAPCD Rule 4002 National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants. The purpose of the rule is to incorporate the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants from Part 61, Chapter I, Subchapter C, Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations and the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Source Categories from Part 63, Chapter I, Subchapter C, Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations to protect the health and safety of the public from hazardous air pollutants, such as asbestos.
- SJVAPCD Rule 4102 Nuisance. The purpose of this rule is to protect the health and safety of the public, and applies to any source operation that emits or may emit air contaminants or other materials.
- SJVAPCD Rule 4601 Architectural Coatings. The purpose of this rule is to limit Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) emissions from architectural coatings. Emissions are reduced by limits on VOC content and providing requirements on coatings storage, cleanup, and labeling.
- SJVAPCD Rule 4641 Cutback, Slow Cure, and Emulsified Asphalt, Paving and Maintenance Operations. The purpose of this rule is to limit VOC emissions from asphalt paving and maintenance operations. If asphalt paving will be used, then the paving operations will be subject to Rule 4641.
- SJVAPCD Rule 4692 Commercial Charbroiling. The purpose of this rule is to limit VOC and PM₁₀ emissions from commercial charbroiling.
- SJVAPCD Regulation VIII Fugitive PM₁₀ Prohibitions. Rule 8011-8081 are designed to reduce PM₁₀ emissions (predominantly dust/dirt) generated by human activity, including construction and demolition activities, road construction, bulk materials storage, paved and unpaved roads, carryout and trackout, etc.
- SJVAPCD Rule 9410 Employer Based Trip Reduction. The purpose of this rule is reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) from private vehicles used by employees to commute to and from their worksites to reduce emissions of NO_x, VOC, and PM. The rule would require larger employers (those with 100 or more eligible employees) to establish employee trip reduction programs to reduce VMT, reducing emissions associated with work commutes. The rule uses a

menu-based Employer Trip Reduction Implementation Plan and periodic reporting requirements to evaluate performance on a phased-in compliance schedule.

• SJVAPCD Rule 9510 – Indirect Source Review. This rule reduces the impact of NO_x and PM_{10} emissions from growth on the Air Basin. The rule places application and emission reduction requirements on development projects meeting applicability criteria in order to reduce emissions through onsite mitigation, offsite SJVAPCD-administered projects, or a combination of the two. This project will submit an Air Impact Assessment application in accordance with Rule 9510's requirements.

Compliance with Rule 9510 (ISR)

Compliance with SJVAPCD Rule 9510 reduces the emissions impact of the project through incorporation of onsite measures as well as payment of an offsite fee that funds emission reduction projects in the Air Basin. The emissions analysis for Rule 9510 is highly detailed and is dependent on the exact project design that is expected to be constructed or installed. Compliance with Rule 9510 is separate from the CEQA process, though the control measures used to comply with Rule 9510 may be used to mitigate CEQA impacts. Minor changes to project components between the CEQA analysis and project construction often occur. An example of such a change is a change in square footage. The required amounts of emission reductions required by Rule 9510 are as follows:

Construction Exhaust:	20 percent of the total NO_x emissions, and	
	45 percent of the total PM_{10} emissions.	
Operational Emissions:	33 percent of NO_x emissions over the first 10 years, and	
	50 percent of the PM_{10} emissions over the first 10 years.	

Local

City of Selma

General Plan

Both the 1997 General Plan and 2035 General Plan set forth the following policies relevant to air quality and greenhouse gases. Note that the goal/policy numbering reflects the 2035 General Plan.

- **Policy 2.60:** The City shall encourage the use of energy efficient and non-polluting fuels and modes of transportation.
- **Policy 2.62:** Promote the long term shifting of peak hour commute trips from the single occupant automobile to ridesharing, buses, pedestrians, and bicycles.
- **Policy 2.63:** Large development shall be encouraged to incorporate transit passenger facilities, bicycle racks or lockers, shower facilities, as well as on site services (eating, mail, banking, etc.) as ways to encourage alternative modes for commute trips.

The 2035 General Plan established the following policies relevant to air quality and greenhouse gases:

- **Policy 2.61:** Transportation System Management and Transportation Demand Management are the applicable strategies for the mitigation of traffic and parking congestion. Public transit, traffic management, ridesharing and parking management are to be used to the greatest extent practical to implement transportation management strategies.
- **Goal [9]:** To protect the health and welfare of Selma residents by promoting development that is compatible with air quality standards.
- **Policy 5.21:** Develop strategies to minimize the number and length of vehicle trips, which may include:
 - Promoting commercial/industrial project proponent sponsorship of van pools or club buses;
 - Encouraging commercial/industrial project day care and employee services at the employment site;
 - Encouraging the provision of transit, especially for employment-intensive uses of 200 or more employees; and
 - Providing expansion and improvement of public transportation services and facilities.
- **Policy 5.22:** Encourage transportation alternatives to motor vehicles by developing infrastructure amenable to such alternatives by doing the following where feasible:
 - Consider right-of-way requirements for bike usage in the planning of new arterial and collector streets and in street improvement projects;
 - Require that new development be designed to promote pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation; and
 - Provide safe and secure bicycle parking facilities at major activity centers, such as public facilities, employment sites, and shopping and office centers.
- **Policy 5.23:** Encourage land use development to be located and designed to conserve air quality and minimize direct and indirect emissions of air contaminants by doing the following where feasible:
 - Locate air pollution point sources, such as manufacturing and extracting facilities in areas designated for industrial development and separated from residential areas and sensitive receptors (e.g., homes, schools, and hospitals); establish buffer zones (e.g., setbacks, landscaping) within residential and other sensitive receptor uses to separate those uses from highways, arterials, hazardous material locations and other sources of air pollution or odor;
 - Consider the jobs/housing/balance relationship (i.e., the proximity of industrial and commercial uses to major residential areas) when making land use decisions;
 - Provide for mixed-use development through land use and zoning to reduce the length and frequency of vehicle trips;
 - Accommodate a portion of the projected population and economic growth of the City in areas having the potential for revitalization;
 - Locate public facilities (libraries, parks, schools, community centers, etc.) with consideration of transit and other transportation opportunities;

- Encourage small neighborhood-serving commercial uses within or adjacent to residential neighborhoods when such areas are aesthetically compatible with adjacent areas; do not create conflicts with neighborhoods schools; minimize traffic, noise, and lighting impacts; encourage and accommodate pedestrian and bicycle access; and, are occupied by commercial uses that have a neighborhood-scale market area rather than a community-wide market area; and
- Encourage a development pattern that is contiguous with existing developed areas of the City.

Climate Change/Greenhouse Gas Regulation

International

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. In 1988, the United Nations and the World Meteorological Organization established the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to assess the scientific, technical and socio economic information relevant to understanding the scientific basis of risk of human-induced climate change, its potential impacts, and options for adaptation and mitigation.

United Nations. On March 21, 1994, the United States joined a number of countries around the world in signing the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. Under the Convention, governments gather and share information on greenhouse gas emissions, national policies, and best practices; launch national strategies for addressing greenhouse gas emissions and adapting to expected impacts, including the provision of financial and technological support to developing countries; and cooperate in preparing for adaptation to the impacts of climate change.

Kyoto Protocol. A particularly notable result of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change efforts is a treaty known as the Kyoto Protocol, which went into effect on February 16, 2005. When countries sign the Kyoto Protocol, they demonstrate their commitment to reduce their emissions of greenhouse gases or engage in emissions trading. More than 170 countries are currently participating in the Kyoto Protocol. Industrialized countries are required to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions by an average of 5 percent below their 1990 levels by 2012. In 1998, United States Vice President Al Gore symbolically signed the Protocol; however, in order for the Kyoto Protocol to be formally ratified, the United States Congress must approve it. Congress did not do this during the Clinton Administration. Former President George W. Bush did not submit the Protocol to Senate to be ratified based on the exemption granted to China. President Barack Obama has not taken action regarding the Kyoto Protocol because it is about to end.

Federal

Clean Vehicles. *Massachusetts v. EPA* (Supreme Court Case 05-1120) was argued before the United States Supreme Court on November 29, 2006, in which it was petitioned that the EPA regulate four greenhouse gases, including carbon dioxide, under Section 202(a)(1) of the Clean Air Act. On April

2, 2007, the Supreme Court held that petitioners have a standing to challenge the EPA and that the EPA has statutory authority to regulate greenhouse gases emissions from new motor vehicles.

Congress first passed the Corporate Average Fuel Economy law in 1975 to increase the fuel economy of cars and light duty trucks. The law has become more stringent over time. On May 19, 2009, President Obama put in motion a new national policy to increase fuel economy for all new cars and trucks sold in the United States. On April 1, 2010, the EPA and the Department of Transportation's National Highway Safety Administration announced a joint final rule establishing a national program that would reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve fuel economy for new cars and trucks sold in the United States.

The first phase of the national program would apply to passenger cars, light-duty trucks, and mediumduty passenger vehicles, covering model years 2012 through 2016. They require these vehicles to meet an estimated combined average emissions level of 250 grams of carbon dioxide per mile, equivalent to 35.5 miles per gallon if the automobile industry were to meet this carbon dioxide level solely through fuel economy improvements. Together, these standards would cut carbon dioxide emissions by an estimated 960 million metric tons and 1.8 billion barrels of oil over the lifetime of the vehicles sold under the program (model years 2012–2016). The second phase of the national program would involve proposing new fuel economy and greenhouse gas standards for model years 2017– 2025 by September 1, 2011.

On October 25, 2010, the EPA and the U.S. Department of Transportation proposed the first national standards to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve fuel efficiency of heavy-duty trucks and buses. For combination tractors, the agencies are proposing engine and vehicle standards that begin in the 2014 model year and achieve up to a 20-percent reduction in carbon dioxide emissions and fuel consumption by the 2018 model year. For heavy-duty pickup trucks and vans, the agencies are proposing separate gasoline and diesel truck standards, which phase in starting in the 2014 model year and achieve up to a 10-percent reduction for gasoline vehicles and a 15-percent reduction for diesel vehicles by 2018 model year (12 and 17 percent respectively if accounting for air conditioning leakage). For vocational vehicles, the agencies are proposing engine and vehicle standards starting in the 2014 model year that would achieve up to a 10-percent reduction in fuel consumption and carbon dioxide emissions by 2018 model year.

Mandatory Reporting of Greenhouse Gases. The Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2008, passed in December 2007, requires the establishment of mandatory greenhouse gas reporting requirements. On September 22, 2009, the EPA issued the Final Mandatory Reporting of Greenhouse Gases Rule. The rule requires reporting of greenhouse gas emissions from large sources and suppliers in the United States, and is intended to collect accurate and timely emissions data to inform future policy decisions. Under the rule, suppliers of fossil fuels or industrial greenhouse gases, manufacturers of vehicles and engines, and facilities that emit 25,000 metric tons or more per year of greenhouse gas emissions are required to submit annual reports to the EPA.

Greenhouse Gas Endangerment. On December 7, 2009, the EPA Administrator signed two distinct findings regarding greenhouse gases under Section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act: 1) Current and projected concentrations of the six key well-mixed greenhouse gases—carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride—in the atmosphere threaten the public health and welfare of current and future generations. 2) The combined emissions of these well-mixed greenhouse gases from new motor vehicles and new motor vehicle engines contribute to the greenhouse gas pollution, which threatens public health and welfare.

New Source Review. The EPA issued a final rule on May 13, 2010 that establishes thresholds for greenhouse gases that define when permits under the New Source Review Prevention of Significant Deterioration and Title V Operating Permit programs are required for new and existing industrial facilities. This final rule "tailors" the requirements of these Clean Air Act permitting programs to limit which facilities will be required to obtain Prevention of Significant Deterioration and Title V permits. In the preamble to the revisions to the federal code of regulations, EPA states:

This rulemaking is necessary because without it the Prevention of Significant Deterioration and Title V requirements would apply, as of January 2, 2011, at the 100 or 250 tons per year levels provided under the Clean Air Act, greatly increasing the number of required permits, imposing undue costs on small sources, overwhelming the resources of permitting authorities, and severely impairing the functioning of the programs. EPA is relieving these resource burdens by phasing in the applicability of these programs to greenhouse gas sources, starting with the largest greenhouse gas emitters. This rule establishes two initial steps of the phase-in. The rule also commits the agency to take certain actions on future steps addressing smaller sources, but excludes certain smaller sources from Prevention of Significant Deterioration and Title V permitting for greenhouse gas emissions until at least April 30, 2016.

The EPA estimates that facilities responsible for nearly 70 percent of the national greenhouse gas emissions from stationary sources will be subject to permitting requirements under this rule. This includes the nation's largest greenhouse gas emitters—power plants, refineries, and cement production facilities.

State

There have been significant legislative and regulatory activities that affect climate change and greenhouse gases in California. Relevant legislation is discussed below.

Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS). In 2002, SB 1078 required electric utilities to increase procurement of power generated by eligible renewable energy sources to 20 percent of total generation by 2017. In 2006, SB 107 accelerated the timetable to require 20 percent renewable energy by 2010. Then, in 2008, the Governor signed Executive Order S-14-08, which increased the required renewables content to 33 percent by 2020. In September 2009, the Governor signed

Executive Order S-21-09, which directed the Air Resources Board to adopt regulations consistent with the 33 percent renewable energy target in Executive Order S-14-08 by July 31, 2010. The 33 percent by 2020 goal was codified with Senate Bill X1-2, which was signed by Governor Edmund G. Brown, Jr., in April 2011. This new RPS preempts the ARB's 33 percent Renewable Electricity Standard and applies to all electricity retailers in the State, including publicly owned utilities (POUs), investor-owned utilities, electricity service providers, and community choice aggregators. All of these entities must adopt the new RPS goals of 20 percent of retails sales from renewables by the end of 2013, 25 percent by the end of 2016, and the 33 percent requirement being met by the end of 2020.

Title 24. Although it was not originally intended to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, California Code of Regulations Title 24 Part 6: California's Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings, was first adopted in 1978 in response to a legislative mandate to reduce California's energy consumption. The standards are updated periodically to allow consideration and possible incorporation of new energy efficient technologies and methods. All buildings for which an application for a building permit is submitted on or after January 1, 2011 must follow the 2008 standards. Energy efficient buildings require less electricity; therefore, increased energy efficiency reduces fossil fuel consumption and decreases greenhouse gas emissions. Revisions to Title 24 are currently in development with adoption expected in 2013.

California Green Building Standards. On January 12, 2010, the State Building Standards Commission unanimously adopted updates to the California Green Building Standards Code, which went into effect on January 1, 2011. The Green Building Standards Code (Code) is a comprehensive and uniform regulatory code for all residential, commercial and school buildings.

The California Green Building Standards Code does not prevent a local jurisdiction from adopting a more stringent code as state law provides methods for local enhancements. The Code recognizes that many jurisdictions have developed existing construction and demolition ordinances, and defers to them as the ruling guidance provided they provide a minimum 50-percent diversion requirement. The code also provides exemptions for areas not served by construction and demolition recycling infrastructure. State building code provides the minimum standard that buildings need to meet in order to be certified for occupancy. Enforcement is generally through the local building official.

The California Green Building Standards Code (code section in parentheses) requires:

- **Short-term bicycle parking.** If a commercial project is anticipated to generate visitor traffic, provide permanently anchored bicycle racks within 200 feet of the visitors' entrance, readily visible to passers-by, for 5 percent of visitor motorized vehicle parking capacity, with a minimum of one two-bike capacity rack (5.106.4.1).
- Long-term bicycle parking. For buildings with over 10 tenant-occupants, provide secure bicycle parking for 5 percent of tenant-occupied motorized vehicle parking capacity, with a minimum of one space (5.106.4.2).

- **Designated parking.** Provide designated parking in commercial projects for any combination of low-emitting, fuel-efficient and carpool/van pool vehicles as shown in Table 5.106.6.2 (5.106.5.2).
- **Recycling by Occupants.** Provide readily accessible areas that serve the entire building and are identified for the depositing, storage and collection of nonhazardous materials for recycling.
- **Construction waste.** A minimum 50-percent diversion of construction and demolition waste from landfills, increasing voluntarily to 65 and-75 percent for new homes and 80-percent for commercial projects. All (100 percent) of trees, stumps, rocks and associated vegetation and soils resulting from land clearing shall be reused or recycled.
- **Wastewater reduction.** Each building shall reduce the generation of wastewater by one of the following methods:
 - 1. The installation of water-conserving fixtures or
 - 2. Utilizing nonpotable water systems (5.303.4).
- Water use savings. 20-percent mandatory reduction in indoor water use with voluntary goal standards for 30, 35, and 40-percent reductions.
- Water meters. Separate water meters for buildings in excess of 50,000 square feet or buildings projected to consume more than 1,000 gallons per day.
- Irrigation efficiency. Moisture-sensing irrigation systems for larger landscaped areas.
- **Materials pollution control.** Low-pollutant emitting interior finish materials such as paints, carpet, vinyl flooring, and particleboard.
- **Building commissioning.** Mandatory inspections of energy systems (i.e. heat furnace, air conditioner, mechanical equipment) for nonresidential buildings over 10,000 square feet to ensure that all are working at their maximum capacity according to their design efficiencies.

The Code does not prevent a local jurisdiction from adopting a more stringent code, as state law provides methods for local enhancements. The Code recognizes that many jurisdictions have developed existing construction and demolition ordinances, and defers to them as the ruling guidance provided they provide a minimum 50-percent diversion requirement. The Code also provides exemptions for areas not served by construction and demolition recycling infrastructure. State building codes provide the minimum standard that buildings need to meet in order to be certified for occupancy. Enforcement is generally through the local building official.

Assembly Bill (AB) 1493 Pavley. California AB 1493, enacted on July 22, 2002, required the ARB to develop and adopt regulations that reduce greenhouse gases emitted by passenger vehicles and light duty trucks. On June 30, 2009, the EPA granted the State's implementation waiver request. The standards phase in during the 2009 through 2016 model years. When fully phased in, the near term

(2009–2012) standards will result in about a 22-percent reduction compared with the 2002 fleet, and the mid-term (2013–2016) standards will result in about a 30-percent reduction.

Low Carbon Fuel Standard – Executive Order S-01-07. The Governor signed Executive Order S-01-07 on January 18, 2007. The order mandates that a statewide goal shall be established to reduce the carbon intensity of California's transportation fuels by at least 10 percent by 2020. In particular, the executive order established a Low Carbon Fuel Standard and directed the Secretary for Environmental Protection to coordinate the actions of the California Energy Commission, the ARB, the University of California, and other agencies to develop and propose protocols for measuring the "life-cycle carbon intensity" of transportation fuels. This analysis supporting development of the protocols was included in the State Implementation Plan for alternative fuels (State Alternative Fuels Plan adopted by California Energy Commission on December 24, 2007) and was submitted to ARB for consideration as an "early action" item under AB 32. The ARB adopted the Low Carbon Fuel Standard on April 23, 2009. The Low Carbon Fuel Standard was challenged in the United States District Court in Fresno in 2011. The court's ruling issued on December 29, 2011 included a preliminary injunction against ARB's implementation of the rule. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals stayed the injunction on April 23, 2012 pending final ruling on appeal, allowing the ARB to continue to implement and enforce the regulation.

Executive Order S-03-05. Notwithstanding the current lack of Federal regulation of greenhouse gas emissions, Executive Order S-03-05, signed by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger on June 1, 2005, calls for a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 and for an 80-percent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions below 1990 levels by 2050 in California. The Secretary of the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) has been charged with coordination of efforts to meet these targets and formed the Climate Action Team to implement the Order. The Climate Action Team also provided strategies and input to the ARB Scoping Plan discussed below.

AB 32. In 2006, the California State Legislature enacted AB 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. AB 32 focuses on reducing greenhouse gas emissions in California. Greenhouse gases, as defined under AB 32, include carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride. AB 32 requires that greenhouse gases emitted in California be reduced to 1990 levels by the year 2020. ARB is the state agency charged with monitoring and regulating sources of emissions of greenhouse gases that cause global warming in order to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases. AB 32 states the following:

Global warming poses a serious threat to the economic well-being, public health, natural resources, and the environment of California. The potential adverse impacts of global warming include the exacerbation of air quality problems, a reduction in the quality and supply of water to the state from the Sierra snowpack, a rise in sea levels resulting in the displacement of thousands of coastal businesses and residences,

damage to marine ecosystems and the natural environment, and an increase in the incidences of infectious diseases, asthma, and other human health-related problems.

The ARB approved the 1990 greenhouse gas emissions level of 427 MMTCO₂e on December 6, 2007. Therefore, emissions generated in California in 2020 are required to be equal to or less than $427 \text{ MMTCO}_{2}e$.

Under the current "business-as-usual"¹ scenario, statewide emissions are increasing at a rate of approximately 1 percent per year as noted below. Also shown are the average reductions needed from all statewide sources (including all existing sources) to reduce greenhouse gas emissions back to 1990 levels.

- 1990: 427 MMTCO₂e
- 2004: 480 MMTCO₂e (an average 11-percent reduction needed to achieve 1990 base)
- 2008: 495 MMTCO₂e (an average 14-percent reduction needed to achieve 1990 base)
- 2020: 596 MMTCO₂e Business As Usual (an average 28-percent reduction needed to achieve 1990 base)

Under AB 32, the ARB published its Final Expanded List of Early Action Measures to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions in California in 2007. Discrete early action measures are currently underway or are enforceable by January 1, 2010. Early action measures are regulatory or non-regulatory and are currently in progress or to be initiated by the ARB in the 2007 to 2012 timeframe. The ARB has 44 early action measures that apply to the transportation, commercial, forestry, agriculture, cement, oil and gas, fire suppression, fuels, education, energy efficiency, electricity, and waste sectors. Of those early action measures, nine are considered discrete early action measures, as they are regulatory and enforceable by January 1, 2010. The ARB estimates that the 44 recommendations are expected to result in reductions of at least 42 MMTCO₂e by 2020, representing approximately 25-percent of the 2020 target.

The ARB's Climate Change Scoping Plan (Scoping Plan) contains measures designed to reduce the State's emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020 (California Air Resources Board 2008). The Scoping Plan identifies recommended measures for multiple greenhouse gas emission sectors and the associated emission reductions needed to achieve the year 2020 emissions target—each sector has a different emission reduction target. Most of the measures target the transportation and electricity sectors. As stated in the Scoping Plan, the key elements of the strategy for achieving the 2020 greenhouse gas target include:

¹ The 2020 business-as-usual forecast does not take any credit for reductions from measures included in the AB 32 Scoping Plan, including the Pavley greenhouse gas emissions standards for vehicles, full implementation of the Renewables Portfolio Standard beyond current levels of renewable energy, or the solar measures.

- Expanding and strengthening existing energy efficiency programs as well as building and appliance standards;
- Achieving a statewide renewables energy mix of 33 percent;
- Developing a California cap-and-trade program that links with other Western Climate Initiative partner programs to create a regional market system;
- Establishing targets for transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions for regions throughout California and pursuing policies and incentives to achieve those targets;
- Adopting and implementing measures pursuant to existing State laws and policies, including California's clean car standards, goods movement measures, and the Low Carbon Fuel Standard; and
- Creating targeted fees, including a public goods charge on water use, fees on high global warming potential gases, and a fee to fund the administrative costs of the State's long-term commitment to AB 32 implementation.

In addition, the Scoping Plan differentiates between "capped" and "uncapped" strategies. "Capped" strategies are subject to the proposed cap-and-trade program. The Scoping Plan states that the inclusion of these emissions within the cap-and trade program will help ensure that the year 2020 emission targets are met despite some degree of uncertainty in the emission reduction estimates for any individual measure. Implementation of the capped strategies is calculated to achieve a sufficient amount of reductions by 2020 to achieve the emission target contained in AB 32. "Uncapped" strategies that will not be subject to the cap-and-trade emissions caps and requirements are provided as a margin of safety by accounting for additional greenhouse gas emission reductions.

The Scoping Plan states that "The 2020 goal was established to be an aggressive, but achievable, midterm target, and the 2050 greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal represents the level scientists believe is necessary to reach levels that will stabilize climate" (California Air Resources Board, 2008a, page 4). The year 2020 goal of AB 32 corresponds with the mid-term target established by S-3-05, which aims to reduce California's fair-share contribution of greenhouse gases in 2050 to levels that will stabilize the climate.

Emission reductions in California would not be able to stabilize the concentration of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. However, California's actions set an example and drive progress towards a reduction in greenhouse gases. If other countries were to follow California's emission reduction targets, this could avoid medium or higher ranges of global temperature increases. Thus, severe consequences of climate change could also be avoided.

It should be noted that AB 32 did not amend CEQA or establish regulatory standards to be applied to new development or environmental review of projects with the State. Accordingly, the California Legislature adopted SB 97.

Senate Bill (SB) 97 was passed in August 2007 and added Section 21083.05 to the Public Resources Code. The code states "(a) On or before July 1, 2009, the Office of Planning and Research shall prepare, develop, and transmit to the Resources Agency guidelines for the mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions or the effects of greenhouse gas emissions as required by this division, including, but not limited to, effects associated with transportation or energy consumption. (b) On or before January 1, 2010, the Resources Agency shall certify and adopt guidelines prepared and developed by the Office of Planning and Research pursuant to subdivision (a)." The SB 97 CEQA Guidelines Amendments were proposed in 2009 and took effect on March 18, 2010.

The CEQA Amendments provide guidance to public agencies regarding the analysis and mitigation of the effects of greenhouse gas emissions in CEQA documents. The CEQA Amendments fit within the existing CEQA framework by amending existing CEQA Guidelines to reference climate change.

A new section, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4, was added to assist agencies in determining the significance of greenhouse gas emissions. The new section allows agencies the discretion to determine whether a quantitative or qualitative analysis is best for a particular project. However, little guidance is offered on the crucial next step in this assessment process—how to determine whether the project's estimated greenhouse gas emissions are significant or cumulatively considerable.

Also amended were CEQA Guidelines Sections 15126.4 and 15130, which address mitigation measures and cumulative impacts respectively. Greenhouse gas mitigation measures are referenced in general terms, but no specific measures are championed. The revision to the cumulative impact discussion requirement (Section 15130) simply directs agencies to analyze greenhouse gas emissions in an EIR when a project's incremental contribution of emissions may be cumulatively considerable, however it does not answer the question of when emissions are cumulatively considerable.

Section 15183.5 permits programmatic greenhouse gas analysis and later project-specific tiering, as well as the preparation of Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plans. Compliance with such plans can support a determination that a project's cumulative effect is not cumulatively considerable, according to proposed Section 15183.5(b).

In addition, the amendments revised Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines, which focuses on Energy Conservation. The sample environmental checklist in Appendix G was amended to include greenhouse gas questions.

SB 375. Passing the Senate on August 30, 2008, SB 375 was signed by the Governor on September 30, 2008. According to SB 375, the transportation sector is the largest contributor of greenhouse gas emissions, which emits over 40 percent of the total greenhouse gas emissions in California. SB 375

states, "Without improved land use and transportation policy, California will not be able to achieve the goals of AB 32." SB 375 does the following: (1) requires metropolitan planning organizations to include sustainable community strategies in their regional transportation plans for reducing greenhouse gas emissions, (2) aligns planning for transportation and housing, and (3) creates specified incentives for the implementation of the strategies. Concerning CEQA, SB 375, Section 21159.28 states that CEQA findings determinations for certain projects are not required to reference, describe, or discuss (1) growth-inducing impacts or (2) any project-specific or cumulative impacts from cars and light-duty truck trips generated by the project on global warming or the regional transportation network if the project:

- 1. Is in an area with an approved sustainable communities strategy or an alternative planning strategy that the ARB accepts as achieving the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets.
- 2. Is consistent with that strategy (in designation, density, building intensity, and applicable policies).
- 3. Incorporates the mitigation measures required by an applicable prior environmental document.

Executive Order S-13-08. Executive Order S-13-08 indicates that "climate change in California during the next century is expected to shift precipitation patterns, accelerate sea level rise and increase temperatures, thereby posing a serious threat to California's economy, to the health and welfare of its population and to its natural resources." Pursuant to the requirements in the order, the 2009 California Climate Adaptation Strategy (California Natural Resources Agency 2009) was adopted, which is the "... first statewide, multi-sector, region-specific, and information-based climate change adaptation strategy in the United States." Objectives include analyzing risks of climate change in California, identifying and exploring strategies to adapt to climate change, and specifying a direction for future research.

Local

Climate Change Action Plan

On August 21, 2008, the SJVAPCD Governing Board approved a proposal, called the Climate Change Action Plan, to begin a public process to bring together stakeholders, land use agencies, environmental groups, and business groups, and conduct public workshops to develop comprehensive policies for CEQA guidelines and a carbon exchange bank, and voluntary greenhouse gas emissions mitigation agreements for the Governing Board's consideration. The Climate Change Action Plan contained the following goals and actions:

Goals:

1. Assist local land-use agencies with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) issues relative to projects with greenhouse gas emissions increases.

- 2. Assist Valley businesses in complying with mandates of AB 32 (Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006).
- 3. Ensure that climate protection measures do not cause increases in toxic or criteria pollutants that adversely impact public health or environmental justice communities.

Actions:

- Authorize the Air Pollution Control Officer to develop greenhouse gas significance threshold(s) or other mechanisms to address CEQA projects with greenhouse gas emissions increases. Begin the requisite public process, including public workshops, and develop recommendations for Governing Board consideration in the spring of 2009.
- 2. Authorize the Air Pollution Control Officer to develop necessary regulations and instruments for establishment and administration of the San Joaquin Valley Carbon Exchange Bank for voluntary greenhouse gas reductions created in the Valley. Begin the requisite public process, including public workshops, and develop recommendations for Governing Board consideration in spring 2009.
- 3. Authorize the Air Pollution Control Officer to enhance the District's existing criteria pollutant emissions inventory reporting system to allow businesses subject to AB 32 emission reporting requirements to submit simultaneous streamlined reports to the District and the state of California with minimal duplication.
- 4. Authorize the Air Pollution Control Officer to develop and administer voluntary greenhouse gas emission reduction agreements to mitigate proposed greenhouse gas increases from new projects.
- 5. Direct the Air Pollution Control Officer to support climate protection measures that reduce greenhouse gas emissions as well as toxic and criteria pollutants. Oppose measures that result in a significant increase in toxic or criteria pollutant emissions in already impacted areas.

SJVAPCD CEQA Greenhouse Gas Guidance

On December 17, 2009, the SJVAPCD Governing Board adopted "Guidance for Valley Land-use Agencies in Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for New Projects under CEQA" and the policy, "District Policy—Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for Stationary Source Projects Under CEQA When Serving as the Lead Agency." The SJVAPCD concluded that the existing science is inadequate to support quantification of the impacts that project-specific greenhouse gas emissions have on global climatic change. The SJVAPCD found the effects of project-specific emissions to be cumulative, and without mitigation, that their incremental contribution to global climatic change could be considered cumulatively considerable. The SJVAPCD found that this cumulative impact is best addressed by requiring all projects to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions, whether through project design elements or mitigation. The SJVAPCD's approach is intended to streamline the process of determining if project-specific greenhouse gas emissions would have a significant effect. Projects exempt from the requirements of CEQA, and projects complying with an approved plan or mitigation program would be determined to have a less than significant cumulative impact. Such plans or programs must be specified in law or adopted by the public agency with jurisdiction over the affected resources and have a certified final CEQA document.

For non-exempt projects, those projects for which there is not applicable approved plan or program, or those projects not complying with an approved plan or program, the lead agency would evaluate the project against a performance-based standards and would require the adoption of design elements, known as a Best Performance Standard, to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The Best Performance Standards have not yet fully been established, though they must be designed to effect a 29-percent reduction when compared with the business-as-usual projections identified in ARB's AB 32 Scoping Plan. Business as usual refers to the emissions occurring in 2020 if the average baseline emissions during the 2002–2004 period were grown to 2020 levels, without control. These standards thus would carry with them pre-quantified emissions reductions, eliminating the need for project-specific quantification. Therefore, projects incorporating these Best Performance Standards would not require specific quantification of greenhouse gas emissions, and automatically would be determined to have a less than significant cumulative impact for greenhouse gas emissions. Again, the air district has not yet fully described the standards, but some general precepts have been established. For instance, for stationary source permitting projects, Best Performance Standards means "The most stringent of the identified alternatives for control of greenhouse gas emissions, including type of equipment, design of equipment and operational and maintenance practices, which are achieved-in-practice for the identified service, operation, or emissions unit class." For development projects, Best Performance Standards means "Any combination of identified greenhouse gas emission reduction measures, including project design elements and land use decisions that reduce project-specific greenhouse gas emission reductions by at least 29 percent compared with business as usual."

The SJVAPCD proposes to create a list of all approved Best Performance Standards to help in the determination as to whether a proposed project has reduced its greenhouse gas emissions by 29 percent. No timeline has been established for the development of said list.

Projects not incorporating Best Performance Standards would require quantification of greenhouse gas emissions and demonstration that business-as-usual greenhouse gas emissions have been reduced or mitigated by 29 percent. Quantification of greenhouse gas emissions would be required for all projects for which the lead agency has determined that an Environmental Impact Report is required, regardless of whether the project incorporates Best Performance Standards.

4.3.4 - Methodology

The analysis that follows was prepared using a variety of data sources and air quality models. The Traffic Impact Study for the project, prepared by Peters Engineering Group was used to obtain

intersection volumes for the CO Hotspot Analysis and average daily trip generation to model operational motor vehicle emissions.

CalEEMod (version 2001.1.1) was used to quantify project related emissions. CalEEMod is a California-specific computer model developed by the South Coast Air Quality Management District in cooperation with local air pollution control districts and air quality management districts throughout the State of California. CalEEMod estimates construction, area source, and operational emissions from potential land uses, using the most recent approved version of relevant ARB emissions models and emission factors and/or District-specific emission factors; and estimates emissions reductions. CalEEMod is the replacement for the URBEMIS 2007 model formerly recommended for modeling land use project emissions. CalEEMod is now recommended for use by the SJVAPCD for estimating project emissions.

Annual increases in vehicular and area emissions (operational emissions) associated with the project were estimated using the CalEEMod. Construction emissions for the project were also modeled using CalEEMod. Greenhouse gas emissions were estimated using CalEEMod. This analysis also follows guidance presented by the SJVAPCD in its 2002 Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts for criteria pollutant and toxic air contaminant analyses. The greenhouse gas analysis follows the SJVAPCD's "Guidance for Valley Land-use Agencies in Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for New Projects under CEQA."

The localized criteria pollutant analysis and toxic air contaminant (TAC) analyses were conducted using several modeling tools. Pollutant emissions from the various mobile sources were calculated using information derived from the project description, the project traffic study (Peters Engineering Group 2012), and mobile source emission factors from the ARB EMFAC2011 emissions factor model. In accordance with guidance from the USEPA and the SJVAPCD (SJVAPCD 2006), the health risk assessment of TAC emissions from this project applied the USEPA AERMOD Model. AERMOD predicts pollutant concentrations from point, area, volume, line, and flare sources with variable emissions in terrain from flat to complex with the inclusion of building downwash effects from buildings on pollutant dispersion. It captures the essential atmospheric physical processes and provides reasonable estimates over a wide range of meteorological conditions and modeling scenarios.

4.3.5 - Thresholds of Significance

According to the CEQA Guidelines' Appendix G Environmental Checklist, to determine whether impacts to air quality are significant environmental effects, the following questions are analyzed and evaluated.

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

Would the project:

- a.) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
- b.) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
- c.) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?
- d.) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
- e.) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

On February 16, 2010, the Office of Administrative Law filed the CEQA Guideline Amendments with the Secretary of State. The Amendments became effective on March 18, 2010. The CEQA Guidelines amendments included two new checklist questions pertaining to greenhouse gas emissions, listed below:

Would the project:

- a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?
- b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

This analysis will follow the guidance in the CEQA Guideline Amendments.

While the final determination of whether or not a project is significant is within the purview of the lead agency pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(b), the SJVAPCD recommends that its quantitative and qualitative air pollution thresholds be used to determine the significance of project emissions. These thresholds are discussed under each impact section below.

4.3.6 - Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This section discusses potential impacts associated with the development of the proposed project and provides mitigation measures where appropriate.

Air Quality Plan

Impact AIR-1:	The proposed project may conflict with or obstruct implementation of the
	applicable air quality plan.

Threshold

The CEQA Guidelines indicate that a significant impact would occur if the proposed project would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. The Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts does not provide specific guidance on analyzing conformity with the AQP. Therefore, the City will use the following criteria for determining project consistency with the current AQPs:

- Will the project result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations, or delay timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emission reductions specified in the AQPs? This measure is determined by comparison to the regional and localized thresholds identified by the SJVAPCD for Regional and Local Air Pollutants.
- 2. Will the project conform to the assumptions in the AQPs?
- 3. Will the project comply with applicable control measures in the AQPs?

The use of the criteria listed above is a standard approach for CEQA analysis of projects in the SJVAPCD's jurisdiction, as well as within other air districts, for the following reasons:

- Significant contribution to existing or new exceedances of the air quality standards would be inconsistent with the goal of attaining the air quality standards.
- AQP emissions inventories and attainment modeling is based on growth assumptions for the area within the air district's jurisdiction,
- AQPs rely on a set of air district-initiated control measures, as well as implementation of federal and state measures, to reduce emissions within their jurisdiction with the goal of attaining the air quality standards.

Impact Analysis

AQPs are plans for reaching attainment of air quality standards. The assumptions, inputs, and control measures are analyzed to determine if the Air Basin can reach attainment for the ambient air quality standards. In order to show attainment of the standards, SJVAPCD analyzes the growth projections in the valley, contributing factors in air pollutant emissions and formations and existing and future emissions controls. The SJVAPCD then formulates a control strategy to reach attainment.

Project's Contribution to Air Quality Violations

A measure of determining if the project is consistent with the AQP is if the project will not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations, or delay timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emission reductions specified in the AQPs. As shown in the discussion in Impact AIR-2, construction of the project would not exceed SJVAPCD thresholds of significance with the application of Mitigation Measure AIR-2a to reduce ROG emissions from architectural coatings. As shown in the discussion in Impact AIR-3, neither construction nor operation of the project would cause a CO violation. However, Impact AIR-2 indicates that operation of the project would exceed SJVAPCD thresholds for ROG, NO_X , and PM_{10} . Therefore, under Criteria 1, the project would contribute to an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations, or delay timely attainment of air quality standards.

Consistency with Assumptions in AQPs

The primary way of determining consistency with the AQP's assumptions is determining consistency with the applicable General Plan to ensure that the project's population density and land use are consistent with the growth assumptions used in the AQPs for the air basin.

As required by California law, city and county general plans contain a land use element that details the types and quantities of land uses that the city or county estimates will be needed for future growth, and that designates locations for land uses to regulate growth. The Fresno County Council of Governments uses the growth projections and land use information in adopted general plans to estimate future average daily trips and then VMT, which are then provided to SJVAPCD to estimate future emissions in the AQPs. Existing and future pollutant emissions computed in the AQP are based on land uses from area general plans. AQPs detail the control measures and emission reductions required for reaching attainment of the air standards.

The applicable general plan for the project is the City of Selma General Plan. According to the 1997 Selma General Plan, the project site is designated Highway Commercial, Heavy Industrial, and Business Park. A small triangular portion of a parcel located at the northwest corner of Phase 3 is designated at Medium Low-Density Residential. According to the approved, but legally challenged Selma 2035 General Plan Update, the entire project site is designated Regional Commercial. The Regional Commercial designation is the same one requested by the applicant. The proposed project is consistent with the approved general plan; however, if the legal challenge is not settled prior to approval of the project, it will require a General Plan Amendment. The proposed project would be consistent with the allowed uses and development intensity of the land use designation. The project would also not result in a substantial increase in development intensity compared the existing highway commercial, heavy industrial, and business park designations. Furthermore, the project is not anticipated to result in substantial direct or indirect population growth. Accordingly, it can be concluded the proposed project's uses are consistent with the growth and VMT projections contained in the AQP. The project impact is less than significant for this criterion.

Air Quality

Control Measures

The AQP contains a number of control measures, including the rules outlined by the SJVAPCD. The control measures in the AQP are enforceable requirements. The project will comply with all of the SJVAPCD's applicable rules and regulations.

Although the project is consistent with air quality plan assumptions, and will comply with all applicable SJVAPCD rules and regulations, the project will exceed SJVAPCD emissions thresholds during project operation. Mitigation measures applied to the project would not reduce emissions to below the thresholds. Therefore, the project's impact is significant and unavoidable.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

Implement Mitigation Measures AIR-2a, AIR-2b, AIR-2c, TRANS-6a, TRANS-6b, and TRANS-6c.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Significant unavoidable impact..

Air Quality Standards/Violations

Impact AIR-2: The proposed project would violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

Thresholds

The SJVAPCD has set thresholds of significance, on a per year basis, for ozone, NO_x , ROG, and PM_{10} . These thresholds will be used for analytical purposes in this EIR.

Ozone is a regional air pollutant that is not emitted directly, but forms from a chemical reaction between the ozone precursors NO_x and ROG in the presence of sunlight. Therefore, the SJVAPCD has set operational significance thresholds on the precursors of ozone.

According to the Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts, the SJVAPCD based the ozone precursor thresholds' "significant contribution" definition on the California Clean Air Act's offset requirements for NO_x and ROG. The ROG and NO_x offset thresholds are described in SJVAPCD Rule 2201 (New and Modified Stationary Source Review). In addition, this analysis will use a PM_{10} threshold based on the SJVAPCD's offset thresholds for PM_{10} in Rule 2201.

Projects within the Air Basin with operational or construction-related emissions in excess of any of the regional thresholds presented in Table 4.3-7 will be considered significant. The SJVAPCD does not have a regional threshold of significance for $PM_{2.5}$; however, since $PM_{2.5}$ is a subset of PM_{10} , the PM_{10} offset threshold will also be applied to $PM_{2.5}$.

Sulfur dioxide and CO are not included in the regional analysis because they are in attainment and the SJVAPCD has not issued significance thresholds for those pollutants. Additionally, only minor amounts of sulfur dioxide are emitted during construction and operation, as shown in the output files contained in Appendix C. CO emissions would not be significant during construction because the background concentration of CO is low, and CO would disperse rapidly and not be at a concentration to evoke negative health effects to nearby receptors. Operational CO impacts from the motor vehicles are assessed in Impact AIR-3.

Pollutant	Tons per Year	
NO _x	10	
ROG	10	
PM ₁₀	15	
PM _{2.5}	15	
Source: San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, 2002		

Table 4.3-7: Regional Thresholds

In addition to the regional thresholds above, the SJVAPCD has requested that projects analyze the potential to generate or substantially contribute to a localized exceedance of nonattainment criteria pollutants. A significant impact would result if the change in the NO₂, SO₂, or CO pollutant impacts from the addition of the project plus the background concentrations of these pollutants contributed by other local and regional emission sources exceeds the most restrictive ambient air quality standards. The significance thresholds identified for PM_{10} and $PM PM_{2.5}$ require a different characterization. Although the Air Basin has not violated the national ambient air quality standards or PM_{10} in the past five years, it has violated the state standard for PM_{10} during the past several years. The Air Basin also exceeds both the national and state $PM_{2.5}$ air standards. The SJVAPCD has not, however, adopted local significance thresholds for either PM_{10} or $PM_{2.5}$.

For pollutants where the air basin is classified as non attainment under either the federal or state ambient air quality standards such as in the Air Basin for PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$, the significance approach accepted by local, state, and federal air agencies is to identify a significant impact level based on a level of increase determined to be *de minimis* by the EPA. CEQA case law (*Kings County Farm Bureau v. the City of Hanford*) established that the threshold in this case is not one additional molecule (or particle), which would require an EIR for any new development while the area was in non-attainment. The ruling stated "The relevant question to be addressed in the EIR is not the relative amount of precursors emitted by the project when compared with preexisting emissions, but whether any additional amount of precursor emissions should be considered significant in light of the serious nature of the ozone problems in this air basin." Therefore, for purposes of this assessment, the EPA significant impact levels contained in Title 40, Part 51, (51.165(b)(2)) of the Code of Federal Regulations were adopted to assess the significance of the change in particulate matter impacts from the project. Significant impact levels are a screening tool used to determine whether a proposed source's emissions will have a significant impact on air quality. If an individual project's impacts are less than the corresponding significant impact levels, its impact is said to be *de minimis*. Significant impact levels are also used to determine whether a proposed source's impact on an existing violation of a standard is significant enough that it is considered to "cause or contribute to" the violation.

The criteria pollutant significance thresholds applied in this assessment are summarized in Table 4.3-8. A significant impact would occur if the change in any pollutant exceeds the appropriate significance threshold.

Pollutant	Air Concentration Threshold	Regulatory Authority	
СО	20 ppm (1-hour) 9 ppm (8-hour)	State Standard State/National Standard	
NO ₂	 0.10 ppm (3-year average of the 98th percentile of maximum daily 1-hour average). 0.18 ppm (1-hour) 0.03 ppm (annual) 	National Standard State Standard State Standard	
PM ₁₀	$5 \ \mu g/m^3$ (24-hour) 1 $\mu g/m^3$ (annual)	EPA 40 CFR Parts 51 and 52 (SIL) EPA 40 CFR Parts 51 and 52 (SIL)	
PM _{2.5}	1.2 μ g/m ³ (24-hour) 0.3 μ g/m ³ (annual)	EPA 40 CFR Parts 51 and 52 (SIL) EPA 40 CFR Parts 51 and 52 (SIL)	
SO ₂	0.25 ppm (1-hour) 0.075 ppm (3-year average of the 99 th percentile of the maximum daily 1-hour average) 0.50 ppm (3-hour average) 0.04 ppm (24-hour average) 0.03 ppm (annual)	State Standard National Standard State Standard State Standard State Standard	
Source: San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, 2012.			

Table 4.3-8: Criteria	Pollutant Localized	Operational	Significance	Threshold	Summary

Impact Analysis

Construction

Construction impacts include fugitive dust and other particulate matter, as well as exhaust emissions generated by earthmoving activities, and operation of grading equipment during site preparation. Construction emissions are caused by onsite or offsite activities. Onsite emissions principally consist of exhaust emissions from heavy-duty construction equipment, motor vehicle operation, and fugitive dust from disturbed soil. Offsite emissions are caused by motor vehicle exhaust from delivery vehicles, as well as worker traffic, but also include road dust.

Construction equipment used on the project site will result in exhaust emissions consisting of NO_x , ROG, CO, PM_{10} , $PM_{2.5}$, CO and minor amounts of sulfur dioxide.

Construction activities are carried out in discrete steps, each of which has a unique mix of equipment. Therefore, the construction emissions can vary substantially from day to day, depending on the level
of activity, the specific type of operation, and the prevailing weather conditions. The analysis used CalEEMod to estimate emissions from the construction of the project.

Paving operations and architectural coatings will release ROG emissions. Impervious surfaces (including buildings, asphalt, and concrete) will cover the development site.

As described in Section 3, Project Description, construction of project could begin as early as 2013, and is anticipated to be completed in 16 to 20 years. The exact construction schedule, including timing of construction phases, is not known at this time. As a conservative assumption, the project was assumed to build out over 12 years. The air quality modeling assumed that construction would include the following activities: demolition of existing structures, fine site grading, paving, building construction, and architectural coating.

The unmitigated analysis does not provide credit for compliance with SJVAPCD Regulation VIII (Fugitive PM10 Prohibitions). Compliance with Regulation VIII is required. When reviewing the CalEEMod printouts in Appendix C, please note that the CalEEMod program lists any measure that reduces emissions from construction activities as "mitigation," regardless of whether the measure fulfills a regulatory requirement or is truly considered mitigation by CEQA standards. The following measures were included in the analyses:

- Water exposed surfaces three times daily.
- Reduce speed on unpaved roads to 5 miles per hour.

It was assumed that the entire site area for each phase would be graded at the beginning of each phase. Default values were used for the area devoted to paving and equipment. The proposed project would require the demolition of houses and outbuildings on the project site. The houses and outbuildings were assumed to range from 1,000 to 2,000 square feet in size. The construction analysis was based on 3.4 million square feet of buildings in three phases that would be constructed over a 12-year period. No changes were made to construction equipment variables in the construction phases; all phases used CalEEMod default values. The project includes the construction of a drainage basin on a portion of a 20-acre parcel at the south end of Phase 2 of the project. The drainage plan indicates that the basin will require the excavation of 465,000 cubic yards of material. The excavated material is expected to be used on the project site. The basin will be constructed in conjunction with Phase 2. Drainage for Phase 1 will be accommodated by existing City of Selma facilities.

Building Demolition

Twelve residential structures located within the project site boundaries will be demolished. Most are small structures, many of which appear to be unoccupied at this time. Two residential structures in Phase 1 will require removal, one of which is a two-story structure. Phase 2 has seven small residential structures, one of which appears vacant. Phase 3 has four small residential structures, three of which appear to be vacant. There are also a number of barns and other outbuildings near some of the residential structures that will be removed. For analysis purposes, the small residential

structures are estimated at 1,000 square feet in size and two are estimated at 2,000 square feet. The outbuildings are estimated to average 1,000 square feet. All but one house is single-story. The CalEEMod default hauling assumptions were utilized.

The estimated annual construction emissions output for each project phase and for the full project buildout are provided in Table 4.3-9.

		Emissions (tons)				
Source	ROG	NO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}		
Phase 1			·			
2013	1.27	9.34	1.56	0.82		
2014	1.03	6.89	0.88	0.39		
2015	6.24	0.67	0.08	0.06		
Phase 2			·			
2017	1.30	9.32	8.08	1.46		
2018	1.00	6.55	1.29	0.29		
2019	11.21	3.55	0.72	0.17		
Phase 3			·			
2021	0.71	4.55	1.32	0.50		
2022	0.66	3.94	1.01	0.16		
2023	1.71	0.25	0.05	0.02		
SJVAPCD Annual Threshold	10	10	15	15		
Significant?*	Yes	No	No	No		

Table 4.3-9: Construc	tion Emissions	(Unmitigated)
-----------------------	----------------	---------------

Pollutants exceeding the annual threshold are indicated in bold font.

CalEEMod output; sources include emissions from off-road equipment, worker, vendor, and haul trips, and/or fugitive dust

Drainage basin excavation and hauling estimated using EMFAC 2011, Offroad 2007 and EPA emission factors. Source: Michael Brandman Associates, 2012.

The results of the analysis indicate that the project would exceed the threshold of significance for ROG of 10 tons per year in 2019. The primary source of ROG emissions during construction are architectural coatings.

Operational Emissions

Operational, or long-term, emissions occur over the life of the project. Operational emissions include mobile and area source emissions. Area source emissions are from consumer products, heaters that consume natural gas, gasoline-powered landscape equipment, and architectural coatings (painting). Mobile emissions are from motor vehicles, which are often the largest single, long-term source of air pollutants from development projects. The Traffic Impact Study prepared by Peters Engineering Group (provided in Appendix L) provided trip generation rates used for the air quality analysis. Additionally, the Traffic Impact Study estimated weekday and weekend daily trip rates for the proposed project. The CalEEMod takes into account the different trip generation rates for weekend and weekdays to generate a weighted trip rate for the proposed project's annual emissions. In addition, the pass-by component of CalEEMod was selected in accordance with SJVAPCD guidance. A pass-by rate is the percentage of drivers who already are using the roadway network, and enter the site as an intermediate stop on the way from or to another destination. Thus, the trip may not necessarily be generated by the project, and would not qualify as a new trip. The Traffic Impact Study for the project estimated a 15-percent pass-by rate; this rate was used as the pass-by rate in CalEEMod for all of the project phases. The project fleet mix was revised so that delivery truck trips match rates identified for other similar commercial projects. The rate for medium heavy and heavy-heavy duty trucks were each set at 0.5 percent of the fleet. This results in 189 weekday truck trips for Phase 1, 152 weekday truck trips for Phase 2, and 153 weekday truck trips for Phase 3 for each weight classification.

The estimated annual operational emissions output for each phase and the total emissions for all phases of the project are provided in Table 4.3-10. As shown below, the project would exceed the SJVAPCD's annual regional thresholds during one year of construction. The emissions of ROG during the architectural coatings phase exceeded the 10-ton-per-year threshold prior to mitigation. During operation, the project would exceed the 10-ton-per-year threshold for ROG and NO_x and the 15-ton-per-year PM₁₀ threshold during each phase and at project buildout, resulting in a potentially significant impact. Emissions of PM_{2.5} would not exceed the 15-ton-per-year threshold; therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant.

	Emissions (tons per year)				
Source	ROG	NO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}	
Phase 1 (2016)	27.28	29.97	34.35	2.61	
Phase 2 (2020)	21.94	18.28	27.91	1.45	
Phase 3 (2024)	18.43	14.85	29.69	2.11	
Total for all Phases	67.65	63.10	91.95	6.17	
SJVAPCD Threshold	10	10	15	15	
Significant?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	
Source: Michael Brandman Associates 2012	(CalEEMod outpu	t: emissions include	motor vehicles nat	ural gas	

Table 4.3-10: Operationa	I Emissions	(Unmitigated)
--------------------------	-------------	---------------

Source: Michael Brandman Associates, 2012 (CalEEMod output; emissions include motor vehicles, natural gas, architectural coating, and consumer products). Modeling used first year of each phase as a conservative analysis year.

The project will be required to comply with SJVAPCD Rule 9510 – Indirect Source Review mitigation requirements for NO_x and PM₁₀ emitted during construction and operation. The rule requires that the combined reductions from onsite measures and offsite mitigation fees reduce

construction NO_x and PM_{10} emissions by 20 percent and 45 percent, respectively. The rule requires operational NO_x and PM_{10} reductions of 33 percent and 15 percent, respectively. Rule 9510 requires the developer to provide feasible onsite measures and to pay mitigation fees for the emissions remaining after onsite mitigation. Because of the rule structure and the way that the CalEEMod program credits measures, reductions achieved by Rule 9510 are represented in the mitigated emission analysis to prevent double counting.

Additional mitigation measures are included in Section 4.12, Transportation to reduce traffic impacts that also reduce air quality impacts. Specifically, Mitigation Measure TRANS-6a requires the incorporation of transit facilities such as a centralized transit facility or enhanced stops that feature turnouts, shelters, seating, lighting, and other amenities, as appropriate. Mitigation Measure TRANS-6b requires the project applicant to install bicycle storage facilities in convenient locations near building entrances that provide spaces equivalent to 2 percent of the building's minimum parking requirement. Mitigation Measure TRANS-6c requires the applicant to prepare and submit plans to the City of Selma depicting pedestrian facilities along all street frontages. Features would include meandering sidewalks along major arterial roadways, and pedestrian facilities along all street frontages that connect to internal pedestrian facilities within each phase.

Although the Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts (GAMAQI) indicates that compliance with SJVAPCD Regulation VIII will normally reduce construction related fugitive PM₁₀ emissions to less than significant, it also recommends that large projects implement enhanced fugitive dust controls to reduce potential PM₁₀ impacts. Revisions to Regulation VIII to comply with best available control measure (BACM) requirements were adopted in 2004, after the GAMAQI was last updated in 2002. The amendments included what were previously considered enhanced measures in the GAMAQI and added the requirement for commercial projects over 5 acres in size to prepare a Dust Control Plan to identify project-specific controls prior to commencing construction. In addition, the project does not exceed the 15-ton-per-year threshold of significance currently recommended by the SJVAPCD. Therefore, construction related PM₁₀ emissions are considered less than significant.

The project exceeds the annual ROG threshold during the 2019 construction year, primarily due to the use of architectural coatings. Mitigation Measure AIR-2a requires the use of low-VOC coatings to reduce emissions from this source. ROG emissions in 2019 are estimated at 11.21 tons per year, of which 8.6 tons are from architectural coatings and 2.61 tons from other sources. Therefore, to reduce emissions below the threshold, a 15 percent reduction is required from painting emissions. This is a conservative estimate because it assumes that all architectural coatings will be applied during a single year, although it is highly likely that coatings will be applied over 2 or more years as the phase is built out. CalEEMod assumed 150 grams per liter of ROG for the unmitigated estimates. In order to reduce ROG emissions to less than significant levels, Mitigation Measure AIR-2 requires a 15 percent reduction in the ROG content to 127 grams per liter of ROG. This mitigation reduces ROG emissions in the year 2019 to 9.9 tons.

As shown in Table 4.3-10, the project exceeds operational thresholds for ROG, NO_x , and PM_{10} , primarily from motor vehicle emissions. The project's design serves to mitigate project emissions by providing a mix of uses, including retail, office, entertainment, and residential within the project. Eventual buildout of the planned growth areas of the Selma General Plan in the vicinity of the project will provide a large population base within bicycling and walking distance of the project. The timing of the buildout of the General Plan is uncertain; therefore, no reductions have been assumed for the location of the project. However, as the phases of the project are built out over time, access by walking, bicycling, and transit will be enhanced. In the interim, site plans showing roadway and pedestrian improvements in the project should identify potential access points and provide adequate right of way and space for eventual connection.

Mitigation Measure AIR-2b provides a list of measures that will be implemented to reduce project emissions. These measures support the reductions claimed for compliance with Rule 9510. The amount of emissions listed in Table 4.3-11 represents the maximum amount of emission reductions that will achieved by the project through the application of onsite mitigation measures and offsite mitigation fees. Reductions achieved by Rule 9510 are quantifiable and enforceable, but only apply to NO_x and PM₁₀ emissions. Mitigation Measure AIR-2c provides additional assurance that developers will be aware of the Rule 9510 requirement. Although emission reductions for ROG and PM_{2.5} will also be achieved with onsite measures, the effectiveness is uncertain, so no reductions have been claimed and, therefore, emissions would still exceed SJVAPCD thresholds. As such, the residual significance of this impact is significant and unavoidable.

	Emissions (tons)			
Source	ROG	NO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Phase 1 Unmitigated	27.28	29.97	34.35	2.61
Phase 1 After Onsite/Rule 9510 Reductions	27.17	22.49	17.18	2.57
Phase 2 Unmitigated	21.94	18.28	27.91	1.45
Phase 2 After Onsite/Rule 9510 Reduction	21.01	13.70	13.96	1.30
Phase 3 Unmitigated	18.43	14.85	29.69	2.11
Phase 3 After Onsite/Rule 9510 Reduction	17.00	11.12	14.84	1.36
Total	67.65	63.10	91.95	6.17
Total After Onsite/Rule 9510 Reduction	65.18	47.32	45.98	5.23
SJVAPCD Threshold	10	10	15	15
Significant?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Note: Reductions for ROG and PM ₂₅ from CalEEMod mitig	ated operational e	missions		

Table 4.3-11: Operational Emissions (Mitigated)

Reductions for ROG and PM_{2.5} from CalEEMod mitigated operational emissions. Source: Michael Brandman Associates, 2012.

Localized Impact Analysis for Criteria Pollutants

The purpose of the localized impact analysis for criteria pollutants is to determine if sensitive receptors will be exposed to pollutant concentrations exceeding state and federal air quality standards or if the project will contribute a substantial increase in pollutant concentrations for pollutants that already exceed standards. The SJVAPCD defines sensitive receptors as "facilities that house or attract children, the elderly, people with illnesses, or others who are especially sensitive to the effects of air pollutants. Hospitals, schools, convalescent facilities, and residential areas are examples of sensitive receptors." Details regarding the modeling methodology and assumptions are provided in the Local Air Quality and Health Risk Assessment included in Appendix B.

Because localized criteria pollutant impacts are a "hot spot" type of analysis (as opposed to an annual emissions threshold), and because the project includes three phases, the analysis years are the operation year for each phase. Phase 1 is assumed to be fully operational in 2017, Phase 2 in 2021, and Phase 3 in 2024. Table 4.3-12 provides a summary of the results of the localized criteria pollutant impact assessment from the project, along with a comparison of the applicable air quality significance thresholds for NO₂ and CO for the cumulative project including all phases. Analysis of each phase individually is provided in Appendix B modeling results. The modeling predicts the greatest impacts for all pollutants with the completion of all three project phases. Note that potential SO_2 impacts are negligible and are not reported.

Table 4.3-13 provides a summary of the project impacts for PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ along with a comparison with the PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ significance threshold for the cumulative project including all phases.

		Concentration (ppm)				
Pollutant	Averaging Time	Back- ground ^{(1), (4)}	Project Impact ⁽²⁾	Background + Project Impact	Air Quality Significance Threshold ⁽³⁾	Exceeds Threshold?
CO	1 Hour	3.34	0.09	3.43	20	No
	8 Hour	2.34	0.04	2.38	9.0	No
	California 1 Hour	0.049	0.040	0.089	0.18 ⁽⁵⁾	No
NO ₂	Federal 1 Hour	0.039 ⁽⁶⁾	0.034	0.073	0.10	No
	Annual	0.009	< 0.001	0.009	0.030	No

Table 4.3-12: Localized Significance Impact Summary for CO, and NO_2 – Phase 1, Phase 2, and Phase 3

Table 4.3-12 (cont.): Localized Significance Impact Summary for CO, and NO2 – Phase 1, Phase 2, and Phase 3

			Concentration (ppm)			
Pollutant	Averaging Time	Back- ground ^{(1), (4)}	Project Impact ⁽²⁾	Background + Project Impact	Air Quality Significance Threshold ⁽³⁾	Exceeds Threshold?
Notes:			-			-
⁽¹⁾ The highest of	concentrations mea	asured during the i	most recent 3-year	r period of 2008 to	2010 or from the	percentile data
collected by	the SJVAPCD for	NO _{2.}				
⁽²⁾ The impacts	noted under the co	olumn labeled "Pro	oject Impact" were	e determined as th	e highest impacts	at any receptor
within the me	odeling domain. T	The highest impact	s during the opera	ation of Phase 1, P	hase 2, and Phase	3 were found to
occur along t	occur along the western edge of Phase 2 across Dockery Avenue.					
⁽³⁾ Significance	⁽³⁾ Significance thresholds derived from Table 4.2-8					
⁽⁴⁾ 1-hour average background CO was derived by dividing the 8-hr average CO by 0.7, since the 1-hour average is not						
routinely reported by CARB.						
⁽⁵⁾ 1-hour Califo	⁽⁵⁾ 1-hour California State standard					
⁽⁶⁾ The backgrou	and 1-hour NO ₂ is	the 3-year averag	e of the 98th perce	entile NO2 concen	trations at the air 1	monitoring
station in Par	station in Parlier. The maximum incremental Project NO ₂ 1-hour impact is the 98th percentile modeled NO ₂					

concentration using the Ozone Limiting Method to convert NO_x to NO₂. Source: Michael Brandman Associates, 2012.

Table 4.3-13: Localized Significance Impact Summary for PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} – Phase 1, Phase 2, and Phase 3

Pollutant	Averaging Time	Project Impacts (µg/m ³)	EPA SIL Significance Threshold (μg/m ³) ^(a)	Exceed Thresholds?
PM ₁₀	24 Hour	$0.27 \ \mu g/m^3$	5	No
1 10110	Annual	$0.04 \ \mu g/m^3$	1	No
PM	24 Hour	$0.25 \ \mu g/m^3$	1.2	No
1 1412.5	Annual	$0.04 \ \mu g/m^3$	0.3	No

Notes:

 PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ = particulate matter $\mu g/m3$ = micrograms per cubic meter (a unit of concentration)

(1) The impacts noted under the column labeled "Project Impact" were determined as the highest impacts at any receptor within the modeling domain. The highest impacts during the operation of Phase 1, Phase 2, and Phase 3 were found to occur along the western edge of Phase 2 across Dockery Avenue.

^(a) EPA SIL = Title 40, Part 51 (51.165(b)(2)) of the Code of Federal Regulations

Source: Michael Brandman Associates, 2012.

The results summarized in Table 4.3-12 indicate that the air quality impacts resulting from the project including the background pollutant levels would not exceed the applicable significance thresholds for NO₂ or CO. The concentration maxima for these pollutants were found to occur along the western edge of Phase 2 of the project.

Table 4.3-13 indicates further that the PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ air quality impacts resulting from the project would also not exceed the significance thresholds for PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$. Impacts would be less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

Implement Mitigation Measures TRANS-6a, TRANS-6b, and TRANS-6c, and:

- MM AIR-2a During construction activities involving architectural coatings, the reactive organic gases/volatile organic compounds limit shall not exceed 127 grams of ROG/VOC/liter.
- **MM AIR-2b** Prior to issuance of building permits, the City of Selma shall verify that the following air emissions reduction measures are depicted on building plans:
 - 1. Provide a pedestrian-friendly and interconnected streetscape to make walking more convenient, comfortable, and safe (including appropriate signalization and signage requirements).
 - 2. Provide good access to/from the development for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users.
 - 3. Provide connections to bicycle routes/lanes in the vicinity of the project.
 - 4. Provide shade tree planting in parking lots to reduce evaporative emissions from parked vehicles. The landscaping design shall provide 50 percent tree coverage within 10 years of construction using low ROG-emitting, low-maintenance, native drought-resistant trees.
 - 5. Use native plants that require minimal watering and are low ROG-emitting.
 - 6. Provide easements or land dedications and construct bikeways and pedestrian walkways as part of roadway improvements along the project frontage.
 - 7. Implement onsite circulation design elements in parking lots to reduce vehicle queuing and improve the pedestrian environment.
 - 8. Provide employee lockers in buildings with a minimum of 50 employees.
 - 9. Plant drought-tolerant native shade trees along southern exposures of buildings to reduce energy used to cool buildings in summer.
 - 10. Provide and maintain a kiosk displaying transportation information in a prominent area accessible to employees and patrons.
 - 11. Implement a Transportation Choice Program to reduce employee commute trips. The applicant shall work with Rideshare for free consulting services on how to start and maintain a program.
- MM AIR-2c Prior to approval of the final City discretionary approval for individual projects within Selma Crossings, the applicant shall provide the Selma Planning Department with a copy of an approved Air Impact Assessment Application as evidence of compliance with Rule 9510 Indirect Source Review.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Significant and unavoidable impact.

Carbon Monoxide

Impact AIR-3:	The proposed project would not violate ambient carbon monoxide (CO) standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation of CO standards.
	Standards.

A carbon monoxide (CO) hotspot analysis is the appropriate tool to determine if project emissions of CO during operation would exceed ambient air quality standards. The main source of air pollutant emissions during operation are from offsite motor vehicles traveling on the roads surrounding the project site.

Project emissions may be considered significant if a CO hotspot intersection analysis determines that project-generated emissions cause a localized violation of the state CO 1-hour standard of 20 parts ppm, state CO 8-hour standard of 9 ppm, federal CO 1-hour standard of 35 ppm, or federal CO 8-hour standard of 9 ppm.

Because increased CO concentrations are usually associated with roadways that are congested and with heavy traffic volume, the SJVAPCD has established that preliminary screening can be used to determine with fair certainty that the effect a project has on any given intersection would not cause a potential CO hotspot. Therefore, the SJVAPCD has established that if all project-affected intersections are negative for both of the following criteria, then the project can be said to have no potential to create a violation of the CO standard, which are 20 ppm and 9 ppm, respectively:

- A traffic study for the project indicates that the Level of Service (LOS) on one or more streets or at one or more intersections in the project vicinity will be reduced to LOS E or F; or
- A traffic study indicates that the project will substantially worsen an already existing LOS F on one or more streets or at one or more intersections in the project vicinity.

If either of the criteria can be associated with any intersection affected by the project, a CO hot spot analysis must be prepared to determine significance.

Impact Analysis

The Traffic Impact Study for the project showed that there were intersections with an LOS of E or F in the project vicinity in the existing plus project scenario. A CO hotspot analysis was conducted using the CALINE4 model for the five intersections with the greatest traffic volume and worst level of service for the project plus 2035 scenario without mitigation. Analysis of potential CO hotspots at these locations represents a particularly conservative approach, since it does not include roadway improvements that would improve traffic flow and reduce CO concentrations. Because the greatest CO concentration potential exists at the intersections, the roadway segments were not evaluated. If the intersections would not violate the CO standard, then the roadway segments, which experience greater dispersion and decreased CO concentration levels, would also not violate the CO standard.

CALINE4 is a dispersion model used to estimate the concentration of CO along roadways and intersections and is recommended by the SJVAPCD for estimating potential CO hotspots. Using the CALINE4 model, potential CO hotspots were analyzed at the five intersections for 2035 with project scenarios using 2013 emission factors from EMFAC2011 as an additional worst-case assumption. Emissions are much higher in 2013 compared with 2035, which is due to the phase-in of increasingly stringent emission controls on new vehicles and retirement of older vehicles.

As shown in Table 4.3-14, the estimated 1-hour and 8-hour average CO concentrations at buildout in combination with background concentrations are below the state and national ambient air quality standards. No CO hotspots are anticipated as a result of traffic-generated emissions by the project in combination with other anticipated development in the area. Therefore, the mobile emissions of CO from the project are not anticipated to contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation of CO. Impacts would be less than significant.

		CO Concentrations (ppm)		Significant
Intersection	Scenario	1 Hour ¹	8 Hour ²	Impact? ³
Mountain View/Golden State	2035 With Project (Sat. Peak)	6.2	4.3	No
Mountain View/State Route 99 SB Offramp	2035 With Project (Sat. Peak)	6.2	4.3	No
Mountain View/Academy	2035 With Project (Sat Peak)	4.9	3.4	No
Mountain View/Dockery	2035 With Project (Sat Peak)	5.9	4.1	No
Floral/Highland	2035 With Project (Sat Peak)	6.3	4.9	No

Table 4.3-14: Carbon Monoxide Concentrations at Intersections

Notes:

¹ CALINE4 output (see Appendix C for modeling output) plus the highest 1-hour background concentration during the past 3 years of 3.34 ppm.

² The 8-hour Long Term With Project-caused increment was calculated by multiplying the 1-hour CALINE4 output by 0.7 (persistence factor), then adding the highest 8-hour background concentration during the past 3 years of 2.34 ppm.
 ³ Comparison of the 1-hour concentration to the state standard of 20 ppm and the 8-hour concentration to the

state/national standard of 9 ppm. Source: Michael Brandman Associates, 2012.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is necessary.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Sensitive Receptors

Impact AIR-4: The proposed project may expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

This impact analysis focuses on toxic air pollutants. See also the discussion of the localized impacts of criteria pollutants under Impact AIR-2, and CO hotspot analysis under Impact AIR-3. These other analyses demonstrate that the project does not cause a violation or contribute to an existing violation of air quality standards per the Impacts AIR-2 and AIR-3, but also consider the effects on sensitive receptors.

Threshold

The SJVAPCD has adopted the following significance thresholds for Toxic Air Contaminants:

- Probability of contracting cancer for the Maximally Exposed Individual (MEI) exceeds 10 in one million, or
- Ground-level concentrations of non-carcinogenic toxic air contaminants would result in a Hazard Index greater than 1 for the MEI.

Impact Analysis

Diesel particulate matter (DPM) is a carcinogenic toxic air contaminant that would be emitted from the delivery trucks that would visit the project site during project operations. A Health Risk Assessment was prepared to assess potential health risks from operational DPM (see Appendix C). As discussed in Pollutants of Concern, DPM is a toxic air contaminant. Toxic air contaminants, also known as hazardous air pollutants, are those pollutants that are known or suspected to cause cancer or other serious health effects, such as reproductive effects or birth defects, or adverse environmental effects.

The air quality and health risk impacts associated with the operation of the project were assessed from the project's estimated emissions and SJVAPCD-approved AERMOD air dispersion models. The impacts were assessed for the project's three build out years: 2016: Phase 1, 2020: Phase 1 and Phase 2, and 2024: Phase 1, Phase 2, and Phase 3.

Project Operational Emissions

Various emission sources contribute to the project's operational impacts. These emission sources include delivery truck and customer vehicles, restaurant cooking, and gasoline service station operations. Motor vehicle emissions were estimated from the project's daily and peak hour trips as presented in the project's traffic impact report, typical delivery truck uses at the various project buildings, and rates of emissions derived for each vehicle type using the ARB EMFAC2011 mobile source emission model. Mobile source emissions were estimated for vehicle travel within the project and along adjacent streets and while idling within the parking areas and at the building loading docks. Emissions were also quantified from the operation of transportation refrigeration units transporting perishable goods to restaurants locations within the project. A vehicle speed of 15 miles per hour,

and idling times of 15 minute per day per delivery truck and 0.5-minute idling time for customer vehicles within the parking lots was assumed. Delivery trucks were assumed to be either 4+axle heavy-heavy duty diesel trucks or 3-axle medium-heavy duty diesel trucks. Mobile source emissions were quantified for NO_x , CO, PM_{10} , $PM_{2.5}$, and diesel particulate matter. Emissions of SO_x were not quantified since the project emits negligible amounts of SO_x emissions.

Restaurant emissions derived from the cooking of meat and release two primary carcinogenic substances: polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons and naphthalene. The exact placement and types of restaurants has not been determined at this time. Therefore, based on the relative placement and size of the conceptual development pads, it was assumed that the restaurants would be located along the eastern end of Phase 1 along Golden State Boulevard, along the northeastern corner of Phase 2, along State Route 99, the northwest corner of Phase 2 along Mountain View Avenue and Dockery Avenue, and at the two hotels in Phase 2. The methodology for estimating restaurant emissions was taken from the SJVAPCD Guidance for Air Dispersion Modeling.

A gasoline service station is also proposed in Phase 2 to be located at the northern entrance to Phase 2. The operation of the service station would result in the emissions of another toxic air contaminant, benzene. Benzene emissions results from the evaporation of gasoline during venting, loading, breathing, and spillage. The assessment assumed an annual throughput of 3.2 million gallons per year, which is equivalent to a daily delivery of one 8,800-gallon tanker truck per day. Benzene emissions were estimated using the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association's Gasoline Service Station Industrywide Risk Assessment Guidelines.

The project includes residential development over lifestyle retail mixed use in Phase 3. The ARB provides advisory recommendations for siting residential development near large existing sources of toxic emissions (ARB 2005). The ARB recommends avoiding siting sensitive land uses within 500 feet of a freeway. A portion of Phase 3 is within 500 feet of State Route 99. The location of the mixed use residential above lifestyle retail has not been identified on the site plan. Therefore, a mitigation measure has been included to ensure that final site plans for Phase 3 locate residential units at least 500 feet from State Route 99 or provide a health risk assessment to determine if any units would exceed the SJVAPCD threshold of significance of 10 in a million increase in cancer risk. If necessary, the project can include design features or mitigation measures such as high efficiency filtration systems in the HVAC system to reduce any potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

Health Risk Assessment Results

The assessment applied the AERMOD air dispersion model to estimate both air quality and health risk impacts. The AERMOD model is required by the SJVAPCD for all CEQA air quality assessments and is consistent with the SJVAPCD's Guidance for Air Dispersion Modeling. The various emission sources included in the modeling assessment were represented as line sources for the motor vehicle travel, point sources for truck idling locations, restaurant locations, service station

venting and breathing loss, area sources for the parking lots, and volume sources for the service station spillage and refueling locations. The air quality and health risk impacts were calculated at over 300 locations in the vicinity of the project, including locations of existing sensitive residences and residences associated with the residential component to be developed in Phase 3. Meteorological data available from the SJVAPCD's Fresno monitoring station for the time period of 2005 to 2009 were used in the AERMOD model to determine the magnitude and direction of emission transport. In addition, ozone data which is required in the estimation of nitrogen dioxide air quality impacts was taken from the SJVAPCD's Parlier air monitoring station. The modeling assessment also assumed a rural land use in estimating the amount of pollutant dispersion.

A summary of the cancer risks from DPM associated with the proposed project is shown in Table 4.3-15. As shown in the table, the cancer risk would be under the significance threshold of 10 in 1 million. Therefore, no significant cancer risks are anticipated from implementation of the project. This impact is less than significant.

	Maximum Cano	Exceeds	
Location	Project Impacts	Significance Threshold	Significance Threshold?
Phase 1 (2016)	1.1	10	No
Phase 1 and Phase 2 (2020)	1.4	10	No
Phase 1, Phase 2, and Phase 3 (2024)	1.3	10	No
Notes:		·	

Table 4.3-15: Summar	y of Cancer Risks from	Project Operations
----------------------	------------------------	---------------------------

The impacts noted under the column labeled "Project Impact" were determined as the highest impacts at any receptor within the modeling domain. The highest impacts during the operation of Phase 1 was found to occur at the southern end of the Phase 1 development, while the highest impacts during the combined operation of Phase 1 and Phase 2 and Phase 1, Phase 2, and Phase 3 were found to occur along the western edge of Phase 2 across Dockery Avenue. Source: Michael Brandman Associates, 2012.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

MM AIR-4 Prior to approval of site plans for Phase 3, the applicant shall identify the location of any residential units and their distance from State Route 99. If any units are proposed at a distance less than 500 feet from State Route 99, the applicant shall provide a health risk assessment to determine if any units would be exposed to risks exceeding the SJVAPCD threshold of significance of 10 in a million, and if necessary, provide mitigation measures to reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels. Such measures may include Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC) systems or use of tree species such as redwood, deodar, or live oak that can filter out particulate matter.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Odors

Impact AIR-5:	The proposed project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial
	number of people.

Threshold

While offensive odors rarely cause any physical harm, they can be very unpleasant, leading to considerable distress among the public and often generating citizen complaints to local governments and the SJVAPCD. Any project with the potential to frequently expose members of the public to objectionable odors would be deemed to have a significant impact.

Background Information

Individual responses to odors are highly variable and can result in a variety of effects. Generally, the impact of an odor results from a variety of factors such as frequency, duration, offensiveness, location, and sensory perception. The frequency is a measure of how often an individual is exposed to an odor in the ambient environment. The intensity refers to an individual's or group's perception of the odor strength or concentration. The duration of an odor refers to the elapsed time over which an odor is experienced. The offensiveness of the odor is the subjective rating of the pleasantness or unpleasantness of an odor. The location accounts for the type of area in which a potentially affected person lives, works, or visits; the type of activity in which he or she is engaged; and the sensitivity of the impacted receptor.

Sensory perception has four major components: detectability, intensity, character, and hedonic tone. The detection (or threshold) of an odor is based on a panel of responses to the odor. There are two types of thresholds: the odor detection threshold and the recognition threshold. The detection threshold is the lowest concentration of an odor that will elicit a response in a percentage of the population, typically presented as the mean (or 50 percent of the population) but sometimes indicated as 100 percent or 10 percent. The recognition threshold is the minimum concentration that is recognized as having a characteristic odor quality by *x* percent (usually 50 percent) of the population. The intensity refers to the perceived strength of the odor. The odor character is what the substance smells like. The hedonic tone is a judgment of the pleasantness or unpleasantness of the odor. The hedonic tone varies in subjective experience, frequency, odor character, odor intensity, and duration.

Impact Analysis

Odor impacts on residential areas and other sensitive receptors, such as hospitals, day-care centers, schools, etc., warrant the closest scrutiny, but consideration should also be given to other land uses where people may congregate, such as recreational facilities, worksites, and commercial areas.

Two situations create a potential for odor impact. The first occurs when a new odor source is located near an existing sensitive receptor. The second occurs when a new sensitive receptor locates near an

existing source of odor. SJVAPCD has determined the common land use types that are known to produce odors in the Air Basin. Included in the types of land uses that are known to create odors are wastewater treatment facilities, chemical manufacturing plants, painting/coating operations, feed lots/dairies, composting facilities, landfills, and transfer stations.

According to the GAMAQI, analysis of potential odor impacts should be conducted for the following two situations:

- Generators Projects that would potentially generate odorous emissions proposed to locate near existing sensitive receptors or other land uses where people may congregate, and
- Receivers Residential or other sensitive receptor projects or other projects built for the intent of attracting people locating near existing odor sources.

The analysis would involve contacting the SJVAPCD's Compliance Division for information regarding odor complaints. For a project locating near an existing source of odors, the project should be identified as having a significant odor impact if it is proposed for a site that is closer to an existing odor source than any location where there have been:

- More than one confirmed complaint per year averaged over a three-year period, or
- Three unconfirmed complaints per year averaged over a three-year period.

Odors from the Project

Types of land uses that are typically identified as sources of objectionable odors include landfills, transfer stations, sewage treatment plants, wastewater pump stations, composting facilities, feedlots, coffee roasters, asphalt batch plants, and rendering plants. The project does not propose any of these activities. Therefore, the proposed project would not be considered to have the potential to expose persons to substantial sources of objectionable odors.

During construction, the various diesel-powered vehicles and equipment in use onsite would create localized odors. These odors would be temporary and would not likely be noticeable for extended periods of time beyond the project's site boundaries. The potential for diesel odor impacts is therefore less than significant.

During project operations, the project could produce odors as a result of refuse storage and collection, and from cooking exhaust at restaurants that could be future tenants. The refuse storage and collection areas will be subject to City of Selma development standards. Regardless, the scale and size of these activities would not meet any recognized standard as a source of substantial odors. Therefore, the odor impacts associated with refuse storage and collection would be less than significant.

Odors from Surrounding Uses

The project's commercial components are not considered sensitive odor receptors. However, the project's residential mixed-use component is a sensitive receptor, and is located approximately 0.5 mile west of industrial facilities and 1,200 feet southwest of a recycling facility. Phase 1 of the project site is approximately 330 feet south of Selma Recycling and Disposal Center. The facility separates household and commercial recyclable materials for the City of Selma and is a potential odor source. The facility is required to comply with CalRecycle and Fresno County Local Enforcement Agency solid waste regulations that would minimize odors. Selma Recycling and Disposal Center prepared an Odor Impact Minimization Plan to ensure the operation does not create an odor nuisance. In addition, the facility is subject to the SJVAPCD's Rule 4102 Nuisance that would provide additional enforcement potential if the facility creates nuisance odors. The project is north and west of the existing industrial facilities along Golden State Boulevard, the largest of which include the Vie Del Co winery, the Sunmaid Raisin packing plant, and the Guardian Industries glass manufacturing plant. The winery and the Sunmaid plant have the potential to create odors from handling and storing fruit. The Guardian Glass plant has large glass furnaces, but has installed best available control technology to minimize emissions from the process and is not expected to be a significant odor source. There are no records of odor complaints from any of these facilities. Based on lack of recorded odor complaints and regulations in place to address potential impacts, significant odor impacts are not expected. This impact is less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is necessary.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Naturally Occurring Asbestos

Impact AIR-6: The proposed project would not significantly impact receptors by disturbing naturally occurring asbestos.

Threshold

As discussed in the Environmental and Regulatory Setting sections, naturally occurring asbestos is a health hazard when airborne. Construction in areas of rock formations that contain naturally occurring asbestos could release asbestos into the air and pose a health hazard.

The Governor's Office of Planning and Research published a memorandum on August 1, 2007 entitled Addressing Naturally Occurring Asbestos in CEQA Documents. The memorandum indicates that the CEQA process provides an opportunity for Lead Agencies to identify whether serpentinite or ultramafic rocks will be disturbed by the proposed project and to investigate ways to avoid, control, or otherwise mitigate the impacts of naturally occurring asbestos.

The Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology published a guide entitled A General Location Guide For Ultramafic Rocks In California – Areas More Likely To Contain Naturally Occurring Asbestos, dated August 2000, for generally identifying areas that are likely to contain naturally occurring asbestos. The screening criterion for determining if a project has the potential to disturb naturally occurring asbestos is to identify if the project location is in an area likely to contain such a substance. The United States Geological Survey in cooperation with the California Geological Survey published additional information on asbestos in California in a pamphlet entitled Reported Historic Asbestos Mines, Historic Asbestos Prospects, and Other Natural Occurrences of Asbestos in California (USGS 2011). The pamphlet identifies both mining sites and locations likely to have asbestos present.

A review of the map contained in the General Location Guide showing areas more likely to have rock formations containing naturally occurring asbestos in California indicates that the project site is not in an area that is likely to contain naturally occurring asbestos. The nearest locations of naturally occurring asbestos shown are approximately 24 miles northeast of the project site near Pine Flat Dam. As noted in the Division of Mines and Geology's report, the map only shows the general location of naturally occurring asbestos-containing formations and may not show all potential occurrences. The USGS website provides a similar more recent map identifying naturally occurring asbestos but provides less detail than the older map; however, no additional locations near the project are identified. Although the project is located in a county known to have naturally occurring asbestos-containing formation is sufficiently far from the project site. Impacts would be less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is necessary.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Impact AIR-7: The proposed project would generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.

Threshold

This analysis will evaluate the following questions from the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G Environmental Checklist Form. Would the project:

- a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment; or
- b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose or reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

Regarding the first question, the evaluation of an impact under CEQA requires measuring data from a project against both existing conditions and a "threshold of significance." With regard to establishing a significance threshold, the Office of Planning and Research's amendments to the CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.7(c) state that "[w]hen adopting thresholds of significance, a lead agency may consider thresholds of significance previously adopted or recommended by other public agencies, or recommended by experts, provided the decision of the lead agency to adopt such thresholds is supported by substantial evidence." As discussed in the Regulatory Section, the amendments took effect on March 18, 2010.

Guideline 15064.4(a) further states, "A lead agency shall have discretion to determine, in the context of a particular project, whether to: (1) Use a model or methodology to quantify greenhouse gas emissions resulting from a project, and which model or methodology to use . . . ; or (2) Rely on a qualitative analysis or performance based standards."

Here, the SJVACPD has established a menu of performance standards, some of which depend on the existence of an adopted climate action plan or the establishment of Best Performance Standards. Since neither of the above currently exists, this analysis adopts the following alternative threshold provided by SJVAPCD: whether the project will reduce or mitigate greenhouse gas levels by 29 percent from business-as-usual levels. To do so, the analysis first will quantify project-related greenhouse gas emissions under a business-as-usual scenario, and then compare these emissions with those that would occur when all project-related design features are accounted for, and when compliance with new regulatory measures is assumed. The standard and methodology is explained in further detail, below.

Regarding the second question, the California Resources Agency has stated that, to be used for the purpose of determining significance, a plan must contain specific requirements that result in reductions of greenhouse gas emissions to a less than significant level. Accordingly, a qualitative determination will be made as to whether the project promotes attainment of California's goals of reducing greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020 as stated in AB 32, including whether the project is consistent with goals to effect an 80-percent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions below 1990 levels by 2050, as stated in Executive Order S-03-05. A plan meeting these requirements does not yet exist at the local, regional, or state level, and so this analysis compares the project with the overarching goals of AB 32 and the strategies of ARB's Scoping Plan. This reasoning is further explained below.

The above approach is consistent with provisions of the CEQA Guidelines amendments for greenhouse gas emissions, which state that a lead agency may take into account the following three considerations in assessing the significance of impacts from greenhouse gas emissions.

- Consideration No. 1: The extent to which the project may increase or reduce greenhouse gas emissions compared with the existing environmental setting. This discussion could involve a quantification of greenhouse gas emissions to the extent feasible.
- Consideration No. 2: Whether the project emissions exceed a threshold of significance that the lead agency determines applies to the project.
- Consideration No. 3: The extent to which the project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions. Such regulations or requirements must be adopted by the relevant public agency through a public review process and must include specific requirements that reduce or mitigate the project's incremental contribution of greenhouse gas emissions. If there is substantial evidence that the possible effects of a particular project are still cumulatively considerable notwithstanding compliance with the adopted regulations or requirements, an EIR must be prepared for the project.

Adoption of the SJVAPCD Threshold

The following supports and explains the election of the SJVAPCD threshold in answering the question of whether the project would generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.

As stated previously, the SJVAPCD, which has jurisdiction over a geographic area that includes the project site, adopted the guidance document, "Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions Impacts Under the California Environmental Quality Act." The guidance document does not propose a specific numeric threshold, but it requires all new projects with increased greenhouse gas emissions to implement performance based standards or otherwise demonstrate the project-specific greenhouse gas emissions have been mitigated by at least 29 percent, compared with the business-as-usual scenario. For development projects (residential, commercial or industrial), business as usual refers to the total baseline emissions for all emissions sources within the development type, projected for the year 2020, assuming no change in greenhouse gas emissions per unit of activity as established for the baseline period. The 29-percent emission reductions in greenhouse gases would be composed of both (a) the emission reduction achieved through implementation of Best Performance Standards and (b) greenhouse gas emission reductions achieved since the 2002–2004 baseline period through efficiencies such as improved energy standards, increased vehicle fuel standards, etc. Improving standards are detailed more completely below, but the following examples help to illustrate how regulatory changes will lead to greenhouse gas emissions reductions:

- The energy used by the project purchased from the grid will result in much lower emissions as the renewable energy portfolio standard is implemented over time.
- Motor vehicle greenhouse gas emissions associated with the project will also decline over time as state and federal fuel efficiency standards are implemented (i.e., see discussion of AB 1493 (Pavley) and Low Carbon Fuel Standard in the regulatory section above).
- The ARB adopted regulation to control emissions of refrigerants in commercial refrigeration systems (Regulation for the Management of High Global Warming Potential Refrigerants for Stationary Sources) is expected to reduce emissions from this source by 50 percent by 2020. Refrigerants are the second-largest source of emissions estimated for the project.
- The project's emissions related to electricity consumption are expected to be substantially lower than the forecasted amounts, because the project met the 2005 and 2008 Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards. Many of these standards are discussed in more detail below.

As applied to the project, the SJVAPCD threshold means that greenhouse gas emissions in the year 2020 must be reduced by 29 percent. This can be achieved through a combination of project design features and regulations adopted since 2002–2004, including improved Building Code requirements, AB 32 scoping plan measures, and updated Building Code requirements and other regulations.

Impact Analysis

Project Inventory – Business as Usual

This analysis reviews the project's increase in emissions, or "net" emissions. Generally, net emissions are calculated by estimating emissions generated after implementation of the project and existing emissions. However, because the traffic study and information available is focused on the net increase itself, this analysis is saved the step of subtracting existing emissions because it accounts for only the increase of activity attributable to the project. This analysis is restricted to greenhouse gases identified by AB 32, which include carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride. The project would generate a variety of greenhouse gases during construction and operation, including several defined by AB 32 such as carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, and hydrofluorocarbons.

The project may emit greenhouse gases that are not defined by AB 32. For example, the project may generate aerosols. Aerosols are suspensions of fine solid particles or liquid droplets in a gas that act similarly to greenhouse gases. They are short-lived and remain in the atmosphere for about one week. Black carbon is a component of aerosol. A few studies have indicated that black carbon has a high global warming potential; however, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (2007) states that it has a low level of scientific certainty. Water vapor, another greenhouse gas, could be emitted from evaporated water used for landscaping, but this is not a significant impact because water vapor concentrations in the upper atmosphere are primarily due to climate feedbacks such as evaporation and condensation effects rather than emissions from project-related activities. The

project would emit nitrogen oxides and volatile organic compounds, which are ozone precursors. Ozone is a greenhouse gas; however, unlike the other greenhouse gases, ozone in the troposphere is relatively short-lived and can be reduced in the troposphere on a daily basis.

Certain greenhouse gases defined by AB 32 would not be emitted by the project. Perfluorocarbons and sulfur hexafluoride are typically used in industrial applications, none of which would be used by the project. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the project would emit perfluorocarbons or sulfur hexafluoride.

For this analysis, business as usual refers to emissions before reductions from project design features and regulations adopted after 2004.

Construction

The project would emit greenhouse gases from upstream emission sources and direct sources (combustion of fuels from worker vehicles and construction equipment).

An upstream emission source (also known as life cycle emissions) refers to emissions that were generated during the manufacture of products to be used for construction of the project. Upstream emission sources for the project include but are not limited to the following: emissions from the manufacture of cement, emissions from the manufacture of steel, and/or emissions from the transportation of building materials. The upstream emissions were not estimated, because they are not within the control of the project and to do so would be speculative at this time. Additionally, the California Air Pollution Control Officer's Association White Paper on CEQA & Climate Change supports this conclusion by stating, "The full life-cycle of GHG [greenhouse gas] emissions from construction activities is not accounted for . . . and the information needed to characterize [life-cycle emissions] would be speculative at the CEQA analysis level." Therefore, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15144 and 15145, upstream/life cycle emissions are deemed to be speculative and no further discussion is required.

Construction equipment such as cranes, bulldozers, forklifts, backhoes, and water trucks are expected to be used on the project site and would result in exhaust emissions consisting of carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide. Construction emissions can vary substantially from day to day, depending on the level of activity, the specific type of operation, and prevailing weather conditions.

The project construction was assumed to begin as early as the first quarter of 2013 and to be completed in phases lasting a total of 12 years. Onsite project construction emissions, construction schedule, and construction equipment inventory were estimated using the CalEEMod.

The installation of new refrigerants may result in fugitive accidental release of refrigerants, and this possibility was assumed to occur and included in the analysis. The global warming potential for the refrigerants, which assume the use of a hydrofluorocarbon called R404a, (3,750) is much greater compared with carbon dioxide (1).

The emissions of carbon dioxide from project construction equipment and worker vehicles are shown in Table 4.3-16. Note that current emissions from construction are zero; therefore, the project construction totals represent the difference from existing conditions.

Phase	Greenhouse Gas Emissions (MTCO₂e)	Percentage of Total Emissions
Demolition	292	2.5
Site Preparation	596	5.2
Site Grading	926	8.1
Drainage Basin Excavation and Hauling	113	1.0
Building Construction	7,572	65.9
Paving	216	1.9
Architectural Coatings	93	0.8
Refrigerant Installation	1781	15.5
Total	11,489	100.0

Table 4.3-16: Construction Greenhouse Gas Estimates

Notes:

 $MTCO_2e =$ metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent, converted to tons per year by multiplying by the global warming potential of the gas and by 0.9072.

Global Warming Potentials: carbon dioxide = 1; hydrofluorocarbons-refrigeration system = 3,750; hydrofluorocarbons-air conditioning = 1,725.

NA = not applicable because refrigerants are hydrofluorocarbons, not carbon dioxide.

N/A = not available from the WARM model

Source of emission data: CalEEMod output in Appendix C.

Source of hydrofluorocarbon emissions: see spreadsheet in Appendix C.

Source: Michael Brandman Associates, 2012.

The modeling shows that the project would contribute 9,595 metric tons of CO₂ equivalent during project construction.

Operational Emission Inventory

Operational or long-term emissions occur over the life of the project. Sources include:

- Motor vehicles and trucks. Motor vehicle sources are exhaust emissions from the employee and customer vehicles and heavy-duty trucks that would access the project site. Motor vehicle and truck emissions were calculated using CalEEMod and information contained in the project's traffic impact study.
- Natural gas. Natural gas refers to exhaust from natural gas usage. Carbon dioxide emissions were estimated using CalEEMod (refer to the modeling results in Appendix C).
- Offsite electricity generation refers to the emissions generated from offsite power plants for the electricity required for the project. Electricity use was estimated using CalEEMod using PG&E utility specific emission rates (refer to the modeling results in Appendix C).

- Water transport refers to the electricity required to transport and treat the water that would be used for the project. Estimated water use for the project was obtained from the Water Supply Assessment prepared for the project. Electricity use required for water transport was estimated using CalEEMod (refer to the modeling results in Appendix C).
- Waste refers to the emissions from the waste generated by the project taken to a landfill and decomposing. CalEEMod was used to estimate these emissions. The complete results of the modeling are provided in Appendix C. The project will be able to take advantage of the City's recycling program that the project will utilize. Further, ARB has established and proposes to increase methane capture requirements for all major landfills.
- Refrigerants refer to fugitive hydrofluorocarbons emissions from normal operation of refrigeration systems and the heating and ventilation systems. The analysis assumed one unit installed for every 5,000 square feet of area including the residential over lifestyle mixed use component. Emission estimate methodology was derived from the EPA, Climate Leaders (refer to the greenhouse gas spreadsheet in Appendix C).

The unmitigated emissions estimations from operating the proposed project are presented in Table 4.3-17. This list presents the major sources of greenhouse gas emissions. Note the analysis accounts only for the increase in activity above the existing environment; therefore, the analysis represents the net emissions, as discussed above.

Source	Phase 1 (MTCO2e per year)	Phase 2 (MTCO₂e per year)	Phase 3 (MTCO₂e per year)	Total All Phases (MTCO₂e per year)
Motor vehicles	30,363	24,663	25,675	80,702
Natural gas	528	907	817	2,252
Electricity	2,357	3,095	2,725	8,705
Area Sources	0	0	416	416
Water transport	202	304	344	850
Waste	421	449	459	1,330
Refrigerants (HVAC)	1,518	2,464	1,956	5,938
Total	35,389	31,882	32,392	99,664

 Table 4.3-17: Operational Business as Usual Greenhouse Gas Estimates

Notes:

 $MTCO_2e =$ metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents (includes carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, and hydrofluorocarbons).

Motor Vehicle Emissions use 2005 emission rates in CalEEMod to generate business as usual motor vehicle emissions, because the model accounts for regulatory reductions from the Pavley and Low Carbon Fuel Standards projected for later years. Source: Michael Brandman Associates, 2012.

As shown in Table 4.3-17, emissions from the project would be approximately 99,664 MTCO₂e per year. The main sources emissions are from motor vehicles (80,701 MTCO₂e [81 percent]), electricity usage (8,777 MTCO₂e [10.2 percent]), and refrigerant leakage from the HVAC systems (5,938 MTCO₂e per year [7.4 percent]).

For reference, emissions worldwide were approximately 49,000 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents (MMTCO₂e) in 2004. In 2004, greenhouse gas emissions in the United States were 7,074.4 MMTCO₂e, approximately 6.7 percent of the emissions in the U.S. California is the second-largest contributor of greenhouse gases in the U.S. and the 16th largest in the world.

As previously stated, the SJVAPCD does not propose a specific mass-quantity threshold, but instead requires projects to demonstrate that project-specific greenhouse gas emissions have been reduced by at least 29 percent compared with the business-as-usual scenario.

Regulation Reductions

State regulations and AB 32 Scoping Plan Measures achieve reductions in greenhouse gas emissions from targeted sectors. The following is a description of the applicable regulatory measures that would reduce the proposed project's business as usual emissions.

- Motor Vehicles, Pavley I Standards: The EPA recently granted the waiver for California for its greenhouse gas emission standards for motor vehicles. The Pavley I (AB 1493) regulation, which has already been adopted by ARB, requires greenhouse gas emission reductions from passenger cars and light trucks up to the 2016 model year. This regulation is expected to provide 27.7 MMTCO₂e of emission reductions in 2020. The Pavley I standards are expected to reduce total emissions for automobiles and light trucks by 17.2 percent relative to the scenario without Pavley or corporate average fuel economy by the year 2020. The ARB is currently developing standards for passenger vehicles model year 2017 and later, which is being referred to as Pavley II. That regulation will also provide reductions by 2020, but are not counted in this analysis. Note that CalEEMod incorporates the reductions from Pavley in the models emission factors for each year.
- Motor Vehicles, Low Carbon Fuel Standard: ARB adopted a new regulation in December 2009 to implement the California Low Carbon Fuel Standard. The regulation is a discrete early action measure under AB 32 and effectuates Governor Schwarzenegger's Executive Order S-01-07. The regulation will reduce greenhouse gas emissions by reducing the carbon intensity of transportation fuels used in California by an average of 10 percent by the year 2020. The ARB Scoping Plan estimates this regulation will provide 15 MMTCO₂e of emission reductions in 2020. The Low Carbon Fuel Standard is expected to reduce total emissions from passenger vehicles and heavy-duty trucks by 7.2 percent.
- Motor Vehicles, Passenger Vehicle Efficiency: ARB identified several measures that would further reduce tailpipe greenhouse gas emissions from passenger vehicles, by increasing

vehicle efficiency. These measures include ensuring proper tire inflation and solar-reflective automotive paint and window glazing (cool car standards). The ARB Scoping Plan estimates these regulations will provide 1.44 MMTCO₂e of emission reductions in 2020. These measures are expected to reduce total emissions from passenger vehicles by 0.9 percent.

- ARB approved the regulation that requires California's automotive maintenance industry to check the tire pressure of every vehicle they service in March 2009. A properly inflated tire helps to reduce fuel greenhouse gas emissions by reducing tire rolling resistance.
- In June 2009, ARB approved the cool car standards, which cut greenhouse gases by reducing heat gain in automobile interiors. The cool car standards begin phasing in with the 2012 model year. The regulation requires that passenger cars, pickup trucks and sport utility vehicles be equipped with windows that reduce the amount of heat that enters the vehicle from solar radiation. Less heat inside the vehicle will allow air conditioning units to be downsized or used less, thereby increasing fuel economy and reducing the amount of greenhouse gases emitted by the vehicle when it is in use.
- Motor Vehicles, Heavy Duty Truck Vehicle Efficiency (Aerodynamic Efficiency): ARB approved this regulation in December 2008. This measure requires existing trucks/trailers to be retrofitted with the best available technology or ARB approved technology. Technologies that reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve the fuel efficiency of trucks may include devices that reduce aerodynamic drag and rolling resistance. The requirements apply to California and out-of-state registered trucks that travel to California. The 2020 estimated greenhouse gas emission reductions could be up to 6.4 MMTCO₂e nationwide, of which about 0.93 MMTCO₂e would occur within California. This regulation is expected to reduce total emissions from heavy-duty trucks by 1.9 percent.
- Natural Gas, Regulations: A 9.2-percent reduction is from the ARB Scoping Plan measure 3, Energy Efficiency, as referenced in Appendix B.
- Electricity Generation, Regulations: The ARB Scoping Plan Measure 3, Energy Efficiency, requires improved energy efficiency with each new version of Title 24, which is updated about every three years. ARB estimated a reduction of 21.9 MMTCO₂e from energy efficiency in the Scoping Plan. Measure 4, Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS) requires electric utilities to provide 33 percent of their power portfolio from renewable sources by 2020. The reductions for RPS are based on the difference between the utilities renewable percentage in the base year and renewable percentage. For this analysis, PG&E's portfolio contained a three year average from 2008-2010 of 14.7 percent that qualified for RPS resulting in a reduction of 18.3 percent, as referenced in Appendix B.
- **Refrigerants, Regulations**: On December 9, 2009, the ARB adopted the Management of High Global Warming potential Refrigerants for Stationary Sources in the California Code of Regulations. Beginning in 2011, the rule will require leak inspection, repairs, required service practices, and recordkeeping for large commercial and industrial systems that use more than 50

pounds of refrigerant for a single unit, about the equivalent of the refrigerant found in 100 household refrigerators. Therefore, the rule would apply to the project. Leak inspections will vary from continuous leak monitoring to quarterly or annual leak inspections, depending on the type and size of refrigeration systems. Potential emission reductions from facilities with applicable refrigeration and air conditioning equipment include HFC emission reductions of approximately 7.2 MMTCO₂e by 2020, with another 0.9 MMTCO₂e additional emission reductions from ozone depleting substances (above the expected transitional decreases), for a total of 8.1 MMTCO₂e greenhouse gas emission reductions. Additional potential emission reductions from AC equipment are 0.5 MMTCO₂e (0.4 from HFC and 0.1 from ozone depleting substances); for total projected emissions reductions of 8.6 MMTCO₂e. ARB estimates that this regulation would reduce refrigerant emissions by approximately 50 percent. This analysis assumes a 50-percent reduction from business-as-usual emissions for compliance with this refrigerant regulation.

Emission Reductions from Future Regulations

The regulations that have already been adopted represent significant reductions in greenhouse gas emissions from the 2020 business-as-usual emissions inventory. The ARB Scoping Plan included other regulations with estimated adoption dates prior to 2012 that will provide further reductions. Below is a list of future regulations that are nearing adoption or under development. These measures are anticipated to be in place by the year 2020 but are not counted as emission reductions for the proposed project because they have not yet been adopted.

- Motor Vehicles, Pavley II Standards: In addition to Pavley I, ARB proposes to further strengthen the vehicle tailpipe emission standards beginning with the 2017 model year. The new standards will follow up on the existing standards that reach maximum stringency in 2016. It is anticipated that the Pavley II standards will achieve additional emission reductions of 4.1 MMTCO₂e in 2020. The Pavley I and II standards are expected to reduce total emissions for automobiles and light trucks by 19.7 percent relative to the scenario without Pavley or corporate average fuel economy by the year 2020.
- Motor Vehicles, Passenger Vehicle Efficiency: Additional measures that would further reduce tailpipe greenhouse gas emissions from passenger vehicles by increasing vehicle efficiency include low friction oil and a tire tread program. The ARB Scoping Plan estimates these regulations will provide 3.1 MMTCO₂e of emission reductions in 2020. These measures are expected to reduce total emissions from passenger vehicles by 1.9 percent.

Emissions with Project Design Features and Regulations

The project incorporates design features, mitigation measures in other impact areas, and will comply with future regulations listed above. The majority of emissions reductions are associated with regulatory measures, though emission reductions from project design features that reduce mobile sources and energy usage totaled 6 percent. The emission reduction percentages were derived from

the SJVAPCD's Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reduction Measures Tool. The project includes the following measures:

- **Proximity to bike path/bike lanes**. Golden State Boulevard is a planned bike route that will provide bike connections to northern Selma and Kingsburg to Phase 1. Phase 2 and 3 are adjacent to planned residential development north and south of Mountain View that will provide bicycle connections when built.
- **Pedestrian Network**. The project will provide internal pedestrian connections throughout the project. Phase 2 and Phase 3 include office, commercial, residential, and entertainment uses within walking distance of one another that will enhance pedestrian activity.
- Energy Star Roof. The project will install Energy Star labeled roof materials or equivalent. Energy star qualified roof products reflect more of the sun's rays, decreasing the amount of heat transferred into a building.
- Exceed Title 24. The project will exceed Title 24 standards by at least 10 percent. This would result in a commensurate reduction in electricity and natural gas consumption for cooling, heating, and lighting.
- Non Roof Surfaces. The project will include measures to provide shade or increased albedo in parking lots, walkways, plazas, etc. to reduce cooling requirements in surrounding buildings and for cars using the project parking lots.
- Suburban Mixed Use. The project includes a mix of residential, retail, office, and entertainment uses that qualify as suburban mixed use. A mix of uses reduces vehicle miles traveled and increases the potential for walking and transit use.

Overall, project reductions and regulations reduce emissions by $35,680 \text{ MTCO}_2\text{e}$, approximately 35.8 percent. Greenhouse gas emissions after project and regulation reductions total $63,984 \text{ MTCO}_2\text{e}$ at buildout in 2024. After application of reductions from the project and regulations, the main source of emissions is from motor vehicles, contributing 86 percent of the emissions.

Source	Phase 1 (MTCO ₂ e per year)	Phase 2 (MTCO ₂ e per year)	Phase 3 (MTCO ₂ e per year)	Total All Phases (MTCO ₂ e per year)	Sector Percent Reduction
Business as Usual Emissions	35,389.9	31,882.2	32,392.4	99,664.5	
Regulatory Reductions					
Renewable Portfolio Standard	431.4	566.3	498.6	1496.4	18.3
Title 24 Electricity	231.1	303.4	267.1	801.7	9.8
Title 24 Natural Gas	48.6	83.4	75.2	207.2	9.2

Table 4.3-18: Greenhouse Gas Emissions (in 2020 with Project Reductions and Regulations)

Source	Phase 1 (MTCO₂e per year)	Phase 2 (MTCO₂e per year)	Phase 3 (MTCO₂e per year)	Total All Phases (MTCO₂e per year)	Sector Percent Reduction
Water – Energy	40.5	60.8	68.7	170.1	20.0
Refrigeration Management	759.0	1,232.0	978.0	2969.0	50.0
Total Regulatory Reductions	1,510.6	2,246.0	1,887.7	5,644.3	
Design Features and Mitigation					
Mobile Sources	1,682.2	1,197.6	1,197.5	4,077.4	6.6
Energy Efficiency Beyond Regulations	235.7	309.5	272.5	817.7	10.0
Total Design and Mitigation	1,918.0	1,507.1	1,470.0	4,895.1	
Total Reductions from BAU	3,428.5	3,753.1	3,357.7	10,539.3	
Emissions Accounting for all Reductions	25,453.7	19,065.2	19,465.6	63,984.5	
Percent Reduction from BAU					35.8

Table 4.3-18Greenhouse Gas Emissions (in 2020 with Project Reductions and Regulations)

Notes:

 $MTCO_2e =$ metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents (includes carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, and hydrofluorocarbons).

BAU includes emission reductions from Pavley and LCFS in CalEEMod.

Total emissions for all phases are based on full project buildout.

See Appendix B for modeling assumptions and reduction documentation.

Source: Michael Brandman Associates, 2012.

Conclusion

In summary, operation-related emissions reductions achieve the designated emissions reduction threshold of 29 percent by 2020 compared to business as usual. The proposed project incorporates a number of features that would minimize greenhouse gas emissions. With implementation of project design features and regulations, greenhouse gas emissions from operations would be reduced by 35.8 percent, to approximately 63,984 MTCO₂e per year. The project reductions thus will comply with the SJVAPCD quantitative threshold of a 29-percent reduction in emissions by 2020 compared with business as usual and is consistent with the goals of AB 32. Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact Analysis 2 – Evaluation of Whether the Project Conflicts with an Applicable Plan

Again, in the absence of a local, regional, or state plan that fully satisfies the requirements of the CEQA Guidelines, this analysis will focus on the project's consistency with the overarching goals of AB 32 and the strategies of ARB's Scoping Plan. For informational purposes, the project also will be evaluated for consistency with measures and guidance provided by the Attorney General's office, the California Air Pollution Control Officers Associates White Paper, the SJVAPCD's preliminary discussion of Best Performance Standards, goals under the State's developing Renewable Portfolio Standard, and the requirements of Title 24.

Construction and operation of the project would be in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations, both in their present form and as adopted in the future. Such regulations include any discrete early action and early action regulations adopted pursuant to ARB's Scoping Plan, such as the Low Carbon Fuel Standard, the tire inflation program, and the aerodynamic efficiency measures describe in the Regulation Reductions section, above.

The project also would include design features and mitigation measures that would meet or exceed various regulations, as well as help implement emission mitigation measures proposed by ARB and other entities. More specifically, the features that would reduce the project's energy and water demand, and create opportunities for reductions in vehicle miles traveled, which will have the effect of helping reduce greenhouse gases either directly onsite, indirectly by reducing the need for electricity generation, or offsite in materials production and materials disposal.

Consistent with the above, the project design features and mitigation measures related to emission reductions from mobile sources would be over and above regulatory measures and are estimated using SJVAPCD emission reduction estimates from their Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emission Reduction Tool. This tool is an interim tool for use pending the adoption of Best Performance Standards for development projects.

Aside from helping to implement measures contemplated in ARB's Scoping Plan, the project design features likely will help to implement measures contemplated by the SJVAPCD CEQA guidance document. As discussed in the regulatory section, the SJVAPCD will establish a list of greenhouse gas emission reduction measures with pre-quantified greenhouse gas emission reduction effectiveness. These best performance standards have not yet been established; however, the SJVAPCD notes in its Staff Report, Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions Impacts Under the California Environmental Quality Act, that emissions from development projects primarily occur indirectly through energy consumption and VMT. The SJVAPCD notes that projects can reduce greenhouse gas emissions from energy consumption through building designs that increase energy efficiency, water conservation, and the use of energy efficient appliances. Projects can further reduce greenhouse gas emissions through project designs that reduce VMT through features that promote pedestrian access and use of public transportation. Land use planning decisions, such as creating mixed-use development, discouraging leapfrog development, and creating favorable jobs to housing ratios can significantly reduce VMT and the associated greenhouse gas emissions.

In terms of land use planning decisions, the proposed project would constitute development within an established community and would not be opening up a new geographical area for development such that it would draw mostly new trips, or substantially lengthen existing trips. The project is designated for commercial development by the City of Selma General Plan 2035 and is a logical extension of the City of Selma. Thus, the project location and associated transportation infrastructure are consistent with the SJVAPCD Best Performance Standards approach to reducing greenhouse gas emissions (as

well as like provisions in ARB's Scoping Plan and SB 375 that discourage leapfrog development and smart growth).

Conclusion

In summary, the project is consistent with the goals established under AB 32. In addition, the project would comply with all present and future regulatory measures developed in accordance with AB 32 and ARB's Scoping Plan, and will incorporate a number of features that would minimize greenhouse gas emissions beyond existing regulatory requirements. Such features also are consistent with the Office of Planning and Research Technical Advisory, the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association white paper, the California Office of the Attorney General's list of measures, and general guidance provided by the SJVAPCD in establishing Best Performance Standards.

It should be noted that, with regard to AB 32 and ARB's Scoping Plan, reductions in greenhouse gas emissions need not be equal amongst all sectors (e.g., the 1990-based reduction levels apply on a statewide basis and are not independently required of every individual project—or sector, for that matter). As stated earlier, the commercial sector accounts for only approximately 3 percent of greenhouse gas emissions; arguably the key means by which to meet the AB 32 and Executive Order S-3-05 goals will be to target the transportation, industrial, and electricity production sectors, which combined create approximately 85 percent of the State's emissions. Regarding goals for 2050 under Executive Order S-3-05, at this time it is not possible to quantify the emissions savings from future regulatory measures, as they have not yet been developed. Nevertheless, it can be anticipated that operation of the project would comply with whatever measures are enacted that state lawmakers decide would lead to an 80-percent reduction below 1990 levels by 2050. Note again that the project already includes several project design features and mitigation measures that exceed regulatory requirements and reduce VMT.

Taking into account the proposed project's emissions, project design features, and the progress being made by the State towards reducing emissions in key sectors such as transportation, industry, and electricity, the proposed project's greenhouse gas emissions would not hinder the State's goals of reducing greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 and an 80-percent reduction below 1990 levels by 2050. In addition, project buildout is conservatively assumed to be complete by 2020 for the greenhouse gas analysis for comparison to the threshold of significance. The later phases of the project will likely be subject to much more stringent regulations at the state level that would substantially reduce emissions; however, the effectiveness and extent of the regulations is uncertain. Impacts would be significant.

Conclusion

The project would not result in an increase in emissions that exceeds the SJVAPCD threshold of significance for greenhouse gas emissions by 2020 after accounting for the benefits of regulations and design features to reduce greenhouse gases. The emission reductions attributable to regulations and project design features would achieve the 29-percent emission reduction by 2020 compared with

business as usual. However, to ensure that the design features are incorporated into future development projects, mitigation measures have been included to provide enforceability. The project also includes Mitigation Measures AIR-2a and AIR-2b that apply to criteria pollutant emissions but also provide greenhouse gas reductions. In addition, Mitigation Measures PSU-3a and PSU-3b for water conservation are included in Section 4.11, Public Services and Utilities, and Mitigation Measures AIR-7a through AIR-7e are proposed to further reduce project emissions. The emission reductions from the mitigation measures may overlap with regulatory measures that are required for the project. To avoid double counting, no additional reductions have been claimed for these measures beyond those shown in Table 4.3-17. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant after mitigation measures are applied to the project.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

Implement Mitigation Measures AIR-2a, AIR-2b, PSU-3a, PSU-3b, and:

MM AIR-7a	Prior to issuance of building permits for each building, the project applicant shall
	prepare and submit plans to the City of Selma that demonstrate the use of light-
	colored "cool" roofs. The approved plans shall be incorporated into the proposed
	project.

- MM AIR-7b Prior to issuance of building permits for each building, the project applicant shall prepare and submit plans to the City of Selma that demonstrate the use of energy efficient lighting, (including light emitting diodes) for outdoor lighting. The approved plans shall be incorporated into the proposed project.
- MM AIR-7c Prior to issuance of building permits for each building, the project applicant shall prepare and submit plans to the City of Selma that demonstrate that project buildings exceed the latest adopted edition of the Title 24 energy efficiency standards by a minimum of 10 percent. The approved plans shall be incorporated into the proposed project.
- MM AIR-7d Prior to issuance of building permits for each building, the project applicant shall prepare and submit plans to the City of Selma that demonstrate that building designs shall incorporate "solar ready" roofs that provide conduits for future solar installation, minimize shade obstructions, and optimize sunlight exposure. The approved plans shall be incorporated into the proposed project.
- **MM AIR-7e** Prior to issuance of building permits for each building, the project applicant shall prepare and submit plans to the City of Selma that demonstrate that shade tree

planting in parking lots can achieve 50 percent shade coverage within 15 years of planting. The approved plans shall be incorporated into the proposed project.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Climate Change Effects

Impact AIR-8:	The proposed project may be subject to significant adverse effects as a result of
	global climate change.

Impact Analysis

This impact addresses the recent amendment to the CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(a), which requires that an EIR analyze the significant effects of bringing development and people to the affected area. As revised, Section 15126.2 would provide that a lead agency should analyze the effects of bringing development to an area that is susceptible to hazards such as flooding and wildfire, both as such hazards currently exist or may occur in the future. Several limitations apply to the analysis of future hazards, however. For example, such an analysis may not be relevant if the potential hazard would likely occur sometime after the projected life of the project (for example, if sea-level projections only project changes 50 years in the future, a 5-year project may not be affected by such changes). Additionally, the degree of analysis should correspond to the probability of the potential hazard (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15143 ["... significant effects should be discussed with emphasis in proportion to their severity and probability of occurrence."]). As discussed in the Environmental Setting, climate change could result in the following environmental impacts in California:

- Reduced precipitation;
- Changes to precipitation and runoff patterns;
- Reduced snowfall (precipitation occurring as rain instead of snow);
- Earlier snowmelt;
- Decreased snowpack;
- Increased agricultural demand for water;
- Intrusion of seawater into coastal aquifers;

- Increased agricultural growing season;
- Increased growth rates of weeds, insect pests and pathogens;
- Inundation of low-lying coastal areas by sea level rise;
- Increased incidents and severity of wildfire events; and,
- Expansion of the range and increased frequency of pest outbreaks.

Although certain environmental effects are widely accepted to be a potential hazard to certain locations, such as rising sea level for low-laying coastal areas, it is currently infeasible to predict all environmental effects of climate change on any one location. Therefore, this analysis examines only the following potential impacts:

- Inundation of low-lying coastal areas by sea level rise
- · Increased incidents and severity of wildfire events
- Reduced water availability

Rise in Sea Levels

Climate change could result in sea level rises and increased flooding. Sea level rise is already affecting much of California's coastal region, including the Southern California coast, the Central California open coast, and the San Francisco Bay and upper estuary. During the past century, sea levels along California's coast have risen about 7 inches. The rate of sea level rise observed at the gauges along the California coast is similar to the estimate for global mean sea level. Sea levels are likely to increase by up to 35 inches by the year 2100, depending on the magnitude of climate warming. Elevations of this magnitude would inundate coastal areas with salt water, accelerate coastal erosion, threaten vital levees and inland water systems, and disrupt wetlands and natural habitats.

The project site is located more than 100 miles inland from the Pacific Ocean and is approximately 308 feet above mean sea level. Therefore, the proposed project would not be susceptible to flooding from sea level rise.

Wildfires

The project site is located on the southern edge of the City of Selma urban area and is adjacent to the Golden State Corridor with existing industrial development. The remaining area surrounding the project site is devoted to irrigated farmland. As such, the project site is not susceptible to wildland fires.

Reduced Water Availability

The California State University Fresno, Institute of Climate Change, Oceans and Atmosphere (ICOA) issued a report in which it evaluated the potential effects of climate change on the greater Fresno area and presented mitigation measures and adaptation strategies for reducing the impacts of climate change. One of the key areas discussed was reduced water availability from global climatic changes, resulting in the following environmental impacts:

- Early snowmelt and reduced storms resulting in longer dry periods
- Change in rainfall intensity resulting in greater runoff with reduced potential to capture and store freshwater for future use

Mitigation measures and adaptation strategies presented included:

- Water conservation
- Expansion of water recharge and water storage
- Expansion of storm drainage infrastructure to capture urban run-off from projected storms with greater intensity
- Greater emphasis on water quality by reducing runoff pollutants (salts, road oils, fertilizers, pesticides, etc.)
- Assessment of new projects' water impacts

The proposed project would be served with potable water supplied by the California Water Service, which relies on groundwater from the Kings Groundwater Subbasin. As discussed in Impact PSU-3 in Section 3.8, Public Services and Utilities, the proposed project is anticipated to demand an increase of 0.934 million gallons of water on a daily basis or 1,048 acre-feet per year. Impact HYD-2 analyzes the project's potential to substantially deplete the area groundwater supply, and finds the potential impact is less than significant. However, because long-term water supply is a significant concern in California, the proposed project would reduce its demand on water supply through the implementation of water conservation measures. In addition, the City of Selma General Plan contains several objectives and policies concerning water conservation measures and practices. As such, Mitigation Measures PSU-3a and PSU-3b are proposed requiring the implementation of outdoor and indoor water conservation measures and practices, respectively.

It can be reasonably concluded that with the incorporation of mitigation measures, the project would be consistent with mitigation and adaptation strategies to reduce the effects of climate change impacts from reduced water availability.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

Implement Mitigation Measures PSU-3a and PSU-3b.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

4.4 - Biological Resources

4.4.1 - Introduction

This section describes the existing biological resources and potential effects from project implementation on the site and its surrounding area. Descriptions and analysis in this section are based on information contained in the Biological Reconnaissance Survey for sensitive species and habitats prepared by Halstead & Associates, and a Biological Resources Assessment prepared by Michael Brandman Associates (MBA). The Halstead & Associates report is contained in Appendix D.1 of this EIR, and the Michael Brandman Associates report is contained in Appendix D.2.

4.4.2 - Environmental Setting

Project Site Conditions

The project site consists of approximately 288 gross acres south of the current Selma city limits. The project site is primarily composed of actively farmed vineyards. There are also fallow vineyards, disked fields, and rural residences. Adjacent land include vineyards, peach orchards, an irrigated pasture, State Route 99 (SR-99), a gas station, recycling center, Golden State Boulevard, a swap meet area, a mini storage facility, a convenience store, and a tire store.

Plant Communities

The plant species that inhabit the project area are typical of the valley floor agricultural lands. The agricultural lands on the project site and project vicinity have been leveled, disked, planted, irrigated and clean-farmed in vineyards, disked fields, orchards and row crops. The edges of the dirt roads, fields, and farmland have a variety of weedy nonnative annual plants and grasses such as puncture vine, telegraph plant, pineapple weed, prickly lettuce, and ripgut brome. Lands around farm residences have been planted with a variety of ornamental and non-native trees, shrubs, annual plants, and grasses. Fallow fields in the area are recently pulled vineyards that now have a variety of weedy plant species. Habitats or microhabitats for sensitive plants species (such as vernal pools) are not present on or adjacent to the project site.

Two plant communities are present on the project site: vineyard and disturbed/developed. These plant communities are described below.

Vineyard

A vineyard is a plantation of grape-bearing vines, grown mainly for winemaking but also as raisins, table grapes, and grape juice. The majority of the project site consists of grape vineyards.

Disturbed

The disturbed habitat onsite consists of disked fields and farm style residences. These areas are located throughout the project site.

Wildlife Communities

Wildlife species that inhabit the project area are typical of the valley floor agricultural lands. Mammals onsite include domestic dogs and cats, striped skunk, and opossum—the predominant large animals in the area. Species commonly occurring in the area include animals such as California ground squirrel, Audubon cottontail, pocket gopher, morning dove, red-winged black bird, European starling, scrub jay, American crow, northern mockingbird, western kingbird, rock dove, American kestrel, red-tailed hawk, American robin, killdeer, house finch, house sparrow, and a variety of other sparrows and warblers. A variety of other birds use the area during the migration season. Reptiles in the area include the western fence lizard, terrestrial garter snake, and gopher snake. Amphibians occurring in the area along ditches and water retention basins include tree frog western toad and bullfrog.

Special-Status Species

Special-status taxa (species) are those animal and plant species that, in the judgment of the resource agencies, trustee agencies, and certain non-governmental organizations, warrant special consideration in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process. This includes the following taxa:

- Officially designated "threatened," "endangered," or "candidate" species federally listed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and protected under the Federal Endangered Species Act.
- Officially designated "rare," "threatened," "endangered," or "candidate" species state listed by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and protected under the California Endangered Species Act. CDFG also maintains a list of "Fully Protected" species as well as "California Special Concern" species that are also generally included as special-status species under CEQA.
- Taxa considered rare, threatened, or endangered under the conditions of Section15380 of the CEQA Guidelines, such as plant taxa identified on lists 1A, 1B, and 2 in the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants of California.
- Other taxa considered sensitive such as nests of birds listed in the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), which includes most native birds, and plants included in lists 3 and 4 in the CNPS Inventory. Taxa may also be designated as species of special concern at the local level, due to limited data regarding distribution, which precludes listing them as threatened or endangered at the state or federal level.

Special-Status Plant Species

Most of project site has been leveled, disked, planted, and irrigated for agricultural land use activities. Weedy, non-native annual plants and grasses exist along roadway edges and within farm fields. None of these species are classified as special-status plant species.
Special-Status Wildlife Species

Based on the results of the wildlife species review and the field site assessments, there are three special-status wildlife species (burrowing owl, Swainson's hawk, San Joaquin kit fox) within the vicinity of the property that may be potentially impacted by the proposed project. However, based on CNDDB-records, only the Swainson's hawk has a recorded occurrence within a 5-mile radius of the project site. The two remaining special-status species (burrowing owl and San Joaquin kit fox) have been recorded at distances greater than 5 miles from the project site. The nearest CNDDB-recorded occurrence for burrowing owl is approximately 9.3 miles away from the project site. The nearest CNDDB-recorded occurrence for San Joaquin kit fox is approximately 7.4 miles from the project site. Additionally, none of the three special-status wildlife species listed above were detected on the project site during the 2007 and 2008 field site assessments conducted by Halstead & Associates and MBA, respectively. A detailed description for the burrowing owl, Swainson's hawk, and San Joaquin kit fox are provided below to include their regulatory status, general habitat requirements, and the period during which they are most identifiable (see Table 4.4-1). Also, see Exhibit 4.3-2 for CNDDB-recorded occurrences of special-status wildlife species within a 5-mile radius of the project site.

Name	Status	General Habitat	Potential for Presence	Period of Identification
Birds	·			·
Burrowing owl (<i>Athene</i> <i>cunicularia</i>)	California species of special concern	Open, dry annual or perennial grasslands, deserts, and scrublands characterized by low- growing vegetation. Subterranean nester, dependent upon burrowing mammals, most notably the California ground squirrel.	Moderate Potential to Occur - Although this species was not detected on the project site marginal habitat exists onsite. The nearest CNDDB-recorded occurrence is approximately 9.3 miles away from the project site.	Year-round
Swainson's hawk (Buteo swainsoni)	State-listed threatened	Breeds in grasslands with scattered trees, juniper- sage flats, riparian areas, savannahs, and agricultural or ranch. Requires adjacent suitable foraging areas such as grasslands, or alfalfa or grain fields supporting rodent populations.	Moderate Potential To Occur: According to the CNDDB a nesting site occurs approximately 2.8 miles away from the project site and suitable foraging habitat occurs onsite.	Year-round. Nesting season March 1 through September 15

Table 4.4-1: Special-Status Wildlife Species

Name	Status	General Habitat	Potential for Presence	Period of Identification
Mammals	·		·	·
San Joaquin kit fox (Vulpus macrotis mutica)	State-listed endangered and federally listed endangered	Prairie and Sonoran grasslands in the vicinity of freshwater marshes and alkali sinks, where there is a dense ground cover of tall grasses and San Joaquin saltbush. Soils are deep, heavy loams that support mixtures of native perennial and introduced grasses. Pupping dens are built in more loosely textured soils at elevations between 110 and 900 meters (350 and 2,950 feet).	Moderate Potential to Occur - Although the species was not detected on the project site, the nearest CNDDB-recorded occurrence is approximately 7.4 miles away from the project site.	Year-round
Source: California Natural Diversity Database, 2008; Michael Brandman Associates, 2008.				

Table 4.4-1 (cont.): Special-Status Wildlife Species

Burrowing owl (Athene cunicularia)

Burrowing owl is a California species of special concern that occurs in a variety of open habitats, including shortgrass prairies, grasslands, lowland scrub, agricultural lands (particularly rangelands), coastal dunes, desert floors, and artificial areas. The burrowing owl requires large, open expanses of sparsely vegetated areas on gently rolling or level terrain with an abundance of active small mammal (e.g., ground squirrel, rabbit) burrows. Occupancy of suitable burrowing owl habitat can be verified at a site by an observation of at least one burrowing owl, molted feathers, cast pellets, prey remains, eggshell fragments, or excrement at or near a burrow entrance. Burrowing owls exhibit high site fidelity, reusing the same burrows year after year. This species was not detected onsite during the 2007 and 2008 field seasons.

Swainson's hawk (Buteo swainsoni)

Swainson's hawk is a state-listed threatened species and breeds in grasslands with scattered trees, juniper-sage flats, riparian areas, savannahs, and agricultural and ranch lands. Swainson's hawk requires adjacent suitable foraging areas such as grasslands, or alfalfa or grain fields supporting rodent populations. The majority of the project site consists of an agricultural field that provides suitable foraging habitat for the species. According to the CNDDB, a nesting site occurs within a 2.8-mile radius of the project site. However, this species was not detected onsite during the 2007 and 2008 field seasons, nor was it detected foraging on the project site.

San Joaquin kit fox (Vulpes macrotis mutica)

The San Joaquin kit fox is a federally listed endangered and state-listed threatened species that occurs in annual grasslands or grassy open stages with scattered shrubby vegetation, which include prairie and Sonoran grasslands in the vicinity of freshwater marshes and alkali sinks, where there is a dense ground cover of tall grasses and San Joaquin saltbush. Preferred soils are deep, heavy loams that support mixtures of native perennial and introduced grasses. Pupping dens are built in more loosely textured soils at elevations between 350 and 2,950 feet. This species was not detected onsite during the 2007 and 2008 field seasons.

Wildlife Movement Corridors

Wildlife movement corridors link areas of suitable wildlife habitat that are otherwise separated by rugged terrain, changes in vegetation, or human disturbance. The fragmentation of open space areas by urbanization creates isolated "islands" of wildlife habitat, separating different populations of a single species. Corridors effectively act as links between these populations. The project site is located in an urban environment surrounded by major roadways and commercial development that impedes wildlife movement across the project site. As such, the project site does not function as a wildlife movement corridor.

4.4.3 - Regulatory Framework

Regulatory Permits

Impacts to natural drainage features and wetland areas are regulated by the United States Army Corp of Engineers (USACE), the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and the CDFG, based upon the policies and regulations discussed below. Discharge of fill material into waters of the State not subject to the jurisdiction of the USACE pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) may require authorization pursuant to the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act through application for waste discharge requirements (WDRs) or through waiver of WDRs, despite the lack of a clear regulatory imperative.

There are no jurisdictional drainages on the project site. As such, no regulatory permits shall be required for project implementation.

Endangered Species Act

The Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973 establishes a framework for protecting and facilitating the recovery of threatened and endangered populations of animal and plant species. Under the ESA, the Secretary of the Interior is required to list species of animals and plants that are both threatened and endangered, a task that is delegated to the USFWS and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). A species can become threatened or endangered as a result of the following factors:

- Present or threatened destruction
- Modification or curtailment of its habitat range
- Over-utilization for commercial recreation, scientific, or educational purposes

- Disease or predation
- Inadequacy of existing statutory mechanisms
- Other natural or man-made factors affecting its continued existence

Section 3 of the ESA defines an endangered species as any species or subspecies of fish, wildlife, or plants "in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range." A threatened species is defined as any species or subspecies "likely to become an endangered species within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of its range." Designated endangered and threatened species, as listed through publication of a final rule in the Federal Register, are fully protected from a "take" without an incidental take permit administered by the USFWS under Section 10 of the ESA. "Take" is defined as to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct (50 CFR 17.3). The term "harm" in the definition of take in the Act means an action that actually kills or injures wildlife. Such action may include significant habitat modification or degradation where it actually kills or injures wildlife by significantly impairing essential behavioral patterns, including breeding, feeding, or sheltering. The term "harass" in the definition of take means an intentional or negligent act or omission that creates the likelihood of injury to wildlife by annoying it to such an extent as to significantly disrupt normal behavioral patterns, which include, but are not limited to, breeding, feeding, or sheltering. Proposed endangered or threatened species are those for which a proposed regulation, but not a final rule, has been published in the Federal Register.

Section 7 of the ESA requires that federal agencies ensure that their actions are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of a listed species, or destroy or adversely modify its critical habitat. This obligation requires federal agencies to consult with the USFWS or the NMFS on any actions (issuing permits including Section 404 permits, issuing licenses, providing federal funding) that may affect listed species to ensure that reasonable and prudent measures will be undertaken to mitigate impacts on listed species. Consultation with the USFWS or the NMFS can be either formal or informal, depending on the likelihood of the action to adversely affect listed species or critical habitat. Once a formal consultation is initiated, the USFWS or the NMFS will issue a Biological Opinion (either a "jeopardy" or a "no jeopardy" opinion) indicating whether the proposed agency action will or will not jeopardize the continued existence of a listed species or result in the destruction or modification of its critical habitat. A permit cannot be issued for a project with a jeopardy opinion unless the project is redesigned to lessen impacts.

State Regulations

Project permitting and approval requires compliance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the 1984 California Endangered Species Act (CESA), and the 1977 Native Plant Protection Act (NPPA). The CESA and NPPA authorize the California Fish and Game Commission to designate Endangered, Threatened and Rare species and to regulate the taking of these species. The California Code of Regulations lists animal species considered Endangered or Threatened by the

State. The Natural Heritage Division of the CDFG administers the state rare species program. The CDFG maintains lists of designated Endangered, Threatened, and Rare plant and animal species. Listed species either were designated under the NPPA or designated by the Fish and Game Commission. In addition to recognizing three levels of endangerment, the CDFG can afford interim protection to candidate species while they are being reviewed by the Fish and Game Commission.

The CDFG also maintains a list of animal species of special concern, most of which are species whose breeding populations in California may face extirpation. Although these species have no legal status, the CDFG recommends considering them during analysis of proposed project impacts to protect declining populations and avoid the need to list them as endangered in the future.

Under provisions of CEQA Guidelines Section 15380(d), the project lead agency and CDFG, in making a determination of significance, must treat non-listed plant and animal species as equivalent to listed species if such species satisfy the minimum biological criteria for listing. In general, the CDFG considers plant species on List 1A (Plants Presumed Extinct in California), List 1B (Plants Rare, Threatened, or Endangered in California and elsewhere), or List 2 (Plants Rare, Threatened, or Endangered in California, But More Common Elsewhere) of the California Native Plant Society's (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants of California as qualifying for legal protection under Section 15380(d). Species on CNPS List 3 or 4 may, but generally do not, qualify for protection under this provision.

Sensitive habitats include riparian corridors, wetlands, habitats for legally protected species and CDFG Species of Special Concern, areas of high biological diversity, areas providing important wildlife habitat, and unusual or regionally restricted habitat types. Habitat types considered sensitive include those listed on the CNDDB working list of "high priority" habitats (i.e., those habitats that are rare or endangered within the borders of California).

Migratory Bird Treaty Act

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (MBTA) makes it unlawful to take (kill, harm, harass, etc.) any migratory bird listed in 50 CFR 10, including its nests, eggs, or products. The MBTA protects over 800 species, including geese, ducks, shorebirds, raptors, songbirds, and many relatively common species, and it was originally drafted to put an end to the commercial trade in birds and their feathers that, by the early years of the 20th century, had wreaked havoc on the populations of many native bird species. The MBTA implements the United States' commitment to four international conventions (with Canada, Japan, Mexico, and Russia) for the protection of a shared migratory bird resource. Each of the conventions protects selected species of birds that are common to both countries (i.e., they occur in both countries at some point during their annual life cycle). The MBTA requires that the removal of any trees, shrubs, or any other potential nesting habitat be conducted outside the avian nesting season, which is generally between early February and late August, unless a qualified biologist performs a survey to determine the presence or absence of avian species nesting onsite. If

such species are found onsite during the nesting season, the nests must be protected during construction until the young have fledged.

Local

City of Selma

General Plan

Both the 1997 General Plan and 2035 General Plan set forth the following goal relevant to biological resources. Note that the goal numbering reflects the 2035 General Plan.

• Goal 1.1: Protect the environment.

The 1997 General Plan established the following goal relevant to biological resources:

• Goal 1.10: Protect rare and endangered plant and animal species, if subsequently found in the Selma Planning area.

The 2035 General Plan established the following goal relevant to biological resources:

• Goal 6: Protect any rare or endangered plant and animal species, found in the Selma area.

4.4.4 - Methodology

Halstead & Associates prepared a Biological Reconnaissance Survey in 2007 and Michael Brandman Associates prepared a Biological Resources Assessment 2008 that assessed plant and wildlife species on the project site. The former report is contained in Appendix D-1 and the latter report is contained in Appendix D-2. Both reports involved literature reviews and field visits to survey for general and sensitive wildlife and plant species.

The literature reviews provide a baseline from which to evaluate the biological resources potentially occurring on the project site, as well as in the surrounding area. A compilation of sensitive plant and wildlife species recorded in the vicinity of the site was derived from the CDFG California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), a sensitive species and plant community account database. Additional recorded occurrences of plant species found on or near the site were obtained in the California Native Plant Society's (CNPS's) Electronic Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants of California database. The CNDDB and CNPS searches were based on the Selma and surrounding Malaga, Sanger, Wahtoke, Conejo, Reedley, Laton, Burris Park, and Traver, California, United States Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute topographic quadrangles. Federal register listings, protocols, and species data provided by the USFWS and CDFG were reviewed in conjunction with anticipated federal and state listed species potentially occurring in the vicinity.

Reconnaissance surveys were conducted by Halstead & Associates, Environmental/Biological consultants on April 25 and 26, 2007 and MBA's biologist conducted a site assessment on June 11, 2008 of an additional 20-acre parcel that had been included with the overall 288-acre project site.

The biological surveys were to assess sensitive habitats and other biological resource that could potentially occur on or adjacent to the project site. The surveys focused on three primary objectives: general habitat assessment, vegetation mapping, and presence/absence of special-status species. Based on the 2008 field site survey, the vegetative communities on the project site have not changed since the 2007 field season.

Plant communities were mapped using 7.5-minute USGS topographic base maps and recent aerial photography. Sensitive or unusual biological resources identified during the literature review were ground-truthed during the reconnaissance-level survey for mapping accuracy. Plant communities within the project site were classified at a general level of detail using the widely accepted descriptions provided in Holland's Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California (1986).

4.4.5 - Thresholds of Significance

According to the CEQA Guidelines' Appendix G Environmental Checklist, to determine whether impacts to biological resources are significant environmental effects, the following questions are analyzed and evaluated:

- a.) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
- b.) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (Refer to Section 7, Effects Found Not To Be Significant.)
- c.) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (Refer to Section 7, Effects Found Not To Be Significant.)
- d.) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites?
- e.) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (Refer to Section 7, Effects Found Not To Be Significant.)
- f.) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (Refer to Section 7, Effects Found Not To Be Significant.)

4.4.6 - Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Special-Status Species

Impact BIO-1: The proposed project may have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on certain species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Impact Analysis

This impact analysis addresses potential impacts on special-status plant and wildlife species from project implementation. Each subject is discussed below.

Special-Status Plant Species

The majority of the project site is currently in agricultural production, with non-native annual weeds and grasses located along roadways and within fields. No special-status plant species were observed on the project site or surrounding area. Therefore, no impacts to special-status plant species would occur.

Special-Status Wildlife Species

Nesting Birds

The project site contains native and non-native trees that could provide suitable nesting habitat for avian species protected by the MBTA during the nesting season. It is recommended that either (1) future vegetation removal associated with development of the property be conducted outside of the bird nesting season, which extends from February 15 to August 31 or (2) a qualified biologist shall conduct a nesting bird survey within 5 days of proposed grading within the nesting season. Accordingly, these recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure BIO-1a.

Burrowing Owl

Although this species was not detected on the project, it does have the potential to occur within the vicinity of the project site. Accordingly, a pre-construction survey and associated contingency measures are set forth in Mitigation Measure BIO-1b.

Swainson's Hawk

Although this species was not detected on the project site, if construction activities occur during the Swainson's hawk nesting season (March 1 through September 15), a nesting raptor survey is recommended by a qualified biologist on the project site and within a 250-foot buffer of the project site, 5 days prior to construction activities. Should an active nest be identified, the CDFG shall be contacted to determine avoidance and mitigation measures pursuant to CDFG's Mitigation Guidelines for Swainson's Hawk. Accordingly, these requirements are reflected in Mitigation Measure BIO-1c.

The project site contains mostly vineyards and fallow fields. The Mitigation Guidelines for Swainson's Hawk indicates that the following agricultural land uses can provide foraging habitat suitable for the Swainson's hawk: "alfalfa; fallow fields; beet, tomato, and other low-growing row or field crops; dry-land and irrigated pasture; rice land (when not flooded); and cereal grain crops (including corn after harvest)." As such, only the portions of the project site containing fallow fields would be considered to have the potential to provide foraging habitat; the vineyards would not.

The nearest Swainson's hawk nesting tree is approximately 2.8 miles away from the project site. The Mitigation Guidelines for Swainson's Hawk establishes that projects within 5 miles of an active nest tree but greater than 1 mile from the nest tree shall provide 0.75 acre of habitat mitigation land for each acre of foraging habitat impacted. Accordingly, these requirements are reflected in Mitigation Measure BIO-1d.

San Joaquin Kit Fox

Although this species was not detected on the project site, it is recommended that prior to grounddisturbing activities on the project site, a qualified biologist shall conduct a 30-day pre-construction San Joaquin kit fox survey to identify any potential kit fox species or denning locations. If kit foxes or kit fox dens are detected, a qualified biologist shall contact USFWS and implement the USFWS's Standard Recommendations for the Protection of the San Joaquin Kit Fox Prior to or During Ground Disturbance. These requirements are reflected in Mitigation Measure BIO-1e.

Summary

Based on site assessments, previous biological surveys, and the literature research conducted for the property, the project has potential to have a substantial adverse affect on Swainson's hawk foraging habitat and nesting bird habitat. In addition, although not expected to occur on the project site based on the lack of detection and distance from the nearest recorded observations, mitigation measures are provided for the protection of the burrowing owl and San Joaquin kit fox.

Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

MM BIO-1a If tree or vegetation removal occurs during the nesting season (February 15 to August 31), no more than 5 days prior to any ground-disturbing activities for each phase or any further subdivision thereof, the project applicant will retain a qualified biologist to conduct a nesting bird survey to determine if nests are active or occupied onsite. If passerine birds are found to be nesting, or there is evidence of nesting behavior within 250 feet of the impact area, a 250-foot buffer shall be established around the nests. For raptor species—birds of prey such as hawks and owls—this buffer shall be 500 feet, whereas for special-status raptor species (such as Swainson's hawk), the buffer shall be 0.5 mile. A qualified biologist shall monitor the nests, and construction activities may commence within the buffer area at the discretion and presence of the biological monitor. No pre-construction survey for nesting birds are

required if construction activities occur outside of the nesting bird season (September 1 through February 14).

- MM BIO-1b Prior to ground-disturbing activities for construction activities that disturb agricultural land for each phase, a qualified biologist shall conduct a 30-day preconstruction burrowing owl survey to determine the presence or absence of this species. If burrowing owls are determined to be present, mitigation measures for potential impacts to this species shall follow the guidelines outlined by the Burrowing Owl Consortium (BOC), including passive relocation.
- MM BIO-1c If construction activities occur during the Swainson's hawk nesting season (March 1 through September 15), a nesting raptor survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist on the project site and within a 250-foot buffer of the project site 5 days prior to construction activities for each phase or any further subdivision thereof. Should an active nest be identified, the CDFG shall be contacted to determine avoidance and mitigation measures pursuant to the California Department of Fish and Game's Mitigation Guidelines for Swainson's Hawk.
- **MM BIO-1d** Prior to issuance of grading permits for each phase or any further subdivision thereof, the applicant shall provide documentation to the City of Selma demonstrating that Swainson's hawk foraging habitat mitigation has been obtained at a ratio of 0.75 acre for each 1.00 acre of suitable foraging habitat developed. "Suitable foraging habitat" consists of fallow fields that would be affected by construction activities. Land planted as vineyards shall not be treated as suitable foraging habitat pursuant to the guidance in the Mitigation Guidelines for Swainson's Hawk. The applicant shall mitigate for the loss of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat through (1) payment of fees for offsite preservation of foraging habitat to a resource agency or a third-party organization acceptable to a resource agency or (2) acquisition of an irrevocable instrument (e.g., deed restriction or easement) for preservation of foraging habitat on a property that provides equal or greater quality habitat. This mitigation measure may be coordinated with Mitigation Measure AG-1.
- MM BIO-1e Prior to ground-disturbing activities for each phase or any further subdivision thereof, a qualified biologist shall conduct a 30-day pre-construction San Joaquin kit fox survey to identify any potential kit fox species or denning locations. If kit foxes or kit fox dens are detected, a qualified biologist shall contact USFWS and implement the USFWS's Standard Recommendations for the Protection of the San Joaquin Kit Fox Prior to or During Ground Disturbance.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Wildlife Corridors and Nursery Sites

Impact BIO-2:	The proposed project would not interfere substantially with the movement of any
	native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native
	resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites.

Impact Analysis

The project site is disturbed and used primarily for extensive agriculture. The project site is separated into two parcels. The western parcel is located west of SR-99. The eastern parcel is located east of SR-99 and west of Golden State Boulevard. The City of Selma is located to the north of the project site. Because of the urban development north and east of the project site and extensive agricultural operations west and south of the site, wildlife movement is limited within and across the property. In addition, the project site does not provide a corridor for regional wildlife movement and does not contain any waterways that would affect any aquatic species, nor does it impede the use of wildlife nursery sites.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is necessary.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

4.5 - Cultural Resources

4.5.1 - Introduction

This section describes the existing cultural resources and potential effects from project implementation on cultural resources, describes the existing conditions and potential effects from project implementation on the site and its surrounding area. Descriptions and analysis in this section are based on information contained in the Phase I Cultural Resource Assessment prepared by Michael Brandman Associates, which is provided in Appendix E of this EIR.

4.5.2 - Environmental Setting

Overview

The term "cultural resources" encompasses historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources, and burial sites. Below is a brief summary of each component:

- **Historic Resources:** Historic resources are associated with the relatively recent past. In California, historic resources are typically associated with the Spanish, Mexican, and American periods in the State's history and are generally less than 200 years old.
- Archaeological Resources: Archaeology is the study of prehistoric human activities and cultures. Archaeological resources are generally associated with Native American cultures.
- Paleontological Resources: Paleontology is the study of plant and animal fossils.
- **Burial Sites:** Burial sites are formal or informal locations where human remains, usually associated with indigenous cultures, are interred.

Cultural Setting

Prehistory

Early archaeological investigations in central California were conducted at sites located in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta region. The first published account documents investigations in the Lodi and Stockton area. The initial archaeological reports typically contained descriptive narratives, with more systematic approaches sponsored by Sacramento Junior College in the 1930s. At the same time, University of California Berkeley excavated several sites in the lower Sacramento Valley and Delta region that resulted in recognizing archaeological site patterns based on variations of inter-site assemblages. Research during the 1930s identified temporal periods in central California prehistory and provided an initial chronological sequence. In the late 1940s and early 1950s, researchers created a cultural model that ultimately became know as the Central California Taxonomic System (CCTS), which was based on documented similarities in artifacts between sites in the San Francisco Bay region and the Delta. This system proposed a uniform, linear sequence of cultural succession. The CCTS system was challenged by radiocarbon dating that indicated that Early and Middle Horizon sites were not subsequent developments but, at least partially, contemporaneous.

To address some of the flaws in the CCTS system, it was revised to incorporate a system of spatial and cultural integrative units. Cultural, temporal, and spatial units were separated from each other and assigned to six chronological periods: Paleo-Indian (10000 to 6000 B.C.); Lower, Middle, and Upper Archaic (6000 B.C. to A.D. 500); and Emergent (Upper and Lower, A.D. 500 to 1800). The suggested temporal ranges are similar to earlier horizons, which are broad cultural units that can be arranged in a temporal sequence. In addition, the revisions included the definition of several patterns, which are a general way of life shared within a specific geographical region. These patterns include:

- Windmiller Pattern or Early Horizon (3000 to 1000 B.C.)
- Berkeley Pattern or Middle Horizon (1000 B.C. to A.D. 500)
- Augustine Pattern or Late Horizon (A.D. 500 to historic period)

Brief descriptions of these temporal ranges and their unique characteristics follow.

Windmiller Pattern or Early Horizon (3000 to 1000 B.C.)

Characterized by the Windmiller Pattern, the Early Horizon was centered in the Cosumnes district of the Delta, and emphasized hunting rather than gathering, as evidenced by the abundance of projectile points in relation to plant processing tools. Additionally, atlatl, dart, and spear technologies typically included stemmed projectile points of slate and chert but minimal obsidian. The large variety of projectile point types and faunal remains suggest exploitation of numerous types of terrestrial and aquatic species. Burials occurred in cemeteries and intra-village graves. These burials were typically ventrally extended—although some dorsal extensions are known with a westerly orientation—and included many grave goods. Trade networks focused on the acquisition of ornamental and ceremonial objects in finished form rather than raw material. The presence of artifacts made of exotic materials such as quartz, obsidian, and shell indicate an extensive trade network that may represent the arrival of Utian populations into central California. Also indicative of this period are rectangular *Haliotis* and *Olivella* shell beads and charmstones that were usually perforated.

Berkeley Pattern or Middle Horizon (1000 B.C. to A.D. 500)

The Middle Horizon is characterized by the Berkeley Pattern, which displays evidence of considerable changes from the Early Horizon. This period exhibited a strong milling technology represented by minimally shaped cobble mortars and pestles, although metates and manos were still used. Dart and atlatl technologies were characterized by non-stemmed projectile points made primarily of obsidian. It is believed that the Berkeley Pattern marked the eastward expansion of Miwok groups from the San Francisco Bay Area. Compared with the Early Horizon, There is a higher proportion of grinding implements at this time implying an emphasis on plant resources rather than on hunting. Typical burials within the village with flexed positions, variable cardinal orientation, and some cremations. The practice of spreading ground ochre over the burial was common at this time. Grave goods during this period are generally sparse and typically include only utilitarian items and a few ornamental objects. However, objects such as charmstones, quartz crystals, and bone whistles were present, which suggests the religious or ceremonial significance of

the individual. During this period, larger populations are suggested by the number and depth of sites compared with the Windmiller Pattern. It is thought that the Berkeley Pattern reflects gradual expansion or assimilation of different populations rather than sudden population replacement and a gradual shift in economic emphasis.

Augustine Pattern or Late Horizon (A.D. 500 to Historic Period)

The Late Horizon is characterized by the Augustine Pattern, which represents a shift in the general subsistence pattern. Changes include the introduction of bow and arrow technology and—most importantly—acorns as the predominant food resource. Trade systems expanded to include raw resources as well as finished products. There are more baked clay artifacts and the extensive use of *Haliotis* ornaments of many elaborate shapes and forms. Burial patterns retained the use of flexed burials with variable orientation, but there was a reduction in the use of ochre and widespread evidence of cremation. Judging from the number and types of grave goods associated with the two types of burials, cremation seems to have been reserved for individuals of higher status, whereas others were buried in flexed positions. It is believed that the Augustine Pattern represents expansion of the Wintuan population from the north, which resulted in combining new traits with those established during the Berkeley Pattern.

Central California research has expanded from an emphasis on defining chronological and cultural units to a more comprehensive look at settlement and subsistence systems. The shift is illustrated by the early use of burials to identify mortuary assemblages and more recent research using osteological data to determine the health of prehistoric populations. Although debate continues over a single model or sequence for central California, the general framework consisting of three temporal/cultural units is generally accepted, although the identification of regional and local variation is a major goal of current archaeological research.

Native American Background

At the time of European contact, most of the San Joaquin Valley and the foothills of the western slope of the Sierra Nevada were occupied by the Yokuts, who are generally recognized as having three major subgroups: the Northern Valley, the Foothill, and the Southern Valley. Each of these ethnolinguistic groups was composed of autonomous, culturally and linguistically related tribes or tribelets. Ethnographic evidence suggests the project area was part of the Southern Valley Yokuts territory that spanned from the area north of Tulare Lake to the Tehachapi Mountains in the south, and from the Tehachapi foothills in the east to the base of the Coastal Ranges on the west.

The Southern Valley Yokuts occupied a rich environment with abundant water resources from the nearby sloughs, lake basins, and river systems. Swamps and tule marshes surrounded the waterways and teemed with wildlife, including aquatic mammals, fish, and waterfowl. Adjacent grasslands provided food for herds of elk, antelope, and—in the winter—deer. The regional flora was equally if not more diverse and was utilized as a main staple of the Yokuts diet. The Southern Valley Yokuts dietary base relied on a mixed strategy of fishing, waterfowl hunting, shellfish, and plant collecting,

with less emphasis on large-game hunting. Important vegetal resources included cattail roots, grasses, nuts, seeds, tule, and bulbs. The resource-rich environment allowed for permanent village sites, which typically were occupied throughout the year.

Items not found in the local environment were obtained through an extensive trade network. Quality stone and wood were lacking in the Valley environment and were often acquired through trade with nearby tribelets. Imported items included acorns, salt, obsidian, and seashells, which were exchanged for locally available asphaltum, steatite, and animal skins.

The material culture of the Southern Valley Yokuts included structures, watercraft, basketry, weapons, and tools fashioned primarily from local resources. The ubiquitous tule was the primary component utilized for house construction and other fiber crafts such as basketry, mats, and cradles. Rafts were central to the economy base because of the abundance of waterways, which made watercraft the preferred mode of transportation. Wood, stone, and bone were commonly used to manufacture a variety of tools and weapons. Sweathouses were common to every settlement and, in the case of the Southern Valley Yokuts, were used exclusively by men on a daily basis.

The Southern Valley Yokuts were divided into true tribes, with individual tribelets having their own name, dialect, and territory. Typically, a tribelet was ruled by a central chief who inherited the position, was assisted by one or more aides, and lived in the largest village. The chief's duties included decisions that affected the well-being of the entire tribelet, sanctioning trade, entertaining guests, and arbitration of intra-tribal disputes. Marriage was typically informal, and patrilocality was the accepted practice following marriage. Thus, if a family had numerous sons, a circle of extended family members would inhabit the area immediately adjacent to the patriarch's home. Polygamy was not objected to, but it was practiced solely by men. There is scant evidence that the Southern Valley Yokuts participated in a large number of organized religious ceremonies. The two most important celebrations were the annual mourning ceremony and the Jimson Weed Ceremony. Tribal shamans varied from possessing minor powers to being considered omnipotent.

Historic Background

The history of the southern San Joaquin Valley can be divided into several periods of influence; pertinent historic periods are briefly summarized below.

Spanish Period

In 1772, Captain Pedro Fages, a Spanish soldier, entered the San Joaquin Valley area searching for military deserters. His diary was one among many that documented the environmental landscape and the cultural setting of the San Joaquin Valley. Fages entered the area from the south, and as he emerged from the lower portion of Tejon Pass, he saw the beautiful lakes, rivers, and plains and named the most prominent lake Buena Vista (beautiful view). Hoping to discover a more direct route from Yuma to Monterey, in 1776, Padre Francisco Garces stayed several weeks in the southern San Joaquin Valley.

The most drastic and permanent change came to the local Southern Valley Yokuts way of life with the establishment of the Spanish Mission system. By the early 1800s, the mission fathers began a process of cultural change that brought the majority of the local Native Americans into the missions. At the expense of traditional skills, the neophytes were taught the pastoral and horticultural skills of the Hispanic tradition. Spanish missionaries traveled into the Valley to recapture escaped neophytes and recruit inland Native Americans for the coastal missions. In 1834, the Mission system was officially secularized, and the majority of the mission Native American population dispersed to local ranches, villages, or nearby pueblos. Following the collapse of the mission system, many of the local Native Americans returned to the southern San Joaquin Valley, bringing with them language and agricultural practices learned from the Spanish. During the latter half of the 19th century, the size of all Yokuts populations dwindled dramatically, due to the spread of European settlements and the diseases the Europeans brought with them.

Mexican Period

With the declaration of Mexican independence in 1821, Spanish control of Alta California ended, although little change actually occurred. Political change did not take place until mission secularization in 1834, when Native Americans were released from missionary control and the mission lands were granted to private individuals. Researchers hypothesize that mission secularization removed the social protection and support on which Native Americans had come to rely. It exposed them to further exploitation by outside interests, often forcing them into a marginal existence as laborers for large ranchos. Following mission secularization, the Mexican population grew as the native population continued to decline. Anglo-American settlers began to arrive in Alta California during this period and often married into Mexican families, becoming Mexican citizens, which made them eligible to receive land grants. In 1846, on the eve of the U.S.-Mexican War (1846 to 1848), the estimated population of Alta California was 8,000 non-natives and 10,000 natives. However, these estimates have been debated. It is estimated that the Native American population was 100,000 in 1850; the U.S. Census of 1880 reports the Native American population as 20,385.

European Expansion

Jedediah Smith was the first to explore the San Joaquin Valley in 1826, but other fur-trapping expeditions soon followed. In 1848, as a result of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, California became a United States territory. Also in 1848, John Marshall found gold at Sutter's Mill, which marked the start of the Gold Rush. The influx of miners and entrepreneurs increased the population of California, not including Native Californians, from 14,000 to 224,000 in just four years. Like the rest of the state, the discovery of gold brought a tremendous influx of miners into the San Joaquin Valley, which in turn stimulated commercial growth as eager entrepreneurs set up business to support the miners and mining operations. When the Gold Rush was over, many of the miners settled in the Valley and established farms, ranches, and lumber mills.

Local History

A trail known as Mustang Road marked the area that would eventually be known as Selma. Originally used by the Butterfield Stage line in the late 1850s, the road fell into disuse, but remnants could be seen by the first settlers in the unincorporated area of Fresno County in 1880. Frank Dusy's sheep grazing and shearing operation marked the first permanent business in the area and for years, his sheep-shearing shack was the only structure between Fresno, located approximately 17 miles to the northeast, and Kings River, located approximately 8 miles to the southwest. Change came to the area when a few small irrigation canals hinted at the agricultural potential of the land. Eventually, larger canals provided the early settlers with enough water to grow lush green fields of wheat. The region's agriculture brought a railroad station to Fresno, and before long, crews went to work on a switch about 15 miles southeast of Fresno. A structure and a few buildings were built to house the work crews and became known as the Section House. Originally located on the west side of the tracks near the Third street crossing, the Section House was the first building in Selma.

In 1876, when it became apparent that more water was needed to accommodate the influx of settlers attracted by the inexpensive land, the Centerville and Kingsburg Irrigation Ditch Company was incorporated. Despite complications associated with irrigating desert soils, a larger canal was completed and allowed further settlement of the area. Soon, the need for a more settled community led to the establishment of the Valley View School District. As a result, the area became known as Valley View. When the Frey brothers established a mill near the canal, the formation of a township followed soon after. The district of Valley View was renamed Selma by the County Board of Supervisors in 1897.

After 15 months, Selma had grown to nearly 250 residents and was served by two blacksmith shops, four general stores, a shoemaker, a baker, a saddler, a hatmaker, a variety store, and a justice of the peace. By 1881, Selma was booming; by 1888, the population was estimated between 1,500 and 2,000. Between 1881 and 1893, fires burned many of the original structures, but the citizens of Selma rebuilt downtown with new and improved construction.

In the early 1900s, prohibition further shaped the town. Selma captured statewide attention by being the first city in the San Joaquin Valley to close its saloons. Selma's clean image brought more settlers, commercial growth, and many civic improvements. Much of the commercial growth occurred on High Street, which became the main business block. Two major agricultural industries bolstered Selma's 1906 economy. One was the raisin plant of the Selma Fruit Company, which operated in the old Whitson Hotel. The other, located next door, was California's largest cannery, established by two Libby brothers and another entrepreneur named McNeill. Although wheat was Selma's original crop, fruit soon took its place. Selma was first known as the "Home of the Peach," and the local peach cannery, where Libby's brand fruit was packed, was a major seasonal employer. Today, 90 percent of American raisins are produced within 8 miles of Selma; appropriately, Selma is known as the "Raisin Capital of the World."

Like many other American cities, post-World War II development spread the growing city to the north and east, away from its business center. State Route 99, once a main road north and south through Selma, was rebuilt as a major freeway in the 1960s. Several blocks to the west of the old road (now Whitson Street and Golden State Boulevard), the freeway bisects the oldest residential neighborhood in Selma. Freeway travel made the new shopping malls of Fresno more accessible. The freeway also made Selma more attractive as a place to live for Fresno workers, who contributed to ever-faster residential growth into the 21st century.

4.5.3 - Regulatory Setting

Federal

National Historic Preservation Act

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), as amended, established the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), which contains an inventory of the nation's significant prehistoric and historic properties. Under 36 CFR 60, a property is recommended for possible inclusion on the NRHP if it is at least 50 years old, has integrity, and meets one of the following criteria:

- It is associated with significant events in history, or broad patterns of events.
- It is associated with significant people in the past.
- It embodies the distinctive characteristics of an architectural type, period, or method of construction; or it is the work of a master or possesses high artistic value; or it represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.
- It has yielded, or may yield, information important in history or prehistory.

Certain types of properties are usually excluded from consideration for listing in the NRHP, but they can be considered if they meet special requirements in addition to meeting the criteria listed above. Such properties include religious sites, relocated properties, graves and cemeteries, reconstructed properties, commemorative properties, and properties that have achieved significance within the past fifty years.

State

California Register of Historical Resources

As defined by Section 15064.5(a)(3)(A-D) of the State CEQA Guidelines, a resource shall be considered historically significant if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (CR). The California Register of Historical Resources and many local preservation ordinances have employed the criteria for eligibility to the NRHP as a model, since the NHPA provides the highest standard for evaluating the significance of historic resources. A resource that meets the NRHP criteria is clearly significant. In addition, a resource that does not meet the NRHP standards may still be considered historically significant at a local or state level.

California Environmental Quality Act

The CEQA Guidelines state that a resource need not be listed on any register to be found historically significant. The CEQA guidelines direct lead agencies to evaluate archaeological sites to determine if they meet the criteria for listing in the California Register. If an archaeological site is a historical resource, in that it is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register, potential adverse impacts to it must be considered. If an archaeological site is considered not to be an historical resource but meets the definition of a "unique archeological resource" as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21083.2, then it would be treated in accordance with the provisions of that section.

Local

City of Selma

General Plan

Both the 1997 General Plan and 2035 General Plan set forth the following goal relevant to cultural resources. Note that the goal numbering reflects the 2035 General Plan.

• Goal 7: Identify and protect unique cultural and historical features of the community.

4.5.4 - Methodology

Michael Brandman Associates (MBA) prepared a Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment of the project site. The Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment consisted of a record searches, site surveys, and building evaluations which are described below.

Record Searches

Southern San Joaquin Valley Archaeological Information Center

On January 18, 200, staff at the SSJVIC conducted a records search (RS No. 06-563) to identify previously recorded historic resources within the project area and a 0.25-mile radius. The search included current inventories of the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the California Register of Historical Resources (CR), the California Historical Landmarks (CHL), the California Points of Historical Interest (CPHI), and the Historic Resources Inventory (HRI).

The results of the records search indicated that one cultural resource study has been conducted within the project area (FR-135). This study was conducted for a statewide pipeline expansion project along the Union Pacific Railroad line and was negative for any prehistoric or historic cultural resources.

In addition, the SSJVIC results indicated that no prehistoric or historic resources have been recorded within the project area or a 0.25-mile radius.

Native American Heritage Commission

On January 3, 2007, MBA sent a letter to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in an effort to determine whether any sacred sites are listed on its Sacred Lands File for the project area. The response from the NAHC was received on January 3, 2007. The NAHC record search did not

indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area. Included with record search results was a list of 11 tribal contacts who may have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. To ensure that all Native American resources are adequately addressed, letters to each of the 11 listed tribal contacts were sent on March 15, 2007. Two responses were received by MBA but both of the responses indicated that the Native Americans had no concerns regarding the proposed project development. If additional responses are received by MBA, they will be forwarded to the applicant and the City as an addendum to the report.

University of California Museum of Paleontology

At MBA's request, Mr. Kenneth L. Finger, Ph.D. conducted a thorough search of the University of California Museum of Paleontology vertebrate paleontology database to identify previously recorded vertebrate fossil localities within the project area. The response, dated January 9, 2007, indicated that there are no vertebrate fossil localities recorded within 10 miles of the project site; however, there are 204 vertebrate localities listed in the database for Fresno. The closest locality to the project site is located approximately 16 miles to the southwest and the second-closest is approximately 25 miles to the northwest.

Site Survey

An MBA Senior Project Archaeologist and MBA Project Archaeologist surveyed the project area on February 24, 2007 and again on March 7, 2008, to survey a 20-acre stormwtater basin addition that was subsequently added to the project plans.

The project area contained a mix of various types of developed and undeveloped land. Most of the land was planted with grapevines and orchards, but some areas were open plowed fields that were being prepared for planting. It is estimated that approximately 70 to 75 percent of the project area was planted in grapevines and other crops or was open fields. The remaining 25 to 30 percent of the project area consisted of buildings, driveways, landscape elements, and roads, which obscured the ground surface and lowered the visibility to zero.

No prehistoric sites, features, or artifactual materials were observed during the course of the pedestrian survey.

Building Evaluations

Six buildings within the project area were examined for their historic potential but were found not to be significant under CEQA criteria 1-4. The historic analysis is discussed in further detail under Impact CUL-1. All historic resources and potential historic resources noted during the field survey were photographed and their locations recorded.

4.5.5 - Thresholds of Significance

According to Appendix G, Environmental Checklist of the CEQA Guidelines, cultural resources impacts resulting from the implementation of the proposed project would be considered significant if the project would:

According to the CEQA Guidelines' Appendix G Environmental Checklist, to determine whether impacts to cultural resources are significant environmental effects, the following questions are analyzed and evaluated. Will the project:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?
- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?
- Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

4.5.6 - Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This section assesses the effects that implementation of the proposed project could have on cultural resources that include historic resources, archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and burial sites or human remains present within the project area. The analysis considers prehistoric and historic resources that are both visible above ground and those that may be uncovered during construction activities.

Historic Resource

Impact CUL-1: Ground-disturbing activities associated with the proposed project may result in damage or destruction of previously undiscovered historic resources.

Impact Analysis

According to the Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment, six buildings and their associated structures warranted consideration for historic potential; however, initial evaluation of the buildings and their associated structures indicate that none of the buildings or structures meets the eligibility criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (CR). The primary reason the buildings do not appear to eligible is their lack of integrity caused by extensive structural improvements, new roofs and window sashes, and building additions.

Although no historic resources are known to exist within the project area, there is always the possibility that previously unknown, buried resources could be uncovered during subsurface earthwork activities. Therefore, this would be a potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measure CUL-1 is proposed to mitigate possible impacts to undiscovered subsurface historic resources. With the implementation of mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

MM CUL-1 If a potentially significant cultural resource is encountered during subsurface excavation for the project, all construction activities within a 50-foot radius of the find shall cease until a qualified archaeologist determines whether the resource requires further study. The City shall require the project applicant to include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement. Any previously undiscovered resources found during construction shall be recorded on appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms and evaluated for significance in terms of California Environmental Quality Act criteria by a qualified archaeologist. Potentially significant cultural resources could consist of but are not limited to stone, bone, glass, ceramic, wood, or shell artifacts; fossils; or features including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites. If the resource is determined significant under CEOA, the qualified archaeologist shall prepare and implement a research design and archaeological data recovery plan that will capture those categories of data for which the site is significant. The archaeologist shall also conduct appropriate technical analyses, prepare a comprehensive report and file it with the appropriate Information Center, and provide for the permanent curation of the recovered materials.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Archaeological Resource

Impact CUL-2: Ground-disturbing activities associated with the proposed project may result in damage or destruction of previously undiscovered archaeological resources.

Impact Analysis

No previously recorded archaeological resources are known to be present within the project area, nor were any encountered during the field survey. The results of the NAHC record search failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate vicinity of the project site. However, subsurface construction activities such as trenching and grading associated with the project could potentially damage or destroy previously undiscovered archaeological resources. Although the cultural resource record searches and surveys indicate that the likelihood for subsurface archaeological resources is small, Mitigation Measure CUL-2 is proposed to mitigate possible

impacts to undiscovered subsurface archaeological resources. With the implementation of mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

MM CUL-2 If deposits of prehistoric or historical archaeological materials are encountered during subsurface earthwork activities, all work within 50 feet of the resource shall cease until a qualified archaeologist can determine the significance of the find. The resource shall be evaluated for eligibility for listing on the California Register and recommendations made. The identified resource shall be avoided by project activities during evaluation. If the resource is not considered eligible, avoidance is not necessary. If the resource is considered eligible, they shall be avoided or any unavoidable adverse effects must be mitigated. Upon completion of the archaeologist's evaluation, a report shall be prepared documenting the methods and results, as well as recommendations. The report shall be submitted to the City and the Southern San Joaquin Valley Inventory Center. The recommendations of the archaeologist shall be incorporated into construction plans.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Paleontological Resource

Impact CUL-3: Ground-disturbing activities associated with the proposed project may result in damage or destruction of previously undiscovered paleontological resources.

Impact Analysis

No paleontological resources were discovered during the pedestrian survey and a review of the University of California Museum of Paleontology (UCMB) database indicates that no vertebrate fossil locations have been recorded within the project area or within 10 miles of the project area. However, two vertebrate localities have been previously discovered within 25 miles of the project area and 204 vertebrate localities exist within Fresno County. The majority of the specimens are in Pleistocene alluvium, which indicates a high paleontological sensitivity for shallow subsurface deposits. Therefore, the proposed project could impact previously undiscovered significant paleontological resources, it is recommended that a qualified paleontologist monitor all deep excavations, such as sewer line trenching and Mitigation Measure CUL-3 is proposed to ensure protection of undiscovered subsurface paleontological resources. With the implementation of mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

MM CUL-3 If animal or plant fossils are encountered during subsurface earthwork activities, all work within 50 feet of the discovery shall cease until a qualified paleontologist has determined the significance of the find and provides recommendations. Project personnel shall not collect or remove any paleontological material. If the paleontological finds are found to be significant, the area shall be avoided by project activities. The recommendations of the paleontologist shall be incorporated into construction plans.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Human Remains

Impact CUL-4: The proposed project would not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Impact Analysis

There are no known human remains or burial sites within the project area. However, subsurface construction activities such as trenching and grading associated with the project could potentially damage or destroy previously undiscovered human remains. Accordingly, this is a potentially significant impact. Mitigation Measure CUL-4 is proposed to reduce this potentially significant impact to a level of less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

MM CUL-4 If human remains are encountered during excavations associated with this project, all work will halt, and the Fresno County Coroner will be notified (Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code). The Coroner will determine whether the remains are of forensic interest. If the coroner, with the aid of the supervising archaeologist, determines that the remains are prehistoric, he/she will contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC will be responsible for designating the most likely descendant (MLD), who will be responsible for the ultimate disposition of the remains, as required by Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code. The MLD will make his/her recommendations within 48 hours of their notification by the NAHC. This recommendation may include scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials (Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code).

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

4.6 - Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

4.6.1 - Introduction

This section describes the existing geology, soils, and seismicity conditions and potential effects from project implementation on the site and its surrounding area. Descriptions and analysis in this section are based on the Geotechnical Feasibility Study prepared by Geomatrix and included in this EIR as Appendix F.

4.6.2 - Environmental Setting

Geology

Regional Geology

Selma is located within the southern San Joaquin Valley. The Sierra Nevada Mountains are located to the east, the Tehachapi Mountains to the south, and the Coast Range to the west. The San Joaquin Valley is a large, structural depression that has been filled with a thick sequence of sedimentary rocks of Jurassic to Recent age derived from erosion of the bordering Sierra Nevada and Coast Ranges. The clastic sediments rest upon bedrock of the Sierran Block.

Local Geology

The project site is underlain by recent alluvial fan deposits of granitic sand and silt probably of the Modesto Formation. These sediments were deposited by streams flowing from the Sierra Nevada Mountains, located approximately 24 miles northeast of the project site.

Seismicity

The term seismicity refers to the location, frequency, magnitude and other characteristics of earthquakes. Overall, Selma lies within a relatively seismically quiet area. A discussion of potential seismic hazards in the Selma area is provided on the following pages.

Faulting

Faults form in rocks when stresses overcome the internal strength of the rock, resulting in a fracture. Large faults develop in response to large regional stresses operating over a long time, such as those stresses caused by the relative displacement between tectonic plates. According to the elastic rebound theory, these stresses build up in the earth's crust until enough stress has built up to exceed the strength along a fault and cause a brittle failure. The rapid slip between the two stuck plates or coherent blocks generates an earthquake. Following an earthquake, stress will build once again until the occurrence of another earthquake. The magnitude of slip is related to the maximum allowable stress that can be built up along a particular fault segment. The greatest buildup in stress due to the largest relative motion between tectonic plates or fault blocks over the longest period will generally produce the largest earthquakes. The distribution of these earthquakes is a study of much interest for both hazard prediction and the study of active deformation of the earth's crust. Deformation is a

complex process and strain caused by tectonic forces is not only accommodated through faulting, but also by folding, uplift, and subsidence, which can be gradual or in direct response to earthquakes.

Faults are mapped to determine earthquake hazards, since they occur where earthquakes tend to recur. A historic plane of weakness is more likely to fail under stress than a previously unbroken block of crust. Faults are, therefore, a prime indicator of past seismic activity, and faults with recent activity are presumed to be the best candidates for future earthquakes. However, since slip is not always accommodated by faults that intersect the surface along traces, and since the orientation of stress and strain in the crust can shift, predicting the location of future earthquakes is complicated. Earthquakes sometimes occur in areas with previously undetected faults or along faults previously thought inactive.

No faults exist in the City of Selma. However, there are a number of faults within and adjacent to Fresno County that can produce seismic events that may be observed in the project vicinity. Active faults nearest to Selma are summarized in Table 4.6-1.

Fault	Distance from Selma (miles/direction)	Fault Classification
Coast Ranges/Sierra Nevada Boundary Zone	46 (Southwest)	Active
Nunez Fault	54 (Southwest)	Active
Ortigalita	75 (West)	Active
San Andreas	65 (Southwest)	Active
Owens Valley	83 (East, Northeast)	Active
Source: Geomatrix, 2008.	·	·

Table 4.6-1: Fault Summary

The City of Selma has been affected by earthquakes in the past. The most notable earthquake in the area was a magnitude 6.5 tremor that occurred in 1983 near Coalinga. This earthquake was associated with the Coast Ranges/Sierra Nevada Boundary Zone, which is thought to be made up of complex thrust fault systems and is considered a greater seismic threat than the San Andreas Fault.

Seismic Hazards

Seismic hazards pose a substantial danger to property and human safety and are present because of the risk of naturally occurring geologic events and processes affecting human development. Therefore, the hazard risk is equally influenced by the condition and location of human development as by the frequency and distribution of major geologic events. Seismic hazards present in California include ground rupture along faults, strong seismic shaking, liquefaction, ground failure, and slope failure.

Fault Rupture

Fault rupture is a seismic hazard that affects structures sited above an active fault. The hazard from fault rupture is the movement of the ground surface along a fault during an earthquake. Typically, this movement takes place during the short time of an earthquake, but it also can occur slowly over many years in a process known as creep. Most structures and underground utilities cannot accommodate the surface displacements of several inches to several feet commonly associated with fault rupture or creep.

Ground Shaking

The severity of ground shaking depends on several variables such as earthquake magnitude, epicenter distance, local geology, thickness, and seismic wave-propagation properties of unconsolidated materials, groundwater conditions, and topographic setting. Ground shaking hazards are most pronounced in areas near faults or with unconsolidated alluvium.

The most common type of damage from ground shaking is structural damage to buildings, which can range from cosmetic cracks to total collapse. The overall level of structural damage from a nearby large earthquake would likely be moderate to heavy, depending on the characteristics of the earthquake, the type of ground, and the condition of the building. Besides damage to buildings, strong ground shaking can cause severe damage from falling objects or broken utility lines. Fire and explosions are also hazards associated with strong ground shaking.

While Richter magnitude provides a useful measure of comparison between earthquakes, the moment magnitude is more widely used for scientific comparison, since it accounts for the actual energy released by the earthquake. Actual damage is due to the propagation of seismic or ground waves as a result of the earthquake, and the intensity of shaking is related to earthquake magnitude and distance as well as to the condition of underlying materials. Loose and soft materials tend to amplify long period vibrations, while hard rock can quickly attenuate them, causing little damage to overlying structures. For this reason, the Modified Mercalli Intensity (MMI) Scale provides a useful qualitative assessment of ground shaking. The MMI Scale is a 12-point scale of earthquake intensity that is based on local effects experienced by people, structures, and earth materials. Each succeeding step on the scale describes a progressively greater amount of damage at a given point of observation. The MMI Scale is shown in Table 4.6-2, along with relative ground velocity and acceleration.

Richter Magnitude	Modified Mercalli Intensity	Effects	Average Peak Ground Velocity (centimeters/ seconds)	Average Peak Acceleration
0.1–0.9	Ι	Not felt. Marginal and long-period		
1.0–2.9	II	Felt by only a few persons at rest, especially on upper floors of building. — Delicately suspended objects may swing.		
3.0–3.9	III	Felt quite noticeably in doors, especially on upper floors of building, but many people do not recognize it as an earthquake. Standing cars may rock slightly. Vibration like passing a truck. Duration estimated.		0.0035–0.007 g
4.0-4.5	IV	During the day, felt indoors by many, outdoors by few. At night, some awakened. Dishes, windows, doors disturbed; walls make creaking sound. Sensations like heavy truck striking building. Standing cars rocked noticeably.	1–3	0.015–0.035 g
4.6-4.9	V	Felt by nearly everyone, many awakened. Some dishes, windows, broken; cracked plaster in a few places; unstable objects overturned. Disturbances of trees, poles, and other tall objects sometimes noticed. Pendulum clocks may stop.	3–7	0.035–0.07 g
5.0–5.5	VI	Felt by all, many frightened and run outdoors. Some heavy furniture moved; a few instances of falling plaster and damaged chimneys. Damage slight.	7–20	0.07–0.15 g
5.6–6.4	VII	Everyone runs outdoors. Damage negligible in buildings of good design and construction; slight to moderate in well built, ordinary structures; considerable in poorly built or badly designed structures; some chimneys broken. Noticed by persons driving cars.	20–60	0.15–0.35 g
6.5–6.9	VIII	Damage slight in specially designed structures; considerable in ordinary substantial buildings with partial collapse; great in poorly built structures. Panel walls thrown out of frame structures. Fall of chimneys, factory stacks, columns, monument walls, and heavy furniture overturned. Sand and mud ejected in small amounts. Changes in well water. Persons driving in cars disturbed.	60–200	0.35–0.7 g

Table 4.6-2: Modified Mercalli Intensity Scale

Richter Magnitude	Modified Mercalli Intensity	Effects	Average Peak Ground Velocity (centimeters/ seconds)	Average Peak Acceleration
7.0–7.4	IX	Damage considerable in specially designed structures; well-designed frame structures thrown out of plumb; great in substantial buildings, with partial collapse. Buildings shifted off foundations. Ground cracked conspicuously. Underground pipes broken.	200–500	0.7–1.2 g
7.5–7.9	X	Some well-built structures destroyed; most masonry and frame structures destroyed with foundations; ground badly cracked. Railway lines bent. Landslides considerable from riverbanks and steep slopes. Shifted sand and mud. Water splashed, slopped over banks.	≥ 500	>1.2 g
8.0-8.4	XI	Few, if any masonry structures remain standing. Bridges destroyed. Broad fissures in ground. Underground pipelines completely out of service. Earth slumps and land slips in soft ground. Rails bent greatly.	_	
≥ 8.5	XII	Total damage. Waves seen on ground. Lines of sight and level distorted. Objects thrown into the air.		_
Source: United States Geologic Survey.				

Table 4.6-2 (cont.): Modified Mercalli Intensity Scale

Ground Failure

Ground failure includes liquefaction and the liquefaction-induced phenomena of lateral spreading and lurching.

Liquefaction is a process by which sediments below the water table temporarily lose strength during an earthquake and behave as a viscous liquid rather than a solid. Liquefaction is restricted to certain geologic and hydrologic environments, primarily recently deposited sand and silt in areas with high groundwater levels. The process of liquefaction involves seismic waves passing through saturated granular layers, distorting the granular structure and causing the particles to collapse. This causes the granular layer to behave temporarily as a viscous liquid rather than a solid, resulting in liquefaction.

Liquefaction can cause the soil beneath a structure to lose strength, which may result in the loss of foundation-bearing capacity, which could cause a structure to settle or tip. Liquefaction can also result in the settlement of large areas due to the densification of the liquefied deposit. Where

structures are located within liquefied deposits, the liquefaction can result in the structure to rise as a result of buoyancy.

Lateral spreading is lateral ground movement, with some vertical component, as a result of liquefaction. In effect, the soil rides on top of the liquefied layer. Lateral spreading can occur on relatively flat sites with slopes less than 2 percent, under certain circumstances, and can cause ground cracking and settlement.

Lurching is the movement of the ground surface toward an open face when the soil liquefies. An open face could be a graded slope, stream bank, canal face, gully, or other similar feature.

Geomatrix concluded that because the depth to groundwater is approximately 30 feet below ground surface, the potential for liquefaction and liquefaction-related phenomena is negligible in the project vicinity.

Landslides and Slope Failure

Landslides and other slope failures form in response to the long-term geologic cycle of uplift, mass wasting, and slope disturbance. Mass wasting refers to a variety of erosional processes from gradual downhill soil creep to mudslides, debris flows, landslides, and rock fall. These processes are commonly triggered by intense precipitation. Seismic activity can also trigger landslides and rockfalls.

Often, various forms of mass wasting are grouped together as landslides, which are generally used to describe the downhill movement of rock and soil. Geologists classify landslides into several different types that reflect differences in the type of material and type of movement. The four most common types of landslides are translational, rotational, earth flow, and rock fall. Debris flows and earth flows are another type of landslide that are characterized by soil and rock particles in suspension with water and which often move with considerable speed. Debris flows often refer to flows that contain coarser soil and rock materials while earth flows frequently refer to slides that are predominantly finer materials. Mudslide is a term that appears in non-technical literature to describe a variety of shallow, rapidly moving earth flows.

The project vicinity is characterized by flat relief, which precludes the possibility of landsliding.

Soils

The United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service indicates that Hanford, Hesperia, Pollasky, and Tajunuga, soils underline the project site. The soil properties are summarized in Table 4.6-3. Soil mapping for the project site was previously provided in Exhibit 4.2-2 in Section 4.2, Agricultural Resources.

Soil Name	Surface Texture	Infiltration Rate	
Hanford	Sandy loam	Moderate	
Hanford	Sandy loam benches	Moderate	
Hanford	Fine sandy loam	Moderate	
Hesperia	Fine sandy loam	Moderate	
Pollasky	Sandy loam, 2 to 9 percent slopes	Moderate	
Tujunga	Sandy loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes	Moderate	
Source: Natural Resources Conservation Service, 2011.			

Table 4.6-3: Soil Properties Summary

All six soil types have been assigned a Hydrologic Group rating of B, indicating that the soils have a moderate infiltration rate when thoroughly wet. In addition, the soils all have a low clay content, which indicates that they have low shrink-swell potential and, therefore, are not considered expansive soils.

Subsurface Exploration

Geomatrix performed a subsurface exploration of the soils onsite in November 2007. Geomatrix collected 10 borings and subjected laboratory testing on selected samples. Testing included evaluations of dry density and moisture content, and soluble sulfate and chloride contents. An explanation of each type of test is provided in the Geotechnical Engineering Study contained in Appendix F.

- The key testing results are summarized below:
- Soil expansion potential is very low.
- Soils have low settlement potential, and therefore, are not likely to collapse. However, soils that have been disturbed by agricultural activities or demolition of existing improvements will need excavation and replacement as engineered fill.
- Soil characteristics related to sulfate concentration indicate that the soils may be moderately corrosive to ferrous (iron) building materials, but non-corrosive to concrete.

Groundwater

The California Department of Water Resources, Kings Groundwater Basin Bulletin 118 summary indicates that the depth to groundwater in the site area is approximately 30 feet below ground surface.

4.6.3 - Regulatory Setting

State

Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act

In response to the severe fault rupture damage of structures by the 1971 San Fernando earthquake, the State of California enacted the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act in 1972. This act required the State Geologist to delineate Earthquake Fault Zones along known active faults that have a relatively high potential for ground rupture. Faults that are zoned under the Alquist-Priolo Act must meet the strict definition of being "sufficiently active" and "well-defined" for inclusion as an Earthquake Fault Zones. The Earthquake Fault Zones are revised periodically, and they extend 200 to 500 feet on either side of identified fault traces. No structures for human occupancy may be built across an identified active fault trace. An area of 50 feet on either side of an active fault trace is assumed to be underlain by the fault, unless proven otherwise. Proposed construction in an Earthquake Fault Zone is permitted only following the completion of a fault location report prepared by a California Registered Geologist.

California Building Standards Code

The California Building Standards Code establishes building requirements for construction and renovation. The most recent version of the California Building Standards Code was adopted in 2007 by the California Building Standards Commission and took effect January 1, 2008, and it is based on the National Fire Protection Association, International Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials, and the International Code Council's Building and Fire Codes. Included in the California Building Standards Code are the Electrical Code, Mechanical Code, Plumbing Code, Energy Code, and Fire Code.

Local

City of Selma

General Plan

Both the 1997 General Plan and 2035 General Plan set forth the following goals and policies relevant to geology soils, and seismicity. Note that the goal/policy numbering reflects the 2035 General Plan.

- **Goal 1:** To prevent loss of life and serious injury, resulting from natural or man-induced hazards, to the residents of Selma.
- Goal 2: To prevent serious structural damage to critical facilities and structures where large numbers of people are expected to congregate at one time.
- **Policy 4.8:** Primary and secondary hazards from seismic activity should be evaluated in all environmental assessment and reporting processes.
- **Policy 4.11:** The City shall continue to adopt current issues of the Uniform Building Code and implement the seismic design standards provided by the Code.

- **Policy 4.12:** Seismic safety information should be made available to the general public. School districts and agencies related to aged, handicapped and seismically susceptible industries should be encouraged to develop education programs for seismic awareness.
- **Policy 4.15:** Continue to enforce the Uniform Building Code in all matters related to soil preparation and foundation requirements.

4.6.4 - Methodology

The geotechnical investigation included field exploration and laboratory testing programs as briefly described below. Detailed descriptions of the field exploration and physical testing programs are presented in the full Geotechnical Report (Appendix F).

Field Exploration

The field exploration program included conducting pre-drilling activities, and drilling and sampling exploratory borings in the area of the proposed development. Field activities were conducted on November 15, 2007 by Geomatrix personnel under the supervision of a California-licensed geotechnical engineer.

Drilling services were performed by Technicon Engineering Services, Inc. of Fresno, California. Ten exploratory borings (B-1 through B-10) were drilled to depths of approximately 25 feet below ground surface (bgs). The borings were drilled using truck-mounted drill rigs equipped with continuous hollow-stem augers. Relatively undisturbed soil samples in brass tubes and rings and bag samples of soil cuttings were obtained at selected depth intervals during drilling and were submitted to the laboratory for physical testing.

Logs of subsurface conditions encountered in the borings were prepared in the field by a Geomatrix engineer. Final boring logs were prepared based on the field logs after reviewing the physical test results and are presented in the full Geotechnical Report (Appendix F)

Physical Testing

Selected samples collected during drilling were tested in the laboratory to assist in evaluating the engineering properties of subsurface materials at the site. Tests performed included in-place moisture content and dry density, and soluble sulfate and chloride contents. Descriptions of the physical testing and test results are presented Appendix F.

4.6.5 - Thresholds of Significance

According to the CEQA Guidelines' Appendix G Environmental Checklist, to determine whether impacts to geology and soils are significant environmental effects, the following questions are analyzed and evaluated.

Would the project:

- a.) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:
 - i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.
 - ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?
 - iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
 - iv. Landslides?
- b.) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?
- c.) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?
- d.) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?
- e.) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? (Refer to Section 7, Effects Found Not to be Significant)

4.6.6 - Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This impact evaluates the proposed project's exposure to seismic hazards (fault rupture, strong ground shaking, ground failure, and landsliding). Each of these hazards is discussed below.

Seismic Hazards

Impact GEO-1: The development of the proposed project would not expose persons or structures to seismic hazards.

Impact Analysis

This impact analysis evaluates the proposed project's potential to expose persons or structures to seismic hazards (fault rupture, ground shaking, ground failure, and landsliding). Each of these hazards and their potential environmental impacts are discussed below.

Fault Rupture

The project site is not located within a currently designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Since no known surface expression of active faults is believed to cross the site, fault rupture through the site is not anticipated. No impacts would occur.

Strong Ground Shaking

The California Geological Survey maintains a web-based computer model that estimates probabilistic seismic ground motions for any location with California. The computer model estimates the "Design
Basis Earthquake" ground motion, which is defined as the peak ground acceleration with a 10-percent chance of exceedance in 50 years. The project site's estimated peak ground acceleration is approximately 0.17g.

Although Selma is located in an area of low seismic activity, the faults and fault systems that lie along the eastern and western boundaries of Fresno County, as well as other regional faults, have the potential to produce high-magnitude earthquakes throughout the County. The City of Selma is located on alluvial deposits, which tend to experience greater ground shaking intensities than areas located on hard rock. However, the distance to the faults that are the expected sources of the shaking would be sufficiently great that the effects should be minimal.

Mitigation Measure GEO-1 requires the applicant to prepare and submit a design-level geotechnical study that complies with all applicable seismic design standards of the California Building Standards Code. Seismic design standards account for peak ground acceleration, soil profile, and other site conditions, and they establish corresponding design standards intended to protect public safety and minimize property damage. This measure would reduce potential ground shaking impacts to a level of less than significant.

Seismic-Related Ground Failure (Including Liquefaction)

The Geotechnical Feasibility Study indicated that groundwater likely occurs at depths of 30 feet below existing ground surface. These subsurface characteristics indicate that the project site has a low susceptibility to liquefaction and liquefaction-related phenomena. No impacts would occur.

Landsliding

The Selma area is characterized by flat relief. This condition precludes the possibility of earthquakeinduced landslides occurring within the project site. No impacts would occur.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

MM GEO-1 Prior to issuance of building permits for the first building in each phase, the project applicant shall submit a design-level geotechnical report to the City of Selma for review and approval. The report shall demonstrate that the proposed project's plans for that structure incorporate all applicable seismic design standards of the latest adopted edition of the California Building Standards Code. The recommendations from the approved design-level geotechnical report shall be incorporated into the project plans, and the project applicant shall adhere to these approved plans in developing the project.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Erosion Hazards

Impact GEO-2: Construction activities associated with the proposed project have the potential to create erosion and sedimentation.

Impact Analysis

Construction activities associated with the proposed project would involve vegetation removal, grading, and excavation activities that could expose barren soils to sources of wind or water, resulting in the potential for erosion and sedimentation on and off the project site. National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) stormwater permitting programs regulate stormwater quality from construction sites, which includes erosion and sedimentation. Under the NPDES permitting program, the preparation and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) are required for construction activities that would disturb an area of 1 acre or more. The SWPPP must identify potential sources of erosion or sedimentation that may be reasonably expected to affect the quality of stormwater discharges as well as identify and implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) that ensure the reduction of these pollutants during stormwater discharges. Typical BMPs intended to control erosion include sand bags, detention basins, silt fencing, storm drain inlet protection, street sweeping, and monitoring of water bodies.

These requirements have been incorporated into the proposed project as mitigation. The implementation of an SWPPP and its associated BMPs would reduce potential erosion impacts to a level of less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

Implement Mitigation Measure HYD-1a in Section 4.7, Hydrology and Water Quality.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Unstable Geologic Units or Soils

Impact GEO-3: The proposed project may expose persons or structures to hazards associated with unstable geologic units or soils.

Impact Analysis

The Geotechnical Feasibility Study concluded that the onsite soils are suitable to support the development of the proposed project. Additionally, the study concluded that the proposed project would not be susceptible to liquefaction, liquefaction-related phenomena, ground failure, or landsliding.

As part of the proposed project, the project site would be graded and the area underlying the building pads would be soil engineered in accordance the requirements of the California Building Standards Code and the recommendations contained in the design-level geotechnical report required under Mitigation Measure GEO-1, to be prepared in connection with project implementation and approved by the City. This process would involve removal of any unsuitable soils, the placement of engineered fill, and compaction in order to ensure that the structures to be constructed as proposed by the project are adequately supported. These practices would ensure the proposed project is located on stable soils and geologic units and would not be susceptible to settlement or ground failure. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, impacts would be less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

Implement Mitigation Measure GEO-1.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Expansive Soils

Impact GEO-4: The proposed project would not expose persons or structures to hazards associated with expansive soils.

Impact Analysis

As shown in Table 4.6-3 and Exhibit 4.2-2, the project boundaries contain the following six soils:

- Hanford fine sandy loam (176.57 acres)
- Hanford sandy loam (41.83 acres)
- Hesperia fine sandy loam (30.38 acres)
- Pollasky sandy loam, 2 to 9 percent slopes (29.16 acres)
- Tujunga sandy loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes (12.78 acres)
- Hanford sandy loam benches (3.94 acres)

As previously noted, these soils have low clay content and possess low shrink-swell properties. Therefore, the development of the proposed project would not expose persons or structures to hazards associated with shrinking and swelling of expansive soils. Impacts would be less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is necessary.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

4.7 - Hazardous Materials

4.7.1 - Introduction

This section describes the existing hazards and hazardous materials conditions and potential impacts from hazards and hazardous materials due to project implementation on the site and its surrounding area. Descriptions and analysis in this section are based primarily on information contained in the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) prepared by Sims & Associates, LLC, included in this EIR as Appendix G, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment.

4.7.2 - Environmental Setting

Hazardous Materials

Hazardous materials, as defined by the California Code of Regulations, are substances with certain physical properties that could pose a substantial present or future hazard to human health or the environment when improperly handled, disposed, or otherwise managed. Hazardous materials are grouped into the following four categories, based on their properties:

- Toxic (causes human health effects)
- Ignitable (has the ability to burn)
- Corrosive (causes severed burns or damage to materials)
- Reactive (causes explosions or generates toxic gases)

A hazardous waste is any hazardous material that is discarded, abandoned, or slated to be recycled. The criteria that render a material hazardous also make a waste hazardous. If improperly handled, hazardous materials and hazardous waste can result in public health hazards if released into the soil or groundwater or through airborne releases in vapors, fumes, or dust. Soil and groundwater having concentrations of hazardous constituents higher than specific regulatory levels must be handled and disposed of as hazardous waste when excavated or pumped from an aquifer. The California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Sections 66261.20-24 contain technical descriptions of toxic characteristics that could cause soil or groundwater to be classified as hazardous waste.

Phase I Environmental Site Assessment

A Phase I ESA was prepared by Sims & Associates to determine the presence or absence of hazardous materials on the project site (see Appendix H). The findings of the Phase I ESA are summarized below.

Records Search

Environmental Data Resources Inc. (EDR) performed a search of federal, state, and local databases listing contaminated sites, Brownfield sites (a development site having the presence or potential presence of a hazardous substance, pollutant, or contaminant), Superfund sites (abandoned hazardous waste sites), underground storage tank (UST) sites, waste storage sites, toxic chemical sites, contaminated well sites, and other sites containing hazardous materials.

Several sites were recorded by EDR in the general vicinity of the project site. These sites are located in close proximity to the project site and involve leaking underground storage tanks (USTs) and one Superfund site identified as the Selma Pressure Treatment Facility (SPT). The USTs were removed and are now considered free of contamination. These sites are summarized in Table 4.7-1.

Name	Distance/Direction	Location	Database
Selma Pressure Treatment Site (SPT)	0.25-0.50 mile NW	949 Golden State Boulevard Selma, CA 93662	NPL, CERCLIS, RCRA-SCQ, LUST and others
Darling Oil & Tire	0.25-0.50 mile SSE	11010 E. Mountain View Avenue Selma CA 93662	LUST and others
Selma Valero	0.39 mile NW	10610 E. Mountain View Avenue Selma CA 93662	LUST, SOG
Selma Shell	Adjacent to South Area	13025 S. Van Horn Avenue Selma CA, 93662	UST
Notes:	·		·

Table 4.7-1: Records Search Summary

NPL = National Priority List (Superfund)

CERCLIS = Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Information System LUST = Leaking Underground Fuel Tank Report. Contains records of reported leaking underground storage tank incidents. RCRA-SQG = Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Small Quantity Generator. Small quantity generator of

hazardous wastes governed by Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Source: Sims & Associates, LLC, 2010.

Below is a discussion of the database findings for recorded sites in the project vicinity.

Selma Pressure Treatment (SPT)

Selma Pressure Treatment (SPT), located adjacent to the Northeast Area, is listed on the National Priorities List, also known as Superfund. The facility is also listed as a Resource Conservation and Recovery Act-Small Quantity Generator, Facility Index System/Facility Registry System, Federal CONSENT Decree, U.S. Engineering and Institutional Controls facility. According to the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Facility Registry System online database and the EPA Enforcement and Compliance History database, the facility is approximately 40 acres that historically included a 14-acre former wood treatment facility.

SPT began wood treatment operations in 1942, which involved dipping wood into a mixture of pentachlorophenol and oil, and then drying the wood on open racks. Pressure treating began in 1965, which entailed using pressurized vessels to impregnate the wood with chemical preservatives. The pressure treated wood was placed on drip racks in a drip area and then moved to a storage area. The waste generated between 1942 and 1971 was disposed of in several different ways: runoff into

drainage ditches and percolation ditches; drainage into dry wells; spillage onto the ground; or placement in an onsite unlined pond and sludge pit. After 1971, an effluent recovery system was installed at the site for waste disposal. The facility ceased operations in 1984 and in 1988, the EPA issued a Record of Decision. The soil was found to be impacted with arsenic, dioxin, PCPs, lead and chromium. Soil was excavated and a cap was placed. It was later found that the groundwater aquifer had been impacted with chromium. In 1998, a groundwater extraction system was placed with an *in situ* bioremediation system placed in 2005 and has been operational since. Currently, the facility is under Land Use Restrictions Institutional and Engineering Controls. The facility remains on the National Priorities List to date until groundwater levels of chromium fall below the threshold limit. The facility continues to be under remediation oversight by the federal and state agencies.

Extraction system wells for the SPT site are located within the Northwest Area on Assessor's Parcel No. (APN) 393-180-44. According to a report submitted to USEPA Region 9 in September 2006 by Shaw Environmental, the hexavalent chromium groundwater contamination plume extends southwest across State Route 99 (SR-99) into the northwest corner of the Northwest Area. In addition, there are extraction system wells for the SPT site located on APN 393-180-44 along the western boundary. Furthermore, the parcels along S. Dockery Avenue and E. Mountain View Avenue have public and private wells that are routinely monitored by the federal and state agencies for the hexavalent chromium groundwater contamination from the upgradient SPT site. Sims & Associates, LLC concluded that the SPT is a recognized environmental condition to the subject property, due to the hexavalent chromium groundwater contamination plume extending into the Northwest Area.

Darling Oil & Tire

The property is located on E. Mountain View Avenue adjacent to the Northeast Area and is listed as having two active underground storage tanks that have had two separate gasoline releases into groundwater. The first, in 1988, was remediated and given regulatory closure in 1998. The second release was reported in 2003 and was a confirmed release of diesel range total petroleum hydrocarbons with impacts to the soil and groundwater. According to the Regional Water Quality Control Board, the site is undergoing pollution characterization and remedial options are being requested. The Phase I ESA concludes that the listing is a de minimus finding to the project site, since the facility is currently undergoing active pollution characterization with state oversight. As such, impacts are considered less than significant to the proposed project.

Selma Valero

The property is located adjacent on the north side of E. Mountain View Avenue (opposite the South Area) and had confirmed incident of gasoline release with impacts to the soil and groundwater in 1999; however, impacts were remediated and this case was given regulatory closure by the RWQB in June 2003. As such, the facility does not represent an environmental concern to the project site.

Selma Shell

The Selma Shell (13025 S. Van Horn Avenue), located adjacent to the South Area is listed on the Fresno County database. The facility has three active underground storage tanks and one aboveground storage tank with no reported violations. One LUST case was reported in May 1998. The impacts were remediated and this case was given regulatory closure by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQB) in November 2002. Because of the absence of reported violations, this listing does not represent an environmental concern to the property.

Aerial Photographs

Aerial photographs of the project area dating to the 1950s were obtained as part of the Phase I ESA process. The changes that occur to the project site and surroundings are summarized in Table 4.7-2.

Year	Description
1957	Based on the review of historical photographs and records, the subject property has historically been agricultural and residential property since at least 1924. The 1957 photo shows commercial and industrial development along old SR-99 prior to construction of the freeway that now runs parallel east of Golden State Boulevard. Most of the site and surrounding area is under cultivation.
1965	The photo shows the addition of Freeway SR-99 and the Mountain View interchange. The land uses remain primarily agricultural with scattered farm residences and related structures.
1984	Commercial businesses have been added west of SR-99 and north of Mountain View Avenue. Additional commercial or industrial structures are present between SR-99 and Golden State Boulevard south of Mountain View. The remaining area continues to be under cultivation or to be used for farm-related housing.
1987	The photo is similar to the 1984 photograph.
1998	The photo shows a small amount of additional development northeast of Golden State Boulevard and Mountain View Avenue.
2010	More industrial development is present southeast of Golden State Boulevard and Mountain View Avenue and north of the project site between SR-99 and Golden State Boulevard and east of Golden State Boulevard. Residential development is filling in from the southern edge of the City north of the project site and west of SR-99. Most of the area and surrounding remain in agriculture.
Source: Michael Bran	ndman Associates, 2011.

Table 4.7-2: Aerial Photograph Summary

Topographic Maps

United States Geologic Survey 7.5-minute topographic maps of the project area dating to the 1920s were obtained as part of the review process. The changes that occur to the project site and surroundings are summarized in Table 4.7-3.

Мар	Year	Description
Selma	1924	The Southern Pacific Railroad* and SR-99 are shown. Several unidentified structures are also depicted throughout the site. Blue line ditches are shown along the eastern and western border of the site.
Selma	1946	No notable changes to the project site. Agriculture is now visible on and around the site. Structures appear to remain the same onsite. Some limited development in the surrounding areas. Odd Fellows Cemetery is shown near the south border of the site.
Selma	1948	No notable changes to project site or surrounding areas.
Selma	1981	The new SR-99 is visible parallel to the railroad, which is noted as being "2 lane." Golden State Boulevard is also visible as the old SR-99. The Selma Speed way is now visible near the northwest corner of the site. Two wells and new structures are also observed.
Notes:		·

Table 4.7-3: Topographic Map Summary

The Southern Pacific Railroad was acquired by Union Pacific Railroad in 1996. Source: Michael Brandman Associates, 2011.

Other Potential Hazards

Chevron Environmental Management Company submitted a letter (dated November 30, 2010) in response to the Re-Revised Notice of Preparation advising of the presence of a formerly active crude oil pipeline along Golden State Boulevard. The pipeline was constructed in the early 1990s by the Tidewater Associated Oil Company and carried crude oil from the Bakersfield area to Richmond. The pipeline was taken out of service in the 1970s.

Chevron advised that the steel pipeline was typically located at depths ranging from 1.5 to 10.0 feet below ground service and was encased in a protective coating consisting of coal tar and asbestoscontaining felt material. The pipeline was removed in certain places and left in place in others; it is uncertain whether it was removed or is still in place in the project vicinity. Chevron noted that subsurface earthwork in the vicinity of the pipeline alignment may encounter residual weathered crude oil.

Hazardous Building Materials

The Phase I ESA assessed the potential for hazardous building materials to be present on the project site. A summary of the findings follows.

Asbestos

Asbestos is the name given to a number of naturally occurring, fibrous silicate minerals mined for their useful properties such as thermal insulation, chemical and thermal stability, and high tensile strength. Asbestos is commonly used as an acoustic insulator, thermal insulation, fireproofing and in other building materials. Asbestos is made up of microscopic bundles of fibers that may become airborne when asbestos-containing materials are damaged or disturbed. When these fibers get into the air they may be inhaled into the lungs, where they can cause significant health problems. The California Occupational Health and Safety Administration (CAL OSHA) defines asbestos-containing building materials as any material that contains 0.1 percent asbestos by weight.

Because the buildings on the project predate the federal ban on asbestos, there is the potential for asbestos-containing building materials to be present onsite.

Lead

Lead is a highly toxic metal that was used until the late 1970s in a number of products, most notably paint. Lead may cause a range of health effects, from behavioral problems and learning disabilities, to seizures and death. Primary sources of lead exposure are deteriorating lead-based paint, lead-contaminated dust, and lead-contaminated soil.

Because the buildings scheduled for demolition predate the federal ban on lead-based paint, there is the potential for lead-based paint to be present onsite.

Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)

Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) are mixtures of man-made chemicals with similar chemical structures. PCBs can range from oily liquids to waxy solids. Because of their non-flammability, chemical stability, high boiling point, and electrical insulating properties, PCBs were used in hundreds of industrial and commercial applications, including electrical, heat transfer, and hydraulic equipment; as plasticizers in paints, plastics, and rubber products; in pigments, dyes, and carbonless copy paper; and many other applications. More than 1.5 billion pounds of PCBs were manufactured in the United States prior to cessation of production in 1977.

Sims & Associates observed numerous exterior pad and pole-mounted transformers on the project site. The transformers are owned by Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E), and appeared to be in good condition with no signs of leakage.

Agricultural Chemicals

Agricultural chemicals include pesticides, which is defined as any substance or mixture of substances intended for preventing, destroying, repelling, or mitigating any pest. The term pesticide applies to insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and various other substances used to control pests. The health effects of pesticides depend on the type of pesticide. Examples of health risks posed by pesticides include cancer, nervous system damage, hormone or endocrine disruption, and eye or skin irritation.

The project site contains active vineyards. Pesticides are typically applied as part of pest abatement. Therefore, pesticide residue is likely present onsite.

Radon

Radon is a carcinogenic, radioactive gas resulting from the natural decay of uranium in soil, rock, and water. Radon gas enters a building through cracks in foundations and walls. Once inside the

building, radon decay products may become attached to dust particles and inhaled, or the decayed radioactive particles alone may be inhaled and cause damage to lung tissue. Radon exposure is the leading cause of lung cancer among nonsmokers in the United States. The EPA has established a safe radon exposure threshold of 4 picoCuries per liter of air (pCi/l).

The EPA has rated Fresno County as a moderate potential (Zone 2), with an average indoor screening level between 2 and 4 pCi/l.

Additionally, the California Department of Public Health has measured indoor radon concentrations by zip code. Table 4.7-4 summarizes the results of indoor radon samples taken in three Selma area zip codes. As shown in the table, when samples from the three zip codes are aggregated, 2 of 27 samples (7 percent) exceed 4.0 pCi/l. The California Department of Health Services classifies zip codes with 7 to 19 percent of samples exceeding 4.0 pCi/l to be areas of moderate radon potential. As such, elevated indoor radon concentrations are not considered a hazard to the proposed project.

	Indoor Radon Samples		
Zip Code	Total No. Taken	No. Exceeding 4.0 pCi/l	Percent Exceeding 4.0 pCi/l
93662 (Selma)	8	1	13%
93634 (Reedley)	16	1	6%
93656 (Riverdale)	3	0	0%
Total	27	2	7%
Notes: Project site located in 93 Source: California Depar	662 (Selma) zip code.	2010.	,

Table 4.7-4: Indoor	[·] Radon	Sample	Summary
---------------------	--------------------	--------	---------

Hydrocarbons/Aboveground and Underground Storage Tanks

Petroleum hydrocarbons are derived from crude oil, which is refined into various petroleum products such as diesel, gasoline, kerosene, lubricants, and heavy fuel oils. Hydrocarbons constituents include benzene, N-heptane, and toluene, and generate health effects such as cancer, leukemia, asthmatic bronchitis, kidney damage, and eye irritation. Hydrocarbons are stored in aboveground storage tanks (ASTs) and underground storage tanks (USTs). Leaking ASTs and USTs can result in contamination of groundwater sources or fire and explosion.

The Phase I ESA indicated that no ASTs or USTs were observed on the project site during the site reconnaissance, but site access was limited. The EDR record search found records indicating that several ASTs or USTs are present or were formerly present on the project site.

High-Voltage Power Lines

High-voltage power lines emit electromagnetic fields (EMFs), which have been alleged to be a cause of cancer. However, scientific research has never conclusively established a link between EMFs and cancer.

Two co-located Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) high-voltage power lines cross the project site. The Kingsburg Cogen Tap and the McCall-Kingsburg No. 1 115-kilovolt transmission lines cross the southern portion of the Northeast Area and the eastern portion of the South Area in a north-south direction.

4.7.3 - Regulatory Setting

Federal

United States Environmental Protection Agency

The EPA leads the nation's environmental science, research, education, and assessment efforts. The EPA's mission is to protect human health and to safeguard the natural environment, related to air, water, and land. The EPA works closely with other federal agencies, state and local governments, and Indian tribes to develop and enforce regulations under existing environmental laws. The EPA is primarily responsible for researching and setting national standards for a variety of environmental programs and delegates to states and tribes responsibility for issuing permits, and monitoring and enforcing compliance. When national standards are not met, the EPA can issue sanctions and take other steps to assist the states and tribes in reaching the desired levels of environmental quality. The EPA also works with industries and all levels of government in a wide variety of voluntary pollution prevention programs and energy conservation efforts.

EPA Region 9 has jurisdiction over the southwestern United States (Arizona, California, Nevada, and Hawaii).

EPA programs related to hazardous materials include:

- Community Right-to-Know Information
- Pesticide Management
- Toxic Release Inventory
- Brownfields (CalSites Database)
- Cleanup Technologies
- Compliance Assistance
- Emergency Response
- Hazardous Waste
- Oil Spills

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act

The 1976 Federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and the 1984 RCRA Amendments regulate the treatment, storage, and disposal of hazardous and non-hazardous wastes. The legislation mandated that hazardous wastes be tracked from the point of generation to their ultimate fate in the environment. This includes detailed tracking of hazardous materials during transport and permitting of hazardous material handling facilities.

The 1984 RCRA amendments provided the framework for a regulatory program designed to prevent releases from USTs. The program establishes tank and leak detection standards, including spill and overflow protection devices for new tanks. The tanks must also meet performance standards to ensure that the stored material will not corrode the tanks. Owners and operators of USTs had until December 1998 to meet the new tank standards. As of 2001, an estimated 85 percent of USTs were in compliance with the required standards.

Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 introduced active federal involvement to emergency response, site remediation, and spill prevention, most notably the Superfund program. The act was intended to be comprehensive in encompassing both the prevention of, and response to, uncontrolled hazardous substances releases. The act deals with environmental response, providing mechanisms for reacting to emergencies and to chronic hazardous material releases. In addition to establishing procedures to prevent and remedy problems, it establishes a system for compensating appropriate individuals and assigning appropriate liability. It is designed to plan for and respond to failure in other regulatory programs and to remedy problems resulting from action taken before the era of comprehensive regulatory protection.

United States Department of Transportation

The Hazardous Materials Transportation Act of 1974, as amended, is the basic statute regulating hazardous materials transportation in the United States. This law gives the U.S. Department of Transportation and other agencies the authority to issue and enforce rules and regulations governing the safe transportation of hazardous materials.

State agencies are authorized to designate highways for the transport of hazardous materials. Where highways have not been designated, hazardous materials must be transported on routes that do not go through or near heavily populated areas.

State

California Health and Safety Code

The California Environmental Protection Agency has established rules governing the use of hazardous materials and the management of hazardous wastes. California Health and Safety Code Sections 25531, et seq. incorporate the requirements of Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act and the Clean Air Act as they pertain to hazardous materials. Health and Safety Code Section

25534 directs facility owners storing or handling acutely hazardous materials in reportable quantities to develop a Risk Management Plan (RMP). The RMP must be submitted to the appropriate local authorities, the designated local administering agency, and the EPA for review and approval.

CEQA and the Cortese List

The Cortese List (Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List) is a planning document used by the state, local agencies, and developers to comply with CEQA requirements to consider Government Code Section 5962.5 in evaluating proposed development projects. Section 65962.5 states that

The list should contain all hazardous waste facilities subject to corrective action, all hazardous waste property or border zone property designations, all information received on hazardous waste disposals on public land, all hazardous substance release sites listed pursuance to Government Code Section 25356, and all sites that were included in the former Abandonment Site Assessment Program.

California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal EPA)

Government Code Section 65962.5 requires the California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal EPA) to develop a Cortese List at least annually. The Department of Toxic Substances Control is responsible for a portion of the information on the list, and other local and state government agencies are required to provide additional information. Cal EPA operates the Air Resources Board, the Department of Pesticide Regulation, the Department of Toxic Substances Control, the Integrated Waste Management Board, the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, and the State Water Resources Control Board. The function of each of these six offices is discussed below.

Air Resources Board (CARB): To promote and protect public health, welfare, and ecological resources through the effective and efficient reduction of air pollutants in recognition and consideration of the effects on the economy of the State.

Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR): Regulates all aspects of pesticide sales and use to protect the public health and the environment for the purpose of evaluating and mitigating impacts of pesticide use, maintaining the safety of the pesticide workplace, ensuring product effectiveness, and encouraging the development and use of reduced risk pest control practices.

Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC): The Department's mission is to restore, protect, and enhance the environment, to ensure public health, environmental quality, and economic vitality, by regulating hazardous waste, conducting and overseeing cleanups, and developing and promoting pollution prevention. DTSC protects residents from exposures to hazardous wastes. DTSC operates programs to:

- Deal with the aftermath of improper hazardous waste management by overseeing site cleanups.
- Prevent releases of hazardous waste by ensuring that those who generate, handle, transport, store, and dispose of wastes do so properly.

- Take enforcement actions against those who fail to manage hazardous wastes appropriately.
- Explore and promote means of preventing pollution, and encourage reuse and recycling.
- Evaluate soil, water, and air samples taken at sites, and develop new analytical methods.

Cal Recycle: Protects the public health and safety and the environment through waste prevention, waste diversion, and safe waste processing and disposal. Cal Recycle is responsible for managing California's solid waste stream. Cal Recycle is helping California divert its waste from landfills by:

- Developing waste reduction programs.
- Providing public education and outreach.
- Assisting local governments and businesses.
- Fostering market development for recyclable materials.
- Encouraging used oil recycling.
- Regulating waste management facilities.
- Cleaning up abandoned and illegal dumpsites.

Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA): OEHHA is responsible for developing and providing risk managers in state and local government agencies with toxicological and medical information relevant to decisions involving public health. OEHHA also works with federal agencies, the scientific community, industry, and the general public on issues of environmental as well as public health. Specific examples of OEHHA responsibilities that directly relate to Manteca include:

- Developing health-protective exposure standards for air, water, and land to recommend to regulatory agencies, including ambient air quality standards for the Air Resources Board and drinking water chemical contaminant standards for the Department of Health Services.
- Assessing health risks to the public from air pollution, pesticide and other chemical contamination of food, seafood, drinking water, and consumer products.
- Providing guidance to local health departments, environmental departments, and other agencies with specific public health problems, including appropriate actions to take in emergencies that may involve chemicals.

State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB): Preserves and enhances the quality of California's water resources, and ensure their proper allocation and efficient use for the benefit of present and future generations. The SRWQCB maintains the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Information System (LUTIS) Database, which contains information on registered leaking underground storage tanks (LUSTs) in the State.

California Occupational Safety and Health Agency (CalOSHA)

CalOSHA sets and enforces standards that insure safe and healthy working conditions for California's workers. The Division of Occupational Safety & Health is charged with the jurisdiction and supervision over workplaces in California that are not under federal jurisdiction. CalOSHA regulates issues involving unsafe workplace conditions, worker exposure to chemicals, illness due to workplace exposure, or improper training.

State Regulatory Programs Division (SRPD)

The SRPD oversees the technical implementation of the State's Unified Program; a consolidation of six environmental programs at the local level, and conducts reviews of Unified Program agencies to ensure their programs are consistent statewide, conform to standards, and deliver quality environmental protection at the local level. SRPD also carries out the State's hazardous waste recycling and resource recovery program designed to facilitate recycling and reuse of hazardous waste. SRPD conducts a corrective action oversight program that assures any releases of hazardous constituents at generator facilities that conduct onsite treatment of hazardous waste are safely and effectively remediated, and oversees the hazardous waste generator and onsite waste treatment surveillance and enforcement program carried out by local Unified Programs.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and California Highway Patrol

The California Vehicle Code Section 31303 requires that hazardous materials be transported via routes with the least overall travel time, and prohibits the transportation of hazardous materials through residential neighborhoods. In California, the California Highway Patrol (CHP) is authorized to designate and enforce route restrictions for the transportation of hazardous materials. To operate in California, all hazardous waste transporters must be registered with the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). Unless specifically exempted, hazardous waste transporters must comply with the California Highway Patrol Regulations, the California State Fire Marshal Regulations, and the United States Department of Transportation Regulations. In addition, hazardous waste transporters must comply with Division 20, Chapter 6.5, Articles 6 and 13 of the California Health and Safety Code, and the Title 22, Division 4.5, Chapter 13 of the California Code of Regulations, both of which are administered by DTSC.

Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)

There are nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs) throughout the State. The Central Valley RWQCB has jurisdiction over the City of Madera. Individual RWQCBs function as the lead agencies responsible for identifying, monitoring, and cleaning up LUSTs. Storage of hazardous materials in USTs is regulated by the SWRCB, which oversees the nine RWQCBs.

Local

City of Selma

General Plan

Both the 1997 General Plan and 2035 General Plan set forth the following goal and policy relevant to hazards and hazardous materials. Note that the goal/policy numbering reflects the 2035 General Plan.

- **Goal 1:** To prevent loss of life and serious injury resulting from natural or man-induced hazards to the residents of the City of Selma.
- **Policy 4.23:** The City shall consider the impacts of potential transportation hazards upon adjacent land uses when considering proposals for new or changed urban uses.

The 2035 General Plan established the following policy relevant to hazards and hazardous materials:

• **Policy 4.40:** To aid in the identification and mapping of abandoned waste disposal sites, as necessary, and in the survey of the kinds, amounts, locations, etc. of hazardous wastes.

4.7.4 - Methodology

Sims & Associates, LLC prepared a Phase I ESA to document potential hazardous conditions on the project site and surrounding land uses. The Phase I ESA consisted of a review of local, state, and federal regulatory agency lists as compiled by Environmental Data Resources, Inc.; a review of historic aerial photographs and topographic maps; and site reconnaissance. The reconnaissance consisted of systematically walking the perimeter of the site and crossing the interior to provide overlapping field view. Adjacent properties were viewed from the site.

4.7.5 - Thresholds of Significance

According to Appendix G, Environmental Checklist of the CEQA Guidelines, hazards and hazardous materials impacts resulting from the implementation of the proposed project would be considered significant if the project would:

- a.) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?
- b.) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the hazardous materials into the environment?
- c.) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? Refer to Section 7, Effects Found Not To Be Significant.)
- d.) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

- e.) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Refer to Section 7, Effects Found Not To Be Significant.)
- f.) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Refer to Section 7, Effects Found Not To Be Significant.)
- g.) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Refer to Section 7, Effects Found Not To Be Significant.)
- h.) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (Refer to Section 7, Effects Found Not To Be Significant.)

4.7.6 - Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This section discusses potential impacts associated with the development of the project and provides mitigation measures where appropriate.

Routine Transport, Use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials

Impact HAZ-1:	The proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or through reasonably foreseeable unset and accident conditions
	or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions.

Impact Analysis

This impact is associated with hazards caused by the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

Project construction activities may involve the use and transport of hazardous materials. These materials may include fuels, oils, mechanical fluids, and other chemicals used during construction. Transportation, storage, use, and disposal of hazardous materials during construction activities would be required to comply with applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations. Compliance would ensure that human health and the environment are not exposed to hazardous materials. In addition, Mitigation Measure HYD-1a requires the project applicant to implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan during construction activities to prevent contaminated runoff from leaving the project site. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur during construction activities.

The proposed project would not be a large-quantity user of hazardous materials. Small quantities of hazardous materials would be used onsite, including cleaning solvents (e.g., degreasers, paint thinners, and aerosol propellants), paints (both latex- and oil-based), acids and bases (such as many cleaners), disinfectants, and fertilizers. These substances would be stored in secure areas and would

comply with all applicable storage, handling, usage, and disposal requirements. The potential risks posed by the use and storage of these hazardous materials are primarily limited to the immediate vicinity of the materials. Transport of these materials would be performed by commercial vendors who would be required to comply with various federal and state laws regarding hazardous materials transportation. As such, these materials are not expected to expose human health or the environment to undue risks associated with their use.

For these reasons, the proposed expansion would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment from routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials to the public or the environment. Impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is necessary.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Past and Present Project Site Usage

Impact HAZ-2: Development of the proposed project may have the potential to expose human health and the environment to hazardous materials associated with past or present site usage.

Impact Analysis

This impact analyzes the potential for exposure to contamination from previous uses of the project site and nearby properties. Issues of concern include the SPT Site, the Tidewater Associated Oil Company Pipeline, hazardous building materials, agricultural chemicals, ASTs/USTs, and high-voltage power lines. Each issue is discussed separately.

Selma Pressure Treatment Site

The SPT site is a "Superfund" site and is located adjacent to the Northeast Area. The site is the source of a hexavalent chromium groundwater plume that extends southwest across SR-99 into the northwest corner of the Northwest Area. Extraction system wells for the plume are located within APN 393-180-44, which is one of the parcels comprising the Northwest Area. Additionally, parcels along Dockery Avenue and Mountain View Avenue have public and private wells that are routinely monitored by the federal and state agencies for the hexavalent chromium groundwater contamination from the upgradient SPT site.

The Phase I ESA recommended that the project applicant consult with the EPA and the California Department of Toxic Substances Control prior to construction activities within the Northwest Area to determine appropriate liability indemnification and establish access agreements to the extraction system wells. This recommendation has been incorporated as Mitigation Measure HAZ-2a.

The actual hexavalent chromium groundwater plume itself would not pose a hazard to project occupants, as the proposed project would be served by potable water provided by California Water Service Company (Cal Water). Cal Water obtains its water from groundwater wells located in various places throughout Selma and potable water is subject to federal and state drinking water standards.

Tidewater Associated Oil Company Pipeline

Chevron Environmental Management Company submitted a letter (dated November 30, 2010) in response to the Re-Revised Notice of Preparation advising of the presence of a formerly active crude oil pipeline along Golden State Boulevard. Chevron advised that the steel pipeline was typically located at depths ranging from 1.5 to 10.0 feet below ground service and was encased in a protective coating consisting of coal tar and asbestos-containing felt material. The pipeline was removed in certain places and left in place in others; it is uncertain whether it was removed or is still in place in the project vicinity. Chevron noted that subsurface earthwork in the vicinity of the pipeline alignment may encounter residual weathered crude oil.

Chevron recommended that the project applicant be prepared to address the potential presence of the pipeline and residual weathered crude oil during subsurface earthwork activities and requested that it be notified in the event these items are encountered. As such, Mitigation Measure HAZ-2b is proposed requiring the project applicant to investigate the potential presence of the pipeline and residual weathered crude oil along the Northeast Area frontage with Golden State Boulevard prior to commencement of construction activities.

Hazardous Building Materials

The project site contains several structures that predate the federal prohibition on asbestos-containing building materials and lead-based paint. In addition, several electrical transformers were observed onsite that may contain PCBs. Improper removal of these materials may result in significant health risks to workers and surrounding residents.

Accordingly, Mitigation Measure HAZ-2c is proposed requiring that these materials be properly removed and disposed of by a certified contractor prior to demolition activities. The implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce impacts to a level of less than significant.

Agricultural Chemicals

The project site contains cultivated agricultural uses (vineyards). Agricultural chemicals such as pesticides are commonly used for pest management purposes.

The proposed project is proposed to be developed in phases; as such, it is expected that portions of the project will remain in agricultural production for several more years. Because of the uncertainty about the duration of continued agricultural chemical usage onsite, Mitigation Measure HAZ-2d is proposed requiring the project applicant to undertake soil testing of the project site prior to construction activities to determine whether residual concentrations of agricultural chemicals are present and, if so, whether these concentrations are within acceptable limits for commercial development. If the concentrations exceed acceptable limits, the mitigation measure requires the applicant to perform soil remediation activities prior to grading to ensure that human health and the environment are not exposed to harmful concentrations of agricultural chemicals. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, impacts would be reduced to a level of less than significant.

Aboveground Storage Tanks/Underground Storage Tanks

The Phase I ESA did not identify any ASTs or USTs within the project site boundaries based on information obtained from the records search or visual observation. However, since the project site contains agricultural uses, it would not be unexpected for ASTs or USTs to be in use. As such, Mitigation Measure HAZ-2e is proposed requiring inspection for such vessels prior to construction activities and, if found to be present, implementation of appropriate removal and abatement measures. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, impacts would be reduced to a level of less than significant.

High-Voltage Power Lines

Two co-located PG&E high-voltage power lines cross the project site. The Kingsburg Cogen Tap and the McCall-Kingsburg No. 1 115-kilovolt transmission lines cross the southern portion of the Northeast Area and the eastern portion of the South Area in a north-south direction.

The proposed project would maintain the high-voltage power lines in their current alignment; no buildings are proposed with the easement. Furthermore, both the Northeast Area and South Area would contain non-residential uses; no residential uses are proposed in either area. Non-residential uses are occupied for much shorter and more discreet intervals of time than residential uses; therefore, to the extent that EMFs may pose a risk to human health, persons within the Northeast and South Areas would not experience extended exposure. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

Government Code 65962.2

The Phase I ESA included a record search of numerous federal, state, and local databases that list contaminated sites, brownfield sites (a development site having the presence or potential presence of a hazardous substance, pollutant, or contaminant), UST sites, waste storage sites, toxic chemical sites, contaminated well sites, clandestine drug lab sites, and other sites containing hazardous materials. The project site was not listed on any databases compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.

Several nearby sites (including the SPT site) are listed on federal state, and local databases compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Refer to the prior discussion regarding potential impacts from those sites.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

- MM HAZ-2a Prior to issuance of grading permits within the Northwest Area, the project applicant shall consult with the United States Environmental Protection Agency and the California Department of Toxic Substances Control regarding the hexavalent chromium plume associated with the Selma Pressure Treatment Site. The consultation shall address (1) appropriate liability indemnification and (2) access agreements to the extraction system wells. Documentation shall be provided to the City of Selma reflecting the outcome of the consultation and recorded in the final map.
- MM HAZ-2b Prior to issuance of grading permits within the Northeast Area, the project applicant shall retain a qualified consultant to investigate the potential presence of the Tidewater Associated Oil Company pipeline and associated residual weathered crude oil along the Golden State Boulevard frontage. The investigation shall include a field survey to determine the presence or absence of the pipeline or residual weathered crude oil. If either is encountered, the applicant shall develop an abatement plan in consultation with Chevron Environmental Management and implement it prior to earthwork activities within the affected area. The applicant shall submit documentation as part of the grading permit application demonstrating that this mitigation measure has been successfully completed.
- MM HAZ-2c Prior to issuance of demolition permits for any structures located on the project site, the project applicant shall retain a certified hazardous waste contractor to properly remove and dispose of all materials containing asbestos and lead paint in accordance with federal and state law. The applicant shall submit documentation to the City of Selma demonstrating that this contractor has been retained part of the demolition permit application. Upon completion of removal and disposal, the project applicant shall provide documentation to the City of Selma demonstrating that these activities were successfully completed.
- MM HAZ-2d Prior to issuance of grading permits for any portion of the project site that involved cultivated agricultural uses within the previous 5 years, the project applicant shall retain a qualified consultant to assess the affected soils for the presence of residual concentrations of agricultural chemicals. Soils shall be laboratory tested for

organochlorine pesticides in accordance with California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) guidelines. If the laboratory testing yields concentrations in excess of acceptable limits for commercial development, the project applicant shall retain a qualified contractor to perform soil remediation in accordance with DTSC guidelines. The soil remediation activities shall be completed prior to grading activities. The applicant shall submit documentation to the City of Selma demonstrating that soil testing was performed and any necessary remediation was completed as part of the grading permit application.

MM HAZ-2e Prior to issuance of grading permits for any of the project uses, the project applicant shall retain a qualified consultant to investigate the potential presence of aboveground storage tanks or underground storage tanks within the project site. The investigation shall include a field survey to determine the presence or absence of these vessels. If one or more vessels are encountered, the applicant shall retain a qualified contractor to remove the vessel(s) in accordance with state and federal requirements. If necessary, soil testing and abatement measures shall be performed in conjunction with vessel removal. The applicant shall submit documentation to the City of Selma demonstrating that investigation was performed and any necessary remediation was completed as part of the grading permit application.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

4.8 - Hydrology and Water Quality

4.8.1 - Introduction

This section describes the existing hydrology and water quality setting and potential effects from project implementation on the site and its surrounding area. Descriptions and analysis in this section are based on information contained in the Draft Storm Drainage Master Plan, prepared by Blair, Church & Flynn, contained in Appendix H of this EIR. Other information was obtained from the Water Supply Assessment, prepared by California Water Service Company, contained in Appendix J of this EIR, as well as the California Department of Water Resources and the City of Selma General Plan.

4.8.2 - Environmental Setting

Climate

The Selma area is considered as having an "inland Mediterranean" climate and is characterized by long, hot, dry summers and short, foggy winters with low precipitation. The average low temperature is 37.6 degrees Fahrenheit (°F) in December and the average high temperature is 98.3°F in July. Rainfall in the area is low, averaging 10.90 inches per year. General meteorological data for the Selma area, as measured at the National Weather Service Fresno Station, is presented in Table 4.8-1.

	Temperature (°F)			
Month	Average Low	Average High	Precipitation (inches)	
January	37.6	54.5	2.11	
February	40.7	61.5	1.92	
March	43.8	67.0	1.85	
April	47.9	74.5	1.03	
May	54.3	83.5	0.36	
June	60.5	91.7	0.14	
July	65.7	98.3	0.01	
August	63.9	96.3	0.01	
September	59.5	90.6	0.16	
October	51.1	79.7	0.52	
November	42.4	65.3	1.13	
December	37.3	54.7	1.66	
Annual Average	50.4	76.5	10.90	
Notes:	1		1	

Table 4.8-1:	Temperature ar	nd Meteorological	Data
--------------	----------------	-------------------	------

Data measured at Fresno WSO AP, California weather station (No. 043257) Source: Western Regional Climate Center, 2011.

Regional Hydrology

The San Joaquin Valley is surrounded on the west by the Coast Ranges, on the south by the San Emigdio and Tehachapi Mountains, on the east by the Sierra Nevada and on the north by the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and Sacramento Valley. The northern portion of the San Joaquin Valley drains toward the Delta by the San Joaquin River and its tributaries, the Fresno, Merced, Tuolumne and Stanislaus rivers. The southern portion of the valley is internally drained by the Kings, Kaweah, Tule, and Kern rivers that flow into the Tulare drainage basin, including the beds of the former Tulare, Buena Vista, and Kern lakes.

Surface Water Bodies

Below are descriptions of significant surface water bodies in the Selma area.

Kings River

The Selma area is within the Kings River watershed. The river begins in the Sierra Nevada Mountains near Kings Canyon National Park and drains to the Tulare Lake bed in Kings County. In the Sierra Foothills near Piedra, the river is impounded by Pine Flat Dam, which forms Pine Flat Lake, a 1 million acre-foot capacity reservoir.

In the Selma area, the river flows west of Reedley and southeast of Kingsburg. Selma is approximately 6 miles from the nearest reach of the Kings River.

Local Water Bodies

The Selma area is traversed by three canals: Centerville, Kingsburg, and Fowler Switch. All three facilities are used for agricultural purposes.

Rockwell Pond is located west of State Route 99. The pond is used as both a drainage and groundwater recharge basin.

Drainage

Existing Facilities

The project site is occupied by agricultural and rural residential land uses. As such, existing storm drainage facilities are limited and primarily consist of roadside ditches and swales. A ponding basin is located on the southwest quadrant of the E. Mountain View Avenue/S. Van Horn Avenue intersection adjacent to the Shell gas station.

City of Selma Storm Drainage Master Plan

The majority of the project site is located within the Drainage Areas 7A and 9A of City of Selma Storm Drainage Master Plan. Approximately 92 acres is outside of the drainage areas identified in the Storm Drainage Master Plan.

Groundwater

Regional Groundwater Basin

The Selma area overlies the San Joaquin Groundwater Basin, Kings Subbasin. The following are summaries of key characteristics as described in the California Department of Water Resources Bulletin 118.

Basin Boundaries and Hydrology

The Kings Subbasin is bounded on the north by the San Joaquin River. The northwest corner of the sub-basin is formed by the intersection of the east line of the Farmers Water District with the San Joaquin River. The west boundary of the Kings Subbasin is the eastern boundaries of the Delta-Mendota and Westside sub-basins. The southern boundary runs easterly along the northern boundary of the Empire West Side Irrigation District, the southern fork of the Kings River, the southern boundary of Laguna Irrigation District, the northern boundary of the Kings County Water District, the southern boundaries of Consolidated and Alta Irrigation Districts, and the western boundary of Stone Corral Irrigation District. The eastern boundary of the sub-basin is the alluvium-granitic rock interface of the Sierra Nevada foothills.

The San Joaquin and Kings rivers are the two principal rivers within or bordering the sub-basin. The Fresno Slough and James Bypass are along the western edge of the sub-basin and connect the Kings River with the San Joaquin River. Average annual precipitation values range from 7 to 10 inches, increasing eastward.

Hydrogeology

The San Joaquin Valley represents the southern portion of the Great Central Valley of California. The San Joaquin Valley is a structural trough up to 200 miles long and 70 miles wide. It is filled with up to 32,000 feet of marine and continental sediments deposited during periodic inundation by the Pacific Ocean and by erosion of the surrounding mountains, respectively. Continental deposits shed from the surrounding mountains form an alluvial wedge that thickens from the valley margins toward the axis of the structural trough. This depositional axis is below to slightly west of the series of rivers, lakes, sloughs, and marshes, which mark the current and historic axis of surface drainage in the San Joaquin Valley.

Water Bearing Formations

The Kings Subbasin groundwater aquifer system consists of unconsolidated continental deposits. These deposits are an older series of Tertiary and Quaternary age overlain by a younger series of deposits of Quaternary age. The Quaternary age deposits are divided into older alluvium, lacustrine and marsh deposits, younger alluvium, and flood-basin deposits.

The older alluvium is an important aquifer in the sub-basin. It consists of intercalated lenses of clay, silt, silty and sandy clay, clayey and silty sand, sand, gravel, cobbles, and boulders. It is generally

fine-grained near the trough of the valley. Lacustrine and marsh deposits are interbedded with the older alluvium in the western portion of the sub-basin.

The younger alluvium is a sedimentary deposit of fluvial arkosic beds that overlies the older alluvium and is interbedded with the flood-basin deposits. Its lithology is similar to the underlying older alluvium. Beneath river channels, the younger alluvium is highly permeable. Beneath flood plains, it may be of poor permeability. The flood basin deposits occur along the Fresno Slough and James Bypass. They consist of sand, silt, and clay.

The continental deposits of Tertiary and Quaternary age crop out beneath the extreme southeastern part of the sub-basin and yield small amounts of water to wells. The deposits of Quaternary age are exposed over most of the area and yield more than 90 percent of the water pumped from wells.

Specific yields in the sub-basin range from a low of 0.2 percent to 36 percent. To calculate storage capacity in the 10- to 200-foot-depth range, a range of specific yields from approximately 6 percent to 18 percent was utilized. An average specific yield of 11.3 percent was used in the area of the sub-basin for computer modeling purposes.

Groundwater Level Trends

Groundwater flow is generally to the southwest. Two notable groundwater depressions exist. One is centered in Fresno-Clovis urban area. The other is centered approximately 20 miles southwest of Fresno in the Raisin City Water District.

Most well water levels indicated a response to the 1976-1977 drought. After the 1987–1992 drought, wells in the northeast showed water levels from 10 to 40 feet below pre-1976–1977 drought water levels. Water levels in the western sub-basin experienced declines of 10 to 50 feet during the 1987–1992 drought and are in various stages of recovery to mid-1980s levels. Water levels in the southeast have, generally, recovered to mid-1980s levels.

Groundwater Storage

Estimations of the total storage capacity of the sub-basin and the amount of water in storage as of 1995 were calculated using an estimated specific yield of 10.4 percent and water levels collected by the DWR and cooperators. According to these calculations, the total storage capacity of this sub-basin is estimated to be 18.5 million acre-feet to a depth of 300 feet and 40.9 million acre-feet to the base of fresh groundwater. These same calculations give an estimate of 12.6 million acre-feet of groundwater to a depth of 300 feet stored in this sub-basin as of 1995. According to published literature, the amount of stored groundwater in this sub-basin as of 1961 is 24 million acre-feet to a depth of 1,000 feet.

Groundwater Quality

The groundwater is predominantly of bicarbonate type. The major cations are calcium, magnesium, and sodium. Sodium appears higher in the western portion of the sub-basin where some chloride

waters are also found. The TDS of groundwater in the Fresno area seldom exceeds 600 milligrams per liter (mg/L), although at greater depths, 2,000 mg/L groundwater has been encountered. A typical range of groundwater quality in the basin is 200 to 700 mg/L. DHS data indicates an average TDS of 240 mg/L from 414 samples from Title 22 water supply wells. These samples ranged from 40 to 570 mg/L.

Local Groundwater

Local groundwater characteristics were assessed by Kenneth D. Schmidt and Associates Groundwater Quality Consultants as part of the City of Selma General Plan 2035 Update. Below is a summary of the findings.

California Water Service Company (Cal Water), the City of Selma's municipal water supply provider, and agricultural land uses are the primary users of local groundwater supplies. Prior to the 1980s, local groundwater users pumped water from the Quaternary Older Alluvium deposits, which is located in the upper 340 feet of the soil profile. However, water quality problems in these shallower deposits in the 1980s prompted Cal Water to drill deeper wells to the Tertiary-Quaternary continental deposits, which are located 340 to 650 feet below ground surface. Most of the other wells continue to pump from the shallower Quaternary Older Alluvium deposits.

Groundwater pumpage in the Selma area (including Cal Water and other users) is estimated to be 7,600 acre-feet annually. Well records for eight wells in the Selma area indicate that groundwater levels have declined an average of 0.35 foot per year since 1960.

Groundwater Contamination

Selma Pressure Treatment (SPT), located adjacent to the Northeast Area, is the source of a hexavalent chromium groundwater plume in the project vicinity. The plume extends southwest across State Route 99 into the northwest corner of the Northwest Area. In addition, there are extraction system wells for the SPT site located on APN No. 393-180-44 along the western boundary. Furthermore, the parcels along Dockery Avenue and Mountain View Avenue have public and private wells that are routinely monitored by the federal and state agencies for the hexavalent chromium groundwater contamination from the upgradient SPT site.

4.8.3 - Regulatory Setting

Federal

Clean Water Act

Section 303 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) requires states to adopt water quality standards for all surface waters of the United States. Water quality standards are typically numeric, although narrative criteria based upon biomonitoring methods may be employed where numerical standards cannot be established or where they are needed to supplement numerical standards. (See a description of State Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, below.) Standards are based on the designated beneficial

use(s) of the water body. Where multiple uses exist, water quality standards must protect the most sensitive use.

Section 402 of the CWA mandates that certain types of construction activity comply with the requirements of National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) stormwater program. The Phase II Rule, issued in 1999, requires that construction activities that disturb land equal to or greater than 1 acre require permitting under the NPDES program. In California, permitting occurs under the General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction Activity, issued to the SWRCB and implemented and enforced by the nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs). The project site is within the boundaries of the Central Valley RWQCB. See below, NPDES, for additional discussion.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) publishes maps, called Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs). The purpose of a FIRM is to show the areas in the community that have a one percent or greater chance of flooding in any given year, known as Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHAs). FIRMs are the result of engineering studies that are reviewed and approved by FEMA.

National Flood Insurance Program

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) administers the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) to provide subsidized flood insurance to communities complying with FEMA regulations that limit development in floodplains. FEMA issues flood insurance rate maps for communities participating in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). These maps delineate flood hazard zones in the community. Executive Order 11988 (Floodplain Management) addresses floodplain issues related to public safety, conservation, and economics. It requires:

- Avoidance of incompatible floodplain development,
- Consistency with the standards and criteria of the NFIP, and
- Restoration and preservation of the natural and beneficial floodplain values.

State

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act

The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act of 1969 establishes a program to protect water quality and beneficial uses of state water resources and includes both groundwater and surface water. The SWRCB and the RWQCBs are the principal agencies responsible for control of water quality.

The Porter-Cologne Act authorizes the SWRCB to provide comprehensive protection for California's waters through water allocation and water quality protection. The SWRCB implements the requirement of the Clean Water Act Section 303, indicating that water quality standards have to be set for certain waters by adopting water quality control plans under the Porter-Cologne Act. The Porter-Cologne Act established the responsibilities and authorities of the nine RWQCBs, which include

preparing water quality plans for areas in the region, identifying water quality objectives, and issuing NPDES permits and Waste Discharge Requirements. Water quality objectives are defined as limits or levels of water quality constituents and characteristics established for reasonable protection of beneficial uses or prevention of nuisance. The Porter-Cologne Act was later amended to provide the authority delegated from the EPA to issue NPDES permits.

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)

The CWA requires local jurisdictions to address the problems of pollutants in stormwater runoff from development. The CWA provides for the control of the discharge of any pollutant into navigable waters from any point sources. To regulate point source pollution, the CWA provides that the EPA may issue NPDES permits. NPDES permits are issued by the EPA or the states under EPA-approved permit programs that incorporate CWA's technological standards. California's NPDES permit program is implemented through SWRCB and the RWQCBs. Section 402(p) of the CWA establishes a framework for regulating municipal and industrial stormwater discharges under the NPDES program, and requires controls to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable, including management practices, control techniques and systems, design and engineering methods.

The RWQCBs implement the CWA's municipal storm water requirements through the State's Municipal Storm Water Permitting Program. While federal regulations allow the permitting options for storm water discharges (individual and general permits), the SWRCB has elected to adopt only one Statewide General Permit. In September 2009, the SWRCB adopted a new NPDES General Permit for the stormwater discharges associated with construction and land disturbance activities (No. 2009-0009-DWQ) that, among other things, requires compliance with certain numeric effluent limitations. This General Permit will become effective on July 1, 2010. It requires development of a site-specific SWPPP that specifies BMPs that will prevent construction pollutants from contacting stormwater with the interest of keeping all products of erosion from moving offsite to receiving waters. This General Permit is implemented and enforced by the nine RWQCBs.

Local

City of Selma

General Plan

Both the 1997 General Plan and 2035 General Plan set forth the following goals and policies relevant to geology soils, and seismicity. Note that the goal/policy numbering reflects the 2035 General Plan.

- **Policy 1.43:** The City shall monitor and update plans for public streets and utilities, particularly as they pertain to new commercial areas.
- **Goal 1:** To prevent loss of life and serious injury resulting from natural or man-induced hazards to the residents of the City of Selma.
- **Policy 4.18:** The City shall continue to implement and administer the Master Plan for Storm Drainage as a means of offsetting increased storm water runoff from urbanization.

The 2035 General Plan established the following policies relevant to geology soils, and seismicity:

- **Policy 1.94:** Development shall be allowed only in areas that already have urban services or are within a master plan to provide those services. Development of lands outside of current service or master plan areas (such as the SKF Sewer District, City of Selma Master Plan for Storm Drainage Area, etc.) may be considered if the following findings can be made:
 - a. The development will not cause a shortfall, either short- or long-term in the financing of any public facility.
 - b. The development will not significantly delay the provision of a public improvement.
 - c. The development will not accelerate the need for a public improvement beyond the ability of the improvement fund to adjust for the improvement.
 - d. Expansion of the master plan area and/or public facility will not result in the City being unable to maintain existing facilities at their current service levels.
 - e. Notwithstanding the improvements proposed by any development, all developments will be required to contribute their pro rata share towards the completion of established Master Plan improvements.
- **Policy 4.20:** The City shall encourage new development to avoid floodplains or require developers to mitigate and protect against flood impacts if development is to be located in such areas.

Storm Drainage Master Plan

The City of Selma Storm Drainage Master Plan serves as the "blueprint" for City's municipal storm drainage system. For storm drainage master planning purposes, the City is divided into drainage areas that correspond to watershed disposal means, which include retention basins, lift pumps to Consolidated Irrigation District canals, or a gravity connection to the canals. The design level of protection for the master plan drainage areas is a minimum of 1 foot of freeboard at each inlet during the 2-year intensity event.

4.8.4 - Methodology

Analysis in this section is based on hydrologic information contained in the Selma Crossings Draft Storm Drainage Master Plan prepared by Blair, Church & Flynn Consulting Engineers (Appendix H) and the Water Supply Assessment, prepared by California Water Service Company (Appendix J). Additional information was provided by the California Department of Water Resources Bulletin 118 and the 2035 City of Selma General Plan and General Plan EIR.

4.8.5 - Thresholds of Significance

According to Appendix G, Environmental Checklist of the CEQA Guidelines, hydrology and water quality impacts resulting from the implementation of the proposed project would be considered significant if the project would:

- a.) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?
- b.) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted?
- c.) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?
- d.) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?
- e.) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?
- f.) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?
- g.) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard
 Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (See Section 7 Effects Found Not To Be Significant.)
- h.) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? (See Section 7 Effects Found Not To Be Significant.)
- i.) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?
- j.) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? (See Section 7 Effects Found Not To Be Significant.)

4.8.6 - Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This section discusses potential impacts associated with the development of the proposed project and provides mitigation measures where appropriate.

Short-Term Water Quality

Impact HYD-1: Construction activities associated with the proposed project may degrade water quality in downstream water bodies.

Impact Analysis

The impact assesses short-term water quality impacts from construction activities and long-term water quality impacts from operational activities. Each topic is discussed separately.

Short-Term Water Quality

Project implementation would require grading of and construction on approximately 288 gross acres of land. During these activities, there would be the potential for surface water to carry sediment from onsite erosion and small quantities of pollutants into the stormwater system and local waterways. Soil erosion may occur along project boundaries during construction in areas where temporary soil storage is required. Small quantities of pollutants have the potential to enter the storm drainage system, thereby potentially degrading water quality.

Construction of the proposed project would also require the use of gasoline- and diesel-powered heavy equipment such as bulldozers, backhoes, water pumps, and air compressors. Chemicals such as gasoline, diesel fuel, lubricating oil, hydraulic oil, lubricating grease, automatic transmission fluid, paints, solvents, glues, and other substances would likely be utilized during construction. An accidental release of any of these substances could degrade the water quality of the surface water runoff and add additional sources of pollution into the drainage system.

The NPDES stormwater permitting program regulates stormwater quality from construction sites. Under the NPDES permitting program, the preparation and implementation of SWPPPs are required for construction activities that disturb more than 1 acre in area. The SWPPP must identify potential sources of pollution that are reasonably expected to affect the quality of stormwater discharges as well as identify and implement BMPs that ensure the reduction of these pollutants during stormwater discharges to the maximum extent practicable.

Mitigation Measure HYD-1a is proposed that would require the project applicant to prepare and implement an SWPPP prior to the issuance of grading or building permits. This would ensure compliance with all applicable water quality requirements. The implementation of the mitigation measure would ensure that potential, short-term, construction water quality impacts are reduced to a level of less than significant.

Long-Term Water Quality

The proposed project would result in development of urban uses on approximately 287 net acres of mostly agricultural and rural residential land currently pervious to water infiltration. After implementation of the proposed project, impervious surfaces including buildings, sidewalks, and parking areas would cover most of the project site.

The introduction of urban uses on the project site would result in increased vehicle use and potential discharge of associated pollutants. Leaks of fuel or lubricants, tire wear, and fallout from exhaust contribute petroleum hydrocarbons, heavy metals, and sediment to the pollutant load in runoff leaving the project site. Runoff from the proposed landscaped areas may contain residual pesticides and nutrients.

Mitigation Measure HYD-1b is proposed that would require the project applicant to prepare and submit a stormwater quality management plan to the City of Selma for review and approval prior to

the issuance of building permits for the proposed project. The plan would require the project applicant to document various stormwater quality control measures that would be in effect during project operations to ensure that water quality in downstream water bodies is not degraded. This would ensure that all applicable water quality requirements are met.

The implementation of these mitigation measures would ensure that potential, long-term, operational water quality impacts are reduced to a level of less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

- MM HYD-1a Prior to the issuance of the first grading permit or building permit for each phase or any further subdivision thereof (whichever occurs first) for the project, the project applicant shall prepare and submit a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to the Central Valley RWQCB that identifies specific actions and Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent stormwater pollution during construction activities to the maximum extent practicable. The City of Selma shall confirm that the RWQCB has approved the SWPPP prior to issuance of the grading permit or building permit (whichever occurs first). The SWPPP shall identify a practical sequence for BMP implementation and maintenance, site restoration, contingency measures, responsible parties, and agency contacts. The SWPPP shall include but not be limited to the following elements:
 - Temporary erosion control measures shall be employed for disturbed areas.
 - No disturbed surfaces shall be left without erosion control measures in place during the winter and spring months.
 - Sediment shall be retained onsite by a system of sediment basins, traps, or other appropriate measures.
 - The construction contractor shall prepare Standard Operating Procedures for the handling of hazardous materials on the construction site to eliminate or reduce discharge of materials to storm drains.
 - BMP performance and effectiveness shall be determined either by visual means where applicable (e.g., observation of above-normal sediment release), or by actual water sampling in cases where verification of contaminant reduction or elimination (such as inadvertent petroleum release) is required by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board to determine adequacy of the measure.
 - In the event of significant construction delays or delays in final landscape installation, native grasses or other appropriate vegetative cover shall be

established on the construction site as soon as possible after disturbance, as an interim erosion control measure throughout the wet season.

- **MM HYD-1b** Prior to the issuance of the first building permit for each phase or any further subdivision thereof, the project applicant shall submit a stormwater quality management plan to the City of Selma for review and approval. The stormwater quality management plan shall identify pollution prevention measures and practices to prevent polluted runoff from leaving the project site. Examples of stormwater pollution prevention measures and practices to be contained in the plan include but are not limited to:
 - Strategically placed bioswales and landscaped areas that promote percolation of runoff
 - Pervious pavement
 - Roof drains that discharge to landscaped areas
 - Trash enclosures with screen walls and roofs
 - Stenciling on storm drains
 - Curb cuts in parking areas to allow runoff to enter landscaped areas
 - Rock-lined areas along landscaped areas in parking lots
 - Catch basins
 - Oil/water separators
 - Regular sweeping of parking areas and cleaning of storm drainage facilities
 - Employee training to inform store personnel of stormwater pollution prevention measures

The project applicant shall also prepare and submit an Operations and Maintenance Agreement to the City of Selma for its approval identifying appropriate procedures to ensure that stormwater quality control measures work properly during operations.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Groundwater

Impact HYD-2:	The proposed project would not contribute to groundwater overdraft, interfere with
	groundwater recharge, or impair groundwater quality.

Impact Analysis

This impact assesses project impacts on groundwater, including overdraft, recharge, and quality. Each issue is discussed separately.
Groundwater Overdraft

Groundwater is the sole source of water for the City of Selma, as well for most of the surrounding agricultural land uses. As previously noted, the amount of groundwater overdraft in the Selma area is estimated to average 800 acre-feet per year.

Cal Water prepared a Water Supply Assessment (Appendix J) for the proposed project that assessed the adequacy of groundwater supplies to serve the proposed project. As part of the Water Supply Assessment, Cal Water evaluated the net change in groundwater recharge that would occur. That discussion is reproduced below.

University of California Cooperative Extension in a Best Management Practices (BMP) document dated 1998 indicates that for raisin grapes the range of irrigation rates in nearby Tulare County is 2.0 to 4.5 acre-feet/acre/year. Consolidated Irrigation District (CID), in a June 2, 2006 letter to Cal Water, believes the average agricultural irrigation rate in the Selma area is 3.05 acre-feet/acre/year.

Groundwater recharge from irrigated agricultural is a function of a many variables, which include weather, hydrologic conditions, irrigation practices, crops, soils, geologic conditions. One way to calculate recharge is to collect data and make estimates of monthly irrigation, monthly precipitation, runoff, plant evapo-transpiration, evaporation, initial soil moisture and soil's available water holding capacity. Recharge is the net of irrigation and precipitation minus water losses associated with other factors.

Since this data was not available and obtaining and analyzing it is beyond the scope of this assessment, a general estimate of recharge to the groundwater is provided here.

CID provided Cal Water with a memorandum titled Urban Versus Agricultural Water Use Comparison prepared by Summers Engineering dated March 24, 2006. In that report, Summers Engineering estimates that 1.60 acre-feet/acre/year (1.60 feet/year) of irrigation water is from surface water and 1.45 feet/year is from groundwater.

If it is assumed that groundwater recharge for both flood and drip irrigation over wet and dry years on average is 25 percent, then the amount of recharge that agriculture provides would be: 0.25×3.05 feet/year or 0.762 feet/year. If 1.60 feet/year of irrigated water is imported surface water, net "consumptive use" of groundwater would be 1.450 feet/year – 0.762 feet/year = 0.688 feet/year.

This compares with the estimated amount of recharge per development acre of 0.75 feet/year and net "consumptive use" of 2.37 feet/year, which is 1.682 feet/year more than agricultural use.

However, it might be argued that surface water not used at the Selma Crossings site for agricultural irrigation would be used for the same purpose in the vicinity of Selma, and, therefore, no area loss of the contribution of surface water would occur. On that basis, net consumptive use of groundwater for agriculture could be calculated as 3.050 feet/year – 0.688 feet/year = 2.362 feet/year.

If the estimated net consumptive use for the proposed project is 2.37 feet/year, and all other factors affecting recharge were the same, there would be in practical terms no change in consumptive use of groundwater, since 2.362 - 2.370 = -0.008 feet/year.

For the proposed project, estimated indoor water is about 900 acre-feet/year/304 acres = 2.96 feet/year. This becomes wastewater that is conveyed and treated in the Selma-Fowler-Kingsburg wastewater treatment facility. Treated plant effluent is applied to disposal fields in the vicinity of the plant. If it is assumed that 50 percent of the applied effluent recharges to groundwater since that is the agency's disposal objective, then 0.5×2.96 feet/year = 1.48 feet/year of additional recharge can be credited to the proposed project.

Therefore, the net decrease in consumptive groundwater use with this additional credit would be 1.480 - 0.008 feet/year = 1.470 feet/year

In total, this equates to a decrease in consumptive use of groundwater: $304 \text{ acres } x 1.47 \text{ feet/year} = 447 \text{ acre-feet/year or } 400,000 \text{ gallons/day} - a significant benefit.}$

As such, the proposed project would not exacerbate existing groundwater overdraft conditions in the Selma area. Impacts would be less than significant.

Groundwater Recharge

Implementation of the proposed project would result in significant increases in impervious surface coverage over existing conditions. Additional impervious surfaces would reduce the amount of groundwater recharge by limiting the percolation of runoff on site. However, the proposed project's onsite runoff would be piped to stormwater basin located adjacent to the South Area. (Refer to Impact HYD-3 for detailed description of the stormwater basin.) This basin would retain water, most of which would ultimately percolate into the soil and recharge the local aquifer. Thus, the proposed project runoff would contribute to groundwater recharge and would not interfere with it. Impacts would be less than significant.

Groundwater Quality

Hexavalent Chromium Groundwater Plume

SPT, located adjacent to the Northeast Area, is the source of a hexavalent chromium groundwater plume in the project vicinity. The plume extends southwest across State Route 99 into the northwest corner of the Northwest Area. In addition, there are extraction system wells for the SPT site located on APN No. 393-180-44 along the western boundary. Furthermore, the parcels along Dockery Avenue and Mountain View Avenue have public and private wells that are routinely monitored by the federal and state agencies for the hexavalent chromium groundwater contamination from the upgradient SPT site.

Because the proposed project proposes to development urban uses within the Northwest Area, Mitigation Measure HYD-2a is proposed requiring the project applicant to provide continued access for groundwater monitoring and remediation efforts within this area. This would ensure that the proposed project would not impede groundwater clean-up efforts. With the implementation of mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.

Wells

The County of Fresno Department of Public Health submitted a letter to the City of Selma dated November 29, 2010 (Appendix A-4) identifying recommendations for proper abandonment and destruction of wells located within the project site. The Department of Public Health indicated that improperly abandoned wells may result in contamination of the local groundwater supply. The letter set forth procedures for proper destruction of the wells, including testing for lubricating oil. The Department of Public Health's recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure HYD-2b. With the implementation of mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

- MM HYD-2a Prior to recordation of the final map for each phase, the project applicant shall demonstrate that ongoing access for monitoring and remediation can be provided within the Northwest Area for the hexavalent chromium groundwater plume associated with the Selma Pressure Treatment site. Access shall be provided for the life of the project or until the regulatory agency(ies) with jurisdiction over the plume determine that it is no longer necessary.
- MM HYD-2b Prior to issuance of the first grading permits for each phase, the project applicant shall properly destroy groundwater wells in accordance with state and local regulations. All wells shall be sampled for lubricating oil prior to destruction. If oil is detected in the samples, the affected water shall be removed and disposed of in accordance with federal, state, and local regulations. The applicant shall include documentation verifying that wells were tested and properly destroyed as part of the grading permit application.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Drainage

Impact HYD-3: The proposed project would increase impervious surface coverage and may create the potential for downstream flooding.

Impact Analysis

The proposed project consists of the development of approximately 3.5 million square feet of urban development and associated infrastructure on 288 gross acres. The addition of impervious surfaces to

an area that predominantly contains pervious soils would create the potential for substantial increases in runoff leaving the project site, which may result in downstream drainage problems.

Blair, Church, & Flynn Consulting Engineers prepared a Draft Storm Drainage Master Plan for the proposed project that identified necessary improvements necessary to provide adequate drainage. The complete Storm Drainage Master Plan is provided in Appendix H. Key aspects of the plan are summarized on the following pages.

Selma Crossings Draft Storm Drainage Master Plan Summary

The majority of the project site is located within the Drainage Areas 7A and 9A of City of Selma Storm Drainage Master Plan. Approximately 92 acres is outside of the drainage areas identified in the City's Storm Drainage Master Plan.

During the Selma Crossings Storm Drainage Master Plan formulation, it was decided to keep the Selma Crossings Project in one drainage area. Therefore, a new drainage area designated Drainage Area 13A was created. This drainage area includes all of Drainage Areas 7A and 9A, and the 25 acres not presently master planned for storm drainage service.

The proposed project is wholly contained within Drainage Area 13A. It consists of 287 net acres of commercial and community commercial land that will be developed in a phases. Selma Crossings comprises over 50 percent of the total area of Drainage Area 13A and forms the core area of the drainage area. Adjacent areas to Selma Crossings were included in the drainage area because they were hydrologically connected to the Selma Crossings development or could not be separated out from the development without incurring large additional costs to provide drainage facilities to the areas.

The drainage infrastructure for the drainage area consists of a surface and underground collection system and a disposal system. Curb and gutter comprises most of the surface collection system. Inlets, manholes, outfalls, and pipelines make up the underground collection system. The disposal system consists of a retention basin.

Collection systems collect runoff from the streets and developed properties convey that stormwater to storm drainage inlets. Runoff from the drain inlets is conveyed to the disposal facility through a pipeline. Inlets are located in the topographic low points within the drainage area.

The drainage area is split into drainage inlet boundaries that represent private drainage collection systems within the commercial and industrial developments. The hydraulic gradeline of the master planned inlet for each drainage boundary is set so that the freeboard at an estimated onsite inlet location in the private collection system will not be less than 1.0 foot at the inlet. The hydraulic grade line was set using hydraulic and hydrology calculations as explained in the previous sections. The calculations for the Selma Crossings Project are in Appendix H.

The diameters of master planned pipelines range from 24 inches to 72 inches.

The planned collection system provides the design standard of a minimum of 1 foot of freeboard at the lowest inlet in the collection system during the 2-year intensity event. The retention basin was designed to retain a total volume generated by 6 inches of rainfall falling on the drainage area served by the basin. Statistically, a storm with a 100-year return period and having a duration of 10 days will have a total precipitation amount of 6 inches.

The retention basin was designed with the following:

- Four horizontal to one vertical side slopes
- An average excavation depth of 25 feet
- No floor slope
- No permanent pumping facilities
- An anticipated percolation rate (using the net basin floor as the percolation area) of three inches in a 5-day period.

The design high water elevation in the basin was taken as either 2 feet below the lowest gutter elevation in the collection system or the lowest fence pad elevation at the basin, whichever is lower.

The retention basin will be located on a 20-acre parcel south of Caruthers Avenue. The top of the slope of the basin is setback 14 feet from the planned property line. The required volume of the basin is 230.1 acre-feet to retain the runoff from 6 inches of rainfall on the basin. The basin is designated as non-residential. Therefore, the side slopes of the basin are graded at a 4:1 slope and only the top one-third of the basin will be landscaped.

The southeast corner of the proposed basin site is 21 feet higher than the other areas of the basin. Because of this, 45,000 cubic yards of material from the southeast corner will have to be excavated to grade the top of the basin to the same elevation as the rest of the basin. The design calculations for the basin are in Appendix H.

Vector Abatement

The Consolidated Mosquito Abatement District submitted a comment letter to the City of Selma dated December 7, 2010 in response to the Re-Revised Notice of Preparation (Appendix A-4) noting the potential for stormwater basins to facilitate breeding for vectors, such as mosquitoes. The Abatement District recommended that four abatement measures be incorporated into the design of the stormwater basin, including:

• The basin shall be designed and managed in manner that maintains water depths at a minimum of 4 feet to preclude invasive emergent vegetation such as cattails.

- If water levels are subject to fluctuation during the summer months (mosquito breeding season), the basin shall be constructed to provide a low flow/sump area to allow water to pond in this area and prevent the growth of invasive emergent vegetation. The low flow/sump area shall be a minimum of 4 feet below the elevation of the basin floor, with the balance of the basin draining to this area.
- A free and unencumbered roadway shall be provided around the perimeter of the basin.
- Basin edges shall be maintained and managed in a manner that prevents excess vegetation growth.

Conclusion

The Selma Crossing Draft Storm Drainage Master Plan identifies a feasible concept for managing the proposed project's stormwater runoff. Accordingly, Mitigation Measure HYD-3a requires the project applicant to obtain City approval of the Selma Crossing Draft Storm Drainage Master Plan prior to recordation of the final map for each phase. As part of this approval process, the City's Storm Drainage Master Plan would be amended to incorporate the relevant provisions of the Selma Crossing Draft Storm Drainage Master Plan, which would ensure internal consistency and prevent inconsistencies that may result in inadequate storm drainage.

In addition, the Consolidated Mosquito Abatement District recommendations have been incorporated as Mitigation Measure HYD-3b.

With the implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts would be less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

- MM HYD-3a Prior to recordation of the final map for each phase, the project applicant shall submit the final project-specific Storm Drainage Master Plan to the City of Selma for review and approval. The final plan shall identify onsite drainage facilities that will ensure that runoff from the project site is controlled in manner equivalent to or better than the standards set forth in the latest adopted version of the City of Selma Storm Drainage Master Plan. Once City staff have determined the project-specific Storm Drainage Master Plan to be satisfactory, the City's Storm Drainage Master Plan shall be amended to reflect the relevant provisions of the project-specific plan. The project applicant shall incorporate the approved plan into the proposed project plans.
- MM HYD-3b Prior to issuance of grading permits for the stormwater basin, the project applicant shall prepare a Vector Management Plan for the basin for review and approval by the City of Selma. At a minimum, the Vector Management Plan shall incorporate the

Consolidated Mosquito Abatement District's recommendations listed below. The approved plan shall be incorporated into the proposed project.

- The basin shall be designed and managed in manner that maintains water depths at a minimum of 4 feet to preclude invasive emergent vegetation such as cattails.
- If water levels are subject to fluctuation during the summer months (mosquito breeding season), the basin shall be constructed to provide a low-flow/sump area to allow water to pond in this area and prevent the growth of invasive emergent vegetation. The low flow/sump area shall be a minimum of 4 feet below the elevation of the basin floor, with the balance of the basin draining to this area.
- A free and unencumbered roadway shall be provided around the perimeter of the basin.
- Basin edges shall be maintained and managed in a manner that prevents excess vegetation growth.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Levee or Dam Failure

Impact HYD-4: The proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.

Impact Analysis

This impact addresses the potential for levee or dam failure. Each issue is discussed separately.

Levee Failure

The City of Selma is not protected by any significant levees. This condition precludes the possibility inudation as a result of levee failure. No impacts would occur.

Dam Failure

The City of Selma General Plan Update 2035 Environmental Impact Report (Figure 3.8-6) indicates that the project site, as with the rest of the City of Selma, is within the "complete dam failure" inundation area of Pine Flat Dam. Complete dam failure is considered a catastrophic event: under this "worst-case" scenario, the inundation area would span 17 miles wide and 8 to 10 feet in depth within 3 hours of the actual failure.

The United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) owns and maintains Pine Flat Dam. USACE has an ongoing program to monitor and evaluate the dam. This program includes visual inspections; monitoring of instrumentation at the dams; evaluation of the instrumentation data; and evaluation of

hydrologic, seismic, and other conditions that may change over time as events occur and technology is improved. The agency maintains response plans to address potential failure conditions, including measures to abate such conditions and, if necessary, notify and evacuate downstream communities.

Accordingly, dam failure at Pine Flat Dam would be a remote and unlikely event. Therefore, it would be unrealistic to anticipate that the project site would be inundated by floodwaters from dam failure over the life of the proposed project.

In summary, dam failure is theoretically possible, but in actual terms, it is a highly unlikely event because of the structural measures, management practices, and monitoring procedures in place. Accordingly, developing the proposed project on the project site is within acceptable risk levels for flooding via dam failure. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures No mitigation is necessary.

Level of Significance After Mitigation Less than significant impact.

4.9 - Land Use

4.9.1 - Introduction

This section describes the existing land use and potential effects from project implementation on the site and its surrounding area. Descriptions and analysis in this section are based on site reconnaissance by Michael Brandman Associates personnel and review of the City of Selma General Plan 1997 Update (1997 General Plan), the City of Selma General Plan 2035 Update (2035 General Plan), the Selma City Code, and the Fresno Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) Standards for Annexation.

4.9.2 - Environmental Setting

Land Use

Project Site

The 288-gross-acre project site is located in unincorporated Fresno County, adjacent to the southern limits of the City of Selma. The project site contains agricultural and rural residential uses. Agricultural uses consist of vineyards and fallow land. Rural residential uses consist of approximately 12 residences, both occupied and abandoned. Photographs of the project site are provided in Exhibit 3-3a and Exhibit 3-3b. The following are summaries of the various areas that comprise the project site.

Northeast Area

The Northeast Area totals 84.50 gross acres and contains vineyards, fallow agricultural lands, and three residential structures, as well as several outbuildings. S. Van Horn Avenue, a two-lane undivided rural road, bisects the Northeast Area and provides access to two of the residences. Two co-located Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) high-voltage power lines (Kingsburg Cogen Tap and the McCall-Kingsburg No. 1) cross the southern portion of Northeast Area in a north-south direction.

South Area

The South Area totals 135.40 gross acres and contains vineyards, fallow agricultural lands, and seven residential structures, as well as several outbuildings. S. Van Horn Avenue, a two-lane undivided rural road, bisects the South Area and provides access to four of the residences. S. Dockery Avenue, also a two-lane undivided rural road, forms the western boundary of the South Area and provides access to the remaining residences. Two co-located PG&E high-voltage power lines (Kingsburg Cogen Tap and the McCall-Kingsburg No. 1) cross the eastern portion of South Area in a north-south direction.

Northwest Area

The Northwest Area totals 68.10 gross acres and contains vineyards, fallow agricultural lands, and two residential structures, as well as several outbuildings. S. Dockery Avenue, a two-lane undivided rural road, forms the eastern boundary of the Northwest Area and provides access to the two

residences. A hexavalent groundwater plume that originated from the Selma Pressure Treatment site on the north side of State Route 99 (SR-99) overlaps with a portion of the Northwest Area. Extraction system wells associated with the groundwater plume are located within the Northwest Area.

Stormwater Basin

The Stormwater Basin area totals 20.0 gross acres and contains vineyards. Access to the stormwater basin site is taken from S. Dockery Avenue.

Surrounding Land Uses

Surrounding land uses are summarized by the various areas that comprise the project site:

Northeast Area

- West: SR-99
- North: Rural residential; Heavy industrial
- East: Golden State Boulevard; Union Pacific Railroad; Cultivated agriculture (vineyards); Rural residential
- South: E. Mountain View Avenue; Darling Oil & Tire; Abandoned multi-family residential structure; Selma Flea Market

South Area

- West: S. Dockery Avenue; Cultivated agriculture (vineyards); Rural Residential
- North: E. Mountain View Avenue; Cultivated agriculture (vineyards); Valero Gas Station; Light industrial; Shell Gas Station
- East: SR-99
- South: Cultivated agriculture (vineyards); Rural residential

Northwest Area

- West: Cultivated agriculture (vineyards); Rural residential
- North: SR-99
- East: S. Dockery Avenue
- South: E. Mountain View Avenue

Stormwater Basin

- West: Cultivated agriculture (vineyards); Rural residential
- North: South Area
- East: Cultivated agriculture (vineyards); Rural residential
- South: Cultivated agriculture (vineyards); Rural residential

Land Use Designations

Project Site

Table 4.9-1 summarizes the County of Fresno and City of Selma General Plan and Zoning designations for the project site. The existing County zoning designations are shown in Exhibit 3-4. The existing 1997 City of Selma General Plan land use designations are shown in Exhibit 3-5. The 2035 City of Selma General Plan land use designations are shown in Exhibit 3-6. The proposed pre-zoning designations are shown in Exhibit 3-7.

Surrounding Area

The land use designations for the properties surrounding the project site are provided in Table 4.9-2.

	Gross	County of Fresno		City of Selma		
Area	Acres	General Plan	Zoning	1997 General Plan	2035 General Plan	Zoning
Northeast (Phase 1)	84.50	Highway Commercial (~42 acres); Light Industrial (~42 acres)	AL20 – Agriculture Limited with 20 acre minimum parcel size	Highway Commercial (~42 acres); Light Industrial (~42 acres)	Regional Commercial	C-R – Regional Commercial*
South (Phase 2)	135.40	Highway Commercial (~100 acres); Agriculture (~35 acres)	AE20 – Agriculture Exclusive 20 acre minimum parcel size; RA – Residential Agriculture	Highway Commercial (~100 acres); No Designation/Outside of Planning Area (~35 acres)	Regional Commercial	C-R – Regional Commercial*
Northwest (Phase 3)	68.10	Highway Commercial	AE20 – Agriculture Exclusive 20 acre minimum parcel size	Business Park	Regional Commercial	C-R – Regional Commercial*
Total	288.00	_	—	—		_
Notes: * Proposed pre-zoning designation						

City of Selma land use designations are non-binding until parcels are annexed into City limits. Source: County of Fresno 2011; City of Selma, 2011.

Table 4.9-2: Surrounding	a Area Existing	Land Use	Designations
	g / oa =/oug		Doorginationio

	Relationship/	County of Fresno		City of Selma		
Land Use	Jurisdiction	General Plan	Zoning	1997 General Plan	2035 General Plan	Zoning
Industrial (Selma Pressure Treatment)	North of Northeast Area/ City of Selma	_	_	Heavy Industrial	Heavy Industrial	_
Cultivated agriculture	East of Northeast Area/ Unincorporated Fresno County	Heavy Industrial	AL20 – Agriculture Limited with 20 acre minimum parcel size; AE20 – Agriculture Exclusive 20 acre minimum parcel size; RA – Residential Agriculture	Heavy Industrial	Heavy Industrial	_
Darling Oil & Tire/ Multi-Family Residential (East Annexation Area)	South of Northeast Area/ Unincorporated Fresno County	Highway Commercial	CM – Commercial and Light Highway Commercial Manufacturing; C-6 – General Commercial	Highway Commercial	Regional Commercial	C-R – Regional Commercial*
Selma Flea Market	South of Northeast Area/ Unincorporated Fresno County	Heavy Industrial	M3 – Heavy Industrial	_	_	
Valero Gas Station/ Industrial Land Uses (West Annexation Area)	North of South Area/East of Northwest Area/ Unincorporated Fresno County	Highway Commercial	CM – Commercial and Light Manufacturing; C- 6 – General Commercial; AE20 – Agriculture Exclusive 20 acre minimum parcel size	Highway Commercial	Regional Commercial	C-R – Regional Commercial*
Shell Gas Station (West Annexation Area)	North of South Area/Unincorporated Fresno County	Highway Commercial	C-6 – General Commercial	Highway Commercial	Regional Commercial	C-R – Regional Commercial*

Table 4.9-2 (cont.): Surrounding Area Existing Land Use Designations

	Relationship/	County of Fresno		City of Selma		
Land Use	Jurisdiction	General Plan	Zoning	1997 General Plan	2035 General Plan	Zoning
Cultivated agriculture	West of South Area/South of Northwest Area/ Unincorporated Fresno County	Agriculture	AE20 – Agriculture Exclusive 20 acre minimum parcel size;	_	Mixed Use	_
Cultivated agriculture	South of South Area/ Unincorporated Fresno County	Agriculture	AE20 – Agriculture Exclusive 20 acre minimum parcel size;	_		_
Cultivated agriculture	West of Northwest Area/ Unincorporated Fresno County	Agriculture	AE20 – Agriculture Exclusive 20 acre minimum parcel size;	Business Park	Mixed Use	
Notes: * Proposed pre-zoning designation						

City of Selma land use designations are non-binding for properties in unincorporated Fresno County until parcels are annexed into City limits.

Source: County of Fresno 2011; City of Selma, 2011.

Non-Selma Crossings Parcels

Land Use

Two unincorporated areas (East and West) totaling 32.16 acres are adjacent to the Selma Crossings project site; refer to Exhibit 3-9. At the request of the Fresno Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO), the City of Selma is evaluating annexation of these areas. The following are summaries of each area:

- East Annexation Area: This area consists of two parcels comprising 3.15 acres located at the northwest corner of Golden State Boulevard and E. Mountain View Avenue. One of the parcels is occupied by Darling Oil & Tire and the other by an abandoned multi-family residential structure.
- West Annexation Area: This area consists of 11 parcels comprising 29.01 acres located at the SR-99/E. Mountain View Southbound Ramps intersection. Ten of the parcels are located north of E. Mountain View Avenue and are bounded by S. Dockery Avenue (west), SR-99 (north), and the SR-99 Southbound off-ramp (east). These parcels contain developed commercial and residential properties, including a Valero gas station. The remaining parcel is located of south of E. Mountain View Avenue and contains a Shell gas station.

Land Use Designations

Land use designations for the East and West area were previously shown in Table 4.9-2.

4.9.3 - Regulatory Setting

City of Selma

General Plan

1997 General Plan

The City of Selma General Plan 1997 Update (1997 General Plan) is the current blueprint for land use and development activities in the Selma planning area. The 1997 General Plan was adopted by the Selma City Council on August 4, 1997 and involved updates to the Land Use and Circulation Elements. The City Council had previously adopted updates to the Housing, Conservation, Open Space/Recreation, Safety, and Noise elements between 1983 and 1993. Each General Plan element contains goals and policies to guide existing and future land use and development activities.

2035 General Plan

The Selma City Council adopted the City of Selma General Plan Update 2035 (2035 General Plan) on October 4, 2010. The 2035 General Plan involved comprehensive updates to the Land Use, Circulation, Conservation, Open Space/Recreation, Public Services and Facilities, Safety, and Noise elements; the Housing Element was reformatted without any material change to its contents.

The 2035 General Plan retained many of the goals and policies set forth in the 1997 General Plan. However, the 2035 General Plan expanded the Planning Area by 4,438 acres to a total of 15,183 acres. Notably, the 2035 General Plan re-designated approximately 267 acres of Selma Crossings Project site to Regional Commercial and the 20 acres proposed for use as a stormwater basin to Public Facilities. Table 4.9-3 summarizes key differences between the 1997 and 2035 general plans.

	Acres			
Category	1997 General Plan	2035 General Plan		
City Limits (without Right-of-Way)	2,431	2,522		
City Limits (with Right-of-Way)	3,294	3,294		
Sphere of Influence (without Right-of-Way)	7,437	7,349		
Sphere of Influence (with Right-of-Way)	8,299	8,299		
Planning Area (without Right-of-Way)	9,719	13,935		
Planning Area (with Right-of-Way)	10,745	15,183		
Commercial Land Use Designations	786	1,467		
Residential Land Use Designations	5,253	5,581		
Industrial Land Use Designations	3,200	2,939		
Public Facilities Land Use Designations	175	382		
Notes:				

Table 4.9-3: Summary of Differences Between 1997 and 2035 General Plans

Acreage values obtained from Table 2-2 of City of Selma General Plan Update Final Environmental Impact Report. Source: Quad Knopf, 2010.

Following adoption of the 2035 General Plan, a legal challenge was filed against the associated Environmental Impact Report. Adoption of the 2035 General Plan has been stayed pending resolution of the challenge; therefore, the 1997 General Plan is the prevailing land use planning document.

Selma City Code

The Selma City Code establishes specific regulation for development and land use activities to protect and promote the health, safety, comfort, convenience, prosperity, and general welfare of residents and businesses in the City. The City Code contains 12 Titles, with Title 11 containing the Zoning Code. The Zoning Code regulates development and land use activities through restrictions established for each zoning district.

The project site requires annexation and City zoning designations. The project applicant is seeking to zone the entire project site to Regional Commercial (C-R). Below are summaries of the new proposed zoning district.

Regional Commercial District (C-R)

The Zoning Code identifies the following land use activities relevant to the proposed project as permitted uses within the Regional Commercial (C-R):

- Auto supply store
- Bank, finance or lending agency
- Barbershop or beauty parlor
- Building material sales
- Department store
- Drive-in restaurant
- Drugstore
- Dry cleaner
- Dry goods, apparel, notions, or variety store
- Electrical appliance store and incidental repairs

- Gymnasium
- Hotel
- Jewelry store
- Machine sales and rentals
- Motel
- Motorcycles sales and service
- New and used auto sales with related services
- Office, business or professional
- Restaurant or cafe
- Supermarket
- Furniture or household appliance store

The following commercial activities that may end uses of the proposed project are subject to a conditional use permit:

- Alcohol beverage sales or service
- Auto service stations
- Lounge, bar, or nightclubs

The Zoning Title establishes the following development standards for the Regional Commercial (C-R) zoning district:

- 75-foot height limit (may exceed this limit with a Conditional Use Permit)
- No limitation on building coverage

Fresno Local Agency Formation Commission

Fresno LAFCO reviews proposals for the formation of new local governmental agencies and for changes in the organization of existing agencies with Fresno County. Fresno LAFCO regulates, through approval or denial, boundary changes proposed by other public agencies or individuals. Boundary changes are assessed against the criteria set forth in California Government Code Section 56668, which establishes factors LAFCO agencies must use in reviewing annexation proposals. In addition, Fresno LAFCO has issued a Standards for Annexation document to provide specific criteria for annexation proposals.

4.9.4 - Methodology

Michael Brandman Associates (MBA) evaluated the potential for land use impacts through site reconnaissance and review of applicable land use policy documents. MBA personnel performed site reconnaissance on the project site and surrounding land uses in June 2008, December 2010, and June 2011. Photographs were taken of the project site and surrounding land uses to document existing conditions. MBA reviewed the 1997 City of Selma General Plan, City of Selma General Plan Update

2035, the Selma City Code, and Fresno LAFCO's Standards for Annexation to identify applicable policies and provisions that pertain to the proposed project.

4.9.5 - Thresholds of Significance

According to the CEQA Guidelines' Appendix G Environmental Checklist, to determine whether land use and planning impacts are significant environmental effects, the following questions are analyzed and evaluated. Would the project:

- a.) Physically divide an established community? (Refer to Section 7, Effects Found Not To Be Significant.)
- b.) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?
- c.) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan? (Refer to Section 7, Effects Found Not To Be Significant.)

4.9.6 - Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This section discusses potential impacts associated with the development of the proposed project and provides mitigation measures where appropriate.

General Plan Consistency

Impact LU-1: The proposed project would be consistent with applicable provisions of the 1997 City of Selma General Plan and the 2035 City of Selma General Plan.

Impact Analysis

This impact discussion assesses the proposed project's consistency with the Selma General Plan (General Plan). As previously explained, the Selma City Council adopted the 2035 General Plan in October 2010; however, adoption has been stayed pending resolution of a legal challenge. As such, the 1997 General Plan is the prevailing document at the time is this writing.

General Plan Amendment

The 2035 General Plan designates the project site as Regional Commercial and Public Facilities. These land use designations reflect the proposed layout and end uses of the Selma Crossings Project and, therefore, the project is consistent with the 2035 General Plan.

As shown in Table 4.9-1, the 1997 General Plan designates approximately 253 acres of the project site as Highway Commercial, Light Industrial, or Business Park; the remaining 35 acres are outside the Planning Area and do not have a land use designation. In the event that the legal challenge to the 2035 General Plan is not resolved by the time the project is up for consideration by the Selma City Council, a conforming General Plan Amendment would be necessary to expand the 1997 General

Plan Planning Area and re-designate the project site to the land use designations contemplated by the 2035 General Plan.

Given that the conforming General Plan Amendment is intended to achieve consistency with the land use designations set forth in the 2035 General Plan, it would be considered internally consistent.

General Plan Consistency Analysis

Land Use Designations

With the approval of the General Plan Update 2035, or the General Plan Amendment, approximately 267 acres of the project site would be designated for Regional Commercial uses. The General Plan identifies retail and service enterprises, offices, restaurants, and residential uses as allowable uses within those two designations. The proposed project consists of approximately 2,092,203 square feet of retail commercial uses, 540,000 square feet of office uses, 250 residential mixed-use dwelling units, an automall, hotels, and water park/entertainment uses. These uses are consistent with the 2035 General Plan's prescribed uses for Regional Commercial uses.

The remaining 20 acres would be designated Public Facilities and would be occupied by a stormwater basin, which is an end use consistent with this land use designation.

Goals and Policies

The proposed project's consistency with the 1997 General Plan's applicable goals and policies is presented in Table 4.9-4. As shown in the table, the proposed project is consistent with all relevant goals and policies.

Element	Goal/ Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
Land Use	Goal 1	Protect adjacent and nearby agricultural lands within the City's Planning Area, while providing for logical growth of the City.	Consistent: The 1997 General Plan designates approximately 253 acres of the project site as Highway Commercial or Light Industrial. These land use designations overlap with most of the portions of the project site designated "Prime Farmland" and "Farmland of Statewide Importance." The re- designation of this area to Regional Commercial and the addition of 35 acres that would be designated either Regional Commercial or Public Facilities represent the logical continuation of the 1997 General Plan's vision for this area. Furthermore, prime agricultural lands west and south of the project site would not be added to the City's

Table 4.9-4: 1997 General Plan Consistency Analysis

Element	Goal/ Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
			Planning Area or Sphere of Influence, which is consistent with the objective of protecting nearby agricultural lands.
	Policy 1.1	To the maximum extent feasible, prime agricultural lands should not be designated for urban development to preserve them as a natural resource and provide a buffer between existing and future development in the City and neighboring cities.	Consistent: Approximately 253 acres of project site were already designated for Highway Commercial or Light Industrial use by the 1997 General Plan. These land use designations overlap with most of the portions of the project site designated "Prime Farmland" and "Farmland of Statewide Importance." The re- designation of this area to Regional Commercial and the addition of 35 acres that would be designated either Regional Commercial or Public Facilities would not represent a significant departure from what was contemplated by the 1997 General Plan. Furthermore, prime agricultural lands west and south of the project site would not be added to the City's Planning Area or Sphere of Influence, which is consistent with the objective of using establishing agricultural buffers.
	Policy 1.2	The premature conversion of producing agricultural lands to urban uses is discouraged. Steps to curb conversion of these lands include the use of Williamson Act contracts and "right to farm" covenants.	Consistent: The project site is contiguous to existing urban development in several locations, such as the Northeast Area. Furthermore, the proposed project would be phased in a manner that would allow the areas adjacent to urban development to develop first, followed by the areas further away. Finally, the parcel that is currently encumbered by a Williamson Act contract would be developed in the last phase, which would allow this property to remain in agricultural production until economic conditions warrant converting this site to urban use. These characteristics are consistent with the objective of discouraging the premature conversion of agricultural land to urban use.
	Policy 1.4	Support Fresno County General Plan objectives and policies which protect agricultural lands by maintaining large agricultural parcel sizes and	Consistent: The proposed project employs phasing provisions to allow the portions of the project site adjacent to urban development to

Element	Goal/ Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
		preventing the development of these parcels until it is appropriate to be annexed into the City for development.	develop first, with areas further away developing later. This would minimize or avoid pressures on the portions of the project site that abut agricultural land uses in unincorporated Fresno County to prematurely convert to urban use.
	Policy 1.5	Support Fresno County General Plan objectives and policies which direct new urban development within the Selma Sphere of Influence to the City.	Consistent: Most of the project site is currently within the Selma Sphere of Influence. As part of the project approvals, the applicant is seeking to annex the entire project site into the Selma city limits, which also involve a concurrent Sphere of Influence adjustment to make the two boundaries coterminous.
	Policy 1.7	Require a "right to farm" covenant to be recorded for all development adjacent to productive agricultural lands, in order to provide notice to future owners and protect the farming activities.	Consistent: As a condition of approval, a "right to farm" covenant will be recorded on all parcels adjacent to productive agricultural lands.
	Policy 1.8	New development in the community should be sequential and contiguous to existing development, to ensure the orderly extension of municipal services and preservation of a free flowing circulation system.	Consistent: The project site is contiguous to existing urban development in several locations, such as the Northeast Area. Adequate levels of public services and utilities can be provided to serve the project. The proposed project would also install or provide fees for traffic improvements.
	Policy 1.9	While the City prefers contiguous urban development, this may not always be feasible or possible given short-term ownership and development constraints. However, leapfrog development greater than ¹ /4 mile from existing urban uses should be discouraged. Such development should be required to submit an analysis of the fiscal and service impacts the development would have upon the City.	Consistent: The project site is contiguous to existing urban development in several locations, such as the Northeast Area. The remaining two areas (South and Northwest) would be developed in later, sequential phases such that they would be contiguous to other existing or planned urban development when they are completed. Regardless, in no case would any portion of the project be greater than 0.25-mile from any existing land use.
	Policy 1.10	The in-fill of existing vacant lands should be encouraged over development on the periphery of the community.	Consistent: There are no vacant parcels within the current Selma city limits that are available and provide sufficient acreage to support the proposed project. Refer to Section 5, Alternatives for further discussion.

Element	Goal/ Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
	Policy 1.11	Development of peninsulas of urban development into agricultural lands should be discouraged.	Consistent: The project site is contiguous to existing urban development in several locations, such as the Northeast Area. The remaining two areas (South and Northwest) would be developed in later, sequential phases such that they would be contiguous to other existing or planned urban development when they are completed. This is consistent with the objective of avoiding peninsular development into agricultural lands.
	Policy 1.12	In cooperation with Fresno County and the Fresno Local Agency Formation Commission, the City should adopt and maintain a Sphere of Influence consistent with this General Plan. The sphere of influence shall serve the mutual interests of the County and City by preserving agriculture uses in a development vulnerable area while protecting the ultimate growth area of the City from potential incompatible or unplanned urban uses.	Consistent: As part of the proposed project, the entire project site would be annexed into the Selma city limits. Concurrent with the annexation, the Selma Sphere of Influence would be adjusted outward to be coterminous with the city limits. The expanded Sphere of Influence would not encompass any agricultural land uses that are outside the project site boundaries and, therefore, would be consistent with the provisions of this policy.
	Policy 1.13	The City should discourage extension of urban services for land which will not be annexed into the City for greater than one year, except when required to eliminate health and safety problems in existing developments.	Consistent: Water, sewer, storm drainage, and other urban services are not proposed to be extended to any properties outside the Selma city limits.
	Goal 8	Provide a full range of commercial activity appropriate to the community.	Consistent: Under the existing 1997 General Plan, the proposed project would require a General Plan Amendment to re-designate approximately 267 acres of the project site to Regional Commercial use. Such a re-designation is necessary to allow development of the proposed project and, therefore, is consistent with the goal of providing a full range of commercial activity appropriate to the community.
	Policy 8.3	The City shall monitor and update plans for public streets and utilities, particularly as they pertain to new commercial areas.	Consistent: As part of the proposed project, upgrades would be made to infrastructure (potable water, sewer, storm drainage, roadways, etc.) that would serve the proposed project. In conjunction with these upgrades, City infrastructure plans would be updated

	Element	Goal/ Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
				to reflect the improvements associated with the project.
	Goal 9	Provide appropriate interface between commercial land uses and residential uses.	Consistent: The only residential land uses that abut the project site are the rural residences located in unincorporated Fresno County; no existing residential development within the city limits abuts the project site. The proposed project would employ the use of landscaping along its frontages near the rural residences to soften the transition and provide an appropriate interface.	
		Policy 9.1	A minimum six-foot high, grout reinforced, solid masonry wall shall be constructed between all new commercial developments and land designated for residential use. A wall taller than six feet may be allowed when required for sound reduction as identified in a noise study or as determined to be necessary for security of commercial property.	Consistent: The property located west of the Northwest Area is designated Business Park by the 1997 General Plan. This property would be re- designated to Mixed Use by the 2035 General Plan. Should it be deemed necessary, a six-foot-high masonry wall will be constructed between the Northwest Area and this land use. All other portions of the project site abut streets or land designated for non-residential use by the 1997 General Plan and 2035 General Plan.
	Policy 9.2	A 20 foot-minimum setback shall be provided between all new developments in the Regional Commercial and Highway Commercial land use designations, and properties designated for residential uses. Half the width of streets and alleys may be counted towards this setback. The setback area shall be landscaped and not include any parking, trash, loading, storage, or similar facilities.	Consistent: The property located west of the Northwest Area is designated Business Park by the 1997 General Plan. This property would be re- designated to Mixed Use by the 2035 General Plan. Should it be deemed necessary, a 20-foot setback will be established along this property line. All other portions of the project site abut streets or land designated for non-residential use by the 1997 General Plan and 2035 General Plan.	
		Goal 10	Provide pleasant interfaces between commercial uses and adjacent public areas.	Consistent: Landscaping and pedestrian facilities would be provided along all street frontages. Additionally, buildings would generally be oriented along freeway and arterial frontages instead of parking areas, which would be consistent with the goal of providing pleasant interfaces.

Element	Goal/ Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
	Policy 10.1	A minimum of 20 feet of landscaping shall be required for all new commercial development adjacent to arterial streets, except in the CBD land use designation.	Consistent: A minimum of 20 feet of landscaping would be provided along all arterial street frontages.
	Policy 10.2	A minimum of 10 feet of landscaping shall be required for all new commercial development adjacent to collector and local streets, except in the CBD land use designation.	Consistent: A minimum of 10 feet of landscaping would be provided along all collector street frontages.
	Policy 10.3	Parking areas shall be screened from adjacent streets in all new commercial developments by either landscaped berming, dense landscaping or low height walls.	Consistent: Buildings and landscaping would abut freeway and arterial frontages, and would serve to screen views of parking areas.
	Policy 10.4	All commercial outdoor storage areas shall be screened from adjacent public right-of-ways.	Consistent: All outdoor storage areas will be screened from view with buildings, landscaping, or walls.
	Policy 10.5	All new commercial developments or substantially rehabilitated commercial buildings shall include trash enclosures. Within the Central Business District and in cases of substantially rehabilitated commercial buildings, the size and configuration of the enclosure may be adjusted to the scale and size of the property.	Consistent: Trash enclosures will be provided in appropriate locations and screened from public view.
	Goal 11	Commercial areas adjacent to Highway 99 shall present a visually pleasing image to the traveler and potential customer to Selma businesses.	Consistent: Buildings, landscaping, and decorative walls would be located along the SR-99 frontage in the Northeast and South Areas. Parking areas, loading areas, and other "rear store" uses would generally be screened from view. Additionally, the water park would be positioned against the freeway to maximize visibility to passing travelers.
	Policy 11.1	All commercial areas adjacent to Highway 99 shall be designed so that truck bays, trash areas, loading docks and other similar areas are visibly screened from the freeway.	Consistent: Buildings, landscaping, and decorative walls would be located along the SR-99 frontage in the Northeast and South Areas. Parking areas, loading areas, and other "rear store" uses would generally be screened from view. Additionally, the water park would be positioned against the freeway to maximize visibility to passing travelers.
	Policy 11.2	If the rear or sides of new buildings or substantially remodeled buildings	Consistent: Building elevations facing SR-99 would maintain the

Element	Goal/ Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
		will be visible from Highway 99, then those building faces shall have architectural features similar to the main entrance to the building. Buildings adjacent to Highway 99 shall contain features such that flat, non-descript walls are eliminated.	architectural theme provided on the front elevation. Flat, non-descript elevations would not be employed.
	Policy 11.3	Visible metal exteriors on commercial buildings shall be prohibited on parcels adjacent to Highway 99, except in the Highway Commercial land use designation.	Consistent: Buildings abutting SR-99 would be expected to be constructed using concrete or masonry block materials, with contemporary architectural treatments. Corrugated metal roofing or siding would not be used.
	Goal 12	Adequate parking should be provided for commercial uses.	Consistent: The Northeast Area would provide off-street parking at a ratio of 5.08 spaces per 1,000 square feet; the South Area at 3.60 spaces per 1,000 square feet, and the Northwest Area at 3.86 spaces per 1,000 square feet. These ratios exceed the minimum off-street parking requirements for these uses.
	Policy 12.1	The City shall require adequate off- street parking for all new commercial developments.	Consistent: The proposed project would provide off-street parking at ratios that exceed the minimum requirements for its uses.
	Policy 12.2	The City shall review all substantial changes of use for adequate parking. If the new use will result in a substantial increase in required off- street parking, then additional parking shall be provided on-site or within 300 feet of the new use prior to commencement of the use, except in the CBD land use designation.	Consistent: The proposed project would provide off-street parking at ratios that exceed the minimum requirements for its uses.
Circulation	Goal	Provide high-quality, efficient, and safe transportation, sewer, water, and storm drain facilities while maintaining the social, economic, and environmental quality in the Community.	Consistent: The proposed project would install necessary infrastructure or provide fees to service providers for the installation of necessary infrastructure, including transportation, sewer, water, and storm drainage facilities. These characteristics are consistent with the objective of providing high-quality, efficient, and safe facilities that maintain social, economic, and environmental quality in the community.
	Policy 3.5	Provide benches, telephones and shaded areas at major transit	Consistent: The proposed project would provide transit facilities that

Element	Goal/ Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
		destinations so people can utilize the transit system safely and comfortably. The City shall determine such need based on site plan review procedure and other planning implementation methods.	would include amenities such as seating, shelters, lighting, and pullouts. These characteristics are consistent with the objective of providing safe and convenience access to transit service. Refer to Section 4.12, Transportation for further discussion.
	Policy 3.6a	Major arterials, arterials, and collectors will be designed to allow transit vehicles to pull out of traffic. This policy may be implemented with either a continuous parking lane with bus stops, or with special bus pull-out lanes.	Consistent: The proposed project would provide transit facilities that would include pullouts. Refer to Section 4.12, Transportation for further discussion.
	Policy 3.7a	Transit centers/stops shall be established to encourage the interface between commercial centers, high density residential uses and the transit system.	Consistent: The proposed project would provide transit facilities that would include amenities such as seating, shelters, lighting, and pullouts. Refer to Section 4.12, Transportation for further discussion.
	Policy 3.8	Arterials should be developed as shown in the Circulation Element of the General Plan.	Consistent: All street and roadway improvements will be designed and constructed in accordance with the Circulation Element.
	Policy 3.11	Arterials shall be improved to four lanes, with appropriate variations in intersection design to alleviate special traffic problems where necessary.	Consistent: Golden State Boulevard and E. Mountain View Avenue would be improved to its full General Plan contemplated section along the project frontage, which would include four lanes.
	Policy 3.13	City circulation system alignments shall be coordinated with Fresno County circulation system street alignments.	Consistent: The proposed project would maintain all existing roadways in their current alignment, including Golden State Boulevard, E. Mountain View Avenue, S. Van Horn Avenue, and S. Dockery Avenue. New internal roadways would be developed to serve the project uses; however, these facilities would not alter any existing alignments.
	Policy 3.22	The primary purpose of arterials is to carry traffic. Parking should be discouraged on such streets and eliminated where is now exists, along arterials as deemed appropriate by the Traffic/Streets Commission and as traffic safety conditions warrant.	Consistent: No on-street parking is proposed on Golden State Boulevard or E. Mountain View Avenue, which are designated arterial roadways.
	Policy 3.24	It shall be the policy of the City to develop major streets in the	Consistent: The proposed project would implement half-width

Element	Goal/ Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
		 community as follows: Golden State Boulevard in its entirety Mountain View Ave. from U.S. Route 99 to easterly limits of sphere of influence 	improvements along its frontage with Golden State Boulevard and E. Mountain View Avenue. The improvements would consist of improving both roadway to their ultimately General Plan buildout section.
	Policy 3.25	All street and roadway improvements shall be in accord with the Circulation Plan.	Consistent: All frontage improvements would reflect the cross sections shown in the Circulation Element.
	Policy 3.27a	The street network should provide a quick and efficient route for emergency vehicles, including police, fire and other vehicles, when responding to calls for service. The length of single-entry access routes shall be restricted.	Consistent: As previously mentioned, the proposed project would maintain existing roadways in their current alignments. Single-entry access roads will be designed and constructed with the latest adopted edition of the California Fire Code.
	Policy 3.28a	Major arterials shall be built in areas where traffic demand warrants the development of this facility to meet the adopted level of service standard.	Consistent: The proposed project would implement improvements to Golden State Boulevard and E. Mountain View Avenue, which are designated as major arterials. This is consistent with the objective of developing such facilities to meet the adopted level of service standard.
	Policy 3.32a	Median breaks and driveway standards for major arterial, arterial and collector streets directly affect the performance of these roadways, and the following minimum standards have been developed to facilitate the proper operation of these roadways. <i>Major Arterial and Arterial Street</i> <i>Standards</i> i.a Driveway access to major activity centers (locations that generate more than 5,000 daily trips) should be located no closer than 200 feet to the adjacent intersection of a collector or arterial street. (Measurement shall be from the curb return to the nearest edge of the driveway). If driveways must be provided near intersections for facilities (such as service stations) these driveways shall not be serviced by median breaks and shall be located no less than 100 feet from the intersection (measurement shall be from the curb return to the nearest	 Consistent: Access points on Golden State Boulevard and E. Mountain View Avenue will be located a minimum of 200 feet from the nearest intersection and a minimum of 400 feet from other access points. The South Area and Northwest Area will locate most access points on S. Van Horn Avenue and S. Dockery Avenue, designated collector roadways, as well as new internal roadways constructed as part of the project. Access points on Van Horn Avenue and S. Dockery Avenue will be located a minimum of 150 feet from the nearest intersection and a minimum of 300 feet from other access points.

Element	Goal/ Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
		edge of the driveway). If more than one is required to serve a property, the driveways shall be separated by 150 feet. (The 150 feet are to be measured edge to edge, not centerline to centerline).	
		ii.a The distance between driveways along commercially developed arterials should not be less than 400 feet (measurement shall be from centerline to centerline). Where this spacing is not practical, the development shall provide acceptable traffic mitigation measures in addition to those already required.	
		iii.a Where practical and desirable, driveways should be located on adjacent collector streets rather than on arterial streets.	
		iv.a Driveway consolidation shall be encouraged through joint access agreements along arterials where standards a. through e. are exceeded.	
		 v.a Full median breaks, where there is no adopted design, should provide access to collector streets and to major activity centers and should parallel the standards for driveways: not less than 200 feet from an adjacent intersection of an arterial or collector street, and not less than 1,000 feet between full median breaks. f. Major arterials shall be developed in conformance with Figure 2-1 and shall be sized in accordance with the projected traffic volumes on road segments and intersections. The preferred minimum distance between intersections along major arterials is ¹/₄ mile. 	
		<i>Collector Streets Standards</i> i.a Driveway access to major activity centers should be located no closer than 150 feet to the adjacent intersection of a collector or arterial street. (Measurement shall be from the curb return to the nearest edge of the driveway). If driveways must be	

Element	Goal/ Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
		provided near intersections for facilities (such as service stations) these driveways shall not be serviced by median breaks and shall be located no less than 100 feet from the intersection. (Measurement shall be from the curb return to the nearest edge of the driveway). If more than one is requested to serve a property, the driveways shall be separated by 150 feet. (The 150 feet are to be measured edge to edge, not centerline to centerline).	
		ii.a The distance between driveways and intersecting local streets should not be less than 300 feet.(Measurement shall be from the curb return to the nearest edge of the driveway). Where this spacing is not practical, the development shall provide acceptable traffic mitigation measures in addition to those already required.	
		iii.a Driveways to residential property along collectors should be consolidated whenever possible.	
		iv.a Medians on collectors shall be provided by concrete where left turn control is needed and by painted medians on two-way left turn pockets where appropriate. Where concrete medians are provided, median breaks should be spaced not less than 300 feet apart.	
	Policy 3.34.a	Continue to provide a high level of service to the community. Therefore, the City designates Service Level "C" as defined in the Highway Capacity Manual (published by the Transportation Research Board of the National Research Council) as the minimum desirable service level at which freeways, expressways, major arterials, arterial streets and collector streets should operate. All new facilities in these categories shall be designed to operate at this level or better for a period of at least 20 years following their construction.	Consistent: The traffic analysis contained in this EIR uses Level of Service C as the minimum acceptable standard for all facilities under the jurisdiction of the City of Selma. Refer to Section 4.12, Transportation for further discussion.

Element	Goal/ Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
	Policy 3.35.a	The circulation system shall be designed and developed to minimize excessive noise impacts on sensitive land uses and traffic congestion which would increase the rate of vehicle emissions. Development shall mitigate noise and emission impacts (e.g. by constructing sound walls [where warranted], designing to minimize emissions, etc.).	Consistent: The proposed project is oriented to have high-visibility from SR-99. As such, most project trips would be expected to use the freeway and exit at E. Mountain View Avenue. Thus, project-related trips would largely avoid residential areas located west and northwest of the project site, thereby minimizing excessive noise impacts and traffic congestion with these areas.
	Policy 3.36.a	Right-of-way essential to the circulation system should be dedicated and/or developed to the appropriate extent and width when a division of property or development occurs. The City shall coordinate street improvements with the County of Fresno so that the same requirements apply within the urban area boundary.	Consistent: The project applicant will dedicate right-of-way to the City of Selma, the County of Fresno, or Caltrans, as appropriate, as part of roadway improvements. Roadway improvements will be coordinated among the three agencies, as appropriate, to ensure that they are implemented in a logical, efficient, and safe manner.
	Policy 3.37.a	The right-of-way widths and construction widths of all classes of streets from local to major arterial shall be updated as necessary to reflect the street classifications in the Element.	Consistent: The roadway improvements to Golden State Boulevard, E. Mountain View Avenue, S. Van Horn Avenue, and S. Dockery Avenue will be constructed in accordance with appropriate widths specified the latest adopted version of the Circulation Element.
	Policy 3.38.a	Developers shall mitigate traffic impacts associated with their projects to minimize the impacts to freeways, major arterials, arterials, and collector streets.	Consistent: The project applicant will either provide the full cost or fair- share cost, as appropriate, of roadway improvements necessary to maintain acceptable levels of service on freeways, major arterials, arterials, and collector streets.
	Policy 3.42.a	Due to the traffic congestion which results from numerous points of ingress and egress along commercial streets, future commercial developments or modifications to existing developments shall be master planned with limited points of ingress and egress onto a major street. Ingress and egress to shopping centers should be carefully designed in order to promote traffic safety. Left-hand movements into and out of commercial areas should be minimized and existing points of ingress and egress shall be consolidated whenever possible.	Consistent: Vehicular access points to and from arterial roadways such as Golden State Boulevard and E. Mountain View Avenue would be limited and spaced far enough away from intersections to prevent the creation of potential safety issues. Both the South Area and Northwest Area would employ internal roadways that would serve as the primary means of circulation within these areas.

	Element	Goal/ Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
		Policy 3.43.a	In order to promote safe and efficient traffic flow throughout the City, traffic signals shall be spaced no closer than ¹ / ₄ mile on arterials except in unusual circumstances. The intersections of arterial and collector streets and the access driveways to major traffic generators shall be located so as to maintain this minimum spacing.	Consistent: Signals are anticipated to be installed at the main access points to the Northeast Area on Golden State Boulevard; the E. Mountain View Avenue/SR-99 Southbound Off-Ramp intersection; and the E. Mountain View Avenue/S. Dockery Avenue intersection. All of these locations are 0.25-mile or further from each other and other existing signalized intersections. Refer to Section 4.12, Transportation for further discussion.
		Policy 3.45.a	Sidewalks, paths, and appropriate crosswalks should be located to facilitate access to all schools and other areas with significant pedestrian traffic. Whenever feasible, pedestrian paths should be developed to allow for unobstructed pedestrian flow from within a neighborhood.	Consistent: Sidewalks or pedestrian paths would be installed along all street frontages. These facilities would be linked to internal pedestrian circulation systems within each project component. Refer to Section 4.12, Transportation for further discussion.
		Policy 3.46.a	The City shall require curb, gutter, and sidewalks in all areas of the community to accommodate pedestrian traffic, especially along routes with high pedestrian traffic such as schools, parks, and the Downtown area. Installation of these improvements shall be encouraged to the extent feasible in existing neighborhoods where they do not currently exist.	Consistent: Frontage improvements, including curb, gutter, and sidewalks, will be installed as part of the proposed project. In addition, sidewalks would be linked to internal pedestrian circulation systems within each project component. Refer to Section 4.12, Transportation for further discussion.
	Policy 3.47.a	The City shall promote safe, convenient and accessible pedestrian ways within the community.	Consistent: Sidewalks or pedestrian paths would be installed along all street frontages. These facilities would be linked to internal pedestrian circulation systems within each project component. These characteristics are consistent with the objective of promoting safe, convenient, and accessible pedestrian mobility. Refer to Section 4.12, Transportation for further discussion.	
		Policy 3.49.a	Adequate off-street parking shall be required of all commercial and industrial land uses to accommodate parking demand. Off-street parking shall also be required of residential land uses to accommodate tenants.	Consistent: The Northeast Area would provide off-street parking at a ratio of 5.08 spaces per 1,000 square feet; the South Area at 3.60 spaces per 1,000 square feet, and the Northwest Area at 3.86 spaces per 1,000 square feet. These ratios exceed the minimum off-street parking requirements for these uses.

Element	Goal/ Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
	Policy 3.50.a	Parking standards shall be evaluated for new development to ensure that parking requirements are satisfied within walking distance of development, and to ensure that arterial streets do not separate parking from the parking demand generator.	Consistent: The proposed project would provide off-street parking at ratios that exceed the minimum requirements for its uses. All parking facilities would be provided onsite; no offsite or satellite facilities are proposed.
	Policy 3.53	To preserve the viability of the Golden State Industrial Corridor, uses or activities shall not be permitted to encroach so as to reduce the efficiency of the rail system.	Consistent: The proposed project is not adjacent to the Union Pacific Bakersfield Subdivision, nor does it propose any modifications to the railroad, including the construction of new grade crossings. As such, it would not reduce the efficiency of the rail system.
	Policy 3.58	The City shall encourage the use of energy efficient and non-polluting modes of transportation.	Consistent: The proposed project would install transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities and, therefore, would provide accessibility to these modes of transportation. This is consistent with the objective of encouraging the use of energy efficient and non-polluting modes of transportation. Refer to Section 4.12, Transportation for further discussion.
	Policy 3.60	Promote the long term shifting of peak hour commute trips from the single occupant automobile to ridesharing, buses, pedestrian, and bicycles.	Consistent: The proposed project would install transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities and, therefore, would further the objective of the long-term shifting of peak hour commute trips from the single occupant automobile to ridesharing, buses, pedestrians, and bicycles. Refer to Section 4.12, Transportation for further discussion.
	Policy 3.63	Large development shall be encouraged to incorporate transit passenger facilities, bicycle racks or lockers, shower facilities, as well as on site services (eating, mail, banking, etc.) as ways to encourage alternative modes for commute trips.	Consistent: The proposed project would install transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. Employee lockers and shower facilities would be installed in appropriate uses (office, hotel, water park, etc.). The proposed project would include onsite services such as restaurants and banking that would be available to project employees.
Conservation and Open Space	Goal 1.1	Protect the environment	Consistent: This EIR evaluates the environmental impact of the proposed project, with the objective of avoiding or minimizing the project's significant

Element	Goal/ Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
			environmental effects. This is consistent with the goal of protecting the environment.
	Goal 1.3	Preserve prime agricultural land;	Consistent: To mitigate the loss of Important Farmland, mitigation is proposed requiring the permanent preservation of Important Farmland elsewhere in Fresno County at no less than a 1:1 ratio. Additionally, the proposed project would be phased over a 12-year period, allow agricultural use to remain in operation until economic conditions warrant the conversion of farmland to non- agricultural use. These characteristics are consistent with the goal of preserving prime agricultural land. Refer to Section 3.2, Agricultural Resources for further discussion.
	Goal 1.4	Preserve groundwater quality and reduce overdraft conditions;	Consistent: The proposed project would result in a net decrease in groundwater consumption relative to existing agricultural irrigation. As such, it would contribute to reducing groundwater overdraft. Additionally, mitigation measures are proposed to protect groundwater quality. Refer to Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality for further discussion.
	Goal 1.10	Protect rare and endangered plant and animal species, if subsequently found in the Selma Planning area;	Consistent: This EIR assesses project impacts on biological resources, including special-status species. Mitigation is proposed to reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. Refer to Section 4.4, Biological Resources for further discussion.
	Goal 1.11	Identify and protect unique cultural and historical features of the community;	Consistent: This EIR assesses project impacts on cultural resources, including historic resources. Mitigation is proposed to reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. Refer to Section 4.5, Cultural Resources for further discussion.
	Goal 1.12	Limit potential threats to human health and property, which may result from natural environmental hazards.	Consistent: This EIR assesses project impacts associated with issues such as seismic hazards, flooding, fires, and other natural hazards and identifies mitigation measures as appropriate to reduce impacts

	Element	Goal/ Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
		Policy 3.4	The City shall endeavor to mitigate, to the fullest extent possible, activities which will exacerbate groundwater overdrafts.	Consistent: The proposed project would result in a net decrease in groundwater consumption relative to existing agricultural irrigation. As such, it would contribute to reducing groundwater overdraft. Refer to Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality for further discussion.
		Policy 3.5	To the fullest degree possible, prime agricultural land shall be preserved for agricultural uses only	Consistent: The proposed project would be phased over a 12-year period, allow agricultural use to remain in operation until economic conditions warrant the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. These characteristics are consistent with the objective of preserving agricultural land.
		Policy 3.6	Agricultural lands which currently produce or have the potential to produce specialty crops for which the area is uniquely suited shall be protected from encroachment by urban uses	Consistent: The project site and surrounding agricultural land uses are primarily planted as vineyards and grow raisin grapes, a local specialty crop. The proposed project would be phased over a 12-year period, allowing agricultural use to remain in operation until economic conditions warrant the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. These characteristics are consistent with the objective of protecting agricultural lands from encroachment.
		Policy 3.8	Commercial, industrial, open space, and recreational uses should be located adjacent to prime agricultural areas to avoid conflicts between agricultural operations and present or planned residential and institutional land uses.	Consistent: The proposed project primarily consists of commercial land uses and, therefore, would be consistent with this policy. The Northwest Area would contain 250 dwelling units in a mixed-use setting; however, this would be the last phase of the project and surrounding land uses would be expected to have converted to urban use by the time this phase is developed.
		Policy 3.14	Require correction of local storm water ponding conditions prior to development in such areas, either through off-site improvements provided by land developers, or through community storm drain facility capital improvement projects.	Consistent: The proposed project would install storm drainage infrastructure, including a 20-acre stormwater basin. These facilities would provide municipal-level storm drainage and would alleviate existing ponding conditions.
	Noise	Goal 1	To protect the peace, health, safety, and welfare of the citizens from the	Consistent: This EIR evaluates potential noise impacts and identifies

Element	Goal/ Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
		adverse effects of any such noise source on the citizen under any condition.	feasible measures to reduce noise levels at surrounding receptors. This is consistent with the goal of protecting the peace, health, safety, and welfare of Selma residents. Refer to Section 4.10, Noise for further discussion.
	Goal 2	To prohibit unnecessary, excessive and offensive noises from all sources subject to local police power.	Consistent: This EIR evaluates potential noise impacts (including from unnecessary, excessive and offensive noise sources) and identifies feasible measures to reduce noise levels at surrounding receptors. Refer to Section 4.10, Noise for further discussion.
	Goal 3	To improve the living, working, and recreational environment through the reduction and control of noise nuisance.	Consistent: This EIR evaluates potential noise impacts and identifies feasible measures to reduce noise levels at surrounding receptors. This is consistent with the goal of improving the living, working, and recreational environment through the reduction and control of noise nuisance. Refer to Section 4.10, Noise for further discussion.
Public Services and Facilities	Goal 1.2	Reduce the threat to persons and property resulting from natural and man-made hazards, including fire, crime and flooding.	Consistent: This EIR addresses impacts associated with natural and man-made hazards including fire, crime, and flooding, and identified mitigation measures as necessary to reduce impacts. As such, this is consistent with the goal of reducing the threat to persons and property resulting from natural and man-made hazards.
	Goal 1.3	Provide a safe and sanitary physical environment.	Consistent: The proposed project would be served with municipal services, including potable water, sewer, and storm drainage. This is consistent with the goal of providing a safe and sanitary physical environment.
	Goal 1.4	Coordinate required improvements of the sewer and storm drainage systems.	Consistent: The project applicant would bear the full cost and install necessary sewer and storm drainage systems. This is consistent with the goal of coordinating required improvements of these utility systems.
	Policy 3.2	Adequate facilities shall be provided for law enforcement and fire	Consistent: Both the Selma Fire Department and Police Department

Element	Goal/ Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
		suppression and prevention programs.	were consulted during the preparation of this EIR and identified necessary facilities that would need to be provided in order to maintain acceptable levels of service. These recommendations are reflected as mitigation measures in the EIR. Refer to Section 4.11, Public Services and Utilities for further discussion.
	Policy 3.8	All new developments shall be required to have community sewer, water and storm water systems.	Consistent: The proposed project would be served with municipal services, including potable water, sewer, and storm drainage. Refer to Section 4.11, Public Services and Utilities for further discussion.
Safety	Goal 1	To prevent loss of life and serious injury resulting from natural or man- induced hazards to the residents of the City of Selma.	Consistent: This EIR assesses project impacts associated with natural or man-induced hazards such as seismic hazards, flooding, and fires and identifies mitigation measures as appropriate to reduce impacts.
	Goal 2	To prevent serious structural damage to critical facilities and structures where large numbers of people are expected to congregate at one time.	Consistent: This EIR evaluates potential seismic hazards and sets forth mitigation to ensure that structures adhere to the latest adopted seismic safety building standards. This is consistent with the goal of preventing serious structural damage to critical facilities and structures. Refer to Section 4.6, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity for further discussion.
	Policy 8	Primary and secondary hazards from seismic activity should be evaluated in all environmental assessment and reporting processes.	Consistent: This EIR evaluates potential seismic hazards and sets forth mitigation to ensure that structures adhere to the latest adopted seismic safety building standards. Refer to Section 4.6, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity for further discussion.
	Policy 11	The City shall continue to adopt current issues of the Uniform Building Code and implement the seismic design standards provided by the Code.	Consistent: This EIR sets forth mitigation to ensure that structures adhere to the latest adopted seismic safety building standards. Refer to Section 4.6, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity for further discussion.
	Policy 12	Seismic safety information should be made available to the general public. School districts and agencies related to aged, handicapped and seismically susceptible industries should be encouraged to develop education	Consistent: This EIR provides information potential seismic hazards in the Selma area, which will be available for public review.
Element	Goal/ Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
---------	------------------------	---	---
		programs for seismic awareness.	
	Policy 2	Continue to enforce the Uniform Building Code in all matters related to soil preparation and foundation requirements.	Consistent: This EIR sets forth mitigation to ensure soil engineering practices and foundations adhere to the latest adopted seismic safety building standards. Refer to Section 4.6, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity for further discussion.
	Policy 3	The City shall continue to implement and administer the Master Plan for Storm Drainage as a means of offsetting increased storm water runoff from urbanization.	Consistent: This EIR includes a Draft Storm Drainage Master Plan (Appendix H), which identifies necessary storm drainage infrastructure to serve the project. It is anticipated that the City's Storm Drainage Master Plan would be amended to include the infrastructure identified in the project master plan. Refer to Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality for further discussion.
	Policy 1	The City shall consider the impacts of potential transportation hazards upon adjacent land uses when considering proposals for new or changed urban uses.	Consistent: This EIR evaluates potential impacts associated with transportation hazards, including railroad grade crossing safety, emergency evacuation, and design features that may create potential safety issues. Refer to Section 4.12, Transportation for further discussion.
	Policy 1	The City shall maintain an efficient fire department operation and strive to keep the staffing and equipment levels in line with the growth of the City.	Consistent: The Selma Fire Department was consulted during the preparation of this EIR and identified necessary facilities that would need to be provided in order to maintain acceptable levels of service. These recommendations are reflected as mitigation measures in the EIR. Refer to Section 4.11, Public Services and Utilities for further discussion.
	Policy 3	The City will require installation, maintenance and inspection of automatic fire detection and suppression devices in structures as required by City Code.	Consistent: The proposed project will be designed and constructed in accordance with the fire safety standards (including those that pertain to detection and suppression devices) set forth in the latest adopted edition of the California Fire Code.
	Policy 5	New development in the City of Selma shall conform to existing fire codes, including the provision of adequate ingress and egress for fire response vehicles.	Consistent: The proposed project will be designed and constructed in accordance with the emergency vehicle access standards set forth in the latest adopted edition of the California Fire Code.

Element	Goal/ Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination	
	Policy 6	The City shall continue to monitor and coordinate the water supply system with California Water for fire protection purposes to include the water supply for both peak load and emergency use. Areas of substandard water supply should be identified, and system improvements completed prior to and in conjunction with new development in the area.	Consistent: California Water Service Company prepared a Water Supply Assessment that indicated that adequate water supplies would be available to serve the proposed project. This includes water supply for both peak load and emergency use. Refer to Section 4.11, Public Services and Utilities for further discussion.	
Source: City of Selma, 2011; Michael Brandman Associates, 2011.				

The proposed project's consistency with the 2035 General Plan's applicable goals and policies is presented in Table 4.9-5. As shown in the table, the proposed project is consistent with all relevant goals and policies.

Element Section	Goal/Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
Land Use	Goal 1	Protect adjacent and nearby agricultural lands within the City's Planning Area, while providing for logical growth of the City.	Consistent: The 2035 General Plan designates approximately 267 acres of the project site as Regional Commercial and the remaining 20 acres as Public Facilities. These land use designations overlap with the portions of the project site designated "Prime Farmland" and "Farmland of Statewide Importance." Thus, the development of this area would represent the logical and orderly expansion of the City of Selma, as envisioned by the 2035 General Plan. Furthermore, prime agricultural lands west and south of the project site would not be added to the City's Planning Area or Sphere of Influence, which is consistent with the objective of protecting nearby agricultural lands.
	Policy 1.2	In order to preserve them as a natural resource and provide a buffer between existing and future development in the City and neighboring cities, prime agricultural lands should not be	Consistent: The 2035 General Plan designates approximately 267 acres of the project site as Regional Commercial and the remaining 20 acres as Public Facilities. These land use

Table 4.9-5: 2035 General Plan Consistency Analysis

Element Section	Goal/Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
		designated for urban development to the extent feasible.	designations overlap with the portions of the project site designated "Prime Farmland" and "Farmland of Statewide Importance." Thus, the conversion of this farmland acreage is contemplated by the 2035 General Plan. Furthermore, prime agricultural lands west and south of the project site would not be added to the City's Planning Area or Sphere of Influence, which is consistent with the objective of establishing agricultural buffers.
	Policy 1.3	The premature conversion of productive agricultural lands to urban uses is discouraged. Steps to curb conversion of these lands include the use of Williamson Act contracts, Farmland Security Zone contracts, agricultural zoning, purchase/transfer of development rights and "right to farm" covenants.	Consistent: The project site is contiguous to existing urban development in several locations. Furthermore, the proposed project would be phased in a manner that would allow the areas adjacent to urban development to develop first, followed by the areas further away. Finally, the parcel that is currently encumbered by a Williamson Act contract would be developed in the last phase, which would allow this property to remain in agricultural production until economic conditions warrant converting this site to urban use. These characteristics are consistent with the objective of discouraging the premature conversion of agricultural land to urban use.
	Policy 1.5	Support Fresno County General Plan objectives and policies which protect agricultural lands by maintaining large agricultural parcel sizes and preventing the development of these parcels until it is appropriate to be annexed into the City for development.	Consistent: The proposed project employs phasing provisions to allow the portions of the project site adjacent to urban development to develop first, with areas further away developing later. This would minimize or avoid pressures on the portions of the project site that abut agricultural land uses in unincorporated Fresno County to prematurely convert to urban use.
	Policy 1.7	Require a "right to farm" covenant	Consistent: As a condition of

Ele	ement Section	Goal/Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
			to be recorded for all development adjacent to productive agricultural lands, in order to provide notice to future owners and protect the farming activities.	approval, a "right to farm" covenant will be recorded on all parcels adjacent to productive agricultural lands.
	Policy 1.8	New development in the community should be sequential and contiguous to existing development, to ensure the orderly extension of municipal services and preservation of an adequate circulation system.	Consistent: The project site is contiguous to existing urban development in several locations, such as the Northeast Area. Adequate levels of public services and utilities can be provided to serve the project. The proposed project would also install or provide fees for traffic improvements.	
	Policy 1.9	While the City prefers contiguous urban development, this may not always be feasible or possible given short-term ownership and development constraints. However, leapfrog development greater than ¼ mile from existing urban uses should be discouraged. Such development should be required to submit an analysis of the fiscal and service impacts the development would have upon the City.	Consistent: The project site is contiguous to existing urban development in several locations, such as the Northeast Area. The remaining two areas (South and Northwest) would be developed in later, sequential phases such that they would be contiguous to other existing or planned urban development when they are completed. Regardless, in no case would any portion of the project be greater than 0.25-mile from any existing land use.	
		Policy 1.10	The in-fill of existing vacant lands within the City limits should be encouraged over development on the periphery of the community.	Consistent: There are no vacant parcels within the current Selma city limits that are available and provide sufficient acreage to support the proposed project. Refer to Section 5, Alternatives for further discussion.
		Policy 1.11	Development of peninsulas of urban development into agricultural lands shall be discouraged.	Consistent: The project site is contiguous to existing urban development in several locations, such as the Northeast Area. The remaining two areas (South and Northwest) would be developed in later, sequential phases such that they would be contiguous to other existing or planned urban development when they are completed. This is consistent with the objective of avoiding peninsular development into agricultural lands.
		Policy 1.12	In cooperation with Fresno County	Consistent: As part of the

Element Section	Goal/Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
		and the Fresno Local Agency Formation Commission, the City shall adopt and maintain a Sphere of Influence consistent with this General Plan. The Sphere of Influence shall serve the mutual interests of the County and City by preserving agricultural uses in areas vulnerable to development while protecting the ultimate growth area of the City from potential incompatible or unplanned urban uses.	proposed project, the entire project site would be annexed into the Selma city limits. Concurrent with the annexation, the Selma Sphere of Influence would be adjusted outward to be coterminous with the city limits. The expanded Sphere of Influence would not encompass any agricultural land uses that are outside the project site boundaries and, therefore, would be consistent with the provisions of this policy.
	Policy 1.13	The City shall discourage extension of urban services for land which will not be annexed into the City for greater than one year, except when required to eliminate health and safety problems in existing developments.	Consistent: Potable water, sewer, storm drainage, and other urban services are not proposed to be extended to any properties outside the Selma city limits.
	Goal 7	Promote a full range of commercial activity appropriate to the community.	Consistent: Under the adopted 2035 General Plan, approximately 267 acres of the project site is designated Regional Commercial use. The proposed project is consistent with the contemplated uses of this designation and, therefore, furthers the goal of providing a full range of commercial activity appropriate to the community.
	Policy 1.40	1.40 The Land Use Element and plan map include eight commercial categories intended to provide a complete range of neighborhood, community, service, regional and highway commercial needs. In addition, there are districts identified for commercial office, planned medical development and the central business district. Below is a summary of the commercial land uses provided for in this General Plan: [] <i>Regional Commercial (RC): 60% Lot Coverage</i> This designation is designed to provide development opportunities for those uses that attract customers from well outside the City of	Consistent: Approximately 267 acres of the project site is designated Regional Commercial by the 2035 General Plan. The proposed project contemplates 3,449,203 square feet on 267 net acres, which translates to 29.7 percent lot coverage. End uses of the proposed project include commercial retail (including regional-serving retail uses), an auto mall, and visitor- serving commercial (e.g., hotel and water park). The project site is located near the SR-99/E. Mountain View Avenue interchange and the Northeast Area fronts Golden

Element Section	Goal/Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
		Selma. To fulfill the role as a regional commercial provider, such development must be close to major transportation links and contain sufficient area to provide adequate facilities and parking. Regional uses have anchor tenants with market areas generally covering at least a fifteen mile radius such as larger durable good retail stores and vehicle sales. []	State Boulevard. As such, convenient access from these regional transportation facilities would be provided.
	Policy 1.43	The City shall monitor and update plans for public streets and utilities, particularly as they pertain to new commercial areas.	Consistent: As part of the proposed project, upgrades would be made to infrastructure (potable water, sewer, storm drainage, roadways, etc.) that would serve the proposed project. In conjunction with these upgrades, City infrastructure plans would be updated to reflect the improvements associated with the project.
	Goal 8	Provide an appropriate interface between commercial and residential land uses.	Consistent: The only residential land uses that abut the project site are the rural residences located in unincorporated Fresno County; no existing residential development within the city limits abuts the project site. The proposed project would employ the use of landscaping along its frontages near the rural residences to soften the transition and provide an appropriate interface.

Element Section	Goal/Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
	Policy 1.45	A minimum six-foot high, grout reinforced, solid masonry wall shall be constructed between all new commercial developments and land designated for residential use. A wall taller than six feet may be allowed when required for sound reduction as identified in a noise study or as determined to be necessary for security of commercial property. Openings in the wall may be provided at appropriate locations to allow for pedestrian connectivity.	Consistent: The property located west of the Northwest Area is designated Business Park by the 1997 General Plan. This property would be re-designated to Mixed Use by the 2035 General Plan. Should it be deemed necessary, a 6-foot-high masonry wall will be constructed between the Northwest Area and this land use. All other portions of the project site abut streets or land designated for non-residential use by the 1997 General Plan and 2035 General Plan.
	Policy 1.46	A 20 foot-minimum setback shall be provided between all new developments in the Regional Commercial and Highway Commercial land use designations, and properties designated for residential uses. Half the width of streets and alleys may be counted towards this setback. The setback area shall be landscaped and not include any parking, trash, loading, storage, or similar facilities.	Consistent: The property located west of the Northwest Area is designated Business Park by the 1997 General Plan. This property would be re-designated to Mixed Use by the 2035 General Plan. Should it be deemed necessary, a 20-foot setback will be established along this property line. All other portions of the project site abut streets or land designated for non-residential use by the 1997 General Plan and 2035 General Plan.
	Goal 9	Developers shall provide pleasant interfaces between commercial uses and adjacent public areas.	Consistent: Landscaping and pedestrian facilities would be provided along all street frontages. Additionally, buildings would generally be oriented along freeway and arterial frontages instead of parking areas, which would be consistent with the goal of providing pleasant interfaces.
	Policy 1.49	A minimum of 20 feet of landscaping shall be required for all new commercial development adjacent to arterial streets, except in the [Central Business District] land use designation.	Consistent: A minimum of 20 feet of landscaping would be provided along all arterial street frontages.

Element Section	Goal/Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
	Policy 1.50	A minimum of 10 feet of landscaping shall be required for all new commercial development adjacent to collector and local streets, except in the CBD land use designation.	Consistent: A minimum of 10 feet of landscaping would be provided along all collector street frontages.
	Policy 1.51	Parking areas shall be screened from adjacent streets in all new commercial developments by either landscaped berming, dense landscaping or low height walls.	Consistent: Buildings and landscaping would abut freeway and arterial frontages, and would serve to screen views of parking areas.
	Policy 1.52	All commercial outdoor storage areas shall be screened from adjacent public right-of-ways.	Consistent: With the exception of the outdoor car sales areas associated with the auto mall, all other outdoor storage areas will be screened from view with either landscaping or walls.
	Policy 1.53	All new commercial developments or substantially rehabilitated commercial buildings shall include trash enclosures. Within the Central Business District and in cases of substantially rehabilitated commercial buildings, the size and configuration of the enclosure may be adjusted to the scale and size of the property.	Consistent: Trash enclosures will be provided in appropriate locations and screened from public view.
	Goal 10	Commercial areas adjacent to Highway 99 shall present a visually pleasing image to the traveler and potential customer to Selma businesses.	Consistent: Buildings, landscaping, and decorative walls would be located along the SR-99 frontage in the Northeast and South Areas. Parking areas, loading areas, and other "rear store" uses would generally be screened from view. Additionally, the water park would be positioned against the freeway to maximize visibility to passing travelers.
	Policy 1.54	All commercial areas adjacent to Highway 99 shall be designed so that truck bays, trash areas, loading docks and other similar areas are visibly screened from the freeway.	Consistent: Buildings, landscaping, and decorative walls would be located along the SR-99 frontage in the Northeast and South Areas. Parking areas, loading areas, and other "rear store" uses would generally be screened from view. Additionally, the water park would be positioned against the freeway to maximize visibility to passing travelers.

Element Section	Goal/Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
	Policy 1.55	If the rear or sides of new buildings or substantially remodeled buildings will be visible from Highway 99, then those building faces shall have architectural features similar to the main entrance to the building. Buildings adjacent to Highway 99 shall contain features such that flat, non- descript walls are eliminated.	Consistent: Building elevations facing SR-99 would maintain the architectural theme provided on the front elevation. Flat, non- descript elevations would not be employed.
	Policy 1.56	Visible metal exteriors on commercial buildings shall be prohibited on parcels adjacent to Highway 99, except in the Highway Commercial land use designation.	Consistent: Buildings abutting SR-99 would be expected to be constructed using concrete or masonry block materials, with contemporary architectural treatments. Corrugated metal roofing or siding would not be used.
	Goal 11	Adequate parking should be provided for commercial uses.	Consistent: The Northeast Area would provide off-street parking at a ratio of 5.08 spaces per 1,000 square feet; the South Area at 3.60 spaces per 1,000 square feet, and the Northwest Area at 3.86 spaces per 1,000 square feet. These ratios exceed the minimum off-street parking requirements for these uses.
	Policy 1.57	The City shall require adequate off- street parking for all new commercial developments.	Consistent: The proposed project would provide off-street parking at ratios that exceed the minimum requirements for its uses.
	Policy 1.58	The City shall review all substantial changes of use for adequate parking. If the new use will result in a substantial increase in required off-street parking, then additional parking shall be provided on-site or within 300 feet of the new use prior to commencement of the use, except in the CBD land use designation.	Consistent: The proposed project would provide off-street parking at ratios that exceed the minimum requirements for its uses.
	Goal 19	Provide flexibility in providing public facilities where needed.	Consistent: The proposed project includes a 20-acre stormwater basin that would be adjacent to the South Area. This location is considered the most appropriate location for this facility and is designated Public Facilities by the 2035 General Plan

Element Section	Goal/Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
	Policy 1.89	The following land use districts are intended to accommodate a variety of public facility and recreational uses. <i>Public Facility (PF)</i> . This designation is intended for public and quasi-public facilities, including, but not limited, to, government services and facilities, fire stations, wastewater treatment facilities, electrical substations, airports, domestic water treatment and storage, recreational facilities, and similar uses. It is also appropriate for institutional uses, such as schools and accredited secondary educational facilities, hospitals, and cemeteries, as well as appropriate lands controlled by philanthropic and nonprofit organizers for existing or future public uses. Facilities such as those described above are not restricted to being located on lands designated Public Facility. []	Consistent: The 20-acre stormwater basin would be designated Public Facilities. This facility would be considered a "public and quasi-public facility" and would serve to provide adequate storm drainage for the project site and neighboring land uses. Therefore, the contemplated uses of this facility are consistent with the Public Facilities land use designation.
	Policy 1.90	The zoning of land less than one acre and designated as Public Facility shall be consistent with adjacent parcels. Where more than one zoning exists adjacent to a Public Facility designation, the Selma Planning Commission shall recommend to the Selma City Council the appropriate zone district. The Selma City Council shall make the final determination.	Consistent: The proposed stormwater basin would be zoned CR – Regional Commercial, which is the zoning designation for the adjoining South Area.
	Policy 1.91	Because of the wide variety of uses and area requirements, public facilities shall not be subject to the minimum lot size of the underlying zone district.	Consistent: In accordance with this policy, the proposed stormwater basin would not be subject to the minimum lot size requirements of the CR – Regional Commercial zoning district.
	Goal 20	Maintain a viable population growth rate in Selma over the plan period that provides for orderly growth with minimal adverse impacts upon City services within the community and consistent with the character of Selma, and with a planned average annual growth rate of 4.0 percent.	Consistent: The proposed project would be developed in phases over a 12-year period. Infrastructure improvements would occur in conjunction with each phase of development. These characteristics are consistent with the objective of orderly and managed growth.

Element Section	Goal/Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
	Policy 1.92	Residential development at urban densities shall be located only where services and facilities can be provided.	Consistent: The Northwest Area would include as many as 250 dwelling units that would be located above ground floor retail uses. The Northwest Area would be served with urban levels of services and infrastructure.
	Policy 1.94	 Development shall be allowed only in areas that already have urban services or are within a master plan to provide those services. Development of lands outside of current service or master plan areas (such as the SKF Sewer District, City of Selma Master Plan for Storm Drainage Area, etc.) may be considered if the following findings can be made: a. The development will not cause a shortfall, either short- or long-term in the financing of any public facility. b The development will not significantly delay the provision of a public improvement. c. The development will not accelerate the need for a public improvement fund to adjust for the improvement. d. Expansion of the master plan area and/or public facility will not result in the City being unable to maintain existing facilities at their current service levels. e. Notwithstanding the improvements proposed by any development, all developments will be required to contribute their pro rata share towards the completion of established Master Plan improvements. 	Consistent: The proposed project would "master plan" potable water, sewer, and storm drainage improvements in accordance with the requirements and standards of the applicable service provider. The project applicant would provide the full cost or, if appropriate, its equitable fair- share cost of all utility infrastructure upgrades necessary to provide acceptable levels of service.
	Goal 21	The City shall establish Urban Development Boundaries to direct growth into areas with adequate infrastructure.	Consistent: The entire project site is within the Urban Development Boundary contemplated by the 2035 General Plan. As such, the extension of urban services to the project site is consistent with the provisions of this policy.

Element Section	Goal/Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
	Policy 1.95	The City shall maintain a 40,000 population and 70,000 population Urban Development Boundary (UDB) that limits development to within those boundaries until the City's population exceeds the corresponding UDB population threshold. The City shall maintain an adequate supply of zoned residential land to meet 10 years of its Regional Housing Needs Allocation, a 10-year supply of zoned commercial land, and a 20- year supply of industrial land. The City shall amend the SOI, UDBs, annex areas, and redesignate "Reserve" lands within the Planning Area as necessary to maintain such supply.	Consistent: The project site is within the Urban Development Boundary contemplated by the 2035 General Plan. As such, the new commercial and residential opportunities associated with the project would be consistent with the growth projections of the 2035 General Plan.
	Policy 1.96	 Establish Urban Development Boundaries as urbanizable areas within which a full-range of urban services will need to be extended to accommodate urban development. These boundaries shall be established based on the following factors: a. Adequate residential, commercial and industrial capacity for the planning period. b. Inclusion of at least a 50 percent vacancy factor ("flexibility factor") for residential and commercial development. c. Provision of adequate industrial land. d. Adequacy of infrastructure including existing and planned capacity of water and sewer facilities, school, roadways, and other urban services and facilities. e. Community growth priorities.	Consistent: The entire project site is within the Urban Development Boundary contemplated by the 2035 General Plan. As such, the extension of urban services to the project site is consistent with the provisions of this policy.
	Policy 1.100	The City shall discourage leapfrog development (defined as urban development more than ½ mile from existing urban development) and development of peninsulas extending into agricultural lands to avoid adverse effects on agricultural lands, and to avoid adverse effects on agricultural	Consistent: The project site is contiguous to existing urban development in several locations, such as the Northeast Area. The remaining two areas (South and Northwest) would be developed in later, sequential phases such that they would be contiguous to other existing or planned urban

Element Section	Goal/Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
		operations that contribute to premature conversion.	development when they are completed. This is consistent with the objective of avoiding peninsular development into agricultural lands.
	Policy 1.101	The City shall support non-renewal processes for Williamson Act designated lands within the 40,000 population Urban Development Boundary.	Consistent: The proposed project includes one parcel that is encumbered by an active Williamson Act contract. The site is within the Urban Development Boundary and the City has previously received approval of a petition to cancel the contract from Fresno LAFCO.
Circulation	Goal 1	To design and maintain a fully integrated local network that provides for safe and convenient circulation using a variety of transportation modes.	Consistent: The proposed project would install necessary infrastructure or provide fees to service providers for the installation of necessary infrastructure, including transportation, sewer, water, and storm drainage facilities. These characteristics are consistent with the objective of providing high-quality, efficient, and safe facilities that maintain social, economic, and environmental quality in the community.
	Policy 2.5	Encourage benches, telephones and shaded areas at major transit destinations so people can utilize the transit system safely and comfortably. The City shall determine such need based on site plan review procedure and other planning implementation methods.	Consistent: The proposed project would provide transit facilities that would include amenities such as seating, shelters, lighting, and pullouts. These characteristics are consistent with the objective of providing safe and convenience access to transit service. Refer to Section 4.12, Transportation for further discussion.
	Policy 2.6	Major arterials, arterials, and collectors will be designed to allow transit vehicles to pull out of traffic. This policy may be implemented with either a continuous parking lane with bus stops, or with special bus pull-out lanes.	Consistent: The proposed project would provide transit facilities that would include pullouts. Refer to Section 4.12, Transportation for further discussion.
	Policy 2.7	Transit centers/stops shall be established to encourage the interface between commercial	Consistent: The proposed project would provide transit facilities that would include

Element Section	Goal/Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
		centers, high density residential uses and the transit system.	amenities such as seating, shelters, lighting, and pullouts. Refer to Section 4.12, Transportation for further discussion.
	Policy 2.8	All street and roadway improvements shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the Circulation Element and Circulation Plan.	Consistent: All street and roadway improvements will be designed and constructed in accordance with the Circulation Element and Circulation Plan.
	Policy 2.13	Arterials shall be improved to four lanes, with appropriate variations in intersection design to alleviate special traffic problems where necessary. Major arterials shall be improved to six lanes, with appropriate variations in intersection design to alleviate special traffic problems where necessary.	Consistent: E. Mountain View Avenue would be improved to its full General Plan contemplated section along the project frontage, which would include four lanes.
	Policy 2.14	Meandering sidewalks shall be encouraged along collectors and arterials.	Consistent: Pedestrian facilities would be installed along the project frontages with all roadways. Meandering sidewalks would be installed where appropriate.
	Policy 2.16	City circulation system alignments shall be coordinated with Fresno County circulation system street alignments.	Consistent: The proposed project would maintain existing arterial roadways in their current alignment, including Golden State Boulevard and E. Mountain View Avenue.
	Policy 2.20	A one-mile arterial frequency grid system plan shall be used to allow efficient access throughout the community and to support the major commercial areas of the City, including McCall Avenue at Dinuba, the downtown area and commercial uses along SR-99.	Consistent: The proposed project would maintain existing roadways in their current alignment, including Golden State Boulevard, and E. Mountain View Avenue, which are designated arterial roadways. Improvements would be made to both facilities. These characteristics are consistent with the objective of maintaining a 1- mile arterial frequency grid system plan in order to provide efficient access throughout the community.
	Policy 2.23	Collector streets shall be at approximately one-mile intervals centered between arterial streets and shall be planned to intersect	Consistent: The proposed project would involve realigning S. Van Horn Avenue south of E. Mountain View Avenue in order

Element Section	Goal/Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
		with other streets so as to maximize traffic safety and discourage fast flowing traffic through residential areas. Where possible, major arterials, arterials, and collectors shall form 4-leg, right-angle intersections; jog, offset and skewed intersections of streets in near proximity shall be avoided where possible.	to accommodate the planned reconfiguration of the SR- 99/Mountain View Avenue interchange. This is consistent with the policy of maximizing traffic safety by avoiding the introduction of unconventional intersection configurations. These characteristics are consistent with the objective of maintaining a 1-mile arterial frequency grid system plan in order to provide efficient access throughout the community.
	Policy 2.25	The primary purpose of arterials is to carry traffic. Parking should be discouraged on such streets and eliminated where is now exists, along arterials as deemed appropriate by the Traffic and Streets Commission and as traffic safety conditions warrant.	Consistent: No on-street parking is proposed on Golden State Boulevard or E. Mountain View Avenue, which are designated arterial roadways.
	Policy 2.27	 It shall be the policy of the City to develop major streets in the community as follows: [] Golden State Boulevard in its entirety [] Mountain View Avenue from De Wolf to Bethel [] 	Consistent: The proposed project would implement half- width improvements along its frontage with Golden State Boulevard and E. Mountain View Avenue. Both roadways would be improved to their ultimate General Plan buildout section.
	Policy 2.28	The street network should provide a quick and efficient route for emergency vehicles, including police, fire and other vehicles, when responding to calls for service. The length of single-entry access routes shall be restricted.	Consistent: As previously mentioned, the proposed project would maintain existing roadways in their current alignments. Single-entry access roads will be designed and constructed with the latest adopted edition of the California Fire Code.
	Policy 2.29	Major arterials shall be built in areas where traffic demand warrants the development of this facility to meet the adopted level of service standard.	Consistent: The proposed project would implement improvements to Golden State Boulevard and E. Mountain View Avenue, which are designated as major arterials. This is consistent with the objective of developing such facilities to meet the adopted level of service standard.
	Policy 2.31	Median breaks and driveway	See next

Element Section	Goal/Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
		standards for major arterial, arterial and collector streets directly affect the performance of these roadways, and the following minimum standards have been developed to facilitate the proper operation of these roadways:	
		 <i>Major Arterial and Arterial Street</i> <i>Standards</i> a. Driveway access to major activity centers (locations that generate more than 5,000 daily trips) should be located no closer than 200 feet to the adjacent intersection of a collector or arterial street. (Measurement shall be from the curb return to the nearest edge of the driveway). If driveways must be provided near intersections for facilities (such as service stations) these driveways shall not be serviced by median breaks and shall be located no less than 100 feet from the intersection (measurement shall be from the curb return to the nearest edge of the driveway). If more than one is required to serve a property, the driveways shall be separated by 150 feet (the 150 feet are to be measured edge to edge, not centerline to centerline). b. The distance between driveways along commercially developed major arterials should not be less than 600 feet (measurement shall be from centerline to centerline). Where this spacing is not practical, the development shall provide acceptable traffic mitigation measures in addition to those already required. c. Where practical and desirable, driveways should be located on adjacent arterial or collector streets rather than on major arterial streets. d. Full median breaks, where there is no adopted design, should provide access to collector streets 	Consistent: Access points on Golden State Boulevard will be located a minimum of 200 feet from the nearest intersection and a minimum of 600 feet from other access points.
		and to major activity centers and	

Element Section	Goal/Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
		should parallel the standards for driveways: not less than 200 feet from an adjacent intersection of an arterial or collector street, and not less than 1,000 feet between full median breaks.	
		e. Driveway consolidation shall be encouraged through joint access agreements along arterials where standards a. through d. are exceeded.	
		f. Major arterials shall be developed in conformance with Figure 2-1 and shall be sized in accordance with the projected traffic volumes on road segments and intersections. The preferred minimum distance between intersections along major arterials is ¹ / ₄ mile.	
		Arterial Street Standards a. Driveway access to major activity centers (locations that generate more than 5,000 daily trips) should be located no closer than 200 feet to the adjacent intersection of a collector or arterial street (measurement shall be from the curb return to the nearest edge of the driveway). If driveways must be provided near intersections for facilities (such as service stations) these driveways shall not be serviced by median breaks and shall be located no less than 100 feet from the intersection (measurement shall be from the curb return to the nearest edge of the driveway). If more than one is required to serve a property, the driveways shall be separated by 150 feet (the 150 feet are to be measured edge to edge, not centerline to centerline). b. The distance between driveways along commercially developed arterials should not be less than 400 feet (measurement shall be from centerline to centerline). Where this spacing is not practical, the davalopment chall mervide	Consistent: Access points on E. Mountain View Avenue will be located a minimum of 200 feet from the nearest intersection and a minimum of 400 feet from other access points. The South Area and Northwest Area will locate most access points on S. Van Horn Avenue and S. Dockery Avenue, designated collector roadways, as well as new internal roadways constructed as part of the project.

Element Section	Goal/Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
		acceptable traffic mitigation measures in addition to those already required.	
		 c. Where practical and desirable, driveways should be located on adjacent collector streets rather than on arterial streets. d. Full median breaks, where there is no adopted design, should provide access to collector streets and to major activity centers and should parallel the standards for driveways: not less than 200 feet from an adjacent intersection of an arterial or collector street, and not less than 1,000 feet between full median breaks. 	
		e. Driveway consolidation shall be encouraged through joint access agreements along arterials where standards a. through d. are exceeded.	
		f. Major arterial and arterials shall be developed in conformance with Figure 2-1 and shall be sized in accordance with the projected traffic volumes on road segments and intersections.	
		<i>Collector Street Standards</i> a. Driveway access to major activity centers should be located no closer than 150 feet to the adjacent intersection of a collector or arterial street (measurement shall be from the curb return to the nearest edge of the driveway). If driveways must be provided near intersections for facilities (such as service stations) these driveways shall not be serviced by median breaks and shall be located no less than 100 feet from the intersection (measurement shall be from the curb return to the edge of the driveway). If more than one is requested to serve a property, the driveways shall be separated by 150 feet (the 150 feet are to be measured edge to edge, not centerline to centerline)	Consistent: Access points on Van Horn Avenue and S. Dockery Avenue will be located a minimum of 150 feet from the nearest intersection and a minimum of 300 feet from other access points.

Element Section	Goal/Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
		 b. The distance between driveways and intersecting local streets should not be less than 300 feet (measurement shall be from the curb return to the nearest edge of the driveway). Where this spacing is not practical, the development shall provide acceptable traffic mitigation measures in addition to those already required. c. Driveways to residential property along collectors should be consolidated whenever possible. d. Medians on collectors shall be provided by concrete where left turn control is needed and by painted medians on two-way left turn pockets where appropriate. Where concrete medians are provided, median breaks should be spaced not less than 300 feet apart. e. Collectors shall be developed in conformance with Figure 2-1 and shall be sized in accordance with the projected traffic volumes on road segments and intersections. [] 	
	Policy 2.32	To continue to provide a high level of service to the community, the City designates Service Level "D" as defined in the Highway Capacity Manual as the minimum desirable service level at which freeways, expressways, major arterials, arterials and collector streets should operate. All new facilities in these categories shall be designed to operate at this level or better for a period of at least 20 years following their construction.	Consistent: The traffic analysis contained in this EIR uses Level of Service C as the minimum acceptable standard for all facilities under the jurisdiction of the City of Selma. Refer to Section 4.12, Transportation for further discussion.
	Policy 2.33	The circulation system shall be designed and developed to minimize excessive noise impacts on sensitive land uses and traffic congestion which would increase the rate of vehicle emissions. New development shall mitigate noise and emission impacts [e.g. by constructing sound walls (where	Consistent: The proposed project is oriented to have high- visibility from SR-99. As such, most project trips would be expected to use the freeway and exit at E. Mountain View Avenue. Thus, project-related trips would largely avoid residential areas located west and

Element Section	Goal/Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
		warranted), designing to minimize emissions (such as roundabout or traffic circle), etc.].	northwest of the project site, thereby minimizing excessive noise impacts and traffic congestion with these areas.
	Policy 2.34	Right-of-way essential to the circulation system should be dedicated and/or developed to the appropriate extent and width when a division of property or development occurs. The City shall coordinate street improvements with the County of Fresno so that the same requirements apply outside the City limits.	Consistent: The project applicant will dedicate right-of- way to the City of Selma, the County of Fresno, or Caltrans, as appropriate, as part of roadway improvements. Roadway improvements will be coordinated among the three agencies, as appropriate, to ensure that they are implemented in a logical, efficient, and safe manner.
	Policy 2.36	Developers shall mitigate traffic impacts associated with their projects to minimize the impacts to highways, major arterials, arterials, and collector streets.	Consistent: The project applicant will either provide the full cost or fair-share cost, as appropriate, of roadway improvements necessary to maintain acceptable levels of service on freeways, major arterials, arterials, and collector streets. Refer to Section 4.12, Transportation for further discussion.
	Policy 2.37	The City will continue to collect development impact fees for the circulation system (streets, signals and bridges) and shall revise and update the development impact fees as needed.	Consistent: The project applicant will pay development impact fees for roadway improvements at the time building permits are sought. Refer to Section 4.12, Transportation for further discussion.
	Policy 2.42	Due to the traffic congestion which results from numerous points of ingress and egress along commercial streets, future commercial developments or modifications to existing developments shall be master planned with limited points of ingress and egress onto a major street. Ingress and egress to shopping centers should be carefully designed in order to promote traffic safety. Left-hand movements into and out of commercial areas should be minimized and existing points of ingress and egress shall be	Consistent: Vehicular access points to and from arterial roadways such as Golden State Boulevard and E. Mountain View Avenue would be limited and spaced far enough away from intersections to prevent the creation of potential safety issues. Both the South Area and Northwest Area would employ internal roadways that would serve as the primary means of circulation within these areas. Refer to Section 4.12, Transportation for further discussion.

Element Section	Goal/Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
		consolidated whenever possible.	
	Policy 2.43	In order to promote safe and efficient traffic flow throughout the City, traffic signals shall be spaced no closer than ¹ /4 mile on arterials except in unusual circumstances. The intersections of arterial and collector streets and the access driveways to major traffic generators shall be located so as to maintain this minimum spacing.	Consistent: Signals are anticipated to installed at: the main access points to the Northeast Area on Golden State Boulevard; the E. Mountain View Avenue/SR-99 Southbound Off-Ramp intersection; and the E. Mountain View Avenue/S. Dockery Avenue intersection. All of these locations are 0.25- mile or further from each other and other existing signalized intersections. Refer to Section 4.12, Transportation for further discussion.
	Policy 2.44	The City will develop, through various funding mechanisms and sources, a city wide bicycle path/lane/route system in conformance with the City's 2003 Bicycle Transportation Plan. The bicycle path/lane/route system will utilize existing or future railroad right-of-way and water courses. The paths (class I), may also include landscaping, lighting, mileage markers, directional signage and benches. The on-road lanes (class II) would include striping and the on-road routes (class III) would not include striping. Reference Figure 2-3 for the proposed city-wide bike plan. The class I bike paths can also be utilized by pedestrians if the proposed paths are wide enough to allow both bicyclists and pedestrians.	Consistent: Bicycle facilities will be installed in conjunction with roadway improvements as contemplated by the City's 2003 Bicycle Transportation Plan. Additionally, bicycle storage facilities will be installed as part of the proposed project. Refer to Section 4.12, Transportation for further discussion.
	Policy 2.45	Sidewalks, paths, and appropriate crosswalks should be located to facilitate access to all schools and other areas with significant pedestrian traffic. Whenever feasible, pedestrian paths should be developed to allow for unobstructed pedestrian flow from within a neighborhood.	Consistent: Sidewalks or pedestrian paths would be installed along all street frontages. These facilities would be linked to internal pedestrian circulation systems within each project component. Refer to Section 4.12, Transportation for further discussion.
	Policy 2.46	The City shall require curb, gutter, and sidewalks in all areas of the community to accommodate pedestrian traffic, especially along routes with high pedestrian traffic	Consistent: Frontage improvements, including curb, gutter, and sidewalks, will be installed as part of the proposed project. In addition, sidewalks

Element Section	Goal/Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
		such as schools, parks, and the Downtown area. Installation of these improvements shall be encouraged to the extent feasible in existing neighborhoods where they do not currently exist.	would be linked to internal pedestrian circulation systems within each project component. Refer to Section 4.12, Transportation for further discussion.
	Policy 2.47	The City shall promote safe, convenient and accessible pedestrian ways within the community.	Consistent: Sidewalks or pedestrian paths would be installed along all street frontages. These facilities would be linked to internal pedestrian circulation systems within each project component. These characteristics are consistent with the objective of promoting safe, convenient and accessible pedestrian mobility. Refer to Section 4.12, Transportation for further discussion.
	Policy 2.49	Street lighting shall be provided for all public streets and pedestrian signals shall be provided at all traffic signal locations.	Consistent: Street lighting would be installed, as appropriate, as part of roadway improvements.
	Policy 2.50	New development shall be required to plant and maintain appropriate trees or other devices in order to achieve shading of at least 50% of all hardscaped parking and pedestrian surfaces.	Consistent: Landscaping would be installed within parking areas with the objective of achieving 50 percent shade coverage.
	Policy 2.51	Adequate off-street parking shall be required of all commercial and industrial land uses to accommodate parking demand. Off-street parking shall also be required of residential land uses to accommodate tenants.	Consistent: The Northeast Area would provide off-street parking at a ratio of 5.08 spaces per 1,000 square feet, the South Area at 3.60 spaces per 1,000 square feet, and the Northwest Area at 3.86 spaces per 1,000 square feet. These ratios exceed the minimum off-street parking requirements for these uses.
	Policy 2.52	Parking standards shall be evaluated for new development to ensure that parking requirements are satisfied within walking distance of development, and to ensure that arterial streets do not separate parking from the parking demand generator.	Consistent: The proposed project would provide off-street parking at ratios that exceed the minimum requirements for its uses. All parking facilities would be provided onsite; no offsite or satellite facilities are proposed.
	Policy 2.55	To preserve the viability of the Golden State Industrial Corridor, uses or activities shall not be permitted to encroach so as to	Consistent: The proposed project is not immediately adjacent to the Union Pacific Bakersfield Subdivision, nor

Element Section	Goal/Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
		reduce the efficiency of the rail system.	does it propose any modifications to the railroad, including the construction of new grade crossings. As such, it would not reduce the efficiency of the rail system.
	Policy 2.60	The City shall encourage the use of energy efficient and non-polluting fuels and modes of transportation.	Consistent: The proposed project would install transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities and, therefore, provide accessibility to these modes of transportation. This is consistent with the objective of encouraging the use of energy efficient and non-polluting modes of transportation. Refer to Section 4.12, Transportation for further discussion.
	Policy 2.61	Transportation System Management and Transportation Demand Management are the applicable strategies for the mitigation of traffic and parking congestion. Public transit, traffic management, ridesharing and parking management are to be used to the greatest extent practical to implement transportation management strategies.	Consistent: The proposed project would install transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. Additionally, project employers would be able to establish ridesharing and carpooling programs as appropriate. Refer to Section 4.12, Transportation for further discussion.
	Policy 2.62	Promote the long term shifting of peak hour commute trips from the single occupant automobile to ridesharing, buses, pedestrians, and bicycles.	Consistent: The proposed project would install transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities and, therefore, would further the objective of the long-term shifting of peak-hour commute trips from the single-occupant automobile to ridesharing, buses, pedestrians, and bicycles. Refer to Section 4.12, Transportation for further discussion.
	Policy 2.63	Large development shall be encouraged to incorporate transit passenger facilities, bicycle racks or lockers, shower facilities, as well as on site services (eating, mail, banking, etc.) as ways to encourage alternative modes for commute trips.	Consistent: The proposed project would install transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. Employee lockers and shower facilities would be installed in appropriate uses (office, hotel, water park, etc.). The proposed project would include onsite services such as restaurants and banking that would be available to project employees.

Element Section	Goal/Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
Noise	Goal 1	To protect the peace, health, safety, and welfare of Selma residents from adverse effects of any such noise source under any condition.	Consistent: This EIR evaluates potential noise impacts and identifies feasible measures to reduce noise levels at surrounding receptors. This is consistent with the goal of protecting the peace, health, safety, and welfare of Selma residents. Refer to Section 4.10, Noise for further discussion.
	Goal 2	To prohibit unnecessary, excessive and offensive noises from all sources subject to local police power.	Consistent: This EIR evaluates potential noise impacts (including from unnecessary, excessive and offensive noise sources) and identifies feasible measures to reduce noise levels at surrounding receptors. Refer to Section 4.10, Noise for further discussion.
	Goal 3	To improve the living, working, and recreational environment through the reduction and control of noise nuisances.	Consistent: This EIR evaluates potential noise impacts and identifies feasible measures to reduce noise levels at surrounding receptors. This is consistent with the goal of improving the living, working, and recreational environment through the reduction and control of noise nuisance. Refer to Section 4.10, Noise for further discussion.
	Policy 3.3	The City shall utilize the noise/land use compatibility standards in Figure 3-2 as a guide for future planning and development decisions.	Consistent: The noise/land use compatibility standards in Figure 3-2 were used as the basis for assessing noise impacts. Refer to Section 4.10, Noise for further discussion.
	Policy 3.4	Areas within Selma shall be recognized as noise impacted if exposed to existing or projected future noise levels at the exterior of buildings in excess of 65 dB L_{dn} (or CNEL).	Consistent: Portions of the project site (i.e., the areas adjacent to SR-99) are currently exposed to noise levels in excess of 65 dB L_{dn} (or CNEL). Thus, these areas are eligible to be recognized as noise-impacted. Refer to Section 4.10, Noise for further discussion.
	Policy 3.6	The City shall enforce applicable State Noise Insulation Standards (California Administrative Code, Title 24) and Uniform Building Code (UBC) noise requirements.	Consistent: All buildings will be constructed in accordance with the latest adopted edition of the California Building Standards Code, including those

Element Section	Goal/Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
			requirements pertaining to noise insulation.
	Policy 3.7	New industrial, commercial or other noise generating land uses (including roadways, railroads, and airports) shall be discouraged if resulting noise levels will exceed 65 dB L_{dn} (or CNEL) at the boundary areas of planned or zoned noise sensitive land uses unless effective mitigation is incorporated into the design of the new noise producing land use.	Consistent: This EIR identifies feasible measures to reduce noise levels at adjoining noise sensitive land uses in accordance with the policy. Refer to Section 4.10, Noise for further discussion.
	Policy 3.8	The City shall review all relevant development plans, programs and proposals to ensure their conformance with the policy framework outlined in this Noise Element.	Consistent: This EIR provides a consistency analysis with the Noise Element. Additionally, relevant Noise Elements goals and policies are noted in Section 4.10, Noise.
	Policy 3.9	The preferred method of noise control used is thoughtful site design. Secondarily, noise control should be achieved through the use of artificial noise barriers. Site and building design guidelines may include: a. Noise sensitive land uses should not front onto the primary noise source. Where this is not possible, the narrow portion of the building should face the primary noise source, and the interior layout should locate the most sensitive areas away from the noise source by placing garages, storage facilities, carports or other such areas nearest the noise source. b. Site design should permit noise to pass around or through a development. This can be achieved by placing the narrow or convex portion of the structure toward the primary noise source. c. Commercial and industrial structures shall be designed so that any noise in excess of 65dB L _{dn} (or CNEL) generated from the interior of the building is focused away from noise sensitive land uses. d. Two story residential construction should be avoided, where possible, immediately adjacent to arterials or	Consistent: The proposed project employs site design techniques that serve to reduce noise exposure, including (1) orienting buildings adjacent to high-traffic roadway facilities such as SR-99, Golden State Boulevard, and E. Mountain View Avenue, and (2) employing the use of setbacks and landscaping as buffers with adjoining uses, such as the properties to the west of the South Area and Northwest Area. Refer to Section 4.10, Noise for further discussion.

Element Section	Goal/Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
		collectors unless adequate combinations of noise attenuation procedures are used. e. When feasible, residential cul- de-sacs should be perpendicular to adjacent arterials or collectors. f. Loading and unloading activities for commercial uses should be conducted in an enclosed loading dock, preferably with a positive seal between the loading dock and trucks.	
	Policy 3.10	Prior to the approval of a proposed development in a noise impacted area, or the development of an industrial, commercial or other noise generating land use in or near an area containing existing or planned noise sensitive land uses, an acoustical analysis may be required if all of the following findings are made: a. The existing or projected future noise exposure at the exterior of buildings which will contain noise sensitive uses or within proposed outdoor activity areas (patios, decks, backyards, pool areas, recreation areas, etc.) exceeds 65 dB L _{dn} (or CNEL). b. Interior residential noise levels resulting from offsite noise are estimated to exceed 45 dBA. c. Estimated or projected noise levels cannot be reduced to the noise exposure limitations specified in this Noise Element by the application of Standard Noise Reduction Methods. When noise studies are necessary they shall: a. Be the responsibility of the applicant. b. Be prepared by an individual or firm with demonstrable experience in the fields of environmental noise assessment and architectural acoustics. c. Include representative noise level measurements with sufficient sampling periods and locations to adequately describe and assess local conditions.	Consistent: An acoustical analysis was prepared as part of this EIR that meets all of the requirements outlined in this policy. Refer to Section 4.10, Noise for further discussion.

Element Section	Goal/Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
		d. Include estimated noise levels in terms of dB L_{dn} (or CNEL) for existing and projected future (10-30 year hence) conditions, with a comparison made to the adopted policies of the Noise Element. e. Include recommendations for appropriate mitigation measures to achieve compliance with the adopted policies and standards of the Noise Element. f. Include estimates of noise exposure after the prescribed mitigation measures have been implemented. If compliance with the adopted policies and standards of the Noise Element will not be achieved, a rationale for acceptance of the project must be provided. g. The acoustical analysis should be prepared as early in the project review or permitting process as possible so that noise mitigation measures may be an integral part of the project design rather than an afterthought.	
	Policy 3.11	The City shall seek to reduce impacts from ground borne vibrations associated with rail operations by requiring that habitable buildings are sited at least 100-feet from the centerline of the tracks, whenever feasible.	Consistent: The Northeast Area is approximately 200 feet from the Union Pacific Railroad; therefore, all habitable structures within this area would be more than 100 feet from the centerline of the tracks.
Safety	Goal 1	To prevent loss of life and serious injury, resulting from natural or man-induced hazards, to the residents of Selma.	Consistent: This EIR assesses project impacts associated with natural or man-induced hazards such as seismic hazards, flooding, and fires and identifies mitigation measures as appropriate to reduce impacts.
	Goal 2	To prevent serious structural damage to critical facilities and structures where large numbers of people are expected to congregate at one time.	Consistent: This EIR evaluates potential seismic hazards and sets forth mitigation to ensure that structures adhere to the latest adopted seismic safety building standards. This is consistent with the goal of preventing serious structural damage to critical facilities and structures. Refer to Section 4.6, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity for further discussion.

Element Section	Goal/Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
	Policy 4.8	Primary and secondary hazards from seismic activity should be evaluated in all environmental assessment and reporting processes.	Consistent: This EIR evaluates potential seismic hazards and sets forth mitigation to ensure that structures adhere to the latest adopted seismic safety building standards. Refer to Section 4.6, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity for further discussion.
	Policy 4.11	The City shall continue to adopt current issues of the Uniform Building Code and implement the seismic design standards provided by the Code.	Consistent: This EIR sets forth mitigation to ensure that structures adhere to the latest adopted seismic safety building standards. Refer to Section 4.6, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity for further discussion.
	Policy 4.12	Seismic safety information should be made available to the general public. School districts and agencies related to aged, handicapped and seismically susceptible industries should be encouraged to develop education programs for seismic awareness.	Consistent: This EIR provides information potential seismic hazards in the Selma area, which will be available for public review.
	Policy 4.15	Continue to enforce the Uniform Building Code in all matters related to soil preparation and foundation requirements.	Consistent: This EIR sets forth mitigation to ensure soil engineering practices and foundations adhere to the latest adopted seismic safety building standards. Refer to Section 4.6, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity for further discussion.
	Policy 4.18	The City shall continue to implement and administer the Master Plan for Storm Drainage as a means of offsetting increased storm water runoff from urbanization.	Consistent: This EIR includes a Draft Storm Drainage Master Plan (Appendix H), which identifies necessary storm drainage infrastructure to serve the project. It is anticipated that the City's Storm Drainage Master Plan would be amended to include the infrastructure identified in the project master plan. Refer to Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality for further discussion.
	Policy 4.20	The City shall encourage new development to avoid floodplains or require developers to mitigate and protect against flood impacts if development is to be located in such areas.	Consistent: The proposed project is not located within a 100-year floodplain.
	Policy 4.23	The City shall consider the impacts of potential transportation hazards	Consistent: This EIR evaluates potential impacts associated with

Element Section	Goal/Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
		upon adjacent land uses when considering proposals for new or changed urban uses.	transportation hazards, including railroad grade crossing safety, emergency evacuation, and design features that may create potential safety issues. Refer to Section 4.12, Transportation for further discussion.
	Policy 4.29	The City shall maintain an efficient fire department operation and strive to keep the staffing and equipment levels in line with the growth of the City.	Consistent: The Selma Fire Department was consulted during the preparation of this EIR and identified necessary facilities that would need to be provided in order to maintain acceptable levels of service. These recommendations are reflected as mitigation measures in the EIR. Refer to Section 4.11, Public Services and Utilities for further discussion.
	Policy 4.31	The City will require installation, maintenance and inspection of automatic fire detection and suppression devices in structures as required by City Code.	Consistent: The proposed project will be designed and constructed in accordance with the fire safety standards (including those that pertain to detection and suppression devices) set forth in the latest adopted edition of the California Fire Code.
	Policy 4.33	New development in the City of Selma shall conform to existing fire codes, including the provision of adequate ingress and egress for fire response vehicles.	Consistent: The proposed project will be designed and constructed in accordance with the emergency vehicle access standards set forth in the latest adopted edition of the California Fire Code.
	Policy 4.34	The City shall continue to monitor and coordinate the water supply system with California Water for fire protection purposes to include the water supply for both peak load and emergency use. Areas of substandard water supply should be identified, and system improvements completed prior to and in conjunction with new development in the area.	Consistent: California Water Service Company prepared a Water Supply Assessment that indicated that adequate water supplies would be available to serve the proposed project. This includes water supply for both peak load and emergency use. Refer to Section 4.11, Public Services and Utilities for further discussion.
	Policy 4.40	To aid in the identification and mapping of abandoned waste disposal sites, as necessary, and in the survey of the kinds, amounts, locations, etc. of hazardous wastes.	Consistent: This EIR evaluates potential hazards associated with abandoned waste disposal sites, including the Selma Pressure Treatment Site. Mitigation is

Element Section	Goal/Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
			proposed as appropriate to ensure that health and human safety are not exposed to unacceptable risks. Refer to Section 4.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials for further discussion.
Open Space, Conservation, and Recreation	Goal 1	Protect the environment.	Consistent: This EIR evaluates the environmental impact of the proposed project, with the objective of avoiding or minimizing the project's significant environmental effects. This is consistent with the goal of protecting the environment.
	Goal 3	Conserve prime agricultural land.	Consistent: To mitigate the loss of Important Farmland, mitigation is proposed requiring the permanent preservation of Important Farmland elsewhere in Fresno County at no less than a 1:1 ratio. Additionally, the proposed project would be phased over a 12-year period, allowing agricultural use to remain in operation until economic conditions warrant the conversion of farmland to non- agricultural use. These characteristics are consistent with the goal of conserving prime agricultural land. Refer to Section 3.2, Agricultural Resources for further discussion.
	Goal 4	Preserve groundwater quality and encourage reduction of overdraft conditions.	Consistent: The proposed project would result in a net decrease in groundwater consumption relative to existing agricultural irrigation. As such, it would contribute to reducing groundwater overdraft. Additionally, mitigation measures are proposed to protect groundwater quality. Refer to Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality for further discussion.
	Goal 6	Protect any rare or endangered plant and animal species, found in the Selma area.	Consistent: This EIR assesses project impacts on biological resources, including special- status species. Mitigation is proposed to reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. Refer to Section 4.4, Biological Resources for further discussion.

Element Section	Goal/Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
	Goal 7	Identify and protect unique cultural and historical features of the community.	Consistent: This EIR assesses project impacts on cultural resources, including historic resources. Mitigation is proposed to reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. Refer to Section 4.5, Cultural Resources for further discussion.
	Goal 8	Limit potential threats to human health and property, which may result from natural environmental hazards.	Consistent: This EIR assesses project impacts associated with issues such as seismic hazards, flooding, fires, and other natural hazards and identifies mitigation measures as appropriate to reduce impacts.
	Policy 5.2	Encourage all construction wastes generated from new construction and demolition to be recycled.	Consistent: This EIR requires construction and demolition debris recycling as a mitigation measure. Refer to Section 3.11, Public Services and Utilities for further discussion.
	Policy 5.6	Continue to implement "user- friendly" recycling and composting programs in compliance with State mandates.	Consistent: This EIR requires the installation of onside recycling collection facilities. Such facilities are intended to make recycling convenient, consistent with the objective of implementing user-friendly recycling programs. Refer to Section 4.11, Public Services and Utilities for further discussion.
	Policy 5.8	Prime and uniquely productive agricultural land should be conserved through orderly expansion of the City.	Consistent: The proposed project would be phased over a 12-year period, allowing agricultural use to remain in operation until economic conditions warrant the conversion of farmland to non- agricultural use. These characteristics are consistent with the objective of conserving agricultural land through orderly expansion of the City. Refer to Section 3.2, Agricultural Resources for further discussion.
	Policy 5.9	To protect human health and safety from potential impacts due to agricultural spraying, dust, and traffic congestion, the City will encourage lower density development adjacent to land	Consistent: The South Area would abut areas to the south and west that are outside the Selma Planning Area and, therefore, contemplated for long-term agricultural uses. These areas

Element Section	Goal/Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
		planned for long-term agricultural uses.	would contain office, retail, auto mall, and waterpark uses, which are non-residential in nature and would be compatible with agricultural operations.
	Policy 5.10	Agricultural lands which currently produce, or have the potential to produce, specialty crops for which the area is uniquely suited, should be protected from encroachment by urban uses.	Consistent: The project site and surrounding agricultural land uses are primarily planted as vineyards and grow raisin grapes, a local specialty crop. The proposed project would be phased over a 12-year period, allowing agricultural use to remain in operation until economic conditions warrant the conversion of farmland to non- agricultural use. These characteristics are consistent with the objective of protecting agricultural lands from encroachment.
	Policy 5.12	Work with regional partners/organizations to develop an agricultural land conservancy program. Encourage the application of new agricultural land preservation and conservancy programs outside of the City's SOI.	Consistent: This EIR requires the project applicant to mitigate for the loss of Important Farmland through the preservation of farmland elsewhere in Fresno County (outside the City of Selma Planning Area) at no less than a 1:1 ratio. Refer to Section 3.2, Agricultural Resources for further discussion.
	Policy 5.13	Require correction of local storm water ponding conditions prior to development in such areas, either through off-site improvements provided by land developers, or through community storm drain facility capital improvement projects.	Consistent: The proposed project would install storm drainage infrastructure, including a 20-acre stormwater basin. These facilities would provide municipal-level storm drainage and would alleviate existing ponding conditions.
	Policy 5.18	The City shall endeavor to mitigate, to the extent feasible, activities which will exacerbate groundwater overdraft.	Consistent: The proposed project would result in a net decrease in groundwater consumption relative to existing agricultural irrigation. As such, it would contribute to reducing groundwater overdraft. Refer to Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality for further discussion.

Element Section	Goal/Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
	Goal [9]	To protect the health and welfare of Selma residents by promoting development that is compatible with air quality standards.	Consistent: This EIR assesses the proposed project air emissions and requires mitigation measures as necessary to reduce emissions in accordance with San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District guidance. This is consistent with the goal of protecting the health and welfare of Selma residents by promoting development that is compatible with air quality standards. Refer to Section 4.3, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases for further discussion.
	Policy 5.21	 Develop strategies to minimize the number and length of vehicle trips, which may include: Promoting commercial/industrial project proponent sponsorship of van pools or club buses; Encouraging commercial/industrial project day care and employee services at the employment site; Encouraging the provision of transit, especially for employment-intensive uses of 200 or more employees; and Providing expansion and improvement of public transportation services and facilities. 	 Consistent: The proposed project would promote reduction in trip length via the following features: Provision of transit facilities with amenities such as turnouts, shelters, and lighting Provision of bicycle storage facilities and on-street bicycle lanes Provision of sidewalks and an internal pedestrian circulation system Additionally, employers may provide vanpool and carpool programs. Refer to Section 4.12, Transportation for further discussion.
	Policy 5.22	 Encourage transportation alternatives to motor vehicles by developing infrastructure amenable to such alternatives by doing the following where feasible: Consider right-of-way requirements for bike usage in the planning of new arterial and collector streets and in street improvement projects; Require that new development be designed to promote pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation; and Provide safe and secure bicycle parking facilities at major activity centers, such as public facilities, employment sites, and shopping and office centers. 	Consistent: The proposed project would install transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. Examples include transit stops with amenities such as turnouts, shelters, and lighting; sidewalks and an internal pedestrian circulation system; bicycle storage facilities; and, where appropriate, on-street bicycle lanes. Refer to Section 4.12, Transportation for further discussion.

Element Section	Goal/Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
	Policy 5.23	 Encourage land use development to be located and designed to conserve air quality and minimize direct and indirect emissions of air contaminants by doing the following where feasible: Locate air pollution point sources, such as manufacturing and extracting facilities in areas designated for industrial development and separated from residential areas and sensitive receptors (e.g., homes, schools, and hospitals); establish buffer zones (e.g., setbacks, landscaping) within residential and other sensitive receptor uses to separate those uses from highways, arterials, hazardous material locations and other sources of air pollution or odor; Consider the jobs/housing/balance relationship (i.e., the proximity of industrial and commercial uses to major residential areas) when making land use decisions; Provide for mixed-use development through land use and zoning to reduce the length and frequency of vehicle trips; Accommodate a portion of the projected population and economic growth of the City in areas having the potential for revitalization; Locate public facilities (libraries, parks, schools, community centers, etc.) with consideration of transit and other transportation opportunities; Encourage small neighborhoods schools; minimize traffic, noise, and lighting impacts; encourage and accommodate pedestrian and bicycle access; and, are occupied by commercial uses that have a 	 Consistent: The proposed project achieves consistency with this policy in the following ways: The proposed project would not have any significant point sources of air pollution. The proposed project would create an estimated 6,809 jobs over the life of the project, which would reduce the local jobs-housing imbalance. The Northwest Area would develop mixed-uses, including 250 dwelling units above ground floor retail. This area would also feature lifestyle retail, which consists of smaller, neighborhood oriented uses. The proposed project would be accessible to public transit, bicycles, and pedestrians. The proposed project would be contiguous to existing development within the Selma city limits.

Element Section	Goal/Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
		 neighborhood-scale market area rather than a community-wide market area; and Encourage a development pattern that is contiguous with existing developed areas of the City. 	
Public Services and Facilities	Goal 2	Reduce the threat to persons and property resulting from natural and manmade hazards including fire, crime and flooding.	Consistent: This EIR addresses impacts associated with natural and man-made hazards including fire, crime, and flooding, and identified mitigation measures as necessary to reduce impacts. As such, this is consistent with the goal of reducing the threat to persons and property resulting from natural and man-made hazards.
	Goal 3	Provide a safe and sanitary physical environment.	Consistent: The proposed project would be served with municipal services, including potable water, sewer, and storm drainage. This is consistent with the goal of providing a safe and sanitary physical environment.
	Goal 4	Coordinate required improvements of the sewer and storm drainage systems.	Consistent: The project applicant would bear the full cost and install necessary sewer and storm drainage systems. This is consistent with the goal of coordinating required improvements of these utility systems. Refer to Section 4.11, Public Services and Utilities for further discussion.
	Policy 6.2	Require the development and extension of infrastructure to proposed developments according to adopted elements and master plans. Projects that are not contiguous to existing urban development shall be required to assess the cumulative impact of all noncontiguous development.	Consistent: The proposed project would extend water, sewer, and storm drainage infrastructure as contemplated by each master plan. In certain cases such as storm drainage, the relevant master plan would be amended to reflect the infrastructure plans of the project. Refer to Section 4.11, Public Services and Utilities for further discussion.
	Policy 6.4	In order to address sewer constraints, new developments shall demonstrate that adequate sewer capacity exists prior to	Consistent: Selma-Kingsburg- Fowler County Sanitation District (SKF CSD) indicated that it would issue a will serve

Element Section	Goal/Policy No.	Goal/Policy Text	Consistency Determination
		development or that mitigation measures will ensure that sewer capacity will be created as part of the project. Mitigation measures may include installation of necessary facilities or other methods acceptable to the City.	letter to the proposed project, signifying that it anticipates adequate capacity will be available to serve the project. The project applicant will install all necessary sewer infrastructure to the SKF CSD system. Refer to Section 4.11, Public Services and Utilities for further discussion.
	Policy 6.8	Adequate facilities shall be provided for law enforcement and fire suppression and prevention programs.	Consistent: Both the Selma Fire Department and Police Department were consulted during the preparation of this EIR and identified necessary facilities that would need to be provided in order to maintain acceptable levels of service. These recommendations are reflected as mitigation measures in the EIR. Refer to Section 4.11, Public Services and Utilities for further discussion.
	Policy 6.11	All new developments shall be required to have community sewer, water and storm water systems.	Consistent: The proposed project would be served with municipal services, including potable water, sewer, and storm drainage. Refer to Section 4.11, Public Services and Utilities for further discussion.

Source: City of Selma, 2011; Michael Brandman Associates, 2011.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is necessary.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.
Selma City Code Consistency

Impact LU-2:	The proposed project will not conflict with the applicable ordinances of the Selma
	City Code.

Impact Analysis

The City of Selma Zoning Code contains the local ordinances most applicable to the proposed project. Below is an evaluation of the proposed project consistency with the allowable uses within the project's sites zoning designations, as well as consistency with the development standards and conditions of zoning.

Allowed, Permitted, and Conditional Uses

The proposed project is seeking to pre-zone the entire site as CR – Regional Commercial. The C-R zone district allows all uses permitted in the Central Commercial (C-2) zone, and the Neighborhood Commercial (C-1) zone. The project proposes a variety of retail uses including anchors, majors, shops, restaurants, auto mall, and lifestyle retail. No specific tenants have been proposed. The C-R zone permits a wide variety of retail uses that are expected as tenants in the proposed site plan. The C-1 zone includes office as a permitted land use; therefore, the office components of the project are permitted uses in the C-R zone. The residential mixed use component is permitted under the C-1 zone that allows uses permitted by the R-3 zone.

The following commercial uses that may end uses of the proposed project are permitted in the C-R zone district:

- Auto supply store
- Bank, finance or lending agency
- Barbershop or beauty parlor
- Building material sales
- Department store
- Drive-in restaurant
- Drugstore
- Dry cleaner
- Dry goods, apparel, notions, or variety store
- Electrical appliance store and incidental repairs
- Furniture or household appliance store

- Gymnasium
- Hotel
- Jewelry store
- Machine sales and rentals
- Motel
- Motorcycles sales and service
- New and used auto sales with related services
- Office, business or professional
- Restaurant or cafe
- Supermarket

The following commercial activities may be end uses of the proposed project that are subject to a conditional use permit:

- Alcohol beverage sales or service
- Auto service stations
- Lounges, bars, or nightclubs

Most of the proposed project's end uses would be classified as permitted uses. For end uses that involve alcohol sales or service, service stations (fuel), or lounge, bars, or nightclub activities, Conditional Use Permits would be required. The project applicant is seeking approval of Conditional Use Permits for such uses and, therefore, would be in compliance with the Zoning Code.

Development Standards

The Regional Commercial (C-R) zoning district establishes a maximum building height of 75 feet and the maximum building coverage limit at 60 percent. No building plans have been submitted for structures that would exceed the 70 foot height limitation. The proposed project is proposed 3,449,203 square feet of development on 267 net acres, which equates to 29.7 percent lot coverage. As such, the proposed project will be consistent with the development standards of the C-R zoning district.

The C-R zone includes front yard and side yard setbacks of 15 feet and rear yard setbacks of 10 feet when the project abuts an alley. The project will comply with these requirements and is consistent with the C-R development standards.

The C-R zone includes the requirement to provide a landscaping plan and to plant parking lot trees that will achieve 50 percent shading within 5 years. Detailed site plans with setbacks and landscaping have not been submitted for the project. Detailed site plans are required prior to construction and will comply with these conditions.

The Zone Code requires 1 parking space per 200 square feet of retail space not otherwise specified. Office space requires 1 parking space per 400 square feet. Parking for other uses is dependent on the specific use. The site plan provides 14,016 parking spaces to serve the project. Final parking requirements will be determined during review of the detailed site plans. Adequate land area is available to ensure that parking will be sufficient to achieve consistency with City standards.

In summary, the proposed project would comply with all applicable provisions of the Regional Commercial (C-R) zoning district development standards. Impacts would be less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures No mitigation is necessary.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

LAFCO Policies Consistency

Impact LU-3:	The proposed project would not conflict with any of the applicable policies
	established by the Fresno County Local Agency Formation Commission.

Impact Analysis

The proposed project would require the following discretionary approvals from Fresno LAFCO:

- Annexation of the Selma Crossings and Non-Selma Crossings parcels into Selma city limits and concurrent adjustment of Sphere of Influence to be coterminous with expanded city limits where necessary.
- Annexation of Selma Crossings and Non-Selma Crossings parcels into Selma-Kingsburg-Fowler Community Sanitation District (SKF CSD) and concurrent adjustment of Sphere of Influence to be coterminous with expanded service area where necessary.

The first set of approvals are associated with expansion of the Selma city limits. Pursuant to state law and Fresno LAFCO procedures, a city's corporate limits must be at a minimum co-terminus with its Sphere of Influence. The applicant is seeking to expand the Sphere of Influence in a manner that renders it co-terminus with the city limits contemplated by the annexation.

The second set of approval consist of expanding the service area of SKF CSD, the entity that would provide wastewater collection and treatment to the proposed Selma Crossings Project as well as the neighboring West and East annexation areas. This agency is classified as a Responsible Agency under CEQA.

As such, this EIR will address project consistency with the criteria set forth in California Government Code Section 56668 (also known as the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000), which establishes factors LAFCO agencies must use in reviewing adjustments to jurisdictional boundaries. Table 4.9-6 provides a consistency analysis with California Government Code Section 56668 for both the City of Selma annexation and the SKF CSD annexation requests.

 Table 4.9-6: California Government Code Section 56668 (Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000) Consistency Analysis

	Consistency Determination	
No. Factor City of Selma	SKF CSD	
1Population and population density; land area and land use; per capita assessed valuation; topography, natural boundaries, and drainage basins; proximity to other populated areas; the likelihood of significant growth in the area, and in adjacentConsistent: The Selma Crossings Project site and the East and West Annexation areas are contiguous to the Selma Crossings Project site contains agricultural and rural CSI residential uses, including 12	onsistent: The Selma rossings Project site and the East and West nnexation areas are portiguous to areas urrently served by SKF SD. See left for further ascussion.	

		Consistency Determination	
No.	Factor	City of Selma	SKF CSD
	unincorporated areas, during the next 10 years.	West Annexation areas contain existing developed uses (gas stations, auto repair, etc.). The collective area is characterized by flat relief and is located in the same drainage basin. The 2035 City of Selma General Plan designates the Selma Crossings Project site and East and West areas "Regional Commercial" and "Public Facilities," signifying that future urban growth is contemplated in these areas.	
2	The need for organized community services; the present cost and adequacy of governmental services and controls in the area; probable future needs for those services and controls; probable effect of the proposed incorporation, formation, annexation, or exclusion and of alternative courses of action on the cost and adequacy of services and controls in the area and adjacent areas. "Services," as used in this subdivision, refers to governmental services whether or not the services are services which would be provided by local agencies subject to this division, and includes the public facilities necessary to provide those services.	Consistent: The Selma Crossings Project consists of approximately 3.5 million square feet of new urban uses on 287 net acres. Such uses require urban levels of public services, which currently are provided in limited form to the project vicinity. The project applicants will be obligated to pay the full cost of all infrastructure improvements necessary to serve the proposed project. Additionally, the applicant will be required to contribute fees for other services such as fire and police. Refer to Section 4.11, Public Services and Utilities for further discussion. Additionally, the concurrent annexation of the East and West Annexation areas would allow for efficient service delivery to the existing developed land uses within these areas.	Consistent: Sewer service is an essential service for urban development. The project applicant will bear the full cost of necessary improvements to facilitate the extension of sewer service to the proposed project.
3	The effect of the proposed action and of alternative actions, on adjacent areas, on mutual social and economic interests, and on the local governmental structure of the county.	Consistent: The proposed project would facilitate the development of higher and better uses within the project boundaries. This would be expected to yield economic benefits in form of new jobs, an expanded tax base, and greater economic activity.	Consistent: In terms of impacts on the local governmental structure of the County, the primary change is that project site would fall under the jurisdiction of SKF CSD. Most of the project site is currently within SKF CSD's Sphere of Influence; thus, it

		Consistency Determination	
	Factor	City of Selma	SKF CSD
		The proposed project would further social interests—albeit indirectly—largely as a result of the economic benefits. For example, the economic benefits (e.g., new jobs and tax revenues) may yield advancements in local health, safety, and welfare.	had been previously contemplated that this area would ultimately join district at a future, undetermined date. As such, this would not represent a significant impact on the local governmental structure of the County.
		In terms of impacts on the local governmental structure of the County, the primary change is that project site would fall under the jurisdiction of the City of Selma. Most of the project site is currently within the City's Sphere of Influence; thus, it had been previously contemplated that this area would ultimately join the City of Selma at a future, undetermined date. As such, this would not represent a significant impact on the local governmental structure of the County.	See left for further discussion.
The confor proposal an effects with commissio providing p efficient pa developme and prioriti Section 56 is reproduce 56377.	mity of both the ad its anticipated h both the adopted n policies on blanned, orderly, atterns of urban nt, and the policies ies set forth in 377. (Section 56377 eed below) In reviewing and approving or disapproving proposals which could reasonably be expected to induce, facilitate, or lead to the conversion of existing open-space lands to uses other than open-space uses, the commission shall consider all of the following policies and priorities: (a) Development or use of land for other	Consistent: The Selma Crossings Project site contains 185.60 acres of Prime Farmland, 23.23 acres of Farmland of Statewide Importance, and 70.38 acres of Farmland of Local Importance. Development of the proposed project would convert all of this farmland acreage to non- agricultural use. This conversion would be consistent with Section 56377 for the following reasons: 1) The proposed project would be phased over a 12-year period. This would allow for the logical and orderly development of urban uses within the project boundaries. As such, it would be expected that less economically viable agricultural land would be developed first and economically viable, prime agricultural land would be developed later	Consistent: See left
	The confor proposal an effects with commissio providing p efficient pa levelopme and prioriti Section 56 s reproduc 56377.	Factor Factor The conformity of both the proposal and its anticipated effects with both the adopted commission policies on providing planned, orderly, efficient patterns of urban levelopment, and the policies and priorities set forth in Section 56377. (Section 56377 seproduced below) 56377. In reviewing and approving or disapproving proposals which could reasonably be expected to induce, facilitate, or lead to the conversion of existing open-space lands to uses other than open-space uses, the commission shall consider all of the following policies and priorities: (a) Development or use of land for other than open-space uses and priorities.	Factor Consistency De City of Selma The proposed project would further social interests—albeit indirectly—largely as a result of the economic benefits. For example, the economic benefits (e.g., new jobs and tax revenues) may yield advancements in local health, safety, and welfare. In terms of impacts on the local governmental structure of the County, the primary change is that project site would fall under the jurisdiction of the City of Selma. Most of the project site is currently within the City's Sphere of Influence; thus, it had been previously contemplated that this area would ultimately join the City of Selma at a future, undetermined date. As such, this would not represent a significant impact on the local governmental structure of the County. The conformity of both the roposal and its anticipated diffects with both the adopted commission policies on providing planned, orderly, efficient patterns of urban levelopment, and the policies and priorities set forth in Section 56377. (Section 56377 is reproduced below) Consistent: The Selma Crossings Project site contains 185.60 acres of Prime Farmland of Statewide Importance, and 70.38 acres of Farmland of Local Importance. Development of the proposed project would convert all of this farmland acreage to non- agricultural use. This conversion would be consistent with Section 56377 for the following pen-space uses, the commission shall consider all of the following policies and priorities: (a) Development or use of land for other han open-space uses, the commission shall consider all of the following policies and priorities: (a) Development or use of land for other han open-space uses, the commission shall consider all of the following policies and priorities: (a) Development or use of land for other han open-space uses, the commission shall consider all of the following policies and priorities: (b)

			Consistency Determination	
No.		Factor	City of Selma	SKF CSD
		shall be guided away from existing prime agricultural lands in open-space use toward areas containing nonprime agricultural lands, unless that action would not promote the planned, orderly, efficient development of an area. (b) Development of existing vacant or nonprime agricultural lands for urban uses within the existing jurisdiction of a local agency or within the sphere of influence of a local agency should be encouraged before any proposal is approved which would allow for or lead to the development of existing open-space lands for non-open- space uses which are outside of the existing jurisdiction of the local agency or outside of the existing sphere of influence of the local agency.	urban uses, including existing industrial and commercial development along Golden State Boulevard and E. Mountain View Avenue. These existing urban uses diminish the agricultural viability of adjoining lands within the project site. 3) Most of the project site is within the City of Selma Sphere of Influence.	
5	The effect maintainin economic agricultura Section 56 is reproduc 56016.	of the proposal on ag the physical and integrity of al lands, as defined by i016. (Section 56016 ced below) "Agricultural lands" means land currently used for the purpose of producing an agricultural	Consistent: The Selma Crossings Project site contains 185.60 acres of Prime Farmland, 23.23 acres of Farmland of Statewide Importance, and 70.38 acres of Farmland of Local Importance. The proposed project would be phased over a 12-year period, which would allow for the logical and orderly development of urban uses	Consistent: See left

		Consistency Determination		
No.	Factor	City of Selma	SKF CSD	
	commodity for commercial purposes, land left fallow under a crop rotational program, or land enrolled in an agricultural subsidy or set-aside program.	As such, these phasing provisions would allow for economically viable agricultural land within the project site to remain in production up until the point that higher and better uses are pursued. This is consistent with the objective of maintaining the physical and economic integrity of agricultural lands.		
6	The definiteness and certainty of the boundaries of the territory, the nonconformance of proposed boundaries with lines of assessment or ownership, the creation of islands or corridors of unincorporated territory, and other similar matters affecting the proposed boundaries.	Consistent: Annexation of the Selma Crossings project site would generally result in the logical and orderly expansion of the Selma City limits, as the boundaries would follow identifiable features such as Golden State Boulevard, E. Mountain View Avenue, SR- 99, and S. Dockery Avenue. In two places, annexation of only the Selma Crossings project site would create "unincorporated islands" or exclude parcels that would create unusual jurisdictional boundaries. As such, annexation of the West and East areas is being considered in conjunction with the annexation of the Selma Crossing Project to promote logical and orderly jurisdictional boundaries.	Consistent: The areas proposed for annexation into SKF CSD include all areas proposed for annexation into the City of Selma. See left for further discussion.	
7	Consistency with city or county general and specific plans.	Consistent: The proposed project is consistent with the applicable provisions of the 1997 and 2035 City of Selma General Plans.	Consistent: The 1997 and 2035 City of Selma General Plans contemplate all developed properties within the Selma city limits being served with sewer service.	
8	The sphere of influence of any local agency which may be applicable to the proposal being reviewed.	Consistent: Most of the project site is within the Selma Sphere of Influence. Concurrent with the annexation, the Selma Sphere of Influence would be expanded outward to be coterminous with the city limits.	Consistent: Most of the project site is within the SKF CSD Sphere of Influence. Concurrent with the annexation, the SKF CSD Sphere of Influence would be expanded outward to be coterminous with the SKF CSD service area.	

			Consistency Determination	
No.		Factor	City of Selma	SKF CSD
9	The comm local agen agency.	nents of any affected cy or other public	Consistent: The Draft EIR and proposal will be circulated to local and affected agencies. Responses to comments will be provided in the Final EIR.	Consistent: See left.
10	The ability or receivin the service subject of area, inclu of revenue following boundary	y of the newly formed ng entity to provide es which are the the application to the ding the sufficiency es for those services the proposed change.	Consistent: The proposed project will be served with municipal services provided by the City of Selma for fire/emergency medical services, police, and storm drainage. The project applicant will provide the full cost of all infrastructure necessary to serve the proposed project. Refer to Section 4.11, Public Services and Utilities for further discussion.	Consistent: The proposed project will be served with sewer service provided by SKF CSD. The project applicant will provide the full cost of all infrastructure necessary to serve the proposed project. Refer to Section 4.11, Public Services and Utilities for further discussion.
11	Timely av supplies ad needs as s 65352.5. reproduce	ailability of water dequate for projected pecified in Section (Section 65352.5 is d below)	Consistent: California Water Service Company prepared a Water Supply Assessment (Appendix J) that indicates that adequate long-term water	Not Applicable: SKF CSD would only be providing sewer service to the proposed project.
	65352.5.	 (a) The Legislature finds and declares that it is vital that there be close coordination and consultation between California's water supply agencies and California's land use approval agencies to ensure that proper water supply planning occurs in order to accommodate projects that will result in increased demands on water supplies. (b) It is, therefore, the intent of the Legislature to provide a standardized process for determining the adequacy of existing and planned future 	the proposed project. Refer to Section 4.11, Public Services and Utilities for further discussion.	

		Consistency De	etermination
No.	Factor	City of Selma	SKF CSD
	water supplies to		
	meet existing and		
	planned future		
	demands on these		
	water supplies		
	(c) Upon receiving.		
	pursuant to Section		
	65352. notification		
	of a city's or a		
	county's proposed		
	action to adopt or		
	substantially amend		
	a general plan, a		
	public water system,		
	as defined in		
	Section 116275 of		
	the Health and		
	Safety Code, with		
	3,000 or more		
	service connections,		
	shall provide the		
	with the following		
	information as is		
	appropriate and		
	relevant:		
	(1) The current		
	version of its urban		
	water management		
	plan, adopted		
	pursuant to Part 2.6		
	(commencing with		
	Section 10610) of		
	Division 6 of the		
	Water Code.		
	(2) The current		
	version of its capital		
	improvement		
	program or plan, as		
	reported pursuant to		
	the Water Code		
	(3) A description of		
	(5) A description of		
	sources of the total		
	water supply		
	currently available		
	to the water supplier		
	by water right or		
	contract, taking into		
	account historical		
	data concerning		
	wet, normal, and		

		Consistency Determination		
No.	Factor	City of Selma	SKF CSD	
	dry runoff years.			
	(4) A description of			
	the quantity of			
	surface water that			
	was purveyed by the			
	water supplier in			
	each of the previous			
	five years.			
	(5) A description of			
	the quantity of			
	groundwater that			
	was purveyed by the			
	water supplier in			
	each of the previous			
	five years.			
	(6) A description of			
	all proposed			
	additional sources			
	of water supplies for			
	including the			
	astimated dates by			
	which these			
	additional sources			
	should be available			
	and the quantities of			
	additional water			
	supplies that are			
	being proposed.			
	(7) A description of			
	the total number of			
	customers currently			
	served by the water			
	supplier, as			
	identified by the			
	following categories			
	and by the amount			
	of water served to			
	each category:			
	(A) Agricultural			
	users.			
	(B) Commercial			
	(C) Industrial usors			
	(D) Residential			
	(8) Quantification of			
	the expected			
	reduction in total			
	water demand.			
	identified by each			
	customer category			
	set forth in			

		Consistency De	etermination
No.	Factor	City of Selma	SKF CSD
	 paragraph (7), associated with future implementation of water use reduction measures identified in the water supplier's urban water management plan. (9) Any additional information that is relevant to determining the adequacy of existing and planned future water supplies to meet existing and planned future demands on these water supplies. 		
12	The extent to which the proposal will affect a city or cities and the county in achieving their respective fair shares of the regional housing needs as determined by the appropriate council of governments consistent with Article 10.6 (commencing with Section 65580) of Chapter 3 of Division 1 of Title 7. (Section 65580 is reproduced below)	Consistent: The 2035 City of Selma General Plan contemplates "Regional Commercial" and "Public Facilities" land uses within the project boundaries. As such, the General Plan Housing Element does not identify this area as a potential housing site for affordable housing. Therefore, the proposed project would not have any effect on	Consistent: See left.
	 65580. The Legislature finds and declares as follows: (a) The availability of housing is of vital statewide importance, and the early attainment of decent housing and a suitable living environment for every Californian, including farmworkers, is a priority of the highest order. (b) The early attainment of this goal requires the cooperative 	the City's ability to meet its regional housing requirements.	

		Consistency De	etermination
No.	Factor	City of Selma	SKF CSD
	participation of		
	government and the		
	private sector in an		
	effort to expand		
	nousing		
	accommodate the		
	housing needs of		
	Californians of all		
	economic levels.		
	(c) The provision of		
	housing affordable		
	to low- and		
	moderate-income		
	households requires		
	the cooperation of		
	all levels of		
	government.		
	(d) Local and state		
	governments have a		
	the powers vested in		
	them to facilitate the		
	improvement and		
	development of		
	housing to make		
	adequate provision		
	for the housing		
	needs of all		
	economic segments		
	of the community.		
	(e) The Legislature		
	carrying out this		
	responsibility, each		
	local government		
	also has the		
	responsibility to		
	consider economic,		
	environmental, and		
	fiscal factors and		
	community goals set		
	forth in the general		
	plan and to		
	local governments		
	and the state in		
	addressing regional		
	housing needs.		
		1	

		Consistency Determination	
No.	Factor	City of Selma	SKF CSD
13	Any information or comments from the landowner or owners, voters, or residents of the affected territory.	Consistent: The project applicant controls all parcels within the 288-gross-acre project boundaries. Property owners, voters, and residents of the project parcels will be noticed about the availability of the CEQA documents and public meetings. These individuals will have the opportunity to submit comments to both the City of Selma and Fresno LAFCo.	Consistent: See left.
14	Any information relating to existing land use designations.	Consistent: The Fresno County General Plan designates the project site and the West and East Annexation areas as Agriculture, Light Industrial, and Highway Commercial. The Fresno County Zoning Ordinance designates the project site and the West and East Annexation areas as AL20 – Agriculture Limited, AE20 – Agriculture Exclusive, RA – Residential Agriculture, CM – Commercial and Light Highway Commercial Manufacturing, C-6 – General Commercial, and CM – Commercial and Light Manufacturing. The 2035 City of General Plan designates the project site and the West and East Annexation areas as Regional Commercial and Public Facility.	Consistent: See left.
15	The extent to which the proposal will promote environmental justice. As used in this subdivision, "environmental justice" means the fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and incomes with respect to the location of public facilities and the provision of public services.	Consistent: Although the proposed project does not purport to alleviate any alleged environmental injustices, it would facilitate the logical and orderly development of the southern portion of the City Selma, including creating new economic opportunities and implementing improvements to infrastructure (e.g., water, sewer, storm drainage,	Consistent: See left.

		Consistency Determination	
No.	Factor	City of Selma	SKF CSD
		roadways, etc.). These characteristics are consistent with the objective of fair treatment of all people with respect to the location of public facilities and the provision of public services.	
Notes: SKF CSD Source: M) = Selma-Kingsburg-Fowler County Sa fichael Brandman Associates, 2011.	anitation District	

Table 4.9-7 provides a consistency analysis of the proposed annexation of the project site into the Selma city limits with Fresno LAFCO's Standards for Annexation. As shown in the table, the proposed annexation of the project site would be consistent with all applicable criteria. Impacts would be less than significant.

Criterion	Consistency Determination
The proposal must be consistent with the adopted sphere of influence of the city and not conflict with the goals and policies of the [Cortese-Knox- Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000].	Consistent: The previous table (Table 4.9-6) provides a consistency analysis with the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 and concluded that the proposed project is consistent with all applicable provisions.
The proposal must be consistent with city general and specific plans, including adopted goals and policies.	Consistent: The proposed project is consistent with all relevant provisions of the 1997 and 2035 City of Selma General Plans. Refer to Impact LU-1 for further discussion.
Pursuant to CEQA, the proposal must mitigate any significant adverse effect on continuing agricultural operations and adjacent properties, to the extent reasonable and consistent with the applicable general and specific plan.	Consistent: This EIR identifies feasible mitigation measures for impacts to agricultural resources. Refer to Section 4.2, Agricultural Resources for further discussion.
 A proposal for annexation is acceptable if one of the following conditions exist: There is existing substantial development, provided the City confines its area requested to that area needed to include the substantial development and create logical boundaries. Development exists that requires urban services which can be provided by the City. If no development exists, at least 50% of the area proposed for annexation has: Approved tentative subdivision map(s) (S.F. residential) Approved site plan (for other uses) 	Consistent: The proposed Selma Crossings project would meet Condition No. 3; the annexation of the West and East Areas would meet Condition No. 1.

Table 4.9-7: Fresno LAFCO Standards For Annexation Consistency Analysis

Criterion	Consistency Determination	
The proposal would not create islands. Boundaries must ultimately minimize creation of peninsulas and corridors, or other distortion of boundaries.	Consistent: Annexation of the Selma Crossings project site would generally result in the logical and orderly expansion of the Selma City limits, as the boundaries would follow identifiable features such as Golden State Boulevard, E. Mountain View Avenue, SR-99, and S. Dockery Avenue.	
	In two places, annexation of only the Selma Crossings project site would create unincorporated islands or exclude parcels that would create unusual jurisdictional boundaries. As such, annexation of the West and East areas is being considered in conjunction with the annexation of the Selma Crossing Project to promote logical and orderly jurisdictional boundaries.	
For any of the following circumstances, a proposal for annexation is presumed to comply with all standards for annexation:		
The request for annexation is by a city for annexation of its own publicly owned property for public use.	Not Applicable. The project site is privately controlled.	
The request for annexation is by a city in order to facilitate construction of public improvements or public facilities which otherwise could not be constructed.	Not Applicable. Although the proposed project would include public improvements, the principal land uses that would be annexed would be private.	
The request for annexation is to remove an unincorporated island or substantially surrounded area.	Consistent: The East and West Annexation Areas are proposed in conjunction with the Selma Crossings project in order to avoid the creation of potential unincorporated islands within the City of Selma.	
The request for annexation is for an industrial or regional commercial project for which a development application has been made and no significant adverse environmental impact will result that cannot be mitigated or overridden by a necessary public purpose. Condition(s) assuring the financing or completion of necessary development infrastructure before completion of annexation shall be made a part of the proposal.	Consistent: The Selma Crossings project consists of a regional commercial project. The applicant has an application on file with the City of Selma. This EIR identifies several significant unavoidable impacts and the City of Selma would be required to adopt a Statement of Overriding Conditions if it elects to approve the project. The Statement of Overriding Conditions would outline the project benefits that outweigh the significant environmental effects of the project.	
	identify specific infrastructure improvements that must be in place at certain times in order for the project to open for business.	

Table 4.9-7 (cont.): Fresno LAFCO Standards For Annexation Consistency Analysis

Table 4.9-7 (cont.): Fresno LAFCO Standards For Annexation Consistency Analysis

Criterion	Consistency Determination
The annexation is intended to mitigate or otherwise comply with standards/conditions required by another agency with respect to another development/annexation.	Consistent: The East and West Annexation Areas are proposed in conjunction with the Selma Crossings project in order to avoid the creation of potential unincorporated islands within the City of Selma, pursuant to policies in the 2035 City of Selma General Plan.
Source: Michael Brandman Associates, 2011.	

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is necessary.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

4.10 - Noise

4.10.1 - Introduction

This section describes the existing noise conditions and potential effects from project implementation on the site and its surrounding area. Descriptions and analysis in this section are based on information contained in the Environmental Noise Assessment prepared by Brown-Buntin and Associates, Inc. included in this EIR as Appendix I.

4.10.2 - Environmental Setting

Acoustical Terminology

The following acoustical terms are used in this EIR section.

Ambient Noise Level: The composite of noise from all sources near and far. In this context, the ambient noise level constitutes the normal or existing level of environmental noise at a given location.

Decibel (db): A unit for describing the amplitude of sound, equal to 20 times the logarithm to the base 10 of the ratio of the pressure of the sound measured to the reference pressure, which is 20 micropascals (20 micronewtons per square meter).

Equivalent Sound Level (L_{eq}): The sound level containing the same total energy as a time varying signal over a given sample period. L_{eq} is typically computed over 1-, 8-, and 24-hour sample periods.

Day/Night Average Sound Level (DNL or L_{dn}): The average equivalent sound level during a 24-hour day, obtained after addition of ten decibels to sound levels in the night after 10:00 p.m. and before 7:00 a.m.

Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL): The average equivalent sound level during a 24-hour day, obtained after addition of approximately five decibels to sound levels in the evening from 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. and ten decibels to sound levels in the night before 7:00 a.m. and after 10:00 p.m.

Maximum Noise Level (L_{max}): The maximum noise level recorded during a noise event.

 L_n : The sound level exceeded *n* percent of the time during a sample interval (L₉₀, L₅₀, L₁₀, etc.). For example, L₁₀ equals the level exceeded 10 percent of the time.

Nose Exposure Contours: Lines drawn about a noise source indicating constant levels of noise exposure. CNEL and DNL contours are frequently utilized to describe community exposure to noise.

Noise Level Reduction: The noise reduction between indoor and outdoor environments or between two rooms that is the numerical difference, in decibels, of the average sound pressure levels in those areas or rooms. A measurement of a noise level reduction combines the effect of the transmission loss performance of the structure plus the effect of acoustic absorption present in the receiving room.

Sound Exposure Level or Single Event Noise Exposure Level: The level of noise accumulated during a single noise event, such as an aircraft overflight, with reference to a duration of one second. More specifically, it is the time-integrated A-weighted squared sound pressure for a stated time interval or event, based on a reference pressure of 20 micropascals and a reference duration of one second.

Sound Level: The sound pressure level in decibels as measured on a sound level meter using the Aweighting filter network. The A-weighting filter de-emphasizes the very low- and very highfrequency components of the sound in a manner similar to the response of the human ear and gives good correlation with subjective reactions to noise.

Sound Transmission Class: The single-number rating of sound transmission loss for a construction element (window, door, etc.) over a frequency range where speech intelligibility largely occurs.

Existing Noise Levels

The predominant existing noise sources affecting the project site and surrounding area include vehicular traffic on State Route 99 (SR-99) and local roadways, rail operations on the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) and noise generated by agricultural and commercial/industrial activities.

Ambient Noise Survey

The locations of the ambient noise monitoring sites are noted on Exhibit 4.10-1. Site 1 was located in the southern portion of the site, approximately 225 feet from the center of S. Van Horn Avenue. Site 2 was located in the northeast portion of the site, approximately 575 feet east of the center of SR-99 and approximately 650 feet west of Golden State Boulevard. Exhibit 4.10-2 summarizes hourly ambient noise levels measured in terms of the energy average level (L_{eq}), maximum level (L_{max}) and L_{90} noise descriptors. The L_{90} describes the noise level exceeded 90 percent of the time during each hour, and is generally considered to represent the residual (or background) noise level in the absence of identifiable single noise events from traffic, trains, aircraft and other local noise sources.

Exhibit 4.10-2 shows that hourly background noise levels (L_{90}) at Site 1 ranged from 48 to 54 dBA. Hourly L_{eq} values ranged from approximately 52 to 58 dBA and hourly maximum noise levels ranged from approximately 62 to 86 dBA. The highest measured Lmax value was most likely caused by farm equipment operations in close proximity to the microphone. The measured DNL for the 24-hour noise measurement period was 60.9 dB. This is below the City's 65-dB DNL standard for development of new noise-sensitive land uses.

Hourly background noise levels (L₉₀) at Site 2 ranged from 53 to 63 dBA. Hourly L_{eq} values ranged from approximately 58-67 dBA and hourly maximum noise levels ranged from approximately 67 to 92 dBA. The cause of the highest hourly Lmax value at Site 2 is unknown. The measured DNL for the 24-hour noise measurement period was 69.5 dB. This is above the City's 65 dB DNL standard for development of new noise-sensitive land uses. Measured DNL values were higher at Site 2 than at Site 1 because it is closer to SR-99.

Noise



2,000

Feet

Exhibit 4.10-1 Noise Measurement Locations

Michael Brandman Associates 31130002 • 02/2012 | 4.10-1_noise.mxd

2,000

1,000

0

CITY OF SELMA • SELMA CROSSINGS PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT



Source: Brown-Buntin Associates, Inc.



Exhibit 4.10-2 Measured Hourly Noise Levels

31130002 • 02/2012 | 4.10-2_hourly_noise_levels.cdr

CITY OF SELMA • SELMA CROSSINGS PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Existing traffic noise levels within and near the project site were modeled using the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model4 and traffic data obtained from the Traffic Impact Study prepared for the project by Peters Engineering Group. The FHWA Model is an analytical method utilized by many state and local agencies, including Caltrans, for highway traffic noise prediction. The FHWA Model is based upon reference energy emission levels for automobiles, medium trucks (two axles) and heavily trucks (three or more axles), with consideration given to vehicles volume, speed, roadway configuration, distance to the receiver, and the acoustical characteristics of the site. The FHWA Model was developed to predict hourly L_{eq} values for free-flowing traffic conditions, and is generally considered to be accurate within ±1.5 dB. To predict DNL values, it is necessary to determine the hourly distribution of traffic for a typical day and adjust the traffic volume input data to yield an equivalent hourly traffic volume. The FHWA Model assumes a clear view of traffic with no shielding at the receiver location.

Table 4.10-1 summarizes existing traffic noise exposure, as defined by the annual average DNL, for various roadways within and near the project site at a reference distance of 75 feet from the center of the roadway. For traffic on SR-99 in the project area, the distance to the 65-dB DNL contour was calculated to be 957 feet from the center of the freeway. Traffic on SR-99 is the dominant source of noise within the project area.

Roadway	Segment	Day/Night Exposure Level (L _{dn}) at 75 feet from Centerline
	West of SR-99 Southbound Offramp	64.0
	East of SR-99 Southbound Offramp	65.1
Floral Avenue	West of Highland Avenue	62.2
1 Ioral 7 Venue	East of Highland Avenue	61.9
	West of SR-99 Northbound Offramp	62.3
	East of SR-99 Northbound Offramp	62.0
	North of Floral Avenue	62.4
	South of Floral Avenue	60.9
Highland Avenue	North of SR-99 Southbound Offramp	62.4
	South of SR-99 Southbound Offramp	62.9
	North of Rose Avenue	64.4
	South of Rose Avenue	63.7
Rose Avenue	West of Highland Avenue	47.0
	East of Highland Avenue	55.6

Table 4.10-1: Existing Traffic Noise Exposure

Roadway	Segment	Day/Night Exposure Level (L _{dn}) at 75 feet from Centerline
	West of SR-99 Southbound Offramp	61.5
Second Street	East of SR-99 Southbound Offramp	62.1
Second Street	West of SR-99 Northbound Offramp	60.7
	East of SR-99 Northbound Offramp	61.3
	West of McCall Avenue	61.3
	East of McCall Avenue	61.7
	West of Dockery Avenue	61.9
	East of Dockery Avenue	57.8
	West of SR-99 Southbound Offramp	58.5
	East of SR-99 Southbound Offramp	60.9
	West of SR-99 Northbound Onramp	60.9
	East of SR-99 Northbound Onramp	62.1
Mountain View	West of SR-99 Northbound Offramp	62.0
Avenue	East of SR-99 Northbound Offramp	61.9
	West of Golden State Boulevard	64.8
	East of Golden State Boulevard	68.5
	West of Bethel Avenue	65.8
	East of Bethel Avenue	66.1
	West of Academy Avenue	64.1
	East of Academy Avenue	64.0
	West of Mendocino Avenue	60.6
	East of Mendocino Avenue	60.7
McCall Avenue	North of Mountain View Avenue	51.2
Weedin Avenue	South of Mountain View Avenue	51.2
Dockery Avenue	North of Mountain View Avenue	41.5
Dockery Avenue	South of Mountain View Avenue	41.5
	North of Mountain View Avenue	66.3
Golden State	South of Mountain View Avenue	66.2
Boulevard	West of Bethel Avenue	61.8
	East of Bethel Avenue	60.6

Table 4.10-1 (cont.): Existing Traffic Noise Exposure

Roadway	Segment	Day/Night Exposure Level (L _{dn}) at 75 feet from Centerline
	North of Mountain View Avenue	53.2
	South of Mountain View Avenue	54.8
Bethel Avenue	North of Golden State Boulevard	56.9
	South of Golden State Boulevard	57.3
	South of Kamm Avenue	53.3
	North of Mountain View Avenue	52.0
Academy Avenue	South of Mountain View Avenue	52.9
Academy Avenue	North of Kamm Avenue	53.7
	South of Kamm Avenue	56.5
Mendocino Avenue	North of Mountain View Avenue	57.3
Wendoemo Avende	South of Mountain View Avenue	56.7
	West of Bethel Avenue	55.2
Kamm Ayanua	East of Bethel Avenue	51.8
Kannin Avenue	West of Academy Avenue	53.1
	East of Academy Avenue	54.4
Source: Brown-Buntin A	Associates, Inc., 2011.	

Table 4.10-1 (cont.): Existing	g Traffic Noise	Exposure
--------------------------------	-----------------	----------

Existing Agricultural and Commercial/Industrial Noise Exposure

Agricultural and commercial/industrial activities represent the only existing stationary noise sources within or adjacent to the project site. Agricultural activity currently occurs throughout most of the project site. Commercial/industrial activities occur adjacent to the northern portion of the project site. Selma Disposal and Dockery Recycling are located along Dockery Avenue, between Golden State Boulevard and SR-99. Measured noise levels at 100 feet from Dockery Recycling ranged from 58 to 75 dBA. Noise producing activities included a bobcat, top loader, compactor, and sorter.

Existing Aircraft Noise Exposure

The project site is located approximately 3.5 miles southwest of the Selma Airport. The airport is a small municipal airport with an average of 33 daily operations, the majority of which are single-engine operations. The project site is subject to periodic aircraft overflights, but such overflights are not considered to be a significant source of noise within the project site.

Existing Railroad Noise Exposure

Portions of the project site are setback approximately 200 feet from the UPRR. According to the UPRR, about 22 freight trains pass through Selma daily. Grade crossings are located at Mountain

View Avenue and East Saginaw Avenue. Train engineers are required to sound the warning horn when approaching within 1,000 feet of a grade crossing.

Railroad noise exposure at the project site was calculated using the above-described operations data from UPRR and noise level data from previous studies conducted by BBA along the UPRR in the San Joaquin Valley. It was assumed for the calculations that train operations could occur at any time throughout the day or night and that operations are equally distributed over a 24-hour day. At a distance of 200 feet from the tracks, the calculated DNL ranges from 62 to 66 dB, depending upon the proximity to the closest grade crossing.

4.10.3 - Regulatory Setting

State

Office of Noise Control Standards

The California Office of Noise Control has set the land use compatibility noise standards and has encouraged local jurisdictions to adopt them. Pursuant to the land use compatibility noise standards, for commercial and industrial uses, noise levels up to 65 dBA CNEL are "normally acceptable;" noise levels between 65 and 75 dBA CNEL are "conditionally acceptable," which means that noise levels are acceptable only when a detailed noise analysis is conducted, and needed noise-insulation features are included in the design. Conventional construction with closed windows and a fresh-air supply system or air conditioning will normally suffice as "acceptable noise insulation" features. Noise levels between 70 and 80 dBA CNEL are generally unacceptable, and development of land uses in noise environments that exceed 75 dBA CNEL are discouraged. For residential development and schools, exterior noise levels ranging up to 60 dBA CNEL are classified as "normally acceptable," based upon the assumption that the homes are built with normal, conventional construction. Noise levels ranging from 55 to 70 dBA CNEL are conditionally acceptable. Noise levels in the 70- to 75-dBA CNEL range are classified as "generally unacceptable," and new construction or development is discouraged but may proceed if a detailed noise analysis is conducted, and needed noise-insulation features are included in the design.

Local

City of Selma

General Plan

Both the 1997 General Plan and 2035 General Plan set forth the following goals relevant to noise. Note that the goal numbering reflects the 2035 General Plan.

- **Goal 1:** To protect the peace, health, safety, and welfare of Selma residents from adverse effects of any such noise source under any condition.
- Goal 2: To prohibit unnecessary, excessive and offensive noises from all sources subject to local police power.
- **Goal 3:** To improve the living, working, and recreational environment through the reduction and control of noise nuisances.

The 2035 General Plan established the following policies relevant to noise:

- **Policy 3.3:** The City shall utilize the noise/land use compatibility standards in Figure 3-2 as a guide for future planning and development decisions.
- **Policy 3.4:** Areas within Selma shall be recognized as noise impacted if exposed to existing or projected future noise levels at the exterior of buildings in excess of 65 dB L_{dn} (or CNEL).
- **Policy 3.6:** The City shall enforce applicable State Noise Insulation Standards (California Administrative Code, Title 24) and Uniform Building Code (UBC) noise requirements.
- **Policy 3.7:** New industrial, commercial or other noise generating land uses (including roadways, railroads, and airports) shall be discouraged if resulting noise levels will exceed 65 dB L_{dn} (or CNEL) at the boundary areas of planned or zoned noise sensitive land uses unless effective mitigation is incorporated into the design of the new noise producing land use.
- **Policy 3.8:** The City shall review all relevant development plans, programs and proposals to ensure their conformance with the policy framework outlined in this Noise Element.
- **Policy 3.9:** The preferred method of noise control used is thoughtful site design. Secondarily, noise control should be achieved through the use of artificial noise barriers. Site and building design guidelines may include:
 - a. Noise sensitive land uses should not front onto the primary noise source. Where this is not possible, the narrow portion of the building should face the primary noise source, and the interior layout should locate the most sensitive areas away from the noise source by placing garages, storage facilities, carports or other such areas nearest the noise source.
 - b. Site design should permit noise to pass around or through a development. This can be achieved by placing the narrow or convex portion of the structure toward the primary noise source.
 - c. Commercial and industrial structures shall be designed so that any noise in excess of 65 dB Ldn (or CNEL) generated from the interior of the building is focused away from noise sensitive land uses.
 - d. Two story residential construction should be avoided, where possible, immediately adjacent to arterials or collectors unless adequate combinations of noise attenuation procedures are used.
 - e. When feasible, residential cul-de-sacs should be perpendicular to adjacent arterials or collectors.
 - f. Loading and unloading activities for commercial uses should be conducted in an enclosed loading dock, preferably with a positive seal between the loading dock and trucks.
- **Policy 3.10:** Prior to the approval of a proposed development in a noise impacted area, or the development of an industrial, commercial or other noise generating land use in or near an area containing existing or planned noise sensitive land uses, an acoustical analysis may be required if all of the following findings are made:

- a. The existing or projected future noise exposure at the exterior of buildings which will contain noise sensitive uses or within proposed outdoor activity areas (patios, decks, backyards, pool areas, recreation areas, etc.) exceeds 65 dB Ldn (or CNEL).
- b. Interior residential noise levels resulting from offsite noise are estimated to exceed 45 dBA.
- c. Estimated or projected noise levels cannot be reduced to the noise exposure limitations specified in this Noise Element by the application of Standard Noise Reduction Methods.
- When noise studies are necessary they shall:
- a. Be the responsibility of the applicant.
- b. Be prepared by an individual or firm with demonstrable experience in the fields of environmental noise assessment and architectural acoustics.
- c. Include representative noise level measurements with sufficient sampling periods and locations to adequately describe and assess local conditions.
- d. Include estimated noise levels in terms of dB Ldn (or CNEL) for existing and projected future (10-30 year hence) conditions, with a comparison made to the adopted policies of the Noise Element.
- e. Include recommendations for appropriate mitigation measures to achieve compliance with the adopted policies and standards of the Noise Element.
- f. Include estimates of noise exposure after the prescribed mitigation measures have been implemented. If compliance with the adopted policies and standards of the Noise Element will not be achieved, a rationale for acceptance of the project must be provided.
- g. The acoustical analysis should be prepared as early in the project review or permitting process as possible so that noise mitigation measures may be an integral part of the project design rather than an afterthought.
- **Policy 3.11:** The City shall seek to reduce impacts from ground borne vibrations associated with rail operations by requiring that habitable buildings are sited at least 100-feet from the centerline of the tracks, whenever feasible.

4.10.4 - Methodology

Brown-Buntin Associates, Inc. evaluated the proposed project's noise impacts in an Environmental Noise Assessment. The complete technical report is provided in Appendix I.

Brown-Buntin Associates, Inc. conducted an ambient noise survey on May 26, 2011. Noise monitoring equipment consisted of Larson-Davis Laboratories Model LDL 820 sound level analyzers equipped with Bruel & Kjaer (B&K) Type 4176 ½-inch microphones. The microphones were located on tripods at approximately 5 feet above the ground. The noise monitoring equipment was calibrated with a B&K Type 4230 acoustical calibrator to ensure the accuracy of the measurements. The

equipment complies with applicable specifications of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for Type 1 sound measurement systems.

4.10.5 - Thresholds of Significance

According to the CEQA Guidelines' Appendix G Environmental Checklist, to determine whether noise impacts are significant environmental effects, the following questions are analyzed and evaluated. Would the project result in:

- a.) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?
- b.) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?
- c.) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
- d.) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
- e.) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Refer to Section 7, Effects Found Not To Be Significant.)
- f.) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Refer to Section 7, Effects Found Not To Be Significant.)

Local Noise Level Standards

The project site is located along the southeastern city limits of Selma within Fresno County. The project site would be annexed to the City of Selma. Applicable local noise standards are therefore contained within the City of Selma 2035 General Plan.

City of Selma Noise Element

The Noise Element of the 2035 Selma General Plan establishes noise level standards for noise compatibility planning within the City. The noise level descriptors utilized within the noise element for transportation and non-transportation noise sources are the Day Night Average Level (DNL or L_{dn}) and Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL). The DNL represents the time-weighted energy average noise level for a 24-hour day, with a 10-dB penalty added to noise levels occurring during the nighttime hours (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.). The CNEL descriptor is identical the DNL except that an additional penalty of 5 dB is added to noise levels occurring during the evening hours between 7:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m. Both descriptors represent cumulative exposure to noise over an extended period

of time and are therefore calculated based upon annual average conditions. The CNEL is applicable only to aircraft noise exposure, as required by the State of California.

Policy 3.3 of the noise element refers to a land use compatibility table that is difficult to interpret because there are overlapping ranges of allowable exterior noise exposure. However, it is clear from Policies 3.5, 3.7, and 3.10 that exterior noise exposure is considered unacceptable if it exceeds 65 dB DNL/CNEL within outdoor activity areas of noise-sensitive uses. Outdoor activity areas include backyards of single-family residences, individual patios or decks of multifamily developments, and common outdoor recreation areas for multi-family or transient lodging developments.

Policy 3.5 specifies an interior noise level standard 45 dB DNL/CNEL within noise-sensitive rooms of noise-sensitive buildings. The intent of the interior noise level standard is to provide an acceptable noise environment for indoor communication and sleep.

Significant Increases in Ambient Noise Levels:

Neither CEQA nor the City of Selma defines what constitutes a substantial increase in ambient noise levels. Some guidance is provided by the 1992 findings of the Federal Interagency Committee on Noise (FICON), which assessed changes in ambient noise levels resulting from aircraft operations. The FICON recommendations are based upon studies that relate aircraft and traffic noise levels to the percentage of persons highly annoyed by the noise. The rationale for the FICON recommendations is that it is possible to consistently describe the annoyance of people exposed to transportation noise in terms of the DNL (or CNEL). Annoyance is a summary measure of the general adverse reaction of people to noise that results in speech interference, sleep disturbance, or interference with other daily activities.

Although the FICON recommendations were specifically developed to address aircraft noise impacts, they are used in this analysis for transportation noise sources that are described in terms of cumulative noise exposure metrics such as the DNL or CNEL. Table 4.10-2 summarizes the FICON recommendations.

Ambient Noise Level Without Project (DNL/CNEL	Significant Impact Assumed to Occur if the Project Increases Ambient Noise Levels By:
<60 dB	+5 dB or more
60-65 dB	+3 dB or more
>65 dB	+1.5 dB or more
Source: Brown-Buntin Associates, Inc., 2011.	

For noise sources that are not transportation-related, which generally include commercial or industrial activities and other stationary noise sources, it is common to assume that a 3- to 5-dB increase in noise levels represents a substantial increase in ambient noise levels. This is based on laboratory tests

that indicate that a 3-dB increase is the minimum change perceptible to most people, and that a 5-dB increase is perceived as a "definitely noticeable change."

4.10.6 - Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This section discusses potential impacts associated with the development of the proposed project and provides mitigation measures where appropriate.

Noise Levels in Excess of Standards

Impact NOI-1:	The proposed project may result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise
	ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.

Impact Analysis

This impact will assess whether the proposed project may expose persons to excessive noise levels associated with non-transportation noise and traffic noise, which the most common noise sources associated with urban development.

Non-Transportation Noise

The proposed commercial uses have the potential to generate significant non-transportation¹ noise levels at nearby existing noise-sensitive uses and proposed mixed commercial/residential uses. The noise levels produced by such sources can be highly variable. Typical examples of commercial noise sources are:

- Fans and blowers
- Truck deliveries
- Loading Docks
- Compactors
- Voices/Public Address systems
- Waste collection activities

Noise levels from commercial land uses associated with the project cannot be predicted with any certainty at this time since detailed development plans are not yet available. However, under some circumstances, there is a potential for such uses to cause annoyance to nearby noise-sensitive uses and/or exceed the City's noise standards. This may be especially true for the proposed commercial shopping center if loading docks, truck routes, or mechanical equipment are to be located adjacent to or near residential uses.

Noise levels from commercial sources may be effectively mitigated by incorporating noise mitigation measures into the project design that consider the geographical relationship between the noise sources of concern and potential receptors, the noise-producing characteristics of the sources, and the path of transmission between noise sources and sensitive receptors. Noise levels from proposed commercial

¹ Non-transportation noise is sometime interchangeably referred to as "stationary" noise.

uses should not exceed 65 dB DNL within outdoor activity areas of noise-sensitive land uses. Options for noise mitigation include the use of building setbacks and the construction of sound walls and/or equipment enclosures. Additionally, Policy 3.9 of the Noise element specifies preferred mitigation measures that should be considered during the design of new commercial uses that may affect nearby noise-sensitive uses. These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure NOI-1a.

Traffic Noise

The project would result in an increase in traffic on some roadways within the project site and near the project site. The potential for significant project-related increases in traffic noise exposure was analyzed using the above-referenced Peters Engineering Group Traffic Impact Study from Peters Engineering Group and the FHWA Model. Traffic noise modeling assumptions are summarized in Appendix I.

Traffic noise levels were calculated at typical residential setbacks for selected roadways for future (2035) conditions. Calculated DNL values with and without the project were compared to determine if the project would cause traffic noise levels to exceed the City's 65 dB DNL exterior standard or result in a significant increase in ambient noise levels as defined by Table 4.10-2. Existing noise barriers or other noise mitigation features were not accounted for in the calculations, since the analysis is intended to demonstrate the relative change in traffic noise exposure that could occur as a result of the project.

Table 4.10-3 summarizes the findings of the traffic noise analysis. Shown by the table are future (2035) with project and future (2035) without project traffic noise levels at typical residential setbacks along roadways analyzed by the traffic impact study. Table 4.10-3 indicates that future (2035) traffic exposure along several nearby roadways will exceed the City's 65 dB DNL standard without the project. Table 4.10-3 also indicates that traffic noise levels along Second Street and Bethel Avenue could increase to above 65 dB DNL as a result of the project. This is considered a significant noise impact. The table also shows that the project could result in significant increases in traffic noise exposure along Second Street, Mountain View Avenue, Dockery Avenue, Golden State Boulevard, and Bethel Avenue.

The project also includes the development of mixed commercial/residential uses and two hotels. Depending upon the specific designs and locations of such uses, noise exposure could exceed the City's noise standards within outdoor activity areas or noise-sensitive interior spaces.

The most effective form of noise mitigation for existing noise-sensitive uses outside the project site is usually considered to be the construction of sound walls. Sound walls may offer acoustic shielding of outdoor activity areas and reduce the amount of noise that may affect indoor uses. Another means of mitigation that only affects indoor noise exposure is the replacement of existing windows and doors with sound-rated assemblies. These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure NOI-1b. Because of the many complications of working with individual landowners to implement such measures, it may not be feasible to achieve successful noise mitigation for all existing noise-sensitive

uses that could be impacted by the project. For that reason, the residual significance of this impact is significant and unavoidable.

With respect to the proposed hotels and mixed commercial/residential uses within the project site, appropriate noise mitigation measures should be incorporated into the project design in order to comply with the City's noise standards. This means that exterior noise exposure within outdoor activity areas should not exceed 65 dB DNL and interior noise exposure within noise sensitive rooms should not exceed 45 dB DNL. This recommendations is reflected in Mitigation Measure NOI-1c.

		DNL (dB) @ Typical Residential Setback ¹			
Roadway	Segment	2035 No Project	2035 Project	Change	Significant?
Floral Avenue	West of SR-99 Southbound Offramp	70.1	70.3	+0.2	No
	East of SR-99 Southbound Offramp	70.3	70.5	+0.2	No
	West of Highland Avenue	67.8	67.9	+0.1	No
	East of Highland Avenue	67.0	67.3	+0.3	No
	West of SR-99 Northbound Offramp	65.9	66.3	+0.4	No
	East of SR-99 Northbound Offramp	65.4	66.0	+0.6	No
Highland Avenue	North of Floral Avenue	67.0	67.3	+0.3	No
	South of Floral Avenue	66.2	66.8	+0.6	No
	North of SR-99 Southbound Onramp	66.2	66.8	+0.6	No
	South of SR-99 Southbound Onramp	65.6	65.9	+0.3	No
	North of Rose Avenue	68.3	58.5	+0.2	No
	South of Rose Avenue	66.8	67.2	+0.4	No
Rose Avenue	West of Highland Avenue	62.3	62.3	0.0	No
	East of Highland Avenue	59.4	59.6	+0.2	No
Second Street	West of SR-99 Southbound Offramp	65.2	65.7	+0.5	No
	East of SR-99 Southbound Offramp	64.9	65.6	+0.7	Yes*

Table 4.10-3: Project-Related	Traffic Noise	Impacts
-------------------------------	---------------	---------

	Segment	DNL (dB) @ Typical Residential Setback ¹			
Roadway		2035 No Project	2035 Project	Change	Significant?
	West of McCall Avenue	68.8	70.5	+1.7	Yes
	East of McCall Avenue	69.0	72.0	+3.0	Yes
	West of Dockery Avenue	69.3	72.1	+2.8	Yes
	East of Dockery Avenue	64.9	69.2	+4.3	Yes
Mountain View Avenue	West of SR-99 Southbound Offramp	64.2	70.9	+6.7	Yes
	East of SR-99 Southbound Offramp	64.6	72.2	+7.6	Yes
	West of SR-99 Northbound Onramp	64.1	72.3	+8.2	Yes
	East of SR-99 Northbound Onramp	64.3	72.3	+8.0	Yes
	West of SR-99 Northbound Offramp	65.8	72.4	+6.6	Yes
	East of SR-99 Northbound Offramp	65.5	72.1	+6.6	Yes
	West of Golden State Boulevard	67.3	72.5	+5.2	Yes
	East of Golden State Boulevard	71.4	75.1	+3.7	Yes
	West of Bethel Avenue	67.4	73.8	+6.4	Yes
	East of Bethel Avenue	67.8	73.3	+5.5	Yes
	West of Academy Avenue	65.9	71.4	+5.5	Yes
	East of Academy Avenue	66.7	70.8	+4.1	Yes
	West of Mendocino Avenue	63.0	67.3	+4.3	Yes
	East of Mendocino Avenue	62.3	65.3	+3.0	Yes
McCall Avenue	North of Mountain View Avenue	59.7	62.3	+2.6	No
Witten Avenue	South of Mountain View Avenue	59.8	60.4	+0.6	No
Dockery Avenue	North of Mountain View Avenue	50.3	61.5	+11.2	Yes
	South of Mountain View Avenue	58.5	64.4	+5.9	Yes
	North of Mountain View Avenue	71.1	76.2	+5.1	Yes
Golden State Boulevard	South of Mountain View Avenue	72.0	73.6	+1.6	Yes
	West of Bethel Avenue	69.9	70.7	+0.8	No
	East of Bethel Avenue	68.6	70.1	+1.5	Yes
Bethel Avenue	North of Mountain View Avenue	56.2	60.9	+4.7	No
	South of Mountain View Avenue	58.7	60.3	+1.6	No

Table 4.10-3 (cont.): Existing Traffic Noise Exposure

		DNL (dB) @ Typical Residential Setback ¹			
Roadway	Segment	2035 No Project	2035 Project	Change	Significant?
	North of Golden State Boulevard	63.2	66.0	+2.8	Yes
	South of Golden State Boulevard	62.3	63.9	+1.6	No
	South of Kamm Avenue	61.3	63.7	+2.4	No
Academy Avenue	North of Mountain View Avenue	59.6	62.4	+2.8	No
	South of Mountain View Avenue	59.5	61.2	+1.7	No
Mendocino Avenue	North of Mountain View Avenue	61.2	64.1	+2.9	No
	South of Mountain View Avenue	59.7	61.3	+1.6	No
Kamm Avenue	West of Bethel Avenue	61.5	63.6	+2.1	No
	East of Bethel Avenue	58.8	59.6	+0.8	No

Table 4.10-3 (cont.): Existing Traffic Noise Exposure

Note:

¹ A typical residential setback was assumed to be 75 feet from the roadway centerline.

* This area is within the Caltrans right-of-way. Although it would exceed the exterior standard for residential uses, there are no actual residences within this area.

Source: Brown-Buntin Associates, Inc., 2011.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

- MM NOI-1a Prior to issuance of building permits for each project use, the project applicant shall prepare and submit building plans to the City of Selma for review and approval demonstrating that appropriate noise attenuation measures have been incorporated to protect nearby sensitive receptors from excessive levels of non-transportation noise sources (mechanical equipment, solid waste and recycling facilities, truck loading areas, etc.). Such noise attenuation measures may include but are not limited to sound walls, landscaped berms, building orientation, setbacks/buffers, and other similar measures. The City of Selma has the discretion to request that the applicant provide calculations to demonstrate that sensitive receptors are protected from excessive levels of non-transportation noise sources on a case-by-case basis. The approved plans shall be incorporated into the project.
- **MM NOI-1b** Prior to issuance of building permits for the first use of each phase, the project applicant shall contact property owners with existing residences within 75 feet of the centerline of the following roadway segments and offer to (1) construct a soundwall along their street frontage or (2) replace existing windows and doors with sound-rated assemblies:

- Mountain View Avenue (between McCall Avenue and Mendocino Avenue)
- Dockery Avenue (north and south of Mountain View Avenue)
- Golden State Boulevard (north and south of Mountain View Avenue; east of Bethel Avenue)
- Bethel Avenue (north of Golden State Boulevard)

The applicant and property owner have the discretion to mutually determine the timing and cost-sharing arrangements of the sound wall or window/door installation. Property owners also have the option of declining the installation of sound walls, windows, or doors.

MM NOI-1cPrior to issuance of building permits for hotels or residential uses, the project
applicant shall prepare and submit building plans to the City of Selma for review and
approval demonstrating compliance with the City's noise standards. Outdoor activity
areas (e.g., patios, balconies) shall be exposed to noise levels no greater than 65 dBA
Ldn and interior areas shall be exposed to noise levels no greater than 45 dBA Ldn.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Significant unavoidable impact.

Excessive Groundborne Vibration

Impact NOI-2: The proposed project would not result in exposing persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

Impact Analysis

The City of Selma does not have regulations that define acceptable levels of vibration. One reference suggesting vibration standards is the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) publication concerning noise and vibration impact assessment from transit activities. Although the FTA guidelines are to be applied to transit activities, they may be reasonably applied to the assessment of the potential for annoyance or structural damage resulting from other activities. To prevent vibration annoyance in residences, a vibration velocity level of 80 VdB or less is suggested when there are fewer than 70 vibration events per day. A level of 100 VdB or less is suggested by the FTA guidelines to prevent damage to fragile buildings.

Vibration from construction activities could occasionally be perceptible at the closest sensitive land uses. The primary vibratory sources during construction activities within the project area would likely be large bulldozers or excavators and loaded trucks. Typical bulldozer or loaded truck activities generate an approximate vibration level of 86 to 87 VdB at a distance of 25 feet. Most sensitive uses would be located at distances greater than 25 feet from major vibratory sources. Typically, vibration levels must exceed 80 VdB before annoyance occurs or 100 VdB before building damage occurs.
The closest vibration sensitive land uses are the single-family homes on the north side of Mountain View Avenue at Dockery Avenue, with the nearest structure located approximately 90 feet from the proposed area to be disturbed during construction. It is anticipated that the vibration levels caused by a large bulldozer operating on the project site would create a vibration level at the nearest structure of less than 80 VdB. This vibration level would not exceed the 80 VdB threshold for annoyance or the 100 VdB threshold for damage to fragile buildings. Therefore, construction-related vibration impacts would be less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is necessary.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels

Impact NOI-3:	The proposed project may result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient
-	noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

Impact Analysis

As discussed in Impact NOI-1, sensitive land uses located along roadways in the project vicinity may be exposed to ambient noise levels in excess of 65 dB DNL exterior noise standard for residential uses. Mitigation Measure NOI-1b is proposed requiring the project applicant to contact residential property owners along the affected roadways and offer to construct a soundwall or replace existing windows and doors with sound-rated assemblies. Although soundwalls or sound-rated window and door assemblies would be expected to ensure that affected residential interior spaces are not exposed to excessive noise levels, there is uncertainty regarding whether all property owners would agree to these improvements. Property owners who elect to decline such improvements may be exposed to permanent increases in ambient noise levels. As such, the residual significance of this impact is significant and unavoidable.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

Implement Mitigation Measure TRANS-1b.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Significant unavoidable impact.

Noise

Temporary or Periodic Increase in Ambient Noise Levels

Impact NOI-4: The proposed project may result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

Impact Analysis

Noise due to construction activities is generally considered to be less than significant if the construction activity is temporary, use of heavy equipment and noisy activities are limited to daytime hours, pile driving or surface blasting would not occur, and all industry-standard noise abatement measures are implemented for noise-producing equipment. These general parameters acknowledge that people are not as likely to be annoyed by activities that are perceived as being necessary for normal commerce, so long as the inconveniences due to noise are of relatively short duration and all practical measures are being implemented to reduce the impacts of noise-producing activities.

Policy 3.1 of the noise element restricts the hours of operation for noise-producing devices, appliances, equipment, or vehicles on public or private property abutting noise sensitive land uses. Such operations are not permitted between 7:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. during weekdays or between 7:00 p.m. and 9:00 a.m. during weekends.

During construction of the project, noise from construction activities could potentially impact noisesensitive uses in the immediate area. Activities associated with construction would generate noise levels at 50 feet as indicated by Table 4.10-4. The heavy equipment that produces the highest noise levels would be associated with project grading and excavation, roadway construction or utility construction.

Type of Equipment	Maximum Level, dB (50 Ft.)	
Backhoe	78	
Concrete Saw	90	
Crane	81	
Excavator	81	
Front End Loader	79	
Jackhammer	89	
Paver	77	
Pneumatic Tools	85	
Bulldozer	82	
Source: Federal Highway Administration, 2012.		

Table 4 10-4	Typical	Construction	Fauinment	Noise Levels
1 abic 4.10-4.	iypicai	CONSULCTION	Lyuipinein	

Noise from construction activities are not usually considered to be significant if construction occurring near noise-sensitive land uses is limited to the daytime hours, extraordinary noise-producing activities (e.g., pile driving) are not anticipated, and construction equipment is adequately

maintained and muffled. Policy 3.1 of the noise element restricts the hours of operation for noiseproducing devices, appliances, equipment, or vehicles on public or private property abutting noise sensitive land uses. Such operations are not permitted between 7:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. during weekdays or between 7:00 p.m. and 9:00 a.m. during weekends. Accordingly, these requirements are reflected in Mitigation Measure NOI-4. With the implementation of mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

MM NOI-4

During construction activities for the proposed project, the applicant shall require its construction contractors to adhere to the following noise attenuation requirements:

- Construction activities shall be limited to the hours between 6 a.m. and 7 p.m. on weekdays and between 9 a.m. and 7 p.m. on weekends. The City of Selma shall have the discretion to permit construction activities to occur outside of allowable hours if compelling circumstances warrant such an exception (e.g., weather conditions necessary to pour concrete).
- All construction equipment shall use noise-reduction features (e.g., mufflers and engine shrouds) that are no less effective than those originally installed by the manufacturer. If no noise-reduction features were installed by the manufacturer, then the contractor shall require that at least a muffler be installed on the equipment.
- Construction staging and heavy equipment maintenance activities shall be performed a minimum distance of 300 feet from the nearest residence, unless safety or technical factors take precedence (e.g., an equipment breakdown).
- A 10-foot-high construction noise barrier shall be installed along the edge of the project site within 300 feet of any offsite residence prior to start of grading activities. The noise barrier shall either be constructed of a minimum ¹/₂-inch plywood or utilize acoustical blankets with a minimum Sound Transmission Class of 12. The barrier shall remain in place until noise intensive aspects of construction are completed.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

4.11 - Public Services and Utilities

4.11.1 - Introduction

This section describes the existing public services and utilities and potential effects from project implementation on the site and its surrounding area. Descriptions and analysis in this section are based on information contained in the Water Supply Assessment prepared by California Water Services Company included in this EIR as Appendix J, and in the Selma Crossings Development Storm Drainage Master Plan prepared by Blair, Church & Flynn Consulting Engineers, included in this EIR as Appendix H.

4.11.2 - Environmental Setting

Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services

The City of Selma Fire Department provides fire protection services, hazardous materials response, emergency medical services, including first response and transportation, and technical rescue to a 6-square-mile area including all areas within the City limits. The Fire Department, as part of the Fresno County Emergency Services System, also covers 150 square miles of Fresno County for paramedic ambulance service.

Stations

The Fire Department has two fire stations, staffed 24 hours a day. The two stations are summarized in Table 4.11-1

Station No.	Location	Distance to Project Site	Apparatus	Staffing
53	1927 West Front Street	2.0 miles	Emergency ambulance; 1,250 gpm; 75-foot ladder truck	3 firefighters (2 assigned to ambulance)
54 (Headquarters)	2857 A Street	2.7 miles	1,500-gpm fire engine; 1 front- line ambulance; 2 backup ambulances	3 firefighters (2 assigned to ambulance)
Notes: gpm = gallon per minute pumper Source: City of Selma, 2010.				

Table 4.11-1: Fire Station Summary

Staffing

The Fire Department has 21 full-time firefighters and 10 reserve firefighters. Minimum daily staffing is six firefighters, four of whom are assigned to ambulances.

Calls for Service

The Selma Fire Department responds to approximately 5,500 calls for service on annual basis, of which 90 percent are medical in nature.

ISO Rating

The Insurance Service Office (ISO) Grading Schedule is a means of classifying cities with reference to their fire defenses and physical conditions, and is designed to rate the quality of fire services in a particular community. The insurance classification developed under this schedule is only one of several elements used in development of fire insurance rates. The ISO rating is on a scale of 1 to 10, where Class 1 is the best rating. In most instances, the fire insurance costs are the same for single-family residential structures in the 2 to 4 rating range. The City's current Insurance Services Office (ISO) fire service rating is 5. The ISO scale goes from 1 (best) to 10 (worst). A higher ISO rating results in higher insurance premiums. The rating is based on an evaluation of a department's fire fighting capability (50 percent of the score), the water system it uses to fight fires (40 percent of the score), and the nature of its dispatch area (10 percent of the score).

In 2008, the City entered into an automatic-aid agreement with Fresno County Fire Protection District. The agreement will send the closest fire engine from either Selma or Fresno County Fire Protection District to medical and fire calls in the County; in return, Fresno County Fire Protection District will send two fire engines and one Battalion Chief to all structure fires in Selma.

Fresno County Fire Protection District

The Fresno County Fire Protection District currently provides fire protection to the project site. The Fire Protection District encompasses 2,655 square miles, with a population of more than 220,000 residents. Station No. 83, located at 11500 E. Mountain View Avenue is the closest station to the project site.

Police Protection

Police protection within the City of Selma is provided by the City of Selma Police Department headquartered at 1935 E. Front Street. Areas outside the City limits are served by the Fresno County Sheriff's Department.

Staffing

The City of Selma Police Department consists of 54 personnel: 37 sworn officers and 17 non-sworn support staff. Based on a total of 37 sworn officers and the current (2008) city population of 23,286 persons, Selma's current patrol officer/population ratio is 1.58:1,000.

Calls for Service

The Police Department responds to approximately 44,000 calls for service on an annual basis.

Response Times

The Police Department response time standards are 3 minutes for Priority 1 calls (emergency), 5 minutes for Priority 2 calls, and 9 minutes for Priority 3 calls. The Police Department has been maintaining theses standards for the past 10 years.

Mutual Aid Agreement

In addition, the City of Selma has a mutual aid agreement with the Fresno County Sheriff's Department.

Potable Water

California Water Service Company (Cal Water), Selma District, provides potable water to the City of Selma. Cal Water, a private company, has provided water to Selma since 1962 and currently serves approximately 6,400 connections in the City. Summaries of the Cal Water conveyance system and water supplies follow.

Water Conveyance

The local Cal Water system consists of more than 80 miles of underground pipelines, which deliver an average of 5.9 million gallons per day. The systems also include storage tanks, booster pumps, and water wells.

Water Supply

The following discussion is derived from the Water Supply Assessment, prepared by Cal Water, provided in its entirety in Appendix J.

Cal Water obtains all of its potable water from groundwater extracted from the Kings River fan aquifers. The Kings River fan is in the Fresno County sub-area of the Tulare Lake Hydrologic Region. This has been and is the sole source of water furnished to customers in the Selma District.

Groundwater is extracted by 14 active wells located throughout the Selma District service area. Five other wells are currently inactive or non-operational. The 2008 Selma District Water Supply and Facility Master Plan indicates that the pump capacity of these wells is 9,810 gallons per minute (gpm). Cal Water constructed and put into operation another new well in 2009 (Station 17-02) with a production capacity of 1,700 gpm, bringing total capacity to 11,510 gpm or 16.57 million gallons per day (mgd). Currently, Cal Water is developing another new well (Station 22-01) and expects it to be in operation by 2012. With installation of Station 22-01 with an estimated production capacity of 1,700 gpm, total well capacity in 2013 will be 13,210 gpm or 19.0 mgd.

Cal Water plans on providing additional wells to increase supply capacity as needed so that there is never an insufficiency of supply to meet maximum day demands. For the period 2015 to 2020, based on demand growth rates, Cal Water would add another two wells with an estimated production capacity of 1,700 gpm per well or 3,400 gpm combined, resulting in a total system capacity of 16,610 gpm or 23.9 mgd. For the period 2020 to 2025, based on demand growth rates, Cal Water would add one more well with an estimated capacity of 1,700 gpm, for an estimated total of 18.310 gpm or 26.37 mgd. For the period 2025 to 2030, based on demand growth rates, it would add one more well with an estimated capacity of 1,700 gpm, for an estimated total of 20,000 gpm or 28.8 mgd.

Currently, Cal Water has two 1-million-gallon (mg) surface storage tanks, which provide storage for peak hour demand and thereby reduce the requirement that the wells operate in response to real time demands. Cal Water plans to construct other surface storage tanks to meet peak hourly demands so that well capacity will only need to meet maximum day demand.

Groundwater Basin Management

The Consolidated Irrigation District (CID) manages the groundwater basin from which water for the Selma District is pumped. CID is located mainly in Fresno County and small portions of Kings and Tulare counties. In 1995, the irrigable acreage in the district was 145,000 acres, of which 92,000 are capable of receiving surface waters from the Kings River. The balance, 53,000 acres, obtains its water solely from groundwater. In drought years, district irrigators have the capability of pumping groundwater to meet their irrigation needs. CID does not own or operate irrigation wells, of which there are approximately 4,500. CID's average annual deliveries of surface water for irrigation are 238,000 acre-feet.

CID's water delivery system comprises about 350 miles of open channels including ditches, natural drains, and sloughs. There are many lateral pipelines and piped portions of the main channel. In addition to gravity surface water deliveries, CID recharges groundwater in the underlying basin through seepage from its channels and through dedicated recharge or spreading basins. Native soils are sandy and allow for rapid infiltration. Aquifers in the groundwater basin are mostly unconfined, which means recharge provides a direct contribution to groundwater storage. CID has 46 dedicated recharge basins totaling 1,300 acres. Water is delivered to these basins through CID's existing conveyance system. Deliveries to recharge basins are based on runoff conditions and available supplies and typically occur when there are flood releases from the Kings River or the Friant-Kern Canal. In-lieu storage of groundwater is also practiced when irrigators who can irrigate with either surface or groundwater use surface water and thereby "bank" the groundwater.

The amount of annual recharge varies considerably from year to year. In 1969, it is estimated that 308,000 acre-feet were recharged, whereas during the drought in 1978, it was estimated that 180,000 acre-feet were recharged. In 1982, estimated recharge was also about 300,000 acre-feet. CID reports that its long-term recharge rate capability is about 1,400 acre-feet per day with present facilities. Thus, it would take about 214 days or 7 months to infiltrate 300,000 acre-feet.

The easterly and southeasterly portions of CID follow the alignment of the Kings River, which has deposited an alluvial fan throughout the area. The apex of the fan is in the northeast corner of CID. Fan deposits spread radially to the southwest covering most of CID's area. Soils are permeable to moderately permeable and are composed of sands and silt and some gravel in the northeast. There are no confined or semi-confined layers in the basin. The United States Geological Survey in a review of well driller logs reports that in the 10- to 200-foot depth, sand and gravel make up about 38 percent of the soil (35 percent sand, 3 percent gravel). The average specific yield (13.4 percent) of these deposits is quite high. Wells in the CID area vary from 80 to 400 feet deep with the average being

200 feet. The specific capacity of wells varies from 40 to 70 gpm per foot with irrigation typical wells yielding 500 to 800 gpm.

In CID's July 26, 1995 Groundwater Management Plan, it was reported that groundwater levels in basin underlying CID, have been gradually declining over a period of 50 to 60 years. The estimated annual overdraft is about 53,000 acre-feet per year (acre-feet/year). This is based on monthly monitoring data acquired from 82 wells in a 2-square-mile grid. CID uses this data as the basis for the actions it formulates with respect to its groundwater management plan. Its overall objective is to protect and maintain a sustainable groundwater supply for users in the CID area. One of CID's primary means to reduce over-pumping of groundwater is through a conjunctive use program involving direct use of surface waters, active recharge of groundwater, and in-lieu recharge. Although the goal of this program is to achieve a balance of recharge and extraction of groundwater over time, the decline in water levels has continued. One of CID's plans, as a correction to this trend, is to identify lands for purchase that could be used to increase the size and number of spreading basins in order to increase the rate of recharge during the wet months when runoff is high and there is minimal irrigation needs.

CID historically has recovered its operating expenses and retired capital debt for its improvement projects through annual acreage assessments on lands within its boundaries. (The City of Selma currently is contesting this assessment in a lawsuit.) CID has three primary assessment rates: (1) a gravity rate for users eligible to receive surface supplies, (2) the "Church" gravity rate for select users eligible to receive water through the Lone Tree Canal system, and (3) the pump rate for users that obtain their supplies only from groundwater. Cities such as Selma are within the CID area but are excluded from its boundary and pay 90 percent of the pump rate charged agricultural users. Assessments to the cities are based on the acreage of land annexed to them since 1979.

Because Cal Water owns and operates the water supply system for Selma, it pays a fee to CID based on the acreage within its Selma District. The City provides assessment collection services for CID. Since CID's revenue is based on assessments from a fixed acreage, its income is fixed irrespective of the amount of water delivered and recharged. Because the areas of cities within the CID area have been growing from annexation and urban development, CID assessment revenues have slightly declined over time. So periodically, it is necessary for CID to increase assessment rates to cover its costs. Currently, Cal Water in 2008 was assessed at a rate of \$6.48/acre. Pending the outcome of the City of Selma's lawsuit on CID assessments, Cal Water has not paid any assessments recently.

Wastewater

Selma-Kingsburg-Fowler County Sanitation District (SKF CSD) provides wastewater collection and treatment to a service area totaling approximately 11 square miles, which encompasses the cities of Selma, Kingsburg, and Fowler, and a small portion of unincorporated Fresno County. SKF CSD is governed by a five-member broad of directors composed of an elected official from each of the three

incorporated cities within its service area and two members of the Fresno County Board of Supervisors. The agency is headquartered at 11301 East Conejo Avenue, Kingsburg.

Collection System

The sewer collection system consists of approximately 150 miles of sewer lines ranging in diameter from 8 inches to 42 inches, and 21 wastewater pump stations. The cities of Selma, Kingsburg, and Fowler own the sewer collection systems within their respective boundaries.

Treatment Plant

SKF CSD operates a wastewater treatment plant on a 550-acre site located 1.5 miles west of Kingsburg. The plant provides secondary-level wastewater treatment. The average dry weather flow is about 4.0 mgd; the average wet weather flow is about 3.8 mgd. The flows are higher in dry weather, due to effluent generated by fruit processing industries in the service area.

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (RWQCB) regulates the treatment plant under Order No. 5-01-255. Although the RWQCB permit currently permits a maximum 30-day average flow of 8 million gallons per day (mgd), the treatment and disposal capacity on a 365-days-per-year basis is 4.8 mgd. The plant has generally met the parameters of the permit and has not received any notices of violation by the RWQCB.

Future Expansion

The SKF CSD Capital Improvement Program, dated February 2010, contemplates expansion of the treatment plant capacity beginning in fiscal year 2017–2018 to serve forecast growth within the service area. The necessary capacity upgrades will be identified in the Wastewater Treatment Plant Facilities Plan, which is currently being prepared. To fund the capacity expansion, SKF CSD levies a capacity charge to new development as measured in "equivalent single-family residence" units.

Storm Drainage

The City of Selma provides storm drainage to areas within the city limits. The City's municipal storm drain system consists of 40 miles of storm drain, approximately 700 drain inlets/catch basins, 15 storm drain lift stations, and eight retention ponds.

The project site is occupied by agricultural and rural residential land uses. As such, existing storm drainage facilities are limited and general consist of informal roadside ditches and swales. A ponding basin is located on the southwest quadrant of the E. Mountain View Avenue/S. Van Horn Avenue intersection adjacent to the Shell gas station.

Solid Waste

Selma Disposal and Recycling provides contract solid waste and recycling services to commercial and residential customers within the City of Selma.

Landfills

Solid waste from Selma is landfilled at the Avenal Regional Landfill near Avenal and the American Avenue Disposal Site near Tranquillity. The landfill characteristics are summarized in Table 4.11-2.

			Cubic Yards	
Facility	Location	Permitted Daily Throughput (tons)	Permitted Capacity	Remaining Capacity
Avenal Regional Landfill	Avenal (Kings County)	6,000	26.0 million	26.0 million
American Avenue Disposal Site	Tranquillity (Fresno County)	2,200	32.7 million	29.4 million
Source: Cal Recycle, 2011.				

Table 4.11-2: Landfill Summary

Waste Diversion/Disposal Rate Target

Pursuant to Senate Bill 1016 (SB 1016), jurisdictions have been assigned target disposal per capita rates for residents and employees. The target rates for the City of Selma are 6.8 pounds/resident/day and 21.1 pounds/employee/day. According to the latest Annual Report (2009) submitted by the City of Selma to Cal Recycle, the actual disposal rate for the City of Selma was 3.5 pounds/resident/day and 14.7 pounds/employee/day, which meet the target rates.

Energy

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) provides electricity and the Southern California Gas Company (Gas Company) provides natural gas to Selma. Each company is described below.

Electricity

PG&E provides electricity service to all or part of 47 counties in California, including Fresno County, constituting most of the northern and central portions of the State. As of December 31, 2010, PG&E provided electricity to approximately 5.2 million customers. In 2010, PG&E obtained 43 percent of electricity from its own generation sources and the remaining 57 percent from outside sources. PG&E-owned generating facilities include nuclear, fossil fuel, hydroelectric, and solar with a net generating capacity of more than 7,300 megawatts. Outside suppliers to PG&E include the California Department of Water Resources, irrigation districts, renewable energy suppliers, and other fossil fuelfired suppliers. PG&E operates approximately 160,000 circuit miles of transmission and distribution lines. PG&E is interconnected with electric power systems in the western Electricity Coordinating Council, which includes 14 western states; Alberta and British Columbia, Canada; and parts of Mexico. In 2010, PG&E delivered 83,908 gigawatt-hours of electricity to its customers.

Natural Gas

The Gas Company provides natural gas service to a territory encompassing approximately 20,000 square miles throughout Central and Southern California, from Fresno County to the Mexican border.

The Gas Company's natural gas facilities include 2,890 miles of transmission and storage pipelines, 53,499 miles of distribution pipelines, and 47,190 miles of service pipelines.

4.11.3 - Regulatory Setting

State

California Building Standards Code

Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, also known as the California Building Standards Code, is a compilation of three types of building standards from three different origins:

- Building standards that have been adopted by state agencies without change from building standards contained in national model codes
- Building standards that have been adopted and adapted from the national model code standards to meet California conditions
- Building standards, authorized by the California legislature, that constitute extensive additions not covered by the model codes that have been adopted to address particular California concerns

The California Fire Code is a component of the California Building Standards Code and contains fire safety-related building standards.

California Green Building Standards Code

The California Green Building Standard Code was adopted January 12, 2009. The purpose of this code is to improve public health, safety, and general welfare by enhancing the design and construction of buildings through the use of building concepts having a positive environmental impact and encouraging sustainable construction practices in the following categories:

- Planning and design
- Energy efficiency
- Water efficiency and conservation
- Material conservation and resource efficiency
- Environmental air quality

The Code addresses exterior envelope, water efficiency, and material conservation components. The aim is to reduce energy usage in non-residential buildings by 20 percent by 2015 and help meet reductions contemplated in AB 32. With the 2008 Building Code, a 15-percent energy reduction over 2007 edition is expected. Compliance became mandatory on January 1, 2011.

California Urban Water Management Planning Act

The Urban Water Management Planning Act (California Water Code Sections 10610-10656) requires that all urban water suppliers with at least 3,000 customers prepare urban water management plans and update them every 5 years. The act requires that urban water management plans include a

description of water management tools and options used by that entity that will maximize resources and minimize the need to import water from other regions. Specifically, urban water management plans must:

- Provide current and projected population, climate, and other demographic factors affecting the supplier's water management planning;
- Identify and quantify, to the extent practicable, the existing and planned sources of water available to the supplier;
- Describe the reliability of the water supply and vulnerability to seasonal or climatic shortage;
- Describe plans to supplement or replace that source with alternative sources or water demand management measures;
- Describe the opportunities for exchanges or transfers of water on a short-term or long-term basis (associated with systems that use surface water);
- Quantify past and current water use;
- Provide a description of the supplier's water demand management measures, including schedule of implementation, program to measure effectiveness of measures, and anticipated water demand reductions associated with the measures; and
- Assessment of the water supply reliability.

Pursuant to the Urban Water Management Planning Act, the California Water Service Company maintains an Urban Water Management Plan.

Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance

The Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance was adopted by the Office of Administrative Law in September 2009 and requires local agencies to implement water efficiency measures as part of its review of landscaping plans. Local agencies can either adopt the Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance or incorporate provisions of the ordinance into code requirements for landscaping. For new landscaping projects of 2,500 square feet or more that require a discretionary or ministerial approval, the applicant is required to submit a detailed Landscape Documentation Package that discusses water efficiency, soil management, and landscape design elements.

Senate Bill 610 and Senate Bill 221

SB 610 and SB 221 amended state law to improve the link between information on water supply availability and certain land use decisions made by cities and counties. SB 610 and SB 221 are companion measures that seek to promote more collaborative planning between local water suppliers and cities and counties. Both statutes require that detailed information regarding water availability be provided to city and county decision-makers prior to approval of specific, large development projects, and that they be included in the administrative record that serves as the evidentiary basis for an

approval action by the city or county on such projects. Both measures recognize local control and decision-making regarding the availability of water for projects and the approval of projects.

2009 Comprehensive Delta/Water Legislation

In November 2009, the California legislature passed the comprehensive 2009 Delta/Water Legislation. The package consists of five bills, the content of which reflects the inextricable linkages between the health of the California Delta and California's statewide water supply management practices and policies. Pertinent components of this legislation include:

- **Groundwater monitoring:** Local water agencies will be required to monitor groundwater elevations throughout the State, and to public the data with the Department of Water Resources (DWR). As California comes to terms with yearly water scarcities, this bill addresses the need for consistent, reliable data—currently not measured at all, or measured with wide inconsistencies—on groundwater levels.
- Water conservation for urban and agricultural users: Between now and 2020, California must achieve a 20 percent drop in urban per capita water use across the State.
- Water diversion and use reporting: This legislation sets out new requirements for the water diversion statements that must be filed by DWR.

California Integrated Waste Management Act

To minimize the amount of solid waste that must be disposed of by transformation and land disposal, the State Legislature passed Assembly Bill 939, the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939), effective January 1990. The legislation requires each local jurisdiction in the State to set diversion requirements of 25 percent in 1995 and 50 percent in 2000; establishes a comprehensive statewide system of permitting, inspections, enforcement, and maintenance for solid waste facilities; and authorizes local jurisdictions to impose fees based on the types or amounts of solid waste generated. In 2007, SB 1016, (Wiggins, Chapter 343, Statutes of 2008) introduced a new per capita disposal and goal measurement system, which moves the emphasis from an estimated diversion measurement number to using an actual disposal measurement number as a per capita disposal rate factor. As such, the new disposal-based indicator (pounds per person per year) uses only two factors: a jurisdiction's population (or in some cases, employment) and its disposal as reported by disposal facilities.

California Public Utilities Commission

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) regulates privately owned telecommunication, electric, natural gas, water, railroad, rail transit, and passenger transportation companies. It is the responsibility of the CPUC to (1) assure California utility customers safe, reliable utility service at reasonable rates; (2) protect utility customers from fraud; and (3) promote a healthy California economy. The Public Utilities Code, adopted by the legislature, defines the jurisdiction of the CPUC.

Title 24, California's Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings

Title 24, Part 6, of the California Code of Regulations establishes California's Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings. The standards were updated in 2005 and recently amended in 2008. The 2008 standards set a goal of reducing growth in electricity use by 561.2 gigawatt-hours per year (GWh/y) and growth in natural gas use by 19 million therms per year (therms/y). The savings attributable to new nonresidential buildings are 151.2 GWh/y of electricity savings and 3.3 million therms. For nonresidential buildings, the standards establish minimum energy efficiency requirements related to building envelope, mechanical systems (e.g., HVAC and water heating systems), indoor and outdoor lighting, and illuminated signs.

Local

City of Selma

General Plan

Both the 1997 General Plan and 2035 General Plan set forth the following goals and policies relevant to public services and utilities. Note that the goal/policy numbering reflects the 2035 General Plan.

- **Goal 1:** Protect adjacent and nearby agricultural lands within the City's Planning Area, while providing for logical growth of the City.
- **Policy 1.13:** The City should discourage extension of urban services for land which will not be annexed into the City for greater than one year, except when required to eliminate health and safety problems in existing developments.
- Goal 7: Provide a full range of commercial activity appropriate to the community.
- **Policy 1.43:** The City shall monitor and update plans for public streets and utilities, particularly as they pertain to new commercial areas.
- **Goal 2:** Reduce the threat to persons and property resulting from natural and man-made hazards, including fire, crime and flooding.
- Goal 3: Provide a safe and sanitary physical environment.
- Goal 4: Coordinate required improvements of the sewer and storm drainage systems.
- **Policy 6.8:** Adequate facilities shall be provided for law enforcement and fire suppression and prevention programs.
- **Policy 6.11:** All new developments shall be required to have community sewer, water and storm water systems.

The 1997 General Plan established the following goals and policies relevant to public services and utilities:

• **Policy 1.8:** New development in the community should be sequential and contiguous to existing development, to ensure the orderly extension of municipal services and preservation of a free flowing circulation system.

The 2035 General Plan established the following policies relevant to public services and utilities:

- **Policy 1.8:** New development in the community should be sequential and contiguous to existing development, to ensure the orderly extension of municipal services and preservation of an adequate circulation system.
- **Policy 1.94:** Development shall be allowed only in areas that already have urban services or are within a master plan to provide those services. Development of lands outside of current service or master plan areas (such as the SKF Sewer District, City of Selma Master Plan for Storm Drainage Area, etc.) may be considered if the following findings can be made:
 - a. The development will not cause a shortfall, either short- or long-term in the financing of any public facility.
 - b. The development will not significantly delay the provision of a public improvement.
 - c. The development will not accelerate the need for a public improvement beyond the ability of the improvement fund to adjust for the improvement.
 - d. Expansion of the master plan area and/or public facility will not result in the City being unable to maintain existing facilities at their current service levels.
 - e. Notwithstanding the improvements proposed by any development, all developments will be required to contribute their pro rata share towards the completion of established Master Plan improvements.
- **Policy 5.2:** Encourage all construction wastes generated from new construction and demolition to be recycled.
- **Policy 5.6:** Continue to implement "user-friendly" recycling and composting programs in compliance with State mandates.
- **Policy 6.2:** Require the development and extension of infrastructure to proposed developments according to adopted elements and master plans. Projects that are not contiguous to existing urban development shall be required to assess the cumulative impact of all noncontiguous development.
- **Policy 6.4:** In order to address sewer constraints, new developments shall demonstrate that adequate sewer capacity exists prior to development or that mitigation measures will ensure that sewer capacity will be created as part of the project. Mitigation measures may include installation of necessary facilities or other methods acceptable to the City.

Storm Drainage Master Plan

The City of Selma Storm Drainage Master Plan serves as the "blueprint" for City's municipal storm drainage system. For storm drainage master planning purposes, the City is divided into drainage areas—each corresponding to a watershed disposal means that includes retention basins, lift pumps to Consolidated Irrigation District canals, or a gravity connection to the canals. The design level of protection for the master plan drainage areas is a minimum of 1 foot of freeboard at each inlet during the 2-year intensity event.

4.11.4 - Methodology

Michael Brandman Associates reviewed information contained in the 2035 City of Selma General Plan, the Fresno County LAFCO Municipal Service Review for the City of Selma, the Water Supply Analysis prepared by Cal Water (Appendix J), and the Selma Crossings Draft Storm Drainage Master Plan (Appendix H). Additionally, Michael Brandman Associates reviewed available information provided by local public services and utilities, including the Selma Fire Department, Selma Police Department, Cal Water, SKF CSD, PG&E, and the Southern California Gas Company. Finally, written responses from public service providers are provided in Appendix K.

4.11.5 - Thresholds of Significance

Public Services

According to the CEQA Guidelines' Appendix G Environmental Checklist, to determine whether environmental effects to public services are significant, the following questions are analyzed and evaluated.

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

- a.) Fire protection?
- b.) Police protection?
- c.) Schools? (Refer to Section 7, Effects Found Not To Be Significant.)
- d.) Parks? (Refer to Section 7, Effects Found Not To Be Significant.)
- e.) Other public facilities? (Refer to Section 7, Effects Found Not To Be Significant.)

Utility Systems

According to the CEQA Guidelines' Appendix G Environmental Checklist, to determine whether impacts to utilities and service systems are significant environmental effects, the following questions are analyzed and evaluated.

Would the project:

- a.) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?
- b.) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

- c.) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- d.) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?
- e.) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?
- f.) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?
- g.) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

4.11.6 - Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This section discusses potential impacts associated with the development of the proposed project and provides mitigation measures where appropriate.

Fire Protection

Impact PSU-1:	The proposed project may result in a need for new or expanded fire protection
	facilities.

Impact Analysis

The project site is currently located in unincorporated Fresno County and is served by the Fresno County Fire Protection District. The project site is proposed to be annexed into the Selma and, therefore, would be served by Selma Fire Department; the project site would be detached from the Fire Protection District.

The Selma Fire Department provided a letter dated November 18, 2010 in response to the Re-Released Notice of Preparation outlining its concerns about the proposed project. (The letter is provided in Appendix A-4.) The Fire Department indicated that the proposed project would significantly increase demand on its ability to provide fire protection and emergency medical services to the community and noted that most of the proposed project is outside of the desired 5-minute response time from the nearest fire station.

To maintain adequate staffing levels and response times, the Fire Department recommended that a staffed fire station with a minimum of three personnel be established in the project vicinity. The Fire Department indicated that this station and the associated personnel could be funded by development impact fees, community facility district fees, sales tax, or some other form of financial assistance from the applicant. The Fire Department identified three options to achieve this objective:

- **Option A:** Develop a new station site (minimum 1.5 acres with a minimum 7,000 square-foot fire station) in the project vicinity that would be open by the completion of the Northeast Area phase. Under this option, three new fire personnel would be added to the Fire Department.
- **Option B:** Enter into an agreement with the Fresno County Fire Protection District to cohabitat Station No. 83 located at 11500 E. Mountain View Avenue. Under this option, two new fire personnel would be added to the Fire Department and two existing Fresno County Fire Protection District positions would be used to augment the station staffing. Ultimately, the City may consider purchasing the station from the Fire Protection District if and when the latter agency vacates the area.
- **Option C:** Enter into an automatic aid agreement with Fresno County Fire District to provide fire protection to the proposed project for an interim period until a new fire station is built in the project vicinity.

The Fire Department indicated that Option A is the preferred option, with Option B a potential interim measure that would be appropriate for the Northeast Area (Phase 1) in lieu of Option A. The Fire Department stated that Option C is the least preferred option.

Accordingly, Mitigation Measure PSU-1 requiring the applicant to: (1) either implement Option A prior to occupancy of the Northeast Area; or (2) implement Option B prior to occupancy of the Northeast Area and ultimately implement Option A prior to occupancy of the remaining phases. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, impacts would be less than significant.

Fresno County Fire Protection District

Fresno County Fire Protection District submitted a letter dated December 22, 2010 in response to the Re-Released Notice of Preparation outlining its concerns about the proposed project. (The letter is provided in Appendix A-4.) The Fire Protection District requested that the Draft EIR evaluate economic impacts on its ability to provide public services in the context of the ongoing state fiscal crisis. As discussed previously, the project site would be annexed into the City of Selma and detached from the Fire Protection District; thus, the latter agency would not be the primary fire protection and emergency medical provider to the proposed project. Furthermore, the City Fire Department has identified two options for providing fire facilities to serve the proposed project, one of which includes cohabitating the existing Fire Protection District Station No. 83 with City personnel. Should the Fire Protection District deem this option unacceptable, Option A (construction of new City Fire Station) would be pursued.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

- **MM PSU-1** Prior to recordation of the final map for Phase 1, the project applicant shall enter into an agreement with the City of Selma to implement one of the following fire protection options:
 - Option A: The developer must dedicate a minimum of 1.5 acres parcel, to be used for a Fire Facility upon or before the issuance of building permits for Phase 1 of the project. Beginning with the issuance of building permits for Phase 1, the developer will contribute compensation equivalent to the cost incurred by the Fire Department to protect any and all structures within or immediately adjacent to the project area. The developer will continue to pay this contribution to the general fund, until the tax revenue generated by the project off sets the burden to the City for providing this public service to the project.
 - **Option B:** Enter into an agreement with the Fresno County Fire Protection District to co-habitat Station No. 83 located at 11500 E. Mountain View Avenue as an interim measure. Under this option, two new fire personnel would need to be added to the Selma Fire Department and two existing Fresno County Fire Protection District positions would be used to augment the station staffing. Ultimately, the City may consider purchasing the station from the Fire Protection District if and when the latter agency vacates the area. Should the City or Fire Protection District deem this option unacceptable, Option A shall be pursued. If Option B is pursued, this approach would only be applicable to the Northeast Area (Phase 1).

If Option B is pursued, this approach would only be applicable to the Northeast Area (Phase 1). Option A would need to be fully implemented prior to occupancy of either the South Area (Phase 2) or the Northwest Area (Phase 3).

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Police Protection

Impact PSU-2:	The proposed project may result in a need for new or expanded police protection
	racintes.

Impact Analysis

The project site is currently located in unincorporated Fresno County and is patrolled by the Fresno County Sheriff's Department. The project site is proposed to be annexed into the Selma and, therefore, would be eligible for service from the Selma Police Department.

The Selma Police Department provided a memo dated December 19, 2007 outlining its concerns about the proposed project. (The letter is provided in Appendix K.) The letter indicated that at buildout, the Selma Crossings project may generate as many as 12,000 calls for service annually or 33 calls per day. The Police Department estimated that 10 percent of the calls would be Priority 1 (highest priority—emergency), 22 percent would be Priority 2 (second-highest priority), and 68 percent of the calls would Priority 3 (lowest priority).

The Police Department indicated that this projected call volume would pose significant challenges to its ability to respond to calls for service within the community and, therefore, would require as many as 11 additional full-time sworn officers by the time project buildout is completed.

Additionally, the Police Department provided the following project-specific security recommendations:

- Inclusion of a storefront Police Department substation in the first phase of the project.
- 24-hour mobile security patrols, including the use of golf carts or bicycles where appropriate and feasible.
- Video surveillance for exterior areas, including parking lot. The video surveillance system would be linked to the City's fiber optic network to allow Police Department personnel to remotely view images.

The Police Department's comments regarding the need for additional staffing are fundamentally a policy issue that is at the discretion of the Selma City Council. Furthermore, staffing levels do not have physical impacts on the environment and, as such, they are outside the scope of this EIR. This does not preclude the City from addressing this issue in another context (for example, Conditions of Approval); it simply means that the EIR is not the appropriate forum to do so.

The Police Department's recommendations that pertain to project-specific security measures are reflected in Mitigation Measure PSU-2. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, impacts would be reduced to a level of less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

- **MM PSU-2** Prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy for each phase, the project applicant shall prepare and submit plans to the City of Selma demonstrating that the following police protection facilities and security measures will be implemented:
 - Inclusion of a storefront Police Department substation, as appropriate.
 - 24-hour mobile private security patrols, including the use of golf carts or bicycles where appropriate and feasible.

• Video surveillance for exterior areas, including parking lot. The video surveillance system would be linked to the City's fiber optic network to allow Police Department personnel to remotely view images.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Potable Water

Impact PSU-3:	The proposed project may result in a need for new water supplies and infrastructure.
	infrastructure.

Impact Analysis

The following discussion is derived from the Water Supply Assessment, prepared by Cal Water, provided in its entirety in Appendix J.

Water Demand

Estimating water usage for commercial, retail and office space on a gallons/square feet basis requires characterizing the type and mix of businesses that are anticipated in the development. If the commercial/retail/office space mix has a higher concentration of businesses that use more water—such as supermarkets, restaurants, coffee shops, and health clubs—the water use factor will be significantly higher than a mix largely comprising dry goods retail activities such as clothing, shoes, jewelry, sporting goods, drug stores, and bookstores.

Cal Water's Dominguez District in Torrance, California, in conjunction with PCR Services Corporation and the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles, developed estimated water demand rates for a variety of commercial activities, which are summarized in Table 4.11-3.

Use	Average Water Demand (gallons/square foot/day)		
Shopping Center	0.358		
Electronic Superstore	0.110		
Home Improvement	0.110		
Discount Club	0.110		
Home Furnishing	0.110		
Office Supplies	0.110		
Pet Supply	0.110		
Supermarket	0.650		
High turnover	1.100		
Fast Food	1.100		
Quality	1.100		
Source: California Water Service Company, 2011.			

Table 4.11-3: Water Demand Rates – Commercial Land Use Activities

Commercial office space water usage was not included in the above figures. In Cal Water's Bayshore District in the City of San Mateo, 3 years of sales records for the Franklin Templeton offices were obtained and analyzed along with data on the square footage of the office complex. Because these offices had more than the usual landscaped area compared with typical office complexes, consumption data for the months from June through October were excluded due to significant increases in water consumption due to irrigation. Data from 23 months of records for the nearby Siebel offices with more representative landscaped area were obtained and reviewed along with square footage. The water use factor (gallons per day/square foot) for this complex was found to be 68 percent of that at the Franklin Templeton complex after correcting for excessive landscape irrigation. The Franklin Templeton office factor was 0.01227 gallons per day/square foot. However, both offices or personal services activities (hair styling, manicures and pedicures, etc.). A conservative factor of 3.25 was applied to the above usage rate to account for more water using activities. The factor used for office commercial here is 0.04 gallon per day/square foot.

Calculated water use for the Selma Crossings development at full buildout is summarized in Table 4.11-4.

Use	Characteristics	Water Demand Rate	Water Demand (gallons/day)
Commercial Retail	2,092,203 square feet	0.30 gallon/square foot/day	627,610
Office	540,000 square feet	0.04 gallon/square foot/day	21,600
Residential Mixed	30,000 square feet 250 dwelling units	0.30 gallon/square foot/day + 3.45 persons/dwelling unit x 140 gallons per day/person	9,000 + 127,750
Auto Mall	400,000 square feet	0.11 gallon/square foot/day	44,000
Hotel	155,000 square feet	0.40 gallon/square foot/day	77,500
Water Park	10,000 square feet	0.80 gallon/square foot/day	8,000
		Subtotal	915,460 (1,026 acre-feet/year)
Irrigation	8.6 acres	2,230 gallons/acre/day	19,180
Total 934,640 (1,048 acre-feet/yea			
Notes: Commercial land use water demand rates shown in Table 3.11-3.			

Table 4.11-4: Estimated Project Water Demand Summary

Irrigation rate based on Selma WSFMP found that the average park irrigation rate was 2.5 acre-feet/acre/year or 2,230 gallons/acre/day.

Source: California Water Service Company, 2011.

In the Selma 2008 WSFMP, water use data from selected sample commercial areas in Selma for 2005 yielded average use factors of 1.6 acre-feet/year/acre for community commercial.

To crosscheck, if an average rate of 1.6 acre- feet/year/acre were used for the proposed Selma Crossings, then total water demand would be 459 acre-feet/year.

The preceding method used for calculating water demands results in an estimated demand that is 2.28 times greater than using a gross acreage figure. Although this suggests that the Selma Crossings project may use significantly less water than what is shown in Table 4.11-4, this water supply analysis will use the higher value in the interests of presenting a "worst case" scenario.

Maximum Day Demand

Maximum day demand is based on the peaking factor determined from historic water use records. For the 26-year average (1980 to 2005), the peaking factor was 1.88. For the years from 2000 to 2008, the average was 1.83. For the Selma Sphere of Influence (SOI), a conservative factor of 1.80 is used because of the increased number of metered services and further reductions in demands due to Cal Water's conservation management program.

However, for the Selma Crossings project, a lower factor (1.50) is used, since commercial retail, office, hotel and entertainment do not have a significant seasonal factor as a result of having very small areas that are irrigated.

Multiplying 1.50 by the total estimated daily water demand value shown in Table 4.11-4 yields a maximum daily demand rate of approximately 1.4 million gallons per day.

Reclaimed Water Demand Forecast

All wastewaters generated in the plan area will be collected, conveyed, and treated in the SKF CSD Regional Treatment Plant wastewater treatment plant, which is approximately 6 miles from Selma. Currently, the SKF CSD plant provides secondary treatment with activated sludge and filtration with dual media filters, prior to discharge to percolation/evaporation ponds. The treated effluent is not disinfected. Approximately 1.8 mgd is received from customers in Cal Water's Selma service area. For reclaimed water to be used for urban irrigation or industrial proposes, additional treatment facilities (at minimum chlorination) would be required. In addition, storage, pumping, transmission, and distribution facilities would be required to convey the reclaimed water to urban reuse sites. Consequently, at this time urban reuse is not considered economically feasible; therefore, the water supply projections in this EIR do not assume that this source of water will be available to the proposed project.

Water Demand Forecast for the Selma District

Cal Water's projected total water demand forecasts in its 2006 Urban Water Management Plan for the Selma District are based on multiplying the forecast of projected services for each customer class by the anticipated demand per service for that class. Forecasts of growth in services are based on the 5-

year average of growth in services by customer class for the last 5 years because it approximates anticipated population growth trends.

Cal Water calculates three different demand scenarios per service per customer class: low, average and high. Low demand uses the lowest recorded demand per service for each customer class during this period and represents a demand that customers could achieve if reductions in demand were required because of diminished supply conditions. Normal or average demand is calculated as the average demand per service and represents the demand most likely to occur when Cal Water's 10-percent conservation goal is achieved. High demand is based on the highest recorded demand per service for each customer class and represents growth with no conservation.

Because of the major decline in the development and housing markets, the rapid rate of forecasted population growth and corresponding water demand presented in the 2006 Urban Water Management Plan has been replaced with a more realistic rate of increase as cited earlier, and the overall water use rate per capita taken into account meter conversion effects and all new services being metered is estimated to be 293 gallons/person/day.

The Selma District forecasted annual average day demand is shown in Table 4.11-5.

Year	Population	Million Gallons per Day	Acre-Feet/Year
2005	22,930	5.93	6,648 (Actual)
2010	25,212	7.38	8,282 (Forecast)
2015	30,024	8.80	9,862
2020	34,836	10.21	11,443
2025	39,648	11.62	13,023
2030	44,460	13.03	14,604
Source: California Water Service Company, 2011.			

Table 4.11-5: Selma District Sphere of Influence Water Demand Forecast

As previously noted, Cal Water's 2006 Urban Water Management Plan population forecast for Selma is not based on a land use forecast that evaluates the location, magnitude and rate of development of approved and proposed developments that are occurring or are forecasted by the City of Selma. The land use development approach, which determines a water duty factor by land use type and area and is used to forecast water demand in the Selma Water Supply and Facilities Master Plan. In 2026, the Selma Water Supply and Facilities Master Plan projected average day demand is 11.7 mgd. This compares to 11.62 mgd using the above method for 2025. Thus, the two different methods yield very similar results.

Water Supply Assessment

It is estimated that development of Selma Crossings project will begin in 2011 and will be completed by 2015 or it will take 5 years to complete build out and full occupancy. It is also assumed that development will occur linearly. Note that this phasing assumption is more aggressive than the 12year buildout period described in Section 3, Project Description and, therefore, provides for a more conservative analysis of water supply impacts.

Using these assumptions, use of commercial facilities would be as follows:

- 2010: 0 percent
- 2015: 100 percent
- 2020: 100 percent
- 2025: 100 percent
- 2030: 100 percent

Estimated average annual day water demand for Selma Crossings project in five-year forecast increments for the next 20 years is shown in Table 4.11-6.

Year	Million Gallons per Day	Acre-Feet/Year		
2010	0.000	0		
2015	0.934	1,048		
2019	0.934	1,048		
2024	0.934	1,048		
2029	0.934	1,048		
Source: California Water Service Company, 2011.				

Table 4.11-6: Selma Crossings Water Demand Forecast

The Selma Crossings project site is within the existing Selma Sphere of Influence. It is assumed here that the Selma District water demand forecast includes the Selma Crossing project demands. Table 4.11-7 compares the demands shown in Table 4.11-5 and Table 4.11-6.

	Million Gallons per Day			
Year	Selma Sphere of Influence	Selma Crossings Project		
2005	5.93	0.000		
2010	7.38	0.000		
2015	8.80	0.934		
2020	10.21	0.934		
2025	11.62	0.934		
2030	13.03	0.934		
Source: California Water Service Company, 2011.				

Table 4.11-7: Comparison of Forecasted Demands

Below is a summary of the water demand by year:

- 2015: The estimated annual average day demand for the existing Selma Sphere of Influence is 8.80 mgd. The projected demand for Selma Crossings is 0.934 mgd or 10.6 percent of the forecasted Sphere of Influence water demand.
- 2020: The estimated annual average day demand for the existing Selma Sphere of Influence is 10.21 mgd. The projected demand for Selma Crossings is 0.934 mgd or 9.1 percent of the forecasted Sphere of Influence water demand.
- 2030: The estimated annual average day demand for the existing Selma Sphere of Influence is 13.03 mgd. The projected demand for Selma Crossings is 0.934 mgd or 7.1 percent of the forecasted Sphere of Influence water demand.

As shown in the preceding analysis, the Selma Crossings project does not represent a significant percentage of the projected increase in total water demand associated with other proposed and planned developments.

Table 4.11-8 provides the projected maximum day demand, which is based on using an average factor of 1.80 times the annual average day.

Table 4.11-8: Selma District Existing Sphere of Influence Maximum Day Water Demand Forecast

Year	Million Gallons per Day	
2010	13.28	
2015	15.84	
2020	18.38	
2025	20.92	
2030	23.45	
Source: California Water Service Company, 2011.		

Adequacy of Well Capacity

Table 4.11-9 is a comparison of forecasted total demand for the Selma District with existing and planned additional well capacity for normal hydrologic conditions.

Table 4.11-9: Selma Forecasted Water Demand Versus Supply (Normal Hydrological Conditions

	Average Demand		Million Gallons/Day			
Year	Million Gallons/Day	Acre- Feet/Year	Maximum Day Demand	Well Capacity	Well Capacity - Maximum Day Demand	
2005	5.93	6,648	10.674	15.90	5.226	
2010	7.38	8,274	13.280	16.57	3.286	
2015	8.80	9,865	15.840	19.00	3.160	
2020	10.21	11,446	18.380	23.92	5.542	
2025	11.62	13,027	20.920	26.37	5.454	
2030	13.03	14,608	23.450	28.80	5.346	
Source: California Water Service Company, 2011.						

The American Water Works Association (AWWA) advises that future water supply projections should assume that the largest well is not operational in order to provide a conservative assessment of supply. The largest well in the Selma District has a capacity of 1,700 gpm or 2.45 mgd. When this well capacity is omitted from the values shown in Table 4.11-9, there is still extra capacity to meet maximum day demand for the next 20 years.

With respect to the average annual day demand, 90 percent utilization of 2010 capacity or 14.91 mgd would be adequate to 2030 if all existing wells remained in operation at current production rates.

For 2030, with respect to forecasted maximum day demand, 2010 well capacity would need to be minimally increased to 25.9 mgd (23.45 + 2.45) using the AWWA assumption that the largest well was not in operation. On the assumption that two of the largest wells (2.45 mgd x 2 = 4.90 mgd)

were not operating, supply capacity would be 23.9 mgd—still sufficient to meet maximum day demand.

Thus, the proposed plan for adding new wells stays ahead of growth in demand and provides sufficient well capacity to maximum day demand even with the largest two wells not in operation.

As the need arises, additional storage facilities with booster pumps will be added to meet peak-hour flow demands.

Thus, Cal Water has sufficient groundwater production and storage capacity to meet annual average day, maximum day demand and peak hour flow conditions.

Adequacy of Groundwater Supply

Measurements by Cal Water of static groundwater elevations in Selma district wells show water levels have been relatively constant for the past 35 years. However, groundwater levels recorded by CID for all of its wells in its 2-square-mile area for a longer period show a gradual decline in static water levels. There have been short periods where groundwater elevations declined more rapidly and then recovered during periods of above normal precipitation. In the Selma District, the combination of increased demand due to growth coupled with the late 1980s multi-year drought, which greatly reduced availability of surface water for aquifer recharge, resulted in a 45-foot decline in static groundwater elevation. High levels of rainfall and storm runoff in the early 1990s enabled CID to supply more surface irrigation water and increase the amount of groundwater recharged. As a result, the average static water level in Cal Water's Selma wells rose to within 10 feet of pre-drought elevations.

Managing the quantity of water recharged to and extracted from the aquifers in the basin is necessary to maintain adequate groundwater storage and hence supply of this resource. Most of the land that is being developed within Selma's sphere of influence is being used to grow grapes and fruit orchards such as apricots. While there are some orchards in this greater area, the preponderance of agricultural irrigation appears to be for production of grapes.

Irrigation methods include traditional flood irrigation or drip irrigation. Source of supply is either surface waters diverted mostly from the Kings River by CID when available or pumped groundwater. Normal practice results in a combination of both surface water and groundwater being used by irrigators.

The estimated annual average day water demand for the Selma Crossings project at buildout is 0.85 mgd (952 acre-feet/year) for an area of 304 acres or about 3.12 acre-feet/year per year. The irrigated landscaping rate is estimated be 3.0 feet/year.

Based on Cal Water historical data for the Selma District, the 10-year average maximum day demand during the 5-month (January, February, March, November, and December) non irrigation period is

3.46 million gallons, whereas it averages 7.76 million gallons for the 7-month (April, May, June, July, August, September, and October) irrigation period. If annual average day use follows a similar pattern, then the percentage of Selma District water used for irrigation is estimated as follows:

$$(7.76 - 3.46) \times 7/(3.46 \times 12) = 30.1/41.32 = 72.8$$
 percent.

As a crosscheck, 2005 average consumption was 314 gallons per person per day and if 27.2 percent was used for indoor domestic consumption, then average indoor use per person was 85 gallons per person per day, which agrees with general planning estimates.

For landscape irrigation, it is assumed that 25 percent of applied irrigation water infiltrates below the plant root zone and vadose zone and passes into the groundwater.

In terms of the proposed project, groundwater recharge would be: 0.25×3 feet/year = 0.75 feet/year.

Net consumptive use is 3.12 feet/year - 0.75 feet/year = 2.37 feet/year.

University of California Cooperative Extension in a Best Management Practices document dated 1998 indicates that for raisin grapes the range of irrigation rates in nearby Tulare County is 2.0 to 4.5 acre-feet/acre/year. CID, in a June 2, 2006 letter to Cal Water, believes the average agricultural irrigation rate in the Selma area is 3.05 feet/acre/year.

Groundwater recharge from irrigated agricultural is a function of a many variables which include weather, hydrologic conditions, irrigation practices, crops, soils, geologic conditions. One way to calculate recharge is to collect data and make estimates of monthly irrigation, monthly precipitation, runoff, plant evapo-transpiration, evaporation, initial soil moisture, and soil's available water holding capacity. Recharge is the net of irrigation and precipitation minus water losses associated with other factors.

Since this data was not available and obtaining and analyzing it is beyond the scope of this assessment, a general estimate of recharge to the groundwater is provided here.

CID provided Cal Water with a memorandum titled Urban Versus Agricultural Water Use Comparison, prepared by Summers Engineering and dated March 24, 2006. In that report, Summers Engineering estimates that 1.60 acre-feet/acre/year (1.60 feet/year) of irrigation water is from surface water and 1.45 feet/year is from groundwater.

If it is assumed that groundwater recharge for both flood and drip irrigation over wet and dry years on average is 25 percent, then the amount of recharge that agriculture provides would be 0.25×3.05 feet/year or 0.762 feet/year. If 1.60 feet/year of irrigated water is imported surface water, net "consumptive use" of groundwater would be 1.450 feet/year – 0.762 feet/year = 0.688 feet/year.

This compares to the estimated amount of recharge per development acre of 0.75 feet/year and net "consumptive use" of 2.37 feet/year, which is 1.682 feet/year more than agricultural use.

However, it is likely that surface water not used at the Selma Crossings site for agricultural irrigation would be used for the same purpose in the vicinity of Selma, and there would be no area loss of the contribution of surface water. On that basis, net consumptive use of groundwater for agriculture would be calculated as 3.050 feet/year – 0.688 feet/year = 2.362 feet/year.

If the estimated net consumptive use for the proposed project is 2.37 feet/year, and all other factors affecting recharge were the same, there would be in practical terms no change in consumptive use of groundwater since 2.362 - 2.370 = -0.008 feet/year.

For the proposed project, estimated indoor water is about 900 acre-feet/year/304 acres = 2.96 feet/year. This becomes wastewater that is conveyed and treated in the Selma-Fowler-Kingsburg wastewater treatment facility. Treated plant effluent is applied to disposal fields in the vicinity of the plant. It is reasonable and appropriate to assume that 50 percent of the applied effluent recharges to groundwater since that is the agency's disposal objective, then 0.5 x 2.96 feet/year = 1.48 feet/year of additional recharge can be credited to the proposed project.

Therefore, the net decrease in consumptive groundwater use with this additional credit would be 1.480 - 0.008 feet/year = 1.470 feet/year

In total, this equates to a decrease in consumptive use of groundwater: $304 \text{ acres } x 1.47 \text{ feet/year} = 447 \text{ acre-feet/year or } 400,000 \text{ gallons/day} - a significant benefit.}$

Since 1996, CID as the lead water agency has developed and continues to work on implementing a Groundwater Management Plan under the provisions of Assembly Bill 3030.

As previously mentioned, CID conveys flood flows from the Kings River and Friant-Kern Canal via its canal and distribution system to irrigators and pond areas for recharging groundwater.

It appears that because of the gradual decline in the area's groundwater table as demonstrated by CID groundwater well monitoring data that additional surface supplies and infiltration or spreading basins are needed to increase the annual quantity of groundwater recharge. It also appears that conversion of agricultural to urbanized use of land, as set forth in the Selma Crossings project, will increase groundwater consumptive use.

Cal Water believes that groundwater for the next 20 years will continue to be a reliable supply to meet forecasted demands for Selma providing measures are taken by CID and other water agencies to reduce withdrawals and/or increase recharge to the groundwater basin. With respect to increasing recharge to the groundwater basin, Cal Water plans to work with CID to develop plans for additional facilities that will accomplish that objective.

Groundwater Rights

Cal Water owns all the land on which its wells are located and would be located if future wells are to be constructed. Under state law, the use of percolating groundwater in California is governed by the doctrine of correlative rights and reasonable use, which gives the overlying property owner a common right to reasonable, beneficial use of the basin supply on the overlying land until the basin is adjudicated. Aside from the correlative water rights, Cal Water does not have any other existing water supply entitlements or water rights.

It is noted that the District's wells are located in a non-adjudicated groundwater basin. The principal concern for this basin is to manage the groundwater system in order to achieve some overall balance between the rates of extraction (pumping) and recharge.

Cal Water has completed a Water Supply and Facilities Master Plan, which more thoroughly assessed groundwater use and management issues. The plan recommends that Cal Water work with CID and the City of Selma to develop a long-term sustainable supply plan for groundwater. This includes conducting a feasibility study of a program for increasing groundwater basin storage in the Selma area through recharge of surplus wet weather surface waters via the Kings River, CID canal conveyance system and new recharge areas.

Demand Management

Cal Water has ongoing water demand management programs as part of its commitment to achieving more efficient uses of water and to specifically address drought conditions that might impact groundwater table levels. Cal Water actively promotes conservation through educational, informational, and customer assistance activities. Cal Water programs include distribution system water audits and leak detection, promotion of water efficient landscape guides, residential surveys, plumbing retrofits, high efficiency washing machine rebates, public education, school education and toilet retrofits.

As a result of new legislation in 2010, all utilities in California are obligated to attempt to meet the goal of a total reduction in demand of 20 percent by 2020. The interpretation of actual reductions to be achieved will depend in part on the base year of reference, since many utilities including Cal Water have already been implementing conservation measures to reduce demand. Cal Water anticipates that in addition to a more intensified conservation program that is supported by the California Public Utilities Commission, it will continue to see reductions in water use as it converts flat-rate residential or unmetered services to metered ones.

State measure AB 2572 requires that all unmetered services be converted to metered services by 2025 as well. The forecasted Selma SOI water demand is based on an annual reduction in unmetered services of 5 percent per year.

Conclusion

Cal Water concluded that adequate long-term water supplies are available to serve the proposed project and indicated that it would provide a "will-serve" letter to the project applicant. Because Cal Water's long-term water projections account for demand management measures during dry years, mitigation is proposed to reduce the project's demand on water supply through the implementation of indoor and outdoor water conservation measures. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a level of less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

- MM PSU-3a Prior to issuance of building permits for each phase, the project applicant shall submit landscaping plans to the City of Selma for review and approval demonstrating that landscaping will comply with the Model Efficient Landscape Water Ordinance. The landscaping plans shall identify outdoor irrigation water conservation measures, such as but not limited to:
 - Separate metering of irrigation water
 - Drought-resistant vegetation
 - Irrigation systems employing the following features:
 - Drip irrigation
 - Low-precipitation-rate sprinklers
 - Bubbler/soaker systems
 - Programmable irrigation controllers with automatic rain shutoff sensors and flow sensing capabilities
 - Matched precipitation rate nozzles that maximize the uniformity of the water distribution characteristics of the irrigation system
 - Conservative sprinkler spacings that minimize overspray onto paved surfaces
 - Hydrozones that keep plants with similar water needs in the same irrigation zone
 - Minimally or gently sloped landscaped areas to minimize runoff and maximize infiltration
 - Organic topdressing mulch in non-turf areas to decrease evaporation and increase water retention
- **MM PSU-3b** Prior to issuance of building permits for each phase, the project applicant shall submit building plans to the City of Selma for review and approval that identify the following indoor water conservation measures:

- Separate metering of domestic water
- Low-flow or ultra-low-flow toilets and urinals
- Sensor-activated, low-flow faucets

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Wastewater

Impact PSU-4:	The proposed project would not exceed Regional Water Quality Control Standards for the treatment of wastewater or require the provision of new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities, and the project will not exceed the capacity of existing wastewater treatment commitments.
---------------	---

Impact Analysis

Table 4.11-10 provides an estimate of the proposed project's estimated daily wastewater generation at buildout. This estimate is based on the industry-standard assumption that wastewater represents 90 percent of domestic water consumption. As shown in the table, the proposed project would generate an estimated 823,914 gallons of effluent per day at buildout.

Domestic Water Demand	Wastewater Generation as a Percentage of Domestic Water	Wastewater Generation (Buildout)	
915,460 gallons/day	90	823,914 gallons/day	
Notes: Domestic water demand value shown in Table 4.11-4. Note that this figure excludes irrigation. Source: Michael Brandman Associates			

As shown in Table 4.11-10, the proposed project would generate approximately 0.824 mgd of effluent at buildout, which is scheduled to occur in 2024 at the earliest. The SKF CSD wastewater treatment plant has a year-round treatment capacity of 4.8 mgd. Currently, the plant receives average dry weather flows of 4.0 mgd and average wet weather flows of 3.8 mgd; therefore, 0.8 to 1.0 mgd remains available for new projects.

As discussed previously, SKF CSD Capital Improvement Program contemplates expansion of the treatment plant to serve new growth in the service area. Currently, expansion is scheduled to begin in fiscal year 2017–2018 and be completed by the end of fiscal year 2019–2020. Therefore, it would be expected that adequate treatment capacity would be in place by the time the project is fully complete. The proposed project would pay capacity fees to SKF CSD, which would be used for capital improvements, such as expansion of the treatment plant.

SKF CSD provided comments in response to the 2010 Re-Revised NOP. The agency advised that its policy is to issue will-serve letters for a project within at the request of any jurisdictions within its

service area. The will-serve letters have a time limit of 2.5 years from date of issuance or expiration of the tentative map, whichever comes later. A will-serve letter is good for the life of a final map.

Finally, the entire project site will need to be annexed into the SKF CSD and a concurrent adjustment of the agency's SOI will also need to occur to ensure that the boundaries are co-terminus. These boundary changes are further discussed in Section 4.9, Land Use.

Impacts would be less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is necessary.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Storm Drainage

Impact PSU-5: The proposed project may require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Impact Analysis

A 20-acre stormwater basin would be developed immediately south of the South Area. The Northeast, South, and Northwest areas, as well as adjoining areas outside of the project boundaries, would convey runoff to this basin via underground pipelines ranging from 24 to 72 inches in diameter.

The basin is proposed to be sized to retain 230 acre-feet of water, which is equivalent to the total volume generated by 6 inches of rainfall falling on the drainage area served by the basin. Statistically, a storm with a 100-year return period and having a duration of 10 days will have a total precipitation amount of 6 inches.

The southeast corner of the proposed basin site is 21 feet higher than the other areas of the basin. Because of this, 45,000 cubic yards of material from the southeast corner will have to be excavated to grade the top of the basin to the same elevation as the rest of the basin.

Refer to Impact HYD-3 in Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality for further discussion.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

Implement Mitigation Measures HYD-3a and HYD-3b in Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

-		
Solid	Waste	

Impact PSU-6:	The proposed project may generate substantial amounts of solid waste that exceed
	the capacity for the landfill or does not comply with federal, state, and local statutes
	and regulations related to solid waste.

Impact Analysis

Solid waste would be generated by construction and operational activities. Each is discussed below.

Construction Solid Waste

Short-term construction waste generation is summarized in Table 4.11-11. The estimate of 9,479 cubic yards was calculated using an average of 3.89 pounds of debris per square foot of non-residential construction and 4.38 pounds of debris per square foot of residential construction, as provided by the United States Environmental Protection Agency. When the total amount of construction waste is averaged over the projected 12-year buildout period of the project, it yields an annual average of 790 cubic yards.

				Construction Waste Generation	
Component	Use	Waste Generation Rate	Characteristics	Tons	Cubic Yards
Northeast	Commercial Retail	3.89 pounds/square foot/year	882,003 square feet	1,715	2,401
South	Commercial Retail/Office/Auto Mall/Hotel/Water Park	3.89 pounds/square foot/year	1,431,200 square feet	2,784	3,898
Northwest	Commercial Retail/Office	3.89 pounds/square foot/year	884,000 square feet	1,719	2,407
	Residential	4.38 pounds/square foot	252,000 square feet	552	773
Grand Total	·		·	6,770	9,479
12-Year Ann	ual Average			564	790
Notes: 1 ton = 2,000 pc 1 ton = 1.4 cubi Source: U.S. E	ounds c yards nvironmental Protection Ag	gency, 1998; Michael Brand	dman Associates, 2011.		

Table 4.11-11: Estimated Construction Waste Generation
While the estimate of 9,479 cubic yards (or 790 cubic yards annually) of construction waste would be an extremely small amount relative to the remaining capacity at the Avenal Regional Landfill (26.0 million cubic yards) and American Avenue Disposal Site (29.4 million cubic yards), mitigation is proposed that would require the project applicant to implement construction and demolition debris recycling measures. The implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce potential impacts to a level of less than significant.

Operational Solid Waste

Operational solid waste generation for the proposed project was calculated using standard waste generation rates provided by Cal Recycle. The project's waste generation calculations are provided in Table 4.11-12. As shown in the table, the proposed project is expected to generate 11,248 cubic yards of waste annually at buildout.

				Const Waste G	ruction eneration
Component	Use	Waste Generation Rate	Characteristics	Tons	Cubic Yards
Northeast	Commercial Retail	4.8 pounds/square foot/year	882,003 square feet	2,117	2,964
South	Commercial Retail/Office/Auto Mall/Hotel/Water Park	4.8 pounds/square foot/year	1,431,200 square feet	3,435	4,809
	Commercial Retail/Office	4.8 pounds/square foot/year	884,000 square feet	2,122	2,971
Northwest	Residential	820 pounds/resident/year	250 dwelling units x 3.64 persons per unit = 910 persons	373	522
Total				8,047	11,248
Notes: Number of resid 1 ton = $2,000$ pc 1 ton = 1.4 cubic	lents estimated using Selma bunds c vards	a's average household size	of 3.64.		

Table 4.11-12: Estimated Operational Waste Generation

Source: Cal Recycle, 2006; Michael Brandman Associates, 2011.

Mitigation is proposed that would require the project applicant to submit a Recycling and Waste Reduction Plan to the City of Selma for review and approval. The plan would identify practices and onsite facilities necessary to ensure that recoverable materials and green waste are diverted from the waste stream to the maximum extent feasible. The implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce solid waste generation and reduce demand for landfill capacity. Therefore, solid waste impacts would be reduced to a level of less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

- MM PSU-6a Prior to issuance of building permits for each building, the project applicant shall submit documentation to the City of Selma as part of the permit application demonstrating that construction and demolition debris recycling measures will be incorporated into the proposed project. Such activities shall include the retention of a qualified contractor to perform construction debris recycling with an objective of diverting a minimum of 50 percent of construction debris from the waste stream.
- MM PSU-6b Prior to issuance of the final certificates of occupancy for each building, the project applicant shall install onsite facilities necessary to collect and store recyclable materials generated by customers and facility operations. Customer recyclable collection facilities (i.e., receptacles) shall be located in public spaces and clearly identify accepted materials. Facility operations recycling facilities (i.e., bale and pallet storage) shall be located in appropriate places and shall be enclosed for screening purposes.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Energy

Impact PSU-7:	The proposed project would not result in the inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary
	consumption of electricity or natural gas.

Impact Analysis

PG&E would provide electricity and the Gas Company would provide natural gas to the proposed project. Table 4.11-13 provides an estimate of the proposed project's annual energy consumption. These figures were derived from energy consumption rates provided by the United States Energy Information Administration. The non-residential energy usage estimates are based on national consumption figures for commercial buildings that operate continuously. The residential electricity energy consumption and natural gas consumption rates are based on PG&E's 10-K Annual Report.

Estimates for non-residential uses likely overstate actual consumption, because they include structures located in different climate regions or states with less stringent energy efficiency standards than those of California. As shown in the table, the proposed project is anticipated to require 69.4 million kilowatt hours annually of electricity and require 198.2 million cubic feet annually of natural gas.

Component	Use	Source	Consumption Rate	Characteristics	Annual Consumption	
Northeast	Commercial Retail	Electricity	21.19 kWh/square foot/year	882 003 square feet	18.7 million kWh	
Horticast	Commercial Retain	Natural Gas	Consumption RateCharacteristicsy21.19 kWh/square foot/year882,003 square feetas58.3 cubic feet/ square foot/year1,431,200 square feety21.19 kWh/square foot/year1,431,200 square feety21.19 kWh/square foot/year884,000 square 	51.4 million cubic feet		
South	Commercial Retail/Office/ Auto	Electricity	21.19 kWh/square foot/year	1,431,200 square	30.3 million kWh	
South	Mall/ Hotel/Water Park	Natural Gas	58.3 cubic feet/ square foot/year	feet	83.4 million cubic feet	
	Commercial	Electricity	21.19 kWh/square foot/year	884 ,000 square	18.7 million kWh	
Northwest	Retail/Office	UseSourceImage: Display transmissionElectricityImage: Display transmissionNatural GasCommercial tail/Office/Auto all/Hotel/Water ParkElectricityNatural GasElectricityCommercial Retail/OfficeElectricityResidentialElectricityResidentialElectricityGrand TotalSame transmission 2008	tail/Office Natural Gas 58.3 cubic feet/ square foot/year		feet	51.4 million cubic feet
Northwest	Desidential	Electricity	6,953 kWh/dwelling unit/year	250 dwelling units	1.7 million kWh	
	Residential		48,000 cubic feet/ dwelling unit/year	250 dwelling units	12.0 million cubic feet	
				Electricity	69.4 million kWh	
Grand Total				Natural Gas	198.2 million cubic feet	
Notes: kWh = kilowatt ho	urs	Iministration 2008	· Pasifia Gas and Electric	Company 2010: Michael	Prandman	

Source: United States Energy Information Administration, 2008; Pacific Gas and Electric Company, 2010; Michael Brandman Associates, 2011.

PG&E provided a letter dated November 5, 2007 confirming that it could provide electricity service to the proposed project. Southern California Gas provided a letter dated November 28, 2007 confirming that it could provide natural gas service to the proposed project. Both letters are provided in Appendix K. The provision of both will-serve letters indicates that both energy providers have adequate supplies and transmission capacity to serve the proposed project, as well as other current and future customers.

The proposed project's structures would be designed in accordance with all applicable state energy efficiency requirements, including the latest edition of Title 24, California's Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings (Title 24 includes the Green Building Standards Code). These standards include minimum energy efficiency requirements related to building envelope, mechanical systems (e.g., HVAC and water heating systems), indoor and outdoor lighting, and illuminated signs. The incorporation of the latest Title 24 standards into the project would ensure that the project would not result in the inefficient, unnecessary, or wasteful consumption of energy.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is necessary.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

4.12 - Transportation

4.12.1 - Introduction

This section describes the existing transportation and traffic setting and potential effects from project implementation on transportation, traffic, the site, and its surrounding area. Descriptions and analysis in this section are based on information contained in the Traffic Impact Study prepared by Peters Engineering Group, included in this EIR as Appendix L.

4.12.2 - Environmental Setting

Roadway Network

Descriptions of the major roadways in the project vicinity are presented on the following pages.

State Route 99

State Route 99 (SR-99) is a six-lane divided freeway that provides primary regional north-south access to Selma. The freeway extends from Tehama County in the north to Kern County in the south and is the primary highway facility connecting the San Joaquin Valley metropolitan areas of Stockton, Modesto, Merced, Fresno, and Bakersfield. In the project vicinity, SR-99 has a full interchange at Mountain View Avenue.

Golden State Boulevard

Golden State Boulevard generally trends north and south, east of and parallel to the SR-99 freeway. The City of Selma General Plan 1997 Update Circulation Element identifies Golden State Boulevard as an expressway adjacent to the project site and an arterial north of Nebraska Avenue. The Fresno County General Plan identifies Golden State Boulevard as a super arterial adjacent to the project site. It is currently a four-lane divided highway located primarily under the jurisdiction of Fresno County, but it also extends into the City of Selma and the City of Kingsburg.

Mountain View Avenue

Mountain View Avenue is an east-west roadway designated in the City of Selma General Plan 1997 Update Circulation Element and the Fresno County General Plan as an arterial street west of SR-99 and an expressway east of SR-99. It is a two-lane undivided highway west of Golden State Boulevard and east of Bethel Avenue. Between Golden State Boulevard and Bethel Avenue, it is currently a four-lane divided highway.

Dockery Avenue

Dockery Avenue is a north-south roadway designated in the City of Selma General Plan 1997 Update Circulation Element as a collector in the vicinity of the project site, where it is currently a narrow two-lane country road.

McCall Avenue

McCall Avenue is a north-south roadway designated in the City of Selma General Plan 1997 Update Circulation Element as an arterial and designated in the Fresno County General Plan as a collector south of Valley View Street, where it is currently a two-lane country highway.

Kamm Avenue

Kamm Avenue is an east-west roadway designated in the Fresno County General Plan as an arterial east of Golden State Boulevard. It is not designated west of Golden State Boulevard, where it is currently a narrow, two-lane country road.

Level of Service

The Transportation Research Board Highway Capacity Manual, 2000 (HCM) defines level of service (LOS) as a qualitative measure describing operational characteristics within a traffic stream, based on service measures such as speed and travel time, freedom to maneuver, traffic interruptions, comfort, and convenience. LOS characteristics for both unsignalized and signalized intersections are presented in Table 4.12-1 and Table 4.12-2. LOS characteristics for road segments are presented in Table 4.12-3.

Level of Service	Description	Average Vehicle Delay (seconds)		
А	Little or no delay	0-10		
В	Short delays	>10-15		
С	Average delays	>15-25		
D	Long delays	>25-35		
Е	Very long delays	>35-50		
F	Extremely long delays	>50		
Source: Transportation Research Board, 2000.				

Table 4.12-1: Level of Service Characteristics for Unsignalized Intersections

Table 4.12-2: Level of Service Characteristics for Signalized Intersections

Level of Service	Description	Average Vehicle Delay (seconds)
А	Extremely favorable progression. Most vehicles arrive during green phase. Many vehicles do not stop.	≤10
В	Good progression.	>10-20
С	Fair progression. Significant number of vehicles stopped. Some queues do not clear.	>20-35

Level of Service	Description	Average Vehicle Delay (seconds)
D	Noticeable congestion. Many vehicles stop. Individual cycle failures are noticeable. Queues often do not clear.	>35–55
E	Poor progression. Individual cycle failures are frequent. Queues frequently do not clear.	>55-80
F	Poor progression. Oversaturation. Many individual cycle failures and queues not cleared.	>80
Source: Transp	ortation Research Board, 2000.	

Table 4.12-2 (cont.): Level of Service Characteristics for Signalized Intersections

Table 4.12-3: Level of Service Characteristics for Roadways

Level of Service	Description
А	Primarily free flow operations
В	Reasonably unimpeded operations, ability to maneuver only slightly restricted
С	Stable operations, ability to maneuver and select operating speed affected
D	Unstable flow, speeds and ability to maneuver restricted
Е	Significant delays, flow quite unstable
F	Extremely slow speeds
Source: Transpo	rtation Research Board, 2000.

The City of Selma, the County of Fresno, and the California Department of Transportation require that an LOS C or better be maintained. It should be noted that the City of Selma General Plan Update was adopted by the City and modifies the City of Selma's minimum acceptable LOS from LOS C to LOS D. However, because of litigation against the City, City staff has indicated that the General Plan Update does not yet apply.

Study Intersections and Roadways

The study intersections and road segments were determined from the anticipated volume and distribution of project traffic in consultation with staff of the following agencies: City of Selma, City of Kingsburg, Fresno County, and Caltrans. This report includes analysis of the following intersections:

- 1. Floral Avenue/SR-99 southbound offramp
- 2. Floral Avenue/Highland Avenue
- 3. Floral-Highland Avenues/SR-99 northbound on loop ramp
- 4. Floral Avenue/SR-99 northbound offramp

- 5. Highland Avenue/SR-99 southbound onramp
- 6. Highland Avenue/Rose Avenue
- 7. Highland Avenue/Nebraska Avenue
- 8. Nebraska Avenue/Thompson Avenue
- 9. Second Street/SR-99 southbound ramps
- 10. Second Street/SR-99 northbound ramps
- 11. Second Street/Whitson Street
- 12. Mountain View Avenue/Highland Avenue
- 13. Mountain View Avenue/Thompson Avenue
- 14. Mountain View Avenue/McCall Avenue
- 15. Mountain View Avenue/Dockery Avenue
- 16. Mountain View Avenue/SR-99 southbound offramp
- 17. Mountain View Avenue/SR-99 southbound onramp
- 18. Mountain View Avenue/SR-99 northbound onramp
- 19. Mountain View Avenue/SR-99 northbound offramp
- 20. Mountain View Avenue/Golden State Boulevard
- 21. Mountain View Avenue/Bethel Avenue
- 22. Mountain View Avenue/Academy Avenue
- 23. Mountain View Avenue/Mendocino Avenue
- 24. Caruthers Avenue/Dockery Avenue
- 25. Golden State Boulevard/Amber Avenue
- 26. Kamm Avenue/Thompson Avenue
- 27. Kamm Avenue/McCall Avenue
- 28. Kamm Avenue/Dockery Avenue
- 29. Kamm Avenue/Van Horn Avenue
- 30. Kamm Avenue/SR-99 southbound offramp
- 31. Bethel Avenue/SR-99 northbound onramp
- 32. Bethel Avenue/Golden State Boulevard
- 33. Bethel Avenue/Kamm Avenue
- 34. Kamm Avenue/Academy Avenue
- 35. Bethel Avenue/SR-99 northbound offramp
- 36. Bethel Avenue/Parkway Drive-SR-99 southbound onramp
- 37. Phase 1 Site Access/Golden State Boulevard
- 38. Phase 2 Site Access/Dockery Avenue
- 39. Phase 3 Site Access/Mountain View Avenue

This report includes analysis of the following road segments:

- 1. Mountain View Avenue between Highland Avenue and Thompson Avenue
- 2. Mountain View Avenue between Thompson Avenue and McCall Avenue

- 3. Mountain View Avenue between McCall Avenue and Dockery Avenue
- 4. Mountain View Avenue between Dockery Avenue and SR-99
- 5. Mountain View Avenue between SR-99 and Golden State Boulevard
- 6. Mountain View Avenue between Golden State Boulevard and Bethel Avenue
- 7. Mountain View Avenue between Bethel Avenue and Academy Avenue
- 8. Mountain View Avenue between Academy Avenue and Mendocino Avenue
- 9. Mountain View Avenue between Mendocino Avenue and Madsen Avenue
- 10. Mountain View Avenue between Madsen Avenue and Zediker Avenue
- 11. Mountain View Avenue between Zediker Avenue and Fresno County Line
- 12. Kamm Avenue between Highland Avenue and Thompson Avenue
- 13. Kamm Avenue between Thompson Avenue and McCall Avenue
- 14. Kamm Avenue between McCall Avenue and Dockery Avenue
- 15. Kamm Avenue between Dockery Avenue and Van Horn Avenue
- 16. Kamm Avenue between Van Horn Avenue and SR-99
- 17. Kamm Avenue between SR-99 and Academy Avenue
- 18. McCall Avenue between Valley View Street and Mountain View Avenue
- 19. McCall Avenue between Mountain View Avenue and Caruthers Avenue
- 20. Dockery Avenue between Mountain View Avenue and Caruthers Avenue
- 21. Golden State Boulevard between Nebraska Avenue and Saginaw Avenue
- 22. Golden State Boulevard between Saginaw Avenue and Phase 1 main site access
- 23. Golden State Boulevard between Phase 1 main site access and Mountain View Avenue
- 24. Golden State Boulevard between Mountain View Avenue and Amber Avenue
- 25. Golden State Boulevard between Amber Avenue and Bethel Avenue

It should be noted that Golden State Boulevard is also known as Whitson Street within the City of Selma and Simpson Street within the City of Kingsburg. The locations of the study intersections and road segments are presented in Exhibit 4.12-1 and existing lane configurations and traffic control devices are depicted in Exhibit 4.12-2.

Existing Intersection Operations

Existing Traffic Volumes

Existing traffic volumes were determined by performing manual turning movement counts at each of the study intersections. The traffic counts included a determination of the number of heavy vehicles on each turning movement, the number of pedestrians crossing each leg, the number of right turns on red at signalized intersections, and observation of the cycle length at signalized intersections. Existing peak-hour turning movement volumes at the study intersections are presented in Exhibit 4.12-3 and Exhibit 4.12-4.

Existing-Conditions Intersection LOS Analysis

The results of the existing-conditions intersection LOS analyses are summarized in Table 4.12-4. Substandard conditions are identified in bold type.

		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak H	lour	Weekend		
Intersection	Control	Delay (seconds)	LOS	Delay (seconds)	LOS	Delay (seconds)	LOS	
Floral/SR-99 Southbound Offramp	Signal	12.6	В	17.9	В	18.1	В	
Floral/Highland	Signal	15.3	В	20.7	C	22.7	C	
Floral/SR-99 Northbound Offramp	Signal	7.1	В	6.7	A	7.2	A	
Highland/SR-99 Southbound Onramp	Signal	11.0	В	11.8	В	12.0	В	
Highland/Rose	TWS	14.5	В	19.7	C	15.8	C	
Highland/Nebraska	Signal	11.1	В	11.3	В	11.8	В	
Nebraska/Thompson	AWS	9.5	A	9.1	A	8.7	A	
Second/SR-99 Southbound	OWS	34.1	D	68.3	F	19.3	C	
Second/SR-99 Northbound	OWS	14.2	В	14.0	В	12.5	В	
Second/Whitson	Signal	14.0	В	18.2	В	15.8	В	
Mountain View/Highland	Signal	17.1	В	13.7	В	14.0	В	
Mountain View/Thompson	TWS	10.2	В	11.0	В	10.5	В	
Mountain View/McCall	AWS	8.1	A	8.7	A	7.9	A	
Mountain View/Dockery	TWS	10.0	В	10.6	В	10.2	В	
Mountain View/SR-99 Southbound Offramp	TWS	22.3	C	25.3	D	15.8	C	
Mountain View/SR-99 Southbound Onramp	Yield	1.4	A	1.6	A	0.8	A	
Mountain View/SR-99 Northbound Onramp	Yield	1.2	A	0.9	A	1.4	A	
Mountain View/SR-99 Northbound Offramp	OWS	14.7	В	15.5	C	12.3	В	
Mountain View/Golden State	Signal	12.2	В	14.7	В	17.8	В	
Mountain View/Bethel	TWS	18.6	C	22.2	C	15.8	C	

Table 4.12-4: Intersection Operations – Existing Conditions

		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak H	our	Weekend		
Intersection	Control	Delay (seconds)	LOS	Delay (seconds)	LOS	Delay (seconds)	LOS	
Mountain View/Academy	TWS	16.7	C	22.5	C	16.6	C	
Mountain View/ Mendocino	Signal	8.8	A	17.0	В	7.4	A	
Caruthers/Dockery	OWS	8.6	A	8.6	A	8.7	A	
Golden State/Amber	OWS	9.8	A	10.2	В	9.8	A	
Kamm/Thompson	OWS	9.0	А	9.2	Α	9.1	Α	
Kamm/McCall	TWS	9.8	А	9.6	Α	9.3	Α	
Kamm/Dockery	TWS	8.9	А	8.9	Α	8.9	Α	
Kamm/Van Horn	TWS	8.9	А	9.0	Α	8.9	Α	
Kamm/SR-99 Southbound Offramp	TWS	7.4	A	7.9	A	7.5	A	
Bethel/SR-99 Northbound Onramp	OWS	11.8	В	10.8	В	10.3	В	
Bethel/Golden State	AWS	9.3	A	8.4	Α	7.8	A	
Bethel/Kamm	AWS	8.4	A	7.9	Α	7.4	Α	
Kamm/Academy	AWS	8.4	A	8.1	Α	7.6	Α	
Bethel/SR-99 Northbound Offramp	OWS	10.8	В	10.3	В	9.4	A	
Bethel/Parkway-SR-99 Southbound Onramp	OWS	12.4	В	11.0	В	9.4	A	
Notes: Bold denotes unacceptable in Source: Peters Engineering G	Notes: Bold denotes unacceptable intersection operation. Source: Peters Engineering Group 2012							

Table 4.12-4 (cont.): Intersection	Operations – Existing	Conditions
------------------------------------	-----------------------	------------

The following study intersections are currently operating at substandard levels of service:

- Second Street/SR-99 southbound ramps (LOS D on the southbound approach during the AM peak hour and LOS F on the southbound approach during the PM peak hour);
- Mountain View Avenue/SR-99 southbound offramp-Van Horn Avenue (LOS D on the southbound approach during the PM peak hour).

The other study intersections are currently operating at acceptable levels of service.

Existing Conditions Road Segment Analyses

The results of the existing-conditions road segment analyses are summarized in Table 4.12-5. The study road segments are currently operating at acceptable levels of service.

		Lanes and	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		Weekend	
Road	Segment	Median	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS
Mountain View Avenue	Highland to Thompson	2U (<2)	200	В	240	В	200	В
	Thompson to McCall	2U (<2)	189	В	235	В	197	В
	McCall to Dockery	2U (<2)	231	В	302	В	226	В
	Dockery to SR-99	2U (<2)	325	В	386	В	265	В
	SR-99 to Golden State	2U (<2)	758	C	813	С	584	В
	Golden State to Bethel	4D-LT (<2)	665	В	769	В	1,043	В
	Bethel to Academy	2U (<2)	659	В	793	C	596	В
	Academy to Mendocino	2U (<2)	702	C	789	С	577	В
	Mendocino to Madsen	2U (<2)	721	C	797	C	592	В
	Madsen to Zediker	2U (<2)	700	C	791	С	608	В
	Zediker to Fresno County Line	2U (<2)	719	C	771	C	601	В
Kamm Avenue	Highland to Thompson	2U (<2)	15	В	23	В	10	В
	Thompson to McCall	2U (<2)	12	В	19	В	12	В
	McCall to Dockery	2U (<2)	21	В	23	В	22	В
	Dockery to Van Horn	2U (<2)	21	В	24	В	22	В
	Van Horn to SR-99	2U (<2)	24	В	40	В	39	В
	SR-99 to Academy	2U (<2)	175	В	169	В	102	В
McCall Avenue	Valley View to Mountain View	2U (<2)	74	В	182	В	90	В
	Mountain View to Caruthers	2U (<2)	106	В	225	В	91	В
Dockery Avenue	Mountain View to Caruthers	2U (<2)	9	В	12	В	7	В
Golden State Boulevard	Nebraska to Saginaw	4D-LT (<2)	299	В	420	В	368	В
	Saginaw to Phase 1 main site access	4D-LT (<2)	261	В	403	В	566	В

Table 4.12-5: Roadway Segment Analysis – Existing Conditions

Road Segment		Lanes and Median	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		Weekend	
			Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS
Golden State Boulevard (<i>cont</i> .)	Phase 1 main site access to Mountain View	4D-LT (<2)	261	В	403	В	566	В
	Mountain View to Amber	4D-LT (<2)	222	В	342	В	561	В
	Amber to Bethel	4D-LT (<2)	263	В	335	В	269	В
Notes:								

Table 4.12-5 (cont.): Roadway Segment Analysis – Existing Conditions

2U: 2-lane undivided 4D-LT: 4-lane divided with left-turn lanes Values in parentheses indicate number of signalized intersections per mile

Source: Peters Engineering Group, 2012.

Rail

The Union Pacific Railroad Bakersfield Subdivision traverses Selma in a northwest-southeast direction, parallel to the SR-99 corridor. The Bakersfield Subdivision is a single-track main line linking Fresno and Bakersfield that serves as Union Pacific's primary north-south freight corridor in California. No scheduled passenger service occurs on the Bakersfield Subdivision.

Railroad Grade Crossings

This report includes analysis of the following at-grade railroad crossings:

- 1. Highland Avenue north of Golden State Boulevard
- 2. Floral Avenue east of Front Street
- 3. Thompson Avenue north of Front Street
- 4. First Street east of Front Street
- 5. Second Street east of Front Street
- 6. Third Street east of Front Street
- 7. Nebraska Avenue east of Golden State Boulevard
- 8. Saginaw Avenue east of Golden State Boulevard
- 9. Mountain View Avenue east of Golden State Boulevard
- 10. Bethel Avenue east of Golden State Boulevard
- 11. Stroud Avenue east of Golden State Boulevard (Simpson Street).

Existing traffic volumes at intersections adjacent to at-grade railroad crossings were determined by performing manual turning movement counts at each of the study intersections. The traffic counts included a determination of the number of heavy vehicles on each turning movement, the number of pedestrians crossing each leg, the number of right turns on red at signalized intersections, and observation of the cycle length at signalized intersections. The traffic count data sheets are attached in Appendix L.

Twelve-hour video surveillance of each side of each crossing was performed on a Tuesday and on a Thursday during typical weekday conditions.

A description of each study crossing follows.

Highland Avenue north of Golden State Boulevard

The Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) at-grade crossing at Highland Avenue in Selma, California is located approximately 70 feet north of Golden State Boulevard. Highland Avenue has double yellow lines separating northbound and southbound traffic. The intersection of Highland Avenue and Golden State Boulevard is signalized. The crossing is equipped with post-mounted flashing lights and automatic gates with "Railroad Crossing" crossbucks (R15-1 signs) and Highway-Rail Grade Crossing Advance Warning signs (W10-1 signs) on both approaches. Railroad crossing pavement markings exist on the southbound approach but not on the northbound approach, due to space limitations. Additional warning signs are not present, such as the W10-2 advance warning sign, which would be placed on Golden State Boulevard to alert drivers to the crossing on the side street, or the W10-11 sign indicating the storage space available between the tracks and the stop bar. No pedestrian facilities exist along Highland Avenue.

According to data available on the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) website, the crossing has experienced two train-related accidents in the last 10 years.

Video surveillance of the crossing was performed on Thursday, March 10, 2011 and Tuesday, March 22, 2011 between 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. During typical peak-hour operations, southbound queues from the intersection of Highland Avenue and Golden State Boulevard often extend beyond the crossing. The surveillance captured five trains on March 10 and seven trains on March 22, during which the gates were closed from 35 seconds to 2 minutes 14 seconds. Observed queues resulting from the trains included more than nine vehicles in the southbound direction and up to three vehicles in the northbound direction.

Floral Avenue east of Front Street

The UPRR at-grade crossing at Floral Avenue in Selma, California is located approximately 80 feet east of Front Street. Traffic on Front Street is controlled by stop signs; traffic on Floral Avenue is not required to stop unless vehicles are yielding to oncoming traffic while making a westbound-tosouthbound left turn. Floral Avenue has a painted median separating eastbound and westbound traffic. The crossing is equipped with cantilevered overhead flashing light signals, R15-1 crossbucks, automatic gates, railroad crossing pavement markings, and W10-1 signs on both approaches. Additional warning signs are not present, such as the W10-2 advance warning sign, which would be placed on Front Street to alert drivers to the crossing on the side street. A sidewalk exists along the north side of Floral Avenue, with an asphalt concrete surface adjacent to the concrete crossing panels.

According to data available on the FRA website, the crossing has experienced no train-related accidents in the last 10 years.



Source: Peters Engineering Group.



Michael Brandman Associates 31130002 • 02/2012 | 4.12-1_study_area_locations.cdr

Exhibit 4.12-1 Study Area and Locations





Exhibit 4.12-2 Existing Lane Configurations and Intersection Controls



Michael Brandman Associates

Exhibit 4.12-3 Existing Weekday Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes

31130002 • 02/2012 | 4.12-3_existing_weekday_traffic_volumes.cdr



Michael Brandman Associates

Exhibit 4.12-4 Existing Saturday Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes

31130002 • 02/2012 | 4.12-4_existing_saturday_traffic_volumes.cdr

Video surveillance of the crossing was performed on Tuesday, March 8, 2011 and Thursday, March 10, 2011 between 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. During typical peak-hour operations, queues do not develop in the vicinity of the crossing. The surveillance captured seven trains on March 8 and five trains on March 10, during which the gates were closed from 25 seconds to 1 minute and 14 seconds. Observed queues resulting from the trains included more than 15 vehicles in the eastbound direction and up to 11 vehicles in the westbound direction.

Thompson Avenue north of Front Street

The UPRR at-grade crossing at Thompson Avenue in Selma, California is located approximately 70 feet north of Front Street. Traffic at the intersection of Thompson Avenue and Front Street is controlled by stop signs in all four directions. Thompson Avenue has double yellow lines separating northbound and southbound traffic. The crossing is equipped with cantilevered overhead flashing light signals, R15-1 crossbucks, automatic gates, and a W10-1 sign on both approaches, although the W10-1 sign on the northbound approach is located at the stop bar and is not in advance of the crossing. Railroad crossing pavement markings exist on the southbound approach but not on the northbound approach, due to space limitations. Additional warning signs are not present, such as the W10-2 advance warning sign, which would be placed on Front Street to alert drivers to the crossing on the side street or the W10-11 sign indicating the storage space available between the tracks and the stop bar. No pedestrian facilities exist along Thompson Avenue at the crossing.

According to data available on the FRA website, the crossing has experienced no train-related accidents in the last 10 years.

Video surveillance of the crossing was performed on Tuesday, March 8, 2011 and Thursday, March 10, 2011 between 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. During typical peak-hour operations, southbound queues from the intersection of Thompson Avenue and Front Street occasionally extend beyond the crossing. A substantial number of pedestrians were observed, primarily on the east side of Thompson Avenue. The surveillance captured seven trains on March 8 and five trains on March 10, during which the gates were closed from 55 seconds to 1 minute and 40 seconds. Observed queues resulting from the trains included up to eight vehicles in the southbound direction and more than eight vehicles in the northbound direction.

1st Street east of Front Street

The UPRR at-grade crossing at 1st Street in Selma, California is located approximately 125 feet northeast of West Front Street and approximately 105 feet southwest of East Front Street. Traffic on East Front Street is controlled by stop signs, while traffic on 1st Street at East Front Street is not required to stop unless vehicles are yielding to oncoming traffic while making a left turn. The intersection of 1st Street and East Front Street is controlled by stop signs in all four directions. 1st Street has double yellow lines separating traffic. The crossing is equipped with post-mounted flashing lights, R15-1 crossbucks, automatic gates, railroad crossing pavement markings, and W10-1 signs on both approaches. Additional warning signs are not present, such as the W10-2 advance warning sign, which would be placed on East Front Street and West Front Street to alert drivers to the crossing on the side street. Sidewalks exist along both sides of 1st Street, with an asphalt concrete surface adjacent to the concrete crossing panels.

According to data available on the FRA website, the crossing has experienced one train-related accident in the last 10 years.

Video surveillance of the crossing was performed on Tuesday, March 8, 2011 and Thursday, March 10, 2011 between 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. During typical peak-hour operations, queues do not develop near the crossing. The surveillance captured seven trains on March 8 and five trains on March 10, during which the gates were closed from 35 seconds to 1 minute and 55 seconds. Observed queues resulting from the trains included up to three vehicles in the southbound direction and more than six vehicles in the northbound direction.

2nd Street east of Front Street

The UPRR at-grade crossing at 2nd Street in Selma, California is located approximately 140 feet northeast of West Front Street and approximately 100 feet southwest of East Front Street. Traffic on East Front Street and West Front Street is controlled by stop signs, while traffic on 2nd Street is not required to stop unless vehicles are yielding to oncoming traffic while making a left turn. 2nd Street has double yellow lines separating traffic. The crossing is equipped with cantilevered overhead flashing light signals, R15-1 crossbucks, automatic gates, railroad crossing pavement markings, and W10-1 signs on both approaches. Additional warning signs are not present, such as the W10-2 advance warning sign, which would be placed on East Front Street and West Front Street to alert drivers to the crossing on the side street. Sidewalks exist along both sides of 2nd Street, with an asphalt concrete surface adjacent to the concrete crossing panels.

According to data available on the FRA website, the crossing has experienced no train-related accidents in the last 10 years.

Video surveillance of the crossing was performed on Tuesday March 8, 2011 and Thursday March 10, 2011 between 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. During typical peak-hour operations, queues do not develop near the crossing. The surveillance captured seven trains on March 8 and five trains on March 10, during which the gates were closed from 35 seconds to 1 minute and 40 seconds. Observed queues resulting from the trains included more than 10 vehicles in both the northbound and southbound directions.

3rd Street east of Front Street

The UPRR at-grade crossing at 3rd Street in Selma, California is located within approximately 90 feet of the intersection of 3rd Street, West Front Street, and McCall Avenue, which is an awkward intersection with five different approaches. Traffic proceeding south on 3rd Street is required to stop at West Front Street. The crossing is located approximately 70 feet southwest of East Front Street, where traffic on 3rd Street is not required to stop unless vehicles are yielding to oncoming traffic

while making a left turn. 3rd Street has double yellow lines separating traffic. The crossing is equipped with post-mounted flashing lights, R15-1 crossbucks, automatic gates, railroad crossing pavement markings, and W10-1 signs on both approaches. Additional warning signs are not present, such as the W10-2 advance warning sign, which would be placed on East Front Street and West Front Street to alert drivers to the crossing on the side street. No pedestrian facilities exist along 3rd Street.

According to data available on the FRA website, the crossing has experienced no train-related accidents in the last 10 years.

Video surveillance of the crossing was performed on Tuesday March 8, 2011 and Thursday March 10, 2011 between 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. During typical peak-hour operations, queues do not develop near the crossing. The surveillance captured seven trains on March 8 and five trains on March 10, during which the gates were closed from 35 seconds to 1 minute and 45 seconds. Observed queues resulting from the trains included up to six vehicles in the southbound direction and up to four vehicles in the northbound direction.

Nebraska Avenue east of Golden State Boulevard

The UPRR at-grade crossing at Nebraska Avenue in Selma, California is located approximately 60 feet northeast of Golden State Boulevard and within 40 feet of the southern terminus of East Front Street. Nebraska Avenue has double yellow lines separating eastbound and westbound traffic. The intersection of Nebraska Avenue and Golden State Boulevard is controlled by stop signs on Nebraska Avenue. Traffic on Golden State Boulevard is not required to stop. The crossing is equipped with post-mounted flashing lights, R15-1 crossbucks, automatic gates, and W10-1 signs on both approaches. R15-1 crossbucks also exist on East Front Street. Railroad crossing pavement markings exist on the westbound approach but not on the eastbound approach, due to space limitations. Additional warning signs are not present, such as the W10-2 advance warning sign, which would be placed on Golden State Boulevard and East Front Street to alert drivers to the crossing on the side street or the W10-11 sign indicating the storage space available between the tracks and the stop bar. No pedestrian facilities exist along Nebraska Avenue.

According to data available on the FRA website, the crossing has experienced one train-related accident in the last 10 years.

Video surveillance of the crossing was performed on Tuesday March 8, 2011 and Thursday March 10, 2011 between 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. During typical peak-hour operations, queues from the intersection of Nebraska Avenue and Golden State Boulevard occasionally extend to the crossing. The surveillance captured seven trains on March 8 and five trains on March 10, during which the gates were closed from 30 seconds to 1 minute and 45 seconds. Observed queues resulting from the trains included up to three vehicles in the southbound direction and up to three vehicles in the northbound direction.

Saginaw Avenue east of Golden State Boulevard

The UPRR at-grade crossing at Saginaw Avenue in Selma, California is located approximately 90 feet east of Golden State Boulevard. Saginaw Avenue does not have pavement delineation separating eastbound and westbound traffic. The intersection of Saginaw Avenue and Golden State Boulevard is controlled by a stop sign on Saginaw Avenue. Traffic on Golden State Boulevard is not required to stop. The crossing is equipped with post-mounted flashing lights, R15-1 crossbucks, automatic gates, and W10-1 signs on both approaches. At the time of the site visit, railroad crossing pavement markings did not exist on relatively new pavement. Additional warning signs are not present, such as the W10-2 advance warning sign, which would be placed on Golden State Boulevard to alert drivers to the crossing on the side street or the W10-11 sign indicating the storage space available between the tracks and the stop bar. No pedestrian facilities exist along Saginaw Avenue.

According to data available on the FRA website, the crossing has experienced no train-related accidents in the last 10 years.

Video surveillance of the crossing was performed on Tuesday March 8, 2011 and Thursday March 10, 2011 between 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. During typical peak-hour operations, queues do not develop near the crossing. The surveillance captured seven trains on March 8 and five trains on March 10, during which the gates were closed from 25 seconds to 1 minute and 50 seconds. Observed queues resulting from the trains included up to one vehicle in the westbound direction and up to two vehicles in the eastbound direction.

Mountain View Avenue east of Golden State Boulevard

The UPRR at-grade crossing at Mountain View Avenue in Selma, California is located approximately 60 feet east of Golden State Boulevard. Mountain View Avenue has a raised median separating eastbound and westbound traffic. The intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Golden State Boulevard is signalized. On the westbound approach, the median is equipped with post-mounted flashing lights, R15-1 crossbucks, automatic gates, R8-8 (DO NOT STOP ON TRACKS) sign, and W10-1 signs. On the westbound approach, the right side of Mountain View Avenue is equipped with cantilevered overhead flashing light signals, R15-1 crossbucks, automatic gates, R8-8 sign, and W10-1 signs.

On the eastbound approach, the median is equipped with post-mounted flashing lights, R15-1 crossbucks, and automatic gates. On the eastbound approach the right side of Mountain View Avenue is equipped with separate post-mounted flashing lights, R15-1 crossbucks, automatic gates, and W10-1 signs for traffic proceeding through on Mountain View Avenue and for traffic turning right from Golden State Boulevard.

Additional warning signs are not present, such as the W10-2 advance warning sign, which would be placed on Golden State Boulevard to alert drivers to the crossing on the side street or the W10-11 sign indicating the storage space available between the tracks and the stop bar. No pedestrian facilities exist along Mountain View Avenue.

According to data available on the FRA website, the crossing has experienced no train-related accidents in the last 10 years. However, a fatal accident not yet included in the data occurred on April 19, 2011 when a vehicle stopped on the tracks in the early morning and was hit by a train.

Video surveillance of the crossing was performed on Thursday March 10, 2011, Tuesday March 22, 2011, and Sunday March 13, 2011 between 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. During typical peak-hour operations, queues from the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Golden State Boulevard extend beyond the crossing. The surveillance captured five trains on March 10, six trains on March 22, and four trains on March 13 with durations that the gates were closed from 25 seconds to 2 minutes and 45 seconds. Observed queues resulting from the trains included more than 20 vehicles in the westbound direction and up to 14 vehicles in the eastbound direction.

The surveillance performed on Sundays revealed that many patrons of the nearby Selma Flea Market parked vehicles in an area south of Mountain View Avenue and east of the railroad tracks, generating a considerable volume of pedestrians at the crossing.

Bethel Avenue east of Golden State Boulevard

The UPRR at-grade crossing at Bethel Avenue in Kingsburg, California is located approximately 55 feet northeast of Golden State Boulevard and within 25 feet of the intersection of Kamm and Bethel Avenues. Bethel Avenue has double yellow lines separating traffic. The intersection of Bethel Avenue and Golden State Boulevard is controlled by stop signs on Bethel Avenue. Traffic on Golden State Boulevard is not required to stop. The intersection of Bethel Avenue is not required to stop. Traffic on Bethel Avenue is not required to stop.

The crossing is equipped with post-mounted flashing lights, R15-1 crossbucks, automatic gates, and a W10-1 sign on both approaches, although the W10-1 sign on the northbound approach is located at the stop bar and is not in advance of the crossing. Railroad crossing pavement markings exist on the westbound approach but not on the eastbound approach, due to space limitations. Additional warning signs are not present, such as the W10-2 advance warning sign, which would be placed on Golden State Boulevard and Kamm Avenue to alert drivers to the crossing on the side street, or the W10-11 sign indicating the storage space available between the tracks and the stop bar. No pedestrian facilities exist along Bethel Avenue.

According to data available on the FRA website, the crossing has experienced no train-related accidents in the last 10 years.

Video surveillance of the crossing was performed on Tuesday March 8, 2011 and Thursday March 10, 2011 between 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. During typical peak-hour operations, queues rarely develop near the crossing. The surveillance captured seven trains on March 8 and five trains on March 10, during which the gates were closed from 50 seconds to 2 minutes and 50 seconds.

Observed queues resulting from the trains included up to six vehicles in the southbound direction and up to five vehicles in the northbound direction.

Stroud Avenue east of Golden State Boulevard (Simpson Street)

The UPRR at-grade crossing at Stroud Avenue in Kingsburg, California is located approximately 75 feet east of Golden State Boulevard. Stroud Avenue has double yellow lines separating traffic. The intersection of Stroud Avenue and Golden State Boulevard is controlled by stop signs on Stroud Avenue. Traffic on Golden State Boulevard is not required to stop.

The crossing is equipped with post-mounted flashing lights, R15-1 crossbucks, and automatic gates on both approaches. Railroad crossing pavement markings and a W10-1 sign exist on the westbound approach only, due to space limitations. Additional warning signs are not present, such as the W10-2 advance warning sign, which would be placed on Golden State Boulevard to alert drivers to the crossing on the side street, or the W10-11 sign indicating the storage space available between the tracks and the stop bar. No pedestrian facilities exist along Stroud Avenue.

According to data available on the FRA website, the crossing has experienced no train-related accidents in the last 10 years.

Video surveillance of the crossing was performed on Tuesday March 8, 2011 and Thursday March 10, 2011 between 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. During typical peak-hour operations, queues do not develop near the crossing. The surveillance captured seven trains on March 8 and five trains on March 10, during which the gates were closed from 41 seconds to 24 minutes and 30 seconds. Observed queues resulting from the trains included up to three vehicles in the westbound direction and more than six vehicles in the eastbound direction.

Existing Grade Crossing Analysis

The results of the existing-conditions at-grade railroad crossing analyses are summarized in Table 4.12-6. Average daily traffic volumes were estimated based on peak-hour volumes. Data available on the Federal Railroad Administration website suggest that up to 29 trains per day pass through Selma. However, the video surveillance revealed only seven trains on March 8, 2011 and five trains on March 10, 2011. The number of trains per day used in the analyses was determined by doubling the maximum number of trains observed during the video surveillance.

Crossing	Trains per Day	Average Daily Traffic	Predicted Accident Frequency per Year	Warrant 9
Highland north of Golden State	14	6,690	0.010	N/R
Floral east of Front Street	14	11,390	0.017	N/R
Thompson north of Front Street	14	2,920	0.005	Met

Table 4.12-6: Existing Grade Crossing Analysis

Crossing	Trains per Day	Average Daily Traffic	Predicted Accident Frequency per Year	Warrant 9
First Street east of Front Street	14	2,840	0.005	N/R
Second Street east of Front Street	14	9,590	0.014	N/R
Third Street east of Front Street	14	2,900	0.005	Not met
Nebraska east of Golden State	14	2,040	0.003	Met
Saginaw east of Golden State	14	280	0.000	Not met
Mountain View east of Golden State	14	7,690	0.012	N/R
Bethel east of Golden State	14	2,590	0.005	Met
Stroud east of Golden State	14	1,800	0.003	Met
Notes:	·			

Table 4.12-6 (cont.): Existing Grade Crossing Analysis

Warrant 9 = Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices Signal Warrant 9 (Intersection Near a Grade Crossing) Analysis N/R = Not Relevant

Source: Peters Engineering Group, 2012.

Public Transit

Selma Transit provides scheduled fixed-route service and demand-responsive service to the community of Selma. The scheduled service occurs Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. The fixed route is generally located along Floral Avenue, McCall Avenue, Whitson Street, and in the downtown Selma area. Demand-responsive service is provided Monday through Friday from 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. and on Saturdays from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Southeast Transit provides scheduled, multiple round-trip, intercity service from Kingsburg, Selma, and Fowler to the Fresno-Clovis Metropolitan Area. Southeast Transit provides three round trips, Monday through Friday, from Kingsburg to downtown Fresno and back, stopping at two locations in Selma in each direction and one in Kingsburg.

Bicycles and Pedestrians

Bike lanes exist on Golden State Boulevard on both directions along the frontage of the project site. With the exception of crosswalks at the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Golden State Boulevard, pedestrian facilities do not currently exist in the vicinity of the project site.

4.12.3 - Regulatory Setting

State

California Department of Transportation

Caltrans maintains a target LOS at the transition between LOS C and LOS D for freeway facilities, which translates to a service flow rate of approximately 1,680 passenger cars per hour per lane. Where an existing freeway is operating at less than the LOS C/LOS D threshold, an existing measure

Transportation

of effectiveness should be maintained. In determining whether a project would create an adverse impact to a freeway facility already operating at LOS E or F, the forecast service flow rate was compared with ideal freeway capacity to establish a theoretical volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratio. A significant cumulative impact is considered to occur if a project would increase the freeway v/c ratio on a facility already operating at LOS E or F by 0.01 or more.

California Public Utilities Commission

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) is the state agency responsible for rail safety. The agency's jurisdiction includes at-grade railroad crossings. CPUC approval is required to modify an existing railroad grade crossing or to construct a new crossing. Completion and submittal of a General Order 88-B is required for any proposed work to a grade crossing.

Regional

Measure C

The 2006 Measure C Extension Plan includes a half-cent sales tax throughout Fresno County for a 20-year extension period to fund freeway extensions, improve roads, and enhance public safety. Information related to Measure C can be found on the Measure C website (www.measurec.com). Funding for the Regional Transportation Program Extension Projects comes from three sources:

- 50 percent from Measure C;
- 20 percent from the State Transportation Improvement Program; and
- 30 percent from the Regional Transportation Impact Fee Program.

The Regional Transportation Impact Fee Program is summarized in a report entitled Fresno Regional Transportation Mitigation Fee Final Report dated August 2008 by PB Americas, Inc.

Local

City of Selma

General Plan

Both the 1997 General Plan and 2035 General Plan set forth the following policies relevant to transportation. Note that the policy numbering reflects the 2035 General Plan.

- **Policy 2.5:** Encourage benches, telephones and shaded areas at major transit destinations so people can utilize the transit system safely and comfortably. The City shall determine such need based on site plan review procedure and other planning implementation methods.
- **Policy 2.6:** Major arterials, arterials, and collectors will be designed to allow transit vehicles to pull out of traffic. This policy may be implemented with either a continuous parking lane with bus stops, or with special bus pull-out lanes.
- **Policy 2.7:** Transit centers/stops shall be established to encourage the interface between commercial centers, high density residential uses and the transit system.

- **Policy 2.16:** City circulation system alignments shall be coordinated with Fresno County circulation system street alignments.
- **Policy 2.24:** Residences shall be permitted to have direct access onto arterials, particularly where traffic volumes are likely to create excessive noise levels or safety hazards.
- **Policy 2.25:** The primary purpose of arterials is to carry traffic. Parking should be discouraged on such streets and eliminated where is now exists, along arterials as deemed appropriate by the Traffic and Streets Commission and as traffic safety conditions warrant.
- Policy 2.33: The circulation system shall be designed and developed to minimize excessive noise impacts on sensitive land uses and traffic congestion which would increase the rate of vehicle emissions. New development shall mitigate noise and emission impacts (e.g. by constructing sound walls [where warranted], designing to minimize emissions [such as roundabout or traffic circle], etc.).
- **Policy 2.36:** Developers shall mitigate traffic impacts associated with their projects to minimize the impacts to highways, major arterials, arterials, and collector streets.
- **Policy 2.42:** Due to the traffic congestion which results from numerous points of ingress and egress along commercial streets, future commercial developments or modifications to existing developments shall be master planned with limited points of ingress and egress onto a major street. Ingress and egress to shopping centers should be carefully designed in order to promote traffic safety. Left-hand movements into and out of commercial areas should be minimized and existing points of ingress and egress shall be consolidated whenever possible.
- **Policy 2.43:** In order to promote safe and efficient traffic flow throughout the City, traffic signals shall be spaced no closer than ¹/₄ mile on arterials except in unusual circumstances. The intersections of arterial and collector streets and the access driveways to major traffic generators shall be located so as to maintain this minimum spacing.
- **Policy 2.45:** Sidewalks, paths, and appropriate crosswalks should be located to facilitate access to all schools and other areas with significant pedestrian traffic. Whenever feasible, pedestrian paths should be developed to allow for unobstructed pedestrian flow from within a neighborhood.
- **Policy 2.46:** The City shall require curb, gutter, and sidewalks in all areas of the community to accommodate pedestrian traffic, especially along routes with high pedestrian traffic such as schools, parks, and the Downtown area. Installation of these improvements shall be encouraged to the extent feasible in existing neighborhoods where they do not currently exist.
- **Policy 2.47:** The City shall promote safe, convenient and accessible pedestrian ways within the community.
- **Policy 2.51:** Adequate off-street parking shall be required of all commercial and industrial land uses to accommodate parking demand. Off-street parking shall also be required of residential land uses to accommodate tenants.

- **Policy 2.52:** Parking standards shall be evaluated for new development to ensure that parking requirements are satisfied within walking distance of development, and to ensure that arterial streets do not separate parking from the parking demand generator.
- **Policy 2.55:** To preserve the viability of the Golden State Industrial Corridor, uses or activities shall not be permitted to encroach so as to reduce the efficiency of the rail system.
- **Policy 2.60:** The City shall encourage the use of energy efficient and non-polluting fuels and modes of transportation.
- **Policy 2.62:** Promote the long term shifting of peak hour commute trips from the single occupant automobile to ridesharing, buses, pedestrians, and bicycles.
- **Policy 2.63:** Large development shall be encouraged to incorporate transit passenger facilities, bicycle racks or lockers, shower facilities, as well as on site services (eating, mail, banking, etc.) as ways to encourage alternative modes for commute trips.

The 1997 General Plan established the following goal and policies relevant to transportation:

- **Goal:** Provide high quality efficient and safe transportation, sewer, water, and storm drain facilities while maintaining the social, economic, and environmental quality in the Community.
- **Policy 3.8:** Arterials should be developed as shown in the Circulation Element of the General Plan.
- **Policy 3.11:** Arterials shall be improved to four lanes, with appropriate variations in intersection design to alleviate special traffic problems where necessary.
- **Policy 3.24:** It shall be the policy of the City to develop major streets in the community as follows:
 - Golden State Boulevard in its entirety
 - Mountain View Ave. from U.S. Route 99 to easterly limits of sphere of influence
- Policy 3.25: All street and roadway improvements shall be in accord with the Circulation Plan.
- **Policy 3.27a:** The street network should provide a quick and efficient route for emergency vehicles, including police, fire and other vehicles, when responding to calls for service. The length of single-entry access routes shall be restricted.
- **Policy 3.28a:** Major arterials shall be built in areas where traffic demand warrants the development of this facility to meet the adopted level of service standard.
- **Policy 3.32a:** Median breaks and driveway standards for major arterial, arterial and collector streets directly affect the performance of these roadways, and the following minimum standards have been developed to facilitate the proper operation of these roadways.
 - Major Arterial and Arterial Street Standards
 - i.a Driveway access to major activity centers (locations that generate more than 5,000 daily trips) should be located no closer than 200 feet to the adjacent intersection of a collector or arterial street. (Measurement shall be from the curb return to the nearest edge of the driveway). If driveways must be provided near intersections for facilities (such as service stations) these driveways shall not be serviced by median

breaks and shall be located no less than 100 feet from the intersection (measurement shall be from the curb return to the nearest edge of the driveway). If more than one is required to serve a property, the driveways shall be separated by 150 feet. (The 150 feet are to be measured edge to edge, not centerline to centerline).

- ii.a The distance between driveways along commercially developed arterials should not be less than 400 feet (measurement shall be from centerline to centerline). Where this spacing is not practical, the development shall provide acceptable traffic mitigation measures in addition to those already required.
- iii.aWhere practical and desirable, driveways should be located on adjacent collector streets rather than on arterial streets.
- iv.a Driveway consolidation shall be encouraged through joint access agreements along arterials where standards a. through e. are exceeded.
- v.a Full median breaks, where there is no adopted design, should provide access to collector streets and to major activity centers and should parallel the standards for driveways: not less than 200 feet from an adjacent intersection of an arterial or collector street, and not less than 1,000 feet between full median breaks.
- f. Major arterials shall be developed in conformance with Figure 2-1 and shall be sized in accordance with the projected traffic volumes on road segments and intersections. The preferred minimum distance between intersections along major arterials is ¹/₄ mile.
- Collector Streets Standards
 - i.a Driveway access to major activity centers should be located no closer than 150 feet to the adjacent intersection of a collector or arterial street. (Measurement shall be from the curb return to the nearest edge of the driveway). If driveways must be provided near intersections for facilities (such as service stations) these driveways shall not be serviced by median breaks and shall be located no less than 100 feet from the intersection. (Measurement shall be from the curb return to the nearest edge of the driveway). If more than one is requested to serve a property, the driveways shall be separated by 150 feet. (The 150 feet are to be measured edge to edge, not centerline).
 - ii.a The distance between driveways and intersecting local streets should not be less than 300 feet. (Measurement shall be from the curb return to the nearest edge of the driveway). Where this spacing is not practical, the development shall provide acceptable traffic mitigation measures in addition to those already required.
 - iii.aDriveways to residential property along collectors should be consolidated whenever possible.
 - iv.a Medians on collectors shall be provided by concrete where left turn control is needed and by painted medians on two-way left turn pockets where appropriate. Where concrete medians are provided, median breaks should be spaced not less than 300 feet apart.

- **Policy 3.34.a:** Continue to provide a high level of service to the community. Therefore, the City designates Service Level "C" as defined in the Highway Capacity Manual (published by the Transportation Research Board of the National Research Council) as the minimum desirable service level at which freeways, expressways, major arterials, arterial streets and collector streets should operate. All new facilities in these categories shall be designed to operate at this level or better for a period of at least 20 years following their construction.
- **Policy 3.36.a:** Right-of-way essential to the circulation system should be dedicated and/or developed to the appropriate extent and width when a division of property or development occurs. The City shall coordinate street improvements with the County of Fresno so that the same requirements apply within the urban area boundary.
- **Policy 3.37.a:** The right-of-way widths and construction widths of all classes of streets from local to major arterial shall be updated as necessary to reflect the street classifications in the Element.

The 2035 General Plan established the following goal and policies relevant to transportation:

- **Goal 1:** To design and maintain a fully integrated local network that provides for safe and convenient circulation using a variety of transportation modes.
- **Policy 2.8:** All street and roadway improvements shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the Circulation Element and Circulation Plan.
- **Policy 2.13:** Arterials shall be improved to four lanes, with appropriate variations in intersection design to alleviate special traffic problems where necessary. Major arterials shall be improved to six lanes, with appropriate variations in intersection design to alleviate special traffic problems where necessary.
- Policy 2.14: Meandering sidewalks shall be encouraged along collectors and arterials.
- **Policy 2.20:** A one-mile arterial frequency grid system plan shall be used to allow efficient access throughout the community and to support the major commercial areas of the City, including McCall Avenue at Dinuba, the downtown area and commercial uses along SR 99.
- **Policy 2.23:** Collector streets shall be at approximately one-mile intervals centered between arterial streets and shall be planned to intersect with other streets so as to maximize traffic safety and discourage fast flowing traffic through residential areas. Where possible, major arterials, arterials, and collectors shall form 4-leg, right-angle intersections; jog, offset and skewed intersections of streets in near proximity shall be avoided where possible.
- **Policy 2.24:** Residences shall be permitted to have direct access onto arterials, particularly where traffic volumes are likely to create excessive noise levels or safety hazards.
- **Policy 2.25:** The primary purpose of arterials is to carry traffic. Parking should be discouraged on such streets and eliminated where is now exists, along arterials as deemed appropriate by the Traffic and Streets Commission and as traffic safety conditions warrant.
- **Policy 2.27:** It shall be the policy of the City to develop major streets in the community as follows: [...]

- Golden State Boulevard in its entirety [...]
- Mountain View Avenue from De Wolf to Bethel [...]
- **Policy 2.28:** The street network should provide a quick and efficient route for emergency vehicles, including police, fire and other vehicles, when responding to calls for service. The length of single-entry access routes shall be restricted.
- **Policy 2.29:** Major arterials shall be built in areas where traffic demand warrants the development of this facility to meet the adopted level of service standard.
- **Policy 2.30:** Major arterial, arterial, collector, minor collector, and local street standards shall be developed to provide an increased quality of life for residential neighborhoods, a more attractive bike and pedestrian environment, conservation of natural resources and adequate capacity for their appropriate function. These new standards shall be incorporated into the City's Standard Specifications for Public Works.
- **Policy 2.31:** Median breaks and driveway standards for major arterial, arterial and collector streets directly affect the performance of these roadways, and the following minimum standards have been developed to facilitate the proper operation of these roadways:
 - Major Arterial and Arterial Street Standards
 - a. Driveway access to major activity centers (locations that generate more than 5,000 daily trips) should be located no closer than 200 feet to the adjacent intersection of a collector or arterial street. (Measurement shall be from the curb return to the nearest edge of the driveway). If driveways must be provided near intersections for facilities (such as service stations) these driveways shall not be serviced by median breaks and shall be located no less than 100 feet from the intersection (measurement shall be from the curb return to the nearest edge of the driveway). If more than one is required to serve a property, the driveways shall be separated by 150 feet (the 150 feet are to be measured edge to edge, not centerline to centerline).
 - b. The distance between driveways along commercially developed major arterials should not be less than 600 feet (measurement shall be from centerline to centerline). Where this spacing is not practical, the development shall provide acceptable traffic mitigation measures in addition to those already required.
 - c. Where practical and desirable, driveways should be located on adjacent arterial or collector streets rather than on major arterial streets.
 - o d. Full median breaks, where there is no adopted design, should provide access to collector streets and to major activity centers and should parallel the standards for driveways: not less than 200 feet from an adjacent intersection of an arterial or collector street, and not less than 1,000 feet between full median breaks.
 - e. Driveway consolidation shall be encouraged through joint access agreements along arterials where standards a. through d. are exceeded.
 - f. Major arterials shall be developed in conformance with Figure 2-1 and shall be sized in accordance with the projected traffic volumes on road segments and

intersections. The preferred minimum distance between intersections along major arterials is ¹/₄ mile.

- Arterial Street Standards
 - a. Driveway access to major activity centers (locations that generate more than 5,000 daily trips) should be located no closer than 200 feet to the adjacent intersection of a collector or arterial street (measurement shall be from the curb return to the nearest edge of the driveway). If driveways must be provided near intersections for facilities (such as service stations) these driveways shall not be serviced by median breaks and shall be located no less than 100 feet from the intersection (measurement shall be from the curb return to the nearest edge of the driveway). If more than one is required to serve a property, the driveways shall be separated by 150 feet (the 150 feet are to be measured edge to edge, not centerline to centerline).
 - b. The distance between driveways along commercially developed arterials should not be less than 400 feet (measurement shall be from centerline to centerline). Where this spacing is not practical, the development shall provide acceptable traffic mitigation measures in addition to those already required.
 - c. Where practical and desirable, driveways should be located on adjacent collector streets rather than on arterial streets.
 - d. Full median breaks, where there is no adopted design, should provide access to collector streets and to major activity centers and should parallel the standards for driveways: not less than 200 feet from an adjacent intersection of an arterial or collector street, and not less than 1,000 feet between full median breaks.
 - e. Driveway consolidation shall be encouraged through joint access agreements along arterials where standards a. through d. are exceeded.
 - f. Major arterial and arterials shall be developed in conformance with Figure 2-1 and shall be sized in accordance with the projected traffic volumes on road segments and intersections.
- Collector Street Standards
 - a. Driveway access to major activity centers should be located no closer than 150 feet to the adjacent intersection of a collector or arterial street (measurement shall be from the curb return to the nearest edge of the driveway). If driveways must be provided near intersections for facilities (such as service stations) these driveways shall not be serviced by median breaks and shall be located no less than 100 feet from the intersection (measurement shall be from the curb return to the edge of the driveway). If more than one is requested to serve a property, the driveways shall be separated by 150 feet (the 150 feet are to be measured edge to edge, not centerline to centerline).
 - b. The distance between driveways and intersecting local streets should not be less than 300 feet (measurement shall be from the curb return to the nearest edge of the
driveway). Where this spacing is not practical, the development shall provide acceptable traffic mitigation measures in addition to those already required.

- c. Driveways to residential property along collectors should be consolidated whenever possible.
- d. Medians on collectors shall be provided by concrete where left turn control is needed and by painted medians on two-way left turn pockets where appropriate. Where concrete medians are provided, median breaks should be spaced not less than 300 feet apart.
- e. Collectors shall be developed in conformance with Figure 2-1 and shall be sized in accordance with the projected traffic volumes on road segments and intersections.
 [...]
- **Policy 2.32:** To continue to provide a high level of service to the community, the City designates Service Level "D" as defined in the Highway Capacity Manual as the minimum desirable service level at which freeways, expressways, major arterials, arterials and collector streets should operate. All new facilities in these categories shall be designed to operate at this level or better for a period of at least 20 years following their construction.
- Policy 2.33: The circulation system shall be designed and developed to minimize excessive noise impacts on sensitive land uses and traffic congestion which would increase the rate of vehicle emissions. New development shall mitigate noise and emission impacts [e.g. by constructing sound walls (where warranted), designing to minimize emissions (such as roundabout or traffic circle), etc.].
- **Policy 2.34:** Right-of-way essential to the circulation system should be dedicated and/or developed to the appropriate extent and width when a division of property or development occurs. The City shall coordinate street improvements with the County of Fresno so that the same requirements apply outside the City limits.
- **Policy 2.36:** Developers shall mitigate traffic impacts associated with their projects to minimize the impacts to highways, major arterials, arterials, and collector streets.
- **Policy 2.37:** The City will continue to collect development impact fees for the circulation system (streets, signals and bridges) and shall revise and update the development impact fees as needed.
- **Policy 2.42:** Due to the traffic congestion which results from numerous points of ingress and egress along commercial streets, future commercial developments or modifications to existing developments shall be master planned with limited points of ingress and egress onto a major street. Ingress and egress to shopping centers should be carefully designed in order to promote traffic safety. Left-hand movements into and out of commercial areas should be minimized and existing points of ingress and egress shall be consolidated whenever possible.
- **Policy 2.43:** In order to promote safe and efficient traffic flow throughout the City, traffic signals shall be spaced no closer than ¹/₄ mile on arterials except in unusual circumstances. The

intersections of arterial and collector streets and the access driveways to major traffic generators shall be located so as to maintain this minimum spacing.

- **Policy 2.44:** The City will develop, through various funding mechanisms and sources, a city wide bicycle path/lane/route system in conformance with the City's 2003 Bicycle Transportation Plan. The bicycle path/lane/route system will utilize existing or future railroad right-of-way and water courses. The paths (class I), may also include landscaping, lighting, mileage markers, directional signage and benches. The on-road lanes (class II) would include striping and the on-road routes (class III) would not include striping. Reference Figure 2-3 for the proposed city-wide bike plan. The class I bike paths can also be utilized by pedestrians if the proposed paths are wide enough to allow both bicyclists and pedestrians.
- **Policy 2.48:** Where security walls or fences are proposed for residential developments along major arterials, arterials, or collector streets, pedestrian access should be considered between the major arterial, arterial, or collector, and the development to allow access to transit vehicles, commercial facilities, educational facilities and recreation areas operating on the street.
- **Policy 2.49:** Street lighting shall be provided for all public streets and pedestrian signals shall be provided at all traffic signal locations.
- **Policy 2.50:** New development shall be required to plant and maintain appropriate trees or other devices in order to achieve shading of at least 50% of all hardscaped parking and pedestrian surfaces.
- **Policy 2.52:** Parking standards shall be evaluated for new development to ensure that parking requirements are satisfied within walking distance of development, and to ensure that arterial streets do not separate parking from the parking demand generator.
- **Policy 2.55:** To preserve the viability of the Golden State Industrial Corridor, uses or activities shall not be permitted to encroach so as to reduce the efficiency of the rail system.
- **Policy 2.60:** The City shall encourage the use of energy efficient and non-polluting fuels and modes of transportation.
- **Policy 2.61:** Transportation System Management and Transportation Demand Management are the applicable strategies for the mitigation of traffic and parking congestion. Public transit, traffic management, ridesharing and parking management are to be used to the greatest extent practical to implement transportation management strategies.
- **Policy 2.62:** Promote the long term shifting of peak hour commute trips from the single occupant automobile to ridesharing, buses, pedestrians, and bicycles.
- **Policy 2.63:** Large development shall be encouraged to incorporate transit passenger facilities, bicycle racks or lockers, shower facilities, as well as on site services (eating, mail, banking, etc.) as ways to encourage alternative modes for commute trips.

4.12.4 - Methodology

Peters Engineers Group prepared a Traffic Impact Study to evaluate the potential traffic impacts related to the proposed project. Additional discussions are included related to transit facilities,

bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities, and regional transportation concepts that are not yet planned and funded. The complete study is provided in Appendix L. The following are summaries of key aspects of the study.

Study Scenarios

The intersection and road segment operational analyses were performed in general conformance with the most recent version of the Caltrans Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies dated December 2002. The following time periods were studied:

- Weekday AM peak hour (one hour between 7:00 and 9:00 a.m.)
- Weekday PM peak hour (one hour between 4:00 and 6:00 p.m.)
- Weekend peak hour (one hour on Saturday between 12:00 and 2:00 p.m.)

The peak hours were analyzed for the following scenarios without the project:

- Existing Conditions;
- Year 2020 No Project Conditions (assumes project site is undeveloped and pending projects are constructed); and
- Year 2035 No Project Conditions (assumes project site is undeveloped).

The peak hours were analyzed for the following scenarios without the project:

- Existing Plus Project Phase 1 Conditions;
- Year 2020 With Project Phases 1 and 2 Conditions; and
- Year 2035 With Project Phases 1, 2, and 3 Conditions.

Traffic Modeling and Baseline Traffic Volumes

The Council of Fresno County Governments (COG) maintains a travel model that is typically used to forecast traffic volumes. To provide a worst-case analysis scenario, the travel model assumptions utilized for the City of Selma General Plan Update were also utilized in these analyses. The baseline traffic volumes for the year 2035 no project conditions were determined using the travel model data obtained from the COG and using the COG Increment Method, which is described in a document available from the COG entitled "Model Steering Committee Recommended Procedures for Using Traffic Projections from the Fresno COG Travel Model" dated December 2002. The Increment Method forecasts future traffic volumes by determining the growth projected by the model between the base year and the horizon year. This growth is then added to the existing traffic volumes. The projected year 2020 no project travel volumes were interpolated between the existing traffic volumes and the year 2035 traffic volumes.

Future turning movements were forecasted based on the methods presented in Chapter 8 of the Transportation Research Board National Cooperative Highway Research Program Report 255 entitled "Highway Traffic Data for Urbanized Area Project Planning and Design."

Pending Projects

The land uses associated with known pending projects were included in the year 2035 traffic model utilized for the Selma General Plan Update and are summarized in Table 4.12-7.

Project	Location
Walmart Supercenter	South side of Floral, west of SR-99
Gill Motel and Commercial	North of Floral, west of SR-99 SB offramp
Bratton single-family residential	South of Rose, west of Highland
Comfort Suites	West of Whitson, north of Stillman
Raven Map 5296	South of Dinuba, east of Dockery
Valley View Map 5303	South of Valley View between Thompson and McCall
Canales Map 5217	East of Highland, south of Nebraska
Eye Q II	West of Whitson, north of Stillman
Graham Commercial	North of Rose, west of SR-99
Raven Commercial	Manning east of McCall
Amberwood Commercial	East of Orange Avenue between Floral and Dinuba
3-MD Industrial Park	Nebraska Avenue east of Dockery
Golden State Industrial Park	Park Street east of SR-99
Rockwell Pond	North side of Floral, west of SR-99
Brandywine	Southwest of Manning and McCall
Other Residential	Various locations – Cambridge, Country Rose, Heritage, Synergy, R.J. Hill, Amberwood, Hinesley, Merigian
Source: Peters Engineering Group, 2012.	

Trip Generation

Data provided in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation, 8th Edition, is typically used to estimate the number of trips anticipated to be generated by proposed projects. Table 4.12-8 through Table 4.12-13 present the trip generation estimates for the proposed project.

Table 4.12-8: Weekday Project Trip Generation: Phase I (Northeast)

		Wee	ekday		AM Pea	k Hour		PM Peak Hour					
Land Use	Size	Rate	Total	Rate	In:Out	In	Out	Rate	In:Out	In	Out		
Shopping Center 820	882 ksf	42.94	37,874	1.00	61:39	538	344	3.73	49:51	1,612	1,678		
Notes: Rates are reported in trips per 1,000 square feet. Splits are reported as Entering/Exiting as a percentage of the total Source: Peters Engineering Group, 2012.													

Table 4.12-9: Weekend Project Trip Generation: Phase I (Northeast)

		Saturday			Satu	Saturday Peak Hour			Sunday		Sunday Peak Hour			
Land Use	Size	Rate	Total	Rate	In:Out	In	Out	Rate	Total	Rate	In:Out	In	Out	
Shopping Center 820	882 ksf	49.97	44,074	4.89	52:48	2,243	2,070	25.24	22,262	3.12	49:51	1,349	1,403	
Notes: Rates are reported in trips per 1,000 square feet. Splits are reported as Entering/Exiting as a percentage of the total														

Source: Peters Engineering Group, 2012.

Table 4.12-10: Weekday Project Trip Generation: Phase II (South)

		Weekday			AM Pea	k Hour		PM Peak Hour				
Land Use	Size	Rate	Total	Rate	In:Out	In	Out	Rate	In:Out	In	Out	
Shopping Center 820	606.2 ksf	42.94	26,031	1.00	61:39	370	237	3.73	49:51	1,108	1,154	
Hotel 310	166 rooms	8.17	1,357	0.56	61:39	57	36	0.59	53:47	52	46	
Water Slide Park 414	200 stalls	2.27	454	0.08	70:30	11	5	0.28	21:79	12	44	
Office 710	260 ksf	11.01	2,863	1.55	88:12	355	48	1.49	17:83	66	322	

Table 4.12-10 (cont.): Weekday Project Trip Generation: Phase II (South)

		Weekday			AM Pea	ak Hour		PM Peak Hour				
Land Use	Size	Rate	Total	Rate	In:Out	In	Out	Rate	In:Out	In	Out	
New Car Sales 841	400 ksf	33.34	13,336	2.03	74:26	601	211	2.59	39:61	404	632	
Total	·	_	44,041	_	_	1,394	537	_	_	1,642	2,198	
Notes: Rates are reported in trips per unit as applicable. Splits are reported as Entering/Exiting as a percentage of the total. Source: Peters Engineering Group, 2012.												

		Satu	ırday	Saturday Peak Hour			Sun	day	Sunday Peak Hour				
Land Use	Size	Rate	Total	Rate	In:Out	In	Out	Rate	Total	Rate	In:Out	In	Out
Shopping Center 820	606.2 ksf	49.97	30,292	4.89	52:48	1,542	1,423	25.24	15,301	3.12	49:51	927	965
Hotel 310	166 rooms	8.19	1,359	0.72	56:44	67	53	5.95	988	0.56	46:54	43	50
Water Slide Park 414	200 stalls	2.91	582	0.39	13:87	10	68	2.28	456	0.33	21:79	14	52
Office 710	260 ksf	2.37	617	0.41	54:46	58	49	0.98	255	0.14	58:42	21	16
New Car Sales 841	400 ksf	21.03	8,412	2.97	51:49	606	582	10.48	4,192	1.48	51:49	302	290
Totals			41,262			2,283	2,175		21,192			1,307	1,373

Notes:

Rates are reported in trips per unit as applicable

Splits are reported as Entering/Exiting as a percentage of the total Values in italic type were estimated based on correlation between Saturday and Sunday daily values; ITE

does not include Sunday peak-hour data. Source: Peters Engineering Group, 2012.

Table 4.12-12: Weekday Proje	ect Trip Generation:	: Phase III (Northwest
------------------------------	----------------------	------------------------

		Wee	kday		AM Pea	ık Hour		PM Peak Hour				
Land Use	Size	Rate	Total	Rate	In:Out	In	Out	Rate	In:Out	In	Out	
Shopping Center 820	604 ksf	42.94	25,936	1.00	61:39	368	236	3.73	49:51	1,104	1,149	
Apartment 220	250 units	6.65	1,663	0.51	20:80	26	102	0.62	65:35	101	54	
Office 710	280 ksf	11.01	3,083	1.55	88:12	382	52	1.49	17:83	71	347	
Totals		—	30,682		_	776	390		_	1,276	1,550	
Notes: Rates are reported in trips per unit as applicable Splits are reported as Entering/Exiting as a percentage of the total. Source: Peters Engineering Group, 2012.												

Table 4.12-13: Weekend Project Trip Generation: Phase III (Northwest)

		Satu	rday	Saturday Peak Hour				Sunday		Sunday Peak Hour			
Land Use	Size	Rate	Total	Rate	In:Out	In	Out	Rate	Total	Rate	In:Out	In	Out
Shopping Center 820	604 ksf	49.97	30,182	4.89	52:48	1,536	1,418	25.24	15,245	3.12	49:51	923	961
Apartment 220	250 units	6.39	1,598	0.52	61:39	79	51	5.86	1,465	0.51	61:39	78	50
Office 710	280 ksf	2.37	664	0.41	54:46	62	53	0.98	275	0.14	58:42	23	17
Totals	·	_	32,444			1,677	1,522		16,985		—	1,024	1,028
Notes:													

Notes:

Rates are reported in trips per unit as applicable Splits are reported as Entering/Exiting as a percentage of the total. Source: Peters Engineering Group, 2012.

Captured Trips

Data presented in the ITE Trip Generation Handbook dated June 2004 suggest that captured-trip reductions are applicable to the proposed project after Phase 2 and Phase 3 have been constructed. (Since Phase 1 is analyzed with only one land use, Shopping Center, captured-trip reductions are not applicable to Phase 1.) Captured-trip reductions were calculated as described by ITE and the calculations are attached. Capture rates between individual uses were taken from Tables 7.1 and 7.2 of the Trip Generation Handbook. Data are not presented in Tables 7.1 and 7.2 of the Trip Generation Handbook for the AM peak hour; therefore, the AM peak-hour capture rates were assumed to be no more than 5 percent, which is the maximum allowed without additional supporting information as described in the Caltrans Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies dated December 2002. Capture rates less than 5 percent were used if the values in Tables 7.1 and 7.2 are less than 5 percent. Table 4.12-14 presents the results of the captured-trip analyses.

	Pha	se 2	Pha	se 3					
Time Period	Entering Site	Exiting Site	Entering Site	Exiting Site					
Weekday	-530	-530	-1,186	-1,186					
Weekday AM Peak Hour	-10	-10	-17	-17					
Weekday PM Peak Hour	-43	-43	-88	-88					
Saturday	-31	-31	-120	-120					
Saturday Peak Hour	-5	-5	-13	-13					
Sunday	-13	-13	-90	-90					
Sunday Peak Hour	-2	-2	-9	-9					
Source: Peters Engineering Group, 2012.									

Table 4.12-14: Captured Trip Reductions

The project traffic volumes with captured-trip reductions applied are presented in Table 4.12-15. These values represent the project traffic that would be expected to occur, and would be observable, at the site entrances and exits.

Table 4.12-15:	External	Project	Traffic
----------------	----------	---------	---------

	Pha	se 1	Pha	se 2	Phase 3		
Time Period	Entering	Exiting	Entering	Exiting	Entering	Exiting	
Weekday	18,937	18,937	21,491	21,491	14,155	14,155	
Weekday AM Peak Hour	538	344	1,384	527	759	373	
Weekday PM Peak Hour	1,612	1,678	1599	2155	1,188	1,462	
Saturday	22,037	22,037	20,600	20,600	16,102	16,102	

	Pha	se 1	Pha	se 2	Phase 3		
Time Period	Entering	Exiting	Entering	Exiting	Entering	Exiting	
Saturday Peak Hour	2,243	2,070	2278	2170	1,664	1,509	
Sunday	11,131	11,131	10,583	10,583	8,403	8,403	
Sunday Peak Hour	1,349	1,403	1,305	1,371	1,015	1,019	
Source: Peters Engineering Gro	oup, 2012.						

Table 4.12-15 (cont.): External Project Traffic

Pass-By Trips

The Trip Generation Handbook presents information suggesting that pass-by reductions are applicable to the project. The Trip Generation Handbook states: "There are instances, however, when the total number of trips generated by a site is different from the amount of new traffic added to the street system by the generator. For example, retail-oriented developments such as shopping centers . . . are often located adjacent to busy streets in order to attract the motorists already on the street. These sites attract a portion of their trips from traffic passing the site These retail trips may not add new traffic to the adjacent street system."

A pass-by reduction of 15 percent was applied to the project traffic volumes in accordance with the procedures outlined in Chapter 5 of the Trip Generation Handbook. The reduction was only applied to shopping center portions of the project, since the other land uses are typically primary trip generators and draw a negligible amount of trips from the adjacent traffic stream passing by the site. The pass-by reductions are presented in Table 4.12-16.

	Pha	se 1	Pha	se 2	Phase 3		
Time Period	Entering	Exiting	Entering	Exiting	Entering	Exiting	
Weekday	-2,840	-2,840	-1,912	-1,912	-1,858	-1,858	
Weekday AM Peak Hour	-81	-51	-55	-34	-54	-34	
Weekday PM Peak Hour	-242	-252	-163	-170	-160	-164	
Saturday	-3,305	-3,305	-2,269	-2,269	-2,255	-2,255	
Saturday Peak Hour	-336	-310	-231	-213	-229	-211	
Sunday	-1,670	-1,670	-1,146	-1,146	-1,137	-1,137	
Sunday Peak Hour	-202	-210	-139	-144	-138	-143	
Source: Peters Engineering Gro	oup, 2012.						

Table 4.12-16: Pass By Reductions

The pass-by trip corrections were applied to the external project trips using procedures similar to those outlined in the Trip Generation Handbook. The values presented in Table 4.12-17 represent the

external non-pass-by trips generated by the project. The totals are summarized in Table 4.12-18. Exhibit 4.12-5 through Exhibit 4.12-10 depict the weekday peak hour and Saturday peak-hour pass-by trips for each phase.

	Pha	se 1	Pha	se 2	Phase 3		
Time Period	Entering	Exiting	Entering	Exiting	Entering	Exiting	
Weekday	16,097	16,097	19,579	19,579	12,297	12,297	
Weekday AM Peak Hour	457	293	1,329	493	705	339	
Weekday PM Peak Hour	1,370	1,426	1,436	1,985	1,028	1,298	
Saturday	18,732	18,732	18,331	18,331	13,847	13,847	
Saturday Peak Hour	1,907	1,760	2,047	1,957	1,435	1,298	
Sunday	9,461	9,461	9,437	9,437	7,266	7,266	
Sunday Peak Hour	1,147	1,193	1,166	1,227	877	876	
Source: Peters Engineering Gro	oup, 2012.						

Table 4.12-17: External Non-Pass-By Trips

Table 4.12-18: Combined External Non-Pass-By Trips

	Phases 1, 2, and 3					
Time Period	Entering	Exiting				
Weekday	47,979	47,979				
Weekday AM Peak Hour	2,491	1,125				
Weekday PM Peak Hour	3,834	4,709				
Saturday	50,910	50,910				
Saturday Peak Hour	5,389	5,015				
Sunday	26,164	26,164				
Sunday Peak Hour	3,190	3,296				
Source: Peters Engineering Group, 2012						

Project Trip Distribution and Assignment

The regional distribution of project traffic can be estimated by performing select zone analyses using available traffic models. The trip generation information and other relevant project data were provided to the COG to perform a project-specific select zone analysis.

The select zone analyses were performed using the year 2010 Fresno County travel model to estimate the project traffic distribution for the existing-plus-project conditions. Additional select zone analyses were performed using the year 2035 Fresno County travel model that the COG developed for

the Selma General Plan Update. It should be noted that the COG travel model provides a basis for the regional distribution of project traffic; however, the project traffic volumes are adjusted manually using engineering judgment to reflect expected driver behavior not accommodated by the travel model considering the locations of alternate routes and local roads, existing traffic patterns, complementary land uses, and the population of Selma and surrounding areas.

The peak-hour project traffic volumes were assigned to the study intersections and road segments based on the results of the select zone analyses. The project traffic volumes at the study intersections are presented in Exhibit 4.12-11 through Exhibit 4.12-16.

The peak-hour project traffic volumes presented in Exhibit 4.12-11 through Exhibit 4.12-16 incorporate the pass-by corrections illustrated in Exhibit 4.12-5 through Exhibit 4.12-10. It should be noted that pass-by reductions are not applied to trips entering and exiting the project site. As such, the trip generation volumes presented at the project driveways are based on the values presented in Table 4.12-15, while the volumes presented at all other intersections are based on the values presented in Table 4.12-17.

Intersection Analysis Methodology

The levels of service and 95th-percentile queues at the study intersections were determined using the computer program Synchro 6 (Build 614), which is based on the HCM procedures for calculating levels of service. For signalized intersections and all-way-stop-controlled intersections, the overall intersection LOS and the average delay per vehicle are presented. For one-way and two-way stop-controlled intersections, an overall intersection LOS is not defined in the HCM. Therefore, for one-way and two-way stop-controlled intersections the LOS and average delay per vehicle for the movement with the greatest delay is reported.

Although peak-hour traffic volumes are typically utilized in the operational analysis of intersections, the HCM actually utilizes the peak 15-minute period as the basis for operational analyses by incorporating the peak-hour factor (PHF) into the analyses. The PHF is the relationship between peak-hour volumes and peak 15-minute volumes calculated by dividing the peak-hour volume by four times the peak 15-minute volume. PHFs for the existing-conditions and existing-plus-project Phase 1 conditions analyses were determined based on the existing traffic volumes. The HCM suggests that a PHF of 0.92 in urban areas and 0.88 in rural areas may be used in the absence of field data. For purposes of the cumulative year 2020 and 2035 analyses performed for this study, in which field data is not available and traffic volumes are projected, a PHF of 0.92 is used for urban intersections and a PHF of 0.88 is used for rural intersections. Adjacent to schools, a PHF no greater than the existing PHF was used during the AM peak hour to account for more intense peak periods resulting from school traffic.

For mitigated scenarios at signalized intersections, queue lengths are analyzed using the Synchro computer program to verify that the proposed mitigation is feasible and that the recommended design will accommodate the anticipated queues.

Traffic Signal Warrants

The California Department of Transportation California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways (CMUTCD) dated January 21, 2010 presents various warrant analyses to assist in evaluating the need for traffic signals at an intersection. Traffic signal warrants are a series of standards that provide guidelines for determining if a traffic signal is appropriate consideration at an intersection that is currently not signalized. If one or more of the signal warrants are met, signalization of the intersection may be an appropriate mitigation. However, a signal likely should not be installed if none or few of the warrants are met since the installation of signals may increase delays on the previously uncontrolled major street and may contribute to an increase in accidents.

The potential need for a traffic signal is considered at each unsignalized intersection at which the project contributes to a significant impact. Since the analyses presented herein are based on peak-hour traffic volumes, Figure 4C-4, Warrant 3, Peak Hour (70 percent Factor) as presented in the CMUTCD was utilized to evaluate the possibility that traffic signals may be warranted at study intersections not currently signalized.

For cases in which the project creates a significant impact by causing or exacerbating a deficiency but traffic signal warrants are not met, traffic signals are not considered a feasible mitigation.

Road Segment Analysis Methodology

Road segment analyses were based on the Florida Department of Transportation Generalized Q/LOS Tables. The Florida road segment tables were developed based on procedures outlined in the HCM and are commonly utilized in the San Joaquin Valley for road segment analyses. The 1997 City of Selma General Plan Circulation Element utilized Florida tables, and other local agencies also refer to the Florida tables for road segment analyses. For example, the Florida tables are specified in the City of Fresno Traffic Impact Study Report Guidelines dated February 2, 2009 as an acceptable method for analysis of road segments in the City of Fresno.





Exhibit 4.12-5 Phase 1 Project Weekday Peak-Hour Pass-By Trips





Exhibit 4.12-6 Phase 1 Project Saturday Peak-Hour Pass-By Trips





Exhibit 4.12-7 Phase 2 Project Weekday Pass-By Trips

31130002 • 02/2012 | 4.12-7_weekday_pass_by_trips_2.cdr





Exhibit 4.12-8 Phase 2 Project Saturday Pass-By Trips





Exhibit 4.12-9 Phase 3 Project Weekday Pass-By Trips





Exhibit 4.12-10 Phase 3 Project Saturday Pass-By Trips





Exhibit 4.12-11 Phase 1 Project Weekday Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes





Exhibit 4.12-12 Phase 1 Project Saturday Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes





Exhibit 4.12-13 Phase 2 Project Weekday Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes

←28	$\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 $		←111	← 28 ∠ 122	0€ ↓ ∠-4	[®] ←15
30 →	$ \begin{array}{c} 24 \longrightarrow \\ 6 \longrightarrow \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\$		$37 \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 8 & 6 \\ 7 & 7 \end{bmatrix}$	³²		$16 \xrightarrow{16} 4 \xrightarrow{1} 4 \xrightarrow{1} 5$
Floral / SR 99 SB Off Ramp	2 Floral / Highland	3 Floral-Highland / SR 99 NB Loop Ramp	4 FLoral / SR 99 NB Off Ramp	5 Highland / SR 99 SB On Ramp	6. Highlanð / Rose	7 Highland / Nebraska
	∑	←-40	507 → 40 × -40	$ \begin{array}{c} & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & $	07 √ 19 √ 80	741 ↓ 135 ↓ 19
$ \stackrel{6}{\longrightarrow} 10 \stackrel{1}{\longrightarrow} \stackrel{1}{\searrow} \stackrel{1}{\longrightarrow} \stackrel{1}{\rightarrow} $	$\begin{array}{c} 6 \longrightarrow \\ 17 \longrightarrow \end{array}$	$9 \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$	$39 \xrightarrow{9} 1$	$20 \rightarrow \int_{\overline{N}}^{7}$	81 →	101→ ⁷ _R
Nebraska / Thompson	9. Second St / SP 99 SB Ramps	10 Second St / SR 99 NB Ramps	11 Second S / Whitson	12 Mountain View / Highland	13 Mountain View / Thompson	14. Mountain Vew / McCall
← 126 ∠ 388	⁹¹ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓	← 1120	← 1120	← 978	€ ←531	€ ←450
$131 \rightarrow 132 $	$394 \rightarrow 131 \rightarrow 121 \xrightarrow{2}{92} \xrightarrow{2}{92}$	1439 → 136 →	$\begin{array}{c} 506 \longrightarrow \\ 933 \longrightarrow \end{array}$	$933 \rightarrow \begin{vmatrix} \frac{5}{2} \\ 1 \end{vmatrix}$	$\begin{array}{ccc} 291 & & & \\ 507 & \rightarrow & & \\ 135 & & & & \\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 58 \\ 430 \\ 19 \\ 19 \\ \end{array} $
Mountain View / Dockery	16 Mountain View / \$R 99 SB Off Ramp	17 Mountain View / \$R 99 SB On Ramp	18 Mountain View / \$R 99 NB On Ramp	19 Mountain View / \$R 99 NB Off Ramp	20 Mountain View / Golden State Blvd	21 Mountain View / Bethel
50 ← 329	52 ← 166	5		←2	$\downarrow \qquad \qquad$	←4
$77 \longrightarrow 1$ $315 \longrightarrow 38 \longrightarrow 9$	$ \begin{array}{c} 117 \\ 160 \\ 38 \\ \hline 5 \end{array} $		142>	$3 \rightarrow$	$3 \rightarrow \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow$	$6 \rightarrow$
Mountain View / Academy	23 Mountain View / Mendocino	24 Caruthers / Dockery	25 Golden State Blvd / Amber	26 Kamm / Thompson	27 Kamm McCall	28 Kamm / Dockery
⁴ − 165	20 20	5 ↓		<u>e</u> -19		
0-	97 - J Ę	ŝ	$ \begin{array}{c} 11 \rightarrow \\ 11 \rightarrow \\ 12 \rightarrow \\ 12 \rightarrow \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 2 \\ 5 \end{array} \end{array} $	88 ~~)) ()) ()	$ \begin{array}{c} 64 \longrightarrow \\ 43 \longrightarrow \\ 43 \longrightarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 9 & 7 \\ 7 & 7 \\ 7 & 7 \end{array} $	50
Kamm / Van Hom	30 Kamm / SR 99 SB Off Ramp	31. Bethel / SR 99 NB On Ramp	32 Bethel / Golden State Blvd	33 Bethel Kamm	34 Kamm / Academy	35 Bethel / SR 99 NB Off Ram
59	←— 305	5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5		LEGEND		
$20 \xrightarrow{7} 100000000000000000000000000000000000$	591 ↑	↑ 7 % ~		۵	STUDY AREA INTERSE	CTIONS
thel / Parkway-SR 99 SB On Ramp	37 Site Access / Golden State	38 Site Access / Dockery	39 Site Access / Mountain View	XX		



Exhibit 4.12-14 Phase 2 Project Saturday Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes

					/								
	← 5(19)	← 14(21) ← 3(5)	€6(25) ←3(16) ∠36(37)				← 37(51)	← 10(14)		<u>←</u> 10(15)	∠2(2)	← 12(15)	← 2(10)
11(15) →		$\begin{array}{c} 8(12) \longrightarrow \\ 2(3) \searrow \end{array}$	(3) 3(12) ↓ 1(1) ↓			12(18) →	6(25) -7 16(64)	2(4)	5(17) →	1(1)		$\begin{array}{c} 5(8) \longrightarrow \\ 2(2) \searrow \end{array}$	¹⁽³⁾ 6(23) ↓ ↓ 0(3) ↓
Floral / SR 99	SB Off Ramp	2 Floral / I	lighland	3 Floral-Highland / S	SR 99 NB Loop Ramp	4 FLoral / SR 9	NB Off Ramp	5 Highland / SR	99 SB On Ramp	6 Highla	nd / Rose	7 Highland /	Nebraska
← 2(4)	∑2(12) ←2(4) ∠ 1(1)	7 – 4(5) د – 1(1)	← 5(18) ∠ 14(21)		← 15(27)	< 70(102)	← 18(19) ⊯ 14(20)	 	√7(26) ←3(12) ∠6(15)	7(10)	2(12) ← 16(53)	یر 49(71)	∑23(90) ← 18(66) ∠2(12)
$2(3) \longrightarrow$ $3(5) \longrightarrow$	(<u>(</u>) (<u>(</u>) (<u>(</u>)) (<u>(</u>)) (()) (($2(3) \longrightarrow 5(9)$		3(4) →	3(12) 7 7(26)	$7(26) \longrightarrow$ $3(4) \longrightarrow$	$1(6) \xrightarrow{1}$ $7(25) \xrightarrow{1}$	7(10) →	7(11)	28(40) →		35(50) →	7(10)
Nebraska /	Thompson	9 Second St / SF	99 SB Ramps	10 Second St / SR	99 NB Ramps	11 Second S	t / Whitson	12 Mountain V	iew / Highland	13 Mountain Vi	ew / Thompson	14. Mountain V	ew / McCall
	∽ 172(177) ← 22(84)	r~ 183(267)	← 337(565)		← 337(565)		← 337(565)		← 288(493)	r 105(154)	← 183(267)	r 21(31)	← 155(225
58(60) → 58(60) →		272(1049) → 10(38) →	33(49)	249(958) → 23(91) →		88(337) → 161(621) →		161(621) →	49(72)	50(194) → 88(337) → 23(90) →	49(72)	$\begin{array}{c} 10(38) \xrightarrow{7} \\ 74(285) \\ 3(12) \end{array}$	7(10)
Mountain Vie	ew / Dockery	16 Mountain View / S	R 99 SB Off Ramp	17 Mountain View / S	R 99 SB On Ramp	18 Mountain View /	SR 99 NB On Ramp	19 Mountain View	\$R 99 NB Off Ramp	20 Mountain View /	/ Golden State Blvd	21 Mountain V	iew / Bethel
7	← 113(165)	r 42(61)	← 58(83)			← 23(90)			←0(1)	←2(11)	← 0(1) ∠ 1(1)		← 1(3)
$13(51) \longrightarrow$ $55(209) \longrightarrow$ $6(25) \longrightarrow$	14(20)	$\begin{array}{c} 20(77) \checkmark \\ 29(106) \rightarrow \\ 7(25) \checkmark \end{array}$	14(21)				49(71) →	1(1) →		1(1) →	(3) (1) (1) (1)	1(3) →	
Mountain Vie	w / Academy	23 Mountain View	v / Mendocino	24 Caruthers	/ Dockery	25. Golden State	Blvd / Amber	26 Kamm /	Thompson	27 Kamm	n / McCall	28 Kamm /	Dockery
الالم الم الم الم الم الم الم الم الم ال	56(82)	7 (31)		← 8(11)		← 10(38) ← 13(51)	[▶] 24(34) ← 4(6)		∠ ⁻³⁽¹²⁾	() 3(15) 3(10)	€ ← 5(8) ← 21(30)	← 8(11)	∽7(10) ∠ 13(20)
1(3) →		16(64) —	35(50)		12(22) →	$\begin{array}{c} 9(9) \xrightarrow{\checkmark} \\ 2(7) \\ 1(8) \end{array}$	4(5) → 17(27) →	15(59) —	29(40) 7(10)	11(42) → 7(29) →	3(12) → 3(12) →		3(13)>
Kamm /	Van Horn	30 Kamm / SR 99	SB Off Ramp	31 Bethel / SR 99	NB On Ramp	32 Bethel / Gold	en State Blvd	33 Bethe	l Kamm	34 Kamm)	/ Academy	35 Bethel / SR 99	NB Off Ramp
7-21(31)		← 194(154)				الحب عارا (104) و- 220(848)	[™] 381(704) ← 12(64)		LEGEND				
$3(13) \xrightarrow{} 6(26) \xrightarrow{} 7(25) \phantom{aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa$	(20)		194) →			$58(91) \xrightarrow{7}$ $33(40) \longrightarrow$			٥	STUDY A	REA INTERS	SECTIONS	
ethel / Parkway-	₹ SR 99 SB On Ramp	37 Site Access /	Golden State	38 Site Acc	ess / Dockery	39 Site Access /	Mountain View		XX (YY)	AM (PM) ' PROJECI	VOLUMES T SITE		



Exhibit 4.12-15 Phase 3 Project Weekday Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes

← 19			←-70	← - 20 - 85	5	⁵⁷ ← 10
21 →	$\begin{array}{c} 17 \longrightarrow \\ 4 \longrightarrow \end{array} \xrightarrow{\uparrow} \\ m \xrightarrow{\frown} \\ m \xrightarrow{\longrightarrow} \\ m \xrightarrow{\frown} \\ m \xrightarrow{\longrightarrow} \\ m \xrightarrow$		$26 \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 25 \\ 52 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 25 \\ 52 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 25 \\ 52 \end{bmatrix}$	5 − √ ⊨		$11 \xrightarrow{3} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \uparrow \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \uparrow \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \uparrow \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \uparrow \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \uparrow \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \uparrow \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow \\ & & \\ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow \\ & & \\ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow \\ & & \\ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \downarrow \uparrow \uparrow \\ & & \\ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \downarrow \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow \\ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \downarrow \uparrow \downarrow \\ & & \\ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \downarrow \downarrow \\ & & \\ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \\ & & \\ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \\ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \\ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \\ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \\ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \\ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \\ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \downarrow $
Floral / SR 99 SB Off Ramp	2. Floral / Highland	3 Floral-Highland / SR 99 NB Loop Ramp	4. FLoral / SR 99 NB Off Ramp	5 Highland / SR 99 SB On Ramp	6 Highland / Rose	7 Highland / Nebraska
	$\int_{-29}^{15} \int_{-29}^{7} \left(\frac{18}{2} \right)^{18}$	← 38	57 ↓ ← 19 ↓ ← 28	87 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50	₹	8
$ \overset{4}{\xrightarrow{7}} \overset{1}{\xrightarrow{9}} \overset{1}{9$	$\begin{array}{c} 4 \longrightarrow \\ 12 \searrow \end{array}$	$6 \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 7 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{6} 6$	$\begin{array}{c} 26 \longrightarrow \\ 6 \longrightarrow \end{array} \qquad \left[\begin{array}{c} \uparrow & \uparrow \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{array} \right] \begin{array}{c} 26 & \downarrow \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{array} \right]$	$14 \rightarrow \int_{\underline{\omega}}^{1}$	$56 \rightarrow$	70 → ⁷
Nebraska / Thompson	9 Second St / SR 99 SB Ramps	10 Second St / SR 99 NB Ramps	11 Second S / Whitson	12 Mountain View / Highland	13 Mountain View / Thompson	14. Mountain View / McCall
78 08 246 → 246 → 246 → 246	€ ←785	← 785	←785	← 685	41	64 ← 313
$ \begin{array}{c} 83 \xrightarrow{7} \\ 78 \end{array} $	$\begin{array}{c} 1049 \rightarrow \\ 38 \rightarrow \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & \ddots \\ & & \\ \end{array} \end{array}$	958 → 91 →	$\begin{array}{c} 337 \longrightarrow \\ 621 \longrightarrow \end{array}$	621 →	194 √ 337 → 90 √	$\begin{array}{c} 38 \xrightarrow{7} \\ 285 \xrightarrow{7} \\ 12 \xrightarrow{7} \end{array} \xrightarrow{7} $
Mountain View / Dockery	16 Mountain View / \$R 99 SB Off Ramp	17 Mountain View / \$R 99 SB On Ramp	18 Mountain View / \$R 99 NB On Ramp	19 Mountain View / \$R 99 NB Off Ramp	20 Mountain View / Golden State Blvd	21. Mountain View / Bethel
ي پ ل ←229	€ ← 115		06 ↓	←1	⊊ ←1 ↓ ←1	←3
$51 \xrightarrow{7} 109 \xrightarrow{1} 209 \xrightarrow{8} 25 \xrightarrow{8} 100$	$\begin{array}{c} 77 \xrightarrow{7} \\ 106 \xrightarrow{7} \\ 25 \xrightarrow{8} \end{array}$		66	$2 \rightarrow$	$2 \rightarrow \left \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \underset{\underset{\scriptstyle \leftarrow}{\sim}}{\uparrow} \\ \underset{\scriptstyle \leftarrow}{\sim} \\ \end{array} \right $	$4 \rightarrow$
Mountain View / Academy	23 Mountain View / Mendocino	24 Caruthers / Dockery	25 Golden State Blvd / Amber	26 Kamm / Thompson	27. Kamm / McCall	28 Kamm / Dockery
€ 114	42	15	⁸ 12 ↓ ↓ ← 8	<u>←</u> 12	12 0 ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓	μΩ μΩ μΩ μΩ μΩ μΩ μΩ μΩ μΩ μΩ
4 —7	64 ~ 2	53	$\begin{array}{c} 9 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ h \\$	59 - 25 - 7	$\begin{array}{c} 42 \longrightarrow \\ 29 \longrightarrow \end{array} \qquad \qquad$	<u></u> ↑
Kamm / Van Horn	30 Kamm / SR 99 SB Off Ramp	31 Bethel / SR 95 NB On Ramp	32 Bethel / Golden State Blvd	33 Bethel Kamm	34 Kamm / Academy	35 Bethel / SR 99 NB Off Ramp
42			70 888 ↓ 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	LEGEND		
$\begin{array}{c}13 \xrightarrow{7} \\ 26 \xrightarrow{7} \\ 25 \xrightarrow{7} \end{array} \qquad $	194		$\begin{array}{c}100 \longrightarrow \\ 83 \longrightarrow\end{array}$	0	STUDY AREA INTERS	SECTIONS
thel / Parkway SR 99 SB On Ramo	37 Site Access / Golden State	38 Site Access / Dockery	39 Site Access / Mountain View	XX	SATURDAY VOLUME	S



Exhibit 4.12-16 Phase 3 Project Saturday Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes




Existing Plus Project Phase 1 Lane Configurations and Intersection Control

Exhibit 4.12-17

The Florida tables present LOS criteria based on the type of roadway being analyzed and the regional setting (i.e., urban areas or transitioning areas). The appropriate Florida table is dependent upon the setting. Table 4, Generalized Peak Hour Two-Way Volumes for Florida's Urbanized Areas (with adjustments for Non-State Roadways, Major City/County Roadways) was utilized in the analysis. Table 3.12-19 and Table 3.12-20 present the specific volume thresholds used in the analyses.

 Table 4.12-19: Volume Thresholds for Road Segment Levels of Service – Less Than 2

 Signalized Intersections Per Mile

Lanes	Median	Α	В	С	D	Е	F
2	Undivided – No Left Turn Lanes	-	≤ 669	670 - 1,080	1,081 - 1,152	> 1,152	*
2	Undivided With Left Turn Lanes	—	≤ 837	838 - 1,350	1,351 - 1,440	> 1,440	*
2	Divided With Left Turn Lanes	_	≤ 878	879 – 1,417	1,418 - 1,512	> 1,512	*
4	Undivided – No Left Turn Lanes	—	≤ 1,917	1,918 - 2,322	2,323 - 2,403	> 2,403	*
4	Undivided With Left Turn Lanes	_	≤ 2,428	2,429 - 2,941	2,941 - 3,043	> 3,043	*
4	Divided With Left Turn Lanes	—	≤ 2,556	2,557 - 3,093	3,097 - 3,204	> 3,204	*
6	Divided With Left Turn Lanes	_	≤ 3,933	3,934 - 4,680	4,680 - 4,824	> 4,824	*
Source: I	Peters Engineering Group, 2012.			·	·		

 Table 4.12-20: Volume Thresholds for Road Segment Levels of Service – 2.0 to 4.5 Signalized

 Intersections Per Mile

Lanes	Median	Α	в	С	D	E	F
2	Undivided – No Left Turn Lanes	_	_	≤734	735 – 1,065	1,066 - 1,130	> 1,130
2	Undivided With Left Turn Lanes	—	—	≤918	919 - 1,332	1,333 - 1,413	> 1,413
2	Divided With Left Turn Lanes	_	_	≤ 963	964 - 1,398	1,399 - 1,483	> 1,483
4	Undivided – No Left Turn Lanes	_	_	≤ 1,633	1,634 - 2,173	2,174 - 2,295	> 2,295
4	Undivided With Left Turn Lanes	_	_	≤ 2,069	2,070 - 2,753	2,754 - 2,907	> 2,907
4	Divided With Left Turn Lanes	_	_	≤ 2,178	2,179 - 2,898	3,899 - 3,060	> 3,060
6	Divided With Left Turn Lanes	_	_	≤ 3,411	3,412 - 4,392	4,393 - 4,635	> 4,635
Source: I	Peters Engineering Group, 2012.						

At-Grade Railroad Crossing Analysis Methodology

The at-grade railroad crossings analysis includes a description of the existing facilities. The Federal Highway Administration (FHA) Railroad-Highway Grade Crossing Handbook dated August 2007 (Appendix E) includes a description of the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report 50 Accident Prediction Formula. The expected number of accidents per year is calculated herein based on the NCHRP procedures as described in the Hazard index analyses are

presented FHA handbook. FHA indicates that an at-grade crossing with a predicted accident frequency greater than 0.02 accidents per year warrants an improvement to a higher level of traffic control devices and warning devices.

The Federal Highway Administration Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices dated December 2009 (MUTCD) presents various traffic signal warrants, including a warrant to determine the need for signalization of intersections near railroad crossings when none of the other traffic signal warrants is met (Warrant 9, Intersection Near a Grade Crossing). The Draft 2011 California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices has not yet been adopted, but it also includes the new Warrant 9. For purposes of this study, Warrant 9 will be analyzed for all of the minor-street unsignalized study at-grade railroad crossings during the weekday peak hour. Warrant 9 is not applicable to locations that are already signalized or where traffic on the crossing is not required to stop at the adjacent intersection. Warrant 9 will be utilized to assist in determining appropriate mitigations, but will not specifically be utilized to determine impacts.

4.12.5 - Thresholds of Significance

According to Appendix G, Environmental Checklist of the CEQA Guidelines, transportation and traffic impacts resulting from the implementation of the proposed project would be considered significant if the project would:

- a.) Exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?
- b.) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?
- c.) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? (Refer to Section 7, Effects Found Not To Be Significant)
- d.) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
- e.) Result in inadequate emergency access?
- f.) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

Regarding thresholds a) and b), the City of Selma, County of Fresno, and Caltrans require that an LOS C or better be maintained. It should be noted that the City of Selma General Plan Update was adopted by the City and modifies the City of Selma's minimum acceptable LOS from LOS C to LOS

D. However, because of litigation against the City, City staff has indicated that the General Plan Update does not yet apply.

A project traffic impact will be recognized if the proposed project will decrease the LOS below the target LOS at an intersection or road segment compared with the no project condition. A project traffic impact will also be recognized if the project will exacerbate an intersection already operating below the target LOS by increasing the average delay at the intersection by 5.0 seconds or more. Finally, a project traffic impact will be recognized if the project will exacerbate a road segment already operating below the target LOS by increasing the volume-to-capacity ratio (v/c) of the road segment by 0.15 or more.

A project traffic impact will be recognized if the proposed project will increase the predicted accident frequency above the threshold accident frequency of 0.02 accidents per year at an at-grade railroad crossing. A project traffic impact will also be recognized if the project will increase a predicted accident frequency at a crossing already operating above the threshold predicted accident frequency of 0.02 accidents per year by 5 percent or more.

4.12.6 - Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This section discusses potential impacts associated with the development of the proposed project and provides mitigation measures where appropriate.

Existing Plus Phase 1 Traffic Conditions

Impact TRANS-1: The proposed project would contribute vehicle trips to intersections, roadway segments, and railroad grade crossings that would operate at unacceptable levels under Existing Plus Phase 1 Conditions.

Impact Analysis

Existing Plus Phase 1 account for buildout of Phase 1 (Northwest) of the proposed project in relation to existing conditions.

Existing Lane Configurations and Intersection Control

Existing lane configurations and intersection control were previously presented in Exhibit 4.12-2.

Existing Traffic Volumes

Existing peak-hour turning movement volumes at the study intersections were previously presented in Exhibit 4.12-3 and Exhibit 4.12-4.

Existing-Plus-Project Phase 1 Lane Configurations and Intersection Control

The existing-plus-project conditions lane configurations and intersection control are presented in Exhibit 4.12-17. The lane configurations are essentially the same as the baseline conditions with the exception of improvements to be constructed by the project along the frontage of the project site.

Transportation

Existing-Plus-Project Phase 1 Traffic Volumes

The existing-plus-project conditions peak-hour traffic volumes are determined by adding the existing traffic volumes and the project traffic volumes. The existing-plus-project Phase 1 conditions peak-hour traffic volumes are presented in Exhibit 4.12-18 and Exhibit 4.12-19.

Intersection LOS Analysis

The results of the existing-plus-project Phase 1 conditions intersection LOS analyses are summarized in Table 4.12-21.

Road Segment Analyses

The results of the existing-plus-project Phase 1 road segment analyses are summarized in Table 4.12-22.

At-Grade Railroad Crossing Analyses

The results of the existing-plus-project Phase 1 at-grade railroad crossing analyses are summarized in Table 4.12-23.

(112) (122	$ \begin{array}{c} (60)\\ (60)\\ (80)\\ (80)\\ (80)\\ 87\\ \hline \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 $		← 482(631)	← 274(279)	(529) (100	$(992)07 \xrightarrow{1}{10} (62)$ $(691)17 \xrightarrow{1}{10} (62)$ $(691)17 \xrightarrow{1}{10} (62)$
203(513) → 23(57) → Floral / SR 99 SB Off Ramp	$\begin{array}{c c} 85(196) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{I}} & & & \uparrow \\ 249(591) \xrightarrow{\rightarrow} & & & \uparrow & \uparrow \\ 60(91) \xrightarrow{\rightarrow} & & & \downarrow \\ & & & \\ \end{array}$	3 Floral-Highland / SR 99 NB Loop Ramp	$333(755) \longrightarrow \bigcap_{\substack{\text{(F)} \\ \text{(F)} \\ ($	304(340) → 304(340) → 5 Highland / SR \$9 SB On Ramp	$\begin{array}{c c} 3(3) & \checkmark & \uparrow & \uparrow \\ 11(11) & \rightarrow & \uparrow & \uparrow & \uparrow \\ 2(2) & \checkmark & \uparrow & \uparrow & \uparrow \\ 6 & \text{Highland} / Rose \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 62(65) \\ 61(69) \\ 5(26) \\ 5(26) \\ \hline \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ (1) \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ $
$\begin{array}{c c} & & & & \\ \hline (0,1)(2)(1,0)(1,0)(1,0)(1,0)(1,0)(1,0)(1,0)(1,0$	$\begin{array}{c} (60)\\(2)\\(2)\\(2)\\(2)\\(2)\\(2)\\(2)\\(2)\\(2)\\(2$	$\begin{array}{c} \overbrace{(2)}{{}{}{}{}{}{}{$	(b) = (b)	(55) (52) (51) (51) (51) (51) (51) (51) (51) (51	$\begin{array}{c c} & & & & \\ & & & & \\ (0)) \begin{array}{c} (0) \\ (0)$	$(1000) \begin{array}{c} (1100) \\ (1100) $
Nebraska Thompson $\begin{array}{c} \overbrace{\bigcirc} \fbox{\bigcirc} \fbox{\bigcirc} \fbox{\bigcirc} \fbox{\bigcirc} \rule{0pt}{0pt} 0$	9 Second St / SR 99 SB Ramps (a) = (b)	10 Second SI / SK 99 NB Ramps ← 129(246) ৮ 39(124) 525(985) → 51(42) 51(42) → SR 99 SB On Ramp	Second S / Whitson Second S / Whitson Second S ~ 361(566) ~ 487(914) ~ 18 Mountain View / \$R 99 NB On Ramp	12 Mountain View / Highland $\leftarrow -523(927)$ $490(914) \rightarrow \int_{[32]} \int_{[32]} \int_{[32]} (92) \int_{[32]} (9$	$\begin{array}{c c} \hline 13 \\ \hline \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0$	$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$
$\begin{array}{c} (1) \\ (2) \\ (3) \\ (2) \\$	$\begin{array}{c} (c_{11})_{22} \\ (c_{11})_{22} \\ (c_{11})_{22} \\ (c_{12})_{22} \\ (c_{12}$	$ \begin{array}{c} $	(FLE) LF1 → 2(2) → 1(1) ↑ ↓ Contensistent Blob / Amber	$\begin{array}{c} (0,1) \\ (0,1) \\ (0,2) \\$	$(b) = \int_{1}^{1} \int_{1}^{1$	$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \end{array} \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\$
$\begin{array}{c} (2) \\ (2) \\ (1) \\ (2) \\ (1) \\ (2) \\ (1) \\ (2) \\$	(821))57 (12)10 12(20) 30 Kamm / SR 99 SB Off Ramp	$(L) \begin{array}{c} (r_{00}) \\ (L) \\ (L$	$\begin{array}{c} (60) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (1$	$\begin{array}{c} \leftarrow 61(90) \\ \swarrow 5(16) \\ \hline 71(66) \rightarrow & & & \\ 42(135) \rightarrow & & & \\ \hline 0 & & & \\ 0 & & & \\ \hline 0 & & & \\ 0 & & & \\ \hline 0 & & & \\ 0 & & & \\ \hline 0 & & & \\ 0 & & & \\ 0 & & & \\ 0 & & \\ 0 & & & \\ 0 & &$	$(00)^{11} \downarrow 00^{-1} \downarrow 00$	(101) (
(29) (20) (20) (20) (20) (20) (20) (20) (20	$\begin{array}{c} \widehat{(2,1)} \\ (2$	38 Site Access / Dockery	39 Ste Access / Mountain View	LEGEN © XX (YY)	D STUDY AREA INTE AM (PM) VOLUMES PROJECT SITE	ERSECTIONS S

Michael Brandman Associates

Existing Plus Project Phase 1 Weekday Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes

31130002 • 02/2012 | 4.12-18_existing_weekday_traffic_volumes_plus_project.cdr

6 5 6 5 6 5 6 5 6 5 6 5 6 5 6 5 6 5 6 5 6 5 6 5 6 5 6 5 6 7 6 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	$\begin{array}{c} 0.000\\ 0.$		←-794 N 7	لا من ا		
585 → (81 √ ∯ Floral / SR 99 SB Off Ramp	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	3 Floral-Highland / SR 99 NB Loop Ramp	$\begin{array}{c} 759 \longrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \\ \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \\ \end{array} \\ \hline \\ \hline$	246 — 1 (资 労 5 Highland / SR 99 SB On Ramp	$ \begin{array}{c} 6 \rightarrow \\ 4 \rightarrow \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} $ \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & \\ \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & \\ \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \end{array}	54 →) (8 →) ⁹ ¹ / ₂ ¹ / ₂ ¹ / ₄
$\begin{array}{c} & & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\$	²³	$ \begin{array}{c} & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & $	$\begin{array}{c} & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & $	$\begin{array}{c} & {\overset{\scriptstyle \leftarrow}{\overset{\scriptstyle \leftarrow}{\atop \leftarrow}{\overset{\scriptstyle \leftarrow}{\overset{\scriptstyle}{}}{\overset{\scriptstyle \leftarrow}{\overset{\scriptstyle \leftarrow}{}}}{\overset{\scriptstyle \scriptstyle}{\overset{\scriptstyle}}{}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}$	$\begin{array}{c} & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & $	$ \begin{array}{c} & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & &$
Nebraska / Thompson	23	10 Second St / SF 99 NB Ramps	172 또 문 문 원 171 Second S / Whitson	33 → ° g G 2 → ° g G 12 Mountain View / Highland	4 View / Thompson	100 등 원 6 등 원 14 Mountain View / McCall
$ \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{}\\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} $	$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & $	$\begin{array}{c} \leftarrow 240 \\ \swarrow & 133 \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{c} 972 \rightarrow \\ 40 \rightarrow \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & &$	← 993 941 →	$\begin{array}{c} 618 \\ 618 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\ $	$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} $
$\begin{array}{c} & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & &$	$\begin{array}{c c} \hline \\ \hline $			$ \begin{array}{c} & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ $	$\begin{array}{c} & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & &$	$\begin{array}{c} \hline \\ \hline $
Mountain View / Academy $\downarrow \downarrow $	Mountain View / Mendocino	24 Caruthers/ Dockery 2 3 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	25 Golden State Blvd / Amber $\begin{array}{c} & & & \\ & &$	26 Kamm / Thompson ← 32 ∠ 15 35 → ∫ / 117 → S 33 Behel Kamm	$\begin{array}{c c} & \text{Kamm} & \text{McCall} \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & & \\ & &$	28 Kamm / Dockery ₹ ~74 ↓ ~8 € € 25 Bethel / SR 99 MB Off Ramo
$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} \\ \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \\ \\ \end{array}{} \\ \\ \\ \end{array}{} \\ \\ \end{array}{} \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array}{} \\ \\ \\ \end{array}{} \\ \\ \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array}{} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array}{} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array}{} $ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\	$\begin{array}{c} 828 \\ 828 \\ 8392 \\ 745 \\ 745 \\ 745 \\ 745 \\ 816 $	20 Site Annes / Dordeny	20 Site Arcess / Monthin View	LEGEND ®	STUDY AREA INTERS	



Exhibit 4.12-19 Existing Plus Project Phase 1 Saturday Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes

31130002 • 02/2012 | 4.12-19_existing_saturday_traffic_volumes_plus_project.cdr

Table 4.12-21: Existing Plus Phase I Intersection Operations

				Existir	ng			Existing Plus Phase I							
		AM Peak	Hour	PM Peak	Hour	Weeke	nd	AM Peak	Hour	PM Peak	Hour	Weeke	nd		
Intersection	Control	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS		
Floral/SR-99 SB offramp	Signal	12.6	В	17.9	В	18.1	В	12.6	В	18.0	В	18.3	В		
Floral/Highland	Signal	15.3	В	20.7	C	22.7	C	15.4	В	21.0	C	23.2	C		
Floral/SR-99 NB offramp	Signal	7.1	В	6.7	A	7.2	A	7.1	A	6.9	Α	8.5	A		
Highland/SR-99 SB onramp	Signal	11.0	В	11.8	В	12.0	В	11.0	В	11.8	В	12.0	В		
Highland/Rose	TWS	14.5	В	19.7	C	15.8	C	14.6	В	20.3	C	16.3	C		
Highland/Nebraska	Signal	11.1	В	11.3	В	11.8	В	11.1	В	11.4	В	11.9	В		
Nebraska/Thompson	AWS	9.5	A	9.1	Α	8.7	A	9.7	Α	10.1	В	9.2	A		
Second/SR-99 SB	OWS	34.1	D	68.3	F	19.3	C	39.4	Е	138.7	F	31.2	D		
Second/SR-99 NB	OWS	14.2	В	14.0	В	12.5	В	14.6	В	15.3	C	13.9	В		
Second/Whitson	Signal	14.0	В	18.2	В	15.8	В	15.4	В	22.8	C	21.4	C		
Mountain View/Highland	Signal	17.1	В	13.7	В	14.0	В	16.1	В	17.7	В	18.2	В		
Mountain View/Thompson	TWS	10.2	В	11.0	В	10.5	В	10.5	В	12.2	В	12.1	В		
Mountain View/McCall	AWS	8.1	A	8.7	A	7.9	A	8.4	Α	10.4	В	9.6	A		
Mountain View/Dockery	TWS	10.0	В	10.6	В	10.2	В	11.2	В	12.7	В	12.8	В		
Mountain View/SR-99 SB offramp	TWS	22.3	C	25.3	D	15.8	C	103.9	F	629.5	F	879.4	F		
Mountain View/SR-99 SB onramp	Yield	1.4	A	1.6	A	0.8	A	2.5	A	6.3	A	7.7	A		
Mountain View/SR-99 NB onramp	Yield	1.2	A	0.9	A	1.4	A	1.2	A	1.7	A	2.6	A		

Table 4.12-21 (cont.): Existing Plus Phase	I Intersection Operations
--	---------------------------

				Existin	g			Existing Plus Phase I							
		AM Peak	Hour	PM Peak	Hour	Weeke	nd	AM Peak	Hour	PM Peak	Hour	Weeke	nd		
Intersection	Control	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS		
Mountain View/SR-99 NB offramp	OWS	14.7	В	15.5	C	12.3	В	18.1	C	142.2	F	159.7	F		
Mountain View/Golden State	Signal	12.2	В	14.7	В	17.8	В	26.2	C	271.0	F	471.5	F		
Mountain View/Bethel	TWS	18.6	C	22.2	C	15.8	C	22.1	C	417.6	F	407.6	F		
Mountain View/Academy	TWS	16.7	C	22.5	C	16.6	C	23.4	C	494.8	F	858.7	F		
Mountain View/Mendocino	Signal	8.8	A	17.0	В	7.4	A	9.4	A	101.2	F	8.7	A		
Caruthers/Dockery	OWS	8.6	A	8.6	Α	8.7	Α	8.6	Α	8.6	A	8.7	A		
Golden State /Amber	OWS	9.8	A	10.2	В	9.8	Α	10.3	В	11.9	В	13.0	В		
Kamm/Thompson	OWS	9.0	A	9.2	Α	9.1	Α	9.0	Α	9.2	A	9.1	A		
Kamm/McCall	TWS	9.8	A	9.6	A	9.3	A	9.9	A	10.3	В	9.7	A		
Kamm/Dockery	TWS	8.9	A	8.9	A	8.9	A	8.9	A	8.9	A	8.9	A		
Kamm/Van Horn	TWS	8.9	A	9.0	Α	8.9	Α	8.9	Α	9.0	Α	8.9	A		
Kamm/SR-99 SB offramp	TWS	7.4	A	7.9	Α	7.5	Α	7.4	Α	7.9	Α	7.5	A		
Bethel/SR-99 NB onramp	OWS	11.8	В	10.8	В	10.3	В	12.2	В	12.0	В	12.1	В		
Bethel/Golden State	AWS	9.3	Α	8.4	Α	7.8	Α	9.9	A	10.3	В	9.8	Α		
Bethel/Kamm	AWS	8.4	A	7.9	A	7.4	A	8.6	A	8.7	A	8.2	A		
Kamm/Academy	AWS	8.4	Α	8.1	Α	7.6	Α	8.8	A	9.6	A	9.3	Α		
Bethel/SR-99 NB offramp	OWS	10.8	В	10.3	В	9.4	A	11.1	В	11.0	В	10.0	A		
Bethel/Parkway-SR-99 SB onramp	OWS	12.4	В	11.0	В	9.4	A	12.9	В	13.1	В	10.5	В		
Golden State/Phase 1 Access	OWS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	98.0	F	*	F	*	F		

Table 4.12-21 (cont.): Existing Plus Phase I Intersection Operations

				Existin	ng			Existing Plus Phase I							
		AM Peak	Hour	PM Peak Hour		Weeke	end	AM Peak	Hour	PM Peak	Hour	Weekend			
Intersection	Control	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS		
Notes: * Delay exceeds calculation limits Bold denotes unacceptable intersect N/A = Not Applicable; intersection Source: Peters Engineering Group,	tion operation does not exist 2012.	t.													

Table 4.12-22: Existing Plus Phase I Roadway Segment Operations

			Existing						Existing Plus Phase I						
		Lanes and	AM Peak	Hour	PM Peak	Hour	Weeke	end	AM Peak	Hour	PM Peak	Hour	Weeke	and	
	Road Segment	Median	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	
Mountain View	Highland to Thompson	2U (<2)	200	В	240	В	200	В	231	В	354	В	349	В	
Avenue	Thompson to McCall	2U (<2)	189	В	235	В	197	В	227	В	376	В	381	В	
	McCall to Dockery	2U (<2)	231	В	302	В	226	В	290	В	525	В	508	В	
	Dockery to SR-99 2U (325	В	386	В	265	В	384	В	609	В	557	В	
	SR-99 to Golden State	2U (<2)	758	C	813	C	584	В	1,063	C	1,959	E	2,083	Ε	
	Golden State to Bethel	4D-LT (<2)	665	В	769	В	1,043	В	859	В	1,495	В	1,993	В	
	Bethel to Academy	2U (<2)	659	В	793	C	596	В	823	C	1,407	Е	1,399	Е	
	Academy to Mendocino	2U (<2)	702	C	789	C	577	В	815	С	1,237	Е	1,163	Е	
	Mendocino to Madsen	2U (<2)	721	C	797	C	592	В	775	C	1,023	C	888	C	
	Madsen to Zediker	2U (<2)	700	C	791	C	608	В	752	С	986	C	864	C	

Table 4.12-22 (cont.): Existing Plus Phase I Roadway Segment Operations

			Existing						Existing Plus Phase I					
		Lanes and	AM Peak	Hour	PM Peak	Hour	Weeke	end	AM Peak	Hour	PM Peak	Hour	Week	and
	Road Segment	Median	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS
Kamm Avenue	Zediker to Fresno County Line	2U (<2)	719	C	771	C	601	В	764	C	938	C	821	C
	Highland to Thompson	2U (<2)	15	В	23	В	10	В	16	В	27	В	15	В
	Thompson to McCall	2U (<2)	12	В	19	В	12	В	13	В	23	В	17	В
	McCall to Dockery	2U (<2)	21	В	23	В	22	В	21	В	23	В	22	В
	Dockery to Van Horn	2U (<2)	21	В	24	В	22	В	21	В	24	В	22	В
	Van Horn to SR-99	2U (<2)	24	В	40	В	39	В	24	В	40	В	39	В
	SR-99 to Academy	2U (<2)	175	В	169	В	102	В	207	В	293	В	264	В
McCall Avenue	Valley View to Mountain View	2U (<2)	74	В	182	В	90	В	88	В	237	В	162	В
	Mountain View to Caruthers	2U (<2)	106	В	225	В	91	В	113	В	252	В	126	В
Dockery Avenue	Mountain View to Caruthers	2U (<2)	9	В	12	В	7	В	9	В	12	В	7	В
Golden State	Nebraska to Saginaw	4D-LT (<2)	299	В	420	В	368	В	434	В	923	В	1,028	В
Boulevard	Saginaw to Phase 1 main site access	4D-LT (<2)	261	В	403	В	566	В	411	В	962	В	1,299	В
	Phase 1 main site access to Mountain View	4D-LT (<2)	261	В	403	В	566	В	857	В	2,637	C	3,489	E
	Mountain View to Amber	4D-LT (<2)	222	В	342	В	561	В	319	В	705	В	1,036	В
	Amber to Bethel	4D-LT (<2)	263	В	335	В	269	В	360	В	698	В	744	В
Notes: 2U: 2-lane undivided Values in parenthese	4D-LT: 4-lane divided with left s indicate number of signalized intersed	-turn lanes ctions per mile.			- -			-	·	-	·	-	-	

Bold denotes unacceptable roadway segment operation. Source: Peters Engineering Group, 2012.

Table 4.12-23: Existing Plus Phase I Grade Crossing Analysis

			Existing		Existing Plus Phase I						
Crossing	Trains per Day	Average Daily Trips	Predicted Accident Frequency per Year	Warrant 9	Trains per Day	Average Daily Trips	Predicted Accident Frequency per Year	Warrant 9			
Highland north of Golden State	14	6,690	0.010	N/R	14	8,621	0.013	N/R			
Floral east of Front Street	14	11,390	0.017	N/R	14	12,356	0.017	N/R			
Thompson north of Front Street	14	2,920	0.005	Met	14	3,564	0.006	Met			
First Street east of Front Street	14	2,840	0.005	N/R	14	3,162	0.005	N/R			
Second Street east of Front Street	14	9,590	0.014	N/R	14	9,912	0.014	N/R			
Third Street east of Front Street	14	2,900	0.005	Not met	14	3,222	0.005	Not met			
Nebraska east of Golden State	14	2,040	0.003	Met	14	3,006	0.005	Met			
Saginaw east of Golden State	14	280	0.000	Not met	14	602	0.001	Not met			
Mountain View east of Golden State	14	7,690	0.012	N/R	14	16,060	0.022	N/R			
Bethel east of Golden State	14	2,590	0.005	Met	14	3,878	0.006	Met			
Stroud east of Golden State	14	1,800	0.003	Met	14	2,122	0.003	Met			

Notes:

Warrant 9 = Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices Signal Warrant 9 (Intersection Near a Grade Crossing) Analysis

N/R = Not Relevant

Bold denotes unacceptable grade crossing operation. Source: Peters Engineering Group, 2012.

Potential Impacts and Mitigation

Traffic impacts identified in the Existing-Plus-Project Phase 1 conditions analyses are stated below, followed by discussion of the recommended mitigation. Recommended turn lane lengths are in accordance with the standards of the agency having jurisdiction unless otherwise noted.

Second Street/SR-99 Southbound Ramps

At the intersection of Second Street and the SR-99 southbound ramps, the project will:

- Exacerbate a substandard condition from LOS D to LOS E during the AM peak hour
- Exacerbate a substandard LOS F during the PM peak hour
- Cause a substandard LOS D during the Saturday peak hour

The addition of lanes at the intersection of Second Street and the SR-99 southbound ramps will not mitigate the substandard levels of service. Traffic signal warrants are not satisfied. Therefore, there is no feasible mitigation. The impact would remain significant until traffic signal warrants are satisfied and traffic signals are installed. The City of Selma development impact fee program includes \$1,500,000 for improvements at the Second Street/SR-99 interchange. Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a requires the project applicant to establish a financing mechanism with the City of Selma to fund transportation improvements that are necessary to mitigate the proposed project's impacts. In this case, the financing mechanism would collect fees and apply them to necessary improvements such as those contemplated at the Second Street/SR-99 interchange.

Mountain View Avenue/SR-99 Southbound Offramp

At the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and the SR-99 southbound offramp, the project will:

- Cause a substandard LOS F during the AM peak hour
- Exacerbate a substandard condition from LOS D to LOS F during the PM peak hour
- Cause a substandard LOS F during the Saturday peak hour

Traffic signal warrants are expected to be met at the intersection. To accommodate signalization of the intersection with protected left-turn phasing, the SR-99 onramp and offramp shall be modified to align with each other. The connection to Van Horn Avenue at Mountain View Avenue will be eliminated, resulting in a cul-de-sac or realignment of Van Horn Avenue south of Mountain View Avenue. This will also require a revision of the project site plan.

The configuration of the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and the SR-99 southbound on- and offramps would be as follows:

Eastbound: One through lane and one right-turn lane Westbound: One left-turn lane (minimum 160 feet) and one through lane Northbound: None Southbound: One left-turn lane and one right-turn lane With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS B during the AM peak hour, LOS C during the PM peak hour, and LOS D during the Saturday peak hour. The LOS D in the mitigated conditions is considered acceptable since the intersection currently operates at LOS D during the worst-case peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program. The bridge structure would need to be widened to accommodate this improvement, and preliminary studies suggest that it will be difficult to incorporate the new bridge widening into the ultimate interchange configuration. Therefore, an alternative roundabout mitigation that does not require bridge widening is recommended as described below.

The proposed roundabout would be constructed in a "teardrop" configuration with two lanes on the eastbound approach and one lane on the westbound approach. There would be two lanes within the roundabout, except along the north side where only one lane would be required. Two exiting lanes in the eastbound direction would drop to one lane across the bridge structure. This alternative requires minimal modification of the existing ramps. However, Van Horn Avenue on the south side of Mountain View Avenue would need to be relocated to the west side of the existing gas station. This configuration is considered preliminary, and modifications of the lane configurations during design may be required and should be allowed for in the mitigation monitoring program. With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS A during the AM peak hour, LOS B during the PM peak hour, and LOS B during the Saturday peak hour.

The roundabout recommendation is reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-1b.

Mountain View Avenue/SR-99 Northbound Offramp

At the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and the SR-99 northbound offramp, the project will cause a substandard LOS F during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour.

Traffic signal warrants are expected to be met at the intersection. To accommodate signalization of the intersection with protected left-turn phasing, the SR-99 onramp and offramp shall be modified to align with each other. The configuration of the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and the SR-99 northbound on and offramps would be as follows:

Eastbound: One left-turn lane (minimum 50 feet) and one through lane Westbound: One through lane and one right-turn lane Northbound: One left-turn lane and one right-turn lane Southbound: None

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS B during the worst-case peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program. The bridge structure would need to be widened to accommodate this improvement, and preliminary studies suggest that it will be difficult to incorporate the new bridge widening into the

ultimate interchange configuration. Therefore, an alternative roundabout mitigation that does not require bridge widening is recommended as described below.

The proposed roundabout would be constructed in a "teardrop" configuration with one lane on the eastbound approach and two lanes on the westbound approach. There would be two lanes within the roundabout, except along the east leg where only one circulating lane would be required. Two circulating lanes in the westbound direction would divide such that the outer lane would be trapped to the northbound onramp and the inner lane would proceed westbound across the bridge structure. This alternative requires minimal modification of the existing ramps. This configuration is considered preliminary and modifications of the lane configurations during design may be required and should be allowed for in the mitigation monitoring program. With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS A during the AM peak hour, LOS B during the PM peak hour, and LOS B during the Saturday peak hour.

The roundabout recommendation is reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-1c.

Mountain View Avenue/Golden State Boulevard

At the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Golden State Boulevard, the project will cause a substandard LOS F during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour.

The intersection is currently signalized and is adjacent to the railroad tracks. The intersection shall be widened to provide a second left-turn lane on all four approaches, two dedicated right-turn lanes on the westbound and southbound approaches, and one dedicated right-turn lane on the eastbound approach. The configuration of the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Golden State Boulevard would be as follows:

Eastbound: Two left-turn lanes (minimum 400 feet), two through lanes, and one right-turn lane Westbound: Two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and two right-turn lanes Northbound: Two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane Southbound: Two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and two right-turn lanes

Modification of the traffic signal system at the intersection shall include installation of pre-signals at the existing at-grade railroad crossing.

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS B during the AM peak hour, LOS C during the PM peak hour, and LOS D during the Saturday peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

The calculated LOS D during the weekend peak hour is considered the best-case scenario, because additional lanes provide only marginal improvements in delay, are not warranted based on the traffic volumes in the lanes, and reduce ease of access for pedestrians by increasing the width of the intersection. Considering that the City of Selma's pending General Plan Update considers LOS D as

acceptable, this mitigation would be substandard only until the General Plan Update is in force and the intersection is annexed into the City of Selma.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-1d.

Mountain View Avenue/Bethel Avenue

At the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Bethel Avenue, the project will cause a substandard LOS F during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour.

Traffic signal warrants are expected to be met at the intersection. The intersection shall be signalized with protected left-turn phasing and widened to provide a dedicated left-turn lane on the northbound and southbound approaches. The configuration of the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Bethel Avenue would be as follows:

Eastbound: One left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn Westbound: One left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn Northbound: One left-turn lane and one through lane with a shared right turn Southbound: One left-turn lane and one through lane with a shared right turn

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS B during the worst-case peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program. Measure C Rural Project I is currently in the design phase and is funded to construct widening of Mountain View Avenue from Bethel Avenue to the Tulare County line.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-1e.

Mountain View Avenue/Academy Avenue

At the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Academy Avenue, the project will cause a substandard LOS F during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour.

Traffic signal warrants are expected to be met at the intersection. The intersection shall be signalized with protected left-turn phasing and widened to provide a dedicated left-turn lane on all approaches and a second through lane in each direction on Mountain View Avenue. The configuration of the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Academy Avenue would be as follows:

Eastbound: One left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn Westbound: One left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn Northbound: One left-turn lane and one through lane with a shared right turn Southbound: One left-turn lane and one through lane with a shared right turn

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS B during the worst-case peak hour.

Measure C Rural Project I is currently in the design phase and is funded to construct this improvement. Therefore, the project will not be required to implement this mitigation.

Mountain View Avenue/Mendocino Avenue

At the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Mendocino Avenue, the project will cause a substandard LOS F during the PM peak hour.

The intersection is currently signalized. The intersection shall be widened to provide a second through lane in each direction on Mountain View Avenue and a dedicated right-turn lane on the southbound approach. The configuration of the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Mendocino Avenue would be as follows:

Eastbound: One left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn Westbound: One left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn Northbound: One left-turn lane and one through lane with a shared right turn Southbound: One left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS C during the worst-case peak hour.

Measure C Rural Project I is currently in the design phase and is funded to construct this improvement. Therefore, the project will not be required to implement this mitigation.

Phase 1 Site Access/Golden State Boulevard

At the intersection of the Phase 1 Site Access and Golden State Boulevard, the project driveway will operate at LOS F during all peak hours if one-way stop-sign control is installed.

Traffic signal warrants are expected to be met at the intersection. The intersection shall be signalized with protected left-turn phasing. The opening-day configuration of the intersection of the Phase 1 Site Access and Golden State Boulevard would be as follows:

Eastbound: Two left-turn lanes and two right-turn lanes Westbound: None Northbound: Two left-turn lanes (minimum 800 feet) and two through lanes Southbound: Two through lanes and a right-turn lane

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS B during the AM peak hour, LOS C during the PM peak hour, and LOS D during the Saturday peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

The calculated LOS D during the weekend peak hour is considered the best-case scenario, because additional lanes provide only marginal improvements in delay, are not warranted based on the traffic volumes in the lanes, and reduce ease of access for pedestrians by increasing the width of the intersection. Considering that the City of Selma's pending General Plan Update considers LOS D as

acceptable, this mitigation would be substandard only until the General Plan Update is in force and the intersection is annexed into the City of Selma.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-1f.

Mountain View Avenue – SR-99 to Golden State Boulevard

On Mountain View Avenue between SR-99 and Golden State Boulevard, the project will cause a substandard LOS E during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour.

The existing two-lane portion of Mountain View Avenue between the SR-99 northbound ramps and Golden State Boulevard shall be widened to four lanes with a median. Transitions to the two-lane portion within the interchange may be accomplished east of the northbound ramps. In the westbound direction, one of the lanes may be trapped as a right-turn lane to northbound SR-99.

With implementation of these improvements, the road segment is expected to operate at LOS C during the worst-case peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-1g.

Mountain View Avenue – Bethel Avenue to Academy Avenue

On Mountain View Avenue between Bethel and Academy Avenues, the project will cause a substandard LOS E during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour.

Mountain View Avenue between Bethel and Academy Avenues shall be widened to four lanes with a median. With implementation of these improvements, the road segment is expected to operate at LOS C during the worst-case peak hour.

Measure C Rural Project I is currently in the design phase and is funded to construct this improvement. Therefore, the project will not be required to implement this mitigation.

Mountain View Avenue – Academy Avenue to Mendocino Avenue

On Mountain View Avenue between Academy and Mendocino Avenues, the project will cause a substandard LOS E during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour.

Mountain View Avenue between Academy and Mendocino Avenues shall be widened to four lanes with a median. With implementation of these improvements, the road segment is expected to operate at LOS C during the worst-case peak hour.

Measure C Rural Project I is currently in the design phase and is funded to construct this improvement. Therefore, the project will not be required to implement this mitigation.

Golden State Boulevard – Phase 1 Main Site Access to Mountain View Avenue On Golden State Boulevard between the Phase 1 main site access and Mountain View Avenue, the project will cause a substandard LOS E during the Saturday peak hour.

Golden State Boulevard between the Phase 1 main site access and Mountain View Avenue shall be widened to six lanes with a median. In the northbound direction, the required third northbound lane may be constructed as a trapped extension of a northbound left-turn lane at the Phase 1 site entrance. In the southbound direction, the required third southbound lane may be constructed as a trapped extension of a southbound right-turn lane at the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Golden State Boulevard.

With implementation of these improvements, the road segment is expected to operate at LOS C during the weekday peak hours, but would operate at substandard LOS D during the worst-case weekend peak hour.

The calculated LOS D during the weekend peak hour is considered the best-case scenario: additional lanes (an eight-lane arterial) provide only marginal improvements, because lanes are not typically evenly utilized near site access locations, reduce ease of access for pedestrians by increasing the widths of intersections, and create substantial additional ongoing maintenance costs to the City. Considering that the City of Selma's pending General Plan Update considers LOS D as acceptable, this mitigation would be substandard only until the General Plan Update is in force and the roadway is annexed into the City of Selma.

The City of Selma development impact fee program includes \$2,235,725 for improvements on Golden State Boulevard between Nebraska Avenue and Mountain View Avenue. As such, payment of fees in accordance with Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a would satisfy the applicant's obligation in this case.

Mountain View Avenue At-Grade Railroad Crossing

At the Mountain View Avenue at-grade railroad crossing east of Golden State Boulevard, the project will cause the predicted accident frequency to exceed 0.02 accidents per year.

In conjunction with the mitigations required at the adjacent intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Golden State Boulevard, the crossing shall be equipped with a pre-signal and pedestrian access. With implementation of this improvement, the predicted accident frequency is expected to be reduced to pre-project levels. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-1h.

Mitigated Existing Plus Project Phase 1 Conditions

Table 4.12-24 and Table 4.12-25 presents levels of service for the mitigated conditions, with the mitigated locations presented in italics.

		AM Pea	k Hour	PM Pea	k Hour	Weel	kend
Intersection	Control	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS
Floral/SR-99 SB offramp	Signal	12.6	В	18.0	В	18.3	В
Floral/Highland	Signal	15.4	В	21.0	С	23.2	C
Floral/SR-99 NB offramp	Signal	7.1	А	6.9	А	8.5	Α
Highland/SR-99 SB onramp	Signal	11.0	В	11.8	В	12.0	В
Highland/Rose	TWS	14.6	В	20.3	С	16.3	C
Highland/Nebraska	Signal	11.1	В	11.4	В	11.9	В
Nebraska/Thompson	AWS	9.7	А	10.1	В	9.2	Α
Second/SR-99 SB	OWS	39.4	E*	138.7	F*	31.2	D*
Second/SR-99 NB	OWS	14.6	В	15.3	С	13.9	В
Second/Whitson	Signal	15.4	В	22.8	С	21.4	C
Mountain View/Highland	Signal	16.1	В	17.7	В	18.2	В
Mountain View/Thompson	TWS	10.5	В	12.2	В	12.1	В
Mountain View/McCall	AWS	8.4	А	10.4	В	9.6	Α
Mountain View/Dockery	TWS	11.2	В	12.7	В	12.8	В
Mountain View/SR-99 SB offramp	Pound	75	Δ	11.0	P	14.1	B
Mountain View/SR-99 SB onramp	- Kouna.	7.5	Л	11.0	D	14.1	D
Mountain View/SR-99 NB onramp	Round	6.8	Δ	10.1	R	11.0	B
Mountain View/SR-99 NB offramp	- Kouna.	0.0	21	10.1	D	11.0	D
Mountain View/Golden State	Signal	17.7	В	29.2	С	39.3	D
Mountain View/Bethel	Signal	14.5	В	15.2	В	15.5	В
Mountain View/Academy	Signal	13.7	В	15.0	В	16.9	В
Mountain View/Mendocino	Signal	17.0	В	31.5	С	18.7	В
Caruthers/Dockery	OWS	8.6	Α	8.6	А	8.7	Α
Golden State/Amber	OWS	10.3	В	11.9	В	13.0	В
Kamm/Thompson	OWS	9.0	A	9.2	Α	9.1	Α
Kamm/McCall	TWS	9.9	А	10.3	В	9.7	A
Kamm/Dockery	TWS	8.9	А	8.9	А	8.9	A
Kamm/Van Horn	TWS	8.9	А	9.0	А	8.9	A

Table 4.12-24: Existing Plus Phase I Intersection Operations – Mitigated

		AM Pea	k Hour	PM Pea	k Hour	Weel	kend
Intersection	Control	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS
Kamm/SR-99 SB offramp	TWS	7.4	A	7.9	A	7.5	A
Bethel/SR-99 NB onramp	OWS	12.2	В	12.0	В	12.1	В
Bethel/Golden State	AWS	9.9	A	10.3	В	9.8	А
Bethel/Kamm	AWS	8.6	A	8.7	Α	8.2	А
Kamm/Academy	AWS	8.8	Α	9.6	Α	9.3	А
Bethel/SR-99 NB offramp	OWS	11.1	В	11.0	В	10.0	А
Bethel/Parkway-SR-99 SB onramp	OWS	12.9	В	13.1	В	10.5	В
Golden State/Phase 1 Access	Signal	11.8	В	29.4	С	50.1	D
Note: <i>Italics</i> denote mitigated operation * No feasible mitigation Source: Peters Engineering Group, 2	2012.			<u>.</u>		<u>.</u>	

Table 4.12-24 (cont.): Existing Plus Phase I Intersection Operations – Mitigated

Table 4.12-25: Existing Plus Phase I Roadway Segment Operations – Mitigated

		l anes and	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		Weekend	
Roa	id Segment	Median	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS
Mountain View Avenue	Highland to Thompson	2U (<2)	231	В	354	В	349	В
	Thompson to McCall	2U (<2)	227	В	376	В	381	В
	McCall to Dockery	2U (<2)	290	В	525	В	508	В
	Dockery to SR-99	2U (<2)	384	В	609	В	557	В
	SR-99 to Golden State	2U (<2)	1,063	С	1,959	Е	2,083	Ε
	Golden State to Bethel	4D-LT (<2)	859	В	1,495	В	1,993	В
	Bethel to Academy	2U (<2)	823	С	1,407	E	1,399	Ε
	Academy to Mendocino	2U (<2)	815	С	1,237	E	1,163	Ε
	Mendocino to Madsen	2U (<2)	775	С	1,023	С	888	С
	Madsen to Zediker	2U (<2)	752	С	986	С	864	С
	Zediker to Fresno County Line	2U (<2)	764	С	938	С	821	С

	Dood Comment	l anes and	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		Weekend	
Roa	id Segment	Median	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS
Kamm Avenue	Highland to Thompson	2U (<2)	16	В	27	В	15	В
	Thompson to McCall	2U (<2)	13	В	23	В	17	В
	McCall to Dockery	2U (<2)	21	В	23	В	22	В
	Dockery to Van Horn	2U (<2)	21	В	24	В	22	В
	Van Horn to SR-99	2U (<2)	24	В	40	В	39	В
	SR-99 to Academy	2U (<2)	207	В	293	В	264	В
McCall Avenue	Valley View to Mountain View	2U (<2)	88	В	237	В	162	В
	Mountain View to Caruthers	2U (<2)	113	В	252	В	126	В
Dockery Avenue	Mountain View to Caruthers	2U (<2)	9	В	12	В	7	В
Golden State	Nebraska to Saginaw	4D-LT (<2)	434	В	923	В	1,028	В
Boulevard	Saginaw to Phase 1 main site access	4D-LT (<2)	411	В	962	В	1,299	В
	Phase 1 main site access to Mountain View	4D-LT (<2)	857	В	2,637	С	3,489	Ε
	Mountain View to Amber	4D-LT (<2)	319	В	705	В	1,036	В
	Amber to Bethel	4D-LT (<2)	360	В	698	В	744	В

Table 4.12-25 (cont.): Existing Plus Phase I Roadway Segment Operations – Mitigated

Notes:

2U: 2-lane undivided 4D-LT: 4-lane divided with left-turn lanes

Values in parentheses indicate number of signalized intersections per mile.

Italics denote mitigated operation

Source: Peters Engineering Group, 2012.

Conclusion

Under Existing Plus Phase 1 conditions, the proposed project would contribute vehicle trips to intersections, roadway segments, and railroad grade crossings that would operate at unacceptable levels. Mitigation is proposed that would require the project applicant to either install or provide fair-share fees for all feasible improvements necessary to improve operations to acceptable levels.

Although the proposed project would contribute funding for necessary improvements, many of the affected facilities are under the jurisdiction of an agency other than the City of Selma (e.g., Caltrans or the County of Fresno). As such, the City of Selma cannot assure that the necessary improvements would be installed as contemplated. Accordingly, the residual significance of this impact is significant and unavoidable.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

- MM TRANS-1a Prior to recordation of the final map for Phase 1, the project applicant and the City of Selma shall establish a community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism to fund transportation improvements. The City of Selma Planning Department, the Selma legal counsel, and the applicant must develop the financing mechanism. The financing mechanism shall include a provision allow the "pass through" of transportation-related development fees collected as part of the City of Selma's standard fee schedule to be applied to planned improvements identified by the City's development fee program. Applicants that pursue development pursuant to the final map shall contribute a fair share of the costs of necessary improvements at the time building permits are sought.
- MM TRANS-1b Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for interim improvements to the Mountain View Avenue/SR-99 Southbound Ramps intersection. The improvements shall consist of the installation of a "teardrop" roundabout with two lanes on the eastbound approach and one lane on the westbound approach. Caltrans shall review and approve the proposed configuration. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.
- **MM TRANS-1c** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for interim improvements to the Mountain View Avenue/SR-99 northbound ramps intersection. The improvements shall consist of the installation of a "teardrop" roundabout with two lanes on the eastbound approach and one lane on the westbound approach. Caltrans shall review and approve the proposed configuration. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.
- **MM TRANS-1d** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Mountain View Avenue/Golden State Boulevard. The improvements shall consist of (1) two left-turn lanes (minimum 400 feet), two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the eastbound approach; (2) two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and two right-turn lanes on the westbound approach; (3) two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lanes, and two right-turn lanes on the northbound approach; (4) two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and two right-turn lanes on the southbound approach; and (5) modification of the signal

operation to incorporate the pre-signal on the westbound approach required by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1h. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.

- **MM TRANS-1e** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Mountain View Avenue/Bethel Avenue. The improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left-turn phasing; (2) one left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn on the eastbound approach; (3) one left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn on the westbound approach; (4) one left-turn lane and one through lane with a shared right turn on the northbound approach; and (5) one left-turn lane and one through lane with a shared right turn on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.
- **MM TRANS-1f** Prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy for Phase 1, the project applicant shall improve the intersection of Phase 1 Site Access/Golden State Boulevard. The improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left-turn phasing; (2) two left-turn lanes and two right-turn lanes on the eastbound approach; (3) two left-turn lanes (minimum 800 feet) and two through lanes on the northbound approach; and (4) two through lanes and a right-turn lane on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be in place prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy of Phase 1. The project applicant shall be responsible for the full cost of the improvements.
- **MM TRANS-1g** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to Mountain View Avenue between SR-99 to Golden State Boulevard. The improvements shall consist of widening Mountain View Avenue between the SR-99 northbound ramps and Golden State Boulevard to four lanes with a median. Transitions to the two-lane portion within the interchange may be accomplished east of the northbound ramps. In the westbound direction, one of the lanes may be trapped as a right-turn lane to northbound SR-99. Caltrans shall review and approve the proposed configuration. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.
- **MM TRANS-1h** Prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy for Phase 1, the project applicant shall improve the Mountain View Avenue railroad grade crossing. The improvements shall consist of (1) installation of a pre-signal on the westbound approach and (2) pedestrian access and safety improvements. This mitigation

measure shall be coordinated with the improvements contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1d. This mitigation measure requires approval from the California Public Utilities Commission.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Significant unavoidable impact.

Year 2020 Traffic Conditions

Impact TRANS-2: The proposed project would contribute vehicle trips to intersections, roadway segments, and railroad grade crossings that would operate at unacceptable levels under Year 2020 Conditions.

Impact Analysis

Year 2020 Conditions account for buildout of Phase 1 (Northwest) and Phase 2 (South) of the proposed project in relation to anticipated traffic conditions in 2020.

Year 2020 No Project Phases 1 and 2 Lane Configurations and Intersection Control

The Year 2020 No Project Phases 1 and 2 conditions lane configurations and intersection control are the same presented previously in Exhibit 4.12-2.

Year 2020 No Project Phases 1 and 2 Traffic Volumes

The Year 2020 no project traffic volumes are presented in Exhibit 4.12-20 and Exhibit 4.12-21.

Year 2020 With Project Phases 1 and 2 Lane Configurations and Intersection Control

The year 2020 With Project Phases 1 and 2 conditions lane configurations and intersection control are presented in Exhibit 4.12-22. The lane configurations are essentially the same as the existing conditions with the exception of improvements to be constructed by the project along the frontage of the project site.

Year 2020 With Project Phases 1 and 2 Traffic Volumes

The year 2020 With Project Phases 1 and 2 conditions peak-hour traffic volumes are determined by adding the year 2020 baseline traffic volumes and the Phase 1 and Phase 2 Project traffic volumes. The year 2020 With Project Phases 1 and 2 conditions peak-hour traffic volumes are presented in Exhibit 4.12-23 and Exhibit 4.12-24.

Year 2020 With Project Phases 1 and 2 Intersection LOS Analysis

The results of the year 2020 With Project Phases 1 and 2 conditions intersection LOS analyses are summarized in Table 4.12-26.

Year 2020 With Project Phases 1 and 2 Road Segment Analyses

The results of the year 2020 With Project Phases 1 and 2 road segment analyses are summarized in Table 4.12-27.

Year 2020 With Project Phases 1 and 2 Conditions At-Grade Railroad Crossing Analyses The results of the year 2020 With Project Phases 1 and 2 at-grade railroad crossing analyses are summarized in Table 4.12-28.

			1			
$(\begin{array}{c} (0) \\ (0)$	$ \begin{array}{c} (1) \\ (2) $		← 661(787)	← 384(424) ∠ 248(285)	$(021)066 \xrightarrow{-1}{12} (122)066 \xrightarrow{-1}{16} (122)06 \xrightarrow{-1} (122)06 \xrightarrow{-1}{16} (122)06 \xrightarrow{-1}{16} (122)06 \xrightarrow$	$ \begin{array}{c} (16) \\ ($
3666(677) → (***********************************	$158(268) \xrightarrow{7} \qquad \qquad$	Floral-Highland / SR 99 NB Loop Ramp	$388(999) \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} & & \\ & &$	355(365) → ↑ (*88) 355(365) → ↑ (*88) 5 Highland / SR 39 SB On Ramp	$\begin{array}{c} 24(92) \\ 41(117) \\ 11(31) \\ 11(31) \\ \end{array} \end{array} \xrightarrow{\left(\begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\$	95(173) → 104(266) → 14(83) → Representation (Nebraska
$ \underbrace{ \begin{array}{c} (2) \\ ($	(11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11)	► 160(169) ← 425(578)	(20) (2)) (2))	$\begin{array}{c} (25) \\ (25) \\ (28) \\ (2$	$ \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} E \\ E $	(25) (25) (25) (25) (25) (25) (25) (25)
$\begin{array}{c c} & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \\ \hline 12(13) & \overrightarrow{} \\ 187(335) & \rightarrow \\ 29(43) & \overrightarrow{} \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & \uparrow & \uparrow \\ & \overbrace{\mathbb{S}} \\ \\ & \overbrace{\mathbb{S}} \\ \\ & \overbrace{\mathbb{S}} \\ \\ & \overbrace{\mathbb{S}} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ $	$465(488) \rightarrow 33(73) \rightarrow 3$	$\begin{array}{c} 81(55) \longrightarrow^{7} \\ 526(623) \longrightarrow \\ \end{array} \xrightarrow{\left(\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \end{array}\right)} \left(\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}\right) \left(\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \end{array}\right) \left(\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ $	$\begin{array}{c c} & & & & \\ \hline & & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & &$	$\begin{array}{c} 46(3)\\ 117(137) \rightarrow \\ 2(9) \rightarrow \\ 2(9) \rightarrow \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 7\\ (21)\\$	$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} $	$\begin{array}{c c} 2 & \checkmark & \downarrow & \downarrow \\ 48(62) \xrightarrow{\frown} \\ 127(129) \xrightarrow{\frown} \\ 23(38) \xrightarrow{\frown} \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \uparrow & \uparrow \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \downarrow \\ 0 $
() Neoraska / Ihompson () () () () () () () () () () () () () (Second S(1 SH 99 SB Ramps (21 L)	■ Second St / St 99 NB Ramps ← 194(273)	Second S / Whitson	Mountain view Hightand ← 515/5451	(662)5014 (77)226(52) (77)227 (77)226(52) (77)26(52) (77)2	(2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2)
$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ 1(1) \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ 240(327) \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ 7(3) \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} $	$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} $	547(658) → 91(100) →	59(55) →7 489(603) →	$489(603) \longrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 &$	$\begin{array}{c c} & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \uparrow & 7(10) \\\hline & 56(30) & \neg & \uparrow & \uparrow & \uparrow \\ 3385(486) & \rightarrow & \uparrow & \uparrow & \uparrow \\ 41(66) & \neg & & & & \uparrow & \uparrow \\ 680 & & & & & 0 \\ \hline & & & & & & 0 \\ \hline & & & & & & 0 \\ \hline & & & & & & & 0 \\ \hline & & & & & & & 0 \\ \hline & & & & & & & & 0 \\ \hline & & & & & & & & & 0 \\ \hline & & & & & & & & & & 0 \\ \hline & & & & & & & & & & & & \\ \hline & & & &$	$\begin{array}{c c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} $
15 Mountain View / Dockery	16 Mountain View / \$R 99 SB Off Ramp	17 Mountain View / \$R 99 SB On Ramp	18 Mountain View / \$R 99 NB On Ramp	19 Mountain View / \$R 99 NB Off Ramp	20 Mountain View / Golden State Blvd	21 Mountain Vew / Bethel
$\begin{array}{c} \underbrace{\begin{array}{c} 11(30) \\ 1200 \\ $	$\begin{array}{c c} & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & $		142(2) ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓	$\begin{array}{c} \overbrace{\begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\$	$(\mathbf{r}) = \mathbf{r} $	$ \begin{array}{c} \widehat{\Sigma} \widehat{\Sigma} \widehat{\Sigma} \\ \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \\ \downarrow & \downarrow & \uparrow (1) \end{array} $
$257(513) \longrightarrow 1 (9(13) \longrightarrow 1) (9(13) \longrightarrow 1) (9(13) (9(13) (9(13) \times 1)) (9(13) \times 1)) (9(13) \times 1) (9(13) \times 1)) (9(13) \times 1)) (9(13) \times 1) (9(13) \times 1)) (9(13) \times 1)) (9(13) \times 1)) (9(13) \times 1) (9(13) \times 1)) (9(13) \times 1)$	$\begin{array}{cccc} 248(431) & \longrightarrow & 1 & -1 & -1 \\ & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & \\ & & & & $	1(1) ~ (후 후 후 후 주 7 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1(1) 1(1) 1(1) 1(1) 1(1) 1(1) 1(1) 1(1)	$\begin{array}{ccc} 8(9) & \longrightarrow & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1(1) & \searrow & & & & \\ \hline & & & & & \\ \hline & & & & & \\ \hline & & & &$	$7(3) \rightarrow 1(4) \rightarrow 1(2) \xrightarrow{1}{(2)} \xrightarrow{1}{$	$\begin{array}{c} 12(13) \longrightarrow \\ 1(1) \longrightarrow \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \end{array} \end{array} $
$ \begin{array}{c} (c) \\ (c) $			$ \begin{array}{c} (27) \\ ($	← 80(117) / 4(12)	(5) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1	(0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
$1(5) \xrightarrow{7} 1(10) \xrightarrow{7} 1(10) \xrightarrow{7} 2 \xrightarrow$	16(26) - 16(1(3) → 1(1) → 1($38(159) \xrightarrow{\frown} \qquad ^{\frown} \qquad \atop_{}^{\frown} \qquad \atop_{}^{\frown} \qquad \atop_{}^{\frown} \qquad ^{\frown} \qquad \atop_{}^{\frown} \qquad \atop_{}^{\bullet} \qquad \atop_{}^{\frown} \qquad _{}^{\frown} \qquad _{}^{\leftarrow} \qquad _{}^{\frown} \qquad _{}^{\leftarrow}$	$93(86) \rightarrow 0$ $41(105) \rightarrow 0$ $386 \rightarrow 0$ $393(86) \rightarrow$	$30(9) \xrightarrow{\sim} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \downarrow \\ \uparrow \\ 29(97) \xrightarrow{\sim} \\ 26(50) \xrightarrow{\sim} \\ 80 \\ 99 \\ 99 \\ 90 \\ 90 \\ 90 \\ 90 \\ 90$	2
(7) (100(81) (11(24)						
$\begin{array}{c c} & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ 39(118) \xrightarrow{-7} & & \\ 6(11) \xrightarrow{-7} & & \\ \hline & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ \hline \end{array}$				LEGEN		
24(111) [7] [7] [7] [7] [7] [7] [7] [7] [7] [7]				XX (YY)	AM (PM) VOLUMES	



Year 2020 No Project Weekday Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes

Exhibit 4.12-20

987 → 1072 ↓ SR 98 SB Off Ramp	$\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\$	Flora-Highland / \$R 99 NB Loop Ramp	$\begin{array}{c} \leftarrow 992 \\ \hline 990 \longrightarrow \bigcap_{K \\ K \\ S \\ $	88 55 5 88 5 264 - → 1 264 - → 1 82 57 5 Highland / SR 99 SB On Ramp	$\begin{array}{c} & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\$	$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ $
$\begin{array}{c} & & & & & \\ & & & & \\$	$\begin{array}{cccc} \underbrace{35} & \underbrace{35} & \leftarrow 353 \\ \underbrace{5} & \underbrace{129} & \underbrace{523} & \leftarrow 129 \\ \underbrace{523} & \underbrace{523} & \underbrace{129} & \underbrace{523} & \underbrace{523} & \underbrace{129} & \underbrace{523} &$	$ \begin{array}{c} & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & $	$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} & & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & & \\ & \\ \end{array}} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & \\ \end{array} \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & & \\ & \\ \end{array}} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & \\ \end{array} \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & \\ & \\ \end{array}} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & \\ \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & \\ & \\ \end{array}} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & \\ & \\ \end{array}} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & \\ \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & \\ & \\ \end{array}} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & \\ & \\ \end{array}} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & \\ & \\ & \\ \end{array}} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & \\ & \\ & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & \\ & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & \\ & \\ & \\ \end{array}} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & \\ & \\ & \\ \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & \\ & \\ \end{array}} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & \\ & \\ & \\ \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & \\ & \\ \end{array}} \begin{array}{c} & \\ & \\ \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & \\ & \\ \end{array}} \begin{array}{c} & \\ & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & \\ & \\ & \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & \\ & \\ & \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & \\ & \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & \\ & \\ & \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & \\ & \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & \\ & \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & \\ & \\ & \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & \\ & \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & \\ & \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & \\ & \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & \\ & \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & \\ & \end{array} \end{array}$ \begin{array}{c} & \\ & \end{array} \end{array}\begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & \\ & \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & \\ & \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \end{array}	$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{tabular}{c}} & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{tabular}{c}} & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{tabular}{c}} & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{tabular}{c}} & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{tabular}{c}} & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{tabular}{c}} & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{tabular}{c}} & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{tabular}{c}} & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & $	$\begin{array}{c} 0 & 12 \\ \downarrow & \downarrow \\ 145 \\ 12 \\ 12 \\ 13 \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 13 \\ \downarrow \\ 12 \\ 12 \\ 12 \\ 12 \\ 12 \\ 12 \\ 12 $	14 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12
$\begin{array}{c} & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & \\ & & & & $	$\begin{array}{c} \overbrace{\downarrow}^{\overbrace{\downarrow}} \longrightarrow \overbrace{\downarrow}^{\overbrace{\downarrow}} \overbrace{\downarrow}^{\overbrace{\downarrow}} 196 \\ \swarrow \swarrow 8 \\ 236 \longrightarrow \overbrace{\uparrow}^{\overbrace{\downarrow}} \overbrace{\downarrow}^{\overbrace{\downarrow}} & \overbrace{} \\ 1 & \searrow \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} \leftarrow 207\\ \swarrow 15\\ 429 \rightarrow \\ 95 \rightarrow \\ 17\\ Mountain View / \$ R 99 SB On Ramp\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & &$	$\begin{array}{c} \leftarrow 435\\ \hline 396 \rightarrow \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \mathcal{R} \\ \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \mathcal{R} \\ \end{array} \end{array}$	$116 \xrightarrow{1} 100$ $110 \xrightarrow{1} 100$ $100 \xrightarrow{1} 100$ 100	$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ \end{array} \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ \end{array}} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ \end{array}} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ \end{array}} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ \end{array}} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ \end{array}} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ \end{array}} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ \end{array}} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & & & \\ \end{array}} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & & & \\ & & & \\ \end{array}} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & & & \\ \end{array}} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c}$
$\begin{array}{c} \underbrace{\begin{array}{c} 50 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1$	$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \end{array}{}$	↓ 3 _7 ↑ 24 Caruthers/Dockery	25 Golden State Blvd / Amber	$ \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} & \end{array}{} & \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} & \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} & \end{array}{} & \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} & \end{array}{} & \end{array}{} & \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} & \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \end{array}{}$	$ \begin{array}{c} $	28 Kamm/Dockary
$\begin{array}{c} & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & $	23 → Kamm / SR 99 SB Off Ramp	8 8 ↓↓ 1 _7 ↑ & ⊕ 31 Bethel/SR 95 NB On Ramp	$\begin{array}{c} 8 & 9 \\ 2 & 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\$	$\begin{array}{c} \leftarrow 42 \\ \swarrow 8 \\ \hline 46 \rightarrow 5 \\ \hline 53 \ \neg 46 \\ 5 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\$	$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ \end{array} \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} 7 \\ \end{array}} \begin{array}{c} & & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} 9 \\ \leftarrow & 38 \\ \leftarrow & -38 \\ \leftarrow & -38 \end{array}} \\ \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} 9 \\ \leftarrow & -38 \\ \leftarrow & -38 \end{array}} \\ \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} 7 \\ \end{array}} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} 9 \\ \leftarrow & -38 \end{array}} \\ \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} 7 \\ \end{array}} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} 7 \\ \end{array}} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} 7 \\ \end{array}} \\ \begin{array}{c} & & \\ \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} 7 \\ \end{array}} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} 7 \\ \end{array}} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} 7 \\ \end{array}} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} 7 \\ \end{array}} \\ \begin{array}{c} & & \\ \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} 7 \\ \end{array}} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} 7 \end{array}} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} 7 \\ \end{array}} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} 7 \end{array}}$	82
$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} $	37 Site Access / Golden State	38 Site Access / Dockery	39 Site Access / Mountain View	LEGEND © XX	STUDY AREA INTERSE SATURDAY VOLUMES PROJECT SITE	CTIONS



Year 2020 No Project Weekend Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes

Exhibit 4.12-21





Exhibit 4.12-22 Year 2020 With Project Phases 1 and 2 Lane Configurations and Intersection Control

(01E) (01E) (0255 - 01 - ← 544(725)	(901)82 - (901)82 - (901)		← 722(885)	- 409(464) - 327(371)	(081)08 (112)98 (112)	(52(65)) (16)/Z → 52(65) (52)/59 → 118(140)
$\begin{array}{c c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} $	$\begin{array}{c c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} $	Flora-Highland / SR 99 NB Loop Ramp	$420(1052) \longrightarrow \bigcap_{0 \\ 820 \\ 8$	↓ ↓ 359(370) √ ↓ 1 359(370) √ ↓ 1	$\begin{array}{c c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} $	$\begin{array}{c c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} $
$ \begin{array}{c} (c) & (c) $	$(r_{12})_{1} (r_{22})_{1} (r_$	► 165(197) ← 461(658)	$(900) \downarrow (150) \downarrow (150$	(33) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10	$(E) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1$	(E) = 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	481(533) → 43(85) → 9 Second St/ SF 99 SB Ramps	$ \begin{array}{c} 53(697) \longrightarrow \\ \hline \\ 553(697) \longrightarrow \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \\ \hline \\ \\ \hline \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\$	486(53) → 131(245) → 131(245) → Second S/ //Whitson	$134(164) \rightarrow 12(9) \rightarrow 16(20)$	$\begin{array}{c} 242(35) \rightarrow \\ 2(17) \rightarrow \end{array}) \begin{array}{c} 1 & 1 \\ \hline 217) \rightarrow \end{array} \\ \hline \begin{array}{c} 217 \\ \hline 217 \\ 217 \\ \hline 217 \\ 217 \\ \hline 217 \\ 217 $	$\begin{array}{c} 4002 \\ 216(209) \rightarrow \\ 23(38) \rightarrow \\ \hline \\ 900 \\ \hline \\ 14 \\ \hline \end{array} $
$\begin{array}{c c} (1,1) & (2,1) \\ (1,1) & (1,1) \\ (1,1) & (1,1) \\ (1,1) & (1,1) \\ (1,1) & (1,1) \\ (1,1) & (1,1) \\ (1,1) & (1,1) \\ (1,1)$	$\begin{array}{c cccc} (123)61E & \swarrow & 1\\ (605)1+2E & \rightarrowtail & \swarrow & 1\\ (605)1+2E & \rightarrowtail & \swarrow & \swarrow & (143)6233)\\ & & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & &$	$\begin{array}{c} \leftarrow 947(1176)\\ \swarrow \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \$	™ 376(606) ← 988(1312) 186(571) → 879(2020) →	$\begin{array}{c} \leftarrow 1271(1819) \\ \hline \\ 879(2020) \longrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} & & \\ (g_{2}) \\ \xi_{2} $	$\begin{array}{c c} (199)\\ $	$\begin{array}{c} (2) \\$
Mountain View / Dockery (2) (1, (2)) (2) (1, (2)) (2) (1, (2)) (2) (1, (2)) (2) (1, (2)) (2) (1, (2)) (2) (1, (2)) (3) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2	(8) (9) (9) (9) (9) (9) (9) (9) (9	17 Mountain View / \$R 99 SB On Ramp	18 Mountain View / SR 99 NB On Ramp (0,5) (9) (9) (1) (1) (1) (1) (2) (1) (1) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2	Y Wountain View / SR 99 NB Off Ramp (S) (C)	20 Mountain View / Golden State Blvd (20) (b) (b) (b) (b) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c	$\underbrace{\begin{array}{c} \underbrace{\textcircled{0}} \\ \underbrace{\underbrace{0}} \\ \underbrace{\underbrace{0}} \\ \underbrace{\underbrace{0}} \\ \underbrace{\underbrace{0}} \\ \underbrace{0} \\ \underbrace$
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	118(338) → 118(338) → 15(709) → 22(99) → 22(90)	3(1) → 1(1) → 1(1) → 24 Caruthers/ Dockery	3(3) →7 1(1) →	1(1) → 10(13) → 1(1) → 1(1) → 26 Kamm / Thompson	$\begin{array}{c c} & \downarrow \\ \hline 4(3) & \frown & \uparrow & \uparrow$	$\begin{array}{c} 2 & \downarrow & \downarrow \\ 1(1) & \neg \\ 14(17) & \rightarrow \\ 1(1) & \neg \\ 1(1) & \neg \\ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \uparrow & \uparrow \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ 28 \end{array}$ Kamm / Dockery
(21) (21)	^K → 45(50) ← 54(213)	(1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1)	(92) (92)	← 80(117) ∠ 11(38)	(1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1)	(GF) (GF)
$\begin{array}{c} y(o) \\ 1(10) \rightarrow \\ 1(1) \\ \neg u \end{array} \xrightarrow{(1)} \begin{array}{c} (1) \\ \vdots \\ $	40(125) - 5 / 5 / 5 / 5 / 5 / 5 / 5 / 5 / 5 / 5	1(1) - 1(1) - 1(9) E(1) (8) 2(1) - 1(1) (8) 2(1) - 1(1)	$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} 0\\ 97(140) \rightarrow \\ 27(87) \rightarrow \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array}$	93(86) → 74(252) → 33 Bethel Kamm	$34^{(o)} \rightarrow 1^{(c)} (2117) \rightarrow 1^{(c)} (2$	687 878 35 Bethel / SR 99 NB Off Ramp
(0) (0) (0) (0) (0) (0) (0) (0)	◆ → → → (ELE)08	(127(431) ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓				
$\begin{array}{ccc} 15(51) & \longrightarrow & & & \\ 34(150) & \searrow & & & & \\ 34(150) & \searrow & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & $	133(602)	- ((+1:)) 8 38 Site Access / Dockery	39 Site Access / Mountain View	XX (YY)	AM (PM) VOLUMES	7950110119



Exhibit 4.12-23 Year 2020 Plus Project Phases 1 and 2 Weekday Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes
$\begin{array}{c} 8 & 9 \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ 1054 \rightarrow & & & \\ & & & \\ 88 & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ &$	$E \underset{i}{\overset{\otimes}{\overset{\otimes}{\overset{\otimes}{\overset{\otimes}{\overset{\otimes}{\overset{\otimes}{\overset{\otimes}{\overset$	3 Flora-Highland / SR 99 NB Loop Ramp	$\leftarrow 1126$ $1064 \rightarrow \bigcap_{ijklim j \\ ijklim j \\$	89 59 ↓ 1 271 → \$27 Highland / SR 99 SB On Ramp	$\begin{array}{c} 8885\\ 2985\\ 2 \\ 1887\\ 1887\\ 63 \\ 63 \\ 63 \\ 63 \\ 63 \\ 63 \\ 63 \\ 63$	$\begin{array}{c} \underset{l}{\overset{(2)}{}} \\ \underset{l}{\overset{(2)}{}} \atop \underset{l}{\overset{(2)}{}} \\ \underset{l}{\overset{(2)}{}} \\ \underset{l}{\overset{(2)}{}} \\ \underset{l}{\overset{(2)}{}} \atop \underset{l}{\overset{(2)}{}} \\ \underset{l}{\overset{(2)}{}} \atop \underset{l}{\overset{(2)}{}} \\ \underset{l}{\overset{(2)}{}} \atop \underset{l}{\overset{(2)}{}} \atop \underset{l}{\overset{(2)}{}} \atop \underset{l}{\overset{(2)}{}} \atop \underset{l}{\overset{(2)}{}} \atop \underset{l}{\overset{(2)}{}} \atop \underset{l}{\overset{(2)}{\overset{(2)}{}} \atop \underset{l}{\overset{(2)}{\overset{(2)}{}} \atop \underset{(2)}{\overset{(2)}{}} \atop \underset{(2)}{\overset{(2)}{}} \atop \underset$
$\begin{array}{c} & & & & & \\ & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & &$	$\begin{array}{c} 0\\ 0\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\$	$ \begin{array}{c} & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ & & & \\ \hline \hline & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ \hline \hline \\ \hline & & & \\ \hline \hline \hline \\ \hline \hline \hline \hline \\ \hline \hline \hline \hline \hline \\ \hline \hline$	$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} & & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ \end{array}} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & & \\ \end{array}} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ \end{array}} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & & \\ \end{array}} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & & \\ \end{array}} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ \end{array}} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & \\ \end{array}} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & & \\ \end{array}} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & $	$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ $	$\begin{array}{c} 0&1&2&1\\ 0&1&2&1&2\\ &&&&&&\\ &&&&&&\\ &&&&&&\\ &&&&&&\\ &&&&&&$	$ \begin{array}{c} \overline{14} \\ \overline{14} $
$ \begin{array}{c} $	16 Mountain View / \$R 99 SB Off Ramp	$\begin{array}{c} \leftarrow 1468 \\ \swarrow 138 \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{c} 2514 \rightarrow \\ 231 \ \searrow \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{c} 17 \\ \text{Mountain View / $R 99 SB On Ramp} \end{array}$	5727 1963 → 18 Mountain View / \$R 99 NB On Ramp	$\begin{array}{c} \leftarrow 2133\\ 1975 \rightarrow \begin{array}{c} & & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \hline \end{array} \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} & & \\ \end{array} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} & & \\ \end{array} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} & & \\ \end{array} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} & & \\ \end{array} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} & & \\ \end{array} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} & & \\ \end{array} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} & & \\ \end{array} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} & & \\ \end{array} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \end{array} $ \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array}	$ \begin{array}{c} \overbrace{i}^{52} \otimes \otimes & \overbrace{\leftarrow}^{6} \otimes \\ \overbrace{\leftarrow}^{6} & 1138 \\ \overbrace{\leftarrow}^{6} & 34 \\ \hline 118 & 7 \\ 1155 & 7 \\ 54 & 7 \\ \hline 34 & 54 \\$
$ \begin{array}{c} 156 \\ 946 \\ 83 \\ 2 \end{array} $ Mountain View / Academy	$\begin{array}{c} 123 \\ 123 \\ 233 \\ 123 \\$		4 √7 1 √2 25 Golden State Blvd / Amber	$ \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} & & & \\ \end{array}{} & & \\ \end{array}{} & & \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} & & \\ \end{array}{} & & \\ \end{array}{} & & \\ \end{array}{} & \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} & \\ \end{array}{} & \\ \end{array}{} & \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} & \\ \end{array}{} & \\ \end{array}{} & \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} & \\ \end{array}{} & \\ \end{array}{} & \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} & \\ \end{array}{} & \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} & \\ \end{array}{} & \\ \end{array}{} & \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} & \\ \end{array}{} & \\ \end{array}{} & \\ \end{array}{} & \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} & \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} & \\ \end{array}{} \\ \\ \end{array}{} & \\ \end{array}{} \\ \\ \end{array}{} \\ \\ \end{array}{} \\ \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \\ \end{array}{} \\ \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \\ \end{array}{} \\$ } \\ \end{array}{} \\ \\ \end{array}{} \\	$ \begin{array}{c} & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & \\ & & & &$	$ \begin{array}{c} \overbrace{}\\ \overbrace{}\\ \overbrace{}\\ \overbrace{}\\ 1 \\ 28 \end{array} $ $ \begin{array}{c} \overbrace{}\\ \overbrace{}}\\ \overbrace{}\\ a$
$ \begin{array}{c} $	120 - 3 30 Kamm / SR 95 SB Off Ramp	82 2 1 1 31 Bethel/SR 95 NB On Ramp	$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} 142\\ 188\\ 19\\ 12\\ 12\\ 12\\ 12\\ 12\\ 12\\ 12\\ 12\\ 12\\ 12$	$\begin{array}{c} \leftarrow 42 \\ \swarrow 35 \\ \hline 46 \rightarrow \\ 221 \rightarrow \\ \hline 33 \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & & \\ $	$\begin{array}{c} & \underbrace{8}_{1} & \underbrace{8}_{1} & \underbrace{8}_{2} & \underbrace{8}_{1} & \underbrace{8}_{1} & \underbrace{1}_{2} & $	927 № 183 ↓ 259 ↑ 22 235 Bethel / SR 95 NB Off Ramp
$\begin{array}{c} F = F \\ \downarrow \\$	$\begin{array}{c} 92\\ 82\\ 92\\ 92\\ 92\\ 92\\ 92\\ 92\\ 92\\ 92\\ 92\\ 9$	7 7 7 414 ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ 2 ↑ ↑ ↑ 8 Stile Access / Dookery	39 Site Access / Mountain View	LEGEND xx s	STUDY AREA INTERSECT SATURDAY VOLUMES PROJECT SITE	IONS

Source: Peters Engineering Group.



Michael Brandman Associates

Exhibit 4.12-24 Year 2020 Plus Project Phases 1 and 2 Saturday Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes

		Year 2020 No Project						Year 2020 Plus Project						
		AM Peak I	lour	PM Peak H	lour	Weeker	nd	AM Peak H	lour	PM Peak H	lour	Weeker	ıd	
Intersection	Control	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	
Floral/SR-99 SB offramp	Signal	12.2	В	22.0	C	21.8	C	12.2	В	22.6	С	22.4	C	
Floral/Highland	Signal	20.0	В	26.7	C	33.9	C	20.6	C	35.0	D	42.6	D	
Floral/SR-99 NB offramp	Signal	9.0	Α	10.5	В	11.5	В	9.9	А	14.4	В	16.0	В	
Highland/SR-99 SB onramp	Signal	13.9	В	15.6	В	16.0	В	16.2	В	18.5	В	24.0	C	
Highland/Rose	TWS	23.6	C	558.7	F	246.7	F	24.1	C	711.7	F	316.1	F	
Highland/Nebraska	Signal	13.8	В	19.8	В	17.2	В	14.0	В	21.5	С	18.2	В	
Nebraska/Thompson	AWS	13.6	В	14.9	В	12.7	В	15.0	С	19.7	С	16.5	C	
Second/SR-99 SB	OWS	273.0	F	276.3	F	25.9	D	477.2	F	715.2	F	110.1	F	
Second/SR-99 NB	OWS	23.1	C	19.0	C	14.6	В	26.1	D	26.3	D	19.3	C	
Second/Whitson	Signal	19.7	В	29.2	C	24.1	C	22.4	С	51.0	D	43.2	D	
Mountain View/Highland	Signal	17.1	В	21.1	C	17.6	В	19.4	В	28.8	С	26.7	С	
Mountain View/Thompson	TWS	11.9	В	13.6	В	13.0	В	13.5	В	20.9	С	22.0	C	
Mountain View/McCall	AWS	9.4	А	14.9	В	9.2	А	12.5	В	152.1	F	68.8	F	
Mountain View/Dockery	TWS	15.1	C	18.8	C	14.4	В	139.3	F	*	F	*	F	
Mountain View/SR-99 SB offramp	TWS	37.8	E	247.6	F	22.4	C	*	F	*	F	*	F	
Mountain View/SR-99 SB onramp	Yield	1.1	А	1.6	А	0.7	А	3.0	А	297.9	F	253.6	F	
Mountain View/SR-99 NB onramp	Yield	1.7	А	1.6	А	2.0	А	19.4	С	144.2	F	266.7	F	
Mountain View/SR-99 NB offramp	OWS	22.1	C	40.5	Е	19.5	C	*	F	*	F	*	F	
Mountain View/Golden State	Signal	13.8	В	16.7	В	26.0	C	54.2	D	441.5	F	756.0	F	
Mountain View/Bethel	TWS	22.5	C	30.1	D	17.5	C	131.1	F	*	F	*	F	

Table 4.12-26 (cont.)): Year 2020	Intersection	Operations
-----------------------	--------------	--------------	------------

		Year 2020 No Project						Year 2020 Plus Project						
		AM Peak H	AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour Weekend		AM Peak H	lour	PM Peak H	lour	Weeker	d				
Intersection	Control	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	
Mountain View/Academy	TWS	30.6	D	162.2	F	26.4	D	*	F	*	F	*	F	
Mountain View/Mendocino	Signal	10.0	A	9.4	A	7.6	A	13.4	В	39.8	D	34.6	C	
Caruthers/Dockery	OWS	8.7	Α	8.6	A	8.7	A	8.7	Α	8.7	A	8.9	A	
Golden State /Amber	OWS	10.2	В	11.0	В	10.2	В	11.4	В	14.6	В	16.9	C	
Kamm/Thompson	OWS	9.0	А	9.3	Α	9.1	Α	9.0	А	9.3	А	9.2	Α	
Kamm/McCall	TWS	10.2	В	10.6	В	9.5	Α	10.4	В	11.2	В	10.4	В	
Kamm/Dockery	TWS	9.0	А	9.0	Α	9.0	Α	9.0	А	9.0	А	9.0	Α	
Kamm/Van Horn	TWS	8.9	Α	9.1	A	8.9	A	9.5	Α	10.4	В	10.6	В	
Kamm/SR-99 SB offramp	TWS	7.4	A	8.4	A	7.6	A	8.0	A	8.7	A	8.9	A	
Bethel/SR-99 NB onramp	OWS	12.4	В	11.4	В	10.6	В	13.1	В	13.4	В	13.0	В	
Bethel/Golden State	AWS	9.6	A	10.8	В	8.5	A	11.6	В	31.2	D	16.2	C	
Bethel/Kamm	AWS	8.6	A	8.5	A	7.8	A	9.6	A	11.7	В	11.6	В	
Kamm/Academy	AWS	10.6	В	9.3	A	8.3	A	13.4	В	17.7	C	15.3	C	
Bethel/SR-99 NB offramp	OWS	10.6	В	12.5	В	10.3	В	12.0	В	17.1	C	13.2	В	
Bethel/Parkway-SR-99 SB onramp	OWS	12.4	В	11.2	В	9.6	A	14.2	В	17.4	C	13.3	В	
Golden State/Phase 1 Access	OWS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	294.6	F	*	F	*	F	
Dockery/Phase 2 Access	OWS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	9.1	A	13.1	В	12.9	В	

Notes:

* Delay exceeds calculation limits.

Bold denotes unacceptable intersection operation.

N/A = Not Applicable; intersection does not exist under Year 2020 No Project conditions.

Source: Peters Engineering Group, 2012.

Table 4.12-27: `	Year 2020 Roadway	y Segment Operations
------------------	-------------------	----------------------

		Year 2020 No Project Year 2030 Plu							is Project					
		l anes and	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak	PM Peak Hour		Weekend		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		nd
Roa	d Segment	Median	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS
Mountain View Avenue	Highland to Thompson	2U (<2)	364	В	480	В	420	В	472	В	733	C	730	C
	Thompson to McCall	2U (<2)	334	В	457	В	359	В	465	В	770	C	743	C
	McCall to Dockery	2U (<2)	297	В	465	В	314	В	592	В	1,131	D	1,121	D
	Dockery to SR-99	2U (<2)	672	C	791	C	550	В	1,278	E	1,992	E	1,882	E
	SR-99 to Golden State	2U (<2)	1,035	C	1,179	E	854	C	2,213	Е	3,966	E	4,265	E
	Golden State to Bethel	4D-LT (<2)	894	В	1,038	В	1,486	В	1,561	В	2,655	C	3,474	E
	Bethel to Academy	2U (<2)	801	C	949	C	710	C	1,367	E	2,319	E	2,394	E
	Academy to Mendocino	2U (<2)	818	C	1,005	C	723	C	1,226	E	2,006	E	1,953	E
	Mendocino to Madsen	2U (<2)	877	C	953	C	706	C	1,082	D	1,459	E	1,328	E
	Madsen to Zediker	2U (<2)	851	C	943	C	727	C	1,030	C	1,372	E	1,263	E
	Zediker to Fresno County Line	2U (<2)	874	C	924	C	713	C	1,028	C	1,296	E	1,173	E
Kamm Avenue	Highland to Thompson	2U (<2)	20	В	30	В	12	В	22	В	38	В	22	В
	Thompson to McCall	2U (<2)	16	В	25	В	15	В	18	В	33	В	25	В
	McCall to Dockery	2U (<2)	26	В	29	В	27	В	29	В	37	В	37	В
	Dockery to Van Horn	2U (<2)	26	В	30	В	27	В	29	В	38	В	37	В
	Van Horn to SR-99	2U (<2)	31	В	52	В	51	В	161	В	267	В	313	В
	SR-99 to Academy	2U (<2)	281	В	226	В	141	В	407	В	529	В	509	В
McCall Avenue	Valley View to Mountain View	2U (<2)	249	В	461	В	220	В	390	В	754	C	569	В
	Mountain View to Caruthers	2U (<2)	286	В	581	В	255	В	309	В	641	В	329	В

Table 4.12-27 (cont.): Year 2020 Roadway Segment Operations

				Year 2020 No Project						Year 2030 Plus Project						
		l anes and	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		Weekend		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		Weekend			
Road Segment		Median	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS		
Dockery Avenue	Mountain View to Caruthers	2U (<2)	115	В	136	В	67	В	577	В	998	C	1,073	C		
Golden State Boulevard	Nebraska to Saginaw	4D-LT (<2)	419	В	816	В	785	В	809	В	1,747	В	2,005	В		
	Saginaw to Phase 1 main site access	4D-LT (<2)	368	В	785	В	1,046	В	791	В	1,859	В	2,375	В		
	Phase 1 main site access to Mountain View	4D-LT (<2)	368	В	785	В	1,046	В	1,237	В	3,531	E	4,565	E		
	Mountain View to Amber	4D-LT (<2)	315	В	697	В	1,145	В	539	В	1,298	В	1,897	В		
	Amber to Bethel	4D-LT (<2)	343	В	437	В	350	В	567	В	1,038	В	1,102	В		
Notes: 2U: 2-lane undivided Values in parentheses indica Bold denotes unacceptable r Source: Peters Engineering (4D-LT: 4-lane divided with left-t te number of signalized intersections oadway segment operation Group, 2012.	urn lanes per mile.											t <u>.</u>			

Table Hill Let Teal Lete Grade Greecong / maryore

			Year 2020 Plus Project								
Crossing	Trains per Day	Average Daily Trips	Predicted Accident Frequency per Year	Warrant 9	Trains per Day	Average Daily Trips	Predicted Accident Frequency per Year	Warrant 9			
Highland north of Golden State	14	9,900	0.014	N/R	14	13,789	0.019	N/R			
Floral east of Front Street	14	15,130	0.022	N/R	14	17,271	0.024	N/R			
Thompson north of Front Street	14	3,645	0.006	Met	14	5,072	0.007	Met			
First Street east of Front Street	14	3,546	0.006	N/R	14	4,260	0.006	N/R			

Table 4.12-28 (cont.): Year 2020 Grade Crossing Analysis

		Year 20	020 No Project		Year 2020 Plus Project						
Crossing	Trains per Day	Average Daily Trips	Predicted Accident Frequency per Year	Warrant 9	Trains per Day	Average Daily Trips	Predicted Accident Frequency per Year	Warrant 9			
Second Street east of Front Street	14	11,980	0.017	N/R	14	13,477	0.019	N/R			
Third Street east of Front Street	14	3,621	0.006	Not met	14	4,335	0.006	Not met			
Nebraska east of Golden State	14	2,547	0.005	Met	14	4,688	0.007	Met			
Saginaw east of Golden State	14	487	0.001	Met	14	1,201	0.002	Met			
Mountain View east of Golden State	14	10,385	0.014	N/R	14	28,936	0.039	N/R			
Bethel east of Golden State	14	3,450	0.005	Met	14	6,304	0.009	Met			
Stroud east of Golden State	14	2,248	0.003	Met	14	2,962	0.005	Met			

Notes:

Warrant 9 = Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices Signal Warrant 9 (Intersection Near a Grade Crossing) Analysis

N/R = Not Relevant

Bold denotes unacceptable grade crossing operation.

Source: Peters Engineering Group, 2012.

Table 4.12-29: Ye	ear 2020 Plus F	Project Intersection	Operations - Mitigate	d
			eperane	-

		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		Weekend	
Intersection	Control	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS
Floral/SR-99 SB offramp	Signal	12.2	В	22.6	С	22.4	С
Floral/Highland	Signal	19.2	В	27.8	С	31.8	С
Floral/SR-99 NB offramp	Signal	9.9	А	14.4	В	16.0	В
Highland/SR-99 SB onramp	Signal	16.2	В	18.5	В	24.0	С
Highland/Rose	Signal	14.6	В	19.5	В	20.6	С

Table 4.12-29 (cont.): Year 2020 Plus Project Intersection Operations - Mitigated

		AM Pea	ak Hour	PM Pea	ak Hour	Weekend	
Intersection	Control	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS
Highland/Nebraska	Signal	14.0	В	21.5	С	18.2	В
Nebraska/Thompson	AWS	15.0	С	19.7	С	16.5	С
Second/SR-99 SB	Signal	14.8	В	17.5	В	17.3	В
Second/SR-99 NB	Signal	10.2	В	18.7	В	10.6	В
Second/Whitson	Signal	20.3	С	30.7	С	29.2	С
Mountain View/Highland	Signal	19.4	В	28.8	С	26.7	С
Mountain View/Thompson	TWS	13.5	В	20.9	С	22.0	С
Mountain View/McCall	Signal	16.4	В	27.4	С	22.1	С
Mountain View/Dockery	Signal	31.4	С	48.7	D	44.7	D
Mountain View/SR-99 SB offramp	Signal	17.7	P	22.0	C	26.4	C
Mountain View/SR-99 SB onramp		17.7	D	22.9	C	20.4	C
Mountain View/SR-99 NB onramp	Signal	17.6	B	12.5	B	24.5	C
Mountain View/SR-99 NB offramp	-	17.0		12.5	D	24.5	
Mountain View/Golden State	Signal	19.0	В	35.4	D	79.6	E
Mountain View/Bethel	Signal	14.9	В	19.8	В	19.8	В
Mountain View/Academy	Signal	17.5	В	23.8	С	22.7	С
Mountain View/Mendocino	Signal	20.3	С	27.5	С	24.8	С
Caruthers/Dockery	OWS	8.7	А	8.7	А	8.9	А
Golden State/Amber	OWS	11.4	В	14.6	В	16.9	С
Kamm/Thompson	OWS	9.0	А	9.3	А	9.2	А
Kamm/McCall	TWS	10.4	В	11.2	В	10.4	В
Kamm/Dockery	TWS	9.0	А	9.0	А	9.0	А

Table 4.12-29 (cont.): Year 2020 Plus Project Intersection Operations - Mitigated

		AM Peak Hour		Peak Hour PM Peak Hour		Weekend	kend
Intersection	Control	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS
Kamm/Van Horn	TWS	9.5	А	10.4	В	10.6	В
Kamm/SR-99 SB offramp	TWS	8.0	А	8.7	А	8.9	А
Bethel/SR-99 NB onramp	OWS	13.1	В	13.4	В	13.0	В
Bethel/Golden State	AWS	11.6	В	31.2	D	16.2	С
Bethel/Kamm	AWS	9.6	А	11.7	В	11.6	В
Kamm/Academy	AWS	13.4	В	17.7	С	15.3	С
Bethel/SR-99 NB offramp	OWS	12.0	В	17.1	С	13.2	В
Bethel/Parkway-SR-99 SB onramp	OWS	14.2	В	17.4	С	13.3	В
Golden State/Phase 1 Access	Signal	11.8	В	39.0	D	80.8	F
Dockery/Phase 2 Access	Signal	12.1	В	15.8	В	12.2	В
Note: * No feasible mitigation <i>Italics</i> denote mitigated operation Source: Peters Engineering Group, 2012.							

Table 4 12-30 [.] Yea	ar 2020 Plus Pro	iect Roadway S	Segment On	erations – Mitigated
		ject Roadway (beginent op	erations – mitigateu

		Lanes and	AM Pea	ak Hour	PM Peak Hour		Weekend	
R	oad Segment	Median	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS
Mountain View	Highland to Thompson	2U (<2)	472	В	733	С	730	С
Avenue	Thompson to McCall	2U (<2)	465	В	770	С	743	С
	McCall to Dockery	2U (<2)	592	С	1,131	С	1,121	С
	Dockery to SR-99	2U (<2)	1,278	С	1,992	С	1,882	С
	SR-99 to Golden State	2U (<2)	2,213	С	3,966	D	4,265	D
	Golden State to Bethel	4D-LT (<2)	1,561	В	2,655	В	3,474	В
	Bethel to Academy	2U (<2)	1,367	В	2,319	В	2,394	В
	Academy to Mendocino	2U (<2)	1,226	В	2,006	В	1,953	В
	Mendocino to Madsen	2U (<2)	1,082	В	1,459	В	1,328	В
	Madsen to Zediker	2U (<2)	1,030	В	1,372	В	1,263	В
	Zediker to Fresno County Line	2U (<2)	1,028	В	1,296	В	1,173	В
Kamm Avenue	Highland to Thompson	2U (<2)	22	В	38	В	22	В
	Thompson to McCall	2U (<2)	18	В	33	В	25	В
	McCall to Dockery	2U (<2)	29	В	37	В	37	В
	Dockery to Van Horn	2U (<2)	29	В	38	В	37	В
	Van Horn to SR-99	2U (<2)	161	В	267	В	313	В
	SR-99 to Academy	2U (<2)	407	В	529	В	509	В
McCall Avenue	Valley View to Mountain View	2U (<2)	390	В	754	С	569	В
	Mountain View to Caruthers	2U (<2)	309	В	641	В	329	В

		Lanes and	AM Pea	ak Hour	PM Pea	ak Hour	Wee	kend
Road Segment		Median	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS
Dockery Avenue	Mountain View to Caruthers	2U (<2)	577	В	998	С	1,073	С
Golden State	Nebraska to Saginaw	4D-LT (<2)	809	В	1,747	В	2,005	В
Boulevard	Saginaw to Phase 1 main site access	4D-LT (<2)	791	В	1,859	В	2,375	В
	Phase 1 main site access to Mountain View	4D-LT (<2)	1,237	С	3,531	D	4,565	E
	Mountain View to Amber	4D-LT (<2)	539	В	1,298	В	1,897	В
	Amber to Bethel	4D-LT (<2)	567	В	1,038	В	1,102	В
Notes:								

4D-LT: 4-lane divided with left-turn lanes 2U: 2-lane undivided

Values in parentheses indicate number of signalized intersections per mile.

Italics denote mitigated operation Source: Peters Engineering Group, 2012.

Potential Impacts and Mitigation

Traffic impacts identified in the year 2020 With Project conditions analyses are stated below, followed by the recommended mitigation. Recommended turn lane lengths are in accordance with the standards of the agency having jurisdiction unless otherwise noted.

Floral Avenue/Highland Avenue

At the intersection of Floral Avenue and Highland Avenue, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS D during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour. The City of Selma's pending General Plan Update considers LOS D as acceptable; therefore, this would not be considered an impact after the General Plan Update is in force.

The intersection is currently signalized. The intersection shall be widened to provide a second leftturn lane on the eastbound approach. The configuration of the intersection of Floral Avenue and Highland Avenue would be as follows:

Eastbound: Two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane Westbound: Two left-turn lanes and two through lanes with a shared right turn Northbound: Two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane Southbound: One left-turn lane, two through lanes, and two right-turn lanes

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS C during the worst-case peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

Because of physical constraints, roadway alignment constraints, and right-of-way constraints, it is possible that the improvements recommended above will not be feasible. In the event that design reveals the recommended improvements, or portions thereof, are not feasible, the impact will not be fully mitigated.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-2a.

Highland Avenue/Rose Avenue

At the intersection of Highland Avenue and Rose Avenue, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS F during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour.

Traffic signal warrants are expected to be met at the intersection. The intersection shall be signalized with protected left-turn phasing and widened to provide a dedicated left-turn lane on the eastbound and westbound approaches. The configuration of the intersection of Highland Avenue and Rose Avenue would be as follows:

Eastbound: One left-turn lane and one through lane with a shared right turn Westbound: One left-turn lane and one through lane with a shared right turn Northbound: One left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane Southbound: One left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS C during the worst-case peak hour. The City of Selma development impact fee program includes \$281,250 for traffic signals at the intersection of Highland Avenue and Rose Avenue. As such, payment of fees in accordance with Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a would satisfy the applicant's obligation in this case.

Second Street/SR-99 Southbound Ramps

At the intersection of Second Street and the SR-99 southbound ramps, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS F during all peak hours.

Traffic signal warrants are expected to be met at the intersection. The intersection shall be signalized with protected left-turn phasing. The existing configuration of the intersection will remain. With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS B during the worst-case peak hour. The City of Selma development impact fee program includes \$1,500,000 for improvements at the Second Street/SR-99 interchange. As such, payment of fees in accordance with Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a would satisfy the applicant's obligation in this case.

Second Street/SR-99 Northbound Ramps

At the intersection of Second Street and the SR-99 northbound ramps, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS F during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour.

Traffic signal warrants are expected to be met at the intersection. The intersection shall be signalized with protected left-turn phasing and widened to provide a dedicated left-turn lane on the eastbound approach. The configuration of the intersection of Second Street and the SR-99 northbound ramps would be as follows:

Eastbound: One left-turn lane and two through lanes Westbound: Two through lanes with a shared right turn Northbound: One shared left-turn/through lane and one right-turn lane Southbound: None

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS B during the worst-case peak hour. The City of Selma development impact fee program includes \$1,500,000 for improvements at the Second Street/SR-99 interchange. As such, payment of fees in accordance with Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a would satisfy the applicant's obligation in this case.

Second Street/Whitson Street

At the intersection of Second Street and Whitson Street, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS D during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour. The City of Selma's pending General Plan Update considers LOS D as acceptable; therefore, this would not be considered an impact after the General Plan Update is in force.

The intersection is currently signalized. The intersection shall be widened to provide a second leftturn lane on the northbound approach and a dedicated right-turn lane on the eastbound approach. The configuration of the intersection of Second Street and Whitson Street would be as follows (assuming Whitson Street is the north-south street):

Eastbound: One left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane Westbound: One left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn Northbound: Two left-turn lanes and two through lanes with a shared right turn Southbound: One left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS C during the worst-case peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

Because of physical constraints, roadway alignment constraints, and right-of-way constraints, it is possible that the improvements recommended above will not be feasible. In the event that design reveals the recommended improvements, or portions thereof, are not feasible, the impact will not be fully mitigated.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-2b.

Mountain View Avenue/McCall Avenue

At the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and McCall Avenue, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS F during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour.

Traffic signal warrants are expected to be met at the intersection. The intersection shall be signalized with protected left-turn phasing and widened to provide a dedicated left-turn lane on all approaches and a dedicated right-turn lane on the westbound approach. The dedicated right-turn lane on the westbound approach may be utilized to trap the second westbound through lane on Mountain View Avenue approaching McCall Avenue. The configuration of the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and McCall Avenue would be as follows:

Eastbound: One left-turn lane and one through lane with a shared right turn Westbound: One left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane Northbound: One left-turn lane and one through lane with a shared right turn Southbound: One left-turn lane and one through lane with a shared right turn

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS C during the worst-case peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-2c.

Mountain View Avenue/Dockery Avenue

At the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Dockery Avenue, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS F during all peak hours.

Traffic signal warrants are expected to be met at the intersection. The intersection shall be signalized with protected left-turn phasing and widened. The configuration of the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Dockery Avenue would be as follows:

Eastbound: One left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane Westbound: Two left-turn lanes (minimum 850 feet) and two through lanes with a shared right turn Northbound: Two left-turn lanes, one through lane, and one right-turn lane Southbound: One left-turn lane and one through lane with a shared right turn

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS D during the PM and Saturday peak hours. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

The calculated LOS D during the PM and weekend peak hour is considered the best-case scenario, because additional lanes provide only marginal improvements in delay, are not warranted based on the traffic volumes in the lanes, and reduce ease of access for pedestrians by increasing the width of the intersection. Considering that the City of Selma's pending General Plan Update considers LOS D as acceptable, this mitigation would be substandard only until the General Plan Update is in force and the intersection is annexed into the City of Selma.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-2d.

Mountain View Avenue/SR-99 Southbound Offramp

At the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and the SR-99 southbound offramp, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS F during all peak hours.

Traffic signal warrants are expected to be met at the intersection. To accommodate signalization of the intersection with protected left-turn phasing, the SR-99 onramp and offramp shall be modified to align with each other. The bridge over SR-99 will require widening. The connection to Van Horn Avenue at Mountain View Avenue will be eliminated, resulting in a cul-de-sac or realignment of Van Horn Avenue south of Mountain View Avenue. This will also require a revision of the project site plan.

The configuration of the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and the SR-99 southbound on and offramps would be as follows:

Eastbound: Three through lanes and one right-turn lane Westbound: One left-turn lane and one two through lanes Northbound: None

Southbound: Two left-turn lanes and two right-turn lanes

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS C during the worst-case peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-2e.

Mountain View Avenue/SR-99 Southbound Onramp

At the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and the SR-99 southbound onramp, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS F during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure TRANS-2e would achieve acceptable LOS C or better during all peak hours.

Mountain View Avenue/SR-99 Northbound Onramp

At the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and the SR-99 northbound onramp, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS F during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour.

Traffic signal warrants are expected to be met at the intersection. To accommodate signalization of the intersection with protected left-turn phasing, the SR-99 onramp and offramp shall be modified to align with each other. The bridge over SR-99 will require widening. The configuration of the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and the SR-99 northbound on and offramps would be as follows:

Eastbound: Two left-turn lanes (minimum 190 feet) and three through lanes Westbound: Two through lanes and one right-turn lane Northbound: One left-turn lane and one right-turn lane Southbound: None

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS C during the worst-case peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-2f.

Mountain View Avenue/SR-99 Northbound Offramp

At the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and the SR-99 northbound offramp, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS F during all peak hours.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure TRANS-2f would achieve acceptable LOS C or better during all peak hours.

Mountain View Avenue and Golden State Boulevard

At the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Golden State Boulevard, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS D during the AM peak hour, and a cumulative substandard LOS F during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour.

The intersection is currently signalized and is adjacent to a railroad track. In addition to the improvements required by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1d, the intersection shall be widened to provide a third through lane and a second right-turn lane on all four approaches. The configuration of the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Golden State Boulevard would be as follows:

Eastbound: Two left-turn lanes (minimum 825 feet), three through lanes, and two right-turn lanes Westbound: Two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and two right-turn lanes Northbound: Two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and two right-turn lanes Southbound: Two left-turn lanes (minimum 400 feet), three through lanes, and two right-turn lanes (minimum 425 feet)

Modification of the traffic signal system at the intersection shall include installation of pre-signals at the existing at-grade railroad crossing.

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS B during the AM peak hour, LOS D during the PM peak hour, and LOS E during the Saturday peak hour. The proposed intersection configuration is considered the maximum feasible intersection configuration. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program. Further improvements could be achieved by implementing the ultimate mitigation as described.

Ultimate Mitigation

To alleviate the severe congestion and long queues associated with the mitigation described above at the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Golden State Boulevard, especially when trains pass by, an ultimate solution involving a grade separation should be considered. Such a project would require a substantial amount of engineering study to investigate feasible alternatives. A similar process is underway in Fresno, California for the proposed SR-99 interchange at Veterans Boulevard, which is also adjacent to Golden State Boulevard and the UPRR railroad. Potential alternatives for the Veterans Boulevard interchange project are similar to those that may be considered at the Mountain View Avenue/Golden State Boulevard intersection.

Mountain View Avenue/Bethel Avenue

At the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Bethel Avenue, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS F during all peak hours.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure TRANS-1e would operate at LOS B during the worst-case peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program. Measure C

Rural Project I is currently in the design phase and is funded to construct widening of Mountain View Avenue from Bethel Avenue to the Tulare County line.

Mountain View Avenue/Academy Avenue

At the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Academy Avenue, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS F during all peak hours.

As previously discussed, improvements for this intersection are contemplated by Measure C Rural Project I. These improvements are currently in the design phase and are funded. Therefore, the project will not be required to implement this mitigation.

Mountain View Avenue/Mendocino Avenue

At the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Mendocino Avenue, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS D during the PM peak hour.

As previously discussed, improvements for this intersection are contemplated by Measure C Rural Project I. These improvements are currently in the design phase and are funded. Therefore, the project will not be required to implement this mitigation.

Phase 1 Site Access/Golden State Boulevard

At the intersection of the Phase 1 Site Access and Golden State Boulevard, the project driveway will operate at LOS F during all peak hours if one-way stop-sign control is installed.

This mitigation is identical to that required for Phase 1 (Mitigation Measure TRANS-1f) with the exception of the length of the northbound left-turn lanes. Traffic signal warrants are expected to be met at the intersection. The intersection shall be signalized with protected left-turn phasing. The configuration of the intersection of the Phase 1 Site Access and Golden State Boulevard would be as follows:

Eastbound: Two left-turn lanes (minimum 350 feet) and two right-turn lanes Westbound: None Northbound: Two left-turn lanes (minimum 1,125 feet) and two through lanes Southbound: Two through lanes and one right-turn lane

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS B during the AM peak hour, LOS D during the PM peak hour, and LOS F during the Saturday peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

The mitigation recommended above reflects Peters Engineering Group's opinion of the most practical approach to the intersection configuration. If the City of Selma considers triple left-turn lanes acceptable, the intersection could operate at LOS C during the Saturday peak hour if the northbound approach is constructed with three left-turn lanes and three through lanes. One of the northbound through lanes could be dropped immediately north of the intersection.

As a second alternative, the site plan could be modified to provide a second signalized main access so that northbound left turns from Golden State Boulevard into the project are not concentrated at one location.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-2h.

Phase 2 Site Access/Dockery Avenue

The project mitigations required along Mountain View Avenue will cause a secondary impact at the intersection of the Phase 2 Site Access and Dockery Avenue. The intersection of the Phase 2 Site Access and Dockery Avenue will operate at LOS F during all peak hours if stop-sign control is installed.

Traffic signal warrants are expected to be met at the intersection (assuming that the project will construct Dockery Avenue along the entire frontage of the site). The intersection shall be signalized with protected left-turn phasing. The configuration of the intersection of the Phase 2 Site Access and Dockery Avenue would be as follows:

Eastbound: None Westbound: One left-turn lane and one right-turn lane Northbound: One through lane and one right-turn lane Southbound: Two left-turn lanes (minimum 450 feet) and one through lane

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS B during the worst-case peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-2i.

Mountain View Avenue – McCall to Dockery Avenues

On Mountain View Avenue between McCall and Dockery Avenues, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS D during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour.

Mountain View Avenue between McCall and Dockery Avenues shall be widened to four lanes with a median. With implementation of these improvements, the road segment is expected to operate at LOS C during the worst-case peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-2j.

Mountain View Avenue – Dockery Avenue to SR-99

On Mountain View Avenue between Dockery Avenue and SR-99, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS E during all peak hours.

Transportation

Mountain View Avenue between Dockery Avenue and SR-99 shall be widened to four lanes with a median. With implementation of these improvements, the road segment is expected to operate at LOS C during the worst-case peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-2k.

Mountain View Avenue - SR-99 to Golden State Boulevard

On Mountain View Avenue between SR-99 and Golden State Boulevard, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS E during all peak hours.

Mountain View Avenue between the SR-99 northbound ramps and Golden State Boulevard shall be widened to six lanes with a median. With implementation of these improvements, the road segment is expected to operate at LOS C during the AM peak hour and LOS D during the PM and Saturday peak hours. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

The calculated LOS D during the PM and weekend peak hours is considered the best-case scenario: additional lanes (an eight-lane arterial) provide only marginal improvements, because lanes are not typically evenly utilized near site access locations, reduce ease of access for pedestrians by increasing the widths of intersections, and create substantial additional ongoing maintenance costs to the City. Considering that the City of Selma's pending General Plan Update considers LOS D as acceptable, this mitigation would be substandard only until the General Plan Update is in force and the roadway is annexed into the City of Selma.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-21.

Mountain View Avenue - Golden State Boulevard to Bethel Avenue

On Mountain View Avenue between Golden State Boulevard and Bethel Avenue, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS E during the Saturday peak hour.

Mountain View Avenue between Golden State Boulevard and Bethel Avenue shall be widened to six lanes with a median. With implementation of these improvements, the road segment is expected to operate at LOS B during the worst-case peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-2m.

Mountain View Avenue – Bethel Avenue to Academy Avenue

On Mountain View Avenue between Bethel and Academy Avenues, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS E during all peak hours.

Mountain View Avenue between Bethel and Academy Avenues shall be widened to four lanes with a median. With implementation of these improvements, the road segment is expected to operate at LOS B during the worst-case peak hour.

Measure C Rural Project I is currently in the design phase and is funded to construct this improvement. Therefore, the project will not be required to implement this mitigation.

Mountain View Avenue – Academy Avenue to Mendocino Avenue

On Mountain View Avenue between Academy and Mendocino Avenues, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS E during all peak hours.

Mountain View Avenue between Academy and Mendocino Avenues shall be widened to four lanes with a median. With implementation of these improvements, the road segment is expected to operate at LOS B during the worst-case peak hour.

Measure C Rural Project I is currently in the design phase and is funded to construct this improvement. Therefore, the project will not be required to implement this mitigation.

Mountain View Avenue – Mendocino Avenue to Madsen Avenue

On Mountain View Avenue between Mendocino and Madsen Avenues, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS D during the AM peak hour, and a cumulative substandard LOS E during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour.

Mountain View Avenue between Mendocino and Madsen Avenues shall be widened to four lanes with a median. With implementation of these improvements, the road segment is expected to operate at LOS B during the worst-case peak hour.

Measure C Rural Project I is currently in the design phase and is funded to construct this improvement. Therefore, the project will not be required to implement this mitigation.

Mountain View Avenue – Madsen Avenue to Zediker Avenue

On Mountain View Avenue between Madsen and Zediker Avenues, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS E during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour.

Mountain View Avenue between Madsen and Zediker Avenues shall be widened to four lanes with a median. With implementation of these improvements, the road segment is expected to operate at LOS B during the worst-case peak hour.

Measure C Rural Project I is currently in the design phase and is funded to construct this improvement. Therefore, the project will not be required to implement this mitigation.

Mountain View Avenue - Zediker Avenue to Fresno County line

On Mountain View Avenue between Zediker Avenue and the Fresno County line, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS E during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour.

Mountain View Avenue between Zediker Avenue and the Fresno County line shall be widened to four lanes with a median. With implementation of these improvements, the road segment is expected to operate at LOS B during the worst-case peak hour.

Measure C Rural Project I is currently in the design phase and is funded to construct this improvement. Therefore, the project will not be required to implement this mitigation.

Golden State Boulevard – Phase 1 Mains Site Access to Mountain View Avenue

On Golden State Boulevard between the Phase 1 main site access and Mountain View Avenue, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS E during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour.

This mitigation is identical to that required for Phase 1 of the project. Golden State Boulevard between the Phase 1 main site access and Mountain View Avenue shall be widened to six lanes with a median. In the northbound direction, the required third northbound lane may be constructed as a trapped extension of a northbound left-turn lane at the Phase 1 site entrance. In the southbound direction, the required third southbound lane may be constructed as a trapped extension of a southbound lane may be constructed as a trapped extension of a southbound lane may be constructed as a trapped extension of a southbound lane may be constructed as a trapped extension of a southbound lane may be constructed as a trapped extension of a southbound right-turn lane at the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Golden State Boulevard.

With implementation of these improvements, the road segment is expected to operate at LOS C during the AM peak hour, but would operate at substandard LOS D during the PM peak hour and substandard LOS E during the weekend peak hour.

The calculated LOS D during the PM and weekend peak hours is considered the best-case scenario: additional lanes (an eight-lane arterial) provide only marginal improvements, because lanes are not typically evenly utilized near site access locations, reduce ease of access for pedestrians by increasing the widths of intersections, and create substantial additional ongoing maintenance costs to the City. Considering that the City of Selma's pending General Plan Update considers LOS D as acceptable, this mitigation would be substandard only until the General Plan Update is in force and the roadway is annexed into the City of Selma.

The City of Selma development impact fee program includes \$2,235,725 for improvements on Golden State Boulevard between Nebraska Avenue and Mountain View Avenue. As such, payment of fees in accordance with Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a would satisfy the applicant's obligation in this case.

Floral Avenue At-Grade Railroad Crossing

At the Floral Avenue at-grade railroad crossing east of Front Street, the project will exacerbate a predicted accident frequency that exceeds 0.02 accidents per year without the project.

The crossing shall be equipped with a raised median. With implementation of this improvement the predicted accident frequency is expected to be reduced to pre-project levels. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-2n.

Mountain View Avenue At-Grade Railroad Crossing

At the Mountain View Avenue at-grade railroad crossing east of Golden State Boulevard, the project will cause the predicted accident frequency to exceed 0.02 accidents per year.

With implementation of Mitigation Measure TRANS-1h, the predicted accident frequency is expected to be reduced to pre-project levels.

Mitigated Year 2020 With Project Phases 1 and 2 Conditions

Table 4.12-29 and Table 4.12-30 present levels of service for the mitigated conditions, with the mitigated locations presented in italics.

Conclusion

Under Year 2020 conditions, the proposed project would contribute vehicle trips to intersections, roadway segments, and railroad grade crossings that would operate at unacceptable levels. Mitigation is proposed that would require the project applicant to either install or provide fair-share fees for all feasible improvements necessary to improve operations to acceptable levels.

Although the proposed project would contribute funding for necessary improvements, many of the affected facilities are under the jurisdiction of an agency other than the City of Selma (e.g., Caltrans or the County of Fresno). As such, the City of Selma cannot assure that the necessary improvements would be installed as contemplated. Accordingly, the residual significance of this impact is significant and unavoidable.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

Implement Mitigation Measures TRANS-1a through TRANS-1h, and:

MM TRANS-2a Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Floral Avenue/Highland Avenue. The improvements shall consist of (1) two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the eastbound approach; (2) two left-turn lanes and two through lanes with a shared right turn on the westbound approach; (3) two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the northbound approach; and (4) one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and two right-turn lanes on the southbound approach.

These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.

- **MM TRANS-2b** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Second Street/Whitson Street. The improvements shall consist of (1) one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the eastbound approach; (2) one left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn on the westbound approach; (3) two left-turn lanes and two through lanes with a shared right turn on the northbound approach; and (4) one left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-la.
- **MM TRANS-2c** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Mountain View Avenue/McCall Avenue. The improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left-turn phasing; (2) one left-turn lane and one through lane with a shared right turn on the eastbound approach; (3) one left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane on the westbound approach; (4) one left-turn lane and one through lane with a shared right turn on the northbound approach; and (5) one left-turn lane and one through lane with a shared right turn on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.
- **MM TRANS-2d** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Mountain View Avenue/Dockery Avenue. The improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left-turn phasing; (2) one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the eastbound approach; (3) two left-turn lanes (minimum 850 feet) and two through lanes with a shared right turn on the westbound approach; (4) two left-turn lanes, one through lane, and one right-turn lane on the northbound approach; and (5) one left-turn lane and one through lane with a shared right turn on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.
- **MM TRANS-2e** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Mountain View Avenue/SR-99 Southbound Ramps. The improvements shall consist of (1) reconfiguring the intersection to have the southbound offramp and southbound onramp align with each

other; (2) signalization with protected left-turn phasing; (3) widening the Mountain View Avenue overcrossing of SR-99; (4) converting Van Horn Avenue to a cul-desac south of Mountain View Avenue to accommodate the relocated southbound onramp; (5) three through lanes and one right-turn lane on the eastbound approach; (6) one left-turn lane and one two through lanes on the westbound approach; and (7) two left-turn lanes and two right-turn lanes on the southbound approach. Caltrans shall review and approve the proposed configuration. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.

- MM TRANS-2f Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Mountain View Avenue/SR-99 Northbound Ramps. The improvements shall consist of (1) reconfiguring the intersection to have the northbound offramp and northbound onramp align with each other; (2) signalization with protected left-turn phasing; (3) widening the Mountain View Avenue overcrossing of SR-99; (4) two left-turn lanes (minimum 190 feet) and three through lanes on the eastbound approach; (5) two through lanes and one right-turn lane on the westbound approach; and (6) one left-turn lane and one right-turn lane on the northbound approach. Caltrans shall review and approve the proposed configuration. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.
- **MM TRANS-2g** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Mountain View Avenue/Golden State Boulevard. The improvements shall consist of (1) two left-turn lanes (minimum 825 feet), three through lanes, and two right-turn lanes on the eastbound approach; (2) two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and two right-turn lanes on the westbound approach; (3) two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and two right-turn lanes (minimum 400 feet), three through lanes, and two right-turn lanes (minimum 400 feet), three through lanes, and two right-turn lanes (minimum 400 feet), three through lanes, and two right-turn lanes (minimum 425 feet) on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.
- **MM TRANS-2h** Prior to issuance of the first certificate occupancy for Phase 2, the project applicant shall improve the intersection of Phase 1 Site Access/Golden State Boulevard. The improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left-turn phasing; (2) two left-turn lanes (minimum 350 feet) and two right-turn lanes on the eastbound approach; (3) two left-turn lanes (minimum 1,125 feet) and two through lanes on the northbound approach; and (4) two through lanes and a right-turn lane on the

southbound approach. In lieu of these improvements, the installation of a second signalized main access would provide acceptable levels of service and avoid concentrated northbound left turns at one location.

- **MM TRANS-2i** Prior to issuance of the first certificate occupancy for Phase 2, the project applicant shall improve the intersection of Phase 2 Site Access/Dockery Avenue. The improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left turn phasing; (2) one left-turn lane and one right-turn lane on the westbound approach; (3) one through lane and one right-turn lane on the northbound approach; and (4) two left-turn lanes (minimum 450 feet) and one through lane on the southbound approach.
- **MM TRANS-2j** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to Mountain View Avenue between McCall and Dockery Avenues. The improvements shall consist of widening Mountain View Avenue to four lanes with a median. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a. The improvements shall be accounted for in the Phase 1 and Phase 2 designs, as applicable.
- **MM TRANS-2k** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to Mountain View Avenue between Dockery Avenue and SR-99. The improvements shall consist of widening Mountain View Avenue to four lanes with a median. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a. The improvements shall be accounted for in the Phase 1 and Phase 2 designs, as applicable.
- MM TRANS-21 Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to Mountain View Avenue between SR-99 and Golden State Boulevard. The improvements shall consist of widening Mountain View Avenue to six lanes with a median. Caltrans shall review and approve the proposed configuration. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a. The improvements shall be accounted for in the Phase 1 and Phase 2 designs, as applicable.
- MM TRANS-2m Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to Mountain View Avenue between Golden State Boulevard and Bethel Avenue. The improvements shall consist of widening Mountain View Avenue to six lanes with a median. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing

mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a. The improvements shall be accounted for in the Phase 1 and Phase 2 designs, as applicable.

MM TRANS-2n Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the Floral Avenue railroad grade crossing. The improvements shall consist of (1) installation of a pre-signal and (2) pedestrian access and safety improvements. This mitigation measure shall be coordinated with the improvements contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1d. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Significant unavoidable impact.

Year 2035 Traffic Conditions

evels
5

Impact Analysis

Year 2035 Conditions account for buildout of Phase 1 (Northwest), Phase 2 (South), and Phase 3 (Northwest) of the proposed project in relation to anticipated traffic conditions in 2035.

Year 2035 With Project Lane Configurations and Intersection Control

The year 2035 No Project conditions lane configurations and intersection control are the same as the existing conditions and were previously shown in Exhibit 4.12-2.

Year 2035 With Project Traffic Volumes

The Year 2035 No Project traffic volumes are presented in Exhibit 4.12-25 and Exhibit 4.12-26.

Year 2035 With Project Lane Configurations and Intersection Control

The Year 2035 With Project conditions lane configurations and intersection control are presented in Exhibit 4.12-27. The lane configurations are essentially the same as the existing conditions with the exception of improvements to be constructed by the project along the frontage of the project site.

Year 2035 With Project Traffic Volumes

The Year 2035 With Project conditions peak-hour traffic volumes are determined by adding the 2035 baseline traffic volumes and the project traffic volumes. The Year 2035 With Project conditions peak-hour traffic volumes are presented in Exhibit 4.12-28 and Exhibit 4.12-29.

Year 2035 With Project Intersection LOS Analysis

The results of the Year 2035 With Project conditions intersection LOS analyses are summarized in Table 4.12-31.

Year 2035 With Project Road Segment Analyses

The results of the Year 2035 With Project road segment analyses are summarized in Table 4.12-32.

Year 2035 With Project Conditions At-Grade Railroad Crossing Analyses

The results of the Year 2035 With Project at-grade railroad crossing analyses are summarized in Table 4.12-33.

Potential Impacts and Mitigation

Traffic impacts identified in the year 2035 With Project conditions analyses are stated below, followed by the recommended mitigation. Recommended turn lane lengths are in accordance with the standards of the agency having jurisdiction unless otherwise noted.

Floral Avenue/SR-99 Southbound Offramp

At the intersection of Floral Avenue and the SR-99 southbound offramp, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS F during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour.

The intersection is currently signalized. The intersection shall be widened to provide a second leftturn lane on the westbound approach, a third through lane on the eastbound and westbound approaches, a second right-turn lane on the northbound approach, and a second right-turn lane on the southbound approach. The configuration of the intersection of Floral Avenue and the SR-99 southbound offramp would be as follows:

Eastbound: Three through lanes and one right-turn lane Westbound: Two left-turn lanes and three through lanes Northbound: Two right-turn lanes Southbound: Two left-turn lanes, one through lane, and two right-turn lanes

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS C during the worst-case peak hour. The City of Selma development impact fee program includes \$3,000,000 for improvements at the Floral Avenue/SR-99 interchange. Payment of fees in accordance with Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a would satisfy the applicant's obligation in this case.

Because of physical constraints, roadway alignment constraints, and right-of-way constraints, it is possible that the improvements recommended above will not be feasible. In the event that design reveals the recommended improvements, or portions thereof, are not feasible, the impact will not be fully mitigated.

$(\begin{array}{c} (+ 0) \\ (+ 0) \\ ($	$\overbrace{}^{(202)}_{(202)} \xrightarrow{(100)}_{(202)} \xrightarrow{(100)}_{(202$		← 945(1444)	← 576(850)	$(301)(08) \xrightarrow{7} 244(281) (365) \xrightarrow{7} 130(108) \xrightarrow{7} 244(281) (110) \xrightarrow{7} 244(281) (110) \xrightarrow{7} 244(21) (110) \xrightarrow{7} 24(41) (110) (11$	(1212) (1212
060(2341) → 29(72) → Floral / SR 99 SB Off Ramp	$\begin{array}{c} 185(389) & \checkmark \\ 900(1991) & \rightarrow \\ 208(546) & \checkmark \\ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} & \uparrow \\ & \uparrow \\ & (000) & RZ \\ & (000)$	Rioral-Highland / SR 99 NB Loop Rame	$759(1452) \longrightarrow \begin{cases} & & \\ & $	439(406)	$74(284) \xrightarrow{7} 1(241) \xrightarrow{7} 1(2$	$\begin{array}{c} 151(335) & \checkmark \\ 174(522) & \rightarrow \\ 32(175) & \checkmark \\ Highland \\ Nebraska \end{array} $
$ \begin{array}{c} (0) \\ (0) $	(200)(594) (80)(594) (810)(594) (810)(594) (144(199)	下193(255) ←580(750)	(100) (100	(121) (121	(65) (65) (102)	(1:8) (1:8)
$\begin{array}{c} 18(20) \checkmark \\ 294(668) \rightarrow \\ 31(70) \checkmark \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ (2) \\ ($	605(769) → 45(183) → 9 Second St / SP 99 SB Ramps	$\begin{array}{c c} 144(92) \xrightarrow{-\!\!\!\!/} & & & & \uparrow \\ 652(888) \xrightarrow{-\!\!\!\!/} & & & & \uparrow \\ \hline & & & & & \uparrow \\ 652(888) \xrightarrow{-\!\!\!\!/} & & & & \uparrow \\ \hline & & & & & & \uparrow \\ \hline & & & & & & \uparrow \\ \hline & & & & & & & \uparrow \\ \hline & & & & & & & \uparrow \\ \hline & & & & & & & & \uparrow \\ \hline & & & & & & & & \uparrow \\ \hline & & & & & & & & & \uparrow \\ \hline & & & & & & & & & \uparrow \\ \hline & & & & & & & & & & \uparrow \\ \hline & & & & & & & & & & \\ \hline & & & & & &$	$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} & & & \\ & & & \\ 88(117) & \checkmark \\ 525(644) & \rightarrow \\ 215(331) & \checkmark \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & \\ &$	$\begin{array}{c} 97(85) \xrightarrow{\scalebox{1}} & & & & & \\ 369(288) \xrightarrow{\scalebox{1}} & & & & & \\ 39(63) \xrightarrow{\scalebox{1}} & & & & \\ \hline & & & & & \\ \hline & & & & & \\ \hline 12 & & & & \\ \end{array} Mountain View / Hightand \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 24(63) \xrightarrow{\frown} & \bigwedge & \bigwedge \\ 402(476) \xrightarrow{\frown} & \bigwedge & \bigwedge & \bigwedge \\ 26(39) \xrightarrow{\frown} & & \overbrace{\widehat{\mathfrak{S}}} & \overbrace{\widehat{\mathfrak{S}}} & \overbrace{\widehat{\mathfrak{S}}} \\ & & & & \\ \hline \mathfrak{S} & & & & \\ & & & & \\ \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{c} 3 \\ \text{Mountain View / Thompson} \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 120(174) & \uparrow \\ 394(432) & \uparrow \\ 66(89) & \uparrow \\ \hline \\ 14 \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} & \uparrow \\ 16 \\ \hline \\ 8 \\ 8 \\ 14 \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} & \uparrow \\ \hline \\ 14 \\ \hline \\ 14 \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} & \uparrow \\ \hline \\ 14 \\ 14$
$\begin{array}{c} (2) \begin{array}{c} (2) \\ (2) \\ (2) \\ (3) \\ (4) \\ (4) \\ (5) \\ (4) \\ (5) \\ (4) \\ (5) \\ (4) \\ (5$	$\begin{array}{c} (225) 126 \\$	$\begin{array}{c} \leftarrow -340(516) \\ \swarrow & -39(149) \end{array}$ 776(868) \rightarrow 157(207) \rightarrow		$\leftarrow -745(939)$ $6688(785) \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} & & \\ $	$(19) \begin{array}{c} (19) \\ (19) \\ (28) \\ (27) \\ (28) \\ (27) \\ (28) \\ (27) \\ (28) \\ (27) \\ (28) \\ (27) \\ (28) \\ (27) \\ (28) \\ (27) \\ (28) \\ (27) \\ (28) \\ (27) \\ (28) \\ (27) \\ (28) \\ (27) \\ (28)$	$\begin{array}{c} & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & &$
Mountain View / Dockery (22) (22) (24) (25)	$\begin{array}{c c} \hline & & \\ \hline & & \\ \hline & & \\ & &$	17 Mountain View / \$R 99 SB On Ramp	18 Mountain View / \$R 99 NB On Ramp (1925) 89 ↓ ↓	$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} & \\ 19 \\ \hline \\ $	$\begin{array}{c} \mathbb{Z} \\ \hline \\ \mathbb{Z} $	21 Mountain View / Bethel $ \begin{array}{c} $
$\begin{array}{c}14(19) \checkmark^{n}\\406(752) \rightarrow\\14(20) \checkmark^{n}\\14(20) \checkmark^{n}\\Wountain View / Academy\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 134(275) & \longrightarrow \\ 280(527) & \longrightarrow \\ 13(63) & \searrow \\ \hline \begin{array}{c} & & & \\ & & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & &$	4(2) → 2(2) → 2(2) → 2(2) → Caruthers/ Dockery	50(266) → ↑ 47(144) → 50 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	$\begin{array}{ccc} 2(2) & \stackrel{-}{\longrightarrow} & & & \uparrow \\ 12(14) & \rightarrow & & & & \uparrow \\ 2(2) & \searrow & & & & & & \\ \hline & & & & & & & & \\ \hline & & & &$	$\begin{array}{c} 4(2) \\ 10(4) \\ 2(6) \\ 2(6) \\ \end{array} \xrightarrow{\uparrow} \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 1$	$\begin{array}{c}1(1) \longrightarrow \\18(20) \longrightarrow \\1(1) \longrightarrow \\28\end{array} \qquad \qquad$
$ \begin{array}{c} (2)\\ (3)\\ (4)\\ (4)\\ (4)\\ (4)\\ (4)\\ (4)\\ (4)\\ (4$	r← 8(10) ← 72(382)	← 372(304) ← 211(403)	$\begin{array}{c} (0)\\ (0)\\ (0)\\ (0)\\ (0)\\ (0)\\ (0)\\ (0)\\$	← 134(383) ৮ ⊄9(69)	(52) (100)	GO CO CO CO CO CO CO CO CO CO C
$\begin{array}{c} 2(8) & \swarrow & \uparrow \\ 2(16) & \rightarrow \\ 2(2) & \frown & \bigcirc & \bigcirc & \bigcirc & \bigcirc \\ 2(2) & \frown & & \bigcirc & \bigcirc & \bigcirc & \bigcirc \\ & \bigcirc & \bigcirc & \bigcirc & \bigcirc & \bigcirc$	24(41) - 24(40) - 24(40) - 24(40) - 24(40) - 24(2(4) 2(2) 2(2) 31 Bethel / SR 95 NB On Ramp	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c} 184(134) \longrightarrow & \begin{array}{c} & & & \\ 126(350) & & & \\ \hline \\ \hline$	$\begin{array}{c} 44(89) & \swarrow & \uparrow \\ 145(375) & \rightarrow \\ 41(177) & \swarrow & \textcircled{F} \\ 300 & \rule{1}{10} \\ 300 & $	€ 100 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 00
				LEGENI)	
$\begin{array}{c} 53(259) \checkmark \\ 8(14) \rightarrow \\ 36(150) \checkmark \\ \end{array} \qquad \left. \begin{array}{c} \bigcap \limits_{(2)} \bigcap \bigcap \limits_{(2)} \bigcap \limits_{(2)} \bigcap \limits_{(2)} \bigcap \limits_{(2)} \bigcap \bigcap \bigcap \limits_{(2)} \bigcap \bigcap \bigcap \limits_{(2)} \bigcap \bigcap$	37 Site Access / Golden State	38 Site Access / Dockery	39 Site Access / Mountain Wew	© XX (YY)	STUDY AREA INTEF AM (PM) VOLUMES	RSECTIONS

Source: Peters Engineering Group.



Year 2035 No Project Weekday Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes

Exhibit 4.12-25

$\begin{array}{c} 688 \\ 698 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 1$	$\begin{array}{c} 9182\\ 9182\\ 917\\ 917\\ 917\\ 917\\ 917\\ 917\\ 917\\ 917$		← 1819	← 761 117	82 65 50 5 50 50 5 50 5 50 5 50 5	$\begin{array}{c} 321\\ 527\\ 527\\ 527\\ 527\\ 527\\ 527\\ 527\\ 527$
$\begin{array}{ccc} 2635 \longrightarrow & 7\\ 102 & & 8\\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 491 \\ 1833 \\ 642 \\ 642 \\ 7 \end{array} \xrightarrow{7} \begin{array}{c} \\ 82 \\ 82 \\ 82 \\ 82 \\ 82 \\ 82 \\ 82 \\ 8$		$1438 \longrightarrow \begin{cases} 1 \\ \frac{1}{5} \\ \frac{1}{5} \\ \frac{1}{5} \end{cases}$	294 - 1 294	$\begin{array}{cccc} 568 & \checkmark \\ 131 & \rightarrow \\ 173 & \checkmark \\ 173 & \checkmark \\ 74 & \cancel{5}2 & \cancel{5}2 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c}314 \\395 \\54 \\54 \\\end{array} \begin{array}{c}7\\\\8\\\\8\\\\8\\\\8\\\\8\\\\8\\\\8\\\\8\\\\8\\\\8\\\\8\\\\8\\\\8$
Floral / SR 99 SB Off Ramp	2 Floral / Highland	3 Floral-Highland / SR 99 NB Loop Ramp	4 FLoral / SR 99 NB Off Ramp	5 Highland / SR 99 SB On Ramp	6 Highland / Rose	Highland / Nebraska
$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \\ \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \\ \\ \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \\$ {} \\ \end{array}{} \end{array}{} \\ \\ } \\ } \\ } \\ } \\ } \\ } \\	⁷ 2 2 2 450 2 450 2 175 825 →	$ \begin{array}{c} & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ 115 & \neg^7 \\ 700 & \rightarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ & & & \\ \hline \end{array} $	$ \begin{array}{c} & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & $	$\begin{array}{c} & & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & &$	$\begin{array}{c} & & & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & &$	$\begin{array}{c} 5 \\ 5 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\$
64 2 87 7 87	222 ~	30	354 ~ 28 28	21 - 21 - 22 8 8		54 -7 05 45 45
Nebraska / Thompson	Second St / SR 99 SB Ramps	Second St / SF 99 NB Ramps	Second SI / Whitson	Mountain View / Highland	Mountain View / Thompson	Mountain View / McCall
$\begin{array}{c} & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\$	$\overbrace{}^{99} \overbrace{}^{0} \overbrace{}^{10} \overbrace{}^{276} \overbrace{}^{376} \overbrace{}^{9}$	← 391 ∠ 62	~ ←590	← 750	6 6 7 128	$\begin{array}{c} 7 & 7 & 7 \\ 2 & 7 & 7 \\$
$\begin{array}{c}2\\385\\105\\105\end{array}$	$ \begin{array}{c} 393 \longrightarrow \\ 2 \longrightarrow \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array} \right) $	566 → 197 →	$\begin{array}{c}100 \longrightarrow \\500 \longrightarrow\end{array}$	$516 \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$	$182 \longrightarrow 7$ $592 \longrightarrow 7$ $149 \longrightarrow 7$ 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	$\begin{array}{c} 14 \\ 438 \\ 43 \\ 43 \\ 43 \end{array} \qquad $
15 Mountain View / Dockery	16 Mountain View / \$R 99 SB Off Ramp	17 Mountain View / \$R 99 SB On Ramp	18 Mountain View / SR 99 NB On Ramp	19 Mountain View / \$R 99 NB Off Ram	np 20 Mountain View / Golden State Bivd	21 Mountain View / Bethel
$\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 $	$\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 $	↓ 4-7 ↑ N	² 29 ² 39 ² 39 	$\begin{array}{c} 7 \xrightarrow{\mp} 0 \\ \downarrow & \downarrow \\ 2 \xrightarrow{7} \\ 3 $	$\begin{array}{c} & & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & &$	$\begin{array}{c} \overbrace{} \overbrace{}} \overbrace{} \overbrace{}} \overbrace{} \overbrace{a} \overbrace{} } \overbrace{} \overbrace{} \overbrace{} \overbrace{} $
22 Mountain View / Academy	23 Mountain View / Mendocino	24 Caruthers / Dockery	25 Golden State Blvd / Amber	26 Kamm / Thompson	27 Kamm / McCall	28 Kamm / Dockery
$\begin{array}{c} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 &$	30 31 33 135 135 135 135 135 135	212 212 212 213 213 213 213 213 213 213	$\begin{array}{c} & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & &$	$\begin{array}{c} \leftarrow 136 \\ \swarrow 46 \\ \hline 71 \rightarrow 0 \\ 211 \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ $	$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} 9 \\ 9 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\$	200 200 200 200 200 200 480 200 480 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 2
29 Kamm / Van Horn	30 Kamm / SR 99 SB Off Ramp	31 Bethel / SR 99 NB On Ramp	32 Bethel / Golden State Blvd	33 Bethel Kamm	34 Kamm / Academy	35 Bethel / SR 99 NB Off Ramp
$\begin{array}{c} \overbrace{}{} \\ \overbrace{}{} \\ \overbrace{}{} \\ \phantom{aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa$				LEGEND © XX	STUDY AREA INTERSECTI	ONS
36 Bethel / Parkway-SR 99 SB On Ramp	37 Site Access / Golden State	38 Site Access / Dockery	39 Site Access / Mountain View		PROJECT SITE	

Source: Peters Engineering Group.



Year 2035 No Project Weekend Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes

Exhibit 4.12-26



Michael Brandman Associates

Exhibit 4.12-27 Year 2035 With Project Phases 1 and 2 Lane Configurations and Intersection Control

31130002 • 02/2012 | 4.12-27_2035_config_and_intersect_1_and2.cdr

			4			
((+07+))025 (01)(10)(+07+)915 (01)(10)(10)(10)(10)(10)(10)(10)(10)(10)	$(\begin{matrix} (1) \\ (2) \\ $		← 1043(1593)	← 611(904)	(100) (000	$ \begin{array}{c} (821)(57) & \swarrow \\ (821)(57) & \longrightarrow \\ (712)(26) & \longrightarrow \\ (712)(26) & \longrightarrow \\ (7110)(26) & \longrightarrow \\ (7110) $
$1100(2404) \longrightarrow \qquad \stackrel{?}{\underset{29(72)}{1}} \qquad \stackrel{?}{\underset{1}{\underset{5}{3}}} \qquad \qquad$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	3 Floral-Highland / SR 99 NB Loop Ramp	$803(1523) \longrightarrow \begin{cases} 7 \\ \hline \hline \\ \hline$	445(415) → (2,1,1) 445(415) → (2,1,1) 5 Highland / SR 99 SB On Ramp	$\begin{array}{c} 74(284) \xrightarrow{-\nearrow} & \uparrow & \uparrow \\ 71(241) & \downarrow & \uparrow \\ 34(88) & \downarrow & \downarrow \\ 1 & \downarrow & \downarrow \\ 2 & \downarrow & \downarrow \\ 1 & \downarrow \\ $	$\begin{array}{c c} 151(335) \checkmark^{\mathcal{A}} & & \uparrow & \uparrow \\ 189(544) \rightarrow & & \downarrow \\ 37(180) \frown & & \downarrow \\ & \downarrow \\ & & \downarrow \\ & \downarrow $
$ \begin{array}{c} (02) \\ ($	(602) (602) (52 (6)2 (52	K─ 198(283) ← 631(857)	$(\begin{array}{c}(1)\\(1)\\(1)\\(1)\\(1)\\(1)\\(1)\\(1)\\(1)\\(1)\\$	$(1+1) \downarrow (2+2) \downarrow (1+1) \downarrow (2+2) \downarrow (2+2$	$ \begin{array}{c} (931)\\ (021)887 \longrightarrow \\ (021)887 \longrightarrow \\ (021)887 \longrightarrow \\ (021)87 \longrightarrow \\ $	$ \begin{array}{c} (181)_{89} \\ (181)_{89} \\ \end{pmatrix} \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} (181)_{89} \\ (181)_{8$
$\begin{array}{c} 18(20) & \checkmark \\ 302(683) & \rightarrow \\ 40(88) & \checkmark \\ \end{array} \overbrace{E}^{(2)} \underset{E}{\otimes} \underset{E}{\underset{E}{\otimes} \underset{E}{\underset{E}{\otimes} \underset{E}{\underset{E}{\otimes} \underset{E}{\underset{E}{\otimes} \underset{E}{\underset{E}{\otimes} \underset{E}{\underset{E}{\underset{E}{\otimes} \underset{E}{\underset{E}{\underset{E}{\underset{E}{\underset{E}{\underset{E}{\underset{E}{E$	623(817) → 61(204) → 9 Second SL/SF 99 SB Ramps	$144(92) \xrightarrow{\sim} 1 \\ 681(967) \xrightarrow{\sim} 1 \\ 1 \\ 10 \\ Second SI/SF 99 NB Ramps$	$\begin{array}{c} 68(117) \checkmark 7\\ 542(710) \rightarrow \\ 245(409) \checkmark \\ 11 \\ \end{array} \qquad \qquad$	97(85) 393(324) → 39(63) → 12 Mountain View // Highland	$\begin{array}{c} 24(63) \xrightarrow{-7} & \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow \\ 502(629) \xrightarrow{-} \\ 26(39) \xrightarrow{-} & \oplus \ \oplus \$	$120(174) \xrightarrow{\sim} 1 \qquad \uparrow \qquad$
$(b) = 0 \\ (b) = 0 \\ (c) $	$(\begin{array}{c} (1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1$	← 1430(1984) ∠ 59(249)	K—546(820) ←1489(2233)	← 1789(2706)	(1000000000000000000000000000000000000	$ \begin{array}{c} (8) \\ (8) \\ (9) \\ (1) \\ (8) \\ (1) $
$\begin{array}{ccc} 49(61) & & & & \\ 800(1599) & \rightarrow & & & \\ 138(224) & & & & \\ \hline & & & & \\ \hline & & & & \\ \hline & & & &$	$1002(2(197) \rightarrow) \begin{array}{c} & & & \\ 125(165) & & & \\ \hline \hline & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ \hline \hline \\ \hline \hline & & & \\ \hline \hline \hline \\ \hline \hline \\ \hline \hline \hline \\ \hline \hline \hline \\ \hline \hline \hline \hline \hline \\ \hline \hline \hline \hline \hline \hline \hline \hline \hline \\ \hline \hline$	1543(3759) → 214(437) → 17 Mountain View / \$R 99 SB On Ramp	304(936) →7 1239(2823) → 18 Mountain View / \$R 99 NB On Ramp	$1239(2823) \longrightarrow \begin{cases} 7 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\$	$\begin{array}{c} 422(1099) \xrightarrow{\sim} 7 \\ 790(1556) \xrightarrow{\rightarrow} \\ 127(368) \xrightarrow{\sim} \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \widehat{gg} \\ $	$\begin{array}{ccc} 44(180) & \checkmark^{7} \\ 588(1707) & \rightarrow \\ 72(99) & \checkmark \\ & \overbrace{\mathbb{E}} & \overbrace{\mathbb{E}} & \overbrace{\mathbb{E}} \\ & \overbrace{\mathbb{E}} & \overbrace{\mathbb{E}} & \overbrace{\mathbb{E}} \\ & \overbrace{\mathbb{E}} & \overbrace{\mathbb{E}} & \overbrace{\mathbb{E}} \\ & \\ & \\ & \\ & \\ & \\ & \\ & \\ & \\ & \\$
$ \begin{array}{c} (E11) \\ (E11) $	(SEC)902 (SEC)902	(2)2 2)2 2)2 2)2 2)2 2)2 2)2 2)2 2)2 2)2	^K —68(251) ← 417(939)	$ \begin{array}{c} (0) \\ (0) $	$ \begin{array}{c} (151) \\ ($	$ \underbrace{ \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} $
$\begin{array}{cccc} 57(207) & & & & & \\ 590(1510) & \rightarrow & & & & \\ 34(112) & & & & & \\ \hline & & & & & \\ \hline & & & & & \\ \hline & & & &$	200(557) 375(911) → 36(155) → 10(155) →	4(2) → 2(2) → 24 Caruthers/ Dockery	50(266) →7 47(144) → 25 Golden State Bivd / Amber	$2(2) \xrightarrow{2} 15(20) \xrightarrow{2} 15(20) \xrightarrow{2} 2(2) \xrightarrow{2} 15(20) \xrightarrow$	$\begin{array}{c} 5(4) \stackrel{\mathcal{I}}{\longrightarrow} \\ 12(7) \stackrel{\mathcal{I}}{\longrightarrow} \\ 2(6) \stackrel{\mathcal{I}}{\longrightarrow} \\ 2\end{array} \stackrel{f}{\underset{\text{Call}}{\mapsto}} \stackrel{f}{\underset{\text{Call}}{\mapsto}} \begin{array}{c} \uparrow & \uparrow \\ \uparrow & \uparrow \\ \downarrow \\ \chi_{\text{Call}} \\ \chi_{\text{Call}} \\ \text{McCall} \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1(1) & \checkmark \\ 21(27) & \rightarrow \\ 1(1) & \checkmark \\ \end{array} \qquad \qquad$
(1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1)	← 69(84) ← 72(382) ←		(0000) (0000)	← 134(383) ∠ 59(107)	$(\begin{array}{c} (1000 \\ (1$	(1050) 052 ↓ ↓ ↓ 175(487)
$\begin{array}{c} 5(15) & \checkmark \\ 2(16) & \rightarrow \\ 2(2) & \searrow \\ 2(2) & \searrow \\ 2(2) & \swarrow \\ 8 & \approx \\ 8 & \approx \\ 8 & \times $	65(204) -	2(4) → ↑ ↑ (1888) 2(2) → 15 (1888) 15 (1889) 15 (1889) 16 (1889) 16 (1889) 16 (1889) 16 (1889) 16 (1889) 16 (1899) 16 (1899)	$\begin{array}{c c} 107(370) & \checkmark & \uparrow & \uparrow \\ 205(386) & \rightarrow \\ 48(143) & \checkmark & [16]{} \\ \hline \\ 32 \end{array} \qquad $	$\begin{array}{c} 184(134) \rightarrow \\ 174(556) \frown \\ \hline \\ 33 \end{array} \xrightarrow{\left(\begin{array}{c} 184(134) \\ 174(556) \end{array}\right)} \\ \hline \\ \end{array} \xrightarrow{\left(\begin{array}{c} 184(134) \\ 174(556) \\ 184(134) \\ 184(13$	$\begin{array}{c} 44(89) & \checkmark & \uparrow \\ 179(523) & \rightarrow \\ 64(273) & \checkmark & \uparrow \\ 1720(523) & \uparrow & \uparrow \\ 1720(523) & \uparrow & \uparrow \\ 1720(521) & \downarrow \\ 1720(521) & \uparrow \\ 1720(521) & \downarrow \\ 1720(521) & \downarrow$	(%) §) §) §) §) §) §) §) §) §) §
た 69(83) た 69(83) た 69(83) た 69(83) た 69(83)	← 64(170) ← 823(1566) ←	(22000 (26)190 ↓ (21) ↓ (21)	(621) (621) 195 ↓ (188) 195 ↓ 195 ↓ 100 100 100 100 100 100 100	LEGEND		
$\begin{array}{ccc} 61(292) & \nearrow & & & & \uparrow \\ 23(80) & \rightarrow & & & \uparrow \\ 53(214) & \searrow & & & & \vdots \\ \hline & & & & & & \\ \hline & & & & & \\ \hline & & & &$	80(313) → 133(602) → 133(502) → 133(5	Access / Dockery	82(124) →7 743(1003) → 39 Site Access / Mountain View	XX (YY)	STUDY AREA INTERSEC AM (PM) VOLUMES PROJECT SITE	CTIONS
				- (222)		

Source: Peters Engineering Group.



Exhibit 4.12-28 Year 2035 Plus Project Weekday Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes
$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} & & & \\ 9489 \\ 9780 \\ 9780 \\ 9$		← 2023	← 837 ← 818		281 1538 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 1
2723 → (¹ 102 → ²	$\begin{array}{c} 491 \xrightarrow{7} \\ 1911 \xrightarrow{7} \\ 652 \xrightarrow{7} \\ 7 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\ 7 \\$		1538 →	306 -√ ¹ 85 55 87	$\begin{array}{c} 568 \xrightarrow{-7} \\ 131 \xrightarrow{-} \\ 175 \xrightarrow{-} \\ 175 \xrightarrow{-} \\ 7568 \xrightarrow{-7} \\ 7568 $	$\begin{array}{c} 314 \xrightarrow{7} & \uparrow & \uparrow \\ 426 & 61 \xrightarrow{9} & 625 \\ & 61 \xrightarrow{9} & 625 \\ \end{array}$
Floral / SR 99 SB Off Ramp	2. Floral / Highland	3 Floral-Highland / SR 99 NB Loop Ramp	4. FLoral / SR 99 NB Off Ramp	5. Highland / SR 99 SB On Ramp	6 Highland / Rose	7. Highland / Nebraska
$\begin{array}{c} 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 &$	$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ \end{array} \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ \end{array}} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ \end{array}} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ \end{array}} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ \end{array} \end{array}{c} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ \end{array} \end{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array}{c} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ \end{array} \end{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array}{c} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ \end{array} \end{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array}$		$\begin{array}{c} & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & $	$\begin{array}{c} & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & $	$\begin{array}{c} & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & $	55 - 7
58 52 58 58 52 58	251	61 19 19 19 19 19	463 - 200	21 22 22 24	26 J SC E	54 7
8 Nebraska / Thompson	9 Second St / SR 99 SB Ramps	10 Second St / SF 99 NB Ramps	11 Second St / Whitson	12 Mountain View / Highland	13 Mountain View / Thompson	14. Mountain Vew / McCall
$ \begin{array}{c} \downarrow \qquad \downarrow \qquad$	689 ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓	←2437 ∠~185	~_847 ← 2759	← 3133	¹⁵ ¹⁵	$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \end{array} \\ $
$\begin{array}{c} 1489 \rightarrow \\ 253 \rightarrow \\ 253 - $	$\begin{array}{c}1969 \rightarrow \\185 7\\187 7\\18$	$3609 \rightarrow 424 \rightarrow$	2700 →	$2716 \rightarrow 1 \qquad 1$	$\begin{array}{c}1436 \longrightarrow 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 374 \longrightarrow 374 & 587 \\ 374 & 587 \\ \end{array}$	$1539 \rightarrow 1 1 1$ $91 \rightarrow 1$ 25×20
15 Mountain View / Dockery	16 Mountain View / \$R 99 SB Off Ramp	17 Mountain View / \$R 99 SB On Ramp	18 Mountain View / SR 99 NB On Ramp	19 Mountain View / \$R 99 NB Off Ramp	20 Mountain View / Golden State Blvd	21. Mountain View / Bethel
$\begin{array}{c} 98 \\ 28 \\ 27 \\ 27 \\ 27 \\ 21 \\ 21 \\ 21 \\ 21 \\ 21$	$\begin{array}{c} 5 \\ 5 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\$		82 Ge 2 J J J 399 → 7 \ \ 1	$\begin{array}{c} & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ \end{array}$		$ \begin{array}{c} \overbrace{} \\ \overbrace{} \\ \overbrace{} \\ 26 \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \overbrace{} \\ \overbrace{}} \\ \overbrace{} \\ \overbrace{a}} \\ \overbrace{} \\ a$
114 - <u>2</u> 5 00	143 - 2 2 2 4		144 - 121 121 121 121 121	2-3	2-∡ "≑"	1-2
22 Mountain View / Academy	23 Mountain View / Mendocino	24 Caruthers / Dockery	25 Golden State Blvd / Amber	26 Kamm / Thompson	27. Kamm / McCall	28 Kamm / Dockery
$ \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} $ } \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} } \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\	→ → 195 195	2.78	$\begin{array}{c} 8246\\ 647\\ 747\\ 747\\ 747\\ 747\\ 747\\ 747\\ 7$	← 136 ∠~ 86	99572 119 119 119 119 119 119 119 11	£ ~347 ↓ 102
	198 - 2	- <u>72</u> 543 —	$ \begin{array}{c} 386 \longrightarrow \\ 143 \longrightarrow \\ 143 \longrightarrow \\ 8 & \text{\ensuremath{\mathbb{G}}} & \text{\ensuremath{\mathbb{G}}} \\ 8 & \text{\ensuremath{\mathbb{G}}} & \text{\ensuremath{\mathbb{C}}} \end{array} $	$\begin{array}{c c} 71 \longrightarrow & & \\ 428 \longrightarrow & & \\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 278 \longrightarrow \\ 212 \longrightarrow \\$	314
29 Kamm / Yan Horn	30 Kamm / SR 99 SB Off Ramp	31 Bethel / SR 99 NB On Ramp	32 Bethel / Golden State Blvd	33 Bethel Kamm	34 Kamm / Academy	35 Bethel / SR 99 NB Off Ramp
	235 → 1734		12 001 ← 1001 ← 1198	LEGEND		
$\begin{array}{c} 135 \longrightarrow \\ 71 \longrightarrow \\ 161 \longrightarrow \\ $	392 → 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		$968 \rightarrow$	۵	STUDY AREA INTERSEC	TIONS
36 Bethel / Parkway SR 99 SB On Ramp	37 Site Access / Golden State	38 Stite Access / Dockery	39 Site Access / Mountain View	XX ⊠	SATURDAY VOLUMES PROJECT SITE	

Source: Peters Engineering Group.



Exhibit 4.12-29 Year 2035 Plus Project Saturday Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes

Table 4.12-31:	Year	2035	Intersection	Operations
----------------	------	------	--------------	------------

			•	Year 2035 No	Project	t		Year 2035 Plus Project							
		AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour Weekend						AM Peak	Hour	PM Peak	Hour	Weeke	nd		
Intersection	Control	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS		
Floral/SR-99 SB offramp	Signal	18.0	В	141.3	F	153.9	F	18.3	В	148.9	F	166.9	F		
Floral/Highland	Signal	34.0	C	116.4	F	166.6	F	37.4	D	146.6	F	198.9	F		
Floral/SR-99 NB offramp	Signal	15.5	В	26.6	C	41.9	D	18.4	В	65.7	E	95.9	F		
Highland/SR-99 SB onramp	Signal	15.8	В	23.9	C	23.2	C	26.9	C	43.2	D	51.4	D		
Highland/Rose	TWS	*	F	*	F	*	F	*	F	*	F	*	F		
Highland/Nebraska	Signal	24.7	C	91.6	F	48.5	D	26.4	C	116.8	F	62.3	E		
Nebraska/Thompson	AWS	94.9	F	167.1	F	118.5	F	116.7	F	234.8	F	193.7	F		
Second/SR-99 SB	OWS	*	F	*	F	104.1	F	*	F	*	F	*	F		
Second/SR-99 NB	OWS	167.3	F	48.0	Е	22.8	C	569.7	F	140.5	F	59.4	F		
Second/Whitson	Signal	31.6	C	107.1	F	63.4	Е	44.6	D	202.1	F	175.3	F		
Mountain View/Highland	Signal	44.4	D	126.0	F	60.6	Е	58.2	Е	191.5	F	128.1	F		
Mountain View/Thompson	TWS	315.5	F	*	F	*	F	924.6	F	*	F	*	F		
Mountain View/McCall	AWS	179.5	F	458.2	F	232.4	F	324.9	F	837.9	F	726.8	F		
Mountain View/Dockery	TWS	51.1	F	*	F	203.3	F	*	F	*	F	*	F		
Mountain View/SR-99 SB offramp	TWS	579.8	F	*	F	273.0	F	*	F	*	F	*	F		
Mountain View/SR-99 SB onramp	Yield	1.9	A	7.2	A	2.3	A	19.8	C	504.7	F	193.1	F		
Mountain View/SR-99 NB onramp	Yield	3.4	A	4.8	A	4.4	A	247.8	F	1257.7	F	2409.5	F		

Table 4.12-31	(cont.):	Year	2035	Intersection	Operations
---------------	----------	------	------	--------------	------------

			١	Year 2035 No	Project	t		Year 2035 Plus Project							
		AM Peak	Hour	PM Peak	Hour	Weeke	nd	AM Peak	Hour	PM Peak	Hour	Weeke	nd		
Intersection	Control	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS		
Mountain View/SR-99 NB offramp	OWS	383.7	F	*	F	388.5	F	*	F	*	F	*	F		
Mountain View/Golden State	Signal	20.1	C	31.4	C	48.1	D	165.3	F	711.3	F	948.9	F		
Mountain View/Bethel	TWS	67.2	F	312.4	F	27.8	D	*	F	*	F	*	F		
Mountain View/Academy	TWS	*	F	*	F	*	F	*	F	*	F	*	F		
Mountain View/Mendocino	Signal	18.1	В	16.0	В	9.0	A	63.1	E	342.0	F	257.5	F		
Caruthers/Dockery	OWS	8.7	A	8.7	Α	8.7	A	8.7	A	8.7	Α	8.9	A		
Golden State /Amber	OWS	15.1	C	*	F	*	F	17.9	C	*	F	*	F		
Kamm/Thompson	OWS	9.1	A	9.4	Α	9.2	A	9.1	A	9.4	Α	9.3	A		
Kamm/McCall	TWS	10.9	В	11.6	В	10.0	A	11.3	В	12.7	В	11.2	В		
Kamm/Dockery	TWS	9.0	A	9.0	A	9.0	A	9.0	A	9.1	A	9.1	A		
Kamm/Van Horn	TWS	9.1	A	9.3	Α	9.1	A	10.0	В	12.5	В	13.1	В		
Kamm/SR-99 SB offramp	TWS	7.5	A	11.0	В	8.0	Α	8.5	A	13.7	В	10.7	В		
Bethel/SR-99 NB onramp	OWS	16.2	C	25.2	D	16.4	C	17.6	C	33.4	D	22.3	C		
Bethel/Golden State	AWS	18.8	C	188.5	F	137.7	F	48.2	E	305.6	F	285.7	F		
Bethel/Kamm	AWS	13.5	В	33.7	D	14.6	В	22.0	C	134.9	F	89.5	F		
Kamm/Academy	AWS	25.3	D	215.5	F	115.9	F	69.1	F	416.5	F	328.0	F		
Bethel/SR-99 NB offramp	OWS	13.0	В	42.6	E	14.2	В	16.5	C	187.5	F	36.5	E		
Bethel/Parkway-SR-99 SB onramp	OWS	15.2	C	367.2	F	16.3	C	20.1	C	*	F	298.8	F		
Golden State/Phase 1 Access	OWS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	*	F	*	F	*	F		

Table 4.12-31	(cont.): Yea	r 2035 Intersection	Operations
---------------	--------------	---------------------	------------

			۱	(ear 2035 N	o Project			Year 2035 Plus Project								
		AM Peak	Hour	PM Peak	Hour	Weeke	end	AM Peak	Hour	PM Peak	Hour	Weeke	Weekend			
Intersection	Control	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS			
Dockery/Phase 2 Access	OWS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	9.2	A	13.5	В	12.9	В			
Mountain View/Phase 3 Access	OWS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	*	F	*	F	*	F			
Notes: * Delay exceeds calculation limits. Bold denotes unacceptable intersection N/A = Not Applicable; intersection d Source: Peters Engineering Group, 20	on operation. oes not exist)12.	under Year 20	35 No Pro	oject condition	ns											

Table 4.12-32: Year 2035 Roadway Segment Operations

					Year 2035 N	o Projec	t		Year 2035 Plus Project						
		Lanes	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		Weekend		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		Weekend		
1	Road Segment	Median	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	
Mountain View	Highland to Thompson	2U (<2)	815	C	1,179	E	1,188	E	967	C	1,526	E	1,608	E	
Avenue	Thompson to McCall	2U (<2)	921	C	1,424	E	1,115	D	1,105	D	1,853	E	1,635	E	
	McCall to Dockery	2U (<2)	1,015	C	1,481	E	1,180	E	1,445	E	2,446	E	2,338	E	
	Dockery to SR-99	2U (<2)	1,178	E	1,403	Е	983	C	2,619	E	4,572	Е	4,627	E	
	SR-99 to Golden State	2U (<2)	1,502	E	1,828	Е	1,342	Е	3,129	E	5,729	Е	6,059	E	
	Golden State to Bethel	4D-LT (<2)	1,407	В	1,687	В	2,031	В	2,345	В	3,908	E	4,727	E	
	Bethel to Academy	2U (<2)	1,118	D	1,199	E	896	C	1,913	E	3,080	E	3,178	E	

Table 4.12-32 (cont.): Year 2035 Roadway Segment Operations

				Year 2035 N	:t		Year 2035 Plus Project							
		Lanes	AM Peak	Hour	PM Peak	Hour	Weeke	end	AM Peak	Hour	PM Peak Hour		Weekend	
	Road Segment	Median	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS
Mountain View	Academy to Mendocino	2U (<2)	1,200	E	1,415	E	1,049	C	1,800	E	2,817	E	2,717	E
Avenue (cont.)	Mendocino to Madsen	2U (<2)	1,046	C	1,145	D	841	C	1,337	E	1,840	E	1,684	E
	Madsen to Zediker	2U (<2)	1,014	C	1,133	D	866	C	1,266	E	1,724	E	1,593	E
	Zediker to Fresno County Line	2U (<2)	1,043	C	1,110	D	849	C	1,259	E	1,621	E	1,472	E
Kamm Avenue	Highland to Thompson	2U (<2)	30	В	47	В	20	В	33	В	57	В	33	В
	Thompson to McCall	2U (<2)	24	В	39	В	24	В	27	В	49	В	37	В
	McCall to Dockery	2U (<2)	39	В	43	В	40	В	43	В	56	В	56	В
	Dockery to Van Horn	2U (<2)	39	В	44	В	40	В	43	В	57	В	56	В
	Van Horn to SR-99	2U (<2)	49	В	81	В	79	В	251	В	443	В	520	В
	SR-99 to Academy	2U (<2)	668	В	987	C	727	C	848	C	1,411	E	1,235	E
McCall Avenue	Valley View to Mountain View	2U (<2)	756	C	1,231	Е	633	В	969	C	1,685	E	1,171	E
	Mountain View to Caruthers	2U (<2)	725	C	1,233	E	646	В	757	C	1,315	E	746	C
Dockery Avenue	Mountain View to Caruthers	2U (<2)	332	В	523	В	357	В	794	C	1,385	E	1,363	E
Golden State Boulevard	Nebraska to Saginaw	4D-LT (<2)	951	В	1,500	В	1,280	В	1,487	В	2,806	C	2,882	C
	Saginaw to Phase 1 main site access	4D-LT (<2)	835	В	1,444	В	1,707	В	1,413	В	2,866	C	3,444	E
	Phase 1 main site access to Mountain View	4D-LT (<2)	835	В	1,444	В	1,707	В	1,859	В	4,538	E	5,634	Е
	Mountain View to Amber	4D-LT (<2)	745	В	1,536	В	2,126	В	1,041	В	2,299	В	3,068	C

Table 4.12-32 (cont.): Year 2035 Roadway Segment Operations

				Year 2035 N	t	Year 2035 Plus Project								
			AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		Weekend		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		Weekend	
	Road Segment	Median	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS
Golden State Boulevard (<i>cont.</i>)	Amber to Bethel	4D-LT (<2)	730	В	1,407	В	1,424	В	1,026	В	2,169	В	2,365	В
Notes: 2U: 2-lane undivided Values in parentheses Bold denotes unaccep Source: Peters Engine	Notes: 2U: 2-lane undivided 4D-LT: 4-lane divided with left-turn lanes Values in parentheses indicate number of signalized intersections per mile Bold denotes unacceptable roadway segment operation. Source: Peters Engineering Group, 2012.													

Table 4.12-33: Year 2035 Grade Crossing Analysis

		Year 2035 No Project Year 2035 Plus Project								
Crossing	Trains per Day	Average Daily Trips	Predicted Accident Frequency per Year	Warrant 9	Trains per Day	Average Daily Trips	Predicted Accident Frequency per Year	Warrant 9		
Highland north of Golden State	14	19,000	0.027	N/R	14	24,119	0.033	N/R		
Floral east of Front Street	14	24,300	0.033	N/R	14	27,179	0.033	N/R		
Thompson north of Front Street	14	5,280	0.007	Met	14	7,198	0.010	Met		
First Street east of Front Street	14	5,150	0.007	N/R	14	6,110	0.009	N/R		
Second Street east of Front Street	14	15,940	0.022	N/R	14	18,175	0.024	N/R		
Third Street east of Front Street	14	5,250	0.007	Met	14	6,210	0.009	Met		
Nebraska east of Golden State	14	3,690	0.006	Met	14	6,569	0.010	Met		
Saginaw east of Golden State	14	1,100	0.002	Met	14	2,060	0.003	Met		
Mountain View east of Golden State	14	16,870	0.022	N/R	14	41,815	0.039	N/R		
Bethel east of Golden State	14	11,400	0.017	Met	14	15,238	0.022	Met		

Table 4.12-33 (cont.): Year 2035 Grade Crossing Analysis

		Year 20	35 No Project		Year 2035 Plus Project						
Crossing	Trains per Day	Average Daily Trips	Predicted Accident Frequency per Year	Warrant 9	Trains per Day	Average Daily Trips	Predicted Accident Frequency per Year	Warrant 9			
Stroud east of Golden State	14	3,255	0.005	Met	14	4,215	0.006	Met			
Notes: Warrant 9 = Manual on Uniform Traffic Co N/R = Not Relevant Bold denotes unacceptable grade crossing of Source: Peters Engineering Group, 2012.	ntrol Devices Si peration.	gnal Warrant 9 (l	ntersection Near a Grade C	Crossing) Analy	ysis						

Floral Avenue/Highland Avenue

At the intersection of Floral Avenue and Highland Avenue, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS D during the AM peak hour, and a cumulative substandard LOS F during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour.

The intersection is currently signalized. The intersection shall be widened to provide a second leftturn lane, a third through lane, and a second right-turn lane on the eastbound approach, a third through lane and a dedicated right-turn lane on the westbound approach, and a second left-turn lane on the southbound approach. The configuration of the intersection of Floral Avenue and Highland Avenue would be as follows:

Eastbound: Two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and two right-turn lanes Westbound: Two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and one right-turn lane Northbound: Two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane Southbound: Two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and two right-turn lanes

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS C during the AM peak hour, LOS D during the PM peak hour, and LOS E during the Saturday peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

The calculated LOS D during the PM peak hour and LOS E during the weekend peak hour are considered the best-case scenario, because additional lanes provide only marginal improvements in delay, are not warranted based on the traffic volumes in the lanes, and reduce ease of access for pedestrians by increasing the width of the intersection. Because the City of Selma's pending General Plan Update considers LOS D as acceptable, this mitigation would be substandard during the PM peak hour only until the General Plan Update is in force.

Because of physical constraints, roadway alignment constraints, and right-of-way constraints, it is possible that the improvements recommended above may not be feasible. In the event that design reveals the recommended improvements, or portions thereof, are not feasible, the impact will not be fully mitigated.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-3a.

Floral Avenue/SR-99 Northbound Offramp

At the intersection of Floral Avenue and the SR-99 northbound offramp, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS E during the PM peak hour and a cumulative substandard LOS F during the Saturday peak hour.

The intersection is currently signalized. The intersection shall be widened to provide a second leftturn lane on the northbound approach. The configuration of the intersection of Floral Avenue and the SR-99 northbound offramp would be as follows: Eastbound: Two through lanes Westbound: Two through lanes Northbound: Two left-turn lanes and one right-turn lane Southbound: None

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS B during the worst-case peak hour. The City of Selma development impact fee program includes \$3,000,000 for improvements at the Floral Avenue/SR-99 interchange. Payment of fees in accordance with Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a would satisfy the applicant's obligation in this case.

Highland Avenue/SR-99 Southbound Onramp

At the intersection of Highland Avenue and the SR-99 southbound onramp, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS D during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour.

The intersection is currently signalized. The intersection shall be widened to provide a second leftturn lane on the southbound approach. The configuration of the intersection of Highland Avenue and the SR-99 southbound onramp would be as follows:

Eastbound: Two right-turn lanes Westbound: None Northbound: Two through lanes and one right-turn lane Southbound: Two left-turn lanes (minimum 275 feet) and two through lanes

This configuration requires widening of the onramp to receive traffic from the two southbound leftturn lanes.

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS B during the worst-case peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-3b.

Highland Avenue/Rose Avenue

At the intersection of Highland Avenue and Rose Avenue, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS F during all peak hours.

Traffic signal warrants are expected to be met at the intersection. The intersection shall be signalized with protected left-turn phasing, and widened to provide two left-turn lanes and a right-turn lane on the eastbound approach, and a left-turn lane and a right-turn lane on the westbound approach. The configuration of the intersection of Highland Avenue and Rose Avenue would be as follows:

Eastbound: Two left-turn lanes, one through lane, and one right-turn lane Westbound: One left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane Northbound: One left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane Southbound: One left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS C during the worst-case peak hour. The City of Selma development impact fee program includes \$281,250 for traffic signals at the intersection of Highland Avenue and Rose Avenue. Payment of fees in accordance with Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a would satisfy the applicant's obligation in this case.

Highland Avenue/Nebraska Avenue

At the intersection of Highland Avenue and Nebraska Avenue, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS F during all peak hours.

The intersection is currently signalized. The intersection shall be widened to provide two left-turn lanes and a right-turn lane on the eastbound approach and a left-turn lane and a right-turn lane on the westbound approach. The configuration of the intersection of Highland Avenue and Nebraska Avenue would be as follows:

Eastbound: Two left-turn lanes, one through lane, and one right-turn lane Westbound: One left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane Northbound: One left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane Southbound: One left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS C during the worst-case peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-3c.

Nebraska Avenue/Thompson Avenue

At the intersection of Nebraska Avenue and Thompson Avenue, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS F during all peak hours.

Traffic signal warrants are expected to be met at the intersection. The intersection shall be signalized with protected left-turn phasing and widened to provide a left-turn lane on all four approaches and right-turn lanes on the eastbound and northbound approaches. The configuration of the intersection of Nebraska Avenue and Thompson Avenue would be as follows:

Eastbound: One left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane Westbound: One left-turn lane (minimum 275 feet) and one through lane with a shared right turn Northbound: One left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane Southbound: One left-turn lane and one through lane with a shared right turn

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS C during the worst-case peak hour. The City of Selma development impact fee program includes \$312,500 for

traffic signals at the intersection of Nebraska Avenue and Thompson Avenue. Payment of fees in accordance with Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a would satisfy the applicant's obligation in this case.

Because of physical constraints, roadway alignment constraints, and right-of-way constraints, it is possible that the improvements recommended above may not be feasible. In the event that design reveals the recommended improvements, or portions thereof, are not feasible, the impact will not be fully mitigated.

Considering that the City of Selma's pending General Plan Update considers LOS D as acceptable, the following configuration is recommended after the General Plan Update is in force:

Eastbound: One left-turn lane and, one through lane with a shared right turn Westbound: One left-turn lane (minimum 275 feet) and one through lane with a shared right turn Northbound: One left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane Southbound: One left-turn lane and one through lane with a shared right turn

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-3d.

Second Street/SR-99 Southbound Ramps

At the intersection of Second Street and the SR-99 southbound ramps, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS F during all peak hours.

Traffic signal warrants are expected to be met at the intersection. The intersection shall be signalized with protected left-turn phasing. The existing configuration of the intersection will remain. With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS C during the worst-case peak hour. The City of Selma development impact fee program includes \$1,500,000 for improvements at the Second Street/SR-99 interchange. Payment of fees in accordance with Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a would satisfy the applicant's obligation in this case.

Second Street/SR-99 Northbound Ramps

At the intersection of Second Street and the SR-99 northbound ramps, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS F during all peak hours.

Traffic signal warrants are expected to be met at the intersection. The intersection shall be signalized with protected left-turn phasing and widened to provide a dedicated left-turn lane on the eastbound approach. The configuration of the intersection of Second Street and the SR-99 northbound ramps would be as follows:

Eastbound: One left-turn lane and two through lanes Westbound: Two through lanes with a shared right turn Northbound: One shared left-turn/through lane and one right-turn lane Southbound: None With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS C during the worst-case peak hour. The City of Selma development impact fee program includes \$1,500,000 for improvements at the Second Street/SR-99 interchange. Payment of fees in accordance with Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a would satisfy the applicant's obligation in this case.

Second Street/Whitson Street

At the intersection of Second Street and Whitson Street, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS D during the AM peak hour, and a cumulative substandard LOS F during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour.

The intersection is currently signalized. The intersection shall be widened to provide a second leftturn lane and one right-turn lane on all four approaches and a third through lane on the northbound and southbound approaches. The configuration of the intersection of Second Street and Whitson Street would be as follows (assuming Whitson Street is the north-south street):

Eastbound: Two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane Westbound: Two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane Northbound: Two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and one right-turn lane Southbound: One left-turn lane and three through lanes with a shared right turn

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS C during the AM peak hour and LOS D during the PM and Saturday peak hours. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

The calculated LOS D during the PM and weekend peak hour is considered the best-case scenario, because additional lanes provide only marginal improvements in delay, are not warranted based on the traffic volumes in the lanes, and reduce ease of access for pedestrians by increasing the width of the intersection. Since the City of Selma's pending General Plan Update considers LOS D as acceptable, this mitigation would be substandard (by the City's standards) only until the General Plan Update is in force.

Because of physical constraints, roadway alignment constraints, and right-of-way constraints, it is possible that the improvements recommended above may not be feasible. In the event that design reveals the recommended improvements, or portions thereof, are not feasible, the impact will not be fully mitigated.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-3e.

Mountain View Avenue/Highland Avenue

At the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Highland Avenue, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS E during the AM peak hour, and a cumulative substandard LOS F during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour.

Transportation

The intersection is currently signalized. The intersection shall be widened to provide a second through lane on all four approaches and a right-turn lane on the northbound and southbound approaches. The configuration of the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Highland Avenue would be as follows:

Eastbound: One left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn Westbound: One left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn Northbound: One left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane Southbound: One left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS C during the worst-case peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-3f.

Mountain View Avenue/Thompson Avenue

At the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Thompson Avenue, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS F during all peak hours.

Traffic signal warrants are expected to be met at the intersection. The intersection shall be signalized with protected left-turn phasing and widened to provide one left-turn lane and two through lanes on all four approaches. The configuration of the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Thompson Avenue would be as follows:

Eastbound: One left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn Westbound: One left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn Northbound: One left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn Southbound: One left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS C during the worst-case peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-3g.

Mountain View Avenue/McCall Avenue

At the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and McCall Avenue, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS F during all peak hours.

Traffic signal warrants are expected to be met at the intersection. The intersection shall be signalized with protected left-turn phasing and widened to provide a dedicated left-turn lane on all approaches, two left-turn lanes on the southbound approach, and a dedicated right-turn lane on the westbound

approach. The configuration of the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and McCall Avenue would be as follows:

Eastbound: One left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn Westbound: One left-turn lane (minimum 300 feet), two through lanes, and one right-turn lane Northbound: One left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn Southbound: Two left-turn lanes and two through lanes with a shared right turn

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS C during the worst-case peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-3h.

Mountain View Avenue/Dockery Avenue

At the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Dockery Avenue, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS F during all peak hours.

Traffic signal warrants are expected to be met at the intersection. The intersection shall be signalized with protected left-turn phasing and widened. The configuration of the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Dockery Avenue would be as follows:

Eastbound: Two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and one right-turn lane Westbound: Two left-turn lanes (minimum 1,225 feet), three through lanes, and one right-turn lane Northbound: Two left-turn lanes (minimum 350 feet), one through lane, and two right-turn lanes Southbound: Two left-turn lanes, one through lane, and one right-turn lane

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS C during the AM peak hour, LOS E during the PM peak hour, and LOS F during the Saturday peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

The mitigation recommended above reflects our opinion of the most practical approach to the intersection configuration. If the City of Selma considers triple left-turn lanes acceptable, the intersection could operate at LOS D during the Saturday peak hour if the westbound approach is constructed with three left-turn lanes and three through lanes.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-3i.

Mountain View Avenue/SR-99 Southbound Offramp

At the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and the SR-99 southbound offramp, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS F during all peak hours.

The Mountain View Avenue interchange on SR-99 should be reconstructed as a Type L-9 interchange, which is described in Chapter 500 of the Caltrans Highway Design Manual dated

September 1, 2006. The Type L-9 interchange eliminates left turns from Mountain View Avenue to the freeway onramps and replaces them with loop onramps that are entered from the right lane of Mountain View Avenue. (For reference purposes, the existing interchange on SR-180 at Marks Avenue in Fresno, California is relatively new and represents an example of a Type L-9 interchange.)

The configuration of the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and the SR-99 southbound on and offramps would be as follows:

Three through lanes and one right-turn lane or slip ramp to SR-99 southbound
direct onramp
Three through lanes and one right-turn lane or slip ramp to SR-99 southbound loop
onramp
None
Two left-turn lanes and three right-turn lanes

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS B during the AM peak hour, LOS C during the PM peak hour, and LOS D during the Saturday peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

The calculated LOS D during the weekend peak hour is considered the best-case scenario, because additional lanes provide only marginal improvements in delay, are not warranted based on the traffic volumes in the lanes, and reduce ease of access for pedestrians by increasing the width of the intersection. Considering that the City of Selma's pending General Plan Update considers LOS D as acceptable, this mitigation would be substandard (by the City's standards) only until the General Plan Update is in force and the intersection is annexed into the City of Selma.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-3j.

Mountain View Avenue/SR-99 Southbound Onramp

At the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and the SR-99 southbound onramp, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS F during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure TRANS-3j would result in acceptable levels of service at this intersection.

Mountain View Avenue/SR-99 Northbound Onramp

At the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and the SR-99 northbound onramp, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS F during all peak hours.

The reconfiguration of the Mountain View Avenue/SR-99 interchange to a Type L-9 configuration would yield the following:

Eastbound: Three through lanes and one right-turn lane or slip ramp to SR-99 northbound loop onramp

Westbound: Three through lanes and one right-turn lane or slip ramp to SR-99 northbound direct onramp Northbound: Two left-turn lanes and one right-turn lane Southbound: None

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS A during the worst-case peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-3j.

Mountain View Avenue/SR-99 Northbound Offramp

At the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and the SR-99 northbound offramp, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS F during all peak hours.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure TRANS-3j would result in acceptable levels of service at this intersection.

Mountain View Avenue/Golden State Boulevard

At the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Golden State Boulevard, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS F during all peak hours.

This mitigation is identical to that required for Phase 2 of the project with the exception of the length of the turn lanes. The intersection is currently signalized and is adjacent to a railroad track. In addition to the improvements required for Phase 1 of the project, the intersection shall be widened to provide a third through lane and a second right-turn lane on all four approaches. The configuration of the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Golden State Boulevard would be as follows:

Eastbound: Two left-turn lanes (minimum 825 feet), three through lanes, and two right-turn lanes Westbound: Two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and two right-turn lanes Northbound: Two left-turn lanes (minimum 350 feet), three through lanes, and two right-turn lanes Southbound: Two left-turn lanes (minimum 450 feet), three through lanes, and two right-turn lanes

Modification of the traffic signal system at the intersection shall include installation of pre-signals at the existing at-grade railroad crossing.

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS C during the AM peak hour, LOS E during the PM peak hour, and LOS F during the Saturday peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure TRANS-3k would result in acceptable levels of service at this intersection.

The proposed intersection configuration is considered the maximum feasible intersection configuration. Further improvements could be achieved by implementing the ultimate mitigation as described below.

Ultimate Mitigation

To alleviate the severe congestion and long queues associated with the mitigation described above at the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Golden State Boulevard, especially when trains pass by, an ultimate solution involving a grade separation should be considered. Such a project would require a substantial amount of engineering study to investigate feasible alternatives. A similar process is underway in Fresno, California for the proposed SR-99 interchange at Veterans Boulevard, which is also adjacent to Golden State Boulevard and the UPRR railroad. Potential alternatives for the Veterans Boulevard interchange project are similar to those that may be considered at the Mountain View Avenue/Golden State Boulevard intersection.

Mountain View Avenue/Bethel Avenue

At the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Bethel Avenue, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS F during all peak hours.

Traffic signal warrants are expected to be met at the intersection. In addition to the mitigations required for Phase 2 of the project (signalization and widening), the intersection shall be widened to provide a second through lane on the northbound and southbound approaches. The configuration of the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Bethel Avenue would be as follows:

Eastbound: One left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn Westbound: One left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn Northbound: One left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn Southbound: One left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS C during the worst-case peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program. Measure C Rural Project I is currently in the design phase and is funded to construct widening of Mountain View Avenue from Bethel Avenue to the Tulare County line.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-31.

Mountain View Avenue/Academy Avenue

At the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Academy Avenue, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS F during all peak hours.

Traffic signal warrants are expected to be met at the intersection. In addition to the mitigations required for Phase 2 of the project (signalization and widening), the intersection shall be widened to provide a second left-turn lane on the eastbound approach and a dedicated right-turn lane on all

approaches. The configuration of the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Academy Avenue would be as follows:

Eastbound: Two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane Westbound: One left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane Northbound: One left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane Southbound: One left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS C during the worst-case peak hour.

Measure C Rural Project I is currently in the design phase and is funded to construct the portion of this improvement required as a mitigation for Phase 2 of the project. The second left-turn lane and dedicated right-turn lanes are not expected to be included in the Measure C project.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-3m.

Mountain View Avenue/Mendocino Avenue

At the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Mendocino Avenue, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS E during the AM peak hour, and a cumulative substandard LOS F during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour.

The intersection is currently signalized. In addition to the mitigations required for Phase 2 of the project (widening), the intersection shall be widened to provide a second left-turn lane on the eastbound approach and dedicated right-turn lanes on all four approaches. The configuration of the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Mendocino Avenue would be as follows:

Eastbound: Two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane Westbound: One left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane Northbound: One left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane Southbound: One left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS C during the worst-case peak hour.

Measure C Rural Project I is currently in the design phase and is funded to construct the portion of this improvement required as a mitigation for Phase 2 of the project. The second left-turn lane and dedicated right-turn lanes are not expected to be included in the Measure C project.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-3n.

Golden State Boulevard/Amber Avenue

At the intersection of Golden State Boulevard and Amber Avenue, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS F during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour.

The intersection shall be modified to allow right-in/right-out access only. Left turns movements will not be permitted at the intersection. With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS C during the PM peak hour and LOS F during the weekend peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-30.

Bethel Avenue/SR-99 Northbound Onramp

At the intersection of Bethel Avenue and the SR-99 northbound onramp, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS D during the PM peak hour.

The addition of lanes at the intersection of Bethel Avenue and the SR-99 northbound onramp will not mitigate the substandard levels of service. Traffic signal warrants are not expected to be satisfied. Only a few vehicles experience the substandard level of service. Therefore, there is no feasible mitigation.

Bethel Avenue/Golden State Boulevard

At the intersection of Bethel Avenue and Golden State Boulevard, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS E during the AM peak hour, and a cumulative substandard LOS F during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour.

Traffic signal warrants are expected to be met at the intersection. The intersection shall be signalized with protected left-turn phasing and widened to provide the following configuration (assuming Golden State Boulevard is the north-south street):

Eastbound: Two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane Westbound: One left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane Northbound: One left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane Southbound: Two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane

The traffic signal system at the intersection shall include installation of pre-signals at the existing atgrade railroad crossing or should be coordinated with traffic signals at the intersection of Bethel and Kamm Avenues.

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS C during the worst-case peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-3p.

Because of physical constraints (including the existing railroad), roadway alignment constraints, and right-of-way constraints, it is possible that the improvements recommended above may not be feasible. In the event that design reveals the recommended improvements, or portions thereof, are not feasible, the impact will not be fully mitigated.

Bethel Avenue/Kamm Avenue

At the intersection of Bethel Avenue and Kamm Avenue, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS F during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour.

Traffic signal warrants are expected to be met at the intersection. The intersection shall be signalized with protected left-turn phasing and widened to provide the following configuration (assuming for the descriptions below that Kamm Avenue is the north-south street):

Eastbound: One through lane and one right-turn lane Westbound: One left-turn lane and one through lane Northbound: One left-turn lane and one right-turn lane Southbound: None

The traffic signal system at the intersection shall include installation of pre-signals at the existing atgrade railroad crossing or should be coordinated with traffic signals at the intersection of Bethel Avenue and Golden State Boulevard.

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS C during the worst-case peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-3q.

Because of physical constraints (including the existing railroad), roadway alignment constraints, and right-of-way constraints, it is possible that the improvements recommended above may not be feasible. In the event that design reveals the recommended improvements, or portions thereof, are not feasible, the impact will not be fully mitigated.

Kamm Avenue/Academy Avenue

At the intersection of Kamm Avenue and Academy Avenue, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS F during all peak hours.

Traffic signal warrants are expected to be met at the intersection. The intersection shall be signalized with protected left-turn phasing and widened to provide the following configuration:

Eastbound: One left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane Westbound: One left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane Northbound: One left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane Southbound: One left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS C during the worst-case peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-3r.

Bethel Avenue/SR-99 Northbound Offramp

At the intersection of Bethel Avenue and the SR-99 northbound offramp, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS F during the PM peak hour and a cumulative substandard LOS E during the Saturday peak hour.

Traffic signal warrants are expected to be met at the intersection. The intersection shall be signalized with protected left-turn phasing and widened to provide a dedicated right-turn lane on the westbound approach. The configuration of the intersection of Bethel Avenue and the SR-99 northbound offramp would be as follows:

Eastbound: None Westbound: One left-turn lane and one right-turn lane Northbound: One through lane Southbound: One through lane

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS B during the worst-case peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-3s.

Bethel Avenue/Parkway Drive-SR-99 Southbound Onramp

At the intersection of Bethel Avenue and Parkway Drive/SR-99 southbound onramp, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS F during the PM and Saturday peak hours.

Traffic signal warrants are expected to be met at the intersection. The intersection shall be signalized with protected left-turn phasing and widened to provide the following configuration:

Eastbound: One left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane Westbound: None Northbound: One left-turn lane and one through lane Southbound: Two left-turn lanes and one through lane with a shared right turn This configuration requires widening of the onramp to receive traffic from the two southbound leftturn lanes.

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS B during the worst-case peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-3t.

Phase 1 Site Access/Golden State Boulevard

At the intersection of the Phase 1 Site Access and Golden State Boulevard, the project driveway will operate at LOS F during all peak hours if one-way stop-sign control is installed.

In addition to the mitigations required for Phases 1 and 2 of the project (signalization and widening), the intersection shall be widened to provide a third through lane on the northbound and southbound approaches. The configuration of the intersection of the Phase 1 Site Access and Golden State Boulevard would be as follows:

Eastbound: Two left-turn lanes and two right-turn lanes Westbound: None Northbound: Two left-turn lanes (minimum 525 feet) and three through lanes Southbound: Three through lanes and one right-turn lane

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS B during the AM peak hour, LOS D during the PM peak hour, and LOS E during the Saturday peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

The mitigation recommended above reflects Peters Engineering Group's opinion of the most practical approach to the intersection configuration. If the City of Selma considers triple left-turn lanes acceptable, the intersection could operate at LOS D during the Saturday peak hour if the northbound approach is constructed with three left-turn lanes and three through lanes.

As a second alternative, the site plan could be modified to provide a second signalized main access so that northbound left turns from Golden State Boulevard into the project are not concentrated at one location.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-3u.

Phase 2 Site Access/Dockery Avenue

The project mitigations required along Mountain View Avenue will cause a secondary impact at the intersection of the Phase 2 Site Access and Dockery Avenue. The intersection of the Phase 2 Site

Access and Dockery Avenue will operate at LOS F during all peak hours if stop-sign control is installed.

This mitigation is identical to that required for Phase 2 of the project with the exception of the length of the turn lanes. Traffic signal warrants are expected to be met at the intersection. The intersection shall be signalized with protected left-turn phasing. The configuration of the intersection of the Phase 2 Site Access and Dockery Avenue would be as follows:

Eastbound: None Westbound: One left-turn lane and one right-turn lane Northbound: One through lane and one right-turn lane Southbound: Two left-turn lanes (minimum 500 feet) and one through lane

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS B during the worst-case peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-3v.

Phase 3 Site Access/Mountain View Avenue

At the intersection of the Phase 3 Site Access and Mountain View Avenue, the project driveway will operate at LOS F during all peak hours if one-way stop-sign control is installed.

Traffic signal warrants are expected to be met at the intersection. The intersection shall be signalized with protected left-turn phasing. The configuration of the intersection of the Phase 3 Site Access and Mountain View Avenue would be as follows:

Eastbound: One left-turn lane and three through lanes Westbound: Three through lanes and one right-turn lane (minimum 475 feet) Northbound: None Southbound: Two left-turn lanes (minimum 325 feet) and one right-turn lane

With implementation of these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS C during the worst-case peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-3w.

Mountain View Avenue – Highland Avenue to Thompson Avenue

On Mountain View Avenue between Highland and Thompson Avenues, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS E during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour.

Mountain View Avenue between Highland and Thompson Avenues shall be widened to four lanes with a median. With implementation of these improvements, the road segment is expected to operate at LOS C during the worst-case peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-3x.

Mountain View Avenue – Thompson Avenue to McCall Avenue

On Mountain View Avenue between Thompson and McCall Avenues, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS D during the AM peak hour, and a cumulative substandard LOS E during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour.

Mountain View Avenue between Thompson and McCall Avenues shall be widened to four lanes with a median. With implementation of these improvements, the road segment is expected to operate at LOS C during the worst-case peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-3y.

Mountain View Avenue – McCall Avenue to Dockery Avenue

On Mountain View Avenue between McCall and Dockery Avenues, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS E during the all peak hours.

Mountain View Avenue between McCall and Dockery Avenues shall be widened to six lanes with a median. With implementation of these improvements, the road segment is expected to operate at LOS C during the worst-case peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-3z.

Mountain View Avenue – Dockery Avenue to SR-99

On Mountain View Avenue between Dockery Avenue and SR-99, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS E during all peak hours.

Mountain View Avenue between Dockery Avenue and SR-99 shall be widened to six lanes with a median. With implementation of these improvements, the road segment is expected to operate at LOS C during the AM peak hour and LOS E during the PM and Saturday peak hours. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-3aa.

The calculated LOS E during the PM and weekend peak hours is considered the best-case scenario because, with the construction of long westbound left-turn lanes as required at the intersection of

Mountain View Avenue and Dockery Avenue and a free right turn to the southbound SR-99 onramp, the road segment will actually have more than six lanes and is likely to function as an eight-lane arterial with respect to the Florida tables. Since the road segment is relatively short, intersection operations are expected to govern the LOS that is experienced by drivers. Furthermore, additional through lanes provide only marginal improvements, because lanes are not typically evenly utilized near site access locations, reduce ease of access for pedestrians by increasing the widths of intersections, and create substantial additional ongoing maintenance costs to the City.

Mountain View Avenue - SR-99 to Golden State Boulevard

On Mountain View Avenue between SR-99 and Golden State Boulevard, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS E during all peak hours.

Mountain View Avenue between the SR-99 northbound ramps and Golden State Boulevard shall be widened to six lanes with a median. With implementation of these improvements, and other required intersection mitigations the road segment is expected to operate at LOS C during the AM peak hour and LOS F during the PM and Saturday peak hours. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-3bb.

The calculated LOS F during the PM and weekend peak hours is considered the best-case scenario because, with the construction of long eastbound left-turn lanes as required at the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Golden State Boulevard and a free right turn to the northbound SR-99 onramp, the road segment will actually have more than six lanes and is likely to function as an eight-lane arterial with respect to the Florida tables. Since the road segment is relatively short, intersection operations are expected to govern the LOS that is experienced by drivers. Furthermore, additional through lanes provide only marginal improvements, because lanes are not typically evenly utilized near site access locations, reduce ease of access for pedestrians by increasing the widths of intersections, and create substantial additional ongoing maintenance costs to the City.

Mountain View Avenue - Golden State Boulevard to Bethel Avenue

On Mountain View Avenue between Golden State Boulevard and Bethel Avenue, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS E during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour.

Mountain View Avenue between Golden State Boulevard and Bethel Avenue shall be widened to six lanes with a median. With implementation of these improvements, the road segment is expected to operate at LOS B during the AM and PM peak hours and LOS D during the Saturday peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-3cc.

The calculated LOS D during the weekend peak hours is considered the best-case scenario: additional lanes (an eight-lane arterial) provide only marginal improvements, because lanes are not typically evenly utilized near site access locations, reduce ease of access for pedestrians by increasing the widths of intersections, and create substantial additional ongoing maintenance costs to the City. Considering that the City of Selma's pending General Plan Update considers LOS D as acceptable, this mitigation would be substandard only until the General Plan Update is in force and the roadway is annexed into the City of Selma.

Mountain View Avenue – Bethel Avenue to Academy Avenue

On Mountain View Avenue between Bethel and Academy Avenues, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS E during all peak hours.

Mountain View Avenue between Bethel and Academy Avenues shall be widened to six lanes with a median. With implementation of these improvements, the road segment is expected to operate at LOS B during the worst-case peak hour.

Measure C Rural Project I is currently in the design phase and is funded to widen Mountain View Avenue to four lanes. Therefore, the project would be responsible for a fair share of only the two outside lanes.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-3dd.

Mountain View Avenue – Academy Avenue to Mendocino Avenue

On Mountain View Avenue between Academy and Mendocino Avenues, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS E during all peak hours.

Mountain View Avenue between Academy and Mendocino Avenues shall be widened to four lanes with a median. With implementation of these improvements, the road segment is expected to operate at LOS C during the worst-case peak hour.

Measure C Rural Project I is currently in the design phase and is funded to construct this improvement. Therefore, the project will not be required to implement this mitigation.

Mountain View Avenue – Mendocino Avenue to Madsen Avenue

On Mountain View Avenue between Mendocino and Madsen Avenues, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS E during all peak hours.

Mountain View Avenue between Mendocino and Madsen Avenues shall be widened to four lanes with a median. With implementation of these improvements, the road segment is expected to operate at LOS B during the worst-case peak hour.

Measure C Rural Project I is currently in the design phase and is funded to construct this improvement. Therefore, the project will not be required to implement this mitigation.

Mountain View Avenue – Madsen Avenue to Zediker Avenue

On Mountain View Avenue between Madsen and Zediker Avenues, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS E during all peak hours.

Mountain View Avenue between Madsen and Zediker Avenues shall be widened to four lanes with a median. With implementation of these improvements, the road segment is expected to operate at LOS B during the worst-case peak hour.

Measure C Rural Project I is currently in the design phase and is funded to construct this improvement. Therefore, the project will not be required to implement this mitigation.

Mountain View Avenue – Zediker Avenue to Fresno County Line

On Mountain View Avenue between Zediker Avenue and the Fresno County line, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS E during all peak hours.

Mountain View Avenue between Zediker Avenue and the Fresno County line shall be widened to four lanes with a median. With implementation of these improvements, the road segment is expected to operate at LOS B during the worst-case peak hour.

Measure C Rural Project I is currently in the design phase and is funded to construct this improvement. Therefore, the project will not be required to implement this mitigation.

Kamm Avenue - SR-99 to Academy Avenue

On Kamm Avenue between SR-99 and Academy Avenue, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS E during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour.

Kamm Avenue between SR-99 and Academy Avenue shall be widened to four lanes. With implementation of these improvements, the road segment is expected to operate at LOS B during the worst-case peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-3ee.

McCall Avenue - Valley View Street to Mountain View Avenue

On McCall Avenue between Valley View Street and Mountain View Avenue, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS E during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour.

McCall Avenue between Valley View Street and Mountain View Avenue shall be widened to four lanes. With implementation of these improvements, the road segment is expected to operate at LOS B during the worst-case peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-3ff.

McCall Avenue -- Mountain View Avenue to Caruthers Avenue

On McCall Avenue between Mountain View and Caruthers Avenues, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS E during the PM peak hour.

McCall Avenue between Mountain View and Caruthers Avenues shall be widened to four lanes. With implementation of these improvements, the road segment is expected to operate at LOS B during the worst-case peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-3gg.

Dockery Avenue - Mountain View Avenue to Caruthers Avenue

On Dockery Avenue between Mountain View and Caruthers Avenues, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS E during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour.

Dockery Avenue between Mountain View and Caruthers Avenues shall be widened to four lanes. With implementation of these improvements, the road segment is expected to operate at LOS B during the worst-case peak hour. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-3hh.

Golden State Boulevard – Saginaw Avenue to Phase 1 Main Site Access

On Golden State Boulevard between Saginaw Avenue and the Phase 1 main site access, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS E during the Saturday peak hour.

Golden State Boulevard between Saginaw Avenue and the Phase 1 main site access shall be widened to six lanes. With implementation of these improvements, the road segment is expected to operate at LOS B during the worst-case peak hour.

The City of Selma development impact fee program includes \$2,235,725 for improvements on Golden State Boulevard between Nebraska Avenue and Mountain View Avenue. Payment of fees in accordance with Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a would satisfy the applicant's obligation in this case.

Golden State Boulevard – Phase 1 Main Site Access to Mountain View Avenue

On Golden State Boulevard between the Phase 1 main site access and Mountain View Avenue, the project will contribute to a cumulative substandard LOS E during the PM peak hour and the Saturday peak hour.

Golden State Boulevard between the Phase 1 main site access and Mountain View Avenue shall be widened to six lanes with a median. In the southbound direction, the required third southbound lane may be constructed as a trapped extension of a southbound right-turn lane at the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Golden State Boulevard.

With implementation of these improvements, the road segment is expected to operate at LOS C during the AM peak hour, but would operate at substandard LOS E during the PM peak hour and substandard LOS F during the Saturday peak hour.

The calculated LOS E during the PM peak hour and LOS F during the weekend peak hour is considered the best-case scenario because, with the construction of long northbound left-turn lanes as required at the intersection of Golden State Boulevard and the Phase 1 main site access long southbound right-turn lanes at the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Golden State Boulevard, the road segment will actually have more than six lanes and is likely to function as an eight-lane arterial with respect to the Florida tables. Since the road segment is relatively short, intersection operations are expected to govern the LOS that is experienced by drivers. Furthermore, additional through lanes provide only marginal improvements, because lanes are not typically evenly utilized near site access locations, reduce ease of access for pedestrians by increasing the widths of intersections, and create substantial additional ongoing maintenance costs to the City.

The City of Selma development impact fee program includes \$2,235,725 for improvements on Golden State Boulevard between Nebraska Avenue and Mountain View Avenue. Payment of fees in accordance with Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a would satisfy the applicant's obligation in this case.

Highland Avenue At-Grade Railroad Crossing

At the Highland Avenue at-grade railroad crossing north of Golden State Avenue, the project will exacerbate a predicted accident frequency that exceeds 0.02 accidents per year without the project.

The crossing shall be equipped with a pre-signal. With implementation of this improvement the predicted accident frequency is expected to be reduced to pre-project levels. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-3ii.

Second Street At-Grade Railroad Crossing

At the Second Street at-grade railroad crossing east of West Front Street, the project will exacerbate a predicted accident frequency that exceeds 0.02 accidents per year without the project.

The crossing shall be equipped with a raised median. With implementation of this improvement, the predicted accident frequency is expected to be reduced to pre-project levels. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-3jj.

Mountain View Avenue At-Grade Railroad Crossing

At the Mountain View Avenue at-grade railroad crossing east of Golden State Boulevard, the project will cause the predicted accident frequency to exceed 0.02 accidents per year.

With the implementation of Mitigation Measure TRANS-1h, the predicted accident frequency is expected to be reduced to pre-project levels. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

Bethel Avenue At-Grade Railroad Crossing

At the Bethel Avenue at-grade railroad crossing east of Golden State Boulevard, the project will cause the predicted accident frequency to exceed 0.02 accidents per year.

The crossing shall be equipped with a raised median. With implementation of this improvement the predicted accident frequency is expected to be reduced to pre-project levels. These improvements are not included in a transportation impact fee program.

These recommendations are reflected in Mitigation Measure TRANS-3kk.

Mitigated Year 2035 With Project Conditions

Table 4.12-34 and Table 4.12-35 present levels of service for the mitigated conditions, with the mitigated locations presented in italics.

		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		Weekend	
Intersection	Control	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS
Floral/SR-99 SB offramp	Signal	14.1	В	31.5	С	32.3	С
Floral/Highland	Signal	24.3	С	48.2	D	56.4	E
Floral/SR-99 NB offramp	Signal	9.6	A	15.0	В	19.6	В
Highland/SR-99 SB onramp	Signal	14.6	В	19.7	В	18.3	В
Highland/Rose	TWS	17.0	В	28.8	С	26.1	С
Highland/Nebraska	Signal	14.1	В	23.4	С	17.9	В
Nebraska/Thompson	AWS	22.3	С	32.9	С	27.4	С
Second/SR-99 SB	OWS	21.2	С	26.1	С	29.0	С
Second/SR-99 NB	OWS	18.8	В	21.0	С	18.3	В
Second/Whitson	Signal	22.7	С	38.1	D	38.9	D
Mountain View/Highland	Signal	21.3	С	31.2	С	29.9	С
Mountain View/Thompson	TWS	18.5	В	24.3	С	26.6	С
Mountain View/McCall	AWS	23.9	С	33.8	С	25.9	С
Mountain View/Dockery	TWS	30.3	С	67.2	E	81.1	F
Mountain View/SR-99 SB offramp	Round	11.6	B	34.6	C	41.7	D
Mountain View/SR-99 SB onramp	- Kouna.	<i>unu.</i> 11.0	D	54.0		71./	

Table 4.12-34: Year 2035 Plus Project Intersection Operations - Mitigated

		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		Weekend	
Intersection	Control	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS
Mountain View/SR-99 NB onramp	Round	79	Δ	8.0	Δ	9.0	Δ
Mountain View/SR-99 NB offramp	Round.	1.5	1	0.0	11		11
Mountain View/Golden State	Signal	25.3	C	77.6	Е	164.8	F
Mountain View/Bethel	Signal	17.5	В	29.4	C	29.7	C
Mountain View/Academy	Signal	20.1	C	34.9	C	27.9	C
Mountain View/Mendocino	Signal	23.3	C	31.3	С	30.3	C
Caruthers/Dockery	OWS	8.7	A	8.7	A	8.9	A
Golden State/Amber	OWS	10.0	В	23.9	С	52.6	F
Kamm/Thompson	OWS	9.1	A	9.4	A	9.3	A
Kamm/McCall	TWS	11.3	В	12.7	В	11.2	В
Kamm/Dockery	TWS	9.0	A	9.1	Α	9.1	Α
Kamm/Van Horn	TWS	10.0	В	12.5	В	13.1	В
Kamm/SR-99 SB offramp	TWS	8.5	A	13.7	В	10.7	В
Bethel/SR-99 NB onramp	OWS	17.6	C	33.4	D*	22.3	C
Bethel/Golden State	AWS	25.9	С	36.3	D	33.5	D
Bethel/Kamm	AWS	22.6	С	35.7	D	28.0	С
Kamm/Academy	AWS	19.3	В	27.2	С	24.3	С
Bethel/SR-99 NB offramp	OWS	6.8	A	14.6	В	8.0	A
Bethel/Parkway-SR-99 SB onramp	OWS	11.5	В	17.5	В	14.9	В
Golden State/Phase 1 Access	Signal	11.1	В	38.0	D	70.8	E
Dockery/Phase 2 Access	Signal	12.4	В	13.1	В	17.8	В
Mountain View/Phase 3 Access	Signal	9.8	A	18.4	В	24.3	С

Table 4.12-34 (cont.): Year 2035 Plus Project Intersection Operations - Mitigated

Note:

* No feasible mitigation.

Italics denote mitigated operation

Source: Peters Engineering Group, 2012.

Road Segment		Lanes and Median	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		Weekend	
			Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS
Mountain View Avenue	Highland to Thompson	2U (<2)	967	С	1,526	С	1,608	С
	Thompson to McCall	2U(<2)	1,105	С	1,853	С	1,635	С
	McCall to Dockery	2U(<2)	1,445	С	2,446	С	2,338	С
	Dockery to SR-99	2U (<2)	2,619	С	4,572	E	4,627	E
	SR-99 to Golden State	2U (<2)	3,129	С	5,729	F	6,059	F
	Golden State to Bethel	4D-LT (<2)	2,345	В	3,908	В	4,727	D
	Bethel to Academy	2U(<2)	1,913	В	3,080	В	3,178	В
	Academy to Mendocino	2U(<2)	1,800	В	2,817	С	2,717	С
	Mendocino to Madsen	2U(<2)	1,337	В	1,840	В	1,684	В
	Madsen to Zediker	2U(<2)	1,266	В	1,724	В	1,593	В
	Zediker to Fresno County Line	2U (<2)	1,259	В	1,621	В	1,472	В
Kamm Avenue	Highland to Thompson	2U (<2)	33	В	57	В	33	В
	Thompson to McCall	2U (<2)	27	В	49	В	37	В
	McCall to Dockery	2U (<2)	43	В	56	В	56	В
	Dockery to Van Horn	2U (<2)	43	В	57	В	56	В
	Van Horn to SR-99	2U (<2)	251	В	443	В	520	В
	SR-99 to Academy	2U(<2)	848	В	1,411	В	1,235	В
McCall Avenue	Valley View to Mountain View	2U(<2)	969	В	1,685	В	1,171	В
	Mountain View to Caruthers	2U(<2)	757	В	1,315	В	746	В
Dockery Avenue	Mountain View to Caruthers	2U(<2)	794	В	1,385	В	1,363	В
Golden State Boulevard	Nebraska to Saginaw	4D-LT (<2)	1,487	В	2,806	C	2,882	C
	Saginaw to Phase 1 main site access	4D-LT (<2)	1,413	В	2,866	В	3,444	В
	Phase 1 main site access to Mountain View	4D-LT (<2)	1,859	С	4,538	E	5,634	F
	Mountain View to Amber	4D-LT (<2)	1,041	В	2,299	В	3,068	С
	Amber to Bethel	4D-LT (<2)	1,026	В	2,169	В	2,365	В

Table 4.12-35: Year 2035 Plus Project Roadway Segment Operations – Mitigated

	Lanos and	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		Weekend	
Road Segment	Median	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS
Notes: 2U: 2-lane undivided 4D-LT: 4-lane divided with left-turn lanes Values in parentheses indicate number of signalized intersections per mile Italics denote mitigated operation. Source: Peters Engineering Group, 2012.							

Table 4.12-35 (cont.): Year 2035 Plus Project Roadway Segment Operations – Mitigated

Conclusion

Under Year 2035 conditions, the proposed project would contribute vehicle trips to intersections, roadway segments, and railroad grade crossings that would operate at unacceptable levels. Mitigation is proposed that would require the project applicant to either install or provide fair-share fees for all feasible improvements necessary to improve operations to acceptable levels.

Although the proposed project would contribute funding for necessary improvements, many of the affected facilities are under the jurisdiction of an agency other than the City of Selma (e.g., Caltrans or the County of Fresno). As such, the City of Selma cannot assure that the necessary improvements would be installed as contemplated. Accordingly, the residual significance of this impact is significant and unavoidable.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

Implement Mitigation Measures TRANS-1a through TRANS-1h, TRANS-2a through TRANS-2n, and:

- MM TRANS-3a Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Floral Avenue/Highland Avenue. The improvements shall consist of (1) two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and two right-turn lanes on the eastbound approach; (2) two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and one right-turn lane; (3) two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane; and (4) two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and two right-turn lanes. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.
- **MM TRANS-3b** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Highland Avenue/SR-99 southbound onramp. The improvements shall consist of (1) two right-turn lanes on the eastbound approach; (2) two through lanes and one right-turn lane on the

northbound approach; and (3) two left-turn lanes (minimum 275 feet) and two through lanes on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.

- **MM TRANS-3c** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Highland Avenue/Nebraska Avenue. The improvements shall consist of (1) two left-turn lanes, one through lane, and one right-turn lane on the eastbound approach; (2) one left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane on the westbound approach; (3) one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the northbound approach; and (4) one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the right-turn lane on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.
- MM TRANS-3d If the improvements identified in the City of Selma development fee program for the intersection of Nebraska Avenue/Thompson Avenue are determined not to be feasible, prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fairshare payments for alternative improvements. The alternative improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left-turn phasing; (2) one left-turn lane and, one through lane with a shared right turn on the eastbound approach; (3) one left-turn lane (minimum 275 feet) and one through lane with a shared right turn on the westbound approach; (4) one left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane on the northbound approach; and (5) one left-turn lane and one through lane with a shared right turn on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a. This mitigation measure shall not apply if the improvements identified in the City of Selma development fee program for the intersection of Nebraska Avenue/Thompson Avenue are determined to be feasible.
- **MM TRANS-3e** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Second Street/Whitson Street. The improvements shall consist of (1) two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the eastbound approach; (2) two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the westbound approach; (3) two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the northbound approach; and (4) one left-turn lane and three through lanes with a shared right turn on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.

- **MM TRANS-3f** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Mountain View Avenue/Highland Avenue. The improvements shall consist of (1) one left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn on the eastbound approach; (2) one left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn on the westbound approach; (3) one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the northbound approach; and (4) one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.
- **MM TRANS-3g** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Mountain View Avenue/Thompson Avenue. The improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left-turn phasing; (2) one left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn on the eastbound approach; (3) one left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn on the westbound approach; (4) one left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn on the northbound approach; and (5) one left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.
- **MM TRANS-3h** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Mountain View Avenue/McCall Avenue. The improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left-turn phasing; (2) one left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn on the eastbound approach; (3) one left-turn lane (minimum 300 feet), two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the westbound approach; (4) one left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn on the northbound approach; and (5) two left-turn lanes and two through lanes with a shared right turn on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.
- **MM TRANS-3i** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Mountain View Avenue/Dockery Avenue. The improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left-turn phasing; (2) two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the eastbound approach; (3) two left-turn lanes (minimum 1,225 feet), three through lanes, and one right-turn lanes (minimum 350 feet), one through lane, and two right-turn lanes on the northbound
approach; and (5) two left-turn lanes, one through lane, and one right-turn lane on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.

- MM TRANS-3j Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the Mountain View Avenue/SR-99 interchange. The improvements shall consist of reconfiguration of the interchange to a Type L-9 as described in the Caltrans Highway Design Manual Chapter 500. The Mountain View Avenue/SR-99 southbound ramps shall provide (1) three through lanes and one rightturn lane or slip ramp to SR-99 southbound direct onramp on the eastbound approach; (2) three through lanes and one right-turn lane or slip ramp to SR-99 southbound loop on ramp on the westbound approach; and (3) two left-turn lanes and three right-turn lanes on the southbound approach. The Mountain View Avenue/SR-99 northbound ramps shall provide (1) three through lanes and one right-turn lane or slip ramp to SR-99 northbound loop on ramp on the eastbound approach; (2) three through lanes and one right-turn lane or slip ramp to SR-99 northbound direct onramp on the westbound approach; and (3) two left-turn lanes and one right-turn lane on the northbound approach. Caltrans shall review and approve the proposed configuration. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.
- MM TRANS-3k Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Mountain View Avenue/Golden State Boulevard. The improvements shall consist of (1) two left-turn lanes (minimum 825 feet), three through lanes, and two right-turn lanes on the eastbound approach; (2) two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and two right-turn lanes on the westbound approach; (3) two left-turn lanes (minimum 350 feet), three through lanes, and two right-turn lanes (minimum 450 feet), three through lanes, and two right-turn lanes (minimum 450 feet), three through lanes, and two right-turn lanes on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.
- **MM TRANS-31** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Mountain View Avenue/Bethel Avenue. The improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left-turn phasing; (2) one left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn on the eastbound approach; (3) one left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn on the westbound approach; (4) one left-turn lane and two through lanes with a

shared right turn on the northbound approach; and (5) one left-turn lane and two through lanes with a shared right turn on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.

- **MM TRANS-3m** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Mountain View Avenue/Academy Avenue. The improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left-turn phasing; (2) two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the eastbound approach; (3) one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the westbound approach; (4) one left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane on the northbound approach; and (5) one left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane on the southbound approach. Measure C Rural Project I contemplates several of the previously described improvements; thus, this mitigation measure is only intended to require improvements that are in addition to those scheduled to be installed. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.
- MM TRANS-3n Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Mountain View Avenue/Mendocino Avenue. The improvements shall consist of (1) two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the eastbound approach; (2) one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the westbound approach; (3) one left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane on the northbound approach; and (4) one left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane on the southbound approach. Measure C Rural Project I contemplates several of the previously described improvements; thus, this mitigation measure is intended to only require improvements that are in addition to those scheduled to be installed. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.
- **MM TRANS-30** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Golden State Boulevard/Amber Avenue. The improvements shall consist of modifying the intersection to allow right-in/right-out access only in order to prevent left turns. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.
- **MM TRANS-3p** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Bethel Avenue/Golden State

Boulevard. The improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected leftturn phasing; (2) two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the eastbound approach; (3) one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the westbound approach; (4) one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one rightturn lane on the northbound approach; and (5) two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a. This mitigation measure shall not apply to any aspect of the previously described improvements if they are not feasible because of physical constraints (right-of-way, railroad, roadway alignment, etc.)

- **MM TRANS-3q** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Bethel Avenue/Kamm Avenue. The improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left-turn phasing; (2) one through lane and one right-turn lane on the eastbound approach; (3) one left-turn lane and one through lane on the westbound approach; and (4) one left-turn lane and one right-turn lane on the northbound approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a. This mitigation measure shall not apply to any aspect of the previously described improvements if they are not feasible, due to physical constraints (e.g., right-of-way, railroad, roadway alignment, etc.)
- MM TRANS-3r Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Kamm Avenue/Academy Avenue. The improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left-turn phasing; (2) one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the eastbound approach; (3) one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the westbound approach; (4) one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the northbound approach; and (5) one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lanes, and one right-turn lane on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.
- **MM TRANS-3s** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Bethel Avenue/SR-99 northbound offramp. The improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left-turn phasing; (2) one left-turn lane and one right-turn lane on the westbound approach; (3) one through lane on the northbound approach; and (4) one through lane on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the

community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.

- **MM TRANS-3t** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Bethel Avenue/Parkway Drive-SR-99 southbound onramp. The improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left-turn phasing; (2) one left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane on the eastbound approach; (3) one left-turn lane and one through lane on the northbound approach; and (4) two left-turn lanes and one through lane with a shared right turn on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.
- **MM TRANS-3u** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Phase 1 Site Access/Golden State Boulevard. The improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left-turn phasing; (2) two left-turn lanes and two right-turn lanes on the eastbound approach; (3) two left-turn lanes (minimum 525 feet) and three through lanes on the northbound approach; and (4) three through lanes and one right-turn lane on the southbound approach. In lieu of these improvements, the installation of a second signalized main access would provide acceptable levels of service and avoid concentrated northbound left turns at one location. These improvements shall be in place prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy of Phase 3. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.
- **MM TRANS-3v** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Phase 2 Site Access/Dockery Avenue. The improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left-turn phasing; (2) one left-turn lane and one right-turn lane on the westbound approach; (3) one through lane and one right-turn lane on the northbound approach; and (4) two left-turn lanes (minimum 500 feet) and one through lane on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be in place prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy of Phase 3. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.
- **MM TRANS-3w** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the intersection of Phase 3 Site Access/Mountain View Avenue. The improvements shall consist of (1) signalization with protected left-turn phasing; (2) one left-turn lane and three through lanes on the eastbound

approach; (3) three through lanes and one right-turn lane (minimum 475 feet) on the westbound approach; and (4) two left-turn lanes (minimum 325 feet) and one right-turn lane on the southbound approach. These improvements shall be in place prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy of Phase 3. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.

- **MM TRANS-3x** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to Mountain View Avenue between Highland Avenue and Thompson Avenue. The improvements shall consist of widening Mountain View Avenue to four lanes with a median. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.
- **MM TRANS-3y** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to Mountain View Avenue between Thompson Avenue and McCall Avenue. The improvements shall consist of widening Mountain View Avenue to four lanes with a median. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.
- **MM TRANS-3z** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to Mountain View Avenue between McCall Avenue and Dockery Avenue. The improvements shall consist of widening Mountain View Avenue to six lanes with a median. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.
- **MM TRANS-3aa** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to Mountain View Avenue between Dockery Avenue and SR-99. The improvements shall consist of widening Mountain View Avenue to six lanes with a median. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.
- MM TRANS-3bb Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to Mountain View Avenue between SR-99 and Golden State Boulevard. The improvements shall consist of widening Mountain View Avenue to six lanes with a median. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.

- **MM TRANS-3cc** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to Mountain View Avenue between Golden State Boulevard and Bethel Avenue. The improvements shall consist of widening Mountain View Avenue to six lanes with a median. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.
- **MM TRANS-3dd** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to Mountain View Avenue between Bethel Avenue and Academy Avenue. The improvements shall consist of widening Mountain View Avenue to six lanes with a median. Measure C Rural Project I contemplates widening this roadway segment to four lanes; thus, this mitigation measure is only intended to require the two additional lanes that are in addition to those scheduled to be installed. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.
- MM TRANS-3ee Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to Kamm Avenue between SR-99 and Academy Avenue. The improvements shall consist of widening Kamm Avenue to four lanes. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.
- **MM TRANS-3ff** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to McCall Avenue between Valley View Street and Mountain View Avenue. The improvements shall consist of widening McCall Avenue to four lanes. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.
- **MM TRANS-3gg** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to McCall Avenue between Mountain View Avenue and Caruthers Avenue. The improvements shall consist of widening McCall Avenue to four lanes. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.
- MM TRANS-3hh Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to Dockery Avenue between Mountain View Avenue and Caruthers Avenue. The improvements shall consist of widening Dockery Avenue to four lanes. These improvements shall be programmed into the community

facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.

- **MM TRANS-3ii** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the Highland Avenue at-grade railroad crossing. The improvements shall consist of installing a pre-signal. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.
- **MM TRANS-3jj** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the Second Street at-grade railroad crossing. The improvements shall consist of a raised median. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.
- **MM TRANS-3kk** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide fair-share payments for improvements to the Bethel Avenue at-grade railroad crossing. The improvements shall consist of a raised median. These improvements shall be programmed into the community facilities financing district or other financing mechanism contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Significant unavoidable impact.

Roadway Safety

Impact TRANS-4: The proposed project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).

Impact Analysis

This impact will assess the potential for the proposed project to substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).

The proposed project proposes a comprehensive internal roadway network featuring two-lane and four-lane facilities that would provide direct and safe access to all project uses; refer to Exhibit 3-8. Roadway cross sections for major roadways would reflect the standards contained in the City of Selma General Plan. All new intersections are proposed at 90-degree angles or near-90-degree angles, maximizing visibility for all approaches. All major internal streets have through connections to other streets. Finally, the project does not propose any unusual features such as tight turn angles (below 70 degrees) or narrow streets that may impair truck circulation. As such, the internal roadway network is consistent with widely accepted standards for safe and efficient circulation.

Agricultural uses surround the project site. Farm equipment has been observed to uses roads in the project vicinity, including Mountain View Avenue, Dockery Avenue, and Van Horn Avenue. As discussed in Section 3, Project Description, the proposed project would improve roadways to add turn lanes, travel lanes, and shoulder. After the improvements are completed, farm equipment could safely travel on the shoulder of both roadways unless otherwise prohibited. This would ensure that the proposed project would not create safety hazards associated with incompatible uses.

Impacts would be less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is necessary.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Emergency Access

Impact TRANS-5: The proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access.

Impact Analysis

As shown in Exhibit 3-8, all project uses would be served with at least two points of vehicular access suitable for use by large, emergency response apparatus such as fire engines, consistent with California Fire Code requirements.

Furthermore, as previously noted, the proposed project would improve roadways in the project vicinity to add turn lanes, travel lanes, and shoulder. These improvements would enhance circulation and safety on roadways in the project vicinity, which would serve to facilitate acceptable emergency access. Impacts would be less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is necessary.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Public Transit, Bicycles, and Pedestrians

Impact TRANS-6:	The proposed project may not provide adequate access to public transit, bicycles,
	or pedestrians.

Impact Analysis

This impact addresses public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian accessibility to the proposed project. Each issue is discussed separately.

Public Transit

Selma Transit and Southeast Transit provide bus service within Selma and along the SR-99 corridor between Fresno and Kingsburg.

The City of Selma 2035 General Plan sets forth several policies that concern public transit. Policies 2.61 through 2.63 promote the use of public transit to reduce traffic congestion. In accordance with these policies, Mitigation Measure TRANS-6a requires the installation of appropriate public transit facilities to serve each phase of the proposed project. The implementation of this mitigation measure would ensure that adequate access to public transit is provided. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Bicycles

Bike lanes exist on Golden State Boulevard on both directions along the frontage of the project site.

The City of Selma 2035 General Plan sets forth several policies that concern bicycles. Policies 2.61 through 2.63 promote the use of bicycling to reduce traffic congestion. In accordance with these policies, Mitigation Measure TRANS-6b requires the installation of bicycle storage facilities in appropriate locations of each phase. The provision of these bicycle storage facilities would ensure that adequate storage is available. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Regarding the potential installation of Class II bicycle facilities (on-street lanes) or Class III bicycle facilities (signed bicycle routes) on the streets in the project vicinity, on-street bicycle facilities are installed on a "corridor" basis—i.e., along continuous segment of roadway—in order facilitate the development of a logical and connected bicycle network. Likewise, installing on-street bicycle facilities on an ad-hoc, project-by-project basis may promote confusion among motorists and bicyclists, leading to unsafe conditions.

Developing on-street bicycle facilities along roadways in the project vicinity (Mountain View Avenue, Dockery Avenue, Van Horn Avenue, etc.) is complicated by the various jurisdictions involved. For example, Fresno County has jurisdiction over segments of Mountain View Avenue west and east of the project site and Caltrans has jurisdiction over the SR-99/Mountain View Avenue interchange. Because different agencies often have different positions on whether installing on-street bicycle facilities is appropriate, it is not considered feasible to require installation of such facilities as a mitigation. Nonetheless, the project applicant would provide half-width improvements along all project roadway frontages that would reflect the ultimate General Plan-contemplated roadway section, which may include room for the installation of on-street bicycle facilities in the future.

Pedestrians

With the exception of crosswalks at the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Golden State Boulevard, pedestrian facilities do not currently exist in the vicinity of the project site.

The City of Selma 2035 General Plan sets forth several policies that concern pedestrian mobility. Policy 2.14 contemplates meandering sidewalks along major roadways, while Policies 2.61 through 2.63 promote the use of walking to reduce traffic congestion. In accordance with these policies, Mitigation Measure TRANS-6c requires the installation of pedestrian facilities along all street frontages that are connected to internal pedestrian facilities within each phase of the project. The provision of these pedestrian facilities would ensure that adequate pedestrian mobility is provided. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

- **MM TRANS-6a** Prior to approval of the final improvement plans for each phase, the project applicant shall prepare and submit plans to the City of Selma depicting appropriate public transit facilities for review and approval. Such facilities may consist of a centralized transit facility or enhanced stops that feature turnouts, shelters, seating, lighting, and other amenities, as appropriate. The approved public transit facilities shall be incorporated into the final improvement plans for each phase.
- **MM TRANS-6b** Prior to issuance of the certificate of occupancy for each building, the project applicant shall install bicycle storage facilities in convenient locations near building entrances. Bicycle storage facilities shall consist of racks that provide spaces equivalent to 2 percent of the building's minimum parking requirement. Where appropriate, the bicycle parking requirements for multiple buildings may be consolidated into a single location.
- **MM TRANS-6c** Prior to approval of the final improvement plans for each phase, the project applicant shall prepare and submit plans to the City of Selma depicting pedestrian facilities along all street frontages. Meandering sidewalks shall be provided along major arterial roadways. All pedestrian facilities along all street frontages shall be connected to internal pedestrian facilities within each phase. The approved pedestrian facilities shall be incorporated into the final improvement plans for each phase.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

4.13.1 - Introduction

This section describes the existing setting regarding urban decay and potential effects from project implementation on the site and its surrounding area. Descriptions and analysis in this section are based on information contained in the Urban Decay Analysis and the Urban Decay Analysis/ Economic Impact Study prepared in the Selma Crossings Urban Decay Analysis by Economic & Planning Systems, Inc., included in this EIR as Appendix M.

4.13.2 - Environmental Setting

Overview of Urban Decay

Urban decay is a physical effect that can result from extended vacancy, deferred maintenance, and abandonment. In its study entitled Supercenters and the Transformation of the Bay Area Grocery Industry: Issues, Trends, and Impacts, the Bay Area Economic Forum describes the process as follows:

Vacant buildings, along with their large parking lots, can attract litter, graffiti, and vandalism, as well as loiterers and homeless population. A decaying building both worsens its own prospects for refurbishment and weakens the vitality both of the buildings around it.

The primary impetus of urban decay often stems from financial conditions faced by the individual property owners; if a landlord is unable to collect rent on a vacant property with minimal likelihood that it can be re-leased, s/he may lose the incentive to maintain it. The effect can spread to adjacent properties and become a self-fulfilling prophecy as customers start to avoid an area and other property owners or tenants perceive an area as no longer vital or safe. Urban decay can be reinforced by a reduction in the fiscal resources of local governing entities because of declining sales and property revenue.

The urban decay process generally takes a number of years to fully materialize and is reinforced by declining economic conditions in a broader area. It is generally not the result of a single property standing vacant for 1 or 2 years in an otherwise vibrant market.

It is worth noting that a declining regional mall known as a "grayfield" can pose a particularly high risk for urban decay if not promptly re-leased. Not only are these facilities bigger and thus generally more difficult to quickly re-lease or reuse compared with small, "infill" sites, they are also more visually significant and thus provide a more widespread signal of decay and negative business climate. In contrast, a number of smaller parcels with varied building types often have a better chance of being adapted and re-leased.

Given the multi-faceted nature of urban decay, its prospects for likelihood can be difficult to predict or quantify with precision. This analysis focuses on three indicators to assess its probability:

- 1. Existing Condition of Retail Sector: All other things being equal, a weak or faltering retail sector will be more susceptible to urban decay. Conversely, a new competitive retail project is less likely to precipitate urban decay if existing market conditions are strong.
- 2. Incidence, Duration, and Size of Sales Shift and/or Vacancies: Urban decay is more likely if a new competitive project results in a relatively large and prolonged shift in retail sales away from existing establishments or high and extended periods of vacancy. Although there is no absolute rule, generally speaking, a shift in retail sales away from existing establishments within a trade area of greater than 10 percent and lasting 3 to 5 years may be large enough to lead to the physical abandonment of buildings. Most establishments can usually withstand a temporary sales shift of 5 to 7 percent over a 3- to 5-year timeframe, as this is equivalent to a typical business cycle downturn. Likewise, market-wide vacancy rates of greater than 10 percent and lasting longer than 5 years can be difficult to sustain. Since the sales shift or vacancy impacts are not likely to be distributed equally across all businesses in a trade area, the incidence of these impacts may also be relevant. For example, if the total sales shift is likely to be focused on several large properties, then the potential for urban decay may exist even if the total sales shift is within the thresholds described above.
- **3.** Attributes and Reuse Options of Affected Properties: The type, location, and parcel configuration of affected properties as well as the range of potential reuse options will also play a role in their susceptibility to urban decay. As noted above, an abandoned "ghost box" poses a particularly strong risk for urban decay because of the difficulty in finding an appropriate replacement tenant. Such a large vacancy can occur as a result of a vulnerable tenant going out of business or a viable tenant relocating to the subject site from within the Trade Area. Given the size and configuration of the big box center, finding viable replacement uses can be difficult and prolonged.

Trade Area Description

A trade area is a geographic region that contains the elements of demand and supply that will determine the performance of a particular retail store or project. Trade areas are influenced by a variety of factors, including the location and density of the targeted residential population, the location of key competitors, the relative distance or travel time for each of the above, geographic and psychological barriers, and existing commute and shopping patterns. Retail establishments outside of a given trade area are not considered to be at risk of urban decay from development within the trade area.

There is no single or definitive methodology for establishing a trade area. The approach typically varies with the type of retail or specific tenants involved (for example, a coffee shop has a smaller trade area relative to a "big box") as well as the overall size of a project. This analysis utilizes a

relatively generic approach for establishing a trade area, as described below, since specific tenants at Selma Crossings have not been identified.

Primary Trade Area (Trade Area)

Because of the significant amount of retail space within the project, this analysis considers the Trade Area outside of the city limits as Selma Crossings will provide a retail mix that appeals to customers well beyond the City's boundary. The Trade Area identified in this analysis consists of neighboring jurisdictions and unincorporated areas around Selma, including Fowler, Parlier, Dinuba, Reedley, and Kingsburg. These communities benefit from direct and convenient access to retail located in Selma and typically have less established retail markets. The Trade Area excludes Fresno and Visalia, the two major regional retail centers to the north and south. These two cities have substantial retail space capacity and effectively serve as separate markets. The Trade Area map is shown in Exhibit 4.13-1.

It is important to note that trade areas are also influenced by the type of tenant as different tenants may draw upon various geographic areas. Given the scale of the Selma Crossings retail, there will likely be a substantial regional retail-serving component, drawing shoppers from a wide geographical sphere and serving residents of cities outside the Trade Area. However, the significance of this regional draw will depend on the existence of competitive establishments elsewhere with similar product lines to those offered at the project (e.g., big box retailers in other jurisdictions).

Fresno and Visalia are not included in the primary Trade Area, as both maintain relatively substantial and self-contained retail markets of their own. A substantial increase in capture of retail sales from these nearby cities may be difficult to support, since both Fresno and Visalia appear to be oversupplied with retail relative to their population and have a queue of new retail projects in the pipeline that will further expand their supply, as described below.

- Fresno has between 4.0 million and 6.6 million square feet of planned, proposed, and entitled retail space, which, if fully built, would support additional sales capacity of up to \$2 billion.
- Visalia is in the process of updating its General Plan and is looking for opportunities to revitalize its commercial corridors such as Mooney Boulevard. Visalia already has a diversified mix of retail supply that supports a regional sales capture. This suggests that the Trade Area for Selma Crossings would be bounded by a smaller geographic area limited by Fowler to the north and Traver to the south.

Secondary Trade Area

The Selma primary Trade Area size represents a conservative estimate of a relatively self-contained retail market for the purpose of this analysis. However, Selma Crossings could potentially capture sales outside of the primary Trade Area because of its size, mix of uses, and competitive market position along SR-99, especially if it is able to differentiate itself from competitive supply of regional retail space. As a result, a broader "Secondary Trade Area" is also considered in this analysis.

Specifically, sales capture from tenants and households located in Fresno and Visalia, each within a 30-minute drive from the Selma Crossings site, is considered another potential source of demand for the project.

Retail Market Trends and Sales Conditions

This discussion provides an overview of the retail market trends relevant to the performance and success of Selma Crossings, the City's sales trends, and leakage analysis. It focuses on retail market conditions, key demographic factors, future retail supply, and retail sales flows.

National Retail Market Conditions

National retail market trends and conditions provide some insight into factors that are currently influencing the retail sector and may influence future retail growth to support the project. The recent recession has had a significant effect on the retail sector, especially in areas like the Central Valley. Starting in 2008, a combination of increasing unemployment rates, reduced consumer credit, home foreclosures, and declining consumer confidence resulted in a significant decline in retail spending nationwide. The decline in retail spending resulted in bankruptcies, store closures, and consolidations among a wide range of formerly successful retail chains including Mervyn's, Sharper Image, Gottschalks, and KB Toys (bankruptcy); Linens 'N Things, Circuit City, Office Depot, Home Expo, and Starbucks (closures); and CVS's acquisition of Long's Drugs (consolidation), which in turn resulted in an over-supply of retail space. The national retail sector has appeared to stabilize and in some categories actually rebounded in 2010–11 with the opening of several chains in California, including Fresh & Easy, WinCo, and Kohl's. Although many shopping centers have attracted replacement tenants including Macy's, Forever 21, and Anna's Linens, among others, vacancies remain somewhat elevated, and significant uncertainty remains.

As described later, Selma's current square footage of retail space falls below the U.S. national average, although this could increase substantially with the completion of Selma Crossings. The retail sector can be expected to continue to evolve to respond to economic and social trends. This leads to uncertainty of the ultimate type and mix of retail that will be attracted to the project. The project has not identified specific tenants, and the site plan provides flexibility to meet the needs of different retail and commercial concepts, subject to the upper limit of analyzed square footage and trip generation.

Although some retail markets may be perceived as saturated, there may still be opportunities for expansion or upgrades in the type of product available. For instance, many markets enhance their performance through innovative strategies such as a differentiated product or market niche, the relocation or consolidation of existing retail categories, direct competition, or a combination of the above. It is also important to note that the recent economic trends suggest that the national retail market is likely to undergo significant transformation in the upcoming years, including substantial consolidation and store closings.



Source: Economic and Planning Systems, Inc.



Michael Brandman Associates

31130002 • 03/2012 | 4.13-1_trade_area_boundaries.cdr

Exhibit 4.13-1 Trade Area Boundaries

Although the recent recession has caused significant turbulence in the retail market and created a higher degree of uncertainty with regard to tenanting and absorption forecasting, fundamental changes in retail also presents new opportunities as more competitive retail tenants, concepts, and formats emerge and establish their presence in new locations.

Citywide Socio-Economic Trends

Existing Trends

Located in the heart of the San Joaquin Valley, the City of Selma has a population of approximately 23,400 residents and 6,600 households. Although relatively small, the City is located along SR-99 roughly equal distance from Fresno and Visalia. SR-99 provides connectivity to other major transportation routes, while the City is also located within 20 minutes of an international airport. Selma's population has been growing at the average annual rate of about 2.3 percent over the last two decades, as shown in Table 4.13-1. This rate of growth is slightly below the broader regional average growth of 2.5 percent a year.

The City has historically experienced comparatively strong retail performance relative to expenditure potential of its residents. The reason for this performance is a diverse retail sector that attracts expenditures from a sub-regional area, including Fowler, Parlier, Dinuba, Reedley, and Kingsburg. This Trade Area has a population of an additional 79,000 residents outside of the City's boundary. The retail performance in Selma has also been enhanced by a cluster of auto dealerships, as well as big box stores such as Walmart and Home Depot. It is worth stating that the City has been conducting various economic development efforts to support its retail performance, such as development of an economic development business plan, utilization of a redevelopment agency, and market studies. Examples of successful economic development include creation of an auto mall and development of Pea Soup Andersen's restaurant. The majority of employment in Selma is in the industrial category (construction, manufacturing, wholesale trade, and transportation/warehousing), followed by education, healthcare, and retail trade. Selma has an unemployment rate of 20 percent according to the data from the City's Economic Development Business Plan.

Projected Trends

Selma's population and employment growth are expected to contribute to future retail demand. The City of Selma recently completed a General Plan update that plans for new growth capacity over the next 25 years. The City is projecting robust population growth of up to 4 percent a year, nearly double the historical growth rate (see Table 4.13-2). The Fresno Council of Governments (Fresno COG), an agency that provides a forecast for population and employment growth for cities in Fresno County by the sphere of influence, projects 2.2 percent annual population growth in the Trade Area cities in Fresno County over the next 20 years¹. Selma's employment growth is also projected to continue, although annual employment growth of 2.1 percent will be below the level of population growth over the next 20 years. This means that the jobs housing balance will worsen in the City. Selma's average annual employment growth rate of 2.0 percent falls in the middle of a range of all Trade Area cities, as shown in Table 4.13-3.

¹ The Trade Area population growth of 2.6 percent shown in Table 4.13-2 is above that forecasted by Fresno COG, because the higher rate of Selma's growth assumed in this analysis is based on the City's General Plan forecast.

													1	990-2010 0	Growth
Item	1990	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Total	% Change	Avg. Annual Growth Rate
Trade Area Cities															
Selma	14,757	19,444	19,946	20,383	21,032	21,846	22,361	22,876	23,044	23,238	23,301	23,435	8,678	58.8%	2.3%
Fowler	3,394	4,046	4,097	4,238	4,367	4,613	4,718	4,843	5,257	5,562	5,671	5,764	2,370	69.8%	2.7%
Parlier	7,938	11,145	11,420	12,085	12,241	12,297	12,679	12,862	12,993	13,299	13,555	13,658	5,720	72.1%	2.8%
Dinuba	12,743	16,844	17,126	17,528	18,388	18,688	19,215	19,445	19,843	20,917	21,237	21,542	8,799	69.0%	2.7%
Reedley	15,791	20,756	20,990	21,215	21,466	21,815	22,549	23,287	24,751	25,538	25,723	26,227	10,436	66.1%	2.6%
Kingsburg	7,245	9,231	9,719	10,100	10,584	11,189	11,210	11,218	11,161	11,234	11,427	11,504	4,259	58.8%	2.3%
Incorporated Total	61,868	81,466	83,298	85,549	88,078	90,448	92,732	94,531	97,049	99,788	100,914	102,130	40,262	65.1%	2.5%
Unincorporated Trade Area ⁽¹⁾	4,171	5,493	5,616	5,768	5,939	6,098	6,252	6,374	6,543	6,728	6,804	6,886	2,715	65.1%	2.5%
Total Trade Area Population	66,039	86,959	88,914	91,317	94,017	96,546	98,984	100,905	103,592	106,516	107,718	109,016	42,977	65.1%	2.5%
Note:	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	

(1) It is assumed that approximately 7% of the trade area population resides in unincorporated areas based on the 2010 Census figures. Sources: CA Department of Finance, Census 2010, and Economic & Planning Systems, Inc.

Table 4.13-2: Trade Area Population Projections (2010–2030)

						2010-2030 Growth		า
Item	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	Total	% Change	Avg. Annual Growth Rate
Selma ⁽¹⁾	26,521	32,267	39,258	47,763	58,111	31,590	119.1%	4.0%
Fowler	7,417	8,604	10,042	11,989	14,682	7,265	97.9%	3.5%
Parlier	13,630	14,610	15,798	17,406	19,630	6,000	44.0%	1.8%
Dinuba ⁽²⁾	21,542	23,435	25,730	28,839	33,139	11,597	53.8%	2.2%
Reedley	24,525	26,344	28,550	31,536	35,666	11,141	45.4%	1.9%
Kingsburg	11,867	12,507	13,284	14,336	15,791	3,925	33.1%	1.4%
Total/Average	105,503	117,768	132,662	151,870	177,021	71,518	67.8%	2.6%

Notes:

Projections are based on aggregations of the traffic analysis zones that represent sphere of influence of the cities rather than the incorporated city boundaries.

(1) Based on the General Plan forecast of 4.0 percent a year through 2035. It is worth noting that this rate of projected population growth exceeds Selma's forecasted average by Fresno COG of 2.5% a year.

⁽²⁾ Employment projections for Dinuba are not available and are based on a weighted average annual growth rate for the other market area cities.

Source: Economic & Planning Systems, 2012.

Table 4.13-3: Trade Area Employment Projections (2010–2030)

						2010-2030 Growth		ı
Item	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	Total	% Change	Avg. Annual Growth Rate
Selma	7,249	7,801	8,507	9,633	10,844	3,595	49.6%	2.0%
Fowler	3,902	4,386	4,999	6,077	7,086	3,184	81.6%	3.0%
Parlier	1,731	1,928	2,174	2,530	2,971	1,239	71.6%	2.7%
Dinuba ⁽¹⁾	5,948	6,450	7,089	8,128	9,217	3,269	55.0%	2.2%
Reedley	7,348	7,813	8,406	9,231	10,323	2,975	40.5%	1.7%
Kingsburg	4,369	4,586	4,862	5,292	5,775	1,406	32.2%	1.4%
Total/Average	30,547	32,964	36,037	40,891	46,215	15,668	51.3%	2.1%

Note:

Projections are based on aggregations of the traffic analysis zones that represent sphere of influence of the cities rather than the incorporated city boundaries. ⁽¹⁾ Employment projections for Dinuba are not available and are based on a weighted average annual growth rate for the other market area cities.

Source: Economic & Planning Systems, 2012.

Selma Retail Market Review

Current Market Conditions

Selma's retail market is estimated to contain approximately 600,000 square feet of space with relatively diversified retail options and retail clusters. The majority of retail in the Trade Area is located within Selma, although limited retail options are available in adjacent unincorporated communities and other cities. According to the Terranomics Q4 2010 market report, the two largest shopping centers in Selma have an annual average leasing rate of \$15 per square foot, below the broader Fresno County average lease rate of \$20 per square foot. The broader Fresno County retail space has a vacancy rate of between 10 and 11 percent, as estimated by Terranomics. These trends suggest Selma's relative cost advantage but locational inferiority compared with the broader Fresno County market, dominated by the City of Fresno. Lower lease rates are also a function of lower land costs in Selma, which reflect its relative affordability on a regional level.

Retail sales in Selma have generally followed the broader economic trends with the sales peaking in 2006 and declining since. The City's share of the broader countywide sales has remained relatively stable historically ranging between 3 and 4 percent during the last decade. However, the City's share of sales started decreasing after the 2006 peak, dropping to a 13-year low of 2.7 in 2009. This trend, illustrated in Table 4.13-4, suggests that Selma has had a relatively well established retail market, although its retail sales may be more vulnerable to economic cycles than the broader region. It is worth stating that the City's rent and vacancy trends are not tracked by any broker houses, but broker interviews reveal that the City has experienced a similar market downturn to the broader region reflected through rent decreases and vacancy increases.

One key retail cluster in the City is in the Central Business District (CBD) in downtown. It offers a range of stand-alone and ground floor retail in a mixed-use, walkable setting located along SR-99. It contains small shops, boutique businesses, and restaurants, while larger retail space, including big box stores such as Walmart and Home Depot, is concentrated in northwest Selma outside of the CBD. The majority of the retail inventory in the CBD is relatively dated, with limited new development in the CBD. Selma's CBD has remained mostly a niche market, the City being the largest town in Central Valley without a Starbucks. Selma's CBD has maintained relatively low retail vacancies despite the broader economic conditions because of its well-diversified tenant mix and scarce space supply. Some of the City's existing CBD business remained in the area despite lease expiration. A number of tenants used this opportunity to secure larger spaces in a better downtown location while taking advantage of lower rents associated with the broader economic trends. For example, The Scrapbooking Garden recently relocated from its free CBD location subsidized by the City's Redevelopment Agency² into a site with better visibility and foot traffic. Other recently relocated CBD businesses include the Kratos Music Center and Maddy N Me Boutique. In addition, the former CBD Cost Less store is being renovated as part of the conversion to a mall. Continued investment and tenant activity provide empirical evidence about optimistic CBD outlook during the economic recovery.

² The City of Selma's Redevelopment Agency was dissolved in early 2012.

Table 4.13-4: Selma's Share in Fresno County (2000–2009)

Item	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
BOE Expenditures (in \$1,000s)										
Selma	\$337,422	\$359,498	\$370,492	\$382,744	\$394,349	\$429,109	\$440,091	\$410,020	\$330,969	\$273,899
Fresno County	\$8,472,055	\$8,592,575	\$9,038,725	\$9,742,637	\$10,722,491	\$11,888,436	\$12,560,649	\$12,308,257	\$11,729,171	\$9,966,448
Selma as % of Fresno County	4.0%	4.2%	4.1%	3.9%	3.7%	3.6%	3.5%	3.3%	2.8%	2.7%
Other Trade Area Cities										
Fowler	\$46,995	\$40,684	\$52,134	\$69,429	\$86,996	\$115,622	\$111,942	\$116,273	\$120,275	\$90,376
Parlier	\$17,840	\$17,258	\$17,986	\$19,587	\$22,317	\$24,530	\$26,358	\$27,374	\$30,695	\$30,174
Dinuba	\$113,786	\$119,228	\$127,847	\$139,923	\$149,588	\$190,565	\$213,189	\$214,873	\$193,938	\$254,019
Reedley	\$119,437	\$127,289	\$125,868	\$127,043	\$132,723	\$147,811	\$146,066	\$146,933	\$144,451	\$124,604
Kingsburg	\$56,157	\$55,342	\$55,003	\$58,986	\$61,993	\$66,615	\$71,869	\$78,393	\$81,654	\$74,135
Trade Area Total	\$691,637	\$719,299	\$749,330	\$797,712	\$847,966	\$974,252	\$1,009,515	\$993,866	\$901,982	\$847,207
Source: Economic & Planning Systems, 2012.										

Table 4.13-5: Selma's Sales per	Capita	(2000–2009)
---------------------------------	--------	-------------

Retail and Food Service Sales (\$1,000s)										
Item	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Selma	\$376,366	\$391,311	\$397,542	\$405,008	\$419,791	\$450,760	\$447,272	\$402,978	\$296,040	\$239,482
Fowler	\$20,580	\$18,872	\$24,817	\$32,291	\$38,427	\$45,901	\$49,604	\$52,088	\$56,047	\$44,555
Parlier	\$18,786	\$17,527	\$18,176	\$19,316	\$21,826	\$23,532	\$23,571	\$23,982	\$25,922	\$22,593
Dinuba	\$124,337	\$126,236	\$131,827	\$141,230	\$151,891	\$188,867	\$209,642	\$205,708	\$177,616	\$231,609
Reedley	\$116,665	\$119,807	\$120,384	\$120,322	\$121,660	\$133,906	\$127,737	\$119,547	\$113,633	\$96,275
Kingsburg	\$59,478	\$54,141	\$51,328	\$55,474	\$56,906	\$60,494	\$62,916	\$64,096	\$64,302	\$56,568
Total	\$716,212	\$727,893	\$744,075	\$773,641	\$810,501	\$903,460	\$920,743	\$868,400	\$733,561	\$691,082
Population-Driven Sales ⁽¹⁾	\$644,590	\$655,104	\$669,668	\$696,277	\$729,451	\$813,114	\$828,668	\$781,560	\$660,205	\$621,974
Citywide Population	81,466	83,298	85,549	88,078	90,448	92,732	94,531	97,049	99,788	105,503
Unincorporated Trade Area Population ⁽²⁾	5,493	5,616	5,768	5,939	6,098	6,252	6,374	6,543	6,728	7,113
Total Trade Area Population	86,959	88,914	91,317	94,017	96,546	98,984	100,905	103,592	106,516	112,616
Per Capita Sales ⁽³⁾	\$7,413	\$7,368	\$7,333	\$7,406	\$7,555	\$8,215	\$8,212	\$7,545	\$6,198	\$5,523

Notes:

 ⁽¹⁾ About 90% of the total sales are assumed to be population-driven rather than driven by non-resident employees.
⁽²⁾ It is assumed that approximately 7% of the trade area population resides in unincorporated areas based on the 2010 Census figures.
⁽³⁾ Reflect sales driven by local population and visitor spending; this analysis implies that all of the trade area residents support retail sales within the Trade Area cities, since most of the retail space within the Trade Area is located in incorporated areas.

Source: Economic & Planning Systems, 2012.

Urban Decay

Future Supply

Economic & Planning Systems, Inc. (EPS) gathered information on anticipated future retail supply within major retail development in the Trade Area based on data from the Trade Area cities. EPS understands that the precise levels and retail tenants for the area have yet to be determined; therefore, this report does not differentiate between types of retail. Instead, retail supply is calculated by estimating the typical or average sale volumes for new space of sales in addition to existing supply and is then compared with projected Trade Area demand for retail sales.

The analysis assumes minimal new retail supply will be developed in the Trade Area, as only one project (the Parlier project) is under construction and one project in Reedley is entitled. When completed, the two Trade Area developments are estimated to support combined annual retail sales of \$35 million, as shown in Table 4.13-6. It is worth stating that Reedley has a modest downtown retail cluster and demonstrated an anti-big box sentiment when a Walmart Supercenter was voted down in the City in 2002. Fowler, Parlier, Dinuba, and Kingsburg are smaller, semi-rural communities with limited retail opportunities.

Project Name	City	Intersection	Retail Square Footage	Planning Stage	Average Sales per Square Foot	Total Sales
West Isaac Commercial Center	Parlier	Newmark Ave. / Manning Ave.	30,000	Under Construction	\$350	\$10,500,000
[Unnamed]	Reedley	Manning Ave. / Zumwalt Ave.	60,000-80,000	Entitled	\$350	\$24,500,000
		Total	100,000	—	—	\$35,000,000
Notes						

Table 4.13-6:	Current	Retail	Pipeline

Note:

Does not include a Rockwell Pond development proposal that includes 973,100 square feet of retail space in Selma. Source: Economic & Planning Systems, 2012.

Trade Area Sales Flows

Selma's retail sales have grown through 2006 and have decreased since, as shown in Table 4.13-5, above. EPS has projected retail demand in Selma, based on several major retail sales factors as described below. The City's sales typically include four major expenditure sources:

- 1. Resident households
- 2. Visitors, such as through commuters
- 3. Workers who live elsewhere (nonresidents)
- 4. Business-to-business purchases

The difference between total taxable sales and retail taxable sales is attributable to business-tobusiness, internet, and other non-site-based sales. For simplification purpose, this analysis assumes the business-to-business sales are excluded from retail taxable sales, as this category does not

typically have significant results on the urban decay analysis findings. EPS has formulated an approach to estimate average population per capita expenditure, nonresident worker expenditure, and visitor expenditure in the Trade Area. Population and visitor per capita expenditures are based on the Trade Area's 10-year taxable retail and restaurant sales average, shown in Table 4.13-5, above. This approach utilizes retail sales average between 2000 and 2009 in order to provide a proxy for long-term retail sales under normalized market conditions rather than reflect a recent instability of a retail market and associated retail sales fluctuations. It also implies that visitor expenditure will increase in proportion to population growth

Non-resident employee expenditures are assumed to comprise 10 percent of the overall Trade Area sales based on an average taxable spending of \$5 per day reflective of typical lunch and gasoline expenditures. Trade Area population-based and visitor retail expenditures are assumed to comprise the remaining 90 percent of the sales. This methodology results in the annual retail and restaurant spending of \$7,300 per capita attributed to the Trade Area residents and visitors based on the average over the last decade; refer to Table 4.13-7.

Category	Item	Total
Trade Area Expenditure	Population and Visitor Expenditure per Capita ⁽¹⁾	\$7,277
	Expenditure per Employee ⁽²⁾	\$1,250
New Growth (2010–2030)	Population ⁽³⁾	71,518
	Employment ⁽³⁾	15,668
	Non-Resident Employment ⁽⁴⁾	12,535
Sales Increase	Population	\$520,423,909
	Employment	\$15,668,130
	Total	\$536,092,039

Table 4.13-7: Trade Area Sales Estimates (2009)

Notes:

* Excludes other retail stores and non-retail sales

⁽¹⁾ Average food and retail sales per capita between 2000 and 2009

⁽²⁾ Based on a net new average daily expenditure of \$5 per workday assuming 250 work days per year

⁽³⁾ Incorporated areas with the Trade Area

⁽⁴⁾ Net of employees who live in the Trade Area; assumes that 20% of employees live in the Trade Area, based on Selma's 2008 employment distribution as reported by Census 2000.

Source: Economic & Planning Systems, 2012.

If the projected level of population, employment, and visitor growth materializes over the next 20 years, retail expenditures associated with the project could increase by \$536 million, a growth of over 200 percent over existing sales. This analysis assumes that the other cities and unincorporated areas outside of Selma will not add any new retail space to their existing inventory above the limited pipeline data discussed above. To the extent that these other communities increase their retail space supply, the ability of Selma Crossings to capture new sales would be diminished.

As shown in Table 4.13-7, per-employee and per capita sales expenditures are assumed to be fixed going forward (i.e., the total will increase in proportion to the Trade Area population and employment growth, respectively). This analysis is based on the assumption that the majority of the new population and employment growth will be concentrated in incorporated areas within the Trade Area, which is a preferred outcome for many growing agricultural regions. To the extent that some new population or employment growth occurs in unincorporated areas, additional demand for retail space would be created for Selma Crossings beyond the level estimated in this analysis. In addition, this analysis assumes that the per capita expenditures in Selma and the broader Trade Area will remain constant (adjusted for inflation) during the forecast period. To the extent that household real incomes increase, Trade Area residents' disposable expenditures may also increase, which would improve retail performance relative to the estimates provided herein.

Retail Leakage Analysis

To better illustrate the types of retail offered in Selma relative to the purchases of local residents, Table 4.13-8 illustrates the major retail categories and the amounts supplied based on 2009 sales data and retail expenditure patterns from the California Board of Equalization (BOE) and Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). These calculations illustrate the concept of "retail leakage" and "retail capture" in the Trade Area by showing how much of a particular category is in demand, based on the income and demographic characteristics of local residents and whether the retail sector is meeting this demand. Non-retail expenditures such as business-to-business and internet sales are excluded from this analysis³.

ltem	Category	Household Demand for Expenditure (\$1,000s)	Actual Retail Sales (\$1,000s)	Net Capture/(Leakage) (\$1,000s)
Capture	General Merchandise	\$5,509	\$44,304	\$38,795
	Food Stores ⁽¹⁾	\$20,925	\$49,290	\$28,365
	Restaurants ⁽²⁾	\$12,714	\$28,767	\$16,053
	Building Materials and Construction	\$3,208	\$23,709	\$20,501
	Service Stations	\$13,924	\$15,656	\$1,732
	Total Capture	\$56,280	\$161,726	\$105,446
Leakage	Apparel	\$8,283	\$1,543	(\$6,740)
	Home Furnishings and Appliances	\$6,830	\$3,916	(\$2,914)

Table 4.13-8: Retail Sales	Leakage in Selma	(2009)
----------------------------	------------------	--------

³ These sales typically do not require any retail space and are assumed to be mostly attributed to business-to-business sales, rather than resident, employee, or visitor expenditures.

Item	Category	Household Demand for Expenditure (\$1,000s)	Actual Retail Sales (\$1,000s)	Net Capture/(Leakage) (\$1,000s)
	Total Leakage	\$15,114	\$5,459	(\$9,655)
Selma Tot sales and s	al (net of automotive supplies)	\$71,394	\$167,185	\$95,792

Table 4.13-8 (cont.): Retail Sales Leakage in Selma (2009)

Notes:

Retail sales leakage excludes other retail stores and non-retail sales.

(1) It is assumed that taxable sales generated by food stores are roughly 1/3 of total sales given no tax on food expenditures.
(2) Eating and drinking places.

Source: Economic & Planning Systems, 2012.

As shown in Table 4.13-8, Selma's 2009 retail sales by category combine for \$167 million, significantly exceeding demand generated by local residents estimated at \$71 million⁴. This suggests that the City captured at least \$96 million in retail sales from residents of other jurisdictions and travelers along SR-99. Apparel and home furnishings are the only two categories that have exhibited retail "leakage," where demand from Selma residents was below the actual retail sales, suggesting that Selma residents shop elsewhere for apparel and home furnishing goods. Selma's retail leakage is estimated at \$9.7 million, significantly below its capture of \$105 million, which suggests a strong retail presence in the City. These findings are generally consistent with the City's official leakage forecast for Q4 2009.

It is also worth noting that a significant amount of retail space in the Project is dedicated for an expanded auto mall. Automotive sales and supplies is a unique category that has recently experienced a significant contraction in the wake of the national recession and the nature and timing of its recovery is highly uncertain. However, Selma has established a cluster of automotive dealers and has historically been successful at attracting regional automotive expenditures. The City recently attracted Chrysler, Dodge, and Jeep dealerships. Additional automotive dealerships proposed as part of the Project could enhance regional competitiveness of the existing automotive sales cluster despite limited expenditure potential of Selma residents. In addition, the automotive retail sector is unique as it often captures regional expenditures without adverse impacts on other retail categories because of the distinct nature of its focus. As a result, the automotive sales and supplies category is excluded from the urban decay analysis.

Comparing sales per household in Selma to California average confirms the City's overall retail capture and reflects its per household expenditures above those of the state average, as shown in Table 4.13-9. While Selma's net retail expenditure capture is predominantly attributed to its automotive sales cluster, its residents generate fewer sales per household than the state average in the Apparel, Home Furnishings and Supplies (which generally confirms the leakage analysis results), as well as Service Stations categories, suggesting that additional sales capacity may exist in these retail categories.

⁴ Excludes "automotive sales and supplies" and "other" retail stores and non-retail sales.

	Selma (6,577 Households)		California (12,790		
Item	Total Sales in \$1,000s	Sales per Household	Total Sales in \$1,000s	Sales per Household	Difference
Apparel Stores	\$1,543	\$235	\$25,641,272	\$2,005	(\$1,770)
General Merchandise Stores	\$44,304	\$6,736	\$64,460,769	\$5,040	\$1,696
Food Stores ⁽¹⁾	\$49,290	\$7,494	\$67,638,855	\$5,288	\$2,206
Restaurants	\$28,767	\$4,374	\$49,921,543	\$3,903	\$471
building Materials and Construction	\$23,709	\$3,605	\$23,978,313	\$1,875	\$1,730
Iome Furnishings and Appliances	\$3,916	\$595	\$21,865,358	\$1,710	(\$1,114)
Iotor Vehicles and Parts	\$89,956	\$13,677	\$44,488,199	\$3,478	\$10,199
ervice Stations	\$15,656	\$2,380	\$39,077,835	\$3,055	(\$675)
otal	\$257,141	\$39,097	\$337,072,144	\$26,354	\$12,743

Table 4.13-9: Household Spending by Category Compared to State Average (2009)

 $^{(1)}$ It is assumed that taxable sales generated by food stores are roughly 1/3 of total sales given no tax on food expenditures.

Source:

4.13.3 - Regulatory Framework

Local

City of Selma

General Plan

Both the 1997 General Plan and 2035 General Plan set forth the following goal relevant to urban decay. Note that the goal numbering reflects the 2035 General Plan.

• Goal 7: Provide a full range of commercial activity appropriate to the community.

The 2035 General Plan established the following policy relevant to urban decay:

• **Policy 1.40:** The Land Use Element and plan map include eight commercial categories intended to provide a complete range of neighborhood, community, service, regional and highway commercial needs. In addition, there are districts identified for commercial office, planned medical development and the central business district. Below is a summary of the commercial land uses provided for in this General Plan: [...]

Regional Commercial (RC): 60% Lot Coverage

This designation is designed to provide development opportunities for those uses that attract customers from well outside the City of Selma. To fulfill the role as a regional commercial provider, such development must be close to major transportation links and contain sufficient area to provide adequate facilities and parking. Regional uses have anchor tenants with market areas generally covering at least a fifteen mile radius such as larger durable good retail stores and vehicle sales. [...]

4.13.4 - Methodology

EPS has been retained by Michael Brandman Associates to conduct an urban decay analysis for the Selma Crossings mixed-use development proposal (the project) located in Selma, California

This report evaluates the project's impact over a 20-year buildout. This buildout schedule corresponds to the time horizon for the Fresno COG population and employment growth projections. It is worth stating that this 20-year buildout schedule differs from the 12-year schedule evaluated in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) associated with this project. To the extent that the project would have a more rapid pace of development, the effect on the local retail market would be more pronounced.

Primary Data Sources

This report relies on a variety of data sources cited throughout the document as well as previous market studies completed for the City. In addition to the primary sources of information listed below, the findings are also based on existing EPS research and in-house data from other retail studies. The primary information sources include but are not limited to the following:

- Demographic and economic data from the Council of Fresno County Governments (COG), the U.S. Census Bureau, the California State Board of Equalization (BOE), the California Department of Finance (DOF), the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), and other publicly available sources.
- Operational and project description information related to Selma Crossings from the project application.
- Urban Decay Analysis and Economic Impact for Selma Crossings prepared by Ramsay Group.
- Interviews with City staff, real estate brokers, and fieldwork.

This analysis is based on constant 2009 dollars (adjusting for inflation), in accordance with the most recent data available.

Urban Decay Analysis Methodology

The proposed Selma Crossings retail will potentially capture retail sales from three major sources:

- 1. Demand that has been historically "leaked" to establishments outside the Trade Area
- 2. Demand from new households and visitors/through commuters
- 3. Demand from new workers who live elsewhere (nonresidents)

The economic impact of the Selma Crossings Project will depend upon the degree to which these three sources of demand are captured. To the extent that the project captures newly created demand, or demand currently leaking outside the Trade Area, the retail market impact on existing establishments will be reduced. However, negative retail market impacts may result if the project captures sales from within the Trade Area that formerly were captured by existing establishments. It is likely that a portion of the Trade Area residents will continue to shop elsewhere; however, this leakage is assumed to be generally offset by expenditures of non-Trade Area residents who would potentially be attracted to Selma by the Selma Crossings Project. Each retail sales source is described below.

Leakage Outside the Trade Area

While leakage analysis described in the previous chapter and shown in Table 4.13-9 suggests an overall retail sales capture in Selma, apparel and home furnishings and supplies are the only two categories that have exhibited retail "leakage" adding up to \$9.7 million, suggesting that Selma residents shop elsewhere for these goods. This analysis assumes that Selma Crossings will capture the existing leakage in the apparel goods and home furnishings and supplies category.

Population, Employment, and Visitors/Regional Commuters Growth

The projected level of population and employment growth over the next 20 years will be attributed to the largest share of new retail expenditures that would likely be captured by the Selma Crossings Project. This analysis assumes that the Trade Area's capture of visitors/regional commuters will

increase in proportion to population growth. Since many Trade Area employees are also residents, this analysis assumes that 80 percent of the Trade Area employees live elsewhere and will result in net new sales beyond those captured under the population retail growth estimates. This ratio is based on Selma's employment composition as reported by Census 2000. New population, non-resident employees, and visitor growth is estimated to increase retail sales by \$536 million, a growth of over 200 percent over existing sales. This projection reflects population growth within a sphere of influence of incorporated Trade Area cities, where most of the growth is likely to occur over the next 20 years.

It is worth stating that while through commuters are assumed to be a component of the overall visitor spending, they do not generate significant expenditures since most of the sales occur at their origin or destination points. For example, shoppers are generally reluctant to purchase "big ticket" items at establishments that are a significant distance from their homes because of inconveniences related to transport and service follow-up (e.g., product return), although long-distance commuters do generate a small level of expenditures associated with gasoline and food/snack purchases. However, only a small portion of through commuters seeking gasoline and food purchases would be captured by Selma Crossings, given a large supply of these services along SR-99.

4.13.5 - Thresholds of Significance

Implementation of the proposed project would result in significant urban decay impacts if it would:

- Create long-term store vacancies or result in the abandonment of buildings within the retail market served by the proposed project; or
- Result in the physical deterioration of properties or structures that impairs the proper utilization of the properties or structures, or health, safety, and welfare of the surrounding community.

4.13.6 - Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This section discusses potential impacts associated with the development of the proposed project and provides mitigation measures where appropriate.

Urban Decay

Impact UD-1:	Blight and urban decay of vacant storefronts are not foreseeable consequences of
	the proposed project.

Impact Analysis

This impact will address potential project impacts associated with urban decay.

Project Sales Estimate

Selma Crossings is a mixed-use development project located along SR-99 and proposed to include nearly 3.5 million square feet of building space assumed to be developed over a 20-year time frame for the purpose of this analysis. The project's uses include a mix of retail, auto mall, office,

residential, hotel and waterpark/entertainment uses. While no specific tenants have been identified, the project is proposed to include the following allocation of uses:

- Retail: 2,092,200 square feet
- Auto Mall: 400,000 square feet
- Office: 540,000 square feet
- Residential: 252,000 square feet
- Hotel: 155,000 square feet
- Waterpark/Entertainment: 10,000 square feet

In this context, the Selma Crossings project proposes about 3.5 million square feet of building space with about 2.5 million square feet dedicated to retail sales-generating uses. Based on standard assumptions regarding likely retail sales targets needed to support new retail development of \$350 per square foot, these new uses are estimated to generate about \$892 million in retail and automotive sales (\$732 million for retail only) per year, as shown in Table 4.13-10.

Item	Building Size (square feet)	Annual Sales per Square Foot	Projected Annual Sales
Retail ⁽¹⁾	2,092,200	\$350	\$732,270,000
Auto Mall	400,000	\$400	\$160,000,000
Office	540,000	NA	NA
Residential	252,000	NA	NA
Hotels	155,000	NA	NA
Waterpark/Entertainment	10,000	NA	NA
Total	3,449,200	_	\$892,270,000
Notes: ⁽¹⁾ Includes anchors, majors, sho NA = not applicable Source: Economic & Planning S	bps, and restaurant pads.	·	,

Table 4.13-10: Selma Crossings Sales Estimate

Potential Urban Decay Results

Retail capture by the proposed Selma Crossings retail includes existing leakage in apparel, expenditures from new population, employment, and visitors/commuter expenditure growth, as shown in Table 4.13-11. This approach results in the project capture of \$546 million in sales or 75 percent of its retail sales capacity, suggesting that the excess project supply of the remaining \$187 million of the total project sales capacity would need to be captured from external sources (sources beyond the Trade Area) or shifted from existing retail in the Trade Area.

Category	Item	Retail Sales
Project Sales	Project Sales ⁽¹⁾	\$732,270,000
Sources of New Demand (2010–2030)	Existing Leakage	\$9,654,626
	Primary Trade Area Growth	\$536,092,039
	Net New Sales	\$545,746,665
	Excess Project Supply ⁽²⁾	\$186,523,335
Trade Area Supply	Existing Trade Area Supply ⁽³⁾	\$847,207,000
	Other Trade Area Retail Pipeline	\$35,000,000
	Total Trade Area Supply	\$882,207,000
	Project as % of Total Trade Area Supply	83%
Excess Supply as % of Trade	Selma Crossings only	22%
Area Supply	With Other Pipeline	21%

Table 4.13-11: Impacts on New Retail and Sales Estimate

Notes:

⁽¹⁾ Net of automotive sales and supplies and non-retail sales.

⁽²⁾ Reflects a capture of existing Trade Area sales or sales that would have to be captured from the secondary trade area, such as Fresno and Visalia.

⁽³⁾ From Table 4.13 4.

Source: Economic & Planning Systems, 2012.

Excess retail supply generated by the Selma Crossings Project is estimated to comprise between 21 and 22 percent of the Trade Area total, depending on whether other cumulative projects in the pipeline are considered. In other words, over 20 percent of retail sales would be shifted from existing establishments in the Trade Area, which could potentially create conditions conducive to urban decay unless sales from outside the Trade Area are attracted. The project's sales capacity exceeds the current citywide capacity by over 300 percent (not considering projected population and employment growth), as shown in Table 4.13-12.

Item	Total			
Project Sales Capacity	\$732,270,000			
Existing Sales \$239,482,000				
Project as % of Existing Sales 306%				
Note: Net of automotive sales and supplies and non-retail sales. Source: Economic & Planning Systems, 2012.				

Despite the level of retail in Selma Crossings significantly exceeding the level of market support from the existing Trade Area, the project's unique scale could appeal to a wider market area and capture regional demand from outside of its Trade Area. Specifically, developing the Selma Crossings

Urban Decay

Project as a "super-regional" destination, drawing a significant amount customers and traffic from beyond the primary Trade Area could provide sufficient sales to support the project and other retail in the Trade Area⁵. If successful, a project would likely benefit rather than hurt existing retail in the area, since it would create significant "spillover" demand opportunities. For example, customers traveling to the Trade Area to patronize Selma Crossing establishments may also stop and make purchases at other nearby retail establishments.

Major destinations with a well-diversified and well-positioned blend of retail space often generate significant retail demand because of a unique focus and a larger market appeal. By targeting a unique retail concept, the Selma Crossings Project may support the size of the retail portion of the project. For example, uses such as entertainment, outlet centers, and tourist/recreation destinations often create a market draw that exceeds that of conventional retail centers. Several prototypical super-regional destinations are described below.

- Entertainment Destinations: retail space located within entertainment-oriented centers often benefits from a wide market draw generated by these centers and supplements their entertainment focus. California examples of entertainment-oriented retail include Magic Mountain, Disneyland, and/or ski resorts. The proposed water park provides some attraction, but the project would also need additional, large-scale entertainment uses to become a super-regional entertainment destination.
- **Outlet Center:** Outlet centers largely consist of branded retail tenants run by brand name manufactures devoted to selling their merchandise at discounted prices. They are typically located in rural areas or tourist locations and generally utilize retail tenant clusters that provide affordable goods to attract customers from a wider market area despite many tenants offering competing merchandise. Unique nature and large size of outlet centers often results in a large market draw that exceeds that of conventional retail. Examples of California outlet centers include Premium Outlets in Gilroy and Vacaville.
- Tourist/Recreation Destinations: This category includes retail clusters that are well positioned adjacent to tourism and/or other recreation destinations to capture significant traffic and spillover sales from tourists. These destinations benefit from a wide market draw generated by the tourism industry. Tourist/recreation destination examples include coastal towns with beaches and quaint downtowns, wine country and vineyard communities, and cities close to state and national parks, forests, rivers, and lakes (such as Yosemite National Park, Lake Tahoe, Modoc National Forest). It is worth stating that Selma's central location situates it close to Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks, Kings River, Pine Flat Reservoir, Yosemite, Sierra National Forest, and other outdoor recreation opportunities. Large-scale

⁵ This analysis does not identify or justify the particular land use or tenants capable of generating such demand or the geography of a super-regional trade area.

outdoor and sporting related stores are examples of retail uses that are known to attract superregional customers and could benefit from Selma's proximity to outdoor recreation attractions.

• Other Specialized or Unique Commercial Cluster: In addition to the concepts described above, other commercial formats can serve as super-regional draws provided that they offer something attractive and unique. For example, the Regional Mall of America has become a national destination, based on its sheer size and other elements. As noted earlier, Selma's cluster of auto dealerships have historically helped draw customers from a relatively large geographic region.

There are examples of other California cities with unique retail centers located outside of the major metropolitan areas that have achieved a high level of retail sales per capita. As shown in Table 4.13-13, Selma currently generates lower per capita sales relative to some of the other high sales-generating cities in California on a per capita basis. While Selma's per capita sales would significantly increase as a result of Selma Crossings development, the new citywide per capita sales would still be below some of the higher sales-generating cities in the State.

City (County)	Sales ⁽¹⁾	Population	Sales per Capita	Market Profile
Selma				
FY2007–08	\$291,559,172	23,238	\$12,547	ΝΔ
With Selma Crossings ⁽²⁾	\$1,183,829,172	58,111	\$20,372	
Selected City (County)				
Bishop (Inyo)	\$166,587,800	3,543	\$47,019	Tourism/recreation
Carmel (Monterey)	\$171,559,500	4,031	\$42,560	High end coastal/ tourism
Sonora (Tuolumne)	\$187,083,400	4,666	\$40,095	Yosemite gateway/ recreation
Del Rey Oaks (Monterey)	\$56,205,000	1,619	\$34,716	High end coastal/ tourism
Alturas (Modoc)	\$86,001,200	2,793	\$30,792	National forest gateway
Willits (Mendocino)	\$152,242,800	5,008	\$30,400	Wine country
Corning (Tehama)	\$195,340,800	7,200	\$27,131	High volume freeway access
Gilroy (Santa Clara)	\$1,085,039,700	50,947	\$21,297	Outlet center
Petaluma (Sonoma)	\$863,620,900	57,187	\$15,102	Outlet center

Table 4.13-13: Sales Per Capita for Select California Cities

California				
50th percentile	\$414,299,336,512	37,883,992	\$10,936	NA
75th percentile	\$639,341,614,190	37,883,992	\$16,876	

Table 4.13-13 (cont.): Sales Per Capita for Select California Cities

City (County)	Sales ⁽¹⁾	Population	Sales per Capita	Market Profile
Notes: ⁽¹⁾ Converted from citywide tax (2) ⁽²⁾ Reflects populating growth for NA = not available. Source: Economic & Planning S	revenues by applying a precasted through 2030. ystems, 2012.	1 percent factor to re	flect local governme	ent sales tax capture.

A combination of different outcomes is possible for implementation of the Selma Crossings given the size of the project. Some of the potential outcomes include alternative development with non-retail commercial or other uses, retail underperformance, the effective re-use of affected retail properties, and isolated rather than across-the-board impacts on existing retail. Each of these potential scenarios is described below.

- Larger Absorption/Buildout Schedule: If a super-regional serving land use(s) is not identified and successfully developed, full buildout of the project would not be likely, given existing Trade Area market conditions and growth trends. Although it appears optimistic that 2.1 million square feet of retail will be fully built and absorbed in Selma in the next 20 years, a slower buildout would result in less potential impact of this retail space. In other words, the level of development and absorption at the site is likely to be responsive to the level of market support, regardless of the approved land use designation. An extension of the project buildout schedule or inclusion of more non-retail commercial uses consistent with the site's Regional Commercial designation will also minimize its potential impact on existing retail. It is important to note that the 20-year buildout schedule differs from the 12-year schedule evaluated in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) associated with this project. To the extent that the project would have a more rapid pace of development, the effect on the local retail market would be more pronounced.
- Lower Sales Performance: While this analysis projects an average sales rate of \$350 per square foot for Selma Crossings, new retail may generate lower sales rates. If it does, the project will generate lower sales, resulting in less impact on the existing retail space than projected in this analysis. The actual sales generation will depend on a number of factors, such as ability to create a unique retail mix and creation of a super-regional draw.
- **Reuse of Affected Retail Properties:** The type, location, and parcel configuration of affected properties as well as the range of potential reuse options will play a role in their susceptibility to urban decay. For example, an abandoned "ghost box," caused by the closure of a vulnerable
tenant or a relocation of a viable tenant within the trade area poses a particularly strong risk for urban decay because of the difficulty in re-tenanting such space. Given the size and configuration of the big box center, finding viable replacement uses can be difficult and prolonged. On the other hand, smaller downtown retail space could be less susceptible to urban decay, since it is easier to reuse as another viable, non-competing use, such as office space, which may be desirable in the downtown area.

• **Isolated Impacts on Existing Retail:** While the project could result in conditions conducive to urban decay, these conditions could materialize in a number of ways, including targeting specific existing retail locations. To the extent that the impacts will be isolated, the urban decay potential may be mitigated by existing property owners. Such mitigation measures include transitioning properties to other non-retail uses that are more viable from a market and financial perspective.

Sources of Uncertainty

This report relies on a number of assumptions that cannot be predicted with certainty at this time. The key assumptions are described below.

- **Population and Employment Growth:** This analysis is based on projected sales increase from future population, employment, and visitor spending growth. Population and employment forecasts in this analysis are used as a basis for the sales increase projections over a 20-year period. If population and employment growth exceeds this forecast, the conditions conducive to urban decay would likely diminish. On the contrary, if the level of growth in the Trade Area is delayed, these conditions may worsen.
- **Project Absorption:** This analysis assumes that the Selma Crossings Project would take 20 years to build out. Given the size of the project and uncertainty related to long-term retail market conditions and economic fluctuations, the development period is uncertain. To the extent that the development schedule is extended beyond a time period of 20 years evaluated in this analysis, the conditions conducive to urban decay are likely to diminish; conversely, these conditions may be exacerbated if the development schedules are accelerated.
- **Project Sales:** This analysis assumes that the project generates an average retail sales rate of \$350 per square foot. This is a typical sales rate for new retail space in Central California and reflects a mix of big box stores, grocery stores, and inline retail. However, given the uncertainty about potential tenants and their sales generation, the project could generate a different sales rate. For example, if a large portion of space is left vacant or is occupied by non-sales-generating tenants (such as a bank, gym, or martial arts studio), overall sales would reduce. While lower sales would result in positive impacts on the Trade Area conditions conducive to urban decay, it may raise feasibility or other implementation issues for the project.

- **Regional Retail Growth:** This analysis assumes that other Trade Area jurisdictions will not develop any significant new retail space that could potentially compete with Selma Crossings. This assumption is based on the existing pipeline for new retail space in the Trade Area, which is minimal. However, if other Trade Area jurisdictions pursue new retail development, the overall supply of retail space in the Trade Area would increase. As a result, conditions conducive to urban decay may be exacerbated.
- **Income Growth:** This analysis assumes that the per capita expenditures in the Trade Area will remain constant (adjusted for inflation) during the next 20 years. To the extent that household real incomes increase, Trade Area residents' disposable expenditures may also increase, which would improve retail demand and retail performance relative to the estimates provided in this analysis.
- National and State Retail Trends: This analysis assumes that post-recession consumer behavior is likely to continue to recover and stabilize in a manner consistent with pre-recession trends. However, the retail sector has experienced dynamic changes during the recent years that raised questions about its long-term viability. Key trends related to evolving the role of the internet, credit card purchases, and consumer preferences in general present significant uncertainty. While some of these shifts may be attributed to recession-driven, short-term consumer preferences, others may be long-term shifts that could undermine the physical performance of new retail space.

Conclusion

The key findings from the urban decay analysis are:

- Success of the retail sector's performance in Selma will be driven by the Trade Area's
 population and employment growth, ability to capture visitor and commuter expenditures,
 and ability to continue taking full advantage of the remaining retail opportunities. Demand
 for new retail space is expected to increase over time as population and employment in the
 Trade Area relevant to the proposed project continues to grow (Fowler, Parlier, Dinuba,
 Reedley, Kingsburg). The proposed project is well-positioned to capture most of this new
 growth given the limited amount of other new retail space in the planning pipeline. In
 addition, the retail portion of the Project is estimated to capture existing Trade Area sales
 leakage in the Apparel and Home Furnishings and Appliances categories and additional
 visitor sales.
- 2. The proposed project will require market support beyond that provided by existing and projected Trade Area growth during full buildout of the proposed retail component. The urban decay analysis indicates that 2.1 million square feet of retail planned for the project will require capture of additional sales from outside the primary Trade Area during the 20-year time frame given the demographic conditions and trends within the Trade Area alone. Specifically, retail sales of \$732 million a year are estimated to be generated by the Selma

Crossings Project. Meanwhile, projected sales increase from future population, employment, and visitor spending growth as well as existing leakage capture in the Trade Area is about \$546 million over the next 20 years, approximately 75 percent of the required sales to support the Project based on standard sales for new development.

Although the City of Selma's General Plan accommodates a large increase in population, the time-frame for this growth is well beyond the buildout schedule assumed for the proposed project. Selma Crossing's retail component reflects an increase of over 300 percent above the existing non-automotive retail sales in Selma, while the City's General Plan buildout accommodates an increase in population of about 400 percent at full buildout, assumed in 2047. As a result, it appears that the project would require additional sales from sources outside the primary Trade Area, changes in project buildout timeframe, or faster than anticipated population and employment growth to support full buildout.

- 3. Full build-out of the project would likely be supported given existing Trade Area market conditions and growth if "super-regional" serving land uses are identified and successfully developed. Adequate market support necessary for the level of retail development proposed for Selma Crossing will likely require tenants and land uses capable of capturing demand from a much broader area, including Fresno, Visalia, and other travelers along SR-99. To the extent that the project can successfully incorporate a "super-regional" destination-oriented theme or concept full buildout of 2.1 million retail square feet is unlikely to create conditions conducive to urban decay. In fact, such a development could have positive impacts on existing Trade Area retail by creating "spill-over" opportunities from customers who might not otherwise visit or shop in the area. A variety of concepts have been successful in other California locations in creating super-regional retail destinations, such as outlet centers or r retail districts that leverage entertainment, tourist, and/or recreation-related activity. Historically, Selma's auto dealerships have also helped draw customers from a relatively large geographic region.
- 4. Actual outcomes will vary depending on sales performance of new retail establishments, attraction of specific tenants that compete directly with one or several existing centers, and the rate of project buildout. To the extent that the development schedule is extended beyond a time period of 20 years evaluated in this analysis, the conditions conducive to urban decay are likely to diminish (conversely, these conditions may be exacerbated if the development schedules are accelerated). A variety of options may be available to existing property owners that could help mitigate against the potential for urban decay, such as transitioning their properties to other non-retail uses that are more viable from a market and financial perspective. Finally, given that the actual level of development and absorption at Selma Crossings is likely to be responsive to market support, potential impact on existing retail would be minimized.

5. The findings in this analysis are premised on a number of assumptions that are subject to change depending on actual market forces and socioeconomic changes. These assumptions include population and employment projections, completion of other retail projects in the Trade Area, and sales performance of the site. Population and employment growth assumptions are based on Fresno COG's projections. Population projections in this analysis are more conservative relative to historic growth over the last 20 years.

In summary, the proposed project would develop a super-regional destination, drawing a significant amount customers and traffic from beyond the primary Trade Area, which could provide sufficient sales to support the project and other retail in the Trade Area. As such, it would largely cater to customers who currently do not patronize Trade Area outlets, which limits the potential for sales diversions.

The project is also proposed to be developed in phases over a period of more than a decade. Most commercial developers build in response to demand; it would be highly unlikely that one or more phases of the project would be built without major tenants. As such, this is a self-mitigating aspect of the proposed project as it relates to urban decay.

Nonetheless, given the amount of new commercial square footage that is proposed, there inevitably would be some level of sales diversions from competing outlets in the Trade Area. The extent of sales diversions will depend largely on the tenants of the proposed project, which are unknown at the time of this writing. Regardless, even if sales diversions are significant enough to cause closure of competing outlets, physical deterioration is not necessarily inevitable for the reasons previously described (such as potential for re-tenanting and reuse). For these reasons, urban decay is not a foreseeable consequence of the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is necessary.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

SECTION 5: ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

5.1 - Introduction

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, this Environmental Impact Report (EIR) contains a comparative impact assessment of alternatives to the proposed project. The primary purpose of this section is to provide decision makers and the general public with a reasonable degree of feasible project alternatives that could attain most of the basic project objectives, while avoiding or reducing any of the proposed project's significant adverse environmental effects. Important considerations for these alternatives analyses are noted below (as stated in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6):

- An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project;
- An EIR should identify alternatives that were considered by the lead agency, but rejected as infeasible during the scoping process;
- Reasons for rejecting an alternative include:
 - Failure to meet most of the basic project objectives;
 - Infeasibility; or
 - Inability to avoid significant environmental effects

5.1.1 - Significant Unavoidable Impacts

The proposed project would result in the following significant unavoidable impacts:

- **Important Farmland:** The proposed project would convert Important Farmland to nonagricultural use. Although mitigation is proposed that would require the applicant to preserve Important Farmland elsewhere in Fresno County, it would not fully mitigate the impact to a level of less than significant. Therefore, the residual significance of this impact is significant and unavoidable.
- Air Quality Plan: The proposed project would generate sources of construction and operational emissions that would exceed San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District thresholds and, thus, be in conflict with the Air Quality Plan. Mitigations are proposed requiring the implementation of emissions reduction measures; however, due to the uncertainty of the effectiveness of certain measures, the residual significance of this impact is significant and unavoidable.
- Air Quality Standards / Violations: The proposed project would generate sources of construction and operational emissions that would exceed San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District thresholds. Mitigations is proposed requiring the implementation of emissions

reduction measures; however, due to the uncertainty of the effectiveness of certain measures, the residual significance of this impact is significant and unavoidable.

- Noise Levels in Excess of Standards: The proposed project would generate new vehicle trips that would expose sensitive land uses along roadways in the project vicinity to excessive noise levels. Mitigation is proposed requiring the applicant to offer to construct soundwalls or replace existing windows and doors with sound-rated assemblies; however, it would not fully mitigate the impact to a level of less than significant. Therefore, the residual significance of this impact is significant and unavoidable.
- **Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels:** The proposed project would generate new vehicle trips that would expose sensitive land uses along roadways to permanent increase in ambient noise levels. Mitigation is proposed requiring the applicant to offer to construct soundwalls or replace existing windows and doors with sound-rated assemblies; however, it would not fully mitigate the impact to a level of less than significant. Therefore, the residual significance of this impact is significant and unavoidable.
- Existing Plus Phase 1 Traffic Conditions: The proposed project would generate new vehicle trips that would contribute to unacceptable intersection, roadway segment, and railroad grade crossing operations under Existing Plus Phase 1 Traffic Conditions. Mitigation is proposed requiring the applicant to install traffic improvements or provide fair share fees for the construction of such improvements; however, it would not fully mitigate the impact to a level of less than significant. Therefore, the residual significance of this impact is significant and unavoidable.
- Year 2020 Traffic Conditions: The proposed project would generate new vehicle trips that would contribute to unacceptable intersection, roadway segment, and railroad grade crossing operations under Year 2020 Traffic Conditions. Mitigation is proposed requiring the applicant to install traffic improvements or provide fair-share fees for the construction of such improvements; however, it would not fully mitigate the impact to a level of less than significant. Therefore, the residual significance of this impact is significant and unavoidable.
- Year 2035 Traffic Conditions: The proposed project would generate new vehicle trips that would contribute to unacceptable intersection, roadway segment, and railroad grade crossing operations under Year 2035 Traffic Conditions. Mitigation is proposed requiring the applicant to install traffic improvements or provide fair-share fees for the construction of such improvements; however, it would not fully mitigate the impact to a level of less than significant. Therefore, the residual significance of this impact is significant and unavoidable.

5.1.2 - Alternatives to the Proposed Project

The four alternatives to the proposed project analyzed in this section are as follows:

- No Project/No Development Alternative: The project site would remain in its existing condition and no new development would occur.
- Northeast Area Alternative: The Northeast Area, which consists of 882,003 square feet on 75.75 net acres, would be developed; the South Area and the Northwest Area would be eliminated.
- Northeast Area and South Area Alternative: The Northeast Area, which consists of 882,003 square feet on 75.75 net acres, and South Area, which consists of 1,431,200 square feet on 124.35 net acres would be developed; the Northwest Area would be eliminated.
- Northwest Area Alternative: The Northwest Area, which consists of 1,136,000 square feet on 66.60 net acres, would be developed; the Northeast Area and South Area would be eliminated.

Four alternatives to the proposed project on the following pages. These analyses compare the proposed project and each individual project alternative. In several cases, the description of the impact may be the same under each alternative when compared with the CEQA Thresholds of Significance (i.e., both the project and the alternative would result in a less than significant impact). The actual degree of impact may be slightly different between the proposed project and each alternative, and this relative difference is the basis for a conclusion of greater or lesser impacts.

5.2 - Project Objectives

The objectives of the proposed project are to:

- Promote economic growth through new capital investment, job creation, and an expanded tax base.
- Create a range of new local employment opportunities including entry-level and career positions.
- Phase new development in a logical and orderly manner that promotes land use compatibility and avoids premature conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural use.
- Provide new regional commercial retail uses that meet the current unmet demand of consumers residing within the Trade Area as well as future demand from planned population growth.
- Develop office space to attract professional employment opportunities and that also increases the availability of professional services to the community.
- Develop visitor-serving lodging and recreational uses that cater to travelers on the SR-99 corridor.
- Maintain and enhance Selma's status as a regional node for automotive sales on the SR-99 corridor.

- Develop attractive, high-quality commercial land uses that are unique and compatible with the local character.
- Provide mixed-use development with housing above retail to create a vibrant atmosphere that promotes pedestrian activity.
- Develop the site at an intensity that most efficiently utilizes the infrastructure available and to be constructed as part of the project.

5.3 - Alternative 1 – No Project/No Development Alternative

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, the parcels comprising the project site would remain unchanged and no development would occur. These parcels would remain in unincorporated Fresno County and would not be annexed into the City of Selma. The existing land use activities of agriculture and rural residential would continue for the foreseeable future.

5.3.1 - Impact Analysis

The project site would remain in its existing condition and no changes would occur. The site would remain committed to agricultural and rural residential use for the foreseeable future for the foreseeable future. The proposed project's significant unavoidable impacts would all be avoided, and the potentially significant impacts that can be mitigated to a level of less than significant would not occur.

5.3.2 - Conclusion

The No Project Alternative/No Development Alternative would avoid the proposed project's significant unavoidable impacts associated with agricultural resources, air quality, noise, and transportation and have less impact on all environmental topical areas.

This alternative would not advance any of the project objectives, including those that pertain to economic growth, new employment opportunities, orderly and logical development patterns, new commercial opportunities, development of attractive, high-quality commercial land uses, and efficient use of infrastructure. Furthermore, it is not a reasonable expectation for the property owners to keep the project site in its existing condition because of its commercial land use designation and location within the Selma Sphere of Influence.

5.4 - Alternative 2 – Northeast Area Alternative

The Northeast Area, which consists of 882,003 square feet on 75.75 net acres, would be developed; the South Area and the Northwest Area would be eliminated. This alternative represents a reduction of 2,567,200 square feet and 211.01 net acres relative to the proposed project.

The Northeast Area would be identical to the concept described in Section 3, Project Description. To recap, Northeast Area would feature 28 building envelopes ranging in size from 15,925 to 344,140

square feet. The larger spaces are set against the SR-99 frontage, with the smaller spaces along the Golden State Boulevard frontage. End uses would consist of anchors, majors, shops, and restaurants. No specific tenants have been identified for any of the buildings.

Vehicular access to the Northeast Area would be taken from several points on Golden State Boulevard. No vehicular access is proposed to or from E. Mountain View Avenue. A total of 4,476 off-street parking spaces are proposed within the Northeast Area, which translates to a ratio of 5.08 spaces per 1,000 square feet of floor area.

In lieu of constructing the 20-acre stormwater basin, this alternative would instead provide an onsite stormwater basin beneath the main parking field.

The entire Northeast Area site, along with the East Annexation area, would be annexed into the Selma city limits and Selma-Kingsburg-Fowler County Sanitation District (SKF CSD). Annexation into the Selma city limits would involve pre-zoning these areas to "CR – Regional Commercial." If necessary, a conforming General Plan Amendment would be required as well. The South and Northwest Areas, along with the West Annexation Area, would not be annexed into either the Selma city limits or the SKF CSD under this alternative.

Table 5-1 summarizes the development contemplated by Northeast Area Alternative and Table 5-2 lists the necessary land use approvals. The purpose of this alternative is to evaluate the component of the project that has the greatest likelihood of being developed in the near-term and which is also continuous to existing urban development within the Selma city limits. This alternative would reduce the footprint of the proposed project, resulting in fewer physical impacts to resources such as agriculture and biological resources, and develop less new square footage, resulting in reductions in vehicle trips, tailpipe emissions, demand for public services and utilities, and sales.

Scenario	Use	Square Feet	Net Acres	
Northeast Area Alternative	Commercial Retail (Total)	882,003	75.75	
Proposed Project	Total	3,449,203	286.76	
Difference	Total	(2,567,200)	(211.01)	
Source: Michael Brandman Associates, 2012.				

Table 5-1:	Northeast Area	Alternative	Development	Summary
------------	-----------------------	-------------	-------------	---------

Geographical Area	Acres	Necessary Land Use Approvals
Northeast Area	75.75	Annexation into Selma city limits
East Annexation Area	3.15	Pre-Zone to "CR – Regional Commercial"
Total	78.90	Conforming General Plan Amendment (if legal challenge to 2035 General Plan is not resolved)
		Annexation into SKF CSD.
Source: Michael Brandman	Associates, 2012	2.

Table 5-2: Northeast Area Alternative Land Use Approvals

5.4.1 - Impact Analysis

Aesthetics, Light, and Glare

This alternative would result in the development of the Northeast Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the South Area and Northwest Area. The proposed project was found to have a less than significant impact on visual character because the conversion of the project site from agricultural and rural residential uses to urban uses has been contemplated by the 2035 General Plan. As such, this alternative would yield a similar conclusion. The proposed project's light and glare impacts were found to be less than significant after the implementation of mitigation. The Northeast Area Alternative would implement similar mitigation to reduce light and glare impacts to a level of less than significant. However, because the Northeast Area Alternative avoids introducing new sources of light and glare to approximately 211 acres of the project site, this alternative would be considered less severe than the proposed project.

Agricultural Resources

This alternative would result in the development of the Northeast Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the South Area and Northwest Area. The proposed project was found to have a significant impact on the conversion of Important Farmland to non-agricultural use. Mitigation was proposed requiring the applicant to preserve Important Farmland elsewhere in Fresno County at no less than a 1:1 ratio; however, this would not fully mitigate the impact to a level of less than significant. Accordingly, the residual significance is significant and unavoidable. The Northeast Area Alternative would convert the 75.75-acre site from agricultural to non-agricultural use, a reduction of approximately 211 acres relative to the proposed project. Although the Northeast Area Alternative would not necessarily avoid this significant unavoidable impact, it would substantially lessen it. As such, this alternative would have fewer impacts on agricultural resources than the proposed project.

Air Quality

This alternative would result in the development of the Northeast Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the South Area and Northwest Area. The proposed project was found to have significant impacts associated with emissions of criteria pollutants and conflicts

with the Air Quality Plan. Mitigation was proposed requiring the implementation of feasible emissions reduction features; however, this would not fully mitigate this impact to a level of less than significant. Accordingly, the residual significance for this issue is significant and unavoidable. All other impacts were less than significant after mitigation or less than significant and did not require mitigation. The Northeast Area Alternative would generate 71,292 fewer weekday trips than the proposed project and, therefore, would lessen the severity of this significant unavoidable impact, although it may not necessarily avoid it. As such, this alternative would have fewer impacts on air quality and greenhouse gases than the proposed project.

Biological Resources

This alternative would result in the development of the Northeast Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the South Area and Northwest Area. The proposed project was found to have significant impacts on special-status species, including nesting birds, the burrowing owl, the Swainson's hawk, and San Joaquin kit fox. Mitigation was proposed to address all of these impacts and would fully mitigate these issues to a level of less than significant. The Northeast Area Alternative would implement similar mitigation for these impacts. However, because the Northeast Area Alternative results in disturbing approximately 211 fewer acres, this alternative would have fewer impacts on biological resources than the proposed project.

Cultural Resources

This alternative would result in the development of the Northeast Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the South Area and Northwest Area. The proposed project was found to have significant impacts on historical resources, archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and burial sites. Mitigation was proposed to address all of these impacts and would fully mitigate these issues to a level of less than significant. The Northeast Area Alternative would implement similar mitigation for these impacts. However, because the Northeast Area Alternative results in disturbing approximately 211 fewer acres, this alternative would be considered less severe than the proposed project. As such, this alternative would have fewer impacts on cultural resources than the proposed project.

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

This alternative would result in the development of the Northeast Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the South Area and Northwest Area. The proposed project was found to have significant impacts on seismic hazards, erosion, and unstable geologic units and soils. Mitigation was proposed to address all of these impacts and would fully mitigate these issues to a level of less than significant. The Northeast Area Alternative would implement similar mitigation for these impacts. However, because the Northeast Area Alternative results in disturbing approximately 211 fewer acres, this alternative would be considered less severe than the proposed

project. As such, this alternative would have fewer impacts on geology, soils, and seismicity than the proposed project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

This alternative would result in the development of the Northeast Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the South Area and Northwest Area. The proposed project was found to have significant impacts associated with remediation of the hexavalent chromium groundwater plume from the Selma Pressure Treatment site, the abandoned Tidewater Associated Oil Company pipeline, hazardous building materials (asbestos and lead-based paint), residual pesticides in soil, aboveground storage tanks, and underground storage tanks. Mitigation was proposed to address all of these impacts and would fully mitigate these issues to a level of less than significant. The Northeast Area Alternative would not be affected by the hexavalent chromium groundwater plume and, therefore, would not need to mitigate for this issue. Additionally, because the Northeast Area Alternative encompasses approximately 211 fewer acres than the proposed project, there would be less potential to encounter hazardous building materials, residual pesticides in soil, aboveground storage tanks. As such, this alternative would have fewer impacts on hazards and hazardous materials than the proposed project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

This alternative would result in the development of the Northeast Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the South Area and Northwest Area. The proposed project was found to have significant impacts on short-term water quality, long-term water quality, groundwater quality (i.e., providing access for remediation of the hexavalent chromium groundwater plume and well abandonment), and drainage. Mitigation was proposed to address all of these impacts and would fully mitigate these issues to a level of less than significant. This alternative would implement similar mitigation for the short-term and long-term water quality impacts. The Northeast Area Alternative would not be affected by the hexavalent chromium groundwater plume and, therefore, would not need to mitigate for this issue. In addition, this alternative would provide an onsite stormwater basin beneath the main parking field instead of constructing the 20-acre stormwater basin contemplated by the proposed project. Because the Northeast Area Alternative would disturb approximately 211 fewer acres than the proposed project, it would be considered less severe than the proposed project. As such, this alternative would have fewer impacts on hydrology and water quality than the proposed project.

Land Use

This alternative would result in the development of the Northeast Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the South Area and Northwest Area. The proposed project was found to be consistent with all applicable provisions of the 1997 General Plan, 2035 General Plan, Selma City Code, and LAFCO Standards for Annexation. As such, all impacts were found to be less than significant. Therefore, this alternative would yield a similar conclusion. As such, this alternative would have land use impacts similar to the proposed project.

Noise

This alternative would result in the development of the Northeast Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the South Area and Northwest Area. The proposed project was found to have significant impacts in terms of exposure of sensitive land uses along roadways in the project vicinity to excessive noise levels and creating a permanent increase in ambient noise level. Mitigation is proposed requiring the applicant to offer to install noise abatement measures at affected sensitive receptors; however, this would not fully mitigate the impact to a level of less than significant. The Northeast Area Alternative would generate 71,292 fewer weekday trips than the proposed project and, therefore, would lessen the severity of these significant unavoidable impacts, although it may not necessarily avoid them. As such, this alternative would have fewer impacts on noise than the proposed project.

Public Services and Utilities

This alternative would result in the development of the Northeast Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the South Area and Northwest Area. The proposed project was found to have significant impacts on fire protection, police protection, potable water, storm drainage, and solid waste. Mitigation was proposed to address all of these impacts and would fully mitigate these issues to a level of less than significant. This alternative would implement similar mitigation of fire protection, police protection, potable water, and solid waste; however, in lieu of developing the 20-acre stormwater basin, an onsite basin would be developed beneath the main parking field. This alternative would develop 2,567,200 fewer square feet of new urban uses than the proposed project and, therefore, would be expected to result in less demand on public services and utility providers. For example, potable water use would be expected to be reduced by at least 50 percent. Thus, this alternative would be considered less severe than the proposed project. As such, this alternative would have fewer impacts on public services and utilities than the proposed project.

Transportation

This alternative would result in the development of the Northeast Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the South Area and Northwest Area. Table 5-3 provides a summary of the Northeast Area Alternative's trip generation. Relative to the proposed project, the Northeast Area Alternative would generate 71,292 fewer daily trips, 3,043 fewer AM peak-hour trips, 6,404 fewer PM peak-hour trips, and 7,621 fewer Saturday peak-hour trips. Although the reduction in peak-hour trip generation would not be enough to reduce the significant unavoidable finding for traffic impacts, it would substantially lessen the severity of these impacts.

		Trip	Generation	
Scenario	Weekday	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	Saturday Peak Hour
Northeast Area Alternative	37,874	882	3,290	4,313
Proposed Project	109,166	3,925	9,694	11,934
Difference	(71,292)	(3,043)	(6,404)	(7,621)
Note: Trip generation values obtained from Table 4.12-15 in Section 4.12, Transportation. Source: Peters Engineering Group, 2012.				

Table 5-3: Northeast Area Alternative Trip Generation

Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would mitigate for impacts on public transit, bicycles, and pedestrians, which would reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. Additionally, as with the proposed project, this alternative would not result in significant impacts on other transportation-related areas.

In summary, the Northeast Area Alternative would substantially reduce trip generation relative to the proposed project, thereby lessening its contribution to significant unavoidable traffic impacts. Therefore, this alternative would have fewer impacts on transportation than the proposed project.

Urban Decay

This alternative would result in the development of the Northeast Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the South Area and Northwest Area. Table 5-4 provides an estimate of the Northeast Area Alternative's sales. Relative to the proposed project, the Northeast Area Alternative would generate \$308.7 million in annual sales, which is \$583.6 million less than the proposed project. The proposed project's urban decay impacts were found to be less than significant; therefore, because this alternative would generate \$583.6 million in fewer sales, it would further lessen the severity of this impact. This alternative would have fewer impacts on urban decay than the proposed project.

Scenario	Commercial Square Feet	Sales Rate	Annual Sales
Northeast Area Alternative	882,003	\$350/square foot	\$308,701,000
Proposed Project	2,492,200		\$892,270,000
Difference	(1,610,197)		(\$583,569,000)

Table 5-4: Northeast Area Alternative Sales Estimate

Notes:

"Commercial Square Feet" consists of retail and auto mall uses, which are the primary sources of taxable sales. Office, hotel, and water park/entertainment uses are excluded from this figure. Source: Economic & Planning Systems, 2011.

Conclusion

The Northeast Area Alternative would result in the same significant unavoidable impacts as the proposed project. However, this alternative would lessen the severity of all of the significant unavoidable impacts because it would reduce agricultural land conversion and trip generation. This alternative would also lessen the severity of impacts associated with aesthetics, light, and glare; biological resources; cultural resources; geology, soils, and seismicity; hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; public services and utilities; and urban decay.

The Northeast Area Alternative would satisfy the project objectives that pertain to economic growth, new employment opportunities, orderly and logical development patterns, new retail opportunities, development of attractive, high-quality commercial land uses, and efficient use of infrastructure, albeit to a lesser degree than the proposed project since less new development would occur. This alternative would not advance the project objectives that concern new office space and professional job opportunities, new visitor-serving uses, automotive sales, and mixed-use development. Finally, this alternative would realize substantially less economic benefit than the proposed project as a result of the \$583.6 million in fewer sales.

5.5 - Alternative 3 – Northeast Area and South Area Alternative

The Northeast Area, which consists of 882,003 square feet on 75.75 net acres, and the South Area, which consists of 1,431,200 million square feet on 124.35 acres would be developed; the Northwest Area would be eliminated. The 20-acre stormwater basin would also be developed under this alternative. In total, 2,313,203 square feet of new construction would occur on 220.10 net acres. This alternative represents a reduction of 1,136,000 square feet and 66.76 net acres relative to the proposed project.

The Northeast Area would be identical to the concept described in Section 3, Project Description. To recap, Northeast Area would consist of commercial retail uses and feature a total of 28 building envelopes ranging in size from 15,925 to 344,140 square feet. The larger spaces are set against the SR-99 frontage, with the smaller spaces along the Golden State Boulevard frontage. End uses would consist of anchors, majors, shops, and restaurants. No specific tenants have been identified for any of the buildings.

Vehicular access to the Northeast Area would be taken from several points on Golden State Boulevard. No vehicular access is proposed to or from E. Mountain View Avenue. A total of 4,476 off-street parking spaces are proposed within the Northeast Area, which translates to a ratio of 5.08 spaces per 1,000 square feet of floor area.

The South Area would be identical to the concept described in Section 3, Project Description. To recap, the South Area would consist of commercial retail, office, automall, and visitor-serving commercial uses and feature a total of 42 building envelopes ranging in size from 11,275 to 591,135

square feet. End uses would consist of anchors, majors, shops, restaurants, fuel, office park, automall, hotel, and waterpark. No specific tenants have been identified for any of the buildings.

Vehicular access to the South Area would be provided from E. Mountain View Avenue, S. Van Horn Avenue, S. Dockery Avenue, and a new east-west new road. A total of 5,159 off-street parking spaces are proposed within the South Area, which translates to a ratio of 3.60 spaces per 1,000 square feet of floor area.

The entire Northeast Area, South Area, and detention basin sites, along with the East and West Annexation areas, would be annexed into the Selma city limits and the SKF CSD. Annexation into the Selma city limits would involve pre-zoning these areas to "CR – Regional Commercial." If necessary, a conforming General Plan Amendment would be required as well. The Northwest Area would not be annexed into either the Selma city limits or the SKF CSD under this alternative.

Table 5-5 summarizes the development contemplated by Northeast Area and South Area Alternative and Table 5-6 lists the necessary land use approvals. The purpose of this alternative is to evaluate two components of the project that have the greatest likelihood of being developed in the near-term and which would also be contiguous to existing urban development within either the Selma city limits or unincorporated Fresno County. This alternative would reduce the footprint of the proposed project, resulting in fewer physical impacts to resources such as agriculture and biological resources, and it would develop less new square footage, resulting in reductions in vehicle trips, tailpipe emissions, demand for public services and utilities, and sales.

Scenario	Component	Use(s)	Square Feet	Net Acres
Northeast Area and South Area Alternative	Northeast Area	Commercial retail	882,003	75.75
	South Area	Commercial retail, office, automall, hotel, and water park	1,431,200	124.35
	Stormwater Basin	Stormwater management		20.00
		Total	2,313,203	220.10
Proposed Project	Total		3,449,203	286.66
Difference	Total		(1,136,000)	(66.76)
Source: Michael Brandman Associates, 2012.				

Table 5-5: Northeast Area and South Area Alternative Summary

Geographical Area	Acres	Necessary Land Use Approvals
Northeast Area	75.75	Annexation into Selma city limits and coterminous adjustment
South Area	124.35	of Sphere of Influence
Stormwater Basin	20.00	Pre-Zone to "CR – Regional Commercial"
East Annexation Area	3.15	2035 General Plan is not resolved)
West Annexation	29.01	Annexation into SKF CSD and coterminous adjustment of
Total	252.26	Sphere of Influence
Source: Michael Brandman Associates, 2012.		

Table 5-6: Northeast Area and South Alternative Land Use Approvals

5.5.1 - Impact Analysis

Aesthetics, Light, and Glare

This alternative would result in the development of the Northeast Area and South Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the Northwest Area. The proposed project was found to have a less than significant impact on visual character because the conversion of the project site from agricultural and rural residential uses to urban uses has been contemplated by the 2035 General Plan. As such, this alternative would yield a similar conclusion. The proposed project's light and glare impacts were found to be less than significant after the implementation of mitigation. The Northeast Area Alternative would implement similar mitigation to reduce light and glare impacts to a level of less than significant. However, because the Northeast Area and South Area Alternative avoids introducing new sources of light and glare to approximately 67 acres of the project site, this alternative would be considered less severe than the proposed project. As such, this alternative would have fewer impacts on aesthetic, light, and glare than the proposed project.

Agricultural Resources

This alternative would result in the development of the Northeast Area and South Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the Northwest Area. The proposed project was found to have a significant impact on the conversion of Important Farmland to non-agricultural use. Mitigation was proposed requiring the applicant to preserve Important Farmland elsewhere in Fresno County at no less than a 1:1 ratio; however, this would not fully mitigate the impact to a level of less than significant. Accordingly, the residual significance is significant and unavoidable. The Northeast Area and South Area Alternative would convert the 220.1-acre site from agricultural to non-agricultural use, a reduction of approximately 67 acres relative to the proposed project. Although the Northeast Area and South Area Alternative would not necessarily avoid this significant unavoidable impact, it would substantially lessen it. As such, this alternative would have fewer impacts on agricultural resources than the proposed project.

Air Quality

This alternative would result in the development of the Northeast Area and South Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the Northwest Area. The proposed project was found to have significant impacts associated with emissions of criteria pollutants and conflicts with the Air Quality Plan. Mitigation was proposed requiring the implementation of feasible emissions reduction features; however, this would not fully mitigate this impact to a level of less than significant. Accordingly, the residual significance for this issue is significant and unavoidable. All other impacts were less than significant after mitigation or less than significant and did not require mitigation. The Northeast Area and South Area Alternative would generate 28,310 fewer weekday trips than the proposed project and, therefore, would lessen the severity of this significant unavoidable impact, although it may not necessarily avoid it. As such, this alternative would have fewer impacts on air quality and greenhouse gases than the proposed project.

Biological Resources

This alternative would result in the development of the Northeast Area and South Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the Northwest Area. The proposed project was found to have significant impacts on special-status species, including nesting birds, the burrowing owl, the Swainson's hawk, and San Joaquin kit fox. Mitigation was proposed to address all of these impacts and would fully mitigate these issues to a level of less than significant. The Northeast Area and South Area Alternative would implement similar mitigation for these impacts. However, because the Northeast Area and South Area Alternative results in disturbing approximately 67 fewer acres, this alternative would be considered less severe than the proposed project. As such, this alternative would have fewer impacts on biological resources than the proposed project.

Cultural Resources

This alternative would result in the development of the Northeast Area and South Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the Northwest Area. The proposed project was found to have significant impacts on historical resources, archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and burial sites. Mitigation was proposed to address all of these impacts and would fully mitigate these issues to a level of less than significant. The Northeast Area and South Area Alternative would implement similar mitigation for these impacts. However, because the Northeast Area and South Area Alternative results in disturbing approximately 67 fewer acres, this alternative would be considered less severe than the proposed project. As such, this alternative would have fewer impacts on cultural resources than the proposed project.

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

This alternative would result in the development of the Northeast Area and South Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of Northwest Area. The proposed project was found to have significant impacts on seismic hazards, erosion, and unstable geologic units and soils. Mitigation was proposed to address all of these impacts and would fully mitigate these issues to a level of less than significant. The Northeast Area and South Area Alternative would implement

similar mitigation for these impacts. However, because the Northeast Area and South Area Alternative results in disturbing approximately 67 fewer acres, this alternative would be considered less severe than the proposed project. As such, this alternative would have fewer impacts on geology, soils, and seismicity than the proposed project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

This alternative would result in the development of the Northeast Area and South Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the Northwest Area. The proposed project was found to have significant impacts associated with remediation of the hexavalent chromium groundwater plume from the Selma Pressure Treatment site, the abandoned Tidewater Associated Oil Company pipeline, hazardous building materials (asbestos and lead-based paint), residual pesticides in soil, aboveground storage tanks, and underground storage tanks. Mitigation was proposed to address all of these impacts and would fully mitigate these issues to a level of less than significant. The Northeast Area and South Area Alternative would not be affected by the hexavalent chromium groundwater plume and, therefore, would not need to mitigate for this issue. Additionally, because the Northeast Area and South Area Alternative encompasses approximately 67 fewer acres than the proposed project, there would be less potential to encounter hazardous building materials, residual pesticides in soil, aboveground storage tanks, and underground storage tanks. As such, this alternative would have fewer impacts on hazards and hazardous materials than the proposed project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

This alternative would result in the development of the Northeast Area and South Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the Northwest Area. The proposed project was found to have significant impacts on short-term water quality, long-term water quality, groundwater quality (i.e., providing access for remediation of the hexavalent chromium groundwater plume and well abandonment), and drainage. Mitigation was proposed to address all of these impacts and would fully mitigate these issues to a level of less than significant. This alternative would implement similar mitigation for the short-term water quality, long-term water quality, and drainage impacts, including the construction of the 20-acre stormwater basin. The Northeast Area and South Area Alternative would not be affected by the hexavalent chromium groundwater plume and, therefore, would not need to mitigate for this issue. Because the Northeast Area and South Area Alternative would disturb approximately fewer 67 acres than the proposed project, it would be considered less severe than the proposed project. As such, this alternative would have fewer impacts on hydrology and water quality than the proposed project.

Land Use

This alternative would result in the development of the Northeast Area and South Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the Northwest Area. The proposed project was found to be consistent with all applicable provisions of the 1997 General Plan, 2035 General Plan, Selma City Code, and LAFCO Standards for Annexation. As such, all impacts were

found to be less than significant. Therefore, this alternative would yield a similar conclusion. As such, this alternative would have land use impacts similar to the proposed project.

Noise

This alternative would result in the development of the Northeast Area and South Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the Northwest Area. The proposed project was found to have significant impacts in terms of exposure of sensitive land uses along roadways in the project vicinity to excessive noise levels and creating a permanent increase in ambient noise level. Mitigation is proposed requiring the applicant to offer to install noise abatement measures at affected sensitive receptors; however, this would not fully mitigate the impact to a level of less than significant. The Northeast Area and South Area Alternative would generate 28,310 fewer weekday trips than the proposed project and, therefore, would lessen the severity of these significant unavoidable impacts, although it may not necessarily avoid them. As such, this alternative would have fewer impacts on noise than the proposed project.

Public Services and Utilities

This alternative would result in the development of the Northeast Area and South Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the Northwest Area. The proposed project was found to have significant impacts on fire protection, police protection, potable water, storm drainage, and solid waste. Mitigation was proposed to address all of these impacts and would fully mitigate these issues to a level of less than significant. This alternative would implement similar mitigation of fire protection, police protection, potable water, storm drainage, and solid waste, including the 20-acre stormwater basin. This alternative would develop 1,136,000 fewer square feet of new urban uses than the proposed project and, therefore, would be expected to result in less demand on public services and utility providers. For example, potable water use would be expected to be reduced by at least 30 percent. Thus, this alternative would be considered less severe than the proposed project. As such, this alternative would have fewer impacts on public services and utilities than the proposed project.

Transportation

This alternative would result in the development of the Northeast Area and South Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the Northwest Area. Table 5-7 provides a summary of the Northeast Area and South Area Alternative's trip generation. Relative to the proposed project, the Northeast Area and South Area Alternative generate 80,856 fewer daily trips, 1,132 fewer AM peak-hour trips, 2,650 fewer PM peak-hour trips, and 3,173 fewer Saturday peak-hour trips. Although the reduction in peak-hour trip generation would not be enough to reduce the significant unavoidable finding for traffic impacts, it would substantially lessen the severity of these impacts.

		Trip Generation			
Scenario	Weekday	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	Saturday Peak Hour	
Northeast Area and South Area Alternative	80,856	2,793	7,044	8,761	
Proposed Project	109,166	3,925	9,694	11,934	
Difference	(28,310)	(1,132)	(2,650)	(3,173)	
Note:		·			

Table 5-7: Northeast Area and South Area Alternative Trip Generation

Trip generation values obtained from Table 4.12-15 in Section 4.12, Transportation. Source: Peters Engineering Group, 2012.

Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would mitigate for impacts on public transit, bicycles, and pedestrians, which would reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. Additionally, as with the proposed project, this alternative would not result in significant impacts on other transportation-related areas.

In summary, the Northeast Area and South Area Alternative would substantially reduce trip generation relative to the proposed project, thereby lessening its contribution to significant unavoidable traffic impacts. Therefore, this alternative would have fewer impacts on transportation than the proposed project.

Urban Decay

This alternative would result in the development of the Northeast Area and South Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the Northwest Area. Table 5-8 provides an estimate of the Northeast Area and South Area Alternative's sales. Relative to the proposed project, the Northeast Area and South Area Alternative would generate \$680.9 million in annual sales, which is \$211.4 million less than the proposed project. The proposed project's urban decay impacts were found to be less than significant; therefore, because this alternative would generate \$211.4 million in fewer sales, it would further lessen the severity of this impact. This alternative would have fewer impacts on urban decay than the proposed project.

Scenario	Use	Commercial Square Feet	Sales Rate	Annual Sales
Northeast Area and South Area Alternative	Retail	1,488,203	\$350/square foot	\$520,871,000
	Auto Mall	400,000	\$400/square foot	\$160,000,000
	Subtotal	1,888,820	_	\$680,870,000
Proposed Project	All	2,492,200		\$892,270,000
Difference	All	(603,380)		(\$211,400,000)

Table 5-8: Northeast Area and South Area Alternative Sales Estimate

Notes:

"Commercial Square Feet" consists of retail and auto mall uses, which are the primary sources of taxable sales. Office, hotel, and water park/entertainment uses are excluded from this figure. Source: Economic & Planning Systems, 2011.

5.5.2 - Conclusion

The Northeast Area and South Area Alternative would result in the same significant unavoidable impacts as the proposed project. However, this alternative would lessen the severity of all of the significant unavoidable impacts because it would reduce agricultural land conversion and trip generation. This alternative would also lessen the severity of impacts associated with aesthetics, light, and glare; biological resources; cultural resources; geology, soils, and seismicity; hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; public services and utilities; and urban decay.

The Northeast Area and South Area Alternative would satisfy the project objectives that pertain to economic growth, new employment opportunities, orderly and logical development patterns, new retail opportunities, development of attractive, high-quality commercial land uses, new office space and professional job opportunities, new visitor-serving uses, automotive sales, and efficient use of infrastructure, albeit to a lesser degree than the proposed project since less new development would occur. This alternative would not advance the project objective that concerns mixed-use development. Finally, this alternative would realize substantially less economic benefit than the proposed project as a result of the \$211.4 million in fewer sales.

5.6 - Alternative 4 – Northwest Area Alternative

The Northwest Area, which consists of 1,136,000 square feet on 66.60 net acres, would be developed; the Northeast Area and South Area would be eliminated. This alternative represents a reduction of 2,313,203 square feet and 240.10 net acres relative to the proposed project.

The Northwest Area would be identical to the concept described in Section 3, Project Description. To recap, Northwest Area would feature a total of 17 building envelopes ranging in size from 37,110 to 632,902 square feet. The larger spaces are set against the SR-99 frontage, with the smaller spaces along the S. Dockery Avenue and E. Mountain View Avenue frontages. End uses would consist of

anchors, majors, shops, lifestyle retail, restaurants, residential (above lifestyle retail) and office (above lifestyle retail). No specific tenants have been identified for any of the buildings.

Vehicular access to the Northwest Area would be taken from S. Dockery Avenue and E. Mountain View Avenue. An internal north-south roadway would link the anchors along the SR-99 frontage with E. Mountain View Avenue. A total of 4,381 off-street parking spaces are proposed within the Northwest Area, which translates to a ratio of 3.86 spaces per 1,000 square feet of floor area.

In lieu of constructing the 20-acre stormwater basin, this alternative would instead provide an onsite stormwater basin beneath the main parking field.

The entire Northwest Area site, along with the West Annexation area (excluding the Shell gas station), would be annexed into the Selma city limits and SKF CSD. Annexation into the Selma city limits would involve pre-zoning these areas to "CR – Regional Commercial." If necessary, a conforming General Plan Amendment would be required as well. The Northeast and South Areas, along with the East Annexation Area, would not be annexed into either the Selma city limits or the SKF CSD under this alternative.

Table 5-9 summarizes the development contemplated by the Northwest Area Alternative and Table 5-10 lists the necessary land use approvals. The purpose of this alternative is to evaluate a component of the project that includes a mix of land uses, including commercial retail, office, and residential. This alternative would reduce the footprint of the proposed project, resulting in fewer physical impacts to resources such as agriculture and biological resources, and it would develop less new square footage, resulting in reductions in vehicle trips, tailpipe emissions, demand for public services and utilities, and sales.

Scenario	Use	Square Feet	Net Acres
Northwest Area Alternative	Commercial Retail	604,000	—
	Office	280,000	
	Residential	252,000 (250 dwelling units)	
	Total	1,136,000	66.60
Proposed Project	Total	3,449,203	286.76
Difference	Total	(2,313,203)	(220.10)
Source: Michael Brandman Associates, 2012.			

Geographical Area	Acres	Necessary Land Use Approvals
Northwest Area	66.60	Annexation into Selma city limits
West Annexation Area	27.51*	Pre-Zone to "CR – Regional Commercial"
Total	94.11	Conforming General Plan Amendment (if legal challenge to 2035 General Plan is not resolved)
		Annexation into SKF CSD and coterminous adjustment of Sphere of Influence
Notes: Excludes Shell gas station, which is approximately 1.5 acres. Source: Michael Brandman Associates, 2012.		

Table 5-10: Northwest Area Alternative Land Use Approvals

5.6.1 - Impact Analysis

Aesthetics, Light, and Glare

This alternative would result in the development of the Northwest Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the Northeast Area and South Area. The proposed project was found to have a less than significant impact on visual character because the conversion of the project site from agricultural and rural residential uses to urban uses has been contemplated by the 2035 General Plan. As such, this alternative would yield a similar conclusion. The proposed project's light and glare impacts were found to be less than significant after the implementation of mitigation. The Northwest Area Alternative would implement similar mitigation to reduce light and glare impacts to a level of less than significant. However, because the Northwest Area Alternative avoids introducing new sources of light and glare to approximately 220 acres of the project site, this alternative would be considered less severe than the proposed project. As such, this alternative would have fewer impacts on aesthetic, light, and glare than the proposed project.

Agricultural Resources

This alternative would result in the development of the Northwest Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the Northeast and South Area. The proposed project was found to have a significant impact on the conversion of Important Farmland to non-agricultural use. Mitigation was proposed requiring the applicant to preserve Important Farmland elsewhere in Fresno County at no less than a 1:1 ratio; however, this would not fully mitigate the impact to a level of less than significant. Accordingly, the residual significance is significant and unavoidable. The Northwest Area Alternative would convert the 60.60-acre site from agricultural to non-agricultural use, a reduction of approximately 220 acres relative to the proposed project. Although the Northwest Area Alternative would not necessarily avoid this significant unavoidable impact, it would substantially lessen it. As such, this alternative would have fewer impacts on agricultural resources than the proposed project.

Air Quality

This alternative would result in the development of the Northwest Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the Northeast and South Area. The proposed project was found to have significant impacts associated with emissions of criteria pollutants and conflicts with the Air Quality Plan. Mitigation was proposed requiring the implementation of feasible emissions reduction features; however, this would not fully mitigate this impact to a level of less than significant. Accordingly, the residual significance for this issue is significant and unavoidable. All other impacts were less than significant after mitigation or less than significant and did not require mitigation. The Northwest Area Alternative would generate 80,856 fewer weekday trips than the proposed project and, therefore, would lessen the severity of this significant unavoidable impact, although it may not necessarily avoid them. As such, this alternative would have fewer impacts on air quality and greenhouse gases than the proposed project.

Biological Resources

This alternative would result in the development of the Northwest Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the Northeast Area and South Area. The proposed project was found to have significant impacts on special-status species, including nesting birds, the burrowing owl, the Swainson's hawk, and San Joaquin kit fox. Mitigation was proposed to address all of these impacts and would fully mitigate these issues to a level of less than significant. The Northwest Area Alternative would implement similar mitigation for these impacts. However, because the Northwest Area Alternative disturbs approximately 220 fewer acres, this alternative would have fewer impacts on biological resources than the proposed project.

Cultural Resources

This alternative would result in the development of the Northwest Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the Northeast Area and South Area. The proposed project was found to have significant impacts on historical resources, archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and burial sites. Mitigation was proposed to address all of these impacts and would fully mitigate these issues to a level of less than significant. The Northwest Area Alternative would implement similar mitigation for these impacts. However, because the Northwest Area Alternative disturbs approximately 220 fewer acres, this alternative would be considered less severe than the proposed project. As such, this alternative would have fewer impacts on cultural resources than the proposed project.

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

This alternative would result in the development of the Northwest Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the Northeast Area and South Area. The proposed project was found to have significant impacts on seismic hazards, erosion, and unstable geologic units and soils. Mitigation was proposed to address all of these impacts and would fully mitigate these issues to

a level of less than significant. The Northwest Area Alternative would implement similar mitigation for these impacts. However, because the Northwest Area Alternative disturbs approximately 220 fewer acres, this alternative would be considered less severe than the proposed project. As such, this alternative would have fewer impacts on geology, soils, and seismicity than the proposed project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

This alternative would result in the development of the Northwest Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the Northeast Area and South Area. The proposed project was found to have significant impacts associated with remediation of the hexavalent chromium groundwater plume from the Selma Pressure Treatment site, the abandoned Tidewater Associated Oil Company pipeline, hazardous building materials (asbestos and lead-based paint), residual pesticides in soil, aboveground storage tanks, and underground storage tanks. Mitigation was proposed to address all of these impacts and would fully mitigate these issues to a level of less than significant. The Northwest Area Alternative would not be affected by the Selma Pressure Treatment site and the abandoned Tidewater Associated Oil Company pipeline and, therefore, would not need to mitigate for this issue. Additionally, because the Northwest Area Alternative encompasses approximately 220 fewer acres than the proposed project, there would be less potential to encounter hazardous building materials, residual pesticides in soil, aboveground storage tanks, and underground storage tanks. As such, this alternative would have fewer impacts on hazards and hazardous materials than the proposed project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

This alternative would result in the development of the Northwest Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the Northeast Area and South Area. The proposed project was found to have significant impacts on short-term water quality, long-term water quality, groundwater quality (i.e., providing access for remediation of the hexavalent chromium groundwater plume and well abandonment), and drainage. Mitigation was proposed to address all of these impacts and would fully mitigate these issues to a level of less than significant. This alternative would implement similar mitigation for the short-term and long-term water quality impacts. In addition, this alternative would provide an onsite stormwater basin beneath the main parking field instead of constructing the 20-acre stormwater basin contemplated by the proposed project. Because the Northwest Area Alternative would disturb approximately 220 fewer acres than the proposed project, it would be considered less severe than the proposed project. As such, this alternative would have fewer impacts on hydrology and water quality than the proposed project.

Land Use

This alternative would result in the development of the Northwest Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the Northeast Area and South Area. The proposed project was found to be consistent with all applicable provisions of the 1997 General Plan, 2035 General Plan, Selma City Code, and LAFCO Standards for Annexation. As such, all impacts were found to

be less than significant. Therefore, this alternative would yield a similar conclusion. As such, this alternative would have land use impacts similar to the proposed project.

Noise

This alternative would result in the development of the Northeast Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the South Area and Northwest Area. The proposed project was found to have significant impacts in terms of exposure of sensitive land uses along roadways in the project vicinity to excessive noise levels and creating a permanent increase in ambient noise level. Mitigation is proposed requiring the applicant to offer to install noise abatement measures at affected sensitive receptors; however, this would not fully mitigate the impact to a level of less than significant. The Northwest Area Alternative would generate 80,856 fewer weekday trips than the proposed project and, therefore, would lessen the severity of these significant unavoidable impacts, although it may not necessarily avoid them. As such, this alternative would have fewer impacts on noise than the proposed project.

Public Services and Utilities

This alternative would result in the development of the Northwest Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the Northeast Area and South Area. The proposed project was found to have significant impacts on fire protection, police protection, potable water, storm drainage, and solid waste. Mitigation was proposed to address all of these impacts and would fully mitigate these issues to a level of less than significant. This alternative would implement similar mitigation of fire protection, police protection, potable water, and solid waste; however, in lieu of developing the 20-acre stormwater basin, an onsite basin would be developed beneath the main parking field. This alternative would develop 2,313,203 fewer square feet of new urban uses than the proposed project and, therefore, would be expected to result in less demand on public services and utility providers. For example, potable water use would be expected to be reduced by at least 60 percent. Thus, this alternative would be considered less severe than the proposed project. As such, this alternative would have fewer impacts on public services and utilities than the proposed project.

Transportation

This alternative would result in the development of the Northwest Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the Northeast Area and South Area. Table 5-11 provides a summary of the Northwest Area Alternative's trip generation. Relative to the proposed project, the Northwest Area Alternative, the Northwest Area Alternative generate 80,856 fewer daily trips, 1,132 fewer AM peak-hour trips, 2,650 fewer PM peak-hour trips, and 3,173 fewer Saturday peak-hour trips. Although the reduction in peak-hour trip generation would not be enough to reduce the significant unavoidable finding for traffic impacts, it would substantially lessen the severity of these impacts.

	Trip Generation				
Scenario	Weekday	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	Saturday Peak Hour	
Northwest Area Alternative	28,310	1,132	2,650	3,173	
Proposed Project	109,166	3,925	9,694	11,934	
Difference	(80,856)	(2,793)	(7,044)	(8,761)	
Notes: Trip generation values obtained from Table 4.12-15 in Section 4.12, Transportation. Source: Peters Engineering Group, 2012.					

Table 5-11: Northwest Area Alternative Trip Generation

Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would mitigate for impacts on public transit, bicycles, and pedestrians, which would reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. Additionally, as with the proposed project, this alternative would not result in significant impacts on other transportation-related areas.

In summary, the Northwest Alternative would substantially reduce trip generation relative to the proposed project, thereby lessening its contribution to significant unavoidable traffic impacts. Therefore, this alternative would have fewer impacts on transportation than the proposed project.

Urban Decay

This alternative would result in the development of the Northwest Area as contemplated by the proposed project and the elimination of the Northeast Area and South Area. Table 5-12 provides an estimate of the Northwest Area Alternative's sales. Relative to the proposed project, the Northwest Area Alternative would generate \$211.4 million in annual sales, which is \$680.9 million less than the proposed project. The proposed project's urban decay impacts were found to be less than significant; therefore, because this alternative would generate \$680.9 million in fewer sales, it would further lessen the severity of this impact. Therefore, this alternative would have fewer impacts on urban decay than the proposed project.

Scenario	Commercial Square Feet	Sales Rate	Annual Sales
Northwest Area Alternative	604,000	\$350/square foot	\$211,400,000
Proposed Project	2,492,200		\$892,270,000
Difference	(1,888,200)		(\$680,870,000)

Table 5-12: Northwest Area	Alternative Sales Estimate
----------------------------	----------------------------

Notes:

"Commercial Square Feet" consists of retail and auto mall uses, which are the primary sources of taxable sales. Office, hotel, and water park/entertainment uses are excluded from this figure. Source: Economic & Planning Systems, 2011.

5.6.2 - Conclusion

The Northwest Area Alternative would result in the same significant unavoidable impacts as the proposed project. However, this alternative would lessen the severity of all of the significant unavoidable impacts because it would reduce agricultural land conversion and trip generation. This alternative would also lessen the severity of impacts associated with aesthetics, light, and glare; biological resources; cultural resources; geology, soils, and seismicity; hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; public services and utilities; and urban decay.

The Northwest Area Alternative would satisfy the project objectives that pertain to economic growth, new employment opportunities, orderly and logical development patterns, new retail opportunities, mixed-use development, development of attractive, high-quality commercial land uses, and efficient use of infrastructure, albeit to a lesser degree than the proposed project since less new development would occur. This alternative would not advance the project objectives that concern new office space and professional job opportunities, new visitor-serving uses, and automotive sales. Finally, this alternative would realize substantially less economic benefit than the proposed project as a result of the \$680.9 million in fewer sales.

5.7 - Environmentally Superior Alternative

The qualitative environmental effects of each alternative in relation to the proposed project are summarized in Table 5-13.

Environmental Topic Area	No Project/ No Development Alternative	Northeast Area Alternative	Northeast and South Area Alternative	Northwest Area Alternative
Aesthetics, Light, and Glare	Less Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact
Agricultural Resources	Less Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact
Air Quality	Less Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact
Biological Resources	Less Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact
Cultural Resources	Less Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact
Geology, Soils, and Seismicity	Less Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Less Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact
Hydrology and Water Quality	Less Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact
Land Use	Less Impact	Similar Impact	Similar Impact	Similar Impact
Noise	Less Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact
Public Services and Utilities	Less Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact
Transportation	Less Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact
Urban Decay	Less Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact
Source: Michael Brandman Associates,	2012.			

Table 5-13: Summary of Alternatives

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126(e)(2) requires an EIR to identify an environmentally superior alternative. If the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, the EIR must also identify an environmentally superior alternative from among the other alternatives. In this case, the No Project/No Development Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, as it avoids all of the proposed project's significant unavoidable impacts.

To determine which of the remaining alternatives is the environmentally superior alternative, Table 5-14 compares how each alternative would avoid or substantially lessen the proposed project's significant unavoidable impacts associated with agricultural resources, air quality/greenhouse gas emissions, noise, and transportation.

Significant Unavoidable Topical Area	Northeast Area Alternative	Northeast Area and South Area Alternative	Northwest Area Alternative
Agricultural Resources	75.75 acres of Important Farmland converted to non-agricultural use	220.10 acres of Important Farmland converted to non-agricultural use	66.60 acres of Important Farmland converted to non-agricultural use
Air Quality	37,874 new daily trips	80,856 new daily trips	28,310 new daily trips
Noise	37,874 new daily trips	80,856 new daily trips	28,310 new daily trips
Transportation	882 new AM peak-hour trips; 3,290 new PM peak-hour trips; 4,313 Saturday peak-hour trips	2,793 new AM peak-hour trips; 7,044 new PM peak-hour trips; 8,761 Saturday peak-hour trips	1,132 new AM peak-hour trips; 2,650 new PM peak-hour trips; 3,173 Saturday peak-hour trips
Source: Michael Brandman Associates, 2012.			

Table 5-14: Comparison of Significant Unavoidable Impacts

As shown in Table 5-14, the Northeast Area and Southeast Area Alternative converts the most amount of Important Farmland to non-agricultural use and generates the most trips of the three alternatives. Thus, the Northeast Area and Southeast Area Alternative is eliminated from consideration, because it would achieve the least benefit in terms of avoiding or substantially reducing significant project impacts.

Of the two remaining alternatives, the Northwest Area Alternative converts the least amount of Important Farmland to non-agricultural use and generates the fewest daily, PM peak-hour, and Saturday peak-hour trips, while the Northeast Area Alternative generates the fewest AM peak-hour trips. At the margin, daily trip generation is the primary cause of the significant unavoidable impacts associated with air quality/greenhouse gases and noise; thus, the Northwest Area Alternative lessens the severity of all of these significant impacts by the greatest degree. Furthermore, the AM peak-hour represents only one of the three peak hours that were evaluated as part of the transportation analysis. Because the Northwest Area Alternative generates the fewest trips during the other two peak hours, it outweighs the benefits of the Northeast Area Alternative in this regard. Accordingly, the Northwest Area Alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

5.8 - Alternatives Rejected From Further Consideration

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c) indicates that EIRs should identify any alternatives considered by the lead agency, but which were rejected as infeasible, along with the reasons underlying the determination. The following alternative was initially considered, but it was rejected from further consideration for the reasons described below.

5.8.1 - Alternative Location

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(2) sets forth considerations to be used in evaluating an alternative location. The section states that the "key question" is whether any of the significant effects of the project would be avoided or substantially lessened by relocating the project. The CEQA Guidelines establishes that only locations that would accomplish this objective should be considered.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(2) sets forth considerations to be used in evaluating an alternative location. The section states that the "key question" is whether any of the significant effects of the project would be avoided or substantially lessened by relocating the project. The CEQA Guidelines identify the following factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of an alternative location:

- 1) Site suitability
- 2) Economic viability
- 3) Availability of infrastructure
- 4) General Plan consistency
- 5) Other plans or regulatory limitations
- 6) Jurisdictional boundaries
- 7) Whether the project applicant can reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to the alternative site.

The CEQA Guidelines establishes that only locations that can avoid or substantially lessen the proposed project's significant impacts should be considered.

Table 5-15 summarizes the feasibility of two potential alternative sites and Exhibit 5-1 depicts the locations of the two sites. As shown in the table, neither site is considered feasible or would avoid or substantially lessen the proposed project's significant impacts.

Site	Description	Feasibility Determination	
Rockwell Pond	Approximately 251 acres located on west side of SR-99 in unincorporated Fresno County adjacent to the Selma city limits. The City of Selma General Plan designates the Reckwell Pond site for "Light	Not Feasible: The project applicant does not own, control, or otherwise have access to the parcels comprising the Rockwell Pond site.	
	Industrial Reserve." Site is subject of an approved development proposal (known as "Rockwell Pond") that contemplates 896,000 square feet of commercial development.	Furthermore, this site is the subject of an entitled, but not constructed commercial development project. The applicant is still pursuing annexation of the site into the City of Selma; thus, this project is considered "active" and the site would not be available to the proposed project.	
		Finally, developing the proposed project at this site would not avoid or substantially lessen any of the proposed project's significant impacts, since (1) the site contains Important Farmland, and (2) the proposed project would generate the same number of daily and peak-hour trips. As such, this site is not a feasible location for the proposed project.	
		As such, this site is not a feasible location for the proposed project.	
Amberwood	AmberwoodApproximately 686 acres located east of Dockery Avenue and Ditch Road in unincorporated Fresno County adjacent to the Selma city limits. The City of Selma	Not Feasible: The project applicant does not own, control, or otherwise have access to the parcels comprising the Amberwood site.	
	General Plan designates the Amberwood site for "Low Density Residential" and "Medium Low Density Residential." Site is subject of a pending development proposal (known as "Amberwood") that contemplates 2,570 residential lots.	Additionally, developing the proposed project at this site would not avoid or substantially lessen any of the proposed project's significant impacts, since (1) the site contains Important Farmland, and (2) the proposed project would generate the same number of daily and peak-hour trips. As such, this site is not a feasible location for the proposed project.	
Source: Michael Brandman Associates, 2012.			

Table 5-15: Alternative Site Study Locations

5.8.2 - Existing County of Fresno Land Use Designations Alternative

For projects that involve annexation into an incorporated city, it is common practice to evaluate an alternative that considers the hypothetical development that could occur under the existing unincorporated land use designations.

As shown in Table 3-3 in Section 3, Project Description, the County of Fresno General Plan designates various portions of the Selma Crossings site for "Highway Commercial," "Light Industrial," and "Agriculture." The Fresno County Zoning Ordinance zones the project site as "AL20 – Agriculture Limited with 20 acre minimum parcel size," "AE20 – Agriculture Exclusive 20 acre minimum parcel size," and "RA – Residential Agriculture." With the exception of 35 acres of the South Area and the entire 20-acre Stormwater Basin site, the General Plan and zoning designations for the remaining 253 acres are in conflict with each other. As such, a zone change (or both) would be necessary in the areas currently designated for urban development by the General Plan but zoned for agricultural use.

The proposed project reconciles these inconsistencies by pre-zoning the entire project site to "CR – Regional Commercial." Because this would be the likely course of action if the proposed project was processed through the County of Fresno, it has no significant difference than the proposed project.

Regarding the potential for amending the Fresno County General Plan to re-designate the portions of the project designated "Highway Commercial" and "Light Industrial" to "Agriculture" in order to achieve consistency with the County's agricultural zoning designations, this would effectively represent the "No Project/No Development Alternative" previously considered in this section.

5.8.3 - 1997 City of Selma General Plan Land Use Designations Alternative

For projects that involve a General Plan Amendment, it is common practice to evaluate an alternative that considers the hypothetical development that could occur under the existing land use designation.

As explained in Section 3, Project Description, the Selma City Council adopted the City of Selma General Plan Update 2035 in October 2010, which re-designated all of the parcels comprising the project site to "Regional Commercial" and contemplated annexation of the site into the Selma city limits. Following the Council action, the certification of the 2035 General Plan EIR was legally challenged and adoption of the 2035 General Plan was stayed until the matter was resolved; thus, the 1997 General Plan is the prevailing document at the time of this writing. The 1997 General Plan designated the parcels comprising the project site for various uses, including Highway Commercial, Light Industrial, and Business Park. Additionally, approximately 55 acres of the project site are outside of the 1997 General Plan Planning Area and, therefore, do not have a land use designation. Finally, it should be noted that the parcels comprising the project site are currently located in unincorporated Fresno County; thus, the 1997 General Plan's land use designations for the project site are non-binding.

Evaluating a project alternative that considered the hypothetical development that could occur under the 1997 General Plan was initially considered, but ultimately rejected because the Selma City Council adopted the 2035 General Plan in October 2010. The 2035 General Plan demonstrates that City has made a different policy determination for the project site than previously set forth in the 1997 General Plan. Although it would be speculative to predict the outcome of the legal challenge to the 2035 General Plan EIR, there is no evidence at this time indicating that the City of Selma would consider reversing course and reverting back to the 1997 General Plan's land use designations for the project site.



Michael Brandman Associates 31130002 • 02/2012 | 5-1_alternatives.mxd CITY OF SELMA · SELMA CROSSINGS PROJECT
SECTION 6: OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 - Significant Unavoidable Impacts

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(a)(b) requires an EIR to identify and focus on the significant environmental effects of the proposed project, including effects that cannot be avoided if the proposed project were implemented.

This section describes significant impacts, including those that can be mitigated but not reduced to a level of less than significant. Where there are impacts that cannot be alleviated without imposing a project alternative, their implications, and the reason why the project is being proposed, notwithstanding their effect, are described. With implementation of the proposed project, eight significant impacts that cannot be avoided would occur. Each significant unavoidable impact is discussed below.

The proposed project would result in the following significant unavoidable impacts:

- **Important Farmland:** The proposed project would convert Important Farmland to nonagricultural use. Although mitigation is proposed that would require the applicant to preserve Important Farmland elsewhere in Fresno County, it would not fully mitigate the impact to a level of less than significant. Therefore, the residual significance of this impact is significant and unavoidable.
- Air Quality Plan: The proposed project would generate sources of construction and operational emissions that would exceed San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District thresholds and, thus, be in conflict with the Air Quality Plan. Mitigations are proposed requiring the implementation of emissions reduction measures; however, due to the uncertainty of the effectiveness of certain measures, the residual significance of this impact is significant and unavoidable.
- Air Quality Standards / Violations: The proposed project would generate sources of construction and operational emissions that would exceed San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District thresholds. Mitigations are proposed requiring the implementation of emissions reduction measures; however, due to the uncertainty of the effectiveness of certain measures, the residual significance of this impact is significant and unavoidable.
- Noise Levels in Excess of Standards: The proposed project would generate new vehicle trips that would expose sensitive land uses along roadways in the project vicinity to excessive noise levels. Mitigation is proposed requiring the applicant to offer to construct soundwalls or replace existing windows and doors with sound-rated assemblies; however, it would not fully mitigate the impact to a level of less than significant. Therefore, the residual significance of this impact is significant and unavoidable.

- **Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels:** The proposed project would generate new vehicle trips that would expose sensitive land uses along roadways to permanent increase in ambient noise levels. Mitigation is proposed requiring the applicant to offer to construct soundwalls or replace existing windows and doors with sound-rated assemblies; however, it would not fully mitigate the impact to a level of less than significant. Therefore, the residual significance of this impact is significant and unavoidable.
- Existing Plus Phase I Traffic Conditions: The proposed project would generate new vehicle trips that would contribute to unacceptable intersection, roadway segment, and railroad grade crossing operations under Existing Plus Phase I Traffic Conditions. Mitigation is proposed requiring the applicant to install traffic improvements or provide fair-share fees for the construction of such improvements; however, it would not fully mitigate the impact to a level of less than significant. Therefore, the residual significance of this impact is significant and unavoidable.
- Year 2020 Traffic Conditions: The proposed project would generate new vehicle trips that would contribute to unacceptable intersection, roadway segment, and railroad grade crossing operations under Year 2020 Traffic Conditions. Mitigation is proposed requiring the applicant to install traffic improvements or provide fair-share fees for the construction of such improvements; however, it would not fully mitigate the impact to a level of less than significant. Therefore, the residual significance of this impact is significant and unavoidable.
- Year 2035 Traffic Conditions: The proposed project would generate new vehicle trips that would contribute to unacceptable intersection, roadway segment, and railroad grade crossing operations under Year 2035 Traffic Conditions. Mitigation is proposed requiring the applicant to install traffic improvements or provide fair-share fees for the construction of such improvements; however, it would not fully mitigate the impact to a level of less than significant. Therefore, the residual significance of this impact is significant and unavoidable.

6.2 - Growth-Inducing Impacts

There are two types of growth-inducing impacts that a project may have: direct and indirect. To assess the potential for growth-inducing impacts, the project's characteristics that may encourage and facilitate activities that individually or cumulatively may affect the environment must be evaluated (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d)).

Direct growth-inducing impacts occur when the development of a project imposes new burdens on a community by directly inducing population growth, or by leading to the construction of additional developments in the same area. Also included in this category are projects that remove physical obstacles to population growth (such as a new road into an undeveloped area or a wastewater treatment plant with excess capacity that could allow additional development in the service area). Construction of these types of infrastructure projects cannot be considered isolated from the

development they facilitate and serve. Projects that physically remove obstacles to growth, or projects that indirectly induce growth may provide a catalyst for future, unrelated development in an area such as a new residential community that requires additional commercial uses to support residents.

The proposed project contemplates a maximum of 250 new dwelling units. Using the City of Selma's average household size of 3.64, the proposed project would be expected to add 910 persons to the City's population. As shown in Table 3-6 in Section 3, Project Description, the project would be phased over a period of 12 years, with the residential component developed over a 4-year period between 2021 and 2024. When residential population growth is averaged over this 4-year period, this translates to 228 new residents per year. This amount of annual population growth represents a 0.98-percent increase above the City's 2011 population of 23,395. As such, this small amount of population growth would not be considered significant. Note that the residential component would be developed as a later phase of the proposed project; therefore, the percentage of population growth would likely be even smaller due to intervening population growth.

As shown in Table 3-5 and Table 3-6 in Section 3, Project Description, the proposed project is estimated to create 6,809 new jobs over a 12-year period. When averaged over this period, this translates to 567 jobs per year. New employment opportunities would consist of full-time, part-time, and seasonal positions. The California Employment Development Department indicates that as of December 2011, there were 2,300 unemployed persons in Selma and 69,700 unemployed persons in Fresno County. Accordingly, it would be expected that the proposed project's new jobs could readily be filled from the local workforce.

Therefore, the proposed project would not have the potential to cause substantial direct or indirect population growth.

6.3 - Significant Irreversible Changes

The environmental effects of the proposed project are summarized in Section ES, Executive Summary, and are analyzed in detail in Section 3, Environmental Impact Analysis, of this EIR.

As mandated by the CEQA Guidelines, the EIR must address any significant irreversible environmental change that would result from implementation of the proposed project. Specifically, pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.2(c)), such an impact would occur if:

- The project would involve a large commitment of nonrenewable resources;
- Irreversible damage can result from environmental accidents associated with the project; and
- The proposed consumption of resources is not justified (e.g., the project results in the wasteful use of energy).

Approval and implementation of actions related to the proposed project would result in an irretrievable commitment of non-renewable resources such as energy supplies and other construction-related materials. The energy resource demands would be used for construction, heating, and cooling of buildings, transportation of people and goods, heating and refrigeration, lighting, and other associated energy needs. However, the proposed project would implement a number of design features and mitigation measures that would reduce energy demand, water consumption, wastewater generation, and solid waste generation that would collectively reduce the demand for resources. This would result in the emission and generation of less pollution and effluent and lessen the severity of corresponding environmental effects. Although the proposed project would result in an irretrievable commitment of non-renewable resources, the commitment of these resources would not be significantly inefficient, unnecessary, or wasteful.

The proposed project would develop commercial retail, office, visitor-serving commercial, residential uses, and associated infrastructure within a 288-gross-acre area. None of these uses would handle large quantities of hazardous materials or engage in activities that have the potential to result in serious environmental accidents (chemical manufacturing, mineral extraction, refining, etc.). As such, the proposed project would not have the potential to cause serious environmental accidents.

The proposed project would result in greater demand for resources such as energy and water; however, such consumption would not be unusually high or disproportionate relative to similar land uses (refer to Section 4.11, Public Services and Utilities for further discussion). The proposed project would implement a number of design features and mitigation measures to reduce energy and water consumption. These design features and mitigation measures exceed state and local requirements for energy and water conservation and demonstrate that the proposed project's consumption would not be unjustified.

6.4 - Cumulative Impacts

CEQA Guidelines Section 15130 requires the consideration of cumulative impacts within an EIR when a project's incremental effects are cumulatively considerable. Cumulatively considerable means that "... the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects." In identifying projects that may contribute to cumulative impacts, the CEQA Guidelines allow the use of a list of past, present, and reasonably anticipated future projects, producing related or cumulative impacts, including those which are outside of the control of the lead agency.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(b), "... the discussion of cumulative impacts shall reflect the severity of the impacts and their likelihood of occurrence, the discussion need not provide as great [a level of] detail as is provided for the effects attributable to the project alone." The discussion should be guided by standards of practicality and reasonableness, and it should focus on

the cumulative impact to which the identified other projects contribute rather than on the attributes of other projects that do not contribute to the cumulative impact.

The proposed project's cumulative impacts were considered in conjunction with other proposed and approved projects in Selma and nearby jurisdictions.

Jurisdiction	Project	Location
City of Selma	Walmart Supercenter	Floral Avenue, West of SR-99
	Gill Motel and Commercial	Floral Avenue, West of SR-99
	Bratton single-family residential	South of Rose Avenue, west of Highland Avenue
	Comfort Suites	West of Whilston Street, North of Stillman Street
	Raven Map 5296	South of Dinuba Avenue, East of Dockery Avenue
	Valley View Map 5303	South of Valley View Street, Between Thompson Avenue and McCall Avenue
	Canales Map 5217	East of Highland Avenue, South of Nebraska Avenue
	Eye Q II	West of Whilston Street, North of Stillman Street
	Graham Commercial	North of Rose Avenue, West of SR-99
	Raven Commercial	Manning Avenue, East of McCall Avenue
	Amberwood Commercial	East of Orange Avenue, Between Floral Avenue and Dinuba Avenue
	3-MD Industrial Park	Nebraska Avenue, East of Dockery Avenue
	Golden State Industrial Park	Park Street, East of SR-99
	Rockwell Pond	Floral Avenue, West of SR-99
	Brandywine	Southwest of Manning Avenue and McCall Avenue
Source: City of Selma.	2012.	·

Table 6-1: Cumulative Projects

_____,____

6.4.1 - Cumulative Impact Analysis

The cumulative impact analysis below is guided by the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Section 15130. Key principles established by this section include:

- A cumulative impact only occurs from impacts caused by the proposed project and other projects. An EIR should not discuss impacts that do not result from the proposed project.
- When the combined cumulative impact from the increment associated with the proposed project and other projects is not significant, an EIR need only briefly explain why the impact is not significant; detailed explanation is not required.

• An EIR may determine that a project's contribution to a cumulative effect impact would be rendered less than cumulatively considerable if a project is required to implement or fund its fair share of mitigation intended to alleviate the cumulative impact.

The cumulative impact analysis that follows relies on these principles as the basis for determining the significance of the proposed project's cumulative contribution to various impacts.

Aesthetics, Light, and Glare

The geographic scope of the cumulative aesthetics, light, and glare analysis is the area surrounding the project site. This is the area within view of the project and, therefore, the area most likely to experience changes in visual character or experience light and glare impacts.

Several of the projects listed in Table 6-1 may have the potential to impact aesthetics, light, and glare. The proposed project would not have significant impacts on scenic vistas and visual character and would have impacts on light and glare that would be less than significant after mitigation. Other projects that result in significant impacts on aesthetics, light, and glare would be required to mitigate for their impacts. Because the proposed impacts would be less than significant or less than significant after mitigation, it would not have a related cumulative considerable impact.

Agricultural Resources

The geographic scope of the cumulative agricultural resources analysis is Fresno County. Agricultural resources are most commonly evaluated in the context of countywide resources; therefore, it is most appropriate to use this as the basis for assessing cumulative impacts.

Several of the projects listed in Table 6-1 would occur on land mapped as Important Farmland and, therefore, would have the potential to convert farmland to non-agricultural use. The proposed project would convert approximately 300 acres of Important Farmland to urban uses. The proposed project exceeds the threshold of significance for conversion of Important Farmland to non-agricultural use according to the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment model. Therefore, mitigation is proposed requiring the project applicant to preserve Important Farmland elsewhere in Fresno County. However, this would not fully mitigate the impact to a level of less than significant, and the residual significance of this impact would be significant and unavoidable. Other projects that convert significant amounts of Important Farmland to non-agricultural use would also contribute to this cumulative impact. As such, the proposed project has a related cumulatively considerable impact.

One parcel is encumbered by an active Williamson Act contract and mitigation is proposed that would fully mitigate this impact to a level of less than significant. In addition, the proposed project would not create pressures to convert adjacent farmland to non-agricultural uses. Other projects listed in Table 6-1 may or may not have significant impacts in these areas. However, because the proposed project would not significantly impact these issues, it would not have a related cumulative considerable impact.

Air Quality

The geographic scope of the cumulative air quality analysis is the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin. Air pollution is regarded as a regional issue; therefore, this area would be the area most likely to be impacted by project emissions.

All of the projects listed in Table 6-1 would result new air emissions, during construction or operations (or both). The proposed would emit construction and operational emissions at levels that would exceed the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) thresholds. Mitigation is proposed requiring the implementation of emissions reductions measures; however, there is uncertainty regarding whether emissions would be reduced to below SJVAPCD thresholds. Other projects that exceed SJVAPCD thresholds would also be required to mitigate their impacts. However, because the proposed project cannot reduce emissions to below SJVAPCD thresholds, it would have cumulatively considerable impact.

The proposed project would emit new greenhouse gas emissions. Other projects would also emit new greenhouse gas emissions. The proposed project was found to be able to achieve a 29-percent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions relative to "business-as-usual" conditions, which is the SJVAPCD's reduction target. Other projects would also be required to meet this target. Because the proposed project can achieve this objective, it would not have a cumulatively considerable impact

All other project air quality impacts were found to be less than significant after mitigation (e.g., objectionable odors) or less than significant and did not require mitigation (e.g., carbon monoxide hotspots). Other projects that result in similar impacts would be required to mitigate for their impacts. Because the proposed project can mitigate all of these remaining air quality impacts to a level of less than significant, it would not have a related cumulative considerable impact.

Biological Resources

The geographic scope of the cumulative biological resources analysis is the project site and nearby properties. Biological impacts tend to be localized; therefore, the area near the project area would be the area most affected by project activities (generally within a 0.5-mile radius).

Several of the projects listed in Table 6-1 may have the potential to impact biological resources. The proposed project would have significant impacts on special-status species, riparian habitat, wetlands, and conflicts with local biological policies that could be mitigated to a level of less than significant. All other project biological impacts were found to be less than significant and did not require mitigation. Other projects that result in similar impacts would be required to mitigate for their impacts. Because the proposed project can mitigate all of its biological impacts to a level of less than significant, it would not have a related cumulative considerable impact.

Cultural Resources

The geographic scope of the cumulative cultural resources analysis is the project site and nearby properties. Cultural resource impacts tend to be localized; therefore, the area near the project area would be the area most affected by project activities (generally within a 500-foot radius).

Several of the projects listed in Table 6-1 may have the potential to impact cultural resources. The proposed project would have significant impacts on historical resources, archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and burial sites that could be mitigated to a level of less than significant. Other projects that result in similar impacts would be required to mitigate for their impacts. Because the proposed project can mitigate all of its cultural impacts to a level of less than significant, it would not have a related cumulative considerable impact.

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

The geographic scope of the cumulative geology, soils, and seismicity analysis is the project site and nearby properties. Geologic, soil, and seismic impacts tend to be localized; therefore, the area near the project area would be the area most affected by project activities.

Several of the projects listed in Table 6-1 may have the potential to impact geology, soils, and seismicity. The proposed project would have significant impacts on seismic hazards, erosion, and unstable geologic units and soils that could be mitigated to a level of less than significant. All other project geologic impacts were found to be less than significant and did not require mitigation. Other projects that result in similar impacts would be required to mitigate for their impacts. Because the proposed project can mitigate all of its geology impacts to a level of less than significant, it would not have a related cumulative considerable impact.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The geographic scope of the cumulative hazards and hazardous materials analysis is the project site and nearby properties. Adverse affects of hazards and hazardous materials tend to be localized; therefore, the area near the project area would be the area most affected by project activities.

Several of the projects listed in Table 6-1 may have the potential to impact hazards and hazardous materials. The proposed project would have significant impacts associated with hazardous materials from past or present site usage that could be mitigated to a level of less than significant. All other Master Plan hazards impacts were found to be less than significant and did not require mitigation. Other projects that result in similar impacts would be required to mitigate for their impacts. Because the proposed Master Plan can mitigate all of its hazards impacts to a level of less than significant, it would not have a related cumulative considerable impact.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The geographic scope of the cumulative hydrology and water quality analysis is the Selma area. Hydrologic and water quality impacts concern local waterways and groundwater sources, which affect the greater Selma area.

Several of the projects listed in Table 6-1 may have the potential to impact hydrology and water quality. The proposed project would have significant impacts on short-term water quality, long-term water quality, groundwater, and drainage that could be mitigated to a level of less than significant. All other project-related hydrology impacts were found to be less than significant and did not require mitigation. Other projects that result in similar impacts would be required to mitigate for their impacts. Because the proposed project can mitigate all of its hydrology impacts to a level of less than significant, it would not have a related cumulative considerable impact.

Land Use

The geographic scope of the cumulative land use analysis is the Selma area. Land use decisions are made at the city level; therefore, the Manteca area is an appropriate geographic scope.

The proposed project and its contemplated end uses were found to be consistent with the City of Selma 2035 General Plan, City of Selma 1997 General Plan, and the Selma Municipal Code. Other projects would be required to demonstrate consistency with applicable land use plans and mitigate where necessary. Because the residual significance of the proposed project's land use impacts would be less than significant, it would not have a related cumulative considerable impact.

Noise

The geographic scope of the cumulative noise analysis is the project site and nearby properties, including surrounding sensitive receptors. Noise impacts tend to be localized; therefore, the area near the project area would be the area most affected by project activities.

All of the projects listed in Table 6-1 have the potential to introduce new sources of noise that could expose nearby receptors to excessive noise levels. The proposed project would have significant impacts associated with noise levels in excess of adopted standards and permanent increase in ambient noise levels. Mitigation is proposed; however, it would not fully mitigate project impacts. Therefore, the residual significance would be significant and unavoidable. The proposed project would have significant impacts with construction noise that could be mitigated to a level of less than significant. All other project noise impacts were found to be less than significant and did not require mitigation. Other projects that result in similar impacts would be required to mitigate for their impacts. Because the proposed project would have a significant unavoidable impact on noise, it would have a cumulative considerable impact in this regard.

Public Services and Utilities

The geographic scope of the cumulative public services and utilities analysis is the Selma area. The service area of the respective service providers primarily encompasses Selma and surrounding communities and, therefore, would be most affected by project activities.

The proposed project was found to have significant impacts on fire protection, police protection, water supply, storm drainage, and solid waste. Mitigation was proposed to address all of these impacts and would fully mitigate these issues to a level of less than significant. All other project-related public services impacts were found to be less than significant and did not require mitigation. Other projects would be required to evaluate whether sufficient public services and utilities are available and mitigate where necessary. Because the residual significance of the proposed project's impacts would be less than significant, it would not have a related cumulative considerable impact.

Transportation

The geographic scope of the cumulative transportation analysis is the Selma area. Note that Section 4.12, Transportation provides a detailed evaluation of project-related transportation impacts.

All the new development projects listed in Table 6-1 would generate new vehicle trips that may trigger or contribute to unacceptable intersection operations, roadway operations, and freeway operations. All projects would be required to mitigate for their fair share of impacts. At buildout, the proposed project would result add new daily and peak-hour trips to roadways in the project vicinity. The proposed project would contribute trips to intersection, roadway segments, at-grade railroad grade crossings that would operate at unacceptable levels under Existing Plus Phase I Conditions, Year 2020 Conditions, and Year 2035 Conditions. All feasible mitigation measures are proposed that would improve operations to acceptable levels. However, there is uncertainty whether all necessary improvements would be fully funded and implemented as contemplated; therefore, the residual significance is significant and unavoidable. The proposed project, in conjunction with other projects, would have a cumulatively considerable contribution to unacceptable traffic operations.

For other transportation-related areas, the proposed project would have significant impacts on public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian modes of transportation. All other project-related transportation impacts were found to be less than significant and did not require mitigation. Other projects that result in similar impacts would be required to mitigate for their impacts. Because the proposed project can mitigate all of its impacts to a level of less than significant, it would not have a related cumulative considerable impact.

Urban Decay

The geographic scope of the cumulative urban analysis is the Trade Area identified in Section 4.13, Urban Decay and shown on Exhibit 4.13-1.

At buildout, the proposed project would generate more than \$772 million in annual sales. The proposed project's commercial retail uses would be primarily "super-regional" in nature and, thus, would be expected to largely cater to customers who currently do not patronize Trade Area outlets. The proposed project is also proposed to be developed in phases over a period of more than a decade. Most commercial developers build in response to demand; it would be highly unlikely that one or more phases of the project would be built without major tenants. As such, this is a self-mitigating aspect of the proposed project as it relates to urban decay. Nonetheless, given the amount of new commercial square footage that is proposed, there inevitably would be some level of sales diversions from competing outlets in the Trade Area. The extent of sales diversions will depend largely on the tenants of the proposed project, which are unknown at the time of this writing. Regardless, even if sales diversions are significant enough to cause closure of competing outlets, physical deterioration is not necessarily inevitable for the reasons previously described (i.e., potential for re-tenanting and reuse). For these reasons, urban decay is not a foreseeable consequence of the proposed project. As such, the proposed project, in conjunction with other projects, would not cumulatively contribute to urban decay.

6.5 - Energy Conservation

Public Resources Code Section 21100(b)(3) and CEOA Guidelines Section 15126.4 require EIRs to describe, where relevant, the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy caused by a project. In 1975, largely in response to the oil crisis of the 1970s, the State Legislature adopted AB 1575, which created the California Energy Commission (CEC). The statutory mission of the CEC is to forecast future energy needs, license thermal power plants of 50 megawatts or larger, develop energy technologies and renewable energy resources, plan for and direct state responses to energy emergencies, and—perhaps most importantly—promote energy efficiency through the adoption and enforcement of appliance and building energy efficiency standards. AB 1575 also amended Public Resources Code Section 21100(b)(3) to require EIRs to consider the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy caused by a project. Thereafter, the State Resources Agency created Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines. Appendix F is an advisory document that assists EIR preparers in determining whether a project will result in the inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy. For the reasons set forth below, this EIR concludes that the proposed project will not result in the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy; will not cause the need for additional natural gas or electrical energy-producing facilities; and, therefore, will not create a significant impact on energy resources.

6.5.1 - Regulatory Setting

Federal and state agencies regulate energy use and consumption through various means and programs. At the federal level, the United States Department of Transportation, the United States Department of Energy, and the United States Environmental Protection Agency are three federal agencies with substantial influence over energy policies and programs. Generally, federal agencies

influence and regulate transportation energy consumption through establishment and enforcement of fuel economy standards for automobiles and light trucks, through funding of energy-related research and development projects, and through funding for transportation infrastructure improvements. At the state level, the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) and the CEC are two agencies with authority over different aspects of energy. The CPUC regulates privately owned utilities in the energy, rail, telecommunications, and water fields. The CEC collects and analyzes energy-related data, prepares statewide energy policy recommendations and plans, promotes and funds energy efficiency programs, and adopts and enforces appliance and building energy efficiency standards. California is exempt under federal law from setting state fuel economy standards for new on-road motor vehicles. Some of the more relevant federal and state energy-related laws and plans are discussed below.

Federal Energy Policy and Conservation Act

The Federal Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975 sought to ensure that all vehicles sold in the U.S. would meet certain fuel economy goals. Through this Act, Congress established the first fuel economy standards for on-road motor vehicles in the U.S. Pursuant to the Act, the National Highway Traffic and Safety Administration, which is part of the United States Department of Transportation, is responsible for establishing additional vehicle standards and for revising existing standards. Since 1990, the fuel economy standard for new passenger cars has been 27.5 miles per gallon. Since 1996, the fuel economy standard for new light trucks (gross vehicle weight of 8,500 pounds or less) has been 20.7 miles per gallon. Heavy-duty vehicles (i.e., vehicles and trucks over 8,500 pounds gross vehicle weight) are not currently subject to fuel economy standards. Compliance with federal fuel economy standards is not determined for each individual vehicle model; rather, compliance is determined on the basis of each manufacturer's average fuel economy for the portion of their vehicles produced for sale in the United States. The Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) program, which is administered by United States Environmental Protection Agency, was created to determine vehicle manufacturers' compliance with the fuel economy standards. The United States Environmental Protection Agency calculates a CAFE value for each manufacturer that is based on city and highway fuel economy test results and vehicle sales. On the basis of the information generated under the CAFE program, the United States Department of Transportation is authorized to assess penalties for noncompliance. In the course of its over 30-year history, this regulatory program has resulted in vastly improved fuel economy throughout the nation's vehicle fleet.

Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA)

The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) promoted the development of inter-modal transportation systems to maximize mobility as well as address national and local interests in air quality and energy. ISTEA contained factors that Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) such as the San Joaquin Council of Governments were required to address in developing transportation plans and programs, including some energy-related factors. To meet the new ISTEA requirements, MPOs adopted explicit policies defining the social, economic, energy, and

environmental values that were to guide transportation decisions in that metropolitan area. The planning process for specific projects would then address these policies. Another requirement was to consider the consistency of transportation planning with federal, state, and local energy goals. Through this requirement, energy consumption was expected to become a decision criterion, along with cost and other values that determine the best transportation solution.

The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21)

The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) was signed into law in 1998 and builds upon the initiatives established in the ISTEA legislation discussed above. TEA-21 authorizes highway, highway safety, transit, and other efficient surface transportation programs. TEA-21 continues the program structure established for highways and transit under ISTEA, such as flexibility in the use of funds, emphasis on measures to improve the environment, and focus on a strong planning process as the foundation of good transportation decisions. TEA-21 also provides for investment in research and its application to maximize the performance of the transportation system through, for example, deployment of Intelligent Transportation Systems, to help improve operations and management of transportation systems and vehicle safety.

State of California Energy Plan

The CEC is responsible for preparing the State Energy Plan, which identifies emerging trends related to energy supply, demand, conservation, public health and safety, and the maintenance of a healthy economy. The plan calls for the State to assist in the transformation of the transportation system to improve air quality, reduce congestion, and increase the efficient use of fuel supplies with the least environmental and energy costs. To further this policy, the plan identifies a number of strategies, including providing assistance to public agencies and fleet operators, encouraging urban designs that reduce vehicle miles traveled, and accommodating pedestrian and bicycle access.

Title 24, Energy Efficiency Standards

Title 24, which was promulgated by the CEC in 1978 in response to a legislative mandate to create uniform building codes to reduce California's energy consumption, provides energy efficiency standards for residential and nonresidential buildings. According to the CEC, since the energy efficiency standards went into effect in 1978, it is estimated that California residential and nonresidential consumers have reduced their utility bills by at least \$15.8 billion. The CEC further estimates that by 2011, residential and nonresidential consumers will have saved an additional \$43 billon in energy costs.

In 2008, the CEC adopted new energy efficiency standards. Effective January 1, 2010, all projects that apply for a building permit must adhere to the new 2008 standards. The 2008 standards reflect the greenhouse gas reduction requirements of the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (Assembly Bill 32).

Because the adoption of Title 24 post-dates the adoption of AB 1575, it has generally been the presumption throughout the State that compliance with Title 24 (as well as compliance with the federal and state regulations discussed above) ensures that projects will not result in the inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy. As is the case with other uniform building codes, Title 24 is designed to provide certainty and uniformity throughout the State while ensuring that the efficient and non-wasteful consumption of energy is carried out through design features. For the vast majority of residential and nonresidential projects, adherence to Title 24 is deemed necessary to ensure that no significant impacts occur from the inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy. As a further example, the adoption of federal vehicle fuel standards, which have been continually improved since their original adoption in 1975, have also protected against the inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary use of energy.

Pursuant to the California Building Standards Code and the Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards, the City will review the design and construction components of the project's Title 24 compliance when specific building plans are submitted.

6.5.2 - Energy Requirements of the Proposed Project

Short-term construction and long-term operational energy consumption are discussed below.

The EPA regulates non-road diesel engines. The EPA has no formal fuel economy standards for nonroad (e.g., construction) diesel engines but does regulate diesel emissions, which indirectly affects fuel economy. In 1994, the EPA adopted the first set of emissions standards (Tier 1) for all new nonroad diesel engines greater than 37 kilowatts (kW) (50 horsepower [hp]). The Tier 1 standards were phased in for different engine sizes between 1996 and 2000, reducing nitrogen oxide (NO_x) emissions from these engines by 30 percent. The EPA has since adopted more stringent emission standards for NO_x, hydrocarbons, and particulate matter from new, non-road diesel engines. This program includes the first set of standards for non-road diesel engines less than 37 kW. It also phases in more stringent Tier 2 emission standards from 2001 to 2006 for all engine sizes and adds yet more stringent Tier 3 standards for engines between 37 and 560 kW (50 and 750 hp) from 2006 to 2008. These standards will further reduce non-road diesel engine emissions by 60 percent for NO_x and 40 percent for particulate matter (PM) from Tier 1 emission levels. In 2004, the EPA issued the Clean Air Non-road Diesel Rule. This rule, which took effect in 2008 and will be fully phased in by 2014, will cut emissions from non-road diesel engines by more than 90 percent. These emission standards are intended to promote advanced clean technologies for non-road diesel engines that improve fuel combustion, but they also result in slight decreases in fuel economy.

The proposed project would be developed in phases over a number of years period. Construction activities would be estimated to consume 7.1 million gallons of diesel or gasoline over the life of the project. There are no unusual project characteristics that would necessitate the use of construction equipment that would be less energy-efficient than at comparable construction sites in other parts of the State. Therefore, it is expected that construction fuel consumption associated with the proposed

project would not be any more inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary than at other construction sites in the region.

Long-Term Operations

Transportation Energy Demand

Vehicle fuel efficiency is regulated at the federal level. Pursuant to the Federal Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975, the National Highway Traffic and Safety Administration is responsible for establishing additional vehicle standards and for revising existing standards.

As of Model Year 2010, the fuel economy standard for new passenger cars is 27.5 miles per gallon and the fuel economy standard for new light trucks (gross vehicle weight of 8,500 pounds or less) is 23.5 miles per gallon. Heavy-duty vehicles (vehicles and trucks over 8,500 pounds gross vehicle weight) are not currently subject to fuel economy standards. Compliance with federal fuel economy standards is not determined for each individual vehicle model; rather, compliance is determined by each manufacturer's average fuel economy for the portion of its vehicles produced for sale in the United States.

The proposed project is estimated to consume 15,091 gallons of both gasoline and diesel on a daily basis. The proposed project would contribute to reducing vehicle miles traveled by locating commercial uses along the SR-99 corridor. This project attribute would be expected to maximize the capture of pass-by trips, which are trips that would otherwise be local roadways, but are diverted into the project. As such, it would be expected that vehicular fuel consumption associated with the proposed project would not be any more inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary than for any other similar land use in the region.

Building Energy Demand

At buildout, the proposed project are estimated to demand 69.4 million kilowatt-hours (kWh) of electricity and 198.2 million cubic feet of natural gas on an annual basis. These figures were derived from energy consumption rates provided by the United States Energy Information Administration. Refer to Impact PSU-7 in Section 4.11, Public Services and Utilities for further discussion about the calculations used to arrive at these consumption estimates, as well as a discussion on local and regional energy supplies and requirements for additional capacity, the effects of the project on energy resources, and the effects of the project on peak demand periods.

In addition, the proposed project will be subject to the most recently adopted edition of the Title 24 energy efficiency standards at the time building permits are sought. The Title 24 standards include a number of requirements associated with energy conservation and, therefore, ensure that the Master Plan uses would not result in the inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary use of energy.

SECTION 7: EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

7.1 - Introduction

This section is based on the original Notice of Preparation (NOP), dated June 28, 2007 and the Re-Released NOP, dated November 9, 2010, both of which are contained in Appendix A of this Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The two NOPs were prepared to identify the potentially significant effects of the proposed projects. In the course of this evaluation, certain impacts were found to be less than significant because the proposed project's characteristics would not create such impacts. This section provides a brief description of effects found not to be significant or less than significant, based on the NOP comments or more detailed analysis conducted as part of the EIR preparation process. Note that a number of impacts that are found to be less than significant are addressed in the various EIR topical sections (Sections 3.1 through 3.13) to provide more comprehensive discussion of why impacts are less than significant, in order to better inform decision makers and the general public.

7.2 - Effects Found Not To Be Significant

7.2.1 - Aesthetics, Light, and Glare

Scenic Vistas

The project site contains agricultural land (both cultivated and fallow) and rural residences. There are no features commonly associated with scenic vistas onsite (e.g., peaks, ridgelines, overlooks, etc.). In addition, the Sierra Nevada Mountains are more than 30 miles away from the project site and, thus, are of limited visibility. Therefore, the proposed project would not have the potential to adversely affect a scenic vista. No impacts would occur.

State Scenic Highways

State Route 99 is not classified as an officially designated or eligible State Scenic Highway in Fresno County. The nearest officially designated State Scenic Highway to the Selma area is State Route 168, located approximately 25 miles to the north. These conditions preclude the possibility of the proposed project adversely impacted scenic resources within view of a State Scenic Highway. No impacts would occur.

7.2.2 - Agricultural Resources

Conversion of Forestland to Non-Forest Use

The project site contains agricultural and rural residential land uses; it does not contain any forestland or timberland. Therefore, land use and development activities contemplated by the proposed project would not impact these resources. No impacts would occur.

Conflicts with Forest Zoning

The parcels comprising the project site are currently designated for agricultural use by the Fresno County Zoning Ordinance. The project site is proposed to be annexed into the Selma city limits and pre-zoned for regional commercial uses. Both the existing and proposed zoning designations are nonforest in character. This condition precludes the possibility of the proposed project conflicting with a forest zoning designation. No impacts would occur.

7.2.3 - Biological Resources

Riparian Habitat or Sensitive Natural Communities

The project site is dominated by agricultural activities, consisting mostly of vineyards. The project site does not contain any riparian habitat or sensitive natural community. The agricultural habitat onsite is not considered a sensitive plant community and does not meet United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) or California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) criteria used to define sensitive riparian and wetland areas (marsh, vernal pool, etc.). Therefore, the proposed project would adversely impact riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities. No impacts would occur.

Federally Protected Wetlands

The project site is dominated by agricultural activities, consisting mostly of vineyards. The project site does not contain any wetlands. The project site does not contain features that would meet USACE or CDFG criteria used to define wetland areas (marsh, vernal pool, etc.). Therefore, the proposed project would not adversely affect federally protected wetlands. No impacts would occur.

Local Biological Policies or Ordinances

The City of Selma does not have existing biological policies or ordinances that are applicable to the proposed project. This condition precludes the possibility of adverse impacts; therefore, no impact would occur.

Conservation Plans

The project site is not within the boundaries of an adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. This condition precludes the possibility of adverse conflicts with such plans. No impacts would occur.

7.2.4 - Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

Septic or Alternative Wastewater Disposal Systems

The proposed project would be served by sanitary sewer service provided by the Kingsburg Selma Fowler County Sanitation District. No septic or alternative wastewater disposal systems would be installed as part of the proposed project. No impacts would occur.

7.2.5 - Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Exposure of Schools to Hazardous Materials

The nearest school to the project site is Washington Elementary School, located 0.75-mile to the northeast. No schools are located within 0.25 mile of the project site. This condition precludes the possibility of activities associated with the proposed project exposing schools within a 0.25-mile radius of the project site to hazardous materials. No impacts would occur.

Airports

The project site is not within the boundaries of an airport land use plan. Selma Airport, located approximately 3.2 miles northwest of the project site, is the nearest airport. Given this distance, the development of the proposed project would not expose person residing or working in the project area to aviation hazards associated with public airports. No impacts would occur.

Private Air Strips

The nearest private airstrip to the project site is located 3.0 miles to the northwest at the Quinn Power Systems – Caterpillar site. Given this distance, the development of the proposed project would not expose person residing or working in the project area to aviation hazards associated with private airstrips. No impacts would occur.

Emergency Evacuation or Response

The 2035 City of Selma General Plan Safety Element Policy 4.13 designates all arterial and collector roadways within the city limits as evacuation routes in the aftermath of a seismic event. In the project vicinity, Golden State Boulevard, E. Mountain View Avenue, S. Dockery Avenue, and S. Van Horn Avenue are designated either arterial and collector roadways and, therefore, would be classified as evacuation routes. The proposed project would improve its frontages with all four roadways, including with additional travel and turn lanes, signals, and either half-width or full-width improvements. Such improvements would allow for efficient and safe travel and provide sufficient access to large emergency vehicles such as fire engines. Furthermore, the proposed project does not propose any permanent road closures, lane reductions, or other features that have the potential to disrupt circulation on these roadways. As such, the proposed project would not interfere with or impair emergency response or evacuation. No impacts would occur.

Wildland Fires

The project site is surrounded by agricultural, industrial, retail, and residential uses. None of these land uses is considered susceptible to wildfires. Therefore, development of the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. No impacts would occur.

7.2.6 - Hydrology and Water Quality

100-Year Flood Hazards

The City of Selma General Plan Update 2035 Environmental Impact Report (Figure 3.8-5) indicates that the project site is outside the boundaries of a 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, the proposed project would not locate structures within a 100-year floodplain. No impact would occur.

Seiches, Tsunamis, or Mudflows

The project site is more than 100 miles from the Pacific Ocean, a condition that precludes the possibility of tsunami inundation. The project site is approximately 25 miles from Pine Flat Lake, which the nearest inland body of water capable of producing a seiche. This condition precludes the possibility of seiche inundation. The project site is not located in a volcanically active area or adjacent to steep slopes. This condition precludes the possibility of mudflow inundation. No impacts would occur.

7.2.7 - Land Use

Division of an Established Community

Twelve residences exist within the project boundaries. These residences are distributed among the three areas (Northeast, South, and Northwest); they are not grouped in a manner that would constitute an established community. Additionally, none of the three areas provides any linkages between any surrounding land uses. As such, the removal of the existing residences and the development of the proposed project would not constitute the division of an established community. No impacts would occur.

Conservation Plans

The project site is not within the boundaries of an adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. This condition precludes the possibility of adverse conflicts with such plans. No impacts would occur.

7.2.8 - Mineral Resources

Mineral Resources of Statewide or Local Importance

The project site does not contain any known mineral deposits or active mineral extraction operations. In addition, the City of Selma General Plan does not identify the project site as containing mineral resources of local importance. This condition precludes the possibility of the loss of important mineral resources as a result of the proposed project. No impacts would occur.

7.2.9 - Noise

Aviation Noise

The project site is not within the boundaries of an airport land use plan. Selma Airport, located approximately 3.2 miles northwest of the project site area, is the nearest airport. This distance

precludes the possibility of the proposed project exposing persons in the project vicinity to excessive aviation noise levels. No impacts would occur.

7.2.10 - Population and Housing

Growth Inducement

The proposed project contemplates a maximum of 250 new dwelling units. Using the City of Selma's average household size of 3.64, the proposed project would be expected to add 910 persons to the City's population. As discussed in Section 3, Project Description, the project would be phased over a period of 12 years, with the residential component developed over a 4-year period between 2021 and 2024. When residential population growth is averaged over this 4-year period, this translates to 228 new residents per year. This amount of annual population growth represents a 0.98-percent increase above the City's 2011 population of 23,395. As such, this small amount of population growth would not be considered significant. Note that the percentage of population growth would likely be even smaller because of intervening population growth that occurs between 2011 and 2021.

As discussed in Section 3, Project Description, the proposed project is estimated to create 6,809 new jobs over a 12-year period. When averaged over this period, this translates to 567 jobs per year. New employment opportunities would consist of full-time, part-time, and seasonal positions. The California Employment Development Department indicates that as of April 2011, there were 2,400 unemployed persons in Selma and 74,300 unemployed persons in Fresno County. Accordingly, it would be expected that the proposed project's new jobs could readily be filled from the local workforce.

Therefore, the proposed project would not have the potential to cause substantial direct or indirect population growth.

Displacement of Persons or Housing

The project site contains 12 dwelling units containing an estimated 44 residents. The proposed project would involve removal of the dwelling units; therefore, occupants of these units would seek new housing. However, residential vacancy rates in the Selma area and Fresno County are high enough that it would be expected that occupants would readily be able to find replacement housing such that the construction of new dwelling units is not necessary. No impacts would occur.

7.2.11 - Public Services and Utilities

Schools

The proposed project contemplates a maximum of 250 new dwelling units, which would be expected to translate to 910 new residents. Assuming that 40 percent of the new population growth represents school age children (K-12), this would represent the addition of as many 364 students to local public schools.

As discussed in Section 3, Project Description, the project would be phased over a 12-year period, with the residential component developed over a 4-year period between 2021 and 2024. When student generation is averaged over this 4-year period, this translates to 91 new students per year. Table 7-1 summarizes the Selma Unified School District's enrollment between Academic Year 2006–2007 and 2009–2010. As shown in the table, enrollment has fluctuated between a high of 6,509 students in 2006–2007 and a low of 6,369 students in 2009–2010. As such, the addition of 91 students each academic year over a 4-year period would be within recent enrollment fluctuation levels; therefore, existing school facilities would be available to serve any enrollment increase attributable to the proposed project.

Academic Year	Enrollment
2006–2007 (High)	6,509
2007–2008	6,480
2008–2009	6,390
2009–2010 (Low)	6,369
Difference Between High and Low Points	140
Source: California Department of Education, 2011.	·

Table 7-1: Selma Unified School District Enrollment (2006–2007 through 2009–2010)

The new employment opportunities created by the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth into the Selma area from outside areas. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the need for new or expanded school facilities. No impacts would occur.

Parks

The proposed project contemplates a maximum of 250 new dwelling units, which would be expected to translate to 910 new residents. As discussed in Section 3, Project Description, the project would be phased over a period of 12 years, with the residential component developed over a 4-year period between 2021 and 2024. When residential population growth is averaged over this 4-year period, this translates to 228 new residents per year. This amount of annual population growth represents a 0.98-percent increase above the City's 2011 population of 23,395. The new employment opportunities created by the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth into the Selma area from outside areas. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the need for new or expanded park facilities. No impacts would occur.

Other Public Facilities

The proposed project contemplates a maximum of 250 new dwelling units, which would be expected to translate to 910 new residents. As discussed in Section 3, Project Description, the project would be phased over a period of 12 years, with the residential component developed over a 4-year period between 2021 and 2024. When residential population growth is averaged over this 4-year period, this translates to 228 new residents per year. This amount of annual population growth represents a 0.98-

percent increase above the City's 2011 population of 23,395. The new employment opportunities created by the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth into the Selma area from outside areas. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the need for new or expanded library or other public facilities. No impacts would occur.

7.2.12 - Recreation

Physical Deterioration of Recreational Facilities

The small amount of population growth attributable to the proposed project would not be large enough to cause physical deterioration of existing recreational facilities. New employment opportunities created by the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth into the Selma area from outside areas. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the physical deterioration of existing recreational facilities. Accordingly, no impacts would occur.

New or Expanded Recreational Facilities

The proposed project contemplates a waterpark as part of the South Area. This recreational facility is accounted for in this EIR's assessment of the proposed project's environmental effects. The proposed project would not necessitate the construction or expansion of offsite recreational facilities. Therefore, no impacts on recreation would occur.

7.2.13 - Transportation

Air Traffic Patterns

The project site is not within the boundaries of an airport land use plan. Selma Airport, located approximately 3.2 miles northwest of the project site area, is the nearest airport. This distance precludes the possibility of the proposed project changing air traffic patterns or causing an increase in air traffic levels. No impacts would occur.

SECTION 8: PERSONS AND ORGANIZATIONS CONSULTED

8.1 - Public Agencies

8.1.1 - City of Selma	
City Manager's Office	
City Manager	D-B Heusser
Community Development Department	
Assistant Planner	Bryant Hemby
Police Department	
Chief	Thomas Whiteside
Fire Department	
Chief	Jeffrey Kestly
8.1.2 - State of California	
California Department of Conservation	
Program Manager, Williamson Act Program	Dan Otis
California Department of Fish and Game	
Regional Manager	W.E. Loudermilk
California Department of Toxic Substances Control	
Hazardous Substances Scientist	Tim Miles
Hazardous Substances Engineer	Sam Martinez, Jr.
California Department of Transportation, District 6	
Transportation Planner	Michael Navarro
California Public Utilities Commission	
Environmental Specialist	Kevin Boles
Rail Corridor Safety Specialist	Moses Stites
Native American Heritage Commission	
Program Analyst	Dave Singleton
8.1.3 - Local Agencies	
County of Fresno, Department of Community Health	
Environmental Health Specialist	Glenn Allen

San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District	
Director of Permits Services	David Warner
Permit Services Manager	Arnaud Marjollet
Selma-Kingsburg-Fowler County Sanitation District	
Supervising Engineering	Veronica Cazares
Engineering Technician I	Frank Hernandez
Fresno Local Agency Formation Commission	
Executive Director	Rick Ballantyne
Kings Canyon Unified School District	
Deputy Superintendent	Ron Hudson
Consolidated Irrigation District	
General Manager	Mark Gilkey
City of Reedley	
City Planner	David Brletic
8.2 - Private Parties	
Chevron Environmental Management Company	
Environmental Project Manager	Lee Higgins
	66
Pacific Gas and Electric Company	
Land Agent	Kyle Patten
Southern California Gas Company	
Pipeline Planning Assistant	Louise Brown

SECTION 9: LIST OF PREPARERS

9.1 - Lead Agency

9.1.1 - City of Selma

City Manager's Office

City Manager...... D-B Heusser

Community Development Department

by
[

9.2 - Lead Consultant

9.2.1 - Michael Brandman Associates

Jason Brandman
Dave Mitchell
Grant Gruber
Janna Waligorski
Carrie Wills
Sandra L. Tomlin
Ed Livingston
Karlee McCracken
Brandon Price
José Morelos
Cole Forbes

9.3 - Technical Subconsultants

9.3.1 - Blair, Church, & Flynn Consulting Engineers

Registered Professional Engineer	Cordie R. Qualie, P.E.
9.3.2 - Brown-Buntin Associates, Inc	
Associate	Walter J. Van Groningen
9.3.3 - Economic & Planning Systems	
Principal	Jason Moody
Economist	
9.3.4 - Geomatrix Consultants, Inc.	
Senior Geotechnical Engineer	Howard R. Barlow, P.E., G.E.

9.3.5 - Halstead & Associates Endangered Species/Environmental Consultants

Biologist	Jeff Halstead
Biologist	Pamela Halstead

9.3.6 - Peters Engineering Group

Principal	David Peters, PE
Project Manager	John Rowland, PE

SECTION 10: REFERENCES

- Association of Environmental Professionals. 2011. California Environmental Quality Act Statute & Guidelines 2011.
- Blair, Church, & Flynn Consulting Engineers. 2011. Selma Crossing Development Storm Drainage Master Plan. May.
- Brown, Louise, Pipeline Planning Assistant, Southern California Gas Company. Personal Communication: Letter. November 28, 2007.
- Brown-Buntin Associates, Inc. 2011. Environmental Noise Assessment, Selma Crossings Commercial Development. August 15.
- California Air Pollution Control Officers Association. 2008. CEQA & Climate Change, Evaluating and Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Projects Subject to the California Environmental Quality Act. January.
- California Department of Conservation. 1997. Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model.
- California Department of Conservation. 2004. California Farmland Conversion Report 2000-2002.
- California Department of Conservation. 2006. California Farmland Conversion Report 2002-2004.
- California Department of Conservation. 2008. California Farmland Conversion Report 2004-2006.
- California Department of Conservation. 2010. Fresno County Important Farmland Map 2008.
- California Department of Health Services. 2010. California Indoor Radon Levels Sorted by Zip Code. May 5.
- California Department of Transportation. 1998. Technical Noise Supplement. October.
- California Department of Transportation. 2002. Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies.
- California Department of Transportation. 2004. Transportation- and Construction-Induced Vibration Guidance Manual. June.
- California Department of Transportation. 2010. Highway Design Manual. October.
- California Department of Transportation. 2011. "California Scenic Highway System." Website: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/cahisys.htm. Accessed July 5.

- California Department of Water Resources, California's Groundwater Bulletin 118 Update 2003, Tulare Lake Hydrologic Region Groundwater Basin. 2003. Website: http://www.water.ca.gov/groundwater/bulletin118/bulletin118update2003.cfm. Accessed December 17, 2009.
- California Employment Development Department. 2011. Labor Force Data for Sub-County Areas.
- California Water Service Company. 2011. SB 610 Water Supply Assessment For Selma Crossings Commercial Development. January 27, 2011.
- City of Selma. 1997. City of Selma General Plan 1997 Update.
- City of Selma. 2010. City of Selma General Plan 2035 Update. October 4.
- City of Selma. 2011. Selma City Code.
- County of Fresno Agricultural Commissioner. 2010. Agricultural Crop and Livestock Report.
- Economic & Planning Systems, Inc. 2012. Selma Crossings Urban Decay Analysis. April.
- Federal Transit Administration. 2006. Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment. May.
- Geomatrix Consulting. 2008. Geotechnical Feasibility Study, Selma Crossings Commercial Development. February.
- Halstead & Associates Endangered Species/Environmental Consultants. 2007. Biological Reconnaissance Survey for Sensitive Species and Habitats for the Selma Crossings Commercial Development Project. July.
- Institute of Transportation Engineers. 2003. Trip Generation Handbook, 2nd Edition.
- Institute of Transportation Engineers. 2008. Trip Generation, 8th Edition.
- Michael Brandman Associates. 2008. Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment and Paleontological Records Review South Selma Crossings EIR. March 18.
- Michael Brandman Associates. 2011. Biological Resources Assessment, Selma Crossings Commercial Development Project. June 28.
- Michael Brandman Associates. 2011. Land Evaluation and Environmental Site Assessment Model. June.
- Michael Brandman Associates. 2012. Air Quality Analysis. March.
- Michael Brandman Associates. 2012. Health Risk Assessment. March.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company. 2011. 10-K Annual Report.

- Peacock, W.L., Williams, L.E., and Christensen L.P. 2000. Water Management and Irrigation Scheduling (PDF). Pages 127-133 in: Raisin Production Manual. University of California, Agricultural and Natural Resources Publication 3393, Oakland, CA.
- Peters Engineering Group. 2012. Traffic Impact Study for Proposed Selma Crossings Project. February.
- San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. 2002. Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts.
- San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. 2004. 1-hour Extreme Ozone Demonstration Plan. October.
- San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. 2006. "Particulate Matter Effects." Website: http://www.valleyair.org/Air_Quality_Plans/AQ_plans_PM_effects.htm.
- San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. 2009. Final Staff Report: Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions Under the California Environmental Quality Act. December 17.
- San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. 2009. Guidance for Valley Land Use Agencies In Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions For New Project Under the California Environmental Quality Act. December 17.
- San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. 2011. Ambient Air Quality Standards and Attainment Status. Website: http://www.valleyair.org/aqinfo/attainment.htm. Accessed December 23.
- Selma-Kingsburg-Fowler County Sanitation District. 2010. Selma-Kingsburg-Fowler County Sanitation District Capital Improvement Program. February.
- Swift, Ray, Industrial Power Engineer, Pacific Gas and Electric Company. Personal communication: letter. November 5, 2007.
- United States Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS). 2004-2008. Website: http://www.nass.usda.gov/Statistics_by_State/California/Publications/AgComm/Summary/index.asp. Accessed October 2009.
- United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2009. "Web Soil Survey." Website: http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/. Accessed October 1, 2009.
- United States Department of Transportation. 2006. FHWA Roadway Construction Noise Model User's Guide. January.
- United States Energy Information Administration. 2006. 2003 Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey. December.
- United States Environmental Protection Agency. 1998. Characterization of Building Related Construction and Demolition Debris in the United States. June.

- United States Environmental Protection Agency. 2004. Direct HFC and PFC Emissions from Use of Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Equipment. October.
- United States Environmental Protection Agency. 2006. High Global Warming Potential Gases. Science. Website: www.epa.gov/highgwp/scientific.html. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990-2006. April 2008. USEPA #430-R-08-005. Website: www.epa.gov/climatechange/emissions /usgginv_archive.html.
- United States Environmental Protection Agency. 2008. National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Website: http://www.epa.gov/air/criteria.html. Accessed December 19, 2009.
- United States Environmental Protection Agency. 2008. The Green Book Nonattainment Areas for Criteria Pollutants. Website: http://www.epa.gov/air/oaqps/greenbk/. Accessed December 19, 2009.

University of California Davis. 1997. Transportation Project-Level Carbon Monoxide Protocol.

Whiteside, Thomas, Chief of Police, Selma Police Department. Personal communication: letter. December 19, 2007.