

CHAPTER 2

Minor Revisions to the Recirculated Draft EIR

This chapter contains revisions and additions to the RDEIR, issued March 2010. These changes clarify, amplify or make insignificant changes to the EIR. None of the changes identified in this chapter constitutes significant new information or results in any new significant impacts.

Revisions are listed in the order they appear in the RDEIR. New text is indicated by underline and deletions are shown in ~~strikethrough~~.

Global Changes to the RDEIR

The County has made minor revisions to the goals, policies, and implementation measures contained in the 2010 draft of the General Plan 2030 Update as outlined in the “General Plan 2030 Update Correctory Table” and the “Summary of Changes” matrix. These documents are herein incorporated by reference, and any references in the RDEIR to these goals and policies shall be read to refer to the revised goal/policy changes *recommended by County staff* in these documents (i.e. “Staff Recommended Changes” and “Staff Recommendation”).

Changes to the Executive Summary

RDEIR page ES-8:

Executive Summary Table ES-3 is amended to include the revised Policy TC-2.7 on page ES-8:

TC-2.7 Rail Facilities and Existing Development. The County will work with the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) to ensure that new railroad rights-of-way, yards, or stations adjacent to existing residential or commercial areas are screened or buffered to reduce noise, air, and visual impacts. Similarly, the County should coordinate with the CPUC and railroad service providers to address railroad safety issues as part of all future new development that affects local rail lines. Specific measures to be considered and incorporated into the design of future projects affecting rail lines include, but are not limited to, the installation of grade separations, warning signage, traffic signaling improvements, vehicle parking prohibitions, installation of pedestrian-specific warning devices, and the construction of pull out lanes for buses and vehicles.

RDEIR page ES-10:

Executive Summary Table ES-3 is amended to include the revised Policy AG-1.6 on page ES-10:

AG-1.6 Conversion Easements. The County may develop an Agricultural Conservation Easement Program (ACEP) to help protect and preserve agricultural lands (including “Important Farmlands”), as defined in this Element. This program may require payment of an in-lieu fee sufficient to purchase a farmland conservation easement, farmland deed restriction, or other farmland conservation mechanism as a condition of approval for ~~conservation~~ conversion of important agricultural land to nonagricultural use. If available, the ACEP shall be used for replacement lands determined to be of statewide significance (Prime or other Important Farmlands), or sensitive and necessary for the preservation of agricultural land, including land that may be part of a community separator as part of a comprehensive program to establish community separators. The in-lieu fee or other conservation mechanism shall recognize the importance of land value and shall require equivalent mitigation.

RDEIR page ES-10:

Executive Summary Table ES-3 is amended to include the following unintentionally omitted Implementation Measure on page ES-10:

Agricultural Element Implementation Measure #15. The County shall consider the implementation of an Agricultural Conservation Easement Program (ACEP) to help protect and preserve agricultural lands (including “Important Farmlands”), as defined in Policy AG-1.6. [New Implementation Program – Draft EIR Analysis]

RDEIR page ES-12:

Impact 3.2-2 on page ES-12 is amended to include the following revised Policy TC-2.7:

TC-2.7 Rail Facilities and Existing Development. The County will work with the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) to ensure that new railroad rights-of-way, yards, or stations adjacent to existing residential or commercial areas are screened or buffered to reduce noise, air, and visual impacts. Similarly, the County should coordinate with the CPUC and railroad service providers to address railroad safety issues as part of all future new development that affects local rail lines. Specific measures to be considered and incorporated into the design of future projects affecting rail lines include, but are not limited to, the installation of grade separations, warning signage, traffic signaling improvements, vehicle parking prohibitions, installation of pedestrian-specific warning devices, and the construction of pull out lanes for buses and vehicles.

RDEIR page ES-13:

Impact 3.4-2 on page ES-13 of the RDEIR is amended in order to be consistent with the impact statement on page 3.4-29 as follows:

The proposed project ~~would not~~ could result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy in the construction and operation of new buildings.

RDEIR page ES-22:

Impact 3.10-1 and 3.10-3 on page ES-22 are amended to include the following revised Policy AG-1.6:

AG-1.6 Conversion Easements. The County may develop an Agricultural Conservation Easement Program (ACEP) to help protect and preserve agricultural lands (including “Important Farmlands”), as defined in this Element. This program may require payment of an in-lieu fee sufficient to purchase a farmland conservation easement, farmland deed restriction, or other farmland conservation mechanism as a condition of approval for ~~conservation~~ conversion of important agricultural land to nonagricultural use. If available, the ACEP shall be used for replacement lands determined to be of statewide significance (Prime or other Important Farmlands), or sensitive and necessary for the preservation of agricultural land, including land that may be part of a community separator as part of a comprehensive program to establish community separators. The in-lieu fee or other conservation mechanism shall recognize the importance of land value and shall require equivalent mitigation.

RDEIR page ES-26:

Beginning at the end of page ES-26, the following information is added to the Executive Summary:

Summary of Alternatives

CEQA requires the lead agency to consider a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project that: (1) meet most of the project’s basic objectives; (2) avoid or substantially reduce one or more of its significant effects; and (3) are potentially feasible. (CEQA Guidelines §15126.6(c).) The proposed project and the alternatives addressed in this RDEIR are based on several ideas and concepts developed with the public during several community workshops held in Visalia, Lindsay, Goshen, Pixley, Orosi, and Springville along with input from the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and County staff during the spring of 2004. This process continued with consideration of information developed for the update 2010 Background Report. A Confined Growth alternative was developed by County staff in fall 2007. As part of this process, several alternative land use scenarios were considered. Ultimately, as a result of this process, the RDEIR evaluated five (5) alternatives for the proposed General Plan 2030 Update.

Below are very brief summaries of each of the alternatives to the General Plan 2030 Update that are examined in Chapter 4 of the RDEIR. Chapter 4 provides a more complete description of each of the alternatives and a qualitative comparison of their potential impacts. The RDEIR includes sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project. However, as authorized under Section 15126.6(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the alternatives are examined at a lesser level of detail than the proposed project. As required under CEQA, the range of alternatives includes the no-project alternative (Alternative 1).

Alternative 1: No-Project Alternative

Section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR evaluate and analyze the environmental impacts of the “No-Project” Alternative. When the project is the revision of an existing land use or regulatory plan or policy, the no-project alternative will be the continuation of the existing plan or policy into the future. Therefore, Alternative 1 (No-Project or Existing General Plan) analyzes the effects of continued implementation of the County’s existing General Plan (including some features that not have not been updated since 1964), which would remain as the adopted long-range planning policy document for the County.

Alternative 2: City-Centered Alternative

The City Centered Alternative (Alternative 2) assumes that cities will accept additional population by increasing the density and developing contiguous land in and around incorporated cities. The cities would also continue to provide sites for urban commercial services and industry. This approach would not ignore the needs of unincorporated communities, and would look at policy solutions to address housing, services, and infrastructure needs to meet future growth. Under this alternative, net new growth for the UDBs would account for a higher percentage (80%) of the overall net new growth for the entire County. While this alternative assumes a higher degree of city growth, Alternative 5 (more fully described below) assumes an even higher degree of city directed growth.

Alternative 3: Rural Communities Alternative

The Rural Communities Alternative (Alternative 3) emphasizes growth in the eleven unincorporated communities that have or are expected to soon have an adopted Community Plan. Under this alternative, 70 percent of net new population growth is directed to incorporated cities. The remaining 30 percent is directed to the 20 unincorporated communities along with other rural areas of the County. Of the total amount distributed to the County, 80 percent is targeted to the eleven unincorporated communities that have an adopted, or are expected to soon have adopted, a Community Plan. Distribution of new population is based on each community’s share of total UDB population of the eleven communities in 2000. The eleven communities are Cutler-Orosi, Ducor, Earlimart, Goshen, Ivanhoe, Pixley, Poplar, Richgrove, Terra Bella, Tipton, and Traver. The other 20 percent of County growth is allocated to the other nine communities based on each community’s percentage share of total UDB population of those nine communities in 2000.

Alternative 4: Transportation Corridors Alternative

The Transportation Corridors Alternative (Alternative 4) assumes that cities and communities along Highways 99 and 65 will accept additional population by increasing the density and developing contiguous land within their UDB or UAB. These communities and cities would also continue to provide sites for urban commercial services and industry.

Under this alternative, 70 percent of net new population growth is directed to incorporated cities, with the remaining 30 percent directed to the 20 unincorporated communities along with other rural areas of the County. The primary difference between this alternative and Alternative 3 is how the future growth is allocated within the unincorporated communities. Of the total amount distributed to the County, the majority of growth (estimated at 80%) would be allocated to the eight communities located on Highways 99 and 65. These eight communities are Ducor, Earlimart, Goshen, Pixley, Strathmore, Terra Bella, Tipton, and Traver. The remaining County growth would be allocated within the other 12 unincorporated communities and County area.

Alternative 5: Confined Growth Alternative

Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 5 assumes that all of the proposed policies and implementation measures contained in the Goals and Policies Report (Part I of the General Plan Update) would be included as part of this alternative. The primary objective of this alternative is to minimize significant and unavoidable impacts to open space areas, agricultural lands, and aesthetic resources. Unlike the proposed project, growth under Alternative 5 would be directed to occur only within established UDB and Hamlet Development Boundaries (HDB). A key assumption of Alternative 5 is that boundary expansion would only be allowed under a “no net gain” scenario. A “no net gain” scenario would allow modifications to the “hard boundaries”, which are defined by the UDBs and Hamlet Boundaries, only if these are offsetting equivalent deductions in boundaries elsewhere. Adjustments to boundaries would also be possible through transferring UDB capacity between cities and communities. Under this alternative, these growth patterns are assumed to continue through the entire 2030 planning horizon, with total unincorporated population being similar to the anticipated population under the proposed project.

Areas of Controversy and Issues to be Resolved

Pursuant to Section 15123 of the CEQA Guidelines, a summary section must identify areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public. In addition, the summary section also identifies issues to be resolved. Each of these issues is discussed below.

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the General Plan 2030 Update was distributed to the State Clearinghouse, responsible agencies, and other interested parties for a 30-day public review period from April 29, 2006 through May 29, 2006. In addition, a public scoping meeting was held during that timeframe. The NOP identified the following topics as being potentially significant impacts to be evaluated in the EIR:

- Aesthetic, Visual and Scenic Resource Impacts
- Agriculture and Open Space Impacts
- Air Quality Impacts
- Biological Resource Impacts
- Cultural Resource Impacts

- Geologic and Natural Resource Impacts
- Hazards and Health and Safety Impacts
- Hydrologic and Water Quality Impacts
- Land Use and Planning Impacts
- Mineral and Natural Resources Impacts
- Noise Impacts
- Population and Housing Impacts
- Public Facilities and Services Impacts
- Recreation Impacts
- Traffic and Circulation Impacts

A number of agencies, organizations, and individuals provided comments on the NOP. These comments suggested areas of study and identified concerns over the direction of the County general plan and its potential environmental impacts.

Areas of Controversy

Below are summaries of controversial issues that are anticipated to be debated during the public review and hearing process of this project.

Water Supply, Availability and Quality

Tulare County relies on a combination of local surface water, imported surface water, and groundwater to meet its agricultural and urban demands and has significant existing water constraints, with the County’ groundwater basin classified as being in a state of “critical condition of overdraft” by the California Department of Water Resources. Additionally, the County’s groundwater basin has some of the most significant issues in the County, with chlorides and nitrates affecting water quality. While communities along the Highway 99 axis have access to good quality deep and shallow sources, water quality in other areas is unacceptable due to arsenic and other naturally occurring contaminants. The issues of water quality and availability will need to be addressed in the General Plan 2030 Update.

Traffic Congestion

Future growth anticipated by the General Plan 2030 Update, as well as city growth during the 2030 planning horizon and beyond, would result in additional vehicle trips on local and regional roadways. These additional vehicle trips may result in some roadways operating at levels that exceed the County’s preferred standard of traffic flow, causing increased traffic congestion in the County.

Loss of Farmland and Open Space

Development and land use activities contemplated by the General Plan 2030 Update could potentially result in the loss of several thousand acres of Important Farmland and other lands considered as open space. The General Plan 2030 Update encourages development to occur first in the cities and within established UDB and Hamlet Development Boundaries (HDB). While future development within cities would require relatively little additional conversion of agricultural land, future development within the unincorporated areas of the County would result in some levels of agricultural/open space land conversion. The conversion of these areas to other uses could potentially result in the significant loss or degradation of biological resources.

Global Climate Change

Emission of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases from routine human activities is inducing global climate change by trapping heat within the atmosphere. California is leading the way among the states in addressing climate change by reducing our greenhouse gas emissions. Local governments, such as Tulare County, are being looked upon to establish land use patterns and regulations that will reduce emissions by conserving energy, reducing vehicle miles travelled, and other actions.

RDEIR page ES-10:

Executive Summary Table ES-3 is amended to include the following unintentionally omitted Implementation Measure on page ES-10:

Agricultural Element Implementation Measure #15. The County shall consider the implementation of an Agricultural Conservation Easement Program (ACEP) to help protect and preserve agricultural lands (including “Important Farmlands”), as defined in Policy AG-1.6. [*New Implementation Program – Draft EIR Analysis*]

RDEIR page ES-13:

Impact 3.4-2 on page ES-13 of the RDEIR is amended in order to be consistent with the impact statement on page 3.4-29 as follows:

The proposed project ~~would not~~ could result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy in the construction and operation of new buildings.

Changes to Section 3.1, Land Use and Aesthetics

RDEIR page 3.1-5:

The fourth paragraph on page 3.1-5 is amended as follows:

Designated candidate scenic highways ~~and County scenic roads~~ are shown on **Figure 3.1-2.** ~~The minimum requirements for scenic corridor protection include:~~

RDEIR page 3.1-21:

The last paragraph on page 3.1-21 of the RDEIR is amended as follows in order to correct a mistake regarding the significance conclusion (correctly identified as *less than significant* on RDEIR page 3.1-20 and elsewhere on page 3.1-21):

~~As stated above, no additional technologically or economically feasible mitigation measures are currently available to reduce this impact to a less than significant level. Consequently, this impact is considered **significant and unavoidable**. The policies referenced above were specifically designed to address established communities. With implementation of the above mentioned policies, this impact is considered *less than significant*.~~

Changes to Section 3.2, Traffic and Circulation

RDEIR page 3.2-26:

The last paragraph on page 3.2-26 of the RDEIR is amended to read as follows in order to correctly name the policy containing the County’s LOS standard:

It should be noted that the LOS standard for Tulare County is “D” as stated in Policy TC-1.16-County LOS Standard.

Changes to Section 3.3, Air Quality

RDEIR page 3.3-18:

Table 3.3-4 is amended to read as follows on page 3.3-18 of the RDEIR in order to correctly list Impact 3.3-2 as Significant and Unavoidable (correctly identified as *significant and unavoidable* on RDEIR pages 3.3-23 and 3.3-25):

Impact 3.3-3: The proposed project could conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable air quality plan.	LTSSU LTSSU LTSSU LTSSU LTSSU
--	-------------------------------

Changes to Section 3.5, Noise

RDEIR page 3.5-36:

The second to last paragraph on page 3.5-36 of the RDEIR is amended to read as follows in order to correctly include the additional General Plan 2030 Update policies necessary to mitigate Impact 3.5-6 (correctly identified as *significant and unavoidable* on page 3.5-36):

In addition to the above mentioned policies and implementation measures, the following new policies are required to address this impact:

- **HS-8.13 Noise Analysis.** The County shall require a detailed noise impact analysis in areas where current or future exterior noise levels from transportation or stationary

sources have the potential to exceed the adopted noise policies of the Health and Safety Element, where there are development of new noise sensitive land uses or the development of potential noise generating land uses near existing sensitive land uses. The noise analysis shall be the responsibility of the project applicant and be prepared by a qualified acoustical engineer (i.e., a Registered Professional Engineer in the State of California, etc.). The analysis shall include recommendations and evidence to establish mitigation that will reduce noise exposure to acceptable levels (such as those referenced in Table 10-1 of the Health and Safety Element). *[New Policy – Draft EIR Analysis]*.

- **HS-8.14 Sound Attenuation Features.** The County shall require sound attenuation features such as walls, berming, heavy landscaping, between commercial, industrial, and residential uses to reduce noise and vibration impacts. *[New Policy – Draft EIR Analysis]*.
- **HS-8.15 Noise Buffering.** The County shall require noise buffering or insulation in new development along major streets, highways, and railroad tracks. *[New Policy - Draft EIR Analysis]*.
- **HS-8.16 State Noise Insulation Standards.** The County shall enforce the State Noise Insulation Standards (California Administrative Code, Title 24) and Chapter 35 of the Uniform Building Code. *[New Policy - Draft EIR Analysis]*.
- **HS-8.17 Coordinate with Caltrans.** The County shall work with Caltrans to mitigate noise impacts on sensitive receptors near State roadways, by requiring noise buffering or insulation in new construction. *[New Policy - Draft EIR Analysis]*.
- **HS-8.18 Construction Noise.** The County shall seek to limit the potential noise impacts of construction activities on surrounding land uses by limiting construction activities to the hours of 7 am to 7 pm, Monday through Saturday when construction activities are located near sensitive receptors. No construction shall occur on Sundays or national holidays without a permit from the County to minimize noise impacts associated with development near sensitive receptors. *[New Policy - Draft EIR Analysis]*.

Changes to Section 3.6, Hydrology, Water Quality and Drainage

RDEIR page 3.6-34

Page 3.6-34 of the RDEIR is amended (text added after second paragraph on page 3.6-34) to include the following text that describes the authority powers of the Tulare County Flood Control District:

There is one flood control district, the Tulare County Flood Control District (TCFCD), established by State legislation in November 1969 and encompassing the entire County (Figure 3.6-6). The Act establishing the District provides the following powers to the District:

The functions of the TCFCD are to construct, maintain, and operate facilities for control and disposition of flood and storm waters.

Changes to Section 3.7, Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Mineral Resources

RDEIR page 3.7-25

Page 3.7-25 of the RDEIR is amended (impact conclusion header) to reflect the correct numbering of Impact 3.7-5:

Significance after Implementation of Mitigation for Impact 3.27-5

RDEIR page 3.7-26

Page 3.7-26 of the RDEIR is amended (impact conclusion header) to reflect the correct numbering of Impact 3.7-6:

Significance after Implementation of Mitigation for Impact 3.27-6

RDEIR page 3.7-28

Page 3.7-28 of the RDEIR is amended (impact conclusion header) to reflect the correct numbering of Impact 3.7-8:

Significance after Implementation of Mitigation for Impact 3.27-8

Changes to Section 3.9, Public Services, Recreation and Utilities

RDEIR page 3.9-39:

The first full paragraph on page 3.9-39 of the RDEIR is amended to note that Success Reservoir has not recently been enlarged:

Additional benefits are expected to be realized with the implementation of the seismic retrofit of Success Dam and the possible future ~~recent~~ enlargement of Success Reservoir.

RDEIR page 3.9-60

The first paragraph on page 3.9-60 of the RDEIR is amended to identify the correct policy number as follows:

To address their own unique fire protection issues within the County's specific planning areas (i.e., Mountain, Foothill, etc.); additional policies (see PFS-7.6, FGMP-10+.2, and FGMP-10+.3) are also included.

RDEIR page 3.9-62:

The first full paragraph on page 3.9-62 of the RDEIR is amended to identify the correct policy number as follows:

To address their own unique fire protection issues within the County's specific planning areas (i.e., Mountain, Foothill, etc.), additional policies (see FGMP-104.2, and FGMP-104.3) are also included.

Changes to Section 3.11, Biological Resources**RDEIR page 3.11-19**

Page 3.11-19 of the RDEIR is amended to include the following new topic and paragraph description related to habitat conservation plans:

Privately Managed Conservation Areas

Within the County, several privately managed conservation or preserve areas have been established by the Sequoia Riverlands Trust (SRT) to preserve a variety of sensitive habitats and species. SRT owns and manages six nature preserves that protect approximately 4,070 acres. These preserve areas in the County include the following:

- Homer Ranch,
- Dry Creek,
- Kaweah Oaks,
- James K. Herbert,
- Blue Oak Ranch, and
- Lewis Hill.

RDEIR page 3.11-20:

Page 3.11-20 of the RDEIR is amended to clarify that the reference to the Sequoia Riverlands Trust is not considered a specific sensitive habitat or species:

- Blue Ridge Ecological Reserve (Condor Habitat), and
- ~~Sequoia Riverlands Trust, and~~
- Kaweah Oaks Preserve.

Changes to Section 3.12, Cultural Resources

RDEIR page 3.12-13

Table 3.12-1 on page 3.12-13 of the RDEIR is amended to include the appropriate reference for the Kaweah Post Office:

Site/Building	Location	Year Constructed	Historical Landmark Designation	National Register Status
Kaweah Post Office	43795 North Fork Drive, Kaweah	1910	CA SHL No. 389	Not Applicable

Changes to Chapter 4, Alternative to the Proposed Project

RDEIR page 4-1

The second paragraph on page 4-1 of the RDEIR is amended in order to correct the referenced CEQA Guidelines Section number:

One finding that is permissible, if supported by substantial evidence, is that “specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations . . . make infeasible the . . . alternatives identified” in the EIR (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. [a]; see also CEQA Guidelines, §159021, subd. [a]).

RDEIR page 4-3

The third bullet from the top of page 4-3 of the RDEIR is amended in order to reference the broader term of Urban Area Boundary/Urban Development Boundary (UAB/UDB) area versus the more specific County Adopted City (CAC) UDB/UAB area:

- Transportation Corridors Alternative – this scenario assumes that cities and communities along Highways 99 and 65 will accept additional population by increasing the density and developing contiguous land within their ~~CACUDB~~ or ~~CACUAB~~. These communities and cities would also continue to provide sites for urban commercial services and industry.

RDEIR page 4-13

The third paragraph on page 4-13 of the RDEIR is amended in order to reference the broader term of Urban Area Boundary/Urban Development Boundary area (UAB/UDB) versus the more specific County Adopted City (CAC) UDB/UAB area:

Under the No-Project Alternative, the existing General Plan does not have a separate Scenic Landscapes Element and lacks updated Land Use and Community Design polices that regulate aesthetics or scenic resource issues (both rural and urban resources). The current Land Use Element includes

some policy guidance with respect to community character and scenic highways; however, the proposed goals and polices provided as part of the proposed project are considerably more comprehensive and detailed than those in the existing General Plan. Additionally, the No-Project Alternative does not provide the necessary policy direction to cluster development within the future growth areas (i.e., ~~CACUDBs~~, HDBs and ~~CACUABs~~) of the County to help minimize aesthetic (including new sources of light and glare or dark sky effects) impacts throughout the County. However, even under the No-Project Alternative it is assumed that the County would continue to evaluate the environmental impacts of these projects on a case-by-case basis and would identify all applicable feasible mitigation measures for significant impacts.

RDEIR page 4-14

The first and last paragraphs on page 4-14 of the RDEIR are amended in order to reference the broader term of Urban Area Boundary/Urban Development Boundary (UAB/UDB) area versus the more specific County Adopted City (CAC) UDB/UAB area:

As previously described, this analysis assumes that similar population patterns to the proposed project would occur under the No Project Alternative. Additionally, the No-Project Alternative does not provide the necessary policy direction to cluster development within the future growth areas (i.e., ~~CACUDBs~~, HDBs and ~~CACUABs~~) of the County to help minimize the conversion of agricultural resource lands. Consequently, quantifying the amount of land conversion that could occur is considered speculative at this point in time. However, implementation of the No-Project Alternative is assumed to result in similar or slightly greater impacts to agricultural resources compared to the proposed project. This is because a greater amount of land designated as Prime, Unique or Farmland of Statewide Importance could be converted to urban uses under the No Project Alternative compared to the amount of farmland that would be converted to urban uses under the proposed project. This conversion of important farmland to urbanized uses is also considered a significant and unavoidable impact.

As previously described, the No-Project Alternative does not provide the necessary policy direction to cluster development within the future growth areas (i.e., ~~CACUDBs~~, HDBs and ~~CACUABs~~) of the County to help minimize the conversion of existing open space lands to a developed use.

RDEIR page 4-18

The second paragraph on page 4-18 of the RDEIR is amended in order to reference the broader term of Urban Area Boundary/Urban Development Boundary (UAB/UDB) area versus the more specific County Adopted City (CAC) UDB/UAB area:

In order to accomplish this land use goal, several revisions to the Goals and Policies Report (Part I of the General Plan 2030 Update) would be required, in particular those included in the Planning Framework Element that are designed to manage growth near existing city boundaries (see Table 4-4). Revised policies would incorporate land use strategies that would require greater land use efficiency standards for development on important farmlands within the CACUDBs (20 year boundary)

for unincorporated communities and hamlets. Additional strategies that could be integrated into the policies and implementation measures of the Goals and Policies Report (Part I of the General Plan 2030 Update) to direct growth within existing CACUDBs for the incorporated cities in the County include:

RDEIR page 4-23

The second and third paragraphs on page 4-23 of the RDEIR are amended in order to reference the broader term of Urban Area Boundary/Urban Development Boundary (UAB/UDB) area versus the more specific County Adopted City (CAC) UDB/UAB area:

As shown in Table 4-1, 70 percent of net new population growth is directed to incorporated cities. The remaining 30 percent is directed to the 20 unincorporated communities along with other rural areas of the County. Of the total amount distributed to the County, 80 percent is targeted to the eleven unincorporated communities that have an adopted, or are expected to soon have adopted, a RPA and Community Plan. Distribution of new population is based on each community's share of total CACUAB/UDB population of the eleven communities in 2000. The eleven communities are Cutler-Orosi, Ducor, Earlimart, Goshen, Ivanhoe, Pixley, Poplar, Richgrove, Terra Bella, Tipton, and Traver. The other 20 percent is allocated to the other nine communities based on each community's percentage share of total CACUAB/UDB population of those nine communities in 2000.

Alternative 3 assumes that most of the proposed policies and implementation measures contained in the Goals and Policies Report (Part I of the General Plan 2030 Update) would be included as part of this alternative. However, unlike the proposed project, the Goals and Policies Report (Part I of the General Plan 2030 Update – Planning Framework Element) would incorporate some land use strategies to direct growth within existing CACUDBs for the unincorporated communities and hamlets in the County, including

RDEIR page 4-27

The third paragraph on page 4-27 of the RDEIR is amended in order to reference the broader term of Urban Area Boundary/Urban Development Boundary (UAB/UDB) area versus the more specific County Adopted City (CAC) UDB/UAB area:

The Transportation Corridors Alternative (Alternative 4) assumes that cities and communities along Highways 99 and 65 will accept additional population by increasing the density and developing contiguous land within their CACUDB or CACUAB. These communities and cities would also continue to provide sites for urban commercial services and industry.

RDEIR page 4-32

The first, second, and third paragraphs on page 4-32 of the RDEIR are amended in order to reference the broader term of Urban Area Boundary/Urban Development Boundary (UAB/UDB) area versus the more specific County Adopted City (CAC) UDB/UAB area:

Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 5 assumes that all of the proposed policies and implementation measures contained in the Goals and Policies Report (Part I of the General Plan Update) would be included as part of this alternative. The primary objective of this alternative is to minimize significant and unavoidable impacts to open space areas, agricultural lands, and aesthetic resources. Unlike the proposed project, growth under Alternative 5 would be directed to occur only within established CACUDB and Hamlet Development Boundaries (HDB). A key assumption of Alternative 5 is that boundary expansion would only be allowed under a “no net gain” scenario. A “no net gain” scenario could allow modifications to the “hard boundaries”, which are defined by the CACUDBs and Hamlet Boundaries, only if these are offsetting equivalent deductions in boundaries elsewhere. Another opportunity for adjustments to boundaries could occur through transferring CACUDB capacity between cities and communities. Under this alternative, these growth patterns are assumed to continue through the entire 2030 planning horizon, with total unincorporated population being similar to the anticipated population under the proposed project (see Table 4-1).

Under Alternative 5, the General Plan 2030 Update would incorporate some land use strategies that would require greater land use efficiency standards for development on important farmlands and promote increased densities and mixed use areas within developed areas. These strategies would be integrated into the policies and implementation measures of the Goals and Policies Report (Part I of the General Plan Update) in order to direct growth within existing CACUDBs and Hamlet Boundaries. Elements of the General Plan that could incorporate these strategies include the Planning Framework, Agriculture, Land Use, Environmental Resources Management, and Public Facilities and Services Elements. Expansion of CACUDBs or Hamlet Boundaries without offsets would only be allowed under extenuating circumstances. Criteria for expansions might include:

However, no boundary adjustments would be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that land use efficiency standards (to be set in the General Plan Update) have been or can be met. No new towns would be allowed on important farmland unless equivalent capacity is transferred from CACUDBs or HDBs through mechanisms such as purchase and transfer of development rights to offset the loss of important farmland.

Changes to Chapter 5, Additional Statutory Considerations

RDEIR page 5-4:

The second to last paragraph on page 5-4 of the RDEIR is amended to reflect the correct growth percentages (correctly identified in Tables 2-11 and Table 5-1):

The overall assumption of the analysis in this RDEIR is that the majority (~~85%~~ 75%) of the net new growth will occur within incorporated city and CACUDBs as opposed to within the unincorporated areas, which will contain a much smaller (~~15%~~ 25%) portion of the net new growth. This distribution of growth is shown in Table 5-1 and Table 2-11 of Chapter 2 of this RDEIR.