



County of Fresno

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND PLANNING
STEVEN E. WHITE, DIRECTOR

Planning Commission Staff Report Agenda Item No. 2 September 14, 2023

SUBJECT: Conduct workshop regarding the General Plan Review and Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance Update including proposed revisions to the General Plan Policy Document and reformatting and revisions to the County Zoning Ordinance.

LOCATION: The General Plan Review and Zoning Ordinance Update is a County-wide matter.

APPLICANT: County of Fresno Department of Public Works and Planning

STAFF CONTACT: Chris Motta
Development Services and Capital Projects Manager
(559) 600-4497

EXHIBITS:

1. How to Use the General Plan – Goals and Policies Readers' Guide
2. Key General Plan Policy Modifications
3. How to Use the General Plan – Implementation Programs Readers' Guide
4. Key General Plan Implementation Program Modifications
5. Summary of Zoning Ordinance Modifications
6. Executive Summary of the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report

WORKSHOP PURPOSE AND PROCEDURAL CONSIDERATIONS:

On April 28, 2023, the Department released the General Plan Background Report, General Plan Policy Document, the Zoning Ordinance Update, and the associated Program Draft Program Environmental Impact Report for a 60-day public review period. The public review period ended on June 27, 2023, and Department staff is in the process of developing responses to the comments received. Once complete, Department staff will schedule the required public hearings before your Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

This General Plan Review and Zoning Ordinance Update workshop is solely for the purpose of providing information to the Planning Commission ahead of scheduling the General Plan Review and Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance Update for your Commission's consideration and recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. The Commission is not being asked to take

any action. Due to the length of time and number of policy modifications in the General Plan Policy Document, staff has focused on key changes and summarized the history of this seventeen-year effort. Staff will have an electronic version of the redlined document available for digital display at the workshop should there be a question about a particular policy or program.

FRAMEWORK FOR THE GENERAL PLAN REVIEW AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE:

Summary of the County General Plan

The General Plan is the document that outlines the County's plan for achieving a long-term vision for the future. It provides guiding goals and policies for land use decisions in the County and informs stakeholders (citizens, developers, and decision-makers) on the County's policies and programs for development within the unincorporated areas of the County and is designed to meet State General Plan requirements. Fresno County's General Plan has a planning horizon of 15 to 25 years.

Fresno County began the review process of the current General Plan in 2006, when it selected a team of consultants to assist the County in its update effort. The General Plan Review seeks to modernize the 2000 General Plan document and bring the document into compliance with various state laws that have been enacted since 2000.

The General Plan Policy Document is a high-level document that sets the framework for other, more community or area-specific, planning documents. The General Plan sets out a vision reflected in goals, policies, programs, and diagrams for Fresno County. The County sees its primary role to be the protector of prime agricultural lands, open space, recreational opportunities, and environmental quality, and the coordinator of countywide efforts to promote economic development. The General Plan is built on the following thirteen major themes:

1. Economic Development
2. Agricultural Land Protection
3. Growth Accommodation
4. Urban-Centered Growth
5. Efficient and Functional Land Use Patterns
6. Service Efficiency
7. Recreation Development
8. Resource Protection
9. Health and Safety Protection
10. Health and Well-Being
11. Enhanced Quality of Life
12. Affordable Housing
13. Environmental Justice (added with the General Plan Review)

The 2023 General Plan Review carries forward those same themes identified in the 2000 General Plan, with the addition of an Environmental Justice Element which contains new policies and implementation programs. Following these themes, there are eight topical

elements of the General Plan set out its goals and policies. For Fresno County these elements are:

- Economic Development
- Agriculture and Land Use
- Transportation and Circulation
- Public Facilities and Services
- Open Space and Conservation
- Health and Safety
- Environmental Justice (proposed with the current General Plan Review)
- Housing (Adopted March 15, 2016, as a separate document, and currently being updated separately from this project).

Key changes to the general plan include extending the Planning Period to 2042, adding updates to address Environmental Justice (Senate Bill 1000 and Assembly Bill 1528), and an improved Safety Element to address climate hazards, vulnerability, and emergency evacuation. There is also added analysis and policies related specifically to air quality. Finally, the 2023 document includes reference to two future study areas for a Fresno County Business and Industrial Campus, and a 7,000-acre development area in eastern Fresno County for a potential educational-based community.

Policies in the General Plan will influence (impact) future Community Plan updates.

Key County General Plan Goals

General Plan goals flow from the Vision Statement and Themes and address a broad range of topics required by State Law and those that address unique local concerns. The policies assist in carrying out the plan goals which requires numerous individual actions and ongoing programs involving virtually every County department and many other public agencies and private organizations to ensure that the policies and proposals of the general plan are systematically implemented and consistent with its adopted general plan.

The countywide General Plan Policy Document contains clear statements of goals, policies, standards, and implementation programs that constitute the formal policy of Fresno County for land use, development, open space protection, and environmental quality.

Public Workshops

Over the past seventeen years there have been a number of workshops conducted and agenda items brought forward to either the Board of Supervisors or Planning Commission regarding the General Plan Review effort. More recently, since Board direction to prepare an Environmental Impact Report, there have been several workshops and community meetings that have occurred since 2018. Specifically, thirty meetings or workshops have occurred including workshops associated with the Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community analysis as required by Senate Bill 244. These meetings are listed below.

No.	Date	Location	Notes
1	June 22, 2023	Betty Rodriguez Library	District 3 Community Mtg
2	June 21, 2023	Riverdale Memorial District	District 4 Community Mtg.
3	June 19, 2023	Woodward Park Library	District 2 Community Mtg.
4	June 15, 2023	Clovis Police Department	District 5 Community Mtg.
5	June 13, 2023	Biola Community Service District Hall	District 1 Community Mtg.
6	May 24, 2023	Malaga Community Center	Env. Justice Workshop
7	May 23, 2023	Cantua Creek Elementary School	Env. Justice Workshop
8	May 19, 2022	Biola Community Center	Series II District 1
9	April 21, 2022	Shaver Lake Community Center	Series II District 5
10	April 19, 2022	Del Rey Community Services District	Series II District 4
11	March 29, 2022	Fig Garden Women's Club	Series II District 2
12	March 28, 2022	Fresno Center, Kings Canyon Rd., Fresno, CA	Series II District 3
13	March 22, 2022	BOS Chambers	Amend Rincon Agt.
14	March 17, 2022	Tombstone Community, Sanger, CA	Series II District 4
15	March 9, 2022	Cantua Creek Elementary School	Series II District 1
16	December 14, 2021	BOS Chambers	Revised Scope (Rincon)
17	September 21, 2021	BOS Chambers	Policy Direction
18	April 14, 2020	BOS Chambers	Revised Scope
19	March 10, 2020	CPDES Hall, Easton, CA	SB 244
20	January 30, 2020	Tranquillity Branch Library	SB 244
21	January 29, 2020	Fowler Branch Library	SB 244
22	January 28, 2020	Riverdale Memorial District	SB 244
23	December 10, 2018	Betty Rodriguez Library, Fresno	Series I District 3
24	December 3, 2018	Woodward Park Library, Fresno	Series I District 2
25	November 27, 2018	Riverdale Memorial District	Series I District 4
26	November 16, 2018	Clovis Police Dept. Headquarters, Clovis, CA	Series I District 5
27	November 14, 2018	Gaston Middle School, Fresno, CA	Series I District 1
28	August 21, 2018	BOS Chambers	Policy Direction
29	March 16, 2018	Riverdale Memorial District	EIR Scoping 2018
30	March 16, 2018	BOS Chambers	EIR Scoping 2018

Presentation of the General Plan Safety Element to the Board of Forestry

Per Government Code section 65302.5 the California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection (BOF) must review updated safety elements at least 90 days prior to the adoption or amendment of the element if the jurisdiction contains State Responsibility Areas (SRAs) and Very High Fire Hazard Safety Zones (VHFHSZs). The draft safety element must be submitted to the BOF. (Gov. Code, § 65302.5, subd. (b). The BOF shall review the safety element and respond to the city or county with its findings regarding the uses of land and policies in SRAs or VHFHSZs that will protect life, property, and natural resources from unreasonable risks associated with wildfires, and the methods and strategies for wildfire risk reduction and prevention within SRAs or VHFHSZs. The Safety Element for Fresno County meets this BOF review criteria.

On May 9, 2023, Public Works and Planning staff and the County's land use/PEIR consultant participated remotely in CalFire staff's presentation of the Safety Element to the BOF. At the meeting, members of the BOF were complimentary of the redrafted Safety Element. Following the meeting, on May 23, 2023, the County received confirmation by BOF staff that they had approved the draft Safety Element without any changes.

KEY GENERAL PLAN POLICY MODIFICATIONS:

Exhibit 1 is a guidance page from the General Plan Policy document to assist to how to read goals, policies. Comparative redlines have been distributed to the commission on digital media and can also be viewed at:

<https://fresnocountygeneralplan.com/> → *Released Documents* → *Release of Public Review Drafts* → *General Plan Policy Document Comparative Draft: Comparative Draft Page*

Attached as Exhibit 2 are key General Plan Goals and Policy modifications organized by Element. The Environmental Justice Element is a new element required by state law since the adoption of the 2000 General Plan. The Safety Element was also significantly modified after the completion of the Climate Vulnerability Assessment and coordination with CalFire and other local agencies.

KEY GENERAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM CHANGES

To help ensure that appropriate actions are taken to implement the General Plan Policies, the Plan includes a set of implementation programs that identify specific steps to be taken by the County to implement the policies. A significant change in the format of the Policy Document has to do with relocating the implementation programs that are currently listed under each policy to Part 3 of the Document, entitled, “Administration and Implementation.”

These Programs may include revisions of current codes and ordinances, plans and capital improvements, programs, financing, and other measures that should be assigned to different County departments after the General Plan is adopted. The types of tools or actions the County can use to carry out its policies and implementation programs generally fall into the eight categories listed below.

- Regulation and Development Review (RDR)
- Plans, Strategies, and Programs (PSP)
- Financing and Budgeting (FB)
- Planning Studies and Reports (PSR)
- County Services and Operations (SO)
- Inter-governmental Coordination (IGC)
- Joint Partnerships with the Private Sector (JP)
- Public Information (PI)

Exhibit 3 is a guidance page from the General Plan Policy document to assist to how to read implementation programs. Exhibit 4 highlights key changes to specific implementation programs. Much like Exhibit 2, due to length, not all Implementation Program changes have been included, but they can be reviewed in the redline draft documents.

KEY ZONING ORDINANCE MODIFICATIONS:

Administrative Draft Zoning Ordinance Update which includes a new format and provisions to implement General Plan policies. The current Zoning Ordinance, which is the principal tool for implementing the County’s General Plan, was adopted in 1960 and has been amended several

times; but the document has never been comprehensively updated. It frequently requires interpretation by staff due to modern land uses and changes to state law.

Key changes to the zoning ordinance include:

- Completely reformatted and modernized the Zoning Ordinance with user-friendly tables, diagrams and graphics.
- Provided additional flexibility for the Director's determination and established Temporary Use Permits for certain uses.
- Incorporated State-mandated requirements and updated zoning practices for accessory dwelling units, objective design standards for multifamily development, and addressed prior Zoning Ordinance ambiguities.

Exhibit 5 is a guide illustrating general locations where sections of the Zoning Ordinance have moved with the comprehensive update.

GENERAL PLAN BACKGROUND REPORT:

The Background Report provides a "snapshot" in time of the County's existing conditions. It presents the physical, social, and economic resource information required to support the preparation of the General Plan. The Background Report serves as the foundation document from which subsequent planning policies and programs will be formulated. The document is also used as the "environmental setting" section of the General Plan EIR. The Background Report is divided into 10 chapters: Introduction; Demographics and Employment; Land Use; Housing; Transportation and Mobility; Public Facilities and Services; Natural Resources; Hazards and Safety; Climate Change; and Noise.

PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT:

Exhibit 6 is the DPEIR Executive Summary. As required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), this EIR examines alternatives to 2042 General Plan. Studied alternatives include the following three alternatives. Based on the alternatives analysis, Alternative 3 was determined to be the environmentally superior alternative.

- Alternative 1: No Project (Continuation of the 2000 General Plan)
- Alternative 2: Moderately Increased Density
- Alternative 3: Substantially Increased Density

CEQA requires that an environmentally superior alternative be identified among those analyzed. It further states that if the No Project Alternative is identified as environmentally superior, the next most environmentally superior alternative must also be identified. When taking into account every environmental impact area, Alternative 3 is the environmentally superior alternative, followed by Alternative 2, and Alternative 1.

Table ES-1 the environmental impacts of 2042 General Plan, the proposed mitigation measures, and residual impacts or significance after mitigation. Impacts are defined as significant, unavoidable adverse impacts that require a statement of overriding consideration, pursuant to Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines if 2042 General Plan is approved; significant, adverse impacts that can be feasibly mitigated to less than significant levels and that require findings to be made under Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines; adverse impacts that are less than those allowed by adopted significance thresholds; and no impact. Several new

policies noted in Exhibit 2 resulted from the preparation of the PEIR. They include Policies OS-J.2; OS-E.19; OS-G.12; OS-G.13; OS-G.14HS-H.10; HS-H.11; HS-H.12. Despite mitigation the PEIR determined that impacts resulting from the adoption of the General Plan Review, mostly associated with build-out of existing areas, would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to agricultural uses, ozone and PM2.5 air emissions, Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG) construction and operational emissions, historical resources, cultural resources, archaeological resources, unique geological or paleontological features, Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT); water and wastewater utilities; waste generation; and fire hazards in Moderate, High and Very High Fire Hazard Safety Zones.

CM:cwm

E:\1 - Development Services & Capital Projects\5 - Miscellaneous Work Projects\GPR ZOU Sept 2023 Workshop\PC Workshop SR.docx

INTRODUCTION TO THE GENERAL PLAN



GOALS AND POLICIES READERS' GUIDE

Each element contains the goals and policies that will be used by the County to guide future land use, development, and environmental protection decisions.

SECTION INTRODUCTION
Provides an overview and discussion of the section and the goals and policies addressed.

SECTION NUMBER/TITLE
Identifies the section of the element.

ELEMENT TITLE
Identifies the element of the General Plan.

PART NUMBER
Identifies the Part of the General Plan Policy Document.

GOALS AND POLICIES
The second major part of the Transportation and Circulation Element sets out goals and policies for streets and highways, transit, transportation systems management, bicycle facilities, rail transportation, and air transportation. Implementation programs related to Transportation and Circulation Element goals and policies can be found in Part 3 of this General Plan.

GOAL TR-A
To plan and provide a unified, multi-modal, coordinated, and cost-efficient countywide street and highway system that ensures the safe, orderly, and efficient movement of people and goods, including travel by walking, bicycle, or transit.

GOAL NUMBERING
Each goal starts with the element acronym and is followed by the letter identifier of the goal.

GOALS
Each goal has one or more policies associated with the goal. A goal states the ultimate purpose of an effort in a way that is general in nature and immeasurable. Each section (topic area) of the plan has only one goal.

POLICY NUMBERING
Continuing from the goal letter, the policy number is shown as the last number, supporting the goal it follows.

POLICY TITLE
Each policy contains a leading title in bold for a quick reference to the policy text. Policy titles are not part of the policy direction.

POLICIES
Each policy is associated with a specific goal. A policy is a specific statement guiding action and implying clear commitment.

PAGE NUMBER
Shows the part and page number.

GOALS AND POLICIES TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

GOALS AND POLICIES

The second major part of the Transportation and Circulation Element sets out goals and policies for streets and highways, transit, transportation systems management, bicycle facilities, rail transportation, and air transportation. Implementation programs related to Transportation and Circulation Element goals and policies can be found in Part 3 of this General Plan.

A. STREETS AND HIGHWAYS

The Fresno County Circulation System is a street and highway plan designed to provide for the safe and efficient movement of people and goods to and within the county and to ensure safe and continuous access to land. Using the State freeways and highways and the County's system of highways as its basic framework, the County Circulation System brings together the circulation plans of the cities and unincorporated communities within the county into a unified, functionally integrated, countywide system that is correlated with the Agriculture and Land Use Element of the General Plan.

Policies in this section seek to create a unified, multi-modal, coordinated, and cost-efficient countywide street and highway system by maintaining and rehabilitating existing roads, maintaining an acceptable level of service (LOS), coordinating improvements with other local jurisdictions, maintaining adequate funding, and providing multi-modal uses where appropriate along street and highway corridors. Related policies are included in Section LU-F, Urban Development Patterns; Section LU-E, Non-Agricultural Development; and Section HS-G, Noise.

TR-A.1 Roadway Design Standards

The County shall plan and construct County-maintained streets and roads according to the County's Roadway Design Standards. Roadway design standards for County-maintained roads shall be based on the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) standards, and supplemented by California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) design standards and by County Department of Public Works & Planning Standards, including complete streets standards. County standards include typical cross sections by roadway classification, consistent with right-of-way widths summarized in Table TR-1.

The County may deviate from the adopted standards in circumstances where conditions warrant special treatment of the roadway. Typical circumstances where exceptions may be warranted may include:

- Extraordinary construction costs due to terrain, roadside development, or unusual right-of-way needs;
- Need for traffic calming measures; and
- Environmental constraints that may otherwise entirely preclude road improvement. (RDR/PSP/SO)

TR-A.2 Level of Service

The County shall plan and design its roadway system in a manner that strives to meet Level of Service (LOS) D on urban roadways within the spheres of influence of the cities of Fresno and Clovis and LOS C on all other roadways in the county.

County of Fresno General Plan Review
Part 3 Goals and Policies

Page | 2-105
Public Review Draft

EXHIBIT 2

Key General Plan Policy Document Modifications

The following key modifications to General Plan Goals and Policies are categorized by element. Due to length, not every modified goal or policy is listed. For modified Goals, bold and underlined text represents new text. Comparative redlines have been distributed to the commission on digital media and can also be viewed at:

<https://fresnocountygeneralplan.com/> → Released Documents → Release of Public Review Drafts → General Plan Policy Document Comparative Draft: Comparative Draft Page

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Modifications to Key Goals:

Goal ED-A - To increase job creation through regional leadership, agricultural productivity, and development **and expansion** of high-value-added processing firms, **and manufacturing and distribution, and vocational educational opportunities**.

Goal ED-B - To diversify the economic base of Fresno County through the expansion of non-agricultural industry clusters and through the development and expansion of **businesses providing** recreation and visitor **services** ~~-serving attractions and accommodations.~~

Modifications to Key Policies:

- ED-A.7 Locating New Industrial Sites – removal of references to Calwa and Malaga; add Environmental Justice cross reference.
- ED-A.9 Fresno County Business and Industrial Campus Special Study Area – add reference for evaluation of a Special Study Area for possible future urban industrial, office and commercial land uses southeast of the City of Fresno.
- ED-A.16 Locating Regional Processing Facilities - add Environmental Justice cross reference.
- Revision of existing Policy ED-A.9 (now ED-A.8) to ensure that efforts are made to retain businesses in the county and to accommodate their expansion to the extent possible.
- Revision of existing Policy ED-A.13 (now ED-A.10) regarding assistance and support to agricultural producers and processors in order to maintain Fresno County as a center for agricultural innovation, entrepreneurship, research and development.

AGRICULTURE AND LAND USE

Modifications to Key Goals:

Goal LU-D To promote continued agricultural uses along Interstate 5, **to the extent water is available**, protect scenic views along the freeway, promote the safe and efficient use of the freeway as a traffic carrier, discourage the establishment of incompatible and hazardous uses along the freeway, and provide for attractive, coordinated development of commercial and service uses that cater specifically to highway travelers, and of agriculture-related uses at key interchanges along Interstate 5.

Goal LU-H - To provide for ~~mobilehome~~ **mobile home** development, home occupations, second dwellings, and planned development in appropriate locations under specified conditions, **to ensure land use compatibility in areas where military readiness activities are conducted,** and to provide for the effective and systematic implementation of the General Plan.

Modifications to Key Policies:

- LU-A.9 Homesite Minimum Parcel Size Exceptions – references 10-acre minimum parcel size for exception parcels subject to an agricultural land conservation contract. A similar standard is also applied to Policy LU-B.7 for areas designated for Westside Rangeland.
- LU-A.13 Agricultural Buffers – added language that County shall consider buffers between agricultural uses and proposed sensitive receptors when processing discretionary land use applications.
- LU-A.23 Prime Farmland Conversion – a mitigation measure from the PEIR; requires discretionary land use projects which propose the permanent conversion of forty acres or more of Prime Farmland to mitigate for farmland loss.
- LU-A.24 Important Farmland Map – a mitigation measure from the PEIR; encourages the State of California Department of Conservation to update its Important Farmland Map in consideration of recent restrictions to groundwater pumping, reduced access to surface water and the potential loss of irrigable.
- LU-C.12 Ribbon of Gems – County recognizes the natural, aesthetics and recreational benefits of the Kings River and supports the Kings River Conservancy’s implementation of the Ribbon of Gems.
- LU-E.7 Special Planned Residential Development – remove references to golf courses and add drought tolerant landscaping.
- LU-E.25 State Route 180/Trimmer Springs Road Special Study Area – add reference for approximately 7,000-acre acres generally located north of the State Route 180/Trimmer Springs Road interchange for future evaluation of a Special Study Area for possible future urban residential, educational, office, and commercial land uses.
- LU-F.30 and LUF.32 Industrial Discretionary Use Permit and Industrial Landscaping – add cross references to Environmental Justice policies.
- LU-F.38 Special Study Area for Fresno County Business and Industrial Campus – add reference for evaluation of a Special Study Area for possible future urban industrial, office and commercial land uses southeast of the City of Fresno.
- Delete policies related to Planned Urban Village (2000 General Plan policies LU-F.40 through LU-F.42).
- Delete 2000 General Plan Policy LU-G.20 related to Special Commercial areas within ½ mile of the city’s sphere of influence.
- Revision of existing Policy LU-A.17, to allow the County to accept new Williamson Act Contracts provided that the County receives full subvention payment from the State.

- Adding Policies LU-C.10 and .11, regarding coordination between the County and other interested agencies in implementing the San Joaquin River Parkway Master Plan and the Kings River Regional Plan.
- Revision of existing Policy LU-G.4, to support SOI expansions where the residential densities are maximized, and the population growth needs are addressed.

TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

Modifications to Goal:

Goal TR-A - To plan and provide a unified, **multi-modal**, coordinated, and cost-efficient countywide street and highway system that ensures the safe, orderly, and efficient movement of people and goods, **including travel by walking, bicycle, or transit**.

Modifications to Key Policies:

- Add a new Policy TR-A.17, to limit the expansion of existing or designation of new truck routes within 500-feet of sensitive land uses such as schools and residential areas.
- TR-A.25 Vehicles Miles Traveled (VMT) Threshold – a new policy that reflects changes to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and its focus on impacts related to trip lengths. A project resulting in VMT that exceeds 87 percent below the countywide average shall be required to implement project-specific mitigation measures aimed at reducing VMT generated by the project.
- Add a new Policy TR-B.7, requiring the County to work with school districts in planning transit routes and designating safe routes to schools to reduce vehicle trips.

PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES

Modifications to Key Policies:

- Adding new Policy PF-A.1, requiring the County to ensure that an infrastructure plan or area facility plan is prepared in conjunction with preparation of a new or update of an existing community plan or specific plan to address the technical, managerial and financial capacity of special districts to serve the proposed developments.
- Adding new Policy PF-C.25, requiring the County to participate in Integrated Regional Water Management Planning efforts with other local and regional water stakeholders to plan for efficient use, enhancement and management of surface and ground water supplies.
- PF-C.28 Man-made Lakes and Ponds – modify existing language to state the County shall generally not approve land use-related projects that incorporate a man-made lake or pond that will be sustained by the use of groundwater.
- Adding new Policy PF-F.2, requiring on-site recycling storage and collection areas for new commercial, industrial, and multi-family residential developments.

OPEN SPACE AND CONSERVATION

Modifications Goal:

Goal OS-J – To identify, protect, and enhance Fresno County’s important historical, archeological, paleontological, geological, and cultural sites and their contributing environment, **and promote and encourage preservation, restoration, and rehabilitation of Fresno County’s historically significant resources in order to promote historical awareness, community identity, and to recognize the County’s valued assets that have contributed to past County events, trends, styles of architecture, and economy.**

Key Policies:

The following six policies are new policies that resulted from the DPEIR.

- OS-E.19 Nesting Birds –For development projects on sites where tree or vegetation/habitat removal is necessary and where the existence of sensitive species and/or bird species protected by California Fish and Game Code Sections 30503 and 305.3 and Migratory Bird Treaty Act has been determined by a qualified biologist, surveys for nesting birds shall be conducted by a qualified biologist for all construction sites where activities occurring during nesting bird season (February 1 through September 15). If active nests are located onsite, then a qualified biologist shall determine an appropriate avoidance buffer for construction activities.
- OS-G.12 Architectural Coating Reactive Organic Gases Content Limits – The County shall review development projects, and encourage the use of architectural coating materials, as defined in the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District’s Rule 4601, that are zero-emission or have a low-ROG content (below 10 grams per liter). Where such ROG coatings are not available, the coating with the lowest ROG rating available shall be used.
- OS-G.13 Diesel Engine Tier Requirements – The County shall require development projects to implement diesel construction equipment meeting California Air Resources Board (CARB) Tier 4 or equivalent emission standards for off-road heavy-duty diesel engines. If use of Tier 4 equipment is not possible due to availability, diesel construction equipment meeting Tier 3 emission standards shall be used. Tier 3 equipment shall use a Level 3 Diesel Particulate Filter.
- OS-G.14 Valley Fever Mitigation – The County shall continue to promote public awareness of Valley Fever risks relating to ground disturbing activities through the provision of educational materials, webpages and resource contact information. For projects involving ground disturbance on unpaved areas left undisturbed for 6 months or more, the County shall require developers to provide project-specific Valley Fever training and training materials.
- OS-J.2 Historic Resources Consideration – The County shall consider historic resources during preparation or evaluation of plans and discretionary development projects that may impact buildings or structures For a project projected on a property that includes buildings, structures, objects, sites, landscapes, or other features that are 45 years of age or older at the time of permit application, the project applicants shall be responsible for preparing and implementation the recommendations of a historical resources evaluation completed by qualified cultural resources practitioners.

- OS-J.4 Cultural Resources Protection and Mitigation – The County shall require that discretionary development projects, as part of any required CEQA review, identify and protect important historical, archeological, tribal, paleontological, and cultural sites and resources. For projects requiring ground disturbance and located within a high or moderate cultural sensitivity areas, a cultural resources technical report may be warranted, including accurate archival research and site surveys conducted by qualified cultural resources practitioners. The need to prepare such studies shall be determined based on the tribal consultation process and initial outreach to local or state information centers.

Other policy modifications include:

- Adding new a new Policy OS-A.6 regarding groundwater recharge protection to ensure that new development does not limit the capacity or function of groundwater recharge areas.
- Adding a new Policy OS-A.10 regarding Sustainable Groundwater Management (SGMA) regarding coordination with relevant Groundwater Sustainability Agencies concerning their Groundwater Sustainability Plans.

HEALTH AND SAFETY

Additional Goal:

Goal HS-G - To improve the sustainability and resiliency of the County through continued efforts to reduce the causes of and adapt to climate change.

Modifications to Key Policies:

An additional eleven policies resulted from the Climate Vulnerability Assessment and collaboration by the County and CalFire as part of significant revision to the Safety Element that occurred in 2022 and 2023. They are summarized below.

- HS-A.6 – Emergency Preparedness Public Awareness Programs – County support to local fire agencies through distribution of information during the permit process, website links and public meeting assistance focusing on vulnerable at-risk communities such as those in the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone.
- HS-A.10 Retrofit Existing Critical Facilities and Related Infrastructure – As part of its five-year Capital Improvement Plan County shall conduct an evaluation of County facilities including those operated by County first responders to determine retrofits that may be needed for long-term resilience (climate change hazards including wildfire and drought).
- HS-B.3 Telecommunications – Coordination with telecommunication service entities to fire-harden communications.
- HS-B.4 Fire Risk Management – The County shall require that new discretionary development (i.e., residential subdivisions and large commercial proposals in high-fire-hazard areas) have fire-resistant vegetation, cleared fire breaks separating communities or clusters of structures from native vegetation, or a long-term comprehensive vegetation

and fuel management program. Shall be incorporated into the design of development projects in fire hazard areas.

- HS-B.22 Defensible Space – The County shall make available and promote educational materials for defensible space standards, or vegetation “clear zones,” and vegetation compliance for all existing and new structures in areas that are designated by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection and Local Ordinance 15.60 as State Responsibility Areas or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones.
- HS-B.25 State Responsibility Areas Fire Safe Regulation – Require development to adhere to standards that meet or exceed Title 14, CCR, Division 1.5, Chapter 7, Subchapter 2, Articles 1-5 (commencing with Section 1299.01) (Fire Hazard Reduction Around Buildings and Structures Regulations) for State Responsibility Areas and/or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones.
- HS-B.26 Master Emergency Services Plan – The County shall maintain and update its Master Emergency Services Plan, as necessary, to include an assessment of current emergency service and projected emergency service needs, and goals or standards for emergency service training for County staff and volunteers.
- HS-B.27 Post Fire Re-development – In the event of a large fire, the County shall evaluate re-development within the impacted fire zone to conform to contemporary fire safe standards and require all development to meet or exceed the County's Title 15 - Building and Construction, Chapter 15.60 State Responsibility Area Fire Safe Regulations of the County under the County's Code of Ordinances and applicable updates.
- HS-B.28 Fire Safe New Construction and Re-Construction - The County shall coordinate with local and state fire agencies to ensure that all new developments and applicable re-constructions (as defined by state law) in the very high fire hazard severity zone and State Responsibility Areas, comply with defensible space regulations, home and street addressing and signage, the latest fire-safe standards, Board of Forestry and Fire Protection fire safe regulations and the most current version of the California Building Code and California Fire Code.
- HS-B.30 Hazard Mitigation Plan - The County shall, if necessary, revise the Health and Safety Element upon each revision of the Housing Element or Fresno County Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan, but not less than once every eight years, to identify new information relating to flood and fire hazards and climate adaptation and resiliency strategies applicable to the county.
- HS-B.31 Restrict Parking - The County shall work with relevant agencies such as CAL FIRE, Fresno County Sheriff's Office, Caltrans, Fresno County Public Works and Planning, and private Homeowners Associations, to restrict parking periodically (e.g., on red flag days) along critical evacuation routes.
- HS-D.5 Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Act – Pursuant to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (Public Resources Code, Chapter 7.5), the County shall not permit any structure for human occupancy to be placed within designated Earthquake Fault Zones

unless the specific provisions of the Act and Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations have been satisfied.

- HS-G.10 Evacuation Awareness – The County shall identify and communicate safe and viable evacuation routes in multiple languages and across various communication platforms, as appropriate, to reach vulnerable populations.
- HS-G.11 Safety Zones – The County shall identify appropriate temporary areas of refuge to provide for shelter-in-place when evacuation routes become blocked.

The following three policies are new policies that resulted from the DPEIR.

- HS-H.10 Funding for a Greenhouse Gas Inventory and Preparation of a Climate Action Plan – The County shall seek a variety of sources including, but not limited to, grants, state funding, and or impact fees to fund the preparation and implementation of a Fresno County specific Climate Action Plan. Once funding is available, the County shall proceed to prepare a Climate Action Plan.
- HS-H.11 Preparation and Implementation of a Climate Action Plan – The County shall undertake a countywide Climate Action Plan (CAP) within two years of the adoption of General Plan Amendment No. 529 (General Plan Review) with the objective of meeting a GHG emissions reduction trajectory consistent with State law (currently codified in Health and Safety Code Section 38566 et seq. [Senate Bill 32] and Executive Order B-55-18).
- HS-H.12 Construction Vibration Control Measures – The following measures to minimize exposure to construction vibration shall be included as standard conditions of approval for projects involving construction vibration within 50 feet of historic buildings or nearby sensitive receivers shall:
 - a. Avoid the use of vibratory rollers within 50 feet of historic buildings or residential buildings with plastered walls that are susceptible to damage from vibration; and
 - b. Schedule construction activities with the highest potential to produce vibration to hours with the least potential to affect nearby institutional, educational, and office uses that are identified as sensitive to daytime vibration by the Federal Transit Administration in Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment.

The following are additional policy modifications proposed.

- Adding introductory language and adopting as part of the General Plan by reference the Fresno County Multijurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP), adopted by the Board on January 9, 2009, then updated in 2018. The LHMP sets out goals and policies for ensuring the maintenance of a healthy and safe physical environment.
- Adding new Policy HS-A.2, requiring the County in coordination with cities, special districts, and other State and Federal agencies maintain the Fresno County Multijurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan.

- Adding new Policies HS-C.1 through HS-C.8 and HS-C.17, regarding flood hazards and to minimize the risk of loss of life, injury, and damage resulting from flood hazards through implementation of Floodplain Management Ordinance.
- Revision of existing Policy HS-C.9, regarding food control through construction of dams and recharge facilities.

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

New Goals:

Goal EJ-A - To ensure the fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and incomes with respect to the development, adoption, implementation and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations and policies do not disproportionately impact any individual race, any culture, income or education level.

Goal EJ-B - To promote physical activities in unincorporated communities by creating equitable opportunities for bicycling, walking, and access to open space areas.

Goal EJ-C - To have consistent, equitable, and improved access to healthy foods and beverages, health services, and resources that enhance quality of life.

Goal EJ-D - Ensure that Fresno County residents have equitable access to safe and sanitary living conditions.

Goal EJ-E - Encourage and facilitate equitable civic engagement in the decision-making process by all County residents.

Key Environmental Justice Policies:

- EJ-A.1 Location of Sensitive Land Uses – The County, during the development review process, shall require proposed new sensitive land uses (such as residential uses, schools, senior care facilities, and day care facilities) to be located an appropriate distance, to be determined during the development review process, from freeways, major roadways, and railroad tracks based on analysis of physical circumstances of the project location so as to minimize potential impacts including, but not limited to, air and water pollution exposure, odor emissions, light, and glare.
- EJ-A.2 Mitigate for Sensitive Land Uses Near Environmental Concerns – The County shall require buffering and screening requirements as part of the development review process for all new potentially pollution producing land uses proposed to be located adjacent to existing sensitive land uses that have historically been associated with heightened levels of pollution. These land uses associated with pollution include industrial land uses, agricultural operations using pesticides applied by spray techniques, wastewater treatment plants, and landfills and waste treatment facilities.
- EJ-A.3 Use of Best Practice – The County shall during the development review land use process coordinate with local commercial and industrial developments to review and require incorporation into their projects the latest technologies and best practices to reduce emissions.
- EJ-A.5 Diesel Particulate Matter - The County shall seek funding, such as the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ), to develop projects to mitigate roadway pollution, such as widening roadway shoulders, the creation

of green barriers and the prohibition of truck routing near or through sensitive land uses in an effort to improve Diesel Particulate Matter pollution along major thoroughfares the County.

- EJ-A.8 Community Input on Development Projects - The County shall provide residents within disadvantaged communities the opportunity to review and comment on discretionary development projects within their communities.
- EJ-A.14 Truck Routes - The County shall prohibit truck traffic from new industrial development to traverse through existing residentially zoned neighborhoods.
- EJ-B.2 Encouraging Outdoor Activity - Annually, the County shall coordinate a meeting with community services districts to explore opportunities for developing equitable and American with Disabilities Act compliant public infrastructure that promotes outdoor physical activity and removes barriers to outdoor activity.
- EJ-B.7 Park Funding - The County shall seek funding from the California Department of Parks and Recreation and other funding sources to develop a targeted Park Improvement Fund to improve the quality, availability, and maintenance of parks in and serving disadvantaged communities. The County shall work with local community services districts in disadvantaged communities to provide support and assistance in their development of park improvement funds for parks in disadvantaged communities that are not owned or operated by the County.
- EJ-C.4 Farmers Markets - The County shall encourage the consistent access to healthy foods for Fresno County residents by creating opportunities for the development of farmer's markets in areas that are considered food deserts (disadvantaged communities of the County). Further, the County shall encourage farmer's market vendors to accept Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) payment.
- EJ-C.5 Strategic Partnerships for Food Access and Recovery - The County shall partner with local stakeholders and food networks to decrease the barriers to accessing the food network and develop policy solutions to address food insecurity and building resilience in the food network to increase consistent, readily available access to food for insecure residents in disadvantaged communities.
- EJ-D.2 Assisted Home Rehabilitation - The County shall support vulnerable residents from disadvantaged communities by continuing to administer its programs that provide funding to support necessary housing rehabilitation projects for senior residents, residents with disabilities, and low-income residents as funding allows.
- EJ-E.1 Engage Disadvantaged Communities - The County shall partner with local agencies and non-profits to conduct ongoing periodic workshop in disadvantaged communities to effectively and equitably engage area residents regarding Fresno County programs and projects (health services and healthy foods, HOME program, major infrastructure).
- EJ-E.4 Community Noticing and Outreach - The County shall consider diversity of its residents when developing noticing and outreach materials for community meetings to ensure pertinent information is equitably dispersed and simply understood.



FRESNO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN

IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAMS READERS' GUIDE

To help ensure that appropriate actions are taken to implement the General Plan, the Plan includes a set of implementation programs. Implementation programs identify the specific steps to be taken by the County to implement the policies. They may include revisions of current codes and ordinances, plans and capital improvements, programs, financing, and other measures that should be assigned to different County departments after the General Plan is adopted. The types of tools or actions the County can use to carry out its policies and implementation programs generally fall into the eight categories listed below. These categories are explained in detail in Part 3, Administration and Implementation, along with a list of specific implementation programs.

- Regulation and Development Review (RDR)
- Plans, Strategies, and Programs (PSP)
- Financing and Budgeting (FB)
- Planning Studies and Reports (PSR)
- County Services and Operations (SO)
- Inter-governmental Coordination (IGC)
- Joint Partnerships with the Private Sector (JP)
- Public Information (PI)

TABLE NUMBER AND NAME
Each section begins with a new table number and section name.

TIMELINE
Identifies an estimated time frame for when the implementation program will be completed. Implementation programs may not be completed as indicated due to budget or resource constraints.

IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM TAG
Each implementation program is followed by a set of letters in italics/parenthesis that identifies the type of tool or action the County will use to implement the program.

Table 3-3 Transportation and Circulation Implementation Programs		2018-2020	2021-2025	Annual	Ongoing
TR-A.E	The County shall update and maintain the Improvement Standards for other County development improvements, including private roads dedicated to public use. <i>(RDR)</i>				✓
Implements Which Policy(ies)	TR-A.1				
Responsible Department(s)	Department of Public Works & Planning				

IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM TEXT
Specific action(s) the County will take to implement the General Plan.

RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT(S)
Identifies which County department(s) are responsible to see the specific implementation is completed and which County department(s), if necessary, will support the responsible department.

SUPPORTING POLICY(IES)
Identifies which policy(ies) the implementation program supports.

EXHIBIT 4

Implementation Programs and Key Modifications

Proposed notable Changes to the Programs

- Revised existing Program ED-A.A, to state the County shall allocate resources to support the County's economic development implementation programs
- Eliminated existing Program ED-A.D, to develop criteria for locating value added agricultural processing facilities. Zoning Ordinance was amended to expand value added processing uses in County Ag Districts – program no longer needed.
- Eliminated ED-A.B and ED-A.C regarding supporting an Action Team and five-year evaluations of the Economic Development Strategy.
- Eliminated existing Program ED-B.D, to identify recreation opportunities in coast range foothills.
- Revised ED-C.E to replace Jobs 2000 services with job readiness.
- Eliminated existing Programs LU-A.A, LU-D.A, LU-F.B, LU-G.A, LU-H.F, regarding update of the Zoning Ordinance. The Zoning Ordinance is being updated. Replaced with LU-A.A- County shall review and amend its Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances to ensure consistency with policies and standards of this section
- Eliminated Revised existing Program LU-A.B, to evaluate agricultural parcel sizes. This 2000 program has been implemented and the minimum parcel sizes in agricultural areas are reflected in the Zoning Ordinance. Replaced with LU-A.B - during the development review process, the County shall evaluate and incorporate all practical buffers for new non-agricultural uses proposed in agricultural areas of the county.
- Delete 2000 General Plan Program LU-A.I regarding establishing an agricultural quality scale system based on other models (LESA, Tulare County Rural Lands Plan 1975 amendment, etc.)
- Delete 2000 General Plan Program LU-H.C for preparation of minimum format and content guidelines in preparation of updated and new regional, community and specific plans.
- Delete 2000 General Plan Program LU-H.E that stipulates the County conduct a major review of the General Plan every five years.
- Add Program TR-A.F that the County prepare Complete Streets Design Guidelines and update them every five years.
- Add Program TR-D.E which states the County shall periodically review and update the Regional Bicycle and Recreational Trails Master Plan.
- Delete 2000 General Plan Program TR-E.B which stated that the County shall use appropriate zoning in designated rail corridors to ensure preservation of rail facilities for future local rail use.
- Delete 2000 General Plan Program PF-B.B stating County shall develop and adopt ordinances specifying acceptable methods for new development to pay for new capital facilities and expanded services. Possible mechanisms include development fees, assessment districts, land/facility dedications, county service areas, and community facilities districts.
- Modify PF-C.A to state the County shall participate in Inter-Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP) efforts with other regional partners to identify and implement projects and programs to improve water supply reliability and quality.

- Delete 2000 General Plan Program PF-C.F which states the County shall establish a review and/or regulatory process for proposed transfers of surface water to areas outside of the county and for substitution of groundwater for transferred surface water.
- Delete 2000 General Plan Program OS-A.A which stated the County shall develop, implement, and maintain a water sustainability plan.
- Modify Program OS-A.D (now OS-A.A) which states the County shall coordinate with Groundwater Sustainability Agencies and other water resource management agencies to identify and protect lands for sustainable for groundwater recharge.
- Delete 2000 General Plan Program OS-E.B which stated the County shall maintain current maps that indicate the extent of significant habitat for important fish and game species, as these maps are made available by the California Department of Fish and Game.
- Add HS-A.A in coordination with cities, special districts, and State and Federal agencies, the County shall review and update regularly the Fresno County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan.
- Added programs HS-A.H, HS-B.A, HS-B.B, HS-B.C, to implement policies that resulted from the updated Climate Vulnerability Assessment and Safety Element which seek and secure funding to conduct near-term and long-term climate hazard assessment; seek funding to establish a climate change education program promote consistency with changing State Fire Code requirements; update emergency planning documents, such as the Emergency Operations Plan, and procedures every eight years in tandem with required Safety Element updates.
- Added HS-B.D, HS-B.E and HSB.F seek federal and/or state funding to support enforcement of defensible space and hardening standards; County shall review proposed new and existing developments and ensure they have adequate emergency access, water supplies and provisions for fire suppression; continue to coordinate with CAL FIRE, the U.S. Forest Service, and neighboring jurisdictions on wildfire risk reduction activities in fire hazard severity zones in, wildland urban interface areas, and open spaces
- Modified HS-C.D establish development standards for new construction to reduce flooding.
- Modified HS-C.E require that the design and location of dams and levees be in accordance with applicable design standards and specifications and accepted design and construction practices.
- Added HS-D.B County shall create and adopt a Geologic Hazards Checklist to be utilized during the development review process.
- Added EJ-A.A - the County shall ensure that adequate measures, including but not limited to, landscaping, buffers, and setbacks are incorporated into each project to minimize potential project impacts associated with odor, light, glare, groundwater contamination and air emissions on disadvantaged community residents.
- Added EJ-A.B – the County shall incorporate into its Zoning Ordinance development standards and that address potentially pollution producing land uses that are proposed to be located adjacent to existing sensitive land uses
- Added EJ -A.C – the County, in coordination with the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, shall develop a list of pollution reducing technologies and best practices to make available to the local commercial and industrial industry.

- Added EJ- A.D and EJ-A.E – the County shall seek funding from the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District and the CalEPA to establish a Healthy Homes HVAC retrofitting subsidy program; County shall coordinate with the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District on County-initiated infrastructure projects and large-scale public or private developments for applicable funding opportunities to mitigate roadway pollution.
- Added EJ-A.G - the County shall mail a written notice to property owners and occupants within 15 days of the County's acceptance of a discretionary development review application located within a disadvantaged community. Notification shall be in English and Spanish and shall provide the opportunity for residents to submit written comments within 15 days following the date of the notice. Notification shall be from the exterior boundary of the property proposed for development and shall be in accordance with the Fresno County Zoning Ordinance public noticing requirements.
- Added EJ-A.H - Annually, the County shall develop a list of viable infrastructure and active transportation improvement projects for its disadvantaged communities and shall seek available grant funding.
- Added EJ-A.I - During the development review process, new industrial projects shall be subject to the Zoning Ordinance industrial development standards to reduce impacts to sensitive receptors and conflicts with surrounding properties.
- Added EJ-B.B - The County shall seek funding from the California Department of Parks and Recreation's Outdoor Equity Grants Program and Per Capita Program to develop a targeted Park Improvement Fund. The County shall work with and assist local community services districts in disadvantaged communities to seek funding from the parks related grant programs to develop their Park Improvement Funds.
- Added EJ-B.C - The County shall seek funding from the Department of Transportation's Safe Streets and Roads to develop the Rural Complete Streets Program.
- Added EJ-C.A - The County shall continue to promote Federally Qualified Health Centers (FQHCs) within disadvantaged areas through letters of support and engagement with local city and County decision-making bodies
- Added EJ-C.B - Annually, the County shall meet with medical service providers to identify obstacles to providing services in disadvantaged communities.
- Added EJ-C.E - The County shall develop a list of potential stakeholder contacts and relevant administering departments prior to initiating outreach. After initial outreach occurs the County shall conduct periodic updates to stakeholder lists and initiate subsequent outreach efforts as needed to ensure education and awareness programs remain current with changing state and local disease indicators and nutrition guidelines.

EXHIBIT 5

Key Zoning Ordinance Changes

Existing Zoning Ordinance Sections	Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance Update
801 Intent and Purpose	Article 1 Chapter 800.1
803 Construction and Definitions	Article 7 Definitions
810 Designation of Land Use Districts; 812 – 849 (zone districts defined)	Article 2 Chapters 806.2 through 814.2
850 Overlay Zones	Article 2 Chapter 818.2
853 Uses Permitted Subject to a Conditional Use Permit	Article 5 Chapter 842.5
854 Uses Expressly Prohibited	DELETED
855-A and B Property Development Standards Lots	Article 3 Chapter 822.3 Parcel Standards and Exceptions
855-E Property Development Standards Yards	Article 3 Chapter 822.3.100 Setback Regulations and Exceptions
855-H Property Development Standards Fences, Hedges and Walls	Article 3 Chapter 822.3
855-I Property Development Standards Off Street Parking	Article 3 Chapter 828.3
855-H Property Development Standards Outdoor Advertising	Article 3 Chapter 830.3
855-L Loading Space Requirements	Article 3 Chapter 828.3
855-N Special Standards of Practice and Regulations	Article 4 – Standards for Specific Uses
855-O Special Standards of Practice and Regulations to Implement the Fresno County Housing Element	Emergency Shelters Article 4 Chapter 834.4.130; Farmworker Housing Article 4 Chapters 834.4.130 and 834.4.160; Reasonable Accommodations Article 5 Chapter 852.5; Density Bonus Article 3 Chapter 824.3
856 Regulations for Single Mobile Home Occupancy	Article 4 Chapter 834.4.330
857 Regulations for Oil Drilling and Similar Uses in All Districts	Article 4 Chapter 834.4.250
858 Regulations for the Development of Material Extraction Sites in All Districts	Article 4 Chapter 834.4.220
860 Regulations for Interstate Freeway Interchange Commercial Development	Article 4 Chapter 834.4.200
861 New Construction and New Uses	Chapter 878.6 Enforcement
867 Regulations for Agricultural and Rural Commercial Centers	Article 4 Chapter 834.4.040
868 Regulations for Siting of Poultry Facilities	Article 4 Chapter 834.4.290
869 Regulations for Siting and Operation of Commercial Cattle Dairy/Feedlot Facilities	Article 4 Chapter 834.4.110
870 Procedures	Articles 1 and 5
872 Uses Permitted Subject to a Director Review and Approval	Article 5 Chapter 846.5

873 Uses Permitted Subject to Conditional Use Permit		Article 5 Chapter 842.5
874 Site Plan Review		Article 5 Chapter 854.5
875 Electric Utilities and Services		DELETED – some components moved into Articles 4 and 5
876 Nonconforming Lots, Buildings, and Uses		Article 6 Chapter 870.6
877 Variances		Article 5 Chapter 860.5
878 Zoning Division Amendment		Article 6 Chapter 872.6
879 Filing Fees		Article 5 Chapter 838.5
880 Form of Application		Article 5 Chapter 838.5
881 Public Hearings		Article 6 Chapter 874.6
882 Legal Procedure		Article 6 Chapter 878.6.040
883 Penalties for Violation		Article 6 Chapter 878.6.030
884 Validity		Article 1 (portions)

EXHIBIT 6

Executive Summary

This section summarizes the characteristics of 2042 General Plan, as well as the General Plan's environmental impacts and recommended mitigation measures.

Project Synopsis

Project Applicant

County of Fresno
2200 Tulare Street
Fresno, CA 93721

Lead Agency

County of Fresno
2200 Tulare Street
Fresno, CA 93721

Project Location

Fresno County is one of the eight counties that collectively form the greater San Joaquin Valley. The County covers approximately 6,000 square miles stretching from the Coast Range Mountains in the west to the Sierra Nevada Range in the east. The San Joaquin Valley region extends from the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta in the north to the Tehachapi Mountains in the south. The valley's primary river is the San Joaquin, which drains north through about half of the valley into the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta. The County has 15 incorporated cities, with the City of Fresno being the largest and the City of Jan Joaquin being the smallest.

Project Description

The revised General Plan is intended to build on the major policies of the current 2000 General Plan but expand and strengthen them to meet the challenges and community needs through planning horizon year 2042. The revised General Plan would accommodate County population growth projected through 2042. The revised General Plan seeks to preserve agricultural land and natural resources; conserve public spaces and recreational resources; promote the wellbeing of County residents; maintain economic vitality and balance; and direct land use policies that enable sustainable and forecasted growth in the County. The major themes of the current 2000 General Plan have been retained in the General Plan Review and include directing urban growth to existing communities, limiting the intrusion of development and incompatible land uses onto productive agricultural land, and limiting rural residential development. The revisions include only minimal changes to the land use designations and land use maps in the existing 2000 General Plan. The majority of revisions are to goals, policies, and implementation programs of the General Plan. The revision also includes addressing laws affecting the General Plan, including the addition of an Environmental Justice Element to the General Plan Policy Document.

Section 65860(c) of the Government Code requires that when a General Plan is amended in a way that makes the Zoning Ordinance inconsistent with the General Plan, “the Zoning Ordinance shall be amended within a reasonable time so that it is consistent with the general plan as amended.” However, the Government Code does not define a specific time period that would constitute a reasonable time. In this instance, the proposed project includes updating the Fresno County Zoning Ordinance to be consistent with the proposed revisions to General Plan Policy Document included in the General Plan Review. Components of the Zoning Ordinance update that could result in physical changes to the environment include the revisions to the regulations for accessory dwelling units, density bonus and other State-mandated changes to California Zoning law which became effective since the adoption of the 2000 General Plan.

Project Objectives

The primary objective of the GPR/ZOU are to ensure that the County’s guiding land use documents are consistent with State legislation that has been enacted subsequent to the adoption of the County 2000 General Plan Update. This includes, but is not limited to, the inclusion of an Environmental Justice Element. Additionally, the current effort proposes to revise and streamline some existing General Plan Policies and programs as well as Zoning Ordinance provision.

The General Plan Vision Statement is as follows:

This General Plan sets out a vision reflected in goals, policies, programs, and diagrams for Fresno County through the plan horizon year of 2042 and beyond. This plan carries forward major policies that have been in place since the mid-1970s, but expands and strengthens them to meet the challenges of the 21st century.

The County sees its primary role to be the protector of productive agricultural lands, open space, recreational opportunities, and environmental quality, and the coordinator of countywide efforts to promote economic development.

In consideration of the County’s General Plan Vision, this General Plan Review and Zoning Ordinance Update does not designate/expand new growth areas or new development, with the exception of those sites within urbanized areas to be identified for additional housing as required to meet the State mandated Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) for the sixth (6th) Cycle Housing Element.

The General Plan provides the following guiding themes:

Economic Development

The plan seeks to promote job growth and reduce unemployment through the enhancement and expansion of its agricultural economic basis plus facilitate business parks that include manufacturing, processing, and distribution.

Agricultural Land Protection

The plan seeks to protect its productive agricultural land as the County’s most valuable natural resource and the historic basis of its economy through directing new urban growth to cities and existing unincorporated communities and by limiting the encroachment of incompatible development upon agricultural lands.

Growth Accommodation

The plan is designed to accommodate population growth through the year 2042 consistent with the forecasted projection of 234,591 people in the unincorporated County by 2042. This represents an additional population of approximately 33,607.

Urban-Centered Growth

The plan promotes compact growth by directing most new urban development to incorporated cities and existing unincorporated urban communities where public facilities and infrastructure are available or can be provided consistent with the adopted General Plan or Community Plan to accommodate such growth. Accordingly, this plan prohibits designation of new areas as Planned Rural Community and restricts the designation of new areas for rural residential development while allowing for the orderly development of existing rural residential areas.

Efficient and Functional Land Use Patterns

The plan promotes compact, mixed-use, and pedestrian- and transit-oriented development within city spheres as well as in the County's unincorporated communities.

Service Efficiency

The plan provides for the orderly and efficient extension of infrastructure such as roadways, water, wastewater, drainage, and expansion services to support the county's economic development goals and to facilitate compact growth patterns. The plan supports development of a multi-modal transportation system that meets community economic and freight mobility needs, improves air quality, and shifts travel away from single-occupant automobiles to less-polluting transportation modes.

Recreational Development

The plan supports the expansion of existing recreational opportunities and the development of new opportunities, particularly along the San Joaquin and Kings Rivers, in the foothills, and in the Sierras, for the employment of County residents and to increase tourism as part of the County's diversified economic base.

Resource Protection

The plan seeks to protect and promote careful management of the County's natural resources, such as its soils, water, air quality, minerals, and wildlife and its habitat, to support the County's economic goals and to maintain the County's environmental quality.

Health and Safety Protection

The plan seeks to protect County residents and visitors through mitigation of hazards and nuisances such as geological and seismic hazards, flooding, wildland fires, transportation hazards, hazardous materials, noise, and air pollution.

Health and Well-Being

The plan seeks to promote the health and well-being of its residents, recognizing that the built environment affects patterns of living that influence health. The plan seeks to ensure long-term conservation of agricultural lands and environmentally sensitive landscapes; encourage walking and biking and provide linked transit systems; promote greater access to healthy foods and produce, particularly fresh locally-grown produce; and create community centers that provide access to employment, education, business, and recreation.

Enhanced Quality of Life

The plan strives throughout all its elements to improve the attractiveness of the County to existing residents, new residents, and visitors through increased prosperity, attractive forms of new development, protection of open space and view corridors, promotion of cultural facilities and activities, efficient delivery of services, and expansion of recreational opportunities.

Affordable Housing

The plan seeks to assure the opportunity for adequate and affordable housing for all residents in Fresno County. While directing most new growth to cities, the plan also seeks to provide for the maintenance of existing housing and for new construction in designated areas within the unincorporated area of the County.

Environmental Justice

The plan is designed to create opportunities for every resident to live in healthy and safe communities regardless of race, color, national origin or income, and to create opportunities for meaningful community involvement in the development of laws and regulations that affect every community's natural surroundings, and the places people live, work, play and learn.

Required Discretionary Approvals

With recommendations from the County's Planning Commission, the Fresno County Board of Supervisors will need to take the following discretionary actions in conjunction with the proposed project:

- Certification of the Final EIR
- Adoption of the proposed General Plan Review
- Approval of the revisions to the Zoning Map and Zoning Ordinance amendments to implement select programs of the General Plan.

Alternatives

As required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), this EIR examines alternatives to 2042 General Plan. Studied alternatives include the following three alternatives. Based on the alternatives analysis, Alternative 3 was determined to be the environmentally superior alternative.

- Alternative 1: No Project (Continuation of the 2000 General Plan)
- Alternative 2: Moderately Increased Density
- Alternative 3: Substantially Increased Density

CEQA requires that an environmentally superior alternative be identified among those analyzed. It further states that if the No Project Alternative is identified as environmentally superior, the next most environmentally superior alternative must also be identified. When taking into account every environmental impact area, Alternative 3 is the environmentally superior alternative, followed by Alternative 2, and Alternative 1.

Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Table ES-1 the environmental impacts of 2042 General Plan, the proposed mitigation measures, and residual impacts or significance after mitigation. Impacts are defined as significant, unavoidable

adverse impacts that require a statement of overriding consideration, pursuant to Section 15093 of the *CEQA Guidelines* if 2042 General Plan is approved; significant, adverse impacts that can be feasibly mitigated to less than significant levels and that require findings to be made under Section 15091 of the *CEQA Guidelines*; adverse impacts that are less than those allowed by adopted significance thresholds; and no impact.

Table ES-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
Aesthetics		
<p>Impact AES-1. The GPR/ZOU would facilitate growth that may lead to intensified development in Fresno County. General Plan policies and development standards would regulate development in areas with scenic vistas or views of natural scenic resources, reducing potential impacts. The impact on scenic vistas would be less than significant.</p>	None required.	Less than Significant
<p>Impact AES-2. The GPR/ZOU proposes no development in designated or eligible scenic highways. Further, development near scenic highways and scenic corridors is regulated by design standards that protect views. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>	None required.	Less than Significant.
<p>Impact AES-3. The proposed General Plan could create land use patterns that would substantially alter the existing visual character of the region, including the quality of public views. In developed areas, changes in zoning designations could result in increased density and more mixed-use-style development. Goals and policies in the General Plan protect visual resources and guide new development in a way that is visually compatible with existing uses, such that impacts would be reduced. Furthermore, new development would be subject to design review. Impacts would be Less than significant.</p>	None required.	Less than Significant
<p>Impact AES-4. New development facilitated by the GPR/ZOU could increase light and glare effects on sensitive receptors, such as residential uses. However, new development would be subject to existing regulations in the County's Zoning Ordinance and 2042 General Plan policies to protect dark skies at night. Therefore, the GPR/ZOU would have a less than significant impact associated with light and glare.</p>	None required.	Less than Significant

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
Agriculture		
<p>Impact AG-1. The GPR/ZOU is designed to encourage the continued operation of existing agriculture lands and Forest lands in The Planning Area. However, buildout of the GPR/ZOU could result in the conversion of Farmland or forestland to non-agricultural use. Therefore, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.</p>	<p><i>AG-1: Agriculture Conservation.</i></p> <p>Policy LU-A.23</p> <p>The County shall require discretionary land use projects which propose the permanent conversion of forty acres or more of Prime Farmland (as designated by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program) to non-agricultural uses to undertake an evaluation of soil type, existing crop history and access to surface irrigation water to support the non-viability of the land for agricultural use. Should documentation indicate a loss of productive agricultural land would occur due to project development, consideration shall be given to offsetting land conversion through grants of perpetual conservation easements, deed restrictions, establishment of land trusts, in-lieu fee payment program or other County-approved farmland conservation mechanisms for the purpose of preserving agricultural land. This policy does not apply to land zoned or designated in the General Plan for non-agricultural land uses.</p> <p>Policy LU-A.24</p> <p>The County shall encourage the State of California Department of Conservation to update its Important Farmland Map in consideration of recent restrictions to groundwater pumping, reduced access to surface water and the potential loss of irrigable land.</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>
<p>Impact AG-2. Buildout of the GPR/ZOU could result in conflicts to existing zoning for agricultural uses and Williamson Act contracts. Therefore, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.</p>	<p>None feasible.</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>
<p>Impact AG-3. The proposed project is designed to encourage the continued operation of existing timber production within the Planning Area. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
Air Quality		
<p>Impact AQ-1. Development facilitated by the GPR/ZOU would generate construction and Operational-related emissions. Emissions generated by the GPR/ZOU would conflict with implementation of the 2016 Ozone Plan and 2018 PM_{2.5} Plan. Implementation of policies in the GPR/ZOU, compliance with existing regulations, and mitigation measures would not be sufficient to demonstrate consistency with the 2016 Ozone Plan and 2018 PM_{2.5} Plan. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.</p>	<p><i>AQ-1: Architectural Coating ROG Content Limits</i></p> <p>Policy OS-G.12: Architectural Coating Reactive Organic Gases Content Limits</p> <p>The County shall review development projects, and encourage the use of architectural coating materials, as defined in the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District's Rule 4601, that are zero-emission or have a low-ROG content (below 10 grams per liter). Where such ROG coatings are not available, the coating with the lowest ROG rating available shall be used.</p> <p><i>AQ-2: Diesel Engine Tier Requirements</i></p> <p>Policy OS-G.13: Diesel Engine Tier Requirements</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
	<p>The County shall require development projects to implement diesel construction equipment meeting California Air Resources Board (CARB) Tier 4 or equivalent emission standards for off-road heavy-duty diesel engines. If use of Tier 4 equipment is not possible due to availability, diesel construction equipment meeting Tier 3 emission standards shall be used. Tier 3 equipment shall use a Level 3 Diesel Particulate Filter.</p>	
<p>Impact AQ-2. Individual development projects carried out under the GPR/ZOU would generate construction and operational-related emissions. Implementation of Plan policies, compliance with existing regulations, and implementation of proposed mitigation would reduce construction and operational emissions, but emissions would remain above applicable thresholds. impacts would be significant and unavoidable.</p>	<p><i>AQ-1: Architectural Coating ROG Content Limits</i> Policy OS-G.12: Architectural Coating Reactive Organic Gases Content Limits The County shall review development projects, and encourage the use of architectural coating materials, as defined in the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District’s Rule 4601, that are zero-emission or have a low-ROG content (below 10 grams per liter). Where such ROG coatings are not available, the coating with the lowest ROG rating available shall be used.</p> <p><i>AQ-2: Diesel Engine Tier Requirements</i> Policy OS-G.13: Diesel Engine Tier Requirements The County shall require development projects to implement diesel construction equipment meeting California Air Resources Board (CARB) Tier 4 or equivalent emission standards for off-road heavy-duty diesel engines. If use of Tier 4 equipment is not possible due to availability, diesel construction equipment meeting Tier 3 emission standards shall be used. Tier 3 equipment shall use a Level 3 Diesel Particulate Filter.</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>
<p>Impact AQ-3. Individual development projects carried out under the GPR/ZOU would generate construction- and operational-related emissions that may expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Such emissions may result in adverse impacts to local air quality. Implementation of Plan policies and compliance with existing regulations would reduce emissions, but not below the level of significance. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.</p>	<p><i>AQ-3: Sensitive Receptor Setbacks</i> Policy EJ-A.15: Sensitive Receptor Setbacks. Consistent with the provisions contained in the California Air Resources Board (CARB) Air Quality and Land Use Handbook, project applicants shall identify appropriate measures for projects with sensitive uses located within 500 feet of freeways, heavily traveled arterials (daily vehicle trips of 10,000 or more), railways, and other sources of diesel particulate matter (DPM) and other known carcinogens. The County shall require development projects that are located within 500 feet of freeways, heavily traveled arterials (daily vehicle trips of 10,000 or more), railways, and other sources of DPM and other known carcinogens to retain a qualified air quality consultant to prepare a health risk assessment (HRA)in accordance with the CARB and the California Environmental Protection Agency’s Office of Environmental Health and Hazard Assessment requirements to determine the exposure of nearby sensitive receptors to emission sources resulting from the project. Measures</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
	<p>identified in the HRA shall be enforced by the County.</p> <p><i>AQ-4: Valley Fever</i></p> <p>Policy OS-G.13: Valley Fever Mitigation.</p> <p>The County shall continue to promote public awareness of Valley Fever risks relating to ground disturbing activities through the provision of educational materials, webpages and resource contact information. For projects involving ground disturbance on unpaved areas left undisturbed for 6 months or more, the County shall require developers to provide project-specific Valley Fever training and training materials.</p>	
<p>Impact AQ-4. The GPR/ZOU would not create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Biological Resources</p>		
<p>Impact BIO-1. The GPR/ZOU envisions development that could impact special-status species. The 2042 General Plan policies would reduce the potential for impacts and the severity of impacts. However, impacts would be potentially significant and thus mitigation is required.</p>	<p><i>BIO-1 Protection of Nesting Birds</i></p> <p>Policy OS-E.19: Nesting Birds.</p> <p>For development projects on sites where tree or vegetation/habitat removal is necessary and where the existence of sensitive species and/or bird species protected by California Fish and Game Code Sections 30503 and 305.3 and Migratory Bird Treaty Act has been determined by a qualified biologist, surveys for nesting birds shall be conducted by a qualified biologist for all construction sites where activities occurring during nesting bird season (February 1 through September 15). If active nests are located onsite, then a qualified biologist shall determine an appropriate avoidance buffer for construction activities.</p>	<p>Less than Significant (with Mitigation)</p>
<p>Impact BIO-2. While the GPR/ZOU would not facilitate development that would directly impact riparian and wetland habitats, there would be potential for adverse indirect impacts from such development on wetlands and areas under the jurisdiction of CDFW and USACE. however, compliance with existing regulations, and implementation of 2042 General Plan policies would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact BIO-3. The GPR/ZOU would largely avoid impacts on wildlife movement corridors by conserving natural areas through policies in the 2042 General Plan. 2042 General Plan policies would protect wildlife corridors and impacts would be less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
<p>Impact BIO-4. Implementation of the GPR/ZOU would conform with applicable local policies protecting biological resources, such as Fresno County Municipal Code and proposed 2042 General Plan policies. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact BIO-5. There are three habitat conservation plans that conserve portions of the Planning Area. Impacts to areas identified in the habitat conservation plans would be protected by conservation strategies contained in goals and policies of the General Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Cultural Resources</p>		
<p>Impact CR-1. Implementation of the GPR/ZOU has the potential to impact built-environment historical resources. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable even with the incorporation of mitigation.</p>	<p><i>CR-1: Architectural History Evaluation.</i> Policy OS-J.2. Historic Resources Consideration. The County shall consider historic resources during preparation or evaluation of plans and discretionary development projects that may impact buildings or structures For a project projected on a property that includes buildings, structures, objects, sites, landscapes, or other features that are 45 years of age or older at the time of permit application, the project applicants shall be responsible for preparing and implementation the recommendations of a historical resources evaluation completed by qualified cultural resources practitioners.</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable.</p>
<p>Impact CR-2. Implementation of the GPR/ZOU has the potential to impact archaeological resources. Impacts would be Significant and unavoidable, even with the incorporation of mitigation.</p>	<p><i>CR-2: Archaeological Resources Study Program.</i> OS-J.4. Cultural Resources Protection and Mitigation The County shall require that discretionary development projects, as part of any required CEQA review, identify and protect important historical, archeological, tribal, paleontological, and cultural sites and resources. For projects requiring ground disturbance and located within a high or moderate cultural sensitivity areas, a cultural resources technical report may be warranted, including accurate archival research and site surveys conducted by qualified cultural resources practitioners. The need to prepare such studies shall be determined based on the tribal consultation process and initial outreach to local or state information centers.</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>
<p>Impact CR-3. Ground-disturbing activities associated with the implementation of the GPR/ZOU could result in damage to or destruction of human burials. However, with compliance with existing regulations, impacts would be less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
Energy		
<p>Impact E-1. Development and population growth facilitated by the GPR/ZOU would result in an increase of overall consumption of energy compared to existing conditions. However, the GPR/ZOU is based on a land-use strategy that would promote greater overall energy efficiency in community and municipal operations. 2042 General Plan policies and implementation programs would ensure that development would comply with existing energy efficiency regulations and would encourage new development to take advantage of voluntary energy-efficiency programs. As such, the consumption of energy resources by development facilitated under the GPR/ZOU would not be wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption, and impacts would be less than significant.</p>	None required.	Less than Significant
<p>Impact E-2. Construction and operation of projects facilitated by the GPR/ZOU would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. No impact would occur.</p>	None required.	No Impact
Geology and Soils		
<p>Impact GEO-1. New development envisioned in the General Plan Review and Zoning Ordinance Update (GPR/ZOU) could result in exposure of people or structures to a risk of loss, injury, or death from seismic events. Additionally, development under the general plan has the potential to be located on an unstable geologic unit or unstable soil, or soil that could become unstable as a result of the project. However, adherence to the requirements of the California Building Code and implementation of the policies in the 2042 General Plan would minimize the potential for loss, injury, or death following a seismic event, as well as the potential for on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse due to unstable soils or unstable geologic units. Impacts would be less than significant level.</p>	None required.	Less than Significant
<p>Impact GEO-2. New development envisioned in the General Plan Review and Zoning Ordinance Update (GPR/ZOU) could result in exposure of people or structures to a risk of loss, injury, or death from seismic events. Additionally, development under the general plan has the potential to be located on an unstable geologic unit or unstable soil, or soil that could become</p>	None required.	Less than Significant

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
<p>unstable as a result of the project. However, adherence to the requirements of the California Building Code and implementation of the policies in the 2042 General Plan would minimize the potential for loss, injury, or death following a seismic event, as well as the potential for on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse due to unstable soils or unstable geologic units. Impacts would be less than significant level.</p>		
<p>Impact GEO-3. Development facilitated by the GPR/ZOU could result in the construction of structures on expansive soils, which could create a substantial risk to life or property. However, new development would be required to comply with the standards of the California Building Code pertaining to expansive soils. Compliance with the requirements of the California Building Code, the Fresno County Municipal Code, and polices in the 2042 General Plan would reduce impacts related to expansive soils to a less-than-significant level.</p>	None required.	Less than Significant
<p>Impact GEO-4. Development envisioned in the GPR/ZOU would be required to connect to public sewer systems where they are available. In areas where public sewer systems are not available, development would have to comply with 2042 General Plan Policies. Implementation of the Fresno County Mandatory Sewer Connection Ordinance and the 2042 General Plan Policies would reduce impacts to less-than-significant.</p>	None required.	Less than Significant
<p>Impact GEO-5. Individual development projects facilitated by the GPR/ZOU may result in ground disturbance that has the potential to directly or indirectly destroy a paleontological resource or unique geologic feature. 2042 General Plan Policies would ensure that individual discretionary development projects are reviewed, designed, and mitigated to reduce potential impacts to paleontological resources; however, this policy would not apply to all development facilitated by the GPR/ZOU. This would be a potentially significant impact, and there would be no feasible mitigation. Therefore, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.</p>	None feasible.	Significant and Unavoidable

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
Greenhouse Gas Emissions		
<p>Impact GHG-1. development envisioned under the GPR/ZOU would generate both short-term and long-term GHG emissions. Implementation of the GPR/ZOU would result in GHG emissions exceeding the locally applicable, project-specific efficiency thresholds. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.</p>	<p><i>GHG-1: Funding for a Greenhouse Gas Inventory and Preparation of a Climate Action Plan</i></p> <p>Policy HS-H.10 Funding for a Greenhouse Gas Inventory and Preparation of a Climate Action Plan.</p> <p>The County shall seek a variety of sources including, but not limited to, grants, state funding, and or impact fees to fund the preparation and implementation of a Fresno County specific Climate Action Plan. Once funding is available, the County shall proceed to prepare a Climate Action Plan.</p> <p><i>GHG-2 Preparation and Implementation of a Climate Action Plan</i></p> <p>Policy HS-H.11 Preparation and Implementation of a Climate Action Plan.</p> <p>The County shall undertake a countywide Climate Action Plan (CAP) within two years of the adoption of General Plan Amendment No. 529 (General Plan Review) with the objective of meeting a GHG emissions reduction trajectory consistent with State law (currently codified in Health and Safety Code Section 38566 et seq. [Senate Bill 32] and Executive Order B-55-18).</p>	Significant and Unavoidable
<p>Impact GHG-2. The GPR/ZOU would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. Impacts would be Less than Significant.</p>	None required.	Less than Significant
Hazards and Hazardous Material		
<p>Impact HAZ-1. Implementation of the GPR/ZOU could result in an incremental increase in the overall routine transport, use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials within the County and increase the risk of release of hazardous materials. However, compliance with applicable regulations related to the handling and storage of hazardous materials and compliance with 2042 General Plan policies would minimize the risk of spills and the public's potential exposure to these substances. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>	None required.	Less than Significant
<p>Impact HAZ-2. Implementation of the GPR/ZOU could result in hazardous emissions or handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within ¼ mile of an existing or proposed school, but compliance with existing regulatory requirements would minimize risks to schools and students, resulting in a less than significant impact.</p>	None required.	Less than Significant

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
<p>Impact HAZ-3. Implementation of the GPR/ZOU could result in development on sites contaminated with hazardous materials. However, compliance with applicable regulations relating to site cleanup and 2042 General Plan policies would minimize impacts from development on contaminated sites, resulting in a less than significant impact.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact HAZ-4. Several public and private airports are located within Fresno County. Increased population, forecasted over the span of the proposed General Plan’s horizon year of 2042, would result in additional airport and airstrip activity. Impacts would be avoided through implementation of goals and policies in the 2042 General Plan and hazardous impacts on people working and residing within the airport area of influence would be less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact HAZ-5. The 2042 General Plan policies address maintenance of a Local Hazard Mitigation Plan and emergency access implementation. Therefore, the GPR/ZOU would not result in interference with these types of adopted plans. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Hydrology and Water Quality</p>		
<p>Impact HWQ-1. Development envisioned by the GPR/ZOU could result in a discharge of pollutants to surface waters or contamination of shallow groundwater through increased soil disturbance and erosion, discharge of contaminated wastewater or stormwater, or accidental spills or leaks of hazardous materials. Compliance with applicable laws and regulations and implementation of the goals and policies of the 2042 General Plan would minimize the potential for water quality degradation and would reduce this impact to a Less-Than-Significant level.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact HWQ-2. The GPR/ZOU would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge due to the county’s policies to recharge the basin. The GPR/ZOU would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a sustainable groundwater management plan. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
<p>Impact HWQ-3. Development facilitated by the GPR/ZOU could alter the existing drainage patterns on future development sites and potentially result in erosion and siltation. Compliance with applicable regulations, including the Clean Water Act, and implementation of the goals and policies of the 2042 General Plan would minimize the potential for erosion and siltation and would reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level.</p>	None required.	Less than Significant
<p>Impact HWQ-4. Development facilitated by the GPR/ZOU could alter the existing drainage patterns and increase the amount of runoff in spheres of influence of incorporated cities and in existing unincorporated communities, which could result in flooding on- or off-site, exceeding the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems, or create substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Compliance with applicable regulations and implementation of the goals and policies of the 2042 General Plan would minimize the potential for increased runoff and flooding. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	None required.	Less than Significant
<p>Impact HWQ-5. Development facilitated by the GPR/ZOU could risk release of pollutants due to project inundation. Compliance with applicable regulations and implementation of the goals and policies of the 2042 General Plan would minimize the potential for adverse effects related to flood hazard and would reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level.</p>	None required.	Less than Significant
Land Use and Planning		
<p>Impact LU-1. Implementation of the GPR/ZOU would not physically divide an established community. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>	None required.	Less than Significant
<p>Impact LU-2. Implementation of the GPR/ZOU would be generally consistent with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations adopted to avoid or mitigate environmental effects, such as FCOG's <i>Regional Transportation Plan 2018-2042</i> and the SJVAPCD Air Quality Management Plans. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>	None required.	Less than Significant

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
Noise		
<p>Impact N-1. Construction of development envisioned in the GPR/ZOU would temporarily generate increased noise levels, potentially affecting nearby noise-sensitive land uses. However, provisions in the Fresno County Ordinance Code and 2042 General Plan policies would limit construction-related noise disturbance, and impacts would be less than significant.</p>	None required.	Less than Significant
<p>Impact N-2. Development envisioned in the GPR/ZOU would introduce new stationary noise sources associated with residential, commercial and industrial land uses and would contribute to an increase in traffic and railway noise. The continued regulation of stationary noise sources, consistent with the County’s Noise Control Ordinance, and implementation of goals and policies in the 2042 General Plan would minimize disturbance to adjacent land uses. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>	None required.	Less than Significant
<p>Impact N-3. Construction of individual projects facilitated by the GPR/ZOU could temporarily generate groundborne vibration, potentially affecting nearby land uses. high-vibration levels during working construction hours could potentially disturb people or damage fragile buildings. This impact would be less than significant with mitigation to apply standard vibration control measures.</p>	<p><i>N-1: Construction Vibration Control Measures.</i> Policy HS-H.12: Construction Vibration Control Measures. The following measures to minimize exposure to construction vibration shall be included as standard conditions of approval for projects involving construction vibration within 50 feet of historic buildings or nearby sensitive receivers shall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Avoid the use of vibratory rollers within 50 feet of historic buildings or residential buildings with plastered walls that are susceptible to damage from vibration and; 2. Schedule construction activities with the highest potential to produce vibration to hours with the least potential to affect nearby institutional, educational, and office uses that are identified as sensitive to daytime vibration by the Federal Transit Administration in <i>Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment</i> (FTA 2018). 	Less than Significant
<p>Impact N-4. Development envisioned by the GPR/ZOU would result in increased airport and airstrip activity. The continued regulation of airport noise consistent with state and federal regulations as well as the implementation of policies in the 2042 General Plan would minimize disturbance to people residing or working within proximity to airports, airstrips, and air bases. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>	None required.	Less than Significant

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
Population and Housing		
Impact PH-1. Implementation of the GPR/ZOU would facilitate new housing in Fresno County, which would increase the County's population over time. However, the growth accommodated by the GPR/ZOU would not exceed FCOG population forecasts and impacts would be less than significant.	None required.	Less than Significant
Impact PH-2. Implementation of the GPR/ZOU would not result in the displacement of substantial numbers of housing or people. The GPR/ZOU would facilitate the development of new housing in accordance with State and local housing requirements, while preserving existing residential neighborhoods. Impacts would be less than significant.	None required.	Less than Significant
Public Services and Recreation		
Impact PS-1. Implementation of the GPR/ZOU would add new population, generating additional need for fire protection services. The proposed 2042 General Plan policies would reduce impacts associated with the provision of fire protection services, and new facilities would be located in developed areas. Impacts would be less than significant.	None required.	Less than Significant
Impact PS-2. Implementation of the GPR/ZOU would add new population, generating additional demand for police services. The proposed 2042 General Plan policies would reduce impacts, and new facilities would be located in developed areas. Impacts would be less than significant.	None required.	Less than Significant
Impact PS-3. Development under the GPR/ZOU would facilitate development that would add school aged children to the county's population. However, facilities have adequate capacity and new development would be required to pay impact fees which would result in less than significant impacts with regard to the provision of school facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.	None required.	Less than Significant
Impact PS-4. Development facilitated by the GPR/ZOU allow for an increase in the County's population and increased demand for library services, which would result in the provision of new or physically altered library facilities. Although compliance with the policies in the 2042 General Plan would	None required.	Less than Significant

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
reduce impacts to library facilities, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.		
Impact PS-5. Development facilitated by the GPR/ZOU would result in an increase in the County's population. This would increase demand for parks and recreation facilities and potentially create the need for new park and recreation facilities. Although compliance with the policies in the 2042 General Plan would reduce impacts to parks and recreation, impacts would be less than significant.	None required.	Less than Significant
Transportation		
Impact T-1. Implementation of the Fresno County GPR/ZOU would be consistent with the California Transportation Plan, the FCOG 2018-2042 RTP/SCS, the Fresno County 2018 Active Transportation Plan, and the Fresno County 2021 Regional Trails Plan. This impact would be less than significant.	None required.	Less than Significant
Impact T-2. The proposed Fresno County GPR/ZOU would result in an increase in VMT per capita and an increase in VMT per employee above 87 percent of the baseline 2019 countywide conditions. VMT per capita and VMT per employee impacts from implementation of the proposed GPR/ZOU would be significant and unavoidable.	<p data-bbox="670 882 1182 919"><i>T-1: VMT Policy</i></p> <p data-bbox="670 919 1182 1125">On a regional level, the following Policy shall be added to the Fresno County General Plan to solidify the County's requirement for individual transportation and land use projects that would generate or attract more than 110 daily trips (pursuant to OPR's SB 743 technical advisory) under their jurisdiction to reduce project related VMT:</p> <p data-bbox="670 1125 1182 1163">Policy TR-A.25 VMT Threshold.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1163 1182 1453">Projects that would generate or attract more than 110 daily vehicle trips shall be evaluated for a transportation VMT impact on an individual basis. The threshold of significance shall be 87 percent below the countywide average rate of VMT. Any individual project resulting in VMT that exceeds 87 percent below the countywide average shall be required to implement project-specific mitigation measures aimed at reducing VMT generated by the project.</p> <p data-bbox="670 1453 1182 1738">The policy detailed above would be consistent with the recommended threshold identified for unincorporated Fresno County in the <i>2021 Fresno County SB 743 Implementation Regional Guidelines</i>. Project specific mitigation may include, but is not limited to, the following regional- and project-level Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies that could further reduce project-level VMT resulting from future development under implementation of the proposed GPR/ZOU.</p> <ul data-bbox="670 1738 1182 1824" style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Expand Transit Service: Consider opportunities to expand FCRTA fixed-route and shuttle-based transit service to serve locations of future 	Significant and Unavoidable

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
	<p>growth, with consideration to anticipated increases in commute trips.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Public-Facing TDM Programs: Promote existing TDM programs led by FCOG and other public agencies including ridesharing programs, carpool and vanpool programs, and demand-response services, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Fresno COG “Valley Rides” Ridesharing ▫ Carpool Incentive Program ▫ Commuter Vanpool Program ▫ Agricultural Worker Vanpool Program ▫ Senior Taxi Scrip Program ▪ Employer-Based TDM Programs: Per San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, the employer-based trip reduction Rule 9410 (December 17, 2009) requires employers with at least 100 eligible employees at a worksite to implement programs to reduce VMT from private vehicles used by employees to commute to and from their worksites. Employers should promote the education, information, and promotion of the above mentioned TDM programs. ▪ Mobility-As-A-Service: Provide additional access and connectivity for underserved populations. Strategies to improve connectivity and access include on-demand shuttles to connect individuals to desired destinations. ▪ Connectivity Enhancement: The bicycle and pedestrian facilities presented in the Fresno County Regional ATP should connect to transit route stops where applicable, to accommodate “first mile” and “last mile” travel (travel between modes to a destination). In addition, existing and future bus stops should be improved to comply with ADA design standards to ensure ADA-accessible bus stops and comfortable bus shelters. ▪ Land Use: Modify land use plans for future proposed development projects to increase residential development in areas with low VMT/capita characteristics and/or decrease development in areas with high VMT/capita characteristics and modify land use plans to increase commercial development in areas with low VMT/employee characteristics and/or decrease development in areas with high VMT/employee characteristics. <p>Education and Promotion/Encouragement: Voluntary travel behavior change program including promotions and marketing.</p> <p>Commute Trip Reductions (smaller employers): Implement or provide access to:</p>	

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
	<p>Voluntary commute trip reduction programs</p> <p>Alternative work schedules and Telework Program</p> <p>Employer-sponsored vanpools or shuttles</p> <p>Rideshare Program - Shift single occupancy vehicle trips to carpooling or vanpooling by providing ride-matching services or shuttle services</p> <p>Provide car-sharing and bike-sharing programs</p> <p>Provide partially or fully subsidized transit passes</p> <p>Provide telework options</p> <p>Provide employee transportation coordinators at employment sites</p> <p>Provide a guaranteed ride home service to users of non-auto modes</p> <p>Bicycle Infrastructure: Implement on-street bicycle facilities, provide bicycle parking, and provide secure bicycle parking and showers.</p> <p>Neighborhood Infrastructure: Implement neighborhood improvements such as:</p> <p>Traffic calming improvements</p> <p>Pedestrian network improvements</p> <p>Provide incentives or subsidies that increase the use of modes other than a single-occupancy vehicle</p> <p>Improve or increase access to transit</p> <p>Increase access to common goods and services, such as groceries, schools, and daycare</p> <p>Incorporate a neighborhood electric vehicle network</p> <p>Limit or eliminate parking supply</p> <p>It should be noted that the above list of measures is not all inclusive; rather, this list includes potential recommendations to be considered if feasible for individual projects implemented under the GPR/ZOU, and alternate measures can and should be evaluated based on a specific project in response to site specific conditions.</p>	
<p>Impact T-3. Implementation of the Fresno County GPR/ZOU would not substantially increase hazards due to geometric design features or incompatible uses. Rather, the proposed goals and policies would make roadways safer. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Impact T-4: The proposed Fresno County GPR/ZOU would not result in inadequate emergency access. Rather, the proposed goals and policies would improve emergency response and facilitate more effective emergency evacuation. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
Tribal Cultural Resources		
Impact TCR-1. Implementation of the proposed project has the potential to impact tribal cultural resources. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.	None feasible.	Significant and Unavoidable
Utilities and Service Systems		
Impact UTL-1. Development facilitated by the GPR/ZOU would require new connections to existing utilities, and may require new or expanded utility infrastructure to accommodate future growth, particularly for the provision of water supply and wastewater treatment. Improvements would also be required for stormwater drainage, electricity, natural gas, and telecommunications, which may require the construction of new facilities. Future development would be consistent with goals and policies in the 2042 General Plan which help to reduce impacts. However, it is not known where or how extensive new facilities would be required; therefore potential impacts would be significant and unavoidable.	None feasible.	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact UTL-2. Development facilitated by the GPR/ZOU would result in incrementally increased water demands tied to population growth. Although future development would be consistent with goals and policies in the 2042 General Plan, including for water supply availability and reliability, it cannot be determined whether sufficient water supplies are available to accommodate this growth. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.	None feasible.	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact UTL-3. Development facilitated by the GPR/ZOU would increase wastewater production, and sufficient treatment capacity is available at the existing Fresno-Clovis RWRf to accommodate this increase. However, because the location of future growth is not known, it cannot be determined whether all new wastewater would be diverted to the Fresno-Clovis RWRf, or if new wastewater treatment facilities would be required. Therefore, although future development would be consistent with goals and policies in the 2042 General Plan to minimize impacts, if new wastewater treatment facilities would be necessary to accommodate growth locations, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.	None feasible.	Significant and Unavoidable

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
<p>Impact UTL-4. Development facilitated by the GPR/ZOU would increase solid waste generation in the county. Future development would be required to comply with State and local regulations related to solid waste, as well as applicable goals and policies in the 2042 General Plan. However, the existing landfill which accommodates most solid waste disposal in the county will reach capacity in 2031, and alternate disposal location(s) have not yet been identified or developed. Therefore, sufficient solid waste disposal capacity is not currently available to accommodate anticipated growth. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.</p>	None feasible.	Significant and Unavoidable
Wildfire		
<p>Impact WFR-1. The proposed 2042 General Plan policies ensure adequate emergency access, response, and preparation. Furthermore, Fresno County works closely with Local Fire Districts to ensure emergency access and fire protection services meet standards. Therefore, the GPR/ZOU would not impair an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>	None required.	Less than Significant
<p>Impact WFR-2. The GPR/ZOU would not facilitate urban development in areas most susceptible to wildfire. Prevailing wind and slopes would generally spread fire away from areas where urban development is envisioned. However, there remains a possibility that development under the GPR/ZOU would occur in areas in proximity to MFHSZ, HFHSZ, and VHFHSZ that could lead to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.</p>	No feasible mitigation exists.	Significant and Unavoidable
<p>Impact WFR-3. The GPR/ZOU facilitates growth primarily as infill and redevelopment within urbanized areas of the County where infrastructure and roads currently exist. The proposed General Plan policies require new development to have adequate fire and emergency access, which would reduce the potential for fire risk. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>	None required.	Less than Significant

This page intentionally left blank.

1 Introduction

This document is a Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) that examines the potential environmental effects associated with implementation of the proposed Fresno County General Plan Review and Zoning Ordinance Update (GPR/ZOU), defined as the proposed project for purposes of this environmental review. This section:

1. Provides an overview of the background behind the proposed project
2. Summarizes the process involved in developing the proposed project
3. Describes the purpose of and legal authority for the adoption of the EIR
4. Summarizes the scope and content of the EIR
5. Lists lead, responsible, and trustee agencies for the EIR
6. Describes the intended uses of the EIR
7. Provides a synopsis of the environmental review process required under CEQA

The contents of other EIR sections are as follows:

- Section 2, *Project Description*, provides a detailed discussion of the proposed project
- Section 3, *Environmental Setting*, describes the existing environmental and geographic conditions within Fresno County
- Section 4, *Environmental Impact Analysis*, describes the potential environmental effects associated with the proposed project, and provides mitigation measures when significant effects are identified
- Section 5, *Other CEQA Required Sections*, discusses issues such as growth inducement, significant irreversible environmental effects, and significant and unavoidable impacts.
- Section 6, *Alternatives*, discusses alternatives to the proposed project, including the CEQA-required “no project” alternative
- Section 7, *References and Report Preparers*, lists informational sources for the EIR and persons involved in the preparation of the document

1.1 Overview of the General Plan Review and Zoning Ordinance Update

The current Fresno County General Plan was adopted by the Fresno County Planning Commission on September 7, 2000, and by the Fresno County Board of Supervisors on October 3, 2000. The current 2000 County General Plan consists of multiple documents: the countywide General Plan Background Report, the countywide General Plan Policy Document, and over 40 regional, community, and specific plans. The General Plan Background Report inventories and analyzes existing conditions and trends in Fresno County and provides the formal supporting documentation for General Plan Policy Document. The countywide General Plan Policy Document contains explicit statements of goals, policies, and implementation programs that constitute the formal policy of Fresno County for land use, development, open space protection, and environmental quality. The current General Plan Policy Document is organized by and consists of the following seven countywide elements: 1)

Economic Development; 2) Agriculture and Land Use; 3) Transportation and Circulation; 4) Public Facilities and Services; 5) Open Space and Conservation; 6) Health and Safety; and 7) Housing.

The County's Zoning Ordinance is officially known as Division VI of the Ordinance Code of the County of Fresno. The stated purpose of the Zoning Ordinance is "to classify and regulate the highest and best use of buildings, structures, and land located in the unincorporated area of the County of Fresno in a manner consistent with the Fresno County General Plan." The Zoning Ordinance is effectively the principal tool for implementing the County's General Plan, and by State law, must be consistent with the General Plan.

In June 2006, the Fresno County Board of Supervisors directed County staff to initiate a review of the 2000 General Plan along with a comprehensive update of the County Zoning Ordinance. This effort was called for in Policy LU-H.16 of the current 2000 General Plan, which states that the County will review the 2000 General Plan goals, policies, and implementation programs every five years and revise them as deemed necessary. With input from the public and other agencies, as well as comments received at several public hearings, the County completed the review and developed a final draft of the revised countywide General Plan Policy Document in 2014. The final draft was presented to the Fresno County Board of Supervisors for adoption at a public hearing that was held on September 30, 2014. However, based on the public testimony, the Board of Supervisors directed County staff to continue the review of the General Plan and update the General Plan Background Report.

The proposed project consists of a comprehensive update of the General Plan Background Report, a review of the General Plan Policy Document, and a comprehensive update of the Zoning Ordinance. The revised General Plan is intended to build on the major policies of the current 2000 General Plan but expand and strengthen them to meet the challenges and community needs through planning horizon year 2042 and address recently adopted State regulations. The revised General Plan would accommodate County population growth projected through 2042. The revised General Plan seeks to preserve agricultural land and natural resources; conserve public spaces and recreational resources; promote the wellbeing of County residents; maintain economic vitality and balance; and direct land use policies that enable sustainable and forecasted growth in the County. The revision includes only minimal changes to the land use designations and land use maps in the existing 2000 General Plan. The majority of revisions are to goals, policies, and implementation programs of the General Plan. The revision also includes addressing laws affecting the General Plan, including the addition of an Environmental Justice Element to the General Plan Policy Document. The Zoning Ordinance update includes provisions, development standards, and guidelines for consistency with the revised General Plan, pursuant to State law.

1.2 Purpose and Legal Authority

The proposed project – adoption and implementation of the GPR/ZOU – requires discretionary approval by the Fresno County Board of Supervisors; therefore, the project is subject to the environmental review requirements of CEQA. This EIR has been prepared in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In accordance with Section 15121 (a) of the *State CEQA Guidelines* (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3), the purpose of an EIR is to:

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

This EIR fulfills the requirements for a Program EIR. Although the legally required contents of a Program EIR are the same as those of a Project EIR, Program EIRs are necessarily more general and may contain a broader discussion of impacts, alternatives, and mitigation measures than a Project EIR. As provided in Section 15168 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, a Program EIR may be prepared on a series of actions that may be characterized as one large project. Use of a Program EIR provides the County, as Lead Agency, with the opportunity to consider broad policy alternatives and program-wide mitigation measures and provides the County with greater flexibility to address environmental issues and/or cumulative impacts on a comprehensive basis. Agencies generally prepare Program EIRs for programs or a series of related actions that are linked geographically, are logical parts of a chain of contemplated events, rules, regulations, or plans that govern the conduct of a continuing program, or are individual activities carried out under the same authority and having generally similar environmental effects that can be mitigated in similar ways. By its nature, a Program EIR considers the largescale effects associated with implementing a program, such as a General Plan or Specific Plan, and does not, and is not intended to, examine the specific environmental effects associated with individual actions that may be undertaken under the guise of the larger program.

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

1. Provision of a more exhaustive consideration of impacts and alternatives than would be practical in an individual EIR.
2. Focus on cumulative impacts that might be overlooked in a case-by-case analysis.
3. Avoidance of continual reconsideration of recurring policy issues.
4. Consideration of broad policy alternatives and programmatic mitigation measures at an early stage when the agency has greater flexibility to deal with them.
5. Reduction of paperwork by encouraging the reuse of data (through tiering).

As a wide-ranging environmental document, the Program EIR uses macro level thresholds as compared to the project-level thresholds that might be used for an EIR on a specific development project. It should not be assumed that impacts determined not to be significant at a macro level would not be significant at a project level. In other words, determination that implementation of the proposed project as a broad program would not have a significant environmental effect does not necessarily mean that an individual project would not have significant effects based on project-level CEQA thresholds, even if the project is consistent with the General Plan.

This EIR has been prepared to analyze potentially significant environmental impacts associated with future development resulting from implementation of the proposed project and its associated action with direction to review the project description section for details, and also addresses

appropriate and feasible mitigation measures or project alternatives that would minimize or eliminate these impacts.

This EIR is intended to provide decision-makers and the public with information that enables them to consider the environmental consequences of the proposed project. This EIR identifies significant or potentially significant environmental effects, as well as ways in which those impacts can be reduced to less-than-significant levels, whether through the imposition of mitigation measures or through the implementation of specific alternatives to the proposed project. In a practical sense, this document functions as a tool for fact-finding, allowing citizens, decision-makers, and agency staff an opportunity to collectively review and evaluate baseline conditions and project impacts through a process of full disclosure.

1.3 Scope and Content

In accordance with the *State CEQA Guidelines*, a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft EIR was circulated to the State Clearinghouse, responsible, and trustee agencies and persons requesting notice on March 20, 2018. The 2018 NOP, included in Appendix NOP, indicated that the EIR would evaluate potential impacts in each of the following resources and issues areas:

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services and Recreation
- Transportation and Traffic
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Utilities and Service Systems

The County received written responses to the 2018 NOP regarding the scope and content of the EIR. The responses, included in Appendix D, are addressed in the analysis contained in the topical subsections of Section 4, *Environmental Impact Analysis*. Table 1-1 summarizes the content of the letters and verbal comments received during the 2018 NOP public review period and where the issues raised are addressed in the EIR.

The County held two EIR scoping meetings both on March 26, 2018, one at the Fresno County Board of Supervisors Chambers and the other at the Riverdale Memorial District, with a number of members of the public in attendance. A summary of the written comments received at this meeting is included at the end of Appendix NOP. Oral and written comments associated with the scoping meetings are addressed, as appropriate, in the analysis contained in the topical subsections of Section 4, *Environmental Impact Analysis*.

However, the County temporarily paused the project for additional changes after circulating the NOP in 2018. As a result, the County prepared an updated NOP on January 15, 2021, which was circulated to the State Clearinghouse, responsible, and trustee agencies and persons requesting

notice. The 2021 NOP, included in Appendix NOP, stated the EIR would evaluate all potential impacts to the resources and issues areas in the 2018 NOP in addition to Wildfire and Energy.

Wildfire and Energy were added as issue areas when the *CEQA Guidelines* were updated and adopted in January 2019. In addition to adding issue areas, significance thresholds in previously included existing issues areas were modified. Therefore, since the 2021 NOP was circulated after the updated *CEQA Guidelines* were released, all revisions to and additions of impact areas are reflected in the EIR.

The County received written responses during the comment period that took place from January 15, 2021 to March 1, 2021 for the 2021 NOP regarding the scope and content of the EIR. The responses, included in Appendix NOP, are addressed in the analysis contained in the topical subsections of Section 4, *Environmental Impact Analysis*. Table 1-1 summarizes the content of the letters and verbal comments received during the 2021 NOP public review period and where the issues raised are addressed in the EIR.

The County held one virtual EIR scoping meeting on January 27, 2021. A summary of the written comments received at this meeting is included at the end of Appendix NOP. Oral and written comments associated with the scoping meeting are addressed, as appropriate, in the analysis contained in the topical subsections of Section 4, *Environmental Impact Analysis*.

Table 1-1 NOP Comments and EIR Response

Commenter (year)	Comment/Request	How and Where It Was Addressed
American Civil Liberties Union (2018)	The General Plan should identify disadvantaged communities.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	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.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	The Draft GP must include objectives and policies that promote safe and sanitary homes.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	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.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
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.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
CDFW Central Region (2021)	Recommends the EIR analyze potential impacts to special-status species with mitigation measures.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on special-status species are evaluated in Section 4.4, <i>Biological Resources</i> .
	Recommends the County consult with US FWS about potential impacts to federally listed species.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on federally listed species are evaluated in Section 4.4, <i>Biological Resources</i> .

Committer (year)	Comment/Request	How and Where It Was Addressed
	If project causes any potential stream or lake disturbance, mitigation should be developed to reduce the need for LSAA in the future.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on streams and lakes are evaluated in Section 4.4, <i>Biological Resources</i> and Section 4.9, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i> .
	Committer provided a Summary Table. Report attachment.	This comment is noted.
California Rural Legal Assistance, Inc. (2018)	Fresno County is not using proper baseline conditions for the analysis.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR
	County must address legal inadequacies in the GP before a proper env. impact analysis can be conducted.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR
	Draft Zoning Ordinance fails to fully implement the mandate density bonus law for affordable housing units.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	County's plan to consolidate small commercial parcels to provide adequate sites for affordable housing is unrealistic.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	The County must conduct a thorough analysis of the infrastructure deficiencies in disadvantaged unincorporated communities within its jurisdiction.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	Draft documents do not facilitate housing for the homeless or other persons with special needs.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
Carpenters Local 701 (2021)	Committer requests that mandatory local hire and apprenticeship language be added to the land use, economic development, and environmental justice elements.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
Carpenters Local 702 (2021)	For every apprenticeable craft, contractors will participate in a Joint Apprenticeship Program.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
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.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
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.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
Christine Flannigan (2021)	Update the Local Area Management Program to include alternative wastewater treatment systems without RWQCB approval.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR
City of Fresno (2021)	Examine policies in relation to well-drilling and the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act with mitigation.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act are evaluated in Section 4.9, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i> .
	Ensure the groundwater quality of septic tanks are thoroughly analyzed.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU regarding septic tanks are evaluated in Section 4.6, <i>Geology and Soils</i> .

Commenter (year)	Comment/Request	How and Where It Was Addressed
	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 Section 4.3, <i>Air Quality</i> . Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on transportation and VMT are evaluated in Section 4.14, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i> . Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on greenhouse gas emissions are evaluated in Section 4.6, <i>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</i> . Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on noise are evaluated in Section 4.11, <i>Noise</i> .
	Impacts of good movements on city roads, AQ, GHG, and noise should be analyzed.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on air quality are evaluated in Section 4.3, <i>Air Quality</i> . Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on transportation are evaluated in Section 4.14, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i> . Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on greenhouse gas emissions are evaluated in Section 4.6, <i>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</i> . Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on noise are evaluated in Section 4.11, <i>Noise</i> .
City of Fresno- Development & Resources Mgmt. Department (2018)	City concurs an EIR is appropriate level of CEQA review.	This comment is noted.
	Commenter provides a comprehensive list of GP review comments; not related to the EIR.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
City of Reedley (2018)	Urge County to incorporate GP designation of "Greenbelt" around the City of Reedley's perimeter.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	Approves of the County's efforts to engage in regional coordination activities, such as the multi-jurisdictional housing element, and RTP.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
David Cehrs (2021)	Claims that the County has not followed up/enforced their own water sustainability policies.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	Asks the County to stop parcel splits.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	Asks the County to stop second homes on a single parcel.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	Asks the County to stop issuing new groundwater well permits.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.

Committer (year)	Comment/Request	How and Where It Was Addressed
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.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU relating to hazardous waste/substances are evaluated in Section 4.8, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i> .
	Identify the mechanisms to initiate any required investigations and the responsible government agency to provide oversight.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU relating to hazardous waste/substances are evaluated in Section 4.8, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i> .
	Recommends collecting soil samples to test for lead prior to any intrusive activities.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU relating to lead in soil are evaluated in Section 4.8, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i> .
	Recommends any areas on/near mining activities should be evaluated for mine waste.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU relating to hazardous substances are evaluated in Section 4.8, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i> .
	If buildings are demolished, surveys should be conducted for the presence of lead-based products, mercury, asbestos, and polychlorinated biphenyl caulk.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU relating to hazardous substances are evaluated in Section 4.8, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i> .
	Recommends imported soils should be sampled for contaminants.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU relating to hazardous substances are evaluated in Section 4.8, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i> .
	If a site has been used for agriculture or weed abatement, the area should be investigated for pesticides.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU relating to hazardous substances are evaluated in Section 4.8, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i> .
Feleena Sutton, Aera Energy (2021)	Committer 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.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
Fresno County Fire Protection District (2018)	Project shall comply with CCR Fire Code.	Compliance with the CCR Fire Code is evaluated in Section 4.17, <i>Wildfire</i> .
Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District (2018)	Development in the GP Planning Area shall be designed to not overload stormwater management and drainage systems.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on stormwater management and drainage systems are evaluated in Section 4.16, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i> .
	Development in the GP shall prevent adverse water quality impacts and discharges.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on water quality and discharges are evaluated in Section 4.9, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i> .
	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.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on runoff are evaluated in Section 4.9, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i> .
Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District (2021)	Committer provided attachment of Fresno Storm Drainage and Flood Control Master Plan.	This comment is noted and does not require revisions to the EIR.
	Maximum flood pool elevation should be studied for all development in the Planning Area.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU flood hazards are evaluated in Section 4.9, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i> .

Commenter (year)	Comment/Request	How and Where It Was Addressed
	Grading within the Planning Area should be designed so there are no adverse impacts on the passage of a major storm through the area.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on runoff are evaluated in Section 4.9, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i> .
	Development should provide any surface flowage easements or covenants for areas of the Plan that cannot convey storm water without crossing private property.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU regarding runoff are evaluated in Section 4.9, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i> .
	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.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on runoff are evaluated in Section 4.9, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i> .
	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.	This comment is noted.
	Storm drain easement will be required whenever storm drain facilities are located on private property.	This comment is noted.
	FMFCD may require developers to construct certain storm drain facilities.	This comment is noted.
	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, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i> .
	The most current Flood Insurance Rate Maps should be reviewed for individual properties.	This comment is noted and does not require revisions to the Draft EIR.
	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.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on runoff are evaluated in Section 4.9, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i> .
Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability (2021)	Ensure an accurate baseline for environmental conditions.	Baseline environmental conditions are analyzed in each respective section.
	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.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU are analyzed using sources from the San Joaquin Valley APCD in Section 4.3, <i>Air Quality</i> . Otherwise, appropriate methodology and sources for analysis were used throughout the Draft EIR.
	Identify and map the location of existing sensitive uses and how they would be impacted by Plan implementation.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on sensitive land uses are analyzed throughout the Draft EIR.
	Consider modifications to ensure buffers between sensitive land uses and polluting land uses.	Impacts to sensitive receptors have been noted throughout the document and mitigation identified where required.
	Consider revisions to the circulation map to minimize impacts on sensitive uses and residential areas.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.

Committer (year)	Comment/Request	How and Where It Was Addressed
	Expand opportunities for higher density housing in growth areas.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	Support infrastructure improvements in zero emission technologies and vehicles, and grid improvements.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	Identify existing water and wastewater needs to ensure all residents have access to safe water services.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on water and wastewater are evaluated in Section 4.16, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i> .
	Identify sufficient land for park and green spaces with prioritization on communities with the least access.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on parks and green spaces are evaluated in Section 4.13, <i>Public Services and Recreation</i> .
	Require adequate landscaping and buffer zones to protect sensitive uses.	Impacts to sensitive receptors have been noted throughout the document and mitigation identified where required.
	Noticing requirements for zoning changes and Conditional Use Permits, including who is noticed and distributing notices in accessible languages.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	Analyze and include mitigation for impacts to housing, water supply, traffic and road safety, public health, utilities, and construction impacts.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on housing are evaluated in Section 4.12, <i>Population and Housing</i> . Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on water supply and utilities are evaluated in Section 4.16, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i> . Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on traffic and road safety are evaluated in Section 4.14, <i>Transpiration and Traffic</i> . Construction impacts of the GPR/ZOU are evaluated throughout the EIR within each respective section.
	Include any and all comments provided to staff in 2018, both oral and written.	Comments from 2018 have been included in this table of the EIR and in Appendix NOP.
	Plan development has not been conducive for informed public decision or encouraging public participation.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	County should partner with diverse stakeholders.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	County needs abide by the implementation of SB 1000, AB 170, and AB 379.	SB 1000 and AB 170 pertains to the General Plan and does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR. Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on wildlife conservation are evaluated in Section 4.4, <i>Biological Resources</i> .
	Incorporate a vulnerability assessment to identify the risks of climate change.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.

Committer (year)	Comment/Request	How and Where It Was Addressed
	Incorporate relevant info from federal, state, regional, and local agencies on the assets, resources, and population at-risk of climate change exposure.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	Include adaptation and resiliency goals.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	Identify feasible implementation measures to minimize climate change impacts.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on climate change are analyzed in Section 4.7, <i>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</i> . Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on climate change related drought and associated water availability are analyzed in Section 4.9, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i> and Section 4.16, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i> .
Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability (2018)	Implementation measures in Section 3 of the Policy Document are ambiguous and deficient.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR
	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	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR
	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.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR
	County must identify financial funding alternatives for the extension of services in disadvantaged unincorporated communities.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR
	Introduction in the GP Land Use Element should also cover unincorporated areas.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR
	GP Land Use Element should include summaries of Community Plans.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR
	Draft Background Report does not satisfy legal requirements to include data and relevant AQ policies, programs, and regulations.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	Draft Background Report does not include an adequate analysis of water supply and drinking water issues.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	Background Report noise analysis should describe the disproportionate impact that noise has on disadvantaged communities.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.

Commenter (year)	Comment/Request	How and Where It Was Addressed
	Background Report should discuss economic and demographic conditions in Fresno County, including disparities by race and income level.	This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	Draft Zoning Ordinance fails to comply with the employee housing act.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	Draft Zoning Ordinance fails to fully implement the mandate density bonus law for affordable housing units.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	Draft Zoning Ordinance must be revised to allow emergency shelters in accordance with Government Code Section 65583.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	Draft Zoning Ordinance does not comply with state and federal laws requiring the county to ensure reasonable accommodations.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
League of Women Voters (2021)	For the "No Project" alternative, reevaluate the adverse effects identified in the 2000-2020 GP.	Alternatives for the GPR/ZOU are evaluated in Section 6, <i>Alternatives</i> .
	The Plan should contain a "No Harm" alternative	Section 6, <i>Alternatives</i> , includes a discussion of the Environmentally Superior Alternative.
	The County should evaluate how the revision of the goals and policies of the Plan could combat climate change.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	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, <i>Biological Resources</i> .
	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, <i>Biological Resources</i> . However, insects are not protected under CEQA or the California Endangered Species Act.
	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.
	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, <i>Energy</i> . However, CEQA does not require an analysis of cost effectiveness.
	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.
	Commenter mentioned that implementation of the GP programs had fallen to 40% in 2019.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
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.	

Commenter (year)	Comment/Request	How and Where It Was Addressed
	The updated Plan should remove barriers to urban sprawl.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	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.
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.	This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	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.
	The County should determine the funding required to fully implement mitigation measures.	This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	The County should determine the conditions under which the GP can work as a self-mitigating document.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	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, <i>Alternatives</i> .
	Commenter objects to the lack of community outreach for the GP review and Zoning Ordinance Update.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
Lucy Hornbaker (2018)	The few people attending the public meeting might be special interests; be aware of this when structuring new plan review.	This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	Air Quality: would like to encourage continued effort; recognizes County for work already done on this issue.	This comment is noted.
Malaga County Water District (2018)	Outdated/inaccurate description of the District in the Background Report (Commenter points out specific examples).	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	County should prepare a specific plan for Malaga Community because Land Use Policies conflict w/ Fresno County GP En.Ju. Element.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
Mary Savala (2021)	Commenter is interested in the criteria and data that will be used to review the GP.	This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	Commenter wants to know what the environmental impacts is 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, <i>Alternatives</i> .
	Commenter believes that a good number of policies and programs of the current GP have been ignored or neglected.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.

Commenter (year)	Comment/Request	How and Where It Was Addressed
Jackie McCoy (2021)	No annual cleanup day for unincorporated area to drop off tires and large things electronics etc.	This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	PG&E cut trees everywhere but not into manageable pieces leaving a huge fire danger	This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	Due to drought, no buildings should be constructed unless a similar building is taken down.	This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	Need solar on both sides of the freeways and highways with charging stations	This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	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	This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	Garbage trucks lose trash along the road	This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	Commenter lives in a dead zone for cell service	This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
John Dirickson, Navy (2018)	NAS Lemoore Military Influence Area -- Navy would like to review & comment; consider environmental factors in relation to local communities.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on sensitive receptors are analyzed in Section 4.3, <i>Air Quality</i> and Section 4.11, <i>Noise</i> .
	NAS Lemoore Air Installation Compatible Use Zone -- consider environmental factors to this area.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on airports and aircrafts are evaluated in Section 4.8, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i> .
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.
	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.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	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 4.8, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i> . Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on agricultural land are evaluated in Section 4.2, <i>Agricultural Resources</i> . Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on stormwater quality in the event of a flood are evaluated in Section 4.9, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i> .
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, <i>Tribal Cultural Resources</i> .
	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, <i>Tribal Cultural Resources</i> .

Commenter (year)	Comment/Request	How and Where It Was Addressed
	Recommends local tribal involvement and consultation as early as possible.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on tribal cultural resources are evaluated in Section 4.15, <i>Tribal Cultural Resources</i> .
	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 4.15, <i>Tribal Cultural Resources</i> .
	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 4.15, <i>Tribal Cultural Resources</i> .
	Recommends contacting CHRIS for a records search.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on tribal cultural resources are evaluated in Section 4.15, <i>Tribal Cultural Resources</i> .
	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, <i>Cultural Resources</i> .
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).	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	The County should consider incorporating key military-community components such as noise contours, accident potential zones, military training routes, and special use airspace.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on noise are evaluated in Section 4.11, <i>Noise</i> . Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on airports and aircrafts are evaluated in Section 4.8, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i> .
	The commenter included an attachment of their May 2018 comments on the NOP and a map of NAS Lemoore.	This comment is noted.
NAWSCL (2021)	The Plan may push urban growth and create conflict with military land and airspace, affecting military readiness	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	Renewable energy technologies may result in adverse impacts on military testing and training so it should occur in a coordinated and compatible manner.	This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	Commenter provides the opportunity to create a partnership between the County of Fresno and NAWSCL to ensure compatible development.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
Radley Reep (2021)	Commenter raises concerns regarding the County's ability to implement the GP, and specifically outlines the failures of self-mitigation.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	The County needs to evaluate the cause for/extent of its inability to implement mitigation measures for the 2000-2020 GP.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	Determine the amount of funding needed to guarantee full implementation.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.

Commenter (year)	Comment/Request	How and Where It Was Addressed
	Determine the conditions under which GP self-mitigation can work.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	Commenter raises concerns surrounding the lack of public engagement and provides a detailed timeline of County's planning process.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	Commenter provided attachments of 2000-2020 GP policies and sig/unavoidable adverse impacts.	This comment is noted.
	Clearly define "valuable agricultural lands" (mentioned in LU-A.1 Agricultural Land Conservation).	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	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, <i>Agricultural Resources</i> .
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.
	There should be appropriate project siting to help ensure there is adequate distance between conflicting land uses and away from sensitive receptors.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on sensitive receptors are evaluated in Section 4.3, <i>Air Quality</i> .
	There should be an effort to reduce VMT.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on VMT are evaluated in Section 4.14, <i>Transpiration and Traffic</i> .
	The commenter recommends that the EIR include or incorporate by reference, policies that will reduce or mitigate VMT impacts to the extent feasible.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on VMT are evaluated in Section 4.14, <i>Transpiration and Traffic</i> .
	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.	Potential construction and operational emission impacts of the GPR/ZOU are evaluated in Section 4.3, <i>Air Quality</i> .
	The commenter recommends the EIR include a discussion on the feasibility of implementing a Voluntary Emission Reduction Agreement for the Plan.	The Voluntary Emission Reduction Agreement is discussed in Section 4.3, <i>Air Quality</i> .
	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.	Potential construction emission impacts of the GPR/ZOU are evaluated in Section 4.3, <i>Air Quality</i> .

Commenter (year)	Comment/Request	How and Where It Was Addressed
	The commenter recommends that an AAQA be performed for a project if emissions exceed 100 pounds per day of any emission.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on emissions are discussed in Section 4.3, <i>Air Quality</i> and Section 4.7, <i>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</i> . Emissions are analyzed using appropriate methodologies.
	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.	Potential cumulative impacts of the GPR/ZOU on criteria pollutants are evaluated at the end of Section 4.3, <i>Air Quality</i> .
	Consider the feasibility of incorporating vegetative barriers and urban greening as a measure to reduce air pollution exposure on sensitive receptors.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on air pollution exposure are discussed in Section 4.3, <i>Air Quality</i> . Mitigation is suggested to address air pollution exposure on sensitive receptors.
	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.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on emissions are evaluated in Section 4.3, <i>Air Quality</i> .
	The commenter provided a list of district rules and regulations that the County should apply to the Plan.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	The commenter recommends that a copy of the district's comments be provided to the Project proponent.	The County if the project proponent and has received a copy of the comments.
Sequoia Riverland's Trust (2018)	The General Plan should distinguish between existing communities (incl. disadvantaged communities) where infrastructure needed and new towns.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	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, <i>Agricultural Resources</i> . No mitigation is incorporated to the Draft EIR.
	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, <i>Agricultural Resources</i> . Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on biological resources are evaluated in Section 4.4, <i>Biological Resources</i> .
	New development should be directed into existing communities.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	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, <i>Agricultural Resources</i> .

Committer (year)	Comment/Request	How and Where It Was Addressed
	Committer requests to be placed on a distribution list for information regarding the Fresno County General Plan Review Zoning Ordinance public meetings.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
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.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	The GP is outdated; many elements are obsolete and currently applicable legal mandates are not met.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	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, <i>Air Quality</i> .
	The Circulation Element fails to consider current state law requiring VMT reduction.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	The County fails to comply with state mandates to prepare for climate change.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
January 2021 Scoping Meeting Verbal Comments	The commentor questions if the County has considered renewable-energy specific elements of the zoning ordinance or land use plans, including solar battery storage and hydrogen technology.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	The commentors suggests alternatives that minimize impacts on disadvantaged communities and that the EIR looks at environmental impacts, such as housing, water, and wastewater services, on vulnerable communities.	Environmental justice analysis is not required under CEQA, but the General Plan contains a new Environmental Justice Element. However, potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on housing, water, and wastewater services are discussed in Section 4.12, <i>Population and Housing</i> and Section 4.16, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i> .
	All feasible mitigation measures on residences and the environment based on community feedback should be used. Feedback should be gathered with a community-based organization engagement plan.	Mitigation measures are implemented throughout the Draft EIR.
	The commentor suggests habitat and agricultural resources mitigation.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU and associated mitigation on habitats and agricultural resources are analyzed in Section 4.2, <i>Agricultural Resources</i> and Section 4.4, <i>Biological Resources</i> .
	The commentor asks for a report on how well previous General Plan policies have worked.	This comment pertains to the General Plan. This comment does not pertain to the scope and contents of the EIR.
	The commentor questions how environmental justice will be analyzed in the EIR.	Environmental justice analysis is not required under CEQA.

Commenter (year)	Comment/Request	How and Where It Was Addressed
	The commentor asks how the Friant Ranch decision impacts air quality analysis.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on air quality are evaluated in Section 4.3, <i>Air Quality</i> .
	The commentor notes the new VMT requirement.	Potential impacts of the GPR/ZOU on VMT are evaluated in Section 4.14, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i> .

In preparing the EIR, use was made of pertinent County policies and guidelines, certified EIRs and other adopted CEQA documents, and other background documents. A full reference list is contained in Section 7, *References and Preparers*.

The alternatives section of the EIR, Section 6, was prepared in accordance with *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6 and focuses on alternatives that are capable of eliminating or reducing significant adverse effects associated with the proposed project while feasibly attaining most of the basic project objectives. In addition, the alternatives section identifies the environmentally superior alternative among the alternatives assessed. The alternatives evaluated include the CEQA-required "No Project" alternative and XX alternative development scenarios.

The level of detail contained throughout this EIR is consistent with the requirements of CEQA and applicable court decisions. *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15151 provides the standard of adequacy on which this document is based. The *Guidelines* state:

An EIR should be prepared with a sufficient degree of analysis to provide decision-makers with information which enables them to make a decision which intelligently takes account of environmental consequences. An evaluation of the environmental effects of the proposed project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is to be reviewed in light of what is reasonably feasible. Disagreement among experts does not make an EIR inadequate, but the EIR should summarize the main points of disagreement among the experts. The courts have looked not for perfection, but for adequacy, completeness, and a good faith effort at full disclosure.

1.4 Lead, Responsible, and Trustee Agencies

The *CEQA Guidelines* define lead, responsible, and trustee agencies. Fresno County is the lead agency under CEQA for this EIR because it has primary discretionary authority to determine whether or how to approve the proposed project.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15381 defines responsible agencies as other public agencies that are responsible for carrying out/implementing a specific component of a proposed project or for approving a project, such as an annexation, that implements the goals and policies of a general plan.

There are no responsible agencies for the proposed project.

Although there are no responsible agencies under CEQA with respect to adoption of the proposed project, several other agencies may have review or approval authority over aspects of projects that could potentially be implemented in accordance with various goals and policies included in the General Plan. These agencies and their roles are listed below.

- The State Geologist is responsible for the review of the County's program for minimizing exposure to geologic hazards and for regulating surface mining activities.

- The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) has responsibility for approving future improvements to the State highway system, including Highway 99 and Interstate 5.
- The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) has responsibility for issuing take permits and streambed alteration agreements for any projects with the potential to affect plant or animal species listed by the State of California as rare, threatened, or endangered or that would disturb waters of the State.
- Any other public agencies, such as: Fresno County Fire Protection District, Fresno Irrigation District, Fresno Unified School District, Fresno Local Agency Formation Commission, Airport Land Use Commission of Fresno County, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Joaquin Valley Air Quality Management District, Army Corps of Engineers, Department of Water Resources, and California Department of Housing and Community Development.

Trustee agencies have jurisdiction over certain resources held in trust for the people of California but do not have a legal authority over approving or carrying out the project. Potential trustee agencies for the General Plan may include CDFW, State Department of Parks and Recreation, and State Lands Commission.

1.5 Intended Uses of the EIR

This EIR is an informational document for use in the County’s review and consideration of the proposed General Plan Review and Zoning Ordinance Update. It is to be used to facilitate creation of a General Plan that incorporates environmental considerations and planning principals into a cohesive policy document. The GPR/ZOU will guide subsequent actions taken by the County in its review of new development projects. This EIR discloses the possible environmental consequences associated with the proposed project. The information in this EIR will be used by the Fresno County Board of Supervisors, the Fresno County Planning Commission, the general public, and potentially the trustee and responsible agencies.

The focus of this EIR is to:

- Provide information about the GPR/ZOU for consideration by the Fresno County Board of Supervisors and Fresno County Planning Commission in their selection of the proposed project, an alternative to the proposed project, or a combination of various chapters from the proposed project and its alternatives, for approval
- Review and evaluate the potentially significant environmental impacts that could occur as a result of the implementation of the GPR/ZOU compared to existing conditions
- Identify feasible mitigation measures that may be incorporated into the proposed project in order to reduce or eliminate potentially significant effects
- Disclose any potential growth-inducing and/or cumulative impacts associated with the proposed project
- Examine a reasonable range of alternatives that could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the proposed project, while eliminating and/or reducing some or all of its potentially significant adverse environmental effects

1.6 Environmental Review Process

The environmental impact review process required under CEQA is summarized below. The steps appear in sequential order.

1. **Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Initial Study.** Immediately after deciding that an EIR is required, the lead agency must file a NOP soliciting input on the EIR scope to "responsible," "trustee," and involved federal agencies; to the State Clearinghouse, if one or more State agencies is a responsible or trustee agency; and to parties previously requesting notice in writing. The NOP must be posted in the County Clerk's office for 30 days. A scoping meeting to solicit public input on the issues to be assessed in the EIR is not required, but may be conducted by the lead agency. An Initial Study may be prepared but is not required.
2. **Draft EIR Prepared.** The Draft EIR must contain: a) table of contents or index; b) summary; c) project description; d) environmental setting; e) significant impacts (direct, indirect, cumulative, growth-inducing and unavoidable impacts); f) alternatives; g) mitigation measures; and h) irreversible changes.
3. **Public Notice and Review.** A lead agency must prepare a Public Notice of Availability of an EIR. The Notice must be placed in the County Clerk's office for 30 days (Public Resources Code Section 21092) and sent to anyone requesting it. Additionally, public notice of Draft EIR availability for a regional document such as a general plan must be given through publication in a newspaper of general circulation. The lead agency must consult with and request comments on the Draft EIR from responsible and trustee agencies, and adjacent cities and counties. The minimum public review period for a Draft EIR is 30 days. When a Draft EIR is sent to the State Clearinghouse for review, the public review period must be 45 days, unless a shorter period is approved by the Clearinghouse (Public Resources Code 21091). Distribution of the Draft EIR may be required through the State Clearinghouse.
4. **Notice of Completion.** A lead agency must file a Notice of Completion with the State Clearinghouse as soon as it completes a Draft EIR.
5. **Final EIR.** A Final EIR must include: a) the Draft EIR; b) copies of comments received during public review; c) list of persons and entities commenting; and d) responses to comments.
6. **Certification of Final EIR.** According to Section 15090 of the *State CEQA Guidelines* prior to approving a project the lead agency shall certify that: "(1) the final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA; (2) the final EIR was presented to the decision-making body of the lead agency, and that the decision-making body reviewed and considered the information contained in the final EIR prior to approving the project; and(3) the final EIR reflects the lead agency's independent judgment and analysis."
7. **Lead Agency Project Decision.** According to Section 15092 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*:
 - (a) After considering the final EIR and in conjunction with making findings under Section 15091, the Lead Agency may decide whether or how to approve or carry out the project.
 - (b) A public agency shall not decide to approve or carry out a project for which an EIR was prepared unless either:
 - (1) The project as approved will not have a significant effect on the environment, or
 - (2) The agency has:
 - (A) Eliminated or substantially lessened all significant effects on the environment where feasible as shown in findings under Section 15091, and

- (B) Determined that any remaining significant effects on the environment found to be unavoidable under Section 15091 are acceptable due to overriding concerns as described in Section 15093.
- (c) With respect to a project which includes housing development, the public agency shall not reduce the proposed number of housing units as a mitigation measure if it determines that there is another feasible specific mitigation measure available that will provide a comparable level of mitigation.

8. **Findings/Statement of Overriding Considerations.** According to Section 15091 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*:

- (a) No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:
 - (1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.
 - (2) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
 - (3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.
- (b) The findings required by subdivision (a) shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.
- (c) The finding in subdivision (a)(2) shall not be made if the agency making the finding has concurrent jurisdiction with another agency to deal with identified feasible mitigation measures or alternatives. The finding in subsection (a)(3) shall describe the specific reasons for rejecting identified mitigation measures and project alternatives.
- (d) When making the findings required in subdivision (a)(1), the agency shall also adopt a program for reporting on or monitoring the changes which it has either required in the project or made a condition of approval to avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects. These measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures.
- (e) The public agency shall specify the location and custodian of the documents or other material which constitute the record of the proceedings upon which its decision is based.
- (f) A statement made pursuant to Section 15093 does not substitute for the findings required by this section.

In addition Section 15093 of the *State CEQA Guidelines* state:

- (a) CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project outweigh the

unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered "acceptable."

- (b) When the lead agency approves a project which will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the final EIR and/or other information in the record. The statement of overriding considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.
 - (c) If an agency makes a statement of overriding considerations, the statement should be included in the record of the project approval and should be mentioned in the notice of determination. This statement does not substitute for, and shall be in addition to, findings required pursuant to Section 15091.
9. **Mitigation Monitoring/Reporting Program.** When an agency makes findings on significant effects identified in the EIR, it must adopt a reporting or monitoring program for mitigation measures that were adopted or made conditions of project approval to mitigate significant effects.
10. **Notice of Determination.** An agency must file a Notice of Determination after deciding to approve a project for which an EIR is prepared. A local agency must file the Notice with the County Clerk. The Notice must be posted for 30 days and sent to anyone previously requesting notice. Posting of the Notice starts a 30-day statute of limitations on CEQA challenges.

This page intentionally left blank