



Addendum

to the

Fresno County General Plan Review and Zoning Ordinance Update Program Environmental Impact Report (SCH No. 2018031066)

for the

Biola and Del Rey Community Plan Updates

April 2025

Report Prepared for:

County of Fresno

Department of Public Works and Planning
Community Development Division
2220 Tulare St. 6th Floor
Fresno, CA 93721

Contact:

Yvette Quiroga, MPPA, Principal Planner
(559) 600-4292

Report Prepared by:

Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group

455 W Fir Avenue
Clovis, CA 93611

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Introduction	1-1
1.1	Project Background	1-1
1.2	Previous Environmental Analysis and Approval.....	1-1
1.3	CEQA Addendum Regulations	1-1
2	Project Description	2-1
2.1	Biola Community Plan Update.....	2-1
2.2	Del Rey Community Plan Update	2-6
3	Impact Evaluation.....	3-1
3.1	Scope of Evaluation	3-1
3.2	Explanation of Evaluation Categories	3-1
3.3	Comparative Impact Checklist Discussion	3-2
3.3.1	Agricultural and Forestry Resources	3-3
4	Determination	4-1

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2-1: Existing Biola Community Plan Land Use Diagram	2-3
Figure 2-2: Proposed Biola Community Plan Land Use Changes	2-4
Figure 2-3: Biola Community Plan Land Use Diagram	2-5
Figure 2-4: Existing Del Rey Community Plan Land Use Diagram	2-7
Figure 2-5: Proposed Del Rey Community Plan Land Use Changes.....	2-8
Figure 2-6: Del Rey Community Plan Land Use Diagram	2-9

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1: Biola Community Plan Expansion Areas	2-2
Table 2-2: Biola Northwest Reserve Overlay Site Land Use Amendments	2-2
Table 2-3: Del Rey Community Plan Expansion Areas	2-6

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Biola Comparative Impact Checklist and Del Rey Comparative Impact Checklist

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

The Fresno County Board of Supervisors adopted the revised 2024 Fresno County General Plan and approved an updated Zoning Ordinance on February 20, 2024. The Board of Supervisors also certified the related Fresno County General Plan Review and Zoning Ordinance Update Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) (State Clearinghouse [SCH] No. 2018031066) on February 20, 2024. While the 2024 Fresno County General Plan applies throughout unincorporated Fresno County, the unincorporated communities within the County are also guided by individual community plans, which augment the goals and policies contained in the General Plan. The unincorporated community plans identify land uses specific to that community and contain additional community-specific goals, policies, and implementation programs which refine, but are consistent with, General Plan goals, policies, and implementation programs.

The County of Fresno initiated updates to two of these community plans, the Biola Community Plan and Del Rey Community Plan, in December 2023. The Biola and Del Rey Community Plan Updates (Project) are discussed in further detail in [Section 2.1](#) and [Section 2.2](#), respectively, including an overview of the proposed land use changes within each community.

1.2 PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS AND APPROVAL

To analyze effects from and facilitate implementation of the 2024 Fresno County General Plan, the County prepared a PEIR, which was certified February 20, 2024 (SCH No. 2018031066). The PEIR analyzed buildout of the 2024 Fresno County General Plan at a programmatic level based on growth projections through the year 2042, including buildout of the unincorporated communities of Biola and Del Rey. The growth projections include a forecast of 234,591 people and 120,019 employees in the unincorporated County, representing an increase of approximately 33,607 people and approximately 20,745 employees through 2042. Several environmental resource categories including Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Cultural, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Transportation, Tribal Cultural, Utilities and Service Systems, and Wildfire were found to have impacts that would be significant and unavoidable. For these impacts the required Findings of Fact and a Statement of Overriding Considerations were adopted with the certification of the PEIR.

1.3 CEQA ADDENDUM REGULATIONS

For streamlining purposes, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines encourage the preparation of later environmental documents to be “tiered” from previously certified EIRs under prescribed circumstances. Section 15164 provides that a lead agency shall prepare an *addendum* to a previously certified EIR if only some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162(a), calling for preparation of a *subsequent EIR*, have occurred.

Section 15162(a) states that “when an EIR has been certified...for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

- (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts;
- (2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts; or

EXHIBIT 1

- (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
- (A) The project will have one or more significant impacts not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
 - (B) Significant impacts previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
 - (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant impacts of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
 - (D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant impacts on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.”

As this Addendum states in additional detail, the proposed updates to the Biola Community Plan and Del Rey Community Plan will not result in the occurrence of any of the conditions found in Section 15162(a). As the updates to the Biola Community Plan and the Del Rey Community Plan refine, but remain consistent with, the goals, policies, and implementation programs, and constitute only minor changes to the 2024 Fresno County General Plan previously evaluated in the PEIR, an addendum to the previously certified PEIR is the appropriate level of environmental analysis. The updates are being addressed within this single Addendum for consistency with the scale of analysis conducted within the PEIR.

2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Biola and Del Rey Community Plans identify goals, policies, and implementation programs specific to the unincorporated communities of Biola and Del Rey, respectively, and will not apply to other unincorporated communities in the County. These goals, policies, and implementation programs are in addition to the goals, policies, and implementation programs adopted in the 2024 Fresno County General Plan, which will continue to apply within the communities of Biola and Del Rey. Both the current Biola and Del Rey Community Plans were adopted in 1976 and have not been comprehensively updated since their original adoption. The last change to the Biola Community Plan occurred in 1990, with a map and text amendment. The last change to the Del Rey Community Plan occurred in 2012, with a map amendment.

The County of Fresno initiated updates to the Biola and Del Rey Community Plans in December 2023. The Biola and Del Rey Community Plan Updates (Project) are discussed in further detail in [Section 2.1](#) and [Section 2.2](#), respectively, including an overview of the proposed land use changes within each community. Related actions that would occur concurrent with or following approval of the updated Biola Community Plan and updated Del Rey Community Plan include the rezoning of properties within the Biola and Del Rey Community Plan boundaries for consistency with the adopted land use designations. Amendment to the Biola Community Services District (CSD) Sphere of Influence (SOI) and Del Rey CSD SOI as well as expansion of the Biola CSD and Del Rey CSD service area boundaries to align with the amended SOIs are also anticipated as subsequent actions. These anticipated subsequent actions have been addressed through the analysis contained herein. However, any future development proposed within the Biola Community Plan and Del Rey Community Plan areas would be required to undergo separate environmental analysis, as applicable, for the use proposed and the site for which it is proposed on.

2.1 BIOLA COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE

The Biola Community Plan area currently encompasses approximately 201 acres, as shown in [Figure 2-1](#). The Project includes an expansion of the Biola Community Plan boundary to encompass a total of 213.2 acres and would amend land use designations within the expanded boundary, as shown in [Figure 2-2](#), and described in further detail below. The Project also includes revisions to the goals, policies, and implementation programs identified in the Community Plan. The Biola Community Plan goals, policies, and implementation programs are specific to the Biola community and refine but are consistent with the Fresno County General Plan goals, policies, and implementation programs.

The Project would add three parcels totaling approximately 12.2 acres to the Biola Community Plan boundary and amend the planned land use designation of these parcels as identified in [Table 2-1](#) and as shown on [Figure 2-2](#).

Table 2-1: Biola Community Plan Expansion Areas

APN ¹	Acres	Existing GPLU	Proposed GPLU	Existing Use	Planned Buildout	
					Residential	Non-Residential ²
016-020-13ST (portion) (Parcel 1)	3.03	Agriculture	Public Facilities	Orchard/ Wastewater Treatment Facility	--	Wastewater Treatment Facility ³
016-300-28ST (Parcel 2)	5.02	Agriculture	Public Facilities	Vacant/ Stormwater Drainage Basin	--	Stormwater Drainage Basin ³
016-300-21S (Parcel 3)	4.15	Agriculture	Industrial: Limited	Orchard	--	Manufacturing Uses: 67,790 square feet 110 employees
Total	12.2	--	--	--	--	67,790 square feet 110 employees

¹ See Figure 2-2 for the location of Parcels 1 through 3.

² Non-residential buildout for Limited Industrial based on 37.5 percent maximum floor area ratio and 615 square feet per employee.

³ Treatment facilities and basins are not expected to add square footage that would result in additional employees.

Additionally, the planned land use designation for approximately 16.5 acres within the existing Biola Community Plan boundary will be redesignated as identified in Table 2-2 and as shown on Figure 2-2. The Project would also redesignate additional parcels, totaling approximately 39.8 acres, within the existing Biola Community Plan boundary, not including the acres identified in Table 2-1 or Table 2-2. The changes include removal of the "Reserve Overlay" designation for approximately 11.5 acres within the existing Biola Community Plan boundary as shown on Figure 2-2. The underlying land use designation is not being amended so there would be no change to the buildout assumptions as previously analyzed for these parcels. Additional amendments, also shown on Figure 2-2, would redesignate approximately 28.3 acres primarily to reflect existing developed uses on-site where no additional development is anticipated.

The proposed Biola Community Plan land use diagram, reflective of the identified land use amendments, is shown on Figure 2-3 below.

Table 2-2: Biola Northwest Reserve Overlay Site Land Use Amendments

APN ¹	Acres	Existing GPLU ²	Proposed GPLU	Existing Use	Planned Buildout	
					Residential ³	Non-Residential ⁴
016-190-73 (portion, Parcel 4)	8.5	Medium Density Residential Reserve	Commercial: Service/ Reserve Overlay	Orchard	--	Commercial Uses: 92,565 square feet 184 employees
016-190-73 (portion, Parcel 5)	3	Medium Density Residential Reserve	Park/ Reserve Overlay	Orchard	--	Park ⁵
016-190-73 (portion, Parcel 6)	5	Medium Density Residential Reserve	Residential: Medium High Density/ Reserve Overlay	Orchard	73 units	--
Total	16.5	--	--	--	73 units	92,565 square feet 184 employees

¹ See Figure 2-2 for the location of Parcels 4 through 6.

² Distribution of land uses will be implemented in accordance with Policy LU-P-2 of the Biola Community Plan.

³ Residential buildout based on 80 percent of maximum density allowed and 4.24 persons per household.

⁴ Non-residential buildout for Service Commercial based on 25 percent maximum floor area ratio and 504 square feet per employee.

⁵ Parks are not expected to add square footage that would result in additional employees.

Figure 2-1: Existing Biola Community Plan Land Use Diagram




Figure 2-2: Proposed Biola Community Plan Land Use Changes




Figure 2-3: Biola Community Plan Land Use Diagram



2.2 DEL REY COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE

The Del Rey Community Plan area currently encompasses approximately 333.5 acres, as shown in [Figure 2-4](#). The Project includes an expansion of the Del Rey Community Plan boundary to encompass a total of 374.3 acres and amend the land use designations within the expanded boundary, as shown in [Figure 2-5](#), and described in further detail below. The Project also includes revisions to the goals, policies, and implementation programs identified in the Del Rey Community Plan. The Del Rey Community Plan goals, policies, and implementation programs are specific to the Del Rey community and refine but are consistent with the 2024 Fresno County General Plan goals, policies, and implementation programs.

The Project would add two parcels totaling approximately 37.5 acres to the Community Plan boundary and would amend the planned land use designation of these parcels as identified in [Table 2-3](#) and shown on [Figure 2-5](#).

Table 2-3: Del Rey Community Plan Expansion Areas

APN ¹	Acres	Existing GPLU	Proposed GPLU ²	Existing Use	Planned Buildout	
					Residential ³	Non-Residential ⁴
350-080-04 (portion, Parcel 1)	5	Agriculture	Commercial: Service Commercial	Single Family Residence/ Orchard	--	Commercial Uses: 54,450 square feet/ 108 employees
350-080-04 (portion, Parcel 1)	6.8	Agriculture	Residential: Medium Density	Single Family Residence/ Orchard	40 dwelling units/ 169 persons	--
350-080-04 (portion, Parcel 1)	6.8	Agriculture	Residential: Medium High Density	Single Family Residence/ Orchard	99 dwelling units/ 419 persons	--
350-230-03T (Parcel 2)	18.9	Agriculture	Public Facilities	Vineyards	--	Wastewater Treatment Facility ⁵
Total	37.5⁶	--	--	--	139 dwelling units/ 588 persons	54,450 square feet/ 108 employees

¹ See [Figure 2-2](#) for the location of Parcels 4 through 6.

² Distribution of land uses will be implemented in accordance with Policy LU-P-2 of the Del Rey Community Plan.

³ Residential buildout based on 80 percent of maximum density allowed and 4.24 persons per household.

⁴ Non-residential buildout based on 25 percent maximum floor area ratio and 504 square feet per employee.

⁵ Treatment facilities are not expected to add square footage that would result in additional employees.

⁶ Total acres do not include right-of-way.

The Project would also redesignate additional parcels, totaling approximately 46.3 acres, within the existing Del Rey Community Plan boundary. The changes include removal of the “Reserve Overlay” designation for approximately 42.9 acres within the existing Del Rey Community Plan boundary as shown on [Figure 2-5](#). The underlying land use designation is not being amended so there would be no change to the buildout assumptions as previously analyzed for these parcels. Additional amendments, also shown on [Figure 2-5](#), would redesignate approximately 3.4 acres to reflect existing developed uses on-site where no additional development is anticipated.

The proposed Del Rey Community Plan land use diagram, reflective of the identified land use amendments, is shown on [Figure 2-6](#) below.

Figure 2-4: Existing Del Rey Community Plan Land Use Diagram




Figure 2-5: Proposed Del Rey Community Plan Land Use Changes





Figure 2-6: Del Rey Community Plan Land Use Diagram



3 IMPACT EVALUATION

3.1 SCOPE OF EVALUATION

As described in [Chapter 2 Project Description](#), the proposed updates to the Biola and Del Rey Community Plans would make minor modifications to the boundaries for each Community Plan area and amend some land use designations within each boundary. To evaluate whether these proposed updates would require additional analysis, a comparative impact checklist was prepared for each Community Plan update as they relate to the 2024 Fresno County General Plan PEIR. The Biola Comparative Impact Checklist and Del Rey Comparative Impact Checklist are included as [Attachment A](#) and include the full range of questions as presented in the current version of Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines.

The columns of the checklists have been modified from Appendix G to help answer required questions pursuant to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. A “no” answer does not necessarily mean that there are no potential impacts relative to the environmental resource category, but rather that there is no change in the condition or status of the impact as analyzed and addressed in the PEIR. For instance, the environmental categories might be answered with a “no” in the checklist because the impacts associated with the Project were adequately addressed in the PEIR, and the conclusions about environmental impact significance from the previous PEIR still apply. A “yes” answer indicates a change in circumstance that warrants additional discussion to determine if the impact of the Project results in a new or more significant impact not previously addressed in the PEIR. The purpose of each column of the checklist is described in [Section 3.2](#) below.

Only those resource categories resulting in a “yes” are discussed further in [Section 3.3](#) with the scope of evaluation completed under this Addendum being limited to comparing the circumstances and potential impacts resulting from the Project with the circumstances and impacts discussed as part of the 2024 Fresno County General Plan PEIR.

3.2 EXPLANATION OF EVALUATION CATEGORIES

The purpose of the columns included in the Comparative Impact Checklists, as included in [Attachment A](#) and [Section 3.3](#), are as follows:

Where Impact was Analyzed in Previous Analysis

This column provides a cross-reference to the Draft and Final version of the PEIR (DEIR and FEIR) where information and analysis may be found relative to the environmental resource listed.

Level of Significance

This column provides the level of significance based on analysis of the 2024 Fresno County General Plan buildout as contained in the PEIR.

Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis

This column identifies the goals, policies, and mitigation measures (MM) that were identified through the PEIR to reduce the potential for impacts to occur as a result of the buildout of the 2024 Fresno County General Plan relative to the environmental resource listed.

New or More Significant Impacts?

Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(2), this column indicates whether there are substantial changes in circumstances under which the Project is undertaken that have occurred subsequent to the certification of the PEIR that would result in the current Project having new significant environmental impacts that were not considered in the prior document or having substantial increases in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

“New” includes things that were previously found to have a no impact designation or a less than significant designation, but now, in consideration of what the Project proposes, could result in significant impacts to the environment if not mitigated. A “more significant” impact is one that was previously identified with a “Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated” designation, or a “Significant and Unavoidable” designation, with the significance or scope of the impact increasing significantly further as a result of the Project.

New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?

Pursuant to Section 15162(a)(3)(A-D) of the CEQA Guidelines, this column indicates whether new information of substantial importance which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous environmental documents were certified as complete is available, requiring an update to the analysis of the previous environmental documents to verify that the environmental conclusions and mitigation measures remain valid. If the new information shows that any of the following conditions are met, the question would be answered “yes”, requiring the preparation of a subsequent EIR or supplement to the EIR: (A) the project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the prior environmental documents; (B) that significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the prior environmental documents; (C) that mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or, (D) that mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the prior environmental documents would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

However, if the additional analyses completed as part of this comparative evaluation indicate that the conclusions of the prior environmental documents remain the same and no new significant impacts are identified, or identified significant environmental impacts are not found to be substantially more severe, the question would be answered “no” and no additional EIR documentation (subsequent EIR or supplement to the EIR) would be required.

Do Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?

This column indicates whether the PEIR and adopted CEQA Findings provide mitigation measures to address effects in the related impact category. A “yes” response will be provided in this instance. If “Not Applicable” is indicated, this evaluation concludes that there was no impact, or the impact was less than significant and, therefore, no mitigation measures are needed. Should the previous analysis and mitigation address and/or resolve the potential impacts of the proposed Project, no further environmental analysis is warranted.

3.3 COMPARITIVE IMPACT CHECKLIST DISCUSSION

As noted in [Section 3.1](#), only those resource categories resulting in a “yes” answer on the comparative impact checklists included as [Attachment A](#) are discussed below. Only the Agricultural and Foresty Resources category warranted further discussion to determine if the impact of the Project results in a new or more significant impact not previously addressed in the 2024 Fresno County General Plan PEIR. As indicated above in [Section 3.1](#), resource categories with a “no” answer indicate that there is no change in the condition or status of the impact as analyzed and addressed in the PEIR, as identified on the comparative impact checklists included as [Attachment A](#). For instance, the environmental categories might be answered with a “no” in the checklist because the impacts associated with the Project were adequately addressed in the PEIR, and the conclusions about environmental impact significance from the previous PEIR still apply. Therefore, no additional analysis was warranted.

3.3.1 AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation Measures that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis ¹	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Do Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	DEIR: Impact AG-1, pgs. 4.2-10 to 4.2-11; Impact LU-2, pgs. 4.11-13 to 4.11-21 FEIR: Pgs. 589-590, Revisions to Policy LU-A.23	Significant and Unavoidable	Policy LU-A.23 (MM) Policy LU-A.24 (MM) Policy LU-A.1 Policy LU-A.2 Policy LU-A.12 Policy LU-A.13 Policy OS-B.1 Policy OS-B.6 Policy OS-B.7	Yes	Yes	Yes, impacts remain significant and unavoidable
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	DEIR: Impact AG-2, pgs. 4.2-12 to 4.2-13; Impact LU-2, pgs. 4.11-13 to 4.11-21	Significant and Unavoidable	No mitigation feasible. Policy LU-A.1 Policy LU-A.16 Policy LU-A.17	Yes	Yes	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible, however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	DEIR: Impact AG-3, pgs. 4.2-13 to 4.2-14	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy OS-B.7 Policy OS-B.9	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	DEIR: Impact AG-3, pgs. 4.2-13 to 4.2-14	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy OS-B.7 Policy OS-B.9	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation Measures that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis ¹	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Do Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	DEIR: Impact AG-1, pgs. 4.2-10 to 4.2-11; Impact LU-2, pgs. 4.11-13 to 4.11-21 FEIR: Pgs. 589-590, Revisions to Policy LU-A.23	Significant and Unavoidable	Policy LU-A.23 (MM) Policy LU-A.24 (MM) Policy LU-A.1 Policy LU-A.2 Policy LU-A.12 Policy LU-A.13 Policy OS-B.1 Policy OS-B.6 Policy OS-B.7	No	No	Yes, impacts remain significant and unavoidable

¹ Policies noted with an (MM) are identified in the PEIR as mitigation measures.

3.3.1.1 IMPACT ASSESSMENT

- a) Would the Project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

Impact AG-1 of the PEIR evaluated potential effects of the 2024 Fresno County General Plan regarding the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique, Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance and determined the impact to be significant and unavoidable. The PEIR acknowledged that full buildout of the 2024 Fresno County General Plan could result in a loss of agricultural lands, including those mapped as Prime Farmland, Unique, Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. General Plan policies as listed in the above table were identified in the PEIR analysis, including General Plan Policies LU-A.23 and LU-A.24 which serve as mitigation measures, that would reduce the impact. Additional General Plan policies, including Policies LU-A.1, LU-A.2, LU-A.12, LU-A.13, OS-B.1, OS-B.6, and OS-B.7 were also cited as policies that would further reduce the impact; however, it was concluded that the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

The Biola Community Plan update would add three parcels totaling approximately 12.2 acres to the Biola Community Plan boundary and amend the planned use designation of these parcels from Agriculture to Public Facilities (APNs 016-020-13ST [portion] and 016-300-28ST) and Industrial: Limited (APN 016-300-21S), as shown in [Figure 2-2](#). All three parcels consist of land designated as Prime Farmland as well as land designated as Urban and Built-Up Land; approximately 4 acres of the 12.2 total acres consist of Prime Farmland.

The Del Rey Community Plan update would add approximately 40.8 total acres to the Del Rey Community Plan boundary and amend the planned land use designation of two parcels totaling 37.5 acres from Agriculture to Service Commercial (a portion of APN 350-080-04), Residential: Medium High Density (a portion of APN 350-080-04), Residential: Medium Density (a portion of APN 350-080-04), and Public Facilities (APN 350-230-03T), as shown in [Figure 2-5](#). The remainder of the expansion area is existing road right-of-way. The two parcels consist of both Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance.

As discussed in the PEIR, there are approximately 1,162,708 acres of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance in the County, accounting for about 54% of the total acreage. The combined conversion acres of Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance between both the Biola Community Plan and Del Rey Community would be approximately 41.5 acres. This would not be a new significant impact nor would impacts be substantially more severe than the significant impacts previously identified and addressed through the 2024 Fresno County General Plan policies noted above. Therefore, the conclusions and findings of the PEIR remain valid, and no further analysis is required. Further, as an informational note, of the 1,162,708 acres of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance in the County, this would represent a conversion of just under 0.004% of such lands in the County.

b) Would the Project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

Impact AG-2 of the PEIR evaluated potential conflicts of the 2024 Fresno County General Plan with existing zoning for agricultural use or with a Williamson Act contract and determined the impact to be significant and unavoidable. General Plan policies as listed in the above table were identified in the PEIR analysis, including General Plan Policies LU-A.1, LU-A.16, and LU-A.17, that would reduce the impact; however, it was concluded that the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

The Biola Community Plan update would add three parcels totaling approximately 12.2 acres to the Biola Community Plan boundary and would amend the planned land use designation of these parcels from Agriculture to Public Facilities (APNs 016-020-13ST [portion] and 016-300-28ST) and Industrial: Limited (APN 016-300-21S). The Del Rey Community Plan update would add two parcels totaling approximately 37.5 acres to the Del Rey Community Plan boundary and would amend the planned land use designation of these parcels from Agriculture to Service Commercial (a portion of APN 350-080-04), Residential: Medium Density (a portion of APN 350-080-04), and Public Facilities (APN 350-230-03T). None of the five parcels are currently under a Williamson Act contract; however, rezoning of the parcels would ultimately occur to align with the amended land use designations.

As discussed in the PEIR, rezoning of land for consistency with land use designations was anticipated and evaluated as part of the analysis, including the rezoning of land from an agricultural zone district to a zone district to allow for non-agricultural uses. The additions to the Biola Community Plan and the Del Rey Community Plan boundaries would result in the eventual rezoning of approximately 41.5 acres from an agricultural zone district to a non-agricultural zone. However, the rezoning would be limited to only those properties located within the Biola Community Plan and Del Rey Community Plan boundaries for consistency with the land use designations. No additional land beyond the boundaries would be rezoned. As such, no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would occur from those previously identified and addressed through the 2024 Fresno County General Plan policies noted above. Therefore, the conclusions and findings of the PEIR remain valid, and no further analysis is required.

3.3.1.2 MITIGATION MEASURES

2024 Fresno County General Plan Policies LU-A.23 and LU-A.24 were cited as mitigation measures in the PEIR for Impact AG-1, identified under impact discussion (a) above. Several additional General Plan policies were also cited to reduce both Impacts AG-1 and AG-2, identified under impact discussions (a) and (b) above, including Policies LU-A.1, LU-A.2, LU-A.12, LU-A.13, LU-A.16, LU-A.17, OS-B.1, OS-B.6, and OS-B.7.

4 DETERMINATION

As discussed in Chapters 1 through 3 above, this Addendum to the PEIR (State Clearinghouse No. 201803106), certified by the County of Fresno on February 20, 2024, supports the conclusion that the Biola and Del Rey Community Plan updates constitute only minor changes to the 2024 Fresno County General Plan previously evaluated and that no further environmental analysis is required. This determination is appropriate because only minor changes or additions to said PEIR are needed to consider the modifications proposed under the Community Plan updates, and these changes or additions do not require preparation of a subsequent EIR for the reasons set forth below. The reasons set forth correspond to items 1 through 3 as enumerated in [Section 1.3 CEQA Addendum Regulations](#) and pursuant to Section 15162(a) of the CEQA Guidelines.

(1) The updates to the Biola and Del Rey Community Plans would not result in the major revision of the PEIR due to the involvement of a new significant environmental impact or substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts. The impacts identified to agricultural resources, as identified in [Section 3.3.1 Agricultural and Forestry Resources](#), would be no more substantial than the impacts to these resources as previously analyzed in the PEIR. All mitigation identified within the PEIR shall apply to the proposed Biola and Del Rey Community Plan updates.

(2) The circumstances under which the update to the Project will be undertaken have not substantially changed from those described in the PEIR, and therefore major revisions of the PEIR are not required due to involvement of new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

(3) There is no new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the PEIR was certified as complete.

(A) The Project will not result in any new significant impacts beyond those evaluated in the PEIR.

(B) The Project will not result in any impacts that would be substantially more severe than those evaluated in the PEIR.

(C) There were no mitigation measures or alternatives found by the PEIR to be infeasible that would in fact be feasible that would substantially reduce one or more significant impacts of resulting from the Project.

(D) There are no mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the PEIR that would substantially reduce one or more significant impacts on the environment that the County declines to adopt for the Project.

Based upon the statements above, and in conjunction with the evaluation further discussed in [Chapter 3](#), none of the conditions described in Section 15162(a) calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred.

Pursuant to the provisions of CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (CEQA Guidelines; California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 3, Section 15000, et seq.) and specifically Section 15164 regarding preparation of addendums to an environmental impact report or negative declaration, the County of Fresno has determined that the Biola and Del Rey Community Plan updates constitute a minor change to the 2024 Fresno County General Plan previously evaluated and that none of the conditions described in Section 15162 of the Guidelines would require the preparation of a subsequent EIR.

Attachment A:

Biola Comparative Impact Checklist and
Del Rey Comparative Impact Checklist

1 BIOLA COMPARATIVE EVALUATION CHECKLIST

1.1 AESTHETICS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Do Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
a) Have substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	DEIR: Impact AES-1, pgs. 4.1-17 to 4.1-18	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Goal OS-K Policy OS-K.1 Policy OS-K.2 Policy OS-K.3 Policy OS-K.4	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	DEIR: Impact AES-2, pg. 4.1-19	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Goal OS-L Policy OS-L.3 Policy OS-L.6 Policy OS-L.9	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	DEIR: Impact AES-3, pgs. 4.1-20 to 4.1-22	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy OS-L.4 Policy LU-B.11 Policy OS-K.1 Policy OS-K.2 Policy OS-K.3 Policy OS-K.4	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	DEIR: Impact AES-4, ph. 4.1-22 to 4.1-23	Less than Significant	None required.	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

1.2 AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	DEIR: Impact AG-1, pgs. 4.2-10 to 4.2-11; Impact LU-2, pgs. 4.11-13 to 4.11-21 FEIR: Pgs. 589-590, Revisions to Policy LU-A.23	Significant and Unavoidable.	Policy LU-A.23 (MM) Policy LU-A.24 (MM) Policy LU-A.1 Policy LU-A.2 Policy LU-A.12 Policy LU-A.13 Policy OS-B.1 Policy OS-B.6 Policy OS-B.7	Yes	Yes	Yes, impacts remain significant and unavoidable.
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	DEIR: Impact AG-2, pgs. 4.2-12 to 4.2-13; Impact LU-2, pgs. 4.11-13 to 4.11-21	Significant and Unavoidable.	No mitigation feasible. Policy LU-A.1 Policy LU-A.16 Policy LU-A.17	Yes	Yes	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible, however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	DEIR: Impact AG-3, pgs. 4.2-13 to 4.2-14	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy OS-B.7 Policy OS-B.9	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	DEIR: Impact AG-3, pgs. 4.2-13 to 4.2-14	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy OS-B.7 Policy OS-B.9	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment	DEIR: Impact AG-1, pgs. 4.2-10 to	Significant and Unavoidable.	Policy LU-A.23 (MM)	Yes	Yes	Yes, impacts remain

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	4.2-11; Impact LU-2, pgs. 4.11-13 to 4.11-21 FEIR: Pgs. 589-590, Revisions to Policy LU-A.23		Policy LU-A.24 (MM) Policy LU-A.1 Policy LU-A.2 Policy LU-A.12 Policy LU-A.13 Policy OS-B.1 Policy OS-B.6 Policy OS-B.7			significant and unavoidable.

1.3 AIR QUALITY

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	DEIR: Impact AQ-1, pgs. 4.3-17 to 4.3-19 FEIR: Pgs. 590-591, revisions to Policy OS- G.12 and AQ- 2	Significant and Unavoidable.	Policy OS-G.12 (MM) Policy OS-G.13 (MM) Policy TR-A.14 Policy OS-G.1 Policy OS-G.2	No	No	Any impacts would not be more significant than previously identified.
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	DEIR: Impact AQ-2, pgs. 4.3-19 to 4.3.21 FEIR: Pgs. 590-591, revisions to Policy OS- G.12 and AQ- 2	Significant and Unavoidable	Policy OS-G.12 (MM) Policy OS-G.13 (MM) Policy EJ-A.2 Policy EJ-A.3 Policy LU-H.7 Policy HS-A.7 Policy OS-G.1 through OS-G.15	No	No	Any impacts would not be more significant than previously identified.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	DEIR: Impact AQ-3, pgs. 4.3-22 to 4.3-26 FEIR: Pgs. 592-594, revisions to Mitigation Measure AQ-3	Significant and Unavoidable	Policy EJ-A.15 (MM) Policy OS-G.14 (MM) Policy EJ-A.5	No	No	Any impacts would not be more significant than previously identified.
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	DEIR: Impact AQ-4, pg. 4.3-26 FEIR: Pgs. 595, revisions to Mitigation Measure AQ-4	Less than Significant	None required.	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

1.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S.	DEIR: Impact BIO-1, pgs. 4.4-24 to 4.4-26 FEIR: Pgs. 595-596, revisions to Policy OS-E.19	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Policy OS-E.19 (MM) Goal OS-D Goal OS-E Goal OS-F Policy OS-E.6 Policy OS-E.1 Policy OS-E.3 Policy OS-E.9 Policy OS-F.4 Policy OS-F.10 Policy OS-F.11	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

EXHIBIT 1

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
Fish and Wildlife Service?						
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	DEIR: Impact BIO-2, pg. 4.4-26	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Goal OS-D Policy OS-D.1 Policy OS-D.2 Policy OS-D.4 Policy OS-D.6	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	DEIR: Impact BIO-2, pg. 4.4-26	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Goal OS-D Policy OS-D.1 Policy OS-D.2 Policy OS-D.4 Policy OS-D.6	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	DEIR: Impact BIO-3, pg. 4.4-27	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy OS-D.4 Policy OS-D.6 Policy OS-D.5 Policy OS-E.3 Policy OS-E.13 Policy OS-E.6 Policy OS-E.14 Policy OS-E.15	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	DEIR: Impact BIO-4, pg. 4.4-28	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy OS-A.20 Policy OS-F.4	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	DEIR: Impact BIO-5, pgs. 4.4-28 to 4.4-29	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Goal OS-E Policy OS-E.1 Policy OS-E.3 Policy OS-E.5 Policy OS-E.12 Policy OS-E.13	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

1.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to in § 15064.5?	DEIR: Impact CR-1, pgs. 4.5-13 to 4.5-15	Significant and Unavoidable	Policy OS-J.2 (MM) Policy ED-A.7 Policy LU-D.2 Policy OS-J.1 Policy OS-J.3 Policy OS-J.4 Policy OS-J.7 Policy OS-J.10	No	No	Any impacts would not be more significant than previously identified.
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	DEIR: Impact CR-2, pgs. 4.5-15 to 4.5-16	Significant and Unavoidable	Policy OS-J.4. (MM) Goal OS-J Policies OS-J.1 through OS-J.7	No	No	Any impacts would not be more significant than previously identified.
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	DEIR: Impact CR-3, pg. 4.5-16	Less than Significant	None required.	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

1.6 ENERGY

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	DEIR: Impact E-1, pgs. 4.6-10 to 4.6-15	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Goal HS-G Policy HS-G.1 Policy HS-G.4 Policy LU-H.7 Policy PF-F.11 Policy TR-A.14 Policy TR-A.15 Policy TR-A.23 Policy TR-A.24 Policy TR-B.1 Policy TR-B.2 Policy TR-B.3 Policy TR-B.6 Policy TR-B.7 Policy TR-C.3 Policy TR-D.4 Policy TR-D.8 Policy TR-E.5 Policy OS-G.1 Policy OS-G.2 Policy OS-G.6 Policy OS-G.7 Policy OS-G.8 Policy OS-G.9 Policy OS-G.10	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	DEIR: Impact E-2, pgs. 4.6-15 to 4.6-17	No impact	No mitigation required.	No	No	Not applicable

1.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:						
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	DEIR: Impact GEO-1, pgs. 4.7-14 to 4.7-16	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy HS-D.3 Policy HS-D.7 Policy HS-D.10	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	DEIR: Impact GEO-1, pgs. 4.7-14 to 4.7-16	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy LU-F.A	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	DEIR: Impact GEO-1, pgs. 4.7-14 to 4.7-16	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy HS-D.12	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
iv) Landslides?	DEIR: Impact GEO-1, pgs. 4.7-14 to 4.7-16	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy HS-D.10 Policy HS-D.11 Policy LU-B.12 Policy HS-D.6 Policy HS-D.7 Policy HS-D.8	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
			Policy HS-D.9			
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	DEIR: Impact HWQ-1, pgs. 4.10-7 to 4.10-9: Impact HWQ-3, pgs. 4.10-11 to 4.10-12; Impact GEO-2, pgs. 4.7-16 to 4.7-17	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy LU-A.19 Policy HS-D.8	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	DEIR: Impact GEO-1, pgs. 4.7-14 to 4.7-16	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy HS-D.10 Policy HS-D.11 Policy LU-B.12 Policy HS-D.6 Policy HS-D.7 Policy HS-D.8 Policy HS-D.9	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994) creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	DEIR: Impact GEO-1, pgs. 4.7-14 to 4.7-16; Impact GEO-3, pgs. 4.7-17 to 4.7-18	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy HS-D.7	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	DEIR: Impact GEO-4, pgs. 4.7-18 to 4.7-19	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy PF-D.4 Policy PF-D.6	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological	DEIR:	Significant and Unavoidable	No feasible mitigation. Goal OS-J	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible,

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
resource or site or unique geological feature?	Impact GEO-5, pgs. 4.7-19 to 4.7-20		Policy OS-J.4			however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

1.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	DEIR: Impact GHG-1, pgs. 4.8-16 to 4.8-18 FEIR: Pg. 596, revisions to Mitigation Measure GHG-1 and GHG-2	Significant and Unavoidable	Policy HS-H.10 (MM) Policy HS-H.11 (MM)	No	No	Any impacts would not be more significant than previously identified.
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	DEIR: Impact GHG-2, pgs. 4.8-18 to 4.8-21	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy HS-D.4 Policy TR-A.22 Policy LU-F.1 Policy LU-F.3 Policy OS-G.3	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

1.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	DEIR: Impact HAZ-1, pgs. 4.9-17 to 4.9-19	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal HS-F	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	DEIR: Impact HAZ-1, pgs. 4.9-17 to 4.9-19	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal HS-F	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	DEIR: Impact HAZ-2, pg. 4.9-20	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required.	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	DEIR: Impact HAZ-3, pg. 4.9-21	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy HS-F.6	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or	DEIR: Impact HAZ-4, pg. 4.9-22	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal HS-E Policy HS-E.2 Policy HS-E.3	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
working in the project area?						
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	DEIR: Impact HAZ-5, pg. 4.9-23	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required.	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	DEIR: Impact WFR-2, pgs. 4.18-15 to 4.18-21; Impact WFR-4, pgs. 4.18-21 to 4.18-22	Significant and Unavoidable.	No feasible mitigation. Policy HS-B.4 Policy HS-B.6 Goal HS-B Policy HS-B.1 Policy HS-B.2 Policy HS-B.3 Policy HS-B.5 Policy HS-B.10 Policy HS-B.11 Policy HS-B.12 Policy HS-B.13 Policy HS-B.14 Policy HS-B.17 Policy HS-B.18 Policy HS-B.21 Policy HS-B.22 Policy HS-B.23 Policy HS-B.25 Policy HS-B.26 Policy HS-B.27 Policy HS-B.28 Policy HS-B.29	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible. The Project area is not one that is susceptible to wildland fire, however any potential for impacts was already deemed significant and unavoidable.

1.10 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge	DEIR: Impact HWQ-1, pgs.	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required.	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	4.10-7 to 4.10-9		Policy OS-A.24 Goal LU-C Goal OS-A Goal PF-C Goal PF-D Goal OS-D Goal OS-E Goal HS-F			than significant.
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	DEIR: Impact HWQ-2, pgs. 4.10-9 to 4.10-11	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy PF-A.4 Policy PF-C.7 Policy PF-C.6 Policy PF-C.23 Policy LU-F.4 Policy LU-F.14 Policy LU-G.4 Policy LU-F.4 Policy OS-A.2 Policy OS-A.5 Policy OS-A.6 Policy OS-A.7 Policy OS-A.11 Policy OS-A.14	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:						
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	DEIR: Impact HWQ-1, pgs. 4.10-7 to 4.10-9: Impact HWQ-3, pgs. 4.10-11 to 4.10-12; Impact GEO-	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy OS-A.24 Policy HS-D.9 Goal PF-E Policy PF-E.4 Policy PF-E.11 Policy PF-E.13 Policy PF-E.16 Policy PF-E.20	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
	2, pgs. 4.7-16 to 4.7-17					
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;	DEIR: Impact HWQ-4, pgs. 4.10-13 to 4.10-14	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy LU-G.4 Goal PF-E Policy HS-D.9 Policy OS-A.21	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	DEIR: Impact HWQ-4, pgs. 4.10-13 to 4.10-14	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy LU-G.4 Goal PF-E Policy HS-D.9 Policy OS-A.21	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	DEIR: Impact HWQ-4, pgs. 4.10-13 to 4.10-14	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy LU-G.4 Goal PF-E Policy HS-D.9 Policy OS-A.21	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	DEIR: Impact HWQ-5, pgs. 4.10-14 to 4.10-15	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal PF-E Policy PF-E.1 Policy PF-E.12 Policy PF-E.9 Policy PF-E.20 Policy HS-C.2 Policy HS-C.9 Policy HS-C.10 Policy HS-C.11 Policy HS-C.12 Policy HS-C.16 Policy HS-C.20	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	DEIR: Impact HWQ-2, pgs. 4.10-9 to 4.10-11	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy PF-A.4 Policy PF-C.7 Policy PF-C.6 Policy PF-C.23 Policy LU-F.4 Policy LU-F.14 Policy LU-G.4 Policy LU-F.4 Policy OS-A.2 Policy OS-A.5 Policy OS-A.6 Policy OS-A.7 Policy OS-A.11 Policy OS-A.14	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

1.11 LAND USE AND PLANNING

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
a) Physically divide an established community?	DEIR: Impact LU-1, pgs. 4.11-11 to 4.11-13	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal LU-F Policy LU-F.1 Policy LU-F.2 Policy LU-F.3 Policy LU-F.4 Policy LU-F.14 Policy TR-A.14 Policy TR-A.23 Policy TR-A.24	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the	DEIR: Impact LU-2, pgs. 4.11-13 to 4.11-21	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal LU-A Policy LU-A.1 Policy LU-A.2 Policy LU-A.7	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			Policy LU-A.12 Policy LU-A.13 Policy LU-A.16 Policy LU-A.17 Goal LU-B Goal LU-C Goal LU-D Goal LU-E Goal LU-F Policy LU-F.4 Policy LU-F.8 Goal LU-G Policy LU-G.4 Policy LU-G.6 Goal TR-A Policy TR-A.14 Policy TR-A.15 Policy TR-A.23 Policy TR-A.24 Goal TR-B Policy TR-B.2 Policy TR-B.3 Policy TR-B.6 Goal TR-D Policy TR-D.1 Policy TR-D.8 Goal TR-E Policy TR-E.5 Goal OS-D Goal OS-E			

1.12 MINERAL RESOURCES

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to	DEIR: Section 4.19.1 (Effects Found Not	No impact.	None required.	No	No	Not applicable

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
the region and the residents of the state?	to Be Significant), pg. 4.19-1					
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	DEIR: Section 4.19.1 (Effects Found Not to Be Significant), pg. 4.19-1	No impact.	None required.	No	No	Not applicable

1.13 NOISE

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	DEIR: Impact N-1, pgs. 4.12-28 to 4.12.29; Impact N-2, pgs. 4.12-30 to 4.12-34	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policies HS-H.1 through HS-H.9 Policy ED-B.14 Policy LU-F.3 Policy LU-F.8 Policy TR-A.14 Policy TR-A.23 Policy TR-A.24 Policy TR-B.1 Policies TR-B.1 through TR-B.7 Policy TR-C.3 Policy TR-D.8 Policy TR-E.1 Policy TR-E.5 Policy TR-E.6 Policy EJ-A.1	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
b) Generation of excessive ground borne vibration or	DEIR:	Less than Significant.	Policy HS-H.12 (MM) Policy HS-H.6	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
ground borne noise levels?	Impact N-3, pgs. 4.12-35 to 4.12-36 FEIR: Pgs. 596-597, revisions to Mitigation Measure N-1		Policy LU-F.30 Policy EJ-A.1			
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	DEIR: Impact N-4, pg. 4.12-37	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy HS-H.9 Policy HS-H.3	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

1.14 POPULATION AND HOUSING

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	DEIR: Impact PH-1, pgs. 4.13-10 to 4.13-11	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policies LU-A.1 through LU-A.22 Policies LU-B.1 through LU-B.14 Policies LU-C.1 through LU-C.12 Policies LU-D.1 through LU-D.4	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
			Policies LU-E.1 through LU-E.24 Policies LU-F.1 through LU-F.11			
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	DEIR: Impact PH-2, pg. 4.13-12	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy LU-F.5 Policy LU-H.1 Policy LU-H.4 Policy LU-G.A.	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

1.15 PUBLIC SERVICES

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:						
i) Fire protection?	DEIR: Impact PS-1, pgs. 4.14-16 to 4.14-17	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal PF-H Policy PF-H.2	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
			Policy PF-H.7 Policy PF-H.8 Policy LU-A.1			
ii) Police protection?	DEIR: Impact PS-2, pgs. 4.14-18 to 4.14-19	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal PF-G Policies PF-G.2 through PF-G.6 Policy LU-A.1	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
iii) Schools?	DEIR: Impact PS-3, pg. 4.14-19	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policies PF-I.1 through PF-I.8	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
iv) Parks?	DEIR: Impact PS-4, pg. 4.14-20	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy PF-I.9	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
v) Other public facilities?	DEIR: Impact PS-5, pgs. 4.14-21 to 4.14-22	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal OS-H Policy OS-H.2 Policy OS-H.9 Goal OS-D Goal OS-E	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

1.16 RECREATION

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	DEIR: Impact PS-5, pgs. 4.14-21 to 4.14-22	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal OS-H Policy OS-H.2 Policy OS-H.9 Goal OS-D Goal OS-E	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the	DEIR:	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal OS-H	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	Impact PS-5, pgs. 4.14-21 to 4.14-22		Policy OS-H.2 Policy OS-H.9 Goal OS-D Goal OS-E			than significant.

1.17 TRANSPORTATION

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	DEIR: Impact LU-1, pgs. 4.11-11 to 4.11-13; Impact LU-2, pgs. 4.11-13 to 4.11-21; Impact T-1, pgs. 4.15-12 to 4.15-15	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal TR-A Policy TR-A.7 Policy TR-A.8 Policy TR-A.14 Policy TR-A.15 Policy TR-A.23 Policy TR-A.24 Goal TR-B Policy TR-B.2 Policy TR-B.7 Goal TR-C Goal TR-D Policy TR-D.1 Policy TR-D.4 Policy TR-D.8 Goal TR-E Policy TR-E.5	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	DEIR: Impact T-2, pgs. 4.15-15 to 4.15-20 FEIR: Pg. 597, revisions to Policy TR-A.25	Significant and Unavoidable.	Mitigation Measure T-1: VMT Policy Policy TR-A.25 (MM) Policy ED-B.14 Policy LU-F.3 Policy LU-F.8 Policy TR-A.14 Policy TR-A.23	No	No	Any impacts would not be more significant than previously identified.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
			Policy TR-A.24 Policies TR-B.2 through TR-B.7 Policy TR-C.3 Policy TR-D.8			
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	DEIR: Impact T-3, pgs. 4.15-20 to 4.15-22	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal TR-A Policy TR-A.1 Policy TR-A.4 Policy TR-A.6 Policy TR-A.10 Policy TR-A.23 Policy TR-A.24 Goal TR-B Policy TR-B.7	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	DEIR: Impact T-4, pgs. 4.15-23 to 4.15-24	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal TR-C Goal HS-A Policy HS-A.1 Policy HS-A.2 Policy HS-A.3 Policy HS-A.8 Policy HS-B.4 Policy HS-B.5	No	No	Yes, mitigation remains unnecessary.

1.18 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined						

EXHIBIT 1

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:						
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in the local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	DEIR: Impact TCR-1, pgs. 4.16-6 to 4.16-7; Impact CR-1, pgs. 4.5-13 to 4.5-15; Impact CR-2, pgs. 4.5-15 to 4.5-16	Significant and Unavoidable	No feasible mitigation. Policies OS-J.1 through OS-J.6	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible, however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	DEIR: Impact TCR-1, pgs. 4.16-6 to 4.16-7; Impact CR-1, pgs. 4.5-13 to 4.5-15; Impact CR-2, pgs. 4.5-15 to 4.5-16	Significant and Unavoidable	No feasible mitigation. Policies OS-J.1 through OS-J.6	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible, however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

1.19 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	DEIR: Impact UTL-1, pgs. 4.17-15 to 4.17-21	Significant and Unavoidable	No feasible mitigation. Goal PF-A Policies PF-A.1 through PF-A.5 Goal PF-B Policy PF-B.1 Policy PF-B.3 Policy PF-B.4 Goal PF-D Policy PF-D.1 Policy PF-D.2 Policy PF-D.4 Policy PF-D.5 Policy PF-D.6 Policy PF-D.7 Goal PF-E Policy PF-E.1 Policy PF-E.4 Policy PF-E.6 Policy PF-E.7 Policy PF-E.8 Goal PF-J Policies PF-J.1 through PF-J.4	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible, however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	DEIR: Impact UTL-2, pgs. 4.17-21 to 4.17-24	Significant and Unavoidable	No feasible mitigation. Goal OS-A Policy OS-A.1 Policy OS-A.2 Policy OS-A.3 Policy OS-A.4 Policy OS-A.9 Policy OS-A.10	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible, however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the	DEIR: Impact UTL-3, pgs. 4.17-24 to 4.17-26	Significant and Unavoidable	No feasible mitigation.	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible, however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
provider's existing commitments?						
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	DEIR: Impact UTL-4, pgs. 4.17-26 to 4.17-29	Significant and Unavoidable	No feasible mitigation. Goal PF-F Policies PF-F.1 through PF-F.6 Policy PF-F.9 Policy PF-F.10 Policy PF-F.11 Policy PF-F.12	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible, however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable..
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	DEIR: Impact UTL-4, pgs. 4.17-26 to 4.17-29	Significant and Unavoidable	No feasible mitigation. Goal PF-F Policies PF-F.1 through PF-F.6 Policy PF-F.9 Policy PF-F.10 Policy PF-F.11 Policy PF-F.12	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible, however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

1.20 WILDFIRE

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	DEIR: Impact WFR-1, pgs. 4.18-11 to 4.18-14	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal HS-A Policies HS-A.1 through HS-A.13 Goal HS-B Policy HS-B.6 Policy HS-B.7 Policy HS-B.8 Policy HS-B.9 Policy HS-B.19 Policy HS-B.20 Policy HS-B.24	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

EXHIBIT 1

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
			Policy HS-B.26 Policy HS-B.30 Policy HS-B.31			
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrollable spread of wildfire?	DEIR: Impact WFR-2, pgs. 4.18-15 to 4.18-20	Significant and Unavoidable	No feasible mitigation. Policy HS-B.4 Policy HS-B.6 Goal HS-B Policy HS-B.1 Policy HS-B.2 Policy HS-B.3 Policy HS-B.5 Policy HS-B.10 Policy HS-B.11 Policy HS-B.12 Policy HS-B.13 Policy HS-B.14 Policy HS-B.17 Policy HS-B.18 Policy HS-B.21 Policy HS-B.22 Policy HS-B.23 Policy HS-B.25 Policy HS-B.26 Policy HS-B.27 Policy HS-B.28 Policy HS-B.29	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible. The Project area is not one that is susceptible to wildland fire, however any potential for impacts was already deemed significant and unavoidable.
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	DEIR: Impact WFR-3, pgs. 4.18-20 to 4.18-21	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy HS-B.7	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	DEIR: Impact WFR-2, pgs. 4.18-15 to 4.18-20; Impact WFR-4, pgs. 4.18-21 to 4.18-22	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy HS-B.4	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

2 DEL REY COMPARITIVE EVALUATION CHECKLIST

2.1 AESTHETICS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
a) Have substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	DEIR: Impact AES-1, pgs. 4.1-17 to 4.1-18	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Goal OS-K Policy OS-K.1 Policy OS-K.2 Policy OS-K.3 Policy OS-K.4	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	DEIR: Impact AES-2, pg. 4.1-19	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Goal OS-L Policy OS-L.3 Policy OS-L.6 Policy OS-L.9	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	DEIR: Impact AES-3, pgs. 4.1-20 to 4.1-22	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy OS-L.4 Policy LU-B.11 Policy OS-K.1 Policy OS-K.2 Policy OS-K.3 Policy OS-K.4	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	DEIR: Impact AES-4, ph. 4.1-22 to 4.1-23	Less than Significant	None required.	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

2.2 AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	DEIR: Impact AG-1, pgs. 4.2-10 to 4.2-11; Impact LU-2, pgs. 4.11-13 to 4.11-21 FEIR: Pgs. 589-590, Revisions to Policy LU-A.23	Significant and Unavoidable.	Policy LU-A.23 (MM) Policy LU-A.24 (MM) Policy LU-A.1 Policy LU-A.2 Policy LU-A.12 Policy LU-A.13 Policy OS-B.1 Policy OS-B.6 Policy OS-B.7	Yes	Yes	Yes, impacts remain significant and unavoidable.
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	DEIR: Impact AG-2, pgs. 4.2-12 to 4.2-13; Impact LU-2, pgs. 4.11-13 to 4.11-21	Significant and Unavoidable.	No mitigation feasible. Policy LU-A.1 Policy LU-A.16 Policy LU-A.17	Yes	Yes	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible, however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	DEIR: Impact AG-3, pgs. 4.2-13 to 4.2-14	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy OS-B.7 Policy OS-B.9	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	DEIR: Impact AG-3, pgs. 4.2-13 to 4.2-14	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy OS-B.7 Policy OS-B.9	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of	DEIR: Impact AG-1, pgs. 4.2-10 to 4.2-11; Impact LU-2,	Significant and Unavoidable.	Policy LU-A.23 (MM) Policy LU-A.24 (MM) Policy LU-A.1 Policy LU-A.2	Yes	Yes	Yes, impacts remain significant and unavoidable.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	pgs. 4.11-13 to 4.11-21 FEIR: Pgs. 589-590, Revisions to Policy LU-A.23		Policy LU-A.12 Policy LU-A.13 Policy OS-B.1 Policy OS-B.6 Policy OS-B.7			

2.3 AIR QUALITY

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	DEIR: Impact AQ-1, pgs. 4.3-17 to 4.3-19 FEIR: Pgs. 590-591, revisions to Policy OS-G.12 and AQ-2	Significant and Unavoidable.	Policy OS-G.12 (MM) Policy OS-G.13 (MM) Policy TR-A.14 Policy OS-G.1 Policy OS-G.2	No	No	Any impacts would not be more significant than previously identified.
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	DEIR: Impact AQ-2, pgs. 4.3-19 to 4.3.21 FEIR: Pgs. 590-591, revisions to Policy OS-G.12 and AQ-2	Significant and Unavoidable	Policy OS-G.12 (MM) Policy OS-G.13 (MM) Policy EJ-A.2 Policy EJ-A.3 Policy LU-H.7 Policy HS-A.7 Policy OS-G.1 through OS-G.15	No	No	Any impacts would not be more significant than previously identified.
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial	DEIR:	Significant and Unavoidable	Policy EJ-A.15 (MM)	No	No	Any impacts would not be more

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
pollutant concentrations?	Impact AQ-3, pgs. 4.3-22 to 4.3-26 FEIR: Pgs. 592-594, revisions to Mitigation Measure AQ-3		Policy OS-G.14(MM) Policy EJ-A.5			significant than previously identified.
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	DEIR: Impact AQ-4, pg. 4.3-26 FEIR: Pgs. 595, revisions to Mitigation Measure AQ-4	Less than Significant	None required.	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

2.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S.	DEIR: Impact BIO-1, pgs. 4.4-24 to 4.4-26 FEIR: Pgs. 595-596, revisions to Policy OS-E.19	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Policy OS-E.19 (MM) Goal OS-D Goal OS-E Goal OS-F Policy OS-E.6 Policy OS-E.1 Policy OS-E.3 Policy OS-E.9 Policy OS-F.4 Policy OS-F.10 Policy OS-F.11	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
Fish and Wildlife Service?						
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	DEIR: Impact BIO-2, pg. 4.4-26	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Goal OS-D Policy OS-D.1 Policy OS-D.2 Policy OS-D.4 Policy OS-D.6	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	DEIR: Impact BIO-2, pg. 4.4-26	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Goal OS-D Policy OS-D.1 Policy OS-D.2 Policy OS-D.4 Policy OS-D.6	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	DEIR: Impact BIO-3, pg. 4.4-27	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy OS-D.4 Policy OS-D.6 Policy OS-D.5 Policy OS-E.3 Policy OS-E.13 Policy OS-E.6 Policy OS-E.14 Policy OS-E.15	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	DEIR: Impact BIO-4, pg. 4.4-28	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy OS-A.20 Policy OS-F.4	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	DEIR: Impact BIO-5, pgs. 4.4-28 to 4.4-29	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Goal OS-E Policy OS-E.1 Policy OS-E.3 Policy OS-E.5 Policy OS-E.12 Policy OS-E.13	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

2.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to in § 15064.5?	DEIR: Impact CR-1, pgs. 4.5-13 to 4.5-15	Significant and Unavoidable	Policy OS-J.2 (MM) Policy ED-A.7 Policy LU-D.2 Policy OS-J.1 Policy OS-J.3 Policy OS-J.4 Policy OS-J.7 Policy OS-J.10	No	No	Any impacts would not be more significant than previously identified.
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	DEIR: Impact CR-2, pgs. 4.5-15 to 4.5-16	Significant and Unavoidable	Policy OS-J.4 (MM) Goal OS-J Policies OS-J.1 through OS-J.7	No	No	Any impacts would not be more significant than previously identified.
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	DEIR: Impact CR-3, pg. 4.5-16	Less than Significant	None required.	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

2.6 ENERGY

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	DEIR: Impact E-1, pgs. 4.6-10 to 4.6-15	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Goal HS-G Policy HS-G.1 Policy HS-G.4 Policy LU-H.7 Policy PF-F.11 Policy TR-A.14 Policy TR-A.15 Policy TR-A.23 Policy TR-A.24 Policy TR-B.1 Policy TR-B.2 Policy TR-B.3 Policy TR-B.6 Policy TR-B.7 Policy TR-C.3 Policy TR-D.4 Policy TR-D.8 Policy TR-E.5 Policy OS-G.1 Policy OS-G.2 Policy OS-G.6 Policy OS-G.7 Policy OS-G.8 Policy OS-G.9 Policy OS-G.10	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	DEIR: Impact E-2, pgs. 4.6-15 to 4.6-17	No impact	No mitigation required.	No	No	Not applicable

2.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:						
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	DEIR: Impact GEO-1, pgs. 4.7-14 to 4.7-16	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy HS-D.3 Policy HS-D.7 Policy HS-D.10	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	DEIR: Impact GEO-1, pgs. 4.7-14 to 4.7-16	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy LU-F.A	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	DEIR: Impact GEO-1, pgs. 4.7-14 to 4.7-16	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy HS-D.12	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
iv) Landslides?	DEIR: Impact GEO-1, pgs. 4.7-14 to 4.7-16	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy HS-D.10 Policy HS-D.11 Policy LU-B.12 Policy HS-D.6 Policy HS-D.7 Policy HS-D.8 Policy HS-D.9	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	DEIR: Impact HWQ-1, pgs. 4.10-7 to 4.10-9:	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy LU-A.19 Policy HS-D.8	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

EXHIBIT 1

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
	Impact HWQ-3, pgs. 4.10-11 to 4.10-12; Impact GEO-2, pgs. 4.7-16 to 4.7-17					
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	DEIR: Impact GEO-1, pgs. 4.7-14 to 4.7-16	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy HS-D.10 Policy HS-D.11 Policy LU-B.12 Policy HS-D.6 Policy HS-D.7 Policy HS-D.8 Policy HS-D.9	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994) creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	DEIR: Impact GEO-1, pgs. 4.7-14 to 4.7-16; Impact GEO-3, pgs. 4.7-17 to 4.7-18	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy HS-D.7	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	DEIR: Impact GEO-4, pgs. 4.7-18 to 4.7-19	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy PF-D.4 Policy PF-D.6	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	DEIR: Impact GEO-5, pgs. 4.7-19 to 4.7-20	Significant and Unavoidable	No feasible mitigation. Goal OS-J Policy OS-J.4	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible, however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

2.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	DEIR: Impact GHG-1, pgs. 4.8-16 to 4.8-18 FEIR: Pg. 596, revisions to Mitigation Measure GHG-1 and GHG-2	Significant and Unavoidable	Policy HS-H.10 (MM) Policy HS-H.11 (MM)	No	No	Any impacts would not be more significant than previously identified.
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	DEIR: Impact GHG-2, pgs. 4.8-18 to 4.8-21	Less than Significant	No mitigation required. Policy HS-D.4 Policy TR-A.22 Policy LU-F.1 Policy LU-F.3 Policy OS-G.3	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

2.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	DEIR: Impact HAZ-1, pgs. 4.9-17 to 4.9-19	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal HS-F	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset	DEIR: Impact HAZ-1, pgs. 4.9-17 to 4.9-19	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal HS-F	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?						
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	DEIR: Impact HAZ-2, pg. 4.9-20	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required.	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	DEIR: Impact HAZ-3, pg. 4.9-21	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy HS-F.6	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	DEIR: Impact HAZ-4, pg. 4.9-22	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal HS-E Policy HS-E.2 Policy HS-E.3	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or	DEIR: Impact HAZ-5, pg. 4.9-23	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required.	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
emergency evacuation plan?						
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	DEIR: Impact WFR-2, pgs. 4.18-15 to 4.18-21; Impact WFR-4, pgs. 4.18-21 to 4.18-22	Significant and Unavoidable.	No feasible mitigation. Policy HS-B.4 Policy HS-B.6 Goal HS-B Policy HS-B.1 Policy HS-B.2 Policy HS-B.3 Policy HS-B.5 Policy HS-B.10 Policy HS-B.11 Policy HS-B.12 Policy HS-B.13 Policy HS-B.14 Policy HS-B.17 Policy HS-B.18 Policy HS-B.21 Policy HS-B.22 Policy HS-B.23 Policy HS-B.25 Policy HS-B.26 Policy HS-B.27 Policy HS-B.28 Policy HS-B.29	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible. The Project area is not one that is susceptible to wildland fire, however any potential for impacts was already deemed significant and unavoidable.

2.10 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	DEIR: Impact HWQ-1, pgs. 4.10-7 to 4.10-9	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy OS-A.24 Goal LU-C Goal OS-A Goal PF-C Goal PF-D Goal OS-D Goal OS-E Goal HS-F	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	DEIR: Impact HWQ-2, pgs. 4.10-9 to 4.10-11	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy PF-A.4 Policy PF-C.7 Policy PF-C.6 Policy PF-C.23 Policy LU-F.4 Policy LU-F.14 Policy LU-G.4 Policy LU-F.4 Policy OS-A.2 Policy OS-A.5 Policy OS-A.6 Policy OS-A.7 Policy OS-A.11 Policy OS-A.14	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:						
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	DEIR: Impact HWQ-1, pgs. 4.10-7 to 4.10-9; Impact HWQ-3, pgs. 4.10-11 to 4.10-12; Impact GEO-2, pgs. 4.7-16 to 4.7-17	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy OS-A.24 Policy HS-D.9 Goal PF-E Policy PF-E.4 Policy PF-E.11 Policy PF-E.13 Policy PF-E.16 Policy PF-E.20	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;	DEIR: Impact HWQ-4, pgs. 4.10-13 to 4.10-14	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy LU-G.4 Goal PF-E Policy HS-D.9 Policy OS-A.21	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the	DEIR: Impact HWQ-4, pgs.	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy LU-G.4 Goal PF-E	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

EXHIBIT 1

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	4.10-13 to 4.10-14		Policy HS-D.9 Policy OS-A.21			
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	DEIR: Impact HWQ-4, pgs. 4.10-13 to 4.10-14	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy LU-G.4 Goal PF-E Policy HS-D.9 Policy OS-A.21	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	DEIR: Impact HWQ-5, pgs. 4.10-14 to 4.10-15	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal PF-E Policy PF-E.1 Policy PF-E.12 Policy PF-E.9 Policy PF-E.20 Policy HS-C.2 Policy HS-C.9 Policy HS-C.10 Policy HS-C.11 Policy HS-C.12 Policy HS-C.16 Policy HS-C.20	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	DEIR: Impact HWQ-2, pgs. 4.10-9 to 4.10-11	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy PF-A.4 Policy PF-C.7 Policy PF-C.6 Policy PF-C.23 Policy LU-F.4 Policy LU-F.14 Policy LU-G.4 Policy LU-F.4 Policy OS-A.2 Policy OS-A.5 Policy OS-A.6 Policy OS-A.7 Policy OS-A.11 Policy OS-A.14	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

2.11 LAND USE AND PLANNING

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
a) Physically divide an established community?	DEIR: Impact LU-1, pgs. 4.11-11 to 4.11-13	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal LU-F Policy LU-F.1 Policy LU-F.2 Policy LU-F.3 Policy LU-F.4 Policy LU-F.14 Policy TR-A.14 Policy TR-A.23 Policy TR-A.24	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	DEIR: Impact LU-2, pgs. 4.11-13 to 4.11-21	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal LU-A Policy LU-A.1 Policy LU-A.2 Policy LU-A.7 Policy LU-A.12 Policy LU-A.13 Policy LU-A.16 Policy LU-A.17 Goal LU-B Goal LU-C Goal LU-D Goal LU-E Goal LU-F Policy LU-F.4 Policy LU-F.8 Goal LU-G Policy LU-G.4 Policy LU-G.6 Goal TR-A Policy TR-A.14 Policy TR-A.15 Policy TR-A.23 Policy TR-A.24 Goal TR-B Policy TR-B.2 Policy TR-B.3 Policy TR-B.6 Goal TR-D Policy TR-D.1 Policy TR-D.8 Goal TR-E Policy TR-E.5 Goal OS-D Goal OS-E	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

2.12 MINERAL RESOURCES

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	DEIR: Section 4.19.1 (Effects Found Not to Be Significant), pg. 4.19-1	No impact.	None required.	No	No	Not applicable
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	DEIR: Section 4.19.1 (Effects Found Not to Be Significant), pg. 4.19-1	No impact.	None required.	No	No	Not applicable

2.13 NOISE

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	DEIR: Impact N-1, pgs. 4.12-28 to 4.12.29; Impact N-2, pgs. 4.12-30 to 4.12-34	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policies HS-H.1 through HS-H.9 Policy ED-B.14 Policy LU-F.3 Policy LU-F.8 Policy TR-A.14 Policy TR-A.23 Policy TR-A.24 Policy TR-B.1 Policies TR-B.1 through TR-B.7 Policy TR-C.3 Policy TR-D.8 Policy TR-E.1 Policy TR-E.5 Policy TR-E.6 Policy EJ-A.1	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

b)	Generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	DEIR: Impact N-3, pgs. 4.12-35 to 4.12-36 FEIR: Pgs. 596- 597, revisions to Mitigation Measure N-1	Less than Significant.	Policy HS-H.12 (MM) Policy HS-H.6 Policy LU-F.30 Policy EJ-A.1	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
c)	For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	DEIR: Impact N-4, pg. 4.12-37	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy HS-H.9 Policy HS-H.3	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

2.14 POPULATION AND HOUSING

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	DEIR: Impact PH-1, pgs. 4.13-10 to 4.13-11	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policies LU-A.1 through LU-A.22 Policies LU-B.1 through LU-B.14 Policies LU-C.1 through LU-C.12 Policies LU-D.1 through LU-D.4 Policies LU-E.1 through LU-E.24 Policies LU-F.1 through LU-F.11	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	DEIR: Impact PH-2, pg. 4.13-12	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy LU-F.5 Policy LU-H.1 Policy LU-H.4 Policy LU-G.A.	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

2.15 PUBLIC SERVICES

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:						
i) Fire protection?	DEIR: Impact PS-1, pgs. 4.14-16 to 4.14-17	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal PF-H Policy PF-H.2 Policy PF-H.7 Policy PF-H.8 Policy LU-A.1	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
ii) Police protection?	DEIR:	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal PF-G	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less

EXHIBIT 1

	Impact PS-2, pgs. 4.14-18 to 4.14-19		Policies PF-G.2 through PF-G.6 Policy LU-A.1			than significant.
iii) Schools?	DEIR: Impact PS-3, pg. 4.14-19	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policies PF-I.1 through PF-I.8	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
iv) Parks?	DEIR: Impact PS-4, pg. 4.14-20	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy PF-I.9	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
v) Other public facilities?	DEIR: Impact PS-5, pgs. 4.14-21 to 4.14-22	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal OS-H Policy OS-H.2 Policy OS-H.9 Goal OS-D Goal OS-E	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

2.16 RECREATION

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	DEIR: Impact PS-5, pgs. 4.14-21 to 4.14-22	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal OS-H Policy OS-H.2 Policy OS-H.9 Goal OS-D Goal OS-E	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	DEIR: Impact PS-5, pgs. 4.14-21 to 4.14-22	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal OS-H Policy OS-H.2 Policy OS-H.9 Goal OS-D Goal OS-E	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

2.17 TRANSPORTATION

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	DEIR: Impact LU-1, pgs. 4.11-11 to 4.11-13; Impact LU-2, pgs. 4.11-13 to 4.11-21; Impact T-1, pgs. 4.15-12 to 4.15-15	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal TR-A Policy TR-A.7 Policy TR-A.8 Policy TR-A.14 Policy TR-A.15 Policy TR-A.23 Policy TR-A.24 Goal TR-B Policy TR-B.2 Policy TR-B.7 Goal TR-C Goal TR-D Policy TR-D.1 Policy TR-D.4 Policy TR-D.8 Goal TR-E Policy TR-E.5	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	DEIR: Impact T-2, pgs. 4.15-15 to 4.15-20 FEIR: Pg. 597, revisions to Policy TR-A.25	Significant and Unavoidable.	Mitigation Measure T-1: VMT Policy Policy TR-A.25 (MM) Policy ED-B.14 Policy LU-F.3 Policy LU-F.8 Policy TR-A.14 Policy TR-A.23 Policy TR-A.24 Policies TR-B.2 through TR-B.7 Policy TR-C.3 Policy TR-D.8	No	No	Any impacts would not be more significant than previously identified.
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	DEIR: Impact T-3, pgs. 4.15-20 to 4.15-22	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal TR-A Policy TR-A.1 Policy TR-A.4 Policy TR-A.6 Policy TR-A.10 Policy TR-A.23 Policy TR-A.24 Goal TR-B Policy TR-B.7	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	DEIR:	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required.	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less

	Impact T-4, pgs. 4.15-23 to 4.15-24		Goal TR-C Goal HS-A Policy HS-A.1 Policy HS-A.2 Policy HS-A.3 Policy HS-A.8 Policy HS-B.4 Policy HS-B.5			than significant.
--	---	--	--	--	--	----------------------

2.18 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:						
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in the local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	DEIR: Impact TCR-1, pgs. 4.16-6 to 4.16-7; Impact CR-1, pgs. 4.5-13 to 4.5-15; Impact CR-2, pgs. 4.5-15 to 4.5-16	Significant and Unavoidable	No feasible mitigation. Policies OS-J.1 through OS-J.6	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible, however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable..
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in	DEIR: Impact TCR-1, pgs. 4.16-6 to 4.16-7; Impact CR-1, pgs. 4.5-13 to 4.5-15; Impact CR-2, pgs. 4.5-15 to 4.5-16	Significant and Unavoidable	No feasible mitigation. Policies OS-J.1 through OS-J.6	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible, however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable..

subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

2.19 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/Resolve Impacts?
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	DEIR: Impact UTL-1, pgs. 4.17-15 to 4.17-21	Significant and Unavoidable	No feasible mitigation. Goal PF-A Policies PF-A.1 through PF-A.5 Goal PF-B Policy PF-B.1 Policy PF-B.3 Policy PF-B.4 Goal PF-D Policy PF-D.1 Policy PF-D.2 Policy PF-D.4 Policy PF-D.5 Policy PF-D.6 Policy PF-D.7 Goal PF-E Policy PF-E.1 Policy PF-E.4 Policy PF-E.6 Policy PF-E.7 Policy PF-E.8 Goal PF-J Policies PF-J.1 through PF-J.4	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible, however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development	DEIR: Impact UTL-2, pgs. 4.17-21 to 4.17-24	Significant and Unavoidable	No feasible mitigation. Goal OS-A Policy OS-A.1 Policy OS-A.2	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible, however

EXHIBIT 1

during normal, dry and multiple dry years?			Policy OS-A.3 Policy OS-A.4 Policy OS-A.9 Policy OS-A.10			impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	DEIR: Impact UTL-3, pgs. 4.17-24 to 4.17-26	Significant and Unavoidable	No feasible mitigation.	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible, however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable..
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	DEIR: Impact UTL-4, pgs. 4.17-26 to 4.17-29	Significant and Unavoidable	No feasible mitigation. Goal PF-F Policies PF-F.1 through PF-F.6 Policy PF-F.9 Policy PF-F.10 Policy PF-F.11 Policy PF-F.12	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible, however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	DEIR: Impact UTL-4, pgs. 4.17-26 to 4.17-29	Significant and Unavoidable	No feasible mitigation. Goal PF-F Policies PF-F.1 through PF-F.6 Policy PF-F.9 Policy PF-F.10 Policy PF-F.11 Policy PF-F.12	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible, however impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

2.20 WILDFIRE

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Where Impact Was Addressed in Previous Analysis	Level of Significance	Goals, Policies, or Mitigation that Reduce the Impact Identified in Previous Analysis	New or More Significant Impact?	New Information Requiring Additional Analysis?	Does Previous Goals, Policies, and/or Mitigation Address/ Resolve Impacts?
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	DEIR: Impact WFR-1, pgs. 4.18-11 to 4.18-14	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Goal HS-A Policies HS-A.1 through HS-A.13 Goal HS-B Policy HS-B.6	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.

EXHIBIT 1

			Policy HS-B.7 Policy HS-B.8 Policy HS-B.9 Policy HS-B.19 Policy HS-B.20 Policy HS-B.24 Policy HS-B.26 Policy HS-B.30 Policy HS-B.31			
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrollable spread of wildfire?	DEIR: Impact WFR-2, pgs. 4.18-15 to 4.18-20	Significant and Unavoidable	No feasible mitigation. Policy HS-B.4 Policy HS-B.6 Goal HS-B Policy HS-B.1 Policy HS-B.2 Policy HS-B.3 Policy HS-B.5 Policy HS-B.10 Policy HS-B.11 Policy HS-B.12 Policy HS-B.13 Policy HS-B.14 Policy HS-B.17 Policy HS-B.18 Policy HS-B.21 Policy HS-B.22 Policy HS-B.23 Policy HS-B.25 Policy HS-B.26 Policy HS-B.27 Policy HS-B.28 Policy HS-B.29	No	No	Mitigation was originally found to be infeasible. The Project area is not one that is susceptible to wildland fire, however any potential for impacts was already deemed significant and unavoidable.
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	DEIR: Impact WFR-3, pgs. 4.18-20 to 4.18-21	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy HS-B.7	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	DEIR: Impact WFR-2, pgs. 4.18-15 to 4.18-20; Impact WFR-4, pgs. 4.18-21 to 4.18-22	Less than Significant.	No mitigation required. Policy HS-B.4	No	No	Yes, impacts remain less than significant.



County of Fresno

Del Rey Community Plan

April 2025

Prepared For:

County of Fresno, Public Works and Planning Department

2220 Tulare Street, 6th Floor

Fresno, CA 93721

Prepared By:

Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group

455 W. Fir Avenue

Clovis, CA 93611

Table of Contents

1. Purpose and Background.....	1
Purpose of the Community Plan	1
Community Plan Organization	2
Community Profile.....	2
Location	2
Demographics	4
2. Del Rey Community Vision.....	6
Public Engagement.....	6
3. Community Plan Elements.....	8
Economic Development Element.....	9
Goals	9
Policies and Implementation Programs.....	9
Agriculture and Land Use Element.....	10
Goals	10
Policies and Implementation Programs.....	10
Transportation and Circulation Element.....	15
Goals	15
Policies and Implementation Programs.....	15
Public Facilities and Services Element.....	17
Goals	17
Policies and Implementation Programs.....	17
Open Space and Conservation Element.....	17
Goals	17
Policies and Implementation Programs.....	18
Health and Safety Element.....	18
Goals	18
Policies and Implementation Programs.....	19
Environmental Justice Element.....	19
Housing Element	19

List of Figures

Figure 1 – Vicinity Map	3
Figure 2 – Land Use Diagram	14
Figure 3 – Circulation Diagram	16

List of Tables

Table 1 – Del Rey Ethnic Population as of 2020	4
Table 2 – Del Rey Community Plan, Total Acres by Land Use	8
Table 3 – Land Use Designation Descriptions.....	10

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Del Rey Community Plan Update Community Meetings Summary

1. Purpose and Background

Purpose of the Community Plan

The Fresno County General Plan states “The fundamental policy directive of this General Plan is to direct intensive development to cities, unincorporated communities, and other areas where public facilities and infrastructure are available or can be provided consistent with the adopted General Plan or Community Plan.”¹

This Community Plan will be used to foster and identify opportunities for development. Throughout the public outreach process, fundamental issues such as economic development, agriculture and land use, transportation and circulation, public facilities and services, open space and conservation, health and safety, environmental justice, and housing were discussed with the community. These discussions are reflected in the goals, policies, and implementation programs. In addition, this Community Plan will help guide Del Rey’s future development and identify opportunities and needs for infrastructure improvements.

What is a Community Plan?

A community plan is a segment of the General Plan that provides a geographic focus. Accordingly, a community plan serves the same purpose as the General Plan except that community plans function at the community level while the General Plan functions at the County level.

Community plans are internally consistent with the General Plan but provide for more community-specific planning addressing the same elements as the General Plan. While community plans can be used to guide community development, they do not guarantee any development will occur nor are they a requirement for development.

The Del Rey Community Plan is consistent with the General Plan Policy Document adopted by the Fresno County Board of Supervisors on February 20, 2024, and is designed to implement the 2024 Fresno County General Plan at a community level. The content in this Community Plan has been identified to refine the intent of the General Plan as it applies to the Del Rey community to address issues of local importance. While the General Plan contains policies that apply to the whole County, Del Rey included, this Community Plan outlines goals, policies, and implementation programs specific to Del Rey. These Del Rey-specific criteria do not apply to the rest of the County. Where the Del Rey Community Plan is silent on a matter, the General Plan controls.

¹ Fresno County. 2024. "Fresno County General Plan Policy Document.", 2-52, https://www.fresnocountyca.gov/files/sharedassets/county/v/3/public-works-and-planning/development-services/planning-and-land-use/environmental-impact-reports/general-plan-review/fcgrp_general-plan_prd-county_01-12_24-clean.pdf.

Community Plan Organization

The chapters of the Del Rey Community Plan are as follows.

Chapter 1: Purpose and Background provides an overview of the purpose, intent, and organization of the Community Plan. This chapter also provides an outline for navigating the Community Plan and additional information about the community of Del Rey, including demographic information.

Chapter 2: Del Rey Community Vision provides a brief overview of the Community Plan update engagement process that led to the development of a vision statement, also included in this chapter. The statement represents the guiding vision that was used to develop the goals and policies of the Community Plan.

Chapter 3: Community Plan Elements outlines the community's goals, policies, and implementation programs related to development, expansion, and preservation specific to the Del Rey Community Plan boundary. The Community Plan elements include Economic Development, Agriculture and Land Use, Transportation and Circulation, Public Facilities and Services, Open Space and Conservation, Health and Safety, Environmental Justice, and Housing. This chapter also contains key diagrams, including the Land Use Diagram and Circulation Diagram.

Community Profile

Location

The community of Del Rey is an unincorporated community within Fresno County. Prior to 1898, Del Rey was known as Clifton. In 1898, when the railroad was built, Clifton was given the name Del Rey, named after the railroad station, Rancho Del Rey.²


Like most other communities and cities throughout Fresno County, Del Rey is an agriculturally-oriented community surrounded by farmland. Del Rey is situated between East American Avenue to the north and East Lincoln Avenue to the south. The nearest incorporated city is the City of Sanger, located approximately 1.8 miles northeast. The City of Fresno, the largest city in Fresno County, is located approximately five miles northwest of Del Rey (see *Figure 1 – Vicinity Map*). Del Rey is a census-designated place (CDP). A CDP is a statistical equivalent of an incorporated community, such as a city, but does not have a legally defined boundary or an active, functioning governmental structure.³ The Del Rey Community Plan covers 322 acres, or approximately 0.5 square miles, and contains 365 parcels as shown in *Figure 2 – Land Use Diagram*.⁴

² Durham, David L. 1998. California's Geographic Names: A Gazetteer of Historic and Modern Names of the State. Clovis, CA: Word Dancer Press.

³ United States Census Bureau. 2023. Census Designated Places. Accessed January 29, 2024. <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/bas/information/cdp.html>.

⁴ Based on GIS mapping data created during the 2024 Community Plan Update process.

Figure 1 – Vicinity Map



Demographics

In the past 30 years, Del Rey has seen both growth and decline in its population. In 1990, Del Rey had a population of 1,150 and approximately 284 occupied housing units.⁵ In 2000, Del Rey had seen a population decrease of 200 people, resulting in a community of 950 people housed by 240 housing units.⁶ Then, Del Rey's population trended upward and by 2010 its population increased by 72.5%, resulting in 1,639 people and 395 housing units.⁷ As of the 2020 Decennial Census, the community of Del Rey had a total population of 1,358 people, 381 total housing units, and an average household size of 3.74 people.

In contrast, Fresno County has seen a continual steady increase in population since 1990. In 1990, Fresno County's population was 667,490. By 2010, its population had grown to 930,450.⁸ As of the 2020 Census, Fresno County had a population of 1,008,654.⁹ Between 1990 and 2020, Fresno County saw a 33.8% increase in population.

Del Rey is predominantly Hispanic, with Hispanics and Latinos accounting for 89% of the total population. White people comprise the next largest ethnic group, representing 5.4% of Del Rey's population. A more detailed breakdown is provided in *Table 1*.

Table 1 – Del Rey Ethnic Population as of 2020

Ethnicity	Number	Percent
Hispanic or Latino	1,207	89.0%
White (Not Hispanic or Latino)	73	5.4%
Asian	45	3.3%
American Indian and Alaska Native	18	1.3%
Black or African American	13	1.0%
Total	1,356*	100%

Source: (United States Census Bureau 2020)

* This number varies from the previous section due to a discrepancy in the Census data from where it was retrieved.

Of the 1,358 people that reside in the community, approximately 1,123 are over the age of 16 and are considered a part of the eligible labor force. Of those 1,123 residents, 610, or 54.3%, are employed, whereas 45.7% are not employed.¹⁰ 97.9% of Del Rey's employed labor force commutes to work with an average commute time of 24.7 minutes.¹¹ Approximately 4.6% of the total population has a bachelor's

⁵ U.S. Department of Commerce. 1990. "1990 Census of Population. General Population Characteristics: California." Accessed January 29, 2024. <https://www2.census.gov/library/publications/decennial/1990/cp-1/cp-1-6-1.pdf>.

⁶ U.S. Department of Commerce. 2002. "California: 2000." Accessed January 29, 2024. <https://www2.census.gov/library/publications/2002/dec/phc-1-6.pdf>.

⁷ U.S. Department of Commerce. 2012. "California: 2010 Population and Housing Counts." Accessed January 29, 2024. <https://www2.census.gov/library/publications/decennial/2010/cph-2/cph-2-6.pdf>.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ United States Census Bureau. 2023. Quick Facts Fresno County, CA. Accessed January 30, 2024. <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/fresnocountycalifornia/PST045222>.

¹⁰ 45.7% represents the total percent of Del Rey residents over the age of 16 who are not employed. This is *not* a representation of unemployment in Del Rey and does not take into account students, retirees, and other community members who are not actively searching for employment.

¹¹ United States Census Bureau. 2022. Employment Status. Accessed January 31, 2024. <https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDP5Y2022.DP03?g=160XX00US0618674>.

EXHIBIT 2

degree or higher in Del Rey, compared to Fresno County which is at 24.2% of its total population.¹² In Del Rey, 9.5% of residents do not have health care coverage, whereas 6.1% are lacking health care coverage in Fresno County.¹³

The median household income (MHI) in Del Rey is estimated to be \$48,897, while the MHI in Fresno County is estimated to be \$69,571. Del Rey is considered a Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community (DUC) since the median household income in the community is less than 80% of the statewide average, as defined in Senate Bill 244.

¹² United States Census Bureau. 2020. Del Rey CDP, California.
[https://data.census.gov/table/DECENNIALPL2020.P1?q=del%20rey%20ca](https://data.census.gov/table/DECENNIALPL2020.P1?q=del%20rey%20ca;).; United States Census Bureau. 2022. Fresno County, CA. https://data.census.gov/profile/Fresno_County_California?g=050XX00US06019.

¹³ United States Census Bureau. 2020. Del Rey CDP, California.
[https://data.census.gov/table/DECENNIALPL2020.P1?q=del%20rey%20ca](https://data.census.gov/table/DECENNIALPL2020.P1?q=del%20rey%20ca;).; United States Census Bureau. 2022. Fresno County, CA. https://data.census.gov/profile/Fresno_County_California?g=050XX00US06019.

2. Del Rey Community Vision

The vision statement provides the framework for understanding the intent and long-term vision for Del Rey and establishes the basis for the Community Plan goals and policies. It identifies key characteristics necessary for sustaining what is important to the community and for Del Rey to achieve its potential.

The Del Rey Community Plan was originally adopted in 1976. As conditions in Del Rey have changed over time, it is important for the community vision to be confirmed to ensure that the goals and policies of the Community Plan continue to reflect the conditions and aspirations of the community. The following vision statement was developed with the community through feedback received during a series of meetings as part of the community plan update effort.

Create a safe, affordable place to live with a variety of amenities for residents, including places for community gatherings, quality housing, and job opportunities for residents. Community members are engaged and work together toward common goals to improve the community and foster connections.

Public Engagement

As part of the process of developing the Del Rey Community Plan, six community meetings were held from December 2023 to April 2024. The goal of these community meetings was to gather input from residents and stakeholders to ensure the plan reflects the needs, desires, and concerns of the community. Additional technical meetings were also held with key stakeholders throughout the planning process.

Meeting 1: Kickoff – December 2023. The Community Plan update process began in December of 2023 with project initiation. The kickoff meeting discussed what a Community Plan is and the upcoming update process.

Meeting 2: Planning Priorities – January 2024. The community provided input on what planning topics should be addressed in the Community Plan update. The community discussed topics such as economic growth and job opportunities; residential development and housing type variety; community boundary growth and expansion; parks, community centers, and recreation programs; transportation; and community safety, among other related topics.

Meeting 3: Vision Confirmation – January 2024. The community provided input on what the community vision should consist of, such as addressing parks and community amenities, additional development, economic growth, transportation safety, and community expansion.

Meeting 4: Transportation – February 2024. The community provided input about the existing circulation system and how it could be improved. Community members identified areas prone to flooding, lacking proper lighting, and areas most used for walking and biking.

Meeting 5: Land Use – February 2024. The existing and proposed land use diagrams were discussed. Community members identified properties within the community that could be improved. Community members also identified potential sites for a new community center.

Meeting 6: Expansion Areas – April 2024. The proposed land use changes were identified and discussed.

Public comments from these meetings are summarized in more detail in *Appendix A*. Generally, the community expressed concern over population decline and slow growth in Del Rey, as well as a need for additional housing units so young residents are able to stay in the community as they get older. Concerns over speeding vehicles and limited utility services, including water and sewer, were also identified.



Small group discussions with Del Rey community members during the public engagement process.

3. Community Plan Elements

The Del Rey Community Plan is composed of the following elements, which align with the 2024 Fresno County General Plan elements:

- Economic Development,
- Agriculture and Land Use,
- Transportation and Circulation,
- Public Facilities and Services,
- Open Space and Conservation,
- Health and Safety,
- Environmental Justice, and
- Housing.

These elements may consist of new or refined policies specific to the Del Rey Community Plan area, as well as implementation programs to implement the policies. The goals, policies, and implementation programs contained in this Community Plan recognize that partnerships with organizations active within Del Rey are critical for successful implementation. While this Community Plan cannot direct or obligate actions of other organizations, collaboration with the County of Fresno in the implementation of this Plan is encouraged.

All goals, policies, and implementation programs of this Community Plan are in addition to the applicable 2024 Fresno County General Plan goals, policies, and implementation programs.

Table 2 summarizes the acreage within the Del Rey Community Plan area by land use designation.

Table 2 – Del Rey Community Plan, Total Acres by Land Use

Planned Land Use		Acres ¹	% of Total ¹
	Residential: Medium Density	92.4	25.0%
	Residential: Medium High Density	34.6	9.2%
	Commercial: Central Business	1.9	0.5%
	Commercial: Service Commercial	13.9	3.7%
	Industrial: Limited	39.3	10.5%
	Industrial: General	89.4	23.9%
	Public Facilities ²	69.3	18.5%
	Reserve Overlay ³	27.2	-
	Right of Way	33.5	9.0%
Total		374.3	100%

¹ Total may not add to 100% due to rounding.

² Public Facilities includes 4.1 acres of park space.

³ The Reserve Overlay areas in Del Rey permit a mix of Medium Density Residential, Medium High Density Residential, Service Commercial, Limited Industrial, and General Industrial land uses based on the mapping and policies included in the Agriculture and Land Use Element. The acreages in the table reflect assumptions about how those land uses will develop in accordance with this Community Plan, so a percent of total calculation is not provided for the overlay itself.

Economic Development Element

The following goals, policies, and implementation programs apply to the Del Rey Community Plan area and are in addition to any applicable goals, policies, and implementation programs of the 2024 Fresno County General Plan Economic Development Element.

Goals

- G-ED-1** To clearly communicate Del Rey's economic development goals to the community and potential businesses.
- G-ED-2** To diversify businesses in Del Rey to meet the needs of the community.

Policies and Implementation Programs

- P-ED-1** Encourage the establishment and expansion of businesses that provide for the needs of community members, including retail, personal, and business services.
 - P-ED-1a** Work with community partners to identify barriers to providing expanded business resources within Del Rey.

*Barriers to the establishment of new businesses or the expansion of existing businesses may include: **availability and adequacy of community infrastructure**, such as water and sewer service, storm drainage facilities, or safe access for consumers and business transport; **capacity and commitment of the community**, such as the presence of business organizations to drive implementation of community economic development goals, or the active participation and support of the Del Rey community members in supporting local businesses.*
- P-ED-2** Coordinate with the Del Rey Community Services District to encourage the establishment of a Chamber of Commerce or similar business organization.
- P-ED-3** Increase the presence and success of locally-owned businesses within the community by fostering an environment that encourages entrepreneurship, innovation, and community engagement.
 - P-ED-3a** Consider launching a marketing campaign in coordination with local business organizations to promote the benefits of supporting local businesses and encourage residents to prioritize shopping at locally-owned establishments.
 - P-ED-3b** Coordinate with local business associations, such as the Fresno County Economic Development Corporation, Valley Community Small Business Development Center, or Chamber of Commerce, to offer information, workshops, and/or training sessions tailored to the needs of local entrepreneurs and small business owners.

P-ED-4 Establish regular communication channels between community leaders and community members.

P-ED-4a Partner with Del Rey Community Services District and other community-specific groups where residents can voice their concerns and provide feedback on various items related to the ongoing business development activities within the community.

P-ED-4b Discuss economic development at other regular community events.

Agriculture and Land Use Element

The following goals, policies, and implementation programs apply to the Del Rey Community Plan area and are in addition to any applicable goals, policies, and implementation programs of the 2024 Fresno County General Plan Agriculture and Land Use Element.

Goals

G-LU-1 To accommodate a wide range of land uses to meet the needs of the community.

Policies and Implementation Programs

P-LU-1 Development shall occur in accordance with the land use designations described in *Table 3 – Land Use Designation Descriptions* and as shown on *Figure 2 – Land Use Diagram*.

Table 3 – Land Use Designation Descriptions

Land Use Designation	Designation Description	Residential Intensity (in gross acres) ¹		Non-residential Intensity (FAR) ²
		Minimum Density	Maximum Density	
Residential: Medium Density	This designation provides for single-family dwellings, multi-family dwellings, and accessory structures.	2.8 DU/acre	5.8 DU/acre	0.40
Residential: Medium High Density	This designation provides for single-family dwellings, multi-family dwellings, accessory structures, churches, schools, and libraries. Maximum density shall be determined based on adequate infrastructure (community water and sewer, adequate roads/access and parking area).	5.8 DU/acre	23 DU/acre (29 net)	0.50

EXHIBIT 2

Land Use Designation		Designation Description	Residential Intensity (in gross acres) ¹		Non-residential Intensity (FAR) ²
			Minimum Density	Maximum Density	
	Commercial: Central Business	This designation provides for development of commercial centers where the full range of retail services and professional and governmental offices are concentrated in a location that is central to most community residents. Typical uses include specialty shops, retail, entertainment uses, apparel stores, restaurants, hotels/motels, and financial, medical, professional offices, and mixed-use developments.	5.85 DU/acre	16 DU/ acre (net)	1.00
	Commercial: Service Commercial	This designation provides for general commercial uses which, due to space requirements or the distinctive nature of the operation, are not usually located in commercial centers. Typical uses include repair, rental, sales, storage, and overnight lodging.	5.8 DU/acre	14.5 DU/acre	1.00
	Industrial: Limited	This designation provides for restricted non-intensive manufacturing and storage activities that do not have detrimental impacts on surrounding properties.	n/a	n/a	1.50
	Industrial: General	This designation provides for the full range of manufacturing, processing, fabrication, and storage activities. Land designated General Industrial may be developed to a less intense industrial use when in a transitional area adjacent to land designated for non-industrial urban uses.	n/a	n/a	1.50
	Public Facilities	This designation provides for the location of services and facilities that are necessary to the welfare of the community. Typical uses include liquid and solid waste disposal, ponding basins, parks, schools, civic centers, hospitals, libraries, penal institutions, and cemeteries.	n/a	n/a	0.5

EXHIBIT 2

Land Use Designation	Designation Description	Residential Intensity (in gross acres) ¹		Non-residential Intensity (FAR) ²
		Minimum Density	Maximum Density	
Reserve Overlay	This overlay is intended to reserve certain lands for future more intensive development by permitting only limited agricultural uses on an interim basis. Typical uses include livestock raising; tree, vine, and field crops; single-family dwellings; and accessory buildings. Where such lands are peripheral to an unincorporated community, development shall be subject to the provision of public facilities and phasing.	0 DU/acre	1.0 DU/20 acres	0.10 ³

¹Maximum allowable residential intensity or allowable range of residential intensity. Gross acreage includes roadways and other rights-of-way. Net acreage is about 80 percent of gross acreage.

²Maximum allowable intensity for non-residential uses allowed as a matter of right in the compatible zone district where parcel size meets or exceeds minimum area requirements of applicable districts.

³Does not apply to facilities necessary for resource production.

P-LU-2 The Medium Density Residential, Medium High Density Residential, and Service Commercial land uses are permitted within the identified Northwest Reserve Overlay Site (as shown in *Figure 2 – Land Use Diagram*). Land uses may be adjusted within the boundary of the Northwest Reserve Overlay Site and shall meet the following criteria:


- Development of the indicated land uses shall be contingent upon annexation to the Del Rey Community Services District.
- Commercial development shall include additional signage directing traffic to the central business district on Portola Avenue.
- Primary access to the Service Commercial designation shall be provided directly from American Avenue.
- Development shall incorporate buffers between the Limited Industrial designation to the east of the Northwest Reserve Overlay Site and any residential buildings developed within the Northwest Reserve Overlay Site, in accordance with the Fresno County Zoning Ordinance.
- No more than 25%, or approximately 5 acres, of the Northwest Reserve Overlay Site may be developed with Service Commercial land uses.

The Fresno County General Plan Reserve Overlay acknowledges the site will be developed with urban uses while facilitating ongoing agricultural uses on-site until such development occurs. No amendment to the General Plan is required to remove the Reserve Overlay designation prior to development of the site; however, a rezone would be necessary.

EXHIBIT 2

- P-LU-3** Encourage a mix of housing at varying densities within projects. Blended densities shall be allowed if they remain within the minimum and maximum densities, as calculated across the entire project site.
- P-LU-4** Facilitate the development of duplex, triplex, and fourplex units in residential land use designations, where appropriate, to further support the increase of housing variety in Del Rey.
- P-LU-5** Future updates to the community plan should consider prioritizing growth to the south of the existing community limits generally between McCall Avenue and Indianola Avenue.
- P-LU-6** The property located on the west side of Center Street south of Las Tunis has been designated Limited Industrial subject to the following:
- Access to the site shall be limited to American and Del Rey Avenues.
 - Uses permitted on the site shall not generate water or sewage service needs beyond those necessitated by a caretaker's residence until such time as the sewage capacity of the Del Rey Community Services District facilities have been approved by the California Water Quality Control Board to receive additional flows.
 - The site shall be operated as a unit with the applicant's adjacent ownership to the west.
- P-LU-7** Maintain the central region of the community, generally located at Portola and Morrow Avenues, as the primary commercial center for the community.
- P-LU-8** Pursuant to the Fresno County Zoning Ordinance, adequate buffering and screening between residential and non-residential areas shall be installed and maintained.
- P-LU-9** Require screening, such as fencing or vegetation, of public utility facilities, such as telecommunications equipment, when interfacing with residential areas.

Figure 2 – Land Use Diagram



Transportation and Circulation Element

The following goals, policies, and implementation programs apply to the Del Rey Community Plan area and are in addition to any applicable goals, policies, and implementation programs of the 2024 Fresno County General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element.

Goals


- G-TC-1** To minimize conflicts among different modes of traffic.
- G-TC-2** To avoid routing industrial traffic through the community on local streets.

Policies and Implementation Programs

- P-TC-1** Establish dedicated pathways, sidewalks, and bike lanes separated from vehicular traffic to reduce conflicts and enhance safety for non-motorized users. Prioritize improvements that provide safe routes to work, schools, parks, and commercial areas to improve safety, efficiency, and connectivity.
 - P-TC-1a** Identify sidewalk and bike lane segments that should be prioritized for improvement based on community feedback.
 - P-TC-1b** Consider partnering with organizations or agencies to conduct walking audits that evaluate pedestrian infrastructure, safety measures, and accessibility in order to identify long-term improvements.

Potential safety improvements may include crosswalks, additional lighting, and providing physical separation from vehicular traffic.
- P-TC-2** Periodically update, as needed, County's active transportation plan to ensure the safety and accessibility of pedestrians and bicyclists.
 - P-TC-2a** Pursue funding opportunities for the development of a Safe Routes to School Plan or similar active transportation plan.
- P-TC-3** Discourage industrial truck traffic from routing through residential areas.
 - P-TC-3a** Evaluate as necessary, installation of potential traffic calming measures on local streets to discourage industrial vehicle traffic.

Figure 3 – Circulation Diagram



Public Facilities and Services Element

The following goals, policies, and implementation programs apply to the Del Rey Community Plan area and are in addition to any applicable goals, policies, and implementation programs of the 2024 Fresno County General Plan Public Facilities and Services Element.

Goals

- G-PFS-1** To provide public facilities, utilities, and community services that reliably meet the needs of the existing community and planned growth.

Policies and Implementation Programs

- P-PFS-1** Coordinate with the Del Rey Community Services District to align its boundaries with the Del Rey Community Plan boundary to accommodate planned growth.

- P-PFS-1a** Encourage Del Rey Community Services District to prepare infrastructure master plans for water, wastewater, and storm drainage infrastructure and service to support future community growth.

- P-PFS-2** Support the Del Rey Community Services District in pursuing funding for the construction of public facilities to adequately serve the existing community and planned growth.

- P-PFS-2a** Work with the Del Rey Community Services District to identify priority water and sewer capacity improvement projects that would facilitate residential and non-residential growth opportunities.

- P-PFS-2b** Conduct an annual survey with Del Rey Community Services District to identify number of connections and available capacity for water and sewer service.

Open Space and Conservation Element

The following goals, policies, and implementation programs apply to the Del Rey Community Plan area and are in addition to any applicable goals, policies, and implementation programs of the 2024 Fresno County General Plan Open Space and Conservation Element.

Goals

- G-OSC-1** To provide and maintain open space areas that enhance community livability and provide opportunities for improved public health.

Policies and Implementation Programs

- P-OSC-1** Coordinate with the Sanger Unified School District to permit the community use of outdoor school facilities, such as playgrounds, blacktop areas, and playing fields, during non-school hours.
- P-OSC-2** Coordinate with community partners to encourage recreational programs.
- P-OSC-3** Ensure that park space is accessible and connected to the community.
 - P-OSC-3a** Continue to work with community partners and the Del Rey Community Services District to maintain and improve open space.
 - P-OSC-3b** Conduct an inventory of existing park space within the community, including size, equipment and facilities, and access.
- P-OSC-4** Within single family residential projects, whether attached or detached, a minimum of 5% of the project site, not inclusive of existing or future major road rights-of-way, shall be developed with usable open space. Such open space shall be maintained by an assessment district, landscape/lighting district, homeowners' association, or other appropriate maintenance entity.
 - P-OSC-4a** Adopt standards that establish minimum requirements for open space areas to qualify as usable for purposes of meeting the 5% usable open space requirement.
- P-OSC-5** Within multifamily residential projects, including mobile home parks, a minimum of 10% of the project site shall be developed with usable open space, which could include swimming pools, green space, recreational trails, or parks.
- P-OSC-6** Provide a community center that is centrally located or easily accessed by the community and plan for its long-term maintenance.
 - P-OSC-6a** Coordinate with the Del Rey Community Services District on the development and maintenance of the community center. Consider collocating the community center with Del Rey Community Services District offices.
 - P-OSC-6b** Coordinate with the Del Rey Community Services District to encourage the expansion of the Senior Center.

Health and Safety Element

The following goals, policies, and implementation programs apply to the Del Rey Community Plan area and are in addition to any applicable goals, policies, and implementation programs of the 2024 Fresno County General Plan Health and Safety Element.

Goals

- G-HS-1** To create a safe and well-lit environment for the community.
- G-HS-2** To limit impacts to the community from natural environmental factors.

Policies and Implementation Programs

- P-HS-1** Enforce code violations, including but not limited to, loitering, unsafe structures, and illegal use of property.
 - P-HS-1a** Coordinate with code enforcement and law enforcement to address complaints in a timely manner.
- P-HS-2** Encourage and support the installation of street lighting and shade coverage throughout Del Rey. Prioritize installations along key pedestrian and bicycle routes and near transit stops.
 - P-HS-2a** Support the Del Rey Community Services District in pursuing funding for street lighting and shade coverage improvements.
- P-HS-3** Coordinate with Sanger Unified School District to bring mobile health facilities to the community.

Environmental Justice Element

The Del Rey Community Plan area is subject to the applicable goals, policies, and implementation programs of the 2024 Fresno County General Plan Environmental Justice Element.

Housing Element

The Del Rey Community Plan area is subject to the applicable goals and programs of the Fresno County Housing Element. The Housing Element is subject to review and certification by the California Department of Housing and Community Development per Government Code section 65580 et seq. and updates are required on a prescribed schedule.

Appendix A:
Del Rey Community Plan Update
Community Meetings Summary

Del Rey Community Plan Update Community Meetings Summary

Meeting 1: Kickoff (12/14/23)

Overview

On December 14, 2023, the Fresno County Public Works Department hosted a public workshop in Del Rey. The session primarily consisted of a question-and-answer format, where community members had the opportunity to discuss housing and zoning codes. This meeting also served as the community kickoff of the Community Plan Update project. Participants could attend in-person or online.

Housing Q&A

Summary of Public Comments

During the public comment session, several key questions were raised, including:

- Why has it taken so long to update the Del Rey Community Plan?
 - The Fresno County General Plan had not been updated. The Public Works department is responsible for updating the General Plan and associated community plans.
- Will the General Plan or Del Rey Community Plan expand the Del Rey Sphere of Influence (SOI)?
 - The Del Rey Community Plan is the document that would expand the SOI, but the update is not a guarantee that the SOI will be expanded or that development will occur.
- Who determines what Del Rey's needs are?
 - The Fresno County Public Works Department visits communities to identify potential needs and find funding opportunities.

The County also discussed additional questions related to project timelines, the Fresno County Zoning Ordinance, opportunities for property owners to sell their property, and past amendments to the Del Rey Community Plan.

In addition to project questions, the community raised some concerns about growth in Del Rey. Residents noted that growth in the community was slow and that the population had actually declined from 1,700 to 1,300 in recent years. Community members identified a lack of housing variety and commercial development in Del Rey, as well as concerns about the poor condition of buildings and infrastructure as potential reasons for this decline and slow growth.

Meeting 2: Planning Priorities (1/16/24)

Overview

A meeting was held in Del Rey covering what the Fresno Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan will cover and to gather community input for the Community Plan on January 16, 2024. Participants could attend in-person or online.

Topic 1: Hazard Mitigation Plan

A consultant from Witt O'Brien's gave a presentation about the Fresno County Hazard Mitigation Plan update.

Summary of Public Comments

No public comments were received related to the Fresno County Hazard Mitigation Plan update.

Topic 2: Community Plan

The Fresno Public Works Department staff attended to gather input from the Del Rey community on their vision for the town's development over the next 30 years. This initiative sought to address current concerns and priorities within the community, reflecting on what residents value most in Del Rey. The goal was to understand both the major concerns of the community and the aspects of Del Rey that people appreciate, ensuring that the Community Plan aligns with the needs and preferences of its residents. The County received general comments from the community and then completed several poster activities intended to help guide the discussion about planning priorities and community vision.

Summary of Public Comments

The County received the following general comments about Del Rey:

- Vehicle speed is a concern throughout the community.
- There is a desire for more housing variety.
- Residents would like to establish a youth facility and/or community center. Specifically, residents noted that young children benefit from the Boys and Girls Club but there are a lack of resources and spaces for community activities for teens and adults.
- The community is eager to develop.

- A representative from Self-Help Enterprises noted their interest in developing rental properties and single-family homes in Del Rey but to do so would need appropriately-zoned property and access to water and sewer systems.

Summary of Posters

Staff prepared four posters for residents to provide input on planning priorities and vision for Del Rey. The first three posters asked open-ended questions about the community and had residents provide input on sticky notes. The fourth poster outlined potential planning priorities and asked residents to vote for the planning priority they thought was most important for Del Rey. The results of these poster activities are summarized below. Italicized comments were translated from Spanish.

What do you like most about the community?

1. Everyone is more like family close – not community
2. I like that there is room for growth
3. The school and the people
4. It's a small community
5. I know everyone
6. The closeness, the school
7. Close community, friendly people
8. Friendly people
9. I like my house and Del Rey and my neighbors
10. I like Del Rey because there's not a lot of noise and it's a small community
11. Closeness of schools and parks and friendly people, especially Boys & Girls Club

What would you change about the community?

1. Trucks driving by the school, add more housing
2. More affordable housing
3. I'd like more single-family homes, a community center for teen, jobs, police
4. Foundation
5. I would like more single-family homes, police, jobs, growth
6. People coming to meetings and put their impact in their community and getting along with each other
7. Overall foundation and the mentality that it is a bad town
8. A bigger safer space to hold Girl Scout meetings. We need a multipurpose center.
9. That we would be more united to make this town better
10. I would like to see fewer stray dogs in the street.

What are your top two concerns about the community?

1. The youth and keeping the school
2. Security
3. Safety
4. Speed bumps
5. More security especially in the school area
6. Speed bumps at school
7. Speed bumps
8. More job opportunities
9. There are no full-time sheriffs or police. Nothing to do for teens
10. Keeping the school open. Affordable Housing
11. Having more stores to shop like other towns and to have more people in this town.
12. Scary dogs in the streets
13. That we have no police
14. More security everywhere

What should be prioritized in the Community Plan?

1. Park, Community Centers, and Recreation Programs (8 votes)
2. Residential Development and Housing Type Variety (6 votes)
3. Economic Growth and Job Opportunities (5 votes)
3. Transportation and Community Safety (5 votes)
4. Community Boundary Growth and Expansion (4 votes)

Meeting 3: Vision Confirmation (1/30/2024)

Overview

On January 30, 2024, the Fresno County Public Works Department hosted a public workshop in Del Rey. The session covered updates to the Community Plan, including discussions on the vision statement, necessary utilities and facilities for growth, and a recap of the previous meeting. Participants could attend in-person or online.

Vision Statement & Public Facilities/Services

Summary of Public Comments

Community members were asked to vote on the planning priorities presented at the previous meeting. Attendees were asked to vote for their top two planning priorities.

1. Residential Development and Housing Type Variety (28 votes)
2. Parks, Community Centers, and Recreation Programs (25 votes)
3. Economic Growth and Job Opportunities (4 votes)
3. Transportation and Community Safety (4 votes)
3. Community Boundary Growth and Expansion (4 votes)

The results varied slightly but generally aligned with the sentiments from the previous community meeting.

The County also received general comments from the community, including:

- A well-designed walking path for families would encourage outdoor exercise, which many residents enjoy.
- Increased street lighting could address safety concerns.
- The establishment of a senior center would support Del Rey's aging population.
- Adding more stores would help address concerns about convenience and economic growth.
- To achieve these changes, it might be beneficial to have a dedicated group advocating for them.
- A resident suggested that Del Rey should become an incorporated city. County staff indicated that if a community wants to become incorporated, it must first achieve financial stability, including the ability to generate enough revenue to support full-time fire and police services.

- A resident raised concerns about the development of new residences, noting that community boundary expansion and limited space for growth make these aspects interlinked.

Additional comments about Self-Help Enterprises programs and Del Rey Community Service District responsibilities were also received and discussed.

Meeting 4: Transportation (2/13/2024)


Overview

On February 13, 2024, County staff provided two poster activities to gather additional feedback from the community. Participants could attend in-person or online.

Poster Activities

The first poster asked participants to mark on a map where they have experienced flooding and where more lighting is needed in Del Rey. Several streets were marked but the most notable ones were Estrella Ave, American Ave, Center St, Carmel Ave, and Redondo Ave.

Figure 1: Flooding and Lighting Poster Results



The second poster asked participants to identify where they feel unsafe walking or biking in Del Rey. The most notable ones were, Jefferson Ave, American Ave, Del Rey Ave, Portola Ave, Carmel Ave, and Wildwood Ave.

Figure 2: Walking and Biking Poster Results



Meeting 5: Land Use (2/27/2024)

Overview

A meeting was held in Del Rey on February 27, 2024. Community members were seated at tables for small group discussions about potential sites for development and redevelopment, as well as potential sites for a community center. Participants could attend in person and online.

Land Use Discussions

Community members at table 1 voted on having the community center next to the school and the second choice was to have it at the old hotel site. Sites that have empty buildings or need significant repairs were also identified on the map.



EXHIBIT 2

Community members at table 2 identified a potential community center site on Morro Ave, with their second choice to locate it by the school and their third choice to locate it on Estrella Ave. Sites that have empty buildings or need significant repairs were also identified on the map.



Meeting 6: Expansion Areas (4/2/2024)

Overview

On April 2, 2024, a community meeting was conducted by Fresno County Public Works Department. Additional project staff was also in attendance. The meeting focused on proposed land expansions and involved sharing details about the suggested changes. Attendees had the opportunity to provide additional feedback through voting. The primary discussion centered around the land use diagram, which included an examination of five specific sites.


Expansion Areas

Summary of Public Comments

The County received general comments from the community about a desire for more housing variety and new housing development beyond low-income accommodations. There were also questions about Self-Help Enterprises programs and affordable housing qualifications.

The County also shared proposed land use changes for the Community Plan Land Use Diagram. Five sites were presented to the community. The first three sites were changes to reflect existing conditions and were not voted on by the community. The community was asked to vote on whether or not to include the proposed land use changes for sites four and five. The community voted to add site four to the Community Plan Area and plan for 10 acres of Medium Density Residential and 10 acres of Service Commercial uses. The community also voted to add a policy to the Community Plan to prioritize future boundary expansion at site five.

Figure 3: Del Rey Opportunity Sites Map



Fresno County

Del Rey Community Plan Update

Response to Public Review Draft Comments

Memorandum

February 10, 2025

Introduction

Fresno County released the Public Review Draft Del Rey Community Plan on October 30th, 2024. The community was encouraged to review the document and provide feedback to the County by November 13th, 2024. The County also hosted a public meeting during the comment period on November 6, 2024 at Del Rey Community Service District's Community Hall. No public comments were received at the meeting.

The County received one public comment letter, dated December 3, 2024, from California Rural Legal Assistance (CRLA) on behalf of Familias de Del Rey para el Cambio (Familias de Del Rey). The following memo summarizes and responds to the comments in the letter from Familias de Del Rey.

Comment Letter Summary and Response

The Familias de Del Rey letter is organized into sections, most of which correspond to the elements of the Community Plan. The letter also includes an overview section, a language section, and a conclusion. Because the comments included in the overview are discussed in more detail in the respective element sections, they are not identified as separate comments in this memo. An annotated copy of the letter is attached as Appendix A to help locate comments within the context of the letter.

Spanish Language Accessibility

Comment 1: Spanish Language Accessibility Summary

The letter notes that the Del Rey Community Plan was only available in English. Familias de Del Rey requests a Spanish copy of the Del Rey Community Plan be made available in accordance with the Dymally-Alatorre Bilingual Services Act.

Response

The Dymally-Alatorre Bilingual Services Act is primarily related to non-English language communication provided by state agencies. Although there are some requirements for local planning agencies to comply

with, these are primarily related to making non-English constituents aware of what services are provided by the agency. Fresno County is not required to provide a Spanish copy of the Del Rey Community Plan and will not be making a Spanish copy available. However, public outreach related to Plan development was conducted in both English and Spanish.

Economic Development

Comment 2: Vague Policy Language

Summary

Familias de Del Rey identifies certain policy terms, including words like “encouragement” (P-ED-1) and “consider” (PD-3a) as vague. The letter indicates a desire for more clearly defined programs and policies. The letter states, “the Plan must go beyond passive encouragement and adopt proactive measures that directly address the structural barriers to business creation and job growth in Del Rey.”

Response

Comment noted.

Comment 3: Economic Development Activities

Summary

The letter identifies potential policy areas and programs Familias de Del Rey would like to see included in the Del Rey Community Plan, including tax incentives, grants, or low-interest loans.

Response

Comment noted. The Fresno County Economic Development Corporation (Fresno EDC) provides business development assistance including economic incentives, marketing, financing, and growth assistance to help bring new investment to Fresno County, including the community of Del Rey. Coordination with Fresno EDC, as well as the Valley Community Small Business Development Center and Chamber of Commerce, is already included as an action item in the Community Plan (P-ED-3b). Language related to the Fresno EDC’s business development activities has been added to the Community Plan.

The Housing Element, as part of the General Plan, also establishes programs aimed to address some of these issues. In Program 30: Access to Education, the County commits to work with the Fresno County Office of Education (FCOE) with their Fresno Regional Occupational Program (ROP), which provides students the opportunity to explore their interests, develop career skills, and reinforce academics through career technical education. The County will assist FCOE in conducting outreach and workshops in unincorporated communities in the western part of Fresno County including Biola, Del Rey, and Riverdale from 2024 to 2026 in an attempt to increase participation in ROP by 10% every year.

Additionally, in Program 32: Access to Employment, the County commits to assist the Central Valley Community Foundation with outreach for their Fresno-Merced Future of Food Initiative by promoting job opportunities to BIPOC, low-income students, and incumbent workers in the western Fresno County

when available and perform outreach for competency-based education (CBE) curriculum in participating community colleges.

Comment 4: Community Service District Economic Development Policies

Summary

The letter expresses concern over the feasibility of certain economic development policies, namely those related to coordinating with the Community Service District (CSD) in the establishment of a Chamber of Commerce in Del Rey (P-ED-2). The letter notes the CSD's current responsibilities are related to the provision of utilities and questions the CSD's authority over economic development activities.

Response

The policy is not intended to add economic development activities to the CSD's existing responsibilities or jurisdiction. However, Fresno County has noted that the Del Rey CSD is an important organization within the community and that CSD meetings are an effective way to gather community input. Therefore, the County believes it would be beneficial to coordinate with the CSD while establishing a Chamber of Commerce as a separate entity. The policy language has been updated to provide additional clarity.

Agriculture and Land Use

Comment 5: Transportation Infrastructure Improvements

Summary

The letter expresses concerns over P-LU-2 which would require new commercial development occurring away from the existing central business district on Portola Avenue to include signage directing people to that area. Familias de Del Rey indicated a desire for additional transportation infrastructure, including bus shelters, safe pedestrian crossings, bicycle parking, and wayfinding signage.

Response

Policies related to transportation safety infrastructure are included in the Transportation and Circulation element. Relevant policies include P-TC-1, which discusses pedestrian and bicyclist infrastructure, and P-TC-3 which discusses traffic calming measures for vehicular traffic. While these policies do not discuss traffic calming between new commercial development and the Portola Avenue business district, they do apply community-wide.

Transportation and Circulation

Comment 6: Transportation Outreach

Summary

Familias de Del Rey supports the inclusion of P-TC-1b which discusses potential partnerships for walking audits and infrastructure evaluations in Del Rey.

Response

Comment noted.

Comment 7: Traffic Calming Measures Summary

Familias de Del Rey notes a desire for signage and enforcement in association with new traffic calming measures installed in Del Rey.

Response

Comment noted.

Comment 8: Infrastructure Design Summary

Familias de Del Rey notes a preference for physically-separated bicycle, pedestrian, and vehicular transportation infrastructure.

Response

Comment noted.

Public Facilities and Services

Comment 9: Water Rates Summary

The letter notes residents in Del Rey currently struggle to pay water bills and advocates for a policy that would support water affordability in the community.

Response

Comment noted.

Open Space and Conservation

Comment 10: Facility Maintenance Summary

The letter notes that residents currently have issues accessing existing public spaces due to trash, odors, stray dogs, and other safety concerns.

Response

Comment noted.

Comment 11: Community Center Location Summary

Familias de Del Rey expressed concern over the co-locating of a community center with CSD facilities. The letter notes that community members would like a separate space to discuss community concerns. The letter also expresses concerns that locating the community center with CSD offices would create an “uneasy environment” that is “political and biased.”

Response

Comment noted. P-OSC-6 (and associated action item P-OSC-6a) is not intended to mandate the establishment of a community center at the CSD offices but is instead intended to direct future consideration of the location identified during the public outreach process. The establishment of a community center is dependent on a community organization’s capacity to develop and maintain the center, and its location would be at the discretion of the organization. The Fresno County Zoning Ordinance permits the establishment of a community center in several locations in Del Rey.

Health and Safety

Comment 12: Stray Dogs Summary

Familias de Del Rey would like the County to include policies that address the presence of stray dogs in the community.

Response

Comment noted.

December 3, 2024

Submitted electronically to:
comdev@fresnocountyca.gov

Fresno County Public Works and Planning
Water Natural Resources Division
2220 Tulare Street, 6th floor
Fresno, CA, 93721

RE: Comments on Del Rey Community Plan

Dear Mr. Kremer,

California Rural Legal Assistance (CRLA) submits these comments on behalf of Familias de Del Rey para el Cambio (Familias de Del Rey) in response to Fresno County's Notice of Availability of the draft Del Rey Community Plan, released on October 30, 2024.

CRLA is a non-profit law firm with over fifty years of experience representing rural, low-income Californians. The Community Equity Initiative (CEI) of CRLA specializes in land use, environmental, and civil rights law. Familias de Del Rey is a community-based organization representing the needs of residents of the disadvantaged unincorporated community of Del Rey.

Familias de Del Rey provides the following comments to ensure that the final Community Plan impacts the Del Rey Community positively and effectively. Familias de Del Rey supports the development and growth of their community. They aim to ensure that this growth will improve the community's well-being and create a vibrant, safe, and healthy environment. We have reviewed the draft of the Community Plan and offer the following comments.

I. Introduction and Overall Comments Regarding Concrete Commitments

The Community Plan (Plan) draft confirms the community's desire for a safe, affordable living place.¹ The vision reflects the need for jobs, housing, parks, and community centers to build a

¹ Del Rey Community Plan, Public Review Draft, (Draft Plan) October 2024, p 6

community where all residents can succeed. However, Familias de Del Rey believes that Fresno County (County) needs to take a more proactive, in-depth approach, and solidify a concrete commitment to the policies and implementation programs proposed in the Plan.

Del Rey adopted its current Community Plan in 1976²; the plan has not been updated in more than 48 years. Residents hope that, after such a long wait, the Plan will refine the Fresno County General Plan (General Plan) policies impacting their geographic area, addressing and potentially resolving local conflicts or issues that concern Familias de Del Rey.³ Although the Plan cannot direct or obligate the actions of third-party organizations,⁴ the County can take a more proactive approach to its implementation. The proposed Plan does not mandate specific, concrete commitments the County will take to effectuate transformative change for Del Rey. Instead, it limits action items to ‘considerations’ and ‘encouragement’ of certain policies and practices. Yet merely considering or encouraging change will be insufficient to realize the Plan's vision and the community members to see positive improvements efficiently take place.

The General Plan’s expressed purpose is to establish a base for subsequent planning efforts, such as preparing and updating community plans.⁵ California Public Resources Code section 21083.3 defines ‘community plans’ as components of a general plan that contain **specific** development policies adopted for a defined area and that identify measures to implement those policies.⁶ Community plans may provide **greater detail** regarding the policies affecting development in a defined area.⁷ Familias de Del Rey’s desire to see further clarity, certainty, and specificity in the County’s commitment to the Plan's implementation programs is consistent with these legal principles. Such commitments will also support the primary objective of the Plan’s update, which is to refine, specify, and provide more significant details of the General Plan in the Del Rey.

The County should make the following changes to the Plan’s policies to ensure that its implementation is meaningful and effective:

- Replace language such as “consider” and “encourage” with firm commitments such as “mandate” and “require.”
- Provide and release a Spanish version of the Community Plan Draft before its final approval hearing at the Board of Supervisors.
- Adjust the policies and implementation programs evaluating CSD’s legal jurisdiction and capacity limits.
- Replace language such as “evaluat[ing]” the installation of traffic calming measures with firm commitments such as “mandate” and “require.”
- Include a policy to support water affordability within the Public Facilities and Services Element of the Del Rey Community Plan.
- Include a policy with more support and enforcement related to stray dogs and other safety and health concerns.

² Id.

³ State of California Governor’s Office of Planning and Research, General Plan Guidelines (General Plan Guidelines), 2017 p. 2:23--24

⁴ Draft Plan, October 2024, p 8

⁵ Fresno County General Plan (1-14).

⁶ Cal. Pub. Resources Code § 21083.3

⁷ General Plan Guidelines at p. 2:23--24

II. Language Barrier Affecting Familias de Del Rey.

The Dymally-Alatorre Bilingual Services Act requires public agencies, including counties, to ensure effective communication between all levels of government and those precluded from utilizing public services because of language barriers.⁸ The law requires more than a jurisdiction simply providing interpretation during outreach related to planning and public services. It requires the jurisdiction to provide materials that allow residents to communicate effectively with the decision-makers. Specifically, the law mandates that state and local government agencies translate vital documents, including planning materials, into languages spoken by significant portions of the population.

Many members of Familias de Del Rey have lived in the community for over twenty years and, like a large portion of its population, are monolingual Spanish speakers. The Plan reflects the presence of Spanish-speaking residents by stating that Hispanics and Latinos account for 89% of its population.⁹ As such, the Dymally-Alatorre Bilingual Services Act mandates apply to the County of Fresno and the Community Services District of Del Rey.

Unfortunately, the draft Plan was only made available in English.¹⁰ Failure to provide a Spanish-language version is inconsistent with the legal mandates that apply to the County and prevents Spanish-speaking community members from providing feedback on the Plan's content. As a result, there is no assurance the desires and feedback of a large percentage of Del Rey's population are accurately reflected in the document. The county must provide a Spanish-language version of the plan to be distributed to residents of Del Rey and provide an opportunity for residents to give meaningful feedback before the document is finalized to ensure the county is acting in a manner consistent with its legal obligations.

III. Economic Development

The General Plan acknowledges the County suffers from high levels of unemployment and low average wages despite its massive success in the agricultural industry.¹¹ A challenge in Del Rey is the long-standing absence of adequate businesses and employment opportunities that directly serve the local community.

The General Plan establishes a variety of policies aimed at addressing these issues. Fresno County, through these policies, commits to promoting economic development to retain and expand existing businesses, encouraging the development of value-added companies, attracting new industries, improving the skills of the workforce, and facilitating the creation of higher-paying jobs.

⁸ Cal Gov Code § 7291

⁹ Draft Plan, October 2024, p 4

¹⁰ Fresno County / Community Plan Website available at <https://www.fresnocountyca.gov/Departments/Public-Works-and-Planning/divisions-of-public-works-and-planning/community-development-division/housing-element/community-plans-on-December-12,2024>

¹¹ Fresno County General Plan

The Plan includes additional language related to economic development. The Plan's first goal is "to communicate Del Rey's economic development goals to the community and potential businesses." This goal may seek to ensure that the community is well-informed about economic development efforts and that potential businesses are aware of opportunities in Del Rey. To accomplish the goal, the Plan proposes to **encourage** the establishment and expansion of businesses and work with community partners to identify barriers to the establishment of new ones.

The Plan's second goal is to diversify Del Rey's businesses. Diversification might require a workforce that is ready to assume the new tasks in the new industry. The Plan includes some language about the County offering information, workshops, and training sessions, but it is unclear what tangible actions the County is proposing to take to equip residents with marketable skills in the long term. For example, a small business owner might need more than one or two workshops to be able actually to establish a business and succeed. Such a goal might require establishing vocational training programs, partnerships with local colleges or trade schools, and skill development initiatives that match the needs of new industries and new small business owners.¹²

Familias de Del Rey maintains that, although well-intentioned, these policies fail to include the types of measurable, concrete actions that the County must take to achieve economic prosperity for Del Rey's residents. Terms like "encouragement" (P-ED-1) and "consider" (PD- 3a) are vague and unlikely to produce significant changes without clearly defined programs or policies. The Plan must go beyond passive encouragement and adopt proactive measures that directly address the structural barriers to business creation and job growth in Del Rey.

Familias de Del Rey seeks to establish more businesses in Del Rey. Their members' wish to be able to get groceries, medicines, or cleaning items without driving long distances. Many people wish to have their retail, personal, and business services within walking distance. Familias de Del Rey asks the County to take concrete steps to support established commercial businesses' growth and attract new ones. For example, the County can create tax incentives, grants, or low-interest loans targeting new businesses and programs that assist local entrepreneurs, especially minority-owned businesses, who may have difficulty securing capital.¹³ This would help stimulate growth and attract businesses to the area, making it easier for them to open and/or expand.¹⁴ This is particularly relevant because policies P-ED3 and PD-2 seek to increase locally owned businesses' presence and success and create an innovative entrepreneurial environment.

¹² U.S. Department of Commerce, Investing in America, Investing in Americans Workforce Development Programs at the U.S. Department of Commerce, <https://www.commerce.gov/news/fact-sheets/2024/05/investing-america-investing-americans-workforce-development-programs-us>

¹³ Bartik, Timothy J. 2018. "Incentives and Local Job Creation." Policy Brief. Kalamazoo, MI: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research. <https://doi.org/10.17848/pb2018-3>; Klein, J. 2024 "Maximizing the Impact of SSBCI on Small-Dollar Small Business Loans: Program Design Recommendations" Business Ownership Initiative, Aspen Institute, Available <https://www.aspeninstitute.org/blog-posts/boi-and-the-initiative-for-inclusive-entrepreneurship-newsletter/#:~:text=The%20Aspen%20Institute,Now%20Reading%203A%20BOI&text=At%20the%20beginning%20of%20this,socially%20and%20economically%20disadvantaged%20individuals.>

¹⁴ Lourder, G; Parilla, J How tax incentives can power more equitable, inclusive growth (2021) available at <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/how-tax-incentives-can-power-more-equitable-inclusive-growth/> on November 23, 2024

In addition to being overly vague and non-committal, some policies in the Plan may be simply untenable. For example, the Plan considers coordinating with the Del Rey Community Services District (CSD) to establish a Chamber of Commerce.¹⁵ While coordination with the CSD is a laudable goal, given its importance in Del Rey, the Plan seems to overlook potential obstacles that may result from the CSD's legal jurisdiction and capacity limits. The CSD's jurisdiction is currently related to provision of water, sewer, lights, and park services within the limits of the community. If the CSD lacks the resources or authority to participate fully in economic development activities, the County may need to provide additional support or collaborate with other entities that can implement these policies. The Plan's economic development policies must be aligned with the practical realities of local governance and service provision.

Familias de Del Rey's requests a more comprehensive and actionable economic development plan. The County needs to go beyond vague intentions and create clear, targeted strategies that attract businesses and ensure that the local workforce is prepared and able to fill the jobs created. This approach will address Del Rey's existing economic challenges and pave the way for sustainable growth and development in the future.

IV. Agriculture and Land Use

The Plan outlines specific land use rules and access requirements, emphasizes buffering between residential and industrial areas, and sets limits on the amount of land allocated for commercial use.¹⁶ These policies aim to manage growth, ensure compatibility between different land uses, and protect residential areas from potential industrial or commercial impacts.¹⁷

Familias de Del Rey is supportive of the town's growth and development and recognizes the need for land use changes to accommodate future growth. The proposed changes seek to address infrastructure needs and ensure that different land uses coexist effectively. Familias de Del Rey hopes these changes will spur economic development, offer a wider variety of housing options, and improve community amenities. However, residents express concerns about infrastructure capacity, traffic, and noise challenges that may result from further development. They expect careful coordination and implementation of the changes proposed by the County to ensure long-term benefits for the community while minimizing any negative impacts.

For example, P-LU-2 mentions, "[c]ommercial development shall include additional signage directing traffic to the central business district on Portola Avenue."¹⁸ As expected, the growth in the area will increase traffic. Familias de Del Rey not only requests signage to direct traffic to the central business district but also asks for the inclusion of infrastructure improvements such as bus shelters, safe pedestrian crossings, bicycle parking, and wayfinding signage at key destinations, including public facilities and open spaces within the community. These additions are necessary to accommodate the growth in a way that benefits everyone, reduces risks to pedestrians—including children—and promotes a high quality of life.

¹⁵ Draft Plan, October 2024, p 9

¹⁶ Draft Plan, October 2024, p 10-14

¹⁷ Id.

¹⁸ Ibid., p 12

V. Transportation and Circulation

The transportation and circulation goals articulated in the Plan focus on enhancing transportation safety and minimizing conflicts between different modes of traffic. They emphasize pedestrian and cyclist safety while discouraging industrial traffic through residential areas. The Plan suggests on P-TC-1b to consider partnering with organizations or agencies to conduct a walking audit to evaluate pedestrian infrastructure.¹⁹ Familias de Del Rey supports this proposal and emphasizes that community engagement should be a core process component of its implementation. Its members believe it is crucial for the County to actively engage with diverse groups, including senior citizens, individuals with disabilities, low-income families, and others who rely heavily on public transportation. By including these groups in the conversation, the County can ensure that transportation solutions are equitable and responsive to all residents' needs.

Policy G-TC-2 aims to avoid routine industrial traffic through the community on local streets.²⁰ Policy P-TC-3a proposes “to evaluate, as necessary, the installation of potential traffic **calming measures** on local streets to discourage industrial vehicle traffic.”²¹ Many members of Families de Del Rey already struggle with truck traffic in local streets and wish that the policies and implementation programs described are more comprehensive, given that residential and industrial areas are expected to grow in the town. Further, Familias de Del Rey reiterates its concern for vague language such as “evaluat[ing]” the installation of traffic calming measures without a commitment to actually *installing* traffic calming measures. Evaluation of a need is pointless if no action will result from such an evaluation.

When implementing such measures, “calming measures” must be accompanied by clear signage and enforcement practices (e.g., cameras, road monitoring, Sheriff patrols) to ensure trucks follow these routes.²² In addition, to minimize disruptions, the County could work with industrial companies in Del Rey to inform and encourage them to seek monetary incentives from federal, state, and local governments for truck drivers utilizing the cleanest available technologies for their equipment.²³

Policy P-TC-2 seeks to ensure the safety and accessibility of pedestrians and bicyclists.²⁴ Residents at Del Rey already face the challenge of not having sidewalks or spaces where they can walk or exercise. Familias del Del Rey welcomes the County's support in pursuing the funding described on P-TC-2a. Still, they hope funding gets invested in high-quality physical separations between cyclists, pedestrians, and truck traffic even if the coverage results in a smaller area. Familias de Del Rey expects durable solutions to protect the community and build a welcoming, active place.

//

//

//

¹⁹ Ibid., p 15

²⁰ Id.

²¹ Id.

²² California Department of Transportation, Traffic Calming Guide, A compendium of Strategies chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/safety-programs/documents/traffic-calming/final-traffic-calming-guide_v2-a11y.pdf 11 24 2024

²³ <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/truckstop-resources/incentives-funding-truckstop>

²⁴ Draft Plan, October 2024, p 15

VI. Public Facilities and Service Element

The Plan seeks to ensure the sustainable growth of the CSD public facilities, utilities, and community services.²⁵ These goals and policies aim to ensure that Del Rey's public infrastructure is proactively managed, planned, and financed to support the community's evolving needs and balance current demands with future development. Policies P-PFS-1 and P-PFS-2 include coordination and support from the County to the CSD, which are essential for expansion. However, Familias de Del Rey expects the growth of Del Rey to decrease—or at least not increase—the current water rates. Many residents in Del Rey currently struggle to afford the water bill, and the affordability of vital services is a matter of significant concern in the community.

On March 21, 2024, the CSD approved a resolution raising the water bill by over 50%.²⁶ Members of Familias de Del Rey attended a CSD meeting after the approval and expressed their discomfort and lack of understanding of the bill's rate.²⁷ After many meetings, the CSD Board explained that the rate study and the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) fees made the increase unavoidable.²⁸ In addition, the CSD Board argues that the increase was necessary to avoid a financial deficit due to the small number of connections.²⁹ Currently, many residents still struggle to pay their water bills. If an increase of this percentage is approved in the next five or ten years due to growth, the rise of SGMA fees, Central Valley Salinity Alternatives for Long-Term Sustainability Program fees, or other circumstances, many residents would be displaced because they could not afford the utilities.

The County should include a policy to support water affordability within the Public Facilities and Services Element of the Del Rey Community Plan. The Central Valley is facing significant water-related challenges for human consumption, which are expected to intensify due to climate change. In unincorporated areas, these challenges could be exacerbated by other negative environmental and social impacts. Thus, Familias de Del Rey advocates for the County to include a policy that considers the affordability of the water and sewer services provided by the CSD.

VII. Open Space and Conservation

The Plan outlines key goals, policies, and implementation programs to improve community livability, public health, and access to recreational spaces.³⁰ These policies and programs are designed to ensure that the Del Rey community has access to sufficient open spaces, recreational opportunities, and community resources that promote a healthier, more connected, and vibrant environment. Familias de Del Rey is excited to hear more about these new spaces for recreation and growth, but it is concerned about the safety and maintenance of the current ones. Policy P-OSC-3a commits the County to conducting an inventory of Park space and to working with the

²⁵ Ibid., p 17

²⁶ Del Rey Community Services District Minutes of the Board of Directors Regular Board Meeting March 21, 2024 7:00 p.m. D-1

²⁷ Del Rey Community Services District Minutes of the Board of Directors Regular Board Meeting April 18, 2024 7:00 p.m. B

²⁸ Id.

²⁹ Id.

³⁰ Draft Plan, October 2024, p 17-18

CSD for maintenance.³¹ Nevertheless, residents often can't enjoy the spaces due to trash, odors, safety, or stray dogs. Familias de Del Rey advocates for the County to include policies with more support and enforcement related to these issues in the plan.

Policy P-OSC-6 plans for a centrally located community center that is easily accessible to residents with guaranteed long-term maintenance.³² The Plan is considering co-locating the community center with the CSD facilities. Familias de Del Rey wants to emphasize that many residents do not want to have a community center combined with the CSD offices because, many times, the community residents wish to have a space to discuss their community and concerns that is separate and distinct from the public agency providing services to the area. Residents also wish this place to be a center led by the community and for the community where the youth and the elderly can connect and enjoy the opportunity to support each other. The community believes that having a community center at the CSD building creates an uneasy environment for many community members. Discussions with the CSD make the environment political and biased. Community members often think that community events organized for children, the elderly, or others are related to the CSD or political filiation. Thus, residents might abstain from participating because they believe activities are related to the CSD.

VIII. Health and Safety

The policies and implementation programs outlined in the Health and Safety portion of the Plan aim to enhance the Del Rey community's safety, livability, and infrastructure.³³ These initiatives include strengthening enforcement against loitering, unsafe structures, and illegal property use.³⁴ Familias de Del Rey agrees with the stated importance of these issues. Simultaneously, its members want to underscore the undeniable fact that stray dogs have become a serious, and escalating health and safety concern.³⁵ Many residents, including children and the elderly, are afraid to walk in the streets of their community because they are afraid of the dogs. Therefore, Familias de Del Rey urges the County to adopt policies that address the growing problem of stray dogs on Del Rey's streets.

Familias de Del Rey believes that addressing the stray dog issue in their community is complex and has been focusing on addressing this issue with CRLA for years using a variety of approaches. Yet substantial, meaningful support from the County is an indispensable component of any long-term solution to this problem. Familias de Del Rey advocates for the County including policies in the Plan focusing on public education related to the responsibilities of pet owners, animal control enforcement. Additionally, the County can implement measures to prevent overpopulation, such as spay/neuter programs, licensing, microchipping, promoting responsible pet ownership, and ensuring that stray dogs are taken to shelters where they can be adopted or receive proper care. An

³¹ Id.

³² Draft Plan, October 2024, p 18-19

³³ Id.

³⁴ Id.

³⁵ Campagna RA, Roberts E, Porco A, Fritz CL. Clinical and epidemiologic features of persons accessing emergency departments for dog and cat bite injuries in California (2005-2019). J Am Vet Med Assoc. 2023 Feb 22;261(5):723-732.doi:10.2460/javma.22.11.0494.PMID:36853875,Availableat https://avmajournals.avma.org/view/journals/javma/261/5/javma.22.11.0494.xml?tab_body=pubmed on November 22,2024.

ongoing problem in reducing the stray dog population in Del Rey is that animal control services do not take proactive action to patrol the community in any way, which means that they typically only visit the community after someone has been harmed by a dog or some other conflict has occurred. Proactive animal control enforcement is a crucial step that should be implemented to reduce stray dogs and the resulting dangers they pose in Del Rey.


While the safety and infrastructure need of the Del Rey community are crucial, addressing the growing issue of stray dogs is equally important for the well-being of residents and animals alike. Familias de Del Rey urges the county to adopt a comprehensive approach that combines enforcement, public education, and animal welfare policies.

IX. Conclusion

While the Del Rey Community Plan addresses many critical issues, Familias de Del Rey urges the County to take more proactive, specific actions in critical areas, including economic development, language access, infrastructure, and public safety. These measures will help ensure the community thrives in a way that reflects its residents' needs and aspirations.

We thank you for considering our comments and look forward to your response.

Sincerely,



Brenda Martin Moya, Esq.
Staff Attorney, Community Equity Initiative
California Rural Legal Assistance, Inc.
3747 E Shields Ave
Fresno, CA 93726
bmoya@crla.org

Attorneys for Familias de Del Rey para el Cambio

EXHIBIT 4	
Del Rey Land Use Changes	
Existing	Proposed
APN 350-080-04: Agriculture (County General Plan)	APN 350-080-04 (portion): Residential: Medium Density (Del Rey Community Plan)
APN 350-080-04: Agriculture (County General Plan)	APN 350-080-04 (portion): Residential: Medium High Density (Del Rey Community Plan)
APN 350-080-04: Agriculture (County General Plan)	APN 350-080-04(portion): Commercial: Service Commercial (Del Rey Community Plan)
APN 350-230-03T: Agriculture (County General Plan)	APN 350-230-03T: Public Facilities (Del Rey Community Plan)
APN 350-230-16T: Industrial: General (Del Rey Community Plan)	APN 350-230-16T: Public Facilities (Del Rey Community Plan)
APN 350-080-80ST: Industrial: Limited (Del Rey Community Plan)	APN 350-080-80ST: Public Facilities (Del Rey Community Plan)
APN 350-123-07U: Residential: Medium Density (Del Rey Community Plan)	APN 350-123-07U: Public Facilities (Del Rey Community Plan)
APN 350-180-05: Public Facilities: Park (Del Rey Community Plan)	APN 350-180-05: Residential: Medium Density (Del Rey Community Plan)
APN 350-180-04: Public Facilities: Park (Del Rey Community Plan)	APN 350-180-04: Residential: Medium Density (Del Rey Community Plan)
APN 350-080-73S: Industrial: Limited (Reserve) (Del Rey Community Plan)	APN 350-080-73S: Industrial: Limited (Del Rey Community Plan)
APN 350-211-08: Residential: Medium Density Reserve (Del Rey Community Plan)	APN 350-211-08: Residential: Medium Density (Del Rey Community Plan)
APN 350-211-10: Residential: Medium Density Reserve (Del Rey Community Plan)	APN 350-211-10: Residential: Medium Density (Del Rey Community Plan)
APN 350-211-01: Residential: Medium Density Reserve (Del Rey Community Plan)	APN 350-211-01: Residential: Medium Density (Del Rey Community Plan)
APN 350-211-17: Residential: Medium Density Reserve (Del Rey Community Plan)	APN 350-211-17: Residential: Medium Density (Del Rey Community Plan)
APN 350-211-11: Residential: Medium Density Reserve (Del Rey Community Plan)	APN 350-211-11: Residential: Medium Density (Del Rey Community Plan)
APN 350-211-02: Residential: Medium Density Reserve (Del Rey Community Plan)	APN 350-211-02: Residential: Medium Density (Del Rey Community Plan)
APN 350-211-09: Residential: Medium Density Reserve (Del Rey Community Plan)	APN 350-211-09: Residential: Medium Density (Del Rey Community Plan)
APN 350-211-12: Residential: Medium Density Reserve (Del Rey Community Plan)	APN 350-211-12: Residential: Medium Density (Del Rey Community Plan)
APN 350-211-03: Residential: Medium Density Reserve (Del Rey Community Plan)	APN 350-211-03: Residential: Medium Density (Del Rey Community Plan)
APN 350-211-04: Residential: Medium Density Reserve (Del Rey Community Plan)	APN 350-211-04: Residential: Medium Density (Del Rey Community Plan)
APN 350-211-13: Residential: Medium Density Reserve (Del Rey Community Plan)	APN 350-211-13: Residential: Medium Density (Del Rey Community Plan)

[illegible]

Existing	Proposed
APN 350-223-07: Residential: Medium Density Reserve (Del Rey Community Plan)	APN 350-223-07: Residential: Medium Density (Del Rey Community Plan)
APN 350-223-08: Residential: Medium Density Reserve (Del Rey Community Plan)	APN 350-223-08: Residential: Medium Density (Del Rey Community Plan)
APN 350-223-09: Residential: Medium Density Reserve (Del Rey Community Plan)	APN 350-223-09: Residential: Medium Density (Del Rey Community Plan)
APN 350-223-10: Residential: Medium Density Reserve (Del Rey Community Plan)	APN 350-223-10: Residential: Medium Density (Del Rey Community Plan)
APN 350-222-24: Residential: Medium Density Reserve (Del Rey Community Plan)	APN 350-222-24: Residential: Medium Density (Del Rey Community Plan)
APN 350-222-17: Residential: Medium Density Reserve (Del Rey Community Plan)	APN 350-222-17: Residential: Medium Density (Del Rey Community Plan)
APN 350-222-18: Residential: Medium Density Reserve (Del Rey Community Plan)	APN 350-222-18: Residential: Medium Density (Del Rey Community Plan)
APN 350-222-19: Residential: Medium Density Reserve (Del Rey Community Plan)	APN 350-222-19: Residential: Medium Density (Del Rey Community Plan)
APN 350-222-20: Residential: Medium Density Reserve (Del Rey Community Plan)	APN 350-222-20: Residential: Medium Density (Del Rey Community Plan)
APN 350-080-90S: Industrial: Limited Reserve (Del Rey Community Plan)	APN 350-080-90S: Industrial: Limited (Del Rey Community Plan)
APN 350-080-91S: Industrial: Limited Reserve (Del Rey Community Plan)	APN 350-080-91S: Industrial: Limited (Del Rey Community Plan)
APN 350-020-55 (portion): Reserve Residential: Medium Density (Del Rey Community Plan)	APN 350-020-55 (portion): Residential: Medium Density (Del Rey Community Plan)
APN 350-101-14: Commercial: Service Commercial (Del Rey Community Plan)	APN 350-101-14: Residential: Medium Density (Del Rey Community Plan)
APN 350-121-04ST: Commercial: Service Commercial (Del Rey Community Plan)	APN 350-121-04ST: Public Facilities (Del Rey Community Plan)