KINGSBURG 13-ACRE PARCEL ANNEXATION

DRAFT INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

NOVEMBER 2023

PREPARED FOR:

City of Kingsburg
1401 Draper Street
Kingsburg, CA, 93631

PREPARED BY:

PROVOST&PRITCHARD
CONSULTING GROUP

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF APPENDICES

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AB ..... Assembly Bill
APN ..... Assessor's Parcel Number
BPS ..... Best Performance Standards
BMP ..... Best Management Practices
CalEEMod ..... California Emissions Estimator Modeling (software)
CARB ..... California Air Resources Board
CALFIRE ..... California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
CCAA ..... California Clean Air Act
CEQA ..... California Environmental Quality Act
CFCs ..... Cholorfluorocarbons
City ..... City of Kingsburg
CGS ..... California Geological Survey
CH_4 ..... Methane
CHRIS ..... California Historical Resources Information System
CO ..... Carbone Monoxide
CO_2 ..... Carbon dioxide
CO2e ..... Carbon Dioxide Equivelents
County ..... Fresno County
DOC ..... Department of Conservation
DTSC ..... Department of Toxic Substances Control
EIR ..... Environmental Impact Report
FEMA ..... Federal Emergency Management Agency
GHG ..... Greenhouse Gas
GSA ..... Groundwater Sustainability Agency
GWP ..... Global Warming Potential
HFCs ..... Hydrofluorocarbons
IS ..... Initial Study
IS/MND ..... Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration
km ..... kilometers
MMRP ..... Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
MND ..... Mitigated Negative Declaration

MRZ ..... Mineral Resource Zones
MT CO2e..... Metric Tons Carbon Dioxide Equivelents
N_2O ..... Nitrous Oxide
NAHC..... Native American Heritage Commission
ND .....Negative Declaration
NO_2 ..... Nitrogen Dioxide
NOx ..... Nitrogen Oxides
NRHP ..... National Register of Historic Places
O_3 .....Ozone
Pb ..... Lead
PFCs ..... Perfluorocarbons
PG&E .....Pacific Gas & Electric Company
PM_{10} ..... particulate matter 10 microns in size
$PM_{2.5}$ ..... particulate matter 2.5 microns in size
ppb .....parts per billion
ppm .....parts per million
Project .....Kingsburg 13-Acre Parcel Annexation Project
QSD .....Qualified Sediment Developer
QSP .....Qualified Sediment Practioner
ROG .....Reactive Organic Gases
SHPO.....State Office of Historic Preservation
SJVAB.....San Joaquin Valley Air Basin
SJVAPCD .....San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District
SKFCSD ..... Selma Kingsburg Fowler County Sanitation District
SO_2 .....Sulfur Dioxide
SSJVIC ..... Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center
SRA ..... State Responsibility Area
CARB.....California Air Resources Board
SWPPP .....Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
SWRCB..... State Water Resources Control Board
USEPA.....United States Environmental Protection Agency
UST .....Underground Storage Tank
VMT ..... Vehicle Miles Traveled
µg/m3.....micrograms per cubic meter

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group (Provost & Pritchard) has prepared this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) on behalf of The City of Kingsburg (City) to address the environmental effects of the Kingsburg 13-Acre Parcel Annexation Project (Project). This document has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq. The City is the CEQA lead agency for this Project.

The site and the Project are described in detail in Chapter 2 Project Description.

1.1 REGULATORY INFORMATION

An Initial Study (IS) is a document prepared by a lead agency to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment. In accordance with California Code of Regulations Title 14 (Chapter 3, Section 15000, *et seq.*)-- also known as the CEQA Guidelines--Section 15064 (a)(1) states that an environmental impact report (EIR) must be prepared if there is substantial evidence in light of the whole record that the Project under review may have a significant effect on the environment and should be further analyzed to determine mitigation measures or project alternatives that might avoid or reduce project impacts to less than significant levels. A negative declaration (ND) may be prepared instead if the lead agency finds that there is no substantial evidence in light of the whole record that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. An ND is a written statement describing the reasons why a proposed Project, not otherwise exempt from CEQA, would not have a significant effect on the environment and, therefore, why it would not require the preparation of an EIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15371). According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15070, a ND or *mitigated* ND shall be prepared for a project subject to CEQA when either:

a. The IS shows there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the agency, that the proposed Project may have a significant effect on the environment, or
b. The IS identified potentially significant effects, but:
    1. Revisions in the project plans or proposals made by or agreed to by the applicant before the proposed MND and IS is released for public review would avoid the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effects would occur is prepared, and
    2. There is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the agency, that the proposed Project as *revised* may have a significant effect on the environment.

1.2 DOCUMENT FORMAT

This IS/MND contains six chapters. Chapter 1 Introduction, provides an overview of the Project and the CEQA process. Chapter 2 Project Description, provides a detailed description of proposed Project components and objectives. Chapter 3 Determination, the Lead Agency's determination based upon this initial evaluation. Chapter 4 Environmental Impact Analysis presents the CEQA checklist and environmental analysis for all impact areas, mandatory findings of significance, and feasible mitigation measures. If the Project does not have the potential to significantly impact a given issue area, the relevant section provides a brief discussion of the reasons why no impacts are expected. If the Project could have a potentially significant impact on a resource, the issue area discussion provides a description of potential impacts, and appropriate mitigation measures and/or permit requirements that would reduce those impacts to a less than significant level. Chapter 5 Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (MMRP), provides the

proposed mitigation measures, implementation timelines, and the entity/agency responsible for ensuring implementation. Chapter 6 References details the documents and reports this document relies upon to provide its analysis.

The Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Model, Biological Resources Information, Cultural Resources Information, and Soils Information are provided as technical Appendix A, Appendix B, Appendix C, and Appendix D respectively, at the end of this document.

CHAPTER 2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

2.1.1 Project Title

Kingsburg 13-Acre Parcel Annexation Project

2.1.2 Lead Agency Name and Address

City of Kingsburg
1401 Draper Street
Kingsburg, CA, 93631

2.1.3 Contact Person and Phone Number

Lead Agency Contact

Holly Owen
Community Development Director
(559) 897-5328

CEQA Consultant

Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group
Wyatt Czeshinski, Project Manager
(559) 449-2700

2.1.4 Project Location

The Project is located in Fresno County, California, approximately 176 miles southeast of Sacramento and 85 miles northwest of Bakersfield (see Figure 2-1). The Project site is located on Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 394-042-04. The centroid of the Project site is 36° 31' 22" N, 119° 34' 9" W.

2.1.5 General Plan Designation and Zoning

The Project site is designated Highway Commercial by the City's General Plan and is currently zoned Exclusive Agriculture (20 acres) by the County of Fresno (County).[1] [2]

2.1.6 Description of Project

The City of Kingsburg has proposed the construction of an approximately 18,500 square foot (sqft) office building on APN 394-042-04 (Project Site). APN 394-042-04 is approximately 13.18 acres in size and is generally located north of the intersection of Avenue B and Ventura Court in the County of Fresno. The

[1] (City of Kingsburg 2014)
[2] (County of Fresno 2023)

Project site is designated as Highway Commercial under the City's General Plan. In order for the proposed building to be constructed on this site, the City of Kingsburg has proposed the annexation and prezoning of APN 394-042-04. In accordance with the site's General Plan Land Use designation, the entire site would be prezoned to the Highway Commercial zone district. Additionally, the City has proposed a Tentative Parcel Map to subdivide the Project site into four smaller parcels. Parcel 1 would be 0.65 acres in size, Parcel 2 would be 2.13 acres in size, Parcel 3 would be 10.3 acres in size, and Parcel 4 would be 0.11 acres in size (total acreages may differ due to rounding). The proposed public facilities office building would be constructed on Parcel 2. Public facilities are an allowed use within the Highway Commercial zone district. Construction activities proposed on the site would be subject to the approval of a Site Plan Review. No development is proposed on Parcel 1, 3, or 4 at this time. Any future development of these parcels would require separate, future environmental analysis. Construction of the Project would involve grading, paving, building construction, and painting. As a part of the Project, Avenue B would be extended, providing access to the Project site. Principal deliveries to the Project site would include construction equipment, concrete and asphalt materials, building materials, and any additional hardware required to construct the Project.

2.1.7 Site and Surrounding Land Uses and Setting

Table 2-1: Existing Uses, General Plan Designation, & Zone Districts of Surrounding Properties[3] [4] [5]

Direction from Project Site	Existing Use	General Plan Designation	Zone District
NORTH	State Route 99	-	-
EAST	Vacant	Highway Commercial	Highway Commercial
SOUTH	Commercial Businesses	Highway Commercial	Highway Commercial
WEST	Agriculture	Agriculture/Open Space (County)	Exclusive Agriculture (County)

2.1.8 Other Public Agencies Whose Approval May Be Required

- County of Fresno
- Fresno Local Agency Formation Commission
- San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District

2.1.9 Consultation with California Native American Tribes

Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1, *et seq. ((codification of Assembly Bill (AB) 52, 2013-14)*) requires that a lead agency, within 14 days of determining that it will undertake a project, must notify in writing any California Native American Tribe traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the project if that Tribe has previously requested notification about projects in that geographic area. The notice must briefly describe the project and inquire whether the Tribe wishes to initiate request formal consultation. Tribes have 30 days from receipt of notification to request formal consultation. The lead agency then has 30 days to initiate the consultation, which then continues until the parties come to an agreement regarding necessary mitigation or agree that no mitigation is needed, or one or both parties determine that negotiation occurred in good faith, but no agreement will be made.

[3] (City of Kingsburg 2014)
[4] (County of Fresno 2023)
[5] (City of Kingsburg 2018)

The City of Kingsburg has not received any written correspondence from a Tribe pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 requesting notification of proposed projects.

Figure 2-1: Regional Vicinity Map



Figure 2-2: Aerial Map

Figure 2-3: Topo Quad



Figure 2-4: General Plan Land Use Designation Map



Figure 2-5: Existing Zoning Map



Figure 2-6: Prezone Map



Figure 2-7: Parcel Map



Figure 2-8: Site Plan



CHAPTER 3 DETERMINATION

3.1 POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

As indicated by the discussions of existing and baseline conditions, and impact analyses that follow in this Chapter, environmental factors not checked below would have no impacts or less than significant impacts resulting from the project. Environmental factors that are. checked below would have potentially significant impacts resulting from the project. Mitigation measures are recommended for each of the potentially significant impacts that would reduce the impact to less than significant.

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

The analyses of environmental impacts in Chapter 4 Impact Analysis result in an impact statement, which shall have the following meanings.

Potentially Significant Impact. This category is applicable if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant, and no feasible mitigation measures can be identified to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. This category applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures would reduce an effect from a "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measure(s), and briefly explain how they would reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from earlier analyses may be cross-referenced).

Less than Significant Impact. This category is identified when the proposed Project would result in impacts below the threshold of significance, and no mitigation measures are required.

No Impact. This category applies when a project would not create an impact in the specific environmental issue area. "No Impact" answers do not require a detailed explanation if they are adequately supported by the information sources cited by the lead agency, which show that the impact does not apply to the specific project (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

3.2 DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation (to be completed by the Lead Agency):

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

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

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

11/14/23
Date

Holly Owen, Community Development Director

Printed Name/Position

CHAPTER 4 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

4.1 AESTHETICS

Table 4-1: Aesthetics Impacts

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

4.1.1 Baseline Conditions

The Project site is located adjacent to the City of Kingsburg within Fresno County. The site is surrounded by commercial uses to the south, agricultural land to the west, State Route (SR) 99 to the north, and vacant land to the east. The Kingsburg General Plan does not list any specific scenic vistas, nor does the Fresno County General Plan Background Report identify one within the vicinity of the Project site.[6] Agriculture and views of the Sierra Nevada Mountains are generally regarded as a scenic resource within Fresno County. Additionally, within Fresno County the SR 99 corridor is an area in which aesthetically pleasing development is emphasized through the Highway 99 Beautification Master Plan.[7] This document encourages the development of areas along SR 99 to be held to a higher standard in terms of image and consistency with the existing themes of each city in Fresno County (Kingsburg Swedish style architecture). Development standards for new development within Kingsburg is regulated by the City's zoning ordinance. The City has also adopted a Highway Beautification Overlay District within its zoning ordinance, providing for additional

[6] (County of Fresno 2000)
[7] (Association for the Beautification of Highway 99 2016)

development standards for projects within the overlay district boundaries. The Project site is located within this overlay district.

4.1.2 Impact Analysis

a) Have substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Less than Significant Impact. The Project would result in the construction of a new office building on an undeveloped and vacant parcel. As mentioned above, the City and County have not designated any scenic vistas on or in the immediate vicinity of the Project site. Agriculture and views of the Sierra Nevada Mountains are generally regarded as resources of aesthetic value within the County. While the Project site has historically been used for agriculture, it is currently vacant and is not currently in use for agricultural purposes. Additionally, while a new building could obstruct views in the immediate area, there are no homes or businesses whose viewshed would be impacted by the proposed building. The Project would also result in a permitted use to be constructed on land planned for commercial development. As a result, development of the parcel has previously been contemplated within the City's General Plan. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

No Impact. The Project would not be located on or in the vicinity of a State scenic highway. The nearest officially designated State scenic highway is SR 180, located approximately 15.7 miles to the northeast of the Project site. The Project would be located within the Highway 99 Beautification Area, where City development standards more strictly enforce building and landscaping character.[8] The Project would be required to comply with all development standards of the Highway 99 Beautification Area. Therefore, there would be no impact.

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

No Impact. The Project would result in the annexation and prezoning of a parcel for the City of Kingsburg. Subsequent to these actions, construction of the proposed office building would be required to meet all applicable City development standards, including those of the Highway 99 Beautification Area. The Project is required to meet all local regulations governing scenic resources. Therefore, there would be no impact.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The Project would result in the construction of an approximately 18,500 sqft office building which would introduce new sources of light and glare to the undeveloped site. The Project would result in the construction of this building in an area planned for commercial development. The Project would be constructed in an existing commercial area with other existing sources of light and glare. While the Project would add to lighting and glare within the area, a review and approval of a lighting plan

[8] (City of Kingsburg 2018)

by the City Engineer and Community Development Director would be required prior to construction of the Project. This would ensure that any potential lighting and glare impacts would be minimized. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

4.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Table 4-2: Agriculture and Forest Impacts

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☒	☐

4.2.1 Baseline Conditions

The Project site is currently located in Fresno County, northwest of the City of Kingsburg. Fresno County and the larger San Joaquin Valley as a whole is one of the largest producers of agricultural products in the world and relies on its agricultural industry to support the regional economy. The Project site has historically been used for agricultural production however is currently vacant. While in production, temporary, nonpermanent buildings supported the agricultural use on site, however these have since been removed. The California Department of Conservation (DOC) identifies the entire site as land that is Prime Farmland.[9] No Williamson Act exists on the site.

[9] (California Department of Conservation 2022)

Figure 4-1: Farmland Designation Map



4.2.2 Impact Analysis

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

Less than Significant Impact. According to the DOC, the Project site is designated as Prime Farmland (see Figure 4-1). The Project would result in the conversion of this land to a non-agricultural use which would constitute a significant environmental impact under CEQA. While the Project would result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, the City of Kingsburg General Plan and EIR acknowledges that significant environmental impacts would result from the buildout of the General Plan and the conversion of agricultural lands to urban uses. Within this acknowledgement, the General Plan and EIR states that if approved, the approving body would be required to make a Statement of Overriding Considerations pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15093.[10] The General Plan and EIR was adopted in July of 1992, at which time a Statement of Overriding Considerations would have been adopted, identifying that buildout of the General Plan would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to agricultural resources due to future development under the General Plan, but that the benefits of the future buildout of the site outweigh the impacts to agricultural resources on-site. Additionally, the Project site was included in a General Plan Amendment in 1996 for which an EIR was prepared.[11] The General Plan Amendment redesignated the site's land use from Highway Commercial Reserve to Highway Commercial. This EIR recognized that future development of the land being redesignated would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to agricultural resources. The Kingsburg City Council adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations for this action on December 11th, 1996, again recognizing that the future buildout of the site would provide a benefit to the City that would outweigh the impacts on agricultural resources that would result. For this reason, conversion and the ultimate development of the Project site to a non-agricultural use would not be considered a significant impact for this Project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The Project site is zoned Exclusive Agriculture by the County of Fresno. The Project site is not under a Williamson Act contract. While the Project would result in the conversion of land zoned for agriculture to a commercial zone district, the prezoning of the site to Highway Commercial promotes consistency with the site's General Plan designation. As a result, the City's previously conducted analysis has already contemplated the conversion of the site from an agricultural use within the County to a commercial use within the City. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

No Impact. The Project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. The site is currently zoned Exclusive Agriculture by the County and would be prezoned Highway Commercial as a part of the Project. Additionally, the site

[10] (City of Kingsburg 1992)
[11] Information derived from City of Kingsburg Resolution 96-52 and correspondence with City staff.

is currently vacant and undeveloped. No forest or timberland exists on the site. Therefore, there would be no impact.

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

No Impact. The Project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. The site is a vacant and undeveloped property, adjacent to urban uses. The site is planned for commercial use by the Kingsburg General Plan. Therefore, there would be no impact.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The Project would not involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, would result in the conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. The site is currently vacant and undeveloped and does not currently contain agriculture or forest lands. As discussed above, the Project would result in the loss of Prime Farmland and the conversion of the site from a County agricultural zoning designation to a City commercial zoning designation. Due to its consistency with the adopted General Plan and EIR, these would not be considered significant for this Project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

4.3 AIR QUALITY

Table 4-3: Air Quality Impacts

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

4.3.1 Baseline Conditions

The Project site is located within the boundaries of the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) and the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin (SJVAB). The SJVAB is positioned within the San Joaquin Valley of California. The San Joaquin Valley is bounded by the Sierra Nevada Mountain Range to the east and the Coastal Mountain Range to the west. Wind within the SJVAB typically channels south-southwest during the summer months, while wind flows to the north-northwest during the winter months. Wind velocity for the region is considered low for an area of such size.[12] Due to a lack of strong wind and the natural confinement of the mountain ranges surrounding the SJVAB, the region experiences some of the worst air quality in the world.

Regulatory Attainment Designations

Under the California Clean Air Act (CCAA), the California Air Resources Board (CARB) is required to designate areas of the State as attainment, nonattainment, or unclassified with respect to applicable standards. An "attainment" designation for an area signifies that pollutant concentrations did not violate the applicable standard in that area. A "nonattainment" designation indicates that a pollutant concentration violated the applicable standard at least once, excluding those occasions when a violation was caused by an exceptional event, as defined in the criteria. Depending on the frequency and severity of pollutants exceeding applicable standards, the nonattainment designation can be further classified as serious nonattainment, severe nonattainment, or extreme nonattainment, with extreme nonattainment being the most severe of the classifications. An "unclassified" designation signifies that the data does not support either an attainment or nonattainment designation. The CCAA divides districts into moderate, serious, and severe air pollution categories, with increasingly stringent control requirements mandated for each category.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) designates areas for ozone, CO, and NO_2 as "does not meet the primary standards," "cannot be classified," or "better than national standards." For

[12] (San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District 2012)

SO_2, areas are designated as "does not meet the primary standards," "does not meet the secondary standards," "cannot be classified," or "better than national standards." However, the CARB terminology of attainment, nonattainment, and unclassified is more frequently used. The USEPA uses the same sub-categories for nonattainment status: serious, severe, and extreme. In 1991, USEPA assigned new nonattainment designations to areas that had previously been classified as Group I, II, or III for PM_{10} based on the likelihood that they would violate national PM_{10} standards. All other areas are designated "unclassified."

According to the USEPA Fresno County was not in non-attainment for two pollutant concentrations, with PM-2.5 (2012) being classified as in serious non-attainment, and 8-hour Ozone (2015) classified as being in extreme non-attainment as of October 20th, 2023.[13]

[13] (United States Environmental Protection Agency 2023)

Table 4-4: Summary of Ambient Air Quality Standards and Attainment Designation

Pollutant	Averaging Time	California Standards*		National Standards*	
		Concentration*	Attainment Status	Primary	Attainment Status
Ozone (O_3)	1-hour	0.09 ppm	Nonattainment/ Severe	–	No Federal Standard
	8-hour	0.070 ppm	Nonattainment	0.075 ppm	Nonattainment (Extreme)**
Particulate Matter (PM_{10})	AAM	20 µg/m^3	Nonattainment	–	Attainment
	24-hour	50 µg/m^3		150 µg/m^3	
Fine Particulate Matter ($PM_{2.5}$)	AAM	12 µg/m^3	Nonattainment	12 µg/m^3	Nonattainment
	24-hour	No Standard		35 µg/m^3	
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	1-hour	20 ppm	Attainment/ Unclassified	35 ppm	Attainment/ Unclassified
	8-hour	9 ppm		9 ppm	
	8-hour (Lake Tahoe)	6 ppm		–	
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO_2)	AAM	0.030 ppm	Attainment	53 ppb	Attainment/ Unclassified
	1-hour	0.18 ppm		100 ppb	
Sulfur Dioxide (SO_2)	AAM	–	Attainment	--	Attainment/ Unclassified
	24-hour	0.04 ppm		--	
	3-hour	–		0.5 ppm	
	1-hour	0.25 ppm		75 ppb	
Lead (Pb)	30-day Average	1.5 µg/m^3	Attainment	–	No Designation/ Classification
	Calendar Quarter	–		--	
	Rolling 3-Month Average	–		0.15 µg/m^3	
Sulfates (SO_4)	24-hour	25 µg/m^3	Attainment	No Federal Standards	
Hydrogen Sulfide (H_2S)	1-hour	0.03 ppm (42 µg/m^3)	Unclassified		
Vinyl Chloride (C_2H_3Cl)	24-hour	0.01 ppm (26 µg/m^3)	Attainment		
Visibility-Reducing Particle Matter	8-hour	Extinction coefficient: 0.23/km-visibility of 10 miles or more due to particles when the relative humidity is less than 70%.	Unclassified		

** For more information on standards visit: https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/research/aaqs/aaqs2.pdf*
*** No Federal 1-hour standard. Reclassified extreme nonattainment for the Federal 8-hour standard 10/20/23.*
****Secondary Standard*
Source: (San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District 2012)

Construction-Generated Emissions

Construction of the Project is assumed to be completed over approximately twelve months. Emissions associated with the Project were calculated using CalEEMod (California Emissions Estimator Model) Air Quality Model, Version 2020.4.0. The emissions modeling includes emissions generated by off-road equipment, haul trucks, and worker commute trips. Emissions were quantified based on anticipated construction schedules and the default parameters contained in the model. Localized air quality impacts associated with the Project would be minor and were qualitatively assessed. Modeling assumptions and output files are included in Appendix A.

Thresholds of Significance

Air pollutant emissions have regional effects and localized effects. This analysis assesses the regional effects of the Project's criteria pollutant emissions in comparison to SJVAPCD thresholds of significance for short-term construction activities and long-term operation of the Project. Localized emissions from Project construction and operation are also assessed using concentration-based thresholds that determine if the Project would result in a localized exceedance of any ambient air quality standards or would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to an existing exceedance.

The primary pollutants of concern during Project construction and operation are ROG (reactive organic gases), NOX, PM10, and PM2.5. The SJVAPCD Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts, adopted in 2015, contains thresholds for ROG and Nitrogen Oxides (NOX); Sulfur Oxides (SOX), CO, PM10, and PM2.5.

Ozone is a secondary pollutant that can be formed miles away from the source of emissions through reactions of ROG and NOX emissions in the presence of sunlight. Therefore, ROG and NOx are termed ozone precursors. The SJVAB often exceeds the state and national ozone standards. Therefore, if the Project emits a substantial quantity of ozone precursors, the Project may contribute to an exceedance of the ozone standard. The SJVAB also exceeds air quality standards for PM10, and PM2.5; therefore, substantial Project emissions may contribute to an exceedance for these pollutants.

The SJVAPCD adopted significance thresholds for construction-related and operational ROG, NO_X, PM, CO, and SO_X, these thresholds are included in Table 4-5.

Table 4-5: Project-Level Air Quality CEQA Thresholds of Significance

Pollutant	Significance Threshold	
	Construction Emissions (tons/year)	Operational Emissions (tons/year)
CO	100	100
NO_x	10	10
ROG	10	10
SO_x	27	27
PM_{10}	15	15
$PM_{2.5}$	15	15

Source: SJVAPCD. 2015. Guidance for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts. Website: https://www.valleyair.org/transportation/GAMAQI-2015/FINAL-DRAFT-GAMAQI.PDF. Accessed October 20, 2023.

4.3.2 Impact Analysis

Short-Term Construction-Generated Emissions

Estimated construction-generated emissions are summarized in Table 4-6.

Table 4-6: Unmitigated Short-Term Construction Generated Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants

Source	Annual Emissions (Tons per Year)					
	ROG	NO_X	CO	SO_X	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Maximum Annual Project Construction Emissions	0.3089	1.2978	1.5415	3.1000e-003	0.0887	0.0575
SJVAPCD Threshold	*10*	*10*	*100*	*27*	*15*	*15*
Threshold Exceeded?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Long-Term Operational-Generated Emissions

Estimated operational-generated emissions are summarized in Table 4-7.

Table 4-7: Unmitigated Long-Term Operational Generated Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants

Source	Annual Emissions (Tons per Year)					
	ROG	NO_X	CO	SO_X	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Total Annual Project Operational Emissions	0.2068	0.1711	0.9026	1.9900e-003	0.1944	0.0538
SJVAPCD Threshold	*10*	*10*	*100*	*27*	*15*	*15*
Threshold Exceeded?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Maximum Daily Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants

Daily construction and operational emissions generated by the Project are summarized in Table 4-7.

Table 4-8: Maximum Daily Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants

Source	Daily Emissions Maximum (in pounds)					
	ROG	NO_X	CO	SO_X	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Construction – Summer	29.0236	13.8343	15.2163	0.0307	7.7373	3.9733
Construction – Winter	29.0213	13.8372	15.0929	0.0304	7.7373	3.9733
Operational – Summer	1.6050	1.2210	7.2162	0.0161	1.5337	0.4214
Operational – Winter	1.3194	1.3562	7.3478	0.0148	1.5337	0.4214
SJVAPCD Threshold	*100*	*100*	*100*	*100*	*100*	*100*
Threshold Exceeded?	No	No	No	No	No	No

a) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

No Impact. The Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of any applicable air quality plan. The proposed Project would not exceed any threshold for air quality emissions that has been set by the SJVAPCD. Therefore, there would be no impact.

b) Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is in non-attainment. As shown in Table 4-6,

Table 4-7, and Table 4-8, the Project would not exceed an emissions threshold which has been set by the SJVAPCD for construction or operational related emissions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c) Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less than Significant Impact. As discussed above, the proposed Project would not result in significant long-term operational emissions. Constructed related emissions, shown in Table 4-6 and Table 4-8, would be temporary in nature and would cease upon Project construction. Short-term construction activities, however, could result in temporary increases in pollutant concentrations that could impact nearby sensitive receptors. Sensitive Receptors are groups that would be more affected by air, noise, and light pollution, pesticides, and other toxic chemicals than others. This includes infants, children under 16, elderly over 65, athletes, and people with cardiovascular and respiratory diseases. High concentrations of these groups would include daycares, residential areas, hospitals, elder care facilities, schools and parks. While the Project would be located in an area near sensitive receptors, such as the residential homes to the north and west and the hotel to the southeast, the Project would not exceed the daily emission thresholds set by the SJVAPCD. Additionally, the HARP2 air dispersion model was run for the Project site to show the health risk the Project would have on sensitive receptors in the area. The model run, which can be viewed in Appendix A, indicates that the Project would result in a cancer risk of 0.0001297 in one million, which is less than the SJVAPCD's threshold of 20 in one million. The Project would also present a chronic risk of 0.00000014586 in one million and an acute risk of 0 in one million, which would be less than the SJVAPCD's threshold of one in one million for both chronic and acute. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d) Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

Less than Significant Impact. During construction activities, construction equipment exhaust and application of asphalt, structural coating and other construction applications would temporarily emit odors. Construction would be completed within the City of Kingsburg (subsequent to annexation), and could have an effect on some residences that would be located near the construction area of the Project. Construction of the Project would be temporary, and odors would not remain after Project completion. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

4.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Table 4-9: Biological Resources Impacts

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

4.4.1 Baseline Conditions

The Project site is located on a vacant and undeveloped site within Fresno County that has previously been used for agricultural production. The site abuts both the City of Kingsburg city limits and SR 99. While the site was previously used for agriculture, no vegetation currently exists on-site, outside of naturally occurring weeds. The site is regularly tilled in order to ensure that naturally occurring weeds do not become a blight. No surface water or canal is located on or within the immediate vicinity of the site. The site is also not located on or near a wetland, according to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.[14] According to the

[14] (United States Fish and Wildlife Service 2023)

City's General Plan and EIR the City's planning area has not been identified to contain any special status species.[15]

4.4.2 Impact Analysis

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

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The Project site is located in an area adjacent to urban uses and has experienced activities that would discourage the occurrence of special status species on-site, such as the use of farming equipment and machinery on-site, and the traffic of SR 99 adjacent to the site. Despite the unlikelihood of special status species occurring on-site, database searches for the Project site indicated that the Fresno Kangaroo Rat, San Joaquin Kit Fox, California Tiger Salamander, Monarch Butterfly, and Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp have the potential to be observed on-site (see Appendix B). The City's General Plan and EIR indicated that no special status species have been observed within the Planning Area. Additionally, the Project site is a vacant field without naturally occurring vegetation (outside of weeds), reducing the likelihood that special status species would be located on-site. Out of an abundance of caution, mitigation measure BIO-1 would be implemented in order to ensure that none of these special status species, and nesting or migratory birds, are located on-site prior to construction activities. This would diminish any potential impacts to a less than significant level.

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

No Impact. The Project site has not been identified as containing riparian habitat or other sensitive natural habitat by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service or within local or regional plans policies and regulations.[16] [17] The site is a vacant and undeveloped parcel which has previously been utilized for agriculture. The site contains a dirt field with naturally occurring weeds as the only vegetation present. The site is routinely tilled in order to control the growth of naturally occurring weeds. Therefore, there would be no impact.

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

No Impact. According to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Project site would not be located on or in the immediate vicinity of a federally protected wetland.[18] As a result, the Project does not have the potential to impact any federally protected wetlands. Therefore, there would be no impact.

[15] (City of Kingsburg 1992)
[16] (United States Fish and Wildlife Service 2023)
[17] (City of Kingsburg 1992)
[18] (United States Fish and Wildlife Service 2023)

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

Less than Significant Impact. The Project site is located adjacent to the City of Kingsburg city limits, abutting an existing commercial area. As a part of the Project the site would be annexed into the City. While the site is vacant and previously undeveloped, it has experienced prior disturbances that would have discouraged the movement of wildlife through the Project site. Such disturbances include the use of the farm equipment and machinery on the site, proximity to urban uses located immediately south of the Project site, and the location of the Project site in proximity to SR 99. SR 99 provides a barrier for movement from the west to the east of this roadway. Additionally, this roadway produces traffic that generates relatively high levels of noise, making it unlikely that a natural wildlife movement corridor would exist in proximity to SR 99. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

No Impact. The Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. The City does not have a tree preservation ordinance and no trees would be removed as part of the Project. The Project would be required to comply with all local policies and regulations protecting biological resources. Therefore, there would be no impact.

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

No Impact. The Project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan. The Project site is located adjacent to the City of Kingsburg and would be annexed to the City as a part of the Project. The site is not currently located within a habitat conservation plan or other type of conservation area. Therefore, there would be no impact.

4.4.3 Mitigation

BIO-1 Prior to issuing a grading permit, the developer shall conduct a pre-construction biological survey prepared by a qualified biologist, acceptable to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. The survey will be focused on the Fresno Kangaroo Rat, San Joaquin Kit Fox, California Tiger Salamander, Monarch Butterfly, Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp and nesting raptors, and migratory birds. The applicant shall follow any recommendations contained in the survey.

4.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Table 4-10: Cultural Resources Impacts

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to in § 15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	☐	☒	☐	☐

4.5.1 Baseline Conditions

Records Search

A records search from the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center (SSJVIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), located at California State University, Bakersfield was conducted in October of 2023. The SSJVIC records search includes a review of all recorded archaeological and built-environment resources as well as a review of cultural resource reports on file. In addition, the California Points of Historical Interest, the California Historical Landmarks, the California Register of Historical Resources, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), and the California State Built Environment Resources Directory listings were reviewed for the above referenced development site and an additional ¼-mile radius. Due to the sensitive nature of cultural resources, archaeological site locations are not released. (Appendix C). Additional sources included the State Office of Historic Preservation (SHPO) Historic Properties Directory, Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility, and the California Inventory of Historic Resources.

4.5.2 Impact Analysis

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to in § 15064.5?

b) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. According to the records search performed by CHRIS staff at California State University Bakersfield, received October 9, 2023, there have been no previous cultural resource studies conducted within the Project area. There have been seven previous cultural resource studies completed within a one half-mile radius: FR-00135, 00669, 00670, 00671, 01940, 02287, & 02452.

There are no recorded resources within the Project area, and it is not known if any exist there. There are three recorded resources within the one-half mile radius: P-10-002966, 003930, & 005812. These resources consist of historic era ditches, and a railroad. Project activities would not have any impacts on these resources.

Resources: P-10-003930, & P-10-005812 have been given California Historical Resource Status codes of 6Y, indicating Determined ineligible for National Register by consensus through Section 106 process – Not evaluated for California Register or local listing. There are no other recorded cultural resources within the Project area or radius that are listed in the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, the California Points of Historical Interest, California Inventory of Historic Resources, for the California State Historic Landmarks.

While there are no known cultural or archeological resources known to exist on the site, a resource could be uncovered during construction activities. Therefore, with incorporation of mitigation measure CUL-1 as outlined below, impacts to archaeological resources that may potentially exist on site would be less than significant.

c) Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. There is no evidence or record that the Project has the potential to be an unknown burial site or the site of buried human remains. In the unlikely event of such a discovery, incorporation of mitigation measure CUL-2, impacts resulting from the discovery of remains interred on the development site would be less than significant.

4.5.3 Mitigation

CUL-1 Should archaeological remains or artifacts be unearthed during any stage of Project activities, work in the area of discovery shall cease until the area is evaluated by a qualified archaeologist. If mitigation is warranted, the Project proponent shall abide by recommendations of the archaeologist.

CUL-2 In the event that any human remains are discovered on the development site, the Fresno County Coroner must be notified of the discovery (California Health and Safety Code, Section 7050.5) and all activities in the immediate area of the find or in any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains must cease until appropriate and lawful measures have been implemented. If the Coroner determines that the remains are not recent, but rather of Native American origin, the Coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in Sacramento within 24 hours to permit the NAHC to determine the Most Likely Descendent of the deceased Native American.

4.6 ENERGY

Table 4-11: Energy Impacts

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	☐	☐	☐	☒

4.6.1 Baseline Conditions

The Project site is located within Fresno County, adjacent to the City of Kingsburg. The Project area is served by Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) for its natural gas and electricity needs.

4.6.2 Impact Analysis

a) Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

Less than Significant Impact. Fuel consumed by construction equipment would be the primary energy resource expended over the course of Project construction. For heavy-duty construction equipment, horsepower and load factor were assumed using default data from the CalEEMod model. Fuel use associated with construction vehicle trips generated by the Project was also estimated; trips include construction worker trips, haul trucks trips for material transport, and vendor trips for construction material deliveries. Fuel use from these vehicles traveling to the Project was based on (1) the projected number of trips the Project would generate (CalEEMod default values), (2) default average trip distance by land use in CalEEMod, and (3) fuel efficiencies estimated in the ARB 2017 Emissions Factors model (EMFAC2017) mobile source emission model.

Construction is estimated to consume a total of 35,656.17 gallons of diesel fuel and 3,415.59 gallons of gasoline fuel (See Appendix A). California Code of Regulations Title 13, Motor Vehicles, Section 2449(d)(2), Idling, limits idling times of construction vehicles to no more than 5 minutes, thereby precluding unnecessary and wasteful consumption of fuel because of unproductive idling of construction equipment. In addition, the energy consumption for construction activities would not be ongoing as they would be limited to the duration of Project construction.

The development's anticipated annual energy consumption is approximately 183,359.8 kilowatt-hours and 2,390.2 therms of natural gas (see Appendix A). Energy consumption of non-residential uses is currently governed by the 2022 California Building Code, Part 6 for structures, and Title 20 of the California Code of Regulations for appliances. Energy consumption is anticipated to decrease over time

as more energy efficient standards take effect and energy-consuming equipment reaches its end-of-life and necessitates replacement. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b) Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

No Impact. State and local authorities regulate energy use and consumption. These regulations at the State level are intended to reduce energy use and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. These include, among others, AB 1493 – Light-Duty Vehicle Standards; California Code of Regulations Title 24, Part 6 – Energy Efficiency Standards; and California Code of Regulations Title 24, Parts 6 and 11 – California Energy Code and Green Building Standards. The Project would not conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Therefore, there would be no impact.

4.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Table 4-12: Geology and Soils Impacts

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iv. Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994) creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	☐	☒	☐	☐

4.7.1 Baseline Conditions

Geology and Soils

According to the Natural Resource Conservation Service's Web Soil Survey, the Project site is comprised of one soil: the Delhi loamy sand 0-3 percent slope (see Appendix D).

Faults and Seismicity

Like most of California, the Project site experiences seismic activity to a varying degree. The Project area is not located on any known fault or fault zone, but it could experience seismic activity as a result of fault

activity in other parts of the state. The nearest active fault is the Kern Canyon Fault, approximately 55 miles to the east of the Project site. The San Andreas Fault is located approximately 85 miles to the west of the Project site.[19]

Liquefaction

Liquefaction is a seismic phenomenon in which loose, saturated granular and non-plastic, fine-grained soils lose their structure or strength when subjected to high-intensity ground shaking. Soil liquefaction causes ground failure that can damage roads, pipelines, underground cables, and buildings with shallow foundations. Liquefaction more commonly occurs in loose, saturated materials. The Project is not known to be an area that experiences liquefaction.

Soil Subsidence

Subsidence occurs below the surface when subsurface pressure is reduced by the withdrawal of fluids (e.g., groundwater, natural gas, oil) resulting in sinking of the ground. While the Central Valley of California is known as an area that has experienced soil subsidence due to groundwater overdraft, the Project is not located in the immediate vicinity of an area that has been subject to subsidence. [20]

Dam and Levee Failure

According to the California Department of Water Resources Dam Breach Inundation Map, the Project is not in an area that would be susceptible to flooding as a result of dam or levee failure.[21]

4.7.2 Impact Analysis

a) Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

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

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less than Significant Impact. Ground shaking intensity is a function of distance from an earthquake's epicenter and underlying geology. The most common impact associated with ground shaking is damage to structures. The Project would result in the construction of a new office building that would meet California Building Code requirements governing potential structural damage due to earthquakes. The Project would not cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death as a result in a rupture of a known earthquake fault, nor would it result in strong seismic activity from Project inundations. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

[19] (California Department of Conservation 2015)
[20] (United States Geological Survey 2023)
[21] (California Department of Water Resources 2023)

No Impact. The Project would not be located in an area that is known to experience liquefaction. The Project would result in the construction of a new office building. The new building would not increase the likelihood for liquefaction to occur within the Project. Therefore, there would be no impact.

iv. Landslides?

No Impact. The Project is located in a relatively flat area with little to no potential for landslides to occur. Construction of the Project would not increase the likelihood for landslides to occur at the Project site. Therefore, there would be no impact.

b) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less than Significant Impact. The Project would result in the construction of a new office building on an approximately 2.13-acre site (Parcel 2). Developers whose projects disturb one (1) or more acres of soil or whose projects disturb less than one acre but are part of a larger common plan of development that in total disturbs one or more acres, are required to obtain coverage under the Statewide General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity (Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009-DWQ). Construction activity subject to this permit includes clearing, grading and disturbances to the ground such as stockpiling, or excavation, and construction of linear underground or overhead facilities associated with trail construction but does not include regular maintenance activities performed to restore the original lines, grade, or capacity of the overhead or underground facilities. The Construction General Permit requires the development of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) by a certified Qualified SWPPP Developer. Project construction activities may result in soil erosion and the loss of topsoil, including the buildup of soil in runoff areas. Through the use of a SWPPP and industry Best Management Practices (BMPs), impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c) Would the project 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?

No Impact. Due to the relatively flat topography of the Project and greater surrounding area and distance from active faults, landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse are not considered a potentially significant geologic hazard. The Project would not be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or would become unstable during seismic activity. Therefore, there would be no impact.

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

No Impact. The Project would not be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building code, creating substantial direct or indirect risks to property or life. The Project site is comprised of loamy sand that is not expansive in nature. Therefore, there would be no impact.

e) Would the project 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?

No Impact. The Project would not result in the use of septic tanks or any alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, there would be no impact.

f) Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. There are no known unique paleontological resources or geological features on the Project; however, during construction unique paleontological or geological resources could be unearthed. In this event all construction would stop, the City would be notified, and a qualified geologist and/or paleontologist would be consulted. Employment of mitigation measure GEO-1 any potential significant impacts would be lowered to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

4.7.3 Mitigation

GEO-1 Should a unique paleontological resource, site, or unique geological feature be unearthed during any stage of Project activities, work in the area of discovery will cease until the area is evaluated by a qualified geologist and/or paleontologist. If discoveries are uncovered, the Project proponent will abide by recommendations of the geologist or paleontologist.

4.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Table 4-13: Greenhouse Gas Emissions Impacts

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☐	☒

4.8.1 Baseline Conditions

Commonly identified GHG emissions and sources include the following:

Carbon dioxide (CO_2) is an odorless, colorless natural greenhouse gas. CO_2 is emitted from natural and anthropogenic sources. Natural sources include the following: decomposition of dead organic matter; respiration of bacteria, plants, animals, and fungus; evaporation from oceans; and volcanic out gassing. Anthropogenic sources include the burning of coal, oil, natural gas, and wood.

Methane (CH_4) is a flammable greenhouse gas. A natural source of methane is the anaerobic decay of organic matter. Geological deposits, known as natural gas fields, also contain methane, which is extracted for fuel. Other sources are from landfills, fermentation of manure, and ruminants such as cattle.

Nitrous oxide (N_2O), also known as laughing gas, is a colorless greenhouse gas. Nitrous oxide is produced by microbial processes in soil and water, including those reactions that occur in fertilizer containing nitrogen. In addition to agricultural sources, some industrial processes (fossil fuel-fired power plants, nylon production, nitric acid production, and vehicle emissions) also contribute to its atmospheric load.

Water vapor is the most abundant, and variable greenhouse gas. It is not considered a pollutant; in the atmosphere, it maintains a climate necessary for life.

Ozone (O_3) is known as a photochemical pollutant and is a greenhouse gas; however, unlike other greenhouse gases, ozone in the troposphere is relatively short-lived and, therefore, is not global in nature. O_3 is not emitted directly into the atmosphere but is formed by a complex series of chemical reactions between volatile organic compounds, nitrogen oxides, and sunlight.

Aerosols are suspensions of particulate matter in a gas emitted into the air through burning biomass (plant material) and fossil fuels. Aerosols can warm the atmosphere by absorbing and emitting heat and can cool the atmosphere by reflecting light.

Chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) are nontoxic, nonflammable, insoluble, and chemically unreactive in the troposphere (the level of air at the earth's surface). CFCs were first synthesized in 1928 for use as

refrigerants, aerosol propellants, and cleaning solvents. CFCs destroy stratospheric ozone; therefore, their production was stopped as required by the Montreal Protocol in 1987.

Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) are synthetic chemicals that are used as a substitute for CFCs. Of all the greenhouse gases, HFCs are one of three groups (the other two are perfluorocarbons and sulfur hexafluoride) with the highest global warming potential. HFCs are human-made for applications such as air conditioners and refrigerants.

Perfluorocarbons (PFCs) have stable molecular structures and do not break down through the chemical processes in the lower atmosphere; therefore, PFCs have long atmospheric lifetimes, between 10,000 and 50,000 years. The two main sources of PFCs are primary aluminum production and semiconductor manufacture.

Sulfur hexafluoride (SF_6) is an inorganic, odorless, colorless, nontoxic, nonflammable gas. It has the highest global warming potential of any gas evaluated. Sulfur hexafluoride is used for insulation in electric power transmission and distribution equipment, in the magnesium industry, in semiconductor manufacturing, and as a tracer gas for leak detection.

There are uncertainties as to exactly what the climate changes will be in various local areas of the earth, and what the effects of clouds will be in determining the rate at which the mean temperature will increase. There are also uncertainties associated with the magnitude and timing of other consequences of a warmer planet: sea level rise, spread of certain diseases out of their usual geographic range, the effect on agricultural production, water supply, sustainability of ecosystems, increased strength and frequency of storms, extreme heat events, air pollution episodes, and the consequence of these effects on the economy.

Emissions of GHGs contributing to global climate change are largely attributable to human activities associated with the industrial/manufacturing, utility, transportation, residential, and agricultural sectors. About three-quarters of human emissions of CO_2 to the global atmosphere during the past 20 years are due to fossil fuel burning. Atmospheric concentrations of CO_2, CH_4, and N_2O have increased by at least 40 percent, 150 percent, and 20 percent respectively since the year 1750. GHG emissions are typically expressed in carbon dioxide-equivalents (CO_2e), based on the GHG's Global Warming Potential (GWP). The GWP is dependent on the lifetime, or persistence, of the gas molecule in the atmosphere. For example, one ton of CH_4 has the same contribution to the greenhouse effect as approximately 25 tons of CO_2. Therefore, CH_4 is a much more potent GHG than CO_2. In accordance with SJVAPCD's *CEQA Greenhouse Gas Guidance for Valley Land-use Agencies in Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for New Projects*[22], proposed projects complying with Best Performance Standards (BPS) would be determined to have a less-than-significant impact. Projects not complying with BPS would be considered less than significant if operational GHG emissions would be reduced or mitigated by a minimum of 29 percent, in comparison to business-as-usual (year 2004) conditions. In addition, project-generated emissions complying with an approved plan or mitigation program would also be determined to have a less-than-significant impact.

4.8.2 Impact Analysis

Project Related Emissions

Short-term construction emissions associated with the Project were calculated using CalEEMod, Version 2020.4.0. The emissions modeling includes emissions generated by off-road equipment, haul trucks, and

[22] (San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District 2009)

worker commute trips. Emissions were quantified based on an anticipated construction schedule of approximately twelve months. Remaining assumptions were based on the default parameters contained in the model. Modeling assumptions and output files are included in Appendix A. Estimated construction-generated and operational related emissions are summarized in Table 4-14 and Table 4-15. GHGs impact the environment over time as they increase and contribute to climate change.

Table 4-14: Short Term Construction Related GHG Emissions

	Emissions (MT CO2e) in Tons per Year
Maximum Annual Construction CO2e Emissions	265.5290
AB 32 Consistency Threshold for Land-Use Development Projects*	1,100
AB 32 Consistency Threshold for Stationary Source Projects*	10,000
Threshold Exceeded?	No

* As published in the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's CEQA Air Quality Guidelines. Available online at http://www.baaqmd.gov/~/media/files/planning-and-research/ceqa/ceqa_guidelines_may2017-pdf.pdf?la=en Accessed 10/19/2023.

Table 4-15: Long Term Operational Related GHG Emissions

	Emissions (MT CO2e) in Tons per Year
Annual Operational CO2e Emissions	227.2875
AB 32 Consistency Threshold for Land-Use Development Projects*	1,100
AB 32 Consistency Threshold for Stationary Source Projects*	10,000
Threshold Exceeded?	No

* As published in the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's CEQA Air Quality Guidelines. Available online at http://www.baaqmd.gov/~/media/files/planning-and-research/ceqa/ceqa_guidelines_may2017-pdf.pdf?la=en Accessed 10/19/2023.

Construction related generation of GHGs would be a maximum of 265.5290 Metric Tons of Carbon Dioxide Equivalent (MT CO2e) per year, while operational emissions are expected to be 227.2875 MTCO2e per year. The Project would not exceed the AB 32 consistency threshold for land use projects for both short term construction emissions and long-term operational emissions as a result.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The Project would not generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. As shown in Table 4-14 and Table 4-15, the Project is not expected to result in the generation of GHG emissions that would exceed the AB 32 consistency threshold of 1,100 MT CO2e annually during both construction and operational activities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

No Impact. The Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. The Project would be in compliance with all SJVAPCD policies and regulations and would not exceed an applicable threshold for GHG emissions. Therefore, there would be no impacts.

4.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Table 4-16: Hazards and Hazardous Materials Impacts

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

4.9.1 Baseline Conditions

Hazardous Materials

The Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites (Cortese) List is a planning document used by the State, local agencies, and developers to comply with CEQA requirements in providing information about the location of hazardous materials release sites. Government Code Section 65962.5 requires the California Environmental Protection Agency to develop at least annually an updated Cortese List. The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) is responsible for a portion of the information contained in the Cortese List. Other State and local government agencies are required to provide additional hazardous material release information for the Cortese List. DTSC's EnviroStor database provides DTSC's component of Cortese

List data (DTSC, 2010). In addition to the EnviroStor database, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Geotracker database provides information on regulated hazardous waste facilities in California, including underground storage tank (UST) cases and non-UST cleanup programs, including Spills-Leaks-Investigations-Cleanups sites, Department of Defense sites, and Land Disposal program. A search of the DTSC EnviroStor database and the SWRCB Geotracker performed on October 18, 2023 determined that there are no known active hazardous waste generators or hazardous material spill sites within the Project site or immediate surrounding vicinity.[23] [24]

Airports

The Project is not located within the boundaries of an adopted Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The nearest airport or air strip to the Project is the Selma Airport located approximately six miles to the northwest.

Emergency Response Plan

The City of Kingsburg has an Emergency Services Plan that was adopted in 2010.[25] The Plan addresses risks to the community such as fire, law enforcement, public health threats, and other risks. An update to the plan is currently underway and should be complete in early 2024.

Sensitive Receptors

Sensitive Receptors are groups that would be more affected by air, noise, and light pollution, pesticides, and other toxic chemicals than others. This includes infants, children under 16, elderly over 65, athletes, and people with cardiovascular and respiratory diseases. High concentrations of these groups would include, daycares, residential areas, hospitals, elder care facilities, schools and parks. The nearest sensitive receptor to the area in which the construction is proposed is a rural residence approximately 900 feet to the northwest.

4.9.2 Impact Analysis

a) Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

b) Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

a-b) Less than Significant Impact. The Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The Project would result in the construction of a new office building on land that would be annexed into the City of Kingsburg. During construction, equipment would be used that could result in the spill of hazardous materials, such as diesel fuel, lubricants, and solvents. However, the contractor would comply with all California Department of Occupational Safety and Health Administration regulations regarding regular maintenance and inspection of equipment, spill prevention, and spill remediation in order to reduce the potential for incidental release of pollutants or hazardous substances onsite. Furthermore, any potential

[23] (California Department of Toxic Substances Control 2023)
[24] (State Water Resources Control Board 2023)
[25] (City of Kingsburg 2010)

accidental hazardous materials spills during construction are the responsibility of the contractor to remediate in accordance with industry BMPs and State and local regulations. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c) Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

No Impact. The Project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one quarter mile of an existing or proposed School. No school, public or private, exists within one quarter mile of the Project site, nor is one currently proposed within one quarter mile of the site. Therefore, there would be no impact.

d) Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

No Impact. The Project would not be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. As discussed above, a search of the EnviroStor and GeoTracker databases was conducted and the Project area has not been identified to contain a known hazardous material spill. Therefore, there would be no impact.

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

No Impact. The Project would not be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public or private airport where such a plan has not been adopted. The Project is located approximately six miles southeast of the nearest airport, the Selma Airport, and is not located within an adopted airport land use compatibility plan. Therefore, there would be no impact.

f) Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

No Impact. The Project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The Project, during construction, would result in truck deliveries, however, no detours or road closures are expected to occur as a result of construction activities. In addition, any potential work within existing roadways would be required to be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer. Therefore, there would be no impact.

g) Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

No Impact. The Project is located adjacent to the City of Kingsburg and would be annexed to the City as a result of the Project. This area is characterized by urban development, where wildland fires are unlikely to occur. The Project is not located within the vicinity of a State Responsibility Area (SRA) or a very high fire hazard severity zone (see Section 4.20, Wildfire). Therefore, there would be no impact.

4.10 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Table 4-17: Hydrology and Water Quality Impacts

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

4.10.1 Baseline Conditions

The Project is located within the San Joaquin Valley Basin and the Kings Subbasin. The site is also located within the boundaries of the of the Central Kings Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA).[26] The City of Kingsburg is, for the most part, located within the boundaries of the South Kings GSA. While the Project site is not located in the vicinity of a surface body of water, the site is located within the boundaries of the Fresno County Sole Source Aquifer.[27] This aquifer provides for the majority of drinking water for the area,

[26] (California Department of Water Resources 2023)
[27] (United States Environmental Protection Agency 2023)

making water quality protection increasingly important in the Project area. According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), the Project site is located approximately 1.8 miles from the nearest flood zone (see Figure 4-2).[28]

[28] (Federal Emergency Management Agency 2023)

Figure 4-2: FEMA Flood Zone Map



4.10.2 Impact Analysis

a) Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

Less than Significant Impact. The Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality. Construction activities could result in a potential impact through the erosion of soils and the build-up of silt and debris in runoff areas, however under California General Construction Permit 2009-0009-DWQ guidelines implementing a SWPPP, performed and approved by a qualified sediment practitioner (QSP) or a qualified sediment developer (QSD), would be required prior to construction, handling, and transportation of hazardous materials within the Project. In addition, construction activities could result in accidental spills of fuels, paints, and other hazardous materials entering runoff areas. Through a SWPPP carried out by the contractor and a QSP/QSD, the Project would design and utilize BMPs in order to stabilize any sedimentation and erosion from leaving the Project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b) Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

Less than Significant Impact. The Project would result in the construction of an 18,500 sqft office building on land planned for commercial use by the City's General Plan. While water would be used by the office building for services such as plumbing, the demand for water is not expected to be substantial. According to the City's 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, which was completed taking into account planned land uses of the General Plan, the City is expected to be in water balance through the year 2040.[29] Because the Project would result in a use that aligns with the site's General Plan land use designation, the Project would be in line with the analysis provided within the City's 2015 Urban Water Management Plan. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

i. result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;

ii. substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;

iii. create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or

iv. impede or redirect flood flows?

i-iv) Less than Significant Impact. The Project would result in the construction of an office building and associated pavement, resulting in the introduction of impervious surfaces to the Project site. The Project would construct storm drainage infrastructure which would connect to the existing City storm basin

[29] (City of Kingsburg 2017)

abutting the Project site to the southwest. The Project site does not contain, nor is it in the immediate vicinity of any naturally occurring surface waters or canals. While construction activities and the introduction of impervious surfaces would result in changes in drainage, connection of the site to the City's drainage basin would ensure that significant impacts do not occur. Any potential erosion and siltation from construction activities would be controlled on-site by the contractor through the implementation of a SWPPP. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d) Would the project in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundations?

No Impact. The Project would not in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to Project inundations. The Project is not located within a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zone. Therefore, there would be no impact.

e) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

No Impact. The Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. The Project would be located within the boundaries of the Central Kings GSA. The City of Kingsburg is primarily located within the South Kings GSA. Subsequent to annexation of the Project site to the City, the California Department of Water Resources and the two aforementioned GSA's could agree upon a boundary realignment which would result in the Project site being moved into the South Kings GSA. Both of the two GSA's have completed their Groundwater Sustainability Plan. The Project would not be in conflict with either plan. Position of the Project site in one GSA or the other could result in a difference in fees due, but would not have a physical impact on the environment. Therefore, there would be no impact.

4.11 LAND USE AND PLANNING

Table 4-18: Land Use and Planning Impacts

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☐	☒

4.11.1 Baseline Conditions

The Project site is located within the County, adjacent to the City of Kingsburg. The site is within the City's sphere of influence and is designated Highway Commercial by the City's General Plan. Additionally, the site is zoned Exclusive Agriculture by the County. As a part of the Project, the site would be annexed into the City and prezoned Highway Commercial consistent with the site's existing Highway Commercial land use designation.

4.11.2 Impact Analysis

a) Would the project physically divide an established community?

No Impact. The Project would not physically divide and existing community. As mentioned above, the subject parcel would be annexed to the City from the County. As the Project site is located adjacent to the current city limits, annexation of this parcel would be done in a contiguous manner. In order for the Project to be approved, the Fresno County Local Agency Formation Commission would be required to approve an application regarding the Project. Furthermore, development proposed as a part of this Project would be completed on a vacant and undeveloped parcel. The City would connect the site to development south of the Project via extension of Avenue B through City owned property. Therefore, there would be no impact.

b) Would the project cause a significant environmental conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

No Impact. The Project would result in the construction of an office building in an area planned for commercial uses. To facilitate the Project, the site would be annexed to the City of Kingsburg and prezoned Highway Commercial to be consistent with the site's existing Highway Commercial land use designation. These actions further the objectives of the City's General Plan by providing development in the areas in the City where they are planned for. The Project would be required to meet all applicable City of Kingsburg land use policies and regulations. Therefore, there would be no impact.

4.12 MINERAL RESOURCES

Table 4-19: Mineral Resources Impacts

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

4.12.1 Baseline Conditions

The California Geological Survey (CGS) is responsible for the classification and designation of areas within California containing or potentially containing significant mineral resources. The CGS classifies lands into Aggregate and Mineral Resource Zones (MRZs) based on guidelines adopted by the California State Mining and Geologic Board, as mandated by the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975. These MRZs identify whether known or inferred significant mineral resources are presented in areas. Lead agencies are required to incorporate identified MRZs resource areas delineated by the state into their general plans.[30]

According to the CGS Mineral Land Classification map, the Fresno County area, including the Project site, is known to produce aggregate materials.[31] The Kingsburg General Plan and the Fresno County General Plan Background Report have not identified the Project site or land in its vicinity as containing mineral resources.[32] [33] The nearest known mineral producing site (sand and gravel) is along the Kings River, approximately 10.5 miles to the northeast.

4.12.2 Impact Analysis

a) Would the project 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?

No Impact. The Project site is not known to contain any mineral deposits that would be of value to the region and the State. The Project would not result in the loss of availability of a mineral resource which would be of value to the region or the State. Therefore, there would be no impact.

b) Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

[30] Public Resources Code, Section 2762(a)(1).
[31] (California Geological Survey 2022)
[32] (City of Kingsburg 1992)
[33] (County of Fresno 2000)

No Impact. The Project site has not been identified as containing a locally important mineral resource by the Kingsburg General Plan, a specific plan, or any other land use plan. The Project would not result in the loss of any locally important mineral resource. Therefore, there would be no impact.

4.13 NOISE

Table 4-20: Noise Impacts

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

4.13.1 Baseline Conditions

The Project site is located within the County of Fresno and would be annexed into the City as a part of the Project. The City of Kingsburg requires that daytime noise sources within commercial areas remain below 65 decibels during the day.[34] The site is located adjacent to an existing commercial area, an agricultural field that is accustomed to heavy machinery use, and SR 99 which produces high levels of noise due to traffic.

4.13.2 Impact Analysis

a) Would the project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Less than Significant Impact. The Project would not result in the generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. During construction, the Project would temporarily utilize equipment that would exceed 65 decibels. While noise levels may temporarily be exceeded during such activities, construction noise would diminish with distance from the source. As a result, construction noise is not anticipated to be significant. Construction noise would also be temporary and cease upon completion. The newly constructed office building would not exceed acceptable noise levels during operation. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

[34] (City of Kingsburg 1992)

b) Would the project result in generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?

Less than Significant Impact. The Project would not result in generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels. Like ordinary noise levels, ground borne noise levels diminish in amplitude with distance from the source. Construction activities can result in varying degrees of ground vibration, depending on the equipment and methods used, distance to the affected structures, and soil type. The generation of vibration can range from no perceptible effects at the lowest vibration levels, to low rumbling sounds and perceptible vibrations at moderate levels, to slight damage at the highest levels. Given the type of improvements, it is not anticipated the Project would generate excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels. The Project would be required to adhere to all applicable City policies and regulations governing ground borne vibration. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

No Impact. The Project would not be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public or private airport where such a plan has not been adopted. The Project is located approximately six miles southeast of the nearest airport, the Selma Airport, and is not located within an adopted airport land use compatibility plan. Therefore, there would be no impact.

4.14 POPULATION AND HOUSING

Table 4-21: Population and Housing Impacts

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

4.14.1 Baseline Conditions

The Project site is located within Fresno County and would be annexed into the City of Kingsburg. According to the United States Census Bureau, the County of Fresno had an estimated population of 1,015,190 in 2022, while the City of Kingsburg had an estimated population of 12,613 people in 2022.[35]

4.14.2 Impact Analysis

a) Would the project induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

No Impact. The Project would not result in substantial direct or indirect population growth. The Project would result in the annexation of an approximately 13.18-acre parcel to the City of Kingsburg and the construction of an 18,500 sqft office building. The land annexed as a part of the Project is planned for commercial use and would be prezoned accordingly. The newly constructed office building would provide the City with additional space for administrative purposes. As a result, the Project does not have the potential to result in substantial unplanned population growth. Therefore, there would be no impact.

b) Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact. The Project would not displace any existing residents, necessitating them to find shelter elsewhere. The Project site is a vacant and undeveloped parcel without any existing structures. Therefore, there would be no impact.

[35] (United States Census Bureau 2023)

4.15 PUBLIC SERVICES

Table 4-22: Public Services

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
i. Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
ii. Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iii. Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iv. Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
v. Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

4.15.1 Baseline Conditions

Fire Protection:

The Project would be served by the Kingsburg Fire Department station located approximately 2,100 feet to the southwest of the Project.

Police Protection:

The Project would be served by the Kingsburg Police Department, located approximately 1.1 miles to the southeast of the Project site.

Schools:

Kingsburg Unified School District operates several schools within the City. The nearest public schools to the site are Reagan Elementary School, approximately 3,400 feet to the south, and Rafer Johnson Junior High School, approximately 3,400 feet to the east of the site. The nearest private school facilities to the Project site are Central Valley Home School and Island Community Day School, located approximately 2,800 feet to the southeast of the site.

Parks:

The City of Kingsburg provides parks and open space for the residents of the City. The nearest City owned and operated parks are Athwal Park, approximately 2,800 feet to the south of the Project site, and Kingsburg Dog Park, approximately 2,300 feet to the southeast.

Landfills:

The City of Kingsburg contracts with Mid Valley Disposal for its trash and recycling services.

4.15.2 Impact Analysis

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

i. Fire Protection:

No Impact. The Project site is located approximately 2,100 from the nearest City of Kingsburg Fire Department station. The service area of this station would remain unchanged with approval of the Project. Therefore, there would be no impact.

ii. Police Protection:

No Impact. The Kingsburg Police Department would provide police protection for the Project once it is annexed to the City. While the site would have been under County jurisdiction prior to annexation, the Kingsburg Police Department would have already responded to calls to the site, as it is the nearest police entity. As a result, the Kingsburg Police Department's service area would remain unchanged due to the Project. Therefore, there would be no impact.

iii. Schools:

No Impact. The Project would result in the construction of an office building. Substantial population growth which would necessitate new school facilities or increases in school staff is not anticipated as a result of the Project. Therefore, there would be no impact.

iv. Parks:

No Impact. The Project does not propose a use that would result in substantial induced population growth. As a result, the usage of existing parks and the demand for new parks is expected to remain unchanged. No additional City staff would be required to maintain parks as a result of this Project. Therefore, there would be no impact.

v. Other public facilities:

Less than Significant Impact. The Project would result in the generation of solid waste during construction and operational activities. During construction, waste produced would be the responsibility of the contractor to dispose of. Subsequent to the construction of the 18,500 sqft office building, operations would result in the generation of solid waste, recyclables, and organics. The Project would be required

to construct a trash enclosure to City standards, allowing for pickup by Mid Valley Disposal. Review by the City Engineer and ultimate approval of the Project during the entitlement process would ensure that generation of waste at the site does not constitute a significant impact. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

4.16 RECREATION

Table 4-23: Recreation Impacts

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒

4.16.1 Baseline Conditions

The Project site would be annexed into the City of Kingsburg as a result of the Project. The City of Kingsburg provides parks and open space for the residents of the City. The nearest City owned and operated parks are Athwal Park, approximately 2,800 feet to the south of the Project site, and Kingsburg Dog Park, approximately 2,300 feet to the southeast.

4.16.2 Impact Analysis

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

No Impact. The Project would not result in increased usage of existing parks and recreational facilities in a manner such that substantial physical deterioration of such resources would occur. The Project would result in the annexation of a commercially planned parcel of approximately 13.18 acres. The Project would also result in the construction of an 18,500 sqft office building and would not result in substantial population growth that would increase use of existing recreational facilities. Therefore, there would be no impact.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

No Impact. The Project would not include the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. The Project proposes the construction of an 18,500 sqft office building. No other construction is currently proposed on the site. Therefore, there would be no impact.

4.17 TRANSPORTATION

Table 4-24: Transportation Impacts

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

4.17.1 Baseline Conditions

The Project would result in the annexation of the Project site to the City of Kingsburg. Major transportation routes within the City include SR 99 and SR 201. The Project site is abutted by SR99 to its northeast.

4.17.2 Impact Analysis

a) Would the project conflict with a plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

Less than Significant Impact. The Project would not conflict with a plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. While the Project would result in the extension of Avenue B, the Project would be required to adhere to all applicable laws, policies, and plans regarding circulation and transit facilities within the City of Kingsburg. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The Project would result in the construction of a new City of Kingsburg office building on land that would be annexed into the City and prezoned Highway Commercial in accordance with the City's General Plan. This analysis relies on a qualitative analysis as permitted by CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b)(3), as models for such land uses are not available. The city facility portion of the Project would have a less than significant impact to vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as, in accordance with the Fresno Council of Governments VMT Guidelines:

> *The development of institutional/government and public service uses that support community health, safety and welfare may also be screened from subsequent CEQA VMT analysis. These facilities (e.g. police stations, fire stations, community centers, refuse stations) are already part of the community and, as a public service, the VMT is accounted for in the existing regional average.*

Many of these facilities generate fewer than 500 ADT and/or use vehicles other than passenger cars or light-duty trucks. These other vehicle fleets are subject to regulation outside of CEQA, such as CARB and the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. The local jurisdiction will have the discretion to determine whether such facilities, that provide safety, security, and serve the local communities, can be screened out from the VMT analysis.

The remaining 10.3-acre portion of the site (Parcel 3) has no specific identified use and may not be developed as public facilities in the future. This area is designated by the Kingsburg General Plan as Highway Commercial, which is "limited to business or services that rely on visibility from highways and/or serve the needs of the traveling public and residents of the surrounding agricultural area." Highway Commercial allows for a site coverage percentage of 60%, or approximately 269,200 square feet of floor area. Commercial land uses in this area as specified rely on visibility from the highway, and thus it is presumed that a significant portion of traffic to these businesses would be "pass-by" trips, where visiting the business is not the primary traveler's goal. Typical uses, as specified by the General Plan, include motels, restaurants, service stations, regional auto malls, factory outlet shopping centers, RV, boat and mobile home sales, transportation services, and governmental and agricultural services relying on highway access. Furthermore, these uses generally do not encourage additional trips, and therefore VMT, simply because they have been constructed. For example, households do not frequent motels more because more motels exist. These uses simply capture a trip when the highway driver finds it most convenient—at the next highway exit. Therefore, it can be presumed that there would no additional increase in VMT from these highway-visible, pass-by trip generating commercial uses. Additionally, future development of the overall Project site, outside of what is proposed under this Project, would be subject to separate environmental review. Impacts would thus be less than significant.

c) Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

No Impact. The Project would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses. The Project would result in the construction of a new office building on a vacant and undeveloped site. The Project does not propose the construction of a hazardous geometric design feature, nor does it propose an incompatible use for the site. Therefore, there would be no impact.

d) Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

No Impact. The Project would not result in inadequate emergency access. The Project would result in the extension of Avenue B to serve the Project site. No complete road closures would be necessary in order for the Project to be developed. The Project would be required to be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer prior to approval, ensuring that access would be maintained. In addition, construction of the Project would be located in an area away from major roadways that would serve as emergency routes. Therefore, there would be no impact.

4.18 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Table 4-25: Tribal Cultural Resources Impacts

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

4.18.1 Baseline Conditions

Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1, et seq. (codification of AB 52, 2013-14) requires that a lead agency, within 14 days of determining that it will undertake a project, must notify in writing any California Native American Tribe traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the project if that Tribe has previously requested notification about projects in that geographic area. The notice must briefly describe the project and inquire whether the Tribe wishes to initiate request formal consultation. Tribes have 30 days from receipt of notification to request formal consultation. The lead agency then has 30 days to initiate the consultation, which then continues until the parties come to an agreement regarding necessary mitigation or agree that no mitigation is needed, or one or both parties determine that negotiation occurred in good faith, but no agreement will be made. Pursuant to PRC Section 21080.3, the City of Kingsburg has not received letters from any tribe requesting notification.

Records Search

A records search from the SSJVIC of the CHRIS, located at California State University, Bakersfield was conducted in October of 2023. The SSJVIC records search includes a review of all recorded archaeological

and built-environment resources as well as a review of cultural resource reports on file. In addition, the California Points of Historical Interest, the California Historical Landmarks, the California Register of Historical Resources, the NRHP, and the California State Built Environment Resources Directory listings were reviewed for the above referenced development site and an additional ¼-mile radius. Due to the sensitive nature of cultural resources, archaeological site locations are not released. (Appendix C). Additional sources included the SHPO Historic Properties Directory, Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility, and the California Inventory of Historic Resources.

4.18.2 Impact Assessment

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in the local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or

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

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The City of Kingsburg, as the lead agency, has not received a letter any tribal letters pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1, et seq. (AB 52) officially requesting notification of any projects. Additionally, a records search of the Project site indicated that there were no known tribal cultural resources on-site. In the unlikely event of a discovery, mitigation will be implemented. With incorporation of mitigation measure **CUL-1** and **CUL-2** described above in Section 4.5, impacts resulting from the discovery of remains interred on the Project site or the discovery of another tribal cultural resource would be less than significant.

4.18.3 Mitigation

Refer to Mitigation Measures **CUL-1** and **CUL-2.**

4.19 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Table 4-26: Utilities and Service Systems Impacts

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

4.19.1 Baseline Conditions

The Project site would be annexed to the City of Kingsburg as a part of the Project. The City of Kingsburg is the water and storm drainage provider for residents of the City. The City also contracts with Mid Valley Disposal for solid waste pickup services. The Selma Kingsburg Fowler County Sanitation District (SKFCSD) is the sewer facilities provider for the City of Kingsburg. PG&E is the natural gas and electricity provider for the area. The Project site is currently vacant and undeveloped, devoid of existing utility services.

4.19.2 Impact Analysis

a) Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Less than Significant Impact. Subsequent to annexation to the City of Kingsburg the Project would connect to City infrastructure for water and storm drainage services. The Project would connect to City water services existing in the commercial development to the south. Additionally, the Project would connect to the existing City storm drain basin abutting the Project site to the southwest. For sewer

services the Project would connect to existing SKFCSD infrastructure located in the commercial development to the south of the Project site. Likewise, the Project would connect to existing PG&E and telecommunications facilities existing in the development immediately south of the site. Utility connections are available within the vicinity of the Project site and no substantial extension of any utility service would be required of the Project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b) Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

Less than Significant Impact. According to the City's 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, the City is expected to be in balance of its water budget through the year 2040. The 2015 Urban Water Management Plan was developed taking into account planned land uses contained in the City's General Plan. Due to the fact that the Project would result in a use that aligns with the site's existing General Plan land use designation, the Project would align with the 2015 Water Urban Management Plan. Additionally, the operation of an 18,500 sqft office building is not expected to result in substantial demand for water supplies. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The Project would be required to connect to existing SKFCSD facilities. While the Project would include a new sewer connection to serve the proposed office building, the added usage as a result of the Project is not anticipated to be substantial. Review by SKFCSD staff during the entitlement process would ensure that significant environmental impacts do not occur as a result of any new sewer connections. The Project would also be required to file all necessary applications and pay fees to the SKFCSD. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d) Would the project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

Less than Significant Impact. The Project would result in the generation of solid waste during construction and operational activities. During construction, waste produced would be the responsibility of the contractor to dispose of. Subsequent to the construction of the 18,500 sqft office building, operations would result in the generation of solid waste, recyclables, and organics. The Project would be required to construct a trash enclosure to City standards, allowing for pickup by Mid Valley Disposal. Review by the City Engineer and ultimate approval of the Project during the entitlement process would ensure that generation of waste at the site does not constitute a significant impact. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

e) Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

No Impact. The Project would be required to comply with all applicable federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, there would be no impact.

4.20 WILDFIRE

Table 4-27: Wildfire Impacts

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

4.20.1 Baseline Conditions

The Project site would be annexed into the City of Kingsburg as a part of the Project. The City of Kingsburg is served by the Kingsburg Fire Department for fire protection services. The nearest Kingsburg Fire Department station to the Project site is located approximately 2,100 feet to the southwest. According to the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CALFIRE) SRA viewer, the nearest SRA to the Project site is located approximately 17 miles to the northeast.[36] Additionally, according to the CALFIRE fire hazard severity map, the Project site is located approximately 22 miles to the southwest of the nearest very high fire hazard severity zone.[37]

4.20.2 Impact Analysis

a) If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

b) If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby

[36] (California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection 2023)
[37] (California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection 2023)

expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

c) If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

d) If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

a-d) No Impact. The Project site is located approximately 17 miles from the nearest SRA and 22 miles from the nearest very high fire hazard severity zone. The site is located on a relatively flat, vacant, and undeveloped site that is surrounded by urban uses, making wildfire unlikely to occur at the site. The Project would be served by the Kingsburg Fire Department station located approximately 2,100 feet to the southwest of the site. Therefore, there would be no impact.

4.21 CEQA MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Table 4-28: CEQA Mandatory Findings of Significance

Does the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☒	☐

4.21.1 Statement of Findings

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

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The analysis conducted in this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration results in a determination that the Project, with incorporation of mitigation measures, would have a less than significant effect on the environment. The potential for impacts to biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, and tribal cultural resources from the implementation of the Project would be less than significant with the incorporation of the mitigation measures identified in this analysis. Accordingly, the Project would involve no potential for significant impacts through the degradation of the quality of the environment, the reduction in the habitat or population of fish or wildlife, including endangered plants or animals, the elimination of a plant or animal community or example of a major period of California history or prehistory.

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

Less than Significant Impact. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(i) States that a Lead Agency shall consider whether the cumulative impact of a project is significant and whether the effects of the project are cumulatively considerable. The assessment of the significance of the cumulative effects of a project must, therefore, be conducted in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects, and probable future projects. The Project involves the annexation of 13.18 acres into the City and the construction and operation of a new City office building, the effects of which would not result in significant cumulatively considerable impacts. Implementation of the Project would not result in significant cumulative impacts and all potential impacts would be less than significant through the implementation of basic regulatory requirements and Project design.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The analysis conducted in this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration results in a determination that the Project, would have a less than significant effect on the environment. All potential impacts to human beings have found to be unsubstantial and would be considered less than significant.

CHAPTER 5 MITIGATION, MONITORING, AND REPORTING PROGRAM

This MMRP has been formulated based upon the findings of the IS/MND for the Project in the City of Kingsburg. The MMRP lists mitigation measures recommended in the IS/MND for the Project and identifies monitoring and reporting requirements.

Table 5-1: Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program presents the mitigation measures identified for the Project. Each mitigation measure is numbered with a symbol indicating the topical section to which it pertains, a hyphen, and the impact number. For example, AIR-2 would be the second mitigation measure identified in the Air Quality analysis of the IS/MND.

The first column of ***Table 5-1: Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting*** Program identifies the mitigation measure. The second column, entitled "When Monitoring is to Occur," identifies the time the mitigation measure should be initiated. The third column, "Frequency of Monitoring," identifies the frequency of the monitoring of the mitigation measure. The fourth column, "Agency Responsible for Monitoring," names the party ultimately responsible for ensuring that the mitigation measure is implemented. The last columns will be used by the Lead and Responsible Agencies to ensure that individual mitigation measures have been complied with and monitored.

Table 5-1: Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program

Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program						
Item	Mitigation Measure	When Monitoring is to Occur	Frequency of Monitoring	Agency Responsible for Monitoring	Method to Verify Compliance	Verification of Compliance
Biological Resources						
BIO-1	Prior to issuing a grading permit, the developer shall conduct a pre-construction biological survey prepared by a qualified biologist, acceptable to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. The survey will be focused on the Fresno Kangaroo Rat, San Joaquin Kit Fox, California Tiger Salamander, Monarch Butterfly, Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp and nesting raptors, and migratory birds. The applicant shall follow any recommendations contained in the survey.	Prior to construction activities	Daily	City of Kingsburg and/or construction contractor	City of Kingsburg with assistance of a qualified biologist	
Cultural Resources						
CUL-1	Should archaeological remains or artifacts be unearthed during any stage of Project activities, work in the area of discovery shall cease until the area is evaluated by a qualified archaeologist. If mitigation is warranted, the Project proponent shall abide by recommendations of the archaeologist.	During construction activities	Daily	City of Kingsburg and/or construction contractor	City of Kingsburg with assistance of a qualified archaeologist	
CUL-2	In the event that any human remains are discovered on the development site, the Fresno County Coroner must be notified of the discovery (California Health and Safety Code, Section 7050.5) and all activities in the immediate area of the find or in any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains must cease until appropriate and lawful measures have been implemented. If the Coroner determines that the remains are not recent, but rather of Native American origin, the Coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in Sacramento within 24 hours to permit the NAHC to determine the Most Likely Descendent of the deceased Native American.	During construction activities	Daily	City of Kingsburg and/or construction contractor	City of Kingsburg with assistance of County Coroner	
Geology and Soils						

Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program						
Item	Mitigation Measure	When Monitoring is to Occur	Frequency of Monitoring	Agency Responsible for Monitoring	Method to Verify Compliance	Verification of Compliance
GEO-1	Should a unique paleontological resource, site, or unique geological feature be unearthed during any stage of Project activities, work in the area of discovery will cease until the area is evaluated by a qualified geologist and/or paleontologist. If discoveries are uncovered, the Project proponent will abide by recommendations of the geologist or paleontologist.	During construction activities	Daily	City of Kingsburg and/or construction contractor	City of Kingsburg with assistance of a qualified geologist and/or paleontologist	

CHAPTER 6 REFERENCES

Association for the Beautification of Highway 99. 2016. *Highway 99 Beautification Master Plan.* Accessed October 16, 2023. https://fresnocog.wpenginepowered.com/wp-content/uploads/publications/99/Master_Plan_2016_Update/Hwy_99_Assoc_MasterPlan_Sept._2016_.pdf.

California Department of Conservation. 2022. *California Important Farmland Finder.* Accessed October 18, 2023. https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/ciff/.

—. 2015. *Fault Activity Map of California.* Accessed October 19, 2023. https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/fam/.

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. 2023. *Fire Hazard Severity Zones in State Responsibility Area.* Accessed October 16, 2023. https://calfire-forestry.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=988d431a42b242b29d89597ab693d008.

—. 2023. *State Responsibility Area (SRA) Viewer.* Accessed October 16, 2023. https://calfire-forestry.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=468717e399fa4238ad86861638765ce1.

California Department of Toxic Substances Control. 2023. *EnviroStor.* Accessed October 18, 2023. https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?global_id=37750009.

California Department of Water Resources. 2023. *Dam Breach Inundation Map Web Publisher.* Accessed October 19, 2023. https://fmds.water.ca.gov/webgis/?appid=dam_prototype_v2.

—. 2023. *GSA Map Viewer.* Accessed October 18, 2023. https://sgma.water.ca.gov/webgis/index.jsp?appid=gasmaster&rz=true.

California Geological Survey. 2022. *CGS Information Warehouse: Mineal Land Classification.* Accessed October 16, 2023. https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/index.html?map=mlc.

City of Kingsburg. 2017. "2015 Urban Water Management Plan."

City of Kingsburg. 2010. "City of Kingsburg Emergency Operations Plan."

—. 1992. *Comprehensive General Plan & Environmental Impact Report for the Swedish Village of Kingsburg.* Accessed October 16, 2023. http://www.cityofkingsburg-ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/1815/City-of-Kingsburg-General-Plan.

—. 2014. *Kingsburg General Plan Land Use Designations.* Accessed October 16, 2023. http://www.cityofkingsburg-ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/185/Kingsburg-Official-General-Plan-Map-PDF.

—. 2018. *Kingsburg Zone Map.* Accessed October 16, 2023. https://www.cityofkingsburg-ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/275/Kingsburg-Official-Zone-Map.

County of Fresno. 2023. *County of Fresno Zoing.* Accessed October 16, 2023. https://gisportal.co.fresno.ca.us/portal/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=b921843d343d4df998b5b3c6a301756a.

County of Fresno. 2000. "General Plan Background Report." Fresno.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. 2023. *FEMA's National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL) Viewer.* Accessed October 18, 2023. https://hazards-fema.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=8b0adb51996444d4879338b5529aa9cd.

San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. 2012. *Air Quality Attainment Plans.* Accessed October 20, 2023. http://valleyair.org/Air_Quality_Plans/air-quality-plans.htm.

San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. 2009. "Guidance for Valley Land-use Agencies in Addressing GHG Emissions Impacts for New Projects under CEQA."

State Water Resources Control Board. 2023. *GeoTracker.* Accessed October 18, 2023. https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=Sacramento.

United States Census Bureau. 2023. *Quickfacts - Kingsburg city, California; Fresno County, California.* Accessed Ocotber 16, 2023. https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/kingsburgcitycalifornia,fresnocountycalifornia/PST045222.

United States Environmental Protection Agency. 2023. *Current Nonattainment Counties for All Criteria Pollutants.* Accessed October 20, 2023. https://www3.epa.gov/airquality/greenbook/ancl.html.

—. 2023. *Map of Sole Source Aquifer Locations.* Accessed October 18, 2023. https://epa.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=9ebb047ba3ec41ada1877155fe31356b.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service. 2023. *National Wetlands Inventory.* Accessed October 20, 2023. https://fwsprimary.wim.usgs.gov/wetlands/apps/wetlands-mapper/.

United States Geological Survey. 2023. *Areas of Land Subsidence in California.* Accessed October 19, 2023. https://ca.water.usgs.gov/land_subsidence/california-subsidence-areas.html.

Appendix A: CalEEMod Output Files

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Annual

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project

Fresno County, Annual

1.0 Project Characteristics

1.1 Land Usage

Land Uses	Size	Metric	Lot Acreage	Floor Surface Area	Population
Government Office Building	18.50	1000sqft	0.42	18,500.00	0
Parking Lot	1.30	Acre	1.30	56,628.00	0
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	0.41	Acre	0.41	17,859.60	0

1.2 Other Project Characteristics

Urbanization	Urban	**Wind Speed (m/s)**	2.2	**Precipitation Freq (Days)**	45
Climate Zone	3			**Operational Year**	2025
Utility Company	Pacific Gas and Electric Company				
CO2 Intensity (lb/MWhr)	203.98	**CH4 Intensity (lb/MWhr)**	0.033	**N2O Intensity (lb/MWhr)**	0.004

1.3 User Entered Comments & Non-Default Data

Project Characteristics -

Land Use -

Construction Phase -

Construction Off-road Equipment Mitigation -

Table Name	Column Name	Default Value	New Value
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	11/27/2025	10/30/2025
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	10/30/2025	10/2/2025
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	12/26/2024	11/28/2024
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	11/13/2025	10/16/2025

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	12/18/2024	11/20/2024
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	11/14/2025	10/17/2025
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	12/27/2024	11/29/2024
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	12/19/2024	11/21/2024
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	10/31/2025	10/3/2025
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	12/14/2024	11/18/2024

2.0 Emissions Summary

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Annual

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

2.1 Overall Construction

Unmitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year	tons/yr										MT/yr					
2024	0.0257	0.2170	0.2150	4.5000e-004	0.0285	8.7200e-003	0.0372	0.0119	8.2500e-003	0.0201	0.0000	38.6517	38.6517	7.3500e-003	5.7000e-004	39.0051
2025	0.3089	1.2978	1.5415	3.1000e-003	0.0398	0.0489	0.0887	0.0108	0.0467	0.0575	0.0000	263.1055	263.1055	0.0408	4.7100e-003	265.5290
Maximum	**0.3089**	**1.2978**	**1.5415**	**3.1000e-003**	**0.0398**	**0.0489**	**0.0887**	**0.0119**	**0.0467**	**0.0575**	**0.0000**	**263.1055**	**263.1055**	**0.0408**	**4.7100e-003**	**265.5290**

Mitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year	tons/yr										MT/yr					
2024	0.0257	0.2170	0.2150	4.5000e-004	0.0141	8.7200e-003	0.0228	5.4300e-003	8.2500e-003	0.0137	0.0000	38.6516	38.6516	7.3500e-003	5.7000e-004	39.0051
2025	0.3089	1.2978	1.5415	3.1000e-003	0.0398	0.0489	0.0887	0.0108	0.0467	0.0575	0.0000	263.1052	263.1052	0.0408	4.7100e-003	265.5288
Maximum	**0.3089**	**1.2978**	**1.5415**	**3.1000e-003**	**0.0398**	**0.0489**	**0.0887**	**0.0108**	**0.0467**	**0.0575**	**0.0000**	**263.1052**	**263.1052**	**0.0408**	**4.7100e-003**	**265.5288**

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Annual

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N20	CO2e
Percent Reduction	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**21.10**	**0.00**	**11.45**	**28.36**	**0.00**	**8.28**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**

Quarter	Start Date	End Date	Maximum Unmitigated ROG + NOX (tons/quarter)	Maximum Mitigated ROG + NOX (tons/quarter)
1	**11-18-2024**	**2-17-2025**	0.4852	0.4852
2	**2-18-2025**	**5-17-2025**	0.4559	0.4559
3	**5-18-2025**	**8-17-2025**	0.4707	0.4707
4	**8-18-2025**	**9-30-2025**	0.2251	0.2251
		Highest	0.4852	0.4852

2.2 Overall Operational

Unmitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Area	0.0915	0.0000	1.9000e-004	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	3.6000e-004	3.6000e-004	0.0000	0.0000	3.8000e-004
Energy	1.2900e-003	0.0117	9.8400e-003	7.0000e-005		8.9000e-004	8.9000e-004		8.9000e-004	8.9000e-004	0.0000	29.7202	29.7202	2.9900e-003	5.7000e-004	29.9637
Mobile	0.1140	0.1594	0.8926	1.9200e-003	0.1919	1.6200e-003	0.1935	0.0513	1.5200e-003	0.0529	0.0000	177.5586	177.5586	0.0114	0.0108	181.0711
Waste						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	3.4935	0.0000	3.4935	0.2065	0.0000	8.6549
Water						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	1.1660	2.5694	3.7354	0.1202	2.8800e-003	7.5974
Total	**0.2068**	**0.1711**	**0.9026**	**1.9900e-003**	**0.1919**	**2.5100e-003**	**0.1944**	**0.0513**	**2.4100e-003**	**0.0538**	**4.6594**	**209.8485**	**214.5080**	**0.3410**	**0.0143**	**227.2875**

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

2.2 Overall Operational

Mitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Area	0.0915	0.0000	1.9000e-004	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	3.6000e-004	3.6000e-004	0.0000	0.0000	3.8000e-004
Energy	1.2900e-003	0.0117	9.8400e-003	7.0000e-005		8.9000e-004	8.9000e-004		8.9000e-004	8.9000e-004	0.0000	29.7202	29.7202	2.9900e-003	5.7000e-004	29.9637
Mobile	0.1140	0.1594	0.8926	1.9200e-003	0.1919	1.6200e-003	0.1935	0.0513	1.5200e-003	0.0529	0.0000	177.5586	177.5586	0.0114	0.0108	181.0711
Waste						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	3.4935	0.0000	3.4935	0.2065	0.0000	8.6549
Water						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	1.1660	2.5694	3.7354	0.1202	2.8800e-003	7.5974
Total	**0.2068**	**0.1711**	**0.9026**	**1.9900e-003**	**0.1919**	**2.5100e-003**	**0.1944**	**0.0513**	**2.4100e-003**	**0.0538**	**4.6594**	**209.8485**	**214.5080**	**0.3410**	**0.0143**	**227.2875**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N20	CO2e
Percent Reduction	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**

3.0 Construction Detail

Construction Phase

Phase Number	Phase Name	Phase Type	Start Date	End Date	Num Days Week	Num Days	Phase Description
1	Site Preparation	Site Preparation	11/18/2024	11/20/2024	5	3	
2	Grading	Grading	11/21/2024	11/28/2024	5	6	
3	Building Construction	Building Construction	11/29/2024	10/2/2025	5	220	

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

4	Paving	Paving	10/3/2025	10/16/2025	5	10	
5	Architectural Coating	Architectural Coating	10/17/2025	10/30/2025	5	10	

Acres of Grading (Site Preparation Phase): 4.5

Acres of Grading (Grading Phase): 6

Acres of Paving: 1.71

Residential Indoor: 0; Residential Outdoor: 0; Non-Residential Indoor: 27,750; Non-Residential Outdoor: 9,250; Striped Parking Area: 4,469 (Architectural Coating – sqft)

OffRoad Equipment

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Type	Amount	Usage Hours	Horse Power	Load Factor
Architectural Coating	Air Compressors	1	6.00	78	0.48
Paving	Cement and Mortar Mixers	1	8.00	9	0.56
Building Construction	Cranes	1	8.00	231	0.29
Building Construction	Forklifts	2	7.00	89	0.20
Building Construction	Generator Sets	1	8.00	84	0.74
Grading	Graders	1	8.00	187	0.41
Site Preparation	Graders	1	8.00	187	0.41
Paving	Pavers	1	8.00	130	0.42
Paving	Paving Equipment	1	8.00	132	0.36
Paving	Rollers	2	8.00	80	0.38
Grading	Rubber Tired Dozers	1	8.00	247	0.40
Site Preparation	Scrapers	1	8.00	367	0.48
Building Construction	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	1	6.00	97	0.37
Grading	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	2	7.00	97	0.37
Paving	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	1	8.00	97	0.37
Site Preparation	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	1	7.00	97	0.37
Building Construction	Welders	3	8.00	46	0.45

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Annual

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

Trips and VMT

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Count	Worker Trip Number	Vendor Trip Number	Hauling Trip Number	Worker Trip Length	Vendor Trip Length	Hauling Trip Length	Worker Vehicle Class	Vendor Vehicle Class	Hauling Vehicle Class
Site Preparation	3	8.00	0.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Grading	4	10.00	0.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Building Construction	8	37.00	15.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Paving	6	15.00	0.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Architectural Coating	1	7.00	0.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT

3.1 Mitigation Measures Construction

Water Exposed Area

3.2 Site Preparation - 2024

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Fugitive Dust					2.3900e-003	0.0000	2.3900e-003	2.6000e-004	0.0000	2.6000e-004	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	1.8600e-003	0.0197	0.0144	4.0000e-005		7.5000e-004	7.5000e-004		6.9000e-004	6.9000e-004	0.0000	3.2300	3.2300	1.0400e-003	0.0000	3.2561
Total	**1.8600e-003**	**0.0197**	**0.0144**	**4.0000e-005**	**2.3900e-003**	**7.5000e-004**	**3.1400e-003**	**2.6000e-004**	**6.9000e-004**	**9.5000e-004**	**0.0000**	**3.2300**	**3.2300**	**1.0400e-003**	**0.0000**	**3.2561**

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Annual

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.2 Site Preparation - 2024

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	3.0000e-005	2.0000e-005	2.6000e-004	0.0000	1.0000e-004	0.0000	1.0000e-004	3.0000e-005	0.0000	3.0000e-005	0.0000	0.0730	0.0730	0.0000	0.0000	0.0736
Total	**3.0000e-005**	**2.0000e-005**	**2.6000e-004**	**0.0000**	**1.0000e-004**	**0.0000**	**1.0000e-004**	**3.0000e-005**	**0.0000**	**3.0000e-005**	**0.0000**	**0.0730**	**0.0730**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0736**

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Fugitive Dust					9.3000e-004	0.0000	9.3000e-004	1.0000e-004	0.0000	1.0000e-004	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	1.8600e-003	0.0197	0.0144	4.0000e-005		7.5000e-004	7.5000e-004		6.9000e-004	6.9000e-004	0.0000	3.2300	3.2300	1.0400e-003	0.0000	3.2561
Total	**1.8600e-003**	**0.0197**	**0.0144**	**4.0000e-005**	**9.3000e-004**	**7.5000e-004**	**1.6800e-003**	**1.0000e-004**	**6.9000e-004**	**7.9000e-004**	**0.0000**	**3.2300**	**3.2300**	**1.0400e-003**	**0.0000**	**3.2561**

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Annual

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.2 Site Preparation - 2024

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	3.0000e-005	2.0000e-005	2.6000e-004	0.0000	1.0000e-004	0.0000	1.0000e-004	3.0000e-005	0.0000	3.0000e-005	0.0000	0.0730	0.0730	0.0000	0.0000	0.0736
Total	**3.0000e-005**	**2.0000e-005**	**2.6000e-004**	**0.0000**	**1.0000e-004**	**0.0000**	**1.0000e-004**	**3.0000e-005**	**0.0000**	**3.0000e-005**	**0.0000**	**0.0730**	**0.0730**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0736**

3.3 Grading - 2024

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Fugitive Dust					0.0213	0.0000	0.0213	0.0103	0.0000	0.0103	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	3.9000e-003	0.0415	0.0261	6.0000e-005		1.7200e-003	1.7200e-003		1.5800e-003	1.5800e-003	0.0000	5.4311	5.4311	1.7600e-003	0.0000	5.4750
Total	**3.9000e-003**	**0.0415**	**0.0261**	**6.0000e-005**	**0.0213**	**1.7200e-003**	**0.0230**	**0.0103**	**1.5800e-003**	**0.0119**	**0.0000**	**5.4311**	**5.4311**	**1.7600e-003**	**0.0000**	**5.4750**

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Annual

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.3 Grading - 2024

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	9.0000e-005	5.0000e-005	6.5000e-004	0.0000	2.4000e-004	0.0000	2.4000e-004	6.0000e-005	0.0000	6.0000e-005	0.0000	0.1824	0.1824	1.0000e-005	1.0000e-005	0.1840
Total	**9.0000e-005**	**5.0000e-005**	**6.5000e-004**	**0.0000**	**2.4000e-004**	**0.0000**	**2.4000e-004**	**6.0000e-005**	**0.0000**	**6.0000e-005**	**0.0000**	**0.1824**	**0.1824**	**1.0000e-005**	**1.0000e-005**	**0.1840**

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Fugitive Dust					8.2900e-003	0.0000	8.2900e-003	4.0100e-003	0.0000	4.0100e-003	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	3.9000e-003	0.0415	0.0261	6.0000e-005		1.7200e-003	1.7200e-003		1.5800e-003	1.5800e-003	0.0000	5.4311	5.4311	1.7600e-003	0.0000	5.4750
Total	**3.9000e-003**	**0.0415**	**0.0261**	**6.0000e-005**	**8.2900e-003**	**1.7200e-003**	**0.0100**	**4.0100e-003**	**1.5800e-003**	**5.5900e-003**	**0.0000**	**5.4311**	**5.4311**	**1.7600e-003**	**0.0000**	**5.4750**

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.3 Grading - 2024

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	9.0000e-005	5.0000e-005	6.5000e-004	0.0000	2.4000e-004	0.0000	2.4000e-004	6.0000e-005	0.0000	6.0000e-005	0.0000	0.1824	0.1824	1.0000e-005	1.0000e-005	0.1840
Total	**9.0000e-005**	**5.0000e-005**	**6.5000e-004**	**0.0000**	**2.4000e-004**	**0.0000**	**2.4000e-004**	**6.0000e-005**	**0.0000**	**6.0000e-005**	**0.0000**	**0.1824**	**0.1824**	**1.0000e-005**	**1.0000e-005**	**0.1840**

3.4 Building Construction - 2024

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Off-Road	0.0184	0.1475	0.1622	2.9000e-004		6.1900e-003	6.1900e-003		5.9300e-003	5.9300e-003	0.0000	23.8871	23.8871	4.4500e-003	0.0000	23.9983
Total	**0.0184**	**0.1475**	**0.1622**	**2.9000e-004**		**6.1900e-003**	**6.1900e-003**		**5.9300e-003**	**5.9300e-003**	**0.0000**	**23.8871**	**23.8871**	**4.4500e-003**	**0.0000**	**23.9983**

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.4 Building Construction - 2024

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	1.8000e-004	7.5800e-003	2.2200e-003	3.0000e-005	1.1400e-003	5.0000e-005	1.1900e-003	3.3000e-004	5.0000e-005	3.8000e-004	0.0000	3.2610	3.2610	2.0000e-005	4.9000e-004	3.4077
Worker	1.2200e-003	7.5000e-004	9.2500e-003	3.0000e-005	3.4000e-003	2.0000e-005	3.4200e-003	9.0000e-004	1.0000e-005	9.2000e-004	0.0000	2.5871	2.5871	7.0000e-005	7.0000e-005	2.6103
Total	**1.4000e-003**	**8.3300e-003**	**0.0115**	**6.0000e-005**	**4.5400e-003**	**7.0000e-005**	**4.6100e-003**	**1.2300e-003**	**6.0000e-005**	**1.3000e-003**	**0.0000**	**5.8481**	**5.8481**	**9.0000e-005**	**5.6000e-004**	**6.0180**

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Off-Road	0.0184	0.1475	0.1622	2.9000e-004		6.1900e-003	6.1900e-003		5.9300e-003	5.9300e-003	0.0000	23.8871	23.8871	4.4500e-003	0.0000	23.9983
Total	**0.0184**	**0.1475**	**0.1622**	**2.9000e-004**		**6.1900e-003**	**6.1900e-003**		**5.9300e-003**	**5.9300e-003**	**0.0000**	**23.8871**	**23.8871**	**4.4500e-003**	**0.0000**	**23.9983**

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Annual

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.4 Building Construction - 2024

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	1.8000e-004	7.5800e-003	2.2200e-003	3.0000e-005	1.1400e-003	5.0000e-005	1.1900e-003	3.3000e-004	5.0000e-005	3.8000e-004	0.0000	3.2610	3.2610	2.0000e-005	4.9000e-004	3.4077
Worker	1.2200e-003	7.5000e-004	9.2500e-003	3.0000e-005	3.4000e-003	2.0000e-005	3.4200e-003	9.0000e-004	1.0000e-005	9.2000e-004	0.0000	2.5871	2.5871	7.0000e-005	7.0000e-005	2.6103
Total	**1.4000e-003**	**8.3300e-003**	**0.0115**	**6.0000e-005**	**4.5400e-003**	**7.0000e-005**	**4.6100e-003**	**1.2300e-003**	**6.0000e-005**	**1.3000e-003**	**0.0000**	**5.8481**	**5.8481**	**9.0000e-005**	**5.6000e-004**	**6.0180**

3.4 Building Construction - 2025

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Off-Road	0.1467	1.1843	1.3797	2.4700e-003		0.0463	0.0463		0.0443	0.0443	0.0000	204.6193	204.6193	0.0375	0.0000	205.5574
Total	**0.1467**	**1.1843**	**1.3797**	**2.4700e-003**		**0.0463**	**0.0463**		**0.0443**	**0.0443**	**0.0000**	**204.6193**	**204.6193**	**0.0375**	**0.0000**	**205.5574**

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Annual

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.4 Building Construction - 2025

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	1.5100e-003	0.0647	0.0186	2.9000e-004	9.8000e-003	4.2000e-004	0.0102	2.8300e-003	4.0000e-004	3.2300e-003	0.0000	27.3943	27.3943	1.4000e-004	4.1200e-003	28.6263
Worker	9.6900e-003	5.7300e-003	0.0735	2.3000e-004	0.0291	1.3000e-004	0.0293	7.7400e-003	1.2000e-004	7.8600e-003	0.0000	21.4126	21.4126	5.7000e-004	5.7000e-004	21.5972
Total	**0.0112**	**0.0704**	**0.0922**	**5.2000e-004**	**0.0389**	**5.5000e-004**	**0.0395**	**0.0106**	**5.2000e-004**	**0.0111**	**0.0000**	**48.8069**	**48.8069**	**7.1000e-004**	**4.6900e-003**	**50.2235**

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Off-Road	0.1467	1.1843	1.3797	2.4700e-003		0.0463	0.0463		0.0443	0.0443	0.0000	204.6190	204.6190	0.0375	0.0000	205.5572
Total	**0.1467**	**1.1843**	**1.3797**	**2.4700e-003**		**0.0463**	**0.0463**		**0.0443**	**0.0443**	**0.0000**	**204.6190**	**204.6190**	**0.0375**	**0.0000**	**205.5572**

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.4 Building Construction - 2025

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	1.5100e-003	0.0647	0.0186	2.9000e-004	9.8000e-003	4.2000e-004	0.0102	2.8300e-003	4.0000e-004	3.2300e-003	0.0000	27.3943	27.3943	1.4000e-004	4.1200e-003	28.6263
Worker	9.6900e-003	5.7300e-003	0.0735	2.3000e-004	0.0291	1.3000e-004	0.0293	7.7400e-003	1.2000e-004	7.8600e-003	0.0000	21.4126	21.4126	5.7000e-004	5.7000e-004	21.5972
Total	**0.0112**	**0.0704**	**0.0922**	**5.2000e-004**	**0.0389**	**5.5000e-004**	**0.0395**	**0.0106**	**5.2000e-004**	**0.0111**	**0.0000**	**48.8069**	**48.8069**	**7.1000e-004**	**4.6900e-003**	**50.2235**

3.5 Paving - 2025

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Off-Road	3.9300e-003	0.0372	0.0584	9.0000e-005		1.7500e-003	1.7500e-003		1.6200e-003	1.6200e-003	0.0000	7.7565	7.7565	2.4600e-003	0.0000	7.8179
Paving	1.7000e-003					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total	**5.6300e-003**	**0.0372**	**0.0584**	**9.0000e-005**		**1.7500e-003**	**1.7500e-003**		**1.6200e-003**	**1.6200e-003**	**0.0000**	**7.7565**	**7.7565**	**2.4600e-003**	**0.0000**	**7.8179**

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Annual

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.5 Paving - 2025

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	2.0000e-004	1.2000e-004	1.5100e-003	0.0000	6.0000e-004	0.0000	6.0000e-004	1.6000e-004	0.0000	1.6000e-004	0.0000	0.4407	0.4407	1.0000e-005	1.0000e-005	0.4445
Total	**2.0000e-004**	**1.2000e-004**	**1.5100e-003**	**0.0000**	**6.0000e-004**	**0.0000**	**6.0000e-004**	**1.6000e-004**	**0.0000**	**1.6000e-004**	**0.0000**	**0.4407**	**0.4407**	**1.0000e-005**	**1.0000e-005**	**0.4445**

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Off-Road	3.9300e-003	0.0372	0.0584	9.0000e-005		1.7500e-003	1.7500e-003		1.6200e-003	1.6200e-003	0.0000	7.7565	7.7565	2.4600e-003	0.0000	7.8179
Paving	1.7000e-003					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total	**5.6300e-003**	**0.0372**	**0.0584**	**9.0000e-005**		**1.7500e-003**	**1.7500e-003**		**1.6200e-003**	**1.6200e-003**	**0.0000**	**7.7565**	**7.7565**	**2.4600e-003**	**0.0000**	**7.8179**

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.5 Paving - 2025

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	2.0000e-004	1.2000e-004	1.5100e-003	0.0000	6.0000e-004	0.0000	6.0000e-004	1.6000e-004	0.0000	1.6000e-004	0.0000	0.4407	0.4407	1.0000e-005	1.0000e-005	0.4445
Total	**2.0000e-004**	**1.2000e-004**	**1.5100e-003**	**0.0000**	**6.0000e-004**	**0.0000**	**6.0000e-004**	**1.6000e-004**	**0.0000**	**1.6000e-004**	**0.0000**	**0.4407**	**0.4407**	**1.0000e-005**	**1.0000e-005**	**0.4445**

3.6 Architectural Coating - 2025

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Archit. Coating	0.1442					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	8.5000e-004	5.7300e-003	9.0500e-003	1.0000e-005		2.6000e-004	2.6000e-004		2.6000e-004	2.6000e-004	0.0000	1.2766	1.2766	7.0000e-005	0.0000	1.2784
Total	**0.1450**	**5.7300e-003**	**9.0500e-003**	**1.0000e-005**		**2.6000e-004**	**2.6000e-004**		**2.6000e-004**	**2.6000e-004**	**0.0000**	**1.2766**	**1.2766**	**7.0000e-005**	**0.0000**	**1.2784**

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.6 Architectural Coating - 2025

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	9.0000e-005	6.0000e-005	7.1000e-004	0.0000	2.8000e-004	0.0000	2.8000e-004	7.0000e-005	0.0000	8.0000e-005	0.0000	0.2056	0.2056	1.0000e-005	1.0000e-005	0.2074
Total	**9.0000e-005**	**6.0000e-005**	**7.1000e-004**	**0.0000**	**2.8000e-004**	**0.0000**	**2.8000e-004**	**7.0000e-005**	**0.0000**	**8.0000e-005**	**0.0000**	**0.2056**	**0.2056**	**1.0000e-005**	**1.0000e-005**	**0.2074**

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Archit. Coating	0.1442					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	8.5000e-004	5.7300e-003	9.0500e-003	1.0000e-005		2.6000e-004	2.6000e-004		2.6000e-004	2.6000e-004	0.0000	1.2766	1.2766	7.0000e-005	0.0000	1.2784
Total	**0.1450**	**5.7300e-003**	**9.0500e-003**	**1.0000e-005**		**2.6000e-004**	**2.6000e-004**		**2.6000e-004**	**2.6000e-004**	**0.0000**	**1.2766**	**1.2766**	**7.0000e-005**	**0.0000**	**1.2784**

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.6 Architectural Coating - 2025

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	9.0000e-005	6.0000e-005	7.1000e-004	0.0000	2.8000e-004	0.0000	2.8000e-004	7.0000e-005	0.0000	8.0000e-005	0.0000	0.2056	0.2056	1.0000e-005	1.0000e-005	0.2074
Total	**9.0000e-005**	**6.0000e-005**	**7.1000e-004**	**0.0000**	**2.8000e-004**	**0.0000**	**2.8000e-004**	**7.0000e-005**	**0.0000**	**8.0000e-005**	**0.0000**	**0.2056**	**0.2056**	**1.0000e-005**	**1.0000e-005**	**0.2074**

4.0 Operational Detail - Mobile

4.1 Mitigation Measures Mobile

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Annual

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Mitigated	0.1140	0.1594	0.8926	1.9200e-003	0.1919	1.6200e-003	0.1935	0.0513	1.5200e-003	0.0529	0.0000	177.5586	177.5586	0.0114	0.0108	181.0711
Unmitigated	0.1140	0.1594	0.8926	1.9200e-003	0.1919	1.6200e-003	0.1935	0.0513	1.5200e-003	0.0529	0.0000	177.5586	177.5586	0.0114	0.0108	181.0711

4.2 Trip Summary Information

	Average Daily Trip Rate			Unmitigated	Mitigated
Land Use	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Annual VMT	Annual VMT
Government Office Building	417.92	0.00	0.00	511,910	511,910
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Parking Lot	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Total	417.92	0.00	0.00	511,910	511,910

4.3 Trip Type Information

	Miles			Trip %			Trip Purpose %		
Land Use	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	Primary	Diverted	Pass-by
Government Office Building	9.50	7.30	7.30	33.00	62.00	5.00	50	34	16
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	9.50	7.30	7.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0
Parking Lot	9.50	7.30	7.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0

4.4 Fleet Mix

Land Use	LDA	LDT1	LDT2	MDV	LHD1	LHD2	MHD	HHD	OBUS	UBUS	MCY	SBUS	MH
Government Office Building	0.521458	0.053308	0.175656	0.151963	0.025001	0.006656	0.014407	0.022718	0.000702	0.000287	0.023515	0.001463	0.002865
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	0.521458	0.053308	0.175656	0.151963	0.025001	0.006656	0.014407	0.022718	0.000702	0.000287	0.023515	0.001463	0.002865

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

Parking Lot	0.521458	0.053308	0.175656	0.151963	0.025001	0.006656	0.014407	0.022718	0.000702	0.000287	0.023515	0.001463	0.002865

5.0 Energy Detail

Historical Energy Use: N

5.1 Mitigation Measures Energy

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Electricity Mitigated						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	16.9651	16.9651	2.7400e-003	3.3000e-004	17.1329
Electricity Unmitigated						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	16.9651	16.9651	2.7400e-003	3.3000e-004	17.1329
NaturalGas Mitigated	1.2900e-003	0.0117	9.8400e-003	7.0000e-005		8.9000e-004	8.9000e-004		8.9000e-004	8.9000e-004	0.0000	12.7550	12.7550	2.4000e-004	2.3000e-004	12.8308
NaturalGas Unmitigated	1.2900e-003	0.0117	9.8400e-003	7.0000e-005		8.9000e-004	8.9000e-004		8.9000e-004	8.9000e-004	0.0000	12.7550	12.7550	2.4000e-004	2.3000e-004	12.8308

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Annual

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

5.2 Energy by Land Use - NaturalGas

Unmitigated

	NaturalGas Use	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kBTU/yr	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Government Office Building	239020	1.2900e-003	0.0117	9.8400e-003	7.0000e-005		8.9000e-004	8.9000e-004		8.9000e-004	8.9000e-004	0.0000	12.7550	12.7550	2.4000e-004	2.3000e-004	12.8308
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Parking Lot	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total		**1.2900e-003**	**0.0117**	**9.8400e-003**	**7.0000e-005**		**8.9000e-004**	**8.9000e-004**		**8.9000e-004**	**8.9000e-004**	**0.0000**	**12.7550**	**12.7550**	**2.4000e-004**	**2.3000e-004**	**12.8308**

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Annual

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

5.2 Energy by Land Use - NaturalGas

Mitigated

	NaturalGas Use	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kBTU/yr	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Government Office Building	239020	1.2900e-003	0.0117	9.8400e-003	7.0000e-005		8.9000e-004	8.9000e-004		8.9000e-004	8.9000e-004	0.0000	12.7550	12.7550	2.4000e-004	2.3000e-004	12.8308
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Parking Lot	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total		**1.2900e-003**	**0.0117**	**9.8400e-003**	**7.0000e-005**		**8.9000e-004**	**8.9000e-004**		**8.9000e-004**	**8.9000e-004**	**0.0000**	**12.7550**	**12.7550**	**2.4000e-004**	**2.3000e-004**	**12.8308**

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

5.3 Energy by Land Use - Electricity

Unmitigated

	Electricity Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kWh/yr	MT/yr			
Government Office Building	163540	15.1313	2.4500e-003	3.0000e-004	15.2810
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Parking Lot	19819.8	1.8338	3.0000e-004	4.0000e-005	1.8519
Total		**16.9651**	**2.7500e-003**	**3.4000e-004**	**17.1329**

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

5.3 Energy by Land Use - Electricity

Mitigated

	Electricity Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kWh/yr	MT/yr			
Government Office Building	163540	15.1313	2.4500e-003	3.0000e-004	15.2810
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Parking Lot	19819.8	1.8338	3.0000e-004	4.0000e-005	1.8519
Total		**16.9651**	**2.7500e-003**	**3.4000e-004**	**17.1329**

6.0 Area Detail

6.1 Mitigation Measures Area

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Annual

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Mitigated	0.0915	0.0000	1.9000e-004	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	3.6000e-004	3.6000e-004	0.0000	0.0000	3.8000e-004
Unmitigated	0.0915	0.0000	1.9000e-004	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	3.6000e-004	3.6000e-004	0.0000	0.0000	3.8000e-004

6.2 Area by SubCategory

Unmitigated

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Architectural Coating	0.0144					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Consumer Products	0.0771					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Landscaping	2.0000e-005	0.0000	1.9000e-004	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	3.6000e-004	3.6000e-004	0.0000	0.0000	3.8000e-004
Total	**0.0915**	**0.0000**	**1.9000e-004**	**0.0000**		**0.0000**	**0.0000**		**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**3.6000e-004**	**3.6000e-004**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**3.8000e-004**

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

6.2 Area by SubCategory

Mitigated

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Architectural Coating	0.0144					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Consumer Products	0.0771					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Landscaping	2.0000e-005	0.0000	1.9000e-004	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	3.6000e-004	3.6000e-004	0.0000	0.0000	3.8000e-004
Total	**0.0915**	**0.0000**	**1.9000e-004**	**0.0000**		**0.0000**	**0.0000**		**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**3.6000e-004**	**3.6000e-004**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**3.8000e-004**

7.0 Water Detail

7.1 Mitigation Measures Water

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	MT/yr			
Mitigated	3.7354	0.1202	2.8800e-003	7.5974
Unmitigated	3.7354	0.1202	2.8800e-003	7.5974

7.2 Water by Land Use

Unmitigated

	Indoor/Outdoor Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	Mgal	MT/yr			
Government Office Building	3.6752 / 2.25254	3.7354	0.1202	2.8800e-003	7.5974
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	0 / 0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Parking Lot	0 / 0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total		**3.7354**	**0.1202**	**2.8800e-003**	**7.5974**

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

7.2 Water by Land Use

Mitigated

	Indoor/Outdoor Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	Mgal	MT/yr			
Government Office Building	3.6752 / 2.25254	3.7354	0.1202	2.8800e-003	7.5974
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	0 / 0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Parking Lot	0 / 0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total		**3.7354**	**0.1202**	**2.8800e-003**	**7.5974**

8.0 Waste Detail

8.1 Mitigation Measures Waste

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

Category/Year

	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
	MT/yr			
Mitigated	3.4935	0.2065	0.0000	8.6549
Unmitigated	3.4935	0.2065	0.0000	8.6549

8.2 Waste by Land Use

Unmitigated

	Waste Disposed	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	tons	MT/yr			
Government Office Building	17.21	3.4935	0.2065	0.0000	8.6549
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Parking Lot	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total		**3.4935**	**0.2065**	**0.0000**	**8.6549**

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

8.2 Waste by Land Use

Mitigated

	Waste Disposed	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	tons	MT/yr			
Government Office Building	17.21	3.4935	0.2065	0.0000	8.6549
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Parking Lot	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total		**3.4935**	**0.2065**	**0.0000**	**8.6549**

9.0 Operational Offroad

Equipment Type	Number	Hours/Day	Days/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type

10.0 Stationary Equipment

Fire Pumps and Emergency Generators

Equipment Type	Number	Hours/Day	Hours/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type

Boilers

Equipment Type	Number	Heat Input/Day	Heat Input/Year	Boiler Rating	Fuel Type

User Defined Equipment

Equipment Type	Number

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

11.0 Vegetation

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project

Fresno County, Summer

1.0 Project Characteristics

1.1 Land Usage

Land Uses	Size	Metric	Lot Acreage	Floor Surface Area	Population
Government Office Building	18.50	1000sqft	0.42	18,500.00	0
Parking Lot	1.30	Acre	1.30	56,628.00	0
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	0.41	Acre	0.41	17,859.60	0

1.2 Other Project Characteristics

Urbanization	Urban	**Wind Speed (m/s)**	2.2	**Precipitation Freq (Days)**	45
Climate Zone	3			**Operational Year**	2025
Utility Company	Pacific Gas and Electric Company				
CO2 Intensity (lb/MWhr)	203.98	**CH4 Intensity (lb/MWhr)**	0.033	**N2O Intensity (lb/MWhr)**	0.004

1.3 User Entered Comments & Non-Default Data

Project Characteristics -

Land Use -

Construction Phase -

Construction Off-road Equipment Mitigation -

Table Name	Column Name	Default Value	New Value
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	11/27/2025	10/30/2025
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	10/30/2025	10/2/2025
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	12/26/2024	11/28/2024
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	11/13/2025	10/16/2025

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	12/18/2024	11/20/2024
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	11/14/2025	10/17/2025
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	12/27/2024	11/29/2024
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	12/19/2024	11/21/2024
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	10/31/2025	10/3/2025
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	12/14/2024	11/18/2024

2.0 Emissions Summary

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

2.1 Overall Construction (Maximum Daily Emission)

Unmitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year	lb/day										lb/day					
2024	1.7355	13.8343	15.2163	0.0307	7.1647	0.5726	7.7373	3.4465	0.5268	3.9733	0.0000	2,871.5698	2,871.5698	0.7691	0.0536	2,898.4045
2025	29.0236	12.7058	15.0512	0.0305	0.4056	0.4755	0.8811	0.1099	0.4551	0.5650	0.0000	2,856.6559	2,856.6559	0.5444	0.0522	2,882.9025
Maximum	**29.0236**	**13.8343**	**15.2163**	**0.0307**	**7.1647**	**0.5726**	**7.7373**	**3.4465**	**0.5268**	**3.9733**	**0.0000**	**2,871.5698**	**2,871.5698**	**0.7691**	**0.0536**	**2,898.4045**

Mitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year	lb/day										lb/day					
2024	1.7355	13.8343	15.2163	0.0307	2.8444	0.5726	3.4170	1.3574	0.5268	1.8842	0.0000	2,871.5698	2,871.5698	0.7691	0.0536	2,898.4045
2025	29.0236	12.7058	15.0512	0.0305	0.4056	0.4755	0.8811	0.1099	0.4551	0.5650	0.0000	2,856.6559	2,856.6559	0.5444	0.0522	2,882.9025
Maximum	**29.0236**	**13.8343**	**15.2163**	**0.0307**	**2.8444**	**0.5726**	**3.4170**	**1.3574**	**0.5268**	**1.8842**	**0.0000**	**2,871.5698**	**2,871.5698**	**0.7691**	**0.0536**	**2,898.4045**

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N20	CO2e
Percent Reduction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	57.07	0.00	50.13	58.74	0.00	46.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

2.2 Overall Operational

Unmitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Area	0.5015	2.0000e-005	2.0600e-003	0.0000		1.0000e-005	1.0000e-005		1.0000e-005	1.0000e-005		4.4200e-003	4.4200e-003	1.0000e-005		4.7100e-003
Energy	7.0600e-003	0.0642	0.0539	3.9000e-004		4.8800e-003	4.8800e-003		4.8800e-003	4.8800e-003		77.0411	77.0411	1.4800e-003	1.4100e-003	77.4989
Mobile	1.0965	1.1568	7.1602	0.0157	1.5164	0.0125	1.5288	0.4048	0.0117	0.4165		1,598.5457	1,598.5457	0.0901	0.0894	1,627.4515
Total	**1.6050**	**1.2210**	**7.2162**	**0.0161**	**1.5164**	**0.0174**	**1.5337**	**0.4048**	**0.0166**	**0.4214**		**1,675.5912**	**1,675.5912**	**0.0916**	**0.0909**	**1,704.9551**

Mitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Area	0.5015	2.0000e-005	2.0600e-003	0.0000		1.0000e-005	1.0000e-005		1.0000e-005	1.0000e-005		4.4200e-003	4.4200e-003	1.0000e-005		4.7100e-003
Energy	7.0600e-003	0.0642	0.0539	3.9000e-004		4.8800e-003	4.8800e-003		4.8800e-003	4.8800e-003		77.0411	77.0411	1.4800e-003	1.4100e-003	77.4989
Mobile	1.0965	1.1568	7.1602	0.0157	1.5164	0.0125	1.5288	0.4048	0.0117	0.4165		1,598.5457	1,598.5457	0.0901	0.0894	1,627.4515
Total	**1.6050**	**1.2210**	**7.2162**	**0.0161**	**1.5164**	**0.0174**	**1.5337**	**0.4048**	**0.0166**	**0.4214**		**1,675.5912**	**1,675.5912**	**0.0916**	**0.0909**	**1,704.9551**

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N20	CO2e
Percent Reduction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

3.0 Construction Detail

Construction Phase

Phase Number	Phase Name	Phase Type	Start Date	End Date	Num Days Week	Num Days	Phase Description
1	Site Preparation	Site Preparation	11/18/2024	11/20/2024	5	3	
2	Grading	Grading	11/21/2024	11/28/2024	5	6	
3	Building Construction	Building Construction	11/29/2024	10/2/2025	5	220	
4	Paving	Paving	10/3/2025	10/16/2025	5	10	
5	Architectural Coating	Architectural Coating	10/17/2025	10/30/2025	5	10	

Acres of Grading (Site Preparation Phase): 4.5

Acres of Grading (Grading Phase): 6

Acres of Paving: 1.71

Residential Indoor: 0; Residential Outdoor: 0; Non-Residential Indoor: 27,750; Non-Residential Outdoor: 9,250; Striped Parking Area: 4,469 (Architectural Coating – sqft)

OffRoad Equipment

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Type	Amount	Usage Hours	Horse Power	Load Factor
Architectural Coating	Air Compressors	1	6.00	78	0.48
Paving	Cement and Mortar Mixers	1	8.00	9	0.56
Building Construction	Cranes	1	8.00	231	0.29
Building Construction	Forklifts	2	7.00	89	0.20
Building Construction	Generator Sets	1	8.00	84	0.74
Grading	Graders	1	8.00	187	0.41

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

Site Preparation	Graders	1	8.00	187	0.41
Paving	Pavers	1	8.00	130	0.42
Paving	Paving Equipment	1	8.00	132	0.36
Paving	Rollers	2	8.00	80	0.38
Grading	Rubber Tired Dozers	1	8.00	247	0.40
Site Preparation	Scrapers	1	8.00	367	0.48
Building Construction	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	1	6.00	97	0.37
Grading	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	2	7.00	97	0.37
Paving	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	1	8.00	97	0.37
Site Preparation	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	1	7.00	97	0.37
Building Construction	Welders	3	8.00	46	0.45

Trips and VMT

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Count	Worker Trip Number	Vendor Trip Number	Hauling Trip Number	Worker Trip Length	Vendor Trip Length	Hauling Trip Length	Worker Vehicle Class	Vendor Vehicle Class	Hauling Vehicle Class
Site Preparation	3	8.00	0.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Grading	4	10.00	0.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Building Construction	8	37.00	15.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Paving	6	15.00	0.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Architectural Coating	1	7.00	0.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT

3.1 Mitigation Measures Construction

Water Exposed Area

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.2 Site Preparation - 2024

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Fugitive Dust					1.5908	0.0000	1.5908	0.1718	0.0000	0.1718			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	1.2406	13.1186	9.5796	0.0245		0.4971	0.4971		0.4573	0.4573		2,373.6514	2,373.6514	0.7677		2,392.8435
Total	**1.2406**	**13.1186**	**9.5796**	**0.0245**	**1.5908**	**0.4971**	**2.0878**	**0.1718**	**0.4573**	**0.6291**		**2,373.6514**	**2,373.6514**	**0.7677**		**2,392.8435**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0264	0.0132	0.2003	5.8000e-004	0.0657	2.9000e-004	0.0660	0.0174	2.7000e-004	0.0177		58.2900	58.2900	1.4500e-003	1.4200e-003	58.7501
Total	**0.0264**	**0.0132**	**0.2003**	**5.8000e-004**	**0.0657**	**2.9000e-004**	**0.0660**	**0.0174**	**2.7000e-004**	**0.0177**		**58.2900**	**58.2900**	**1.4500e-003**	**1.4200e-003**	**58.7501**

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.2 Site Preparation - 2024

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Fugitive Dust					0.6204	0.0000	0.6204	0.0670	0.0000	0.0670			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	1.2406	13.1186	9.5796	0.0245		0.4971	0.4971		0.4573	0.4573	0.0000	2,373.6514	2,373.6514	0.7677		2,392.8435
Total	**1.2406**	**13.1186**	**9.5796**	**0.0245**	**0.6204**	**0.4971**	**1.1175**	**0.0670**	**0.4573**	**0.5243**	**0.0000**	**2,373.6514**	**2,373.6514**	**0.7677**		**2,392.8435**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0264	0.0132	0.2003	5.8000e-004	0.0657	2.9000e-004	0.0660	0.0174	2.7000e-004	0.0177		58.2900	58.2900	1.4500e-003	1.4200e-003	58.7501
Total	**0.0264**	**0.0132**	**0.2003**	**5.8000e-004**	**0.0657**	**2.9000e-004**	**0.0660**	**0.0174**	**2.7000e-004**	**0.0177**		**58.2900**	**58.2900**	**1.4500e-003**	**1.4200e-003**	**58.7501**

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.3 Grading - 2024

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Fugitive Dust					7.0826	0.0000	7.0826	3.4247	0.0000	3.4247			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	1.3015	13.8178	8.6998	0.0206		0.5722	0.5722		0.5265	0.5265		1,995.5803	1,995.5803	0.6454		2,011.7155
Total	**1.3015**	**13.8178**	**8.6998**	**0.0206**	**7.0826**	**0.5722**	**7.6548**	**3.4247**	**0.5265**	**3.9512**		**1,995.5803**	**1,995.5803**	**0.6454**		**2,011.7155**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0330	0.0165	0.2503	7.2000e-004	0.0822	3.6000e-004	0.0825	0.0218	3.4000e-004	0.0221		72.8625	72.8625	1.8100e-003	1.7800e-003	73.4377
Total	**0.0330**	**0.0165**	**0.2503**	**7.2000e-004**	**0.0822**	**3.6000e-004**	**0.0825**	**0.0218**	**3.4000e-004**	**0.0221**		**72.8625**	**72.8625**	**1.8100e-003**	**1.7800e-003**	**73.4377**

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.3 Grading - 2024

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Fugitive Dust					2.7622	0.0000	2.7622	1.3357	0.0000	1.3357			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	1.3015	13.8178	8.6998	0.0206		0.5722	0.5722		0.5265	0.5265	0.0000	1,995.5803	1,995.5803	0.6454		2,011.7155
Total	**1.3015**	**13.8178**	**8.6998**	**0.0206**	**2.7622**	**0.5722**	**3.3345**	**1.3357**	**0.5265**	**1.8621**	**0.0000**	**1,995.5803**	**1,995.5803**	**0.6454**		**2,011.7155**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0330	0.0165	0.2503	7.2000e-004	0.0822	3.6000e-004	0.0825	0.0218	3.4000e-004	0.0221		72.8625	72.8625	1.8100e-003	1.7800e-003	73.4377
Total	**0.0330**	**0.0165**	**0.2503**	**7.2000e-004**	**0.0822**	**3.6000e-004**	**0.0825**	**0.0218**	**3.4000e-004**	**0.0221**		**72.8625**	**72.8625**	**1.8100e-003**	**1.7800e-003**	**73.4377**

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.4 Building Construction - 2024

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Off-Road	1.5971	12.8235	14.1002	0.0250		0.5381	0.5381		0.5153	0.5153		2,289.6541	2,289.6541	0.4265		2,300.3154
Total	**1.5971**	**12.8235**	**14.1002**	**0.0250**		**0.5381**	**0.5381**		**0.5153**	**0.5153**		**2,289.6541**	**2,289.6541**	**0.4265**		**2,300.3154**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0162	0.6306	0.1900	2.9500e-003	0.1017	4.2500e-003	0.1059	0.0293	4.0700e-003	0.0334		312.3245	312.3245	1.6500e-003	0.0470	326.3698
Worker	0.1222	0.0611	0.9262	2.6700e-003	0.3040	1.3500e-003	0.3053	0.0806	1.2400e-003	0.0819		269.5912	269.5912	6.6900e-003	6.5800e-003	271.7193
Total	**0.1384**	**0.6917**	**1.1162**	**5.6200e-003**	**0.4056**	**5.6000e-003**	**0.4112**	**0.1099**	**5.3100e-003**	**0.1152**		**581.9157**	**581.9157**	**8.3400e-003**	**0.0536**	**598.0891**

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.4 Building Construction - 2024

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Off-Road	1.5971	12.8235	14.1002	0.0250		0.5381	0.5381		0.5153	0.5153	0.0000	2,289.6541	2,289.6541	0.4265		2,300.3154
Total	**1.5971**	**12.8235**	**14.1002**	**0.0250**		**0.5381**	**0.5381**		**0.5153**	**0.5153**	**0.0000**	**2,289.6541**	**2,289.6541**	**0.4265**		**2,300.3154**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0162	0.6306	0.1900	2.9500e-003	0.1017	4.2500e-003	0.1059	0.0293	4.0700e-003	0.0334		312.3245	312.3245	1.6500e-003	0.0470	326.3698
Worker	0.1222	0.0611	0.9262	2.6700e-003	0.3040	1.3500e-003	0.3053	0.0806	1.2400e-003	0.0819		269.5912	269.5912	6.6900e-003	6.5800e-003	271.7193
Total	**0.1384**	**0.6917**	**1.1162**	**5.6200e-003**	**0.4056**	**5.6000e-003**	**0.4112**	**0.1099**	**5.3100e-003**	**0.1152**		**581.9157**	**581.9157**	**8.3400e-003**	**0.0536**	**598.0891**

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.4 Building Construction - 2025

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Off-Road	1.4897	12.0233	14.0072	0.0250		0.4700	0.4700		0.4498	0.4498		2,289.8898	2,289.8898	0.4200		2,300.3887
Total	**1.4897**	**12.0233**	**14.0072**	**0.0250**		**0.4700**	**0.4700**		**0.4498**	**0.4498**		**2,289.8898**	**2,289.8898**	**0.4200**		**2,300.3887**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0158	0.6281	0.1861	2.9000e-003	0.1017	4.2500e-003	0.1059	0.0293	4.0600e-003	0.0333		306.3193	306.3193	1.5600e-003	0.0461	320.0910
Worker	0.1134	0.0544	0.8579	2.5800e-003	0.3040	1.2800e-003	0.3052	0.0806	1.1800e-003	0.0818		260.4468	260.4468	6.0200e-003	6.1300e-003	262.4228
Total	**0.1292**	**0.6825**	**1.0440**	**5.4800e-003**	**0.4056**	**5.5300e-003**	**0.4112**	**0.1099**	**5.2400e-003**	**0.1151**		**566.7661**	**566.7661**	**7.5800e-003**	**0.0522**	**582.5139**

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.4 Building Construction - 2025

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Off-Road	1.4897	12.0233	14.0072	0.0250		0.4700	0.4700		0.4498	0.4498	0.0000	2,289.8898	2,289.8898	0.4200		2,300.3887
Total	**1.4897**	**12.0233**	**14.0072**	**0.0250**		**0.4700**	**0.4700**		**0.4498**	**0.4498**	**0.0000**	**2,289.8898**	**2,289.8898**	**0.4200**		**2,300.3887**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0158	0.6281	0.1861	2.9000e-003	0.1017	4.2500e-003	0.1059	0.0293	4.0600e-003	0.0333		306.3193	306.3193	1.5600e-003	0.0461	320.0910
Worker	0.1134	0.0544	0.8579	2.5800e-003	0.3040	1.2800e-003	0.3052	0.0806	1.1800e-003	0.0818		260.4468	260.4468	6.0200e-003	6.1300e-003	262.4228
Total	**0.1292**	**0.6825**	**1.0440**	**5.4800e-003**	**0.4056**	**5.5300e-003**	**0.4112**	**0.1099**	**5.2400e-003**	**0.1151**		**566.7661**	**566.7661**	**7.5800e-003**	**0.0522**	**582.5139**

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.5 Paving - 2025

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Off-Road	0.7854	7.4371	11.6737	0.0179		0.3503	0.3503		0.3234	0.3234		1,710.0067	1,710.0067	0.5420		1,723.5556
Paving	0.3406					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Total	**1.1260**	**7.4371**	**11.6737**	**0.0179**		**0.3503**	**0.3503**		**0.3234**	**0.3234**		**1,710.0067**	**1,710.0067**	**0.5420**		**1,723.5556**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0460	0.0220	0.3478	1.0400e-003	0.1232	5.2000e-004	0.1237	0.0327	4.8000e-004	0.0332		105.5866	105.5866	2.4400e-003	2.4800e-003	106.3876
Total	**0.0460**	**0.0220**	**0.3478**	**1.0400e-003**	**0.1232**	**5.2000e-004**	**0.1237**	**0.0327**	**4.8000e-004**	**0.0332**		**105.5866**	**105.5866**	**2.4400e-003**	**2.4800e-003**	**106.3876**

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.5 Paving - 2025

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Off-Road	0.7854	7.4371	11.6737	0.0179		0.3503	0.3503		0.3234	0.3234	0.0000	1,710.0067	1,710.0067	0.5420		1,723.5556
Paving	0.3406					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Total	**1.1260**	**7.4371**	**11.6737**	**0.0179**		**0.3503**	**0.3503**		**0.3234**	**0.3234**	**0.0000**	**1,710.0067**	**1,710.0067**	**0.5420**		**1,723.5556**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0460	0.0220	0.3478	1.0400e-003	0.1232	5.2000e-004	0.1237	0.0327	4.8000e-004	0.0332		105.5866	105.5866	2.4400e-003	2.4800e-003	106.3876
Total	**0.0460**	**0.0220**	**0.3478**	**1.0400e-003**	**0.1232**	**5.2000e-004**	**0.1237**	**0.0327**	**4.8000e-004**	**0.0332**		**105.5866**	**105.5866**	**2.4400e-003**	**2.4800e-003**	**106.3876**

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.6 Architectural Coating - 2025

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Archit. Coating	28.8313					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.1709	1.1455	1.8091	2.9700e-003		0.0515	0.0515		0.0515	0.0515		281.4481	281.4481	0.0154		281.8319
Total	**29.0022**	**1.1455**	**1.8091**	**2.9700e-003**		**0.0515**	**0.0515**		**0.0515**	**0.0515**		**281.4481**	**281.4481**	**0.0154**		**281.8319**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0215	0.0103	0.1623	4.9000e-004	0.0575	2.4000e-004	0.0578	0.0153	2.2000e-004	0.0155		49.2737	49.2737	1.1400e-003	1.1600e-003	49.6476
Total	**0.0215**	**0.0103**	**0.1623**	**4.9000e-004**	**0.0575**	**2.4000e-004**	**0.0578**	**0.0153**	**2.2000e-004**	**0.0155**		**49.2737**	**49.2737**	**1.1400e-003**	**1.1600e-003**	**49.6476**

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.6 Architectural Coating - 2025

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Archit. Coating	28.8313					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.1709	1.1455	1.8091	2.9700e-003		0.0515	0.0515		0.0515	0.0515	0.0000	281.4481	281.4481	0.0154		281.8319
Total	**29.0022**	**1.1455**	**1.8091**	**2.9700e-003**		**0.0515**	**0.0515**		**0.0515**	**0.0515**	**0.0000**	**281.4481**	**281.4481**	**0.0154**		**281.8319**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0215	0.0103	0.1623	4.9000e-004	0.0575	2.4000e-004	0.0578	0.0153	2.2000e-004	0.0155		49.2737	49.2737	1.1400e-003	1.1600e-003	49.6476
Total	**0.0215**	**0.0103**	**0.1623**	**4.9000e-004**	**0.0575**	**2.4000e-004**	**0.0578**	**0.0153**	**2.2000e-004**	**0.0155**		**49.2737**	**49.2737**	**1.1400e-003**	**1.1600e-003**	**49.6476**

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

4.0 Operational Detail - Mobile

4.1 Mitigation Measures Mobile

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Mitigated	1.0965	1.1568	7.1602	0.0157	1.5164	0.0125	1.5288	0.4048	0.0117	0.4165		1,598.5457	1,598.5457	0.0901	0.0894	1,627.4515
Unmitigated	1.0965	1.1568	7.1602	0.0157	1.5164	0.0125	1.5288	0.4048	0.0117	0.4165		1,598.5457	1,598.5457	0.0901	0.0894	1,627.4515

4.2 Trip Summary Information

	Average Daily Trip Rate			Unmitigated	Mitigated
Land Use	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Annual VMT	Annual VMT
Government Office Building	417.92	0.00	0.00	511,910	511,910
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Parking Lot	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Total	417.92	0.00	0.00	511,910	511,910

4.3 Trip Type Information

	Miles			Trip %			Trip Purpose %		
Land Use	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	Primary	Diverted	Pass-by
Government Office Building	9.50	7.30	7.30	33.00	62.00	5.00	50	34	16
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	9.50	7.30	7.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0
Parking Lot	9.50	7.30	7.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

4.4 Fleet Mix

Land Use	LDA	LDT1	LDT2	MDV	LHD1	LHD2	MHD	HHD	OBUS	UBUS	MCY	SBUS	MH
Government Office Building	0.521458	0.053308	0.175656	0.151963	0.025001	0.006656	0.014407	0.022718	0.000702	0.000287	0.023515	0.001463	0.002865
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	0.521458	0.053308	0.175656	0.151963	0.025001	0.006656	0.014407	0.022718	0.000702	0.000287	0.023515	0.001463	0.002865
Parking Lot	0.521458	0.053308	0.175656	0.151963	0.025001	0.006656	0.014407	0.022718	0.000702	0.000287	0.023515	0.001463	0.002865

5.0 Energy Detail

Historical Energy Use: N

5.1 Mitigation Measures Energy

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
NaturalGas Mitigated	7.0600e-003	0.0642	0.0539	3.9000e-004		4.8800e-003	4.8800e-003		4.8800e-003	4.8800e-003		77.0411	77.0411	1.4800e-003	1.4100e-003	77.4989
NaturalGas Unmitigated	7.0600e-003	0.0642	0.0539	3.9000e-004		4.8800e-003	4.8800e-003		4.8800e-003	4.8800e-003		77.0411	77.0411	1.4800e-003	1.4100e-003	77.4989

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

5.2 Energy by Land Use - NaturalGas

Unmitigated

	NaturalGas Use	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kBTU/yr	lb/day										lb/day					
Government Office Building	654.849	7.0600e-003	0.0642	0.0539	3.9000e-004		4.8800e-003	4.8800e-003		4.8800e-003	4.8800e-003		77.0411	77.0411	1.4800e-003	1.4100e-003	77.4989
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Parking Lot	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total		**7.0600e-003**	**0.0642**	**0.0539**	**3.9000e-004**		**4.8800e-003**	**4.8800e-003**		**4.8800e-003**	**4.8800e-003**		**77.0411**	**77.0411**	**1.4800e-003**	**1.4100e-003**	**77.4989**

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

5.2 Energy by Land Use - NaturalGas

Mitigated

	NaturalGas Use	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kBTU/yr	lb/day										lb/day					
Government Office Building	0.654849	7.0600e-003	0.0642	0.0539	3.9000e-004		4.8800e-003	4.8800e-003		4.8800e-003	4.8800e-003		77.0411	77.0411	1.4800e-003	1.4100e-003	77.4989
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Parking Lot	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total		**7.0600e-003**	**0.0642**	**0.0539**	**3.9000e-004**		**4.8800e-003**	**4.8800e-003**		**4.8800e-003**	**4.8800e-003**		**77.0411**	**77.0411**	**1.4800e-003**	**1.4100e-003**	**77.4989**

6.0 Area Detail

6.1 Mitigation Measures Area

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Mitigated	0.5015	2.0000e-005	2.0600e-003	0.0000		1.0000e-005	1.0000e-005		1.0000e-005	1.0000e-005		4.4200e-003	4.4200e-003	1.0000e-005		4.7100e-003
Unmitigated	0.5015	2.0000e-005	2.0600e-003	0.0000		1.0000e-005	1.0000e-005		1.0000e-005	1.0000e-005		4.4200e-003	4.4200e-003	1.0000e-005		4.7100e-003

6.2 Area by SubCategory

Unmitigated

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory	lb/day										lb/day					
Architectural Coating	0.0790					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Consumer Products	0.4223					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Landscaping	1.9000e-004	2.0000e-005	2.0600e-003	0.0000		1.0000e-005	1.0000e-005		1.0000e-005	1.0000e-005		4.4200e-003	4.4200e-003	1.0000e-005		4.7100e-003
Total	**0.5015**	**2.0000e-005**	**2.0600e-003**	**0.0000**		**1.0000e-005**	**1.0000e-005**		**1.0000e-005**	**1.0000e-005**		**4.4200e-003**	**4.4200e-003**	**1.0000e-005**		**4.7100e-003**

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Summer

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

6.2 Area by SubCategory

Mitigated

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory	lb/day										lb/day					
Architectural Coating	0.0790					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Consumer Products	0.4223					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Landscaping	1.9000e-004	2.0000e-005	2.0600e-003	0.0000		1.0000e-005	1.0000e-005		1.0000e-005	1.0000e-005		4.4200e-003	4.4200e-003	1.0000e-005		4.7100e-003
Total	**0.5015**	**2.0000e-005**	**2.0600e-003**	**0.0000**		**1.0000e-005**	**1.0000e-005**		**1.0000e-005**	**1.0000e-005**		**4.4200e-003**	**4.4200e-003**	**1.0000e-005**		**4.7100e-003**

7.0 Water Detail

7.1 Mitigation Measures Water

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

8.0 Waste Detail

8.1 Mitigation Measures Waste

9.0 Operational Offroad

Equipment Type	Number	Hours/Day	Days/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type

10.0 Stationary Equipment

Fire Pumps and Emergency Generators

Equipment Type	Number	Hours/Day	Hours/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type

Boilers

Equipment Type	Number	Heat Input/Day	Heat Input/Year	Boiler Rating	Fuel Type

User Defined Equipment

Equipment Type	Number

11.0 Vegetation

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Winter

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project

Fresno County, Winter

1.0 Project Characteristics

1.1 Land Usage

Land Uses	Size	Metric	Lot Acreage	Floor Surface Area	Population
Government Office Building	18.50	1000sqft	0.42	18,500.00	0
Parking Lot	1.30	Acre	1.30	56,628.00	0
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	0.41	Acre	0.41	17,859.60	0

1.2 Other Project Characteristics

Urbanization	Urban	**Wind Speed (m/s)**	2.2	**Precipitation Freq (Days)**	45
Climate Zone	3			**Operational Year**	2025
Utility Company	Pacific Gas and Electric Company				
CO2 Intensity (lb/MWhr)	203.98	**CH4 Intensity (lb/MWhr)**	0.033	**N2O Intensity (lb/MWhr)**	0.004

1.3 User Entered Comments & Non-Default Data

Project Characteristics -

Land Use -

Construction Phase -

Construction Off-road Equipment Mitigation -

Table Name	Column Name	Default Value	New Value
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	11/27/2025	10/30/2025
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	10/30/2025	10/2/2025
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	12/26/2024	11/28/2024
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	11/13/2025	10/16/2025

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	12/18/2024	11/20/2024
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	11/14/2025	10/17/2025
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	12/27/2024	11/29/2024
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	12/19/2024	11/21/2024
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	10/31/2025	10/3/2025
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	12/14/2024	11/18/2024

2.0 Emissions Summary

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Winter

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

2.1 Overall Construction (Maximum Daily Emission)

Unmitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year	lb/day										lb/day					
2024	1.7210	13.8372	15.0929	0.0304	7.1647	0.5726	7.7373	3.4465	0.5268	3.9733	0.0000	2,841.9610	2,841.9610	0.7693	0.0544	2,869.0734
2025	29.0213	12.7589	14.9403	0.0302	0.4056	0.4755	0.8811	0.1099	0.4551	0.5650	0.0000	2,828.1402	2,828.1402	0.5447	0.0530	2,854.6458
Maximum	**29.0213**	**13.8372**	**15.0929**	**0.0304**	**7.1647**	**0.5726**	**7.7373**	**3.4465**	**0.5268**	**3.9733**	**0.0000**	**2,841.9610**	**2,841.9610**	**0.7693**	**0.0544**	**2,869.0734**

Mitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year	lb/day										lb/day					
2024	1.7210	13.8372	15.0929	0.0304	2.8444	0.5726	3.4170	1.3574	0.5268	1.8842	0.0000	2,841.9610	2,841.9610	0.7693	0.0544	2,869.0734
2025	29.0213	12.7589	14.9403	0.0302	0.4056	0.4755	0.8811	0.1099	0.4551	0.5650	0.0000	2,828.1402	2,828.1402	0.5447	0.0530	2,854.6458
Maximum	**29.0213**	**13.8372**	**15.0929**	**0.0304**	**2.8444**	**0.5726**	**3.4170**	**1.3574**	**0.5268**	**1.8842**	**0.0000**	**2,841.9610**	**2,841.9610**	**0.7693**	**0.0544**	**2,869.0734**

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Winter

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N20	CO2e
Percent Reduction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	57.07	0.00	50.13	58.74	0.00	46.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Winter

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

2.2 Overall Operational

Unmitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Area	0.5015	2.0000e-005	2.0600e-003	0.0000		1.0000e-005	1.0000e-005		1.0000e-005	1.0000e-005		4.4200e-003	4.4200e-003	1.0000e-005		4.7100e-003
Energy	7.0600e-003	0.0642	0.0539	3.9000e-004		4.8800e-003	4.8800e-003		4.8800e-003	4.8800e-003		77.0411	77.0411	1.4800e-003	1.4100e-003	77.4989
Mobile	0.8109	1.2920	7.2919	0.0144	1.5164	0.0125	1.5288	0.4048	0.0117	0.4165		1,472.0172	1,472.0172	0.1050	0.0952	1,503.0204
Total	**1.3194**	**1.3562**	**7.3478**	**0.0148**	**1.5164**	**0.0174**	**1.5337**	**0.4048**	**0.0166**	**0.4214**		**1,549.0627**	**1,549.0627**	**0.1065**	**0.0966**	**1,580.5240**

Mitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Area	0.5015	2.0000e-005	2.0600e-003	0.0000		1.0000e-005	1.0000e-005		1.0000e-005	1.0000e-005		4.4200e-003	4.4200e-003	1.0000e-005		4.7100e-003
Energy	7.0600e-003	0.0642	0.0539	3.9000e-004		4.8800e-003	4.8800e-003		4.8800e-003	4.8800e-003		77.0411	77.0411	1.4800e-003	1.4100e-003	77.4989
Mobile	0.8109	1.2920	7.2919	0.0144	1.5164	0.0125	1.5288	0.4048	0.0117	0.4165		1,472.0172	1,472.0172	0.1050	0.0952	1,503.0204
Total	**1.3194**	**1.3562**	**7.3478**	**0.0148**	**1.5164**	**0.0174**	**1.5337**	**0.4048**	**0.0166**	**0.4214**		**1,549.0627**	**1,549.0627**	**0.1065**	**0.0966**	**1,580.5240**

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N20	CO2e
Percent Reduction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

3.0 Construction Detail

Construction Phase

Phase Number	Phase Name	Phase Type	Start Date	End Date	Num Days Week	Num Days	Phase Description
1	Site Preparation	Site Preparation	11/18/2024	11/20/2024	5	3	
2	Grading	Grading	11/21/2024	11/28/2024	5	6	
3	Building Construction	Building Construction	11/29/2024	10/2/2025	5	220	
4	Paving	Paving	10/3/2025	10/16/2025	5	10	
5	Architectural Coating	Architectural Coating	10/17/2025	10/30/2025	5	10	

Acres of Grading (Site Preparation Phase): 4.5

Acres of Grading (Grading Phase): 6

Acres of Paving: 1.71

Residential Indoor: 0; Residential Outdoor: 0; Non-Residential Indoor: 27,750; Non-Residential Outdoor: 9,250; Striped Parking Area: 4,469 (Architectural Coating – sqft)

OffRoad Equipment

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Type	Amount	Usage Hours	Horse Power	Load Factor
Architectural Coating	Air Compressors	1	6.00	78	0.48
Paving	Cement and Mortar Mixers	1	8.00	9	0.56
Building Construction	Cranes	1	8.00	231	0.29
Building Construction	Forklifts	2	7.00	89	0.20
Building Construction	Generator Sets	1	8.00	84	0.74
Grading	Graders	1	8.00	187	0.41

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

Site Preparation	Graders	1	8.00	187	0.41
Paving	Pavers	1	8.00	130	0.42
Paving	Paving Equipment	1	8.00	132	0.36
Paving	Rollers	2	8.00	80	0.38
Grading	Rubber Tired Dozers	1	8.00	247	0.40
Site Preparation	Scrapers	1	8.00	367	0.48
Building Construction	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	1	6.00	97	0.37
Grading	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	2	7.00	97	0.37
Paving	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	1	8.00	97	0.37
Site Preparation	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	1	7.00	97	0.37
Building Construction	Welders	3	8.00	46	0.45

Trips and VMT

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Count	Worker Trip Number	Vendor Trip Number	Hauling Trip Number	Worker Trip Length	Vendor Trip Length	Hauling Trip Length	Worker Vehicle Class	Vendor Vehicle Class	Hauling Vehicle Class
Site Preparation	3	8.00	0.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Grading	4	10.00	0.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Building Construction	8	37.00	15.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Paving	6	15.00	0.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Architectural Coating	1	7.00	0.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT

3.1 Mitigation Measures Construction

Water Exposed Area

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Winter

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.2 Site Preparation - 2024

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Fugitive Dust					1.5908	0.0000	1.5908	0.1718	0.0000	0.1718			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	1.2406	13.1186	9.5796	0.0245		0.4971	0.4971		0.4573	0.4573		2,373.6514	2,373.6514	0.7677		2,392.8435
Total	**1.2406**	**13.1186**	**9.5796**	**0.0245**	**1.5908**	**0.4971**	**2.0878**	**0.1718**	**0.4573**	**0.6291**		**2,373.6514**	**2,373.6514**	**0.7677**		**2,392.8435**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0235	0.0155	0.1722	5.1000e-004	0.0657	2.9000e-004	0.0660	0.0174	2.7000e-004	0.0177		51.7577	51.7577	1.6400e-003	1.5800e-003	52.2700
Total	**0.0235**	**0.0155**	**0.1722**	**5.1000e-004**	**0.0657**	**2.9000e-004**	**0.0660**	**0.0174**	**2.7000e-004**	**0.0177**		**51.7577**	**51.7577**	**1.6400e-003**	**1.5800e-003**	**52.2700**

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Winter

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.2 Site Preparation - 2024

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Fugitive Dust					0.6204	0.0000	0.6204	0.0670	0.0000	0.0670			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	1.2406	13.1186	9.5796	0.0245		0.4971	0.4971		0.4573	0.4573	0.0000	2,373.6514	2,373.6514	0.7677		2,392.8435
Total	**1.2406**	**13.1186**	**9.5796**	**0.0245**	**0.6204**	**0.4971**	**1.1175**	**0.0670**	**0.4573**	**0.5243**	**0.0000**	**2,373.6514**	**2,373.6514**	**0.7677**		**2,392.8435**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0235	0.0155	0.1722	5.1000e-004	0.0657	2.9000e-004	0.0660	0.0174	2.7000e-004	0.0177		51.7577	51.7577	1.6400e-003	1.5800e-003	52.2700
Total	**0.0235**	**0.0155**	**0.1722**	**5.1000e-004**	**0.0657**	**2.9000e-004**	**0.0660**	**0.0174**	**2.7000e-004**	**0.0177**		**51.7577**	**51.7577**	**1.6400e-003**	**1.5800e-003**	**52.2700**

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Winter

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.3 Grading - 2024

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Fugitive Dust					7.0826	0.0000	7.0826	3.4247	0.0000	3.4247			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	1.3015	13.8178	8.6998	0.0206		0.5722	0.5722		0.5265	0.5265		1,995.5803	1,995.5803	0.6454		2,011.7155
Total	**1.3015**	**13.8178**	**8.6998**	**0.0206**	**7.0826**	**0.5722**	**7.6548**	**3.4247**	**0.5265**	**3.9512**		**1,995.5803**	**1,995.5803**	**0.6454**		**2,011.7155**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0294	0.0194	0.2152	6.4000e-004	0.0822	3.6000e-004	0.0825	0.0218	3.4000e-004	0.0221		64.6972	64.6972	2.0500e-003	1.9800e-003	65.3374
Total	**0.0294**	**0.0194**	**0.2152**	**6.4000e-004**	**0.0822**	**3.6000e-004**	**0.0825**	**0.0218**	**3.4000e-004**	**0.0221**		**64.6972**	**64.6972**	**2.0500e-003**	**1.9800e-003**	**65.3374**

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Winter

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.3 Grading - 2024

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Fugitive Dust					2.7622	0.0000	2.7622	1.3357	0.0000	1.3357			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	1.3015	13.8178	8.6998	0.0206		0.5722	0.5722		0.5265	0.5265	0.0000	1,995.5803	1,995.5803	0.6454		2,011.7155
Total	**1.3015**	**13.8178**	**8.6998**	**0.0206**	**2.7622**	**0.5722**	**3.3345**	**1.3357**	**0.5265**	**1.8621**	**0.0000**	**1,995.5803**	**1,995.5803**	**0.6454**		**2,011.7155**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0294	0.0194	0.2152	6.4000e-004	0.0822	3.6000e-004	0.0825	0.0218	3.4000e-004	0.0221		64.6972	64.6972	2.0500e-003	1.9800e-003	65.3374
Total	**0.0294**	**0.0194**	**0.2152**	**6.4000e-004**	**0.0822**	**3.6000e-004**	**0.0825**	**0.0218**	**3.4000e-004**	**0.0221**		**64.6972**	**64.6972**	**2.0500e-003**	**1.9800e-003**	**65.3374**

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.4 Building Construction - 2024

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Off-Road	1.5971	12.8235	14.1002	0.0250		0.5381	0.5381		0.5153	0.5153		2,289.6541	2,289.6541	0.4265		2,300.3154
Total	**1.5971**	**12.8235**	**14.1002**	**0.0250**		**0.5381**	**0.5381**		**0.5153**	**0.5153**		**2,289.6541**	**2,289.6541**	**0.4265**		**2,300.3154**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0152	0.6746	0.1965	2.9600e-003	0.1017	4.2600e-003	0.1060	0.0293	4.0800e-003	0.0334		312.9274	312.9274	1.6000e-003	0.0471	327.0095
Worker	0.1087	0.0717	0.7963	2.3700e-003	0.3040	1.3500e-003	0.3053	0.0806	1.2400e-003	0.0819		239.3795	239.3795	7.5700e-003	7.3100e-003	241.7485
Total	**0.1239**	**0.7463**	**0.9928**	**5.3300e-003**	**0.4056**	**5.6100e-003**	**0.4113**	**0.1099**	**5.3200e-003**	**0.1152**		**552.3069**	**552.3069**	**9.1700e-003**	**0.0544**	**568.7580**

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Winter

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.4 Building Construction - 2024

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Off-Road	1.5971	12.8235	14.1002	0.0250		0.5381	0.5381		0.5153	0.5153	0.0000	2,289.6541	2,289.6541	0.4265		2,300.3154
Total	**1.5971**	**12.8235**	**14.1002**	**0.0250**		**0.5381**	**0.5381**		**0.5153**	**0.5153**	**0.0000**	**2,289.6541**	**2,289.6541**	**0.4265**		**2,300.3154**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0152	0.6746	0.1965	2.9600e-003	0.1017	4.2600e-003	0.1060	0.0293	4.0800e-003	0.0334		312.9274	312.9274	1.6000e-003	0.0471	327.0095
Worker	0.1087	0.0717	0.7963	2.3700e-003	0.3040	1.3500e-003	0.3053	0.0806	1.2400e-003	0.0819		239.3795	239.3795	7.5700e-003	7.3100e-003	241.7485
Total	**0.1239**	**0.7463**	**0.9928**	**5.3300e-003**	**0.4056**	**5.6100e-003**	**0.4113**	**0.1099**	**5.3200e-003**	**0.1152**		**552.3069**	**552.3069**	**9.1700e-003**	**0.0544**	**568.7580**

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Winter

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.4 Building Construction - 2025

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Off-Road	1.4897	12.0233	14.0072	0.0250		0.4700	0.4700		0.4498	0.4498		2,289.8898	2,289.8898	0.4200		2,300.3887
Total	**1.4897**	**12.0233**	**14.0072**	**0.0250**		**0.4700**	**0.4700**		**0.4498**	**0.4498**		**2,289.8898**	**2,289.8898**	**0.4200**		**2,300.3887**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0148	0.6719	0.1925	2.9000e-003	0.1017	4.2600e-003	0.1059	0.0293	4.0800e-003	0.0334		306.9140	306.9140	1.5200e-003	0.0462	320.7213
Worker	0.1012	0.0637	0.7405	2.2900e-003	0.3040	1.2800e-003	0.3052	0.0806	1.1800e-003	0.0818		231.3364	231.3364	6.8500e-003	6.8100e-003	233.5358
Total	**0.1160**	**0.7356**	**0.9331**	**5.1900e-003**	**0.4056**	**5.5400e-003**	**0.4112**	**0.1099**	**5.2600e-003**	**0.1152**		**538.2504**	**538.2504**	**8.3700e-003**	**0.0530**	**554.2571**

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.4 Building Construction - 2025

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Off-Road	1.4897	12.0233	14.0072	0.0250		0.4700	0.4700		0.4498	0.4498	0.0000	2,289.8898	2,289.8898	0.4200		2,300.3887
Total	**1.4897**	**12.0233**	**14.0072**	**0.0250**		**0.4700**	**0.4700**		**0.4498**	**0.4498**	**0.0000**	**2,289.8898**	**2,289.8898**	**0.4200**		**2,300.3887**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0148	0.6719	0.1925	2.9000e-003	0.1017	4.2600e-003	0.1059	0.0293	4.0800e-003	0.0334		306.9140	306.9140	1.5200e-003	0.0462	320.7213
Worker	0.1012	0.0637	0.7405	2.2900e-003	0.3040	1.2800e-003	0.3052	0.0806	1.1800e-003	0.0818		231.3364	231.3364	6.8500e-003	6.8100e-003	233.5358
Total	**0.1160**	**0.7356**	**0.9331**	**5.1900e-003**	**0.4056**	**5.5400e-003**	**0.4112**	**0.1099**	**5.2600e-003**	**0.1152**		**538.2504**	**538.2504**	**8.3700e-003**	**0.0530**	**554.2571**

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Winter

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.5 Paving - 2025

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Off-Road	0.7854	7.4371	11.6737	0.0179		0.3503	0.3503		0.3234	0.3234		1,710.0067	1,710.0067	0.5420		1,723.5556
Paving	0.3406					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Total	**1.1260**	**7.4371**	**11.6737**	**0.0179**		**0.3503**	**0.3503**		**0.3234**	**0.3234**		**1,710.0067**	**1,710.0067**	**0.5420**		**1,723.5556**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0410	0.0258	0.3002	9.3000e-004	0.1232	5.2000e-004	0.1237	0.0327	4.8000e-004	0.0332		93.7850	93.7850	2.7800e-003	2.7600e-003	94.6767
Total	**0.0410**	**0.0258**	**0.3002**	**9.3000e-004**	**0.1232**	**5.2000e-004**	**0.1237**	**0.0327**	**4.8000e-004**	**0.0332**		**93.7850**	**93.7850**	**2.7800e-003**	**2.7600e-003**	**94.6767**

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Winter

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.5 Paving - 2025

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Off-Road	0.7854	7.4371	11.6737	0.0179		0.3503	0.3503		0.3234	0.3234	0.0000	1,710.0067	1,710.0067	0.5420		1,723.5556
Paving	0.3406					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Total	**1.1260**	**7.4371**	**11.6737**	**0.0179**		**0.3503**	**0.3503**		**0.3234**	**0.3234**	**0.0000**	**1,710.0067**	**1,710.0067**	**0.5420**		**1,723.5556**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0410	0.0258	0.3002	9.3000e-004	0.1232	5.2000e-004	0.1237	0.0327	4.8000e-004	0.0332		93.7850	93.7850	2.7800e-003	2.7600e-003	94.6767
Total	**0.0410**	**0.0258**	**0.3002**	**9.3000e-004**	**0.1232**	**5.2000e-004**	**0.1237**	**0.0327**	**4.8000e-004**	**0.0332**		**93.7850**	**93.7850**	**2.7800e-003**	**2.7600e-003**	**94.6767**

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Winter

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.6 Architectural Coating - 2025

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Archit. Coating	28.8313					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.1709	1.1455	1.8091	2.9700e-003		0.0515	0.0515		0.0515	0.0515		281.4481	281.4481	0.0154		281.8319
Total	**29.0022**	**1.1455**	**1.8091**	**2.9700e-003**		**0.0515**	**0.0515**		**0.0515**	**0.0515**		**281.4481**	**281.4481**	**0.0154**		**281.8319**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0192	0.0121	0.1401	4.3000e-004	0.0575	2.4000e-004	0.0578	0.0153	2.2000e-004	0.0155		43.7663	43.7663	1.3000e-003	1.2900e-003	44.1825
Total	**0.0192**	**0.0121**	**0.1401**	**4.3000e-004**	**0.0575**	**2.4000e-004**	**0.0578**	**0.0153**	**2.2000e-004**	**0.0155**		**43.7663**	**43.7663**	**1.3000e-003**	**1.2900e-003**	**44.1825**

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Winter

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

3.6 Architectural Coating - 2025

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Archit. Coating	28.8313					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.1709	1.1455	1.8091	2.9700e-003		0.0515	0.0515		0.0515	0.0515	0.0000	281.4481	281.4481	0.0154		281.8319
Total	**29.0022**	**1.1455**	**1.8091**	**2.9700e-003**		**0.0515**	**0.0515**		**0.0515**	**0.0515**	**0.0000**	**281.4481**	**281.4481**	**0.0154**		**281.8319**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0192	0.0121	0.1401	4.3000e-004	0.0575	2.4000e-004	0.0578	0.0153	2.2000e-004	0.0155		43.7663	43.7663	1.3000e-003	1.2900e-003	44.1825
Total	**0.0192**	**0.0121**	**0.1401**	**4.3000e-004**	**0.0575**	**2.4000e-004**	**0.0578**	**0.0153**	**2.2000e-004**	**0.0155**		**43.7663**	**43.7663**	**1.3000e-003**	**1.2900e-003**	**44.1825**

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Winter

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

4.0 Operational Detail - Mobile

4.1 Mitigation Measures Mobile

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Mitigated	0.8109	1.2920	7.2919	0.0144	1.5164	0.0125	1.5288	0.4048	0.0117	0.4165		1,472.0172	1,472.0172	0.1050	0.0952	1,503.0204
Unmitigated	0.8109	1.2920	7.2919	0.0144	1.5164	0.0125	1.5288	0.4048	0.0117	0.4165		1,472.0172	1,472.0172	0.1050	0.0952	1,503.0204

4.2 Trip Summary Information

	Average Daily Trip Rate			Unmitigated	Mitigated
Land Use	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Annual VMT	Annual VMT
Government Office Building	417.92	0.00	0.00	511,910	511,910
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Parking Lot	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Total	417.92	0.00	0.00	511,910	511,910

4.3 Trip Type Information

	Miles			Trip %			Trip Purpose %		
Land Use	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	Primary	Diverted	Pass-by
Government Office Building	9.50	7.30	7.30	33.00	62.00	5.00	50	34	16
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	9.50	7.30	7.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0
Parking Lot	9.50	7.30	7.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

4.4 Fleet Mix

Land Use	LDA	LDT1	LDT2	MDV	LHD1	LHD2	MHD	HHD	OBUS	UBUS	MCY	SBUS	MH
Government Office Building	0.521458	0.053308	0.175656	0.151963	0.025001	0.006656	0.014407	0.022718	0.000702	0.000287	0.023515	0.001463	0.002865
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	0.521458	0.053308	0.175656	0.151963	0.025001	0.006656	0.014407	0.022718	0.000702	0.000287	0.023515	0.001463	0.002865
Parking Lot	0.521458	0.053308	0.175656	0.151963	0.025001	0.006656	0.014407	0.022718	0.000702	0.000287	0.023515	0.001463	0.002865

5.0 Energy Detail

Historical Energy Use: N

5.1 Mitigation Measures Energy

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
NaturalGas Mitigated	7.0600e-003	0.0642	0.0539	3.9000e-004		4.8800e-003	4.8800e-003		4.8800e-003	4.8800e-003		77.0411	77.0411	1.4800e-003	1.4100e-003	77.4989
NaturalGas Unmitigated	7.0600e-003	0.0642	0.0539	3.9000e-004		4.8800e-003	4.8800e-003		4.8800e-003	4.8800e-003		77.0411	77.0411	1.4800e-003	1.4100e-003	77.4989

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

5.2 Energy by Land Use - NaturalGas

Unmitigated

	NaturalGas Use	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kBTU/yr	lb/day										lb/day					
Government Office Building	654.849	7.0600e-003	0.0642	0.0539	3.9000e-004		4.8800e-003	4.8800e-003		4.8800e-003	4.8800e-003		77.0411	77.0411	1.4800e-003	1.4100e-003	77.4989
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Parking Lot	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total		**7.0600e-003**	**0.0642**	**0.0539**	**3.9000e-004**		**4.8800e-003**	**4.8800e-003**		**4.8800e-003**	**4.8800e-003**		**77.0411**	**77.0411**	**1.4800e-003**	**1.4100e-003**	**77.4989**

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

5.2 Energy by Land Use - NaturalGas

Mitigated

	NaturalGas Use	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kBTU/yr	lb/day										lb/day					
Government Office Building	0.654849	7.0600e-003	0.0642	0.0539	3.9000e-004		4.8800e-003	4.8800e-003		4.8800e-003	4.8800e-003		77.0411	77.0411	1.4800e-003	1.4100e-003	77.4989
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Parking Lot	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total		**7.0600e-003**	**0.0642**	**0.0539**	**3.9000e-004**		**4.8800e-003**	**4.8800e-003**		**4.8800e-003**	**4.8800e-003**		**77.0411**	**77.0411**	**1.4800e-003**	**1.4100e-003**	**77.4989**

6.0 Area Detail

6.1 Mitigation Measures Area

Kingsburg 13 ACre Parcel Annexation Project - Fresno County, Winter

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Mitigated	0.5015	2.0000e-005	2.0600e-003	0.0000		1.0000e-005	1.0000e-005		1.0000e-005	1.0000e-005		4.4200e-003	4.4200e-003	1.0000e-005		4.7100e-003
Unmitigated	0.5015	2.0000e-005	2.0600e-003	0.0000		1.0000e-005	1.0000e-005		1.0000e-005	1.0000e-005		4.4200e-003	4.4200e-003	1.0000e-005		4.7100e-003

6.2 Area by SubCategory

Unmitigated

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory	lb/day										lb/day					
Architectural Coating	0.0790					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Consumer Products	0.4223					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Landscaping	1.9000e-004	2.0000e-005	2.0600e-003	0.0000		1.0000e-005	1.0000e-005		1.0000e-005	1.0000e-005		4.4200e-003	4.4200e-003	1.0000e-005		4.7100e-003
Total	**0.5015**	**2.0000e-005**	**2.0600e-003**	**0.0000**		**1.0000e-005**	**1.0000e-005**		**1.0000e-005**	**1.0000e-005**		**4.4200e-003**	**4.4200e-003**	**1.0000e-005**		**4.7100e-003**

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

6.2 Area by SubCategory

Mitigated

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory	lb/day										lb/day					
Architectural Coating	0.0790					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Consumer Products	0.4223					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Landscaping	1.9000e-004	2.0000e-005	2.0600e-003	0.0000		1.0000e-005	1.0000e-005		1.0000e-005	1.0000e-005		4.4200e-003	4.4200e-003	1.0000e-005		4.7100e-003
Total	**0.5015**	**2.0000e-005**	**2.0600e-003**	**0.0000**		**1.0000e-005**	**1.0000e-005**		**1.0000e-005**	**1.0000e-005**		**4.4200e-003**	**4.4200e-003**	**1.0000e-005**		**4.7100e-003**

7.0 Water Detail

7.1 Mitigation Measures Water

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

8.0 Waste Detail

8.1 Mitigation Measures Waste

9.0 Operational Offroad

Equipment Type	Number	Hours/Day	Days/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type

10.0 Stationary Equipment

Fire Pumps and Emergency Generators

Equipment Type	Number	Hours/Day	Hours/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type

Boilers

Equipment Type	Number	Heat Input/Day	Heat Input/Year	Boiler Rating	Fuel Type

User Defined Equipment

Equipment Type	Number

11.0 Vegetation

HARP Project Summary Report 10/24/2023 10:06:40 AM

PROJECT INFORMATION
HARP Version: 22118
Project Name: KINGSBURG_ANX
Project Output Directory: G:\Kingsburg_City of - 1345\134523002-Parcel Annexation\200 Technical\215 Environmental Planning\Appendices\App A - Air Quality\KINGSBURG_ANX HARP Database: NA

FACILITY INFORMATION
Origin
X (m):269936
Y (m):4044897
Zone:11
No. of Sources:1
No. of Buildings:0

EMISSION INVENTORY
No. of Pollutants:1
No. of Background Pollutants:0

Emissions
ScrID StkID ProID PolID PolAbbrev Multi Annual Ems MaxHr Ems MWAF
 (lbs/yr) (lbs/hr)
_____
_____ PJT_AREA 0 0
9901 DieselExhPM 1 115.24 0.071575 1

Background
PolID PolAbbrev Conc (ug/m^3) MWAF
_____

Ground level concentration files (\glc\)
_____
9901MAXHR.txt
9901PER.txt

POLLUTANT HEALTH INFORMATION
Health Database: C:\HARP2\Tables\HEALTH17320.mdb
Health Table Version: HEALTH22013
Official: True

PolID PolAbbrev InhCancer OralCancer AcuteREL InhChronicREL OralChronicREL InhChronic8HRREL
_____
_____
9901 DieselExhPM 1.1 5

AIR DISPERSION MODELING INFORMATION Versions used in HARP. All executables were obtained from USEPA's Support Center for Regulatory Atmospheric Modeling website (http://www.epa.gov/scram001/) AERMOD: 18081
AERMAP: 18081
BPIPPRM: 04274
AERPLOT: 13329

METEOROLOGICAL INFORMATION
Version: 18081
Surface File: G:\Kingsburg_City of - 1345\134523002-Parcel Annexation\200 Technical\215 Environmental Planning\Appendices\App A - Air Quality\KINGSBURG_ANX\Visalia_2007-2010.SFC Profile File: G:\Kingsburg_City of - 1345\134523002-Parcel Annexation\200 Technical\215 Environmental Planning\Appendices\App A - Air Quality\KINGSBURG_ANX\Visalia_2007-2010.PFL Surface Station: 93144
Upper Station: 23230
On-Site Station: 0
Start Date & Time: 7 1 1 1
End Date & Time: 10 12 31 24
Hours Processed: 35064
Calm Hours: 9717
Missing Hours: 1213

LIST OF AIR DISPERSION FILES
AERMOD Input File: \KINGSBURG_ANX_AERMOD.inp
AERMOD Output File: \KINGSBURG_ANX_AERMOD.out
AERMOD Error File: \KINGSBURG_ANX_AERMOD.ERR
Plotfile list _____
MAX1HRPJT_AREA.PLT
PERIODPJT_AREA.PLT

LIST OF RISK ASSESSMENT FILES
Health risk analysis files (\hra\)
_____
Con_CancerRisk.csv
Con_CancerRiskSumByRec.csv
Con_GLCList.csv
Con_HRAInput.hra
Con_NCAcuteRisk.csv
Con_NCAcuteRiskSumByRec.csv
Con_NCChronicRisk.csv
Con_NCChronicRiskSumByRec.csv
Con_Output.txt
Con_PathwayRec.csv
Con_PolDB.csv

Spatial averaging files (\sa\)
_____

**HARP - Air Dispersion Modeling and Risk Tool v22118																		
**10/24/2023																		
**Exported Risk Results																		
REC	GRP	NETID	X	Y	RISK_SUM	SCENARIO	INHAL_RISK	SOIL_RISK	DERMAL_RISK	MMILK_RISK	WATER_RISK	FISH_RISK	CROP_RISK	BEEF_RISK	DAIRY_RISK	PIG_RISK	CHICKEN_RISK	EGG_RISK
4	SENSITIV		269446	4044913	2.6531E-11	1YrCancerDerived_InhSoilDermMMilk_FAH16to70	2.6531E-11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	SENSITIV		269626	4045220	1.1202E-10	1YrCancerDerived_InhSoilDermMMilk_FAH16to70	1.1202E-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

3	SENSITIV		270253	4044772	1.297E-10	1YrCancerDerived_InhSoilDermMMilk_FAH16to70	1.297E-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**HARP - Air Dispersion Modeling and Risk Tool v22118																				
**10/24/2023																				
**Exported Risk Results																				
REC	GRP	NETID	X	Y	SCENARIO	CV	CNS	IMMUN	KIDNEY	GILV	REPRO/DEVEL	RESP	SKIN	EYE	BONE/TEETH	ENDO	BLOOD	ODOR	GENERAL	MAXHI
4	SENSITIV		269446	4044913	NonCancerChronicDerived_InhSoilDermMMilk	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.9835E-08	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.9835E-08
2	SENSITIV		269626	4045220	NonCancerChronicDerived_InhSoilDermMMilk	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.2597E-07	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.2597E-07

3	SENSITIV		270253	4044772	Non Cancer Chronic Derived_Inh Soil Der mM Milk	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.4586E-07	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.4586E-07

**HARP - Air Dispersion Modeling and Risk Tool v22118																				
**10/24/2023																				
**Exported Risk Results																				
REC	GRP	NETID	X	Y	SCENARIO	CV	CNS	IMMUN	KIDNEY	GILV	REPRO/DEVEL	RESP	SKIN	EYE	BONE/TEETH	ENDO	BLOOD	ODOR	GENERAL	MAXHI
1	SENSITIV		269754	4045239	NonCancerAcute	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	SENSITIV		269626	4045220	NonCancerAcute	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	SENSITIV		270253	4044772	NonCancerAcute	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Appendix B: Biological Resources

Selected Elements by Common Name

California Department of Fish and Wildlife

California Natural Diversity Database

Query Criteria: Quad IS (Selma (3611955) OR Malaga (3611966) OR Sanger (3611965) OR Wahtoke (3611964) OR Reedley (3611954) OR Conejo (3611956) OR Laton (3611946) OR Burris Park (3611945) OR Traver (3611944))

Species	Element Code	Federal Status	State Status	Global Rank	State Rank	Rare Plant Rank/CDFW SSC or FP
alkali-sink goldfields *Lasthenia chrysantha*	PDAST5L030	None	None	G2	S2	1B.1
American bumble bee *Bombus pensylvanicus*	IIHYM24260	None	None	G3G4	S2	
Antioch efferian robberfly *Efferia antiochi*	IIDIP07010	None	None	G1G2	S1S2	
bristly sedge *Carex comosa*	PMCYP032Y0	None	None	G5	S2	2B.1
brittlescale *Atriplex depressa*	PDCHE042L0	None	None	G2	S2	1B.2
burrowing owl *Athene cunicularia*	ABNSB10010	None	None	G4	S2	SSC
California alkali grass *Puccinellia simplex*	PMPOA53110	None	None	G2	S2	1B.2
California glossy snake *Arizona elegans occidentalis*	ARADB01017	None	None	G5T2	S2	SSC
California jewelflower *Caulanthus californicus*	PDBRA31010	Endangered	Endangered	G1	S1	1B.1
California linderiella *Linderiella occidentalis*	ICBRA06010	None	None	G2G3	S2S3	
California satintail *Imperata brevifolia*	PMPOA3D020	None	None	G3	S3	2B.1
California tiger salamander - central California DPS *Ambystoma californiense pop. 1*	AAAAA01181	Threatened	Threatened	G2G3T3	S3	WL
coast horned lizard *Phrynosoma blainvillii*	ARACF12100	None	None	G4	S4	SSC
Crotch bumble bee *Bombus crotchii*	IIHYM24480	None	Candidate Endangered	G2	S2	
Earlimart orache *Atriplex cordulata var. erecticaulis*	PDCHE042V0	None	None	G3T1	S1	1B.2
foothill yellow-legged frog - south Sierra DPS *Rana boylii pop. 5*	AAABH01055	Proposed Endangered	Endangered	G3T2	S2	
Great Valley Mixed Riparian Forest *Great Valley Mixed Riparian Forest*	CTT61420CA	None	None	G2	S2.2	
Greene's tuctoria *Tuctoria greenei*	PMPOA6N010	Endangered	Rare	G1	S1	1B.1
hoary bat *Lasiurus cinereus*	AMACC05032	None	None	G3G4	S4	

Species	Element Code	Federal Status	State Status	Global Rank	State Rank	Rare Plant Rank/CDFW SSC or FP
Hurd's metapogon robberfly *Metapogon hurdi*	IIDIP08010	None	None	G1G2	S1S2	
lesser saltscale *Atriplex minuscula*	PDCHE042M0	None	None	G2	S2	1B.1
loggerhead shrike *Lanius ludovicianus*	ABPBR01030	None	None	G4	S4	SSC
Madera leptosiphon *Leptosiphon serrulatus*	PDPLM09130	None	None	G3	S3	1B.2
molestan blister beetle *Lytta molesta*	IICOL4C030	None	None	G2	S2	
Morrison bumble bee *Bombus morrisoni*	IIHYM24460	None	None	G3	S1S2	
Northern California legless lizard *Anniella pulchra*	ARACC01020	None	None	G3	S2S3	SSC
Northern Claypan Vernal Pool *Northern Claypan Vernal Pool*	CTT44120CA	None	None	G1	S1.1	
pallid bat *Antrozous pallidus*	AMACC10010	None	None	G4	S3	SSC
San Joaquin adobe sunburst *Pseudobahia peirsonii*	PDAST7P030	Threatened	Endangered	G1	S1	1B.1
San Joaquin kit fox *Vulpes macrotis mutica*	AMAJA03041	Endangered	Threatened	G4T2	S3	
San Joaquin Valley Orcutt grass *Orcuttia inaequalis*	PMPOA4G060	Threatened	Endangered	G1	S1	1B.1
Sanford's arrowhead *Sagittaria sanfordii*	PMALI040Q0	None	None	G3	S3	1B.2
spiny-sepaled button-celery *Eryngium spinosepalum*	PDAPI0Z0Y0	None	None	G2	S2	1B.2
Swainson's hawk *Buteo swainsoni*	ABNKC19070	None	Threatened	G5	S4	
valley elderberry longhorn beetle *Desmocerus californicus dimorphus*	IICOL48011	Threatened	None	G3T3	S3	
Valley Sacaton Grassland *Valley Sacaton Grassland*	CTT42120CA	None	None	G1	S1.1	
vernal pool fairy shrimp *Branchinecta lynchi*	ICBRA03030	Threatened	None	G3	S3	
vernal pool tadpole shrimp *Lepidurus packardi*	ICBRA10010	Endangered	None	G3	S3	
western mastiff bat *Eumops perotis californicus*	AMACD02011	None	None	G4G5T4	S3S4	SSC
western pond turtle *Emys marmorata*	ARAAD02030	None	None	G3G4	S3	SSC

Selected Elements by Common Name

California Department of Fish and Wildlife

California Natural Diversity Database

Species	Element Code	Federal Status	State Status	Global Rank	State Rank	Rare Plant Rank/CDFW SSC or FP
western spadefoot *Spea hammondii*	AAABF02020	None	None	G2G3	S3S4	SSC
western yellow-billed cuckoo *Coccyzus americanus occidentalis*	ABNRB02022	Threatened	Endangered	G5T2T3	S1	
Winter's sunflower *Helianthus winteri*	PDAST4N260	None	None	G2?	S2?	1B.2

Record Count: 43

United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Sacramento Fish And Wildlife Office
Federal Building
2800 Cottage Way, Room W-2605
Sacramento, CA 95825-1846
Phone: (916) 414-6600 Fax: (916) 414-6713

In Reply Refer To: September 29, 2023
Project Code: 2023-0135623
Project Name: City of Kingsburg 13 Acre Parcel Annexation CEQA Document

Subject: List of threatened and endangered species that may occur in your proposed project location or may be affected by your proposed project

To Whom It May Concern:

The enclosed species list identifies threatened, endangered, proposed and candidate species, as well as proposed and final designated critical habitat, that may occur within the boundary of your proposed project and/or may be affected by your proposed project. The species list fulfills the requirements of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) under section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*).

New information based on updated surveys, changes in the abundance and distribution of species, changed habitat conditions, or other factors could change this list. Please feel free to contact us if you need more current information or assistance regarding the potential impacts to federally proposed, listed, and candidate species and federally designated and proposed critical habitat. Please note that under 50 CFR 402.12(e) of the regulations implementing section 7 of the Act, the accuracy of this species list should be verified after 90 days. This verification can be completed formally or informally as desired. The Service recommends that verification be completed by visiting the IPaC website at regular intervals during project planning and implementation for updates to species lists and information. An updated list may be requested through the IPaC system by completing the same process used to receive the enclosed list.

The purpose of the Act is to provide a means whereby threatened and endangered species and the ecosystems upon which they depend may be conserved. Under sections 7(a)(1) and 7(a)(2) of the Act and its implementing regulations (50 CFR 402 *et seq.*), Federal agencies are required to utilize their authorities to carry out programs for the conservation of threatened and endangered species and to determine whether projects may affect threatened and endangered species and/or designated critical habitat.

A Biological Assessment is required for construction projects (or other undertakings having similar physical impacts) that are major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment as defined in the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)

(c)). For projects other than major construction activities, the Service suggests that a biological evaluation similar to a Biological Assessment be prepared to determine whether the project may affect listed or proposed species and/or designated or proposed critical habitat. Recommended contents of a Biological Assessment are described at 50 CFR 402.12.

If a Federal agency determines, based on the Biological Assessment or biological evaluation, that listed species and/or designated critical habitat may be affected by the proposed project, the agency is required to consult with the Service pursuant to 50 CFR 402. In addition, the Service recommends that candidate species, proposed species and proposed critical habitat be addressed within the consultation. More information on the regulations and procedures for section 7 consultation, including the role of permit or license applicants, can be found in the "Endangered Species Consultation Handbook" at:

https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/documents/endangered-species-consultation-handbook.pdf

Migratory Birds: In addition to responsibilities to protect threatened and endangered species under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), there are additional responsibilities under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (BGEPA) to protect native birds from project-related impacts. Any activity, intentional or unintentional, resulting in take of migratory birds, including eagles, is prohibited unless otherwise permitted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (50 C.F.R. Sec. 10.12 and 16 U.S.C. Sec. 668(a)). For more information regarding these Acts, see https://www.fws.gov/program/migratory-bird-permit/what-we-do.

The MBTA has no provision for allowing take of migratory birds that may be unintentionally killed or injured by otherwise lawful activities. It is the responsibility of the project proponent to comply with these Acts by identifying potential impacts to migratory birds and eagles within applicable NEPA documents (when there is a federal nexus) or a Bird/Eagle Conservation Plan (when there is no federal nexus). Proponents should implement conservation measures to avoid or minimize the production of project-related stressors or minimize the exposure of birds and their resources to the project-related stressors. For more information on avian stressors and recommended conservation measures, see https://www.fws.gov/library/collections/threats-birds.

In addition to MBTA and BGEPA, Executive Order 13186: *Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory Birds*, obligates all Federal agencies that engage in or authorize activities that might affect migratory birds, to minimize those effects and encourage conservation measures that will improve bird populations. Executive Order 13186 provides for the protection of both migratory birds and migratory bird habitat. For information regarding the implementation of Executive Order 13186, please visit https://www.fws.gov/partner/council-conservation-migratory-birds.

We appreciate your concern for threatened and endangered species. The Service encourages Federal agencies to include conservation of threatened and endangered species into their project planning to further the purposes of the Act. Please include the Consultation Code in the header of this letter with any request for consultation or correspondence about your project that you submit to our office.

Attachment(s):

- Official Species List

OFFICIAL SPECIES LIST

This list is provided pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, and fulfills the requirement for Federal agencies to "request of the Secretary of the Interior information whether any species which is listed or proposed to be listed may be present in the area of a proposed action".

This species list is provided by:

Sacramento Fish And Wildlife Office
Federal Building
2800 Cottage Way, Room W-2605
Sacramento, CA 95825-1846
(916) 414-6600

PROJECT SUMMARY

Project Code: 2023-0135623
Project Name: City of Kingsburg 13 Acre Parcel Annexation CEQA Document
Project Type: New Constr - Above Ground
Project Description: The City of Kingsburg has proposed the annexation and prezoning of Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 394-042-04. Additionally, the City has proposed a Tentative Parcel Map to subdivide the APN into four smaller parcels. Parcel 1 would be 0.65 acres in size, Parcel 2 would be 2.13 acres in size, Parcel 3 would be 10.3 acres in size, and Parcel 4 would be 0.11 acres in size. The City of Kingsburg has proposed the construction of an approximately 18,500 square foot office building on Parcel 2 (project site). The project site is approximately 13.18 acres in size and is generally located north of the intersection of Avenue B and Ventura Court in the County of Fresno. No development is proposed on Parcel 1, 3, or 4 at this time. Any future development of these parcels would require separate, future environmental analysis. Construction of the project would involve grading, paving, building construction, and painting. As a part of the project, Avenue B would be extended, providing access to the project site.

Project Location:

The approximate location of the project can be viewed in Google Maps: https://www.google.com/maps/@36.52363975,-119.56975194735551,14z

Counties: Fresno County, California

ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT SPECIES

There is a total of 5 threatened, endangered, or candidate species on this species list.

Species on this list should be considered in an effects analysis for your project and could include species that exist in another geographic area. For example, certain fish may appear on the species list because a project could affect downstream species.

IPaC does not display listed species or critical habitats under the sole jurisdiction of NOAA Fisheries[1], as USFWS does not have the authority to speak on behalf of NOAA and the Department of Commerce.

See the "Critical habitats" section below for those critical habitats that lie wholly or partially within your project area under this office's jurisdiction. Please contact the designated FWS office if you have questions.

---

1. NOAA Fisheries, also known as the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), is an office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration within the Department of Commerce.

MAMMALS

NAME	STATUS
Fresno Kangaroo Rat *Dipodomys nitratoides exilis* There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5150	Endangered
San Joaquin Kit Fox *Vulpes macrotis mutica* No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/2873	Endangered

AMPHIBIANS

NAME	STATUS
California Tiger Salamander *Ambystoma californiense* Population: U.S.A. (Central CA DPS) There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/2076	Threatened

INSECTS

NAME	STATUS
Monarch Butterfly *Danaus plexippus* No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9743	Candidate

CRUSTACEANS

NAME	STATUS
Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp *Branchinecta lynchi*	Threatened

There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat.
Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/498

CRITICAL HABITATS

THERE ARE NO CRITICAL HABITATS WITHIN YOUR PROJECT AREA UNDER THIS OFFICE'S JURISDICTION.

YOU ARE STILL REQUIRED TO DETERMINE IF YOUR PROJECT(S) MAY HAVE EFFECTS ON ALL ABOVE LISTED SPECIES.

IPAC USER CONTACT INFORMATION

Agency: Provost & Pritchard Consulting
Name: Shaylea Stark
Address: 455 W Fir Ave
City: Clovis
State: CA
Zip: 93612
Email sstark@ppeng.com
Phone: 5594492700

Appendix C: Cultural Resources

California Historical Resources Information System

Fresno
Kern
Kings
Madera
Tulare

Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center
California State University, Bakersfield
Mail Stop: 72 DOB
9001 Stockdale Highway
Bakersfield, California 93311-1022
(661) 654-2289
E-mail: ssjvic@csub.edu
Website: www.csub.edu/ssjvic

To: Wyatt Czeshinski
Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group
455 W. Fir Ave.
Clovis, CA 93611

Record Search 23-414

Date: October 9, 2023

Re: City of Kingsburg Parcel Annexation CEQA Project

County: Fresno

Map(s): Selma 7.5'

CULTURAL RESOURCES RECORDS SEARCH

The California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) contracts with the California Historical Resources Information System's (CHRIS) regional Information Centers (ICs) to maintain information in the CHRIS inventory and make it available to local, state, and federal agencies, cultural resource professionals, Native American tribes, researchers, and the public. Recommendations made by IC coordinators or their staff regarding the interpretation and application of this information are advisory only. Such recommendations do not necessarily represent the evaluation or opinion of the State Historic Preservation Officer in carrying out the OHP's regulatory authority under federal and state law.

The following are the results of a search of the cultural resource files at the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center. These files include known and recorded cultural resources sites, inventory and excavation reports filed with this office, and resources listed on the National Register of Historic Places, the OHP Built Environment Resources Directory, California State Historical Landmarks, California Register of Historical Resources, California Inventory of Historic Resources, and California Points of Historical Interest. Due to processing delays and other factors, not all of the historical resource reports and resource records that have been submitted to the OHP are available via this records search. Additional information may be available through the federal, state, and local agencies that produced or paid for historical resource management work in the search area.

PRIOR CULTURAL RESOURCE STUDIES CONDUCTED WITHIN THE PROJECT AREA AND THE ONE-HALF MILE RADIUS

According to the information in our files, there have been no previous cultural resource studies completed within the project area. There have been seven previous cultural resource studies completed within the one half-mile radius: FR-00135, 00669, 00670, 00671, 01940, 02287, & 02452.

Record Search 23-414

KNOWN/RECORDED CULTURAL RESOURCES WITHIN THE PROJECT AREA AND THE ONE-HALF MILE RADIUS

According to the information in our files, there are no recorded resources within the project area, and it is unknown if any exist there. There are three recorded resources within the one-half mile radius: P-10-002966, 003930, & 005812. These resources consist of historic era ditches, and a railroad.

Resources: P-10-003930, & P-10-005812 have been given California Historical Resource Status codes of 6Y, indicating Determined ineligible for National Register by consensus through Section 106 process – Not evaluated for California Register or local listing. There are no other recorded cultural resources within the project area or radius that are listed in the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, the California Points of Historical Interest, California Inventory of Historic Resources, for the California State Historic Landmarks.

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

We understand the project consists of the construction of a 18,500 square foot building, the annexation and prezoning of APN 394-042-04. At present time, this project area has not been previously studied for cultural resources, and it is unknown if any exist there. As such, prior to ground disturbance activities, we recommend a qualified, professional consultant conduct a field survey to determine if cultural resources are present. A list of qualified consultants can be found at www.chrisinfo.org.

We also recommend that you contact the Native American Heritage Commission in Sacramento. They will provide you with a current list of Native American individuals/organizations that can assist you with information regarding cultural resources that may not be included in the CHRIS Inventory and that may be of concern to the Native groups in the area. The Commission can consult their "Sacred Lands Inventory" file to determine what sacred resources, if any, exist within this project area and the way in which these resources might be managed. Finally, please consult with the lead agency on this project to determine if any other cultural resource investigation is required. If you need any additional information or have any questions or concerns, please contact our office at (661) 654-2289.

By:

Jeremy E David, Assistant Coordinator **Date**: October 9, 2023

Please note that invoices for Information Center services will be sent under separate cover from the California State University, Bakersfield Accounting Office.

Appendix D: Natural Resources Conservation Service

United States Department of Agriculture

NRCS

Natural Resources Conservation Service

A product of the National Cooperative Soil Survey, a joint effort of the United States Department of Agriculture and other Federal agencies, State agencies including the Agricultural Experiment Stations, and local participants

Custom Soil Resource Report for Eastern Fresno Area, California

October 17, 2023

Preface

Soil surveys contain information that affects land use planning in survey areas. They highlight soil limitations that affect various land uses and provide information about the properties of the soils in the survey areas. Soil surveys are designed for many different users, including farmers, ranchers, foresters, agronomists, urban planners, community officials, engineers, developers, builders, and home buyers. Also, conservationists, teachers, students, and specialists in recreation, waste disposal, and pollution control can use the surveys to help them understand, protect, or enhance the environment.

Various land use regulations of Federal, State, and local governments may impose special restrictions on land use or land treatment. Soil surveys identify soil properties that are used in making various land use or land treatment decisions. The information is intended to help the land users identify and reduce the effects of soil limitations on various land uses. The landowner or user is responsible for identifying and complying with existing laws and regulations.

Although soil survey information can be used for general farm, local, and wider area planning, onsite investigation is needed to supplement this information in some cases. Examples include soil quality assessments (http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/soils/health/) and certain conservation and engineering applications. For more detailed information, contact your local USDA Service Center (https://offices.sc.egov.usda.gov/locator/app?agency=nrcs) or your NRCS State Soil Scientist (http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/soils/contactus/?cid=nrcs142p2_053951).

Great differences in soil properties can occur within short distances. Some soils are seasonally wet or subject to flooding. Some are too unstable to be used as a foundation for buildings or roads. Clayey or wet soils are poorly suited to use as septic tank absorption fields. A high water table makes a soil poorly suited to basements or underground installations.

The National Cooperative Soil Survey is a joint effort of the United States Department of Agriculture and other Federal agencies, State agencies including the Agricultural Experiment Stations, and local agencies. The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) has leadership for the Federal part of the National Cooperative Soil Survey.

Information about soils is updated periodically. Updated information is available through the NRCS Web Soil Survey, the site for official soil survey information.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or a part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require

alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250-9410 or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Contents

How Soil Surveys Are Made

Soil surveys are made to provide information about the soils and miscellaneous areas in a specific area. They include a description of the soils and miscellaneous areas and their location on the landscape and tables that show soil properties and limitations affecting various uses. Soil scientists observed the steepness, length, and shape of the slopes; the general pattern of drainage; the kinds of crops and native plants; and the kinds of bedrock. They observed and described many soil profiles. A soil profile is the sequence of natural layers, or horizons, in a soil. The profile extends from the surface down into the unconsolidated material in which the soil formed or from the surface down to bedrock. The unconsolidated material is devoid of roots and other living organisms and has not been changed by other biological activity.

Currently, soils are mapped according to the boundaries of major land resource areas (MLRAs). MLRAs are geographically associated land resource units that share common characteristics related to physiography, geology, climate, water resources, soils, biological resources, and land uses (USDA, 2006). Soil survey areas typically consist of parts of one or more MLRA.

The soils and miscellaneous areas in a survey area occur in an orderly pattern that is related to the geology, landforms, relief, climate, and natural vegetation of the area. Each kind of soil and miscellaneous area is associated with a particular kind of landform or with a segment of the landform. By observing the soils and miscellaneous areas in the survey area and relating their position to specific segments of the landform, a soil scientist develops a concept, or model, of how they were formed. Thus, during mapping, this model enables the soil scientist to predict with a considerable degree of accuracy the kind of soil or miscellaneous area at a specific location on the landscape.

Commonly, individual soils on the landscape merge into one another as their characteristics gradually change. To construct an accurate soil map, however, soil scientists must determine the boundaries between the soils. They can observe only a limited number of soil profiles. Nevertheless, these observations, supplemented by an understanding of the soil-vegetation-landscape relationship, are sufficient to verify predictions of the kinds of soil in an area and to determine the boundaries.

Soil scientists recorded the characteristics of the soil profiles that they studied. They noted soil color, texture, size and shape of soil aggregates, kind and amount of rock fragments, distribution of plant roots, reaction, and other features that enable them to identify soils. After describing the soils in the survey area and determining their properties, the soil scientists assigned the soils to taxonomic classes (units). Taxonomic classes are concepts. Each taxonomic class has a set of soil characteristics with precisely defined limits. The classes are used as a basis for comparison to classify soils systematically. Soil taxonomy, the system of taxonomic classification used in the United States, is based mainly on the kind and character of soil properties and the arrangement of horizons within the profile. After the soil

scientists classified and named the soils in the survey area, they compared the individual soils with similar soils in the same taxonomic class in other areas so that they could confirm data and assemble additional data based on experience and research.

The objective of soil mapping is not to delineate pure map unit components; the objective is to separate the landscape into landforms or landform segments that have similar use and management requirements. Each map unit is defined by a unique combination of soil components and/or miscellaneous areas in predictable proportions. Some components may be highly contrasting to the other components of the map unit. The presence of minor components in a map unit in no way diminishes the usefulness or accuracy of the data. The delineation of such landforms and landform segments on the map provides sufficient information for the development of resource plans. If intensive use of small areas is planned, onsite investigation is needed to define and locate the soils and miscellaneous areas.

Soil scientists make many field observations in the process of producing a soil map. The frequency of observation is dependent upon several factors, including scale of mapping, intensity of mapping, design of map units, complexity of the landscape, and experience of the soil scientist. Observations are made to test and refine the soil-landscape model and predictions and to verify the classification of the soils at specific locations. Once the soil-landscape model is refined, a significantly smaller number of measurements of individual soil properties are made and recorded. These measurements may include field measurements, such as those for color, depth to bedrock, and texture, and laboratory measurements, such as those for content of sand, silt, clay, salt, and other components. Properties of each soil typically vary from one point to another across the landscape.

Observations for map unit components are aggregated to develop ranges of characteristics for the components. The aggregated values are presented. Direct measurements do not exist for every property presented for every map unit component. Values for some properties are estimated from combinations of other properties.

While a soil survey is in progress, samples of some of the soils in the area generally are collected for laboratory analyses and for engineering tests. Soil scientists interpret the data from these analyses and tests as well as the field-observed characteristics and the soil properties to determine the expected behavior of the soils under different uses. Interpretations for all of the soils are field tested through observation of the soils in different uses and under different levels of management. Some interpretations are modified to fit local conditions, and some new interpretations are developed to meet local needs. Data are assembled from other sources, such as research information, production records, and field experience of specialists. For example, data on crop yields under defined levels of management are assembled from farm records and from field or plot experiments on the same kinds of soil.

Predictions about soil behavior are based not only on soil properties but also on such variables as climate and biological activity. Soil conditions are predictable over long periods of time, but they are not predictable from year to year. For example, soil scientists can predict with a fairly high degree of accuracy that a given soil will have a high water table within certain depths in most years, but they cannot predict that a high water table will always be at a specific level in the soil on a specific date.

After soil scientists located and identified the significant natural bodies of soil in the survey area, they drew the boundaries of these bodies on aerial photographs and

identified each as a specific map unit. Aerial photographs show trees, buildings, fields, roads, and rivers, all of which help in locating boundaries accurately.

Soil Map

The soil map section includes the soil map for the defined area of interest, a list of soil map units on the map and extent of each map unit, and cartographic symbols displayed on the map. Also presented are various metadata about data used to produce the map, and a description of each soil map unit.

Custom Soil Resource Report
Soil Map

Map Scale: 1:2,180 if printed on A portrait (8.5" x 11") sheet.

N

Meters: 0 30 60 120 180

Feet: 0 100 200 400 600

Map projection: Web Mercator Corner coordinates: WGS84 Edge tics: UTM Zone 11N WGS84

MAP LEGEND

Area of Interest (AOI)
- Area of Interest (AOI)

Soils
- Soil Map Unit Polygons
- Soil Map Unit Lines
- Soil Map Unit Points

Special Point Features
- Blowout
- Borrow Pit
- Clay Spot
- Closed Depression
- Gravel Pit
- Gravelly Spot
- Landfill
- Lava Flow
- Marsh or swamp
- Mine or Quarry
- Miscellaneous Water
- Perennial Water
- Rock Outcrop
- Saline Spot
- Sandy Spot
- Severely Eroded Spot
- Sinkhole
- Slide or Slip
- Sodic Spot
- Spoil Area
- Stony Spot
- Very Stony Spot
- Wet Spot
- Other
- Special Line Features

Water Features
- Streams and Canals

Transportation
- Rails
- Interstate Highways
- US Routes
- Major Roads
- Local Roads

Background
- Aerial Photography

MAP INFORMATION

The soil surveys that comprise your AOI were mapped at 1:24,000.

Warning: Soil Map may not be valid at this scale.

Enlargement of maps beyond the scale of mapping can cause misunderstanding of the detail of mapping and accuracy of soil line placement. The maps do not show the small areas of contrasting soils that could have been shown at a more detailed scale.

Please rely on the bar scale on each map sheet for map measurements.

Source of Map: Natural Resources Conservation Service
Web Soil Survey URL:
Coordinate System: Web Mercator (EPSG:3857)

Maps from the Web Soil Survey are based on the Web Mercator projection, which preserves direction and shape but distorts distance and area. A projection that preserves area, such as the Albers equal-area conic projection, should be used if more accurate calculations of distance or area are required.

This product is generated from the USDA-NRCS certified data as of the version date(s) listed below.

Soil Survey Area: Eastern Fresno Area, California
Survey Area Data: Version 16, Aug 31, 2023

Soil map units are labeled (as space allows) for map scales 1:50,000 or larger.

Date(s) aerial images were photographed: Mar 16, 2022—May 30, 2022

The orthophoto or other base map on which the soil lines were compiled and digitized probably differs from the background imagery displayed on these maps. As a result, some minor shifting of map unit boundaries may be evident.

Map Unit Legend

Map Unit Symbol	Map Unit Name	Acres in AOI	Percent of AOI
DhA	Delhi loamy sand, 0 to 3 percent slopes, MLRA 17	13.2	100.0%
Totals for Area of Interest		**13.2**	**100.0%**

Map Unit Descriptions

The map units delineated on the detailed soil maps in a soil survey represent the soils or miscellaneous areas in the survey area. The map unit descriptions, along with the maps, can be used to determine the composition and properties of a unit.

A map unit delineation on a soil map represents an area dominated by one or more major kinds of soil or miscellaneous areas. A map unit is identified and named according to the taxonomic classification of the dominant soils. Within a taxonomic class there are precisely defined limits for the properties of the soils. On the landscape, however, the soils are natural phenomena, and they have the characteristic variability of all natural phenomena. Thus, the range of some observed properties may extend beyond the limits defined for a taxonomic class. Areas of soils of a single taxonomic class rarely, if ever, can be mapped without including areas of other taxonomic classes. Consequently, every map unit is made up of the soils or miscellaneous areas for which it is named and some minor components that belong to taxonomic classes other than those of the major soils.

Most minor soils have properties similar to those of the dominant soil or soils in the map unit, and thus they do not affect use and management. These are called noncontrasting, or similar, components. They may or may not be mentioned in a particular map unit description. Other minor components, however, have properties and behavioral characteristics divergent enough to affect use or to require different management. These are called contrasting, or dissimilar, components. They generally are in small areas and could not be mapped separately because of the scale used. Some small areas of strongly contrasting soils or miscellaneous areas are identified by a special symbol on the maps. If included in the database for a given area, the contrasting minor components are identified in the map unit descriptions along with some characteristics of each. A few areas of minor components may not have been observed, and consequently they are not mentioned in the descriptions, especially where the pattern was so complex that it was impractical to make enough observations to identify all the soils and miscellaneous areas on the landscape.

The presence of minor components in a map unit in no way diminishes the usefulness or accuracy of the data. The objective of mapping is not to delineate pure taxonomic classes but rather to separate the landscape into landforms or landform segments that have similar use and management requirements. The delineation of such segments on the map provides sufficient information for the development of resource plans. If intensive use of small areas is planned, however, onsite investigation is needed to define and locate the soils and miscellaneous areas.

An identifying symbol precedes the map unit name in the map unit descriptions. Each description includes general facts about the unit and gives important soil properties and qualities.

Soils that have profiles that are almost alike make up a *soil series*. Except for differences in texture of the surface layer, all the soils of a series have major horizons that are similar in composition, thickness, and arrangement.

Soils of one series can differ in texture of the surface layer, slope, stoniness, salinity, degree of erosion, and other characteristics that affect their use. On the basis of such differences, a soil series is divided into *soil phases*. Most of the areas shown on the detailed soil maps are phases of soil series. The name of a soil phase commonly indicates a feature that affects use or management. For example, Alpha silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is a phase of the Alpha series.

Some map units are made up of two or more major soils or miscellaneous areas. These map units are complexes, associations, or undifferentiated groups.

A *complex* consists of two or more soils or miscellaneous areas in such an intricate pattern or in such small areas that they cannot be shown separately on the maps. The pattern and proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas are somewhat similar in all areas. Alpha-Beta complex, 0 to 6 percent slopes, is an example.

An *association* is made up of two or more geographically associated soils or miscellaneous areas that are shown as one unit on the maps. Because of present or anticipated uses of the map units in the survey area, it was not considered practical or necessary to map the soils or miscellaneous areas separately. The pattern and relative proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas are somewhat similar. Alpha-Beta association, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is an example.

An *undifferentiated group* is made up of two or more soils or miscellaneous areas that could be mapped individually but are mapped as one unit because similar interpretations can be made for use and management. The pattern and proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas in a mapped area are not uniform. An area can be made up of only one of the major soils or miscellaneous areas, or it can be made up of all of them. Alpha and Beta soils, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is an example.

Some surveys include *miscellaneous areas*. Such areas have little or no soil material and support little or no vegetation. Rock outcrop is an example.

Eastern Fresno Area, California

DhA—Delhi loamy sand, 0 to 3 percent slopes, MLRA 17

Map Unit Setting

National map unit symbol: 2ss8r
Elevation: 30 to 430 feet
Mean annual precipitation: 9 to 16 inches
Mean annual air temperature: 59 to 64 degrees F
Frost-free period: 225 to 310 days
Farmland classification: Prime farmland if irrigated

Map Unit Composition

Delhi and similar soils: 85 percent
Minor components: 15 percent
Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.

Description of Delhi

Setting

Landform: Dunes on fan remnants
Landform position (two-dimensional): Shoulder, toeslope
Landform position (three-dimensional): Side slope
Down-slope shape: Linear
Across-slope shape: Linear
Parent material: Eolian deposits derived from sandy alluvium derived from granite

Typical profile

A - 0 to 7 inches: loamy sand
C1 - 7 to 25 inches: loamy sand
C2 - 25 to 60 inches: loamy sand

Properties and qualities

Slope: 0 to 3 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Drainage class: Somewhat excessively drained
Runoff class: Very low
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): High to very high (5.95 to 19.98 in/hr)
Depth to water table: More than 80 inches
Frequency of flooding: None
Frequency of ponding: None
Maximum salinity: Nonsaline (0.0 to 1.0 mmhos/cm)
Available water supply, 0 to 60 inches: Low (about 4.2 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): 3s
Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 4e
Hydrologic Soil Group: A
Ecological site: R017XY906CA - Non-Alkali San Joaquin Valley Desert
Hydric soil rating: No

Minor Components

Hanford

Percent of map unit: 6 percent

Landform: Depressions on fan remnants
Hydric soil rating: No

Dello

Percent of map unit: 6 percent
Landform: Depressions on fan remnants
Hydric soil rating: Yes

Grangeville

Percent of map unit: 1 percent
Hydric soil rating: No

Hilmar

Percent of map unit: 1 percent
Hydric soil rating: No

Dinuba

Percent of map unit: 1 percent
Hydric soil rating: No

References

American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO). 2004. Standard specifications for transportation materials and methods of sampling and testing. 24th edition.

American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM). 2005. Standard classification of soils for engineering purposes. ASTM Standard D2487-00.

Cowardin, L.M., V. Carter, F.C. Golet, and E.T. LaRoe. 1979. Classification of wetlands and deep-water habitats of the United States. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service FWS/OBS-79/31.

Federal Register. July 13, 1994. Changes in hydric soils of the United States.

Federal Register. September 18, 2002. Hydric soils of the United States.

Hurt, G.W., and L.M. Vasilas, editors. Version 6.0, 2006. Field indicators of hydric soils in the United States.

National Research Council. 1995. Wetlands: Characteristics and boundaries.

Soil Survey Division Staff. 1993. Soil survey manual. Soil Conservation Service. U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 18. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/soils/?cid=nrcs142p2_054262

Soil Survey Staff. 1999. Soil taxonomy: A basic system of soil classification for making and interpreting soil surveys. 2nd edition. Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 436. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/soils/?cid=nrcs142p2_053577

Soil Survey Staff. 2010. Keys to soil taxonomy. 11th edition. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/soils/?cid=nrcs142p2_053580

Tiner, R.W., Jr. 1985. Wetlands of Delaware. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control, Wetlands Section.

United States Army Corps of Engineers, Environmental Laboratory. 1987. Corps of Engineers wetlands delineation manual. Waterways Experiment Station Technical Report Y-87-1.

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. National forestry manual. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/soils/home/?cid=nrcs142p2_053374

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. National range and pasture handbook. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/landuse/rangepasture/?cid=stelprdb1043084

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. National soil survey handbook, title 430-VI. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/soils/scientists/?cid=nrcs142p2_054242

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2006. Land resource regions and major land resource areas of the United States, the Caribbean, and the Pacific Basin. U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 296. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/soils/?cid=nrcs142p2_053624

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service. 1961. Land capability classification. U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 210. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/nrcs142p2_052290.pdf