Master Environmental Impact Report
General Plan and Development Code Update
City of Fresno, Fresno County, California

Planned Land Use Requests
Environmental Evaluation

Prepared for:

City of Fresno
2600 Fresno Street
Fresno, CA 93721

Contact: Jennifer Clark, AICP

Prepared by:

FirstCarbon Solutions
1234 O Street
Fresno, CA 93721
888.826.5814

Contact: Michael Houlihan, AICP

December 5, 2014

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

During the preparation of the General Plan and Development Code Update and the Master Environmental Impact Report (EIR), the City of Fresno staff recorded requests from property owners and non-property owners to modify land use designations identified on the City of Fresno General Plan Land Use Diagram, Figure LU-1, in the General Plan. The City of Fresno staff also requested revisions to the General Plan land uses. The land uses illustrated on Figure LU-1 include those uses that were identified by the City of Fresno City Council in August 2012 to be further evaluated in the Master EIR. The land uses illustrated on Figure LU-1 were fully evaluated in the Draft Master EIR.

Subsequent to distributing the Draft Master EIR for public review, the City of Fresno has prepared this additional environmental evaluation to assess the potential effects associated with the requested land use changes.

Based on Section 15088.5(a) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, the City of Fresno is required to recirculate an EIR when significant new information is added to the Master EIR after public notice is given to the availability of the Master EIR for public review but before certification.

> "New information added to an EIR is not 'significant' unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project's proponents have declined to implement. 'Significant new information' requiring recirculation include, for example, a disclosure showing that
>
> (1) A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.
>
> (2) A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.
>
> (3) A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the project, but the project's proponents decline to adopt it.
>
> (4) The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded. *(Mountain Lion Coalition v. Fish and Game Com. (1989) 214 Cal.App.3d 1043)*.

According to Section 15088.5(b) of the CEQA Guidelines, the City of Fresno is not required to recirculate the Master EIR where the new information added to the Master EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate Master EIR.

SECTION 2: PROPOSED LAND USE CHANGE REQUESTS

The requested land use changes are provided in Attachment 1 to this appendix. Tables 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 in Attachment 1 provide the proposed land use changes. Table 1.1 includes those requests by property owners and non-property owners for specific parcels, as well as proposed land use changes for the same specific parcels by the City of Fresno staff. Where there were multiple land use change requests for a parcel, the change request that would result in the greatest traffic volume increase is identified as the worst-case request and further evaluated. The worst-case change request for each parcel is highlighted in red. Table 1.2 includes land use change request by the City of Fresno staff for parcels not identified in Table 1.1. In addition, Table 1.3 includes land use change requests by the City of Fresno staff for existing, approved Final Maps that either have been fully constructed, substantially constructed, and those that do not have any lots constructed on the parcels. The Final Maps with no lots constructed on the parcels are the first four Final Maps listed in Table 1.3.

The Final Maps that have been fully constructed or substantially constructed would not result in substantial changes to the traffic volumes evaluated in the Draft Master EIR because even though the General Plan land uses are recommended to be revised, the proposed land use designations would be consistent with the densities that have been constructed on the sites of these Final Maps and consistent with the traffic volumes evaluated in the Draft Master EIR for these sites.

Additional data for each of the land use change requests are provided in Tables 1.3, 1.4 and 1.5 in Attachment 1. These tables provide information on the changes in dwelling units, square footage of non-residential uses, employment, and daily trips for each proposed land use change request.

.

SECTION 3: ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

The initial evaluation of the proposed land use change requests included a qualitative traffic impact evaluation by Fehr & Peers, the traffic consultant who prepared the traffic evaluation in the Master EIR. The volume to capacity ratios, corresponding levels of service, and the significance thresholds for the Traffic Impact Zones (TAZ) identified in General Plan Policy MT-2-I for roadways in the vicinity of each proposed land use change request were evaluated. Attachment 2 to this appendix includes Table 2.1 that categorizes each of the land use requests that would result in a change in traffic volume. The categories that were used include the following:

0 Increase in traffic would not likely create new impact

1 Increase in traffic may cause new impact. Adjacent or nearby roadways operate close to the significance threshold for the Traffic Impact Zone (TAZ). Increase in traffic may cause the threshold to be exceeded or may exacerbate LOS exception. The outcome may depend on development in adjacent areas.

2 Increase in traffic would likely create a new impact.

3 The area in the vicinity of the land use request change would results in less traffic or an increase of less than 10 trips. The request land use change would not create a new impact.

Based on the qualitative traffic evaluation, some of the land use requests could result in additional significant traffic impacts (Categories 1 and 2). These land use requests are identified as Categories 1 and 2 and provided in Table 1 below. If the City of Fresno City Council considers the land use requests in Table 1, a recirculated Master EIR would be required.

Table 1: Land Use Change Requests Within the City of Fresno Planning Area That Could Result in Additional Significant Traffic Impacts

Identification Number1,2	Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location1	Acres1
3.h.1	**West Fresno Community Leaders (Not Owners)** West side of Elm btwn. Church and Jensen	12.21
3.h.2	**West Fresno Community Leaders (Not Owners)** West side of Elm btwn. Church and Jensen	3.96
5.g	**City Councilman Oliver Baines – November 12, 2013** South of Church/Walnut/Grove/Thorne (leave proposed school site)	30
6	**Eisner Family Trust –** 5633 N. Fig Garden Loop (APN 509-290-07) What about southern half of PLU designation at this corner (APN 509-290-06 at 2.05 acres)?	2.29

Identification Number1,2	Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location1	Acres1
17.b	**Fancher Creek Properties – Nov. 2012** NEC Fowler/Fancher Creek	3.64
21.f	**Granville Homes** **NE Grantland/Barstow** **(**APN 505-281-16, 17 and 18)	3.93
41.b	**Parga Partners - College Park Master Planned Community** APN 316-040-77	26.90
41.c	**Parga Partners - College Park Master Planned Community** APN 316-040-66	3.06
41.d	**Parga Partners - College Park Master Planned Community** APN 316-040-63	5.77
41.e	**Parga Partners - College Park Master Planned Community** APN 316-040-17S	19.1
41.f	**Parga Partners - College Park Master Planned Community** APN 316-180-09	19.55
41.k.1	**Parga Partners - College Park Master Planned Community** APN 316-051-07	20
44	**River Park Tower** APN 303-201-29	2.1
46	**Shamlian Property** APN 510-040-30	2.2
47	**Sol Development** APN 507-021-01S, 02S, 03S, 05S, 09S, 10S, 17S, 22S, 37S, 38S, 39S, and 40S	13.04
50	**SEGA Plan Mod – Mansmann/Greenwood** A-08-12 APN 316-051-06	19.02
51	**SEGA Plan Mod - Dennis Simonian** A-08-14 APN 316-051-02	17.53
53.a	**SEGA Plan Mod – Berberian Ranches Inc.** A-08-21 APN 316-040-58	74

Identification Number1,2	Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location1	Acres1
53.b	**SEGA Plan Mod – Berberian Ranches Inc.** A-08-21 APN 316-040-58	25.94
53.c	**SEGA Plan Mod – Berberian Ranches Inc.** A-08-21 APN 316-040-58	8
54.c.1	**SEGA Plan Mod – Greg Gaddie** A-08-24 Exhibit A-3a: APN 313-400-09, 15, and 16	47
54.c.2	**SEGA Plan Mod – Greg Gaddie** A-08-24 Exhibit A-3a: APN 313-400-09, 15, and 16	22.81
56.e.1	**Ashley Werner** Replace Industrial within the Industrial Triangle between Hwy 99 and 41 with Business Park	2,135.28
56.e.2	**Ashley Werner** Replace Industrial within the Industrial Triangle between Hwy 99 and 41 with Business Park	140.45
56.e.3	**Ashley Werner** Replace Industrial within the Industrial Triangle between Hwy 99 and 41 with Business Park	58.47
56.e.4	**Ashley Werner** Replace Industrial within the Industrial Triangle between Hwy 99 and 41 with Business Park	32.75
F11	**NWC Elm and Jensen**	6.5
F12	**NWC Elm and Jensen**	9.81
Total		1,053

[1] Data obtained from Tables 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 in Attachment 1
[2] Specific land use requests were obtained from Table 2.1 in Attachment 2.
Source: FirstCarbon Solutions, 2014

The remaining land use change requests that result in a change to the General Plan land use designation on a parcel within the City of Fresno Planning Area are depicted in Table 2, below. These remaining requests are evaluated for each of the environmental issues discussed in the Master EIR.

Table 2: Land Use Change Requests Within the City of Fresno Planning Area Further Analyzed in this Evaluation

Identification Number[1]	Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location[1]	Acres[1]
1	**McCaffrey – NW Herndon/Hayes** (APN 503-020-09) TM 6052	14.15
2	**McCaffrey – NE Herndon/Hayes** (APN 503-020-51) FM 6053	4.10
3.c.4	**West Fresno Community Leaders (Not Owners)** Marks-Valentine-Whites Bridge-Madison	28.2
3.c.5	**West Fresno Community Leaders (Not Owners)** Marks-Valentine-Whites Bridge-Madison	14.5
3.g	**West Fresno Community Leaders (Not Owners)** Marks-Valentine-Whites Bridge-Madison ¼ section NE Marks and Church (Hughes-Marks-Church-Jensen) (Per phone conversation with Bob Mitchell on 11/27/2013, request change from rm to change to rl)	129.65
4	**Lisa Mochizuki – SWC – Kings Canyon and Minnewawa**	9.02
5.b.1	**City Councilman Oliver Baines – November 12, 2013** Hughes-Whites Bridge-Valentine-Kearney	106.46
5.b.2.a	**City Councilman Oliver Baines – November 12, 2013** Marks-Valentine-Whites Bridge-Madison	6.5
5.b.2.b	**City Councilman Oliver Baines – November 12, 2013** Marks-Valentine-Whites Bridge-Madison	52
5.b.2.c	**City Councilman Oliver Baines – November 12, 2013** Marks-Valentine-Whites Bridge-Madison	19.6
5.c	**City Councilman Oliver Baines – November 12, 2013** North-Walnut-West-Annadale	226.64
5.e.1	**City Councilman Oliver Baines – November 12, 2013** Whites Bridge – SR180 – West to Brawley	20
5.e.2	**City Councilman Oliver Baines – November 12, 2013** Whites Bridge – SR180 – West to Brawley	41
5.e.3	**City Councilman Oliver Baines – November 12, 2013** Whites Bridge – SR180 – West to Brawley	38
5.e.4	**City Councilman Oliver Baines – November 12, 2013** Whites Bridge – SR180 – West to Brawley	9
5.e.5	**City Councilman Oliver Baines – November 12, 2013** Whites Bridge – SR180 – West to Brawley	5

Identification Number[1]	Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location[1]	Acres[1]
5.f.1	**City Councilman Oliver Baines – November 12, 2013** South of Church to Jensen between Walnut and Martin Luther King	30.75
5.f.2	**City Councilman Oliver Baines – November 12, 2013** South of Church to Jensen between Walnut and Martin Luther King	19.25
5.h	**City Councilman Oliver Baines – November 12, 2013** SW Hughes/California (reduce 40 acre park to 20)	18.69
5.i.2	**City Councilman Oliver Baines – November 12, 2013** California-Hughes-Church-Marks Res. High to Res. Medium	38.14
5.i.3	**City Councilman Oliver Baines – November 12, 2013** California-Hughes-Church-Marks Res. Urban Neighborhood to Res. Medium	35.50
7.a	**Central Unified School District – June 25,2013** SE Veterans Blvd and Barstow	10.59
7.b	**Central Unified School District – June 25,2013** NE Grantland/Ashlan (labeling issue)	160
7.c	**Central Unified School District – June 25,2013** NW Grantland/Dakota (labeling issue)	15.68
7.d	**Central Unified School District – June 25,2013** North side Shields btwn. Bryan/Hayes (labeling issue)	13.88
7.e	**Central Unified School District – June 25,2013** SE Shields and Valentine TM 5481 (9.81 acres with 80 du)	13.64
7.f	**Central Unified School District – June 25,2013** North side McKinley between Brawley/Valentine	19.24
7.g	**Central Unified School District – June 25,2013** NE Brawley/Madison (labeling issue)	20
7.h	**Central Unified School District – June 25,2013** West side of Brawley between Belmont and Olive	18.33
7.i.1	**Central Unified School District – June 25,2013** North side of California between Valentine and Brawley Change to Ponding Basin	9.15
7.i.2	**Central Unified School District – June 25,2013** North side of California between Valentine and Brawley Change to Res Low	9.15

Identification Number[1]	Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location[1]	Acres[1]
8.a	**Fresno Unified School District – July 2, 2013** West side Marks, south of Ashlan	9
8.b	**Fresno Unified School District – July 2, 2013** Tenaya Middle School - NE Fruit/Bullard (labeling issue)	21.7
8.c	**Fresno Unified School District – July 2, 2013** Cooper Middle School - SW Hughes/Bellaire (labeling issue)	16.6
8.d	**Fresno Unified School District – July 2, 2013** Addicott Elementary School - SW Chestnut/Dayton (labeling issue)	3.8
8.e.1	**Fresno Unified School District – July 2, 2013** Gaston Middle School – SE Church/MLK (labeling issue) Rename Elem and PB/B to Middle School	21.44
8.e.2[2]	**Fresno Unified School District – July 2, 2013**	21.44
8.f	**Fresno Unified School District – July 2, 2013** Sunset Elementary - SE Crystal/Eden (labeling issue)	9.67
8.g.1	**Fresno Unified School District – July 2, 2013** Future Schools: W of West, S of California Ave. (labeling issue)	10.25
8.h	**Fresno Unified School District – July 2, 2013** Sequoia Middle - SW Cedar Hamilton (labeling issue)	16.86
8.i	**Fresno Unified School District – July 2, 2013** Vang Pao Elementary – SW Cedar/Heaton	8.07
8.j	**Fresno Unified School District – July 2, 2013** Bakman Elementary – NE Belmont/Helm	11.5
8.k	**Fresno Unified School District – July 2, 2013** NW Willow/Belmont	8
9.a	**Clovis Unified School District** SE Clinton/Temperance – email 10-25-13 *(CUSD says 775 students & 1,000 trips/day for new school)*	23.53
9.b	**Clovis Unified School District - August 12, 2013 Letter** SE – Olive/De Wolf in SEGA	20.8
9.d	**Clovis Unified School District - August 12, 2013 Letter** New Elem. School -Clinton & Armstrong	13.72
9.e	**Clovis Unified School District - May 23, 2013 Letter** NW Olive/Armstrong – Future Water Treatment facility shown as SS – Spec. School POSS (Correct NW	55.95

Identification Number[1]	Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location[1]	Acres[1]
	Treatment Facility designation too)	
10.a.1 and 10.a.2	**Sanger Unified Schools - May 1, 2013 Letter** Correct HS, MS, ES designations N of Jensen between Fowler and Temperance – shown as SS on POSS - Correct Fowler, Church, Armstrong, and Jenson to Public Facility – Middle & High School - Correct school site east of Armstrong and north of Jensen to Public Facility – Elementary School	127
12.b	**Fresno Metro Flood Control District (FMFCD) – July 23, 2013 and Oct. 9, 2013** Basin specific map changes SE corner of McKinley and Bryan Avenue alignment	2.87
12.c	**Fresno Metro Flood Control District (FMFCD) – July 23, 2013 and Oct. 9, 2013** Basin specific map changes SE corner of Jensen and Marks Avenue	10.30
12.e	**Fresno Metro Flood Control District (FMFCD) – July 23, 2013 and Oct. 9, 2013** Basin "AS" at Northwest Corner of California and Valentine	7.8
12.f	**Fresno Metro Flood Control District (FMFCD) – July 23, 2013 and Oct. 9, 2013** Armstrong and Church	6
14.a	**Steve Weil** – West Barstow/Veterans Blvd/Herndon Canal APN 505-060-08. Also, letters from Sol Development dated August 18, 2014, and August 29, 2012, and subsequent emails. (Staff intended CMX – mapping looks like RMX) RMX and Park to CMX (11.28 acre RMX & 5.6 acre Park)	16.88
14.b	**Steve Weil** – West Barstow/Veterans Blvd/Herndon Canal APN 505-060-08. Also, letters from Sol Development dated August 18, 2014, and August 29, 2012, and subsequent emails. (Staff intended CMX – mapping looks like RMX) RMX to CMX (13.22 acres with 175 dwelling units)	13.22
15	**Grubb and Ellis for Owner** – SWC W. Sierra/N. Polk	3.91
16.a	**Grubb and Ellis for Partial Owner**-Veterans/Bryan Or - Expand Highway and Auto for more uses	42.25

Identification Number[1]	Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location[1]	Acres[1]
	APN 040-08-081, 83S, 85S, 90S, 91S, 96S and 97S	
16.b	**Grubb and Ellis for Partial Owner** Veterans/Bryan Or - Expand Highway and Auto for more uses APN 040-08-081, 83S, 85S, 90S, 91S, 96S and 97S	2.89
16.c	**Grubb and Ellis for Partial Owner** Veterans/Bryan Or - Expand Highway and Auto for more uses APN 040-08-081, 83S, 85S, 90S, 91S, 96S and 97S	0.63
17.c	**Fancher Creek Properties – Nov. 2012** Add Transit Station or Police Station Precedent/ Consequences	1.5
18.b	**Ken Nguyen** Above NW Maple/California (APN: 471-302-28)	1.97
21.a.1	**Granville Homes** **Copper River** Outlot M	20.52
21.a.2	**Granville Homes** **Copper River** Outlot P (request change to 17.83 acres while the rest can remain Res. Medium High)	17.63
21.a.3.a	**Granville Homes** **Copper River** Outlot Q	16.49
21.a.3.b	**Granville Homes** **Copper River** Village I	30.09
21.a.3.c	**Granville Homes** **Copper River** Outlot LL	2.95
21.a.4	**Granville Homes** **Copper River** Outlot Y	10.08
21.a.5	**Granville Homes** **Copper River** Outlot X	12.85
21.a.6	**Granville Homes** **Copper River**	5.27

Identification Number[1]	Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location[1]	Acres[1]
	CRR owned lot adjacent to Lanier lot (APN 579-074-42S and 44S)	
21.a.7	**Granville Homes** **Copper River** Outlot OO	26.82
21.a.8	**Granville Homes** **Copper River** Outlot NN (Street to be realigned directly southerly)	6.66
21.a.9	**Granville Homes** **Copper River** Outlot PP (request change to 12 acres while the rest can remain Commercial)	12
21.a.10	**Granville Homes** **Copper River** Park and Surrounding – NW Chestnut/Copper TM6087	14.5
21.a.11	**Granville Homes** **Copper River** Outlot JJ (Portion)	3.5
21.a.12	**Granville Homes** **Copper River - Approved/Finished Developments** Village A (T5205 Terrabella)	28.44
21.a.13.a	**Granville Homes** **Copper River - Approved/Finished Developments** Village D - Eastern Portion	13
21.a.13.b	**Granville Homes** **Copper River - Approved/Finished Developments** Village A (T5205 Terrabella) Village D - Western Portion	22.8
21.a.14.a	**Granville Homes** **Copper River - Approved/Finished Developments** Village E (T5271 Links) - Western Portion	16.5
21.a.14.b	**Granville Homes** **Copper River - Approved/Finished Developments** Village E (T5271 Links) - Eastern Portion	10.21
21.a.15	**Granville Homes** **Copper River - Approved/Finished Developments** Village G (T892, 6045, 6065)	32.80

Identification Number[1]	Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location[1]	Acres[1]
21.a.16.a	**Granville Homes** **Copper River - Approved/Finished Developments** The Top of portion of Village F	13.07
21.a.16.b	**Granville Homes** **Copper River - Approved/Finished Developments** Village A (T5205 Terrabella)	0.6
21.a.17	**Granville Homes** **Copper River - Approved/Finished Developments** T5963	23.69
21.b.1.A	**Granville Homes** **Tract 5717 and 6033 – NE ¼ Section Fowler/Clinton** APN: 310-041-38 (T6033)	1
21.b.1.B	**Granville Homes** **Tract 5717 and 6033 – NE ¼ Section Fowler/Clinton** APN: 310-041-38 (T6033)	3.56
21.b.1.C	**Granville Homes** **Tract 5717 and 6033 – NE ¼ Section Fowler/Clinton** APN: 310-041-38 (T6033)	31
21.b.3.A	**Granville Homes** **Tract 5717 and 6033 – NE ¼ Section Fowler/Clinton** APN: 310-740-07 (Ensure Live Work Units can happen on this property.	1
21.b.3.B	**Granville Homes** **Tract 5717 and 6033 – NE ¼ Section Fowler/Clinton** APN: 310-740-07 Keep similar to current Light Industrial CM zoning as is under 2025 General Plan and existing zoning code	3.87
21.b.4	**Granville Homes** **Tract 5717 and 6033 – NE ¼ Section Fowler/Clinton** APN: 310-740-08 and 09	14.02
21.c	**Granville Homes** **North side of Bullard near Bryan – to HWY 99** (APN 504-080-16S) (TM 5584)	9.51
21.d	**Granville Homes** **North side Clinton –Bet. Polk/Hayes –**(APN 312-061-	19.51

Identification Number[1]	Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location[1]	Acres[1]
	18) TM 5560	
21.e	**Granville Homes** **Grantland – South of Dakota Alignment** (APN 512-141-33)	19.56
21.g.1	**Granville Homes** **Artisan Square Area – NE Ashlan/Bryan/Hayes** (TM 5891)	4
21.g.2	**Granville Homes** **Artisan Square Area – NE Ashlan/Bryan/Hayes** (TM 5891)	1
21.g.3	**Granville Homes** **Artisan Square Area – NE Ashlan/Bryan/Hayes** (TM 5891)	12
21.g.4	**Granville Homes** **Artisan Square Area – NE Ashlan/Bryan/Hayes** (TM 5891)	21
21.h	**Granville Homes** **Bryan, between Ashlan and Dakota (APN 512-050-89)**	17.54
21.i.2	**Granville Homes** **Mission Ranch** Hughes-Marks-Whites Bridge-Kearney	14.02
21.i.3	**Granville Homes** **Mission Ranch**	4.92
21.i.4	**Granville Homes** **Mission Ranch**	16.42
21.i.5.a	**Granville Homes** **Mission Ranch**	3.45
21.i.5.b	**Granville Homes** **Mission Ranch**	3.61
21.i.5.c	**Granville Homes** **Mission Ranch**	7.24
21.i.6.a	**Granville Homes** **Mission Ranch**	14.09
21.i.6.b	**Granville Homes** **Mission Ranch**	5.2
21.i.7	**Granville Homes**	9.75

Identification Number[1]	Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location[1]	Acres[1]
	Mission Ranch	
21.i.8	**Granville Homes** **Mission Ranch**	4.95
21.i.9	**Granville Homes** **Mission Ranch**	14.31
21.i.10	**Granville Homes** **Mission Ranch**	9.81
21.i.11	**Granville Homes** **Mission Ranch**	17.95
21.i.12	**Granville Homes** **Mission Ranch**	18.89
21.i.13	**Granville Homes** **Mission Ranch**	18.96
21.i.14	**Granville Homes** **Mission Ranch**	17.65
21.i.15	**Granville Homes** **Mission Ranch**	7.07
21.i.16	**Granville Homes** **Mission Ranch**	19.55
21.j.3	**Westlake – Tract 5915 (Gettysburg, Grantland, Shields, and Garfield)** Eliminate CMX and replace with Medium Density	15
21.j.4	**Westlake – Tract 5915 (Gettysburg, Grantland, Shields, and Garfield)** Reduce size of Commercial (Ashlan and Grantland)	2.9
21.j.5	**Westlake – Tract 5915 (Gettysburg, Grantland, Shields, and Garfield)** Reduce size of Urban Neighborhood	18.2
21.j.6	**Westlake – Tract 5915 (Gettysburg, Grantland, Shields, and Garfield)** Commercial on Shields and Grantland	3.5
21.k.1	**Recorded Final Maps/Under Construction/Already Developed** SW Church/Fowler – Tract 5450 (6.54 du/ac)	18.07
21.k.2	**Recorded Final Maps/Under Construction/Already Developed**	86.87

Identification Number[1]	Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location[1]	Acres[1]
	SE Sunnyside/Church – Tracts 5458/5477 (4.19 du/ac)	
21.k.3	**Recorded Final Maps/Under Construction/Already Developed** NE Bullard/Grantland – Tract 5357 (5.46 du/ac)	36.22
21.k.4	**Recorded Final Maps/Under Construction/Already Developed** 4179/4171 W. Sample – Tract 5278 (3.27 du/ac)	17.41
21.k.5	**Recorded Final Maps/Under Construction/Already Developed** NE Garfield and Barstow – Tract 5597 (APN 505-321-01 thru 22, 505-322-01 thru 08, 505-331-01 thru 13, 505-332-01 thru 19 (4.87 du/ac)	27.91
22	**Sol Development for Owner**- West side of Maple between Perrin and Shepherd (developed condo complex)	4.5
23	**Sol Development for Owner**- SWC Valentine and McKinley (APN 449-030-63)	8.77
24.a	**The Kashian Group – Shaw and Hwy 99** APN 508-030-04 and 05	15.54
24.b	**The Kashian Group – Shaw and Hwy 99** APN 508-030-06	27.61
25	**Paul Fourchy** APN 506-130-28	17.6
26	**Art Terzian** APN 433-080-01 and 02	4.89
27	**Troy McKenney** APN 442-022-08 and 09	0.86
28	**Alfonso Manrique** APN 428-340-09	0.37
29	**Will Tackett** APN 494-060-51T	0.3
30	**Arkel Arisian** APN 568-010-20	20
31	**Chestnut and Alluvial (Land owners who have written letters** include: Beth Brown, Dan Taylor, Erica Ayala, Jerry Pohl, Kassandra Booth, Mary Grant Bell, Michael and Barbara Garrison, Dr. and Mrs James Fletcher, Ray Loom and Rick Olsen, Shalea and Mark Pitman, Steve and Lorie Collins, Tiffany and Josh Madsen, William and	18.52

Identification Number[1]	Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location[1]	Acres[1]
	Linda Hicks, William Gong, RJ Perez, Norma and Alice Otani, Kerry McGuire, James Olber, Denise and Winfred Nishmine) APN 404-071-45	
32	**Generation Home - Steven Spano** APN 402-030-70 Steve Brandau made same request on behalf of owner	3.06
33	**Kathy Van** APN 480-213-13, 14, and 15 (Request 18a is likely a previous land owner for APN 480-213-14)	1.13
34	**Fresno Pacific University** – Dirk Poeschel APN 472-040-25, 26, 27 and 28	2.56
35	**Gary Giannetta** APN 312-081-12 TM 6091	2.25
36	**Gary Giannetta** APN 472-022-13 TM 5387	8.73
37	**Gary Giannetta** APN 511-011-18 TM 5538 Also, letter from Wagner and Wagner asking for same thing	19.85
38	**John Valentino** APN 459-200-01	0.38
39	**Mark Knox** APN 507-021-02S	0.86
40.a	**Steve Ohanesian** APN 481-020-01	11
40.b	**Steve Ohanesian** APN 481-020-01	5
41.a	**Parga Partners - College Park Master Planned Community** APN 316-071-42	34.83
41.g.1	**Parga Partners - College Park Master Planned Community** APN 316-051-18	7
41.g.2	**Parga Partners - College Park Master Planned Community** APN 316-051-18	30
41.h	**Parga Partners - College Park Master Planned Community**	37.72

Identification Number[1]	Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location[1]	Acres[1]
	APN 316-051-20	
41.i	**Parga Partners - College Park Master Planned Community** APN 316-051-21	80
41.j	**Parga Partners - College Park Master Planned Community** APN 316-051-09	14
41.k.2	**Parga Partners - College Park Master Planned Community** APN 316-051-07	13
42	**Sherman Spalding property – Dirk Poeschel** APN 403-030-07	2.8
43	**Sherman Spalding property – Dirk Poeschel** APN 509-020-35S	12.28
45.a	**Sequoia Fresno Joint Venture** APN 402-220-66 and 67	18.25
45.b	**Sequoia Fresno Joint Venture** APN 402-220-66 and 67	9.15
45.c	**Sequoia Fresno Joint Venture** APN 402-220-66 and 67	0.6
48	**Stone Soup** APN 418-401-10	1.48
49	**Sarkis Atachian** APN 433-210-33, 39 and 40	2.77
52.a	**SEGA Plan Mod – Ralph and Frances Reitz** A-08-20 Property Owner #5: APN 316-150-01 and 02	18.95
52.b.1	**SEGA Plan Mod – Ralph and Frances Reitz** A-08-20 Property Owner #6: APN 316-150-11	4.27
52.b.2	**SEGA Plan Mod – Ralph and Frances Reitz** A-08-20 Property Owner #6: APN 316-150-11	5.65
52.c	**SEGA Plan Mod – Ralph and Frances Reitz** A-08-20 Property Owner #7: APN 316-150-13	0.97
52.d.1	**SEGA Plan Mod – Ralph and Frances Reitz** A-08-20 Property Owner #8: APN 316-150-14	8
52.d.2	**SEGA Plan Mod – Ralph and Frances Reitz** A-08-20 Property Owner #8: APN 316-150-14	10.2
52.e	**SEGA Plan Mod – Ralph and Frances Reitz** A-08-20 Property Owner #10 and 11: APN 316-150-31 and 32	18.6

Identification Number[1]	Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location[1]	Acres[1]
52.f.1	**SEGA Plan Mod – Ralph and Frances Reitz** A-08-20 Property Owner #12: APN 316-150-33	4.25
52.f.2	**SEGA Plan Mod – Ralph and Frances Reitz** A-08-20 Property Owner #12: APN 316-150-33	1.75
52.g.1	**SEGA Plan Mod – Ralph and Frances Reitz** A-08-20 Property Owner #14: APN 316-150-35	15.74
52.g.2	**SEGA Plan Mod – Ralph and Frances Reitz** A-08-20 Property Owner #14: APN 316-150-35	3.85
52.h	**SEGA Plan Mod – Ralph and Frances Reitz** A-08-20 Property Owner #16: APN 316-150-38	2.41
52.i	**SEGA Plan Mod – Ralph and Frances Reitz** A-08-20 Property Owner #18: APN 316-150-44	2.46
52.j	**SEGA Plan Mod – Ralph and Frances Reitz** A-08-20 Property Owner #19: APN 316-150-45	7.32
52.k	**SEGA Plan Mod – Ralph and Frances Reitz** A-08-20 Property Owner #20: APN 316-150-46	12.50
52.l	**SEGA Plan Mod – Ralph and Frances Reitz** A-08-20 Property Owner #21: APN 316-150-47	7.32
52.m	**SEGA Plan Mod – Ralph and Frances Reitz** A-08-20 Property Owner #27: APN 316-150-57	3.04
52.n	**SEGA Plan Mod – Ralph and Frances Reitz** A-08-20 Property Owner #16 and 17: APN 316-170-16 and 17	10.83
54.a.1	**SEGA Plan Mod – Greg Gaddie** A-08-24 Exhibit A-1a: APN 316-031-21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 61, 62, 62, and 64	104.07
54.a.2	**SEGA Plan Mod – Greg Gaddie** A-08-24 Exhibit A-1a: APN 316-031-21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 61, 62, 62, and 64	51
54.b.1	**SEGA Plan Mod – Greg Gaddie** A-08-24 Exhibit A-2a: APN 313-410-13 and 15	57.68
54.b.2	**SEGA Plan Mod – Greg Gaddie** A-08-24 Exhibit A-2a: APN 313-410-13 and 15	30.8
54.d.1	**SEGA Plan Mod – Greg Gaddie** A-08-24 Exhibit A-4a: APN 313-030-35, 40, 50, 51, 52, and 53	47.3
54.d.2	**SEGA Plan Mod – Greg Gaddie** A-08-24 Exhibit A-4a: APN 313-030-35, 40, 50, 51, 52, and 53	97.42

Identification Number[1]	Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location[1]	Acres[1]
54.e	**SEGA Plan Mod – Greg Gaddie** A-08-24 Exhibit A-5a: APN 310-342-04, 05, and 06	33.36
54.g.1	**SEGA Plan Mod – Greg Gaddie** A-08-24 Exhibit A-7a: APN 310-090-10 and 11	38.90
54.g.2	**SEGA Plan Mod – Greg Gaddie** A-08-24 Exhibit A-7a: APN 310-090-10 and 11	17.83
54.h.1	**SEGA Plan Mod – Greg Gaddie** A-08-24 Exhibit A-8a: APN 309-210-41	20.1
54.h.2	**SEGA Plan Mod – Greg Gaddie** A-08-24 Exhibit A-8a: APN 309-210-41	9.2
54.i.1	**SEGA Plan Mod – Greg Gaddie** A-08-24 Exhibit A-8a: APN 309-210-41	37
54.i.2	**SEGA Plan Mod – Greg Gaddie** A-08-24 Exhibit A-8a: APN 309-210-41	11.5
56.c	**Ashley Werner** Replace Regional Business Park adjoining residential near Fig and Muscat with Business Park.	50
F.1	**City of Fresno Staff** **Calwa Industrial Area[3]**	66.41
F.7	**City of Fresno Staff** W. Bullard and Carnegie	8.52
F.8	**City of Fresno Staff** Golden St. and Veteran's Blvd. interchange	118.87
F.14	**City of Fresno Staff** NWC Elm and Jensen	3.16
F.15	**City of Fresno Staff** NEC Whites Bridge and Blyth	39.92
F.17	**City of Fresno Staff** Nielson and Marks	35.69
F.20	**City of Fresno Staff** SWC of S. Marks and W. Whitesbridge	8.87
F.24	**City of Fresno Staff** NWC of Valentine and W. Madison	18.14
F.25	**City of Fresno Staff** Brawley, just north of Madison (north of the school)	32

Identification Number[1]	Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location[1]	Acres[1]
F.26	**City of Fresno Staff** SWC of W. Shaw and N. Brawley	204.06
W.1	**City of Fresno Staff** Vicinity of Hwy 180 and Marks	41.98
W.2	**City of Fresno Staff** Vicinity of Hwy 180 and Marks	23.38
W.3	**City of Fresno Staff** Vicinity of Hwy 180 and Marks	44.82
W.5	**City of Fresno Staff** Vicinity of Hwy 180 and Marks	38.89
W.6	**City of Fresno Staff** Vicinity of Hwy 180 and Marks	35.46
W.7	**City of Fresno Staff** Vicinity of Hwy 180 and Marks	9.74
W.11	**City of Fresno Staff** Vicinity of Hwy 180 and Marks	57.68
W.12	**City of Fresno Staff** Vicinity of Hwy 180 and Marks	18.50
W.14	**City of Fresno Staff** Vicinity of Hwy 180 and Marks	26.83
W.15	**City of Fresno Staff** Vicinity of Hwy 180 and Marks	50.39
W.21	**City of Fresno Staff** Vicinity of Hwy 180 and Marks	27.90
W.22	**City of Fresno Staff** Vicinity of Hwy 180 and Marks	18.38
W.23	**City of Fresno Staff** Vicinity of Hwy 180 and Marks	16.91
4772	**Final Map 4772**	2.85
4983	**Final Map 4983**	12.75
5567	**Final Map 5567**	3.87
5770[4]	**Final Map 5770**	14.9
6028	**Final Map 6028**	14.5
Various	**Final Maps[5]**	11.03

Identification Number[1]	Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location[1]	Acres[1]
Total		4,859

City of Fresno Development and Resource Management Department, 2014

[2] Land use request 8.e.2 is on a parcel that has been recently developed with a land use that is consistent with the proposed land use request. This request is further evaluated below with all other requests identified in Table 2.

[3] Land use request F1 was evaluated as Business Park and would likely result in a significant traffic impact on Jensen Avenue as stated in Table 2.1 in Attachment 2. City staff has modified this land use request as shown in Table 1.2 in Attachment 1. With the revised land use request, no significant traffic impact would occur along Jensen Avenue.

[4] Although this land use request was included as a Category 1 as shown in Table 2.1 in Attachment 2, a further review found the lots associated with this Final Map to be substantially constructed.

[5] The Final Maps include all the Final Maps listed on Table 1.3 in Attachment 1, except for the four Final Maps that are listed at the top of the table. These four Final Maps have not been constructed.

Note: Land use request 5.g in Table 2.1 and listed in Table 1 above is located in an area that would have sufficient capacity as long as other referenced requests are not implemented. As a result, this land use request is further evaluated below with all other requests identified in Table 2.

Source: FirstCarbon Solutions, 2014

The following environmental evaluation addresses the potential effects associated with the land use requests that are provided in Table 2 above. The evaluation determines if the potential effects are new significant effects or substantial changes to the environmental evaluation provided in the Draft Master EIR. The potential impacts associated with each environmental topical issue is discussed below.

3.1 - Aesthetics

Based on the Draft Master EIR, distant views of highly valued features such as the San Joaquin River, the foothills of the Sierra Nevada, and the Downtown Fresno buildings are provided within the Planning Area. However, the implementation of the General Plan and Development Code Update would result in less than significant impacts on scenic vistas and scenic resources within a State scenic highway. The implementation of the above land use change requests would result in a combination of de-intensifying some areas and intensifying some areas within the Planning Area. These proposed land use changes would not substantially alter distant views of highly valued features such as those identified above. In addition, since a State scenic highway is more than 5 miles from the Planning Area, viewsheds from the scenic highway would not be substantially altered due to the land use change requests. Therefore, no new significant effects or substantial changes to the environmental evaluation in the Draft Master EIR regarding scenic vistas and scenic resources within a State scenic highway would occur.

The Draft Master EIR identified the potential for significant visual character impacts from views within the Planning Area as well as from views outside of the Planning Area. In addition, the Draft Master EIR identified potential significant increases in light and glare impacts with the development proposed in the General Plan and Development Code Update. The implementation of the land use change requests would result in some areas with higher intensity uses and others with lower intensity uses. The higher intensity uses include intensifying a planned urban use as well as intensifying areas planned for park, open space, or buffer area that account for approximately 670 acres, representing approximately 0.6 percent of the Planning Area. Collectively, the land use change requests identified in Table 2 would not substantially alter the impact conclusions identified for visual character, light, or glare. Furthermore, with the implementation of the General Plan policies to reduce potential visual character impacts, these impacts would remain significant with the proposed land use requests and these impacts would not be substantially different than those identified in the Draft Master EIR. The land use change requests will also increase light and glare and with the implementation of Mitigation Measures AES-1 through AES-5, potential impacts would be reduced; however, the impacts would remain significant. The level of impact would not be substantially different with the land use change request compared to the impacts identified in the Draft Master EIR.

Based on a review of the aesthetics issues, no new significant or substantial changes to the aesthetics evaluation in the Draft Master EIR would occur with the implementation of the proposed land use change requests.

3.2 - Agricultural Resources

As discussed in the Draft Master EIR, approximately 15,903 acres of Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) designated farmland and approximately 11,714 acres of existing farmland would be converted to uses other than agriculture. With the implementation of the land use change requests, there would be no change in the amount of FMMP-designated farmland or existing farmland that would be converted to non-farmland. Therefore, the implementation of the proposed land use change request would not alter the agricultural resources impact conclusions provided in the Draft Master EIR. In addition, the land use change requests would not alter the impact on Williamson Act Contract land identified in the Draft Master EIR.

Based on a review of the agricultural resources issues, no new significant or substantial changes to the agricultural resources evaluation in the Draft Master EIR would occur with the implementation of the proposed land use change requests.

3.3 - Air Quality

The Draft Master EIR identified that the General Plan and Development Code Update would not exceed the growth projections used in the applicable attainment plans. In addition, the Draft Master EIR identified that the project's goals, policies, and development standards would not be in conflict with the development related control measures in the attainment plans. The implementation of the land use change requests would not alter the growth projections and would not alter the project's goals, policies, and development standards.

The Draft Master EIR identified that the General Plan and Development Code would not violate any air quality standard, specifically carbon monoxide (CO) and sulfur dioxide (SOx). Based on a review of the land use change requests provided in Tables 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 in Attachment 1, the amount of daily trips associated with the General Plan and Development Code Update would decrease by approximately 221,000 daily trips. This reduction in trips would reduce CO and SOx emissions. With the incorporation of the land use change requests, the General Plan and Development Code Update would continue to not violate CO and SOx air quality standards.

The Draft Master EIR identified that the project would result in a considerable net increase in criteria pollutants during construction and operational activities. Although the amount of development could reduce with the implementation of the land use change requests and there would be a reduction in air emissions from vehicle trips, the project would continue to reduce criteria air pollutants compared to the year 2010 pollutant levels, but the quantity of criteria pollutants generated with the development of the project with the land use change requests would continue to be significant.

As identified in the Draft Master EIR, the project could expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. The concentrations include oxides of nitrogen (NOx), CO, NOx, particulate matter less than 10 micrometers in diameter (PM10), and particulate matter less than 2.5 micrometers in diameter (PM2.5). Elevated concentrations of these pollutants can occur where a large number of sources are located in a concentrated area or when particularly large sources are located near sensitive receptors. Based on a review of the land use change requests, no substantial changes to the pollutant concentrations identified in the Draft Master EIR would occur with the implementation of the proposed land use change requests. With the land use change requests, impacts would remain significant and Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2 would be required for project-specific impacts and Mitigation Measures AQ-3 and AQ-4 would be required for cumulative impacts. After the implementation of the above mitigation measures, potential impacts would remain significant similar to the conclusion identified in the Draft Master EIR.

The implementation of the General Plan and Development Code Update was found to not result in objectionable odors after the implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-4. The proposed land use change requests would not alter the odor finding provided in the Draft Master EIR.

Based on a review of the air quality issues, no new significant or substantial changes to the air quality evaluation in the Draft Master EIR would occur with the implementation of the proposed land use change requests.

3.4 - Biological Resources

As discussed in the Draft Master EIR, development in accordance with the General Plan and Development Code Update could result in potential impacts on various biological resources. With the proposed land use change requests, the potential impacts on biological resources would remain because the land use changes would continue to result in disturbance of the parcels within the Planning Area. Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-9 would continue to be required with the

proposed land use requests, and the level of impact after the implementation of the mitigation measures would be less than significant.

Therefore, based on a review of the biological resources issues, no new significant or substantial changes to the biological resources evaluation in the Draft Master EIR would occur with the implementation of the proposed land use change requests.

3.5 - Cultural Resources

As discussed in the Draft Master EIR, the General Plan and Development Code could result in significant impacts on historical resources after the implementation of mitigation measures. With the implementation of the land use change requests, Mitigation Measure CUL-1 would be required; however, the potential significant impacts on historical resources would remain.

Potential impacts would also occur on archaeological, paleontological, and human remains as identified in the Draft Master EIR. These impacts would remain with the proposed land use change requests, even after the implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-2 through CUL-4. The resulting impacts would remain significant.

Therefore, based on a review of the cultural resources issues, no new significant or substantial changes to the cultural resources evaluation in the Draft Master EIR would occur with the implementation of the proposed land use change requests.

3.6 - Geology and Soils

According to the Draft Master EIR, the implementation of the General Plan and Development Code Update would result in less than significant impacts associated with earthquakes, seismic ground shaking, seismic ground failure, landslides, soil erosion/topsoil loss, unstable geologic soils, expansive soils, and soils capable of supporting wastewater disposal systems. The implementation of the proposed land use change requests will continue to allow development and/or grading on parcels, and future development of these parcels would be required to comply with local, state, and federal regulations regarding geotechnical issues.

Therefore, based on a review of the geological resources issues, no new significant or substantial changes to the geological resources evaluation in the Draft Master EIR would occur with the implementation of the proposed land use change requests.

3.7 - Greenhouse Gases

The Draft Master EIR identified that the proposed project would result in the generation of a substantial amount of greenhouse gases through the use of motor vehicles, electricity, natural gas, waste, offroad equipment, and ozone depleting substance substitutes (refrigerants). The evaluation found that the project could achieve and exceed the 21.7 percent greenhouse gas reduction required to show consistency with Assembly Bill (AB) 32 targets and would be considered less than significant for growth occurring through 2020. In addition, the Draft Master EIR identified the greenhouse gas

reductions for the year 2035, 2050, and 2056 (buildout). These reductions would meet the 2020 target reductions; however, if the State ultimately sets targets based on achieving 80 percent reduction below 1990 levels by 2050, greenhouse gas impacts after the year 2020 would be significant.

The proposed land use change requests would result in the reduction of approximately 221,000 daily trips within the Planning Area. In addition, the proposed land use change requests would reduce residential densities. Based on a review of the total revised number of units with the land use change requests (332,004 + 2,309 = 334,313 units) and a revised residential acreage (45,566 + 1,242 [shown in Table 3.1 in Attachment 3] = 46,808 acres), the residential density would change from 7.286 units per acre (332,004 divided by 45,566) under the General Plan and Development Code Update to 7.142 units per acre (334,313 divided by 46,808) with the proposed land use change requests. This revision in density throughout the Planning Area is not considered to be a substantial change. Therefore, the generation of greenhouse gas emissions with the land use change request would not be substantially different than the generation of greenhouse gas emission identified in the Draft Master EIR.

Therefore, based on a review of the greenhouse gas emissions issues, no new significant or substantial changes to the greenhouse gas emissions evaluation in the Draft Master EIR would occur with the implementation of the proposed land use change requests.

3.8 - Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The Draft Master EIR identified that the General Plan and Development Code Update would result in less than significant hazards and hazardous waste impacts related to routine use of hazardous materials, potential hazards to the public or environment from accidents, hazardous emissions near schools, hazardous materials on specific sites, and wildland fires. The proposed land use request would alter land uses in specific locations and potential hazards and hazardous materials impacts would remain; however, existing local, state, and federal regulations as well as the objectives and policies within the General Plan Update would reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

The Draft Master EIR identified potential hazard impacts in the vicinity of public airports. Mitigation measures were recommended to reduce these potential impacts to less than significant. The implementation of the proposed land use change requests would still require the implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-5, and the resulting impact would remain less than significant. Similar to the finding in the Draft Master EIR, the proposed land use requests would result in less than significant impacts associated with hazards in the vicinity of private airports.

Therefore, based on a review of the hazards and hazardous materials issues, no new significant or substantial changes to the hazards and hazardous materials evaluation in the Draft Master EIR would occur with the implementation of the proposed land use change requests.

3.9 - Hydrology and Water Quality

The Draft Master EIR identified less than significant impacts to water quality, erosion, flooding, and mudflows. Water quality impacts would be less than significant with the implementation of regulatory mechanisms such as the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction General Permit and the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4) Permit. Erosion impacts were found to be less than significant after the implementation of the grading permit process as well as the General Plan policies. Flooding impacts were found to be less than significant with the implementation of the grading permit process and the General Plan policies. Due to the limited development proposed in areas that could be exposed to mudflows such as the San Joaquin River Bluffs, potential impacts were found to be less than significant. The implementation of the proposed land use change requests would result in similar impacts associated with water quality, erosion, flooding, and mudflows.

Potential significant impacts related to groundwater supplies and runoff were found with the implementation of the General Plan and Development Code Update. These impacts would be reduced with General Plan policies; however, mitigation measures (Mitigation Measures HYD-1, HYD-2, HYD-5.1 through HYD-5.5) were required to reduce potential impacts to less than significant. With the implementation of the proposed land use change requests, Mitigation Measures HYD-1, HYD-2, HYD-5.1 through HYD-5.5 would be required and the resulting impact would be less than significant, similar to the General Plan and Development Code evaluated in the Draft Master EIR.

Therefore, based on a review of the hydrology and water quality issues, no new significant or substantial changes to the hydrology and water quality evaluation in the Draft Master EIR would occur with the implementation of the proposed land use change requests.

3.10 - Land Use and Planning

The findings in the Draft Master EIR identified less than significant impacts associated with the project causing a division of an established community and conflict with applicable plans, policies, or regulations. No project or cumulative impacts were found associated with conflicts with conservation plans. With the implementation of the proposed land use changes, the potential land use planning impacts would remain less than significant because the proposed changes would not result in a division of an established community and would not conflict with current plans, policies or regulations with the implementation of the proposed General Plan objectives and policies. The proposed land use changes would not conflict with conservation plans because there are no conservation plans that encompass any portion of the Planning Area.

Therefore, based on a review of the land use and planning issues, no new significant or substantial changes to the land use and planning evaluation in the Draft Master EIR would occur with the implementation of the proposed land use change requests.

3.11 - Noise

The Draft Master EIR stated that the implementation of the General Plan and Development Code Update will result in temporary and long-term increases in noise levels. Construction activities will increase noise levels; however, compliance with the existing noise ordinance would reduce potential construction noise to less than significant. With the proposed land use changes, similar construction noise increases would occur, and these increases would be less than significant with the implementation of the City's noise ordinance.

Long-term noise levels will result from stationary sources, motor vehicles, and aircraft. The Draft Master EIR identified the increases in long-term noise levels could be reduced with the implementation of Policy NS-1-a through Policy NS-1-p, which includes several structural design measures. However, these policies and the measures that they would implement are ultimately limited, as even advanced policies and measures are limited in what they can do to remediate or reduce the magnitude of noise effect on many existing noise sensitive land uses in areas with current high noise exposures or where substantial noise increases are expected with the implementation of General Plan and Development Code Update buildout. Therefore, potential impacts were found to be significant and unavoidable. In addition, potential impacts from aircraft noise were found; however, the General Plan Policy NS-1-p would reduce the potential impact to less than significant. The implementation of the proposed land use changes would contribute to the increase in noise levels, and the noise findings would remain the same.

Therefore, based on a review of the noise issues, no new significant or substantial changes to the noise evaluation in the Draft Master EIR would occur with the implementation of the proposed land use change requests.

3.12 - Population and Housing

As discussed in the Draft Master EIR, the implementation of the General Plan and Development Code would not induce substantial population growth or displace housing or people. With the project, the number of employees who are projected to reside in the Planning Area and leave the Planning Area for employment is approximately 10,517 employees in the year 2056. This is a decrease in employees leaving the Planning Area compared to the 2010 estimate of approximately 17,937 employees. With the proposed land use changes, there would be approximately 2,309 more housing units which would result in approximately 2,956 (2,309 housing units x 1.28 employees per house) more employees who could reside within the Planning Area. Therefore, the projected year 2056 number of employees who would need to leave the Planning Area for employment would reduce from 10,517 employees to 7,561 employees. As a result, the proposed land use changes would provide a closer balance of the number of jobs provided in the Planning Area compared to the number of employees who reside within the Planning Area.

In addition, the implementation of the proposed land use change request would not displace housing or people after the implementation of the General Plan and Development Code Update.

Therefore, based on a review of the population and housing issues, no new significant or substantial changes to the population and housing evaluation in the Draft Master EIR would occur with the implementation of the proposed land use change requests.

3.13 - Public Services

The implementation of the General Plan and Development Code Update would increase the need for public services such as police protection, fire protection, schools, parks/recreation, courts, libraries, and hospitals. This increased need could result in an increase in the construction of facilities to provide additional services. As discussed in the Draft Master EIR, the provision of additional facilities could result in significant environmental impacts; however, Mitigation Measures PS-1 through PS-5 would reduce the potential construction impacts to less than significant. With the implementation of the proposed land use changes, the implementation of the project would still result in potential significant environmental impacts due to the construction of facilities to increase public services; however, the impact would be less than significant.

Therefore, based on a review of the public services issues, no new significant or substantial changes to the public services evaluation in the Draft Master EIR would occur with the implementation of the proposed land use change requests.

3.14 - Transportation and Traffic

As discussed towards the beginning of this environmental evaluation, the land use changes requests were qualitatively evaluated by Fehr & Peers, the traffic consultant who prepared the traffic evaluation in the Master EIR. The volume to capacity ratios, corresponding levels of service, and the significance thresholds for the Traffic Impact Zones (TAZ) identified in General Plan Policy MT-2-I for roadways in the vicinity of each proposed land use change request were evaluated. The increase in traffic volumes identified in Table 1.1 in Attachment 1 were converted to peak hour trips and identified in Table 2.1 in Attachment 2. Each of the land use requests were evaluated and those requests identified in Table 2 were qualitatively determined that either the increase traffic would not likely create a new impact, or the traffic volumes in the area would result in less traffic or an increase of less than 10 peak hour trips. As discussed in the Draft Master EIR, traffic volumes associated with the project could result in significant and unavoidable adverse traffic impacts. The proposed land use changes identified in Table 2 would not alter the significance determinations for any of the roadway segments within the Planning Area.

Therefore, based on a review of the transportation and traffic issues, no new significant or substantial changes to the transportation and traffic evaluation in the Draft Master EIR would occur with the implementation of the proposed land use change requests.

3.15 - Utilities and Service Systems

The implementation of the General Plan and Development Code Update would increase the need for wastewater, water, drainage/flood control, and solid/hazardous waste services. This increased need could result in an increase in the construction of facilities to provide additional services. As

discussed in the Draft Master EIR, the provision of additional facilities could result in significant environmental impacts; and various mitigation measures are provided to reduce potential impacts. However, it is anticipated that some of the impacts resulting from construction could remain significant after the implementation of mitigation measures. The implementation of the proposed land use change requests would result in similar impacts as those evaluated in the Draft Master EIR.

Therefore, based on a review of the utilities and service systems issues, no new significant or substantial changes to the utilities and service systems evaluation in the Draft Master EIR would occur with the implementation of the proposed land use change requests.

3.16 - Energy Consumption

As discussed in the Draft Master EIR, the proposed General Plan and Development Code Update would increase the demand for energy in the form of electricity, natural gas, and fuel. The analysis concluded that with the implementation of the objectives and policies within the General Plan Update, the project would result in no impact related to the inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy. With the proposed land use change requests, the amount of energy consumed would not be substantially different than the amount identified in the Draft Master EIR. Furthermore, the implementation of the land use change request would also result in no impact related to the inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy.

Therefore, based on a review of the energy consumption issues, no new significant or substantial changes to the energy consumption evaluation in the Draft Master EIR would occur with the implementation of the proposed land use change requests.

SECTION 4: CONCLUSION

Based on the findings and the information contained in the Draft Master EIR and the environmental evaluation above, the proposed land use changes requests identified in Table 2 above would not result in any new significant or substantial changes to the evaluation of the environmental resources within and outside of the Planning Area that was addressed in the Draft Master EIR.

Attachment 1:
Data for Proposed Land Use Change Request

Table 1.1: Fresno General Plan – Workbook of Planned Land Use Requests and Corresponding CEQA Impacts – December 05, 2014

Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location	Size (acres)	GP Update PLU (Aug. 9, 2012 Initiation Map)	Change Request			City of Fresno Preferred PLU	
			Planned Land Use	Density or Square Footage Change[1]	CEQA Impacts[1,2,3]	Planned Land Use	CEQA Impacts[1,2]
Assume ALL GPAs Approved before Update Are Approved							
1. McCaffrey – NW Herndon/Hayes (APN 503-020-09) TM 6052	14.15	Res. Urban Neighborhood	Res. Medium (95 du mapped)	From 20 to 6.71 du/ac	**-188 du -978 daily trips**	Res. Medium	**-188 du -978 daily trips**
2. McCaffrey – NE Herndon/Hayes (APN 503-020-51) FM 6053	4.10	Res. Medium	Res. Medium Low (15 du mapped)	From 6.5 to 3.65 du/ac	**-12 du -114 daily trips**	Res. Medium Low	**-12 du -114 daily trips**
3. West Fresno Community Leaders (Not Owners) - Per phone conversation with Bob Mitchell on 11/27/2013, requests were modified from the letter to what is represented below.							
a. Valentine-Marks-California-Whites-Bridge	320	No change	No change	No change	**No impact**	No change to the GP Update map.	**No impact**
b. Hughes-Marks-Whites Bridge-Kearney *1.* ***(Same area as 5b.1 and 21i.1)***	106.46	Res. Medium	Res. Low	From 6.5 to 1.5 du/ac	**-532 du -5,065 daily trips**	Res. Low	From 6.5 to 1.5 du/ac = **-532 du -5,054 daily trips**
2. ***(Same area as 21i.2)***	14	Res. Urban Neigh.	Res. Low	From 20 to 1.5 du/ac	**-259 du -1,662 daily trips**	Res. Low	From 20 to 1.5 du/ac = **-259 du -1,662 daily trips**
c. Marks-Valentine-Whites Bridge-Madison *1.* ***(Same area as 5b.2.a)***	6.5	Res. Medium	Res. Low	From 6.5 to 1.5 du/ac	**-33 du -314 daily trips**	Res. Low	**-33 du -314 daily trips**
2. ***(Same area as 5b.2.b)***	52	Res. Medium	Res. Low	From 6.5 to 1.5 du/ac	**-260 du -2,475 daily trips**	Res. Medium	**No impact**
3. ***(Same area as 5b.2.c)***	19.6	Res. Medium	Res. Low	From 6.5 to 1.5 du/ac	**-98 du -933 daily trips**	Res. Low	**-98 du -933 daily trips**
4. ***(Same area as 5b.2.d)***	28.2	Res. Medium	Res. Low	From 6.5 to 1.5 du/ac	**-141 du -1,342 daily trips**	Res. High	**+776 du +7,292 daily trips**
5.	14.5	Res. Urban Neigh.	Res Low	From 20 to 1.5 du/ac	**-268 du -1,720 daily trips**	Res. Urban Neigh.	**No impact**
d. Zoning Near Cargill (North-Fig-Walnut-Edgar alignment) (Per phone conversation with Bob Mitchell on 11/27/2013, request withdrawn)	320	No change	No change	No change	**No impact**	No change to the GP Update map.	**No impact**
e. ¼ section NE of Marks and North (Annadale-North-Hughes-Marks) (Per phone conversation with Bob Mitchell on 11/27/2013, request withdrawn)	160	No change	No change	No change	**No impact**	No change to the GP Update map.	**No impact**
f. ¼ section NE Marks and Annadale (Hughes-Marks-Jensen-Annadale) (Per phone conversation with Bob Mitchell on 11/27/2013, request withdrawn)	160	No change	No change	No change	**No impact**	No change to the GP Update map.	**No impact**
g. ¼ section NE Marks and Church (Hughes-Marks-Church-Jensen) (Per phone	129.65	Res. Medium	Res. Medium Low	From 6.5 to 4 du/ac	**-324 du -3,084 daily trips**	Res. Medium	**No impact**

[1] Reasonable dwelling unit per acre and FAR build out capacity estimate for unmapped vacant lots: Low = 1.5 du/ac; Med-Low = 4 du/ac; Medium = 6.5 du/ac; Medium-High = 14.0 du/ac; Urban Neighborhood = 20.0 du/ac; High = 34.0 du/ac; NMX = 14.0 (x .5 net); CMX = 20.0 (x .4 net); RMX = 34.0 (x .3 net); Community Commercial = .3 FAR; Community Recreational = .2 FAR; General Commercial = .35 FAR; Main Street = .5 FAR; Neighborhood Commercial = .35 FAR; Regional Commercial = .25, Highway and Auto = .25 FAR; Office = .5 FAR; Business Park = .4 FAR; Regional Business Park = .4 FAR; Light Industrial = .3 FAR; Heavy Industrial = .3 FAR; CMX = .25 FAR; CMX (SEGA) = .2 FAR; RMX = .25 FAR; RMX (SEGA) = .15 FAR; and NMX = .25

[2] Daily trip generation taken from Spack Consulting calculator table based on ITE Trip Generation Rates - 9th Edition.

[3] Fresno COG Employment Factors by Land Use: Community Commercial = 500; General Commercial 600, all Mixed-Use = 425; Regional Commercial and Commercial Recreation = 400; Highway & Auto = 700; Office = 400; Light and Heavy Industrial = 1100; and Business Park and Regional Business Park = 925.

Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location	Size (acres)	GP Update PLU (Aug. 9, 2012 Initiation Map)	Change Request			City of Fresno Preferred PLU	
			Planned Land Use	Density or Square Footage Change[1]	CEQA Impacts[1,2,3]	Planned Land Use	CEQA Impacts[1,2]
conversation with Bob Mitchell on 11/27/2013, request change from rm to change to rl)							
h. West side of Elm btwn. Church and Jensen 1. ***(Same area as 5d, 19 and 20)***	12.21	Res. Medium High	General Commercial	From 14 to 0 du/ac From 0 to .35 FAR (12.21 acres x .35 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**-171 du** **+186,153 sq. ft.** commercial/office space **+9,028 daily trips**	Res. Medium High	**No impact**
2. ***(Same area as 5d, 19 and 20)***	3.96	Res. Medium High	General Commercial	From 14 to 0 du/ac From 0 to .35 FAR (3.96 acres x .35 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**-55 du** **+60,374 sq. ft.** commercial/office space **+101 employment** **+4,506 daily trips**	Community Commercial	**-55 du** From 0 to .3 FAR (3.96 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) **+51,749 sq. ft.** commercial/office space **+4,057 daily trips**
4. Lisa Mochizuki – SWC – Kings Canyon and Minnewawa	9.02	Community Park	Corridor/Center Mixed-Use	From 0 to 8 du/ac From 0 to .25 FAR (9.02 acres x .6 net acres x .25 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**+72 du** **+124,603 sq. ft.** commercial/ office space **+293 employment** **+4,100 daily trips**	Community Park	**No impact**
5. City Councilman Oliver Baines – November 12, 2013							
a. Darling and Foster Farms at Belgravia and Fruit Relocated to Regional Waste Water Treatment Plant	30.77	Heavy Industry (28.77 acres) Light Industry (2 acres)	No change requested to planned land use	No change	**No impact**	Outside of SOI	**No impact**
b. 1. Hughes-Whites Bridge-Valentine-Kearney ***(Same area as 3b.1 and 21i.1)***	106.46	Res. Medium	Res. Medium Low	From 6.5 to 4 du/ac	**-266 du** **-2,546 daily trips**	Res. Low	From 6.5 du/ac to 1.5 **-532 du** **-5,057 daily trips**
2. Marks-Valentine-Whites Bridge-Madison a. ***(Same area as 3c.1)***	6.5	Res. Medium	Res. Medium Low	From 6.5 to 4 du/ac	**-16 du** **-152 daily trips**	Res. Low	**-33 du** **daily trips**
b. ***(Same area as 3c.2)***	52	Res. Medium	Res. Medium Low	From 6.5 to 4 du/ac	**-130 du** **-1,238 daily trips**	Res. Medium	**No Impact**
c. ***(Same area as 3c.3)***	19.6	Res. Medium	Res. Medium Low	From 6.5 to 4 du/ac	**-49 du** **-466 daily trips**	Res. Low	**-98 du** **-933 daily trips**
d. ***(Same area as 3c.4)***	28.2	Res. Medium	Res. Medium Low	From 6.5 to 4 du/ac	**-71 du** **-676 daily trips**	Res. High	**+776 du** **+7,292 daily trips**
c. North-Walnut-West-Annadale	226.64	Res. Medium-Low	Res. Medium (Leave RUN and Parks)	From 4 to 6.5 du/ac	**+567 du** **-5,398 daily trips**	Res. Medium	**+567 du** **-5,398 daily trips**
d. West side of Elm Street Corridor between Church and Jensen ***(Same as 3h.1 and 3h.2, 19 and 20)***	16.17	See 3h.1 and 3h.2	See 3h.1 and 3h.2	See 3h.1 and 3h.2	See 3h.1 and 3h.2	See 3h.1 and 3h.2	See 3h.1 and 3h.2
e. Whites Bridge – SR180 – West to Brawley 1.	20	Business Park	General Commercial	From .4 to .35 FAR (20 acres x .05 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**-43,560 sq. ft.** commercial/office space **-47 employment** **-541 daily trips**	Business Park	**No Impact**
2.	41	Business Park	General Commercial	From .4 to .35 FAR	**-89,298 sq. ft.**	Community	From .4 to .3 FAR

Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location	Size (acres)	GP Update PLU (Aug. 9, 2012 Initiation Map)	Change Request			City of Fresno Preferred PLU	
			Planned Land Use	Density or Square Footage Change[1]	CEQA Impacts[1,2,3]	Planned Land Use	CEQA Impacts[1,2]
				(41 acres x .05 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	commercial/office space **-97 employment** **-1,111 daily trips**	Commercial	(41 acres x .1 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) = **-178,596 sq. ft.** **-2,222 daily trips**
3.	38	Business Park	General Commercial	From .4 to .35 FAR (38 acres x .05 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**-82,764 sq. ft.** commercial/office space **-89 employment** **-1,029 daily trips**	Corridor/Center Mixed-Use	From 0 to 8 du/ac **+304 du** (38 acres x .6 x .25 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) = **- 413,820 sq. ft.** **-5,148 daily trips**
4.	9	Business Park	General Commercial	From .4 to .35 FAR (9 acres x .05 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**-19,602 sq. ft.** commercial/office space **-21 employment** **-244 daily trips**	Park	From .4 to 0 FAR (9 acres x .4 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) = **-156,816 sq. ft.** **-1,951 daily trips**
5.	5	Business Park	General Commercial	From .4 to .35 FAR (5 acres x .05 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**-10,890 sq. ft.** commercial/office space **-12 employment** **-136 daily trips**	Ponding Basin	From .4 to 0 FAR (5 acres x .4 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) = **-87,120 sq. ft.** **-1,084 daily trips**
f. South of Church to Jensen between Walnut and Martin Luther King 1.	30.75	Res. Urban Neighborhood	Res. Medium High	From 20 to 14 du/ac	**-185 du** **-1,230 daily trips**	Res. Urban Neighborhood	No Impact
2.	19.25	Res. Urban Neighborhood	Res. Medium High	From 20 to 14 du/ac	**-116 du** **- 771 daily trips**	Res. Medium	From 20 to 6.5 du/ac **-260 du** **-1,370 daily trips**
g. South of Church/Walnut/Grove/Thorne (leave proposed school site)	30	Res. Urban Neigh. (10 acres) Res. Medium (20 acres)	Res. Medium High	From 20 to 14 du/ac From 6.5 to 14 du/ac	-60 du +150 du **Total +90 du** **+225 daily trips**	Res. Medium High	-60 du +150 du **Total +90 du** **+225 daily trips**
h. SW Hughes/California (reduce 40 acre park to 20) ***(Same area as 21i.17)***	18.69	Park	Res. Medium	From 0 to 6.5 du/ac	**+122 du** **+1,126 daily trips**	Res. Low	From 0 to 1.5 du/ac **+28 du** **+231 daily trips**
i. California-Hughes-Church-Marks							
1. Insert ponding basin east ½ of 40 acres on NE Marks/California (located in area north of bounds designated in 5i) ***(Same area as 21i.12)***	18.84	Res. High	Ponding Basin	From 34 du/ac to 0	**-640 du** **-4,256 daily trips**	Ponding Basin	**-640 du** **-4,256 daily trips**
2. Res. High to Res. Medium ***(Same area as 21i.18)***	38.14	Res. High	Res. Medium	From 34 to 6.5 du/ac	**-1,048 du** **-2,160 daily trips**	Res. Low	**-1,245 du** **-8,113 daily trips**
3. Res. Urban Neigh. to Res. Medium ***(Same area as 21i.19)***	35.50	Res. Urban Neigh.	Res. Medium	From 20 to 6.5 du/ac	**-479 du** **+1,293 daily trips**	Res. Low	**-816 du** **-5,237 daily trips**
6. **Eisner Family Trust –** 5633 N. Fig Garden Loop (APN 509-290-07) What about southern half of PLU designation at this corner (APN 509-290-06 at	2.29	Office	Community Commercial	From .5 to .3 FAR (2.29 acres x .2 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**-19,950 sq. ft.** commercial/office space **-50 employment**	Office	**No Impact**

Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location	Size (acres)	GP Update PLU (Aug. 9, 2012 Initiation Map)	Change Request			City of Fresno Preferred PLU	
			Planned Land Use	Density or Square Footage Change[1]	CEQA Impacts[1,2,3]	Planned Land Use	CEQA Impacts[1,2]
2.05 acres)?					**+729 daily trips**		
7. **Central Unified School District** – June 25,2013							
a. SE Veterans Blvd and Barstow	10.59	Elementary School	Res. Urban Neighborhood	From 0 to 20 du/ac	**+212 du** **+410 daily trips**	Res. Urban Neighborhood	**+212 du** **+410 daily trips**
b. NE Grantland/Ashlan (labeling issue)	160	Special School	High, Middle, & Elem. School	No change	No impact	High, Middle, & Elem. School	**No impact**
c. NW Grantland/Dakota (labeling issue)	15.68	Special School	Elementary School	No change	No impact	Elementary School	**No impact**
d. North side Shields btwn. Bryan/Hayes (labeling issue)	13.88	Elementary School	Elementary School	No change	No impact	Elementary School	**No impact**
e. SE Shields and Valentine TM 5481 (9.81 acres with 80 du)	13.64	Elem. School	Res. Medium	Unmapped - From 0 to 14 du/ac (3.83 ac) Mapped - From 0 to (9.81 acres with 80 du)	**+134 du** **+276 daily trips**	Res. Medium	**+134 du** **+276 daily trips**
f. North side McKinley between Brawley/Valentine	19.24	Elem. School	Res. Medium	From 0 to 6.5 du/ac	**+125 du** **+190 daily trips**	Res. Medium	**+125 du** **+190 daily trips**
g. NE Brawley/Madison (labeling issue)	20	Special School	Elementary School	No change	No impact	Elementary School	**No impact**
h. West side of Brawley between Belmont and Olive	18.33	Elem. School	Res. Medium	From 0 to 4 du/ac	**+73 du** **-305 daily trips**	Res. Medium	**+73 du** **-305 daily trips**
i. North side of California between Valentine and Brawley 1. Change to Ponding Basin	9.15	Elem. School	Ponding Basin		**-1,000 daily trips**	Ponding Basin	**-1,000 daily trips**
2. Change to Res Low	9.15	Elem. School	Res. Low	From 0 to 1.5 du/ac	**+14 du** **-867 daily trips**	Res. Low	**+14 du** **-867 daily trips**
8. **Fresno Unified School District** – July 2, 2013							
a. West side Marks, south of Ashlan	9	Elem. School	Res. Medium	From 0 to 6.5 du/ac	**+59 du** **-438 daily trips**	Res. Medium	**+59 du** **-438 daily trips**
b. Tenaya Middle School - NE Fruit/Bullard (labeling issue)	21.7	Elem. School	Middle School	No change	No impact	Middle School	**No impact**
c. Cooper Middle School - SW Hughes/Bellaire (labeling issue)	16.6	Middle School (M) Correct POSS map	Middle School	No change	No impact	Middle School	**No impact**
d. Addicott Elementary School - SW Chestnut/Dayton (labeling issue)	3.8	Special School (SS) Correct POSS map	Elementary School	No change	No impact	Elementary School	**No impact**
e. Gaston Middle School – SE Church/MLK (labeling issue) 1. Rename Elem and PB/B to Middle School	21.44	Elem. School and PB/P	Middle School	No change	No impact	Middle School	**No impact**
2. Change Elem School to Res. Medium High	4.56	Elem. School	Res. Medium High	From 0 to existing 72 du apartment complex	**+72 du** **+1,131 daily trips**	Res. Med. High	**+72 du** **+1,131 daily trips**
f. Sunset Elementary - SE Crystal/Eden (labeling issue)	9.67	Middle School	Elementary School	No change	No impact	Elementary School	**No impact**
g. Future Schools: 1. W of West, S of California Ave. (labeling issue) 2. E of Marks, S of Kearney Ave. (labeling issue) ***(Same area as 21i.7)***	20 (2 sites)	Special School	Elementary School	No change	No impact	Elementary School	**No impact**
h. Sequoia Middle - SW Cedar Hamilton (labeling issue)	16.86	Elementary School	Middle School	No change	No impact	Middle School	**No impact**
i. Vang Pao Elementary – SW Cedar/Heaton	8.07	Res. Medium High (5 acres)	Elementary School	From 14 du/ac to 0 From 6.5 du/ac to 0	-70 du -14 du	Elementary School	-70 du -14 du

Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location	Size (acres)	GP Update PLU (Aug. 9, 2012 Initiation Map)	Change Request			City of Fresno Preferred PLU	
			Planned Land Use	Density or Square Footage Change[1]	CEQA Impacts[1,2,3]	Planned Land Use	CEQA Impacts[1,2]
		Res. Medium (2.1 acres) Public Facility (.96 acres)			**Total -84 du** **+401 daily trips**		**Total -84 du** **+401 daily trips**
j. Bakman Elementary – NE Belmont/Helm	11.5	Res. Medium High (3.8 acres) Res. Medium Low (4.1 acres) Comm. Commercial (2.9 acres) Office (.7 acres)	Elementary School	From 14 du/ac to 0 From 4 du/ac to 0 From .3 FAR to 0 FAR (2.9 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) From .5 FAR to 0 FAR (.7 acres x .5 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	-53 du -16 du **Total -69 du** -37,897 sq. ft. -15,246 sq. ft. **Total -53,143 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-114 employment** **-1,786 daily trips**	Elementary School	53 du -16 du **Total -69 du** -37,897 sq. ft. -15,246 sq. ft. **Total -53,143 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-1,786 daily trips**
k. NW Willow/Belmont	8	Elem. School	Res. Low	Existing 3.3 du/acre	**+24 du** **-772 daily trips**	Res. Medium	**+24 du** **-772 daily trips**
l. No Schools shown in Downtown Inset	No change	No change	No change	No change	No impact	No changes proposed.	**No impact**
m. Edison High, Computech & Roosevelt not shown on POSS	No change	No change	No change	No change	No impact	No changes proposed.	**No impact**
n. Problem w/Policy POSS-8-b – GPA Req'd (page 5-29)	No change	No change	No change	No change	No impact	No land use changes proposed.	**No impact**
o. Symbol for possible new SE High School - Church & Peach	Can't assess	Can't assess	High School	Can't assess	Can't assess	No changes proposed.	**No impact**
9. **Clovis Unified Schools**							
a. SE Clinton/Temperance – email 10-25-13 *(CUSD says 775 students & 1,000 trips/day for new school)*	23.53	Res. Medium Low	Elementary School	From 4 du/ac to 0	**+94 du** **+105 daily trips**	Elementary School	**+94 du** **+105 daily trips**
August 12, 2013 Letter							
b. SE – Olive/De Wolf in SEGA	20.8	School with Park	Res. Medium	From 0 to 6.5 du/ac	**+135 du** **-1,285 daily trips**	Res. Medium	**+135 du** **-1,285 daily trips**
c. Shields/Locan Elem. School (request replaced by 9a)	No change	No Change	No Change	No change	No Impact	No changes proposed.	**No Impact**
d. New Elem. School -Clinton & Armstrong	13.72	Park (10) Res Medium (3.72)	Elementary School	From 6.5 du to 0	**-65 du** **+370 daily trips**	Elementary School	**-65 du** **+370 daily trips**
May 23, 2013 Letter							
e. NW Olive/Armstrong – Future Water Treatment facility shown as SS – Spec. School POSS (Correct NW Treatment Facility designation too)	55.95	Public Facility	Public Facility – Surface Water Treatment Facility	No change	No Impact	Public/Quasi-public Facility	**No Impact**
10. **Sanger Unified Schools** May 1, 2013 Letter							
a. Correct HS, MS, ES designations N of Jensen between Fowler and Temperance – shown as SS on POSS 1. Correct Fowler, Church, Armstrong, and Jenson to Public Facility – Middle & High School 2. Correct school site east of Armstrong	127	No designation	Middle & High School Elementary School	No change	No Impact	Middle & High School Elementary School	**No Impact**

Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location	Size (acres)	GP Update PLU (Aug. 9, 2012 Initiation Map)	Change Request			City of Fresno Preferred PLU	
			Planned Land Use	Density or Square Footage Change[1]	CEQA Impacts[1,2,3]	Planned Land Use	CEQA Impacts[1,2]
and north of Jensen to Public Facility – Elementary School							
b. Flexibility requested on SEGA school site locations and Problem w/Policy POSS-8-b – GPA Req'd (p. 5-29)	No change	No Change	No Change	No change	No Impact	No land use changes proposed	**No Impact**
11. **Washington Unified Schools** – West Fresno – Nothing							
12. **Fresno Metro Flood Control District** (FMFCD) – July 23, 2013 and Oct. 9, 2013							
a. Basin specific map changes SE corner of Cornelia and Belmont Avenues (located outside SOI)	No change	No Change	No Change	No change	No Impact	Outside of SOI	**No Impact**
b. Basin specific map changes SE corner of McKinley and Bryan Avenue alignment	2.87	Elementary School	Ponding Basin	No change	**-1,000 daily trips**	Ponding basin	**-1,000 daily trips**
c. Basin specific map changes SE corner of Jensen and Marks Avenue	10.30	Res. Medium Low	Ponding Basin	From 4 du/ac to 0	**-41 du** **-390 daily trips**	Ponding basin	**-41 du** **-390 daily trips**
d. Potentially 3 more locations for future ponding basins, but locations not provided at this time	Can't assess	Can't assess	Can't assess	Can't assess	Can't assess	No land use changes proposed	**No Impact**
e. Basin "AS" at Northwest Corner of California and Valentine	7.8	Res. Medium Low	Ponding Basin	From 4 du/ac to 0	**-31 du** **-295 daily trips**	Ponding basin	**-31 du** **-295 daily trips**
f. Armstrong and Church	6	Res. Urban Neighborhood	Ponding Basin	From 20 du/ac to 0	**-120 du** **-798 daily trips**	Ponding basin	**-120 du** **-798 daily trips**
13. **WG Enterprises (Rick Ginder)** – SWC Herndon and Milburn (portion wrapping existing shopping center – total parcel 17 acres) (Light Industrial in General Commercial?) ***See request 47 submitted on behalf of owner***	See request 47 below	See request 47	See request 47	See request 47	**See request 47**	See request 47	**No Impact**
14. **Steve Weil** – West Barstow/Veterans Blvd/Herndon Canal APN 505-060-08. Also, letters from Sol Development dated August 8, 2014, and August 29, 2012, and subsequent emails. (Staff intended CMX – mapping looks like RMX) a. RMX and Park to CMX (11.28 acre RMX & 5.6 acre Park) b. RMX to CMX (13.22 acres with 175 dwelling units)	30.1	Regional Mixed-Use and Park Regional Mixed-Use	Corridor/Center Mixed-Use Residential Medium High	14a. From 34 du/ac (.3) (11.28 acres) to 20 du/ac (.4) (11.28 acres); From (11.28 acres x .7 x .25 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) to (11.28 acres x .6 x .25 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) = **-25 du and – 12,283 sq ft** From 0 to 20 du/ac (.4) (5.6 acres) and from 0 to (5.6 acres x .6 x .25 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) = **+45 du and + 36,590 sq ft** 14b. From 34 du/ac (.3) to 175 du (mapped) From (13.22 acres x .7 x .25 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) to 0 = **+165 du and -136,343 sq. ft.**	**+185 du** **-112,036 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-264 employment** **-3,734 daily trips**	Corridor/Center Mixed-Use Residential Medium High	**+185 du** **-112,036 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-3,734 daily trips**
15. **Grubb and Ellis for Owner** – SWC W. Sierra/N. Polk	3.91	Office	Res. Urban Neighborhood	From 0 to 20 du/ac From .5 FAR to 0 FAR (3.91 acres x .5 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**+78 du** **-85,160 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-213 employment** **-419 daily trips**	Office	**No Impact**

Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location	Size (acres)	GP Update PLU (Aug. 9, 2012 Initiation Map)	Change Request			City of Fresno Preferred PLU	
			Planned Land Use	Density or Square Footage Change[1]	CEQA Impacts[1,2,3]	Planned Land Use	CEQA Impacts[1,2]
16. **Grubb and Ellis for Partial Owner**- Veterans/Bryan Or - Expand Highway and Auto for more uses APN 040-08-081, 83S, 85S, 90S, 91S, 96S and 97S	42.25 2.89 .63	a. Highway and Auto b. Res. Urban Neighborhood c. Community Commercial	RMX RMX	From 0 to 10 du/ac From 20 to 10 du/ac From .25 FAR to .25FAR From (42.25 acres x .25 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) to (42.25 acres x .7 x .25 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) From .3 FAR to .25FAR From (.63 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) to (.63 acres x .7 x .25 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	+429 du -29du **Total = +400 du** **-141,461 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-3,611 daily trips**	a. Light Industrial (42.25 ac) b. Res Medium High (2.89 ac) and c. Park (.63 ac)	From .25 FAR to .3FAR (42.25 acres x .05 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) = +92,020 sq. ft. From .3 FAR to 0 (.63 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) = -8,233 sq. ft. **+83,787 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+88 employment** From 20 to 14 du/ac **-17 du** **+3,601 daily trips**
17. **Fancher Creek Properties** – Nov. 2012							
a. Fancher Creek Parkway and Trail – add to map – Actually is shown on POSS Path & Trails Map	No change	No Change	No Change	No change	No Impact	No change to the Planned Land Use map.	**No Impact**
b. NEC Fowler/Fancher Creek	3.64	Res. Medium	Community Commercial	From 6.5 du/ac to 0 From 0 to .3 FAR (3.64 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**-24 du** **+47,568 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+95 employment** **+1,779 daily trips**	Res. Medium	**No Impact**
c. Add Transit Station or Police Station Precedent/ Consequences	1.5	Corridor/Center Mixed-Use	Public/Quasi Public Facility	From 8 to 0 du/ac From (1.5 acres x .6 x .25 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) to 0	**-12 du** **-9,801 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-23 employment** **+10 daily trips**	Public/Quasi Public Facility	**-12 du** **-9,801 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+10 daily trips**
d. Add Lake near Clovis at Town Center to map? Precedent/ Consequences?	Can't assess	Can't assess	Can't assess	Can't assess	Can't assess	Not a land use item.	**No Impact**
18. Ken Nguyen							
a. NW Chestnut/Church (APN: 480-213-14) *Same request as item 33.*	0.38	Res. Medium	Community Commercial	From 6.5 du/ac to 0 From 0 to .3 FAR (.38 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**-3 du** **+4,966 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+10 employment** **+185 daily trips**	Refer to item 33	**No Impact**
b. Above NW Maple/California (APN: 471-302-28)	1.97	Res. Medium	Res. Urban Neighborhood	From 6.5 to 20 du/ac	**+27 du** **+142 daily trips**	Res. Medium	**No Impact**
19. **Jeff Wolpert of Grubb and Ellis for Owners** – West side of Elm Ave. south of Church – Split Zoning RA and C-6 ***(same request as 3h.1 and 3h.2, 5d, and 20)***	See 3h.1 and 3h.2	See 3h.1 and 3h.2	See 3h.1 and 3h.2	See 3h.1 and 3h.2	See 3h.1 and 3h.2	See 3h.1 and 3h.2	See 3h.1 and 3h.2
20. **Sol Development for Owners** – West side of Elm Ave. south of Church – Split Zoning RA and C-6 ***(same request as 3h.1 and 3h.2, 5d, and 19)***	See 3h.1 and 3h.2	See 3h.1 and 3h.2	See 3h.1 and 3h.2	See 3h.1 and 3h.2	See 3h.1 and 3h.2	See 3h.1 and 3h.2	See 3h.1 and 3h.2
21. **Granville Homes**							
a. Copper River							

Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location	Size (acres)	GP Update PLU (Aug. 9, 2012 Initiation Map)	Change Request			City of Fresno Preferred PLU	
			Planned Land Use	Density or Square Footage Change[1]	CEQA Impacts[1,2,3]	Planned Land Use	CEQA Impacts[1,2]
1. Outlot M	20.52	Res. High	Res. Urban Neighborhood	From 34 to 20 du/ac	**-288 du** **-1,915 daily trips**	Res. High	**No Impact**
2. Outlot P (request change to 17.83 acres while the rest can remain Res. Medium High)	17.63	Res. Medium High	Res. Urban Neighborhood	From 14 to 20 du/ac	**+110 du** **+732 daily trips**	Res. Medium High	**No Impact**
3. 3a. Outlot Q	16.49	Res. Medium	Res. Medium Low	From 6.5 to 4 du/ac	**-41 du** **-390 daily trips**	Res. Medium Low	**-41 du** **-390 daily trips**
3b. Village I	30.09	Res. Medium Low	Res. Low	From 4 to 1.5 du/ac	**-75 du** **-714 daily trips**	Res. Medium Low	**No Impact**
3c. Outlot LL	2.95	Res. Medium High	Res. Medium Low	From 14 to 4 du/ac	**-29 du** **- 159 daily trips**	Res. Medium High	**No Impact**
4. Outlot Y	10.08	Res. Medium High	Res. Medium	From 14 to 6.5 du/ac	**-75 du** **-310 daily trips**	Res. Medium High	**No Impact**
5. Outlot X	12.85	Res. Medium High	Res. Medium Low	From 14 to 4 du/ac	**-129 du** **-702 daily trips**	Res. Medium High	**No Impact**
6. CRR owned lot adjacent to Lanier lot (APN 579-074-42S and 44S	5.27	Open Space	Res. Medium	From 0 to 6.5 du/ac	**+34 du** **+324 daily trips**	Open Space	**No Impact**
7. Outlot OO	26.82	Res. Medium High	Res. Medium	From 14 to 6.5 du/ac	**-202 du** **- 834 daily trips**	Res. Medium High	**No Impact**
8. Outlot NN (Street to be realigned directly southerly)	6.66	Res. Medium High (5.31) Community Commercial (1.35)	Res. Medium	From 14 to 6.5 du/ac From 0 to 6.5 du/ac From .3 to 0 FAR (1.35 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**-30 du** **-17,642 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-35 employment** **-799 daily trips**	Res. Medium High (5.31) Community Commercial (1.35)	**No Impact**
9. Outlot PP (request change to 12 acres while the rest can remain Commercial)	12	Community Commercial	Res. Medium High	From 0 to 14 du/ac From .3 to 0 FAR (12 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**+168 du** **-156,816 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-314 employment** **-5,554 daily trips**	Community Commercial	**No Impact**
10. Park and Surrounding – NW Chestnut/Copper TM6087	14.5	Park (4.88) Res. Medium High (4.48) Res. Medium (5.14)	Res. Medium Low	From 0 to 4 du/ac From 14 to 4 du/ac From 6.5 to 4 du/ac	**-37 du** **-191 daily trips**	Res. Medium Low	**-37 du** **-191 daily trips**
11. Outlot JJ (Portion)	3.5	Community Commercial	Res. Medium Low	From 0 to 4 du/ac From .3 to 0 FAR (3.5 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**+14 du** **-45,738 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-91 employment** **-1,789 daily trips**	Community Commercial	**No Impact**
Approved/Finished Developments (Copper River)							
12. Village A (T5205 Terrabella)	28.44	Res. Medium	Res. Medium Low	From 6.5 to 4 du/ac	**-71 du** **-676 daily trips**	Res. Medium Low	**-71 du** **-676 daily trips**
13. Village D a. Eastern Portion	13	Res. Medium Low	Res. Low	From 4 du/ac x 13 ac = 52 du to 56du	**+4 du** **+38 daily trips**	Res. Low	**+4 du** **+38 daily trips**
b. Western Portion	22.8	Res. Medium Low	Res. Low	From 4 du/ac x 22.8 ac = 91 du to 50 du	**-41 du** **-390 daily trips**	Res. Medium Low	**No Impact**
14. Village E (T5271 Links) a. Western Portion	16.5	Res. Medium Low	Res. Low	From 4 to 1.5 du/ac	**-41 du** **-392 daily trips**	Res. Low	**-41 du** **-392 daily trips**

Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location	Size (acres)	GP Update PLU (Aug. 9, 2012 Initiation Map)	Change Request			City of Fresno Preferred PLU	
			Planned Land Use	Density or Square Footage Change[1]	CEQA Impacts[1,2,3]	Planned Land Use	CEQA Impacts[1,2]
b. Eastern Portion	10.21	Res. Medium Low	Res. Low	From 4 to 1.5 du/ac	**-26 du** **-243 daily trips**	Res. Low	**-26 du** **-243 daily trips**
15. Village G (T892, 6045, 6065)	32.80	Res. Medium Low	Res. Medium	From 4 to 6.5 du/ac	**+82 du** **+781 daily trips**	Res. Medium	**+82 du** **+781 daily trips**
16. 16a. Village F	13.07	Res. Medium	Res. Low	From 6.5 to 1.5 du/ac	**-65 du** **-619 daily trips**	Res. Low	**-65 du** **-619 daily trips**
16b. The Top of portion of Village F	0.6	Res. Medium	Golf Course/Open Space	From 6.5 to 0 du/ac	**-4 du** **-35 daily trips**	Golf Course/Open Space	**-4 du** **-35 daily trips**
17. T5963	23.69	Res. Medium Low	Res. Medium	From 4 to 6.5 du/ac	**+59 du** **+562 daily trips**	Res. Medium	**+59 du** **+562 daily trips**
b. Tract 5717 and 6033 – NE ¼ Section Fowler/Clinton							
1. APN: 310-041-38 (T6033) A.	1	Business Park	Community Commercial	From .4 to .3 FAR (1 acres x .1 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**-4,356 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-5 employment** **+121 daily trips**	Business Park	**No Impact**
B.	3.56	Business Park	Res. Medium	From 0 to 6.5 du/ac From .4 to 0 FAR (3.56 acres x .4 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**+23 du** **-62,029 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-67 employment** **-552 daily trips**	Business Park	**No Impact**
C.	31	Res. Urban Neighborhood (28) Business Park (3)	Res. Medium Low	From 20 du/ac x (28 ac) = 560 du to 169 du From .4 to 0 FAR (3 acres x .4 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**-391 du** **-20,909 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-23 employment** **-1,252 daily trips**	Res. Medium Low	**-391 du** **-20,909 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-1,252 daily trips**
2. APN: 310-041-39 (This is a reconfiguration of Community Commercial, but maintains same area)	2.18	Community Commercial	Community Commercial	No Change	**No change**	Community Commercial	**No Impact**
3. APN: 310-740-07 A. (Ensure Live Work Units can happen on this property.	1	Business Park	Community Commercial	From .4 to .3 FAR (1 acres x .1 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**-4,356 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-5 employment** **+121 daily trips**	Business Park	**No Impact**
B. Keep similar to current Light Industrial CM zoning as is under 2025 General Plan and existing zoning code	3.87	Business Park	Light Industrial	From .4 to .3 FAR (3.87 acres x .1 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**-16,858 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-18 employment** **-87 daily trips**	Light Industrial	**-16,858 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-87 daily trips**
4. APN: 310-740-08 and 09	14.02	Business Park	Res. Urban Neighborhood	From 0 to 20 du/ac From .4 to 0 FAR (14.02 acres x .4 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**+280 du** **-244,285 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-264 employment** **-1,173 daily trips**	Business Park	**No Impact**
c. North side of Bullard near Bryan – to HWY 99 (APN 504-080-16S) (TM 5584)	9.51	Res. Medium High	Res. Medium Low	From 14 to 4 du/ac	**-95 du** **-522 daily trips**	Res. Medium	From 14 to 6.5 du/ac **-71 du** **-294 daily trips**
d. North side Clinton –Bet. Polk/Hayes –(APN 312-061-18) TM 5560	19.51	Res. Medium	Res. Medium Low	From 6.5 to 4 du/ac	**-49 du** **-466 daily trips**	Res. Medium	**No Impact**
e. Grantland – South of Dakota Alignment	19.56	Res. High	Res. Medium	From 34 to 6.5 du/ac	**-538 du**	Res. Urban	From 34 to 20 du/ac

Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location	Size (acres)	GP Update PLU (Aug. 9, 2012 Initiation Map)	Change Request			City of Fresno Preferred PLU	
			Planned Land Use	Density or Square Footage Change[1]	CEQA Impacts[1,2,3]	Planned Land Use	CEQA Impacts[1,2]
(APN 512-141-33)					**-3,213 daily trips**	Neighborhood	**-274 du** **-1,822 daily trips**
f. NE Grantland/Barstow (APN 505-281-16, 17 and 18)	3.93	Res. Urban Neighborhood	Community Commercial	From 20 to 0 du/ac From 0 to .3 FAR (3.93 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**-79 du** **+52,357 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+105 employment** **+1,695 daily trips**	Community Commercial	**-79 du** **+52,357 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+1,695 daily trips**
g. <u>Artisan Square Area</u> – NE Ashlan/Bryan/Hayes (TM 5891) 1. Change to Res. Medium 2. Change to Res. Med Low (33 acres) 3. Change to Res. High (5 acres) 4. Change to Community Commercial (1 acre)	39	Community Commercial (4) Res. Medium (1) Parks (12) Res. Medium (21)	Res. Medium High (4) Res. Medium High (1) Res. Medium Low (12) Res. Medium Low (21)	From 0 to 14 du/ac From .3 FAR to 0 FAR (4 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) From 6.5 to 14 du/ac From 0 to 4 du/ac From 6.5 to 4 du/ac	**+56 du** **+8 du** **+48 du** **-53 du** **+59 Total du** **-52,275 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+105 employment** **-893 daily trips**	Community Commercial (4) Res. Medium (1) Parks (12 acres) Res. Medium (21)	**No Impact**
h. Bryan, between Ashlan and Dakota (APN 512-050-89)	17.54	Res. Urban Neighborhood	Res. Medium	From 20 to 6.5 du/ac	**-237 du** **-1,249 daily trips**	Res. Urban Neighborhood	**No Impact**
i. Mission Ranch							
Change all to Medium Low Density						Low Res.	See 21i1 thru 21i19 below
Eliminate Connector Street(s)						Connector streets omitted from map.	**No Impact**
1. ***(Same area as 3b.1 and 5b.1)***	Same as 5b.1	Same as 5b.1	Same as 5b.1	Same as 5b.1	Same as 5b.1	Same as 5b.1	Same as 5b.1
2. ***(Same area as 3b.2)***	14.02	Res. Urban Neighborhood	Res. Medium Low	From 20 to 4 du/ac	**-224 du** **-1,329 daily trips**	Low Res.	From 20 to 1.5 du/ac **-259 du** **-1,662 daily trips**
3.	4.92	Open Space/Park	Res. Medium Low	From 0 to 4 du/ac	**+20 du** **+190 daily trips**	Low Res.	From 0 to 1.5 du/ac **+7 du** **+70 daily trips**
4.	16.42	Res. Low	Res. Medium Low	From 1.5 to 4 du/ac	**+41 du** **+390 daily trips**	Low Res.	**No Impact**
5.a.	3.45	Res. Low	Res. Medium Low	From 1.5 to 4 du/ac	**+9 du** **+85 daily trips**	Low Res.	**No Impact**
b.	3.61	Res. Low	Res. Medium Low	From 1.5 to 4 du/ac	**+9 du** **+85 daily trips**	Ponding Basin	From 1.5 to 0 du/ac **-5 du** **-48 daily trips**
c.	7.24	Res. Low	Res. Medium Low	From 1.5 to 4 du/ac	**+18 du** **+172 daily trips**	Low Res.	**No Impact**
6. a.	14.09	Res. Medium	Res. Medium Low	From 6.5 to 4 du/ac	**-35 du** **-335 daily trips**	Low Res.	From 6.5 to 1.5 du/ac **-70 du** **-669 daily trips**
b.	5.2	Res. Medium	Res. Medium Low	From 6.5 to 4 du/ac	**-13 du** **-124 daily trips**	Ponding Basin	From 6.5 to 0 du/ac **-34 du** **-321 daily trips**

Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location	Size (acres)	GP Update PLU (Aug. 9, 2012 Initiation Map)	Change Request			City of Fresno Preferred PLU	
			Planned Land Use	Density or Square Footage Change[1]	CEQA Impacts[1,2,3]	Planned Land Use	CEQA Impacts[1,2]
7. ***(Same area as 8g.2)***	9.75	Elementary School	Res. Medium Low	From 0 to 4 du/ac	**+39 du** **+371 Daily trips**	Low Res.	**No Impact**
8.	4.95	Open Space/Park	Res. Medium Low	From 0 to 4 du/ac	**+20 du** **+190 daily trips**	Low Res.	From 0 to 1.5 du/ac **+7 du** **+70 daily trips**
9.	14.31	Res. Urban Neighborhood	Res. Medium Low	From 20 to 4 du/ac	**-229 du** **-1,359 daily trips**	Low Res.	From 20 to 1.5 du/ac **-264 du** **-1,693 daily trips**
10.	9.81	Res. Medium	Res. Medium Low	From 6.5 to 4 du/ac	**-25 du** **-238 daily trips**	Low Res.	From 6.5 to 1.5 du/ac **-49 du** **-466 daily trips**
11.	17.95	Res. Urban Neighborhood	Res. Medium Low	From 20 to 4 du/ac	**-287 du** **-1,702 daily trips**	Low Res.	From 20 to 1.5 du/ac **-332 du** **-2,130 daily trips**
12. ***(Same area as 5i.1)***	18.84	Res. High	Res. Medium Low	From 34 to 4 du/ac	**-567 du** **-3,545 daily trips**	Ponding Basin	**-640 du** **-4,256 daily trips**
13.	18.96	Res. High	Res. Medium Low	From 34 to 4 du/ac	**-569 du** **-3,565 daily trips**	Low Res.	From 34 to 1.5 du/ac **-617 du** **-4,022 daily trips**
14.	17.65	Community Commercial	Res. Medium Low	From 0 du/ac to 4 du/ac From .3 FAR to 0 FAR (17.65 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**+71 du** **-230,650 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-461 employment** **-11,013 daily trips**	Low Res.	From 0 to 1.5 du = **+27du** From .3 to 0 FAR (17.65 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)= **-230,650 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-11,649 daily trips**
15.	7.07	Res. Urban Neighborhood	Res. Medium Low	From 20 to 4 du/ac	**-113 du** **-671 daily trips**	Low Res.	From 20 to 1.5 du/ac **-130 du** **-838 Daily trips**
16.	19.55	Open Space/Park	Res. Medium Low	From 0 to 4 du/ac	**+78 du** **+743 daily trips**	Low Res.	From 0 to 1.5 du/ac **+29 du** **+242 daily trips**
17. ***(Same area as 5h)***	18.69	Open Space/Park	Res. Medium Low	From 0 to 4 du/ac	**+75 du** **+714 daily trips**	Low Res.	From 0 to 1.5 du/ac **+28 du** **+231 daily trips**
18. ***(Same area as 5i.2)***	38.14	Res. High	Res. Medium Low	From 34 to 4 du/ac	**-1,144 du** **-7,172 daily trips**	Low Res.	From 34 to 1.5 du/ac **-1,245 du** **-8,113 daily trips**
19. ***(Same area as 5i.3)***	35.50	Res. Urban Neighborhood	Res. Medium Low	From 20 to 4 du/ac	**-568 du** **-3,370 daily trips**	Low Res.	From 20 to 1.5 du/ac **-816 du** **-5,237 daily trips**
j. Westlake – Tract 5915 (Gettysburg, Grantland, Shields, and Garfield)							
1. Eliminate Connector Streets and replace with "Special Collector" streets						Connector streets omitted from map.	**No Impact**

Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location	Size (acres)	GP Update PLU (Aug. 9, 2012 Initiation Map)	Change Request			City of Fresno Preferred PLU	
			Planned Land Use	Density or Square Footage Change[1]	CEQA Impacts[1,2,3]	Planned Land Use	CEQA Impacts[1,2]
2. Consider this area "Annexed" and "Priority Development Area" #1							
3. Eliminate CMX and replace with Medium Density	15	Corridor/Center Mixed-Use	Res. Medium	From 8 to 6.5 du/ac From (15 acres x .6 x .25 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) to 0	**-23 du** **-98,010 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-231 employment** **+1,111 daily trips**	Res. Medium	**-23 du** **-98,010 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+1,111 daily trips**
4. Reduce size of Commercial (Ashlan and Grantland)	2.9	Community Commercial	Res. Medium	From 0 to 6.5 du/ac From .3 to 0 FAR (2.9 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**+19 du** **-37,897 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-76 employment** **-1,399 daily trips**	Community Commercial	**No Impact**
5. Reduce size of Urban Neighborhood	18.2	Res. Urban Neighborhood	Res. Medium	From 20 to 6.5 du/ac	**-246 du** **-1,298 daily trips**	Res. Urban Neighborhood	**No Impact**
6. Commercial on Shields and Grantland	3.5	Community Commercial	Res. Medium	From 0 to 6.5 du/ac From .3 to 0 FAR (3.5 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**-23 du** **-45,738 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-91 employment** **-1,703 daily trips**	Res. Medium	**-23 du** **-45,738 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-1,703 daily trips**
k. Recorded Final Maps/Under Construction/Already Developed							
1. SW Church/Fowler – Tract 5450 (6.54 du/ac)	13.24 4.83	Res. Urban Neighborhood Res. Medium High	Res. Medium	From (20 du/ac x 13.24) + (14 du/ac x 4.83) = 333 du to 118 du	**-215 du** **-1,430 daily trips**	Res. Medium	**-215 du** **-1,430 daily trips**
2. SE Sunnyside/Church – Tracts 5458/5477 (4.19 du/ac)	86.87	Res. Medium	Res. Medium Low	From 6.5 du/ac x 86.87 ac = 565du to 364 du	**-201 du** **-1,914 daily trips**	Res. Medium Low	**-201 du** **-1,914 daily trips**
3. NE Bullard/Grantland – Tract 5357 (5.46 du/ac)	36.22	Res. Medium	Res. Medium Low	From 6.5 du/ac x 36.22 = 235 du to 198 du	**-37 du** **-352 daily trips**	Res. Medium Low	**-37 du** **-352 daily trips**
4. 4179/4171 W. Sample – Tract 5278 (3.27 du/ac)	17.41	Res. Medium Low	Res. Low	From 4 du/ac x 17.41 ac = 70 du to 75du	**+5 du** **+48 daily trips**	Res. Low	**+5 du** **+48 daily trips**
5. NE Garfield and Barstow – Tract 5597 (APN 505-321-01 thru 22, 505-322-01 thru 08, 505-331-01 thru 13, 505-332-01 thru 19 (4.87 du/ac)	27.91	Res. Medium High	Res. Medium Low	From 14 du/ac x 27.91 ac = 391du to 136 du	**-254 du** **-2,418 daily trips**	Res. Medium Low	**-254 du** **-2,418 daily trips**
22. **Sol Development for Owner**- West side of Maple between Perrin and Shepherd (developed condo complex)	4.5	Res. Medium Low	Res. Medium High	From 4 to 14 du/ac	**+45 du** **+248 daily trips**	Res. Medium Low	**No Impact**
23. **Sol Development for Owner**- SWC Valentine and McKinley (APN 449-030-63)	8.77	Res. Low	Res. Medium	From 1.5 to 6.5 du/ac	**+44 du** **+419 daily trips**	Res. Medium	**+44 du** **+419 daily trips**
24. **The Kashian Group** – Shaw and Hwy 99 24a. APN 508-030-04 and 05	15.54	Community Commercial	Regional Mixed-Use	From 0 du/ac to (34 du/ac x .3) From (15.54 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) to (15.54 acres x .7 net x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**+171 du** **-60,923 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-122 employment** **-1,238 daily trips**	Regional Mixed-Use	**+171 du** **-60,923 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-1,238 daily trips**
24b. APN 508-030-06	27.61	Community Commercial	Regional Mixed-Use	From 0 du/ac to (34 du/ac x .3) From (27.61 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) to (27.61 acres x .7 net x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**+282 du** **-108,242 sq. ft.** office/commercial space	Regional Mixed-Use	**+282 du** **-108,242 sq. ft.** office/commercial space

Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location	Size (acres)	GP Update PLU (Aug. 9, 2012 Initiation Map)	Change Request			City of Fresno Preferred PLU	
			Planned Land Use	Density or Square Footage Change[1]	CEQA Impacts[1,2,3]	Planned Land Use	CEQA Impacts[1,2]
					-216 employment **-2,327 daily trips**		**-2,327 daily trips**
25. **Paul Fourchy** APN 506-130-28	17.6	Highway & Auto	Res. Urban Neighborhood	From 0 to 20 du/ac From .25 to 0 FAR (17.6 acres x .25 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**+352 du** **-191,664 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-9,484 daily trips**	Light Industrial	From .25 FAR to .3 FAR (17.6 acres x .05 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) **+38,333 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **35 employment** **+268 daily trips**
26. **Art Terzian** APN 433-080-01 and 02	4.89	Res. Medium	Light Industrial	From 6.5 to 0 du/ac From 0 to .3 FAR (4.89 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**-32 du** **+63,903 sq. ft.** office/commercial space- **58 employment** **+141 daily trips**	Res. Medium	**No Impact**
27. **Troy McKenney** APN 442-022-08 and 09	0.86	Office	Commercial General	From (.86 acres x .5 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) to (.86 acres x .35 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**-5,619 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-14 employment** **+356 daily trips**	Office	**-5,619 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+356 daily trips**
28. **Alfonso Manrique** APN 428-340-09	0.37	Office	Res. Urban Neighborhood	From 0 du/ac to 20 du/ac From (.37 acres x .5 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) to 0 sq. ft.	**+7 du** **-8,058 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-20 employment** **-41 daily trips**	Office	**+7 du** **-8,058 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-41 daily trips**
29. **Will Tackett** APN 494-060-51T	.3	Fire Station	Light Industrial	From 0 sq. ft. to (.3 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**+3,920 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+4 employment** **+27 daily trips**	Light Industrial	**+3,920 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+27 daily trips**
30. **Arkel Arisian** APN 568-010-20	20	Community Commercial	Corridor/Center Mixed Use	From 0 du/ac to 8 du/ac From (20 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) to (20 acres x .6 net x .25 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**+160 du** **-130,680 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-261 employment** **-4,319 daily trips**	Corridor/Center Mixed Use	**+160 du** **-130,680 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-4,319 daily trips**
31. **Chestnut and Alluvial (Land owners who have written letters** include: Beth Brown, Dan Taylor, Erica Ayala, Jerry Pohl, Kassandra Booth, Mary Grant Bell, Michael and Barbara Garrison, Dr. and Mrs James Fletcher, Ray Loom and Rick Olsen, Shalea and Mark Pitman, Steve and Lorie Collins, Tiffany and Josh Madsen, William and Linda Hicks, William Gong, RJ Perez, Norma and Alice Otani, Kerry McGuire, James Olber, Denise and Winfred Nishmine) APN 404-071-45	18.52	Res. Medium High	Res. Medium Low	From 14 to 4 du/ac	**-185 du** **-1,025 daily trips**	Res. Medium	From 14 to 6.5 du/ac **-139 du** **-587 daily trips**
32. **Generation Home - Steven Spano** APN 402-030-70 Steve Brandau made same request on behalf of owner	3.06	Community Commercial	Corridor/Center Mixed Use	From 0 to 8 du/ac From (3.06 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) to (3.06 acres x .6 net x .25 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**+25 du** **-20,190 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-40 employment** **-656 daily trips**	Community Commercial	**No Impact**
33. Kathy Van APN 480-213-13, 14, and 15	1.13	Res. Medium	Community Commercial	From 6.5 to 0 du/ac From 0 to .3 FAR	**+7 du** **+14,767 sq. ft.**	Community Commercial	**+7 du** **+14,767 sq. ft.** office/commercial space

Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location	Size (acres)	GP Update PLU (Aug. 9, 2012 Initiation Map)	Change Request			City of Fresno Preferred PLU	
			Planned Land Use	Density or Square Footage Change[1]	CEQA Impacts[1,2,3]	Planned Land Use	CEQA Impacts[1,2]
(Request 18a is likely a previous land owner for APN 480-213-14)				(1.13 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	office/commercial space **+30 employment** **+561 daily trips**		**+561 daily trips**
34. **Fresno Pacific University** – Dirk Poeschel APN 472-040-25, 26, 27 and 28	2.56	Res. Medium High	Corridor/Center Mixed Use	From 14 to 8 du/ac From 0 to (2.56 acres x .6 net x .25 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**-15 du** **+16,727 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+39 employment** **+640 daily trips**	Corridor/Center Mixed Use	**-15 du** **+16,727 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+640 daily trips**
35. **Gary Giannetta** APN 312-081-12 TM 6091	2.25	Res. Low	Res. Medium Low	From 1.5 du/ac x 2.25 ac = 4 du to 7 du	**+3 du** **+29 daily trips**	Res. Medium Low	**+3 du** **+29 daily trips**
36. **Gary Giannetta** APN 472-022-13 TM 5387	8.73	Open Space/ Community Park	Res. Low	From 0 to 1.95 du/ac	**+17 du** **+162 daily trips**	Res. Low	**+17 du** **+162 daily trips**
37. **Gary Giannetta** APN 511-011-18 TM 5538 Also, letter from Wagner and Wagner asking for same thing	19.85	Res. Medium High	Res. Medium Low	From 14 du/ac x 19.85 ac = 278 du to 93 du	**-185 du** **-964 daily trips**	Res. Medium Low	**-185 du** **-964 daily trips**
38. **John Valentino** APN 459-200-01	0.38	Open Space	No current PLU to match request	Can't assess	**Can't assess**	Open Space (Dual Designation of Light Industrial)	**No Impact**
39. **Mark Knox** APN 507-021-02S	0.86	Community Commercial	Light Industrial	Same FAR of .3	**No Change to sq. ft. nor daily trips**	Light Industrial	**No Change to sq. ft. nor daily trips**
40. **Steve Ohanesian** APN 481-020-01 **a.**	11	Open Space Park	Res. Medium	From 0 to 6.5 du/ac	**+72 du** **+684 daily trips**	Res. Medium (11 ac)	**+72 du** **+684 daily trips**
b.	5	Open Space Park	Res. Medium	From 0 to 6.5 du/ac	**+32 du** **+304 daily trips**	Open Space Park (5 ac)	**No Impact**
41. **Parga Partners** - College Park Master Planned Community							
a. APN 316-071-42	34.83	Light Industrial (17.83) Business Park (17)	Heavy Industrial	Same FAR of .3 From (17 acres x .4 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) to (17 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**-74,052 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-80 employment** **-4,623 daily trips**	Light Industrial (17.83) Business Park (17)	**No Impact**
b. APN 316-040-77	26.90	Res. Medium	Light Industrial	From 6.5 to 0 du/ac From 0 to (26.9 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**-175 du** **+351,529 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+320 employment** **+780 daily trips**	Res. Medium	**No Impact**
c. APN 316-040-66	3.06	Res. Urban Neighborhood (1.86) Res. Medium (1.2) Canal	Regional Business Park	From 20 to 0 du/ac From 0 FAR to .4 FAR (3.06 acres x .4 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) From 6.5 du/ac to 0du/ac	**-45 du** **+53,317 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+58 employment** **+936 daily trips**	Res. Urban Neighborhood (1.86) Res. Medium (1.2) Canal	**No Impact**
d. APN 316-040-63	5.77	Res. Urban Neighborhood (4.77) Res. Medium (1)	Regional Business Park	From 20 to 0 du/ac From 0 FAR to .4 FAR (5.77 acres x .4 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) From 6.5 du/ac to 0 du/ac	**-102 du** **+100,537 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+109 employment**	Res. Urban Neighborhood (4.77) Res. Medium (1)	**No Impact**

Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location	Size (acres)	GP Update PLU (Aug. 9, 2012 Initiation Map)	Change Request			City of Fresno Preferred PLU	
			Planned Land Use	Density or Square Footage Change[1]	CEQA Impacts[1,2,3]	Planned Land Use	CEQA Impacts[1,2]
		Canal			**+936 daily trips**	Canal	
e. APN 316-040-17S	19.1	Res. Urban Neighborhood (18) Res. Medium (1.1)	Regional Business Park	From 20 to 0 du/ac From 0 FAR to .4 FAR (19.1 acres x .4 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) From 6.5 du/ac to 0 du/ac	**-367 du** **+332,798 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+360 employment** **+1,669 daily trips**	Res. Urban Neighborhood (18) Res. Medium (1.1)	**No Impact**
f. APN 316-180-09	19.55	Res. Medium	Regional Business Park	From 6.5 to 0 du/ac From 0 FAR to .4 FAR (19.55 acres x .4 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**-127 du** **+340,639 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+368 employment** **+3,021 daily trips**	Res. Medium	**No Impact**
g. APN 316-051-18 1.	7	Corridor/Center Mixed Use	Res. Urban Neigh.	From 8 to 20 du/ac From (7acres x .6 net x .25 FAR x 43,560sq. ft.) to 0	**+84 du** **-45,738 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-108 employment** **-2,025 daily trips**	Corridor/Center Mixed Use	**No Impact**
2.	30	Office	Res. Medium	From 0 to 6.5 du/ac From (30 acres x .5 FAR x 43,560sq. ft.) to 0	**+195 du** **-653,400 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-1,634 employment** **-7,207 daily trips**	Office	**No Impact**
h. APN 316-051-20	37.72	Office	Res. Medium	From 0 to 6.5 du/ac From (37.72 acres x .5 FAR x 43,560sq. ft.) to 0	**+245 du** **-821,542 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-2,054 employment** **-6,729 daily trips**	Office	**No Impact**
i. APN 316-051-21	80	Regional Business Park	Res. Medium	From 0 to 6.5 du/ac From .4 FAR to 0 FAR (80 acres x .4 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**+520 du** **-1,393,920 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-1,507 employment** **-12,379 daily trips**	Regional Business Park	**No Impact**
j. APN 316-051-09	14	School with Park	Res. Medium	From 0 to 6.5 du/ac	**+91 du** **-144 daily trips**	School with Park	**No Impact**
k. APN 316-051-07 1.	20	Res. Urban Neighborhood	Corridor/Center Mixed Use	From 20 to 8 du/ac From 0 to (20 acres x .6net x .25FAR x 43,560 sq ft)	**-240 du** **+130,680 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+307 employment** **+4,197 daily trips**	Res. Urban Neighborhood	**No Impact**
2.	13	School with Park	Res. Medium	From 0 to 6.5 du/ac	**+85 du** **-201 daily trips**	School with Park	**No Impact**
42. **Sherman Spalding property** – Dirk Poeschel APN 403-030-07	2.8	Res. Urban Neighborhood	Res. Medium High	From 20 to 14 du/ac	**-17 du** **-113 daily trips**	Res. Medium High	**-17 du** **-113 daily trips**
43. **Sherman Spalding property** – Dirk Poeschel APN 509-020-35S	12.28	Res. Urban Neighborhood	Res. Medium High	From 20 to 14 du/ac	**-74 du** **-492 daily trips**	Res. Medium High	**-74 du** **-492 daily trips**
44. **River Park Tower** APN 303-201-29	2.1	Office	Corridor/Center Mixed Use	From 0 to 8 du/ac From (2.1acres x .5FAR x 43,560 sq ft) to (2.1acres x .6net x .25FAR x 43,560 sq ft)	**+16 du** **-32,017 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-80 employment**	Office	**No Impact**

Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location	Size (acres)	GP Update PLU (Aug. 9, 2012 Initiation Map)	Change Request			City of Fresno Preferred PLU	
			Planned Land Use	Density or Square Footage Change[1]	CEQA Impacts[1,2,3]	Planned Land Use	CEQA Impacts[1,2]
					+209 daily trips		
45. **Sequoia Fresno Joint Venture** APN 402-220-66 and 67 45a.	18.25	Corridor/Center Mixed Use (17) Park (1.25)	Recreation Commercial	From 8 to 0 du/ac (17 acres x .6 net x .25 FAR x 43,560 sq ft) to (17 acres x .2 FAR x 43,560sq. ft.) From 0 to (1.25 acres x .2 FAR x 43,560sq. ft.)	**-136 du** **-26,136 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-61 employment** **+93 daily trips**	Recreation Commercial	**-136 du** **-26,136 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+93 daily trips**
45b.	9.15	Corridor/Center Mixed Use (5.25) Park (3.9)	Office	From 8 to 0 du/ac (5.25 acres x .6 net x .25 FAR x 43,560 sq ft) to (5.25acres x .5 FAR x 43,560sq. ft.) From 0 to (3.9 acres x .5 FAR x 43,560sq. ft.)	**-42 du** **+148,649 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+372 employment** **-223 daily trips**	Office	**-42 du** **+148,649 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-223 daily trips**
45c.	.6	Corridor/Center Mixed Use	Community Commercial	From 8 to 0 du/ac (.6 acres x .6 net x .25 FAR x 43,560 sq ft) to (.6 acres x .2 FAR x 43,560sq. ft.)	**-5 du** **+1,307 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+3 employment** **+4 daily trips**	Community Commercial	**-5 du** **+1,307 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+4 daily trips**
46. **Shamlian Property** APN 510-040-30	2.2	Res. Urban Neighborhood	Community Commercial	From 20 to 0 du/ac From 0 to (2.2 acres x .2 FAR x 43,560sq. ft.)	**-44 du** **+19,166 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+38 employment** **+523 daily trips**	NMX	From 20 du/ac to 7 du/ac **-29 du** From 0 to (2.2 acres x .25 FAR x .5 x 43,560sq. ft.) **+11,979 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+334 daily trips**
47. **Sol Development** APN 507-021-01S, 02S, 03S, 05S, 09S, 10S, 17S, 22S, 37S, 38S, 39S, and 40S	13.04	Community Commercial	General Commercial	From .3 to .35 FAR (13.04 acres x .05 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**+28,401 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+47 employment** **+1,259 daily trips**	Light Industrial	From .3 to .3 FAR 0 sq. ft. office/commercial space **No Impact**
48. **Stone Soup** APN 418-401-10	1.48	Corridor/Center Mixed Use	Office	From 8 to 0 du/ac From (1.48 acres x .6 net x .25 FAR x 43,560 sq ft) to (1.48 acres x .5 FAR x 43,560sq. ft.)	**-12 du** **+22,564 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+56 employment** **-155 daily trips**	Office	**No Impact**
49. **Sarkis Atachian** APN 433-210-33, 39 and 40	2.77	Res. Medium	Light Industrial	From 6.5 to 0 du/ac From 0 to (2.77 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**-18 du** **+36,198 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+33 employment** **+ 81 daily trips**	Res. Medium	**No Impact**
50. **SEGA Plan Mod – Mansmann/Greenwood** A-08-12 APN 316-051-06	19.02	School with Park	Community Commercial	From 0 to (19.02 acres x .2 FAR x 43,560sq. ft.)	**+165,702 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+331 employment** **+8,430 daily trips**	School with Park	**No Impact**
51. **SEGA Plan Mod - Dennis Simonian** A-08-14 APN 316-051-02	17.53	Res. Medium	Community Commercial	From 20 to 0 du/ac From 0 to (17.53 acres x .2 FAR x 43,560sq. ft.)	**-351 du** **+152,721 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+305 employment** **+3,426 daily trips**	Res. Medium	**No Impact**
52. **SEGA Plan Mod – Ralph and Frances Reitz** A-08-20	18.95	Regional Business Park	Corridor/Center Mixed Use	From 0 to 8 du/ac From (18.95 acres x .4 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) to	**+152 du** **-206,366 sq. ft.**	Regional Business Park	**No Impact**

Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location	Size (acres)	GP Update PLU (Aug. 9, 2012 Initiation Map)	Change Request			City of Fresno Preferred PLU	
			Planned Land Use	Density or Square Footage Change[1]	CEQA Impacts[1,2,3]	Planned Land Use	CEQA Impacts[1,2]
a. Property Owner #5: APN 316-150-01 and 02				(18.95 acres x .6 x .25 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	office/commercial space **-223 employment** **-1,557 daily trips**		
b. Property Owner #6: APN 316-150-11	9.92	Regional Business Park	1. Res. Urban Neigh. (4.27)	From 0 to 20 du/ac From (4.27 acres x .4 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) to 0	**+85 du** **-74,400 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-80 employment** **+361 daily trips**	Regional Business Park	**No Impact**
			2. Res. Medium (5.65)	From 0 to 6.5 du/ac From (5.65 acres x .4 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) to 0	**+37 du** **-98,446 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-106 employment** **-874 daily trips**	Regional Business Park	**No Impact**
c. Property Owner #7: APN 316-150-13	0.97	Regional Business Park	Res. Medium	From 0 to 6.5 du/ac From (0.97 acres x .4 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) to 0	**+6 du** **-16,901 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-18 employment** **-153 daily trips**	Regional Business Park	**No Impact**
d. Property Owner #8: APN 316-150-14	18.20	Regional Business Park	1. Res. Urban Neigh. (8)	From 0 to 20 du/ac From (8 acres x .4 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) to 0	**+160 du** **-139,392 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-151 employment** **-1677 daily trips**	Regional Business Park	**No Impact**
			2. Res. Medium (10.2)	From 0 to 6.5 du/ac From (10.2 acres x .4 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) to 0	**+66 du** **-177,725 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-192 employment** **-1,583 daily trips**	Regional Business Park	**No Impact**
e. Property Owner #10 and 11: APN 316-150-31 and 32	18.6	Regional Business Park	Corridor/Center Mixed Use	From 0 to 8 du/ac From (18.6 acres x .4 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) to (18.6 acres x .6 x .25 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**-149 du** **-202,554 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-219 employment** **-1,529 daily trips**	Regional Business Park	**No Impact**
f. Property Owner #12: APN 316-150-33	6	Regional Business Park	1. Res. Urban Neigh. (4.25)	From 0 to 20 du/ac From (4.25 acres x .4 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) to 0	**+85 du** **-74,052 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-80 employment** **-357 daily trips**	Regional Business Park	**No Impact**
			2. Res. Medium (1.75)	From 0 to 6.5 du/ac From (1.75 acres x .4 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) to 0	**+11 du** **-30,492 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-33 employment** **-274 daily trips**	Regional Business Park	**No Impact**
g. Property Owner #14: APN 316-150-35	19.59	Regional Business Park	1. Res. Urban Neigh. (15.74)	From 0 to 20 du/ac From (15.74 acres x .4 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) to 0	**+315 du** **-274,254 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-296 employment** **-1,317 daily trips**	Regional Business Park	**No Impact**

Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location	Size (acres)	GP Update PLU (Aug. 9, 2012 Initiation Map)	Change Request			City of Fresno Preferred PLU	
			Planned Land Use	Density or Square Footage Change[1]	CEQA Impacts[1,2,3]	Planned Land Use	CEQA Impacts[1,2]
			2. Res. Medium (3.85)	From 0 to 6.5 du/ac From (3.85 acres x .4 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) to 0	**+25 du** **-67,082 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-73 employment** **-597 daily trips**	Regional Business Park	**No Impact**
h. Property Owner #16: APN 316-150-38	2.41	Regional Business Park	Regional Business Park	No Change	**No Change**	Regional Business Park	**No Impact**
i. Property Owner #18: APN 316-150-44	2.46	Regional Business Park	Regional Business Park	No Change	**No Change**	Regional Business Park	**No Impact**
j. Property Owner #19: APN 316-150-45	7.32	Regional Business Park	Regional Business Park	No Change	**No Change**	Regional Business Park	**No Impact**
k. Property Owner #20: APN 316-150-46	12.50	Regional Business Park	Regional Business Park	No Change	**No Change**	Regional Business Park	**No Impact**
l. Property Owner #21: APN 316-150-47	7.32	Regional Business Park	Res. Medium	From 0 to 6.5 du/ac From (7.32 acres x .4 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) to 0	**+48 du** **-127,544 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-138 employment** **-1,129 daily trips**	Regional Business Park	**No Impact**
m. Property Owner #27: APN 316-150-57	3.04	Regional Business Park	Res. Medium	From 0 to 6.5 du/ac From (3.04 acres x .4 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) to 0	**+20 du** **-52,969 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-57 employment** **-469 daily trips**	Regional Business Park	**No Impact**
n. Property Owner #16 and 17: APN 316-170-16 and 17	10.83	Regional Business Park	Res. Medium	From 0 to 6.5 du/ac From (10.83 acres x .4 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) to 0	**+70 du** **-188,702 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-204 employment** **-1,681 daily trips**	Regional Business Park	**No Impact**
53. **SEGA Plan Mod – Berberian Ranches Inc.** A-08-21 APN 316-040-58	74	School (10) with Park (5) Res. Medium (39) Res. Urban Neighborhood (20)	a. Light Industrial	From 0 to (74 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) From 0 to 6.5 du/ac From 0 to 20 du/ac	**+654 du** **+967,032 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+879 employment** **+653 daily trips**	School (10) with Park (5) Res. Medium (39) Res. Urban Neighborhood (20)	**No Impact**
	25.94	Res. Urban Neighborhood	b. Office	From 0 to 20 du/ac From (25.94 acres x .5 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) to 0 sq. ft.	**-519 du** **+564,973 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+1,412 employment** **+2,781 daily trips**	Res. Urban Neighborhood	**No Impact**
	8	Corridor/Center Mixed Use	c. Community Commercial	From 8 to 0 du/ac (8 acres x .6 net x .25 FAR x 43,560 sq ft) to (8 acres x .2 FAR x 43,560sq. ft.)	**-64 du** **+17,424 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+35 employment** **+1,753 daily trips**	Corridor/Center Mixed Use	**No Impact**
54. **SEGA Plan Mod – Greg Gaddie** A-08-24							
a. Exhibit A-1a: APN 316-031-21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 61, 62, 62, and 64	155.07	Buffer	1. Res. Medium (104.07)	From 0 to 6.5 du/ac	**+676 du** **+6436 daily trips**	Buffer	**No Impact**
			2. Res. Low (51)	From 0 to 1.5 du/ac	**+77 du**	Buffer	**No Impact**

Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location	Size (acres)	GP Update PLU (Aug. 9, 2012 Initiation Map)	Change Request			City of Fresno Preferred PLU	
			Planned Land Use	Density or Square Footage Change[1]	CEQA Impacts[1,2,3]	Planned Land Use	CEQA Impacts[1,2]
					+733 daily trips		
b. Exhibit A-2a: APN 313-410-13 and 15	88.48	Buffer	1. Res. Medium (57.68)	From 0 to 6.5 du/ac	**+375 du** **+3,570 daily trips**	Buffer	**No Impact**
			2. Res. Low (30.8)	From 0 to 1.5 du/ac	**+46 du** **+438 daily trips**	Buffer	**No Impact**
c. Exhibit A-3a: APN 313-400-09, 15, and 16	69.81	Buffer	1. Res. Medium (47)	From 0 to 6.5 du/ac	**+307 du** **+2,923 daily trips**	Buffer	**No Impact**
			2. Res. Low (22.81)	From 0 to 1.5 du/ac	**+34 du** **+324 daily trips**	Buffer	**No Impact**
d. Exhibit A-4a: APN 313-030-35, 40, 50, 51, 52, and 53	144.72	Buffer	1. Res. Medium (47.3)	From 0 to 6.5 du/ac	**+307 du** **+2,923 daily trips**	Buffer	**No Impact**
			2. Res. Low (97.42)	From 0 to 1.5 du/ac	**+146 du** **+1,390 daily trips**	Buffer	**No Impact**
e. Exhibit A-5a: APN 310-342-04, 05, and 06	33.36	Buffer	Res. Low	From 0 to 1.5 du/ac	**+50 du** **+476 daily trips**	Buffer	**No Impact**
f. Exhibit A-6a: APN 310-240-14, 22, and 23	23.08	Buffer	No contact by applicant with these land owners	No Change	**No Change**	No land use change proposed.	**No Impact**
g. Exhibit A-7a: APN 310-090-10 and 11	56.73	Buffer	1. Res. Low (38.90)	From 0 to 1.5 du/ac	**+58 du** **+552 daily trips**	Buffer	**No Impact**
			2. Res. Low (17.83)	From 0 to 1.5 du/ac	**+27 du** **+257 daily trips**	Buffer	**No Impact**
h. Exhibit A-8a: APN 309-210-41	29.30	Buffer	1. Res. Medium (20.1)	From 0 to 6.5 du/ac	**+131 du** **+1,247 daily trips**	Buffer	**No Impact**
			2. Res. Low (9.2)	From 0 to 1.5 du/ac	**+14 du** **+133 daily trips**	Buffer	**No Impact**
i. Exhibit A-8a: APN 309-210-41	48.5	Buffer	1. Res. Medium (37)	From 0 to 6.5 du/ac	**+241 du** **+2,294 daily trips**	Buffer	**No Impact**
			2. Res. Low (11.5)	From 0 to 1.5 du/ac	**+17 du** **+162 daily trips**	Buffer	**No Impact**
55. **SEGA Plan Mod – BN Childers** A-08-25 APN 310-052-25	21.5	Res. Medium	Res. Medium	No Change	**No Change**	No land use change proposed.	**No Impact**
56. **Ashley Werner**							
a. Replace Industrial and Business Park in the area bounded by Whites Bridge, Blythe, Belmont, and Downtown Planning Area with mix of medium and high density residential, office, commercial, mixed-use, open space, and public facilities.	+-1,416	Industrial and Business Park	Mix of medium and high density residential, office, commercial, mixed-use, open space, and public facilities.	No Change	**No Change**	Industrial and Business Park	**No Impact**
b. Replace Industrial and Business Park in vicinity of West & Church and Fruit & Church with mix of medium and high density residential, commercial, mixed-use, open space, and public facilities.	+-182	Industrial and Business Park	Mix of medium and high density residential, commercial, mixed-use, open space, and public facilities.	No Change	**No Change**	Industrial and Business Park	**No Impact**
c. Replace Regional Business Park adjoining residential near Fig and Muscat with Business Park.	50	Regional Business Park	Business Park	Same FAR of .4 therefore no change in commercial/office square footage	**No Change**	Business Park	**No Impact**

Owner (and Non-Owner Requesters) and Property Location	Size (acres)	GP Update PLU (Aug. 9, 2012 Initiation Map)	Change Request			City of Fresno Preferred PLU	
			Planned Land Use	Density or Square Footage Change[1]	CEQA Impacts[1,2,3]	Planned Land Use	CEQA Impacts[1,2]
d. Replace Highway & Auto and Industrial between Jensen and North and Elm and Hwy 180 with a mix of Residential, Office, Business Park, Commercial, Open Space and Public Facilities.	49	Highway & Auto and Industrial	Mix of Residential, Office, Business Park, Commercial, Open Space and Public Facilities	No Change	**No Change**	Highway & Auto and Industrial	**No Impact**
e. Replace Industrial within the Industrial Triangle between Hwy 99 and 41 with Business Park							
1.	2,135.28	Heavy Industrial	Business Park	From .3 to .4 FAR (2,135.28 acres x .1 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**+9,301,280 sq. ft.** office/commercial spac **+10,055 employment** **+420,974 daily trips**	Heavy Industrial	**No Impact**
2.	140.45	Heavy Industrial	Business Park	From .3 to .4 FAR (140.45 acres x .1 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**+611,800 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+661 employment** **+27,688 daily trips**	Light Industrial	**No change in sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-10,040 daily trips**
3.	58.47	Heavy Industrial	Business Park	From .3 to .4 FAR (58.47 acres x .1 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**+254,695 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+275 employment** **+11,528 daily trips**	Light Industrial	**No change in sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-4,180 daily trips**
4.	32.75	Light Industrial	Business Park	From .3 to .4 FAR (32.75 acres x .1 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**+142,659 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+154 employment** **+4,116 daily trips**	Light Industrial	**No Impact**
f. Replace Industrial within ½ mile of Downtown, Calwa and Southeast Fresno residential neighborhoods with a mix of medium and high density residential, office, commercial, mixed-use, open space, and public facilities.	+-1,245	Industrial	Mix of medium and high density residential, office, commercial, mixed-use, open space, and public facilities.	No Change	**No Change**	Industrial	**No Impact**

Table 1.2: Fresno Staff Change Request – Workbook of Planned Land Use Requests and Corresponding CEQA Impacts made by City staff. These were not requested land use change – December 05, 2014

Property Location	**Size (acres)**	**GP Update PLU** (Aug. 9, 2012 Initiation Map)	**City Staff Change Requested To:**	**Density or Sq. Ft. Change**[1]	**Other CEQA Impacts**[2]
F1. Calwa Industrial Area	64.26	Light Industrial (55.35) Light Industrial (6.68) General Commercial (1.09) Community Commercial (1.14)	Business Park Residential Residential Residential	0 du, +157,300 sq. ft. and +4,535 daily trips +23 du, -74,800 sq. ft. and -651 daily trips + 6 du, -15,000 sq. ft. and -584 daily trips +7 du, -16,600 sq. ft. and -642 daily trips	**+36 du** **+50,900 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+2,658 daily trips**
F7. W. Bullard and Carnegie	8.52	Highway & Auto Commercial	Business Park	From .25 to .4 FAR (8.52 acres x .15 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**+55,670 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-1,150 daily trips**
F8. Golden St. and Veteran's Blvd. interchange	118.87	Highway & Auto Commercial	Light Industrial	From .25 to .3 FAR (118.87 acres x .05 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**+258,899 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-30,985 daily trips**
F11. NWC Elm and Jensen	6.5	Res. Medium	Ponding Basin	From 6.5 to 0 du/ac	**-42 du** **-400 daily trips**
F12. NWC Elm and Jensen	9.81	Res. Medium	Res. Medium High	From 6.5 to 14 du/ac	**+74 du** **+302 daily trips**
F14. NWC Elm and Jensen	3.16	Res. Medium	Park	From 6.5 to 0 du/ac	**-21 du** **-194 daily trips**
F15. NEC Whites Bridge and Blyth	39.92	Light Industrial	Public Facility/Cemetery (alternative PLU should be Light Industrial)	From .3 to 0 FAR (39.92 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**-521,675 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-3,447 daily trips**
F17. Nielson and Marks	35.69	Light Industrial	Public Facility/Ponding Basin (alternative PLU should be Light Industrial)	From .3 to 0 FAR (35.69 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**-466,397 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-3,251 daily trips**
F20. SWC of S. Marks and W. Whitesbridge	8.87	Community Commercial	Corridor/Center Mixed-Use	From 0 to 8 du/ac From .3 to .25 FAR (8.87 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.) - (8.87 acres x .6 net acres x .25 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**+71 du** **-57,956 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-2,382 daily trips**
F24. NWC of Valentine and W. Madison	18.14	Res. Medium	Res. Medium-high	From 6.5 to 14 du/ac	**+136 du** **+1,295 daily trips**
F25. Brawley, just north of Madison (north of the school)	32	Res. Urban Neighborhood (27) and Park (5)	Res. Medium	From 20 to 6.5 du/ac From 0 to 6.5 du/ac	**+332 du** **-1,971 daily trips**
F26. SWC of W. Shaw and N. Brawley	204.06	Regional Business Park	Light Industrial	From .4 to .3 FAR (204.06 acres x .1 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**-888,885 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-25,643 daily trips**
W1	41.98	Light Industrial	Business Park	From .3 to .4 FAR (41.98 acres x .1 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**+182, 865 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+5,276 daily trips**
W2	23.38	Light Industrial	Business Park	From .3 to .4 FAR (23.38 acres x .1 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**+101,843 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+2,939 daily trips**
W3	44.82	Light Industrial	Business Park	From .3 to .4 FAR	**+195,236 sq. ft.**

[1] Reasonable dwelling unit per acre and FAR build out capacity estimate for unmapped vacant lots: Low = 1.5 du/ac; Med-Low = 4 du/ac; Medium = 6.5 du/ac; Medium-High = 14.0 du/ac; Urban Neighborhood = 20.0 du/ac; High = 34.0 du/ac; NMX = 14.0 (x .5 net); CMX = 20.0 (x .4 net); RMX = 34.0 (x .3 net); Community Commercial = .3 FAR; Community Recreational = .2 FAR; General Commercial = .35 FAR; Main Street = .5 FAR; Neighborhood Commercial = .35 FAR; Regional Commercial = .25, Highway and Auto = .25 FAR; Office = .5 FAR; Business Park = .4 FAR; Regional Business Park = .4 FAR; Light Industrial = .3 FAR; Heavy Industrial = .3 FAR; CMX = .25 FAR; CMX (SEGA) = .2 FAR; RMX = .25 FAR; RMX (SEGA) = .15 FAR; and NMX = .25

[2] Daily trip generation taken from Spack Consulting calculator table based on ITE Trip Generation Rates - 9th Edition.

Property Location	Size (acres)	GP Update PLU (Aug. 9, 2012 Initiation Map)	City Staff Change Requested To:	Density or Sq. Ft. Change[1]	Other CEQA Impacts[2]
				(44.82 acres x .1 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	office/commercial space **+5,632 daily trips**
W5	38.89	Light Industrial	Highway and Auto	From .3 to .25 FAR (38.89 acres x .05 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**-84, 702 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+1,726 daily trips**
W6	35.46	Light Industrial	Highway and Auto	From .3 to .25 FAR (35.46 acres x .05 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**-77,254 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **+1,574 daily trips**
W7	9.74	Light Industrial	Park	From .3 to 0 FAR (9.74 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**-127,282 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-887 daily trips**
W11	57.68	Light Industrial	Res. Medium	From 0 to 6.5 du/ac From .3 to 0 FAR (57.68 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**+375 du** **-753, 762 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-5,254 daily trips**
W12	18.50	Light Industrial	Res. Medium	From 0 to 6.5 du/ac From .3 to 0 FAR (18.50 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**+120 du** **-241,758 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-1,685 daily trips**
W14	26.83	Light Industrial	Res. Medium-high	From 0 to 14 du/ac From .3 to 0 FAR (26.83 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**+376 du** **-350,614 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-2,444 daily trips**
W15	50.39	Light Industrial	Res. Medium-high	From 0 to 14 du/ac From .3 to 0 FAR (50.39 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**+706 du** **-658,497 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-4,590 daily trips**
W21	27.90	Light Industrial	Res. Medium-low	From 0 to 4 du/ac From .3 to 0 FAR (27.90 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**+112 du** **-364,597 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-2,541 daily trips**
W22	18.38	Light Industrial	Res. Urban Neighborhood	From 0 to 20 du/ac From .3 to 0 FAR (18.38 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**+368 du** **-240,190 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-1,674 daily trips**
W23	16.91	Light Industrial	Res. Urban Neighborhood	From 0 to 20 du/ac From .3 to 0 FAR (16.91 acres x .3 FAR x 43,560 sq. ft.)	**+338 du** **-220,980 sq. ft.** office/commercial space **-1,546 daily trips**

Table 1.3: Land Use Change Requests - Recorded Final Maps (3)

							City of Fresno Staff Preferred Land Use					
Final Map #	Exhibit Page	# of vacant lots	# of total lots	Acres	calculated density (du/ac)	Initiation Draft GP Land Use (Aug. 9, 2012)	Staff preferred land use (2)	Change in # of dwelling units (1)	Change of Daily Trips	Dwelling unit type	Development Area	Location
4772	2	9	9	2.85	3.16	Medium	Low	-10	-90	Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
4983	4	53	53	12.75	4.16	Medium	Medium Low	-30	-284	Single family	DA-1 North	City
5567	1	17	17	3.87	4.4	Medium	Medium Low	-8	-77	Single family	DA-1 North	City
6028	6	93	93	14.5	6.41	Medium Low (12.1) and Low (2.4)	Medium	42	399	Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
							Total:	**-6**	**-53**			
4173	2	7	113	35.7	3.17	Medium	Low			Single family	EN North of Shaw	City
4281	2	3	140	100.6	1.39	Medium Low	Low			Single family	EN North of Shaw	City
4422	2	5	6	2.09	2.87	Medium	Low			Single family	EN North of Shaw	City
4487	3	3	37	11.68	3.17	Medium Low	Low			Single family	EN North of Shaw	City
4544	4	0	89	18	4.94	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	DA-1 North	City
4682	8, 9, 11	4	107	22.75	4.70	Medium Low and Medium High (4.5)	Medium Low			Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
4697	4	1	34	7.64	4.45	Medium Low and Medium (5.4)	Medium Low			Single family	DA-1 North	City
4701	4	0	95	19.07	4.98	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	DA-1 North	City
4723	2	2	32	13.6	2.35	Medium Low	Low			Single family	EN North of Shaw	City
4743	4	0	52	10.69	4.86	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	DA-1 North	City
4772	2	9	9	2.85	3.16	Medium	Low			Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
4831	8, 11	0	91	23.55	3.86	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	EN North of Shaw	City
4868	2	0	221	65	3.40	Medium Low	Low			Single family	EN North of Shaw	City
4903	3	0	60	17.2	3.49	Medium Low	Low			Single family	EN North of Shaw	City
4933	1	0	81	19.43	4.17	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	EN North of Shaw	City
4971	2	0	6	1.52	3.95	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
4974	5	0	95	19.2	4.95	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	DA-4 West	City
4983	4	53	53	12.75	4.16	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	DA-1 North	City
4988	4	0	8	4.39	1.82	Medium Low	Low			Single family	EN North of Shaw	City
5000	2	3	123	47.22	2.60	Medium Low	Low			Single family	EN North of Shaw	City
5010	1	3	95	35.4	2.68	Medium Low	Low			Single family	EN North of Shaw	City
5011	1	0	108	30.34	3.56	Medium Low	Medium Low			Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
5014	9, 11	0	21	4.16	5.05	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
5070	8, 11	0	42	9.48	4.43	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	EN North of Shaw	City
5071	2	0	74	15.1	4.90	Medium (8) and Medium High (7.1)	Medium Low			Single family	DA-4 West	City
5078	4	0	209	51.82	4.03	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	EN North of Shaw	City
5081	2	0	224	17.33	12.93	Medium Low	Medium High			Multi-family	EN North of Shaw	City
5082	1	3	107	21.8	4.91	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	DA-4 West	City
5086	4	4	42	16.31	2.58	Medium Low	Low			Single family	EN North of Shaw	City
5101	2	0	52	19	2.74	Medium Low	Low			Single family	EN North of Shaw	City
5103	1	0	49	9.55	5.13	Medium Low and Medium High (4.7)	Medium Low			Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
5107	9, 11	0	18	6.2	2.90	Medium High	Low			Single family	DA-1 North	City
5109	4	0	85	24.57	3.46	Medium Low	Low			Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
5110	9, 11	1	48	17.74	2.71	Medium Low	Low			Single family	EN North of Shaw	City
5117	1	3	35	7.18	4.87	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	DA-4 West	City

(1) Reasonable dwelling unit per acre and FAR build out capacity estimate for unmapped vacant lots: Low = 1.5 du/ac; Med-Low = 4 du/ac; Medium = 6.5 du/ac; Medium-High = 14.0 du/ac; Urban Neighborhood = 20.0 du/ac; High = 34.0 du/ac; NMX = 14.0 (x .5 net); CMX = 20.0 (x .4 net); RMX = 34.0 (x .3 net); Community Commercial = .3 FAR; Community Recreat
General Commercial = .35 FAR; Main Street = .5 FAR; Neighborhood Commercial = .35 FAR; Regional Commercial = .25, Highway and Auto = .25 FAR; Office = .5 FAR; Business Park = .4 FAR; Regional Business Park = .4 FAR; Light Industrial = .3 FAR; Heavy Industrial = .3 FAR; CMX = .25 FAR; CMX (SEGA) = .2 FAR; RMX = .25 FAR; RMX (SEGA) = .15 FAR; and NMX = .25

(2) Land Use based on calculated density

(3) These are all Recorded Final Maps from 2002 through 2014 and those prior to 2002 that have vacant lots. Recorded Final Maps 4772, 4983, 5567, 6028, are currently undeveloped as of December 5, 2014. A change in dwelling unit count is provided for these maps only since they could potentially develop at the Staff Preferred Land Use density. All other maps a
administrative change to reflect the mapped density.

Final Map #	Exhibit Page	# of vacant lots	# of total lots	Acres	calculated density (du/ac)	Initiation Draft GP Land Use (Aug. 9, 2012)	City of Fresno Staff Preferred Land Use				Development Area	Location
							Staff preferred land use (2)	Change in # of dwelling units (1)	Change of Daily Trips	Dwelling unit type		
5127	4	0	49	14.07	3.48	Medium Low (5.4) and Medium (8.67)	Low			Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
5129	9, 11	0	188	10.5	17.90	Medium High	Urban Neigh.			Multi-family	EN North of Shaw	City
5134	1	0	92	19.95	4.61	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	DA-1 North	City
5135	2, 4	0	189	55	3.44	Medium Low	Low			Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
5136	9, 11	0	19	4.21	4.51	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	DA-1 North	City
5137	4	4	131	27	4.85	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	DA-4 West	City
5141	4	2	142	36	3.94	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	EN North of Shaw	City
5145	2	0	16	3.4	4.71	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	DA-1 North	City
5148	4	0	35	7.01	4.99	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	DA-1 North	City
5150	4	13	28	12.51	2.24	Medium Low	Low			Single family	EN North of Shaw	City
5163	1	0	68	15.03	4.52	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	DA-1 North	City
5171	2	70	82	17	4.82	Medium (12.7) and Medium High (4.3)	Medium Low			Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
5184	9, 11	4	23	4.93	4.67	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	EN North of Shaw	City
5189	2	0	60	14.43	4.16	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
5190	6	0	55	11.8	4.66	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	DA-4 West	City
5195	4	8	23	14.35	1.60	Medium Low	Low			Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
5206	8, 9, 11	3	58	17.75	3.27	Medium Low	Low			Single family	DA-1 South	City
5210	7	9	41	16.8	2.44	Medium (1.57) and Medium High (15.23)	Low			Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
5215	8, 11	0	35	7.36	4.76	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
5220	8	3	61	20.6	2.96	Medium Low	Low			Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
5229	8, 11	4	8	4.6	1.74	Medium Low	Low			Single family	EN North of Shaw	City
5232	1	216	412	118.73	3.47	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
5247	6, 9	0	250	80	3.13	Medium	Low			Single family	DA-1 North	City
5251	2	0	84	17.04	4.93	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	DA-4 West	City
5258	4	0	97	34	2.85	Medium Low (32.7) and Medium (1.3)	Low			Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
5259	9, 11	1	12	3.27	3.67	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	DA-1 North	City
5260	4	3	60	22.42	2.68	Medium Low	Low			Single family	EN North of Shaw	City
5261	1	10	21	8.13	2.58	Medium Low	Low			Single family	EN North of Shaw	City
5281	1	0	43	9.08	4.74	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
5284	6	0	115	25.23	4.56	Low (.85), Medium (16.38) and Medium High (8)	Medium Low			Single family	DA-4 West	City
5287	4	0	186	42.29	4.40	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
5295	8, 10, 11	0	21	5.21	4.03	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
5300	9, 11	30	62	14.53	4.27	Low (5.5), Medium (2.4) and Medium High (6.63)	Medium Low			Single family	DA-1 North	City
5312	4	0	95	19.4	4.90	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
5313	6	0	75	19.19	3.91	Medium (10) and Medium High (9.19)	Medium Low			Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
5316	8, 11	9	98	23	4.26	Medium (18.75) and High (4.25)	Medium Low			Single family	DA-1 North	City
5321	4	0	86	18.06	4.76	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	DA-4 West	City
5338	4	8	109	38.66	2.82	Medium	Low			Single family	DA-1 North	City
5352	2	3	109	24	4.54	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	DA-1 North	City
5358	2	131	230	50.8	4.78	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	EN North of Shaw	City
5368	2	0	38	9.57	3.97	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	DA-1 North	City
5370	4	0	81	22.48	3.60	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
5374	6	5	96	19.83	4.84	Medium (9.83) and Medium High (10)	Medium Low			Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
5376	8, 11	1	31	9.15	3.39	Medium Low	Low			Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
5377	9, 11	0	91	20.7	4.40	Low (2.3) and Medium Low	Medium Low			Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
5395	9, 11	3	52	14.32	3.63	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	DA-1 North	City
5396	2	0	47	10.96	4.29	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	DA-1 North	City

Final Map #	Exhibit Page	# of vacant lots	# of total lots	Acres	calculated density (du/ac)	Initiation Draft GP Land Use (Aug. 9, 2012)	City of Fresno Staff Preferred Land Use				Development Area	Location
							Staff preferred land use (2)	Change in # of dwelling units (1)	Change of Daily Trips	Dwelling unit type		
5400	2	0	231	57.4	4.02	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	DA-1 North	City
5406	4	48	256	55.26	4.63	Medium Low and Medium (51.13)	Medium Low			Single family	DA-1 North	City
5409	4	0	106	4.55	23.30	Medium High	Urban Neigh.			Multi-family	EN South of Shaw	City
5414	5	0	64	13.9	4.60	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
5427	4	99	174	43.2	4.03	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
5433	6	0	168	22.22	7.56	Medium High	Medium			Single family	EN North of Shaw	City
5445	2	40	77	20.9	3.68	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
5446	9, 11	9	75	21.72	3.45	Medium Low (4.9) and Medium (16.82)	Low			Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
5447	9, 11	33	75	17.8	4.2	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
5455	6	0	199	26.21	7.59	Medium High	Medium			Single family	EN North of Shaw	City
5457	2	0	66	14.69	4.49	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	DA-1 North	City
5461	2	219	257	66.3	3.88	Low (26) and Medium Low	Medium Low			Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
5462	6	6	10	1.9	5.26	Medium High	Medium			Single family	EN North of Shaw	City
5482	2	26	79	18.1	4.37	Medium High	Medium Low			Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
5489	8, 11	0	79	8.5	9.29	Medium High	Medium			Single family	DA-1 North	City
5510	4	0	8	1.92	4.17	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
5512	5	99	126	29.95	4.2	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	DA-1 North	City
5517	4		117	28.07	4.17	Medium	Medium Low			Single family		City
5557	6	0	20	1.94	10.31	High	Medium			Single family	DA-1 North	City
5564	2		6	2.62	2.29	Medium Low	Low			Single family		City
5567	1	17	17	3.87	4.4	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	DA-1 North	City
5600	4	0	82	20	4.1	Medium (18.2) and Medium Low (1.8)	Medium Low			Single family	DA-1 North	City
5614	2	0	14	4.6	3.04	Medium	Low			Single family	DA-1 North	City
5646	2	0	32	3.76	8.51	Low	Medium			Single family	EN North of Shaw	City
5686	3	3	165	36.7	4.5	Medium	Medium Low			Single family	EN South of Shaw	City
5710	6	34	46	7.14	6.44	Medium High	Medium			Single family	DA-1 North	City
5728	4	57	155	34	4.56	Medium (30.82) and Urban Neigh. (3.18)	Medium Low			Single family	DA-1 North	City
5770	4	70	76	14.9	5.1	Medium and low (10.6)	Medium			Single family	DA-1 North	City
5856	4	0	30	2.83	10.6	Medium Low	Medium			Single family	EN North of Shaw	City
5951	2	0	88	4.4	20	Medium	Urban Neigh.			Multi-family	EN North of Shaw	City
5983	2	0	65	3.56	18.26	Office	Urban Neigh.			Multi-family	EN North of Shaw	City
5987	2	0	36	4.67	7.71	Low	Medium			Single family	EN North of Shaw	City
5995	2	0	44	6.5	6.8	Medium High	Medium			Single family	EN North of Shaw	City
5996	2	0	50	3.57	14	Office	Medium High			Multi-family	EN North of Shaw	City
5997	1	0	8	2.33	3.43	Medium Low	Low			Single family	EN North of Shaw	City
6037	2	38	56	11.03	5.08	Medium High	Medium Low			Single family	DA-1 North	City

:ional = .2 FAR;
;

are an

Table 1.4 CEQA Impacts for all General Plan Change of Planned Land Use Requests - Worse Case Senario

I.D.	du	sq. ft.	employment factor	employment	daily trips
1	-188				-978
2	-12				-114
3c4	776				7292
3c5	-268				-1720
3g	-324				-3,084
3h1	-171	186153	600	310	9,028
3h2	-55	60374	600	101	4506
4	72	124603	425	293	4100
5b1	-266				-2546
5b2a	-16				-152
5b2b	-130				-1238
5b2c	-49				-466
5c	567				-5398
5e1		-43560	925	-47	-541
5e2		-89298	925	-97	-1111
5e3		-82764	925	-89	-1029
5e4		-19602	925	-21	-244
5e5		-10890	925	-12	-136
5f1	-185				-1230
5f2	-116				-771
5g	90				225
5h	122				1126
5i2	-1048				-2160
5i3	-479				1293
6		-19950	400	-50	729
7a	212				410
7e	134				276
7f	125				190
7h	73				-305
7i1	0				-1,000
7i2	14				-867
8a	59				-438
8e	72				1131
8i	-84				401
8j	-69	-37897	500	-76	-1618
		-15246	400	-38	-168
8k	24				-772
9a	94				105
9b	135				-1285
9d	-65				370
12b					-1000
12c	-41				-390
12e	-31				-295
12f	-120				-798
14a and 14b	185	-112036	425	-264	-3734

Table 1.4 CEQA Impacts for all General Plan Change of Planned Land Use Requests - Worse Case Senario

15	78	-85160	400	-213	-419
16 a, b, c	-17	83787	950	88	3601
17b	-24	47568	500	95	1779
17c	-12	-9801	425	-23	10
18b	27				142
21a1	-288				-1915
21a2	110				732
21a3a	-41				-390
21a3b	-75				-714
21a3c	-29				-159
21a4	-75				-310
21a5	-129				-702
21a6	34				324
21a7	-202				-834
21a8	-30	-17642	500	-35	-799
21a9	168	-156816	500	-314	-5554
21a10	-37				-191
21a11	14	-45738	500	-91	-1789
21a12	-71				-676
21a13a	4				38
21a13b	-41				-390
21a14a	-41				-392
21a14b	-26				-243
21a15	82				781
21a16a	-65				-619
21a16b	-4				-35
21a17	59				562
21b1A		-4356	925	-5	121
21b1B	23	-62029	925	-67	-552
21b1C	-391	-20909	925	-23	-1252
21b3A		-4356	925	-5	121
21b3B		-16858	925	-18	-87
21b4	280	-244285	925	-264	-1173
21c	-71				-294
21d	-49				-466
21e	-274				-1822
21f	-79	52357	500	105	1695
21g1	56				
21g2	8				
21g3	48				
21g4	-53	-52275	500	-105	-893
21h	-237				-1249
21i2	-224				-1329
21i3	20				190
21i4	41				390
21i5a	9				85
21i5b	9				85

Table 1.4 CEQA Impacts for all General Plan Change of Planned Land Use Requests - Worse Case Senario

21i5c	18				172
21i6a	-35				-335
21i6b	-13				-124
21i7	39				371
21i8	20				190
21i9	-229				-1359
21i10	-25				-238
21i11	-287				-1702
21i12	-567				-3545
21i13	-569				-3565
21i14	71	-230650	500	-461	-11013
21i15	-113				-671
21i16	78				743
21j3	-23	-98010	425	-231	1111
21j4	19	-37897	500	-76	-1399
21j5	-246				-1298
21j6	-23	-45738	500	-91	-1703
21k1	-215				-1430
21k2	-201				-1914
21k3	-37				-352
21k4	5				48
21k5	-254				-2418
22	45				248
23	44				419
24a	171	-60923	500	-122	-1238
24b	282	-108242	500	-216	-2327
25		38333	1100	35	268
26	-32	63903	1100	58	141
27		-5619	400	-14	356
28	7	-8058	400	-20	-41
29		3920	1100	4	27
30	160	-130680	500	-261	-4319
31	-139				-587
32	25	-20190	500	-40	-656
33	7	14767	500	30	561
34	-15	16727	425	39	640
35	3				29
36	17				162
37	-185				-964
40a	72				684
40b	32		0		304
41a		-74052	925	-80	-4623
41b	-175	351529	1100	320	780
41c	-45	53317	925	58	936
41d	-102	100537	925	109	936
41e	-367	332798	925	360	1669
41f	-127	340639	925	368	3021

Table 1.4 CEQA Impacts for all General Plan Change of Planned Land Use Requests - Worse Case Senario

41g1	84	-45,738	425	-108	-2025
41g2	195	-653400	400	-1634	-7207
41h	245	-821542	400	-2054	-6729
41i	520	-1393920	925	-1507	-12379
41j	91				-144
41k1	-240	130680	425	307	4197
41k2	85				-201
42	-17				-113
43	-74				-492
44	16	-32017	400	-80	209
45a	-136	-26136	425	-61	93
45b	-42	148649	400	372	-223
45c	-5	1307	500	3	4
46	-44	19166	500	38	523
47		28401	600	47	1259
48	-12	22564	400	56	-155
49	-18	36198	1100	33	81
50		165702	500	331	8430
51	-351	152721	500	305	3426
52a	152	-206366	925	-223	-1557
52b1	85	-74400	925	-80	361
52b2	37	-98446	925	-106	-874
52c	6	-16901	925	-18	-153
52d1	160	-139392	925	-151	-1677
52d2	66	-177725	925	-192	-1583
52e	-149	-202554	925	-219	-1529
52f1	85	-74052	925	-80	-357
52f2	11	-30492	925	-33	-274
52g1	315	-274254	925	-296	-1317
52g2	25	-67082	925	-73	-597
52l	48	-127544	925	-138	-1129
52m	20	-52969	925	-57	-469
52n	70	-188702	925	-204	-1681
53a	654	967032	1100	879	653
53b	-519	564973	400	1412	2781
53c	-64	17424	500	35	1753
54a1	676				6436
54a2	77				733
54b1	375				3570
54b2	46				438
54c1	307				2923
54c2	34				324
54d1	307				2923
54d2	146				1390
54e	50				476
54g1	58				552
54g2	27				257

Table 1.4 CEQA Impacts for all General Plan Change of Planned Land Use Requests - Worse Case Senario

54h1	131				1247
54h2	14				133
54i1	241				2294
54i2	17				162
55	0	0			0
56b	0	0			0
56c	0	0			0
56d	0	0			0
56e1		9301280	925	10055	420974
56e2		611800	925	661	27688
56e3		254695	925	275	11528
56e4		142659	925	154	4116
56f	0	0			0
Total	**-1582**	**7761404**		**6554**	**416066**

Conclusions:

With 1,582 fewer residential units as a result of the proposed land use changes, there would be approximately **2,024** fewer employees (1,582 units x 1.28 employees to housing ratio).

With the 6,554 increase in jobs due to proposed land use requests changes, there would be approximately **3,963** (10,517 - 6,554) jobs lacking to employ residents in the Planning Area.

Therefore, there would be approximately **1,939** (3,963 - 2,024) employees who are projected to live in the Planning Area that will be required to leave the Planning Area due to lack of employment in the Planning Area.

With **1,939** employees living in the Planning Area projected to leave the Planning Area for employment the Planning Area will remain job poor.

Table 1.5: CEQA Impacts for City of Fresno Staff Change Requests

I.D.	du	sq. ft.	Employment Factor	Employment	daily trips
F1	36	50900	925	55	2658
F7		55670	925	60	1150
F8		258899	1100	235	-30985
F11	-42				-400
F12	74				302
F14	-21				-194
F15		-521675	1100	-474	-3447
F17		-466397	1100	-424	-3251
F20	71	-57,956	500	-116	-2382
F24	136				1295
F25	332				-1971
F26		-888885	925	-961	-25643
W1		182865	925	198	5276
W2		101843	925	110	2939
W3		195236	1100	177	5632
W5		-84702	1100	-77	1726
W6		-77254	1100	-70	1574
W7		-127282	1100	-116	-887
W11	375	-753762	1100	-685	-5254
W12	120	-241758	1100	-220	-1685
W14	376	-350614	1100	-319	-2444
W15	706	-658497	1100	-599	-4590
W21	112	-364597	1100	-331	-2541
W22	368	-240190	1100	-218	-1674
W23	338	-220980	1100	-201	-1546
Total	**2981**	**-4209136**		**-3975**	**-66342**

Attachment 2:
Qualitative Traffic Evaluation

Table 2.1 - Qualitative Traffic Evaluation

Category	ID	Peak Hour Trips	Note	Summary
0	3c4	729	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (with reductions in adjacent areas)	Increase in traffic would not likely create new impact.
0	4	410	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
0	5h	113	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (with reductions in adjacent areas)	
0	7a	41	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
0	7e	28	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
0	7f	19	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
0	8i	40	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
0	9a	11	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
0	9d	37	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
0	18a		Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
0	18b	14	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
0	21a2	73	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (with reductions in adjacent areas)	
0	21a6	32	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (with reductions in adjacent areas)	
0	21a15	78	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (with reductions in adjacent areas)	
0	21a17	56	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (with reductions in adjacent areas)	
0	21b1A	12	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (with reductions in adjacent areas)	
0	21b3A	12	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (with reductions in adjacent areas)	
0	21i3	19	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (with reductions in adjacent areas)	
0	21i4	39	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (with reductions in adjacent areas)	
0	21i5	34	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (with reductions in adjacent areas)	
0	21i7	37	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (with reductions in adjacent areas)	
0	21i8	19	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (with reductions in adjacent areas)	
0	21i16	74	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (with reductions in adjacent areas)	
0	21i17		Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (with reductions in adjacent areas)	
0	21j3	111	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (with reductions in adjacent areas)	
0	22	25	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
0	23	42	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
0	25	27	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
0	26	14	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
0	27	36	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
0	33	56	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
0	34	64	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
0	36	16	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
0	52b1	36	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (with reductions in adjacent areas)	
0	54a1	644	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
0	54a2	73	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
0	54b1	357	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
0	54b2	44	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
0	54d1	292	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
0	54d2	139	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
0	54e	48	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
0	54g1	55	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
0	54g2	26	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
0	54h1	125	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
0	54h2	13	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
0	54i1	229	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	

0	54i2	16	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
0	16	360	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (with reductions in F8)	
0	5i3	129	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (with reductions in adjacent areas)	
0	40a	68	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
0	40b	30	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
0	F7	115	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (with reductions in F8)	
0	F24	130	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (with reductions in adjacent areas)	
0	W1	528	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (with reductions in adjacent areas)	
0	W2	294	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (with reductions in adjacent areas)	
0	W3	563	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (with reductions in adjacent areas)	
0	W5	173	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (with reductions in adjacent areas)	
0	W6	157	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (with reductions in adjacent areas)	
0	5461	58	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
0	5983	48	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
0	5987	28	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
0	5996	34	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
0	6028	40	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
1	3h2	451	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (Church east os MLK at LOS E < 151 trips from LOS F). Depends on 5g, 8e, 56e, 3h1	Increase in traffic may cause new impact. Adjacent or nearby roadway operate close to significance threshold for TIZ. Increase in traffic may cause threshold to be exceeded or may exacerbate LOS exception. Outcome may depend on development in adjacent areas.
1	5g	23	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (Church east os MLK at LOS E < 151 trips from LOS F). Depends on 8e, 3h, 56e	
1	6	73	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (Herndon west of Milburn at LOS F)	
1	8e	113	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (Church east os MLK at LOS E < 151 trips from LOS F). Depends on 5g, 3h, 56e	
1	17b	178	Sufficient capacity on City roadways (TIZ III). May worsen LOS F on Fowler south of Kings Canyon in County.	
1	21f	170	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (Veterans IC near LOSF east of SR 99)	
1	41b	78	Limited capacity on adjacent roadways (LOS E on Jensen (about 600 trips to LOS F) east of Peach. Depends on 53a-c, 50, 51, 41k1.	
1	41c	94	Limited capacity on adjacent roadways (LOS E on Jensen (about 600 trips to LOS F) east of Peach. Depends on 53a-c, 50, 51, 41k1.	
1	41d	94	Limited capacity on adjacent roadways (LOS E on Jensen (about 600 trips to LOS F) east of Peach. Depends on 53a-c, 50, 51, 41k1.	
1	41e	167	Limited capacity on adjacent roadways (LOS E on Jensen (about 600 trips to LOS F) east of Peach. Depends on 53a-c, 50, 51, 41k1.	
1	41f	302	Limited capacity on adjacent roadways (LOS E on Jensen (about 600 trips to LOS F) east of Peach. Depends on 53a-c, 50, 51, 41k1.	
1	41k1	420	Limited capacity on adjacent roadways (LOS E on Jensen (about 600 trips to LOS F) east of Peach. Depends on 41a-f, 53a-c, 50, 51.	
1	44	21	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (Fresno LOS E/F south of Herndon)	
1	46	52	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (Shaw east of SR 99 at LOS F)	
1	50	843	Limited capacity on adjacent roadways (LOS E on Jensen (about 600 trips to LOS F) east of Peach. Depends on 41a-f, 53a-c, 41k1.	
1	51	343	Limited capacity on adjacent roadways (LOS E on Jensen (about 600 trips to LOS F) east of Peach. Depends on 41a-f, 53a-c, 41k1.	
1	53a	65	Limited capacity on adjacent roadways (LOS E on Jensen (about 600 trips to LOS F) east of Peach. Depends on 41a-f, 41k1, 50, 51.	
1	53b	278	Limited capacity on adjacent roadways (LOS E on Jensen (about 600 trips to LOS F) east of Peach. Depends on 41a-f, 41k1, 50, 51.	
1	53c	175	Limited capacity on adjacent roadways (LOS E on Jensen (about 600 trips to LOS F) east of Peach. Depends on 41a-f, 41k1, 50, 51.	
1	54c1	292	Limited capacity on adjacent roadways (about 240 trips to LOS E) on Highland south of SR 180.	
1	54c2	32	Limited capacity on adjacent roadways (about 240 trips to LOS E) on Highland south of SR 180.	
1	56e2	2769	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways. Depends 56e1	
1	56e3	1153	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways. Depends 56e1	
1	56e4	412	Limited capacity on adjacent roadways (LOE on Jensen west of SR 41 close to LOS F)	
1	3h1	903	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (Church east os MLK at LOS E < 151 trips from LOS F). Depends on 5g, 8e, 56e1-4, 3h2	
1	F11	21	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (Church east os MLK at LOS E < 151 trips from LOS F). Depends on 5g, 8e, 56e1-4, 3h1-2	
1	F12	30	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (Church east os MLK at LOS E < 151 trips from LOS F). Depends on 5g, 8e, 56e1-4, 3h1-2	
1	5770	51	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (LOS Fon Cornelia north of Clinton)	
2	47	126	Sufficient capacity on adjacent roadways (Herndon west of Milburn at LOS F)	Increase in traffic would likely create new impact
2	56e1	42097	Insufficient capacity on adjacent roadways	
2	F1	834	LOS E on Jensen (Trip increae would result in LOS F)	
3	1	-98		Area results in less traffic or an

3	2	-11		increase of less than 10 trips.
3	3b1			Would not create new impact.
3	3c5	-172		
3	3g	-308		
3	5b1	-255		
3	5b2a	-15		
3	5b2b	-124		
3	5b2c	-47		
3	5c	-540		
3	5e1	-54		
3	5e2	-111		
3	5e3	-103		
3	5e4	-24		
3	5e5	-14		
3	5f1	-123		
3	5f2	-77		
3	5i1			
3	5i2	-216		
3	7h	-31		
3	7i1	-100		
3	7i2	-87		
3	8a	-44		
3	8j	-328		
3	8k	-77		
3	9b	-129		
3	12b	-100		
3	12c	-39		
3	12e	-30		
3	12f	-80		
3	14a	-373		
3	14b	-373		
3	15	-42		
3	17c	1		
3	21a1	-192		
3	21a3a	-39		
3	21a3b	-71		
3	21a3c	-16		
3	21a4	-31		
3	21a5	-70		
3	21a7	-83		
3	21a8	-80		
3	21a9	-555		
3	21a10	-19		
3	21a11	-179		
3	21a12	-68		
3	21a13a	4		
3	21a13b	-39		
3	21a14a	-39		
3	21a14b	-24		

3	21a16a	-62	
3	21a16b	-4	
3	21b1B	-55	
3	21b1C	-125	
3	21b3B	-9	
3	21b4	-117	
3	21c	-29	
3	21d	-47	
3	21e	-182	
3	21g1	-89	
3	21g2		
3	21g3		
3	21g4		
3	21h	-125	
3	21i2	-133	
3	21i6	-46	
3	21i9	-136	
3	21i10	-24	
3	21i11	-170	
3	21i12	-355	
3	21i13	-357	
3	21i14	-1101	
3	21i15	-67	
3	21j4	-140	
3	21j5	-130	
3	21j6	-170	
3	21k1	-143	
3	21k2	-191	
3	21k3	-35	
3	21k4	5	
3	21k5	-242	
3	24a	-124	
3	24b	-233	
3	28	-4	
3	29	-25	
3	30	-432	
3	31	-59	
3	32	-66	
3	35	3	
3	37	-96	
3	41a	-462	
3	41g1	-203	
3	41g2	-721	
3	41h	-673	
3	41i	-1238	
3	41j	-14	
3	41k2	-20	
3	42	-11	
3	43	-49	

3	45a	9		
3	45b	-22		
3	45c	0		
3	48	-16		
3	49	8		
3	52a	-156		
3	52b2	-87		
3	52c	-15		
3	52d1	-168		
3	52d2	-158		
3	52e	-153		
3	52f1	-36		
3	52f2	-27		
3	52g1	-132		
3	52g2	-60		
3	52l	-113		
3	52m	-47		
3	52n	-168		
3	55	0		
3	56b	0		
3	56c	0		
3	56d	0		
3	56f	0		
3	F8	-3099		
3	F14	-19		
3	F15	-345		
3	F17	-325		
3	F20	-238		
3	F25	-197		
3	F26	-2564		
3	W7	-89		
3	W11	-525		
3	W12	-169		
3	W14	-244		
3	W15	-459		
3	W21	-254		
3	W22	-167		
3	W23	-155		
3	4422	-7		
3	4772	-9		
3	4983	-28		
3	5171	-58		
3	5358	-121		
3	5447	-39		
3	5567	-8		
3	5995	-44		
3	5997	-1		
3	6037	-93		

Notes:
Includes evaluation of Table 1a_CEQA Impacts from Change of PLU_Worst case senario_111814.xlsx
Includes evaluation of Table 2a_CEQA Impacts from Change of PLU_Fresno Staff Changes_111314.xlsx
Includes evaluation of Table 3_Final Map changes_111914.xls (red highlighted cells only)

Attachment 3:
Residential Land Use Designation Changes

Table 3.1 : Residential Land Use Designation Changes within the City of Fresno Planning Area

Identification Number[1]	Change in Residential Acres[1,2]
5.h	18.69
7.a	10.59
7.e	13.64
7.f	19.24
7.h	18.33
7.i.2	9.15
8.a	9.0
8.i	-8.07
8.j	-11.5
8.k	8.0
9.a	-23.53
9.b	20.8
12.c	-10.3
12.e	-7.8
12.f	6.0
14.b	13.22
15	3.91
17.b	-3.64
18.a	-0.38
21.a.b	5.27
21.a.9	12.0
21.a.10	4.88
21.a.11	3.5
21.a.16.b	0.6
21.b.1.b	3.56
21.b.1.c	3.0
21.b.4	14.02
21.g.2	12.0
21.g.3	4.0

21.i.3	49.2
21.i.7	9.75
21.i.8	4.95
21.i.12	-18.84
21.i.14	17.65
21.i.16	19.55
21.j.3	15.0
21.j.4	2.9
21.j.6	3.5
26	-4.89
28	0.37
33	-1.13
34	-2.56
36	8.73
40	16..0
41.g.1	7.0
41.g.2	30.0
41.h	37.72
41.i	80.0
41.j	14.0
41.k.2	13.0
49	-2.77
52.b.1	4.27
52.b.2	5.65
52.c	0.97
52.d.1	8.0
52.d.2	10.2
52.f.1	4.25
52.f.2	1.75
52.g.1	15.74
52.g.2	3.85
52.l	7.32
52.m	3.04
52.n	10.83

54.a.1	104.07
54.a.2	51.0
54.b.1	57.68
54.b.2	30.8
54.d.1	47.3
54.d.2	97.42
54.e	33.36
54.g.1	38.90
54.g.2	17.83
54.h.1	20.1
54.h.2	9.2
52.i.l	37
54.i.2	11.5
F.14	-3.16
W.11	57.68
W.12	18.50
W.14	26.83
W.15	50.39
W.21	27.90
W.22	18.38
W.23	16.91
5983	3.56
5996	3.57
TOTAL:	**1242.40**

[1] Data obtained from Tables 1, 2, and 3 from Attachment 1 of Appendix 1.
[2] Requested change to a residential designation from a non-residential Designation is shown above as a positive number. Requested change from a residential designation to a non-residential designation is shown as a negative number.
Source: FirstCarbon Solutions, 2014