

EXHIBIT 5 - Planning Commission Staff Report - January 25, 2024

FRESNO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN REVIEW, ZONING CODE UPDATE AND PROGRAM EIR					
Public Comment Summary					
2018 through 2021					
Comment Number	Commenter	Document	Page #	Comment	Response
Federal Agencies					
1	John Dirikson -The Navy	Email - dated May 4, 2018	1	It's a great opportunity to include several military influence areas found in Fresno County. The impacts of these military influences should be considered in the EIR.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on noise are evaluated in Section 4.11, Noise. Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on airports and aircrafts are evaluated in Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials.
2			1	The Navy request that all projects proposed to the County inside the MIA be forwarded to the Navy for review and comment.	See General Plan Policies LU-H.8 through L-H.10
3	John Dirickson, Navy (2018)			NAS Lemoore Military Influence Area -- Navy would like to review & comment; consider environmental factors in relation to local communities.	See General Plan Policies LU-H.8 through L-H.10
4				NAS Lemoore Air Installation Compatible Use Zone -- consider environmental factors to this area.	See General Plan Policies LU-H.8 through L-H.10
5	Naval Facilities Engineering Systems Command (2021)			The County should consider the impact of new growth on military readiness activities on the Military Influence Area and NAS Lemoore Air Installation Compatible Land Use Zone (AICUZ).	See General Plan Policies LU-H.8 through L-H.10
6				The County should consider incorporating key military-community components such as noise contours, accident potential zones, military training routes, and special use airspace.	See General Plan Policies LU-H.8 through L-H.10 and Section 4.11, Noise. Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on airports and aircrafts are evaluated in Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials
7				The commenter included an attachment of their May 2018 comments on the NOP and a map of NAS Lemoore.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on airports and aircrafts are evaluated in Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials.
8	NAWSCL (2021)			The Plan may push urban growth and create conflict with military land and airspace, affecting military readiness	See General Plan Policies LU-H.8 through L-H.10
9				Renewable energy technologies may result in adverse impacts on military testing and training so it should occur in a coordinated and compatible manner.	See General Plan Policies LU-H.8 through L-H.10
10				Commenter provides the opportunity to create a partnership between the County of Fresno and NAWSCL to ensure compatible development.	Comment noted.
State Agencies					
11	Johnson CalFire - Fresno County Fire	Letter - dated April 19, 2018		No comments requiring action/response.	Comment noted.
12	Shaw- Central Valley Flood Protection Board	Letter - dated April 10, 2018	1	Submit the draft Safety Element of the General Plan to the Board at least 90 days prior to the adoption of the General Plan.	Draft General Plan Document was provided to CVFCB staff for review both in July of 2021 and in April of 2023.
13	Spouza-Native American Heritage Commission	Letter - dated April 30, 2018	1	The NAHC recommends consultation with California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally officiated with the geographic area of your proposed project as early as possible.	County Staff initiated Tribal Consultation prior to the release of the DPEIR.

Comment Number	Commenter	Document	Page #	Comment	Response
14	Department of Toxic Substances (2021)			Acknowledge the potential for historic or future activities on/near Planning Area to result in the release of hazardous wastes/substances.	Hazardous materials are discussed in policies HS-F.1 through HS-F.8.
15				Identify the mechanisms to initiate any required investigations and the responsible government agency to provide oversight.	Hazardous materials are discussed in policies HS-F.1 through HS-F.8.
16				Recommends collecting soil samples to test for lead prior to any intrusive activities.	Comment noted. Comment is project specific and not applicable to GPR.
17				Recommends any areas on/near mining activities should be evaluated for mine waste.	Surface mining operations are noted in policies OS-C.1 through OS-C.12.
18				If buildings are demolished, surveys should be conducted for the presence of lead-based products, mercury, asbestos, and polychlorinated biphenyl caulk.	Demolition of structures are discussed in Policy HS-F.5 through HS-F.6.
19				Recommends imported soils should be sampled for contaminants.	Comment noted. Comment is project specific and not applicable to GPR.
20				If a site has been used for agriculture or weed abatement, the area should be investigated for pesticides.	Comment noted. Comment is project specific and not applicable to GPR.
21	San Joaquin Valley APCD (2021)			Commenter offers an ongoing commitment to strengthen the relationship between APCD and the City	The Lead Agency for this document is Fresno County.
22				There should be appropriate project siting to help ensure there is adequate distance between conflicting land uses and away from sensitive receptors.	See policies EJ-A.1 through EJ-A.7 and additional modifications in the Zoning Ordinance including Chapter 828.3.080.
23				There should be an effort to reduce VMT.	See policies TR-A.2 and TR-A.25
24				The commenter recommends that the EIR include or incorporate by reference, policies that will reduce or mitigate VMT impacts to the extent feasible.	See Section 4.3 <i>Air Quality</i> and 4.15 <i>Transportation and Traffic</i> if the DPEIR.
25				The commenter recommends that a more detailed preliminary review of the Plan be conducted for construction and operational emissions including potential impacts on: construction and operational emissions, recommended model, truck routing, cleanest available truck, idling, electric and on-road equipment, and under-fired char broilers.	See Section 4.3 <i>Air Quality</i> and 4.15 <i>Transportation and Traffic</i> if the DPEIR.

Comment Number	Commenter	Document	Page #	Comment	Response
26				The commenter recommends the EIR include a discussion on the feasibility of implementing a Voluntary Emission Reduction Agreement for the Plan.	See Section 4.3 <i>Air Quality of the DPEIR</i> .
27				The commenter recommends that future development projects should be evaluated for potential health impacts to surrounding receptors resulting from operational and multi-year construction TAC emissions.	Comment noted. See Section 4.3 Air Quality DPEIR.
28				The commenter recommends that an AAQA be performed for a project if emissions exceed 100 pounds per day of any emission.	Comment noted. See Section 4.3 Air Quality and Policies OS-G.1 through OS-G.5 of the General Plan Policy Document.
29				The commenter recommends that the EIR include a discussion of whether future development would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant or precursor.	See Section 4.3 <i>Air Quality of the DPEIR</i> .
30				Consider the feasibility of incorporating vegetative barriers and urban greening as a measure to reduce air pollution exposure on sensitive receptors.	Comment noted. See policies LU-A.13, EJ-A.12, EJ-A.13, EJ-A.15 and Chapter 822.3 of the Zoning Ordinance.
31				The commenter recommends that the EIR include a measure requiring the assessment and potential installation of particulate matter emission control systems for new large restaurants operating under-fired char broilers.	Comment noted. Comment is more oriented towards project-level mitigation. Section 4.3 Air Quality DPEIR does include discussion of air quality mitigation including listing of potential project-level mitigation to reduce emissions.
32				The commenter provided a list of district rules and regulations that the County should apply to the Plan.	Received. Comment noted.
33				The commenter recommends that a copy of the district's comments be provided to the Project proponent.	Comment noted.
Local Agencies/Cities					
34	Clark-City of Fresno - Development and Resource Management Department	Letter - dated May 4, 2018	1	Regarding policy ED-B.5, the GP uses the term Fresno County as a location, for example, ".... and the location of High Speed Rail heavy maintenance and operation facilities within Fresno County. It might be helpful at the beginning of the GP to clarify that the use of term "Fresno County" in this way is intended to be general, not jurisdictional, so it would include all lands within Fresno County, including incorporated cities.	Modified as Policy ED.B4. Language has been modified.

Comment Number	Commenter	Document	Page #	Comment	Response
35			2	The City of Fresno Development Code establishes the 2014 Fresno General Plan as the, plan that take priority over community plans, excepting airport land use plans and the Downtown Plans. Recommend that the County clarify its priority of plans for areas within the city of Fresno and its sphere of influence by cross referencing applicable policies and/or Fresno Municipal Code sections as may be amended. We also recommend that county land use in the Fresno Sphere of Influence (SOI) be consistent with the Fresno General Plan's Land Use Diagram (Figure LU-1).	Comment noted. The County cannot commit to updating all of our plans but has since adopted a plan updating prioritization process. The County will not seek to back-zone RR properties cannot enforce the City's municipal code. The County's primary interest is preserving the road right-of-way.
36			0	Policy ED-8.4: UC Medical School. This policy states that the County shall support the establishment of a University of California Medical School in the San Joaquin Valley and its associated research and training facilities in Fresno County. The City interprets this policy as directing any such facility to an incorporated or urbanized area within the County.	This policy has been deleted.
37			2	Page 2-50, Policy LU-C.4: Does the deletion of this policy result in the repealing of the Friant Community Plan?	The Friant Community Plan is not being repealed.
38			2	Policy LU-E.6: Planned Residential Development Conditions. We suggest that any rural residential development within the SOI should require a conditional use permit to enable application of the City's development standards. Suggest adding another policy category titled "Planned Residential Development within City Spheres of Influence", or something similar. In addition, the conditions for both this policy and the following one (Policy LU-E.7) do not require the availability of an adequate water source. We recommend that this requirement be included in these two policies. We note that such language is included in Policy LU-E.8, Rural Residential Northeast of the Enterprise Canal (Clovis).	Comments noted. The County will not be pursuing conditional use permits for rural residential development. County is also not pursuing a blanket planned residential development requirement within the SOIs. PRDs may continue to be considered on a project-by-project basis.
39			0	Policy LU-G.8: Community Plan Updates. The City supports the idea of jointly updating any overlapping county plans when it updates its own plans. In addition, the City would encourage the County to consider the adoption of the city's land use within the SOI.	Comment noted.

Comment Number	Commenter	Document	Page #	Comment	Response
40			0	Policy LU-G.13: Leapfrog Growth. The City supports this policy, but would encourage flexibility in its application when processing contested annexations.	Comment noted.
41			2	Page 2-81: LU G.19 (No Title). The City suggests that this policy be maintained, but modified as follows: "On land that is not within a city's planned urban boundary but is within a city's sphere of influence, the County shall maintain zoning consistent with the General Plan (or if applicable, community or specific plan) land use designations adopted by the city for land within its sphere of influence. Methods to ensure consistency could include but not limited to joint amendments to land use maps through specific planning processes."	Comment noted. The County is deleting this policy.
42			3	Page 2-167, Goal OS-J: To identify, project, and enhance Fresno County's important historical.... It appears that this goal actually contains three goals and might be more understandable if split into three separate parts.	Goal OS-J has been modified to expand its scope.
43			Attachment A	Transportation and Circulation Comments (see Attachment A)	The County has been in discussion with City of Fresno staff to address the classification inconsistencies. There will be future opportunities to address inconsistencies through amendments and the MOU process.
44	Lum-Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District	Letter - dated May 4, 2018		No comments requiring action/response.	Comments noted.
45	Jim- Anderson -Malaga County Water District	Letter dated March 13, 2018	1	Much of the information in the Background Report related to the services provided by the District is inaccurate or outdated.	The County's SB 244 analysis, attached to the Background Report as Appendix A, has updated much of this information.
46				"Water is provided to this area by the Malaga County Water District through 2 groundwater wells." The District currently has 3 water wells.	
47				"The water infrastructure is sufficient to serve the current population." This statement is true.	

Comment Number	Commenter	Document	Page #	Comment	Response
48				"The KBDAC Study noted, however, that Malaga's drinking water exceeded acceptable standards for DBCP and arsenic." This statement is erroneous. Wastewater: (page 3-69)	
49				"The sewer infrastructure is sufficient to serve the current population." This statement is true.	
50				"The KBDAC Study reported that there have been problems with infiltration." This statement is erroneous. Fresno County General Plan Policy Document.	
51			3	The information provided in the Background Report related to solid waste collection services provided by the Malaga County Water District (page 6-7) is based on the 2007 MSR and as a result is outdated and incomplete.	
52			3	Policy ED-A.7: This policy, at least as it relates to Malaga, appears to be in direct contradiction to the proposed Environmental Justice Element of the Fresno County General Plan. ("FCEJE") Under CalEnviroScreen 3.0 scores, generated by the California Environmental Agency ("Cal EPA") referenced in the FCEJE, the Malaga Census Tract (Tract 6019001500) has the 5th highest score in the State of California with a pollution burden percentile of 99.99 and disadvantaged- population characteristics percentile of 92.77. Considering that the Malaga Census Tract extends eastward to Temperance Avenue, well beyond the Malaga Community, the Malaga Community with its proximately to State Route 99 corridor and industrial development in and around the Malaga Community, certainly would score much higher. The high pollution burden and high disadvantaged population characteristics of the Malaga Community are, as the FCEJE states: "largely a result of inappropriate zoning (e.g., residential uses located adjacent to industrial uses)."	References to Malaga have been removed from Policy ED-A.7. Staff recommended the Board not consider initiating the preparation of a specific plan for the community of Malaga at this time. The Board concurred with staff's recommendation in its unanimous August 21, 2018 direction to staff.
53			4	The current Land Use Policies of the County and the new proposed Land Use Policies including Section ED-A.7 violate most of the policy goals of the FCEJE listed at pages 2-206 - 2-207 of the draft policy document together with numerous existing General Plan Policies and Goals.	References to Malaga have been removed from Policy ED-A.7.
54			4	The County should prepare a specific plan for the Malaga Community.	The Board did not direct staff to prepare as specific plan for Malaga.

Comment Number	Commenter	Document	Page #	Comment	Response
55			4	The Malaga County Water District looks forward to working with the County to mitigate the impacts of the County's concentration of industrial, manufacturing, and commercial uses within the Malaga Community and providing necessary services to improve the health, safety, and welfare of the residents of the greater Malaga Community through the development of a Malaga Community specific plan or other mitigating measures.	The Malaga County Water District is welcomed to participate in the GP Review and Revision process. An Environmental Justice-orientated workshop related to the release of the GPR and PDEIR documents was held in Malaga in May of 2023.
56	Rob Terry- City of Reedley - Community Development	Letter - dated April 12, 2018	1	The City encourages Fresno County to incorporate the designation of a "greenbelt" around the City of Reedley's perimeter, allowing for a buffer between neighboring Fresno County cities. Such a designation is to accommodate the protection of both environmentally sensitive areas and existing agricultural activities found within these areas, and provide for the maintenance of physical separation vital to a sense of place. Such a buffer is identified within the City of Reedley's currently adopted General Plan, within the Conservation, Open Space, Parks and Recreation Element (COSP 4.38). The City also welcomes open dialogue with the County regarding specific strategies to incorporate such an area through the use of existing zoning designations, overlay zones, or additional methodologies most appropriate for the area, if desired.	Comment noted. If the City of Reedley wishes to identify a greenbelt around the city as a buffer between the City of Reedley and neighboring cities, they may do so as long as the greenbelt is within their SOI. No policy change.
57	City of Fresno (2021)			Examine policies in relation to well-drilling and the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act with mitigation.	Policies associated with SGMA are located in Section A, Water Resources of the Open Space and Conservation Element of the General Plan Policy Document.
58				Ensure the groundwater quality of septic tanks are thoroughly analyzed.	Policies OS-A.17 addresses septic system design.
59				Avoid or mitigate impacts of AQ, transportation, VMT, GHG, and noise in rural residential parcels.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on air quality are evaluated in DPEIR Section 4.3, Air Quality. Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on transportation and VMT are evaluated in Section 4.15, Transportation and Traffic. Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on greenhouse gas emissions are evaluated in Section 4.8, Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on noise are evaluated in Section 4.12, Noise.

Comment Number	Commenter	Document	Page #	Comment	Response
60				Impacts of good movements on city roads should be analyzed.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on air quality are evaluated in DPEIR Section 4.3, Air Quality. Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on transportation and VMT are evaluated in Section 4.15, Transportation and Traffic. Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on greenhouse gas emissions are evaluated in Section 4.8, Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on noise are evaluated in Section 4.12, Noise.
61	City of Fresno- Development & Resources Mgmt. Department (2018)			City concurs an EIR is appropriate level of CEQA review.	This comment is noted.
62			Pages 1 through 13	Commenter provides a comprehensive list of GP review comments. Many comments several comments note typographical errors; requested wording modifications or requests for partnering or coordination.	These comemnts have been noted. Sme corrections have been made. The County will continue to coordinate with the City on projects within the SOI.
63			2	Policy ED-A.7 cites new industrial uses near Calwa and Malaga which could add pollution burden to these communities.	Policy has been modified to remove refernce to these communities.
64			3	Policy ED-A.16 Locating regional processing facilities. The City requests additional language to encourage community consultation.	Additional policies have been included in the EJ Element to expand publci notification for projects in procimity to DACs.
65			4	Policy LU-A.8 Policy may need to be updated to acknowledge new state laws regarding ADUs.	The County is addressing ADUs in compliance with state law and has updated ADU provisions in its Zoning Ordnance.
66			4	Policy LU-A.16 and LU-A.17/LU-B.14 Long Range Planning would like to see a stronger commitment to his policies and recommends using "shall" rather than "should".	The language of LU-B.14 provides a key response to these comments in that the County should be provided subvention payment as partial replacement for foregone tax revenue.
67			4	Policy LU-E.24 Long Range Planning feels this policy is contrary to Goal LU-G. Such new development would cause impacts to City roads while increasing VMT. Recommends greenfield development be contingent on a lack of ability to grow in existing incorporated and unincorporated centers.	Comments noted. The Reno, Garonne, Willow Bluff Rural Residential Area addresses existing development patterns and does not remove the need to complete additional CEQA analysis or discretionary land use permitting (rezoning). Establishes a future five-acre minimum parcel size.
68			5	Policy LU-F.8 Regarding Complete Streets, how does the County incorporate design guidelines into the City's community or specific plan and how are these enforced without the City incorporating them into their community or specific plan?	Large scale community plan updates within the City's SOI would be coordinated with the City for comment. More likely, ona project-level basis, the County would coordinate with the City regarding street design or construction projects within the SOI.
69			5	Policy LU-F.19 Suggest adding General Industrial to this policy regarding Residential Area Buffers.	The County has included policies in its EJ Element to address potential conflicts between certain industrial uses and sensitive receptors. The Zoning Ordinance has also been revised to add buffering provisions to implement these policies.
70			6	Policy LU-F.29 Questioning whether it would be simpler to direct an interest party to rezone desired land to industrial rather that examine the conditions listed.	Comment noted. This policy has limited applicability. There is no evidence that this existing policy has been problematic.

Comment Number	Commenter	Document	Page #	Comment	Response
71			6	Policy LU-F.30 Suggest adding physical measures and design elements to address industrial development cited in the policy.	The County has addressed this through EJ policies and changes to the Zoning Ordinance to implement these policies.
72			6	Policy LU-F.32 In some cases there may not be adequate setbacks/landscaping in existing neighborhoods to buffer against increased industrial traffic, so a higher standard may be necessary.	The County has addressed some of these issues through EJ policies and changes to the Zoning Ordinance to implement these policies.
73			6	It would be nice if new parking areas could meet a higher design standard than what may have existed in the past. The use of trees and other planting can significantly improve the visual appearance of surface parking areas, as well as provide shade.	The County has addressed some of these issues through EJ policies and changes to the Zoning Ordinance to implement these policies.
74			7	Policies LU-G.8 and 9 Does the County's planned land use designation for unincorporated land within the Fresno's SOI match that of Fresno's planned land use designation as identified in the Fresno General Plan Figure LU-1? Do the zone districts match?	Comments noted. Depending on date of Community Plan adoption and subsequent City actions, there may be inconsistencies in designation or zoning. This can be rectified during the annexation process or comprehensive community plan updates. Policies are proposed to remain unchanged.
75			7	Figure TR-1b needs to be updated to match the Fresno General Plan Circulation Element and the inset to match the Downtown Neighborhoods Plan.	Comments noted. Diagrams may be updated through a separate effort in further coordination with City and County staff.
76			10	Policy PF-A.5 Would like to see canals removed from this list and instead promoted as landscape features and/or multi-use trails, similar to the language in OS-A.13 regarding natural water courses.	The majority of open channel facilities in the unincorporated areas are under the control of their entities, such as FID. FID has specifically requested trails to be outside of their right-of-way, likely for liability or maintenance purposes. The requested policy change would run counter to requests made by agencies that control the infrastructure.
77			10	Policy PF-C.18 (PF-C.22) This policy seems unwise given our overdrawn groundwater table.	This policy regarding out-of-county groundwater transfers states the County shall support efforts to regulate the transfer of groundwater. It does not state such efforts will be supported.
78			10	Policy PF-F.3 Long Range Planning suggests aiming for stronger protections, particularly the establishment of Community Benefits Agreements.	Comment noted. The County is not considering imposing CBAs for development projects.
79			11	Policy PF-F.10 Request to include language that states "Transfer stations shall not be located within city sphere of influences."	Modification too restrictive. Some industrial areas still remain in the SOI. Development into greenfield areas could displace agricultural land or cause placement in proximity to DUCs.
80			12	Policy EJ-B.1 The County should commit to providing needed infrastructure to enable this policy, such as installing sidewalks near schools, retail locations, etc.	The language has been revised to tie such efforts appropriately to community plan updates. Needed infrastructure will vary by community and circumstance. Policy flexibility must be retained.
81			12	Policy EJ-B.4 Request changing "encourage" to "require" for bicycle parking racks for new multi-family residential, commercial, and industrial developments.	This modification has been made.

Comment Number	Commenter	Document	Page #	Comment	Response
82			12	Policy EJ-D.1 Language could be enhanced to explain how meaningful engagement could occur.	Policy modified as EJ-E.1 and includes language to encourage partnering with local agencies and non-profits. Additional modifications also were made. The County would not approach modifying this policy with language that includes multiple learning sessions.
83	City of Reedley (2018)			Urge County to incorporate GP designation of "Greenbelt" around the City of Reedley's perimeter.	Comment noted. If the City of Reedley wishes to identify a greenbelt around the city as a buffer between the City of Reedley and neighboring cities, they may do so as long as the greenbelt is within their SOI. No policy change.
84				Approves of the County's efforts to engage in regional coordination activities, such as the multi-jurisdictional housing element, and RTP.	Comment noted.
85	Fresno Irrigation District Laurence Kimura, P.E 9 Chief Engineer	Letter Received December 22, 2021		FID supports many provisions of the 2021 Draft General Plan Policy Document.	Comment noted.
86				FID is concerned about impacts of future industrial, commercial or residential development without FID improved facilities. Becomes more difficult for FID to maintain.	Comment noted. The County will continue to use nexus and rough proportionality when evaluating requested improvements at the project level.
87				It is imperative that FID facilities be upgraded. Small canals and pipelines must be upgraded in an urban development setting.	Comment noted. The County will continue to use nexus and rough proportionality when evaluating requested improvements at the project level.
88				FID would like the County's support when properties are subject to rezoning. Greater support for nexus determinations.	Comment noted. See General Plan Policies PF-A.5
89				County must support FID's needs to mitigate development's impacts to third party facilities and that canal improvements are fully-funded.	Comment noted. See General Plan Policies PF-A.5 The County will continue to use nexus and rough proportionality when evaluating requested improvements at the project level.
90				Request FID approval of all plans.	County does not relinquish plan approval to other agencies excluding fire districts. Through the project and Site Plan Review process, the County will distribute relevant plans for comment by FID.
91				FID will not allow trail easements in FID-owned right-of-way. FID requires all trail improvements be placed in FID-area right-of-way.	Comment noted. This is a project-specific comment that would be appropriate when FID review a specific trail improvement project. See General Plan Policy OS-I.13 regarding trail maintenance.
92				Additional FID Comments 2.A through 4.D	These are project-specific comments that would be appropriately made when a discretionary land use application is proposed within proximity to FID facilities.
93				FID comments 5.A through 5.D regarding potential impacts to groundwater through development, that the County require proposed developments balance anticipated groundwater use with reduction in the demand side or use of recharge, resolution of water supply issues and demand side of water be evaluated as much as the supply side.	Comments noted. See General Plan policies LU-A.20, LU-E.8 and PF-C.1 through PF-C.10. Also see Domestic Water Supply Policies PF-C.11 through PF-C.20; Water Conservation Policies PF-C.23 through PF-C.28; and PF-E.14 regarding Retention-Recharge Basins

Comment Number	Commenter	Document	Page #	Comment	Response
Organizations					
94	Cador- American Civil Liberties Union Foundation of Northern California	Letter - dated May 4, 2018	2	Disadvantaged communities should be identified by census tracts. The methodology for identification of disadvantaged communities needs to be identified.	General Plan identifies disadvantaged communities and outlines the selection criteria for these communities on Table EJ-1 on page 2-193 through 2-194. Section 3.12 of the General Plan Background Report identifies SB 1000 communities by Census Tract.
95			3	The Background Report(BKGR) omits 67 census tracks identified by CALEPA (In April 2017, CALEPA identified 119 census tracts in the County as disadvantaged). The BKGR identifies 52.	The General Plan meets each of the requirements of SB 1000 by addressing each of the points set forth in Government Code section 65302(h) and SB 1000 Guidelines put forth by the Governor's Office of Research and Planning (OPR). More specifically the General Plan meets each of the SB 1000 requirements as follows 1) Identify disadvantaged communities within the area covered by the General Plan of a county; 2) The General Plan identifies disadvantaged communities and outlines the selection criteria for these communities on Table EJ-1 on page 2-193 through 2-194. The General Plan Background Report also includes a list and analysis of identified disadvantaged communities in Appendix A.
96			3	The GP must include policies and programs promoting safe and sanitary housing	Comment noted. See Section D <i>Safe and Sanitary Homes</i> of the General Plan's Environmental Justice Element.
97			4	Identify objectives and polices to reduce the unique or compound health risks in disadvantage communities by means to include, but are not limited to, the reduction of pollution exposure, including the improvement of air quality, and the promotion of public facilities, food access, safe and sanitary homes, and physical activities.	Comment noted. Many of these points have been addressed in the General Plan's Environmental Justice Element.
98				Need more concrete polices for civil engagement.	Comment noted. See Section E <i>Community Participation</i> of the General Plan's Environmental Justice Element.
99				The County should engage disadvantaged communities in crafting the policies.	Comment noted. The County held a number of community workshops in 2018, 2022 and 2023 including two Environmental Justice Workshops in May of 2023. The County also held workshops for its SB 244 Analysis in early 2020.
100	Prandini-Building Industry Association of Fresno/Madera Counties, Inc.	Letter - dated April 12, 2018	1	BIA proposes that 3,650 acres of land between the Friant Community Plan and Millerton Specific Plan area be considered for residential development.	The BIA's proposal was rejected by the Board in August of 2018.
101	Mariah Thompson -California Rural Legal Assistance, Inc.	Letter - Dated May 4, 2018	2	Data on freight shipment and truck routes are six years old. Transportation project tables are not current.	The Background Report was updated to include freight and truck data from 2017 and 2018.
102			2	Transportation project tables are not current.	See response above.

Comment Number	Commenter	Document	Page #	Comment	Response
103			2	Data on water systems and quality and quantity are based on outdated MSRs. The service providers must be contacted individually.	Water data was updated in the 2020 SB 244 Analysis included as Appendix A to the Background Report.
104			2	This section also fails to identify water contamination in multiple communities, contains outdated information on SGMA, and insufficiently reflects infrastructure needs in rural communities such as new construction of water treatment facilities, delayed maintenance, and wells impacted by the drought.	See above.
105			2	Each water provider must be individually contacted for updated information related to water quality, availability, and the anticipated sustainability of water resources, because MSRs and SOIs are too old to provide accurate data.	Updated data was utilized for the SB 244 analysis.
106			2	Wastewater treatment facility information is also old.	See above.
107				Info regarding the Fresno County Local Agency Management Program (LAMP) should be integrated into this section to ensure accuracy.	DPEIR page 4.7-18 has a discussion of the LAMP. Also incorporated into policies in the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance Update.
108			2	Data related to solid waste and solid waste management is 20 years old.	Background Report was updated pulling data from SWIS and other more recent sources.
109			3	The groundwater information must be updated to address recent developments in SGMA. Groundwater contaminants must be identified in communities throughout Fresno County.	SGMA is discussed extensively 4.10-2, 3, 9; 4.17-2 of the DPEIR
110				Air quality data and the emissions inventory are outdated and include data from a single air monitor. Attainment data must be current.	Air Quality is discussed in Section 4.3 of the DPEIR and in the Open Space and Health and Safety Elements of the General Plan Policy Document.
111				Attainment status data for the San Joaquin Valley Area Basin must be current.	Air Quality is discussed in Section 4.3 of the DPEIR.

Comment Number	Commenter	Document	Page #	Comment	Response
112			4	Jurisdictions must include climate adaptation planning in their safety element upon the next revision of the jurisdiction's Local Hazard Mitigation Plan after Jan.1, 2017. Jurisdictions are required to conduct a vulnerability assessment to identify the risks that climate change poses to local jurisdictions and then identify policies and implementation measures to address the risks. Jurisdictions may use their their Local Hazard Mitigation Plan to fulfill this requirement if the plan meets the requirements.	CVA was prepared and included as Appendix C to the General Plan Policy document. CVA resulted in updated General Plan Policies.
113			5	Density bonus law prohibits density bonus be given where affordable housing is demolished to provide for market rate housing .	Density Bonus provisions updated with Amendment to Text No. 380 approved in 2020. Incorporated into the Zoning Ordinance Update.
114			6	Units provided with density bonus must include deed restriction for affordability for 55 years.	Density Bonus provisions updated with Amendment to Text No. 380 approved in 2020. Incorporated into the Zoning Ordinance Update.
115			6	There are insufficient parcels that are zoned R-3 and R-4 to accommodate high density multi-family units requiring developers to change the designation and zoning to develop multi-family units.	R-4 Zoning is propsoed to be removed from the Zoning Ordinance. The Sixth-Cycle Adoption of the Housing Element, a separate effort, is reviewing additional R-3 areas.
116				County relies heavily on C-4 parcels for low income housing.	Comment noted. Also being addressed through Sixth Cycle Housing Element.
117				County must re-zone land to R3 and R4 to accommodate housing for low income population.	R-4 Zoning is propsoed to be removed from the Zoning Ordinance. The Sixth-Cycle Adoption of the Housing Element, a separate effort, is reviewing additional R-3 areas.
118			7	Commercial parcels are insufficient to meet housing needs.	See above.
119				Cost reduction for density bonus projects must benefit affordable housing development.	Density Bonus provisions updated with Amendment to Text No. 380 approved in 2020. Incorporated into the Zoning Ordinance Update.
120				County must not require a Use Permit for developments that apply for density bonus.	Density Bonus provisions updated with Amendment to Text No. 380 approved in 2020. Incorporated into the Zoning Ordinance Update.
121				The County fails to adequately identify infrastructure deficiencies in DUCs	SB 244 Analysis was updated in 2020 and attached as Appendix A to the Background Report.

Comment Number	Commenter	Document	Page #	Comment	Response
122			7	The SB 244 section must analyze water quality, water availability, sustainability of the water supply, wastewater or septic systems and their state of repair, the adequacy of existing stormwater drainage systems for preventing flooding and the structural fire protection needs in the community.	See above.
123			10	Commitment in the 5th-Cycle to allow Emergency Shelters as a by-right use in R-3, R-4 and C-4. Not addressed in the updated ZO. Also, provisions for SRO units need to be revisited.	Emergency Shelters and SRO provisions have been modified in the latest draft of ZOU.
124			11	The draft documents [General Plan and Zoning Ordinance] do not facilitate housing for the homeless and other persons with special needs	See above. Also,, provisions for reasonable accommodations updated.
125			12	The EIR must analyze the effects of increased development and industry.	DPEIR has analyzed impacts based on updated build-out estimates.
126	Monaco - (Leadership Counsel for Justice & Accountability)	Letter - Dated May 4, 2018	2	The County's methodology in identifying these communities is inconsistent with the statute. The statute directs jurisdictions to consider the number of units without regard to parcel density.	See Master Response to SB 244 as part of 2023 General Plan Response to Comments.
127			2	Expand analysis of infrastructure and service deficiencies in disadvantaged communities to identify present and future needs in light of existing and forecasted conditions.	See Master Response to SB 244 as part of 2023 General Plan Response to Comments.
128				Inadequate information as to the adequacy of wastewater infrastructure.	See Master Response to SB 244 as part of 2023 General Plan Response to Comments.
129				Inadequate information as to the adequacy of stormwater infrastructure.	See Master Response to SB 244 as part of 2023 General Plan Response to Comments.
130				Inadequate information regarding drinking water access and quality-groundwater in DUCs are contaminated and some wells have failed.	See Master Response to SB 244 as part of 2023 General Plan Response to Comments.
131			4	The draft BKGR is missing several legacy communities .	Background Report updated to include revised SB 244 and SB 1000 analysis.
132				The County must correct its analysis of legacy communities consistent with legal mandates.	See Master Response to SB 244 as part of 2023 General Plan Response to Comments.

Comment Number	Commenter	Document	Page #	Comment	Response
133			5	Fresno County must set out possible avenues of financial support on a case-by -case basis and consider regional solutions.	See Master Response to SB 244 as part of 2023 General Plan Response to Comments.
134			5	The land use chapter introduction should cover unincorporated areas in addition to incorporated areas. Sections 3.1 and 3.2 of the land use chapter does not provide information on development and investment in unincorporated areas.	Background Report updated; unedrcores most of the development has occurred in the Fresno/Clovis metropolitan area.
135			5	The land use element should include summaries of community plans. Address the need for updating the community plans.	Not required by law. Community plans listed.
136			6	Background Report does not satisfy legal requirements regarding air quality.	Background report was updated. Additional analysis has occurred in the DPEIR.
137			7	Background Report does not include analysis of water shortage, drinking and groundwater issues in Fresno County.	See above.
138			7	The noise analysis should describe the disproportionate noise impact on disadvantaged communities.	Additional noise discussion included in the General Plan Policy document. Key noise and Environmental Justice policies have been cross referenced.
139			8	The Background Report should discuss economic and demographic conditions in Fresno County including disparities by race and income level.	Background Report has been updated to include SB 244 and SB 1000 analysis.
140			8	Economic Development Goals and Policies Should Prioritize Economic Development for Lower Income Communities and Residents through Community Development and Career Development Strategies.	Comment noted. Cross references between the Economic Development and Environmental Justice elements have been added.
141				Incorporate effective measures to prevent displacement of existing businesses and ensure local hire.	Comment noted. Effort has been made to balance Economic Development goals and policies with Environmental Justice goals and policies to avoid displacement by adding additional mitigation for certain types of intensive activities.
142				Adopt and prioritize in-fill development as an economic development strategy.	Efforts have been made to balance Economic Development with Environmental Justice. Staff acknowledges there are challenges developing or intensifying commercial or industrial uses in areas adjacet to historically disadvantaged communities.

Comment Number	Commenter	Document	Page #	Comment	Response
143			10	Ensure that development programs advance workforce development and living wage job and career opportunities suited to a changing economy. Recommend changes to the following policies: ED-A.3- the Economic Development Team to include representation from community based organizations, community based workforce development and apprenticeship programs, labor unions, local school districts, State Center Community College District and local universities such as Fresno State and Fresno Pacific. Include new economic development policies focused on strengthening draft policies ED-A.9, A. 10, A.13 and A.14 - by requiring partnerships between communities, business leaders, regional workforce developers, local schools and universities to establish workforce development programs to ensure that workers impacted and/or displaced by decreased labor demands due to changing crop patterns, crop shifts, and climate change receive training and necessary support to transition to new and emerging economic development opportunities. Additionally, ED-A.12 and A.13 should ensure inclusion of and opportunities for small-scale farmers and farmers from under-represented communities.	Comments noted. Several of the noted requests are very specific and could constrict existing policies or discourage policy flexibility.
144				All projects potentially impacting water resources should be analyzed for their impacts on water supply and quality, including cumulative impacts.	Existing and revised policies require water supply analysis for discretionary projects. Water quality and cumulative impacts are evaluated at the project level through the CEQA analysis process.
145				The General Plan must Include Goals and Policies that promote economic and environmental well-being in existing communities, in particular communities confronting historic underinvestment and environmental degradation.	Cross referencing between the Economic Fvelopment and some of the Environmental Justice Analysis policies has occurred.
146			12	Ensure adequate drinking water, wastewater, and stormwater infrastructure and services in disadvantaged communities.	SB 244 Analysis was updated in 2020 and attached as Appendix A to the Background Report. County has also added policies to the Environmental Justice Element.
147			13	Include and Implement Infill Development Policies to Leverage Opportunities in Disadvantaged Communities.	The County will continue to direct growth to the cities and existing established unincorporated communities.
148			14	Address transportation in disadvantaged communities through rural complete streets, alternative public transit models, and investment.	Rural Complete Streets policies have been added and additional policies have been included in the EJ Element.
149			15	Access to healthy green spaces for disadvantaged communities.	Additional policies have been included in the EJ Element.
150			16	Complete and update community plans; definition of urban areas.	A community plan prioritization processs was adopted in the Summer of 2023 which address unincorporated community plans.

Comment Number	Commenter	Document	Page #	Comment	Response
151			16	Protect disadvantaged communities from polluting activities and prioritize improving air quality in vulnerable neighborhoods.	Additional policies have been included in the EJ Element.
152			17	Improve identification of environmental justice communities and explain methodology for identifying these communities.	SB 244 and SB 1000 analysis has been updated.
153			18	Include adequate protections of environmental justice communities from polluting land uses.	Additional policies have been included in the EJ Element.
154			20	Improve planning for infrastructure and service provision to environmental justice communities.	SB 244 Analysis updated in 2020. Additional policies have been included in the EJ Element.
155			21	Change land use and zoning to protect environmental justice communities.	Additional policies have been included in the EJ Element. Additional limitations and buffering provisions added to the Zoning Ordinance to address Warehouse and industrial uses.
156			21	Incorporate climate change planning.	CVA was prepared and included as Appendix C to the General Plan Policy document. CVA resulted in updated General Plan Policies.
157			21	Ensure that policies and programs facilitate and promote civic engagement by disadvantaged communities in the public decision-making process.	Additional policies have been included in the EJ Element.
158			22	The Draft Zoning Ordinance allows for various land uses that are associated with significant adverse impacts to public health, quality of life, and use and enjoyment of housing in the vicinity of such land uses with minimal to no public notice requirements. For instance, warehousing and wholesale is allowed by right-- with no public process -- in all industrial zones.	Modifications have been made to the Zoning Ordinance and General Plan EJ Element to address potential land use conflicts between warehousing, commercial and industrial uses and certain sensitive receptors.
159			22	The Draft Zoning Ordinance includes no requirement for translation of notices into languages commonly spoken in neighborhoods where uses are proposed to be located.	EJ Element policies have been included to address some of these concerns for projects with identifies DACs.
160			22	Existing and proposed industrial sites are disproportionately located next to disadvantaged communities that are disproportionately comprised of people of color, immigrants, and other groups protected under State and Federal civil rights and fair housing laws.	Modifications have been made to the Zoning Ordinance and General Plan EJ Element to address potential land use conflicts between warehousing, commercial and industrial uses and certain sensitive receptors.
161			23	Adopt a comprehensive set of goals and policies to improve air quality.	Through the DPEIR and CVA, additional policies have been added to address air quality include targets to complete a Climate Action Plan.
162			24	Improve protections of vital groundwater resources.	Additional policies have been included in the Public Facilities and Health and Safety elements.
163			24	Create a water budget in collaboration with local GSAs. Do not delete the current policy (PF-C5).	Policies have been modified in light of the advent of SGMA.

Comment Number	Commenter	Document	Page #	Comment	Response
164			25	All projects potentially impacting water resources should be analyzed for their impacts on water supply and quality, including cumulative impacts.	Comment noted. This is required by CEQA.
165			25	Protect drinking water supplies by enacting a strong policy to encourage consolidation of drinking water systems.	This is already required by the State of California and is addressed at the project level.
166			26	Provide an accurate land use designation map and better define land use designations.	Comment noted. The County will continue to use it's broad land use diagram while directing reviewers to the community, regional or specific plans.
167			26	Define the term certain non-agricultural uses.	Policy ED-B.1 lists some the the potential non-agriclutral uses that could be developed.
168			26	Incorporate effective climate adaptation and mitigation policies.	Completion of the CVA resulted in new or modified policies to address climate change and resiliency.
169	Werner (Leadership Counsel for Justice & Accountability)	Letter dated May 4, 2018	2	The Draft Zoning Ordinance fails to comply with Employee Housing Act ("EHA"), Health and Safety Code Section 17000, et seq., by excluding housing expressly included in the EHA in its definitions of employee housing, by failing to allow employee housing in zones where agriculture is allowed and by placing unwarranted restrictions on the development of employee housing.	The Zoning Ordinance was modified in 2020 and 2022 to address employee and farworker housing to bring it more into compliance with state law.
170			3	The Draft Zoning Ordinance definition of farmworker housing dwellings and farmworker complexes excludes employee housing encompassed by the EHA.	The Zoning Ordinance was modified in 2020 and 2022 to address employee and farworker housing to bringing it more into compliance with state law.
171			4	The Draft Ordinance improperly excludes farmworker housing from zone districts where agricultural uses are allowed.	The Zoning Ordinance was modified in 2020 and 2022 to address employee and farworker housing to bringing it more into compliance with state law.
172			4	The Draft Ordinance places unwarranted restrictions on farmworker housing complexes.	The Zoning Ordinance was modified in 2020 and 2022 to address employee and farworker housing to bringing it more into compliance with state law.
173			5	The Draft Ordinance is inconsistent with the State Density Bonus Law.	The Zoning Ordinance has been updated since this comment was made.
174			5	The Draft Ordinance fails to provide for a density bonus for housing for foster youth, disabled veterans, and homeless persons as required by Government Code Section 65915.	The Zoning Ordinance has been updated since this comment was made.
175			6	The Draft Ordinance includes exceptions to the requirement to grant concessions or incentives that are not permitted by State law.	The Zoning Ordinance has been updated since this comment was made.
176			7	The proposed discretionary approval requirement for a density bonus approval is inconsistent with Section 65915(f)(5).	The Zoning Ordinance has been updated since this comment was made.
177			7	The Draft Ordinance basis to deny waivers of development standards exceeds those allowed under Section 65915.	The Zoning Ordinance has been updated since this comment was made.

Comment Number	Commenter	Document	Page #	Comment	Response
178			8	The County must revise the Draft Ordinance to allow emergency shelters in accordance with Government Code Section 65583.	The Zoning Ordinance has been updated since this comment was made.
179			8	The Draft Ordinance does not comply with State and Federal laws requiring the County to ensure reasonable accommodations.	The Zoning Ordinance has been updated since this comment was made.
180			9	The County must revise the Draft Ordinance to include transitional and supportive housing in the residential land uses chart.	The Zoning Ordinance has been updated since this comment was made.
181			10	The Draft Zoning Ordinance does not allow adequate density in TP or CP zones or establish minimum densities in zones identified to accommodate the County's lower-income RHNA.	The Zoning Ordinance has been updated since this comment was made.
182			10	Residential densities allowed under the Draft Zoning Ordinance and General Plan documents are inconsistent.	Modifications to both documents have been made since receiving this comment.
183	Kast- League of Women Voters of Fresno	Letter #1 - dated May 4, 2018	2	The County has not established a program to monitor implementation.	Comment noted. The County will continue to use its General Plan Annual Progress Report to report implementation.
184			2	Evaluate the cause for and the extent of the County's inability to implement mitigation measures in the 2000 General Plan	Comment noted. This has been addressed in prior General Plan Annual Progress Reports.
185			2	Describe in measurable terms the physical effects of any adverse impacts that remain significant after mitigation.	DPEIR has provided an analysis of impacts noted as significant and unavoidable.
186			2	Determine the amount of funding needed to fully implement mitigation measures so that implementation is assured.	Comment noted.
187			2	Determine the conditions under which General Plan "Self-mitigation" can work.	Utilizing policies as a means to mitigate general plans is a standard practice and places restrictions on new discretionary projects.
188			2	Include in the range of reasonable alternatives a no-harm alternative.	Comment noted. The County is not analyzing a "no-harm" alternative.
189	Kast- League of Women Voters of Fresno	Letter #2 - dated May 4, 2018		No comments requiring action/response.	No response required.
190	Mulholland-Sequoia Riverlands Trust	Letter - dated May 1, 2018	2	We are concerned about the proposal to alter General Plan Policy LU-A.1, which calls for "direct[ing] urban growth away from valuable agricultural land to cities, unincorporated communities, and other areas planned for such development where public facilities and infrastructure are available."	Comment noted. Policy modifications continue to promote the County's goals.

Comment Number	Commenter	Document	Page #	Comment	Response
191			2	If the General Plan is going to call for new infrastructure, it should distinguish between existing communities (including disadvantaged communities) where such infrastructure is needed, and new towns, which are inconsistent with the goal of directing growth away from agricultural land.	Comment noted. "New Towns" will continue to be evaluated against existing policies and the provisions of CEQA.
192			2	We would also encourage the County to consider a more comprehensive and integrated agricultural mitigation policy.	Comment noted. Additional agricultural mitigation has been included.
193			2	These [agricultural] policies could be strengthened by setting a required mitigation ratio of at least one acre of farmland conserved for every acre converted, and integrating elements listed in LU-A.16, such as conservation easements held by land trusts, into a more clearly-defined farmland mitigation program.	Comment noted. Additional agricultural mitigation has been included.
194	American Civil Liberties Union (2018)			The General Plan should identify disadvantaged communities.	SB 244 and SB 1000 analysis has been updated.
195				The Draft GP should identify the Census Tracts of disadvantaged communities it included in the General Plan and to explain methodology for identifying these communities.	SB 244 and SB 1000 analysis has been updated.
196				The Draft GP must include objectives and policies that promote safe and sanitary homes.	Additional policies included in the EJ Element.
197				County should amend its EJ policies and objectives to address needs of disadvantaged communities and should adopt more concrete policies for promoting public facilities, safe and sanitary homes, and civic engagement in the public decision-making process.	EJ Element policies have been included to address some of these concerns for projects within identified DACs.
198	Building Industry Association (2018)			Commenter provides a map showing an area they feel should be designated for residential development. Area is northeast of the City of Fresno, north of the Clovis Landfill.	BIA's proposal was rejected by the Board in August of 2018.
199	CDFW Central Region (2021)			Recommends the EIR analyze potential impacts to special-status species with mitigation measures.	DPEIR provides analysis of impacts to special status species.
200				Recommends the County consult with US FWS about potential impacts to federally listed species.	US F&W was provided the opportunity to comment on the draft documents.
201				If project causes any potential stream or lake disturbance, mitigation should be developed to reduce the need for LSAA in the future.	Comment noted. Much of this would be project specific mitigation.
202				Commenter provided a Summary Table. Report attachment.	Comment noted.

Comment Number	Commenter	Document	Page #	Comment	Response
203	California Rural Legal Assistance, Inc. (2018)			Fresno County is not using proper baseline conditions for the analysis.	Consultant has updated information in the Background Report and projected build-out based on updated data.
204				County must address legal inadequacies in the GP before a proper env. impact analysis can be conducted.	Updates to the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance have been made to bring document into compliance.
205				Draft Zoning Ordinance fails to fully implement the mandate density bonus law for affordable housing units.	Zoning Ordinance has since been updated.
206				County's plan to consolidate small commercial parcels to provide adequate sites for affordable housing is unrealistic.	Comment pertains to the 5th Cycle Housing Element. The 6th Cycle which is underway is re-evaluating adequate sites.
207				The County must conduct a thorough analysis of the infrastructure deficiencies in disadvantaged unincorporated communities within its jurisdiction.	An updated SB 244 Analysis was completed in 2020.
208				Draft documents do not facilitate housing for the homeless or other persons with special needs.	Emergency Shelters, SRO and reasonable accommodation provisions have been modified in the latest draft of ZOU.
209	Carpenters Local 701 (2021)			Commenter requests that mandatory local hire and apprenticeship language be added to the land use, economic development, and environmental justice elements.	Comment noted. This would be difficult if not impossible to enforce at the County-wide level.
210	Carpenters Local 702 (2021)			For every apprenticeable craft, contractors will participate in a Joint Apprenticeship Program.	See above comment.
211	Carpenters Local 703 (2021)			Contractors will hire a minimum of 25% of staff with home addresses within Fresno, Madera, Tulare, or Kings Counties within 180 days of NOP issuance.	See above comment.
212	Central Valley Flood Protection Board (2018)			The draft Safety Element of the GP must be submitted to the Board at least 90 days in advance of adoption.	The Safety Element was provided to staff of the Central Valley Flood Protection Board.
213	Feleena Sutton, Aera Energy (2021)			Commenter requested to be placed on a distribution list for information regarding the Fresno County General Plan Review Zoning Ordinance Update public meetings as it relates to the work on the Climate Action Plan.	Commenter was placed on the distribution lists.
214	Fresno County Fire Protection District (2018)			Project shall comply with CCR Fire Code.	Comment noted.
215	Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District (2018)			Development in the GP Planning Area shall be designed to not overload stormwater management and drainage systems.	Comment noted. Flooding analysis included in the DPEIR. This comment would be addressed at the individual project level in consultation with FMFCD.
216				Development in the GP shall prevent adverse water quality impacts and discharges.	Addressed at the project level through CEQA and in consultation with FMFCD.
217				Table LU-1 of the draft GP proposes changes to land use designations that may increase the amount of impervious surface in the region, and the current storm drain system may be undersized for runoff from this increased impervious surface.	Addressed at the project level through CEQA and in consultation with FMFCD. The GPR proposes no new development areas.
218	Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District (2021)			Commenter provided attachment of Fresno Storm Drainage and Flood Control Master Plan.	Comment noted.

Comment Number	Commenter	Document	Page #	Comment	Response
219				Maximum flood pool elevation should be studied for all development in the Planning Area.	Comment noted. Flooding analysis included in the DPEIR. This comment would be addressed at the individual project level in consultation with FMFCD.
220				Grading within the Planning Area should be designed so there are no adverse impacts on the passage of a major storm through the area.	Comment noted. Flooding analysis included in the DPEIR. This comment would be addressed at the individual project level in consultation with FMFCD.
221				Development should provide any surface flowage easements or covenants for areas of the Plan that cannot convey storm water without crossing private property.	Comment noted. Flooding analysis included in the DPEIR. This comment would be addressed at the individual project level in consultation with FMFCD.
222				Storm water discharges from private facilities to FMFCD's storm drainage system should consist only of storm water runoff and shall be free of solids and debris.	Comment noted. Flooding analysis included in the DPEIR. This comment would be addressed at the individual project level in consultation with FMFCD.
223				FMFCD will need to review and approve the final improvement plans for all development within the boundaries of the Planning Area to insure consistency with the future Storm Drainage Master Plan.	Comment noted. Flooding analysis included in the DPEIR. This comment would be addressed at the individual project level in consultation with FMFCD.
224				Storm drain easement will be required whenever storm drain facilities are located on private property.	Comment noted. Flooding analysis included in the DPEIR. This comment would be addressed at the individual project level in consultation with FMFCD.
225				FMFCD may require developers to construct certain storm drain facilities.	Comment noted. Flooding analysis included in the DPEIR. This comment would be addressed at the individual project level in consultation with FMFCD.
226				Outdoor storage areas should be constructed to improve storm runoff quality.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on runoff are evaluated in Section 4.9, Hydrology and Water Quality.
227				The most current Flood Insurance Rate Maps should be reviewed for individual properties.	Comment noted. Flooding analysis included in the DPEIR. This comment would be addressed at the individual project level in consultation with FMFCD.
228				If the land use changes to a "higher intensity" at a later date, the public drainage system may be undersized to accommodate the higher storm water runoff rates.	Comment noted. Flooding analysis included in the DPEIR. This comment would be addressed at the individual project level in consultation with FMFCD.
229	Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability (2021)			Ensure an accurate baseline for environmental conditions.	Baseline environmental conditions are analyzed in each respective section.
230				In its analysis, the PEIR should utilize CalEnviroScreen 3.0, the San Joaquin Valley APCD, AB 617 and AB 686, the CA Housing Partnership reports, the CA Healthy Places Index, FCHIP, and the Fresno County Community Health Needs Assessment.	SB 1000 analysis utilized CalEnviroScreen and data from other sources. Comment noted.
231				Identify and map the location of existing sensitive uses and how they would be impacted by Plan implementation.	DACs have been mapped. Impacts discussed in the DPEIR.
232				Consider modifications to ensure buffers between sensitive land uses and polluting land uses.	Additional policies included in the EJ Element and modifications to provide buffering from certain uses added to the Zoning Ordinance.
233				Consider revisions to the circulation map to minimize impacts on sensitive uses and residential areas.	EJ and Transportation element modifications have taken into consideration truck traffic.
234				Expand opportunities for higher density housing in growth areas.	Some of this is being undertaken as part of the 6th Cycle Housing Element.

Comment Number	Commenter	Document	Page #	Comment	Response
235				Support infrastructure improvements in zero emission technologies and vehicles, and grid improvements.	Comment noted.
236				Identify existing water and wastewater needs to ensure all residents have access to safe water services.	SB 244 analysis has identified deficiencies in certain DUCs.
237				Identify sufficient land for park and green spaces with prioritization on communities with the least access.	Comment noted. More appropriately addressed at the community plan update level.
238				Require adequate landscaping and buffer zones to protect sensitive uses.	Additional policies included in the EJ Element and modifications to provide buffering from certain uses added to the Zoning Ordinance.
239				Noticing requirements for zoning changes and Conditional Use Permits, including who is noticed and distributing notices in accessible languages.	Some additional policies relating to this included in the EJ Element.
240				Analyze and include mitigation for impacts to housing, water supply, traffic and road safety, public health, utilities, and construction impacts.	DPEIR addresses some of these concerns.
241				Include any and all comments provided to staff in 2018, both oral and written.	Comment noted.
242				Plan development has not been conducive for informed public decision or encouraging public participation.	Updates to the community plan prioritization process has occurred since comment was provided.
243				County should partner with diverse stakeholders.	Comment noted.
244				County needs abide by the implementation of SB 1000, AB 170, and AB 379.	Comment noted. Documents have been updated to provide for great compliance with state law.
245				Incorporate a vulnerability assessment to identify the risks of climate change.	A CVA was completed and attached to the General Plan Policy Document as Appendix C.
246				Incorporate relevant info from federal, state, regional, and local agencies on the assets, resources, and population at-risk of climate change exposure.	See comment above.
247				Include adaptation and resiliency goals.	A CVA was completed and attached to the General Plan Policy Document as Appendix C.
248				Identify feasible implementation measures to minimize climate change impacts.	A CVA was completed and attached to the General Plan Policy Document as Appendix C.
249	Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability (2018)			Implementation measures in Section 3 of the Policy Document are ambiguous and deficient.	Implementation measures have been updated since comment.
250				The County must conduct a thorough analysis of the infrastructure deficiencies in disadvantaged unincorporated communities within its jurisdiction, and include methodology used to identify these communities.	SB 244 analysis was completed in 2020. Uncluded updated analysis of deficiencies.
251				County should expand analysis of infrastructure and service deficiencies in disadvantage unincorporated communities to identify present and future needs in light of existing and forecast conditions.	SB 244 analysis was completed in 2020. Uncluded updated analysis of deficiencies.

Comment Number	Commenter	Document	Page #	Comment	Response
252				County must identify financial funding alternatives for the extension of services in disadvantaged unincorporated communities.	SB 244 analysis was completed in 2020.
253				Introduction in the GP Land Use Element should also cover unincorporated areas.	Comment noted.
254				GP Land Use Element should include summaries of Community Plans.	Comment noted. Community Plans are listed on page 1-6 of the General Plan Policy Document.
255				Draft Background Report does not satisfy legal requirements to include data and relevant AQ policies, programs, and regulations.	Background Report was updated and following update a CVA was completed which provided additional data for the DPEIR.
256				Draft Background Report does not include an adequate analysis of water supply and drinking water issues.	SB 244 analysis provided additional data about community water systems.
257				Background Report noise analysis should describe the disproportionate impact that noise has on disadvantaged communities.	Additional EJ policies and changes to the Zoning Ordinance provided additional buffering requirements for certain uses near DUCs.
258				Background Report should discuss economic and demographic conditions in Fresno County, including disparities by race and income level.	SB 1000 and SB 244 analysis provides additional discussion.
259				Draft Zoning Ordinance fails to comply with the employee housing act.	Zoning Ordinance has since been updated.
260				Draft Zoning Ordinance fails to fully implement the mandate density bonus law for affordable housing units.	Zoning Ordinance has since been updated.
261				Draft Zoning Ordinance must be revised to allow emergency shelters in accordance with Government Code Section 65583.	Zoning Ordinance has since been updated.
262				Draft Zoning Ordinance does not comply with state and federal laws requiring the county to ensure reasonable accommodations.	Reasonable accommodations was updated in 2022 to provide greater compliance with state law.
263	League of Women Voters (2021)			For the "No Project" alternative, reevaluate the adverse effects identified in the 2000-2020 GP.	Comment noted. Alternatives for the GPR/ZOU are evaluated on Section 6, Alternatives.
264				The Plan should contain a "No Harm" alternative	Comment noted. The County will not be considering a "no harm" alternative.
265				The County should evaluate how the revision of the goals and policies of the Plan could combat climate change.	The completed CVA has resulted in additional policies to aid in addressing climate change.
266				The County should evaluate the relationship between human activity under the GP and the viability of native plants and animals.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on native plants and animals are evaluated in Section 4.4, Biological Resources.
267				The EIR should assess how the GP support for agriculture with its heavy reliance on pesticides is contributing to the decline on insect numbers in the country.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on special-status animal species are analyzed in Section 4.4, Biological Resources. However, insects are not protected under CEQA or the California Endangered Species Act.
268				The EIR should address the GP goals that promote development and how achieving them affects the environment.	This EIR analyzes impacts of development facilitated under the GPR/ZOU on the environment.
269				The EIR should assess whether pursuing cost-effectiveness inhibits County support for energy sources that are more costly but environmentally superior.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on energy sources are analyzed in Section 4.6, Energy. However, CEQA does not require an analysis of cost effectiveness.

Comment Number	Commenter	Document	Page #	Comment	Response
270				The County may not have the means to achieve the environmental protection goals outlined in the draft GP.	This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
271				Commenter mentioned that implementation of the GP programs had fallen to 40% in 2019.	Comment noted. Program implementation can vary by year depending on resources and demands.
272				The EIR should evaluate the environmental consequences of the County not being able to successfully execute its existing implementation programs.	The EIR analyzes the GPR/ZOU , which is the proposed project. The GPR/ZOU contains implementation programs that would become the applicable County programs moving forward if the GPR/ZOU is adopted.
273				The updated Plan should remove barriers to urban sprawl.	The General Plan will continue to direct growth to the cities and unincorporated communities.
274				The EIR should evaluate the environmental effect of lack of funding to implement the GP.	The EIR analyzes the GPR/ZOU , which is the proposed project. CEQA requires analysis of a proposed project's impacts, not the impacts of not implementing a project.
275	League of Women Voters of Fresno (2018)			The County should evaluate the cause for and the extent of the County's inability to implement mitigation measures in the 2000 GP, since many of these same measures will be carried over into the draft GP.	Comment noted.
276				Significant and unavoidable impacts should be described in measurable terms.	Significance thresholds are provided in the impact analysis of each section, and significant impacts are explained where identified.
277				The County should determine the funding required to fully implement mitigation measures.	The EIR analyzes the GPR/ZOU , which is the proposed project. CEQA requires analysis of a proposed project's impacts, not the impacts of not implementing a project.
278				The County should determine the conditions under which the GP can work as a self-mitigating document.	Utilizing policies as a means to mitigate general plans is a standard practice and places restrictions on new discretionary projects.
279				A range of reasonable alternatives should be evaluated, including one that has no impacts harmful to the environment.	Alternatives for the GPR/ZOU are evaluated on Section 6, Alternatives.
280				Commenter objects to the lack of community outreach for the GP review and Zoning Ordinance Update.	Additional outreach was conducted in 2018, 2022 and 2023.
281	Malaga County Water District (2018)			Outdated/inaccurate description of the District in the Background Report (Commenter points out specific examples).	Revised SB 244 analysis has updated information of the Community of Malaga.
282				County should prepare a specific plan for Malaga Community because Land Use Policies conflict w/ Fresno County GP En.Ju. Element.	Comment noted. The County is not pursuing a specific plan for Malaga at this time.
283	Mary Savala (2021)			Commenter is interested in the criteria and data that will be used to review the GP.	Criteria and data provided in both the updated Background Report and DPEIR.
284				Commenter wants to know what the environmental impacts are if current or expanded programs/policies are not implemented.	Potential environmental impacts of the GPR/ZOU are analyzed in each respective section of this EIR. Alternatives to the GPR/ZOU are analyzed in Section 6, Alternatives.
285				Commenter believes that a good number of policies and programs of the current GP have been ignored or neglected.	Comment noted.

Comment Number	Commenter	Document	Page #	Comment	Response
286	Native American Heritage Commission (2018)			AB 52 & SB 18 have tribal consultation requirements; NAHC recommends consulting with tribes affiliated with the Planning Area ASAP.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on tribal cultural resources are evaluated in Section 4.15, Tribal Cultural Resources.
287				Summarizes provisions of SB 18 & AB 32 as they related to the CEQA process.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on tribal cultural resources are evaluated in Section 4.15, Tribal Cultural Resources.
288				Recommends local tribal involvement and consultation as early as possible.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on tribal cultural resources are evaluated in Section 4.16, Tribal Cultural Resources.
289				Commenter provided a breakdown of AB 52, SB 18, and additional CEQA requirements.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on tribal cultural resources are evaluated in Section 4.16, Tribal Cultural Resources.
290				Recommends consulting with legal counsel about compliance with AB 52, SB 18, and any other applicable laws	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on tribal cultural resources are evaluated in Section 4.16, Tribal Cultural Resources.
291				Recommends contacting CHRIS for a records search.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on tribal cultural resources are evaluated in Section 4.16, Tribal Cultural Resources.
292				Commenter mentions that lack of surface evidence of archeological resources does not preclude their subsurface existence so mitigation and monitoring should be conscious of that.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on archeological resources are evaluated in Section 4.5, Cultural Resources.
293	Sequoia Riverland's Trust (2018)			The General Plan should distinguish between existing communities (incl. disadvantaged communities) where infrastructure needed and new towns.	The General Plan Background Report has included SB 244 and SB 1000 analysis. The EJ element has provided additional policies for DUCs.
294				Set a mitigation ratio of at least 1:1; integrate elements from LU-A1.6 into a more clearly defined farmland mitigation program.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on agriculture are evaluated in Section 4.2, Agricultural Resources. Agricultural mitigation proposed, although not at 1:1.
295				The Plan should avoid unnecessary impacts to agricultural and biological resources.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on agriculture are evaluated in Section 4.2, Agricultural Resources.
296				New development should be directed into existing communities.	Comment noted. General Plan Review continues these policies.
297				Commenter suggest strengthening L.U. polices by setting a mitigation measure requiring that for each acre of ag land converted to development, another acre of equivalent quality land is permanently conserved.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on agriculture are evaluated in Section 4.2, Agricultural Resources. Agricultural mitigation proposed, although not at 1:1.
298				Commenter requests to be placed on a distribution list for information regarding the Fresno County General Plan Review Zoning Ordinance public meetings.	Sequoia Riverland's Trust has been placed on the distribution list.
299	Sierra Club Fresno County (2021)			The County may not legally approve any project relying on the GP while the GP is clearly noncompliant with state Planning and Zoning Law.	Comment noted. The GPR seeks to bring the General Plan into compliance.
300				The GP is outdated; many elements are obsolete and currently applicable legal mandates are not met.	Comment noted. The GPR seeks to bring the General Plan into compliance.
301				AQ issues in Fresno County are inadequately addressed; not currently complying with AB 170 but commenter believes it is feasible and overdue.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on emissions are evaluated in Section 4.3, Air Quality.
302				The Circulation Element fails to consider current state law requiring VMT reduction.	VMT discussion and policies have been included in the DPEIR and the General Plan Policy Document.

Comment Number	Commenter	Document	Page #	Comment	Response
303				The County fails to comply with state mandates to prepare for climate change.	A CVA was completed and attached to the General Plan Policy Document as Appendix C. Additional policies have been included in the General Plan Policy Document.
Individuals					
304	Radley Reep	Letter - dated May 4, 2018	1	Clearly define what is meant by "valuable agricultural lands."	LU-A.23 lists farmland of Unique, Statewide Importance or Prime soil classifications.
305			1	With this change in Policy LU-A.1, the County is saying that commercial or residential development can be approved most anywhere in the county as long as the Board of Supervisors changes the underlying land use designation to match.	Comment noted. The Board may consider any request to change an underlying land use designation.
306			1	The EIR address the impacts to agriculture that may result from the change that directs new urban development to areas where it does not "already" exist but "can be provided."	Section 4.2 of the DPEIR discusses impacts to Agriculture.
307	Christine Flannigan (2021)			Update the Local Area Management Program to include alternative wastewater treatment systems without RWQCB approval.	This pertains to a County Ordinance requirement rather than General Plan Policy. There are variance provisions to the LAMP.
308	David Cehrs (2021)			Claims that the County has not followed up/enforced their own water sustainability policies.	Comment noted. Policy modifications have been made with the advent of SGMA.
309				Asks the County to stop parcel splits.	Comment noted. The County will not place a moratorium on parcel splits.
310				Asks the County to stop second homes on a single parcel.	Comment noted. The County will not place a moratorium on second residences. The state has mandated that ADUs be permitted.
311				Asks the County to stop issuing new groundwater well permits.	Comment noted. The County will not place a moratorium on groundwater wells.
312	Lucy Hornbaker (2018)			The few people attending the public meeting might be special interests; be aware of this when structuring new plan review.	Comment noted.
313				Air Quality: would like to encourage continued effort; recognizes County for work already done on this issue.	Section 4.3 of the DPEIR addresses Air Quality. Additional air quality mitigation proposed.
314	Jackie McCoy (2021)			No annual cleanup day for unincorporated area to drop off tires and large things electronics etc.	Comment noted. Does not pertain directly to the GPR.
315				PG&E cut trees everywhere but not into manageable pieces leaving a huge fire danger	Comment noted. Additional policies incorporated into the General Plan Policy Document. PG&E and a s public utility is under oversight of the State of CA.
316				Due to drought, no buildings should be constructed unless a similar building is taken down.	Comment noted.
317				Need solar on both sides of the freeways and highways with charging stations	Comment noted.

Comment Number	Commenter	Document	Page #	Comment	Response
318				Need restrooms or rest stop facilities for visitors to Pine Flat Lake. People pull over leaving trash and human excrement along Hughes Creek and the Road	Comment noted.
319				Garbage trucks lose trash along the road	Comment noted.
320				Commenter lives in a dead zone for cell service	Comment noted. The County does not have oversight over telecommunications providers.
321	Ken Wall (2021)			The GP should address GHG in the form of a separate Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan or a Climate Action Plan.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
322				The Plan should make mention of and consider the possibility of a massive atmospheric river event that may submerge the Central Valley in up to 30 feet of water and how Fresno may be affected.	GHG Emissions are discussed in Section 4.8 of the DPEIR.
323				The Plan should address evacuation scenarios, agricultural losses, and stormwater quality in the event of a massive flooding event.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on evacuation plans are evaluated in Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on agricultural land are evaluated in Section 4.2, Agricultural Resources. Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on stormwater quality in the event of a flood are evaluated in Section 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality. With completion of the CVA, additional policies included in the Health and Safety Element.
324	Radley Reep (2021)			Commenter raises concerns regarding the County's ability to implement the GP, and specifically outlines the failures of self-mitigation.	Utilizing policies as a means to mitigate general plans is a standard practice and places restrictions on new discretionary projects.
325				The County needs to evaluate the cause for/extent of its inability to implement mitigation measures for the 2000-2020 GP.	Comment noted.
326				Determine the amount of funding needed to guarantee full implementation.	The EIR analyzes the GPR/ZOU , which is the proposed project. CEQA requires analysis of a proposed project's impacts, not the impacts of not implementing a project.
327				Determine the conditions under which GP self-mitigation can work.	Utilizing policies as a means to mitigate general plans is a standard practice and places restrictions on new discretionary projects.
328				Commenter raises concerns surrounding the lack of public engagement and provides a detailed timeline of County's planning process.	Additional outreach was conducted in 2018, 2022 and 2023.
329				Commenter provided attachments of 2000-2020 GP policies and sig/unavoidable adverse impacts.	This comment is noted.
330				Clearly define "valuable agricultural lands" (mentioned in LU-A.1 Agricultural Land Conservation).	LU-A.23 lists farmland of Unique, Statewide Importance or Prime soil classifications.

Comment Number	Commenter	Document	Page #	Comment	Response
331				EIR should address impacts to agriculture that may result from new urban development allowed by GP policy revisions.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on agriculture are evaluated in Section 4.2, Agricultural Resources.
Verbal comments received at community workshops					
332	Unidentified; District 1 (11/14/18)			I live in the West Park community. Old General Plan says West Park community doesn't have flooding issues. The West Park community has flooding issues, septic system issues, no sidewalks, no street lights. Will the new General Plan solve these problems and provide sidewalks and street lights? We live in the West Park community and are forming a non-profit to address sewer and water issues. We are agriculture, don't want to be re-zoned. I am from the West Park community; this is a health issue. Even though its expensive, it has to be taken care of today. Get a grant or something. I have 5 acres with a canal on it. The previous property owner was told 60 years ago that the canal would be replaced with an underground pipeline, but it hasn't been done. People in the rural areas are farmworkers and they're tired, they're not going to go to a library. You should send a Notice to community organizations in each area so they can inform people. The Notices should be sent at least two weeks ahead of time. The new Plan looks like a duplicate of the old Plan. The new Plan doesn't identify the West Park community.	Comments noted. The Westpark Community is discussed in the County SB 244 analysis included as Appendix A to the Background Report. The GPR will not address all community-level issues.

Comment Number	Commenter	Document	Page #	Comment	Response
333	Mariah Thompson (CRLA); District 1 (11/14/18)			<p>West Park is a disadvantaged unincorporated community, and SB 244 analysis in draft General Plan failed to accurately identify their issues. West Park has leaky septic systems, and no drainage ditches to control flooding leading to mosquito issues and other public health hazards, and contaminated wells. What is the County doing to update Community Plans? The Community Plans are so far out-of-date that they cannot be relied upon for future development. The current draft documents reference the Community Plans as being part of the General Plan. Until the Community Plans are updated, the General Plan won't represent the existing inadequate conditions as required by CEQA. The County needs to update or replace the Community Plans, or the County will face CEQA challenges. SB 35 Streamlining Guidelines are coming out later this year; don't know if these are being integrated, but they have to be. When were all of these things sent out in advance of this meeting, and who were they sent to? Did you mail anything to anyone anywhere to tell them that this meeting was going to happen? Don't lie to us. What the law requires is a baseline, meaningful public participation goes beyond that. We want robust public participation, not just the legal requirement.</p>	<p>SB 244 analysis updated in 2020 and expanded discussion of the Westpark Community. UniUnincorporated Plans and Prioritization Criteria considered and approved by the BOS in July of 2023. The County used multiple techniques to engage the public including coordination with NGOs. Other comments noted.</p>
334	Juan Benavidez; District 1 (11/14/18)			<p>Some communities are not identified according to their proper name, and the West Park community is not identified in the General Plan. If the West Park community was noted in the General Plan, the community wouldn't be overlooked.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

Comment Number	Commenter	Document	Page #	Comment	Response
335	Radley Reep (League of Women Voters); District 1 (11/14/18)			Are the second series of community meetings going to be after or before the draft EIR is released? Are you going to release the revised documents prior to releasing the draft EIR? Are the second series of community meetings going to be before or after the revised documents are released? You extended the comment period to the end of this year; how does the County plan on informing the public? Formal notice needs to be sent to everyone in the County notifying of the extended comment period. Regarding the purpose to revise the General Plan Policy Document, what are the changed priorities and changed conditions of the County? Can you provide a document to the public explaining what the Board of Supervisors' changed priorities are? Who is deciding what the priority changes should be? Can you provide a document to the public explaining what the changed conditions are? There are problems with the red-line tracked changes in that I don't understand if the crossed-out and underlined text are included or not. Are you planning on correcting the tracked changes any time soon? Is the newsletter new? Is the County continuing with the EIR preparation while public comments are being received through December 31st?	Many of these comments have been addressed with the release of documents in 2021 and again in 2023.
336	Victoria Santillan (CRLA); District 1 (11/14/18)			Regarding public notification for community outreach meetings, is the County willing to mail Notices to all residents or provide Notice through the school systems? Who was the newsletter sent to? Public participation is not happening, so I don't think the public is being properly informed.	Comments noted. Noticed to all County residents will not be undertaken. County used a variety of other techniques to notify the public.
337	Gloria Hernandez; District 1 (11/14/18)			West Park Community was not informed in 1960 about what the current General Plan would include. West Park Community isn't being notified about the current effort. Its crucial that we are notified.	NGOs that represent Westpark have been included in the notification process. The County has attempted to post flyers at the local school when community meetings scheduled for the GPR and SB 244.
338	Ashley Warner (Leadership Council); District 1 (11/14/18)			County should work cooperatively with our organization to effectively notify the public. SB 244 and air quality requirements were not identified in the meeting. The County needs to work with our organization and community leaders. There are millions of dollars available from the State for disadvantaged communities, example would be SB 2. The County got this far in the current effort without consulting the public first; County should have started with public input. Its unreasonable to ask people to monitor the effort on their own via the website.	Comments noted. The County worked with LCJA regarding the 2023 EJ workshops for the GPR/ZOU. County has sought funding through SB 2.

Comment Number	Commenter	Document	Page #	Comment	Response
339	Ivanka Saunders with Veronica Garibay's Group (Leadership Council for Justice and Accountability); District 1 (11/14/18)			The County is not being transparent with this effort. The rest of California is moving beyond racial issues that have always affected the West side of the County. This is our community, not a pretty little board of white men that think they have power. Is this General Plan being prepared by City and County officials, or are you hiring an outside consultant to prepare the Plan? Are the outside experts from within Fresno County, or are you bringing people in from more progressive areas? At the Sacramento level, people understand modern terms such as "robust", "transparency" and "disadvantaged communities". Outsiders understand the cultural biases and institutionalized racism of the County. We need a modern progressive plan. Don't lie to us, be honest.	Comments noted.
340	Janeen Sanders; District 5 (11/16/18)			How long has it been since the General Plan was revised? Can the public give input regarding the Zoning Ordinance? Is there a way to make the public more aware of this effort?	The last comprehensive revision to the General Plan was the 2000 General Plan adopted in October of 2000. The public can and has commented on the Zoning Ordinance. The County has established e-mail lists and utilized social media to distribute information on the 2023 workshops.
341	Unidentified; District 4 (11/27/18)			Can you share with us what are the changes in the draft documents that have been released? I am a resident of the Riverdale area. Where is the information about these meetings, and where is the information about what I can do in the community? This information is supposed to be accessible by all people.	Comments noted. Redlined documents have been made available to the public on the County's dedicated webpage for the General Plan Review. County has expanded it's e-mail and mailing list to keep interested residents updated on the process.
342	Isabel Solorio (via translator); District 4 (11/27/18)			I'm a Lanare community resident. Lanare needs AB 170 air quality. County has obligation to diminish expansion of toxic air emissions in Lanare. County has to invest in and support street improvements. SB 1000 requires County to reduce health risks in unfavored communities. Lanare community priorities are as follows: better parks; sidewalks; street lights; improved housing; separation between farmland and residential. The due date for SB 244 and AB 170 have already passed. County needs to help Lanare and similar communities. County needs to make sure General Plan becomes more public, and the County needs to notify everyone regularly. The County should have community involvement in this process. County should notify people about meetings with plenty of advance notice. We don't have internet access in Lanare. We need these documents to be delivered to our homes.	Comments noted. The County has since completed its SB 244 analysis, updated its SB 1000 analysis in its Background Report and General Plan. Additional air quality analysis has been undertaken in the DPEIR and has resulted in additional General Plan policies. The County is unable to deliver documents to all individuals via doorstep.

Comment Number	Commenter	Document	Page #	Comment	Response
343	Ashley Werner/Veronica Garibay Group (Leadership Council); District 4 (11/27/18)			It is very important to do robust community process, especially because the County has been out of compliance for multiple years. Most of the disadvantaged communities in the County do not have access to the internet. Most people in said communities don't have personal computers and cant get to a library. Don't believe the hundreds of pages of documents have been translated into Spanish or other languages. There's no feasible way for people in said communities to grapple with all the content. It's a standard throughout California to present this information to the people and seek their input, especially important in light of SB 1000. Encourage the County to re-think their process and dedicate meaningful resources to the effort. The County is out of compliance with various laws. Housing Element requirement to amend Zoning Ordinance to make affordable housing more feasible, especially in disadvantaged communities. SB 244 deadline was in December 2015. State law requires the County to prepare an Air Quality Element, which was due in 2008.	Comments noted. The County has since completed its SB 244 analysis, updated its SB 1000 analysis in its Background Report and General Plan. Additional air quality analysis has been undertaken in the DPEIR and has resulted in additional General Plan policies. The County is unable to deliver documents to all individuals via doorstep. The County has established e-mail lists and utilized social media to distribute information on the 2023 workshops.
344	Radley Reep (League of Women Voters); District 4 (11/27/18)			I hoped these community meetings would explain the problems and issues that may be important in the next 20 years and explain how the County will address them in the General Plan, and ask for public input if they would like to identify additional anticipated problems and issues. I wanted to ask questions.	Comments noted. The County held workshops in early 2020 regarding its SB 244 analysis and solicited input on deficiencies in identified communities.
345	Jeff Roberts (Assemi Group); District 2 (12/3/18)			Are you going to keep the same Zone Districts currently in effect?	Yes, the County will keep the same Zone Districts. Modifications will be made to some districts.
346	Robert Snow (Fresno Audubon Society); District 2 (12/3/18)			How is climate change going to be addressed by the County in the new Plan? Regarding the Zoning Ordinance, I suggest adding hyperlinks to the table of contents. How do you prepare a PEIR at the same time that you are receiving comments from the public?	The County through its consultant completed a Climate Vulnerability Assessment which updated policies in multiple elements including Health and Safety and Environmental Justice. The County provided multiple opportunities to comment on the DPEIR.
347	Barbara Bailey (Fresno Audubon Society); District 2 (12/3/18)			Will there be public workshops regarding SGMA (Sustainable Groundwater Management Act)? How is SGMA going to be incorporated into the General Plan? What is your view of the public's role in evaluating and developing policies? The public should have a role. The County could use "Next door Neighbor" software to email everyone in the County, like the Sheriff's Department does.	Comments noted. The Water Resources section of the General Plan's Open Space Element has additional discussion regarding SGMA. Public workshops will not focus solely on this topic. County has considered public comments in policy modifications. Social media has been utilized to distribute information for 2022 and 2023 workshops.

Comment Number	Commenter	Document	Page #	Comment	Response
348	Connie Young; District 2 (12/3/18)			Where is air quality and air pollution addressed in the General Plan? Is there flexibility to revise the General Plan to address air quality issues as additional air quality reports become available? I didn't receive a notice for this meeting. I have received notice in the past for other projects. Every member of the Districts should be notified. Is there a Citizens' Advisory Committee for the General Plan?	Comments noted. A CAC was not assembled for this effort. Individual noticing for the GPR workshops was not undertaken, but multiple workshops have been held. Air Pollution has been discussed in both the DPEIR and the revised Health and Safety Element of the General Plan.
349	Radley Reep (League of Women Voters); District 2 (12/3/18)			Can the County provide public notice that the comment period has been extended to the end of the year? Can the County explain the scope of comments they are willing to accept? When will the General Plan be updated as it was in 1976 and 2000?The new Zoning Ordinance doesn't have track changes, so I can't tell what is being changed. Can't the County provide a document explaining all the changes in the Zoning Ordinance?	Comments noted. Additional period to provide comments occurred in late April of 2023. This effort is not a General Plan Update and it is unknown when a full update will occur again. Formatting changes to the Zoning Ordinance are too broad to permit tracked changes. A summary page has been prepared and provided at the Planning Commission Workshop that occurred in September of 2023.
350	Diane Merrill; District 2 (12/3/18)			SGMA plans are due in January 2020. How is SGMA going to be incorporated into the General Plan? How are forestry and fire safety measures going to be incorporated into the General Plan? Are new State and Federal laws going to supersede Policies in the General Plan? I think postcards should be sent to everyone in the County informing them of these meetings.	Comments noted. The Water Resources section of the General Plan's Open Space Element has additional discussion regarding SGMA. The Safety Element was updated based on a completed CVA and in discussion with CalFire. The document was presented to the Board of Forestry in May of 2023. Social media has been utilized to distribute information for 2022 and 2023 workshops.
351	Linda Piearcy; District 2 (12/3/18)			Are Code Enforcement issues going to be addressed in this effort? Can you Notice in the Bee? Will future workshops be conducted the same as the current meetings? We need a Citizens' Committee for all issues. We need a County website for people to express any issues they have.	Code Enforcement issues are not specifically part of the GPR/ZOU. Workshops have been noticed in various papers but not the Fresno Bee. A CAC was not formed but the County webpage was updated in 2018 and again in 2022.
352	Woody Hastings (Center for Climate Protection); District 3 (12/10/18)			Will the new General Plan provide community choice for energy policies? Does the new General Plan address the use of electric vehicles for mass transit? Does the new General Plan address access to charging stations for electric vehicles? When you say this effort will not expand the Sphere-of-Influence (SOI) of any city, does that refer to a geographic boundary or a political boundary?	The General Plan does not provide community choice for energy. The County does not directly provide mass transit services. Charging stations have been addressed in changes to state law which the County must comply. This effort would not expand the boundary of the LAFCo-adopted SOI.
353	Destiny Rodriguez (Center for Climate Protection); District 3 (12/10/18)			How will future public outreach be conducted?	Staff will use mailing lists (hard copy and e-mail) comprised of interested individuals; coordinate with NGOs; utilize a dedicated webpage and social media.