May 24, 2010

Supervisor Phil Cox
Resource Management Agency
5961 S. Mooney Blvd.
Visalia, CA 93277

As an interested citizen, I have reviewed most of the General Plan. That doesn't mean I have read all of it! I would say the most important parts addressed are concerning air quality, land use (development), and transportation (vehicles), which are inter-related.

After the first draft of the General Plan was made public in 2008, a letter from Deputy Attorney General Susan Fiering gave a scathing rebuke, listing all the reasons the county had to get serious about greenhouse gases. She was concerned that county emissions of CO2 are expected to increase by 1.7 tons and considers air quality the most important, with vehicular traffic the main factor. She wrote that greenhouse gases affect us by more fires, and increase in health problems and deaths, more dairy cattle dying from heat as temperatures increase, climate change affecting crops such as stone fruit, etc. She writes that the plan leaves land uses and growth to allow market forces to decide and that it considers a narrow range of alternatives, ignoring "smart growth." "Significant but unavoidable" is not satisfactory. She states that no alternatives or enforceable restrictions are given for building projects or land use, but that the state can help the county with needed changes.

A large criticism of the plan is that it is vague, without specifics, measurements, regulations, monitoring or enforcement and "no mitigation measures are available" for change. It seems not much has changed since 2008 in the updated version. For instance, in the air quality section:

> P. AQ1-3 "The county shall require development to be located, designed and constructed in such a manner that would minimize cumulative air quality impacts. Applicants (for development) are to propose alternatives to reduce air emissions."

Is the county setting standards for approval that are specific, and if possible, measured from a present baseline?What changes are they to make? Are they deciding or are you? What about enforcement of smart growth principles for smaller lots, development in such a manner to be close to shopping, parks, etc.? We are talking about the 25% asthma rate of children living here. Every time you see a toddler, you have to consider their future health.

Consider how weak your plans are:

> P. AQ 1-12 "The county shall encourage LEED (leadership in energy and environmental design) and ND (neighborhood development) certification for new development to promote energy conservation and sustainability."
>
> P. AQ 3.4 "The county shall encourage ecologically based landscape principles that can improve air quality improving CO2."
>
> P. AQ 3-5 "The county shall encourage all new development including rehabilitation, renovation, and redevelopment to incorporate energy conservation and green building practices to the maximum extent feasible."
>
> P. AQ 4.1 "The county shall support air quality attainment plans. Measures will be applied to new development approvals and permits as appropriate."

Encourage, support, propose alternatives as appropriate – how concrete and regulatory is that? Will anything really change in our air quality? No wonder the Deputy Attorney General calls the county building plans "market driven." In other words, where is any incentive for developers to go much beyond the status quo, or just enough to get by?

Besides air quality issues, the other alarming part of the General Plan concerns land use planning. The one most affecting our area is to take place in "Cotton King" Boswell's Yokohl Valley development at

the eastern base of Badger Hill, extending north to Highway 198 and south to the entrance of the scenic highway to Springville. It is projected to be a planned community of 34,000 inhabitants, with some lots of 1.3 acres, not exactly smart growth. However, the plans shown to the public when the EIR began, showed no shopping or employment opportunities. It would be a bedroom community. The air emissions from driving for most services would back up against the hills to collect and stagnate. Were you aware that is already the case in Three Rivers in the fall until the rainy season? Take a plane ride up the canyon and see for yourself.

The other new Urban Development Boundaries where 25% of the growth will take place will also cause more traffic. This would seem to contradict the county "Alternatives to the Proposed Project" (EIR 4-2). "Significant environmental impacts that the county seeks to eliminate or reduce are:

Air quality impacts from increased development and vehicular traffic
Loss of Agricultural land
Biological resource impacts resulting from loss of habitat
Viewshed impacts resulting from increased development
Groundwater impacts and availability of adequate water supply resulting from increased development

How would air pollution be reduced if all these new urban townspeople drove to major areas for medical services, auto services, hospitals, cultural events, etc.? Will the new areas be self-contained and businesses be encouraged to meet the needs of the public so there is less driving?

I will say the General Plan is a huge effort to compile. Small comments (only suggestions, not regulations) such as ATMs and vending machines at large employee sites, staggering work hrs., carpooling, studying traffic patterns of intersections of high emissions, paving dirt roads, paving or stabilizing shoulders of roads, etc. may help, but are not enough, and not nearly as significant as regulations of new development.

Several subjects seemed to be left out, for instance the impact of agriculture, which comprises 23% of our economy, according to the Tulare County Economic Development Department. You do not address the dust of tree shaking during the nut harvest. You do not address the problem of dairies which by your statistics in your inventory in Appendix E, figure 1, measure greenhouse gases as comprising 63% of the county's greenhouse gases. Any equipment with engines such as agricultural also contributes to air pollution, as well as motorboats on Lake Kaweah. How are they regulated?

I am upset about land taken out of cultivation for small parcels for homeowners who decide they want to live in the country, known as ranchettes. This is not recognized for what it is, rural sprawl. As they are allowed to locate closer to towns, they contribute to cities growing together such as Exeter and Farmersville. Also, as you allow county land to be annexed to enlarge city boundaries for developers, it gives opportunity to hopscotch over agricultural land instead of infill. City growth needs to be planned growth, not beholden to developers' voracious appetite for profit. County planning, or lack of it, is as much responsible for this as city planning commissions. City planning commissions are not always wise and thinking for future good, such as smart growth and saving ag land for the future food production of our nation.

Decisions made now are not just for tomorrow. They are for always. With such feeble attempts at reigning in air pollution with an attitude of "significant but unavoidable," with more cars on the road as each year comes, I see little hope for our county and the health of our residents. It doesn't seem like your plans take air quality seriously and are content with status quo with minor adjustments. There are bold solutions that apparently the state would help you implement if the desire was there. I would hope that there is a phase two of writing county regulations to achieve better air quality than was in this General Plan.

Sincerely,

Connie Fry

connielfry@sbcglobal.net

May 24, 2010

Supervisor Mike Ennis
Resource Management Agency
5961 S. Mooney Blvd.
Visalia, CA 93277

As an interested citizen, I have reviewed most of the General Plan. That doesn't mean I have read all of it! I would say the most important parts addressed are concerning air quality, land use (development), and transportation (vehicles), which are inter-related.

After the first draft of the General Plan was made public in 2008, a letter from Deputy Attorney General Susan Fiering gave a scathing rebuke, listing all the reasons the county had to get serious about greenhouse gases. She was concerned that county emissions of CO2 are expected to increase by 1.7 tons and considers air quality the most important, with vehicular traffic the main factor. She wrote that greenhouse gases affect us by more fires, and increase in health problems and deaths, more dairy cattle dying from heat as temperatures increase, climate change affecting crops such as stone fruit, etc. She writes that the plan leaves land uses and growth to allow market forces to decide and that it considers a narrow range of alternatives, ignoring "smart growth." "Significant but unavoidable" is not satisfactory. She states that no alternatives or enforceable restrictions are given for building projects or land use, but that the state can help the county with needed changes.

A large criticism of the plan is that it is vague, without specifics, measurements, regulations, monitoring or enforcement and "no mitigation measures are available" for change. It seems not much has changed since 2008 in the updated version. For instance, in the air quality section:

> P. AQ1-3 "The county shall require development to be located, designed and constructed in such a manner that would minimize cumulative air quality impacts. Applicants (for development) are to propose alternatives to reduce air emissions."

Is the county setting standards for approval that are specific, and if possible, measured from a present baseline?What changes are they to make? Are they deciding or are you? What about enforcement of smart growth principles for smaller lots, development in such a manner to be close to shopping, parks, etc.? We are talking about the 25% asthma rate of children living here. Every time you see a toddler, you have to consider their future health.

Consider how weak your plans are:

> P. AQ 1-12 "The county shall encourage LEED (leadership in energy and environmental design) and ND (neighborhood development) certification for new development to promote energy conservation and sustainability."
>
> P. AQ 3.4 "The county shall encourage ecologically based landscape principles that can improve air quality improving CO2."
>
> P. AQ 3-5 "The county shall encourage all new development including rehabilitation, renovation, and redevelopment to incorporate energy conservation and green building practices to the maximum extent feasible."
>
> P. AQ 4.1 "The county shall support air quality attainment plans. Measures will be applied to new development approvals and permits as appropriate."

Encourage, support, propose alternatives as appropriate – how concrete and regulatory is that? Will anything really change in our air quality? No wonder the Deputy Attorney General calls the county building plans "market driven." In other words, where is any incentive for developers to go much beyond the status quo, or just enough to get by?

Besides air quality issues, the other alarming part of the General Plan concerns land use planning. The one most affecting our area is to take place in "Cotton King" Boswell's Yokohl Valley development at

the eastern base of Badger Hill, extending north to Highway 198 and south to the entrance of the scenic highway to Springville. It is projected to be a planned community of 34,000 inhabitants, with some lots of 1.3 acres, not exactly smart growth. However, the plans shown to the public when the EIR began, showed no shopping or employment opportunities. It would be a bedroom community. The air emissions from driving for most services would back up against the hills to collect and stagnate. Were you aware that is already the case in Three Rivers in the fall until the rainy season? Take a plane ride up the canyon and see for yourself.

The other new Urban Development Boundaries where 25% of the growth will take place will also cause more traffic. This would seem to contradict the county "Alternatives to the Proposed Project" (EIR 4-2). "Significant environmental impacts that the county seeks to eliminate or reduce are:

Air quality impacts from increased development and vehicular traffic
Loss of Agricultural land
Biological resource impacts resulting from loss of habitat
Viewshed impacts resulting from increased development
Groundwater impacts and availability of adequate water supply resulting from increased development

How would air pollution be reduced if all these new urban townspeople drove to major areas for medical services, auto services, hospitals, cultural events, etc.? Will the new areas be self-contained and businesses be encouraged to meet the needs of the public so there is less driving?

I will say the General Plan is a huge effort to compile. Small comments (only suggestions, not regulations) such as ATMs and vending machines at large employee sites, staggering work hrs., carpooling, studying traffic patterns of intersections of high emissions, paving dirt roads, paving or stabilizing shoulders of roads, etc. may help, but are not enough, and not nearly as significant as regulations of new development.

Several subjects seemed to be left out, for instance the impact of agriculture, which comprises 23% of our economy, according to the Tulare County Economic Development Department. You do not address the dust of tree shaking during the nut harvest. You do not address the problem of dairies which by your statistics in your inventory in Appendix E, figure 1, measure greenhouse gases as comprising 63% of the county's greenhouse gases. Any equipment with engines such as agricultural also contributes to air pollution, as well as motorboats on Lake Kaweah. How are they regulated?

I am upset about land taken out of cultivation for small parcels for homeowners who decide they want to live in the country, known as ranchettes. This is not recognized for what it is, rural sprawl. As they are allowed to locate closer to towns, they contribute to cities growing together such as Exeter and Farmersville. Also, as you allow county land to be annexed to enlarge city boundaries for developers, it gives opportunity to hopscotch over agricultural land instead of infill. City growth needs to be planned growth, not beholden to developers' voracious appetite for profit. County planning, or lack of it, is as much responsible for this as city planning commissions. City planning commissions are not always wise and thinking for future good, such as smart growth and saving ag land for the future food production of our nation.

Decisions made now are not just for tomorrow. They are for always. With such feeble attempts at reigning in air pollution with an attitude of "significant but unavoidable," with more cars on the road as each year comes, I see little hope for our county and the health of our residents. It doesn't seem like your plans take air quality seriously and are content with status quo with minor adjustments. There are bold solutions that apparently the state would help you implement if the desire was there. I would hope that there is a phase two of writing county regulations to achieve better air quality than was in this General Plan.

Sincerely,

Connie Fry

Connie Fry

connielfry@sbcglobal.net

May 24, 2010

Supervisor Steve Worthley
Resource Management Agency
5961 S. Mooney Blvd.
Visalia, CA 93277

As an interested citizen, I have reviewed most of the General Plan. That doesn't mean I have read all of it! I would say the most important parts addressed are concerning air quality, land use (development), and transportation (vehicles), which are inter-related.

After the first draft of the General Plan was made public in 2008, a letter from Deputy Attorney General Susan Fiering gave a scathing rebuke, listing all the reasons the county had to get serious about greenhouse gases. She was concerned that county emissions of CO2 are expected to increase by 1.7 tons and considers air quality the most important, with vehicular traffic the main factor. She wrote that greenhouse gases affect us by more fires, and increase in health problems and deaths, more dairy cattle dying from heat as temperatures increase, climate change affecting crops such as stone fruit, etc. She writes that the plan leaves land uses and growth to allow market forces to decide and that it considers a narrow range of alternatives, ignoring "smart growth." "Significant but unavoidable" is not satisfactory. She states that no alternatives or enforceable restrictions are given for building projects or land use, but that the state can help the county with needed changes.

A large criticism of the plan is that it is vague, without specifics, measurements, regulations, monitoring or enforcement and "no mitigation measures are available" for change. It seems not much has changed since 2008 in the updated version. For instance, in the air quality section:

> P. AQ1-3 "The county shall require development to be located, designed and constructed in such a manner that would minimize cumulative air quality impacts. Applicants (for development) are to propose alternatives to reduce air emissions."

Is the county setting standards for approval that are specific, and if possible, measured from a present baseline?What changes are they to make? Are they deciding or are you? What about enforcement of smart growth principles for smaller lots, development in such a manner to be close to shopping, parks, etc.? We are talking about the 25% asthma rate of children living here. Every time you see a toddler, you have to consider their future health.

Consider how weak your plans are:

> P. AQ 1-12 "The county shall encourage LEED (leadership in energy and environmental design) and ND (neighborhood development) certification for new development to promote energy conservation and sustainability."
>
> P. AQ 3.4 "The county shall encourage ecologically based landscape principles that can improve air quality improving CO2."
>
> P. AQ 3-5 "The county shall encourage all new development including rehabilitation, renovation, and redevelopment to incorporate energy conservation and green building practices to the maximum extent feasible."
>
> P. AQ 4.1 "The county shall support air quality attainment plans. Measures will be applied to new development approvals and permits as appropriate."

Encourage, support, propose alternatives as appropriate – how concrete and regulatory is that? Will anything really change in our air quality? No wonder the Deputy Attorney General calls the county building plans "market driven." In other words, where is any incentive for developers to go much beyond the status quo, or just enough to get by?

Besides air quality issues, the other alarming part of the General Plan concerns land use planning. The one most affecting our area is to take place in "Cotton King" Boswell's Yokohl Valley development at

the eastern base of Badger Hill, extending north to Highway 198 and south to the entrance of the scenic highway to Springville. It is projected to be a planned community of 34,000 inhabitants, with some lots of 1.3 acres, not exactly smart growth. However, the plans shown to the public when the EIR began, showed no shopping or employment opportunities. It would be a bedroom community. The air emissions from driving for most services would back up against the hills to collect and stagnate. Were you aware that is already the case in Three Rivers in the fall until the rainy season? Take a plane ride up the canyon and see for yourself.

The other new Urban Development Boundaries where 25% of the growth will take place will also cause more traffic. This would seem to contradict the county "Alternatives to the Proposed Project" (EIR 4-2). "Significant environmental impacts that the county seeks to eliminate or reduce are:

Air quality impacts from increased development and vehicular traffic
Loss of Agricultural land
Biological resource impacts resulting from loss of habitat
Viewshed impacts resulting from increased development
Groundwater impacts and availability of adequate water supply resulting from increased development

How would air pollution be reduced if all these new urban townspeople drove to major areas for medical services, auto services, hospitals, cultural events, etc.? Will the new areas be self-contained and businesses be encouraged to meet the needs of the public so there is less driving?

I will say the General Plan is a huge effort to compile. Small comments (only suggestions, not regulations) such as ATMs and vending machines at large employee sites, staggering work hrs., carpooling, studying traffic patterns of intersections of high emissions, paving dirt roads, paving or stabilizing shoulders of roads, etc. may help, but are not enough, and not nearly as significant as regulations of new development.

Several subjects seemed to be left out, for instance the impact of agriculture, which comprises 23% of our economy, according to the Tulare County Economic Development Department. You do not address the dust of tree shaking during the nut harvest. You do not address the problem of dairies which by your statistics in your inventory in Appendix E, figure 1, measure greenhouse gases as comprising 63% of the county's greenhouse gases. Any equipment with engines such as agricultural also contributes to air pollution, as well as motorboats on Lake Kaweah. How are they regulated?

I am upset about land taken out of cultivation for small parcels for homeowners who decide they want to live in the country, known as ranchettes. This is not recognized for what it is, rural sprawl. As they are allowed to locate closer to towns, they contribute to cities growing together such as Exeter and Farmersville. Also, as you allow county land to be annexed to enlarge city boundaries for developers, it gives opportunity to hopscotch over agricultural land instead of infill. City growth needs to be planned growth, not beholden to developers' voracious appetite for profit. County planning, or lack of it, is as much responsible for this as city planning commissions. City planning commissions are not always wise and thinking for future good, such as smart growth and saving ag land for the future food production of our nation.

Decisions made now are not just for tomorrow. They are for always. With such feeble attempts at reigning in air pollution with an attitude of "significant but unavoidable," with more cars on the road as each year comes, I see little hope for our county and the health of our residents. It doesn't seem like your plans take air quality seriously and are content with status quo with minor adjustments. There are bold solutions that apparently the state would help you implement if the desire was there. I would hope that there is a phase two of writing county regulations to achieve better air quality than was in this General Plan.

Sincerely,

Connie Fry

Connie Fry

connielfry@sbcglobal.net

May 24, 2010

Supervisor Alan Ishida
Resource Management Agency
5961 S. Mooney Blvd.
Visalia, CA 93277

As an interested citizen, I have reviewed most of the General Plan. That doesn't mean I have read all of it! I would say the most important parts addressed are concerning air quality, land use (development), and transportation (vehicles), which are inter-related.

After the first draft of the General Plan was made public in 2008, a letter from Deputy Attorney General Susan Fiering gave a scathing rebuke, listing all the reasons the county had to get serious about greenhouse gases. She was concerned that county emissions of CO2 are expected to increase by 1.7 tons and considers air quality the most important, with vehicular traffic the main factor. She wrote that greenhouse gases affect us by more fires, and increase in health problems and deaths, more dairy cattle dying from heat as temperatures increase, climate change affecting crops such as stone fruit, etc. She writes that the plan leaves land uses and growth to allow market forces to decide and that it considers a narrow range of alternatives, ignoring "smart growth." "Significant but unavoidable" is not satisfactory. She states that no alternatives or enforceable restrictions are given for building projects or land use, but that the state can help the county with needed changes.

A large criticism of the plan is that it is vague, without specifics, measurements, regulations, monitoring or enforcement and "no mitigation measures are available" for change. It seems not much has changed since 2008 in the updated version. For instance, in the air quality section:

> P. AQ1-3 "The county shall require development to be located, designed and constructed in such a manner that would minimize cumulative air quality impacts. Applicants (for development) are to propose alternatives to reduce air emissions."

Is the county setting standards for approval that are specific, and if possible, measured from a present baseline?What changes are they to make? Are they deciding or are you? What about enforcement of smart growth principles for smaller lots, development in such a manner to be close to shopping, parks, etc.? We are talking about the 25% asthma rate of children living here. Every time you see a toddler, you have to consider their future health.

Consider how weak your plans are:

> P. AQ 1-12 "The county shall encourage LEED (leadership in energy and environmental design) and ND (neighborhood development) certification for new development to promote energy conservation and sustainability."
>
> P. AQ 3.4 "The county shall encourage ecologically based landscape principles that can improve air quality improving CO2."
>
> P. AQ 3-5 "The county shall encourage all new development including rehabilitation, renovation, and redevelopment to incorporate energy conservation and green building practices to the maximum extent feasible."
>
> P. AQ 4.1 "The county shall support air quality attainment plans. Measures will be applied to new development approvals and permits as appropriate."

Encourage, support, propose alternatives as appropriate – how concrete and regulatory is that? Will anything really change in our air quality? No wonder the Deputy Attorney General calls the county building plans "market driven." In other words, where is any incentive for developers to go much beyond the status quo, or just enough to get by?

Besides air quality issues, the other alarming part of the General Plan concerns land use planning. The one most affecting our area is to take place in "Cotton King" Boswell's Yokohl Valley development at

the eastern base of Badger Hill, extending north to Highway 198 and south to the entrance of the scenic highway to Springville. It is projected to be a planned community of 34,000 inhabitants, with some lots of 1.3 acres, not exactly smart growth. However, the plans shown to the public when the EIR began, showed no shopping or employment opportunities. It would be a bedroom community. The air emissions from driving for most services would back up against the hills to collect and stagnate. Were you aware that is already the case in Three Rivers in the fall until the rainy season? Take a plane ride up the canyon and see for yourself.

The other new Urban Development Boundaries where 25% of the growth will take place will also cause more traffic. This would seem to contradict the county "Alternatives to the Proposed Project" (EIR 4-2). "Significant environmental impacts that the county seeks to eliminate or reduce are:

Air quality impacts from increased development and vehicular traffic
Loss of Agricultural land
Biological resource impacts resulting from loss of habitat
Viewshed impacts resulting from increased development
Groundwater impacts and availability of adequate water supply resulting from increased development

How would air pollution be reduced if all these new urban townspeople drove to major areas for medical services, auto services, hospitals, cultural events, etc.? Will the new areas be self-contained and businesses be encouraged to meet the needs of the public so there is less driving?

I will say the General Plan is a huge effort to compile. Small comments (only suggestions, not regulations) such as ATMs and vending machines at large employee sites, staggering work hrs., carpooling, studying traffic patterns of intersections of high emissions, paving dirt roads, paving or stabilizing shoulders of roads, etc. may help, but are not enough, and not nearly as significant as regulations of new development.

Several subjects seemed to be left out, for instance the impact of agriculture, which comprises 23% of our economy, according to the Tulare County Economic Development Department. You do not address the dust of tree shaking during the nut harvest. You do not address the problem of dairies which by your statistics in your inventory in Appendix E, figure 1, measure greenhouse gases as comprising 63% of the county's greenhouse gases. Any equipment with engines such as agricultural also contributes to air pollution, as well as motorboats on Lake Kaweah. How are they regulated?

I am upset about land taken out of cultivation for small parcels for homeowners who decide they want to live in the country, known as ranchettes. This is not recognized for what it is, rural sprawl. As they are allowed to locate closer to towns, they contribute to cities growing together such as Exeter and Farmersville. Also, as you allow county land to be annexed to enlarge city boundaries for developers, it gives opportunity to hopscotch over agricultural land instead of infill. City growth needs to be planned growth, not beholden to developers' voracious appetite for profit. County planning, or lack of it, is as much responsible for this as city planning commissions. City planning commissions are not always wise and thinking for future good, such as smart growth and saving ag land for the future food production of our nation.

Decisions made now are not just for tomorrow. They are for always. With such feeble attempts at reigning in air pollution with an attitude of "significant but unavoidable," with more cars on the road as each year comes, I see little hope for our county and the health of our residents. It doesn't seem like your plans take air quality seriously and are content with status quo with minor adjustments. There are bold solutions that apparently the state would help you implement if the desire was there. I would hope that there is a phase two of writing county regulations to achieve better air quality than was in this General Plan.

Sincerely,

Connie Fry

Connie Fry

connielfry@sbcglobal.net

May 24, 2010

Supervisor Pete Vanderpool
Resource Management Agency
5961 S. Mooney Blvd.
Visalia, CA 93277

As an interested citizen, I have reviewed most of the General Plan. That doesn't mean I have read all of it! I would say the most important parts addressed are concerning air quality, land use (development), and transportation (vehicles), which are inter-related.

After the first draft of the General Plan was made public in 2008, a letter from Deputy Attorney General Susan Fiering gave a scathing rebuke, listing all the reasons the county had to get serious about greenhouse gases. She was concerned that county emissions of CO2 are expected to increase by 1.7 tons and considers air quality the most important, with vehicular traffic the main factor. She wrote that greenhouse gases affect us by more fires, and increase in health problems and deaths, more dairy cattle dying from heat as temperatures increase, climate change affecting crops such as stone fruit, etc. She writes that the plan leaves land uses and growth to allow market forces to decide and that it considers a narrow range of alternatives, ignoring "smart growth." "Significant but unavoidable" is not satisfactory. She states that no alternatives or enforceable restrictions are given for building projects or land use, but that the state can help the county with needed changes.

A large criticism of the plan is that it is vague, without specifics, measurements, regulations, monitoring or enforcement and "no mitigation measures are available" for change. It seems not much has changed since 2008 in the updated version. For instance, in the air quality section:

> P. AQ1-3 "The county shall require development to be located, designed and constructed in such a manner that would minimize cumulative air quality impacts. Applicants (for development) are to propose alternatives to reduce air emissions."

Is the county setting standards for approval that are specific, and if possible, measured from a present baseline?What changes are they to make? Are they deciding or are you? What about enforcement of smart growth principles for smaller lots, development in such a manner to be close to shopping, parks, etc.? We are talking about the 25% asthma rate of children living here. Every time you see a toddler, you have to consider their future health.

Consider how weak your plans are:

> P. AQ 1-12 "The county shall encourage LEED (leadership in energy and environmental design) and ND (neighborhood development) certification for new development to promote energy conservation and sustainability."
>
> P. AQ 3.4 "The county shall encourage ecologically based landscape principles that can improve air quality improving CO2."
>
> P. AQ 3-5 "The county shall encourage all new development including rehabilitation, renovation, and redevelopment to incorporate energy conservation and green building practices to the maximum extent feasible."
>
> P. AQ 4.1 "The county shall support air quality attainment plans. Measures will be applied to new development approvals and permits as appropriate."

Encourage, support, propose alternatives as appropriate – how concrete and regulatory is that? Will anything really change in our air quality? No wonder the Deputy Attorney General calls the county building plans "market driven." In other words, where is any incentive for developers to go much beyond the status quo, or just enough to get by?

Besides air quality issues, the other alarming part of the General Plan concerns land use planning. The one most affecting our area is to take place in "Cotton King" Boswell's Yokohl Valley development at

the eastern base of Badger Hill, extending north to Highway 198 and south to the entrance of the scenic highway to Springville. It is projected to be a planned community of 34,000 inhabitants, with some lots of 1.3 acres, not exactly smart growth. However, the plans shown to the public when the EIR began, showed no shopping or employment opportunities. It would be a bedroom community. The air emissions from driving for most services would back up against the hills to collect and stagnate. Were you aware that is already the case in Three Rivers in the fall until the rainy season? Take a plane ride up the canyon and see for yourself.

The other new Urban Development Boundaries where 25% of the growth will take place will also cause more traffic. This would seem to contradict the county "Alternatives to the Proposed Project" (EIR 4-2). "Significant environmental impacts that the county seeks to eliminate or reduce are:

Air quality impacts from increased development and vehicular traffic
Loss of Agricultural land
Biological resource impacts resulting from loss of habitat
Viewshed impacts resulting from increased development
Groundwater impacts and availability of adequate water supply resulting from increased development

How would air pollution be reduced if all these new urban townspeople drove to major areas for medical services, auto services, hospitals, cultural events, etc.? Will the new areas be self-contained and businesses be encouraged to meet the needs of the public so there is less driving?

I will say the General Plan is a huge effort to compile. Small comments (only suggestions, not regulations) such as ATMs and vending machines at large employee sites, staggering work hrs., carpooling, studying traffic patterns of intersections of high emissions, paving dirt roads, paving or stabilizing shoulders of roads, etc. may help, but are not enough, and not nearly as significant as regulations of new development.

Several subjects seemed to be left out, for instance the impact of agriculture, which comprises 23% of our economy, according to the Tulare County Economic Development Department. You do not address the dust of tree shaking during the nut harvest. You do not address the problem of dairies which by your statistics in your inventory in Appendix E, figure 1, measure greenhouse gases as comprising 63% of the county's greenhouse gases. Any equipment with engines such as agricultural also contributes to air pollution, as well as motorboats on Lake Kaweah. How are they regulated?

I am upset about land taken out of cultivation for small parcels for homeowners who decide they want to live in the country, known as ranchettes. This is not recognized for what it is, rural sprawl. As they are allowed to locate closer to towns, they contribute to cities growing together such as Exeter and Farmersville. Also, as you allow county land to be annexed to enlarge city boundaries for developers, it gives opportunity to hopscotch over agricultural land instead of infill. City growth needs to be planned growth, not beholden to developers' voracious appetite for profit. County planning, or lack of it, is as much responsible for this as city planning commissions. City planning commissions are not always wise and thinking for future good, such as smart growth and saving ag land for the future food production of our nation.

Decisions made now are not just for tomorrow. They are for always. With such feeble attempts at reigning in air pollution with an attitude of "significant but unavoidable," with more cars on the road as each year comes, I see little hope for our county and the health of our residents. It doesn't seem like your plans take air quality seriously and are content with status quo with minor adjustments. There are bold solutions that apparently the state would help you implement if the desire was there. I would hope that there is a phase two of writing county regulations to achieve better air quality than was in this General Plan.

Sincerely,

Connie Fry

Connie Fry

connielfry@sbcglobal.net