

# Tulare County Citizens for Responsible Growth

*Working to ensure that future growth protects our local economy, communities and natural resources*

April 15 2008

Tulare County Resource Management Agency  
ATTN: David Bryant, Project Planner  
Government Plaza  
5961 South Mooney Boulevard  
Visalia, CA 93277

RE: General Plan 2030 Update and Draft Environmental Impact Report (SCH No. 2006041162)

Dear Mr. Bryant:

On behalf of Tulare County Citizens for Responsible Growth, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Tulare County General Plan Update 2030 (GPU). We are eager to continue working with you, the Board of Supervisors and the Planning Commission to shape a final General Plan that protects everything we love about Tulare County, while providing appropriate opportunities for development that benefits our communities.

123-81

## **Who we are**

Tulare County Citizens for Responsible Growth is a diverse group of local residents concerned about the direction of growth in our County. We are united by a desire for a General Plan Update that will ensure cleaner air, secure and reliable water supplies, a strong and more diverse economy, and the protection of our agricultural and natural resource lands. We believe that focusing future growth in our existing urbanized areas is the key to achieving these priorities.

123-82

## **Tulare's Chance to get it Right**

Our tremendous natural resources, successful agricultural economy, central location, huge recreational potential, and attractive small towns provide a strong foundation on which to grow. Our General Plan must work to ensure that the County's growth will be a blessing, not a curse.

123-83

## **The DEIR is Flawed Because It's Tied To A Flawed General Plan**

123-84

The DEIR, which must evaluate the potential environmental impacts of adopting and implementing the GPU, recognizes **31** significant and unavoidable impacts. Such extensive negative impacts clearly should be considered unacceptable in a plan that claims “The beauty of the County and the health and safety of its residents will be protected and enhanced.”

123-84  
cont'd

Furthermore, the DEIR’s impact analysis is inadequate. The DEIR fails to establish baselines for such vital components as water supply and current land uses, or to quantify the impacts brought about by this General Plan Update (e.g., number of acres of prime agricultural land converted, number of additional tons of CO2 emitted, etc.) because the General Plan Update on which it is based is riddled with loopholes, vague language and inconsistent provisions. The GPU in its current form provides no meaningful land use designations, comprehensive land use diagrams or maps. The GPU’s determined avoidance of mandatory language, and refusal to “solidly advocate, promote, or represent any one development scenario because any attempt to predict the exact pace and locations of market-driven growth is considered speculative” not only fails to guide future growth of the County, but makes it impossible for the DEIR to adequately evaluate the environmental impacts of the Plan.

Without detailed information, provided by the goals, policies and implementation measures of the GPR, regarding where and to what extent future growth will occur, it is impossible for this DEIR -- or any DEIR – to provide an adequate baseline or analysis or to adequately describe the potential environmental impacts of the projected growth.

The GPU and DEIR must be significantly revised if either document is to fulfill its intended purpose and statutory responsibility. We are therefore asking for a substantial revision and recirculation of the General Plan Update and DEIR, with the inclusion of our “Healthy Growth” Alternative, which would also be the environmentally superior alternative.

123-85

We propose the following alternate goals, policies and implementation measures, which will provide a clear direction for the County’s future growth, mitigating potential negative impacts associated with the County’s anticipated substantial population increase, and permitting the revised GPU and DEIR to meet the needs of future decision-makers:

- 1. Base the location, density, and amount of growth within urbanized areas on their desire and capacity to accommodate growth.**

123-86

The General Plan Update<sup>1</sup> should promote a balanced and functional mix of land uses consistent with community values and resource availability. Existing infrastructure, water supply, environmental conditions, and proximity to jobs, transit, schools, and civic and commercial centers, and the desire of the community to accommodate additional growth should be the primary considerations in determining where to locate growth. Our current Rural Valley Lands Plan and Foothill Growth Management Plan laid the foundation for resource-driven land use planning. The spirit of these admirable planning documents should inform this Alternative, and the General Plan Update.

123-86  
cont'd

We suggest the following revisions to the draft policies set out below (current GPU provisions in italics; proposed revisions below):

123-87

*PF- 1.4 Available Infrastructure: The County shall encourage residential growth to locate in existing UDBs and HDBs where infrastructure is available. The County shall ensure that development does not occur unless adequate infrastructure is available or can be made available for that area and that there are adequate provisions for long term maintenance.*

This is a good goal that needs to be clarified and strengthened. We urge the County to do so by adopting the following revision: The County shall permit residential growth to locate in existing UDBs and HDBs only where infrastructure is available or has been funded and will be provided concurrently with development, and where there are adequate provisions for long term maintenance.

*PF-1.6 Appropriate Land Uses by Location: The County shall utilize the Land Use Element and adopted community, hamlet or area plans to designate land uses and intensities that reflect and maintain the appropriate level of urbanized development in each community, hamlet, or planning area.*

123-88

Please clarify this policy by defining “appropriate,” and provide a supporting implementation measure. The GPU should quantify “appropriate” levels by setting standards for population density and development intensity for each community, hamlet, and area plan, based on sustainable, available resources such as a safe, reliable water supply. In order to do this, the GPU must first provide a comprehensive baseline analysis of existing conditions, infrastructure, and resource availability for each community and hamlet. Only once the DEIR portion of the GPU has provided this analysis can it reasonably evaluate the suggested Alternatives.

---

<sup>1</sup> Because, as noted in the DEIR at ES-2-3, the DEIR is so interrelated with the GPU Background and Goals and Policies Reports, we refer to the combined documents as the General Plan Update or GPU in this comment letter.

*PF -1.9 Capacity Building and Self Governance: The County shall encourage the residents in unincorporated communities and hamlets to be actively involved in self governance.*

123-89

*PF 2.4 Community Plans: The County shall ensure that Community Plans are prepared (where no plan exists), updated, and maintained for each of the communities. These plans shall include the entire area within the community's UDB and shall address the community's short- and long-term ability to provide necessary urban services.*

*PF-3.3 Hamlet Plans: The County shall ensure that Hamlet Plans are updated and maintained for each of the identified hamlets. These plans shall include the entire area within the HDB. The plans will provide a land use diagram with a discussion of allowed uses and densities/intensities. A discussion of the hamlet's short- and long-term ability to provide necessary urban services will also be provided.*

We applaud these policies that encourage local residents to play an active role in the planning and evolution of their community or hamlet. It is critical that the plans be based on clear and accurate information about available infrastructure and resources so as to better inform community and hamlet decision-makers about current conditions and future options. Adoption and implementation of the proposals made above with respect to PF-1.4 and 1.6 will support the County's efforts in this regard. Moreover, without such detailed and specific plans, it is impossible for the DEIR to provide an adequate baseline, to evaluate the potential impacts of growth on these areas or the County as a whole, or to determine what mitigation measures are required or likely to be effective.

Until hamlet plans can be developed, we suggest that the County adopt the Ahwahnee Principles and require interim development to adhere to them. No significant new development project should be approved in a community whose guiding planning document is nonexistent, inadequate or out of date. We must start requiring resource efficient growth now if we are to protect our natural resource, agricultural and open space lands.

123-90

Despite the County's purported support of community and hamlet plans, most community and hamlet plans are woefully out of date or nonexistent. The County should prioritize the development and updating of community and hamlet plans. These plans be developed through an inclusive, democratic process that is open to all and fosters broad community participation and support for the plan.

123-91

PF-2.4 and PF 3.3 should therefore include a provision which reads: The County shall require that all Community/Hamlet Plans be prepared through a process which includes extensive public participation and outreach. To implement this provision, the County should develop guidelines for public participation and outreach that must be adhered to during the creation, implementation and update of community and hamlet plans. Important items to include in these guidelines:

|23-91  
cont'd

- The County shall hold meetings in the local community/hamlet in the evening so that residents can participate after work
- The County shall provide adequate notice of meetings in Spanish and English and post them in public areas of unincorporated communities and hamlets
- The County shall conduct meetings in both English and Spanish if at least 10% of the community/hamlet speaks predominantly Spanish
- All documents for public review shall be translated into Spanish if at least 10% of the community/hamlet speaks predominantly Spanish.

**2. Locate development (except that which is directly related to agriculture) within existing Development Boundaries, without loopholes or exceptions that allow for “leapfrog” new town or growth corridor development.**

|23-92

Locate new development according to these priorities:

- Renew and maintain existing urbanized areas
- Develop vacant land within urban areas that is already served by streets, water, sewer, and other public services
- When necessary to develop beyond the existing urban footprint, use land contiguous to existing development

Do not permit new urban development, other than replacement or redevelopment of existing urban uses in urban areas, in:

- Areas without current adequate public service and utility capacities or funded capital improvement plans
- Areas where the proposed project would result in significant adverse and unavoidable impacts to biological and/or agricultural resources; or
- Outside existing urban development boundaries, unless:
  - The County specifically finds that no suitable alternative site exists within the urban boundaries,

- The proposed project is otherwise consistent with all applicable General Plan goals and policies,
- The County can assure residents that the project will not be used as a precedent for future developments outside the development boundaries, and
- The project directly benefits the nearby communities.

I23-92  
cont'd

We suggest revisions to the following draft policies:

I23-93

*PF-1.2 Location of Urban Development*

*The County shall ensure that urban development takes place only within the following areas:*

1. *Within incorporated cities. As an exception to this policy, the County may consider proposals for urban development within UAB or UDB for cities if all of the following criteria are met. . .*

This policy contradicts Policy PF-4.4, which establishes that the cities are responsible for urban development within their UDBs; accordingly, development within an incorporated city should be approved only by the city itself.

The County should avoid creating pockets of low density, unincorporated development within or adjacent to cities. These unincorporated “islands” complicate and frustrate the provision of adequate infrastructure, law enforcement and other essential public facilities and services. Additionally, such development interferes with orderly, planned growth of the cities by creating inefficient, often low-density unincorporated “neighborhoods” incompatible with more efficient urban growth.

We suggest that PF-1.2 be revised to read:

*The County shall ensure that urban development only takes place in the following areas:*

- *Within incorporated cities, within the UDBs of adjacent cities in other counties, unincorporated communities and HDBs of hamlets* with the remainder of the policy deleted.

*PF-5.1 New Towns*

*The development of new communities should be discouraged, at least to the extent that haphazard attempts at community development away from established urban centers should be discouraged. However, should circumstances appear to justify development of a ‘planned’ community with its*

I23-94

*own complex of residential, commercial, industrial, public use areas and related facilities, it would have to be judged on its individual merits and functions as it would affect the area as a whole and other policies and proposals of the General Plan.*

123-94  
cont'd

Policy PF – 5.1 fundamentally undermines the Guiding Principles and other policies within the Planning Framework which emphasize directing growth into existing communities, and it directly contradicts the priorities of the citizens of Tulare County.

In effect, this provision encourages the building of entirely new towns by failing to establish any specific, measurable standards for when such a massive undertaking might be “justified” by unspecified and unlimited “circumstances” that “would have to be judged on its individual merits.” This vague language leaves the door to “leapfrog” development wide open.

While we recognize that there is a New Towns provision in the General Plan now being updated, the purpose of an Update is to revise the Plan to reflect changed needs and priorities. A New Towns provision is no longer needed or justified: planned communities can easily be accommodated within existing development boundaries, and Tulare County citizens don’t want to see more new towns. The County’s existing cities, communities and hamlets already offer more than enough land within their existing development boundaries to accommodate 50 years worth of growth at current densities;<sup>2</sup> more than that at higher density. Moreover, existing urban areas can more efficiently expand their infrastructure to support such growth at a much lower cost than would be required to establish entirely new roads, water and power systems, public safety facilities, schools, etc. The County’s existing urban areas should be permitted to grow and provide whatever “benefits” any new town could provide.

Instead, this proposed policy forces Tulare County’s cities, hamlets and communities to compete with undeveloped land for investment dollars. While infill development may be more of a challenge to developers, it can also be ultimately more rewarding, as property values rise as a result of their development. Infill development also benefits the entire community – not just a particular development – as older downtowns revitalize, attracting new businesses and good-paying jobs, and bringing much-needed revenue to improve aging infrastructure.

By inviting new town development, Tulare County is putting its existing communities at a competitive disadvantage and jeopardizing their chances of getting the investment they need. This growth-inducing policy will also invite sprawl; worsen air quality; increase traffic problems; accelerate loss of agricultural lands, wildlife habitat, open

---

<sup>2</sup> Tulare County General Plan “Policy Alternatives” August 2005

space, and scenic views; and result in higher costs and greater inefficiencies because of failure to utilize existing services, facilities, and infrastructure – to the detriment of the quality of life of all Tulare County residents.

123-94  
cont'd

If the County chooses to retain the New Towns provisions in the GPU, the DEIR must carefully examine the impact on the existing communities. As explained above, it is likely that creation of New Towns in Tulare County would result in significant adverse impacts on existing communities, many of which already suffer from lack of adequate infrastructure and public services. Moreover, the County must specifically define the conditions under which New Towns may be considered justified. The rules should be defined during the General Plan Update process, not tailor-made for each individual project at the time the project is proposed for approval.

**We recommend that this policy be removed altogether as there is simply NO NEED for, and County citizens have said they don't want to see the development of, entirely new towns.**

*LU-4.2 Big Box Development: The County shall limit the size of large, "big box," retail businesses on a case-by-case basis to be consistent with the character of the area.*

123-95

The County should adopt a uniform standard policy for "big box" development, which should be limited to cities and larger communities that serve a regional, rather than a local, population. Allowing case-by-case evaluation of proposed big box retail locations (which often take over formerly-agricultural land) outside of UDBs would be extremely growth-inducing, as additional retail and other development clusters and expands around the "anchor" location.

This policy should be revised to read: *The County shall approve large, "big box," retail businesses only within UDBs, and then only when they are consistent with the character of the area, the desires of the citizenry and the area's economic development plans.*

*LU-4.3 Commercial Service Locations: The County shall provide for commercial service businesses such as warehouses, repair services, business support services, furniture sales and building materials sales where they will not adversely affect surrounding properties, typically in areas serving occasional needs rather than day-to-day needs. Criteria to be used in siting commercial service areas are...*

123-96



These types of large commercial services belong within the UDBs of cities or communities, and should not be allowed in areas set aside for agriculture unless their service is directly related to agriculture. This policy should be revised to read:

123-96  
cont'd

*The County shall provide for non-agricultural commercial service businesses such as warehouses, repair services, business support services, furniture sales and building materials sales where they will not adversely affect surrounding properties, typically in areas serving occasional needs rather than day-to-day needs, and only within UDBs of communities.*

**3. Require (or incentivize) efficient development, within or contiguous to existing urbanized areas.**

123-97

- Work with cities, communities and other agencies (e.g., the Local Agency Formation Commission) to promote more efficient development
- Require minimum efficiency standards in higher density development
- Prioritize the redevelopment and reuse of existing urban cores, by creating incentives (e.g., density bonuses and/or tax incentives)
- Restrict the extension of urban services (sewer lines, water, roads, electricity, etc.) into areas not identified in adopted plans for contiguous urban growth
- Defer approval of development within incorporated cities' Spheres of Influence to city governments
- Adopt smart growth principles and provide policies prohibiting "leapfrog" developments

We suggest the following policy revisions and additions:

*New Policy: Efficient development in communities*

The County should add a new policy under PF-2 that establishes standards for land use efficiency within communities. These standards could be mandatory, and/or it could be linked to incentives such as mitigation requirements, impact fees, permit expediting, etc.

Such a policy has two benefits: (1) it will minimize the conversion of lands important for agriculture and natural resources by ensuring that every acre is used efficiently; and (2) efficient development fosters a built environment that is more conducive to economically sound development patterns, making communities more attractive to both investors and residents by emphasizing mixed-use, and promoting pedestrian, bicycle, and public transit services, which in turn enhance a feeling of community and overall quality of life.

*New Policy: Efficient Development in Hamlets*

|23-98

For the reasons stated directly above re PF-2, the County should also add a new policy under PF-3 that establishes standards for land use efficiency within hamlets. These standards could be mandatory, or it could be linked to incentives such as mitigation requirements, impact fees, permit expediting, etc.

*PF-4.1 UABs for Cities: The County shall establish UABs which define the area where land uses are presumed to have an impact upon the adjacent incorporated city, and within which the cities' concerns are to be given serious consideration as part of the land use review process. The lands within the UAB are considered to be the next logical area in which urban development may occur and the area within which UDBs may ultimately be expanded.*

|23-99

By requiring only that the County give "serious consideration" to cities' concerns regarding County-authorized development decisions in UABs, rather than setting concrete standards, this policy enables inefficient rural development in the path of urban growth, precluding the future orderly expansion of cities and encouraging the premature conversion of farmland, wildlife habitat and open space. In consideration of appropriate revenue sharing agreements, the County should not consider or approve development in the inevitable path of city growth. Lands outside the UDBs should remain rural, until such time as those lands are added to the UDB.

*PF-4.4 Planning in UDBs: The County acknowledges that the cities have primary responsibility for planning within their UDBs and are responsible for urban development and the provision of urban services within their UDBs.*

|23-100

We support this policy, recognizing that cities alone should be approving development within their UDBs; we commend this policy and recommend revising the contradictory policy in PF-1.2, which allows the County to approve development within the UDBs of cities.

*PF 4.6 Orderly Expansion of City Boundaries: The County shall encourage orderly outward expansion of urban development by supporting those city UDB expansion proposals where the city has demonstrated a need for additional territory after documenting a good faith effort to implement programs for infill development and/or increased efficiency of development and minimize conversion of agricultural lands.*

|23-101

This is a good policy that needs strengthening and clarification. The County should include implementation measures detailing specific efficiency standards or average densities that would have to be met before UDB expansion would be considered.

I23-101  
cont'd

However, in situations in which an underdeveloped hamlet can be serviced by a nearby incorporated city, and the citizens of the hamlet support such an effort, the County should work with the City to encourage annexation, even if it means creating irregular boundaries. These beneficial annexations, while not meeting the ultimate goal of concentric growth, would help meet the goals of providing adequate water and wastewater infrastructure to existing underserved populations and preserving prime agricultural lands.

*LU-1.1: Smart Growth and Healthy Communities; LU-1.2: Innovative Development; LU-1.3: Prevent Incompatible Uses; LU-1.4: Compact Development; LU- 1.8: Encourage Infill Development*

I23-102

These excellent policies are unfortunately rendered meaningless by the failure to make their provisions mandatory; they must be strengthened. We also recommend an additional policy: *Efficiency of land use*. This set of policies should inform the entire General Plan Update process. A GPU built around these smart-growth principles, the Awhahnee Principles, and/or the new LEED-ND standards would reduce the environmental impacts of a growing population, while ensuring a better future for Tulare County residents.

*Specific Plan Content (Policy LU 1.10): All specific plans prepared for projects in the unincorporated portions of the county must meet the requirements of state law and comprise five planning frameworks...*

I23-103

This policy states that all Specific Plans must comprise five planning frameworks: Land Use, Design, Circulation, Infrastructure/Public Facilities and Finance. Specific Plans should also include a Conservation/Open Space Framework, which addresses issues including, but not limited to, preservation of agricultural and open space lands and wildlife habitat; protection of water resources; energy and water efficiency; and air quality.

*LU-3.2 Clustering of Rural Development: The County shall encourage proposed residential development to be clustered onto portions of the site that are more suitable to accommodating the development, and shall require access either directly onto a public road or via a privately-maintained road designed to meet County road standards.*

I23-104

*ERM-1.3 Encourage Cluster Development: When reviewing development proposals, the County shall encourage cluster development in areas with moderate to high potential for sensitive habitat*

I23-104  
cont'd

We support the concept of clustering, which has been shown to minimize overall impacts of rural development when done properly. However, absent detailed guidelines for where and how and under what circumstances clustering should occur, such policies can cause unintended problems by creating isolated pockets of dense development without adequate provisions for circulation, fire protection and sewer, water and other public services. We recommend that the County develop a cluster ordinance that addresses issues including, but not limited to:

- Locational criteria requiring clustered development to be adjacent to existing development with adequate public services and facilities.
- Requirements for both maximum and minimum densities of clustered parcels;
- Procedures that ensure the permanent preservation of remainder portions of the property;
- Thresholds of significance for provision of shared services such as water and sewer, fire-safe design (i.e., defensible space and multiple access roads), and transportation improvements;
- In hillside areas, use of a slope-density formula to calculate the number of allowable clustered parcels.<sup>3</sup>
- In Foothill Agriculture zones, require additional dwelling units to be ancillary to the original agricultural operation and clustered in one area to avoid the parcelization of grazing lands.

*LU-3.5 Rural Residential Designations: The County shall not designate any new areas for rural residential development in the RVLPA area, unless it can be shown that other objectives such as buffers can be achieved.*

I23-105

Low-density development such as would be permitted under the current provision, (commonly termed “sprawl”), stresses water and wastewater infrastructure, encourages reliance on unmonitored groundwater resources, fragments wildlife habitat, and consumes open space – including important agricultural land. Such development also threatens the economic, social and political vibrancy of our existing communities because it draws residents and businesses away from our community centers. We

---

<sup>3</sup> Slope-density formulas are widely used by jurisdictions throughout California that allow development in hillside areas, in recognition of the fact that very steep slopes cannot safely support as much development as more gradual slopes due to geologic and fire hazards, and water, septic and road constraints. See Santa Clara County Code sections 2.20 and 5.45

suggest this policy be revised so that it reads: *The County shall not designate any new areas for rural residential development* with the remainder of the policy deleted.

I23-105  
cont'd

**4. Make community and hamlet development boundaries meaningful, long-term planning boundaries by firmly limiting the circumstances under which they can be expanded.**

I23-106

- Require a General Plan amendment for any proposed expansion of development boundaries, in addition to an amendment to the community or hamlet plan (if it has adopted one), including a well-advertised public hearing and comment period, held at times convenient for public participation.
- Focus on revitalization of existing urbanized areas before allowing greenfield development, especially in areas that lack adequate infrastructure and reliable water supplies.

We suggest the following policy revisions:

I23-107

*PF-2.2 Modification of Community UDB*

*1. The County may consider modification to a community UDB under the following circumstances:*

\*\*\*\*\*

- *A request for expansion can be applied for as part of a subdivision or Specific Plan proposal, or at the request of a special district or the community.*

*Notwithstanding the foregoing criteria, the County may consider modification to a community UDB if it is determined that the modification qualifies as a “regionally significant proposal,” which means that the proposal must demonstrate “special significance” to Tulare County based on any of the following factors:*

- The proposed land uses will be consistent with innovative land use planning and design principles in addition to those in this plan;*
- Significant habitat or agricultural resources will be addressed through on-site preservation or through the acquisition of off-site resources and/or fees in lieu thereof*

- iii. *Substantial financial benefits will be conferred on county wide operations; or*
- iv. *Any other relevant factor considered on a case-by-case basis*

I23-107  
cont'd

We support the concept of the UDB because it will attract economic investment and improve the quality of life in existing communities, while discouraging premature conversion of agricultural and natural resource lands. However, the UDB will be a useful tool only if it creates a real boundary that is enforced. The current language creates opportunities for the UDB to be changed anytime there is a subdivision proposal, or potential “financial benefits” to the county, or even “any other relevant factor considered on a case by case basis.” The result is that the Urban Development Boundary is no boundary at all. This provision should be revised completely to strengthen and uphold UDBs as meaningful planning tools.

We applaud the concept of drawing the boundaries in the context of a comprehensive community plan update, and we recommend that the policy be changed to state that modification of the UDB will be allowed only in the context of a comprehensive community plan update, or a community plan amendment and general plan amendment.

#### *PF-3.2 Modification of HDB-Hamlet*

I23-108

*The County may consider modification of a HDB under the following circumstances:*

- *A request for expansion can be applied for as part of a subdivision or specific plan proposal, or at the request of a special district or residents.*

Comments provided above in connection with PF-2.2, apply equally to this policy. PF-3.2 must likewise be completely revised to make the HDB a meaningful boundary.

#### **5. Discourage the conversion of agricultural lands to urban uses, and offset unavoidable impacts to agricultural lands and natural resource areas with mandatory mitigation measures such as conservation and agricultural easements.**

I23-109

Work with the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) and the incorporated cities to develop policies based on the following principles:

- Agricultural land shall not be annexed for non-agricultural purposes when feasible alternatives exist
- New development shall not be approved on prime agricultural lands unless the Board specifically finds that no feasible alternative sites exist to accommodate the proposed project and that the proposed project will fill an objectively identified need in the community
- The continued productivity and viability of agricultural land surrounding existing urbanized areas shall be promoted by preventing the conversion of agricultural land to other uses before an objective need has been found, and, to the extent feasible, by minimizing conflicts between agricultural and other land uses (e.g., by establishing adequate buffers, by enforcing Right to Farm measures, etc.)
- Division of agricultural lands shall not be permitted unless the Agricultural Commissioner / Sealer – Weights & Measures finds that the resulting parcels can be viably farmed.
- Water supplies that historically supported agricultural operations shall not be used to support residential or commercial development.

I23-109  
cont'd

Work with the cities and the Tulare County Association of Governments to establish a comprehensive agricultural land mitigation program, including specific mitigation ratios and triggers to ensure adequate offsets, based on the following principles:

- At least one acre of equivalent agricultural land must be permanently preserved as mitigation for each acre of agricultural land changed to a non-agricultural zoning classification (1:1 ratio)
- Each acre of agricultural or other land proposed as mitigation for the potential loss of an equivalent acre must be proven equivalent in terms of: soil quality, water supply adequacy, proximity to the subject site, and other relevant factors
- The division of agricultural land shall not be permitted unless the resulting parcels can support viable agricultural operations

We suggest the following policy revisions:

I23-110

*AG-1.4 Williamson Act in UDBs and HDBs: The County shall support non-renewal or cancellation processes for lands within UDBs and HDBs.*

County should develop a minimum land use efficiency standard that must be adhered to in exchange for supporting Williamson Act cancellations and non-renewals in HDBs and UDBs.

In addition, we propose that this provision be amended to read: *The County shall support landowner-initiated non-renewal or cancellation processes for lands within UDBs and HDBs.*

I23-111

Contracts for lands within UDBs are currently reviewed every five (5) years to determine whether any community is unduly restrained in its growth by the existence of an agriculture preserve. The County initiates the non-renewal process if a property is found to be inhibiting urban growth, and the contract is allowed to lapse at the end of its term. This existing procedure is more than adequate to protect the interests of both the urban community and the agricultural user. The proposed amendment to AG-1.4 would ensure that Williamson Act contracts on land within UDBs or HDBS are not earlier cancelled or non-renewed unless requested by the landowner, thus preventing premature conversion of land from agricultural to other uses before the natural expansion of the urban center would require it, and simply because the land had become enveloped by a UDB or HDB.

*AG-1.12 Ranchettes: The County shall discourage the creation of ranchettes in areas designated Valley Agriculture and Foothill Agriculture.*

I23-112

We support the concept of limiting ranchette development, but this policy has no supporting implementation measure, which renders it meaningless. We suggest that this policy be revised to read: *The County shall not allow the creation of ranchettes in areas designated Valley Agriculture and Foothill Agriculture.*

*ERM-1.2 Development in Environmentally Sensitive Areas: The County shall limit development within areas that contain a moderate to high potential for sensitive habitat, and direct development into less significant habitat areas. Development in natural habitats shall be controlled so as to minimize erosion and maximize beneficial vegetative growth.*

I23-113

This is a good policy, but it lacks specific, detailed measures to identify or to ensure that environmentally sensitive areas are protected, and it fails to provide for mitigation for destruction of these lands. Moreover, it is not clear what is meant by “limit”. In addition to establishing a standard by which an area’s potential for sensitive habitat and communities can be evaluated, the policy should be revised as follows:

*ERM-1.2: Development in Environmentally Sensitive Areas: The County shall prohibit, restrict, or modify proposed development in areas that contain essential habitat for special status species, sensitive natural communities, and wetlands and riparian habitats as necessary to ensure the continued health and survival of these species and sensitive areas. Approved development projects*



shall be modified to avoid impacts to these resources to the maximum extent feasible.

I23-113  
cont'd

If habitat cannot be preserved, the County shall require developers of these resources to preserve at least one acre of land with comparable or greater resource value for every acre developed. The preservation of resource land shall be accomplished by purchasing the land in fee and dedicating a permanent conservation easement to a local non-profit land conservation organization; by dedicating a permanent easement over a portion of the property to be developed (generally on the edges of natural communities); or by paying a fee that will allow land with comparable resource values to be purchased and maintained by a local land conservation organization.

*ERM-5.15 Open Space Preservation: The County shall preserve natural open space resources through the concentration of development in existing communities, use of cluster development techniques, maintaining large lot sizes in agricultural areas, avoiding conversion of lands currently used for agricultural production, limiting development in areas constrained by natural hazards, and encouraging agricultural and ranching interests to maintain natural habitat in open space areas where the terrain or soil is not conducive to agricultural production.*

I23-114

This is a good policy, but the implementation measures identified are inadequate. A number of tools, both voluntary and mandatory, are available to assist the County and landowners in preserving open space. For example, a transfer of development rights program, or TDR, that creates an economic incentive for landowners to protect open space by selling their development rights to a developer in an area where development is appropriate. In exchange, that developer is able to increase the density of development on his or her project. Such an implementation measure might look like:

TDR Program. Establish a Transfer of Development Rights program to achieve effective protection of open space and agricultural lands and maintain viability of existing agricultural operations and conservation of habitat and watershed lands. The County in collaboration with local non-profits will seek funding to prepare and implement a TDR program including the following:

- a) Evaluate the potential for donor and receiver sites within the unincorporated county as well as consider the feasibility of potential receiver sites within incorporated cities and unincorporated communities in Tulare County.

- b) Establish criteria to identify donor and receiver sites, and recommend procedures for the resale and transfer of purchased residential development rights
- c) Evaluate the feasibility of utilizing existing non-profit entities to administer or participate in an expanded program.
- d) The program should be prepared by qualified consultants with expertise in developing and implementing TDR programs.

I23-114  
cont'd

Other tools include transfer of development rights to, or participation in, conservation programs offered through the California Rangeland Trust, the California Rangeland Conservation Coalition, and other agricultural or environmental groups.

**6. Provide strong, clear policies with concrete, enforceable implementation measures that include definite timeframes, funding sources, and departments in charge of monitoring and enforcement.**

I23-115

The draft GPU provides future elected officials with too little real guidance, and the people of Tulare County with too little assurance, that their vision for the County's future will be protected. We need a General Plan with strong, clear, enforceable policies and concrete, trackable, timely implementation measures.

The GPU states that a policy is "a statement that guides a specific course of action for decision-makers to achieve a desired goal. The County has strived to develop clear and unambiguous policies." The Goals and Policies Report (GPR) goes on to state that the GPR is the "essence" of the General Plan and that it "identifies a full set of implementation measures that will ensure the goals and policies in the General Plan will be carried out." Finally, the GPR states that an implementation measure is "a specific measure, program, procedure, or technique that carries out plan policies" and that "Implementation measures should describe actions that are concrete and measurable so their completion can be easily monitored in annual reports."

Unfortunately, the GPU fails to meet its own standards in many respects. Many of the policies are far from specific, clear, and unambiguous, and many have no identified corresponding implementation measures. Many of the implementation measures that are provided are so vague as to be neither measurable nor enforceable; many state that they are "new," yet indicate for their timeline that they are "ongoing," so that one cannot determine whether they are supposedly already being implemented (in which case the date of actual implementation should be shown) or when one could expect them to be in force; others are scheduled to be commenced so far in the future that it is doubtful that

much in the way of meaningful outcomes can be made to result from them within the life of the General Plan.

I23-115  
cont'd

Below are a few examples:

*LU-7.13: The County shall encourage preservation of buildings and areas with special and recognized historic, architectural, or aesthetic value. New development should respect architecturally and historically significant buildings and areas.*

I23-116

“Encourage” is not a clear, unambiguous, specific course of action, as required by the GPU’s earlier definition of a policy. The Implementation Measure (#23) states: *The County shall cooperate with local preservation groups and community property owners who identify historic buildings . . . to encourage perpetuation of identified architectural characteristics in new proposed development . . . within the same viewshed as the historic building.* This is set forth as a New Program, but the timeframe is shown as “Ongoing.”

This Implementation Measure is simply not “a specific measure, program, procedure, or technique,” nor is it concrete or measurable, as prescribed by the GPR’s definition of an implementation measure. How does one measure or enforce “encourage,” “should,” and “cooperate?” The policy to “encourage” is to be implemented by a measure requiring the County to “cooperate” with others to “encourage.” The goal behind this policy is admirable, but neither the policy nor its implementation measure can possibly ensure achievement of the desirable goal.

*LU-7.15: The County shall encourage the use of solar power and energy conservation building techniques in all new development.*

I23-117

This policy’s Implementation Measure (#24) says “*The County shall review LEED and LEED-ND certification requirements and develop an implementation program.*” This review is timed to start sometime between 2010-2015. Again, the policy (“encourage”) is in no way a statement of a clear, unambiguous, specific course of action, and the implementation measure (“develop . . . a program”) is far from being a concrete, measurable, specific measure, program, procedure, or technique. Given the urgency of global warming and the need to comply with AB32, not to mention the County’s severe air and water problems, and also given the abundance of jurisdictions which have already adopted and implemented LEED standards, the County must do much more than merely “encourage” use of solar power and energy conservation building techniques, and the requirement to do so should commence well before 2010.

Unfortunately, these examples are typical of the GPU's policies and implementation measures: vague, ambiguous, and not measurable. Thus, the policies and implementation measures cannot be relied on to achieve the goals of the GPU, to effect the DEIR's mitigation measures, nor to implement the selected DEIR Alternative.

I23-117  
cont'd

### **Analysis of the General Plan Update and Draft Environmental Impact Report**

#### **Mandatory General Plan Requirements**

California Government Code contains certain concrete and specific requirements for general plans. Some of the key provisions of state law as it relates to Tulare County General Plan Update are listed below:

I23-118

##### **Land Use**

The Land Use Element (LUE) designates the general distribution and location and extent of the uses of the land for housing, business, industry, etc. Gov. C §65302(a). The LUE must include a "statement of standards of population density and building intensity recommended" for the all areas covered by the General Plan. Id.

I23-119

##### **Housing**

The General Plan Housing Element (HE) must identify and analyze existing and projected housing needs and to state "goals, policies, quantified objectives, financial resources, and scheduled programs for the preservation, improvement and development of housing." Gov. C. §65883. The HE must identify adequate sites for housing, and must make adequate provision for existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the community. Id. The HE must include an assessment of housing needs and an inventory of resources and constraints relevant to meeting those needs. Gov. C. §65883(a). This means that the Tulare County General Plan must include an honest and objective assessment of the County's of need for additional housing and the availability of resources (e.g. water supplies, wastewater treatment capacity, circulation infrastructure, etc.) to meet the anticipated needs.

I23-120

Based on its conclusions regarding the County's future housing needs, the County must designate areas that are best suited to meeting that need. In so doing, the County must critically consider availability of resources (e.g. water supplies, sewer treatment capacity, infrastructure, etc.), the priority goals of protection of natural and agricultural resources, and land use patterns.

The HE does not contain an adequate analysis of the County's anticipated housing needs.

##### **Conservation**

I23-121

The Conservation Element (CE) must analyze and devise policies for the conservation, development and utilization of natural resources. Gov. C. §65302(d). The CE must consider the effects of the growth and development proposed by the LUE on natural resources. There is no indication that the CE has or will include the kind and extent of analysis of the General Plan as is required by the Gov. Code.

I23-121  
cont'd

State law further requires that the portion of the conservation element addressing water must be developed in coordination with any countywide water agency and with all district and city agencies, including flood management, water conservation, or groundwater agencies that have developed, served, controlled, managed, or conserved water of any type for any purpose in the county or city for which the plan is prepared. Id.

Here, it does not appear that the amendments to the CE have been developed in coordination with water agencies to the extent required by the Code.

#### Open Space

State law also requires the County to include an Open Space Element (OSE) to ensure “the continued availability of land for the production of food fiber, for the enjoyment of scenic beauty, for recreation and for the use of natural resources.” Gov. C. §65561(a).

I23-122

The legislature declared that:

“The anticipated increase in the population of the state demands that cities, counties, and the state at the earliest possible date make definite plans for the preservation of valuable open space land and take positive action to carry out such plans by the adoption and strict administration of laws, ordinances, rules and regulations as authorized.” Gov. C. §65561(e).

The legislature adopted the requirement for an OSE to ensure that the County “will prepare and carry out open-space plans which, along with state and regional open-space plans, will accomplish the objectives of a comprehensive open-space program.” Gov. C. §65562(b). The OSE must include an action plan containing specific programs that the County intends to pursue to implement its open-space plan. Gov. C. §65564.

It does not appear that the County’s OSE, even with the proposed updates, meets the requirements of the Government Code. The OSE does not contain specific measures or an “action plan” for implementation of concrete preservation goals and objectives.

#### **Project Description**

The DEIR states that although the General Plan contains policies to control the amount and location of growth, “it does not solidly advocate, promote or represent any one

I23-123

development scenario because any attempt to predict the exact pace and locations of future market-driven growth is considered speculative” (EIR 2-9).

123-123  
cont'd

The following passage in the DEIR (ES-5) further reveals the passive nature of the proposed General Plan Update: “Approximately 75% of the population growth is expected to occur within the Urban Development Boundaries of incorporated cities throughout the County. The remaining population growth will be directed towards unincorporated communities, hamlets and development corridors.”

These statements suggest that the principal purpose of the General Plan update is to accommodate and absorb population growth wherever the market drives it, rather than direct growth in areas that do not conflict with the goal of preserving Tulare County’s farm lands, scenery and other natural resources.

The County may not abdicate its responsibility to chart a logical and appropriate path for the County’s future growth and prosperity on the theory that growth is driven purely by market forces that are wholly unpredictable and not subject to government control. Both state law and good planning principles require the County, in consideration of the will of the people and their needs, to chart a course for the future of the County.

### **Critique of Land Use Policies**

Proposed Policy PF2.2 (modification of Community UDB) provides that *a request for expansion [of a community UDB] can be applied for as part of a subdivision map or specific plan proposal, or at the request of a special district or the community*. As proposed, this policy essentially reduces to a nullity Policy PF-2 which purports to limit urban development to the area within the designated UDB for each community. This policy would encourage disorderly development outside UDBs without regard to existence of alternative sites with the community UDB, or any objective community need for the proposed project. Applications for projects outside the community UDB should be prohibited out right, or at a minimum be allowed only if the County finds that there is a demonstrable need for the proposed project, that no alternative sites exist within the community or neighboring communities to accommodate the project, and that the project would not result in significant adverse impacts on biological or agricultural resources.

123-124

PF-2.2 also provides that the County may consider a modification of the UDB if the modification qualifies as a regionally significant proposal. It is not clear whether the criteria set forth in the proposed policy apply to individual projects, or whether projects that are not regionally significant may not be the subject of a request for modification of the UDB. This must be clarified.

As the DEIR notes, most community plans in Tulare are out of date. The General Plan should include a mandate that proposals for UDB expansion shall not be approved unless and until the community plan has been updated. Without such a mandate, it is likely that communities will continue to grow, not subject to a comprehensive plan that takes into account community needs and resources, but based on financial speculation and not in an orderly manner.

123-124  
cont'd

Policy PF-3.2, like PF 2.2, contains a provision pursuant to which a request for expansion of a Hamlet Development Boundary (HDB) can be made as part of a subdivision or specific plan proposal. Comments above relevant to PF2.2 apply equally to Policy 3.2.

GPU policy (PF-5.1) retains the language regarding consideration of new town development in Tulare County:

123-125

*The development of new communities should be discouraged at least to the extent that haphazard attempts at community development away from established urban centers should be discouraged. However, should circumstances appear to justify development of a “planned” community.....it would have to be judged on its individual merits and functions as it would affect the area as a whole and other policies and proposals of the General Plan.*

In regard to any “circumstances that appear to justify development of a planned community,” the revised DEIR must disclose whether land outside of existing urban and hamlet boundaries is required to meet growth projections contained in the draft General Plan Update. In answering this question, the revised DEIR must reference a study prepared by Tulare County consultants, which found that over 950,000 people could be accommodated within existing development boundaries, and that over 826,000 people could be accommodated within the development boundaries of the incorporated cities alone (Tulare County General Plan “Policy Alternatives,” p. 9).

If, as Tulare County’s consultants have concluded, all projected population growth in Tulare County can be accommodated within existing urban growth boundaries, the revised DEIR must disclose the specific need to retain policies in the General Plan Update that would allow for new town development. Since existing development boundaries have more than enough capacity to absorb the population of 621,000 people projected in the General Plan Update, in what way would any new town development be justified by current or projected growth circumstances?

The GPU should further explain and define the “circumstances that appear to justify development of a planned community.” The GPU should set forth specific objectives

and guidelines to better explain the circumstances that can justify the approval of a new community. Without a more concrete definition and guidelines, a clever planner can explain why a given new planned community is justified by any set of circumstances. To fulfill its legal mandate to serve as the constitution of the County, the General Plan must give the residents of Tulare County a much better idea of the circumstances which would justify the creation of a new community.

123-125  
cont'd

### **Critique of the DEIR**

The DEIR fails to meet CEQA requirements in every resource section, lacks baseline measurements, and fails to disclose, analyze or mitigate GPU impacts.

123-126

The DEIR lacks any meaningful baseline measurements, without which the impact analysis is fatally flawed. As a preliminary matter, CEQA requires the EIR to describe the baseline environmental conditions against which the impacts of the project will be measured.

For example, the DEIR fails to provide baseline information on the location of different classifications of farm land, current air quality and related health conditions, existing groundwater supplies, peak hour traffic conditions and current vehicle trips, special-status species or their habitats, scenic resources, water quality, etc. The lack of baseline measurements means that the public and Tulare County decision-makers have no basis to analyze and assess the significance of the environmental impacts that will be caused by the GPU.

The DEIR consistently fails to provide a quantified, objective analysis of the significant impacts that would be generated by the GPU. Instead, thinly supported, general impact assessments are put forth with little description, with the conclusion that 31 impacts are significant and unavoidable. The DEIR lacks any form of analysis to evaluate the significance of a particular impact compared with current conditions.

The DEIR also consistently fails to suggest feasible mitigation measures that could plausibly reduce the severity of likely impacts.

Both the General Plan Update and the DEIR, therefore, must be revised to provide the public and decision-makers more specific information about where development will and won't be allowed, agricultural, natural resource, scenic, historical and other areas that will and will not be protected, the full set of associated specific and cumulative environmental impacts compared with baseline conditions, and mitigation measures sufficient to reduce the significance of those impacts.

123-127



The revised DEIR must describe the monitoring, mitigation and enforcement program that will be used for each of the identified impacts. The revised DEIR must provide as much detail on all of these programs as possible, including analysis and justification where the DEIR claims proposed mitigation measures will sufficiently or effectively offset significant adverse effects of the GPU. We ask that particular attention be paid to impacts that affect ecosystem functions, human health, wildlife habitat and agricultural resources.

123-127  
cont'd

The analysis requested above must include a discussion of any relevant empirical data which the County contends supports the choice of mitigation measures. Other important evidence includes but is not limited to case studies, studies, articles, books and other that can support the choice and the analysis of the efficacy of the proposed mitigation measures.

The DEIR does not address the enforcement mechanisms that the County intends to utilize to ensure that the mitigation measures adopted by the County will be implemented. What are the consequences for failure to implement mitigation measures? What will happen if the proposed mitigation measures prove to be ineffective in reducing significant adverse impacts of development?

#### AGRICULTURE

Tulare County contains some of the most fertile and productive farmlands in California, making this County one of the most agriculturally productive counties in the state, if not the world. Our history is founded on agriculture; agriculture influences our culture and drives our economy.

123-128

The DEIR lists as one of the General Plan's guiding principles: "Protect the County's important agricultural resources and scenic natural lands from urban encroachment." Yet the first impact analyzed in the DEIR, AG-1, states that the "General Plan Update could result in the substantial conversion of important farmland to non-agricultural uses."

The DEIR fails to provide specific information about the extent and location of farmland conversion that could occur. Instead, the DEIR again offers only a vague projection of the amount of future development that would occur on agricultural lands, which would be dependent upon the whims of the marketplace, rather than by clearly defined growth boundaries or mandatory polices to protect farmland.

The DEIR states (3-6):

*Although these future population distribution patterns form one of the key assumptions behind the General Plan Update, the specific location as to where this development would occur within these unincorporated communities is*

123-129

*currently not known and would only be available as future development proposals are brought forward for consideration by the County. Consequently, the specific impacts to existing or future agricultural resources cannot be quantified at this time. Because of this uncertainty, this analysis assumes that future growth and development within the County would result in some limited conversion of existing agricultural resources to developed uses.*

I23-129  
cont'd

A revised and re-circulated DEIR must provide specific information about the amount and the location of farmland in all categories (farmland of statewide importance, prime farmland, grazing land) that would be converted or be at risk of being converted to non-agricultural uses under the General Plan Update at build-out. The build-out scenario should assume that development is conducted at the maximum level of intensity and density that would be allowed by the proposed land use designations, new town, transportation development corridors and other provisions in the Draft GPU.

If the County contends that the maximum build-out scenario is unlikely, in addition to the maximum build-out scenario, the GPU and the revised DEIR could include a “likely build-out” scenario to explain the level of build-out that the County believes will likely result. Of course, such a scenario should be adequately justified with reference to factors that the County believes are likely to result in less than a maximum build-out.

Without disclosing the full extent of potential farm land conversion that would be allowed by the GPU, the DEIR fails to achieve a core CEQA requirement to disclose and analyze project impacts.

#### Agricultural Mitigation Measures

The DEIR offers a number of mitigation measures to offset the potentially “substantial” loss of farm lands designed to “promote the conservation of agricultural resources.” The DEIR fails to disclose how these measures would actually protect farmland from conversion to urban uses should a “market-driven” proposal for a subdivision or other development be proposed. A revised DEIR should disclose whether these provisions offer any substantive protection against farmland conversion to developed uses.

I23-130

AG policy 1.6 (3-9) calls for the development of an Ag Conservation Easement Program to help protect and preserve agricultural lands within the County. This mitigation measure is poorly defined and is not reasonably crafted to ensure it will be effective. Because it is open-ended and absent any deadlines for the creation of the Program, AG Policy 1.6 may not be effective in mitigating the loss of a substantial amount of AG lands that could result from implementation of the General Plan Amendments.

To be effective, the GPU must set specific deadlines and milestones for the creation of the Program to ensure its timely implementation. Moreover, the GPU must contain a prohibition against approving projects that would result in loss of agricultural lands

until and unless the Program is in place, unless the County requires alternative mitigation measures in lieu of taking part in the Program.

I23-130  
cont'd

AG Policy 1.6 is also inadequate in that it does not contain specific and well defined guidelines for acquisition of agricultural conservation easements. The type of details that must be defined by the General Plan include the appropriate ratio of agricultural land to mitigation land, the type of amenities that mitigation lands must possess, location criteria for the mitigation lands, etc. Unless these important details are worked out during the environmental review program, it would be impossible to determine at this stage whether the Program proposed by AG Policy 1.6 could effectively and adequately mitigate the conversion of agricultural lands the GPU will undoubtedly foster.

#### Williamson Act Contracts

Cancellation of a Williamson Act contract requires elected officials to make a number of mandatory findings. The DEIR must be revised and re-circulated to include a description of the findings necessary to cancel Williamson Act contracts.

I23-131

Similarly, the DEIR must be revised to include an estimate of the number of acres of farmland currently protected by Williamson Act contracts, including a break down by land type, type of crop, and identify (by geographic area or other criteria) of the farmland that is most likely to be subject to cancellation of Williamson Act contracts to accommodate development as a result of the adoption of the GPU. These calculations should be based on a maximum density and intensity of development scenario within each land use designation.

The revised DEIR should include maps showing the current distribution of Williamson Act contracts and agricultural preserves by land type and crop, and a map depicting agricultural preserves and Williamson Act-protected acreage impacted at build-out of the GPU, at maximum allowed development intensity and density.

The revised DEIR must describe the impact that cancellation of Williamson Act contracts would have on adjacent agricultural properties. The revised DEIR should include an analysis of whether the findings in support of cancellation of Williamson Act contracts can be made by the County.

#### Indirect Impacts

DEIR Impact AG-3 describes the significant and unavoidable indirect impacts from urban development allowed by the GPU that would be accrue in areas currently identified as important farmland. These impacts include increased costs to agricultural operations, rising land values for residential development, again encouraging

I23-132

conversion of additional important farmland to urban uses. Again, the DEIR fails to provide specific information about the extent and location of farmland conversion that could occur.

I23-132  
cont'd

A revised and re-circulated DEIR must specify the amount, location of farmland in all categories (farmland of statewide importance, prime farmland, grazing land) that would be converted or be at risk of being converted to non-agricultural uses due to the indirect effects described in GPU Impact AG-3 at build-out, assuming that development is conducted at the maximum level of intensity and density that would be allowed by the proposed land use designations, new town and transportation corridor and other provisions in the Draft GPU.

The GPU and DEIR must be revised to include policies that would replace the current weak, permissive, ambiguous and unenforceable plan language with specific, mandatory, strong, enforceable policies to actually achieve the GPU's stated goal of: "Protect[ing] the County's important agricultural resources and scenic natural lands from urban encroachment."

TCCRG has provided specific policy recommendations as part of a proposed "Healthy Growth Alternative" later in this document under the heading "Alternatives to the General Plan."

### SCENIC LANDSCAPES

As explained above, state law requires the County General Plan to include concrete plans, laws and implementation programs to identify and preserve scenic resources. The County's General Plan, as updated, does not meet this mandate. Instead, the General Plan Open Space Element contains vague goals and policies that give the County decision makers much discretion to analyze projects on a case by case basis. Without specific maps, plans and guidelines, and mandatory requirement for all development projects and zoning decisions to conform to these plans and guidelines, future growth and development will likely result in adverse impact to the County's open space and biologically sensitive lands.

I23-133

For example, Policy SL-1 (intended to protect and feature the beauty of the County's views of working and natural landscapes) requires the County to "as appropriate, require new development to not significantly impact or block views of Tulare County landscapes." This goal, along with others that are similarly worded, will not effectively protect natural resources and viewsheds.

The County Open Space Element violates state law because it does not contain include specific plans for preservation of specific open space lands.

*Impact SL-1: The General Plan Update would substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality in areas of the County.*

I23-133  
cont'd

*The DEIR states: ...it is assumed that some new development (i.e., new residential, commercial, or infrastructure-related, etc.) resulting from population growth associated with the General Plan Update would result in changes to existing views within the County's communities, hamlets, or rural areas. As a portion of this new development could be proposed on land currently used for a variety of rural residential, agricultural, and open space uses, new development would alter the existing open space views of surrounding visible areas and contrast with the surrounding open space/agricultural environment at the edge of these new development areas. Consequently, even with implementation of the below mentioned policies and implementation measure, this impact is still considered potentially significant.*

Similar to its inadequate analysis of the specific impacts of the GPU on agriculture, the DEIR fails to provide specific information about the extent and location of development on scenic open space lands that could result from the implementation of the GPU.

The DEIR forecasts that only "a portion" of new development would occur on land currently in open space. This claim is not substantiated with reference to evidence in the record. The EIR should be revised to include a more thorough explanation for this claim. On the other hand, if this claim is not supported by substantial evidence, it must be stricken from the EIR.

A revised and re-circulated DEIR must specify the amount and location of scenic open space that would be converted or be at risk of being converted to development uses at build-out of the GPU, assuming that development is conducted at the maximum level of intensity and density that would be allowed by the proposed land use designations, including new town, transportation corridor and other provisions.

I23-134

The revised DEIR must describe the scenic impacts caused by road widening, traffic and related pollution that obscures scenic views, new power lines, light and glare and the myriad other ways in which scenic landscapes would be cluttered with residential, commercial, and resort development under the GPU at build-out.

The revised DEIR must analyze policies that would avoid or minimize the sort of rural residential sprawl development that would destroy agriculture, open space and scenic views, including policies that locate all development to within existing UDBs and HDBs and require compact, efficient development, expanding in concentric circles from existing urban areas.

TCCRG has provided a set of recommendations for protecting scenic landscapes in a later section detailing our proposed “Healthy Growth Alternative.”

123-134  
cont'd

*Impact SL-3: The GPU would create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in areas of the County.*

The DEIR States (4-9) : ... *new development resulting from population growth anticipated as part of the General Plan Update would increase the amount of light and glare associated with the development of urban uses, such as additional parking lots, building lights, and streetlights within areas that currently have no light or minimal amounts of light and glare. While the types of lighting and their specific locations are not specified at this point, development proposed under the General Plan Update would increase the amount of spill light and glare onto adjacent areas.*

The revised DEIR must provide baseline conditions by documenting the size and location of areas of the county that currently enjoy night views that currently have no light or a minimal amount of light and glare. The DEIR should describe the current view of the night sky from current and proposed urban development areas in the County.

The revised DEIR must then specify the total amount and location of areas that currently have dark night skies that would be negatively impacted by spill light and glare at build-out of the GPU, assuming that development is conducted at the maximum level of intensity and density that would be allowed by the proposed land use designations, development of new towns, transportation development corridors, and other provisions.

#### BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

*Impact ERM-1: The GPU could have a substantial adverse effect, directly and through habitat modification, on many fish or wildlife species including those officially designated species identified as endangered, threatened, candidate, sensitive or special status species...*

123-135

This impact is assessed as significant and unavoidable.

The DEIR states: Sensitive vegetation communities or habitats in the County include Northern Hardpan Vernal Pool, Valley Saltbrush Scrub, Central Valley Drainage Hardhead/Squawfish Stream, and Blue Ridge Ecological Reserve (Condor Habitat). Within these sensitive habitat areas, a number of sensitive plant and wildlife species are known to occur or have the potential to occur in the County.”

The DEIR fails to describe or map the location of the sensitive vegetation communities or habitats, or to list or map a single sensitive plant or wildlife species that reside in

those habitats. Again, the DEIR fails to describe the baseline condition against which impacts of the proposed GPU could be realistically assessed, failing a crucial requirement of CEQA. The revised DEIR must address this failure by surveying and mapping the location of sensitive vegetation communities or habitats, along with resident endangered, threatened, candidate, sensitive or special status wildlife species and sensitive plant species. A thorough biological study must be conducted and documented, using approved and up-to-date protocols. The revised DEIR must disclose the survey methods used to conduct biological assessments.

I23-135  
cont'd

The revised DEIR should reference the “Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley,” adopted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in 1998, and discuss ways in which the proposed GPU is consistent with, or contradictory to, the findings and recommendations of the report.

I23-136

The DEIR describes in a general way the myriad negative impacts that could be caused to sensitive habitats, plants and species by the GPU: *...the General Plan Update will allow for the introduction of development (predominately agricultural land uses) into largely undisturbed areas. Such construction has the potential to result in a significant impact on sensitive habitats, individual plants, and wildlife species. The primary impact will be the potential for removal of sensitive habitats for building pad development and the construction of buildings, infrastructure and roadways. Additional impacts will result from a continued increased incidence of fire due to human activity, increased erosion from roadways, and the introduction of non-native weed species. The introduction of developed land uses will also result in the elimination of habitat and food resources for wildlife through the removal of vegetative communities. The introduction of new sources of light and glare could affect nesting habitat and migratory corridors. These effects may be particularly pronounced for wildlife species with low tolerance for habitat modification or disturbance, especially some riparian bird and reptile species.*

Again the DEIR has failed to disclose or map the location and extent of effects from development that would be allowed by the proposed GPU. A revised DEIR must specify and map the total size and location of development that could be introduced into currently undisturbed areas by the GPU, resulting in the removal of sensitive habitats and vegetative communities. Similarly, the revised DEIR must quantify the size and location of negative impacts to sensitive species that would be caused by increased fire risk, erosion, introduction of non-native weed species, light glare, the introduction of thousands of domestic pets, and other effects of development allowed under the GPU. These impact analyses must assume that development is conducted at the maximum level of intensity and density that would be allowed by the proposed land use

designations, including new town, transportation corridor and other provisions proposed in the GPU.

I23-136  
cont'd

*Impact ERM-2: The General Plan Update could have a substantial adverse effect on the riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.*

I23-137

The DEIR states: *As more fully described above under Impact ERM-1, development resulting from implementation of the General Plan Update may result in both direct and indirect significant adverse impacts to riparian and other sensitive natural communities occurring in the County.*

The DEIR fails to describe, survey or map the location of riparian, forest, oak woodlands, wetlands or vernal pool habitats, or to list a list a single plant or wildlife species that resides in those habitats. The revised DEIR must correct this by mapping the location and size of riparian, forest, oak woodlands, wetlands or vernal pool habitats, along with an inventory of resident endangered, threatened, candidate, sensitive or special status wildlife species and sensitive plant species.

A revised DEIR must specify and map the total amount and location of development that could be introduced into currently undisturbed areas by the GPU, resulting in the removal of riparian, forest, oak woodlands, wetlands, and vernal pool habitats. The DEIR must disclose the wildlife and plant species that would be negatively impacted by development of these habitat areas.

The impacts of new structures and roadways extend far beyond their physical location. Native species have reduced survival and reproduction rates near homes and roadways. The zone from which an ecological impact of houses and roads is seen on plant and wildlife communities is termed the “Disturbance Zone,” and can stretch several hundred meters around buildings and roads. When including disturbance zones in the calculation for development impacts, the area of impact increases greatly. The revised DEIR should include disturbance zones in its evaluation of cumulative impacts on native wildlife, wildlife habitat and plant species.

The revised DEIR must fully disclose and describe all potential impacts to riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities caused by the diversion of water, loss of groundwater recharge areas, diminishment of groundwater resources, lowering of water tables, and related effects of development facilitated by the GPU.

#### Oak Woodlands

I23-138



Tulare County is blessed with one of the largest expanses of blue oak woodland in California. Tulare County's oak woodlands are some of the most visible and magnificent features of the county. They help make Tulare County unique, and give us a sense of place.

123-138  
cont'd

Oak woodland runs through the foothills of Tulare County, covering a vast, relatively uninterrupted landscape. Most of our blue oak woodlands are also working landscapes – doubling as habitat for wildlife and grazing land for ranchers. The oak woodland ecosystem provides a home to more than 200 plant species and 300 vertebrate wildlife species<sup>4</sup>, including mountain lion, mule deer, and raptors, which depend on a large, interconnected ecosystem to maintain viable populations.

The revised DEIR should acknowledge that Valley Oak and Blue Oak woodlands are two of the most threatened ecosystems in the state. The revised DEIR should evaluate the extent to which the proposed GPU at build-out would divide the current range of blue oak woodland into fragments. The DEIR must disclose all potential impacts, including the possible disturbance or disruption of the north-south gene flow of blue oak woodland species and disturbance or interruption of migration patterns of any wildlife and bird species.

The DEIR must describe the way in which the GPU would comply with California Senate Bill 1334, an oak woodland protection bill passed into law in 2005.

123-139

*GPU Policy ERM 1.12 Management of Oak Woodland Communities: The County shall support the conservation and management of oak woodland communities and their habitats.” This mitigation measure would attempt to offset the conversion of oak woodlands destroyed by development by planting new oaks elsewhere. (ERM, IM 16) This mitigation measure is premised on the assumption that a newly planted oak can offset the destruction of a mature tree. The two aren’t remotely equivalent. The revised DEIR should acknowledge that planting young saplings is not an adequate mitigation measure for destruction of mature or old growth trees, and forests.*

We applaud the County for considering developing an oak woodland management plan in order to qualify for funding under the Oak Woodlands Conservation Act of 2001. However, the County should commit to developing this management plan, rather than simply agreeing to assemble stakeholders to assess the feasibility of such a program.

---

<sup>4</sup> Standiford, R.B., J. Klein, and B. Garrison. 1996. Sustainability of Sierra Nevada hardwood rangelands. In: Status of the Sierra Nevada: Volume III Sierra Nevada Ecosystem Project Report. Pages 637-680. UC Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources. Wildland Resources Center Report No. 38

The DEIR states (4-16): *The policies ERM-1.1 through 1.8 and 1.12 require the County to protect other key sensitive habitats (i.e., riparian, wetlands, and oak woodlands, etc.) by encouraging future County growth outside these sensitive habitat areas. Policy ERM-1.14 directs the County to support the establishment and administration of a mitigation banking program.*

123-140

These policies are typical of the weak, permissive mitigation measures that are embedded throughout the DEIR. In what way would policies ERM-1.1 through 1.8 and 1.12 protect sensitive habitat areas, in cases where “market-driven” development proposals are presented for consideration in these areas, despite “encouragement” to develop elsewhere?

Policy ERM-1.14 is inadequate in that it fails to provide any details about or guidelines for mitigation banking programs to be established. What type of offsets would be required for destruction of sensitive wildlife habitats and species, and sensitive plant species? What is the ratio of sensitive species habitat that would be restored and preserved in exchange for destruction of sensitive habitat? How would effective mitigation of destroyed habitat be assessed? Unless these important details are worked out during the environmental review program, it would be impossible to determine at this stage whether the Program proposed by Policy ERM-1.14 could effectively and adequately mitigate the “substantial adverse effect” to sensitive wildlife and plant habitats and species that is predicted to occur as a result of GPU implementation.

*Impact ERM-3: The General Plan Update could have a substantial adverse effect on “federally protected” wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.*

123-141

Protection of wetlands should not be limited to those that are “federally protected” under the Federal Clean Water Act. In California, different state agencies have adopted their own wetland definition, all of which are broader and therefore more conservative than the federal definition. Under the Keene-Nejedly California Wetlands Preservation Act wetlands are defined as: “...streams, channels, lakes reservoirs, bays, estuaries, lagoons, marshes, and the lands underlying and adjoining such waters, whether permanently or intermittently submerged to the extent that such waters and lands support and contain significant fish, wildlife, recreational, aesthetic, or scientific purposes.” (Pub. Res. Code §5812).

Under the California Wildlife Protection Act “wetlands” means lands which may be covered periodically or permanently with shallow water and which include saltwater marshes, freshwater marshes, open or closed brackish water marshes, swamps,

mudflats, fens, and vernal pools. (Fish & Game Code §2785) We urge you to use one of the more conservative State definitions. For more information regarding the definition of “wetland” please go to [http://ceres.ca.gov/wetlands/introduction/defining\\_wetlands.html](http://ceres.ca.gov/wetlands/introduction/defining_wetlands.html).

123-141  
cont'd

The DEIR failed to address the following demand for identification of affected waters, submitted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, on 5/30/06, as comment on the NOP for the GPU:

123-142

“Please map all waters of the State, as defined by CWA Section 13050(e), potentially affected by the development proposed....and list them in appropriate tabular format, organized by waterbody type. Include wetlands, riparian areas as defined by the National Academy of Sciences, and “isolated” waters. For waterbodies expected to be directly affected, identify the approximate acreage and (for drainage features) the number of linear feet directly impacted and sum the total affected acres and linear feet by waterbody type. Identify any “isolated” wetlands or other waters excluded from federal jurisdiction by court decisions.”

As it is, the DEIR has not provided a baseline assessment of wetlands in Tulare County, as previously requested by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, failing a basic CEQA requirement. The revised DEIR must correct this by mapping the location and size of all Tulare County wetlands, including those protected under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, as well as riparian areas and “isolated” waters, and areas that meet the State definition of wetlands.

A revised DEIR must specify and map the total amount and location of development that could occur on Tulare County wetlands, including wetlands protected by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. How many acres of wetlands would be directly or indirectly impacted by the development at build-out of the GPU at maximum allowable density and intensity of development within each land use designation? How will loss of wetlands affect rates of flooding and volume of flood waters, stream bank erosion, water quality, and riparian and aquatic habitat?

*Impact ERM-4: The General Plan Update could interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.*

123-143

The DEIR states (4-19): “Several areas within the County (predominately waterways and the riparian areas that border them) are utilized as migratory corridors for the movement of wildlife (including a variety of bird, mammal, and fish species). As more

fully described above under Impact ERM-1, development resulting from implementation of the General Plan Update may have potential to remove or interfere with existing linkages between habitat areas currently providing cover and could increase the distance that animals would need to traverse. Additionally, development within the County would also cause an increase in both vehicular traffic levels and nighttime light levels, which would also serve to deter wildlife movement in the area.”

123-143  
cont'd

The DEIR fails to describe or map the location of resident or migratory wildlife corridors or nursery sites. The DEIR has failed to provide a critical baseline condition against which impacts of the proposed GPU could be realistically assessed. The revised DEIR must correct this by mapping the location of resident or migratory wildlife corridors or nursery sites.

The revised DEIR must quantify the size and location of negative impacts to resident or wildlife corridors or nursery sites that would be caused by implementation of the General Plan Update, including direct development, traffic, noise, lighting, increased presence of humans and pets, etc.

#### The Solution

The solution to protecting Tulare County’s biological resources is to adopt a General Plan that requires compact, efficient development within our existing development boundaries, and specific, mandatory, enforceable protections against development in riparian, forest, oak woodlands, wetlands or vernal pool habitats, and other areas where sensitive wildlife and plant species reside.

123-144

We have provided a detailed set of policy proposals to accomplish this objective in an accompanying document describing our proposed Healthy Growth Alternative. This Alternative should be incorporated into a revised GPU, and analyzed in the revised DEIR.

#### RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE RESOURCES

*Impact ERM-11: The General Plan Update would result in the substantial physical deterioration of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities through increased use.*

123-145

This impact is assessed as insignificant in the DEIR, based upon the assumption that new or expanded park facilities and recreation programs will be developed to accommodate the development facilitated by the GPU. A related impact, *ERM-12*, states: *The General Plan Update would include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which would have an adverse physical effect on the environment.*

The DEIR states: *Similar to any other development in areas of new growth, the construction of any future required park or recreation facilities could also result in a variety of environmental impacts (i.e., conversion of existing open space/agricultural lands, noise, traffic, light/glare, etc.) that cannot be mitigated. Without definitive plans, it cannot be determined at this time whether these impacts would be substantial and are therefore characterized as potentially significant.*

123-145  
cont'd

The revised DEIR must provide an analysis of the total size and location of park or recreation facilities that would be required to accompany the development that could be facilitated by the GPU.

### CULTURAL RESOURCES

The DEIR states (4-37): *Impacts on particular properties or areas are not identified because specific information concerning the location and design of future development is unknown at this time. Thus, the DEIR fails to provide a map or to list known historic, cultural or paleontological resources that are within areas that could be opened to new development under the Draft GPU. The DEIR again lacks baseline information required by CEQA to evaluate the significance of impacts that will be caused by project (GPU) implementation.*

123-146

All areas of spiritual, cultural, historical, archaeological, paleontological, etc. significance by tribes with roots in Tulare County, and/or by historical societies which are at risk of development under the GPU at build-out should be clearly identified. The potential impact on each of these areas should be assessed and discussed with as much detail as possible.

### Mitigation measures

*ERM Implementation Measure 56A Archaeological Resource Surveys. Prior to project approval and after consultation, the County shall determine the need for project applicant to have a qualified archeologist conduct the following activities: (1) conduct a record search at the Regional Archaeological Information Center and other appropriate historical repositories, (2) conduct field surveys where appropriate, and (3) prepare technical reports, where appropriate, meeting California Office of Historic Preservation Standards (Archeological Resource Management Reports). [New Policy – Draft EIR Analysis].*

123-147

The revised DEIR must specify the criteria that will be used by the County to determine the need for a project application to have a qualified archaeologist. Without knowing

these criteria, it would be impossible to determine the efficacy of this proposed mitigation measure.

123-147  
cont'd

*ERM Implementation Measure 56B Discovery of Archaeological Resources: In the event that archaeological or paleontological resources are discovered during site excavation, the County shall require that grading and construction work on the project site be suspended until the significance of the features can be determined by a qualified archaeologist or paleontologist. The County will require that a qualified archeologist/paleontologist make recommendations for measures necessary to protect any site determined to contain or constitute an historical resource, a unique archaeological resource, or a unique paleontological resource or to undertake data recovery, excavation, analysis, and curation of archaeological or paleontological materials. County staff shall consider such recommendations and implement them where they are feasible in light of project design as previously approved by the County. [New Policy – Draft EIR Analysis].*

123-148

The revised DEIR must specify the criteria that will be used to determine the “feasibility” of considering recommendations made by archaeologists/paleontologists for measures to protect sites determined to contain or contain or constitute an historical resource, a unique archaeological resource, or a unique paleontological resource. For example, what cost to a developer for the purposes of redesigning a project to avoid these resources would be considered excessive and infeasible? Specific guidelines must be provided in the DEIR to guide County staff in making determinations about when recommendations MUST be not only considered, but adopted. Without stricter guidelines, the mere promise that the County staff will “consider” expert recommendations and make a feasibility determination – without any public review—amounts almost to no mitigation at all.

*ERM Implementation Measure 56C Discovery of Human Remains: “If any human remains are discovered or recognized in any location on the project site, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until:*

123-149

*...The landowner or his or her authorized representative rejects any timely recommendations of the descendent, and mediation conducted by the Native American Heritage Commission has failed to provide measures acceptable to the landowner. [New Policy – Draft EIR Analysis].*

This exception must be deleted in a revised DEIR, as it completely contradicts and disregards other provisions designed to avoid or minimize disturbance of human remains, particularly those of Native American origin. If this provision is retained, the

revised DEIR must analyze whether this provision conflicts with Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. We contend that this provision would conflict with both the Code and the CEQA Guidelines.

I23-149  
cont'd

The DEIR states: *Because it is possible that, after County decision-makers have approved a development project, grading activities in an area identified for development reveal an archaeological resource meeting the definition of an historical resource, and that such a previously unknown historical resource cannot be preserved or avoided without substantial redesign at significant cost, the County cannot be sure that impacts on all such historical resources can be mitigated to less than significant levels. For this reason, impacts to historical resources would still result in a significant and unavoidable impact.*

I23-150

This DEIR language leaves open the possibility that no historical resources would be protected because of cost considerations. The revised DEIR must provide more specificity about how “substantial” redesign and how “significant” cost would have to be in order for those factors to take precedence over preservation of historic resources.

This discussion also ignores the County’s responsibility to ensure these cultural and historical resources are protected.

## AIR QUALITY AND GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

### Air Quality

Tulare County residents already suffer from some of the worst air quality in the nation. It has been said that breathing our air is the equivalent to smoking a half a pack of cigarettes a day. As the DEIR points out, Tulare County is already in violation of small particulate (PM10) and ozone standards.

I23-151

The people of Tulare County have emphasized repeatedly that improvement in air quality is their highest priority for the County’s goals. The EIR should include public input on air quality concerns generated at public workshops, hearings and other forums in the development of the Tulare County General Plan Update.

*Impact AQ-1: The General Plan Update would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of air pollutants. Future growth in accordance with the General Plan Update would exceed the SJVAPCD thresholds for ROG and PM-10.*

The revised DEIR must examine and disclose the health effects of the increase in ROG and PM-10.

The San Joaquin Valley Air Basin is designated non-attainment for ozone and particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>). The revised DEIR must describe how any net increase in PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and ozone will exacerbate the degree to which Tulare County is in violation of these standards.

123-151  
cont'd

The revised DEIR must provide data on expected increases to baseline air pollution figures that will result from the proposed General Plan Update at build-out at maximum allowable intensity/density of development. The assessment of air quality impacts for the revised DEIR must include methodology, data inputs and model assumptions, such as the distribution of future land uses facilitated by the GPU and resulting traffic patterns.

123-152

The DEIR states (4-54): *Depending on the feasibility and level of implementation as applied to individual development projects consistent with the General Plan, the inclusion of additional trip reduction measures would help to further reduce vehicle-related emissions.*

The revised DEIR must describe how “feasibility” of trip reduction measures will be determined. This language should be altered to say: Mandatory trip reduction measures will be required to offset new development projects that increase vehicle trips.

*Impact AQ-2: The General Plan Update would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable air quality plan.*

123-153

The revised DEIR must examine how the GPU would affect regional air quality and compliance with the Clean Air Act and the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) standards, regulations and rules. The revised DEIR should also include an independent critique of project air pollution impacts from the SJVAPCD.

The DEIR must address requirements of SJVAPCD’s new Indirect Source Review (Rule 9510), and disclose mitigation measures for emissions covered by the new ISR rule as well as for emissions not covered by the rule.

*Impact AQ-3: The General Plan Update would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.*

In the last decade, the rate of childhood asthma has soared – in the Central Valley it has nearly doubled. Tulare County experiences some of the worst health conditions in the state, with avoidable hospitalizations about 20% higher than the statewide average, including diagnoses of asthma, congestive heart failure, diabetes, and hypertension.

123-154



The revised DEIR must include data pertaining to current air pollution-related health problems in Tulare County. The EIR must provide analysis of expected air pollution-related health impacts, including projected incidences of air pollution-related diseases in Tulare County as the result of the impacts from the GPU as proposed at build-out at maximum allowable densities per land use designation.

123-154  
cont'd

The revised DEIR should incorporate statistics related to projected work days lost and premature deaths per year caused directly or indirectly by the additional air pollution that would be generated by the proposed GPU at build-out, assuming maximum allowable intensity/density of development.

The County must assess the health effects of the GPU on sensitive receptors. The revised DEIR must provide specific mitigation measures that would reduce the significance of projected air pollution and health impacts, including measures strong enough to reduce the significance of impacts to sensitive receptors such as children, the elderly and persons with chronic illnesses. The basis used to evaluate the sufficiency and effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures must also be provided.

#### Climate Change

*Impact AQ-5: The General Plan Update could conflict with implementation of state goals for reducing greenhouse gas emissions and thereby have a negative effect on Global Climate Change due to CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from on-road vehicles and methane emissions from cattle and cattle manure.*

123-155

In the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, the State has declared, “Global warming poses a serious threat to the economic well-being, public health, natural resources, and the environment of California.” This legislation requires statewide greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. Reducing global warming gas emissions is a statewide priority, and the CA Attorney General has stated that lead agencies, such as Tulare County, have the responsibility under CEQA to address the issue.

The DEIR concludes that Tulare County’s General Plan Update will create greenhouse gas emissions equivalent to 1% of the entire state of California’s reduction goal. The revised DEIR must disclose the data inputs and assumptions used to make this forecast. Is the 1% growth in greenhouse gas emissions forecast in the DEIR based upon baseline conditions versus a 2030 build-out scenario at maximum density and intensity, including the substantial amount of new town, transportation growth corridor and leapfrog sprawl development that would be allowed under the GPU?

The greenhouse gas emissions inventory in the revised DEIR must take account of the emissions from electricity and gas usage, vehicle trips generated by the GPU, water supply and transportation, operation of construction vehicles and machinery,

transportation of construction materials, and waste disposal including transport of solid waste.

123-155  
cont'd

The revised DEIR must also assess the impacts of global warming on planning and development considerations within the GPU, including flooding caused by increased rainfall and a proportionate reduction in the amount of snow, increased average temperature, and increased risk of fire.

The DEIR fails to incorporate or analyze development strategies or mitigation measure that would significantly reduce Tulare County's contribution of greenhouse gas emissions, in accordance with AB32. California counties that have failed to sufficiently plan to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions in their general plans have faced challenges from the California Attorney General, including the following examples:

123-156

In a June 19, 2007, letter to the City of San Jose regarding its Coyote Valley Specific Plan, the California Attorney General stated, "More importantly, we note that the City has avoided its fundamental responsibility under CEQA to determine whether this Project's contribution to the quintessentially cumulative problem of global warming is significant and, if so to require changes or mitigation that will avoid or reduce these impacts."

The August 21, 2007, agreement between the California Attorney General and San Bernardino County requires the County to add a policy to its General Plan that "describes the County's goal of reducing those greenhouse gas emissions reasonably attributable to the County's discretionary land use decisions and the County's internal government operations, and calls for adoption of a Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan." In addition to requiring the County to inventory GHG emissions, the agreement requires the County to include in its Plan "a target for the reduction of those sources of emissions reasonably attributable to the County's discretionary land use decisions and the County's internal government operations."

The City of Rancho Cordova in its recent Rio del Oro Specific Plan EIR/DEIS stated, "A project would increase GHG (greenhouse gasses) above the (Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006) 1990 goal if it would result in generation of more than 2 tons of CO<sub>2</sub> per capita annually." The same document then computed that "approximately 6 tons of CO<sub>2</sub> /person would be generated by the project annually." Thus, "These emissions would be nearly 3 times the per capita level that would be needed to achieve 1990 GHG levels, if the goals of AB 32 were extended to all sources of emissions." Considering this information as well as the number of new residents of the project, the document concluded that, "The project would, therefore, contribute substantially to global warming impacts." A conclusion of substantial contribution and significance for GPU at buildout could very well be the same, and the revised DEIR should address this issue.

The Center for Biological Diversity (CBD) argues convincingly in their September, 2007, report entitled The California Environmental Quality Act – On the Front Lines of California’s Fight Against Global Warming that “In light of the magnitude and scope of the climate change impacts facing California and the mandate of both the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 and Executive Order S-3-05 that existing levels of greenhouse gases be significantly reduced, any new emissions generated by a project should be considered cumulatively significant.”

123-157

The revised DEIR should discuss whether, in light of AB32, any new greenhouse gas emissions caused by implementation of the General Plan Update should be considered cumulatively significant.

CEQA requires the County to consider a reasonable range of alternatives to avoid the impact on global warming. In this case, a reasonable range of alternatives include higher density development, mixed use, and alternative locations closer to urban areas that would reduce vehicle miles traveled.

In addition to considering alternatives, the County must also consider mitigation measures to reduce the project’s impacts on global warming. PRC §21002. The County’s first priority must be to adopt mitigation measures that would reduce the project’s greenhouse emissions. See PRC § 21100(b)(3); CEQA Guidelines, App. F; see also Anderson First Coalition v. City of Anderson (2005) 130 Cal.App.4th 1173.

The DEIR (4-67) states that “addition of trip reduction measures would help reduce vehicle-related CO2 emissions,” but fails to include any such measures. The revised DEIR must require specific trip-reduction measures that would significantly reduce CO2 emissions, including general plan policies which locate all development to within existing UDBs and HDBs, and require (or incentivize) compact, efficient development, expanding in concentric circles from existing urban areas.

123-158

The revised DEIR should analyze suggestions contained in a September, 2007 report prepared by the California chapter of the American Planning Agency titled, “Planning Policy Principles for Climate Change Response.” Suggestion for reduction of greenhouse gas emissions by local governments include adoption of land use plans and codes that encourage mixed land use, higher densities (especially around transit), affordable housing, compact form, non-motor vehicle circulation, water and energy conservation, and other strategies.

TCCRG has proposed a “Healthy Growth Alternative” for inclusion in a revised DEIR that utilizes these principles, which would greatly reduce the amount of transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions produced by the GPU. This alternative, described later on in this document, should be evaluated in the DEIR for its efficacy in greatly reducing

the level of greenhouse gas emissions produced in Tulare County during the term of the GPU.

123-158  
cont'd

#### URBAN AND WILDLAND FIRE HAZARDS

*Impact HS-11: The General Plan Update could expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.*

123-159

This impact is assessed as less than significant. The revised DEIR should re-evaluate the fire risk that would be caused by the GPU at build-out, and upgrade the significance of this impact.

The DEIR states (4-89): *Wildland fires would continue to pose a significant threat to the people and structures of the County, in particular those residing in the Foothill and Mountain Growth Areas, which are more susceptible to wildland fires due to potential fuel loads (grassland and other vegetation). One of the primary factors contributing to the effective control of a vegetation fire is the rapid response by local fire units. This is especially true during fire season, when fire units may be committed to other fires and are unavailable to respond as quickly.*

The DEIR fails to analyze how much new development would be allowed by the GPU at build-out in areas assessed as high or extreme wildfire risk. This must be disclosed in the revised DEIR, to allow a more comprehensive assessment of new fire risks posed by urban construction in fire-prone areas.

The revised DEIR must provide baseline data on the number of Tulare County residents that currently reside in areas at high risk of wildland fire, and compare that number with the number of people that residences and persons that would live in high wildland risk areas at full GPU build-out. How would the introduction of this development and population affect the wildland fire risk of current residents of these areas? How would the total increase in population and residences of these areas affect the ability of local fire units to provide adequate coverage to the full area at build-out?

The DEIR does not disclose the cost of providing an adequate number of firefighters to help protect the vast areas of new development allowed by the GPU. The revised DEIR must disclose the cost of providing adequate fire protection for the proposed GPU at build-out. The revised DEIR must also disclose lessening of fire protection for existing communities that would occur in a scenario where adequate additional funding is not provided.

The DEIR fails to consider the impacts of climate change on fire risk in Tulare County, particularly the widely forecast diminishment of snowpack, resulting in drier conditions for a longer portion of the year. The revised DEIR must include a discussion of the increase in wildland fire risk that is predicted by climate change forecasts, and describe how that increase risk will inform development siting decisions.

I23-159  
cont'd

The revised DEIR should compare the relative fire risks and financial burden to the county of General Plan alternatives that allow sprawling rural development versus development within existing boundaries served by existing fire-fighting districts. The revised DEIR should analyze the following approaches to lowering risk and costs of wildlife in the General Plan Update:

- Mandatory impact fees on new development that reflect the true cost of providing fire protection and fuel reduction over the long-term
- Infill development within existing development boundaries which keeps fire emergency response time short and makes fire fuel-reduction programs more efficient.
- Restriction of new parcels in high hazard fire areas outside of fire district boundaries.

## NOISE

*Impact HS-13: The General Plan Update would result in the exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies; or would result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project; or would result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.*

I23-160

The revised DEIR must include data on current average ambient noise levels, including analysis of peak noise events and one-hour averages (for multiple periods of the day and night) at selected undeveloped areas eligible for development under the GPU. This data must then be compared with projected average, peak and one-hour events post-GPU build-out, assuming development occurs at maximum density and intensity within all land use designations. The revised DEIR should quantify the expected increase in noise levels that will be experienced by those living along travel routes that will experience substantial increases in traffic volume as a result of development patterns allowed and facilitated by the GPU at build-out.

The revised DEIR must describe the impact of increased noise on health and stress levels for humans living or working in areas that will have significant increases in noise

levels at GPU build-out. What impact will permanent, temporary and periodic increases in ambient noise levels have on wildlife species and habitat?

|23-160  
cont'd

## WATER RESOURCES

### Water Supply

The GPU DEIR explains that water supplies and water infrastructure analysis for the General Plan is contained in a document entitled Water Resources General Plan Update. The DEIR relies upon and refers to this water report. EIR 4-105. But consistent with California Oak Foundation et al. v. City of Santa Clarita (2005), 133 Cal.App.4<sup>th</sup> 1219, the EIR is required to summarize the conclusions and analysis of the Water Resources General Plan. The DEIR does not contain an adequate summary of the information and analysis contained in the Background Report (BR).

The BR explains that demand for water within Tulare County is met from 4 major sources, which include groundwater, surface water, imported water, and exchanged surface water. EIR 7-10. Untreated groundwater constitutes the principle source of water in the County. Ibid. As the DEIR admits, although the water suppliers that operate within the County are not subject to County control, the County must coordinate with these districts to assure that sufficient water will be available to meet the demand created by the anticipated growth.

Overall, the DEIR and the BR on which it relies are legally inadequate because they lack sufficient detail about existing and projected water supplies. In most instances, the BR does not quantify existing supplies, or explain whether sufficient supplies likely exist to meet future water needs. Generally, the assessment of these water districts is not based on accurate and reliable data. Instead of relying on verifiable data and studies of underground water supplies, the BR relies on anecdotal evidence, and hearsay.

In many instances, the BR states that individual water agency's water supplies can be increased simply by adding new wells and/or water delivery infrastructure. These claims are contradicted and undermined by information contained elsewhere in the report, which reveals that the overdraft in the Tulare Lake Basin is estimated at a staggering 820,000 acre-feet per year (AFY). BR 10-11. The BR admits that this massive overdraft is the greatest overdraft projected in the state, and accounts for 56% of the statewide total overdraft.

The BR further explains that this overdraft is largely caused by restrictions on, and reductions in surface waters supply deliveries from the Delta, which have been caused in part by reductions that have resulted from the implementation of the Endangered Species Act in the Delta, "and other factors." Ibid. CVP exporters, who have seen their

|23-161

deliveries reduced by up to 50%, have turned to pumping groundwater. BR 10-12. The BR further states that overdraft is most pronounced along the western boundary of the county, but there has also been a progressive lowering of groundwater levels along the easterly margins of the basin, particularly in the southerly part of the Kern-Tulare Water District's jurisdiction. Ibid.

123-161  
cont'd

The BR speculates that future reduction in irrigated acreage along the County's western boundary, as well as importation of CVP water through the Cross Valley Canal, obtained by exchange with Arvin-Edison Water Storage District, "will act to mitigate the lowering of water levels. . . ." Ibid. The BR fails to provide any evidence to support these speculations. No evidence is cited to support the contention that irrigated acreage will be reduced, or to describe the water exchange. There is no information from which the reader can understand whether the proposed exchange is likely to occur, the size of the exchange, or what approvals will be needed. Moreover, the BR makes no attempt to quantify the impact of these alleged mitigation measures, or to offer clues about the magnitude of the mitigation. The BR contains very little analysis or explanation of the environmental and regulatory factors that have resulted in the reduction of deliveries from the Delta.

The BR and the EIR do not contain the type of reliable and objective evidence that affords the County Board of Supervisors the ability to make reasoned and well-informed decisions about future growth in Tulare County.

Although these comments will not address each individual water supplier discussed in the EIR and the BR, the following examples illustrate these shortcomings.

#### *Alpaugh Joint Power Authority*

The BR explains that the Alpaugh Joint Power Authority water system has been plagued by high arsenic levels. (7-15). With respect to Well #10 ( a new well on the edge of town), the BR states that water from this well is safe by government standards, as indicated by State Health officials. The BR then goes on to state that federal arsenic standards became more stringent in January 2006. The report fails to explain, however, whether water from Well No. 10 meets this more recent and stringent federal standard. The reader, therefore, is left to wonder whether water from Well No. 10 is safe or not.

123-162

The BR also states that "[a]lthough the Authority is unable to support additional connections at this time, ongoing system improvements will improve the system capacity and allow for additional service connections within the time horizon of the General Plan." (Background Report (BR)7-15.) This summary assessment of the Authority's future capacity does not constitute reliable or "substantial" evidence because it lacks any detail, and fails to discuss how system capacity will be improved, and

whether additional water will be available even if the system is improved, whether the water will be safe, and finally how much additional water may become available.	I23-162 cont'd
--	-------------------

*Cutler Public Utility District*

The BR states that some of the water from the District's wells is not suitable for drinking because of high nitrate levels. BR 7-15. The BR also states that the District intends to dig additional wells and facilities to mix and dilute the contaminated water to make it suitable for drinking. The BR does not discuss the total capacity of the aquifer from which groundwater can be extracted, or the extent of the contamination, or whether it can or will be remediated. Without this information, it is impossible to draw any conclusions about future water supply availability.	I23-163
--	---------

*Earlimart Public Utility District*

The BR states that based on "available" information, this water system is operating at 88% capacity. BR 7-19. This statement leaves the reader to wonder whether the system can reliably serve its customers' water demand through multiple dry years, or whether the 88% refers to an average year. Likewise, insufficient information is provided to decide whether the aquifer from which Earlimart PUD extracts water has sufficient capacity to support additional supplies to support any additional growth.	I23-164
--	---------

*California Water Service Company*

The BR contains only anecdotal information about this water company, which supplies water to the community of Goshen. <u>Ibid.</u> The WRGPU expresses some "concerns" about water supplies, based on conversations with Cal. Water staff, who "indicated that with the projected population growth, the water supply is inadequate with concerns [sic.]" <u>Ibid.</u> Despite the water quality concerns and the apparent inadequacy of existing supplies, the BR opines that "water supply to accommodate future growth would likely be derived from additional groundwater wells." The BR makes no attempt to discuss the extent of the nitrate contamination of the Cal. Water wells, the company's ability to afford additional infrastructure, or whether the community has sufficient supplies to accommodate any future growth.	I23-165
---	---------

*Ivanhoe PUD*

The BR states that Ivanhoe PUD has ample water supplies, but sites no documents or studies as support for this contention. BR 7-20	I23-166
--	---------

*London Community Services District*

The BR admits that "specific carrying capacity information [for London CSD] is not available, however, it is likely that the London CSD would need to expand its water supply and improve the distribution system to support any significant growth . . ." BR 7-22. The BR goes on to report that the "district is confident that their water supply (three	I23-167
---	---------



wells) could support additional development” with additional infrastructure. The statement that specific capacity information is lacking cannot be reconciled with the CSD’s “confidence” that existing wells can support additional capacity. The BR’s conclusions and analysis are therefore unreliable.

I23-167  
cont'd

*Poplar Community Services District*

The BR states that “based on available” information, Poplar CSD has excess capacity that can be used to accommodate future growth. BR 7-24. The BR does not provide the reader with any information about the source or reliability of the “available information.” The conclusions drawn from this undisclosed information, therefore, are inherently unreliable.

I23-168

*Springville PUD*

The Springville PUD derives all of its water from the Tule River. The BR states that current demand is on average .3 million MGD, but Springville PUD estimates that it has a capacity of 1.5 MGD. BR 7-25.

I23-169

*Water Code §10910 et seq.*

Water Code (“Wat C”) §10910 et seq., which codified SB 610, requires that when the lead agency (here, the County) prepares a notice of preparation for an EIR, it must identify public water systems that may supply water for the implementation of the proposed project, and must ask each such water agency to assess whether demand for water supplies generated by the proposed project was included in a the most recent urban water management plan (UWMP).

I23-170

If the project was not accounted for by an adopted UWMP, or one does not exist, the water supplier(s) must prepare a Water Supply Assessment (WSA) to analyze the availability of water for the project. The WSA, which must be adopted at regular or special meeting of the water supply agency, must be included in the EIR.

This requirement applies to a general plan amendment. It does not appear that the County here has complied with the requirements of Wat. C. §10910 et seq., in that the Draft EIR does not contain any WSAs, nor any evidence that the County timely requested that water suppliers prepare a WSA as required by the Water Code.

In the recent Vineyard Area Citizens et al. vs City of Rancho Cordova et al. 40 Cal. 4th 412 (2007) decision, the California Supreme Court stated,

I23-171

“We conclude that while the EIR adequately informed decision makers and the public of the County’s plan for near-term provision of water to the development, it failed to do so as to the long-term provision and hence failed to disclose the

impacts of providing the necessary supplies in the long term. While the EIR identifies the intended water sources in general terms, it does not clearly and coherently explain, using material properly stated or incorporated in the EIR, how the long-term demand is likely to be met with those sources, the environmental impacts of exploiting those sources, and how those impacts are to be mitigated.”

I23-171  
cont'd

The revised EIR must include verification of sufficient water supplies for the future and must discuss the environmental impacts of supplying future water to all development allowed by the GPU at full build-out, assuming maximum permissible development intensity and density.

*The EIR Water Supply Analysis is Inadequate*

The EIR fails to adequately describe and analyze the substantial uncertainty surrounding the County’s water supplies. As noted above, the majority of the County’s residents and businesses consume groundwater. Despite the BR’s admission that the groundwater basin underlying the County suffers from massive overdraft, the EIR fails to adequately disclose and discuss the overdraft and how it affects the County’s existing residents, not to mention future growth.

I23-172

The EIR does not really contain a detailed analysis of water supplies. As explained above, the water supply analysis in the BR does not cite or rely on objective, reliable sources for its water supply analysis. Instead, the BR and the EIR largely rely on hearsay and anecdotal information to conclude in most instances that sufficient supplies exist with additional wells and/or infrastructure. In its discussion of individual water agencies, the EIR uncritically states that the water supplies can be expanded with new wells and/or improvements to the distribution infrastructure. The EIR’s discussion of the individual suppliers ignores the EIR’s admission that

*...in some of the unincorporated urban developments development areas, there are concerns that adequate water supplies cannot be achieved through sustainable groundwater management, that is, without creating declining groundwater levels, and adversely affecting existing wells. Such concerns are heightened by the fact that most of these areas are presently dependent on groundwater supplies. (4-129); and*

*Until comprehensive assessments of groundwater and groundwater management efforts occur, it is not possible to conclude that the County’s groundwater resources would be capable of meeting future water demands resulting from implementation of the General Plan Update. (4-130).*

In other words, the EIR's conclusion that individual water supply agencies could increase capacity by digging additional wells did not take into account the overdraft condition of the aquifer. The DEIR must be revised in order to specifically identify communities whose water supplies cannot be expanded without exacerbating the existing overdraft conditions. A water demand and supply analysis should be conducted by Tulare County, in coordination with local water agencies, and presented in the revised DEIR. The General Plan must also be revised to include a curb on new development in such areas unless new sources of water are found.

123-172  
cont'd

Remarkably, the EIR never admits that any community within the County will not have sufficient supplies to meet future growth. Table 4-4, which contains a population estimate of the unincorporated community in the County, includes an estimate of population under the General Plan. It is completely unclear whether these population estimates take water supplies into account.

123-173

Table 4-5 summarizes domestic water supply conditions for unincorporated communities. Despite the groundwater overdraft, the cutbacks in water deliveries from the Delta, and the fact that the BR admits some communities do not possess water supplies adequate to support existing residents, let alone future growth, Table 4-5 finds that all rural communities have adequate or more than adequate water supplies. EIR, 4-107.

Instead of this vague and inaccurate table, the EIR must be revised to accurately and realistically disclose the extent of water supplies and admit the potential shortcomings without subterfuge. It should be noted that although not disclosed in Table 4-5, the text of the EIR admits that "sufficient water supplies may not be available at this time to serve all future growth consistent with the General Plan Update within some unincorporated communities" (4-127).

Elsewhere, the EIR admits that the County does not possess adequate information about groundwater resources (4-129). This revelation, although more honest than Table 4-5, is still too vague. The revised DEIR should clearly and unambiguously identify the communities which lack sufficient water to accommodate growth.

The General Plan, likewise, should be revised to identify those areas which, owing to lack of reliable water supplies, are not capable of sustaining growth. Moreover, the General Plan should be revised to include policies that clearly mandate that additional growth in unincorporated areas is not to be approved unless sufficient water supplies are provided. The revised DEIR must include analysis of general plan policies and mitigation measures that would maximize protection of groundwater supplies and groundwater recharge.

123-174

The DEIR also fails to adequately analyze the significant environmental impacts that would be caused by the increased pumping of groundwater to sustain the anticipated level of growth over the term of the General Plan Update. The revised DEIR should answer these questions:

123-174  
cont'd

- What effect will increased groundwater pumping have on groundwater levels and on water quality?
- How will potential lowering of groundwater levels affect nearby agricultural wells?
- Where will recharge water come from?
- Will this water be of sufficient quality to be used for recharge purposes?
- Rights to this recharge water should be substantiated.
- What are the long-term competing uses for this groundwater, for the agricultural water, and for the recharge water?
- What uncertainties are associated with long-term groundwater or alternative water supplies?
- What are the environmental impacts associated with securing and delivering these supplies?
- What mitigation is feasible for these environmental impacts?

The DEIR fails to adequately analyze the widely forecast impacts of climate change, including diminished snowpack and the resulting diminished water supply. The Final DEIR must provide an analysis of how available surface and groundwater would be affected by climate change impacts, and in turn how those projections will be used to inform planning for future development in Tulare County.

#### Water Quality

*Impact WR-4: The General Plan Update could violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, or otherwise degrade water quality.*

123-175

The DEIR analyzes this impact is less than significant. No analysis of baseline conditions is provided, and no analysis is performed of water quality impacts that will occur as a result of intensive new development allowed by the GPU. As such, the water quality assessment fails basic requirements to provide a baseline assessment of conditions, and to analyze significant effects that will be caused by project implementation.

The revised DEIR must provide a more substantial analysis of the impact that the GPU would have on the health of Tulare County watersheds and water quality. This analysis must include impacts associated with the wholesale grading of natural topography, loss

of natural vegetation, filling of streams and wetlands, compaction of soils, and removal of trees. The revised DEIR should describe the extent of such watershed disturbances projected to occur as a result of the GPU at full build-out at maximum allowable densities, and related affects such as alteration of local drainage patterns, increased impervious cover, loss of topsoil, increased erosion, and increased runoff.

123-175  
cont'd

Numerous studies indicate that when 10% or less of a watershed is covered in impervious surfaces, it becomes impaired. Greater amounts of impervious cover result in water quality impairments from increased pollution and runoff, as well as water supply impacts due to loss of groundwater recharge and contamination of local supplies. Increased runoff results in erosion and instability of stream banks, changes to channel structure, loss of natural vegetation and increased sedimentation.

The revised DEIR should analyze the expected increase in impervious coverage that would result from the GPU at full build-out, assuming maximum allowable development intensity/density, and describe related stormwater, runoff pollution, flooding, erosion, loss of groundwater recharge and all other related impacts that would occur.

In analyzing the impact of increased impervious coverage, the DEIR should reference the Impervious Coverage Model, and studies that link a percentage of watershed impervious surface with water body impairment

## TRAFFIC

*Impact TC-1: The General Plan Update would result in a substantial increase in vehicular traffic.*

123-176

Between 1990 and 2000, VMT increased by 30% in the Sierra region, and is expected to continue to increase. (Planning for the Future, 2005, SBC Sierra Wealth Index) This increase in VMT is nearly double the increase in population, indicating that low-density development patterns are leading to longer commutes and more driving. This translates to development that consumes more land and generates greater amounts of impervious cover in the watershed.

A key factor driving these patterns is use separation, a conventional zoning practice that separates housing, jobs, schools, and retail, and is a common characteristic of suburban and exurban sprawl. The result is more driving – longer trips and more trips – because people need to drive between various uses to take care of daily needs.

The DEIR concludes that the General Plan Update will produce a substantial increase in traffic, and worsening conditions on most of our roads. The DEIR anticipates the need to widen 8 road segments in the county from 4 lanes to 6 lanes.

The DEIR states (5-12): Implementation of the General Plan Update would result in additional County-wide residential and non-residential land use developments, with many of the resulting population growth contributing additional vehicle use on local and regional streets and highways.

123-177

Despite a general forecast of increased traffic requiring widening of many roads, The DEIR fails to provide baseline assessments of peak hour traffic conditions at major intersections, current daily vehicle trips (DVT) or vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per day in Tulare County, etc. The DEIR also fails to quantify expected increases in vehicle trips, vehicle miles traveled and peak hour traffic conditions at major intersections.

The revised DEIR must quantify projections on expected increases in DVT, VMT and peak hour traffic at key intersections that would be allowed and facilitated by the GPU at full build-out. The revised DEIR must provide details of the traffic model and assumptions used to justify those projections, including analysis of traffic increases that would be caused by a substantial increase in new town, transportation growth corridor and rural residential sprawl development allowed under the GPU.

One of the most important numbers in determining traffic impacts (and resulting air quality impacts) is the number of vehicle trips per household per day. Clearly, the more such vehicle trips, the greater the traffic and air pollution. The Institute of Traffic Engineers single-family housing average value (and the default value for the URBEMIS air quality model) is 9.57 trips per household per day. If a rate lower than the average 9.57 rate is used in the revised DEIR, it should be thoroughly documented and justified. Similarly, methodology to determine the projected number of vehicle trips per tourist, per employee, etc. at project build-out must be disclosed.

123-178

The DEIR should analyze the increase in traffic gridlock expected if funds are not available for new road widening or interchange improvements. The revised DEIR must also analyze all of the impacts that would be caused by increased traffic and road widening, including increased noise, polluted road runoff, dust from pulverized road abrasives, loss of groundwater recharge areas, etc.

The DEIR states that “trip reduction measures” would help to offset the additional air pollution from automobiles forecast under the plan, but no such measures are proposed in the document. Other than proposed road widening and interchange improvements, for which funding is not identified, the DEIR offers no mitigation measures to reduce the substantial increases in traffic.

The revised DEIR must include measures to mitigate the impact of new traffic that will be caused by this plan, including an analysis of general plan policies that would locate

all development to within existing UDBs and HDBs, and require compact, efficient development.

123-178  
cont'd

The revised DEIR must compare and describe the difference in daily vehicle trips, vehicle miles traveled, road congestion, etc caused by general plan policies that allow substantial auto-dependent rural sprawl vs. policies that require efficient, compact development utilizing smart growth principles.

## PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES

### Wastewater

123-179

*Impact PFS-1: The General Plan Update would exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB for certain service providers and/or result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.*

The DEIR notes that most of the wastewater treatment facilities (WWTF) in the County operate at or above capacity. Although the DEIR notes that some districts have plans to increase capacity, the DEIR correctly concludes that the future adequacy of wastewater capacity is unpredictable at this point in time. Based on this unpredictability, the DEIR essentially concludes that the growth planned by the General Plan exceeds the current and predicted wastewater treatment capacity. The DEIR notes that this constitutes a significant adverse impact. Owing to this significant adverse impact, the County must adopt concrete guidelines that would prevent future growth unless the County makes a finding that reliable wastewater treatment capacity exists to serve the proposed growth.

The revised DEIR must also provide a more comprehensive analysis of existing sewer system and wastewater treatment infrastructure upgrade needs in all areas of Tulare County, and an analysis of how funds diverted to service new development would affect investment in upgrading existing wastewater infrastructure.

The revised DEIR should analyze the higher costs of serving dispersed development and extending new infrastructure rather than repairing and maintaining existing systems, and the expected extra burden to rate and tax payers.

*Impact PFS-4: The General Plan Update could substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in on- or off- site flooding.*

123-180

The DEIR states (5-50): Drainage runoff from developing areas or parcels is dependent on the percent of impervious surface assigned to individual parcels or projects. Development proposed under the Preferred Alternative especially on currently undeveloped areas, will increase the amount of impervious surfaces, thereby increasing the amounts and speed of runoff. Increased runoff volumes and speeds may increase erosion or siltation and result in localized nuisance flooding in areas without adequate drainage facilities.

I23-180  
cont'd

The DEIR analyzes this impact as less than significant. No analysis of baseline conditions is provided, and no analysis is performed of changes in drainage patterns and resulting erosion, siltation or surface runoff that will occur as a result of intensive new development allowed by the GPU at build-out.

The revised DEIR must analyze all changes to drainage patterns and related runoff, flooding, erosion and other effects that would occur under the GPU build-out, including impacts associated with the wholesale grading of natural topography, increases in impervious cover, loss of natural vegetation and topsoil, filling of streams and wetlands, compaction of soils, loss of topsoil, and removal of trees.

#### Stormwater runoff

*Impact PFS-5: The General Plan Update could create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.*

I23-181

The DEIR analyzes this impact as less than significant. No analysis of baseline conditions is provided, and no analysis is performed of runoff volume that will occur as a result of intensive new development allowed by the GPU, nor whether existing or proposed stormwater drainage systems would be adequate to absorb the increased runoff. As such, stormwater runoff assessment fails basic requirements to provide a baseline assessment of conditions, and to analyze significant effects that will be caused by project implementation.

#### FOOTHILL GROWTH MANAGEMENT PLAN

The DEIR lists 21 impacts related to the FGMP update proposed in the GPU. However, the DEIR fails to sufficiently analyze or reveal the scale of adverse impacts that would be generated by changes to the existing FGMP, including policies that may ease restrictions on development in foothill growth corridors, such as the new proposed policy FGMP.

I23-182



The DEIR fails to provide baseline data for the current FGMP, a rationale for why any changes are needed to the existing FGMP, or what the range of impacts will be related to each proposed change and all of the changes on a cumulative basis.

I23-182  
cont'd

The revised DEIR must provide this information, and reveal how much additional development could be allowed during the term of the GPU by proposed changes to the FGMP, compared with continued implementation of the existing plan. All proposed changes to policies and implementation measures should be displayed side by side, so that the reader can fully understand what exactly will change in the FGMP, the basis for those changes, and the corresponding impacts that could occur with those changes if development is permitted at the maximum levels of intensities and densities allowed.

#### MOUNTAIN FRAMEWORK PLAN

The DEIR fails to sufficiently analyze or reveal the scale of adverse impacts that would be generated by changes to the existing Mountain Framework Plan, including policies that may ease restrictions on development, such as the new proposed policies contained in Framework Plan Policy M-1.

I23-183

The DEIR fails to provide baseline data for the current Mountain Framework Plan, a rationale for why any changes are needed to the existing Mountain Framework Plan, or what the range of impacts will be related to each proposed change and all of the changes on a cumulative basis.

The revised DEIR must provide this information, and reveal how much additional development could be allowed during the term of the GPU by proposed changes to the Mountain Framework Plan, compared with continued implementation of the existing plan. All proposed changes to policies and implementation measures should be displayed side by side, so that the reader can fully understand what exactly will change in the Mountain Framework Plan, the basis for those changes, and the corresponding impacts that could occur with those changes if development is permitted at the maximum levels of intensities and densities allowed.

#### ALTERNATIVES TO THE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

The DEIR states (7-1): “The purpose of this section of the EIR is to describe a reasonable range of alternatives to the project...that could feasibly attain most of the objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and to evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.” Unfortunately, the DEIR fails all aspects of this CEQA requirement.

I23-184

As an initial matter, the DEIR can't reasonably evaluate any alternatives, including the GPU alternative, unless meaningful baseline measures have been established. The total

lack of such baseline measures makes both the GPU and the DEIR merely speculative, and as such, not in compliance with the core CEQA requirements.

123-184  
cont'd

The DEIR also fails to provide a “reasonable range of alternatives” for consideration by Tulare County citizens and decision-makers. As described in the DEIR, each proposed Alternative “assumes that all of the proposed policies and implementation measures contained in the Goals and Policies Report for the updated General Plan would be included as part of (this) alternative.” In other words, the four GPU Alternatives proposed in the DEIR (in addition to the “no-project alternative”), while offering minor differences on the surface, have all been framed to implement the same non-specific and loophole-ridden General Plan policies and implementation measures set out in the GPU.

123-185

Although the proposed Alternatives have different titles and different stated priorities, they are as vague and general in nature as the underlying General Plan that they would implement. Because all Alternatives incorporate the policies and implementation measures of the GPU, they lack specific growth-directing measures that would in fact produce different General Plan outcomes. As a result, each Alternative would allow, and even encourage, costly, inefficient sprawl development that would challenge our existing communities economically and politically while also jeopardizing Tulare County’s farmlands, natural resources, public health, and quality of life.

This critique applies equally to Alternative 5, which was purportedly developed based upon “comments from Tulare County Citizens for Responsible Growth and American Farmland Trust.” While we appreciate the attempt to include a GPU Alternative that addresses the goals we share with the overwhelming majority of Tulare County citizens who participated in the “visioning” process, the proposed Alternative 5 is not reflective of our core concerns or the extensive and detailed input we previously provided. Given its exceptions, omissions and vagueness, Alternative 5 offers little essential or practical difference from the other development alternatives presented, and cannot therefore be objectively considered a true, much less an environmentally-superior, development alternative.

The DEIR projects that, whichever Alternative is selected, 26-30% of growth during the term of the GPU would occur in Tulare County’s unincorporated areas. Again, the nearly identical outcomes in terms of future population distribution are predetermined by the incorporation of the GPU’s flawed policies and implementation measures into each “alternative.” No alternative is provided that would, for example, direct 90% or more of future growth to already urbanized areas, require resource-efficient development, and strictly limit the circumstances under which development boundaries could be modified.

Notably, however, there is *no* population distribution information given for the "Confined Growth" Alternative 5. Why is this information "not available" for this Alternative only?

123-186

The DEIR is also inherently inadequate because it includes only a superficial assessment of the degree to which each proposed Alternative would meet the stated objectives of the GPU, without detailed justification for its conclusions. Conclusions about the failure of the City-Centered and the Confined-Growth alternatives to meet various project objectives are not well explained, and are simply not supportable given the absence of details provided about the specifics of each Alternative's proposal.

Similarly, the DEIR fails to provide a quantified, objective comparison of the significant impacts that would result from the adoption of each Alternative. Instead, unsupported, general assessments are proffered about the impact each Alternative would have compared with the General Plan Update (i.e., a more or less Significant Impact than the GPU), with no basis provided for these assessments. What criteria were used to categorize the relative impacts generated by each proposed Alternative to the GPU? What data, benchmarks, thresholds or other forms of analysis were used to conclude that an impact created by one Alternative would be lesser or greater than the GPU's impact? Indeed, how can any assessment be made at all, without baseline measures against which the results can be compared?

The root of the DEIR's problem is that non-specific Alternatives are proposed to implement a vague and loophole-ridden GPU, making it virtually impossible to "evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives," as required by CEQA.

As a result, the relative comparisons of the Alternatives are meaningless and of little or no value in helping Tulare County decision-makers select an Alternative that could "feasibly attain most of the objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project."

To fulfill the most basic of CEQA requirements, the DEIR must be meaningfully revised to present a reasonable range of General Plan Alternatives that includes at least one alternative that clearly and firmly directs growth into those urbanized areas that have the desire and capacity to accommodate that growth.

#### Healthy Growth Alternative

We urge the County to include an Alternative to the GPU that truly directs growth into our existing urbanized areas, that protects agriculture and open space through efficient development, that allows no leapfrog development of new towns and growth corridors, and provides only very limited circumstances under which urban development

123-187

boundaries may be expanded. This loophole-free "Healthy Growth Alternative" should include clear, firm policies that support the following:

- Base the location, density, and amount of growth within urbanized areas on their desire and capacity to accommodate growth.
- Locate development (except that which is directly related to agriculture) within existing Development Boundaries, without loopholes or exceptions that allow for leapfrog new town or growth corridor development.
- Require (or incentivize) efficient development within or contiguous to existing urbanized areas.
- Make community and hamlet development boundaries meaningful, long-term planning boundaries by firmly limiting the circumstances under which they can be expanded.
- Discourage the premature conversion of agricultural lands to urban uses, and offset unavoidable impacts to agricultural lands and natural resource areas with mandatory mitigation measures such as conservation and agricultural easements.
- Provide strong, clear policies with concrete, enforceable implementation measures that include definite timeframes, funding sources, and departments in charge of monitoring and enforcement.

I23-187  
cont'd

To provide a true Healthy Growth Alternative for consideration in a revised DEIR, the underlying General Plan Update must also be substantially revised to provide specificity about where growth will be directed during the duration of the GPU, and how agricultural and natural resource lands will be protected and preserved.

I23-188

The revised DEIR must include for the Healthy Growth Alternative a detailed, quantified, justified analysis of its relative costs, benefits and capacity to achieve GPU objectives relative to other proposed GPU Alternatives.

In performing a quantified comparison of a true range of General Plan Update Alternatives, the revised DEIR must identify which of the Alternatives would "avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project," particularly in regard to areas identified as priorities for the County in the DEIR:

- Transportation and Circulation Impacts
- Air Quality Impacts
- Noise and Nuisance Effects
- Loss of Agricultural Land
- Biological Resource Impacts
- Viewshed Impacts

The revised DEIR must compare the specific environmental and fiscal effects of an Alternative that features efficient city and community-centered development with the effects of Alternatives that allow "market-driven," sprawling development -- including specific effects on agricultural/open space land consumption, costs of providing and servicing infrastructure (e.g., roads, water, sewer, schools, police, firefighters, parks, etc.), vehicle miles traveled per capita, tons of greenhouse gases and air pollutants such as NOx emitted, impact on and compatibility with existing water supplies, water quality and wastewater treatment facilities, amount of new impervious surfaces created, acres of wildlife habitat lost, etc.

I23-188  
cont'd

The following are examples of the specific questions that must be addressed in a quantitative comparison of GPU Alternatives, including TCCRG's proposed "Healthy Growth Alternative."

I23-189

- What is the difference between the General Plan Update and each Alternative in the number of acres of important agricultural land converted to urban or other non-agricultural uses?
- What acreage of wildlife habitat would be disrupted by each Alternative?
- How many tons of additional air pollutants, such as ozone and PM2.5 will be produced by each Alternative?
- How many additional air pollution- induced diseases, such as asthma, are projected to occur under each Alternative?

The DEIR describes policies (e.g., Land Use policies 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.8) to reduce air pollution, including the following which are "designed to encourage economic and social growth while retaining quality of life standards":

I23-190

- smart growth and healthy communities
- innovative development
- prevent incompatible uses
- compact development
- encourage infill development

The revised DEIR should address the ways that the various GPU Alternatives would conform to the above air-pollution reducing planning approaches, as well as proposed "trip reduction measures." The extent to which the proposed GPU Alternatives would meet these criteria should be evaluated in the context of existing land uses, traffic patterns, location of employment and shopping centers, etc. in Tulare County.

The revised DEIR must quantify projected increases in vehicle trip generation and vehicle emissions that will accompany each alternative, including analysis of TCCRG's

I23-191

proposed Healthy Growth Alternative. The underlying traffic model and assumptions must be provided. How many more cars are expected on our roads per day under each alternative? How much traffic gridlock delay is expected if funds are not available for new road widening or interchange improvements? What effect would such road widening or interchange improvements have on overall traffic levels? On air quality?

I23-191  
cont'd

Using the best greenhouse gas modeling tools available, the Final EIR must provide a more specific, quantified analysis of the difference in greenhouse gas emissions that would be produced by each alternative, including TCCRG's proposed Healthy Growth Alternative. The revised DEIR should consider which of the proposed GPU Alternatives would be most commensurate with California AB32. As part of this analysis, the revised DEIR should reference a September, 2007 report prepared by the California chapter of the American Planning Agency entitled, "Planning Policy Principles for Climate Change Response." Its suggestions for reduction of greenhouse gas emissions include mixed land use, higher densities (especially around transit), affordable housing, compact form, non-motor vehicle circulation, water and energy conservation, and other strategies.

How would open space scenery and night sky views be affected by alternatives that allow significant growth in currently undeveloped areas, as opposed to an alternative that would direct all growth to within existing development boundaries, using efficient, infill development approaches? A visual/scenic simulation of each proposed GPU Alternative at build-out should be provided, from the vantage point of key observation points in the County.

I23-192

The DEIR should compare the amount of projected population increase that would be accommodated within the existing development footprint (urbanized areas) of Tulare County, and within existing development boundaries, among the GPU Alternatives, using a range of density per acre scenarios. Similarly, the revised DEIR should analyze the corresponding acreage of farmland and wildlife habitat that would be developed, vehicle trips generated, air pollution generated and related impacts associated with compact, efficient development within existing urbanized areas versus a more dispersed, sprawling pattern of development.

The revised DEIR should analyze the expected increase in impervious coverage that would result from each GPU Alternative at full build-out, assuming maximum allowable development intensity/density, and describe related stormwater, flooding, erosion, loss of groundwater recharge and other impacts that would occur.

I23-193

- What is the acreage of new impervious surfaces that would be created under each Alternative?

- How would total area of impervious cover differ among Alternatives in groundwater recharge areas?
- How do the Alternatives compare in terms of reliance upon depleted or unknown water supplies?
- How do the Alternatives compare in regard to compatibility with existing wastewater infrastructure?

123-193  
cont'd

If, after conducting a specific analysis among all Alternatives, the revised DIER concludes that the Healthy Growth Alternative is the environmentally-superior alternative but evaluates it as being less feasible, more costly, or less able to achieve the desired GPU outcomes, then the revised DEIR must provide detailed substantiation of these conclusions.

123-194

The revised DEIR must include extensive analysis and justification for assessments made about the ability of each of the proposed Alternatives to meet project objectives, as well as the relative priority of each Project Objective. For example:

- What is the relative importance to Tulare County of helping unincorporated communities to grow versus meeting other project objectives such as protecting the County's agricultural uses and scenic lands from urban encroachment, avoiding rural residential sprawl and promoting reinvestment in existing communities?
- What is the relative importance of helping unincorporated communities to grow versus accommodating new growth in places that produce the fewest negative effects to farm land, water quality and supply, traffic volumes, air quality, etc?

In considering the economic feasibility and/or costs of implementing a Healthy Growth Alternative compared with the four Alternatives presented in the DEIR that would allow leapfrog sprawl and related development, the revised DEIR should reference relevant studies conducted on the financial costs of sprawl vs. efficient, infill development.

123-195

In recent decades, numerous studies have documented the costs of public services to serve different development patterns. Unsurprisingly, most of these studies have found that it costs considerably less to provide linear services (sewer, water, streets) to a compact, efficient development pattern (city/community-centered growth) than to a sprawling pattern. The revised DEIR should include reference to at least the following studies and their conclusions:

- A 1995 study, *Alternatives for future urban growth in California's Central Valley: The Bottom Line*, compared the consequences of adding an expected 8 million people by the year 2040 to the Central Valley in two possible scenarios: at

3 dwelling units per acre and at 6 units per acre. The study concluded that cities and counties would save \$29 billion in the cost of taxpayer-financed services over a 45 year period if housing developed at an average density of 6 units per acre rather than 3 units per acre.

- A CSU-Bakersfield study compared the infrastructure costs associated with a community-centered development in central Bakersfield with those costs for a sprawling subdivision away from town. The sprawl development cost 25% more, \$927 per house, per year, to service.

123-195  
cont'd

The revised DEIR must address these relevant studies, and apply their findings. Any findings presented in the DEIR contrary to those provided in relevant studies such as those presented above must be substantiated. As part of the analysis of the costs to Tulare County of servicing different GPU Alternatives, the revised DEIR must relate those findings to the ability of Tulare County to achieve the stated GPU Project Objectives, including: Promote reinvestment in existing communities and hamlets in a way that enhances the quality of life in these locations.

123-196

In other words, the DEIR must determine which of the Alternatives would be expected to generate the most revenue and cost the least to serve, and therefore produce the most net funds to help existing communities to meet currently un-met needs, such as water supply and transportation infrastructure upgrades.

Finally, in order to ensure that the DEIR is revised sufficiently to provide a reasonable range of Alternatives under CEQA, including a true Healthy Growth Alternative, and that the GPU documents have been revised sufficiently to provide clear, unambiguous policies and concrete, measurable implementations that would truly effectuate a Healthy Growth Alternative, we urge the County to engage the public by circulating the improved, revised draft GPU and DEIR.

## **Growth Inducing Effects of the General Plan Update**

### Population Growth: Induced or Absorbed?

The General Plan Update is predicated upon a substantial increase in population in Tulare County by 2030. The DEIR states, that “future development in Tulare County will be driven by population growth and the distribution of that growth throughout the County.”

The DEIR states that the “...County experienced a 36.8 percent population increase since 1980.” Yet, the DEIR forecasts a 69% rate of growth during the term of the

123-197



General Plan Update, nearly double the rate of growth that has occurred over the last two decades.

I23-197  
cont'd

The revised DEIR must fully disclose the data, models and assumptions used by the California Department of Finance and the Tulare County Association of Governments to project growth in Tulare County over the life of the General Plan Update. Why is the rate of growth projected during the term of the GPU projected at nearly double the rate of growth that has occurred in recent decades?

The DEIR states that “implementation of the GPU would induce some of the population and housing growth in the County, in part because it increases intensity of uses and densities in both the cities and communities that comprise the County.”

The revised DEIR must disclose what portion of the population growth projected in the DEIR would be induced by the increases of uses and densities, and other changes proposed in the GPU, including new towns, growth corridors and alterations to the FGMP. The revised DEIR should include a TCAG forecast for population growth in Tulare County that would occur under the current General Plan/no-project Alternative.

A revised DEIR must analyze the extent, to which the proposed GPU would allow and even encourage sprawl development, and therefore induce population growth rather than serve as a guide for where growth is to be allowed. In other words, what is the expected future population level under General Plan policies that would direct growth to defined areas, versus induce growth by allowing leapfrog sprawl development wherever it is proposed? What level of population growth, with what impacts, would occur if market-driven growth were permitted at maximum density on all land use designations, as proposed in the GPU?

I23-198

Since Tulare County’s consultants have concluded that all projected population growth in Tulare County can be accommodated within existing urban development boundaries, the revised DEIR must disclose the reason for not directing a greater share of expected growth within those boundaries, as well as the rationale for directing 25% of expected population growth to growth corridors, new towns, and rural areas throughout the county.

The DEIR should analyze how much new population could be accommodated within the existing development footprint (e.g., infill) of Tulare County’s existing urbanized areas if density were increased from current levels to a range of 10-30 people per acre, with increasing density scaled in over the term of the GPU.

Without this information, it would be impossible to adequately analyze the various alternatives proposed by DEIR in order to reach an informed and reasoned conclusion.

123-198  
cont'd

Thank you for consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,

Sarah Graber  
Executive Director

Laurie Schwaller  
Co-Chair

Jeff Steen  
Co-Chair



## **Comments and Recommendations on the Proposed Tulare County General Plan Update**

February 14, 2007

The proposed Tulare County general plan update (GPU) was released to the public in November 2006 as a draft *Goals and Policies Report* (GPR). The deadline for public comment is February 14, 2007.

American Farmland Trust deeply appreciates the opportunity to submit comments on the proposed general plan update. We have the utmost respect for local land use decision making, and have consulted farmers, officials and others in Tulare County as we prepared these comments. We hope and trust that they will be received in the same spirit of cooperation as they are offered. We would be glad to discuss them with County planners and elected officials at any time.

### **Summary**

Tulare County is developing more land per new resident than any other county in the Central Valley. At the current rate, its urban area will almost double in size by 2025. Most of the 40 cities, communities and hamlets in the county – all of which are slated to grow under the proposed general plan update -- are located in the midst of productive farmland. Thus, the only effective way for the county and its cities to conserve a meaningful amount of farmland is to improve the efficiency of development. The proposed general plan update includes many policies aimed at minimizing the conversion of farmland, but none directly addresses the critical issue of per capita land consumption. AFT proposes that the County adopt an explicit policy of measuring, tracking, publicizing and reducing per capita land consumption and pledges to work with County officials to implement it.

### **American Farmland Trust and Its Interest in the Tulare GPU**

AFT is a national nonprofit organization founded in 1980 to protect the best farmland from conversion to other uses and to help farmers adopt agricultural practices that will improve environmental quality. It is widely acknowledged to be the nation's most authoritative source of information and expertise about farmland protection policies. We have had an office in California since 1983 and have made the Central Valley the focus of our efforts in the state ever since an AFT research report *Farming on the Edge* (1993) concluded that the region was – as it still is -- the most productive agricultural area in America under the most severe urban growth pressure. As the second highest grossing agricultural county in the Valley – indeed, in the United States – Tulare is among the jurisdictions that AFT is most interested in helping to conserve the farmland that is the basis of its economy.

In 1995, AFT completed another research project in cooperation with the University of California campuses at Berkeley and Davis, entitled *Alternatives for Future Urban Growth in California's*

*Central Valley: The Bottom Line for Agriculture and Taxpayers*.<sup>1</sup> That study projected two different growth patterns into the future, finding that a continuation of present trends would consume far more farmland and have a greater negative impact on both the agricultural economy and the cost of municipal services than a more compact, efficient model of development that has come to be called “smart growth.” In 2006, AFT released another report *The Future Is Now: Central Valley Farmland at the Tipping Point*<sup>2</sup> which found that, despite the adoption of local plans and policies favoring smarter growth, the pattern of development in the Central Valley has not changed much from a decade earlier. Tulare County was the only county that actually regressed by developing less efficiently than in the past.

AFT places a great deal of emphasis on factual analysis as the basis for public policies that will effectively conserve and protect farmland for agricultural use. We, therefore, offer the facts as we know them as the basis for our comments on the proposed Tulare County general plan update. While we have confidence in our sources and analysis, we acknowledge that the County itself may have better information, gathered from local rather than the statewide sources AFT relied on, that may shed even clearer light on the issues raised by the plan. If so, we encourage the County to recalculate the key figures presented below on farmland conversion and planned growth.

## **Factual Background**

Tulare County has long been acclaimed as a national leader in farmland protection. For more than a quarter-century, its Rural Valley Lands Plan has been celebrated as an innovative approach to preventing the unnecessary development of high quality agricultural land. Recent evidence, however, calls into question the efficacy of the county’s overall policy framework – and, not to be ignored, the policies of the cities within it – at preventing the kind of unnecessary farmland conversion that can undermine the health of its agricultural economy.

In a region like the Central Valley where the population is exploding, but the amount of farmland remains relatively fixed,<sup>3</sup> the key to minimizing the loss of farmland and, thereby, maintaining agricultural production capacity, is to reduce *per capita* land consumption, i.e., the amount of land developed for each new resident. During the 1990’s, development within Tulare County (including its cities) consumed an acre of farmland – 10,070 acres in all -- for every 5.7 new residents, ranking it at the very bottom of all Central Valley counties in its performance at avoiding unnecessary farmland loss.<sup>4</sup> Indeed, measured on a *per capita* basis, Tulare is using up farmland 1.4 times as fast as the Valley as a whole, which itself averaged only 8 people per acre.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>[http://www.farmlandinfo.org/documents/30361/FUTURE\\_URBAN\\_GROWTH\\_IN\\_CALIFORNIAS\\_CENTRAL\\_VALLEY.pdf](http://www.farmlandinfo.org/documents/30361/FUTURE_URBAN_GROWTH_IN_CALIFORNIAS_CENTRAL_VALLEY.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> [www.farmland.org/programs/states/futureisnow/default.asp](http://www.farmland.org/programs/states/futureisnow/default.asp)

<sup>3</sup> There is simply no substitute for high-quality farmland. As the *Report of the Agricultural Task Force for Resource Conservation and Economic Growth in the Central Valley* (1998), whose vice chair was current state Resources Agency Secretary Mike Chrisman, put it: “During California’s post World War II sprawl, new agricultural technologies and additional irrigation allowed more intense agricultural production to occur while prime soils were being urbanized. This is no longer a viable option. We cannot expect the same kinds of yields nor to remain competitive in a global market if agriculture is pushed onto lower quality soils that require higher inputs.” <http://www.cfbf.com/issues/landuse/report1.cfm>

<sup>4</sup> This and, unless otherwise referenced, all other figures in this comment letter are from AFT’s 2006 report, *The Future Is Now: Central Valley Farmland at the Tipping Point*, cited above. Most of the raw data on

The inefficiency of development in Tulare County wouldn't be so problematic if the land being lost were not so highly productive. But 58 percent of all the land developed in Tulare during the 1990's -- and 71 percent of that developed between 2000 and 2004 -- was prime, unique or statewide important farmland. This is attributable to the fact that almost all of Tulare's cities, communities, hamlets and other developing areas are located in the midst of this high quality farmland. Indeed, 78 percent of all the land within current city spheres of influence in Tulare County is high quality farmland. Thus, as long as the existing cities and unincorporated communities in Tulare County continue to grow, it is unrealistic to suggest (as the GPU does) that a strategy of directing development away from high quality farmland can succeed. The only way to truly minimize the loss of the county's best farmland is to reduce the amount of this land consumed by each new resident.

If the current, inefficient development patterns continue, and the county's population grows by the 189,400 people the County's *General Plan Background Report* (at 2-40) predicts by 2025,<sup>6</sup> Tulare County will lose another 33,200 acres of farmland to urbanization -- roughly doubling the current urban area of the county's cities. By contrast, about 50,900 (59%) of the 86,700 acres within the current city spheres of influence in Tulare County remain undeveloped. We have not been able to determine the amount of undeveloped land within community and hamlet urban development boundaries. But the developed area outside city spheres of influence (16,400 acres) represents about 31 percent of the developed area within them.<sup>7</sup> If we assume that these outlying areas are permitted to grow at roughly the same proportion as areas within spheres, it would suggest that an additional 15,800 acres could be available for development.<sup>8</sup> Thus, the total land now planned for urban growth appears to be as much as 66,700 acres -- more than twice as much as would be needed to accommodate all development through 2025, even if its efficiency is not increased at all. On the other hand, if the efficiency of development were increased to the Valley-wide average of 8 people per acre, only 23,675 acres would be needed to accommodate growth through 2025; and if it were increased to 15 people per acre, roughly comparable to the prevailing average in the Bay Area and urban Southern California, only 12,625 acres would be needed -- less than 20 percent of the land currently planned for development.

In summary, Tulare County and its cities are consuming more farmland per new resident than any other county in the Central Valley. They have earmarked far more land for development than is needed for growth through 2025, even if development does not become more efficient. And most of the land being developed, as well as that planned for development around existing cities and other communities, is of the highest quality for agriculture, making a strategy of avoiding high

---

which that report relies is from the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the state Department of Conservation.

<sup>5</sup> For comparison, new development in the urban areas of the Bay Area and Southern California averaged 14 and 15 people per acre respectively in the 1990's.

<sup>6</sup> The report projects a population of 630,529 by 2025. A 2007 population estimate of 441,100 was obtained by interpolating the 2005 and 2010 data in Table 2-25, yielding a net increase of about 189,400.

<sup>7</sup> This does not include another 21,000 acres of existing "ranchette" development (rural residences on lots from 1 ½ to 20 acres, which are, needless to say, the most inefficient development of all.

<sup>8</sup> Estimated by multiplying the 31 percent of development outside spheres by the amount of available land within spheres (0.31 x 50,900 = 15,800).

quality farmland unrealistic. It is against this background that we evaluated the proposed general plan update.

### **Our Core Recommendation**

- Our principal recommendation for improving the draft general plan is to incorporate policies and implementing mechanisms that will commit the county (and the cities within it) to making a concerted, systematic and good faith effort to increase the efficiency of development and thereby reduce overall per capita land consumption to the extent necessary to save a specific amount of high-quality farmland that would otherwise be developed by the year 2025. In this way – and perhaps only in this way – can the County actually implement its proposed policy of “minimiz[ing] the conversion of existing agricultural land ... associated with new development” (LU-1.8, Land Use Element, New Policy, GPR, 5-12) while enabling its cities and other communities to continue to grow.

Increasing development efficiency will also help achieve other smart growth goals that the County says it embraces, among them, reducing public service costs, traffic congestion and air pollution (including greenhouse gas emissions), and creating more economic opportunity for all communities. True economic opportunity for communities in Tulare County can be realized, we submit, without the unnecessary sacrifice of farmland. Indeed, wasting land on sprawling development is widely recognized to be a deterrent to true economic opportunity because of the excessive financial burdens it puts on growing communities.<sup>9</sup>

### **Critique of the Proposed General Plan Update**

The proposed general plan update contains many lofty and laudable goals with respect to protecting farmland through smarter growth, among them:

- “The County will protect its agricultural economy while diversifying employment opportunities.” Value Statement #1, *Goals and Policy Report* (GPR), A-1
- “Protect the county’s agricultural uses ... from urban encroachment.” Principle 3, Planning Framework, GPR, A-2
- “Preservation of productive agricultural lands shall be the highest priority when considering modifications (to urban development boundaries).” PF-2.2, Planning Framework, GPR, 2-6
- “The County shall maintain agriculture as the primary land use in the valley region of the county.” AG-1.1, Agriculture Element, GPR, 4-3

---

<sup>9</sup> For example, AFT’s report *Alternative Futures for California’s Central Valley*, cited above, found that a continuation of current development patterns would result in 24% higher public service costs for municipalities than would the same amount of development that is roughly twice as efficient, making it less likely that adequate services could be provided. (Summary Report, at 12).

- “The County shall promote the preservation of its agricultural economic base and open space resources through ... identification of urban growth parameters for all urban areas located in the county.” AG-1.7, Agriculture Element, GPR, 4-4
- “The County shall promote the principles of smart growth within UDBs and HDBs, including ... discouraging sprawl, urban infill and preserving open space.” LU-1.1, Land Use Element, GPR, 5-12; and last but perhaps most importantly ...
- “The County shall encourage and provide incentives for infill development ... to maximize the use of land within existing urban areas, [and] minimize the conversion of existing agricultural land ... associated with new development. LU-1.8, Land Use Element, New Policy, GPR, 5-12.

We applaud these good intentions. But the ability of the County to achieve these goals will be made very difficult by several other key policy decisions reflected in the proposed GPU:

- New development is permitted in a large number of widely-scattered cities (8), unincorporated communities (19), hamlets (13), and an unspecified number of possible new towns (PF-2, GPR, 2-5; PF-3, GPR, 2-8; PF-5, GPR, 2-10);
- An exceedingly liberal policy of considering urban boundary expansions upon a simple request for subdivision approval, among other methods. (PF-2.2, GPR, 2-6; PF-3.2, GPR, 2-8). This is exacerbated by an illusory policy of allowing urban boundary expansions “only when ... non-agricultural lands are not reasonably available to the community,” a condition that will almost always be met because nearly every community and hamlet in the county is surrounded by productive farmland.<sup>10</sup> (PF-4.6, GPR, 2-10)
- The designation of far more land within city spheres of influence and the urban development boundaries of unincorporated communities and hamlets than will be needed to accommodate the population in 2025 (see Factual Background, above).

All of these are open invitations to inefficient urban sprawl that is likely to consume far more agricultural land than is necessary to achieve the county’s economic opportunity goals, sacrificing agricultural production, revenue, jobs and open space that could be saved if these policies were tightened. We suggest changes in each of these three policy decisions.

Permitting urban expansion merely through a subdivision proposal, really ought to be reconsidered. There appears to be no good reason for such a piecemeal approach to expansion, one that will be subject to political favoritism and likely to ignore cumulative impacts on farmland. The GPU offers several other, more comprehensive avenues for considering expansion that probably are not as subject to these pitfalls.

---

<sup>10</sup> Similarly, the proposed new policy of “direct[ing] development away from valuable agricultural lands to cities, unincorporated communities and hamlets (LU-2.1, GPR, 5-15) appears to be completely ineffectual, given that practically all the undeveloped land in these settlements is productive agricultural land.

Permitting development in every existing community, large and small, and allowing adequate room for it to occur (as the first and third of the above policies do), appear to be unavoidable as long as the county is committed to promoting economic opportunity for all. But new towns should be carefully evaluated lest they divert economic opportunity away from existing communities and pose additional risks to agriculture as new magnets for development, land price inflation and potential land use conflicts. And the county should take stronger measures to assure that economic opportunity is not squandered by allowing development to consume more farmland and tax dollars than necessary.

One measure that is essential to preventing unnecessary, counterproductive farmland conversion in Tulare County, given the foregoing circumstances and policies, is the adoption of an explicit policy of minimizing conversion of the highest quality farmland and a mechanism by which to implement it in the only way that is likely to be effective: measure, track and reduce the total amount of farmland consumed by the 189,400 new residents the county will add by 2025.

The closest that the GPU appears to come to such a policy is in its conditions for supporting the expansion of city urban development boundaries:

“The County shall encourage orderly outward expansion of urban development by supporting those city UDB expansion proposals where the city has demonstrated a need for additional territory after documenting a good faith effort to implement an infill development program and *minimize conversion of productive agricultural lands.*”  
(Emphasis added, PF-4.6, GPR, 2-10)

Again, the intention is praiseworthy, if limited in scope. But unless there is some way to measure how much land development is consuming, not just in the aggregate and after the fact, but in advance and in terms of the amount used on average for each new resident; and unless there are affirmative steps taken to try to decrease *per capita* land consumption; it is difficult to understand how any city could demonstrate the kind of good faith effort this policy seems to call for. Further, limiting the policy to the expansion of cities, in which the county has only an advisory role, inexplicably excludes the opportunity to minimize farmland conversion in cases where the county has direct approval authority over the expansion of unincorporated communities and hamlets and over the location and configuration of new towns.

Therefore, we propose that the County adopt the following policy (or a refinement thereof) as part of the general plan update. It is intended to supplement the other well-intentioned farmland protection policies in the GPU by providing a test that can be applied to future decisions about development to provide better information on which to base such decisions.

#### **LU-1.x Efficient Development to Minimize Agricultural Land Conversion**

The County shall promote efficient development that minimizes the conversion of agricultural land and other resources by adopting and applying Development Efficiency Targets in making future land use decisions affecting agricultural land. The County shall establish Targets for average residential density and commercial floor-to-area ratios (to be applied to public projects as well a private development), based on the amount of land to be dedicated to these uses, the projected population and the goal of limiting future



urbanization of agricultural and other open land within the County (including those portions within cities) to not more than 16,000 acres through the year 2025.<sup>11</sup>

The County shall use these Targets (and encourage cities to use them) to evaluate existing spheres of influence and urban development boundaries, existing zoning districts, rezoning petitions, community and specific plans, new town proposals, agreements with cities that would expand their spheres of influence or urban development boundaries, and all new development projects within the unincorporated area of the County that are not already part of a community or specific plan. Such evaluations shall include specific findings, to be made available to the general public, that quantify any deviation of the efficiency of the development that is or would be authorized from the applicable Development Efficiency Targets.

The County shall also identify obstacles to increasing the efficiency of urban development and shall adopt (and encourage cities to adopt) changes in policies, zoning, rules and incentives to enable and encourage all communities to meet Development Efficiency Targets.

This proposed policy would be relatively simple to implement<sup>12</sup> and would provide vital information for future land use decision making. It would not require any specific changes in local zoning or subdivision rules, though it could lay the foundation for graduated mitigation fees and other incentives to encourage more efficient development of farmland. What it ultimately would do is focus the attention of decision makers on the critical issue of development efficiency and, by making empirical information available to them and the public, encourage greater accountability for implementing the County policy of minimizing agricultural land conversion. If it is sincere about wanting to conserve farmland and protect agriculture, frankly, we see no good reason why the County would not want to adopt such a policy and implementing mechanisms.

We would welcome the opportunity to discuss our comments and recommendations with County planners, elected officials and others with an interest in conserving farmland and safeguarding the agricultural economy of Tulare County, while providing greater economic opportunity for all.

Respectfully,

Edward Thompson, Jr.  
California Director  
530-753-1073  
[ethompson@farmland.org](mailto:ethompson@farmland.org)

---

<sup>11</sup> This implies an average development efficiency of about 12 people per acre over the period, double the current trend in Tulare County. It would save 25 square miles of farmland. Obviously, a less ambitious goal could be established, but we believe that what we propose is both realistic and worthwhile.

<sup>12</sup> We are incorporating as part of our comments a spreadsheet that begins to suggest a general approach to establishing Development Efficiency Targets and allows the County to substitute its own data for the sample data it contains. A printout of the sample data is on the next page.

<b>Establishing Development Efficiency Targets:</b>	
<b>Comparison of Current Trend with Potential Gains in Efficiency</b>	
<i>Enter data into green cells only.</i>	
<b>Inputs</b>	
Urban Population - Current	300,000
Total Area of Urban Footprint (Ac) - Current	50,000
Percentage of Community = Residential	75%
Population - Projected	490,000
<b>Existing Conditions - Outputs</b>	
Residential Acreage	37,500
Commercial/Other Acreage	12,500
People Per Acre (Gross)	6.0
People Per Acre (Net Residential)	8.0
Average DU/Ac (assume 3 people per household)	2.7
Commercial/Other Density (FAR) - Current	0.25
<b>Improved Development Efficiency Goals</b>	
Target Residential Density (PPA)	16.2
Equivalent Net DU/Ac	5.4
Target FAR	0.35
<b>Current Trend Analysis</b>	
Increase in Area of Residential Area	23,750
Increase in Area of Commercial/Other*	5,938
Total	29,688
Gross PPA for New Development	6.4
New Gross PPA	6.1
<b>Improved Efficiency Alternative Analysis</b>	
Increase in Residential Area (at Target Density)	11,761
Increase in Commercial/Other Area (at Target FAR)*	4,241
Total	16,002
Gross PPA for New Development	11.9
New Gross PPA	7.4
Total Land Saved by Meeting Targets	13,685
Percentage of Land Saved	46%
Proportion due to Residential	88%
Proportion due to Commercial/Other	14%
Increase in Gross Residential Density	102%
* Assumes same pct of footprint is commercial/other in future.	