2. Executive Summary

This chapter presents an overview of the proposed San Joaquin River Parkway Master Plan Update, herein referred to as "Project." This executive summary also provides a summary of the alternatives to the Project, identifies issues to be resolved, areas of controversy, and conclusions of the analysis contained in Chapters 4.1 through 4.16, of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR). For a complete description of the Project, please see Chapter 3, Project Description, of the Draft EIR. For a complete discussion of Project Alternatives, please see Chapter 6 of the Draft EIR, Alternatives to the Project.

The Draft EIR addresses the environmental effects associated with the implementation of the Project. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that government agencies, prior to taking action on projects over which they have discretionary approval authority, consider the environmental consequences of such projects. An EIR is a public document designed to provide the public, and local and State governmental agency decision-makers with an analysis of potential environmental consequences to support informed decision-making.

The Draft EIR and this Final EIR have been prepared pursuant to the requirements of CEQA[1] and the State CEQA Guidelines[2] to determine if approval of the identified discretionary actions and related subsequent development could have a significant impact on the environment. The San Joaquin River Conservancy, as the Lead Agency, has reviewed and revised as necessary submitted drafts, technical studies, and reports to reflect its own independent judgment, including reliance on applicable Conservancy technical personnel and review of all technical consultant reports. Information for the Draft EIR was obtained from: on-site field observations; discussions with affected agencies; analysis of adopted plans and policies; review of available studies, reports, data, and similar literature in the public domain; and specialized environmental assessments (e.g., air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, geotechnical and transportation and traffic).

2.1 ENVIRONMENTAL PROCEDURES

The Draft EIR was prepared to assess the environmental effects associated with implementation of the Project, as well as anticipated future discretionary actions and approvals. The six main objectives of the Draft EIR as established by CEQA are:

- To disclose to decision-makers and the public the significant environmental effects of proposed activities.

[1] California Public Resources Code, Division 13, Section 2100, et seq.
[2] Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, Division 6, Chapter 3, Section 15000, et seq.

- To identify ways to avoid or reduce environmental damage.
- To prevent environmental damage by requiring implementation of feasible alternatives or mitigation measures.
- To disclose to the public reasons for agency approval of projects with significant environmental effects.
- To foster interagency coordination in the review of projects.
- To enhance public participation in the planning process.

An EIR is the most comprehensive form of environmental documentation identified in the CEQA statute and in the CEQA Guidelines. It provides the information needed to assess the environmental consequences of a proposed project, to the extent feasible. EIRs are intended to provide an objective, factually supported, full-disclosure analysis of the environmental consequences associated with a proposed project that has the potential to result in significant, adverse environmental impacts. An EIR is also one of various decision-making tools used by a lead agency to consider the merits and disadvantages of a project that is subject to its discretionary authority. Prior to approving a proposed project, the lead agency must consider the information contained in the EIR, determine whether the EIR was properly prepared in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, determine that it reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency, adopt findings concerning the project's significant environmental impacts and alternatives, and adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations if the proposed project would result in significant impacts that cannot be avoided.

2.1.1 DRAFT EIR ORGANIZATION

The Draft EIR is organized into the following chapters:

- Chapter 1: Executive Summary. Summarizes Project location, overview, and environmental consequences that would result from implementation of the Project, describes recommended mitigation measures, and indicates level of significance of environmental impacts with and without mitigation.
- Chapter 2: Introduction. Provides an overview of the Draft EIR document.
- Chapter 3: Project Description. Describes the Project in detail, including the Project site location and characteristics, Project objectives, and the structural and technical elements of the proposed action.
- Chapter 4: Environmental Analysis. This chapter is divided into 16 subchapters. Each subchapter corresponds to the environmental resource categories identified in CEQA Guidelines Appendix F, Energy Conservation, and Appendix G, Environmental Checklist, as amended per Assembly Bill 52 (Tribal Cultural Resources) and the California Supreme Court in a December 2015 opinion [*California Building Industry Association (CBIA) v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD)*, 62 Cal. 4th 369 (No. S 213478)]. This chapter provides a description of the physical environmental conditions within the Parkway Plan Area, as they existed at the time the Notice of Preparation was published,

from both a local and regional perspective, as well as an analysis of the potential environmental impacts of the proposed Project, and recommended mitigation measures, if required, to reduce their significance. The environmental setting included in each subchapter provides baseline physical conditions from which the Conservancy, acting as the lead agency, will determine the significance of environmental impacts resulting from the proposed Project. Each subchapter also includes a description of the thresholds used to determine if a significant impact would occur; the methodology to identify and evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed Project; and the potential cumulative impacts associated with the proposed Project.

- Chapter 5: Significant and Unavoidable Adverse Impacts. Describes the significant unavoidable adverse impacts of the Project.
- Chapter 6: Alternatives to the Project. Considers two alternatives to the Project, including the CEQA-required "No Project Alternative."
- Chapter 7: CEQA Mandated Sections. Discusses growth inducement, unavoidable significant effects, and significant irreversible changes of the Project.
- Chapter 8: Organizations and Persons Consulted. Identifies the preparers of the Draft EIR.
- Appendices. The appendices for the Draft EIR contain the following supporting documents:
  - Appendix A: NOP & Initial Study
  - Appendix B: Scoping Comments
  - Appendix C: San Joaquin River Parkway Master Plan Update
  - Appendix D: Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Assumptions
  - Appendix E: Biological Resources
  - Appendix F: Cultural Resources Existing Conditions Report
  - Appendix G: Transportation & Traffic

2.1.2 FINAL EIR ORGANIZATION

The Draft EIR combined with this document comprise the Final EIR for the proposed Project. This document is organized into the following chapters:

- Chapter 1: Introduction. This chapter discusses the use and organization of this document.
- Chapter 2: Executive Summary. This chapter provides an overview summary of: the proposed project; environmental review procedures; alternatives examined; significant impacts and mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR; and other conclusions from the Draft EIR.
- Chapter 3: Revisions to the Draft EIR. This chapter presents revisions and corrections to the text and graphics of the Draft EIR and the Master Plan Update. Underline text represents language that has been added, and text with ~~strikethrough~~ represents language that has been deleted.
- Chapter 4: List of Commenters. This chapter provides a list of agencies and individuals who commented on the Draft EIR.

- Chapter 5: Comments and Responses. This chapter lists the comments received from agencies and the public on the Draft EIR, and provides responses to those comments.
- Appendices. The appendices for this document contain the following supporting documents:
  - Appendix H: Comment Letters including any attachments
  - Appendix I: City of Fresno 2035 General Plan Update Consistency Analysis

2.2 TYPE AND PURPOSE OF THIS EIR

According to Section 15121(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, the purpose of an EIR is to:

> *Inform public agency decision makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effects of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project.*

Because of the long-term planning horizon of the proposed Project, and the acquisition, permitting, planning, and development actions that are related both geographically and as logical parts in the chain of contemplated actions for implementation, the Draft EIR was prepared as a program EIR for the proposed project, pursuant to Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Once a program EIR has been certified, subsequent activities within the program must be evaluated to determine whether additional CEQA review is required. If the program EIR addresses the program's effects as specifically and comprehensively as possible, subsequent activities could be found to be within the program EIR scope, and additional environmental review may not be required (CEQA Guidelines Section 15168[c]). When a program EIR is relied on for a subsequent activity, the lead agency must incorporate feasible mitigation measures and alternatives developed in the program EIR into the subsequent activities (CEQA Guidelines Section 15168[c][3]). If a subsequent activity would have effects that are not within the scope of a program EIR, the lead agency must prepare a new Initial Study leading to a Negative Declaration, a Mitigated Negative Declaration, or an EIR. For these subsequent environmental review documents, this program EIR will serve as the first-tier environmental analysis.

2.3 PROJECT SUMMARY

The Conservancy is proposing to update the existing San Joaquin River Parkway Interim Master Plan, which was adopted in December 1997 by the Conservancy. The proposed Plan will serve as the document that will guide future improvements to the Parkway incrementally and in phases over many years. As such, the proposed Plan includes goals, policies, and conceptual improvement projects and opportunities under which Parkway development would be pursued and implemented. Future projects under the plan will be reviewed under California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements, as needed, to determine potential impacts and mitigation measures on a site-specific basis.

The Draft EIR analyzed alternatives to the proposed Project that may feasibly attain some of the Project objectives. A total of two were analyzed in detail. They are listed below, and each is described and analyzed in Chapter 6 of the Draft EIR.

2.4 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT

2.4.1 NO-PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

Consistent with Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, under the No Project Alternative, the existing San Joaquin River Master Plan, adopted in December 1997, would remain in effect. This alternative would continue to implement the existing 1997 Parkway Master Plan and would generally meet the project objectives, with the exception of the objective of cohesively generating environmental benefits and mitigating the impacts of Parkway development, rather than relying to a much greater extent on project-specific, incremental mitigation. This alternative would not comprehensively implement the updated policies of the Master Plan Update, nor would it implement the mitigation requirements identified in the Draft EIR.

2.4.2 INCREASED NATURAL RESERVES ALTERNATIVE

Under the Increased Natural Reserves alternative, the proposed Project would continue to be implemented; however, the focus would shift to increasing natural reserves through land acquisitions, and not enhance or increase the existing network of multi-use trails or other public access and recreation improvements. Under this alternative, the overall land area of natural reserves would be increased and the public access facilities would remain similar to existing conditions; therefore, trail connections and other public access improvements would be minimal. As such, fewer recreation and education facilities and trail enhancements would occur, thereby, reducing visitation and further opportunities for low-impact recreation compared to the proposed Project. Under this alternative the same goals and policies as included in the proposed Project would be applicable. This alternative would not meet the project objectives, the statutory mission of the San Joaquin Conservancy, the mandate of the San Joaquin River Conservancy Act, nor achieve the purposes of the San Joaquin River Parkway, as it would not provide for low impact public recreation.

2.5 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

Section 15123(b)(3) of CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR identify issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate significant impacts. With regard to the proposed Plan, the major issues identified in the Draft EIR to be resolved include decisions by the San Joaquin River Conservancy, as the lead agency, related to:

- Whether the Draft EIR adequately describes the environmental impact of the Plan.

- Whether the proposed land use changes are compatible with the character of the existing area.
- Whether the identified mitigation measures should be adopted or modified.
- Whether there are other mitigation measures that should be applied to the Plan in addition to or instead of the mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR.
- Whether there are any alternatives to the Plan that would substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the proposed Plan and achieve most of the basic objectives.

2.6 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

The San Joaquin River Conservancy issued a Notice of Preparation and Initial Study for the EIR on June 17, 2013 and held a scoping meeting on July 9, 2013 to receive scoping comments. The scoping period ran from June 17, 2013 through July 17, 2013, during which time responsible agencies and interested members of the public were invited to submit comments as to the scope and content of the Draft EIR. The comments received focused primarily on the issues listed below. The NOP and Initial Study are included in Appendix A of the Draft EIR, and comments received during the scoping period are included in Appendix B of the Draft EIR.

- Location and alignment of the San Joaquin River Parkway multi-use trail.
- Public safety and law enforcement.
- Economics of implementing the proposed Plan, including in particular operations and maintenance costs.
- Habitat protection and restoration.
- Noise and light pollution.
- Parking and vehicular access to the Parkway.
- Public transit access.
- Safe access for boats, kayaks, and canoes.
- Impacts to properties adjacent to the Parkway.
- Traffic and circulation (bike and vehicle).

2.7 SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Under CEQA, a significant impact on the environment is defined as a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the Project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic and aesthetic significance.

The proposed Project has the potential to generate significant environmental impacts in a number of areas. Table 2-1 summarizes the conclusions of the environmental analysis contained in the Draft EIR and presents a summary of impacts and mitigation measures identified. It is organized to correspond with the

environmental issues discussed in Chapters 4.0 through 4.16 of the Draft EIR. The table is arranged in four columns: 1) environmental impacts, 2) significance before mitigation, 3) mitigation measures, and 4) significance after mitigation. The abbreviations used in Table 2-1 are as follows:

- LTS: Less than Significant. Indicates the impact was determined to be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required under CEQA.
- No Impact. Indicates that an impact would be neither less-than-significant, nor significant.
- N/A: Not Applicable. Indicates that mitigation measures are not required under CEQA because the level of significance is less than significant or no impact.
- S: Significant. Indicates that the level of significance of an impact would be significant and, therefore, consideration of feasible mitigation measures is required under CEQA.
- SU: Significant and Unavoidable. Indicates that an impact was determined to be significant, and after inclusion of feasible mitigation measures, the impact would remain significant and therefore unavoidable. A finding of significant and unavoidable impacts requires the Conservancy Board to include a statement of overriding considerations in its findings when approving the project.

For a complete description of potential environmental impacts, please refer to the specific discussions in Chapters 4.0 through 4.16 of the Draft EIR.

2.8 TERMINOLOGY

Commonly referred to terminology throughout the Draft EIR is as follows:

- San Joaquin River Conservancy (Conservancy): The State of California agency created by the State Legislature to develop and manage the San Joaquin River Parkway.
- San Joaquin River Parkway (Parkway): Public lands that are acquired, developed, and managed to provide a harmonious combination of low-impact recreation, natural and cultural resources conservation, and educational uses. It is envisioned that the Parkway will eventually be linked from Friant Dam to Highway 99 by a 22-mile-long multiple use trail and contiguous wildlife habitat corridor.
- San Joaquin River Parkway Interim Master Plan and EIR 1997 (existing, or 1997 Parkway Master Plan): The San Joaquin River Parkway Interim Master Plan and Environmental Impact Report approved by the Conservancy in 1997. The Plan and EIR's goals, policies, and mitigation measures guide the development of the Parkway.
- San Joaquin River Parkway Master Plan Update (the Proposed Project, or Proposed Plan): This Final EIR presents the proposed updated Parkway Master Plan, the proposed Project reviewed in the EIR.
- San Joaquin River Parkway Planning Area (Parkway Plan Area): The area eligible for Parkway planning and development by the Conservancy, comprised of lands on both sides of the river from Friant Dam to Highway 99. Floodplain lands below the river's bluffs are the focus of Parkway planning; however,

adjoining lands for appurtenant facilities are also eligible for acquisition, improvement, and incorporation into the Parkway.

- Low-Impact Recreation and Public Access: The public access and recreational improvements to be considered, developed, operated and maintained as a part of the proposed Project, which are required by statute to be low-intensity, largely passive recreational uses compatible with conservation of the natural resources of the Parkway Plan Area (see San Joaquin River Conservancy Act, and Access and Habitat policies of the proposed Plan).

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Summary of Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
AESTHETICS			
AES-1: The proposed Project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.	LTS	N/A	N/A
AES-2: The proposed Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.	LTS	N/A	N/A
AES-3: The proposed Project would not substantially degrade the view from a scenic highway, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings.	No Impact	N/A	N/A
AES-4: The proposed Project would not expose people on- or off-site to substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	LTS	N/A	N/A
AES-5: The proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less than significant cumulative impacts with respect to aesthetics.	LTS	N/A	N/A
AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES			
AG-1: The proposed Project would 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.	S	AG-1: No mitigation measures are feasible to reduce the potential impact to less than significant levels. The intent of the Plan is to enhance recreational opportunities and create habitat conservation areas within the Parkway Plan Area. The farmland in the Parkway Plan Area may remain in agriculture, or may be offered for sale to the Conservancy, evaluated for acquisition, and may be acquired. Avoiding the acquisition of offered agricultural lands could interfere with achievement of Parkway goals and objectives. As part of the process for each individual site-specific development project under the Parkway Master Plan Update, an appropriate or applicable agricultural in-lieu mitigation fee for each acre of prime farmland to be developed shall be paid by the Conservancy at the time that agricultural land is to be developed or converted to non-agricultural uses, to an entity or agency holding or facilitating agricultural conservation easements within the region.	SU

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Summary of Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		Notwithstanding the above commitment, in order to implement the Plan, conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses would not be reduced to a less-than-significant level, and the Project's impacts in this regard would be *significant and unavoidable*.	
AG-2: The proposed Project would conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.	S	AG-2: No mitigation measures are feasible to reduce the potential impact. The intent of the Plan is to enhance recreational opportunities and create habitat conservation areas within the Parkway Plan Area. The farmland in the Parkway Plan Area may remain in agriculture, or may be offered for sale to the Conservancy, evaluated for acquisition, and may be acquired. Avoiding the acquisition of offered agricultural lands could interfere with achievement of Parkway goals and objectives. Implementation of the Plan would conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or Williamson Act contract and cannot be reduced to a less-than-significant level, and the Project's impacts in this regard would be *significant and unavoidable*.	SU
AG-3: The proposed Project would involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, would result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use.	S	AG-3: No mitigation measures are feasible to reduce the potential impact to less than significant levels. The intent of the Plan is to enhance recreational opportunities and create habitat conservation areas within the Parkway Plan Area. The farmland in the Parkway Plan Area may remain in agriculture, or may be offered for sale to the Conservancy, evaluated for acquisition, and may be acquired. Avoiding the acquisition of offered agricultural lands could interfere with achievement of Parkway goals and objectives. Even with the incorporation of Mitigation Measure AG-1, in order to implement the Plan, conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses cannot be reduced to a less-than-significant level, and the Project's impacts in this regard would be *significant and unavoidable*.	SU
AG-4: Implementation of the Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in significant cumulative impacts with respect to agricultural resources.	S	AG-4: The intent of the Plan is to enhance recreational opportunities and create habitat conservation areas within the Parkway Plan Area. In order to implement the Plan, impacts to agricultural resources, in combination with the potential conversion of agricultural land resulting from others' unrelated actions, cannot be reduced to a less than significant level, and the Project's cumulative impact in this regard would be *significant and unavoidable*.	SU

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Summary of Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
AIR QUALITY			
AQ-1: Subsequent environmental review of future projects within the San Joaquin River Parkway may identify that individual projects could exceed the applicable SJVAPCD thresholds and therefore is inconsistent with SJVAPCD's air quality management plans.	S	AQ-1: Mitigation measures identified for Impact AQ-3 would lessen impacts associated with inconsistency with SJVAPCD's air quality management plans.	SU
AQ-2: Subsequent environmental review of future projects within the San Joaquin River Parkway may identify that individual projects could exceed the applicable SJVAPCD thresholds and therefore the Project could violate air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.	S	AQ-2: Mitigation measures identified for Impact AQ-3 would lessen impacts associated with inconsistency with SJVAPCD's air quality management plans.	SU
AQ-3: Subsequent environmental review of future projects under the proposed Project may identify that construction and operational phase emissions would exceed SJVAPCD's project-level regional significance thresholds and the Project would cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations in the SJVAB.	S	AQ-3a: Prior to initiation of construction activities, construction contractors shall prepare and submit to the Conservancy a technical assessment evaluating potential project construction-related air quality impacts. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) methodology in assessing air quality impacts. The following identified measures shall be incorporated into all appropriate construction documents (e.g., construction management plans) and submitted to the Conservancy. Mitigation measures to reduce construction-related emissions include, but are not limited to: ▪ Using construction equipment rated by the United States Environmental Protection Agency as having Tier 3 (model year 2006 or newer) or Tier 4 (model year 2008 or newer) emission limits, applicable for engines between 50 and 750 horsepower. A list of construction equipment by type and model year shall be maintained by the construction contractor on-site, which shall be available for Conservancy review upon request. ▪ Ensuring construction equipment is properly serviced and maintained to the manufacturer's standards. ▪ Use of alternative-fueled or catalyst-equipped diesel construction equipment, if available and feasible. ▪ Clearly posted signs that require operators of trucks and construction	SU

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Summary of Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		equipment to minimize idling time (e.g., 5-minute maximum). ▪ Preparation and implementation of a fugitive dust control plan that may include the following measures: ▪ Disturbed areas (including storage piles) that are not being actively utilized for construction purposes shall be effectively stabilized using water, chemical stabilizer/suppressant, or covered with a tarp or other suitable cover (e.g., revegetated). ▪ On-site unpaved roads and off-site unpaved access roads shall be effectively stabilized using water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant. ▪ Land clearing, grubbing, scraping, excavation, land leveling, grading, cut and fill, and demolition activities shall be effectively controlled utilizing application of water or by presoaking. ▪ Material shall be covered, or effectively wetted to limit visible dust emissions, and at least six inches of freeboard space from the top of the container shall be maintained when materials are transported off-site. ▪ Operations shall limit or expeditiously remove the accumulation of mud or dirt from adjacent public streets at the end of each workday. (The use of dry rotary brushes is expressly prohibited except where preceded or accompanied by sufficient wetting to limit the visible dust emissions.) (Use of blower devices is expressly forbidden.) ▪ Following the addition of materials to or the removal of materials from the surface of outdoor storage piles, said piles shall be effectively stabilized of fugitive dust emissions utilizing sufficient water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant. ▪ Within urban areas, trackout shall be immediately removed when it extends 50 or more feet from the site and at the end of each workday. ▪ Any site with 150 or more vehicle trips per day shall prevent carryout and trackout. ▪ Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph. ▪ Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt	

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Summary of Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		runoff to public roadways from sites with a slope greater than 1 percent. ▪ Install wheel washers for all exiting trucks or wash off all trucks and equipment leaving the project area. ▪ Adhere to Regulation VIII's 20 percent opacity limitation, as applicable.	
		AQ-3b: Prior to initiation of construction activities, construction contractors shall prepare and submit to the Conservancy a technical assessment evaluating potential project operation phase-related air quality impacts. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) methodology in assessing air quality impacts. If operational-related criteria air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the SJVAPCD adopted thresholds of significance, as identified in the Guidance for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts (GAMAQI), the Conservancy shall require the construction contractor to incorporate mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions during operational activities. The identified measures shall be included as part of the Standard Conditions of Approval. Mitigation measures to reduce long-term emissions can include, but are not limited to: ▪ Site-specific development shall demonstrate an adequate number of electrical vehicle Level 2 charging stations are provided on-site. The location of the electrical outlets shall be specified on building plans, included in subsequent environmental review, and proper installation shall be verified by the Conservancy prior to operation. ▪ Appliances shall be Energy Star appliances (dishwashers, refrigerators, clothes washers, and dryers). Installation of Energy Star appliances shall be verified by the Conservancy prior to operation.	
		AQ-3c: The use of outdoor fire pits shall be prohibited.	
AQ-4: Emissions generated by the project could exceed the California or National AAQS.	S	AQ-4: Mitigation Measures identified for Impact AQ-3 would lessen impacts associated with Project-related emissions contributing to SJVAB ambient air quality standards.	SU

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Summary of Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
AQ-5: Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.	LTS	N/A	N/A
AQ-6: Subsequent environmental review of future projects associated with the proposed Project may identify that construction phase emissions would exceed SJVAPCD's project-level localized significance thresholds for ambient air quality standards.	S	AQ-6: Implement Mitigation Measure AQ-3.	SU
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES			
BIO-1A: Future development under the proposed Project could result in the loss of individual special-status plants.	S	BIO-1A: Preserve populations of CRPR species: *Avoid and Minimize Impacts*. For each future project to implement the proposed Plan, when the project is defined to a level that impacts can be evaluated, prior to taking action the Conservancy will assess the site to determine, avoid, and minimize potential adverse impacts to special status plants in accordance with BMP BIO-4. On a case-by-case basis, minimization measures may include transplanting perennial species, seed collection and dispersal for annual species, and other conservation strategies that will protect the viability of the local population. Monitoring plant populations will be conducted annually for five years; the performance standard will be no net reduction in the size or viability of the local population. *Compensate for Potentially Significant Impacts*. Where special-status plants are present and adverse impacts cannot be avoided or minimized: ▪ To compensate for potentially significant adverse impacts, habitat occupied by the affected species outside the impact area will be preserved and managed in perpetuity at a minimum 1:1 mitigation ratio (at least one plant preserved for each plant affected, and also at least one occupied acre preserved for each occupied acre affected), up to the significance threshold (e.g., for a CRPR 1B species where 15 percent of the known population within 5 miles of the future impact area will be affected, mitigation must be provided at a 1:1 equivalent of 15 percent of that regional population), or in accordance with current guidance issued by or as required by regulatory agencies. ▪ Conservancy will develop a Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan	LTS

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Summary of Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		(HMMP) describing the measures that will be taken to enhance and manage the mitigation lands and to monitor the effects of management on the focal special-status plant species. That plan will include, at a minimum, the following: ▪ A summary of impacts on special-status plant populations, and the proposed mitigation; ▪ A description of the location and boundaries of the mitigation site and description of existing site conditions; ▪ A description of measures to be undertaken if necessary to enhance (e.g., through focused management) the mitigation site for special-status species; ▪ A description of measures to transplant individual plants or seeds from the impact area to the mitigation site, if determined by a qualified botanist to be appropriate and to have a high likelihood of success; ▪ Proposed management activities to maintain high-quality habitat conditions for the focal species; ▪ A description of species monitoring measures on the mitigation site, including specific, objective goals, objectives, policies, design guidelines, and BMPs (including enhancement of populations of focal special-status species on the mitigation site), performance indicators and success criteria (including increasing the abundance of the focal species by at least as many individuals as were impacted), monitoring methods (including sampling for the focal species), data analysis, reporting requirements, and monitoring schedule. Determining specific performance/success criteria requires information regarding the specific mitigation site, its conditions, the biological resources present on the site, the specific plant species for which mitigation is being provided, and the specific enhancement and management measures tailored to the mitigation site and its conditions. As a result, those specific criteria will be defined in the HMMP rather than in this EIR. Nevertheless, the performance/success criteria described in the HMMP will guide the mitigation to manage and protect high-	

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Summary of Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		quality habitat for, and populations of, the impacted species. The HMMP will include monitoring for non-native plant species and remediation measures in the event that such species are detected on the site; ▪ A description of the management plan's adaptive component, including potential contingency measures for mitigation elements that do not meet performance criteria; and ▪ A description of the funding mechanism for the long-term maintenance and monitoring of the mitigation lands.	
BIO-1B: Complete avoidance of elderberry shrubs may not be feasible and the proposed Project could result in the loss of individual valley elderberry longhorn beetle and/or habitat.	S	BIO-1B: Protect critical valley elderberry longhorn beetle habitat. *Avoid and Minimize Impacts.* For each future project to implement the proposed Plan, when the project is defined to a level that impacts can be evaluated, prior to taking action the Conservancy will assess the site to determine, avoid, and minimize potential adverse impacts to valley elderberry longhorn beetle in accordance with BMP BIO-4. ▪ All elderberry shrubs with one or more stems measuring 1.0 inch or greater in diameter at ground level that occur on or adjacent to any proposed project site in the Parkway Plan Area will be tallied by diameter size class and thoroughly searched for beetle exit holes. The absence of exit holes will require compensatory mitigation, consistent with the *Conservation Guidelines for Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle* (see Table 4.4-6). ▪ Complete avoidance (i.e., no adverse impact) may be assumed when a 100-foot (or wider) buffer is established and maintained around elderberry plants containing stems measuring 1.0 inch or greater in diameter at ground level. Measures to protect buffer areas will be instituted prior to construction and will include fencing, signs, and worker education programs ▪ Any damage done to buffer areas during construction will be restored to pre-project conditions (e.g., revegetation of buffer area with appropriate native plants). The project sponsor will retain a qualified biologist to prepare a written description of how the buffer areas are to be restored, protected, and maintained after construction is completed.	LTS

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Summary of Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		Typical measures include fencing, signs, weeding, and trash removal. *Compensate for Potentially Significant Impacts*. Where elderberry shrubs are present and potentially significant adverse impacts to valley elderberry longhorn beetle cannot be avoided, the Conservancy will implement standard USFWS mitigation protocol (or current standard protocol): ▪ Elderberry plants that cannot be avoided by project construction activities (i.e., disturbance will occur within 20 feet of the shrub) will be transplanted to a USFWS-approved conservation area prior to construction under the supervision of a qualified biologist. Each elderberry stem measuring 1.0 inch or greater in diameter at ground level that is adversely affected (i.e., transplanted or destroyed) will also be replaced, in the conservation area, with elderberry seedlings or cuttings. The Conservancy will consult with USFWS to determine appropriate compensation ratios. Compensatory mitigation will be consistent with the *Conservation Guidelines for Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle* (see Table 4.4-6), or in accordance with current guidance. The conservation area will be protected in perpetuity as habitat for the valley elderberry longhorn beetle, and the Conservancy will provide a written monitoring plan to the USFWS. At a minimum the monitoring plan will include the following information: ▪ Species monitoring measures on the conservation site, including specific goals, objectives, policies, design guidelines, and BMPs and objectives, performance indicators, success criteria, monitoring methods, data analysis, and a monitoring schedule. At a minimum, success criteria will meet current guidance and requirements, such as the following: - A minimum survival rate of at least 60 percent of the elderberry plants and 60 percent of the associated native plants must be maintained throughout the monitoring period; - The monitoring plan's adaptive component, including potential contingency measures for mitigation elements that do not meet performance criteria; and	

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Summary of Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		- The funding mechanism in place to ensure long-term maintenance and monitoring of the conservation lands.	
BIO-1C: Implementation of the proposed Project could result in the loss of suitable habitat for the California tiger salamander.	S	BIO-1C: Protect California tiger salamander. *Avoid and Minimize Impacts.* All projects to install or construct trails, kiosks, restrooms, restore habitat, and other improvements contemplated in the proposed Project will be subject to project- and site-specific environmental review pursuant to CEQA. For each future project to implement the proposed Plan, when the project is defined to a level that impacts can be evaluated, prior to taking action the Conservancy will assess the site to determine, avoid, and minimize potentially significant impacts to California tiger salamanders in accordance with BMP BIO-5. Where California tiger salamanders are found on-site through protocol surveys (or assumed in the absence of surveys), avoidance and minimization measures will also include: ▪ When feasible, a 50-foot no-disturbance buffer will be established around burrows that provide suitable upland habitat for California tiger salamander. Burrows considered suitable for California tiger salamander will be determined by a qualified biologist, approved by USFWS. ▪ All suitable burrows directly impacted by construction will be hand excavated under the supervision of a qualified wildlife biologist. If California tiger salamander are found, the biologist will relocate the organism to the nearest burrow that is outside of the construction impact area. ▪ All ground-disturbing work will occur during daylight hours in coordination with USFWS, and depending on the level of rainfall and site conditions. The National Weather Service (NWS) 72-hour forecast for the work area will be monitored. If a 70 percent or greater chance of rainfall is predicted within 72 hours of project activity, all activities in areas within 1.3 miles of potential or known California tiger salamander breeding sites will cease until no further rain is forecast. If work must continue when rain is forecast, a qualified biologist will survey the project site before construction begins each day rain is forecast. If rain	LTS

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Summary of Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		exceeds 0.25-inch during a 24-hour period, work will cease until no further rain is forecast. This restriction is not applicable for areas located greater than 1.3 miles from potential or known California tiger salamander breeding sites once they have been encircled with California tiger salamander exclusion fencing. However, even after exclusion fencing is installed, this condition would still apply to construction related traffic moving though areas within 1.3 miles of potential or known California tiger salamander breeding sites but outside of the salamander exclusion fencing (e.g., on roads). ▪ For work conducted during the California tiger salamander migration season (November 1 to May 31), exclusionary fencing will be erected around the construction site during ground-disturbing activities after hand excavation of burrows has been completed. A qualified biologist will visit the site weekly to ensure that the fencing is in good working condition. Fencing material and design will be subject to the approval of the USFWS. If exclusionary fencing is not used, a qualified biological monitor will be on-site during all ground disturbance activities. Exclusion fencing will also be placed around all spoils and stockpiles. ▪ For work conducted during the California tiger salamander migration season (November 1 to May 31), a qualified biologist will survey the active work areas (including access roads) in mornings following measurable precipitation events. Construction may commence once the biologist has confirmed that no California tiger salamander are in the work area. ▪ Prior to beginning work each day, underneath equipment and stored pipes greater than 1.2 inches (3 centimeters) in diameter will be inspected for California tiger salamander. If any are found they will be allowed to move out of the construction area under their own accord. ▪ Trenches and holes will be covered and inspected daily for stranded animals. Trenches and holes deeper than 1 foot will contain escape ramps (maximum slope of 2:1) to allow trapped animals to escape uncovered holes or trenches. Holes and trenches will be inspected prior to filling.	

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Summary of Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		▪ All food and food-related trash will be enclosed in sealed trash containers at the end of each workday and removed completely from the construction site once every three days to avoid attracting wildlife. ▪ A speed limit of 15 miles per hour will be maintained on dirt roads. *Compensate for Potentially Significant Impacts.* Where California tiger salamanders are present and potentially significant adverse impacts cannot be avoided and minimized through the above measures, the Conservancy will implement standard USFWS compensatory mitigation (or current standards).Compensation for unavoidable impacts will be provided via the protection, enhancement, and management of habitat that currently supports, or can support, this species at a 3:1 (mitigation: impact) ratio, on an acreage basis, or in accordance with current guidance issued by or as required by regulatory agencies. Compensatory mitigation may be carried out through one or more of the following methods, in order of preference: ▪ The preservation, management, and enhancement (e.g., through long-term management targeted toward this species) of high-quality habitat that is already occupied by California tiger salamanders. ▪ Purchase of mitigation credits at approved mitigation banks whose service area includes the Parkway Plan Area. ▪ The restoration or enhancement of degraded habitat or habitat that is unsuitable for use by California tiger salamanders, but that (a) is in close proximity to areas of known occurrence and (b) can be made more suitable for use via construction of one or more breeding ponds or management to improve the quality and availability of burrows in upland habitat. Because most, if not all, impacts on California tiger salamander habitat resulting from implementing the proposed Project would consist of modification of upland refugial/dispersal habitat (rather than aquatic breeding habitat), mitigation lands will also consist of upland habitat for this species, as appropriate. All mitigation lands for this species will be located within Fresno or Madera counties.	

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Summary of Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		For any compensatory mitigation described above, the Conservancy will develop an HMMP describing the measures that will be taken to manage the mitigation property and to monitor the effects of management on the California tiger salamander. That plan will include, at a minimum, the following: ▪ A summary of impacts on California tiger salamander habitat and populations, and the proposed mitigation; ▪ A description of the location and boundaries of the mitigation site and description of existing site conditions; ▪ A description of measures to be undertaken if necessary to enhance (e.g., through focused management) the mitigation site for California tiger salamanders; ▪ Proposed management activities, such as managed grazing, management of invasive plants, measures targeted at sustaining populations of burrowing mammals, or other measures to maintain high-quality habitat for California tiger salamanders; ▪ A description of species monitoring measures on the mitigation site, including specific, objective goals, objectives, policies, design guidelines, and BMPs (such as maintaining or increasing abundance of California tiger salamanders or maintaining or improving habitat suitability), performance indicators and success criteria (such as presence or abundance of upland refugia or hydroperiod of breeding habitat), monitoring methods (such as sampling of upland refugia or monitoring of the hydroperiod of breeding habitat), data analysis, reporting requirements, and monitoring schedule. Determining specific performance/success criteria requires information regarding the specific mitigation site, its conditions, and the specific enhancement and management measures tailored to the mitigation site and its conditions. For example, performance criteria for a mitigation site providing only upland habitat for California tiger salamanders would include the maintenance of grassland habitat of a suitable height and density for burrowing mammals, and maintenance of suitable burrowing mammal	

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Summary of Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		populations, whereas a mitigation site providing salamander breeding habitat would also include criteria related to adequate depth and hydroperiod of breeding habitat. As a result, those specific criteria will be defined in the HMMP rather than in this EIR. Nevertheless, the performance/success criteria described in the HMMP will guide the mitigation to manage and protect high-quality habitat for the California tiger salamander, adequate to compensate for impacts. ▪ A description of the management plan's adaptive component, including potential contingency measures for mitigation elements that do not meet performance criteria; and ▪ A description of the funding mechanism for the long-term maintenance and monitoring of the mitigation lands. If Conservancy lands can be enhanced (e.g., via the construction of breeding ponds) in such a way as to substantially improve their value to California tiger salamanders, then the Conservancy may use those lands as mitigation for the California tiger salamander. The proposed project-specific mitigation and HMMP will be provided to the USFWS and CDFW for review because this species is both state and federally listed. It is possible that this mitigation measure may be refined in coordination with USFWS during the Section 7 consultation process (e.g., in the Biological Opinion covering project effects on the California tiger salamander) or the Section 2081 consultation process with the CDFW (e.g., in an Incidental Take Permit), in which case the refinements required by these agencies would be implemented.	
BIO-1D: Indirect impacts on habitat may result due to a loss of riparian vegetation that support the Kern Brook lamprey and San Joaquin roach.	S	BIO-1D: Implement Mitigation Measure BIO-3.	LTS
BIO-1E: Implementation of the proposed Project could result in the loss of suitable habitat for the western pond turtle.	S	BIO-1E: Protect western pond turtle. *Avoid and Minimize Impacts.* For each future project to implement the proposed Plan, when the project is defined to a level that impacts can be evaluated, prior to taking action the Conservancy will assess the site to determine, avoid, and minimize potentially significant impacts to western	LTS

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Summary of Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		pond turtles in accordance with BMP BIO-5. Where suitable habitat exists (e.g., along riparian areas and freshwater emergent wetlands) for western pond turtles on-site, avoidance and minimization measures will also include: ▪ Pre-construction surveys for western pond turtle will be conducted by a qualified biologist 14 days before and 24 hours before the start of ground-disturbing activities. ▪ If western pond turtles or their nests are observed during pre-construction surveys, a qualified biologist shall be on-site to monitor construction in suitable turtle habitat. Western pond turtle found within the construction area will be allowed to leave of its own volition or it will be captured by a qualified biologist and relocated out of harm's way to the nearest suitable habitat immediately upstream or downstream from the project site. ▪ If western pond turtle nests are identified in the work area during pre-construction surveys, a 300-foot no-disturbance buffer shall be established between the nest and any areas of potential disturbance. Buffers shall be clearly marked with temporary fencing. Construction will not be allowed to commence in the exclusion area until hatchlings have emerged from the nest, or the nest is deemed inactive by a qualified biologist. *Compensate for Potentially Significant Impacts.* If occupied breeding (aquatic) habitat for western pond turtles is detected and would be permanently affected, compensatory mitigation will be provided at a 1:1 ratio (preserved habitat: affected aquatic habitat), or in accordance with current guidance issued by or as required by regulatory agencies. If a qualified biologist determines that the compensatory mitigation acreage provides suitable mitigation for other species, such as the California tiger salamander, western spadefoot, or other species, the acreage may be used to provide mitigation for multiple species. ▪ An HMMP will be developed describing the measures that will be taken to manage the property and to monitor the effects of management on	

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Summary of Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		western pond turtles. That plan will include, at a minimum, the information described in Mitigation Measure BIO-1C.	
BIO-1F: Future development could result in the loss of western spadefoot aquatic habitat.	S	BIO-1F: Protect western spadefoot toad. *Avoid and Minimize Impacts.* For each future project to implement the proposed Plan, when the project is defined to a level that impacts can be evaluated, prior to taking action the Conservancy will assess the site to determine, avoid, and minimize potentially significant impacts to western spadefoot in accordance with BMP BIO-5. Where suitable habitat exists for western spadefoot on-site, avoidance and minimization measures will also include: ▪ For work conducted during the western spadefoot toad migration and breeding season (November 1 to May 31), a qualified biologist will survey the active work areas (including access roads) in mornings following measurable precipitation events. Construction may commence once the biologist has confirmed that no spadefoot toads are in the work area. ▪ When feasible, there will be a 50-foot no-disturbance buffer around burrows that provide suitable upland habitat for western spadefoot toad. Burrows considered suitable for spadefoot will be identified by a qualified CDFW biologist. The biologist will delineate and mark the no-disturbance buffer. ▪ If western spadefoot toad is found within the construction footprint, it will be allowed to move out of harm's way of its own volition or a qualified biologist will relocate the organism to the nearest burrow that is outside of the construction impact area. ▪ Prior to beginning work each day, a qualified biologist will inspect underneath equipment and stored pipes greater than 1.2 inches (3 centimeters) in diameter for western spadefoot toad. If any are found they will be allowed to move out of the construction area under their own accord. ▪ Trenches and holes will be covered and inspected daily for stranded animals. Trenches and holes deeper than 1 foot deep will contain escape ramps (maximum slope of 2:1) to allow trapped animals to	LTS

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Summary of Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		escape uncovered holes or trenches. Holes and trenches will be inspected prior to filling. *Compensate for Potentially Significant Impacts.* If occupied breeding (aquatic) habitat for the western spadefoot is detected and would be permanently affected, compensatory mitigation will be implemented as follows: ▪ Permanently affected occupied breeding habitat will be replaced at a 2:1 ratio (mitigation area: affected area), or in accordance with current guidance issued by or as required by regulatory agencies. To the extent that there is an overlap in habitat value and occupied habitat, preservation lands may be the same as those provided for other species, such as the California tiger salamander. ▪ Any occupied breeding pond that would be permanently affected and cannot be preserved for western spadefoots will not be disturbed or affected until compensatory breeding habitat has been created. Once the compensatory habitat is created, all western spadefoot adults, tadpoles, and egg masses detected in the impact area during surveys, will be moved to the created pool habitat. If construction impacts on occupied breeding ponds would occur during the dry season, the replacement habitat will be in place prior to the beginning of the next wet season. Surveys near the affected pond will take place during the wet season, and all western spadefoot toads detected will be moved to the replacement habitat. ▪ The Conservancy will develop an HMMP describing the measures that will be taken to manage the property and to monitor the effects of management on western spadefoot. That plan will include, at a minimum, the information described in Mitigation Measure BIO-1D.	
BIO-1G: Future development could result in the loss of occupied breeding habitat and may result in a substantial impact on regional burrowing owl populations.	S	BIO-1G: Protect burrowing owls. *Avoid and Minimize Impacts.* For each future project to implement the proposed Plan, when the project is defined to a level that impacts can be evaluated, prior to taking action the Conservancy will assess the site to determine, avoid, and minimize potentially significant adverse impacts to burrowing owls in accordance with BMP BIO-7. During the non-breeding	LTS

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Summary of Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		season, and after owls have been relocated or evicted in accordance with BMP BIO-7, the work area will be monitored daily for one week prior initial ground-disturbing activities to confirm owls have nor remained in or returned to burrows. Where possible, burrows will be excavated using hand tools and refilled to prevent reoccupation (flexible pipe will be inserted during excavation to maintain an escape route). If the habitat surrounding the burrow from which the owl is evicted remains suitable for use by burrowing owls following completion of the project activity (based on an assessment by a qualified biologist), the Conservancy will have the option of either providing habitat mitigation off-site, as described below, or monitoring the work site to determine whether it is re-occupied by burrowing owls. If the Conservancy documents nesting by burrowing owls within two years of completion of project activity in the vicinity of the impact site indicating that the activity did not have a long-term impact on the owls' use of the site, no further mitigation would be required. *Compensate for Potentially Significant Impacts.* For each future project to implement the proposed Plan, where burrowing owls are present and potentially significant adverse impacts cannot be avoided compensatory habitat mitigation will be provided as follows: ▪ If an occupied burrow cannot be avoided during the non-breeding season, burrows will be enhanced or created in adjacent habitat at a 1:1 ratio of burrow destroyed to be created at least one week prior to implementation of passive relocation techniques. If burrowing owl habitat enhancement or creation takes place, a monitoring and management plan will be developed and implemented to assess the effectiveness of the mitigation. If monitoring indicates that the actions have not adequately mitigated for the Project's impacts, remedial actions (e.g., enhancing or creating additional burrows) will be implemented that compensate for these impacts. ▪ If the project activity will degrade habitat quality to the extent that maintaining owl use of the site is not feasible or ecologically preferable,	

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Summary of Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		in the opinion of a qualified biologist, then off-site mitigation will be provided to compensate for the loss of occupied burrowing owl nesting habitat. Mitigation acreage will be provided in accordance with the California burrowing owl mitigation guidelines (9.75 to 19.5 acres of habitat be preserved and managed per occupied burrowing owl nest burrow, whether by a pair or singly), or in accordance with current guidance or requirements of the regulatory agencies. The amount of mitigation habitat provided will depend on whether the mitigation habitat is occupied by burrowing owls (9.75 acres), adjacent to occupied habitat (13.0 acres), or suitable but unoccupied (19.5 acres). The mitigation site will be located in Fresno or Madera counties so that the mitigation supports the maintenance of regional burrowing owl populations. ▪ This mitigation may be provided via the management of suitable habitat on Conservancy lands (either existing lands or lands that are acquired), purchase of credits in a mitigation bank (if one is available), or contribution of funds toward the management of the required amount of suitable habitat owned by another entity. If the Conservancy provides habitat mitigation on existing Conservancy lands or on lands that are acquired for mitigation purposes, an HMMP will be prepared detailing the areas to be preserved for owls; the methods for managing on-site habitat for owls and their prey (such as vegetation management to maintain low-statured herbaceous vegetation); methods for enhancing burrow availability within the mitigation site (potentially including the provision of artificial burrows, although long-term management for ground squirrels will be important as well); measures to minimize adverse effects of development on owls on-site; and a monitoring program and adaptive management program. Determining specific performance/success criteria requires information regarding the specific mitigation site, its conditions, and the specific enhancement and management measures tailored to the mitigation site and its conditions. For example, performance criteria for a site where burrowing owls are known to occur (which may include maintenance of a certain number of	

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Summary of Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		pairs of owls) may differ from those for an unoccupied site adjacent to occupied burrowing owl habitat (which may include attracting owls to breed on the mitigation site). As a result, those specific criteria will be defined in the HMMP rather than in this EIR. Nevertheless, the performance/success criteria described in the HMMP will guide the mitigation to manage and protect high-quality habitat for burrowing owls, adequate to compensate for impacts. ▪ The HMMP will be submitted to the CDFW for review. ▪ If a mitigation bank providing credits for burrowing owls is established within the aforementioned mitigation area (i.e., in Fresno or Madera County), then mitigation may take the form of the purchase of credits equivalent to the number of acres of mitigation required.	
BIO-1H: Future development of the proposed Plan could result in the disturbance of habitat for special-status species, including the Townsend's western big-eared bat and pallid bat, by permanently impacting roosting sites or causing long-term roost abandonment.	S	BIO-lH: Protect special-status bats. *Avoid and Minimize Impacts.* For each future project to implement the proposed Plan, when the project is defined to a level that impacts can be evaluated, prior to taking action the Conservancy will assess the site to determine, avoid, and minimize potentially significant adverse impacts to Townsend's western big-eared bats and pallid bats in accordance with BMP BIO-8. *Compensate for Potentially Significant Impacts.* For each future project to implement the proposed Plan, where special status bats are present and potentially significant adverse impacts cannot be avoided, compensatory habitat mitigation will be provided as follows: ▪ If roosts must be removed, the bats will be excluded from the roosting site before it is removed. ▪ If a tree or structure containing a Townsend's western big-eared bat or pallid bat maternity roost is to be removed, a qualified biologist will design, and determine an appropriate location for, an alternative roost structure. If a tree containing a maternity roost of either species is not removed, but project-related disturbance causes the abandonment of the roost site (even during the non-breeding season), then the Conservancy may either monitor the roost site to determine whether	LTS

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Summary of Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		the affected species returns to the roost, or construct an alternative roost. If the Conservancy elects to monitor the roost and bats do not return within 1 year, then an alternative roost will be constructed. ▪ A qualified biologist will determine the appropriate location for the alternative roost structure, based on the location of the original roost and habitat conditions in the vicinity. The roost structure will be built to specifications as determined by a qualified biologist, or it may be purchased from an appropriate vendor. The structure will be placed as close to the impacted roost site as feasible. The Conservancy will monitor the roost for up to three years (or until occupancy is determined, whichever occurs first) to determine use by bats. If by Year 3, the bat species for which the structure was designed are not using the structure, a qualified bat biologist, in consultation with the CDFW, will identify alternative roost designs or locations for placement of the roost, and monitoring of the new roost will occur for an additional three years (or until occupancy has been verified).	
BIO-2A: Implementation of the proposed Project could result in short-term degradation of riparian habitat and temporary and permanent loss of riparian vegetation.	S	BIO-2A: Protect riparian habitat. *Avoid and Minimize Impacts.* For each future project to implement the proposed Plan, when the project is defined to a level that impacts can be evaluated, prior to taking action the Conservancy will assess the site to determine, avoid, and minimize potentially significant adverse impacts to riparian habitat, including implementation of the proposed Plan's setback and buffer policies and BMP BIO-4. Each future project shall be preceded by a pre-construction survey during which a qualified botanist will identify sensitive natural vegetation communities, including riparian areas, within the project footprint and clearly map them as needed to avoid and/or minimize disturbance. *Compensate for Potentially Significant Impacts.* For each future project to implement the proposed Plan, where sensitive habitats are present and potentially significant adverse impacts cannot be avoided and would not be offset by habitat enhancement and creation benefits of the project, compensatory habitat mitigation will be provided in accordance with proposed Plan policies and BMP BIO-13, and as follows:	LTS

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Summary of Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation

		▪ Secure, implement, and comply with measures to protect habitat in a streambed alteration agreement with CDFW in accordance with California Fish and Game Code Section 1600.
		▪ Develop a project-specific habitat restoration and revegetation plan for review and approval of CDFW. Replace on-site any native trees and shrubs, and any non-native plant species greater than four inches diameter breast height, removed to construct the project, on no less than a 3:1 ratio (replaced:removed), or in accordance with guidance or as required by regulatory agencies. Achieve successful establishment of 70 percent of the new plants within five years, or in accordance with guidance or as required by regulatory agencies.
		▪ Follow invasive species removal protocols approved by CDFW. After invasive species removal, revegetate disturbed soils with appropriate fast-colonizing understory grasses and forbs within one growing season as described in BMP-13.
		▪ For all projects other than invasive species removal projects that that do not include a habitat restoration component, if permanent impacts on more than one acre of contiguous riparian habitat are unavoidable, habitat will be restored or created to compensate for permanent impacts in a manner that achieves no net loss in acreage or function. Mitigation for riparian habitat dominated by native species and supporting tree canopy will be provided at a ratio of 3:1 (3 acres of mitigation for every 1 acre of disturbed) via creation or restoration of riparian habitat, or in accordance with guidance or as required by the regulatory agencies.
		▪ Mitigation will be achieved through one or more options, potentially including (but not limited to):
		  ▪ Restoration or creation within the project site.
		  ▪ Restoration or creation of riparian habitat within the Parkway Plan Area.
		  ▪ Restoration/creation in close proximity to but outside of the Parkway Plan Area.	

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Summary of Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		▪ Purchase of mitigation credits at approved mitigation banks whose service area includes the project site.	
BIO-2B: Implementation of the proposed Plan could result in impacts on Essential Fish Habitat.	S	BIO-2B: *Protect Essential Fish Habitat.* Each project to install or construct trails, kiosks, restrooms, and other improvements contemplated in the proposed Project shall be preceded by a pre-construction survey during which a qualified botanist will identify sensitive natural vegetation communities, including wetlands and other waters, within the project footprint and clearly map or delineate them as needed to avoid and/or minimize disturbance. For each future project to implement the proposed Plan, where EFH is present and potentially significant adverse permanent impacts cannot be avoided and would not be offset by habitat enhancement and creation benefits of the project, Mitigation Measure BIO-3 (see below) will be implemented to reduce impacts on EFH to a less-than-significant level.	LTS
BIO-3: Implementation of the proposed Plan could result in the temporal loss of ecologically valuable habitat, and the permanent loss of both vegetated wetlands and unvegetated aquatic habitats, including jurisdictional wetlands and other waters, is considered significant.	S	BIO-3: Protect wetlands and other waters. *Avoid and Minimize Impacts.* For each future project to implement the proposed Plan, when the project is defined to a level that impacts can be evaluated, prior to taking action the Conservancy will assess the site in accordance with BMP BIO-2, to determine, avoid, and minimize potentially significant adverse impacts to wetland habitat and waters, including implementation of the proposed Plan's setback and buffer policies and BMP BIO-4. *Compensate for Potentially Significant Impacts.* For each future project to implement the proposed Plan, where sensitive habitats are present and potentially significant adverse impacts cannot be avoided and would not be offset by habitat enhancement and creation benefits of the project, compensatory habitat mitigation will be provided in accordance with proposed Plan policies and BMP BIO-13. Permanent impacts on, wetlands and other waters will be compensated by ensuring there is no net loss of acreage, functions, or values as follows: ▪ In coordination with USACE, the acreage of effects on waters of the U.S. and waters of the State that will result from implementation of the proposed Project will be determined.	LTS

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Summary of Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation

		▪ Section 404 and Section 401 permits will be secured and the permittee will implement and comply with all permit terms. The acreage, location, and methods for compensation will be determined during the Section 401 and Section 404 permitting processes.
		▪ The performance standard will be "no net loss" on the basis of the acreage of wetlands and other waters of the U.S. and waters of the State that will be removed and/or degraded. Wetland habitat will be restored, enhanced, and/or replaced at an acreage and location and by methods agreeable to USACE, and/or the Central Valley RWQCB, as appropriate, depending on agency jurisdiction. The replacement of waters or wetlands will be equivalent to the nature of the habitat lost, and will be provided at a suitable ratio to ensure that, at a minimum, there is no net loss of habitat acreage or value. The replacement habitat will be set aside in perpetuity for habitat use.
		▪ Mitigation will be achieved through one or more options, potentially including (but not limited to):
		  ▪ Restoration or creation within the project site.
		  ▪ Restoration or creation of wetlands/other waters within the Parkway Plan Area.
		  ▪ Restoration/creation in close proximity to but outside of the Parkway Plan Area.
		  ▪ Purchase of mitigation credits at approved mitigation banks whose service area includes the project site.	

BIO-4: Future development under the proposed Plan 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 native wildlife nursery sites.	LTS	N/A	N/A
BIO-5: The proposed Plan, and future development under the proposed Plan, would not conflict with any HCPs / City or County specific plans, policies, or regulations.	LTS	N/A	N/A
BIO-6: Future development under the proposed Plan, in	LTS	N/A	N/A

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Summary of Impact	Significance Before Mitigation		Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable growth, would result in less than significant cumulative impacts with respect biological resources.				
CULTURAL RESOURCES				
CULT-1: The proposed Project would not cause a significant substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.	LTS	N/A		N/A
CULT-2: The proposed Project would not cause a significant substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource.	LTS	N/A		N/A
CULT-3: The proposed Project would not cause significant impacts that would directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature.	LTS	N/A		N/A
CULT-4: The proposed Project would not result in significant impacts that would disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.	LTS	N/A		N/A
CULT-5: The proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would not result in significant impacts with respect to cultural resources.	LTS	N/A		N/A
GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND SEISMICITY				
GEO-1: The proposed Plan would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving surface rupture along a known active fault; strong seismic ground shaking; seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; and landslides.	LTS	N/A		N/A
GEO-2: Future development under the proposed Plan would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	LTS	N/A		N/A
GEO-3: Future development under the proposed Plan would not be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.	LTS	N/A		N/A

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Summary of Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
GEO-4: Future development under the proposed Plan would not 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.	LTS	N/A	N/A
GEO-5: Future development under the proposed Plan would not 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.	LTS	N/A	N/A
GEO-6: The proposed Plan, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less than significant cumulative impacts with respect to geology, soil, and seismicity.	LTS	N/A	N/A
GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS			
GHG-1: The Project would result in a substantial increase in GHG emissions and would not achieve a 29 percent reduction from BAU.	S	GHG-1: New structures shall be constructed with photovoltaic solar panels to offset building energy use, unless it can be demonstrated that such systems are not technologically feasible based on the location of structures, shading, or other site constraints.	SU
GHG-2: Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the GHG emissions.	LTS	N/A	N/A
GHG-3: The Project would result in a substantial increase in cumulatively considerable GHG emissions and would not achieve a 29 percent reduction from BAU. Mitigation Measures identified for Impact AQ-3 would also lessen impacts associated with an increase in GHG emissions. The additional measures identified in Mitigation Measure GHG-1 would reduce Project-related GHG emissions.	S	GHG-3: Implement Mitigation Measure GHG-1.	SU
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS			
HAZ-1: Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HAZ-2: Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and	LTS	N/A	N/A

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Summary of Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.			
HAZ-3: Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within ¼-mile of an existing or proposed school.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HAZ-4: 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, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HAZ-5: Be 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.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HAZ-6: Be within the vicinity of a private airstrip and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in The Parkway Area.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HAZ-7: Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HAZ-8: 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.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HAZ-9: Future development under the proposed Plan, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable growth, would result in less than significant cumulative impacts with respect hazards and hazardous materials.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY			
HYDRO-1: The proposed Plan would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HYDRO-2: The proposed Plan would not 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	LTS	N/A	N/A

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Summary of Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
level.			
HYDRO-3: The proposed Plan would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion, siltation, or flooding on- or off-site.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HYDRO-4: The proposed Plan would not 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.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HYDRO-5: The proposed Plan would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HYDRO-6: The proposed Plan would result in a less-than-significant impact with respect to the placement of housing or structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary Map, or Flood Insurance Rate Map, or other flood hazard delineation map.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HYDRO-7: The proposed Plan would 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.	S	HYDRO-7: The proposed Project would result in significant and unavoidable risk of exposing structures to significant risk of loss involving flooding as a result of the failure of Friant Dam.	SU
HYDRO-8: The proposed Plan would result in less than significant adverse effects related to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HYDRO-9: The proposed Plan, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development, would result in less than significant cumulative impacts with respect to hydrology and water quality.	LTS	N/A	N/A
LAND USE AND PLANNING			
LAND-1: The proposed Plan would not physically divide an established community.	None	N/A	N/A
LAND-2: The proposed Plan would not conflict with applicable	LTS	N/A	N/A

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Summary of Impact	Significance Before Mitigation		Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
land use plans, policies, or regulations.				
LAND-3: The proposed Plan would not conflict with applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan.	LTS	N/A		N/A
LAND-4: The proposed Plan, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would not result in significant cumulative impacts with respect to land use and planning.	LTS	N/A		N/A
MINERAL RESOURCES				
MR-1: The proposed Plan would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State.	LTS	N/A		N/A
MR-2: The proposed Plan would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.	LTS	N/A		N/A
MR-3: The Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects would not have a significant cumulative impact with respect to mineral resources.	LTS	N/A		N/A
NOISE				
NOISE-1: The proposed Plan would not expose people to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the General Plan or the Municipal Code, and/or the applicable standards of other agencies.	LTS	N/A		N/A
NOISE-2: The proposed Plan would not expose people to or result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.	LTS	N/A		N/A
NOISE-3: The proposed Plan would not cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project.	LTS	N/A		N/A
NOISE-4: The proposed Plan would not cause a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the	LTS	N/A		N/A

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Summary of Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project.			
NOISE-5: The proposed Plan would not cause exposure of people residing or working in the vicinity of the plan area to excessive aircraft noise levels, for a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport.	LTS	N/A	N/A
NOISE-6: The proposed Plan would not cause the exposure of people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels, for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip.	LTS	N/A	N/A
NOISE-7: Implementation of the proposed Master Plan, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would not result in additional cumulatively considerable noise, or ground-borne noise and vibration impacts.	LTS	N/A	N/A
POPULATION AND HOUSING			
POP-1: The proposed Project would not induce substantial unexpected population growth, or growth for which inadequate planning has occurred, either directly or indirectly.	LTS	N/A	N/A
POP-2: The proposed Project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.	LTS	N/A	N/A
POP-3: The proposed Project would not displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.	LTS	N/A	N/A
POP-4: The proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less than significant impacts with respect to population and housing.	LTS	N/A	N/A
PUBLIC SERVICES AND RECREATION			
PS-1: The proposed Project would not result in the provision of or need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities, the construction or operation of which could cause significant environmental impacts.	LTS	N/A	N/A

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Summary of Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
PS-2: The proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less than significant cumulative impacts with respect to fire protection service.	LTS	N/A	N/A
PS-3: The proposed Project would not result in the provision of or need for new or physically altered police facilities, the construction or operation of which could cause significant environmental impacts.	LTS	N/A	N/A
PS-4: The proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less than significant cumulative impacts with respect to police protection service.	LTS	N/A	N/A
PS-5: The proposed Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered parks and recreational facilities in order to maintain acceptable ratios of parkland per thousand residents.	LTS	N/A	N/A
PS-6: The proposed Project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities, such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur, or be accelerated.	None	N/A	N/A
PS-7: The proposed Project would not include or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.	LTS	N/A	N/A
PS-8: The proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable growth, would result in less than significant cumulative impacts with respect to parks and recreational facilities.	LTS	N/A	N/A
TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC			
TRAF-1: Development of additional trailheads and activity centers within the San Joaquin River Parkway could create unsafe and unacceptable LOS conditions.	S	TRAF-1: If a future project implemented under the proposed Plan is estimated to generate daily or peak hour volumes of traffic that trigger requirements of a state or local agency to prepare a site access, circulation, and traffic study, the Conservancy shall consult with the respective agency. The Conservancy shall assist in the evaluation and address as necessary any	LTS

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Summary of Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		unsafe traffic conditions potentially created by the proposed project. Project engineering plans shall incorporate designs and features necessary to ensure safe and acceptable traffic operations associated with the project, in accordance with applicable LOS policies of the respective agencies.	
TRAF-2: The proposed Project would not conflict with an applicable congestion management plan.	LTS	N/A	N/A
TRAF-3: The proposed Project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns that results in substantial safety risks.	None	N/A	N/A
TRAF-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).	LTS	N/A	N/A
TRAF-5: The proposed Project would not result in inadequate emergency access.	LTS	N/A	N/A
TRAF-6: The proposed Project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.	LTS	N/A	N/A
TRAF-7: The proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects would result in less than significant cumulative impacts with respect to transportation and traffic.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS			
UTIL-1: The Project would result in a less than significant impact on water supplies available to serve the Plan Area from existing entitlements and resources. No new or expanded entitlements would be needed.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-2: The Project would not require or result in the construction of new water facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-3: The Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less than	LTS	N/A	N/A

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Summary of Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
significant cumulative impacts with respect to water service.			
UTIL-4: The Project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-5: The Project would not require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-6: The Project would not result in the determination by the wastewater treatment provider(s) which serves or may serve the Parkway Plan Area that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the Plan's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-7: The Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less than significant cumulative impacts with respect to sewer service.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-8: The Project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Plan's solid waste disposal needs.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-9: The Project would not be out of compliance with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-10: The Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less than significant cumulative impacts with respect to solid waste.	LTS	N/A	N/A

This page intentionally blank