



5961 S. Mooney
Blvd
Visalia, CA
93277
624-7000 Phone
730-2653 Fax

**RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
AGENCY
COUNTY OF TULARE
PLANNING COMMISSION
SUMMARY**

PLANNING COMMISSION

CHAIRMAN: Wayne Millies
VICE-CHAIR: Charlie Norman

COMMISSIONERS:

Bill Whitlatch
John Elliott
Ed Dias
Melvin Gong
Nancy Pitigliano
Gil Aguilar (Alt.)

AIRPORT LAND USE

COMMISSIONERS (ALUC)

Doug Silveria
Jack Ritchie

PROJECT NO.: GENERAL PLAN 2030 UPDATE	AGENDA DATE:	12/07/2011
APPLICANT:	AGENDA ITEM NUMBER. :	5A
AGENT:		
SUBJECT: Planning Commission Continued Public Hearing on the Proposed Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update, Proposed Climate Action Plan and Proposed Final Environmental Impact Report.		AGENDA ITEM TYPE
		Presentation
		Consent Calendar
		Unfinished Business
		New Business
		Public Hearing
		Continued Public Hearing
		Discussion
		X
		Other:
		ACTION REQUESTED
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting	Resolution - Planning	X
Findings of Fact	Commission	
Statement of Overriding Considerations		X
CONTACT PERSON: David Bryant	Recommendation to BOS	

RECOMMENDATION(S):

That the Planning Commission:

- (1) Receive a Staff Presentation on Staff's summary of the public input regarding Proposed General Plan 2030 Update, Proposed Climate Action Plan, and Proposed Final Environmental Impact Report from the Planning Commission Public Hearing on October 19, 2011, and November 16, 2011.
- (2) Review Staff recommendations, and approve the following Planning Commission recommendations to the Board of Supervisors:

SUBJECT: General Plan 2030 Update
DATE: December 7, 2011

1. Resolution recommending certification of the Proposed FEIR for the Proposed General Plan 2030 Update and Proposed Climate Action Plan;
2. Resolution recommending adoption of the Proposed General Plan 2030 Update incorporating modifications described therein;
3. Resolution recommending adoption of the Proposed Climate Action Plan.

PLANNING COMMISSION ALTERNATIVES:

ALTERNATIVE No. 1: Refer back to Staff for further study and report.

PROJECT OVERVIEW:

General Plan 2030 Update:

The General Plan is the County's "Constitution" for future development and growth within the unincorporated areas of the County. State law requires that the County prepare and adopt a comprehensive and long-range general plan (Government Code Section 65300). The County of Tulare is amending and updating its existing General Plan. The name used for the proposed amendment and update is the Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update (GPU). The GPU will reorganize, update, and modernize the County's general plan policies and documents as described in Chapter 1 of the GPU (Please see Part I Chapter 1 Section 1.2 of the GPU).

The General Plan Update maintains the long standing tradition of supporting sustainable agricultural resources through the Rural Valley Lands Plan, and directing future urban growth into established areas containing existing development through the proposed Planning Framework Element (update of the existing Urban Boundaries Element).

This GPU addresses six of the seven mandatory general plan elements required by the State: land use, circulation, open-space, conservation, safety, and noise (Government Code Section 65302). The Housing Element is required to be updated every five years and, therefore, follows a separate track than that of the GPU. The current Housing Element was adopted by the County in 2010, and is under review by the State Department of Housing and Community Development prior to certification. (Please see Part I Chapter 1 Table 1.1 General Plan Consistency Matrix of the GPU).

The proposed GPU documents include Part I (the Goals and Policies Report) and Part II (the Area Plans), and the Tulare County General Plan 2010 Background Report. As is required by state law, an environmental document, in this case, a Proposed Final Environmental Impact Report was prepared by the County and was circulated prior to

SUBJECT: General Plan 2030 Update
DATE: December 7, 2011

this meeting. A Proposed Climate Action Plan has been prepared as an implementation measure of the GPU. The Proposed Climate Action Plan is not a part of the formal GPU documents but will be considered for approval contemporaneous with the adoption of the GPU.

The GPU is a programmatic policy level document which provides for a general level of specificity to provide flexibility in order to address the diverse geographical nature of the County which includes Valley, Foothill, and Mountain areas while also recognizing the historical context of over 30 unincorporated communities. A greater level of specificity is provided through the provision of individual Area, Sub-Area, Community, Hamlet, Mountain, County Adopted City General Plans, and as provided through the Tulare County Zoning Ordinance and Tulare County Ordinance Code. It is important to note that the GPU is a living document and each element can be amended up to four times per year.

Overall, the objectives of the proposed project are to adopt an update to the existing County General Plan that achieves the following:

- Protects the County's important agricultural resources and scenic natural lands from urban encroachment through the implementation of goals and policies of the General Plan;
- Strictly limits rural residential development in important agricultural areas outside of unincorporated communities' and cities' UABs and UDBs (i.e., avoid rural residential sprawl) by directing development into the cities and into the defined unincorporated UDB, HDB and MSC boundaries where supporting infrastructure is or will be made available.
- Promotes sustainability by including a Climate Action Strategy and by promoting Smart Growth and Healthy Communities;
- Provides opportunities for small unincorporated communities to grow or improve quality of life and their economic viability and to provide the framework for planning new self sustaining communities;
- Promotes reinvestment in existing unincorporated communities in a way that enhances the quality of life and their economic viability in these locations;
- Allows existing and outdated agricultural facilities in rural areas to be retrofitted and used for new agricultural related businesses (including value added processing facilities and uses) subject to specified criteria; and
- Enhance planning coordination and cooperation with the agencies and organizations with land management responsibilities in and adjacent to Tulare County.

Purposes of the Meeting:

The purposes of this meeting are to: (1) Receive a Staff Presentation on Staff's summary of the public input regarding Proposed General Plan 2030 Update Proposed Climate Action Plan and Proposed Final Environmental Impact Report from the Planning Commission Public Hearing on October 19, 2011 and November 16, 2011,

SUBJECT: General Plan 2030 Update
DATE: December 7, 2011

and (2) Review Staff recommendations, and approve the following Planning Commission recommendations to the Board of Supervisors: [1.] Resolution recommending certification of the Proposed FEIR for the Proposed General Plan 2030 Update and Proposed Climate Action Plan; [2.] Resolution recommending adoption of the Proposed General Plan 2030 Update incorporating modifications described therein; [3.] Resolution recommending adoption of the Proposed Climate Action Plan.

Comment Overview-October 19, 2011 hearing and November 16, 2011 hearing:

At your October 19, 2011 public hearing, 23 persons provided verbal comments. A transcript has been prepared of the verbal comments and has been reviewed by staff. Twenty written comment letters which include e-mail transmittals were also submitted before during and after the October 19, 2011 hearing. As of November 8, 2011, the written and verbal comments received on or before this date have been reviewed by staff.

At your November 16, 2011 public hearing, 21 persons provided verbal comments. A transcript has been prepared of the verbal comments and has been reviewed by staff. Twenty four written comment letters which include e-mail transmittals were also submitted after the October 19, 2011 hearing and up to and including the public hearing on November 16, 2011. As of November 16, 2011, the written and verbal comments received on or before this date have been reviewed by staff.

Of the 85 separate comments identified, approximately 34 percent were received from Three Rivers residents, and two individual parties accounted for 21 percent of the total number of written comments. Almost half of the total comments were received from Foothill Community areas, including Three Rivers, Springville, Lemon Cove, and from several Exeter residents. Please see Attachment 2 (Summary list of Comments).

The following list represents areas of continued comment regarding the GPU and proposed final RDEIR:

Climate Change/Air Quality.

Water quality and quantity.

Land Use and Project buildout assumptions.

Level of detail and programmatic nature of the RDEIR.

Enforcement of the general plan policies.

Range of Alternatives.

Healthy Growth, Smart Growth, Compact Development, City Centered Growth

Location of Development/New Towns

Regional Growth Corridors

Preservation of Agricultural Land and Open Space

Disadvantaged Communities/Infrastructure Needs

Inventories

Archeological Resources

Flood Control

SUBJECT: General Plan 2030 Update
DATE: December 7, 2011

Staff's review of the written and verbal comments has not identified any new CEQA issues that would require additional environmental studies.

Climate change- A Climate Action Plan has been prepared to address AB 32 Compliance. SB 375 Components are addressed in the following ways: Range of Housing Opportunities, Walkability, Collaboration, Attractive Communities, Sense of Place, Predictable Decisions, Mix of Land Uses, Open Space Preservation, Variety of Transportation Choices, Direct development to Urban Communities, Compact Building Design, Economic Vitality, and Resource Management.

These areas of continued comment regarding the GPU are addressed in the following manner:

The Climate Action Plan, The GPU Planning Framework Element, Agricultural Element, Air Quality Element, Land Use Element, Environmental Resources Management Element, Health and Safety Element, Transportation and Circulation Element, Public Facilities and Services Element, Economic Development Element, Scenic Landscapes, Water Resources Element, the RDEIR and its appendices, and the FEIR including Master Response #10.

Water quality and quantity- The GPU provides for the current and long-range water needs of the County and for the protection of the quality and quantity of surface and groundwater resources. Water Supply is adequately addresses at the programmatic level in the RDEIR Water Supply Evaluation.

These areas of continued comment regarding the GPU are addressed in the following manner:

The GPU Planning Framework Element, Environmental Resources Management Element, Health and Safety Element, Public Facilities and Services Element, and Water Resources Element and The RDEIR and its appendices, and the FEIR including Master Response #6.

Land Use and Project buildout assumptions- The land use diagram in Figure 4-1 provides an appropriate level of detail at the General Plan level. A greater level of specificity is appropriate at the Area, Sub-Area, and Community Plan level. A build out analysis is included in the FEIR.

These areas of continued comment regarding the GPU are addressed in the following manner:

GPU Land Use Element, The RDEIR and its appendices, and the FEIR including Master Response #5.

SUBJECT: General Plan 2030 Update
DATE: December 7, 2011

Level of detail and programmatic nature of the RDEIR- Programmatic Document policies are adequate at the General Plan level, greater level of specificity is provided at the Area, Sub Area, Community Plan level including the ordinance code.

These areas of continued comment regarding the GPU are addressed in the following manner:

The RDEIR and its appendices, and the FEIR including Master Response #4.

Enforcement of the general plan policies- Programmatic Document, policies are adequate at the General Plan level, greater level of specificity is provided at the Area, Sub Area, Community Plan level including the Tulare County Ordinance Code and Tulare County Zoning Ordinance.

These areas of areas of continued comment regarding the GPU are addressed in the following manner:

The RDEIR and its appendices, and the FEIR including Master Response #3.

Range of Alternatives- Consistent with CEQA requirements (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a)), the EIR process reviewed scenarios and developed a range of alternatives designed to feasibly attain most of the project objectives but also avoid or lessen several significant effects associated with the proposed project.

These areas of continued comment regarding the GPU are addressed in the following manner:

The RDEIR, and the FEIR including Master Response #9.

Healthy Growth, Smart Growth, Compact Development, City Centered Growth- The GPU provides for Smart Growth and Healthy Communities, Promotion of Infill, Mixed-Use, LEED, and Intermodal Connectivity.

These areas of areas of continued comment regarding the GPU: are addressed in the following manner:

The Climate Action Plan, The GPU Planning Framework Element, Agricultural Element, Air Quality Element, Land Use Element, Environmental Resources Management Element, Health and Safety Element, Transportation and Circulation Element, Public Facilities and Services Element, Economic Development Element, Scenic Landscapes, Water Resources Element, Rural Valley Lands Plan, Foothill Growth Management Plan, Mountain Framework Plan, the RDEIR and its appendices, and the FEIR.

SUBJECT: General Plan 2030 Update
DATE: December 7, 2011

Location of Development/New Towns- Preservation of Resource Conservation is accomplished by managed growth in urban communities and consistency as applicable with associated Area Plans.

These areas of continued comment regarding the GPU are addressed in the following manner:

The GPU Planning Framework Element, Agricultural Element, Air Quality Element, Land Use Element, Environmental Resources Management Element, Public Facilities and Services Element, Economic Development Element, Scenic Landscapes, Rural Valley Lands Plan, Foothill Growth Management Plan, Mountain Framework Plan, the RDEIR and its appendices, and the FEIR.

Regional Growth Corridors- The Corridor Framework Plan provides framing policies for future corridor plans to be adopted. Pending adoption of regional growth corridor plans, the County may approve highway oriented commercial, industrial, and mixed use development only at specific intersections of major collectors subject to conformity with the RVLP and specified standards.

These areas of continued comment regarding the GPU are addressed in the following manner:

The GPU Planning Framework Element, Corridors Framework Plan, the RDEIR and its appendices, and the FEIR.

Preservation of Agricultural Land and Open Space- The GPU promotes the long-term preservation of productive and potentially-productive agricultural lands and to accommodate agricultural-support services and agriculturally-related activities that supports the viability of agriculture and further the County's economic development goals.

These areas of continued comment regarding the GPU are addressed in the following manner:

The GPU Planning Framework Element, Agricultural Element, Land Use Element, Environmental Resources Management Element, Transportation and Circulation Element, Public Facilities and Services Element, Scenic Landscapes, Rural Valley Lands Plan, Foothill Growth Management Plan, Mountain Framework Plan, the RDEIR and its appendices, and the FEIR.

Disadvantaged Communities/Infrastructure Needs- The GPU Planning Framework Element provides a framework for economic development, the provision of public services, and quality of life in Hamlets. The Public Facilities and Services Element provides policies that maintains acceptable levels of service, minimize costs, and provide criteria for determining the location, capacity, and timing of existing and future public facilities and services

SUBJECT: General Plan 2030 Update
DATE: December 7, 2011

These areas of continued comment regarding the GPU are addressed in the following manner:

The GPU Planning Framework Element, Agricultural Element, Air Quality Element, Land Use Element, Environmental Resources Management Element, Health and Safety Element, Transportation and Circulation Element, Public Facilities and Financing Element, Economic Development Element, Water Resources Element, the RDEIR and its appendices, and the FEIR.

Inventories- Numerous inventories are contained in the Background Report and RDEIR and its appendices. The Background report contains over 130 tables and over 40 figures. The RDEIR contains over 100 tables and over 30 figures. Areas of interest include Williamson Act Properties (Background Report Chapter 4), Natural Communities (Background Report Chapter 9), Scenic Resources (Background Report Chapter 11), Public Facilities (Background Report Chapter 7).

These areas of continued comment regarding the GPU are addressed in the following manner:

The Background Report , the RDEIR and its appendices.

Archeological Resources- The GPU provides policies to manage and protect sites of cultural and archaeological importance for the benefit of present and future generations. Certified Local Government is addressed in the GPU in the Environmental Resources Management Element.

These areas of continued comment regarding the GPU are addressed in the following manner:

The GPU Land Use Element, Environmental Resources Management Element, Foothill Growth Management Plan, the RDEIR and its appendices.

Flood Control- The GPU Health and Safety Element contains policies to minimize the possibility for loss of life, injury, or damage to property as a result of flood hazards.

These areas of continued comment regarding the GPU are addressed in the following manner:

The GPU meets the requirements of AB 162 as specified in Policy Comment Matrix 3C Number 33.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUMMARY:

Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report (RDEIR):

SUBJECT: General Plan 2030 Update
DATE: December 7, 2011

The RDEIR is part of the proposed Final Environmental Impact Report and analyzes the environmental impacts of the Proposed Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update. Additionally, the RDEIR identifies ways to minimize or mitigate significant effects of the GPU and describes reasonable alternatives to the GPU that would avoid or reduce the GPU significant effects (Section 15121[a] CEQA Guidelines).

The Background Report, an informational document, offers insight into the conditions and environment that existed in the County during the preparation of the GPU. The RDEIR lists the potential effects that the new policies found in the GPU will have on the environment and identifies mitigation measures that could potentially lessen the effects of these impacts. The RDEIR also contains an executive summary and describes the environmental setting of the GPU.

Summary Of Comments Received On The RDEIR:

A Total of 44 comment letters were received on the RDEIR during the public comment period from March 25, 2010 to May 27, 2010. These letters contained approximately 2,300 comments, with approximately 1,570 pages of materials. Letters received from government and local agencies accounted for 4 percent of the total comments received. Letters received from individuals and organizations comprised 96 percent of the total comments received. There were seven letters from private citizens residing in Three Rivers that submitted the majority of comments which totaled approximately 1,330 and accounted for 57 percent of the total comments received from government, local agencies, and individuals and organizations.

The majority of comment letters were classified within several key topics:

- Policy Comments that do not Raise CEQA Issues
- Previous Comment Letters and the RDEIR
- Enforceable Policy Language
- Level of Detail for the General Plan and RDEIR Programmatic Nature
- Land Use Diagram and Build-out Assumptions
- Water Supply Evaluation Assumptions and Methodology
- Implementation Measures
- Foothill Growth Management Plan
- Range of Alternatives Addressed in the RDEIR
- Climate Action Plan

Proposed Final EIR (FEIR): The proposed FEIR addresses the comments received on the RDEIR, in accordance with the requirements of the State California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines and includes the following chapters: Executive Summary contains the FEIR Overview, Chapter 1, "Introduction and Reader's Guide," discusses the purpose of this document, public review process, CEQA requirements, and use of this document, Chapter 2, "Minor Revisions to the RDEIR," contains minor changes and edits to the text of the RDEIR made in response to the comments. These changes are

SUBJECT: General Plan 2030 Update
DATE: December 7, 2011

to correct minor errors and for purposes of clarification, Chapter 3, "Comments on the RDEIR," includes a copy of each of the comment letters received during the review period from March 25, 2010 to May 27, 2010. The individual comment letter numbers correspond to those responses provided in Chapter 5, Chapter 4, "Master Responses," is comprised of general responses that address similar comments received regarding certain specified subject areas, Chapter 5, "Responses to Comments on the RDEIR," contains the individual comments received during the public review period for the RDEIR along with written responses to those comments, Chapter 6, Report Preparation, identifies of lead agency and consulting team who prepared the report.

A correctory matrix has been prepared to identify minor changes to Chapter 2 of the FEIR which includes minor changes to the RDEIR. These minor changes are identified in Attachment 2.

The FEIR for the General Plan 2030 Update was prepared in compliance with the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14). The County of Tulare (County) is the Lead Agency for the environmental review of the proposed project and has the principal responsibility for approving the General Plan 2030 Update and the Climate Action Plan.

The Lead Agency must "certify" the FEIR consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15090. According to the CEQA Guidelines, "certification" consists of three separate steps. Prior to approving a project, the lead agency shall certify that: (1) the FEIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA; (2) the FEIR was presented to the decision-making body of the lead agency and that the body has reviewed and considered the information contained in the FEIR prior to approving the project; and (3) that the FEIR reflects the Lead Agency's independent judgment and analysis (CEQA Guidelines, §15090(a); see also Public Resources Code, §21082.1(c)(3)). For the adoption of the General Plan Update, the decision making body is the Tulare County Board of Supervisors who have the responsibility of certifying the Environmental Impact Report. (See CEQA Guidelines Sections 15090, 15356, and Government Code Section 65356.)

PROJECT SUMMARY:

The General Plan was first adopted in 1964. Since then, numerous elements and amendments of the General Plan have been adopted. The 1964 General Plan and its numerous unconsolidated documents is what remains in use today. The GPU is the product of an update process that, in 2011, added a variety of important new goals, policies, and implementation measures to existing components of the County's General Plan.

In the summer of 2003, the Tulare County Board of Supervisors approved a work program to prepare an update of the County's General Plan. A series of 19 workshops, 11 public Board of Supervisors study sessions, 12 technical advisory committee meetings and four joint Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission meetings were held to discuss, review, recommend and provide public comment on the GPU. A

SUBJECT: General Plan 2030 Update
DATE: December 7, 2011

Technical Advisory Committee Draft GPU was prepared in July 2006. Additional Drafts were prepared including an October 2006 Board of Supervisors Draft, a November 2006 Public Draft and a July 2007 Revised Draft. Over 300 pages of comments, suggestions and recommendations were received by the County during the public outreach meetings. All comments received by the County were placed into a 2007 policy comment matrix.

After many community and County workshops, the County published in January 2008 a proposed Tulare County General Plan Update and Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). The DEIR was circulated for public review and comment for an extended period of over 90 days (January 14, 2008 through April 15, 2008) to allow for maximum public involvement and input. After analysis of the comments received, the County decided to significantly revise the DEIR and on March 25, 2010, released the Recirculated DEIR and revised proposed GPU.

Additional public outreach was conducted in 2010 with presentations made to each city council and also included a number of unincorporated community presentations. In addition, there were coordination meetings with the Council of Cities staff to resolve policy issues related to coordinating development around each city. On August 31, 2011, a joint workshop was held by the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission to receive an update from staff regarding staff review of comments received on the Proposed General Plan 2030 Update Goals and Policies Report, Proposed Climate Action Plan and DEIR. At the workshop staff was authorized to release the proposed FEIR and supporting documents to the public and pertinent public agencies. Please see Attachment 2 for a list of dates these meetings and presentations were conducted.

Climate Action Plan:

As part of the Climate Action Strategy, a Proposed Climate Action Plan has been prepared. The Tulare County Climate Action Plan (CAP) serves as a guiding document for County actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the potential effects of climate change. The CAP is an implementation measure of the GPU. An Implementation Measure is a specific action, program, procedure, or technique. Implementation Measures are provided to help ensure that appropriate actions are taken to implement the General Plan. Implementation Measures may be adjusted over time, without amending the General Plan, based on new information, changing circumstances, and evaluation of their effectiveness, so long as they remain consistent with the intent of the General Plan and adopted mitigation measures. The Proposed GPU provides the supporting framework for development in the County to produce fewer greenhouse gas emissions during Plan buildout. The CAP builds on the GPU framework with more specific actions that will be applied to achieve emission reduction targets consistent with California legislation.

Policy Comment Matrices:

SUBJECT: General Plan 2030 Update
DATE: December 7, 2011

In response to the comments received on the General Plan during the public comment period, three policy comment matrices are included in the Planning Commission agenda materials as Attachment 3. The first matrix (Attachment 3 A) titled "Public Policy Comment Matrix" is a staff compiled matrix designed to address some of the more policy specific changes suggested in the comments. The second and third matrices (Attachments 3 B and 3 C) are those referenced under the heading "Global Changes to the RDEIR" in the FEIR. Attachment 3B is titled "Tulare County 2030 General Plan Update Summary of Changes" and identifies recommended policy changes suggested in the RDEIR. Attachment 3 C is titled the "General Plan 2030 Update Correctory Table" and identifies clerical and staff recommended changes to the General Plan 2030 Update. All of these documents are intended to be "working documents" and additional information, materials or recommendations may be added or modified by the County during the public hearing and decision making process for this project.

PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE:

The Planning Commission held a public hearing on this matter on October 19, 2011. This public hearing was continued to November 16, 2011, to allow additional written comment, and was closed on November 16, 2011. A public notice for this hearing was printed in the Dinuba Sentinel on October 6, 2011, the Visalia Times Delta, Porterville Recorder, and the Tulare Advance Register on October 7, 2011 at least ten days prior to the scheduled date of the October 19, 2011 public hearing (Please see Attachment 4 Copy of Public Notice). A public notice was mailed to all individuals and agencies who commented on the RDEIR. In addition, a public notice was mailed to all individuals who requested to be notified of future public hearings regarding the project. The notice was posted outside of the Board of Supervisors Chambers (where the Planning Commission meets) and included in the General Plan Update section of the County of Tulare website.

Gov. Code Section 65009(b) requires the County to include in any public notice issued pursuant to Government Code, Title 7, Planning and Land Use, a notice substantially stating all of the following: "If you challenge the Certification of the Final EIR and adoption of the GPU, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the County of Tulare at, or prior to, the public hearing."

Timing And Nature Of Public Hearings:

After the close of the public hearing by the Planning Commission, it was recommended that the Planning Commission approve appropriate resolutions for the Planning Commission's recommendations to the Board of Supervisors. The Planning Commission continued this matter to December 7, 2011, for action on the recommended resolutions. Action by the Planning Commission on a General Plan Amendment is advisory. The Planning Commission may recommend to the Board of

SUBJECT: General Plan 2030 Update
DATE: December 7, 2011

Supervisors that the proposed amendment be approved, approved with modifications, or disapproved.


After the Planning Commission has made its recommendation on the proposed project, the Tulare County Board of Supervisors will notice and hold a public hearing on the proposed General Plan Update and will consider the Final EIR. The County could then certify the FEIR, adopt Findings, a Mitigation and Monitoring Program, if needed, a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and adopt the General Plan and Climate Action Plan. A Statement of Overriding Considerations would determine that the GPU project would provide an economic, legal, social, technological or other benefit that would outweigh the project's significant and unavoidable impacts that cannot be lessened or avoided with the adoption of feasible mitigation measures.

Public hearings before the Board of Supervisors will be noticed and held separately after the Planning Commission public hearings are completed. Copies of the notice will be sent to any individual or entity requesting notice.


ATTACHMENTS:

1. FEIR Chapter 2 Minor Revisions Correctory
2. Summary List of Commenter's
3. Policy Comment Matrices

PROJECT PLANNER:


Dave Bryant, Special Projects Manager

CHIEF PLANNER:


Fred Brusuelas, AICP

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR:


Michael C. Spata

BEFORE THE PLANNING COMMISSION

COUNTY OF TULARE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

**IN THE MATTER OF THE TULARE)
COUNTY PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN)
2030 UPDATE PROPOSED FINAL) RESOLUTION NO. XXXX
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT)
)**

Resolution of the Planning Commission of the County of Tulare regarding the Final Environmental Impact Report for the proposed General Plan 2030 Update and the proposed Climate Action Plan.

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission of the County of Tulare considered a Final Environmental Impact Report for the adoption of the General Plan 2030 Update at a duly advertised public hearing held on October 19, 2011 and November 16, 2011, at which time oral and documentary evidence was presented; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has given notice of the proposed amendment to the General Plan as provided in Sections 65353, 65090, and 65091 of the Government Code of the State of California and as provided for in the County's California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines; and

WHEREAS, staff has made such investigation of fact bearing upon the proposed General Plan 2030 Update to assure action consistent with the procedures and purposes set forth in the California Government Code, the State General Plan Guidelines, and the Tulare County General Plan; and

WHEREAS, a public notice was printed in the Dinuba Sentinel on October 6, 2011, the Visalia Times Delta, Porterville Recorder, and the Tulare Advance Register on October 7, 2011 at least ten days prior to the public hearing and that hearing was held at which public testimony was received at a public hearing before the Planning Commission on October 19, 2011 and continued on November 16, 2011;

WHEREAS, the Planning Commissions's public hearing was closed after public testimony was received on November 16, 2011 and the matter was continued to December 7, 2011 ; and

WHEREAS, a proposed Final Environmental Impact Report on the Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update (State Clearinghouse No. 2006041162) has been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA, Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.) to analyze the environmental impacts of the new General Plan; and

WHEREAS, a series of 19 workshops, 11 public Board of Supervisors study sessions, 12 technical advisory committee meetings and four joint Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission meetings were held to discuss, review, recommend and provide public comment to the GPU; and

WHEREAS, After many community and County workshops, the County published in January 2008 a proposed Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update and Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). The DEIR was circulated for public review and comment for an extended period of over 90 days (January 14, 2008 through April 15, 2008) to allow for maximum public involvement and input; and

WHEREAS, Consideration of the various comments received on the DEIR, as well as continued developments in the areas of air quality, climate change impacts regulation and water resources resulted in the County's decision to update a number of sections of the previous DEIR as well as the Background Report; and

WHEREAS, This resulted in release of the "proposed project" draft of the General Plan 2030 update also known as the "February 2010 General Plan 2030 Update Document", (B) the Recirculated Draft EIR, and (C) preparation of a Climate Action Plan circulated for a 60 day review period between March 25, 2011 and May 27, 2011 to allow for maximum public involvement and input; and

WHEREAS, On August 31, 2011 a joint workshop was held by the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission to receive an update from staff regarding staff review of comments received on the Proposed General Plan 2030 Update Goals and Policies Report, Proposed Climate Action Plan and DEIR; and

WHEREAS, Planning Commission has reviewed and considered the Recirculated Draft EIR, and the proposed Final Recirculated Draft EIR, including comment letters, responses to comments, and additional public comments made and submitted at public meetings up to the time of adoption of this resolution; and

WHEREAS, at said public hearing the Planning Commission considered the staff report, which is maintained by the County and incorporated herein by reference along with evidence and testimony at said hearing; and the recommended action to certify the Final Environmental Impact Report; and

WHEREAS, the action recited herein is found to be essential for the preservation of public health, safety, and general welfare; and

WHEREAS, staff has made such investigation of fact bearing upon the proposed General Plan 2030 Update to assure action consistent with the procedures and purposes set forth in the California Government Code, the State General Plan Guidelines, and the Tulare County General Plan; and

WHEREAS, the “Recirculated Draft EIR” refers to the Recirculated Draft EIR released for review in March 2010; and

WHEREAS, the “Final Recirculated Draft EIR” also referred to as the “Final EIR” or “Final Environmental Impact Report” for the Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update and the Climate Action Plan (SCH#2006041162), includes the following documents (consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15132): the Recirculated Draft EIR, Table of Contents, Executive Summary, Chapter 1 “Introduction and Readers Guide”, Chapter 2 “Minor Revisions to the RDEIR”, Chapter 3 “Comments on the RDEIR” as provided in Volume II, Chapter 4 “Master Responses”, Chapter 5 “Response to Comments on the RDEIR”.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED as follows:

That the Planning Commission has reviewed and considered the information contained in the proposed Final Environmental Impact Report, including the Recirculated Draft EIR and oral and written comments up to the time of the adoption of this resolution, and hereby recommends that the Board of Supervisors certify said Final Environmental Impact Report and adopt the Findings, Statement of Overriding Considerations, and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

Planning Commission recommends the Board of Supervisors certify the Environmental Impact Report as follows:

1. The Planning Commission has reviewed and considered the information in the Final Environmental Impact Report, including the Recirculated Draft EIR, and comments received after the close of the public review period and up to the adoption of this resolution, and the summary of comments included in Attachment A, before recommending certification of the Final EIR to the Board of Supervisors and recommending approval of the General Plan 2030 Update.
2. The Final Environmental Impact Report, including the Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report (RDEIR), has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act, and is on file in the office of the Resource Management Agency.
3. The Final Environmental Impact Report, including the Recirculated Draft EIR, was presented to the Board of Supervisors, and that the Board of Supervisors reviewed and considered the information contained in the proposed Final EIR prior to approving the project.
4. The Final Environmental Impact Report reflects Tulare County’s independent judgment and analysis.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED as follows:

That the Planning Commission directs staff to prepare as appropriate a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, Statement of Overriding Considerations, and Findings of Fact for consideration by the Board of Supervisors.

The foregoing resolution was adopted upon motion of Commissioner _____, seconded by Commissioner _____, at a meeting of the Planning Commission on the 7th day of December 2011, by the following roll call vote.

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

TULARE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Michael C. Spata, Secretary

ATTACHMENT A
AREAS OF CONTINUED COMMENT REGARDING THE GPU AND
PROPOSED FINAL RECIRCULATED DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
REPORT

Climate Change/Air Quality.

Water quality and quantity.

Land Use and Project buildout assumptions.

Level of detail and programmatic nature of the RDEIR.

Enforcement of the general plan policies.

Range of Alternatives.

Healthy Growth, Smart Growth, Compact Development, City Centered Growth

Location of Development/New Towns

Regional Growth Corridors

Preservation of Agricultural Land and Open Space

Disadvantaged Communities/Infrastructure Needs

Inventories

Archeological Resources

Flood Control

Climate change- A Climate Action Plan has been prepared to address AB 32 Compliance. SB 375 Components are addressed in the following ways: Range of Housing Opportunities, Walkability, Collaboration, Attractive Communities, Sense of Place, Predictable Decisions, Mix of Land Uses, Open Space Preservation, Variety of Transportation Choices, Direct development to Urban Communities, Compact Building Design, Economic Vitality, and Resource Management.

These areas of areas of continued comment regarding the GPU are addressed in the following manner:

The Climate Action Plan, The GPU Planning Framework Element, Agricultural Element, Air Quality Element, Land Use Element, Environmental Resources Management Element, Health and Safety Element, Transportation and Circulation Element, Public Facilities and Services Element, Economic Development Element, Scenic Landscapes, Water Resources Element, the RDEIR and its appendices, and the FEIR including Master Response #10.

Water quality and quantity- The GPU provides for the current and long-range water needs of the County and for the protection of the quality and quantity of

surface and groundwater resources. Water Supply is adequately addresses at the programmatic level in the RDEIR Water Supply Evaluation.

These areas of continued comment regarding the GPU are addressed in the following manner:

The GPU Planning Framework Element, Environmental Resources Management Element, Health and Safety Element, Public Facilities and Services Element, and Water Resources Element and The RDEIR and its appendices, and the FEIR including Master Response #6.

Land Use and Project buildup assumptions- The land use diagram in Figure 4-1 provides an appropriate level of detail at the General Plan level. A greater level of specificity is appropriate at the Area, Sub-Area, and Community Plan level. A build out analysis is included in the FEIR.

These areas of continued comment regarding the GPU are addressed in the following manner:

GPU Land Use Element, The RDEIR and its appendices, and the FEIR including Master Response #5.

Level of detail and programmatic nature of the RDEIR- Programmatic Document policies are adequate at the General Plan level, greater level of specificity is provided at the Area, Sub Area, Community Plan level including the ordinance code.

These areas of continued comment regarding the GPU are addressed in the following manner:

The RDEIR and its appendices, and the FEIR including Master Response #4.

Enforcement of the general plan policies- Programmatic Document, policies are adequate at the General Plan level, greater level of specificity is provided at the Area, Sub Area, Community Plan level including the ordinance code.

These areas of areas of continued comment regarding the GPU are addressed in the following manner:

The RDEIR and its appendices, and the FEIR including Master Response #3.

Range of Alternatives- Consistent with CEQA requirements (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a)), the EIR process reviewed scenarios and developed a range of alternatives designed to feasibly attain most of the project objectives but also avoid or lessen several significant effects associated with the proposed project.

These areas of continued comment regarding the GPU are addressed in the following manner:

The RDEIR, and the FEIR including Master Response #9.

Healthy Growth, Smart Growth, Compact Development, City Centered

Growth- The GPU provides for Smart Growth and Healthy Communities, Promotion of Infill, Mixed-Use, LEED, and Intermodal Connectivity.

These areas of areas of continued comment regarding the GPU are addressed in the following manner:

The Climate Action Plan, The GPU Planning Framework Element, Agricultural Element, Air Quality Element, Land Use Element, Environmental Resources Management Element, Health and Safety Element, Transportation and Circulation Element, Public Facilities and Services Element, Economic Development Element, Scenic Landscapes, Water Resources Element, Rural Valley Lands Plan, Foothill Growth Management Plan, Mountain Framework Plan, the RDEIR and its appendices, and the FEIR.

Location of Development/New Towns- Preservation of Resource Conservation is accomplished by managed growth in urban communities and consistency as applicable with associated Area Plans.

These areas of continued comment regarding the GPU are addressed in the following manner:

The GPU Planning Framework Element, Agricultural Element, Air Quality Element, Land Use Element, Environmental Resources Management Element, Public Facilities and Services Element, Economic Development Element, Scenic Landscapes, Rural Valley Lands Plan, Foothill Growth Management Plan, Mountain Framework Plan, the RDEIR and its appendices, and the FEIR.

Regional Growth Corridors- The Corridor Framework Plan provides framing policies for future corridor plans to be adopted. Pending adoption of regional growth corridor plans, the County may approve highway oriented commercial, industrial, and mixed use development only at specific intersections of major collectors subject to conformity with the RVLP and specified standards.

These areas of continued comment regarding the GPU are addressed in the following manner:

The GPU Planning Framework Element, Corridors Framework Plan, the RDEIR and its appendices, and the FEIR.

Preservation of Agricultural Land and Open Space- The GPU promotes the long-term preservation of productive and potentially-productive agricultural lands and to accommodate agricultural-support services and agriculturally-related activities that supports the viability of agriculture and further the County's economic development goals.

These areas of continued comment regarding the GPU are addressed in the following manner:

The GPU Planning Framework Element, Agricultural Element, Land Use Element, Environmental Resources Management Element, Transportation and Circulation Element, Public Facilities and Services Element, Scenic Landscapes, Rural Valley Lands Plan, Foothill Growth Management Plan, Mountain Framework Plan, the RDEIR and its appendices, and the FEIR.

Disadvantaged Communities/Infrastructure Needs- The GPU Planning Framework Element provides a framework for economic development, the provision of public services, and quality of life in Hamlets. The Public Facilities and Services Element provides policies that maintains acceptable levels of service, minimize costs, and provide criteria for determining the location, capacity, and timing of existing and future public facilities and services

These areas of continued comment regarding the GPU are addressed in the following manner:

The GPU Planning Framework Element, Agricultural Element, Air Quality Element, Land Use Element, Environmental Resources Management Element, Health and Safety Element, Transportation and Circulation Element, Public Facilities and Financing Element, Economic Development Element, Water Resources Element, the RDEIR and its appendices, and the FEIR.

Inventories- Numerous inventories are contained in the Background Report and RDEIR and its appendices. The Background report contains over 130 tables and over 40 figures. The RDEIR contains over 100 tables and over 30 figures. Areas of interest include Williamson Act Properties (Background Report Chapter 4), Natural Communities (Background Report Chapter 9), Scenic Resources (Background Report Chapter 11), Public Facilities (Background Report Chapter 7).

These areas of continued comment regarding the GPU are addressed in the following manner:

The Background Report , the RDEIR and its appendices.

Archeological Resources- The GPU provides policies to manage and protect sites of cultural and archaeological importance for the benefit of present and future generations. Certified Local Government is addressed in the GPU in the Environmental Resources Management Element.


These areas of continued comment regarding the GPU are addressed in the following manner:

The GPU Land Use Element, Environmental Resources Management Element, Foothill Growth Management Plan, the RDEIR and its appendices.

Flood Control- The GPU Health and Safety Element contains policies to minimize the possibility for loss of life, injury, or damage to property as a result of flood hazards.

These areas of continued comment regarding the GPU are addressed in the following manner:

The GPU meets the requirements of AB 162 as specified in Policy Comment Matrix 3C Number 33.



BEFORE THE PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OF TULARE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

**IN THE MATTER OF THE TULARE)
COUNTY PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN)
2030 UPDATE) **RESOLUTION NO. XXXX**
)
)**

Resolution of the Planning Commission of the County of Tulare recommending the adoption of the proposed General Plan 2030 Update, with modifications described in greater detail below.

WHEREAS, the Tulare County Board of Supervisors has initiated action to amend the Tulare County General Plan pursuant to title 7, Chapter 3, Articles 5 and 6 of the Government Code of the State of California; and

WHEREAS, Tulare County ("County") is a political subdivision of the State of California, and is located in California's central valley bounded by Fresno County to the north, Kern County to the south, Inyo County to the east, and Kings County to the west; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has given notice of the proposed amendment to the General Plan as provided in Sections 65353, 65090, and 65091 of the Government Code of the State of California and as provided for in the County's California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines; and

WHEREAS, staff has made such investigation of fact bearing upon the proposed General Plan 2030 Update to assure action consistent with the procedures and purposes set forth in the California Government Code, the State General Plan Guidelines, and the Tulare County General Plan; and

WHEREAS, a public notice was printed in the Dinuba Sentinel on October 6, 2011, the Visalia Times Delta, Porterville Recorder, and the Tulare Advance Register on October 7, 2011 at least ten days prior to the public hearing and that hearing was held at which public testimony was received at a public hearing before the Planning Commission on October 19, 2011 and November 16, 2011;

WHEREAS, the General 2030 Plan Update document consists of:

Part I, called the "Goals and Policies Report," includes fourteen elements that apply countywide. Those adopted in 2012 as new or revised elements join three existing elements, the Housing Element (adopted in 2003), Flood Control Master Plan (1972) and the Animal Confinement Facilities Plan (ACFP)-Phase I (adopted in 2000). The Housing

Element, the Flood Control Master Plan, and Animal Confinement Facilities Plan (ACFP)-Phase I, were not revised or readopted as part of the Update but are included in Part I. The Goals and Policies Report is organized into four components and includes:

Component A. General Plan Framework:

- Planning Framework Element (adopted 2012)

Component B. Prosperity:

- Agriculture Element (adopted 2012)
- Land Use Element (adopted 2012)
- Economic Development Element (adopted 2012)
- Housing Element (adopted 2010)

Component C. Environment:

- Scenic Landscapes Element (adopted 2012)
- Environmental Resource Management Element (adopted 2012)
- Air Quality Element (adopted 2012)
- Health and Safety Element (adopted 2012)
- Water Resources Element (adopted 2012)
- Animal Confinement Facilities Plan (ACPF)-Phase I (adopted 2000)

Component D. Infrastructure:

- Transportation and Circulation Element (adopted 2012)
- Public Facilities and Services Element (adopted 2012)
- The Flood Control Master Plan (adopted 1972)

The structure and organization of the Goals and Policies Report is described in greater detail later in this Introduction under “Goals and Policies Report Framework.”

Part II includes three “Area Plans,” one for each of the three major geographic areas of the County. They are:

- Rural Valley Lands Plan (adopted in revised form 2012)
- Foothill Growth Management Plan (adopted in revised form 2012)
- Mountain Framework Plan (adopted 2012)

Part II also includes a new Corridor Framework Plan (adopted 2010), which establishes policies that will guide the potential adoption of Corridor Plans within the County. Any such adopted Corridor Plan will be included in Part III.

Part III of the General Plan 2030 Update consists of a number of existing planning documents: Sub-Area Plans, County Adopted City General Plans, and Community Plans. Each of these plans, described in the following pages, applies tailored policies to specified portions of the County. These existing plans were not revised or readopted in 2010 as part of the General Plan Update with two exceptions: the Urban Development Boundary for the Pixley Community Plan was modified to include the Harmon Field Airport and the County Adopted City General Plan for Dinuba was modified to reflect that the Dinuba Golf Course, residential and wastewater treatment area were annexed to the City of Dinuba.

Furthermore, the General Plan 2030 Update anticipates adopting additional Sub-Area Plans, County Adopted City General Plans, and Community Plans, as well as Mountain Service Center Plans, Hamlet Plans, and Corridor Plans. These anticipated plans are discussed below. Each will become components of Part III of the General Plan when adopted:

Thus, Part III includes:

- Five existing Sub-Area plans:
 - Great Western Divide North Half Plan (a Sub-Area plan located within the boundaries of the Mountain Framework Plan) (adopted 1990)
 - Kennedy Meadows Plan (a Sub-Area plan located within the boundaries of the Mountain Framework Plan) (adopted 1986)
 - Kings River Plan (a Sub-Area plan located within the boundaries of the Rural Valley Lands Plan) (adopted 1975)
 - Sequoia Field Land Use and Public Buildings Element (adopted 1981) amended to Juvenile Detention Facility-Sequoia Field Land Use and Public Buildings Elements (adopted 1995)

The Goals and Policies Report also identifies five additional Sub-Areas, all within the Mountain Framework Plan area, for which Sub-Area plans have not been adopted to date. These Sub-Areas will become components of Part III of the General Plan when adopted:

- Great Western Divide South Half Plan
- Posey Plan
- Redwood Mountain Plan
- South Sierra Plan
- Upper Balch Park Plan
- Eight existing County Adopted City General Plans, including two neighborhood plans, that cover the areas between the city limit lines of the eight incorporated

cities in Tulare County and the County-adopted Urban Area Boundaries and Urban Development Boundaries for those cities (note that Tulare County does not have the authority to regulate land use within the city limits of those cities):

- Dinuba (adopted 1964, revised 2012 by this update to include the Dinuba Golf Course)
 - Exeter (adopted 1976)
 - Farmersville (adopted 1976)
 - Lindsay (adopted 1981)
 - Porterville (adopted 1990)
 - East Porterville Neighborhood Plan (adopted 1990)
 - Tulare (adopted 1980)
 - Visalia (adopted 1992)
 - Patterson Tract Neighborhood Plan (adopted 1992)
 - Woodlake (adopted 1986)
- In addition, the Goals and Policies Report calls for adopting two additional County Adopted City General Plans. Both of these areas have established Urban Development Boundaries. These County Adopted City General Plans will become components of Part III of the General Plan when adopted:
- Delano
 - Kingsburg
- Twelve Existing Community Plans:
- Cutler/Orosi Community Plan (adopted 1988)
 - Earlimart Community Plan (adopted 1988)
 - Goshen Community Plan (adopted 1978)
 - Ivanhoe Community Plan (adopted 1990)
 - Pixley Community Plan (adopted 1997, revised 2010 by this update to include Harmon Field)
 - Poplar/Cotton Center Community Plan (adopted 1996)
 - Richgrove Community Plan (adopted 1987)
 - Springville Community Plan (adopted 1985)
 - Strathmore Community Plan (adopted 1989)
 - Terra Bella/Ducor Community Plan (adopted 2004)
 - Three Rivers Community Plan (adopted 1980)
 - Traver Community Plan (adopted 1989)
- In addition, the Goals and Policies Report designates eight additional communities and calls for adopting a Community Plan for each. Each of these Communities has an existing Urban Development Boundary except Sultana.

These Community Plans will become components of Part III of the General Plan when adopted:

- Alpaugh
 - East Orosi
 - Lemon Cove
 - London
 - Plainview
 - Sultana
 - Tipton
 - Woodville
- Mountain Service Center Plans: The Goals and Policies Report designates certain existing developed areas within the boundaries of the Mountain Framework Plan as Mountain Service Centers and calls for adopting Mountain Service Center Plans (as a part of the Mountain Sub Area Plan) for these locations. These Mountain Service Center Plans will become components of Part III of the General Plan when adopted:
- Balance Rock
 - Balch Park
 - Blue Ridge
 - California Hot Springs/Pine Flat
 - Fairview
 - Hartland
 - Johnsdale
 - McClenney Tract
 - Panorama Heights
 - Posey/Idlewild
 - Poso Park
 - Silver City
 - Sugarloaf Mountain Park
 - Sugarloaf Park
 - Sugarloaf Village
 - Wilsonia
- Hamlet Development Plans: The Goals and Policies Report also designates certain locations as Hamlets and calls for the adoption of a Hamlet Development Plan for each of these. These Hamlet Development Plans will become components of Part III of the General Plan when adopted:
- Allensworth
 - Delft Colony

- East Tulare Villa
 - Lindcove
 - Monson
 - Seville
 - Teviston
 - Tonyville
 - Waukena
 - West Goshen
 - Yettem
- Corridor Plans: The Corridor Framework Plan in Part II establishes policies that would guide the potential adoption of “Corridor Plans” within the County. When adopted the Corridor Plans will become part of Part III of the General Plan. This may include:
- The Mooney Corridor Concepts Plan (suspended by Tulare County Board of Supervisors, General Plan Amendment 04-001 and Resolution No. 04-0651 pending adoption of the Corridor Framework Plan)
 - Additional Corridor Plans to be determined

Updated or Deleted Sections and Elements

The following provisions of the County’s prior General Plan are deleted with the 2010 adoption of General Plan 2030 Update. State-mandated content formerly addressed in these elements is now covered in new provisions of the General Plan, as described in Table 1.1 (page 1-12):

- Civic Center Master Plan
- Environmental Resource Management Element (Open Space/Recreation/Conservation Element)
- Land Use Element
- Library Master Plan
- Noise Element
- Public Buildings Plan
- Safety Element
- Scenic Highways Element
- Seismic Safety Element
- Transportation/Circulation Element
- Urban Boundaries Element
- Water and Liquid Waste Management Element

; and

WHEREAS, the General Plan is the County's principal policy document to guide growth, development, and conservation, and is the foundation for all planning decisions; and

WHEREAS, the Tulare County Ordinance Code and Tulare County Zoning Ordinance implements the broad policies of the General Plan by specifying the uses permitted on each parcel of land, the intensity of development, and standards for development; and

WHEREAS, at said public hearing the Planning Commission considered the staff report contained which is maintained by the County and incorporated herein by reference along with evidence and testimony at said hearing; and the recommended action to certify the Final Environmental Impact Report ; and

WHEREAS, Planning Commission has considered (A) the "proposed project" draft of the General Plan also known as the "February 2010 General Plan 2030 Update Document", (B) revisions to the General Plan based upon mitigation measures and alternatives identified in the Recirculated Draft EIR, and the proposed Final EIR, (C) revisions to the General Plan suggested in comment letters, the Correctory Table and Matrices (Attachment 3 A) titled "Public Policy Comment Matrix"), Attachment 3B is titled "Tulare County 2030 General Plan Update Summary of Changes", Attachment 3 C is titled the "General Plan 2030 Update Correctory Table", response to comments, and additional public comments made and submitted at public meetings up to the time of adoption of this resolution; and

WHEREAS, prior to said hearing, the County sought out and incorporated public input throughout the preparation of the General Plan Update. As part of the public outreach and participation efforts, the County held a total of 87 public workshops, Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors working sessions, community meetings, technical committee meetings, and other public engagement events at different locations throughout the County, in addition to public hearings before the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors; and

WHEREAS, letters in compliance with SB 18 as Enacted March 1, 2005 were sent with offer for consultation, to the California American Native Tribes on October 3, 2006. Consultation was only requested by Lawrence Bill (SNNAC) within the 90-day consultation period. Staff met with Lawrence Bill and SNNAC members on February 11, 2007. Discussion emphasized burial issues and not specific General Plan issues; and

WHEREAS, the "Recirculated Draft EIR" refers to the Recirculated Draft EIR released for review in March 2010.

WHEREAS, the “Final Recirculated Draft EIR”, also referred to as the “Final EIR” or “Final Environmental Impact Report” for the Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update and the Climate Action Plan (SCH#2006041162), includes the following documents (consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15132): the Recirculated Draft EIR, Table of Contents, Executive Summary, Chapter 1 “Introduction and Readers Guide”, Chapter 2 “Minor Revisions to the RDEIR”, Chapter 3 “Comments on the RDEIR” as provided in Volume II , Chapter 4 “Master Responses”, Chapter 5 “Response to Comments on the RDEIR”; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission recognizes the need and desirability to conduct reviews of, and consider amendments to, the General Plan to accommodate the changing needs of the County; and

WHEREAS, staff has made such investigation of fact bearing upon the proposed General Plan 2030 Update to assure action consistent with the procedures and purposes set forth in the California Government Code; and

WHEREAS, this action is taken to all applicable procedures required by state law and the County of Tulare; and

WHEREAS, the action recited herein is found to be essential for the preservation of public health, safety, and general welfare; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED as follows:

- A. The Planning Commission hereby finds that the above recitals are true and correct and are incorporated herein by reference as if set forth in full,
- B. The Planning Commission opened the Public hearing and Received a Staff Presentation on the General Plan 2030 Update Proposed Climate Action Plan and Proposed Final Environmental Impact Report,
- C. The Planning Commission has received public comment and testimony regarding adoption of the Proposed General Plan 2030 Update,
- D. The Planning Commission Closed the Public Hearing,
- E. Planning Commission hereby recommends adoption of the “February 2010 General Plan 2030 Update Document” (attached as Appendix C to the Recirculated Draft EIR) also known as the “proposed project” in the Final Recirculated Draft EIR, as modified by (A) the mitigation measures suggested by the preparers of the Final Recirculated Draft EIR (i.e. those mitigation measures and policies identified in the sections of the Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report labeled “Required Additional Mitigating Policies and

Implementation Measures") as modified in the Final Recirculated Draft EIR, (B) the revisions recommended by Staff in the Correctory Table ((Attachment 3 A) titled "Public Policy Comment Matrix"), revisions recommended by Staff in Attachment 3B titled "Tulare County 2030 General Plan Update Summary of Changes", revisions recommended by Staff in Attachment 3 C titled the "General Plan 2030 Update Correctory Table", and (3) those revisions suggested by Staff in the Addendum to Attachment 3C titled " Addendum to Attachment 3C General Plan City Section PF – 4 Comment Matrix.

The foregoing resolution was adopted upon motion of Commissioner_____, seconded by Commissioner_____, at a meeting of the Planning Commission on the 7th day of December, by the following roll call vote.

AYES:


NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

TULARE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Michael C. Spata, Secretary



BEFORE THE PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OF TULARE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

**IN THE MATTER OF THE TULARE)
COUNTY PROPSED GENERAL PLAN 2030)
UPDATE PROPOSED CLIMATE ACTION) RESOLUTION NO. XXXX
PLAN)
)
)**

Resolution of the Planning Commission of the County of Tulare regarding the recommendation for the adoption of the Proposed Climate Action Plan.

WHEREAS, the Tulare County Board of Supervisors has initiated action to amend the Tulare County General Plan pursuant to title 7, Chapter 3, Articles 5 and 6 of the Government Code of the State of California; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has given notice of the proposed amendment to the General Plan as provided in Sections 65353, 65090, and 65091 of the Government Code of the State of California and as provided for in the County's California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines; and

WHEREAS, staff has made such investigation of fact bearing upon the proposed General Plan 2030 Update to assure action consistent with the procedures and purposes set forth in the California Government Code, the State General Plan Guidelines, and the Tulare County General Plan; and

WHEREAS, a public notice was printed in the Dinuba Sentinel on October 6, 2011, the Visalia Times Delta, Porterville Recorder, and the Tulare Advance Register on October 7, 2011 at least ten days prior to the public hearing and that hearing was held at which public testimony was received at a public hearing before the Planning Commission on October 19, 2011 and November 16, 2011;

WHEREAS, to augment the Goals, Policies and Actions of the General Plan 2030 Update, the County has prepared a Climate Action Plan (CAP); and

WHEREAS, the County of Tulare Climate Action Plan was evaluated concurrently with the proposed General Plan 2030 Update and analyzed in the Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report and Final Environmental Impact Report ; and

WHEREAS, the Climate Action Plan incorporates many of the General Plan 2030 Update and Goals, Policies addressing the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and adaptation strategies which are contained throughout the General Plan 2030 Update; and

WHEREAS, The Climate Action Plan provides the strategies for the County of Tulare to reduce greenhouse gas emissions consistent with the direction of the State of California via AB32 the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (2006 Stats, Ch. 488) and Governor's Executive Order S-03-05; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED as follows:

- A. That the Planning Commission of the County of Tulare, California find that the above recitals are true and correct and are incorporated herein by this reference as if set forth in full.
- B. That the Planning Commission opened the Public hearing and received a Staff Presentation on the General Plan 2030 Update Proposed Climate Action Plan.
- C. The Planning Commission has received and considered all public comment and testimony regarding Proposed Climate Action Plan.
- D. The Planning Commission Closed the Public Hearing and the Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Board of Supervisors adopt the Climate Action Plan.

The foregoing resolution was adopted upon motion of Commissioner_____, seconded by Commissioner_____, at a meeting of the Planning Commission on the 7th day of December 2011, by the following roll call vote.

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

TULARE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Michael C. Spata, Secretary

Attachment 1
Minor Changes to Final EIR Text
Version date: November 10, 2011

Final EIR Minor Changes Matrix

Introduction:

This “Final EIR Minor Changes Matrix” has been prepared for the convenience of the County decision makers and for use by County staff and the public. To the extent possible, this “Final EIR Minor Changes Matrix” identifies minor revisions and editorial changes identified by reviewers of the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) during the public review period on the FEIR for the proposed Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update. These changes clarify, amplify or make insignificant changes to the EIR. New text is indicated by underline and deletions are shown in ~~strikethrough~~. None of the changes identified in this matrix constitutes significant new information or results in any new significant impacts.

The matrix lists the specific change, identifies the policy number (if applicable) addressed and provides preliminary staff recommendations. This matrix is intended to be a “working document” and therefore additional information, materials or recommendations may be added or modified by the County during the public hearing and decision making process for this project.

No.	Comment No.	Policy/Imp.	Staff Recommendation	Planning Comm. Recommendation	Board Direction
1	Master Response #6	None	<p>The following addition is recommended on page 4-31 (at the conclusion of the 2nd paragraph) of the FEIR:</p> <p>Consequently, SB610 lists several other 'projects' requiring a WSA and a General Plan is not on that list. (See also Citizens for Responsible Equitable Environmental Development v. City of Chino (County of San Bernardino Superior Court Case No. CIVRS1008458) 8-12-2011 Minute Order ["The Court denies the writ as to the contention that the City failed to have a water supply assessment (WSA) done for the project under water code 10910 and included in the EIR since a proposed general plan is not the type of actual development project identified in water code 10912</p>		

No.	Comment No.	Policy/Imp.	Staff Recommendation	Planning Comm. Recommendation	Board Direction
2	A8-10	None	<p>The following revision is recommended for the response to Comment A8-10 on page 5-24 of the FEIR:</p> <p>CEQA requires analysis of reasonably foreseeable impacts (see CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(d)). As a corollary to this rule, CEQA does not require analysis of impacts that are too remote or speculative. It is appropriate to discuss reasonably foreseeable growth at the horizon year of the proposed project; impacts beyond this time frame are highly speculative. As discussed in <i>In re Bay-Delta Programmatic Environmental Impact Report Coordinated Proceedings</i> (2008) 43 Cal.4th 1143, 1173, over a 30-year period, it is “impracticable to foresee with certainty specific source of water and their impacts...” Similarly, for the proposed project, maximum theoretical buildout would not occur, if ever, until the year <u>2023</u> <u>2123</u> (see Master Response #5). It is not possible to determine how development will occur beyond the project’s horizon year in the year <u>2023</u> <u>2123</u>. The approach taken in the RDEIR is consistent with OPR’s 2003 General Plan Guidelines, which states that most jurisdictions select a 15 to 20 year planning horizon. This approach is also consistent with recent CEQA case law (see <i>Save Round Valley Alliance v. County of Inyo</i> (2007) 157 Cal.App.4th 1437 [holding the DEIR did not need to assume second dwelling unit [theoretical buildout] would be constructed even though allowed by zoning]).</p>		
3	I11-206	None	<p>The following revision is recommended for the response to Comment I11-206 on page 5-145 of the</p>		

No.	Comment No.	Policy/Imp.	Staff Recommendation	Planning Comm. Recommendation	Board Direction
			FEIR: The various question/comments regarding Policy AQ-1.5 policies AQ-2.2, AQ-4.2, AQ-4.3, and AQ-4.4 will be forwarded to County decision makers (see Master Response #1). The commenter is referred to Master Response #7 regarding implementation measures and Master Response #3 and #4 regarding the enforceability of general plan policies, and the appropriate level of detail for the program-level RDEIR. The commenter is referred to the response to Comment 11-190 regarding the effectiveness of general plan policies. While the SJVAPCD is directly responsible for implementing the referenced air quality measures, the County believes these air quality measures are important methods to address air quality issues worthy of documentation in the General Plan 2030 Update.		
4	111-209	None	The following revision is recommended for the response to Comment 111-209 on page 5-145 of the FEIR: The various question/comments regarding Policy AQ-3.5 will be forwarded to County decision makers (see Master Response #1). The commenter is referred to Master Response #3, #4 and #7 regarding implementation, the enforceability of general plan policies, and the appropriate level of detail for the program-level RDEIR. The commenter is referred to the response to Comment 11-190 regarding the effectiveness of general plan policies. See Response to 111-207.		
5	111-210	None	The following revision is recommended for the response to Comment 111-210 on page 5-145 of the		

No.	Comment No.	Policy/Imp.	Staff Recommendation	Planning Comm. Recommendation	Board Direction
6	111-220	None	<p>FEIR:</p> <p>The various question/comments regarding Air Quality Implementation Measure #12 will be forwarded to County decision makers (see Master Response #1). The commenter is referred to Master Response #3, #4 and #7 regarding implementation, the enforceability of general plan policies, and the appropriate level of detail for the program-level RDEIR. of the General Plan and the level of detail. The commenter is referred to the response to Comment 111-190 regarding the effectiveness of general plan policies.</p>	<p>The following revision is recommended for the response to Comment 111-220 on page 5-148 of the FEIR:</p> <p>The various question/comments regarding Energy Resources Goal ERM-4 will be forwarded to County decision makers (see Master Response #1). The commenter is referred to the response to Master Response #3, <u>#4, and #7, and Comment 111-190 regarding the effectiveness of general plan policies.</u> regarding implementation, the enforceability of general plan policies, and the appropriate level of detail for the program-level RDEIR.</p>	
7	111-221	None		<p>The following revision is recommended for the response to Comment 111-221 on page 5-148 of the FEIR:</p> <p>The various question/comments regarding Land Use Implementation Measure #3 will be forwarded to County decision makers (see Master Response #1). The commenter is referred to Master Response #7 regarding implementation</p>	

No	Comment No	Policy/Imp	Staff Recommendation	Planning Comm Recommendation	Board Direction
			measures and Master Response #3 and #4 regarding the enforceability of general plan policies, and the appropriate level of detail for the program-level RDEIR. As noted in these Master Responses individual policies should not be reviewed in a vacuum. For example PFS Implementation #4 includes density bonuses and financial assistance to promote infill development. The commenter is referred to the response to Comment H1-190 regarding the effectiveness of general plan policies.		
8	H11-224	None	The following revision is recommended for the response to Comment H11-224 on page 5-149 of the FEIR: The commenter's recommendations will be forwarded to County decision makers prior to their decision on the proposed project (see Master Response #1). Regarding the commenter's suggestion to revise policy language, please see Master Responses #3 and #4 regarding enforceable policy language and level of detail and programmatic nature of the RDEIR. Please see Master Response #7 regarding implementation measures. Please see Response to Comment H11-190 regarding the effectiveness of general plan policies. The commenter is also referred to the response prepared for Comment A7-12 and A7-13 regarding impact fees. The commenter is also referred to the response prepared for Comment A7-21 regarding transit impacts. Please note that, as discussed in the RDEIR, Impact 3.2-1 would remain significant and unavoidable because projected increases in traffic would be due mostly to growth within the cities that is not directly controlled by the plan; furthermore physical improvements to reduce this impact require cooperation and funding from a variety of other		

Attachment 2 Verbal Public Hearing Comments 10-19-11 and 11-16-11

No.	Received	Commenter	Agency
1	10/19/2011	Lasky, Gary	Sierra Club, Fresno
2	10/19/2011	Clum, Peter	Individual
3	10/19/2011	Jackson, James	Individual
4	10/19/2011	McIntire, Richard	Sierra Nevada Alliance
5	10/19/2011	Campbell, Warren	Individual
6	10/19/2011	Johnson, David	Individual
7	10/19/2011	Dackawich, John	Individual
8	10/19/2011	Cid, Amparo	Individual
9	10/19/2011	Brodfuehrer, Kara	California Rural Legal Assistance
10	10/19/2011	Brannan, Lois	Tulare County League of Women Voters
11	10/19/2011	Ooley, Leon	Individual
12	10/19/2011	Nielsen, Bill	Individual
13	10/19/2011	Manning, Terry	Individual
14	10/19/2011	Bodner, Karen	Individual
15	10/19/2011	Schawaller, Laurie	Individual
16	10/19/2011	Gorden, Mary	South Sierra Archeological Society
17	10/19/2011	Schawaller, Greg	Individual
18	10/19/2011	Kendall, Roy	Individual
19	10/19/2011	Seligman, James	Individual
20	10/19/2011	Kirkpatrick, Shirley	Individual
21	10/19/2011	Manro, Don	Individual
22	10/19/2011	Newton, Brian	Tulare County Audubon Society
23	10/19/2011	Clum, Carole	Individual
24	11/16/2011	Cid, Amparo	California Rural Legal Assistance
25	11/16/2011	Quevedo, Jesus	Individual
26	11/16/2011	Hollingshed, Deborah	Individual
27	11/16/2011	Zaragoza, Ofelia	Individual
28	11/16/2011	Lapalma, Jeanette	Individual
29	11/16/2011	Fry, Connie	Individual
30	11/16/2011	Smith, Ken	Individual
31	11/16/2011	Seligman, Kathleen	Individual
32	11/16/2011	Campe, Sarah	Individual
33	11/16/2011	Peck, Stephen	Peck Planning and Development
34	11/16/2011	Sartucche, Johnny	Individual
35	11/16/2011	Nesmith, Rudy	Individual
36	11/16/2011	West, Shiela	Individual
37	11/16/2011	Clum, Carole	Individual
38	11/16/2011	Bodner, Karen	Individual
39	11/16/2011	Manning, Terry	Individual
40	11/16/2011	Newton, Brian	Tulare County Audubon Society
41	11/16/2011	Manro, Don	Individual
42	11/16/2011	Dunlap, Brad	City of Porterville Planning Department
43	11/16/2011	Kendall, Roy	Individual
44	11/16/2011	Schwaller, Laurie	Individual

Attachment 2 Written Comments Received 10-6-11 to 11-16-11

No.	Received	Commenter	Agency/Individual
1	10/06/11	Pilling, George	Individual
2	10/12/11	Peck, Stephen	Individual
3	10/16/11	Bluestein, Ken and Laurie	Individual
4	10/17/11	Stewart, Joan	California Native Plant Society
5	10/18/11	Marks, Anne	Individual
6	10/18/11	Nipp, Gordon L.	Sierra Club Kern Kaweah Chapter
7	10/18/11	Breckenridge, Sara	Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger, LLP
8	10/18/11	Glanter, Tamara S.	Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger, LLP
9	10/19/11	Kendall, Roy J.	Individual
10	10/19/11	Schwaller, Greg	Individual
11	10/19/11	Schwaller, Laurie	Individual
12	10/19/11	Ooley, Leon	Individual
13	10/19/11	Brodfuehrer, Kara	California Rural Legal Assistance, Inc.
14	10/19/11	Jackson, James and Ericka	Jim Jackson Family Farms
15	10/19/11	Keenan, Bob	Home Builders Association
16	10/19/11	Clum, Peter	Individual
17	10/19/11	Clum, Carole	Individual
18	10/21/11	Combs, Carole K.	Tulare Basin Wildlife Partners11/1
19	10/24/11	Huber, Ann	Individual
20	10/27/11	Schwaller, Greg and Laurie	Individual
21	10/31/11	Pugh, Paul F.	Sequoia Valley Resource Corporation
22	11/08/11	Schwaller, Greg and Laurie	Individual
23	11/09/11	Peck, Stephen	Peck Planning and Development, LLC
24	11/12/11	Adest, Gary	River Ridge Ranch
25	11/13/11	Mayer, Jean	Individual
26	11/13/11	Gregg, Mignon	Individual
27	11/13/11	Selph, Mona Fox	Individual
28	11/13/11	Bullene, Dan and Sharon	Sequoia River Dance Bed & Breakfast
29	11/14/11	Mutch, Linda	Individual
30	11/14/11	Robillard, Sylvie and Gordon, Mary A.	Southern Sierra Archaeological Society
31	11/15/11	McMillan, Mehmet	Individual
32	11/15/11	Watts, Bruce	Individual
33	11/15/11	Winters, Sue	Individual
34	11/15/11	Schwaller, Greg and Laurie	Individual
35	11/16/11	Pensar, Bill	Individual
36	11/16/11	Bodner, Karen	Individual
37	11/16/11	Schwaller, Laurie	Individual
38	11/16/11	Gunther-Seligman, Kathleen	Individual
39	11/16/11	Campe, Sarah	Individual
40	11/16/11	Quevedo, Jesus	Asociacion de Gente Unida Por El Agua
41	11/16/11	Clum, Peter and Carole	Sierra Club Kern Kaweah Chapter

Attachment 3 A
Public Policy Comment Matrix
Version date: November 21, 2011

Public Policy Comment Matrix

Introduction:

This “Public Policy Comment Matrix” has been prepared for the convenience of the County decision makers and for use by County staff and the public. To the extent possible, this “Public Policy Comment Matrix” identifies comments received from private individuals or groups during the public review period on the Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report (RDEIR) on the proposed Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update, which comments suggest *specific changes* to (as opposed to criticism of or questions on) particular policies in the proposed General Plan 2030 Update but do not address the adequacy of the RDEIR. The matrix lists the comment by its number in Chapter 3 of the proposed Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), identifies the policy number addressed and provides preliminary staff recommendations. This matrix is intended to be a “working document” and therefore additional information, materials or recommendations may be added or modified by the County during the public hearing and decision making process for this project. Chapters 4 and 5 of the proposed FEIR provide responses that address comments on the EIR, and are in some cases also relevant to commenters’ policy recommendations.

Background:

The RDEIR was circulated for public review as provided by California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resource Code Sections 21091 and 21092.1, starting March 25, 2010, through May 27, 2010 (a 60 day review period). Forty-four (44) comment letters from both public agencies and private individuals and groups were submitted during the recirculated public review period. These comment letters contained over 2300 comments. A significant number of comments were on policy matters pertaining to the General Plan 2030 Update principles, concepts, goals, policies and implementation measures rather than on the RDEIR’s analysis of environmental impacts of the proposed General Plan amendment. A number of these comments suggest changes to the language of particular policies in the Proposed General Plan 2030 Update but do not address the adequacy of the analysis in the RDEIR. As indicated in Master Response #1 in chapter 4 of the FEIR, CEQA does not require responses to these types of comments.

However, these comments are part of the administrative records and, by inclusion in the proposed FEIR, have been effectively forwarded to County decision makers. The responses to individual comments (in Chapter 5) in the FEIR generally refer to Master Response #1 or state that the policies will be referred to the County decision makers. By making these comments, the FEIR is in effect referring the comments to the County

decision makers and the comments will be considered by the County decision makers through their review of the FEIR during the public hearing process on the proposed General Plan 2030 Update.

Of the comments that addressed policy matters instead of the adequacy of the RDEIR, a significant number are of general application or criticism or ask questions regarding various policy matters and do not actively suggest specific policy changes or at least identifiable policy changes. The comments or questions of general application or criticism will be considered by the County policy makers through the review of the proposed FEIR during the public hearing process and will generally not be addressed in this matrix. This matrix is designed to address specific policy suggestions that have been identified during the preparation of the proposed FEIR. As mentioned above, this matrix is intended to be a “working document” and therefore additional information, materials or recommendations may be added or modified by the County during the public hearing and decision making process for this project.

General Policy Response:

A significant number of the comments suggest similar types or kinds of policy changes. For example, some comments suggest that the word “should” be changed to “shall”, that the word “encourage” be changed to “required”, or suggest other changes of a similar nature. The commenters argue that these changes are necessary to make the policies effective and enforceable. This is not the case. This General Policy Response has been prepared to address these comments. When used in the attached matrix, the reference “General Policy Response” shall mean, and incorporates by reference, the following response:

Because a general plan is a long range planning document, it must be general enough to allow a degree of flexibility in decision-making as times and circumstances differ or change (see the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research General Plan Guidelines, pages 13 - 14). The language of the proposed General Plan 2030 Update policies and implementation measures have been carefully crafted to provide directives that clearly convey the County’s intent and preference for physical development yet are flexible enough to remain applicable to the inevitable changes that will occur in the County over the course of twenty years and to allow for parcel specific considerations, including but not limited to the differentiation necessary to address the three distinct geographical areas (valley, foothill and mountain areas) in the County’s over 2100 square mile planning area and to accommodate the historical development, resources and character of existing communities, hamlets and other urban service centers in the County’s planning area. Use of the words “should”, “encourage” or similar terms in individual policies will effectively require the analysis of such policies, as subject appropriate, in future land use decisions by the County. Please see Master Responses Nos. 3 and 4 in Chapter 4 of the proposed FEIR for further discussion.

No.	Comment No.	GPU/Policy/M	Staff Recommendation	Planning Comm. Recommendation	Board Direction
1	I10-7	Infrastructure service levels	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment.		
2	I11-23	HS-5.4, WR-1.5 WR-3.1 WR-3.6 WR-IM-6 WR-IM-10 WR-IM-27 HS-5.1 through HS-5.11 HS-IM-14	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: Assembly Bill 162 (AB 162); codified in Government Code Section 65302(d)(3) and (g)(2)) was signed into law in October 2007 and requires cities and counties to increase their attention to flood-related matters by identifying information regarding flood hazards. To accomplish this, the Bill requires the identification and mapping of available information regarding flood hazards from a number of sources: Please also see the Responses to Comments I17-705 and I17-728.	The requirements of Government Code Section 65302 (g)(2)(A) and (d)(3) are addressed as follows: Government Code Section 65302 (g)(2)(A) i. Flood hazard zones as published by an official flood insurance rate maps issued by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).	The FEMA flood hazard zones are shown in Figure 10.1A, discussed on page 3.6-29, and

No.	Comment No.	GPU/Policy/M	Staff Recommendation	Planning Comm. Recommendation	Board Direction
			<p>shown in Figure 3.6-5 in the RDEIR. The FEMA flood hazard zones are also discussed on page 8-14 and shown in Figure 8-1 of the Background Report.</p> <p>ii. National Flood Insurance Program maps published by FEMA.</p> <p>Maps showing the FEMA flood hazard zones from the National Flood Insurance Rate maps published by FEMA are shown in Figure 10.1A, Figure 3.6-5 of the RDEIR, and Figure 8-1 of the Background Report.</p> <p>iii. Information about flood hazards, available from the United States Army Corps of Engineers.</p> <p>Information about flood hazards available from the United States Army Corps of Engineers is identified in the Flood Control Master Plan selected bibliography on page 58.</p> <p>iv. Designated floodway maps available from the Central Valley Flood Protection Board.</p> <p>The designated floodway maps from the Central Valley Flood Protection Board are described and established through the Tulare County Flood Prevention Ordinance Flood Plain zones. The definition of floodway from the Ordinance is</p>		

No.	Comment No.	GPU/Policy/M.	Staff Recommendation	Planning Comm. Recommendation	Board Direction
			<p>"FLOODWAY" means the channel of a river or other watercourse and the adjacent land area that must be reserved in order to discharge the base flood without cumulatively increasing the water surface elevation more than one (1) foot. The floodway is delineated on the Flood Boundary Floodway Map, on maps adopted by the State Reclamation Board when acting within its jurisdiction, and/or on the County Zoning Map (signified by the F-1, Primary Flood Plain Zone).</p> <p>v. Dam failure inundation maps prepared pursuant to Section 8589.5, available from the California Emergency Management Agency.</p> <p>The dam failure inundation zones are included on Figure 10.1A of the FEIR</p> <p>vi. Awareness Floodplain Mapping Program maps and 200-year flood plain maps that are or may be available from, or accepted by, the Department of Water Resources.</p> <p>The DWR Awareness Floodplain Boundaries are included in Figure 10.1A of the FEIR.</p> <p>SB 5, which was enacted in 2007, authorized the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) to develop the Best Available Maps</p>		

No.	Comment No.	GPPU/Policy/Title	Staff Recommendation	Planning Comm. Recommendation	Board Direction
			<p>(BAM) displaying 100- and 200-year floodplains for areas located within the Sacramento-San Joaquin (SAC-SJ) Valley watershed. SB 5 requires that these maps contain the best available information on flood hazards and be provided to cities and counties in the SAC-SJ Valley watershed. This effort was completed by DWR in 2008. Tulare County is not in the SAC-SJ Valley watershed, and 200-year floodplains for Tulare County were not included as a part of that study.</p> <p>vii. Maps of levee protection zones.</p> <p>According to legislation for AB 162 a levee protection zone is defined as follows:</p> <p>(b) For the purposes of this article, a “levee protection zone” is an area that is protected, as determined by the Central Valley Flood Protection Board or the Department of Water Resources, by a levee that is part of the facilities of the State Plan of Flood Control, as defined under Section 5096.805 of the Public Resources Code.</p> <p>The DWR has two Levee Flood Protection Zone (LFPZ) maps within the Sacramento River Basin and the San Joaquin River Basin. According to the San Joaquin River Basin map there is no LFPZ for the Tulare County area.</p>		

No.	Comment No.	GPU/Policy/M	Staff Recommendation	Planning Comm. Recommendation	Board Direction
	viii.	Areas subject to inundation in the event of the failure of project or non-project levees or floodwalls.	<p>Inundation areas from failure of project or non-project levees or floodwalls for Tulare County is addressed in the Flood Control Master Plan.</p> <p>ix. Historical data on flooding, including locally prepared maps of areas subject to flooding, areas vulnerable to flooding after wildfires, and sites that have been repeatedly damaged by flooding.</p> <p>The Tulare County Flood Control Master Plan contains historical data on flooding, including locally prepared maps of areas subject to flooding, and sites that have been repeatedly damaged by flooding. Figure 10.1A contains data of areas vulnerable to wildfires and FEMA flood zones, which can be used in conjunction to determine areas vulnerable to flooding after wildfires.</p> <p>x. Existing and planned development in flood hazard zones, including structures, roads, utilities, and essential public facilities</p> <p>Figure 10.1A shows urban development boundaries, hamlet development boundaries, and mountain service centers where existing and</p>		

No.	Comment No.	GPU/Policy/Measure	Staff Recommendation	Planning Comm. Recommendation	Board Direction
			<p>xi. Local, state, and federal agencies with responsibility for flood protection, including special districts and local offices of emergency services</p> <p>Page 50 of the Tulare County Flood Control Master Plan contains information on local, state and federal agencies responsible for flood protection, including the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers, Department of Water Resources, Central Valley Flood Protection Board (State Reclamation Board), and the Tulare County Flood Control District. Agencies are also discussed on page 3.6-7 of the RDEIR. The contact information for these various agencies can be found in Appendix A mailing list for the NOP. Government Code Section 65302 (d)(3)</p> <p>(3) Identification of Rivers, creeks, streams, flood corridors, riparian habitats, and land that may accommodate floodwater for purposes of groundwater recharge and stormwater management,</p>	<p>planned development will occur including structures, roads, utilities, and essential public facilities. The Figure also shows where flood hazard zones are within these urban boundaries.</p>	

Figure 8-1 of the Environmental Resource Management Element section of the General Plan Update and Figure 10.1 identifies rivers, creeks, streams, flood corridors, and all open space land

No.	Comment No.	GP/Policy/M.	Staff Recommendation	Planning Comm. Recommendation	Board Direction
3	I11-193	LU-2.1	Changes recommended: The comment contains questions regarding implementation of policy LU-2.1 (Agricultural Lands). Staff recommends the following clarification by making the following changes: "The County shall maintain agriculturally designated areas for agricultural use and shall direct by directing urban development away from valuable agricultural land, to cities, unincorporated communities, hamlets, and planned community areas where public facilities and infrastructure is available.		
4	I11-204	AQ-1.5	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The comment indicates that new development should be required to participate in an emissions reduction program to reduce air quality impacts to zero. The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Please see General Policy Response. In addition the County of Tulare has no jurisdiction to require by the SJVAPCD.		
5	I11-207	AQ-1.6 AQ-2.3 AQ-2.4 AQ-2.5 AQ-3.1 AQ-3.3 AQ-3.4 AQ-3.5 AQ-3.6 AQ-4.5	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Please see General Policy Response.		

No.	Comment No.	GPU/Policy/M.	Staff Recommendation	Planning Comm. Recommendation	Board Direction
6	I11-209	AQ 3.5	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Please see General Policy Response.		
7	I11-210	AQ-IM-12	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Please see General Policy Response.		
8	I11-220	ERM-4	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Please see General Policy Response.		
9	I11-221	LJU-IM-3	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment.		
10	I11-224	LJU-1.1 LJU-1.4 LJU-1.8 AG-1.6 AG-1.7 TC-IM-2	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Please see General Policy Response.		
11	I11-226	TC-1.19	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment.		
12	I11-244	ERM-4	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Please see General Policy Response.		
13	I11-255	Climate Action Plan	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Please see General Policy Response.		
14	I11-258		Suggested Changes Not Recommended		
15	I11-259		Suggested Changes Not Recommended		
16	I11-261	Value Statement re beauty, health and safety;	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment.		

No	Comment No	GPU/Policy/M	Staff Recommendation	Planning Comm Recommendation	Board Direction
17	I11-272	Concentrate 95% of growth in incorporated cities	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment.		
18	I14-9	LU-1.1	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment.		
19	I14-10	LU-1.8 LU-IM-3	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment.		
20	I14-11	LU-1.9	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment.		
21	I14-12	LU-4.1	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment.		
22	I14-20	PF-2.5	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: Planning Framework 2.5 should be retained to encourage proactive financing. PF Implementation measures #3 and #18 provide for enhanced local input.		
23	I14-22	TC-1.1	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment.		
24	I14.23	TC-1.7	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment.		
25	I14-24	TC-1.8	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The following policies promote ridesharing and alternate transportation modes: AQ-2.4, AQ-2.5. AQ-2.3 also directs the County to work with TCAG to study transportation methods to reduce air pollution, including public transportation and alternative transportation modes such as cycling and walking. The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment.		
26	I14-26	TC-4.4	Suggested Changes Not Recommended:		

No.	Comment No.	GPPU/Policy/M.	Staff Recommendation	Planning Comm. Recommendation	Board Direction
			The following policy promotes coordination with TCAG in annual review of Countywide public transportation needs: TC-4.		
27	I14-27	TC-4.5	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment.		
28	I14-38	AQ-IM-12 PFS-5.4 PFS- 5.5 ERM 4.6 ERM-4.3 (General recommendations regarding energy conservation)	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Also see LU -IM-24.		
29	I14-69	WR-3.9 WR-2.6	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. WR-2.6 addresses degraded water resources, and is consistent with the commenter's recommendation.		
30	I14-88	PFS 4.1	Suggested changes not recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment.		
31	I14-95	PFS-IM-8	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment.. PFS-IM-8 is consistent with the commenter's recommendation. Other PFS Implementation Measures also address affordability and cost; see, e.g., PFS-IM-1 through PFS-IM-3.		

No.	Comment No.	GPU/Policy/Measure	Staff Recommendation	Planning Comm. Recommendation	Board Direction
32	I14.105	TC-1.19	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment.		
33	I17-13	General recommendations for GPU.	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: Please see MR #5 in the FEIR pages 4-15, 4-16, 4-17, and LU-1.1.		
34	I17-29	Recommends reverting to language in 2008 GPR regarding policy interpretation.	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The intent expressed in the 2010 Goals and Policies Report is consistent with the commenter's suggestion. Also see General Policy Response and MR# 3 and 4 of the FEIR. Consistency determinations are described in greater detail in Section 1.5 of Chapter 1 Part 1 of the GPU		
35	I17-30	General recommendation to re-label/re-organize policies, implementation measures	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Implementation Measures are set forth at the end of each Element. The Implementation Measures state which policy(ies) the Implementation Measure supports, Please see General Policy Response.		
36	I17-40	General recommendation to adopt the Anwahnee Principles to support “healthy growth”.	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Please see LU-1.1, Table 4.3, and the General Policy Response.		
37	I17-42	General recommendation to adopt the Anwahnee	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The comment indicates that various goals and policies are approximations of the Anwahnee Principles. The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment.		

No.	Comment No.	GPU/Policy/M.	Staff Recommendation	Planning Comm. Recommendation	Board Direction
38	I17-51	Principles.	Please see LU-1.1, Table 4.3, and the General Policy Response.		
39	I17-231	Add a new Value Statement.	No changes recommend: Commenter suggest an additional value statement, no policy changes are suggested.		
40	I17-315	ED-5.5	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Please see General Policy Response.		
41	I17-322	LU-5.5	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Please see General Policy Response.		
42	I17-415	LU-6.3	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Please see General Policy Response.		
43	I17-419	Include ERM Key Term for “Major Waterway	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment.		
44	I17-421	Revise ERM Key Term: “Williamson Act	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Please also see Attachment 3C #26 on page 7.		
45	I17-446	Existing Conditions Overview	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Please see General Policy Response.		
46	I17-474	ERM-1.2	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The ERME implementation measures removed are a duplication of SMARA PRC Division 2, Chapter 9,		

No.	Comment No.	GPU/Policy/IM	Staff Recommendation	Planning Comm. Recommendation	Board Direction
47	I17-476	ERM-2.6	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: Change is unnecessary because State law (CEQA) continues to apply.		
48	I17-478	ERM-2.7 ERM-IMP-27	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Please see General Policy Response.		
49	I17-482	ERM-IM-31 ERM-2.13 EMR-IM-38	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The ERME implementation measures removed are a duplication of SMARA PRC Division 2, Chapter 9, Section 2710 et seq. The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment.		
50	I17-731	HS-5.2	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment.		
51	I17-1007	FGMP-1.5	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: Please see Master Response #3 and #8.		
52	I17-1008	FGMP-1.6	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Please see General Policy Response and Master Response #8.		
53	I17-1009		Suggested Changes Not Recommended: Development standards in the FGMP are identified in FGMP Section 3.1.2 beginning on page Part II 3-29. See Matrix Response to I19-211 for recommended changes to FGMP Development Standards. (See Chapter 12 of Part II.)		
54	I17-1010	FGMP-IMP #7	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The Planning Commission has taken over this task.		
55	I17-1011	FGMP-1.7	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Please see General Policy Response and Master Response #8.		

No.	Comment No.	GPA/Policy/M.	FGMP-IM-7	Staff Recommendation	Planning Comm. Recommendation	Board Direction
56	I17-1012			Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The Planning Commission has taken over this task. Please see Attachment 3C, #53 which addresses a global change made by the Board of Supervisors transferring Site Plan Review Committee functions to the Planning Commission.		
57	I17-1014		FGMP-1.9	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Please see General Policy Response and Master Response #8.		
58	I17-1019		FGMP-2.1	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: Please see General Policy Response and Master Response #8.		
59	I17-1022		FGMP-3.1	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: These policies are carried over from the existing Foothill Growth Management Plan (GPA 83-03).		
60	I17-1023		FGMP-IMP-10	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: Badger Development Corridor minimum parcel sizes are carried over from the existing (1981) Foothill Growth Management Plan (GPA 83-03).		
61	I17-1024		FGMP-3.2	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: This policy was updated to reflect the type of permit required. The Surface Mining permitting and environmental review process addresses environmental, social, and economic impacts.		
62	I17-1025		FGMP-4.1	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: This policy was revised to clarify that the policy applies to habitat for all special status species, not just wildlife species.		
63	I17-1032		FGMP-6.3	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: Development standards in the FGMP are clearly identified in FGMP Section 3.12 beginning on page Part		

No	Comment No.	GPU/Policy/M	Staff Recommendation	Planning Comm. Recommendation	Board Direction
			II 3-29. Development standards related to the scenic highway corridor are listed as #38-43 on page Part II 3-33. FGMP-IM-6 requires the County to use the Site Plan Review Committee to ensure new development adjacent to scenic highways and roads meets development standards. See Matrix Response to I19-211 for recommended changes to FGMP Development Standards.		
64	I19-21	PF-2.1 and PF-2.2	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment.		
65	I19-24	PF-3.2, PF-2.2	Suggested Changes Not Recommended, except: Add Policy PF-3.2 to the list of policies that PF Implementation Measure# 8 will implement. Please see General Policy Response.		
66	I19-29	New Towns	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: Please see Response to Comment A8-7 for discussion of new towns and growth corridors. Please also see Response to Comment I19-28.		
67	I19-41	FGMP-8.18	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The commenter is referred to the FEIR response and also to the FEIR response to Comment I19-39. Please see Master Response #3 regarding General Plan implementation.		
68	I19-106	WR-1.3	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment.		
69	I19-142	FGMP-IM-2	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Please also see Master Responses #7 and #8 in Chapter 4 of the FEIR.		
70	I19-144	FGMP-1.4 FGMP-IM-5	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: FGMP-1.4 is an existing policy (from the 1981 FGMP) carried forward into proposed Chapter III of Part II.		

No.	Comment No.	GPU/Policy M.	Staff Recommendation	Planning Comm. Recommendation	Board Direction
71	I19-145	FGMP-1.5 FGMP-IM-7	FGMP-IM-5 is also carried forward from the 1981 FGMP. Please also see Master Response #8 in Chapter 4 of the FEIR. Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Please see General Policy Response. Please also see Master Responses # 7 and #8 in Chapter 4 of the FEIR. Please see Attachment 3C, #53 which addresses a global change made by the Board of Supervisors transferring Site Plan Review Committee functions to the Planning Commission		
72	I19-146	FGMP-1.6 FGMP-IM-7	Suggested changes not recommended: There only been minor changes to the existing policy to bring it in line with the rest of the General Plan Update. Please see General Policy Response. Please also see Master Responses #7 and #8 in Chapter 4 of the FEIR. Please see Attachment 3C, #53 which addresses a global change made by the Board of Supervisors transferring Site Plan Review Committee functions to the Planning Commission		
73	I19-147	FGMP-1.7 FGMP-IM-7	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: Please see General Policy Response. Please also see Master Responses #7 and #8 in Chapter 4 of the FEIR.		
74	I19-148	FGMP-1.8	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Please see General Policy Response. Please note that State General Plan Guidelines are advisory rather than mandatory (See Response to Comment I19-72.) Please also see Master Responses #7 and #8 in Chapter 4 of the FEIR.		
75	I19-149	FGMP-1.9	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment.		

No	Comment No	GPU/Policy/M	Staff Recommendation	Planning Comm Recommendation	Board Direction
76	I19-150	FGMP-IM-21	Please also see Master Responses #7 #8 in Chapter 4 of the FEIR.		
77	I19-151	FGMP-IM-13	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: Existing Implementation Measure carried forward from 1981 FGMP. Please also see Master Responses #7 and #8 in Chapter 4 of the FEIR.		
78	I19-152	FGMP-1.12 FGMP-IM-8	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Existing Implementation Measure carried forward from 1981 FGMP. Please see General Policy Response. Please also see Master Responses #7 and #8 in Chapter 4 of the FEIR.		
79	I19-153	FGMP-1.13 FGMP-1.1 FGMP-1.14	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Please also see Master Responses #7 and #8 in Chapter 4 of the FEIR.		
80	I19-154	FGMP-1.14	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Please also see Master Responses #7 and #8 in Chapter 4 of the FEIR.		
81	I19-155	FGMP-1.15	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Please also see Master Responses #7 and #8 in Chapter 4 of the FEIR.		
82	I19-156	FGMP-1.16 FGMP-IM-8	Changes recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Please also see Master Responses #7 and #8 in Chapter 4 of the FEIR. Suggest changing the word "Appendix" to "Section 3.12" in FGMP Policy 1.16.		

No.	Comment No.	GP/Policy/M.	Staff Recommendation	Planning Comm. Recommendation	Board Direction
83	I19-157	FGMP-2.1 FGMP-IM-9	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Please also see Master Response #8 in Chapter 4 of the FEIR.		
84	I19-158	FGMP-2.2 FGMP-IM-11	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: This policy and Implementation Measure are carried over from the existing (1981) Foothill Growth Management Plan (GPA 83-03). Amendment 83-03 to the 1981 FGMP revised the Badger Development Corridor policy. It is part of the existing (1981) FGMP as amended and is incorporated into the FGMP in Part II, Chapter 3. Please also see the FEIR Response to this comment.		
85	I19-159	FGMP-2.3 FGMP-IM-10	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: This policy and Implementation Measure are carried over from the existing Foothill Growth Management Plan (GPA 83-03).		
86	I19-160	FGMP-3.1 FGMP-IM-7	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment.		
87	I19-161	FGMP-3.2	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Please see General Policy Response. Please also see Master Responses #7 and #8 in Chapter 4 of the FEIR.		
88	I19-163	FGMP-4.1	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Please also see Master Response #8 in Chapter 4 of the FEIR.		
89	I19-165	FGMP-4.3 FGMP-IM-15	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: Please see the FEIR Response to this comment. Please also see Master Responses #7 and #8 in Chapter 4 of the FEIR.		
90	I19-167	FGMP-5.1 FGMP-IM-12	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: Please also see Master Response #8 in Chapter 4 of the		

No.	Comment No.	GPU/Policy/IM	Staff Recommendation	Planning Comm. Recommendation	Board Direction
		FGMP-IM-17 FGMP-IM-18 FGMP-IM-19	FEIR.		
91	119-168	FGMP-IM-6	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Please also see Master Responses #7 and #8 in Chapter 4 of the FEIR.		
92	119-169	FGMP-6.2	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: Please see the FEIR Response to this comment. Please also see Master Response #8 in Chapter 4 of the FEIR.		
93	119-170	FGMP-6.3 FGMP-IM-6 FGMP IM-14	Suggested changes not recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. The Planning Commission has taken over the task in FGMP-IM-6. Please also see Master Responses #7 and #8 in Chapter 4 of the FEIR. Please see Attachment 3C, #53 which addresses a global change made by the Board of Supervisors transferring Site Plan Review Committee functions to the Planning Commission		
94	119-171	FGMP-6.4 FGMP-IM-14	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Please also see Master Response #8 in Chapter 4 of the FEIR.		
95	119-190	FGMP-8.14	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment.		
96	119-201	FGMP-10.1 FGMP-IM-16 FGMP-IM-32	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: Please see Master Responses #7 and #8 in Chapter 4 of the FEIR.		
97	119-204	FGMP-IM-33	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: Suggested change could result in an illegal delegation of discretion. Generally, legislation cannot bind the future exercise of legislative power. Please see FGMP 10.4,		

No.	Comment No.	GPU/Policy/M.	Staff Recommendation	Planning Comm. Recommendation	Board Direction
98	I19-207	FGMP-DEV-STDN-17	PFS-1.4 and PFS-1.5 Suggested Changes Not Recommended: Please see Master Response #8 in Chapter 4 of the FEIR.		
99	I19-211	FGMP DEV STD 8 & 17	Changes recommended: Revise FGMP Development Standard #8 to read: “Graded slopes consisting primarily of soil shall be planted with vegetation to stabilize slopes and prevent erosion. Native plant materials or similar climactically adapted vegetation shall be used whenever possible.” (See Standard #8, Standard #17).		
100	I19-212	FGMP DEV STD 32	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: Existing Board of Supervisors Policy requires the formation of assessment districts or other equivalent mechanism such as homeowners associations to provide for financing and maintenance of streets, walkways and bike path improvements due to new private development. Please see the FEIR Response to this Comment. Please also see Master Response #8 in Chapter 4 of the FEIR and policies PFS 1.5 and 1.6.		
101	I20-7	GPU Alternatives	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: See Master Response #9 for a discussion of the commenter-proposed “Healthy Growth Alternative.” Additionally, please see the response prepared for Comments I11-59, I18-4, I18-5, and I23-77.		
102	I22-6	Guideline Principle 5	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: Please see General Policy Response.		
103	I22-9	SL-3.4	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: Please see General Policy Response.		
104	I22-11	SL-IM-1	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: Various 2010 GPU Goals and Policies provide for consultation and communication with cultural groups; the composition and identities of such groups may		

No.	Comment No.	GPU/Policy/Title	Staff Recommendation	Planning Comm. Recommendation	Board Direction
			change over time. Please see General Policy Response. County should not be limited to a particular type of advisory committee. Please see, e.g., ERM-6.7 and ERM-IM-50.		
105	I22-13		Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The County already complies with SB18 and the County should have discretion to determine what local groups participation would be appropriate in particular situations. Various 2010 GPU Goals and Policies provide for consultation and communication with cultural groups; the composition and identities of such groups may change over time. Please see, e.g., Goals PF-6 and ERM-6.		
106	I22-14	ERM-6.2	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment.		
107	I22-23		Suggested Changes Not Recommended: Please see General Policy Response.		
108	I23-8		Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment.		
109	I23-9		Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment.		
110	I23-14		No Changes recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Please note that AG-IM-7 requires the county to coordinate with LAFCO and TCAG to monitor the amount of agricultural land converted to urban uses, and to provide a comparative assessment of development efficiency, consistent with the commenter's suggestion. Please also see FEIR Response I23-42.		
111	I23-44	AG-1.4	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Please see AG-IM-2.		

No.	Comment No.	GPU/Policy/Measure	Staff Recommendation	Planning Comm. Recommendation	Board Direction
112	I23-45	AG-1.12	Changes recommended: AG-1.12 should be added to the list of policies implemented by LU-IM-11.		
113	I23-52	ERM-1.2	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: ERM Implementation Measures #4, 5, and 8 are consistent with the commenter's suggestion.		
114	I23-53	ERM-1.14	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: ERM Implementation Measure #8 is designed to help implement ERM-1.14.		
115	I25-3		Suggested Changes Not Recommended: See Master Response No. 2 in Chapter 4 of the FEIR.		
116	I27-9		Suggested Changes Not Recommended: See Master Response No. 4 in Chapter 4 of the FEIR.		
117	I27-11		Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. See ERM Imp. #14 and 15.		
118	I28-4		Suggested Changes Not Recommended: County has adopted an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance adding section 16.(Variances and Special Use Permits), II, B, pertaining to Assemblage of People for educational and/or entertainment purposes on Oct 5, 2010. The ordinance requires a Special Use Permit for such assemblages, and only in various zones identified in the ordinance.		
119	I28-5		Suggested Changes Not Recommended: See LU-2.5, LU-IM-16 and LU-IM-17; PF-4.22 and PF-4.23.		
120	I28-11	AG-1.11 AG-IM-9	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: Please see General Policy Response.		
121	I28-12		Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The definition as used in "Key Terms" is consistent with the commenter's suggestion.		

No.	Comment No.	GPU/Policy M	Staff Recommendation	Planning Comm. Recommendation	Board Direction
122	I28-13	AG-2.11	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Please see General Policy Response.		
123	I28-15	ERM-5.7	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR Response is adequate to address the comment. Please see General Policy Response.		
124	I28-16	ERM-5.18	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: This policy is applicable to urbanized areas (i.e., community, mountain service center, or hamlet) and is not intended to apply to agricultural areas. ERM-5.18		
125	I28-18	WR-1.10	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: Implementation Measure WR #15 recognizes channel modification as a part of flood control management.		
126	I28-19	WR-2.8	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The County will continue to work with the Regional Water Quality Board to address point source control. This policy is limited to project specific implementation.		
127	I28-20	WR-3.7	Suggested Changes Not Recommended: Policy WR -3.7 applies only to domestic water service providers operated by the County and not agricultural operations.		
128	I28-22		Suggested Changes Not Recommended: The FEIR response is adequate to address the comment.		






Figure 10-1A
Flood Hazards and
Faults

Attachment 3 B
Tulare County 2030 General Plan Update
Summary of Changes
Version Date 11-10-11

Comment Letter (Date)	Comment No.	General Plan Element	Overview of Changes Requested/Made	Staff Recommendation	Planning Comm. Recommendation	Board Direction
1. Letter A5, California Department of Conservation	A5-2	Agriculture Element	<p>The following revisions to Policy AG-1.6 incorporates corrections and other revisions that provide flexibility for the County and are generally consistent with the commenter's recommendations:</p> <p>AG-1.6 Conservation 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 conversion-conversion of important agricultural land to nonagricultural use. If available, The ACEP shall not 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. [New Policy – Modified Draft EIR Analysis]</p>			

Attachment 3 B
Tulare County 2030 General Plan Update
Summary of Changes
Version Date 11-10-11

Comment Letter (Date)	Comment No.	General Plan Element	Overview of Changes Requested/Made	Staff Recommendation	Planning Comm. Recommendation	Board Direction
2. Letter III. Sierra Club Kern-Kaweah Chapter (Cums)	111-186	Water Resources Element	<p>Commenter suggests adding policy language that mandates the inclusion of the most water efficient showerheads, washing machines, dishwashers, toilets and hot water heaters in all new development. The following new policy is consistent with the commenter's suggestion:</p> <p>Policy (To BE Determined) Energy Efficient Appliances. The County shall encourage the use of Energy Star certified appliances, such as water heaters, swimming pool heaters, cooking equipment, refrigerators, furnaces and boiler units, in all new developments. The County will also support all appliance retrofits of existing buildings.</p> <p><i>[Suggested new policy—Final EIR]</i></p>	<p>Do not suggest incorporation into Final General Plan.</p> <p>The County already has a number of water conservation measures incorporated into the County Code including compliance with Title 24 energy requirements. These requirements would remain or be strengthened as a result of the proposed General Plan. Currently County Code Section 8-07-1180 requires the use of low flush water saving toilets for new construction.</p> <p>The specificity of this regulation as requested by the commenter is more appropriate at the development standards implementation level or project specific level.</p>	<p>Suggest incorporation into Final General Plan.</p>	
3. Letter II4. Center for Race, Poverty, and the Environment	114-31	Air Quality Element	<p>Commenter suggests adding policy language to address the issue of alternative vehicle infrastructure, into the General Plan 2030 Update.</p> <p>The following new policy is suggested:</p>			

Attachment 3 B
Tulare County 2030 General Plan Update
Summary of Changes
Version Date 11-10-11

Comment Letter (Date)	Comment No.	General Plan Element	Overview of Changes Requested/Made	Staff Recommendation	Planning Comm. Recommendation	Board Direction
			Policy AQ-1.8 Alternative Fuel Vehicle Infrastructure. The County shall support the development of necessary facilities and infrastructure needed to encourage the use of low or zero-emission vehicles (e.g., electric vehicle charging facilities and conveniently located alternative fueling stations, including CNG filling stations). <i>[New Policy – Final EIR]</i>			
4.	Letter I14. Center for Race, Poverty, and the Environment	I14-56 Water Resources Element	Commenter suggests adding policy language to address the issue of groundwater restoration activities. The following new implementation measure for Policy WR-2.6 is consistent with the commenter's suggestion, and would also support a wider variety of efforts to restore water quality in surface and groundwater resources:	Suggest incorporation into Final General Plan.		
				Water Resources Implementation Measure #28. The County shall work with other local/regional agencies, water purveyors, and interest groups to seek funding sources to implement a variety of surface and groundwater restoration activities. <i>[New Program – Final EIR]</i>	Suggest incorporation into Final General Plan. Please also note that Pub. Res. Code Section 75026(b)(6) already provides a preference for "[p]roposals that	
5.	Letter I14. Center for Race, Poverty, and the Environment	I14-58 Water Resources Element	The following revisions to existing Policy WR-3.2 are consistent with the commenter's suggested revisions to Policy WR-3.2. Policy WR-3.2 Develop an Integrated Regional Water Management Plan. The County will participate with other agencies and			

Attachment 3 B
Tulare County 2030 General Plan Update
Summary of Changes
Version Date 11-10-11

Comment Letter (Date)	Comment No.	General Plan Element	Overview of Changes Requested/Made	Staff Recommendation	Planning Comm. Recommendation	Board Direction
			organizations that share water management responsibilities in the County to enhance modeling, data collection, reporting and public outreach efforts to support the development and implementation of appropriate Integrated Regional Water Management Plans (<u>IRWMP</u>) within the County [<i>New Policy</i>].	address critical water supply or water quality needs for disadvantaged communities within the region."		
6.	Letter I14. Center for Race, Poverty, and the Environment	I14-61	Water Resources Element	The following revisions to existing Policy WR-2.3 are consistent with the commenter's suggestions: Policy WR-2.3 Best Management Practices (BMFs). The County shall continue to require the use of feasible BMFs and other mitigation measures designed to protect surface water and groundwater from the adverse effects of construction activities, agricultural operations requiring a County Permit, and urban runoff in coordination with the Water Quality Control Board [<i>New Policy</i>].	Suggest incorporation into Final General Plan. Please also note that the County's General Plan does not stand alone, there are numerous existing Federal, State, and local regulations which control non-point sources of pollution, as discussed in RDEIR Section 3.6 "Regulatory Setting."	
7.	Letter I14. Center for Race, Poverty, and the Environment	I14-63	Water Resources Element	The commenter's suggestion is to indicate that existing Water Resources Implementation Measure #24 also implements Policy WR-2.1 in the Table in Part I, Page 11-15.	Suggest incorporation into Final General Plan.	
8.	Letter I14. Center for Race, Poverty, and the Environment	I14-68	Water Resources Element	The following revisions to existing Implementation Measure #17 is consistent with the commenter's suggestion: Water Resource Implementation Measure	Suggest incorporation into Final General Plan. See Tulare County Ordinance Code Section Part 4	

Attachment 3 B
Tulare County 2030 General Plan Update
Summary of Changes
Version Date 11-10-11

Comment Letter (Date)	Comment No.	General Plan Element	Overview of Changes Requested/Made	Staff Recommendation	Planning Comm. Recommendation	Board Direction
			#17. The County shall amend the well ordinance to require deeper seals in areas of known contaminants. The County shall also oversee the proper abandonment of unused wells. <i>[New Program]</i> .	Chapter 13.		
9.	Letter II4. Center for Race, Poverty, and the Environment	II4-70 Water Resources Element	The following revisions to existing Policy WR-3.9 are consistent with the commenter's suggestion: Policy WR-3.9 Establish Critical Water Supply Areas. The County shall designate Critical Water Supply Areas to include the specific areas used by a municipality or community for its water supply system, areas critical to groundwater recharge, and other areas possessing a vital role in the management of the water resources in the County, including those areas with degraded groundwater quality. <i>[New Policy]</i> .		Suggest incorporation into Final General Plan.	
10.	Letter II4. Center for Race, Poverty, and the Environment	II4-71 Water Resources Element	The following revisions to existing Implementation Measure #24 are consistent with the commenter's suggestion: Water Resource Implementation Measure #24. The County shall protect groundwater recharge areas (including those identified as Critical Water Supply Areas) in the County by carefully regulating the type of development within these areas. Regulations may include, but are not limited to, the limitation of structural coverage and impervious surfaces and prohibition of uses with		Suggest incorporation into Final General Plan.	

Attachment 3 B
Tulare County 2030 General Plan Update
Summary of Changes
Version Date 11-10-11

Comment Letter (Date)	Comment No.	General Plan Element	Overview of Changes Requested/Made	Staff Recommendation	Planning Comm. Recommendation	Board Direction
			the potential to discharge harmful pollutants, increase erosion, or create other impacts degrading water quality or affecting groundwater supply <i>[Revised New Program based on ERM/E IV-C; Groundwater, Recommendation 2, Pg. 38].</i>			
11.	Letter II4. Center for Race, Poverty, and the Environment	114-76 Water Resources Element	Commenter suggests adding policy language to address the issue of groundwater overdraft conditions. The following new policy is consistent with the commenter's suggestion: <u>Policy WR-1.11 Groundwater Overdraft.</u> The County shall consult with water agencies within those areas of the County where groundwater extraction exceeds groundwater recharge, with the goal of reducing and ultimately reversing groundwater overdraft conditions in the County <i>[New Policy – Final EIR].</i>	Suggest incorporation into Final General Plan.		
12.	Letter II4. Center for Race, Poverty, and the Environment	114-88 Public Facilities and Services Element	Commenter suggests revising policy language to address the strength of the following policy. The following revisions to Policy PFS-4.1 are consistent with the commenter's suggestion: <u>Policy PFS-4.1 Stormwater Management Plans.</u> The County shall consider-oversee, as per Community Plan Content Table PE-2.1 and Specific Plan Content Hamlet Plans Policy PF-3.3 Table LU 4.3, the preparation and adoption of stormwater management plans for communities and hamlets to reduce flood risk,	Suggest incorporation into Final General Plan.		

Attachment 3 B
Tulare County 2030 General Plan Update
Summary of Changes
Version Date 11-10-11

Comment Letter (Date)	Comment No.	General Plan Element	Overview of Changes Requested/Made	Staff Recommendation	Planning Comm. Recommendation	Board Direction
			protect soils from erosion, control stormwater, and minimize impacts on existing drainage facilities, and develop funding mechanisms as part of the Community Plan and Hamlet Plan process. <u>[New Policy]</u>			
13.	Letter I17. Greg and Laurie Schwaller	I17-715	Health and Safety	Commenter suggests adding policy language to address the County's use of pesticides and integrated pest management. The following new policy is consistent with the commenter:	Suggest incorporation into Final General Plan.	
			<p><u>Policy HS-4.8 Pesticide Use.</u> The County shall support an integrated pest management program, which includes the biological control methods overseen by the Tulare County Agricultural Commissioner's Office. <u>[New Policy – Final EIR]</u></p>			
14.	Letter I22. Southern Sierra Archaeological Society	I22-16	Environmental Resources Management	Commenter suggests adding language to Implementation Measure #49 to provide additional detail and guidance for implementation. The following revision to implementation measure ERM IM 49 is consistent with the commenter's suggestion:	Suggest incorporation into Final General Plan. The recommended change however, doesn't fundamentally affect the strength of the policy.	
			<p>Environmental Resources Management Implementation Measure 49. The County shall incorporate provisions into development regulations that in the event archaeological and/or buried historic resources are discovered during site excavation, grading, or construction, work on the site will be suspended until the significance of the</p>			

Attachment 3 B
Tulare County 2030 General Plan Update
Summary of Changes
Version Date 11-10-11

Comment Letter (Date)	Comment No.	General Plan Element	Overview of Changes Requested/Made	Staff Recommendation	Planning Comm. Recommendation	Board Direction
			features can be determined by a qualified archaeologist. If significant resources are determined to exist, the archaeologist shall make recommendations for protection or recovery of the resource. <i>[New Program]</i> .			

Attachment 3 C
General Plan 2030 Update Correctory Table
Version Date 11-10-11

Page #	February 2010 Revised Draft General Plan 2030 Update	October 2011 Staff Recommended Changes General Plan 2030 Update	Comment/ Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation	Board Direction
1. Part I, 1-2 Historic General Plan Overview	Historically, the Tulare County General Plan has been structured in an informal, three tier system:	Historically, the Tulare County General Plan has been structured in an informal, three tier system:	In undertaking the General Plan 2030 Update (GPU) and preparing the Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report (RDEIR), the County of Tulare is not writing on a "blank slate". The GPU amends the existing County General Plan by modernizing, updating, and adding to existing General Plan policies that have been developed over time since the first County general plan was adopted in 1964.	The first tier consisted of the seven mandatory elements of a General Plan and several optional or voluntary elements, including the Urban Boundaries Element, the Animal Confinement Facilities Plan (ACFP)-Phase I, and others. The policies in these elements applied countywide.	The first tier consisted of the seven mandatory elements of a General Plan and several optional or voluntary elements, including the Urban Boundaries Element, the Animal Confinement Facilities Plan (ACFP)-Phase I, and others. The policies in these elements applied countywide.
2. Part I, 1-4 Five Existing Sub-Area Plans		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Juvenile Detention Facility- Sequoia Field Land Use and Public Buildings Elements (adopted 1995) • Sequoia Field Land Use and Public Buildings Element (adopted 1981) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Juvenile Detention Facility- Sequoia Field Land Use and Public Buildings Elements (adopted 1981, amended 1995) 	Combined to accurately reflect that the 1995 General Plan Amendment for the Juvenile Detention Facility- Sequoia Field amended the Land Use and Public Buildings Elements	

Attachment 3 C
General Plan 2030 Update Correctory Table
Version Date 11-10-11

Page #	February 2010 Revised Draft General Plan 2030 Update	October 2011 Staff Recommended Changes General Plan 2030 Update	Comment/ Recommendation:	Planning Commission Recommendation	Board Direction
3.					
3.	Part I, 1-11 Section 9.1 Implementation Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The timelines associated with the Implementation Measures are general guidelines for completion of the Work Plan. Because implementation will take time and will be costly, the County will need to prioritize Implementation Measures. It is contemplated that this ongoing process is part of the County's annual general policy-making function and budget cycle. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The timelines associated with the Implementation Measures are general guidelines for completion of the Work Plan and may be changed without an amendment to the General Plan. 	<p>Combined the two points and added language to indicate that work program changes do not require a general plan amendment.</p> <p>Because implementation will take time and will be costly, the County will need to prioritize Implementation Measures. It is contemplated that this ongoing process is part of the County's annual general policy-making function and budget cycle.</p>	
4.	Part I, 2-4 Existing Conditions Overview	Ivanhoe Community Plan (1990)	Ivanhoe Community Plan (1990)	Typographical error.	
5.	Part I, 2-10 Policy PF-2.3	The County shall work with...	The County shall work with provide notice and opportunity to comment for...	The intent is to take specific steps to ensure that the County takes into consideration the needs of special school and other service provider	

Attachment 3 C
General Plan 2030 Update Correctory Table
Version Date 11-10-11

Page #	February 2010 Revised Draft General Plan 2030 Update	October 2011 Staff Recommended Changes General Plan 2030 Update	Comment/Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation	Board Direction
6.	Part I, 2-36 Policy PF-3.4	Unless a traditional plan approach is requested by the hamlet, land use designations within the HDB shall be the mixed use land use designations as provided in Chapter 4-Land Use that promotes the integration of a compatible mix of residential types and densities, commercial uses, public facilities and services, and employment opportunities [New Policy, Board of Supervisors, August 2006]	Unless or until a traditional plan approach is requested by the hamlet and such a plan is adopted, land use designations within the HDB shall be the mixed use land use designations as provided in Chapter 4-Land Use that promotes the integration of a compatible mix of residential types and densities, commercial uses, public facilities and services, and employment opportunities [New Policy, Board of Supervisors, August 2006]	Clarifying policy statement.	
7.	Part I, 2-49 Section 2.4 Cities	Figure 2.4-1 shows the locations of all eight incorporated cities within Tulare County and Figures 2.4-2 through 2.3-9 show the County Adopted City (CAC) UABs and UDBs Urban Development Boundaries (CACUDBs) and County Adopted City Urban Area Boundaries (CACUABs) for each city.	Figure 2.4-1 shows the locations of all eight incorporated cities within Tulare County and Figures 2.4-2 through 2.3-9 show the County Adopted City (CAC) UABs and UDBs Urban Development Boundaries (CACUDBs) and County Adopted City Urban Area Boundaries (CACUABs) for each city.	Clarifying name and Acronym correction.	
8.	Part I, B-1 Concept 4: Housing	The purpose of the Housing Element is to identify the County's housing needs, state the counties goals...	The purpose of the Housing Element is to identify the County's housing needs, state the <u>counties</u> County's goals...	Typographical error correction.	
9.	Part I, B-2 Guiding Principle s Housing	Housing. [Not included in this document. Adopted as a separate document on a schedule designed designated by the State Legislator.]	Housing.	Typographical error corrections.	

Attachment 3 C
General Plan 2030 Update Correctory Table
Version Date 11-10-11

Page #	February 2010 Revised Draft General Plan 2030 Update	Staff Recommended Changes General Plan 2030 Update	Comment/ Recommendation:	Planning Commission Recommendation	Board Direction
10. Part I, 2-12 Table 2-1 Community Plan Content	Table 2.1	Add 5. <u>Plan Performance</u>	This Plan Performance requirement was inadvertently left out of 2010 version, was included in 2008 version.		
11. Part I, 2-72 Section 2.8 PF Implementation Measure #7	The County shall use the Rural Valley Lands Plan Parcel Evaluation Procedure within RVLP areas to evaluate changes to agricultural zoning as per RVLP Policy-1.1. For the establishment or expansion of UDBs only, the evaluation procedure shall be considered along with other relevant information [New Program].	The County shall use the Rural Valley Lands Plan Parcel Evaluation Procedure within RVLP areas to evaluate changes to agricultural zoning as per RVLP Policy-1.1. For the establishment or expansion of UDBs, HDBs, and PCAs only, the evaluation procedure shall be considered along with other relevant information [New Program]. PF-5.2	This content topic was inadvertently left out HDBs and PCAs and added Policy PF-5.2 is also implemented by this implementation measure.		
12. Part I, 3-1 Key Terms Farmland of Local Importance	Farmland of Local Importance. ... lands that have physical characteristics that would qualify for 'Prime' or "Statewide Import" ...	Farmland of Local Importance. lands that have physical characteristics that would qualify for 'Prime' or "Statewide Import" ...	Typographical error	Typographical error correction.	
13. Part I, 3-5 Policy AG-1.8	If proposed within a UDB of an incorporated city, the County shall give written notice to the affected city pursuant Government Code 151233....	If proposed within a UDB of an incorporated city, the County shall give written notice to the affected city pursuant to Government Code 151233....	... If proposed within a UDB of an incorporated city, the County shall give written notice to the affected city pursuant to Government Code 151233....	Missing word.	
14. Part I, 3-6 Policy AG-1.13	The use should not be sited on productive agricultural lands if less productive land is available in the vicinity	The use shall <u>should</u> -not be sited on productive agricultural lands if less productive land is available in the vicinity	Typographical error	Typographical error correction.	

Attachment 3 C
General Plan 2030 Update Correctory Table
Version Date 11-10-11

Page #	February 2010 Revised Draft General Plan 2030 Update	October 2011 Staff Recommended Changes General Plan 2030 Update	Comment/ Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation	Board Direction
15.	Part I, 4-7 Table 4.1 Land Use Designations	Rural Residential ¹⁰ 1 unit/1 or 10 acres.	Rural Residential ¹⁰ 1 unit/4 or 10 acres	Typographical error correction.	
16.	Part I, 4-7 Table 4.1 Land Use Designations	Mountain Residential ¹⁰ 1 Unit/1 Additional Unit for every 40 Acres	1 Unit/20,000 square feet plus 1 Additional Unit for every 40 Acres	Typographical error correction.	
17.	Part I, 4-2	Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design for Neighborhood Development (LEED-ND) ... are in the process of developing a LEED-ND rating system. The LEED-ND rating system, to be launched in 2009, will combine smart growth new urbanism, and green building principles into the first national standard for neighborhood design.	Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design for Neighborhood Development (LEED-ND) ... are in the process of developing a LEED-ND rating system. The LEED-ND rating system, to be launched in 2009, will combine smart growth new urbanism, and green building principles into the first national standard for neighborhood design.	Update language to reflect current status of the program.	
18.	Part I, 4-19 Town Center (TC) definition	... uses typically allowed include: eating and drinking establishments; retail sales; personal, medical, and professional services; entertainment venues; civic uses; medium-high and high-density residential dwellings; and mixed use development.	... uses typically allowed include: eating and drinking establishments; retail sales; personal, medical, and professional services; entertainment venues; civic uses; medium-high and high-density residential dwellings; and mixed use development.	Typographical error correction – delete hyphen after "medium-high-high".	
19.	Part I, 4-27	High-Density Residential Locations... (greater than 16.1	High-Density Residential Locations... (greater than 16.1	Corrected figure as 14 is consistent with	

Attachment 3 C
General Plan 2030 Update Correctory Table
Version Date 11-10-11

Page #	February 2010 Revised Draft General Plan 2030 Update	October 2011 Staff Recommended Changes General Plan 2030 Update	Planning Commission Recommendation	Board Direction
Policy LU-3.3	dwelling units per gross acre)...	dwelling units per gross acre)...	Table 4.1	
20. Part I, 4-33 Section 4.8 LU Implementation Measures	2007-2010, 2010-2015, 2015-2030	2007-2010, 2010-2015, 2015-2020, 2015-2030 <u>2020-2030</u>	Update column heading for dates to match timeframes in other elements.	
21. Part I, 4-33 Section 4.8 LU Implementation Measures #2	...street scraping...	...street scraping scraping...	Typographical error correction.	
22. Part I, 5-2 Policy ED-1.3	To the extend appropriate...	To the extend extent appropriate...	Typographical error correction.	
23. Part I, 5-8 Goal ED-6	To take full advantage of the natural, cultural, and social opportunities available in the County for the enhancement of tourism [New Goal]	Address regional and local commercial needs by continuing to support downtowns, town centers, and neighborhood services.	Goal ED 6 is a duplication of Goal ED 5. Goal ED 6 should read as recommended by staff.	
24. Part I, 7-5 Figure 7-1 Legend and Title	Legend: County Scenic Roads	Legend: County Scenic Roads Routes	Title: Designated Candidate Scenic State Highways and County Scenic Roads Routes	Corrected to reflect consistency with text in Policy SL-2.1
25. Part I, 8-3 Vernal	Vernal Pools. ...While the pools are shallow enough to dry up		Vernal Pools. ...While the pools are shallow enough to dry up each session	Typographical error correction.

Attachment 3 C
General Plan 2030 Update Correctory Table
Version Date 11-10-11

Page #	February 2010 Revised Draft General Plan 2030 Update	October 2011 Staff Recommended Changes General Plan 2030 Update	Comment/ Recommendation:	Planning Commission Recommendation	Board Direction
Pools definition.	each session,...	season,...			
26. Part 1, 8- 6 ERM Element Heading	Basic Components of the Environmental Resources Management Element. ERME brings together two mandatory elements of the General Plan as specified by State Law in a single element correlated with other complimentary elements of the County's General Plan, including the Agriculture, Scenic Landscapes, and Water Resources Elements	Basic Components of the Environmental Resources Management Element. ERME brings together two mandatory elements of the General Plan as specified by State Law in a single element correlated with other <u>complementary elements</u> of the County's General Plan, including the Agriculture, Scenic Landscapes, and Water Resources Elements	Typographical error correction.		
27. Part I, 8- 7, 8-8 Figure 8- 1 Legend	Mountain Service Centers; Color Green	Mountain Service Centers; Color Green Orange	Corrected to reflect map color.		
28. Part I, 10-15 Policy HS-8.11	The County shall limit noise generating activities, such as construction, to hours of normal business operation. No peak noise generating activities shall be allowed to occur outside of normal business hours without County approval	The County shall limit noise generating activities, such as construction, to hours of normal business operation (<u>7 A.M. to 7 P.M.</u>). No peak noise generating activities shall be allowed to occur outside of normal business hours without County approval	Clarification of normal business hours.		
29. Part I, 8- 14 Policy ERM-3.5	Reclamation costs shall be born...	Reclamation costs shall be <u>born borne...</u>	Typographical error correction.		
30. Part I, 8- 27 Section 8.8 ERM Impleme	ERM-2.8, ERM-2.7	ERM-2.8, ERM-2.7, ERM-2.8	Corrected to reflect numerical order.		

Attachment 3 C
General Plan 2030 Update Correctory Table
Version Date 11-10-11

Page #	February 2010 Revised Draft General Plan 2030 Update	October 2011 Staff Recommended Changes General Plan 2030 Update	Planning Commission Recommendation	Comment Recommendation	Board Direction	
Rotation Measure #29						
31. Part I, 9-12 Section 9.5 AQ Implementation Measure #10	...evaluate and implement flexline...	...evaluate and implement flexline...		Typographical error correction.		
32. Part I, 9-12 Section 9.5 AQ Implementation Measure #10	AQ-2.4, AQ-2.2	AQ-2.4, AQ-2.2, AQ-2.2, AQ-2.4		Corrected to reflect numerical order.		
33. Part I, 10-3 Health and Safety Element Existing Conditions Overview	[Insert above "10.1 General"]		Assembly Bill 162 (AB 162) was signed into law in October 2007 and requires cities and counties to increase their attention to flood-related matters in the land use, conservation, safety, and housing elements of their general plans. To accomplish this, AB 162 recommends the identification and mapping of available information regarding flood hazards from the following sources:	Compliance with AB 162 [2007] land use, conservation, safety, and housing elements. This added language demonstrates existing compliance with AB 1358.		i. <u>Flood hazard zones as published by an official flood insurance rate maps issued by the Federal Emergency</u>

Attachment 3 C
General Plan 2030 Update Correctory Table
Version Date 11-10-11

Page #	February 2010 Revised Draft General Plan 2030 Update	October 2011 Staff Recommended Changes General Plan 2030 Update	Comment/ Recommendation:	Planning Commission Recommendation	Board Direction
			<p>Management Agency (FEMA).</p> <p>The FEMA flood hazard zones are shown in Figure 10.1A, discussed on page 3.6-29, and shown in Figure 3.6-5 in the RDEIR. The FEMA flood hazard zones are also discussed on page 8-14 and shown in Figure 8-1 of the <u>Background Report</u>.</p> <p>ii. National Flood Insurance Program maps published by FEMA.</p> <p>Maps showing the FEMA flood hazard zones from the National Flood Insurance Rate maps published by FEMA are shown in Figure 10.1A, Figure 3.6-5 of the RDEIR, and Figure 8-1 of the <u>Background Report</u>.</p> <p>iii. Information about flood hazards, available from the United States Army Corps of Engineers.</p> <p>Information about flood hazards available from the United States Army Corps of Engineers is identified in the Flood Control Master Plan selected bibliography.</p>		

Attachment 3 C
General Plan 2030 Update Correctory Table
Version Date 11-10-11

Page #	February 2010 Revised Draft General Plan 2030 Update	October 2011 Staff Recommended Changes General Plan 2030 Update	Comment/ Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation	Board Direction
		<p>iv. Designated floodway maps available from the Central Valley Flood Protection Board.</p> <p>The designated floodway maps from the <u>Central Valley Flood Protection Board</u> are described and established through the <u>Tulare County Flood Prevention Ordinance</u> <u>Flood Plain zones</u>. The <u>definition of floodway</u> from the <u>Ordinance</u> is shown below.</p> <p>"<u>FLOODWAY</u>" means the channel of a river or other watercourse and the adjacent land area that must be reserved in order to discharge the base flood without cumulatively increasing the water surface elevation more than one (1) foot. The floodway is delineated on the <u>Flood Boundary Floodway Map</u>, on maps adopted by the <u>State Reclamation Board</u> when acting within its jurisdiction, and/or on</p>			

Attachment 3 C
General Plan 2030 Update Correctory Table
Version Date 11-10-11

Page #	February 2010 Revised Draft General Plan 2030 Update	October 2011 Staff Recommended Changes General Plan 2030 Update	Comment Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation	Board Direction
		<p>the County Zoning Map (signified by the F-1, Primary Flood Plain Zone).</p> <p>v. <u>Dam failure inundation maps prepared pursuant to Section 8589.5, available from the California Emergency Management Agency.</u></p> <p>The dam failure inundation zones are included on Figure 10.1A of the FEIR</p> <p>vi. <u>Awareness Floodplain Mapping Program maps and 200-year flood plain maps that are or may be available from, or accepted by, the Department of Water Resources.</u></p> <p>The DWR Awareness Floodplain Boundaries are included in Figure 10.1A of the FEIR.</p> <p>SB 5, which was enacted in 2007, authorized the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) to develop the Best Available Maps (BAM) displaying</p>			

Attachment 3 C
General Plan 2030 Update Correctory Table
Version Date 11-10-11

Page #	February 2010 Revised Draft General Plan 2030 Update	October 2011 Staff Recommended Changes General Plan 2030 Update	Comment/ Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation	Board Direction
		<p>100- and 200-year floodplains for areas located within the Sacramento-San Joaquin (SAC-SJ) Valley watershed. SB 5 requires that these maps contain the best available information on flood hazards and be provided to cities and counties in the SAC-SJ Valley watershed. This effort was completed by DWR in 2008. Tulare County is not in the SAC-SJ Valley watershed, and 200-year floodplains for Tulare County were not included as a part of that study.</p>	<p>vii. <u>Maps of levee protection zones.</u></p> <p>According to legislation for AB 162 a levee protection zone is defined as follows:</p> <p>(b) For the purposes of this article, a "levee protection zone" is an area that is protected <u>as determined by the Central Valley Flood Protection Board or the Department of Water Resources</u>, by a levee that is part of the facilities of the State Plan of Flood Control, as</p>		

Attachment 3 C
General Plan 2030 Update Correctory Table
Version Date 11-10-11

Page #	Board Direction	Planning Commission Recommendation
Page #	Comment/ Recommendation	
February 2010 Revised Draft General Plan 2030 Update	October 2011 Staff Recommended Changes General Plan 2030 Update defined under Section 5096.805 of the Public Resources Code.	<p>The DWR has two Levee Flood Protection Zone (LFPZ) maps within the Sacramento River Basin and the San Joaquin River Basin. According to the San Joaquin River Basin map there is no LFPZ for the Tulare County area.</p> <p><u>viii. Areas subject to inundation in the event of the failure of project or non-project levees or floodwalls.</u></p> <p>Inundation areas from failure of project or non-project levees or floodwalls for Tulare County is addressed in the Flood Control Master Plan.</p> <p><u>ix. Historical data on flooding, including locally prepared maps of areas subject to flooding, areas vulnerable to flooding after wildfires, and sites that have been repeatedly damaged by flooding.</u></p> <p>The Tulare County Flood Control</p>

Attachment 3 C
General Plan 2030 Update Correctory Table
Version Date 11-10-11

Page #	February 2010 Revised Draft General Plan 2030 Update	October 2011 Staff Recommended Changes General Plan 2030 Update	Comment/ Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation	Board Direction
		<p>Master Plan contains historical date on flooding, including locally prepared maps of areas subject to flooding, and sites that have been repeatedly damaged by flooding. Figure 10.1A contains data of areas vulnerable to wildfires and FEMA flood zones, which can be used in conjunction to determine areas vulnerable to flooding after wildfires.</p> <p>x. Existing and planned development in flood hazard zones, including structures, roads, utilities, and essential public facilities</p>		<p>Figure 10.1A shows urban development boundaries, hamlet development boundaries, and mountain service centers where existing and planned development will occur including structures, roads, utilities, and essential public facilities. The Figure also shows where flood hazard zones are within these</p>	

Attachment 3 C
General Plan 2030 Update Correctory Table
Version Date 11-10-11

Page #	February 2010 Revised Draft General Plan 2030 Update	October 2011 Staff Recommended Changes General Plan 2030 Update	Comment/Recommendation:	Planning Commission Recommendation:	Board Direction:
		<p><u>xi. Local, state, and federal agencies with responsibility for flood protection, including special districts and local offices of emergency services</u></p> <p>urban boundaries.</p>		<p>Page 50 of the Tulare County Flood Control Master Plan contains information on local, state and federal agencies responsible for flood protection, including the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers, Department of Water Resources, Central Valley Flood Protection Board (State Reclamation Board), and the Tulare County Flood Control District. Agencies are also discussed on page 3.6-7 of the RDEIR. The contact information for these various agencies can be found in Appendix A mailing list for the NOP.</p> <p><u>xii. Identification of Rivers, creeks, streams, flood corridors, riparian habitats, and land that may</u></p>	

Attachment 3 C
General Plan 2030 Update Correctory Table
Version Date 11-10-11

Page #	February 2010 Revised Draft General Plan 2030 Update	October 2011 Staff Recommended Changes General Plan 2030 Update	Comment Recommendation:	Planning Commission Recommendation	Board Direction
			<u>accommodate floodwater for purposes of groundwater recharge and stormwater management.</u>	Figure 8-1 of the Environmental Resource Management Element section of the General Plan Update identifies rivers, creeks, streams, flood corridors, and all open space land, including riparian habitat, that may accommodate floodwater for the purposes of groundwater recharge and stormwater management.	
34.	Part I, 10-19 Section 10.10 HS Implementation Measure # 11	Any other methods determined by Safety Committee...	Any other information request by the Safety Committee Emergency Council of the Tulare Operational Area as necessary...	Corrected to reflect current name as per Tulare County Ordinance Code Section 1-15-1010.	
35.	Part I, 11-6 Policy WR-1.1	...intended to help the County migrate...	intended to help the County mitigate ...	Typographical error correction.	
36.	Part I, 11-15 Policy WR- Implementation Measure #24	[Water Resources Implementation Measure #24 also implements Policy WR-2.1 WR-3.9]	WR-3.9 WR-2.1		
37.	Part I, 13-9	To improve and enhance current rail service that stimulates	To improve and enhance current rail service that stimulates economic growth	Goal was edited in error. The correct	

Attachment 3 C
General Plan 2030 Update Correctory Table
Version Date 11-10-11

Page #	February 2010 Revised Draft General Plan 2030 Update	October 2011 Staff Recommended Changes General Plan 2030 Update	Planning Commission Recommendation	Comment/Recommendation	Board Direction
Goal TC-3	economic growth and meet the needs of freight and human transportation.	and meet the needs of freight and human transportation. To enhance airports in the County to meet the County's changing needs and demands while, minimizing adverse airport related environmental impacts and safety hazards.	goal now in place. The original goal is being restored as it was inadvertently deleted due to editing error.	2. Less than forty forty (40) acres ...	Typographical error correction.
38. Part II, 1-4 Policy RVL P 1-6	2. Less than forth (40) acres...	... The development must have access to a publicly maintained road and be located within 1/8 mile of the major collector mentioned above	... The development must have access to a publicly maintained road and be located within 1/8 mile of the major collector mentioned above	Replaced missing word.	
39. Part II, 2-2 Policy C-1.6	... The development must have access to a publicly maintained road and be located within 1/8 of the major collector mentioned above	The Rural Valley Land Plan (RVL P) point evaluation, the property is determined to meet the values that would render the property "restricted to agriculture", and	The Rural Valley Land Plan (RVL P) point evaluation, the property is determined to meet the values that would render the property "restricted to agriculture", and	Replaced missing letter.	
40. Part II, 2-2 Policy C-1.6 Third Bullet	... to locate within, HDB's	... to locate within, HDB's	... to locate within <u>UDBs</u> , HDB's...	Inadvertently omitted from editing between the 2008 and 2010 version. Replaced missing acronym in 2008 version.	
41. Part II, 2-2 Policy C-1.8					
42. Part II, 3-4 The Fourth Level" of FGMP Development Standard	Once the project has received initial site plan review and the required conditions and consistency determinations have been made, the final step of the review procedure is to meet the development standards outlined in the Section 3.12 of this Chapter or for planned communities, those standards established through the			Once the project has received initial site plan review and the required conditions and consistency determinations have been made, the final step of the review procedure is to meet the development standards outlined in the Section 3.12 of this Chapter or for planned communities, those standards established through the	Corrected Grammatical error.

Attachment 3 C
General Plan 2030 Update Correctory Table
Version Date 11-10-11

Page #	February 2010 Revised Draft General Plan 2030 Update	October 2011 Staff Recommended Changes General Plan 2030 Update	Comment Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation	Board Direction
5	or for planned communities, those standards established through the project approval process.	project approval process.			
43. Part II, 3-5 Summary	The implementation strategies will give the County the tools needed to guide development in a manner consistent with the FGMP.	The implementation strategies <u>measures</u> will give the County the tools needed to guide development in a manner consistent with the FGMP..	Corrected to provide direct reference to FGMP Implementation Measures.		
44. Part II, 3-13 Policy FGMP- 8.10	The County shall prohibit development that is considered to be geologically hazardous (slides, earthquake faults, etc.)	The County shall prohibit development in area that are that is considered to be geologically hazardous (slides, earthquake faults, etc.)	Inadvertently omitted from editing between the 2008 and 2010 version. Replaced missing words from 2008 version.		
45. Part II, 3-13 Policy FGMP- 8.19	...oak groves...	... oak <u>groves</u> <u>woodlands</u> ...	Updated terminology correction.		
46. Part II, 3-27 Policy FGMP- IMP # 30	The County shall require a properly designed wastewater disposal system to prevent surface or groundwater contamination and a drainage plan which minimizes sedimentation and/or contamination of the lake environment are engineering measures capable of meeting the intent of this policy.	The County shall require a properly designed wastewater disposal system to prevent surface or groundwater contamination and a drainage plan which minimizes sedimentation and/or contamination of the lake environment by engineering measures capable of meeting the intent of this policy.	Typographical error correction.		
47. Part II, 3-29 Policy FGMP- Develop ment	Those portions of the site which are adjacent to a watercourse area, contain undeveloped slopes 30 percent or greater or encompass environmental, archaeological, or historically sensitive	Those portions of the site which are adjacent to a watercourse area, contain undeveloped slopes 30 percent or greater or encompass environmental, archaeological, or historically sensitive	Inadvertently omitted from editing between the 2008 and 2010 version. Replaced missing word from		

Attachment 3 C
General Plan 2030 Update Correctory Table
Version Date 11-10-11

Page #	February 2010 Revised Draft General Plan 2030 Update	October 2011 Staff Recommended Changes General Plan 2030 Update	Comment/Recommendation:	Planning Commission Recommendation:	Board Direction:	
Standard # 5	archaeological, or historically sensitive areas shall remain in common space.	areas shall remain in common open space.	2008 version.			
48. Part II, 4-3 Policy M-1.1	The County shall develop and adopt a land use plan for each sub-area specifying desired densities and land use categories...	The County shall develop and adopt a land use plan for each sub-area specifying desired densities and land use categories <u>designations</u> ...	Consistency change to match land use designations in Chapter 4.			
49. Part II, 4-4 Policy Title	M-1.5 Mountain Service Areas	M-1.5 Mountain Service Areas Mountain Service Area Designations	Clarify title-Specificity			
50. Part II, 4-4 Policy Title	M-1.6 Mountain Service Areas	M-1.6 Mountain Service Areas Establishing Mountain Service Areas	Clarify title-Specificity			
51. Part II, 4-8 Policy Title	M-1.28 Mountain Service Areas	M-1.28 Mountain Service Areas Mountain Service Areas Compatibility	Clarify title-Specificity			
52. Appendix B ('Policy Glossary by Subject'), B-7	PFS 7.12 Locations of Fire and Sheriff Stations/substations, PFS 7.13 Design Features for Crime Prevention and Reduction	PFS-7-12_PFS 7.11 Locations of Fire and Sheriff Stations/substations PFS-7-13_PFS 7.12 Design Features for Crime Prevention and Reduction	Corrected to correspond to actual policy # in PFS Element.			
53. Universal Change-Entire Document	Site Plan Review Committee	Site-Plan-Review Committee, Planning Commission	As per BOS Action on 4/5/11 to transfer site plan review committee responsibilities to the planning commission as a part of the Resource Management Agency ("RMA") streamlining program.			
54. Part I,	[Insert text just above "13.1	The General Plan 2030 Update	Compliance with AB			

Attachment 3 C
General Plan 2030 Update Correctory Table
Version Date 11-10-11

Page #	February 2010 Revised Draft General Plan 2030 Update	October 2011 Staff Recommended Changes General Plan 2030 Update	Comment Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation	Board Direction
13-2	Roadways and Highways	<p>Transportation and Circulation Element Existing Condition Overview</p> <p>[Insert text following last paragraph in "Existing Conditions Overview"]</p>	<p>amendment includes planning objectives, policies, and standards to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, make the most efficient use of urban land and transportation infrastructure, and improve public health by encouraging physical activity. The Transportation and Circulation element contains programmatic policies that provide a guide for a balanced, multimodal transportation network that meets the needs of all users of County streets, roads, and highways for safe and convenient travel manner that is suitable for all users, including bicyclists, children, persons with disabilities, motorists, movers of commercial goods, pedestrians, users of public transportation, and seniors. These planning objectives, policies and standards reflect the rural, suburban, and urban contexts of each of the individual planning areas within the County.</p>	<p>1358 [2008] <u>Complete Streets Act.</u> This added language clarifies that the draft GPU is in compliance with AB 1358.</p>	
55.	Part I, 13-1 Transportation and Circulation Element Key Terms		<p>Multimodal Transportation Networks. Multimodal transportation networks allow for all modes of travel including walking, bicycling, and transit to be used to reach key destinations in a community and region safely and directly.</p>	<p>Compliance with AB 1358 [2008] <u>Complete Streets Act.</u> This added language clarifies that the draft GPU is in compliance with AB 1358.</p>	
56.	Part I, 13-1 Transportation and Circulation Element Key Terms	<p>Transit Dependent. Dependency upon public or private transportation services by persons that are either unable to operate a vehicle, or do not have access</p>		<p>Compliance with AB 1358 [2008] <u>Complete Streets Act.</u> This added</p>	

Attachment 3 C
General Plan 2030 Update Correctory Table
Version Date 11-10-11

Page #	February 2010 Revised Draft General Plan 2030 Update	October 2011 Staff Recommended Changes General Plan 2030 Update	Planning Commission Recommendation	Board Direction
			Comment/ Recommendation:	
Circulatio n Element Key Terms	operate a vehicle, or do not have access to a vehicle. Generally, the elderly, youth, and persons with disabilities.	to a vehicle. Generally, the elderly (seniors), youth (children), and persons with disabilities.	language clarifies that the draft GPU is in compliance with AB 1358.	
57.	Part I, 13-8 Transport ation and Circulatio n Element Policy 1.18	Balanced System The County shall strive to meet transportation needs and maintain LOS standards through a balanced <u>Multimodal Transportation Network</u> , <u>transportation system</u> that provides alternatives to the automobile [New Policy].	Compliance with AB 1358 [2008] Complete Streets Act. This added language clarifies that the draft GPU is in compliance with AB 1358.	
58.				
59.				
60.				
61.				
62.				
63.				
64.				
65.				
66.				
67.				
68.				
69.				
70.				
71.				
72.				
73.				
74.				
75.				
76.				
77.				
78.				

Attachment 3 C
General Plan 2030 Update Correctory Table
Version Date 11-10-11

Page #	February 2010 Revised Draft General Plan 2030 Update	October 2011 Staff Recommended Changes General Plan 2030 Update	Comment Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation	Board Direction
79.					
80.					
81.					
82.					
83.					
84.					
85.					
86.					
87.					
88.					
89.					
90.					
91.					
92.					
93.					
94.					
95.					
96.					
97.					

Addendum to Attachment 3 C
General Plan City Section PF-4 Comment Matrix
Version 11-10-11

Comment Letter (Date)	Comment #	General Plan Element	Overview of Changes Requested/Made	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation	Board Direction
1. Council of Cities Staff	N/A	Planning Framework	Section 2.4 Cities Introduction	The following goal and policies are designed to foster a cooperative planning environment between the County and each city with respect to development within the fringe areas of the cities. The following policies <u>PF-4.8, PF-4.10, PF-4.12, PF-4.13, PF-4.14, and all policies in PF-4A will become applicable upon mutually adopted agreement between the County and each city.</u>	Suggest incorporation into Final General Plan.	
2. Council of Cities Staff	N/A	Planning Framework	PF-4.17 Cooperation with Individual Cities	Suggest incorporation into Final General Plan.	The County may use the policies set forth under this goal (PF-4A: Cities: Continued) to work with individual cities to further manage development within that CACUDB or CACUAB to the extent that the financial needs of the County are met and the County's ability to provide facilities and County services used by all of the residents in the County and cities is enhanced. The County and Cities will establish a working committee to facilitate the policies identified in this section <u>[New Policy]</u> .	
3. Council of Cities Staff	N/A	Planning Framework	PF-4.18 Future Land Use Entitlements in a CACUDB	Suggest incorporation into Final General Plan.	The County may work with an individual city to limit any General Plan amendments to change the land use designations of any parcel or any	

Addendum to Attachment 3 C
General Plan City Section PF-4 Comment Matrix
Version 11-10-11

Comment Letter (Date)	Comment #	General Plan Element	Overview of Changes Requested/Made	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation	Board Direction
			<p>amendments to the County zoning ordinance to add uses to a current zoning classification or change the zoning district designation of any parcel within a CACUDB except as follows:</p> <p>a. This policy will not apply to amendments or changes to a County unincorporated UJDB, Hamlet Development Boundary (HDB), including where the boundary line may increase an <u>outward expansion of the an overlap area with a CACUDB area that is not coterminous to the city's Urban Development Boundary/Sphere of Influence (UDB or SOI), or to any General Plan amendment adopting a new County unincorporated UDB, an HDB, or Planned Community or Corridor Plan areas that may fall within a CACUDB area. County Corridor development nodes will not be located inside a city's Urban Development Boundary/Sphere of Influence (UDB or SOI).</u></p> <p>b. This policy will not apply where the General Plan land use designation or the zoning district classification of a particular parcel is inconsistent with an existing special use permit, variance, or legal non-conforming use.</p> <p>c. This policy will not apply where there is no viable use for the parcel under the existing General Plan land use designation or zoning district classification due to, but not limited to, the following: size, shape, topography, soil content or classification, water availability, location, existing structures and site improvements, or surrounding</p>			

Addendum to Attachment 3 C
General Plan City Section PF-4 Comment Matrix
Version 11-10-11

Comment Letter Comm. # (Date)	General Plan Element	Overview of Changes Requested/Made	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation	Board Direction
		<p>uses-as As determined by the RVL P checklist, the County shall encourage beneficial reuse of existing or vacant agricultural support facilities for new businesses (including non-agricultural uses) <u>and</u> for which the city <u>cannot</u> or will not annex as per <u>PF-4.24</u>.</p> <p>d. This policy will not apply where the effect of the amendments to the General Plan land use designation or of the rezoning is to designate or zone the parcel to an agricultural designation or zone except where the effect of the amendment creates a less intensive agricultural designation or zone.</p> <p>e. This policy will not apply where amendments to the General Plan land use designations or the zoning classifications apply only to that portion of a CACUDB that is overlapped [where exterior UDB's are coterminous] by a County unincorporated UDB, Hamlet Development Boundary (HDB), or Corridor Plan area.</p> <p>f. This policy will not apply where amendment to the General Plan land use designation or the zoning classification is required to bring the County regulations into compliance with more restrictive State or Federal <u>statutes</u> or regulations.</p> <p>g. This <u>amendment</u> policy will not apply where amendments to the Zoning Ordinance are part of a comprehensive modernization or restructuring of the processes or procedures set out in the Zoning Ordinance or part of a comprehensive</p>			

Addendum to Attachment 3 C
General Plan City Section PF-4 Comment Matrix
Version 11-10-11

Comment Letter Comment # (Date)	General Plan Element	Overview of Changes Requested/Made	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation	Board Direction
		<p>update to the text of the zoning classifications to bring the Zoning Ordinance procedures and text into consistency with the General Plan update. [This comprehensive modernization, restructuring or update would not include any rezonings outside that allowed in this policy. However, revision of processes and procedures and simplification of existing ordinances may occur.]</p> <p>h. This policy would not apply to a comprehensive update of a County Adopted City General Plan, including rezoning there under, in cooperation with the affected city.</p> <p>i. This policy would not apply where the County has worked with the city to identify and structure as mutually acceptable alternative General Plan land use designation or zoning classification [New Policy].</p>			
4. Council of Cities Staff	N/A	Planning Framework	PF-4.19 Future Land Use Entitlements in a CACUAB	Suggest incorporation into Final General Plan.	

Addendum to Attachment 3 C

General Plan City Section PF-4 Comment Matrix

Version 11-10-11

Comment Letter #	Comment #	General Plan Element	Overview of Changes Requested/Made	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation	Board Direction
			alternative General Plan land use designation or zoning classification. This policy will not apply to amendments or changes to a County unincorporated UDB, Hamlet Development Boundary (HDB), or Corridor Plan area boundary line, including where the boundary line may increase an overlap area with a CACUDB area, or to any General Plan amendment adopting a new UDB, an HDB, or Corridor Plan area that may fall within a CACUDB area. This policy shall not apply within a County unincorporated UDB, an HDB, or Corridor Plan area where that area overlaps a CACUAB area. Development of County corridor development nodes in an affected city's UAB would only occur after the County has provided written consultation and has allowed for a reasonable timed response from the affected city prior to decision making and before the adoption of the Corridor Plan. New development in a city's UAB would be subject to adopted plan lines and setback standards. Adopted facility plans and legally adopted General Plans will be considered during the development review process. Small “stand alone,” non urban projects which are defined as residential projects of four or fewer lots or non-residential projects smaller than two acres do not need city standards but shall respect city utility and street master plans for setbacks. Large, urban-style projects include residential projects of five or more lots averaging less than one acre per lot and non-residential projects two acres or larger will use uniform urban development standards, financing mechanisms, consent to annexation, application of reciprocal development impact fees and city streets/utility setbacks /disclosure requirements. [New Policy].			

Addendum to Attachment 3 C
General Plan City Section PF-4 Comment Matrix
Version 11-10-11

Comment Letter (Date)	Comment #	General Plan Element	Overview of Changes Requested/Made	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation	Board Direction
5. Council of Cities Staff	N/A	Planning Framework	PF-4.22 Reuse of Abandoned Improvements in a CACUDB	Suggest incorporation into Final General Plan.		
			<p>In accordance with other policies in this General Plan, the County may work with a city to provide that any alternative land uses within a CACUDB not otherwise allowed under a particular zoning classification but which are allowed by County policies due to the existence of abandoned structures or improvements with no other available, viable economic uses on the parcel will be reviewed in light of impacts on such regional concerns as water and sewage disposal availability and preservation of transportation and utility corridors. For agricultural related uses, reoccupation and/or expansion is limited (not to exceed 20% of the site and/or building square footage subject to special use permit with city consultation). Conversion to non-agricultural uses requiring a zone change is limited not to exceed 20% of the site and/or building square footage or as mutually agreed upon by the city and County. Any expansions are subject to special use permit. <i>[New Policy]</i>.</p>			
				PF-4.23 Reuse of Abandoned Improvements in a CACUAB	Suggest incorporation into Final General Plan.	

Addendum to Attachment 3 C
General Plan City Section PF-4 Comment Matrix
Version 11-10-11

Comment Letter Comment # (Date)	General Plan Element	Overview of Changes Requested/Made	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation	Board Direction
		structures or improvements with no other available, viable economic uses on the parcel will be reviewed in light of impacts on such regional concerns as water and sewage disposal availability and preservation of transportation and utility corridors. Expansion or re-occupation will require irrevocable consents to annex, and accommodation for setbacks and other standards for future streets and utilities. The RVLP will be used to determine if non-agricultural use is appropriate. [New Policy].			
7.	Council of Cities Staff	N/A	Planning Framework	PF-4.24 Annexations to a City within the CACUDB	Suggest incorporation into Final General Plan.

Addendum to Attachment 3 C
General Plan City Section PF-4 Comment Matrix
Version 11-10-11

Comment Letter Comment (Date)	Comment #	General Plan Element	Overview of Changes Requested/Made	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation	Board Direction
			<p>adopted city long-range infrastructure plan.</p> <p>b. The referral would, at least, be subject to the requirement that the city inform the County within three (3) months that it is or is not able and willing to commence annexation proceedings to accommodate the project; or the city is willing and able to commence annexation proceedings, the County would not take action to approve the project unless the applicant has submitted a completed application for annexation and city fails to take action on such application within six months;</p> <p>c. If the affected city is not willing or able to commence annexation proceedings, approval by the County of the project would be conditioned on conformance with County adopted city development standards, County Adopted City General Plans and zoning and any County adopted city long-range infrastructure plan adopted.</p> <p>d. The County may, as part of this policy, require a consent to future annexation be recorded concurrent with approval of the project special use permit for development within the County [<i>New Policy</i>].</p>			
8.	Council of Cities Staff	N/A	Planning Framework	PF-4.27 Impacts of Development within the County on City Facilities and County	Suggest incorporation into Final General Plan.	

Addendum to Attachment 3 C
General Plan City Section PF-4 Comment Matrix
Version 11-10-11

Comment Letter #	Comment (Date)	General Plan Element	Overview of Changes Requested/Made		
			Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation	Board Direction
		Facilities	The County may work with a city to consider the adoption, imposition and collection for payment to the city pursuant to agreement Development Impact Fees or other comparable financing mechanisms within the CACUDB, as may be proposed by the city from time to time to offset the impacts of development in the County on city facilities. Reciprocally, and under the same conditions, the city will consider the collection of Development Impact Fees or other comparable financing mechanisms within the city to offset the impact of development within the city on County facilities. <i>[New Policy]</i> .		