

City Council Special Meeting Agenda



SEPTEMBER 11, 2012

4:30 p.m.

City of Turlock Yosemite Room

156 S. Broadway, Turlock, California

Mayor
John S. Lazar

Council Members
William DeHart, Jr.
Forrest White
Amy Bublak
Mary Jackson
Vice Mayor

City Manager
Roy W. Wasden
City Clerk
Kellie E. Weaver
City Attorney
Phaedra A. Norton

SPEAKER CARDS: To accommodate those wishing to address the Council and allow for staff follow-up, speaker cards are available for any agenda item or any other topic delivered under Public Comment. Please fill out and provide the Comment Card to the City Clerk or Police Officer.

NOTICE REGARDING NON-ENGLISH SPEAKERS: The Turlock City Council meetings are conducted in English and translation to other languages is not provided. Please make arrangements for an interpreter if necessary.

EQUAL ACCESS POLICY: If you have a disability which affects your access to public facilities or services, please contact the City Clerk's Office at (209) 668-5540. The City is committed to taking all reasonable measures to provide access to its facilities and services. Please allow sufficient time for the City to process and respond to your request.

NOTICE: Pursuant to California Government Code Section 54954.3, any member of the public may directly address the City Council on any item appearing on the agenda, including Consent Calendar and Public Hearing items, before or during the City Council's consideration of the item.

AGENDA PACKETS: Prior to the City Council meeting, a complete Agenda Packet is available for review on the City's website at www.cityofturlock.org and in the City Clerk's Office at 156 S. Broadway, Suite 230, Turlock, during normal business hours. Materials related to an item on this Agenda submitted to the Council after distribution of the Agenda Packet are also available for public inspection in the City Clerk's Office. Such documents may be available on the City's website subject to staff's ability to post the documents before the meeting.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION – LIMITED TO ITEMS DESCRIBED IN THE NOTICE FOR THIS MEETING**
This is the time set aside for citizens to address the City Council concerning any item that has been described in the notice for the meeting before or during consideration of that item. You will be allowed three (3) minutes for your comments. If you wish to speak regarding an item on the agenda, you may be asked to defer your remarks until the Council addresses the matter.
- 3. DECLARATION OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND DISQUALIFICATIONS**
- 4. CONSENT CALENDAR: None**

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT 2012-03 AND CITYWIDE REZONE 2012-03
(TURLOCK GENERAL PLAN UPDATE)

The City Council will consider a comprehensive update to the City's General Plan and citywide rezone affecting multiple properties within the City of Turlock. The proposed General Plan will guide future development of the City and result in the growth of the City to a cumulative population of around 127,000. The City of Turlock last comprehensively updated its General Plan in 1992, with a major amendment completed in 2003. (*Whitmore*)

Recommended Actions:

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:

Resolution: Certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report for the New General Plan for the City of Turlock (GPA 2012-03), adopting Findings of Fact, and adopting the Statement of Overriding Considerations as required by the California Environmental Quality Act

GENERAL PLAN DOCUMENT:

ALTERNATIVE A: ADOPTING THE PREFERRED LAND USE PLAN AS DESCRIBED IN THE PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT GENERAL PLAN AND ERRATA

Resolution: Adopting a New General Plan for the City of Turlock (GPA 2012-03) with the Preferred Land Use Diagram described in the Public Review Draft General Plan and Errata

ALTERNATIVE B: ADOPTING TURLOCK GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVE 1 WITH THE ADDITION OF A POLICY REQUIRING 70% OF THE BUILDING PERMITS TO BE ISSUED FOR NORTHEAST TURLOCK MASTER PLAN, EAST TUOLUMNE MASTER PLAN, AND SOUTHEAST MASTER PLAN 1, CUMULATIVELY, BEFORE INITIATING SOUTHEAST MASTER PLAN 2

Motion: Modifying Guiding Policy 3.1-g and Implementation Policy 3.1-p by adding the following language: "*Prior to proceeding with the planning, annexation and development of Southeast Master Plan 2, 70 percent of the building permits shall be issued for the Northeast Master Plan, East Tuolumne Master Plan, and Southeast Master Plan 1, calculated on a cumulative basis.*"

Resolution: Adopting a New General Plan for the City of Turlock (GPA 2012-03) with the Alternative 1 Land Use Diagram described in the Draft Environmental Impact Report, amending Guiding Policy 3.1-g and Implementation Policy 3.1-p as needed, and directing staff to revise the Public Review Draft General Plan in accordance with the Alternative 1 Land Use Diagram, as recommended by the Planning Commission

CITYWIDE REZONE (Introduced at this meeting)

Ordinance: Amending the Zoning Map of the City of Turlock, California, attached to Title 9 of the Turlock Municipal Code [Rezone 2012-03 (Turlock General Plan Update Citywide Rezone)]

6. CLOSED SESSION

Conference with Real Property Negotiators, Cal. Gov't Code §54956.8

Property: 301 Starr Ave., Turlock, APN 042-022-083-000

Agency Negotiators: Roy Wasden

Negotiating Parties: Havens Women's Center

Under Negotiation: Price and Terms of Payment

Conference with Labor Negotiators, Cal. Gov't Code §54957.6

Agency Negotiators: Roy W. Wasden/Phil Lancaster

Employee Organization: Turlock Associated Police Officers

Employee Organization: Turlock City Employee Association

Employee Organization: Turlock Firefighters Association. Local 2434

Employee Organization: Turlock Management Association-Public Safety

Unrepresented Employees: Accountant, Sr., Assistant to the City Manager for Economic Development/Redevelopment, Community Housing Services Manager, Deputy Development Services Director/Planning, Development Services Director/City Engineer, Development Services Supervisor/City Surveyor, Executive Assistant to the City Manager/City Clerk, Finance Customer Service Supervisor, Fire Chief, Human Resources Manager, Human Resources Technician, Legal Assistant, Municipal Services Director, Payroll Coordinator, Principal Civil Engineer, Public Facilities Maintenance Manager, Regulatory Affairs Manager, Secretary/Deputy City Clerk, Executive Administrative Assistant/Public Safety, Technical Services Manager, Traffic/Transportation Engineering Supervisor, Utilities Manager, Water Quality Control Division Manager

7. ADJOURNMENT

The foregoing meeting is hereby called by Mayor John S. Lazar at the above mentioned date and time pursuant to California Government Code §54956.



JOHN S. LAZAR, Mayor



Council Synopsis

September 11, 2012

From: Michael G. Pitcock, P.E., Director of Development Services/City Engineer

Prepared and Presented by: Debra A. Whitmore, Deputy Director of Development Services/ Planning

Agendized by: Roy W. Wasden, City Manager

1. ACTION RECOMMENDED:

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:

Resolution: Certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report for the New General Plan for the City of Turlock (GPA 2012-03), adopting Findings of Fact, and adopting the Statement of Overriding Considerations as required by the California Environmental Quality Act

GENERAL PLAN DOCUMENT:

ALTERNATIVE A: ADOPTING THE PREFERRED LAND USE PLAN AS DESCRIBED IN THE PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT GENERAL PLAN AND ERRATA

Resolution: Adopting a New General Plan for the City of Turlock (GPA 2012-03) with the Preferred Land Use Diagram described in the Public Review Draft General Plan and Errata

ALTERNATIVE B: ADOPTING TURLOCK GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVE 1 WITH THE ADDITION OF A POLICY REQUIRING 70% OF THE BUILDING PERMITS TO BE ISSUED FOR NORTHEAST TURLOCK MASTER PLAN, EAST TUOLUMNE MASTER PLAN, AND SOUTHEAST MASTER PLAN 1, CUMULATIVELY, BEFORE INITIATING SOUTHEAST MASTER PLAN 2

Motion: Modifying Guiding Policy 3.1-g and Implementation Policy 3.1-p by adding the following language: *“Prior to proceeding with the planning, annexation and development of Southeast Master Plan 2, 70 percent of the building permits shall be issued for the Northeast Master Plan, East Tuolumne Master Plan, and Southeast Master Plan 1, calculated on a cumulative basis.”*

Resolution: Adopting a New General Plan for the City of Turlock (GPA 2012-03) with the Alternative 1 Land Use Diagram described in the Draft Environmental Impact Report, amending Guiding Policy 3.1-g and Implementation Policy 3.1-p as needed, and directing staff to revise the Public Review Draft General Plan in accordance with the Alternative 1 Land Use Diagram, as recommended by the Planning Commission

CITYWIDE REZONE (Introduced at this meeting)

Ordinance: Amending the Zoning Map of the City of Turlock, California, attached to Title 9 of the Turlock Municipal Code [Rezone 2012-03 (Turlock General Plan Update Citywide Rezone)]

2. DISCUSSION OF ISSUE:

The matter before the City Council is the consideration of a recommendation to City Council to adopt the new General Plan. As required by State Law, the City of Turlock has circulated a Draft Environmental Impact Report for public comment, received comments from various public agencies and private individuals, and provided responses to those comments through the preparation of a Final Environmental Impact Report.

NEW GENERAL PLAN

The new General Plan presented for consideration is the result of four years of input and dialogue on how the City of Turlock should grow in the future. The new General Plan consists of two documents- the Public Review Draft General Plan and the August 2012 Public Review Draft General Plan Errata.

During the course of developing this Plan, the City held four community meetings and seven joint City Council and Planning Commission meetings to allow the public to provide input to the Council and Planning Commission on the proposed General Plan.

In previous meetings, the City Council has seen many of the overarching elements of the General Plan Update- the vision and themes, the land use diagram, and the conceptual master plans. The preliminary infrastructure plans and cost estimates were evaluated for the four preliminary land use alternatives. In March 2011, the City Council provided direction on the EIR alternatives that have been evaluated and added a policy to re-study the economic feasibility of designating an area for Regional Commercial uses once the City reaches 27,000

housing units. In November 2011, the Council and Planning Commission approved the release of the public review Draft General Plan and the October 2011 Errata documents which allowed staff to complete the preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Report.

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) along with the public review Draft General Plan was circulated for its mandatory 45-day public review beginning on June 5, 2012, ending on July 20, 2012. A public open house was held on June 14, 2012, to receive public comments on the Draft EIR. The comments received at the public workshop and during the public review period are included in the Final EIR document. The Final EIR includes the required responses to each comment received by the City of Turlock.

Prior to acting on the General Plan, the City Council must consider the information provided in the public comments on the Draft EIR and the responses provided by the City in the Final EIR. The City Council must be able to approve the Findings of Fact regarding each environmental effect and alternatives to the project, and Statement of Overriding Considerations identifying the benefits of the project that support approval of the project in light of significant unavoidable environmental effects of the project identified in the EIR. The Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations are provided as exhibits to Draft Resolution 2012-12 certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report.

CITYWIDE REZONE

Adoption of the new General Plan would require changes in both the General Plan land use designations for 85 properties located within the City Limits. State Law requires consistency between the General Plan designation and the Zoning designation for property. To maintain consistency between the General Plan and Zoning for the 85 properties, these properties must be also rezoned. The properties are identified in the exhibits attached to the Draft Council Ordinance.

State Law requires the City directly notify property owners whose land development rights are directly impacted by the proposed General Plan and zoning changes. As this process has unfolded, we have received comments from individual property owners requesting deletion of their properties from the original list proposed in Citywide Rezone 2012-03, circulated with the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR. Ten properties were removed from the original list as a result of these property owner requests. The exhibits attached to the draft resolution and ordinance reflect these property owner requests.

There remains, however, some disagreement among the property owners for three parcels located on Colorado – 1128, 1204 and 1208 Colorado – that are proposed to be redesignated (and rezoned) from Low Density Residential (RL) to a mix of Medium Density Residential and Office (RM/CO). As this proposed

change was requested by one of the property owners, staff is requesting that the City Council specifically address this issue in their action. The list in Exhibit A of the Draft General Plan Resolution and Citywide Rezone Ordinance includes the proposed change.

HOUSING ELEMENT FINDINGS

The Housing Element is a mandated element of the General Plan, although adopted separately, and a project proposing to rezone property, like this one, must be able to demonstrate consistency with this Housing Element as well. State Law [Government Code Section 65863(a)] requires the City make specific findings whenever rezoning actions that reduce the residential density of any parcel identified in the Housing Element. First, the reduction must be consistent with the City's General Plan. Second, the remaining sites identified in the Housing Element must be adequate to accommodate the jurisdiction's share of regional housing need.

While this action would re-designate parcels from residential to commercial, thereby reducing the inventory of land available for residential development, there are corresponding changes in density for other parcels or redesignation of other parcels from nonresidential to residential uses that increase the potential housing that could be developed within the existing City Limits by 184 units. Therefore, the proposed General Plan Amendment and Citywide Rezoning is consistent with the General Plan and Housing Element.

Staff recommended approval of the Public Review Draft General Plan as amended by the Errata document dated August 2012. Staff believes that all of the findings for certification of the Environmental Impact Reports and Statement of Overriding Considerations can be made. Staff also believes the required Housing Element findings can be made.

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Commission heard testimony encouraging a reduction in the amount of growth to be accommodated in the General Plan. Several commenters recommended that the Planning Commission recommend adoption of either the "No Project" Alternative or to limit growth to the existing City Limits, an alternative that was not analyzed in the Draft EIR.

The Planning Commission recommended adoption of Alternative 1, rather than the Preferred Land Use Plan. Alternative 1 is described in more detail in Chapter 4 of the Draft Environmental Impact Report and includes development of Phase 1 of the General Plan (i.e., infill development and Southeast Master Plan 1, 2 and 3 only).

The Planning Commission also recommended that the City Council clarify the “timing policy” in the General Plan, contained in Guiding Policy 3.1-g and Implementing Policy 3.1-p by clarifying that additional annexations would not be initiated until at least 70 percent of the building permits are issued for the existing master plans located within the City which includes Southeast Master Plan 1 (Morgan Ranch), the Northeast Master Plan and East Tuolumne Master Plan. The policy presented in the Public Review Draft EIR would have required 70 percent issuance of building permits of Southeast Master Plan 1 (Morgan Ranch) only.

To reflect the Planning Commission’s recommendation, staff has developed the following language to add to the two policies referred above:

“Prior to proceeding with the planning, annexation and development of Southeast Master Plan 2, 70 percent of the building permits shall be issued for the Northeast Master Plan, East Tuolumne Master Plan, and Southeast Master Plan 1, calculated on a cumulative basis.”

To further clarify how this new threshold would be calculated, the development potential for all three existing master plans (Northeast, East Tuolumne and Morgan Ranch) would be added together, as well as the number of building permits issued and remaining for all three areas. If 70 percent of the cumulative total of all building permits has been issued, the City Council would be able to initiate planning, annexation, and development of Southeast Master Plan 2. Staff will provide a more detailed analysis of the implications of this policy change at the Council meeting.

The Planning Commission also received testimony regarding the proposed Citywide Rezone accompanying the General Plan Update. After hearing several of the property owner speak regarding the proposed rezoning of three properties on Colorado Avenue – 1128, 1204, 1208 Colorado- the Planning Commission voted unanimously to recommend that the properties be redesignated and rezoned from Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential/Office as presented in the staff recommendation.

3. BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION:

- A. The General Plan is required by State Law to be updated at the end of its planning horizon. The planning horizon for the current General Plan, originally adopted in 1993, ends in 2012. After making the necessary environmental findings and determinations, the Planning Commission recommended the City Council adopt the new General Plan with the Alternative 1 Land Use Diagram and modifying Guiding Policy 3.1-g and Implementation Policy 3.1-p by adding the following language: *“Prior to proceeding with the planning, annexation and development of Southeast*

Master Plan 2, 70 percent of the building permits shall be issued for the Northeast Master Plan, East Tuolumne Master Plan, and Southeast Master Plan 1, calculated on a cumulative basis.”

B. CITY OF TURLOCK STRATEGIC PLAN 2011-13

Strategic Plan Initiative B. FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

Goal(s):

- b. Identify smart revenue opportunities including but not limited to grants and outside sources of funding.

Strategic Plan Initiative: F. INTELLIGENT, PLANNED, MANAGED GROWTH

Goal(s):

- a. Ensure all growth adds value to the current and future community
- b. Continue use of Specific and Master Plans
- c. Ensure that all new growth pays for itself (Assessment Districts, CFF/PAF, CFD)
- d. Provide for housing diversity
 - i) Include affordable housing
- e. Create long-term, value-added plan for In-fill
- f. Ensure all growth and development reflects balanced land use through the General Plan implementation which will address future growth and development
- g. Coordinate with various agencies on the planning and implementation of the South County Corridor

Actions:

- a. General Plan adoption

4. FISCAL IMPACT / BUDGET AMENDMENT:

Fiscal Impact: The General Plan proposes changes in the future land use pattern and growth of the City of Turlock. The General Plan also proposes that the City develop fiscal policies to ensure that development pays its fair share of the additional costs that would result from growth. The City has adopted funding mechanisms, such as the Capital Facility Fee Program, master plan fees, and a Community Facilities District to offset both the initial capital costs and ongoing operating costs associated with new development.

Budget Amendment: None

5. CITY MANAGER'S COMMENTS:

Recommends approval.

6. ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:

An Environmental Impact Report has been prepared and circulated in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act. Prior to adopting the new General Plan, the City Council must certify that environmental document as well as adopt Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations.

7. ALTERNATIVES:

Alternatives to the preferred land use plan have been described and evaluated in the Draft EIR. These alternatives have been fully explored as part of the public input process for both the General Plan Update and the Environmental Impact Report. Although staff is recommending approval of the preferred land use plan as presented in the Public Review Draft General Plan and Errata, the City Council may adopt an alternative land use plan as part of its action. The Planning Commission has recommended adoption of Alternative 1 as presented in the Draft EIR.

While the alternatives do not fully meet the vision and goals established by the Council and Planning Commission at the outset of this planning process, they are consistent with the overall vision and goals. Should growth rates rebound and growth pressures increase, there may be a need to revisit the General Plan earlier than its current planning horizon if one of the alternatives is adopted as the General Plan. More recent forecasts that are being prepared by the Stanislaus Council of Governments show much lower growth rates than assumed

in this General Plan Update process; however, those forecasts are updated by StanCOG every four years, where the General Plan is intended to last through the entire 20 year planning period. The growth policies contained in the proposed General Plan ensure that the City will not prematurely annex territory unless it is required to meet growth demand, by preventing the City from developing the next new master plan until at least 70 percent of the building permits have been issued in the prior master plan area.

DOCUMENTS AVAILABLE ONLINE AT <http://www.gpupdate.turlock.ca.us>:

Turlock General Plan Public Review Draft – dated June 2012

Turlock General Plan Public Review Draft Errata – dated August 2012

Turlock General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report – dated June 2012

Turlock General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report – dated August 2012

BEFORE THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TURLOCK

IN THE MATTER OF CERTIFYING THE }
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT }
FOR THE NEW GENERAL PLAN FOR }
THE CITY OF TURLOCK, ADOPTING }
FINDINGS OF FACT, AND ADOPTING A }
STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING }
CONSIDERATIONS AS REQUIRED BY THE }
CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY }
ACT }

RESOLUTION NO. 2012-

WHEREAS, on December 27, 2010, the City of Turlock, acting as Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), published a Notice of Preparation and initiated work on a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) on a new General Plan for the City of Turlock; and

WHEREAS, the DEIR was circulated for public review and comment from June 5, 2012 to July 20, 2012, and a public open house to receive comments on the DEIR was held June 14, 2012; and

WHEREAS, the City of Turlock prepared the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the new Turlock General Plan by incorporating the DEIR; comments received about the DEIR and responses to those comments; and changes, clarifications and corrections to the DEIR, and as required by CEQA, the FEIR was mailed to those public agencies that commented on the DEIR, as well as all of the other commenters on August 23, 2012; and

WHEREAS, the Environmental Impact Report, including the DEIR and the FEIR, is a program EIR that examines the potential effects resulting from implementing the proposed General Plan, evaluates the General Plan as a whole and identifies the broad, regional effects that may occur with its implementation; and

WHEREAS, the EIR evaluated the potential environmental impacts that could result from the approval of the Project, alternatives to the Project, and the self-mitigating General Plan implementing policies designed to mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts of the Project; and

WHEREAS, policies that would reduce or avoid environmental impacts are built into the General Plan and will be implemented and enforced through the application of the Turlock General Plan in land use and planning decisions. The monitoring plan for policies in the General Plan that would reduce or avoid impacts is the General Plan itself. The reporting program for these mitigating implementation policies is the City's annual General Plan reporting process; and

WHEREAS, for mitigation measures that extend beyond the General Plan

implementing policies and are separately identified in the EIR, a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program has been developed in accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15097, and will be administered by the City; and

WHEREAS, the Turlock City Council has reviewed the Final Environmental Impact Report for the new General Plan (“CEQA Documentation”) consisting of the Draft EIR dated June 5, 2012, comments received on the Draft EIR and the Response to Comments Document dated August 23, 2012; and

WHEREAS, the Turlock Planning Commission, at their September 6, 2012 meeting, made the CEQA required findings and voted to recommend to the City Council that the FEIR for the Turlock General Plan be certified pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15090.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that, based on its review and consideration of the foregoing documents, and any remaining public testimony, the City Council makes the following specific findings:

- A. Compliance with CEQA Requirements: The City Council has received, reviewed and considered the CEQA Documentation and other substantive and procedural components of CEQA compliance for the new General Plan of the City of Turlock. The CEQA Documentation prepared for the General Plan has been completed, and review procedures required by CEQA for a Lead Agency have been completed in conformance with CEQA as set forth in the recitals to this resolution.

Pursuant to CEQA, including without limitations CEQA Guidelines §15090, the City Council further finds, determines and certifies that the City of Turlock has complied with all of its duties as a Lead Agency for the Turlock General Plan FEIR, that the FEIR was presented to the City Council, and the City Council has reviewed and considered the information contained in the FEIR. Further, the City Council finds that the FEIR was completed in compliance with CEQA.

Specifically:

1. That a Notice of Preparation was published on December 27, 2010, giving public agencies and citizens until 30 days after their receipt of the Notice of Preparation to review and respond to the proposed scope of the General Plan EIR, and that a copy of such notice was mailed to the General Plan interested parties list, as well as surrounding cities and other public agencies; and a duly noticed public scoping session was held on January 18, 2011.
2. That the DEIR was prepared in compliance with CEQA Guidelines §15120 through 15132.

3. That the DEIR was published on June 5, 2012 and circulated for public review and comment until July 20, 2012, thus complying with the 45 day review period, and as part of this review period a Notice of Availability was posted and mailed to interested parties, to all parties who had previously expressed interest to be notified about the matter and to all surrounding cities and public agencies.
 4. That the FEIR has been prepared, consisting of the comment letters received; the response to written comments; the response to oral comments received at the June 14, 2012 public open house; and a comprehensive list of changes, clarifications and corrections to the DEIR and revisions to the Draft General Plan in the August 2012 Public Review Draft Errata.
- B. The FEIR reflects the Lead Agency's independent judgment and analysis. The City Council finds that the FEIR, as certified and finally revised, reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the City Council and the City of Turlock. The City Council specifically finds that at this time, the FEIR for the Turlock General Plan accurately and completely presents adequate information upon which to base future environmental decisions about the broad effects of implementing the General Plan, including specific actions, such as zoning regulations, zoning map amendments, design guidelines, specific plans, capital improvement programs, and projects that are consistent with the policies and implementation measures of the Plan. The City Council confirms that no new information of substantial importance showing new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant environmental effects beyond those effects analyzed in the DEIR for the new General Plan were identified during the public comment period or during the preparation of the FEIR.
- C. The City Council hereby certifies the FEIR for the Turlock General Plan pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15090.
- D. The Council hereby adopts the Findings of Facts and Statement of Overriding Considerations (Exhibit A) and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Exhibit B) in accordance with CEQA Guidelines §§15091, 15093, and 15097.

PASSED AND ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Turlock this 11th day of September, 2012, by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
NOT PARTICIPATING:
ABSENT:

ATTEST:

Kellie E. Weaver, City Clerk,
City of Turlock, County of Stanislaus,
State of California

Exhibit A

Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The City of Turlock is located in Stanislaus County, on the eastern side of California's San Joaquin Valley, 100 miles east of the San Francisco Bay Area. The City is on the State Highway 99 corridor, linking it to other Central Valley cities including Stockton and Sacramento to the north and Fresno and Bakersfield to the south. Turlock's Planning Area is the geographic area for which the General Plan establishes policies about future urban growth, long-term agricultural activity, and natural resource conservation. The Planning Area extends beyond Turlock's city limits and includes the unincorporated communities of Keyes and Denair. The Planning Area occupies 29,800 acres or 46.5 square miles.

The Study Area is a subset of the Planning Area. It was defined as the area in which the City would study the extent to which Turlock's urban development would need to expand in order to accommodate growth over the next 20 years. The majority of existing conditions research, analysis, and policy formulation pertains only to the Study Area. The Study Area is roughly bounded by Taylor Road to the north, Waring and Verduga roads to the east, Harding Road to the south, and Commons and Washington roads to the west. It also includes some additional land at the northwest corner, along the State Route 99 Corridor, encompassing the Taylor Road interchange. The Study Area comprises 17,460 acres or 27 square miles. The City of Turlock's existing city limits encompasses approximately 8,730 acres (13.6 square miles) of incorporated land or 51 percent of the Study Area.

The General Plan also covers Turlock's adopted Sphere of Influence (SOI) as well as any land outside of it that is relevant to the city's planning. The SOI is a boundary that encompasses lands that are expected to ultimately be annexed by the City, and the City will apply to LAFCO to expand the SOI as part of the General Plan Update. Portions of the Planning Area beyond the SOI may or may not be annexed to Turlock, but are still considered to be related to and influenced by the City's planning.

The proposed Turlock General Plan is intended to replace the existing General Plan, which was last updated in 1992. The Plan includes the seven elements required by Government Code Section 65302: Land Use, Circulation, Housing, Conservation, Open Space, Noise, and Safety. Additional elements may be included in the general plan as well, at the discretion of the City. The proposed Turlock General Plan also includes the optional elements of New Growth Areas and Infrastructure; Parks, Schools, and Community Facilities; and City Design. Economic Development policies are found in the Land Use element. Turlock's Housing Element was updated in 2009-2010 through a separate process and is not part of the current General Plan Update, so is not analyzed in the EIR.

Full development under the proposed General Plan is referred to as "buildout." Although the proposed General Plan horizon is the year 2030, the Plan is not intended to specify or anticipate when buildout will actually occur; nor does the designation of a site for a certain use necessarily mean the site will be used in such a way within the next 20 years.

Based on past development trends, regional growth forecasts, and applying assumptions on future growth, the Turlock Planning Area will accommodate approximately 126,500 residents and 44,100 housing units at maximum buildout, an increase of about 79 percent over the current population estimate of 71,000.

Residential Development

Approximately 24,400 housing units currently exist in the Turlock Planning Area. The proposed General Plan will accommodate a further 19,700 housing units through new development and infill development at maximum buildout. Most of the new residential developments are expected to be in compact, mixed-use master planned neighborhoods in the City's Southeast and Northwest areas. A smaller portion of new housing will be developed on infill sites closer to Downtown and elsewhere in existing city limits.

New Development in Master Plans

The General Plan introduces six new master plan areas for future neighborhood development, five of which are located in the southeast and one in the northwest. An additional master plan area is identified within the city's current boundaries, encompassing significant areas of unincorporated "county islands." The concept behind provision of master plan areas is twofold: to ensure that future development at the urban edge of Turlock proceeds in a discrete, orderly fashion, according to prescribed phasing and with adequate infrastructure; and second, to create complete neighborhoods that are compact, walkable, and mixed use, with a variety of housing types and public amenities.

A Master Plan or Specific Plan must be prepared for each area. The General Plan assigns a minimum average residential density to each master plan area. Builders/developers may plan and construct a variety of housing types within each area, so long as the overall density meets the minimum threshold. The General Plan also specifies the amount and general location of other complementary uses, such as parks, schools, and shopping centers, as well as the appropriate locations for heavier commercial and industrial uses. The master plans must also provide major transportation infrastructure (collectors, arterials, and expressways) in accordance with the overall citywide circulation diagram, and appropriate utility infrastructure. Essentially, the General Plan provides standards and guidelines for the mix and location of land uses and supporting public facilities and infrastructure for each area, and the master plans may be designed with some flexibility as long as these standards are met and the plans are consistent with the overall citywide systems.

Phasing of Master Plans

Turlock's development is planned to proceed in two major phases. Development of a subsequent master plan may not proceed until 70 percent of the building permits for the preceding area have been issued. The first phase includes infill development,¹ development of projects in the pipeline, and master plan areas Southeast 1, Southeast 2, and Southeast 3. Accommodating some 11,700 new housing units and 32,900 new residents (104,000 total residents), Phase I could proceed without triggering the need for a new Highway 99

¹ Vacant and underutilized infill opportunity sites could accommodate approximately 4,200 housing units. Given the challenges and constraints often posed by infill development, the General Plan assumes that 70 percent of these sites will develop, equaling approximately 3,000 housing units. Development associated with the Montana-West (County Island) master plan is included in this estimate.

interchange in the southeast. In addition, most of Phase I could be developed without the need for major new potable water infrastructure.

Phase II includes master plan areas Southeast 4, Southeast 5, and Northwest. Following Phase I development, the City may choose whether to go to the Northwest or whether to continue building in the southeast. Buildout of all of Phase II would add another 8,000 housing units and 22,500 people, bringing the citywide totals at full buildout to 55,400 housing units and 126,500 residents. Table 2.4-2 summarizes buildout for the proposed General Plan by population and housing units for each phase of development.

TABLE 2.4-2: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL BY PHASE (EXCERPT FROM GENERAL PLAN)

<i>Phase</i>	<i>Housing Units by Phase</i>	<i>Cumulative Housing Units</i>	<i>Population by Phase</i>	<i>Cumulative Population</i>
Existing (2010)	24,400	24,400	71,000	71,000
Phase I				
Approved Projects	1,400	25,800	3,900	75,000
Infill	3,000	28,800	8,400	83,400
Southeast 1 (Morgan Ranch)	900	29,700	2,500	85,900
Southeast 2	2,400	32,100	6,800	92,700
Southeast 3	4,000	36,100	11,300	104,000
Subtotal Phase I	11,700	36,100	32,900	104,000
Phase II				
Southeast 4	1,700	37,800	4,800	108,800
Southeast 5	2,000	39,800	5,600	114,400
Option 1 Subtotal: Southeast 4, Southeast 5 only	3,700	39,800	10,400	114,400
Northwest	4,300	40,400	12,100	116,100
Option 2 Subtotal: NW only	4,300	40,400	12,100	116,100
Subtotal Phase II (SE4, SE5, and NW)	8,000	44,100	22,500	126,500
Minimum (Phase I only) and Maximum (Phase I and II) Possible New Development	11,700 – 19,700		32,900 – 55,400	
Minimum (Phase I only) and Maximum (Phase I and II) Possible Citywide Buildout, Including Existing (Phase I, SE4, SE5, and NW)	36,100 – 44,100		104,000 – 126,500	

Source: Dyett & Bhatia, 2011

Economic Development

Turlock will accommodate approximately 60,200 jobs at buildout, an increase of approximately 109 percent from the number of jobs in 2007 (28,258). The total additional number of jobs accommodated by the proposed General Plan is about 32,000. Over a 23 year period (2007-2030), this represents an average annual growth rate of about 4.7 percent. The majority of jobs will be concentrated in five land use categories, which will account for 83% of all jobs in Turlock: Downtown Mixed Use (23%), Community Commercial (23%), Office (20%), Heavy Commercial (17%), and Industrial (11%).

TABLE 2.4-3 GENERAL PLAN BUILDOUT: JOBS BY LAND USE DESIGNATION (EXCERPT FROM GENERAL PLAN)

<i>Land Use</i>	<i>Square Feet</i>	<i>Jobs</i>
Downtown Mixed Use ¹	5,479,700	13,700
Office	2,431,700	7,500
Office or High Density Residential ²	108,700	300
Community Commercial	6,413,800	12,800
Community Commercial or Office	198,900	500
Community Commercial or High Density Residential ³	93,500	200
Medium Density Residential or Office ⁴	47,400	100
Neighborhood Center ⁵	391,400	1,000
Heavy Commercial	7,250,400	12,100
Highway Commercial	2,040,900	4,100
Industrial ⁶	6,695,400	6,700
Business Park ⁷	622,200	1,200
Total	28,733,900	60,200

Note: Items may not sum to totals due to rounding.

1. Assumes 75% buildout as non-residential. Actual buildout may vary.
2. Assumes 50% buildout as office. Actual buildout may vary.
3. Assumes 50% buildout as non-residential. Actual buildout may vary.
4. Assumes 50% buildout as non-residential. Actual buildout may vary.
5. Assumes 75% buildout as non-residential. Actual buildout may vary.
6. Assumes 15% buildout of available land inventory, per employment projections.
7. Assumes 15% buildout of available land inventory, per employment projections.

II. FINAL EIR

The Final EIR consists of the Draft EIR and the Response to Comments Document.

III. THE RECORD

The record, upon which all Findings and determinations related to the approval of the Project are based, includes the following:

- The EIR and all documents referenced in or relied upon by the EIR.
- All testimony, documentary evidence and all correspondence submitted to or delivered to the City of Turlock in connection with the project.
- All staff reports, memoranda, maps, slides, letters, minutes of public meetings and other documents relied upon or prepared by City staff or consultants relating to this project.
- These Findings and the Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted in connection with this project.
- The Mitigation Monitoring and Report Program adopted in connection with this project.
- All other documents composing the record pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21167.6(e).

IV. CUSTODIAN OF DOCUMENTS

The custodian of the documents and other materials that constitute the record of the proceedings upon which the City's decisions are based is the City of Turlock Planning Division. Such documents and other material are located at City of Turlock, Planning Division, 156 S. Broadway, Suite 120, Turlock, CA 95380.

V. FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF FACTS SUPPORTING THE FINDINGS

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 and 15093, no public agency shall approve a project for which a certified EIR identifies one or more significant environmental effects unless the agency makes findings regarding each effect. These findings can show that significant environmental effects can be avoided or substantially lessened by changes required in or incorporated into the project or by changes that are within the responsibility or jurisdiction of another public agency and that can or should be adopted. The Turlock City Council hereby declares that it has made a reasonable and good faith effort to eliminate or substantially mitigate the potential impacts resulting from the Project.

Findings can also be made of specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers that make the mitigation measures or project alternatives infeasible. In addition, findings are required if specific economic, legal, social, technological or other benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects. In such a situation, the adverse environmental effects may be considered "acceptable" and the project approved.

A. Findings Regarding Significant and Unavoidable Impacts from the Project

The significant and unavoidable impacts of the projects as determined by the City are listed below. Also, the findings and facts supporting the findings in connection therewith are listed.

Agriculture and Soil Resources

- a. Impact 3.1-1 Buildout of the proposed General Plan would convert substantial amounts of Important Farmland to non-agricultural use, and would conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or Williamson Act contracts.

Mitigation Measures

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified that would reduce the impacts on agricultural land conversion. Development of the Turlock General Plan will result in the loss of 1,986 acres of farmland. Conversion of agricultural land to urban use is not directly mitigable, aside from preventing development altogether. As the land within the General Plan area and the Study Area as well as that immediately adjacent to the Study Area is classified as farmland, establishing an agricultural easement outside the proposed General Plan buildout area would not create any new farmland. Therefore, the loss of farmland would not be replaced or substituted.

Policies

Multiple policies are identified in the proposed General Plan to prevent excessive agricultural land conversion, including prioritizing infill development within the existing city limits, clear phasing of growth, compact development in new growth areas, and the continuation of most agricultural activities in the Study Area. The following proposed policies in the Turlock General Plan are specifically targeted at reducing the potential impacts of agricultural land conversion:

Conservation Element Policies

- 7.2-a **Preserve Farmland.** Promote the preservation and economic viability of agricultural land adjacent to the City of Turlock.
- 7.2-b **Limit Urban Expansion.** Retain Turlock’s agricultural setting by limiting urban expansion to designated areas and minimizing conflicts between agriculture and urban activities.
- 7.2-c **Protect Soil and Water.** Work to protect and restore natural resources essential for agricultural production.
- 7.2-e **Require Compact Development.** Require development at densities higher than typical in recent years in order to limit conversion of agricultural land and minimize the urban/agricultural interface.
- 7.2-f **Annex Land As Needed.** Annex land to the City only as it is needed for development of designated growth areas, consistent with policies in Chapter 3 of the General Plan and with the City’s Annexation Policy. Do not annex agricultural land unless urban development consistent with the General Plan has been approved.

- 7.2-g **Allow Agricultural Uses to Continue.** Where agriculture exists within City limits, allow uses to continue until urban development occurs on these properties.
- 7.2-h **Support Participation in Williamson Act Program.** Support participation in the Williamson Act program by Study Area landowners.
- 7.2-k **Support Agricultural Industry.** Support agricultural industry within the city, while discouraging industrial uses in the unincorporated portions of the Study Area.

Growth Management and Infrastructure Element Policies

- 3.1-a **Proactively manage growth.** Proactively manage and plan for growth in an orderly, sequential, and contiguous fashion.
- 3.1-c **Promote good design in new growth areas.** Design new growth and development so that it is compact; preserves natural, environmental, and economic resources; and provides the efficient and timely delivery of infrastructure, public facilities, and services to new residents and businesses.
- 3.1-e **Continue prezoning.** Continue to promote orderly expansion of the City’s boundaries through prezoning territory prior to annexation.
- 3.1-g **Master Plan Areas.** Plan for growth in phases and discreet master plan areas, so that neighborhoods are fully planned and at least 70 percent of building permits issued prior to the construction of the next master plan area.
- 3.2-f **Minimum average densities established for master plan areas.** Each master plan, or portion of a master plan, must be built to achieve the minimum average residential density specified on the Land Use Diagram and may go up to an overall average density that is 20 percent higher. (If the developer of a master plan area wishes to build to a higher density than 20 percent above the minimum, then a General Plan amendment and an analysis of environmental impacts would be required.)The minimum density calculation does not apply to land that is to be used for public parks, schools, or other non-residential uses.

Findings

Based upon the EIR and the entire record before this City, the City finds that there are no feasible mitigation measures that have been identified that would reduce the impacts on Important Farmland. The City finds a certain amount of growth to occur in the Study Area necessitates conversion of farmland to urban uses. The proposed Plan includes growth management policies to prevent the premature conversion of farmland, by encouraging infill development, by requiring new development to be built at considerably higher densities than Turlock has traditionally seen, and by phasing of new master planned growth areas. These policies are intended to offset the impact to agricultural land conversion to the greatest degree possible. The City finds there are no feasible mitigation measures to agricultural land conversion that would also fulfill the objectives of and implement the General Plan as proposed. Although there are policies in the proposed General Plan to reduce this impact, the City finds the potential conversion of agricultural land—which will affect some agricultural activities and prime agricultural soils—is significant and unavoidable.

Transportation

- b. **Impact 3.3-1** The proposed General Plan would conflict with an applicable plan, congestion management program, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit. Specifically, several local roadways would operate below LOS D (measured at the average daily traffic level) and all segments of SR 99 in the Study Area would operate below LOS C at General Plan buildout after all identified, feasible improvements were implemented.

Mitigation Measures

There are no mitigation measures that would reduce or eliminate the significant impacts to local and regional roads in the Study Area. Several roadways are identified as operating at LOS E or F at General Plan buildout. Congestion will occur in the vicinity of SR 99, notably between SR 99 and Golden State Boulevard.

For local roads, in development of the proposed Circulation Diagram, every segment projected to operate below LOS D at buildout was examined individually to determine whether an improvement would be feasible. Where improvements were feasible, they have been incorporated into the proposed plan, and the roadways are no longer shown to operate below LOS D at buildout. However, in some locations, widening roadways to accommodate traffic projections would conflict with competing General Plan policies to provide a balanced transportation system. Intersections and roadways along these segments will likely experience delays during peak periods. Other intersections not on these corridors may also experience moments of delays during peak commute periods. The proposed General Plan acknowledges some vehicular congestion in exchange for balanced improvement projects cognizant of all travel modes; however, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable relative to the defined threshold.

For regional roads, there are no feasible mitigation measures that the City of Turlock can perform independently. To mitigate the impact to SR 99, the freeway would have to be widened in each direction, a substantial undertaking involving planning, funding, and coordination at the state and regional level. StanCOG's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the document that identifies and prioritizes roadway improvements in the county, does not identify widening SR 99 in the Study Area as a Tier I project with a high priority with funding identified. In the absence of this, the necessary improvement will not occur. While growth in the City of Turlock will contribute to the facility's future congestion, it is not feasible for the City to mitigate this impact. Thus, the City of Turlock is neither responsible for nor capable of mitigating the impact on its own, so it is considered significant and unavoidable.

Policies

The General Plan includes several policies that will reduce the impact of new traffic generated by buildout of the proposed General Plan, while fostering cooperation and collaboration between jurisdictional partner agencies in order to plan, finance, and construct improvements outside the City's purview. These are included below:

- 5.2-a **A safe and efficient roadway system.** Promote a safe and efficient roadway system for the movement of both people and goods.
- 5.2-b **Implement planned roadway improvements.** Use Figure 5-2: Circulation System, and Table B-1 in Appendix B, Major Circulation Improvements, to identify, schedule, and implement roadway improvements as development occurs in the future; evaluate future development and roadway improvement plans against standards for the classifications as set forth in Tables 5-4, 5-5, and 5-6 [of the General Plan].
- 5.2-c **Complete Streets.** Maintain and update street standards that provide for the design, construction, and maintenance of “Complete Streets.” Turlock’s Complete Streets shall enable safe, comfortable, and attractive access for all users: pedestrians, motorists, bicyclists, and transit riders of all ages and abilities, in a form that is compatible with and complementary to adjacent land uses, and promotes connectivity between uses and areas.
- 5.2-d **Design for street improvements.** The roadway facility classifications indicated on the General Plan circulation diagram (Figure 5-2) shall be the standard to which roads needing improvements are built. The circulation diagram depicts the facility types that represent the maximum standards to which a road segment or intersection shall be improved to support traffic generated by General Plan 2030 land use buildout. LOS is *not* used as a standard for determining the ultimate design of roadway facilities.
- 5.2-e **Use of existing facilities.** Make efficient use of existing transportation facilities, and improve these facilities as necessary in accordance with the circulation diagram.
- 5.2-h **Circulation System Enhancements.** Maintain projected levels of service where possible, and ensure that future development and the circulation system are in balance. Improve the circulation system as necessary, in accordance with the circulation diagram and spacing/access standards, to support multimodal travel of all users and goods.
- 5.2-j **Work with Caltrans on freeway improvements.** Continue to work with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to achieve timely construction of programmed freeway and interchange improvements.
- 5.2-k **Coordinate standards.** Continue to coordinate the City’s design standards for regional roadways with the standards of other agencies.
- 5.2-l **New southeast interchange.** Work with Stanislaus County and other partner entities to implement a new interchange on State Route 99 at Youngstown Road.
- 5.2-m **Amend Regional Expressway Study.** Seek to amend Stanislaus County’s Regional Expressway Study (most recently updated in 2010) to add the Waring/Verduga expressway. The precise alignment shall be determined by the Roadway Circulation Study (see Policy 5.2-tt)
- 5.2-n **Use of Congestion Management Process.** Utilize the StanCOG Congestion Management Process (CMP) to determine the timing and degree of regional roadway facility improvements in accordance with region-wide plans.

- 5.2-o **Off-Site roadway mitigation.** If an annexed area will utilize County roads, developers shall be required to fund improvements of affected County roads that connect to the citywide system to meet County standards.
- 5.2-p **Area of Influence fee.** In order to ensure that all development affecting Turlock's transportation infrastructure contributes to its expansion and maintenance, the City will work with County to expand the current SOI fee into adjacent unincorporated areas where nexus can be established. The SOI fee is to be maintained until the new Area of Influence (AOI) fee is in place.
- 5.2-q **Regional fair-share fee program.** Work with Caltrans, Stanislaus County, and other jurisdictions to establish a fair-share fee program for improvements to regional routes and state highways. This fee should reflect traffic generated by individual municipalities/unincorporated communities as well as pass-through traffic.
- 5.2-r **Follow circulation plan diagram.** Locate freeways, expressways, and arterials according to the general alignment shown in the Circulation Plan Diagram. Slight variation from the depicted alignments for collectors will not require a General Plan amendment.
- 5.2-r* **Trigger for Improvements.** Require improvements to be constructed where adequate ROW is available and impacts to adjacent land uses can be avoided or adequately mitigated to GP standards when LOS is projected to drop below LOS D (on an average daily trips basis).
- 5.2-s **Follow adopted City standards.** Build freeways, expressways, arterials, and collector streets in accordance with adopted city standards. Where these standards deviate from those set forth in the General Plan, amend the city standards to be consistent with the General Plan.
- 5.2-t **Roundabouts.** Roundabouts may be used in place of signalized intersections on any roadway facility or intersection type. Roundabouts are particularly encouraged at the intersection of two collector streets.
- 5.2-u **Maintain standards through ongoing improvements.** Ensure improvements to the circulation system required to maintain standards as set forth in Section 5.2. Improvements shall take place in accord with the City's Capital Improvement Program.
- 5.2-v **Expressway access from private property.** In general, access from individual private properties onto expressways is not permitted. An exception may be granted by the City Engineer if it is determined that the conditions listed below are met. In these cases, one access point may be provided onto future expressways to a parcel in existence at the date of adoption of the General Plan. The City may allow access from a private parcel onto an expressway if:
- The applicant has satisfactorily demonstrated to the city that there are either no or only highly restrictive alternative access solutions available to that particular parcel;
 - The applicant agrees to take full financial responsibility for constructing the access point, including any reconstruction of the expressway that may be necessary; and
 - A properly designed access solution is approved by the City Engineer.

- 5.2-w **CFF and Capital Improvement Program.** As part of the 20-year Capital Facilities Fee Program (CFF), annually update a five-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP) of projects required to construct and/or update circulation facilities. The analysis should identify the type of facility, length of the project, right-of-way requirements, physical improvements required and estimated cost.
- 5.2-x **Streets in County Islands.** Coordinate with Stanislaus County to evaluate the condition of existing streets in unincorporated areas and explore cooperative funding mechanisms to improve existing substandard streets and install sidewalks, curbs, gutters, and street lighting as a condition of incorporation.
- 5.2-aa **Impacts of new development.** No new development will be approved unless it can show that required service standards (accessibility, spacing and capacity in the circulation diagram and in Section 5.2) are provided on the affected roadways.
- 5.2-aa* **Downtown exempted from LOS standards.** Exempt Downtown from LOS trigger in order to encourage infill development, the creation of a pedestrian friendly urban design character, and the densities and intensities of development necessary to support transit and local business development. Development decisions Downtown should be based on community design and livability goals, rather than traffic LOS. Downtown is defined by the Downtown designation on the Land Use Diagram (Figure 2-2).
- 5.2-ag **Utilize outside funding sources.** Link improvement projects to the most current estimates of available funding from County, State, and federal sources. Continue to participate in the effort to develop and coordinate a financing mechanism for major regional transportation improvements.

Findings

The City finds widening all local and regional roadways to achieve a specific LOS is unfeasible and unavoidable. The policies of this General Plan are designed to balance improvement projects such that access to other travel modes including bicycles, pedestrian, and transit is improved. Widening all City roadways to achieve vehicular LOS D could dissuade use of alternative transportation modes by promoting vehicular service above all. The City finds that further improvements beyond those identified in the General Plan Circulation Diagram would be economically or technically infeasible, and would conflict with City policies that promote “Complete Street” concepts.

Additionally, SR 99 is a State Highway outside the City’s sphere of influence and facilities under Caltrans purview. It will operate below LOS C upon General Plan buildout and will constitute significant and unavoidable impacts per each agency’s significance criteria. The City of Turlock is neither responsible for nor capable of mitigating the impact on its own, so it is considered significant and unavoidable. The City has adopted policies to coordinate local and regional actions by participating in the development of the Regional Transportation Plan and Regional Expressway Study. The City finds this impact is unavoidable because there are no feasible mitigation measures that the City of Turlock can undertake independently. Thus, overall the City finds that certain local roadways, and SR 99 at LOS C and D and higher level impacts, are significant and unavoidable.

Air Quality

- c. **Impact 3.4-2** Implementation of the proposed Turlock General Plan would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants which may conflict with or violate an applicable air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

Mitigation Measures

No feasible mitigation measures are currently available to reduce this air quality impact to a less-than-significant level.

Policies

The proposed General Plan features a wide range of policies that will help reduce potential air quality impacts associated with criteria air pollutant emissions:

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases Element: Air Quality

- 8.1-a **Prioritize Air Quality in Local Planning.** Continue efforts to improve air quality in Turlock by integrating air quality analysis and mitigation in land use and transportation planning, environmental review, public facilities and operations, and special programs.
- 8.1-b **Participate in Regional Efforts.** Cooperate with the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District and Stanislaus Council of Governments in developing and implementing air quality regulations and incentives.
- 8.1-c **Coordination with Other Agencies.** Work with neighboring jurisdictions and affected agencies to address cross-jurisdictional and regional transportation and air quality issues.
- 8.1-d **Transportation and Residential Density.** Designate residential land uses to be higher density than in the past in order to meet population demand and reduce total vehicle miles travelled.
- 8.1-e **Establish Land Use Pattern That Supports Trip Reduction.** Establish land use pattern that enables alternatives to automobile use and reduces trip lengths, including transit-oriented, mixed use development and neighborhood commercial areas.
- 8.1-f **Plant and Maintain Trees in Streets and Parks.** Adopt a comprehensive tree-planting and maintenance program that recognizes the effect of air pollutants on trees and the role trees can play in removing particulate matter and gaseous pollutants. Provide a viable financing program, particularly in older neighborhoods that are not in a landscape and lighting assessment district.
- 8.1-g **Reduce Roadway Dust.** Improve City roads to reduce dust to the greatest extent feasible by planting shoulders and medians. Dust from roadways contributes to PM10 pollution.
- 8.1-j **Support Indirect Source Review Program.** Support the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District in implementing its Indirect Source Review program to reduce emissions of NO_x and PM10 from new development projects. Under ISR, projects will be required to estimate off-site emissions and to pay a fee to the District to mitigate these emissions. Other General Plan policies encourage or require new development to have qualities that mitigate air quality impacts and consequently lower

Indirect Source fees. These include bicycle lanes, mixed uses, cleaner construction vehicles, and superior energy efficiency.

- 8.1-k **Air Quality Improvement Fee.** In the Capital Facilities Fee (CFF) program, establish a fund to collect a fee to be paid by all new development to assist in the funding of local projects that contribute to the enhancement of air quality.
- 8.1-l **Use Air District Guidance in Environmental Review.** Continue to use the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District's Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts for determining and mitigating project air quality impacts and related thresholds of significance for use in environmental documents. Coordinate with the Air District, project applicants, and other interested parties, during pre-development consultation and negotiation over CEQA preparation.
- 8.1-m **Minimize Roadway Dust.** Require all access roads, driveways, and parking areas serving new development to be constructed with materials that minimize particulate emissions and are appropriate to the scale and intensity of use. To balance the goals of dust reduction and water infiltration, encourage the use of permeable paving or well-maintained gravel for parking spaces.
- 8.1-m* **Construction-Related Air Emissions Impacts.** Continue to require mitigation measures as a condition of obtaining permits to minimize dust and air emissions impacts from construction. Require contractors to implement dust suppression measures during excavation, grading, and site preparation activities. Techniques may include, but are not limited to:
- Site watering or application of dust suppressants;
 - Phasing or extension of grading operations;
 - Covering of stockpiles;
 - Suspension of grading activities during high wind periods (typically winds greater than 25 miles per hour); and
 - Revegetation of graded areas.
- 8.1-n **Reduce Trips by City Government.** Take the lead in implementing a trip-reduction program for City employees. The program may include carpooling and ridesharing; reimbursement of transit costs; encouragement of flexible work schedules, telecommuting, and teleconferencing.
- 8.1-o **Transition to Clean City Fleet.** Ensure through its long-range capital expenditure plans that the City deploys cutting-edge technologies and available incentives to minimize emissions from the City's fleet.
- 8.1-q **Institute Green Contracting.** Using the Air District's model ordinance as a guide, establish and follow a "green contracting" rule, awarding points in the bidding process to companies that use low-emission vehicles and equipment.
- 8.1-r **Promote Public Awareness.** Support the Air District's efforts to promote public awareness about air pollution and its relationship to land use and transportation.

- 8.1-s **Expand Spare-the-Air Efforts.** Be an active partner with the Air District in its “Spare the Air” program. Encourage businesses and residents to avoid pollution-producing activities such as the use of fireplaces and wood stoves, charcoal lighter fluid, pesticides, aerosol products, oil-based paints, and automobiles and other gasoline engines on days when high ozone levels are expected, and promote low-emission vehicles and alternatives to driving.
- 8.1-t **Implement REMOVE II Program.** Support the Air District in implementing its REMOVE II incentive program to reduce mobile source emissions. Seek funding for City projects, publicize the availability of incentive funding, and identify potentially eligible projects. As defined by the Air District, the following projects may be eligible:
- Public transportation and commuter vanpool passenger subsidies;
 - Telecommunications, including videoconferencing, distance learning, and internet-based business transactions;
 - Bike path construction;
 - Alternative-fuel mechanic training.
- 8.1-u **Support Employer-Based Trip Reduction.** Support the Air District’s requirement that companies and organizations with 100 or more employees establish ride-sharing programs, and provide incentives to companies with 25 to 100 employees that do the same. Ridesharing programs may include market-based incentives such as cash for ridesharing, preferential parking for carpools, transit subsidies, cash allowances in lieu of parking spaces, telecommuting and flexible work schedules.

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases Element: Energy and Climate Change

- 8.2-b **Decrease Vehicle-Miles Travelled.** Promote a broad range of transportation, land use, and site design measures that result in a decrease in the number of automobile trips and vehicle-miles travelled.
- 8.2-d **Promote Energy Conservation.** Support understanding of the relationship between energy consumption, air quality, and greenhouse gases, and promote energy-saving practices.
- 8.2-g **Develop Circulation System That Facilitates Alternative Transportation Modes.** Promote alternatives to automobile use by establishing a Circulation Plan and street design standards that enable safe, comfortable, and attractive access and travel for pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, and transit users of all ages and abilities. Plan Elements include a citywide bike network and traffic calming street design. See Chapter 5, Circulation.
- 8.2-h **Establish Connective Street Network to Minimize Trip Length.** Minimize vehicle-miles travelled by establishing a connective circulation network providing multiple, direct paths. See Chapter 5, Circulation.
- 8.2-i **Provide Bicycle Facilities.** Require minimum bike parking for multi-family residential and commercial development, and encourage provision of additional end-of-trip facilities.
- 8.2-j **Minimize Parking.** Encourage the provision of minimum parking required to support uses.

- 8.2-k **Establish Land Use Pattern That Supports Trip Reduction.** Establish a land-use pattern that enables alternatives to automobile use and reduces trip-lengths, including increased residential density, transit-oriented and mixed-use development, neighborhood commercial areas, and pedestrian realm enhancements.
- 8.2-l **Pedestrian-Oriented Site Design.** Orient development to encourage pedestrian and transit accessibility. Strategies include locating buildings and primary entrances adjacent to public streets; placing parking at the rear of sites or in structures above retail; and providing clear and direct pedestrian paths across parking areas.
- 8.2-m **Improve Energy Efficiency in Public Buildings.** Prepare and implement a plan to increase energy efficiency in public buildings, as part of the GHG Emissions Reduction Plan described in 8.2-f. Measures may include but not be limited to the following:
- Conduct energy audits for all municipal facilities;
 - Retrofit municipal facilities for energy efficiency where feasible and when remodeling or replacing components, including increased insulation, installing green or reflective roofs, installing automated lighting controls, and retrofitting heating and cooling systems.
 - Require that any newly constructed, purchased, or leased municipal space meet minimum standards, such as exceeding Title 24 energy efficiency by 20 percent;
 - Educate employees on energy conservation.
- 8.2-m* **Wastewater and Water System Efficiency.** Maximize the efficiency of City-operated wastewater treatment, water treatment, pumping, and distribution equipment. This measure may be part of the GHG Emissions Reduction Plan described in 8.2-f.
- 8.2-m** **Outdoor Lighting.** Establish outdoor lighting standards to minimize energy use while ensuring appropriate light levels. Standards could include:
- Photocells or astronomical time switches;
 - Directional and shielded LED lights
 - Security lights with motion detectors;
 - Prohibition against continuous all-night outdoor lighting unless required for security reasons.
- New outdoor lighting standards should apply to municipal operations, including traffic signals, as well as to new private development.*
- 8.2-n **Promote Energy Conservation Programs.** Promote and support State and TID energy conservation programs for housing construction and rehabilitation, including energy audits, weatherization assistance, and energy rebates for energy-efficient appliances and lighting, ventilation, and other systems.
- For participants in the Home Rehabilitation Loan program, provide information and technical support regarding available rebate and incentive programs (through TID and PG&E) for energy efficient appliances and weatherization tools.

- Require Energy Star electrical appliances when replacing appliances in City-funded Home Rehabilitation projects.
- 8.2-o **Encourage Greater Energy Efficiency in New Development.** For new Master Plan Areas, seek to expedite permit processing for new buildings to meet or exceed the Tier 1 optional standards in the 2010 California Green Building Standards Code.
- 8.2-p **Require Energy Efficiency for Projects Receiving Public Assistance.** Require that projects receiving assistance from the City of Turlock, including but not limited to infrastructure projects and affordable housing, include energy efficiency measures beyond the minimum standards of Title 24.
- 8.2-q **Encourage Solar Power Generation.** Encourage the use of passive and active solar devices such as solar collectors, solar cells, and solar heating systems into the design of buildings and parking areas by participating in existing incentive programs and considering new incentives for Turlock property owners.
- 8.2-r **Encourage Other Onsite Renewable Energy Systems.** Encourage the installation of other renewable energy systems in new or existing development. Renewable power generation may count toward the Air District’s proposed BPS for projects with systems capable of generating at least 2.5 percent of their energy need.
- 8.2-r* **Methane Capture.** Continue to produce energy through methane capture from waste using the fuel cell system at the Regional Water Quality Control Facility, in partnership with Turlock Irrigation District. Explore opportunities to enhance waste-to-energy generation if feasible.

Circulation Element: Roadway Network, Standards, and Improvements

- 5.2-c **Complete Streets.** Maintain and update street standards that provide for the design, construction, and maintenance of “Complete Streets.” Turlock’s Complete Streets shall enable safe, comfortable, and attractive access for all users: pedestrians, motorists, bicyclists, and transit riders of all ages and abilities, in a form that is compatible with and complementary to adjacent land uses, and promotes connectivity between uses and areas.
- 5.2-as **General transit and pedestrian access.** In reviewing designs of proposed developments, ensure that provision is made for access to current and future public transit services. In particular, pedestrian access to arterial and collector streets from subdivisions should not be impeded by continuous segments of sound walls.

Circulation Element: Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation

- 5.3-a **Promote walking and bicycling.** Promote walking and bike riding for transportation, recreation, and improvement of public and environmental health.
- 5.3-c **Develop a safe and efficient non-motorized circulation system.** Provide safe and direct pedestrian routes and bikeways between places.
- 5.3-d **Integration of land use planning.** Implement land use policies designed to create a pattern of activity that makes it easy to shop, play, visit friends, and conduct personal business without driving.

The neighborhoods described in the Land Use and City Design elements are designed to promote non-motorized transportation and to make it easy for those people who cannot or choose not to drive to be independent.

5.3-e **Provision of bicycle facilities.** Facilities for bicycle travel (Class I bike/multiuse paths, Class II bike lanes, and Class III bike routes) shall be provided as shown on Figure 5-3. Bike lane width shall follow the standards in tables 5-4 and 5-5. In cases where existing right of way constraints limit development of Class II facilities, Class III signage and demarcation may be permitted at the discretion of the City Engineer. Deviations from these standards and from the routing shown on the diagram shall only be permitted at the discretion of the City Engineer.

5.3-f **Street trees for shade and comfort.** Ensure that planting plans for street trees take into consideration shade and comfort for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Particular attention should be paid to places frequented by pedestrians, such as Main Street and other areas in Downtown and City Hall. Detailed measures relating to street trees are prescribed in policies in Section 6-8, Urban Design.

5.3-g **Children's access to schools.** Work with the Turlock Unified School District to promote drawing of school attendance areas so as to minimize crossings of major arterial streets.

5.3-i **Air quality funding for bikeways plan.** Continue using the Air Quality Trust Fund (and other grants and outside funding sources) to assist in the funding of implementation of the Bikeways plan depicted in Figure 5-3. Update the CFF to expand this program citywide to fund these improvements.

5.3-k **Bicycle Master Plan.** Prepare a Bicycle Master Plan consistent with the requirements in the Streets and Highways Code in order to be eligible for further funding for improvements from the State, such as the Bicycle Lane Account funds.

5.3-l **Reduced fees for Downtown and Pedestrian Priority Areas.** In recognition of its reduced impact on demand for new infrastructure due to its central/infill location, development projects located in Downtown Turlock and in designated Pedestrian Priority Areas will be granted a reduction in capital facilities fees owed. Reduced fees aim to encourage infill development, the creation of a pedestrian friendly urban design character, and the densities and intensities of development necessary to support transit and local business development. Downtown and other Pedestrian Priority Areas are defined on Figure 5-4.

5.3-m **Street trees in Capital Improvement Program.** Include street trees as part of Capital Improvement Program programming and implementation.

5.3-n **Bicycle use by City employees.** Establish a program to encourage bicycle use among City employees.

Bike storage facilities and shower and locker rooms should be provided where feasible. Funding shall be provided through these facilities' incorporation into the CFF.

5.3-o **Bicycling access to parks.** Provide safe bicycle access to and parking facilities at all community parks.

- 5.3-p **Bicycle safety.** Increase the safety of those traveling by bicycle by:
- Sweeping and repairing bicycle paths and lanes on a regular basis;
 - Ensuring that bikeways are delineated and signed according to Caltrans or City standards, and that lighting is provided where needed;
 - Providing bicycle paths and lanes on bridges and overpasses;
 - Ensuring that all new and improved streets have bicycle-safe drainage grates and are free of hazards such as uneven pavement or gravel;
 - Providing adequate signage and markings warning vehicular traffic of the existence of merging or crossing bicycle traffic where bike routes and paths make transitions into or across roadways; and
 - Work with the Turlock Unified School District to promote classes on bicycle safety in the schools.
- 5.3-q **Demarcation of Class III Bikeways.** In order to increase awareness of bicyclists sharing the roadway with motorized vehicles, demarcate Class III bicycle facilities by painting “sharrows” on streets. Because of high maintenance costs associated with sharrows, their use should be prioritized on areas with higher frequency of bicycle conflicts or where the bikeway may be obscured by traffic or geometrics. This shall apply only to Class III facilities shown on Figure 5-4, and not on local streets.
- 5.3-r **Improved bikeway visibility.** Use visual cues, such as brightly-colored paint on bike lanes or a one-foot painted buffer strip, along bicycle routes to provide a visual signal to drivers to watch out for bicyclists and nurture a “share the lane” ethic. Start with areas of town where automobile-bicycle collisions have occurred in the past, based on data from the Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System maintained by the California Highway Patrol.
- 5.3-s **Pedestrian access to shopping centers.** Install clearly marked crosswalks at intersections near all neighborhood commercial centers, as well as clearly marked pedestrian paths within parking areas. Crosswalks and signage indicating pedestrian activity should also be installed at mid-block entrances where existing shopping centers are adjacent to other high-intensity uses, such as parks and schools where necessary for safety; however, mid-block crossings are discouraged in new development.
- 5.3-t **Pedestrian connections at employment centers.** Encourage the development of a network of continuous walkways within new office parks, commercial areas, or industrial areas to improve workers’ ability to walk safely around and from their workplaces.
- 5.3-u **Bikeway improvements in infill areas.** To address the Priority Infill Bikeway Improvement Areas indicated on Figure 5-3, complete a feasibility study that identifies planned improvements and analyzes the cost and process associated with implementing those improvements. The feasibility study shall evaluate the identified areas for safety concerns and identify the minimum improvements necessary to address safety and usability issues.

The feasibility study may identify a range of possible improvements to the targeted areas that can be implemented incrementally as funding becomes available. Low-cost enhancements that render some immediate safety improvements may be implemented first. The appropriateness of each type of improvement will be related to the constraints of each individual site. Possible improvements include, but are not limited to:

- Signage improvements
- Painting or re-painting of lanes and/or sharrows
- Installation of “soft-hit” posts or other removable barriers that separate bike lanes from motorized traffic
- Changes to intersection signalization or timing

The feasibility study shall also identify and list possible funding sources.

Circulation Element: Public Transportation

- 5.4-a **Promote safe, efficient, and convenient public transportation.** Promote the use of public transportation for daily trips, including to schools and workplaces, as well as other purposes.
- 5.4-b **Work with multiple agencies and jurisdictions.** Continue to cooperate with other agencies and jurisdictions to promote local and regional public transit serving Turlock.
- 5.4-c **Improve local transit operations.** Continue the present course of expanding its fixed route service and improving operations.
- 5.4-d **Improvements to Demand-Responsive transit.** Improve the City’s dial-a-ride system. Aggressively pursue transit grant funds in order to continue funding operations.
- 5.4-h **Funding for transit services.** Continue to pursue federal funds to cover capital and operating costs associated with Turlock’s transit operation. (Currently, federal funding is sufficient to cover these costs.) If federal funds are reduced and capital needs are not being met, transit may be added to the Capital Facilities Fee (CFF) through a Nexus Study.
- 5.4-i **Transit usability.** Situate transit stops at locations that are convenient for transit users, and promote increased transit ridership through the provision of shelters, benches, bike racks on buses, and other amenities.
- 5.4-j **Transit services marketing.** Encourage ridership on public transit systems through marketing and promotional efforts. Provide information to residents and employees on transit services available for local and regional trips.
- 5.4-k **Transit for seniors.** Require new community care facilities and senior housing projects with over 25 beds to provide accessible transportation services for the convenience of residents.
- 5.4-l **Development that supports transit.** Ensure that new development is designed to make transit a viable transportation choice for residents. Design options include:
- Have neighborhood centers or focal points with sheltered bus stops;
 - Locate medium and high density development on or near streets served by transit wherever feasible; and
 - Link neighborhoods to bus stops by continuous sidewalks or pedestrian paths.

- 5.4-n **Correspondence between local and regional transit.** As Turlock's local transit system continues to be developed, services should be oriented to link with potential future commuter and/or high-speed rail.
- 5.4-o **Regional rail.** Support regional efforts to provide regional passenger train services, via commuter rail and/or High Speed Rail. As necessary, engage in Station Area planning efforts to examine and coordinate land uses surrounding a future train station in Turlock.
- 5.4-p **Support existing regional transit services.** Continue to support the MT Stage service provided by Stanislaus County and THE BUS service provided by Merced County.
- 5.4-r **Regional Transit Agency.** Support efforts to improve the coordination and efficiency of bus service on a regional level and, if appropriate, the regionalization of transit service delivery.

Other Elements

Policies in the Land Use, Infrastructure and New Growth Areas, and City Design Elements will also contribute to an overall land use and development pattern that supports decreasing vehicle-miles-travelled per capita and more trips being made by walking, biking, and transit.

Findings

The City finds that total emissions associated with development of the proposed General Plan would still exceed San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) thresholds for PM10 and PM2.5. The SJVAPCD has developed and the State and EPA have reviewed and adopted a series of air quality plans for ozone and particulate matter. The plans feature strict rules for stationary sources, and rely on State and federal actions concerning vehicle tailpipe standards, inspections, and other Reasonably Available Control Measures (RACM) to reduce emissions from mobile sources. The proposed General Plan would not conflict with the policies in these plans or the ability of relevant agencies to carry them out. However, new development under the Plan is projected to result in emissions that exceed significance thresholds for certain criteria pollutants.

The proposed General Plan would result in an increase in criteria pollutant emissions primarily due to local and regional vehicle emissions and vehicle travel generated by future population growth associated with buildout of the proposed Plan. The proposed General Plan is being offered despite these significant impacts because the City is in need of an updated land use plan that can thoughtfully and creatively accommodate projected population growth, as well as provide for jobs and economic development over the next 20 years. Full buildout of the proposed General Plan would result in a significant, unavoidable, and cumulatively considerable increase of criteria pollutants, which significantly impact air quality. The City finds no additional feasible mitigation measures are currently available to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

- d. **Impact 3.4-3** Implementation of the proposed Turlock General Plan would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Mitigation Measures

This impact remains significant and unavoidable, given the uncertainty as to whether future air quality impacts associated with the potential exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations

could be adequately mitigated. No feasible mitigation measures are currently available to reduce this air quality impact relating to criteria pollutants to a less-than-significant level.

Policies

Policies listed below help to reduce air quality Impact 3.4-3:

New Growth Areas and Infrastructure Policies

3.3-ae **Encourage Use of Less Toxic Agricultural Chemicals.** In cooperation with the Stanislaus County Agricultural Center, provide education and incentives to encourage the use of less toxic forms of pesticides, insecticides, herbicides, or other chemical substances by households and farmers.

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases Policies

8.1-f **Plant and Maintain Trees in Streets and Parks.** Adopt a comprehensive tree-planting and maintenance program that recognizes the effect of air pollutants on trees and the role trees can play in removing particulate matter and gaseous pollutants. Provide a viable financing program, particularly in older neighborhoods that are not in a landscape and lighting assessment district.

See also policies in Sections 5.2: Roadway Network, Standards and Improvements and 6.3: Street Design and Connectivity relating to street trees.

Studies have shown that immediately adjacent to arterial streets, the lead content of air can be about 15 times as high as “normal.” Hardy trees, or those adapted to such conditions, are likely to do much better over time with less care than trees that are unsuited.

Rows of trees planted close together and selected and spaced to provide a buffer between the streets and the surrounding areas (such as by a combination of low and high branching trees planted in alternate rows) can be effective in filtering fumes and particulate matter.

The update of the street tree ordinance should also consider reducing existing spacing standards between trees. Spacing standards vary from 40 to 60 feet for all streets on the list; in older areas, such as along Sycamore Street, tall trees are planted as close as 20 feet apart.

Shade trees also reduce radiation heating (the “heat island effect,”) helping to cool the urban environment and reduce peak energy use, and consequently reduce both ozone formation and greenhouse gas production.

8.1-h **Protect Sensitive Receptors from Toxic Air Emissions.** For all new development, maintain a minimum 300-foot overlay zone with an overall goal of 500 feet on either side of Highway 99 within the Study Area to protect sensitive receptors from toxic air emissions. Within this overlay, avoid approval of new sensitive land uses, and for those projects permitted, require site-specific project design improvements (such as higher-performance windows and HVAC systems) in order to reduce public health risks associated with poor air quality in these locations.

Sensitive receptors are those segments of the population most susceptible to poor air quality, such as children, the elderly, and those with pre-existing serious health problems affected by air quality. Land uses where sensitive receptors are most likely to spend time include, but are not limited to, hospitals and other medical facilities, schools and school yards,

senior centers, child care centers, parks and playgrounds, and residential communities. In traffic related studies, additional non-cancer health risk attributable to proximity was seen within 1,000 feet and was strongest within 300 feet. California freeway studies show about a 70 percent drop-off in particulate pollution levels at 500 feet.

Findings

Full buildout of the proposed General Plan would result in a significant, unavoidable, and cumulatively considerable impact on sensitive receptors by exposure to significant pollutant concentrations. The current General Plan is no longer practical for Turlock because stronger growth management is necessary and the current Plan does not offer adequate, concrete policies in accordance with recent State laws to promote walkability, bikeability, and minimize the impacts of growth. The proposed General Plan is consistent with regional and Statewide smart growth and Sustainable Communities Strategy goals in which urban development is directed toward existing urban infill sites near transit corridors in order to avoid the loss of open space. The densities of the seven growth areas are significantly higher than existing densities, and contain more medium-density and high-density housing. The Downtown Area density has also been increased. The significant impacts related to the proposed General Plan would not be considerably different under any other likely growth scenario for Turlock that accommodates the anticipated residential and non-residential growth projected for the city. The City finds no feasible mitigation measures are currently available to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Climate Change and Greenhouse Gases

- e. **Impact 3.5-1** Implementation of the proposed General Plan, combined with regional growth, would result in annual greenhouse gas emissions in the Study Area in an amount greater than 6.6 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO_{2e}) gases per service population in 2020, or greater than 3.8 MTCO_{2e} in 2030.
- f. **Impact 3.5-2** Buildout of the proposed General Plan, combined with regional growth, could result in the generation of GHG emissions from passenger vehicles in an amount greater than 3.53 metric tons per capita by 2020 or 3.47 metric tons per capita by 2030, not accounting for State mandates.

Mitigation Measures

It is not feasible to meet the standards for MTCO_{2e} or for GHG emissions given the large amount of growth projected in Turlock, or reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Policies

Policies relating to meeting the AB 32 GHG reduction goal and to undertake a strategic plan for GHG emissions reductions are listed below:

Energy and Climate Change Policies

- 8.2-a **Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions.** Reduce greenhouse gas emissions to support statewide GHG reduction goals under the California Global Warming Solutions Act (AB 32).
- 8.2-f **GHG Emissions Reduction Implementation.** Within three years of General Plan adoption, prepare a strategic plan for reducing greenhouse gas emissions, focusing on technically and financially

feasible implementation measures that can be taken by the City. The Plan will guide the City to lower emissions from its buildings, fleet, and operations.

A Stanislaus County greenhouse gas inventory will be funded by a Proposition 84 grant from the State. The next Regional Transportation Plan is due in 2013 and will include a Sustainable Communities Strategy to meet the requirements of Senate Bill 375. Data and programs from these sources will be incorporated in the GHG Emissions Reduction Plan.

Additional Policies

Plan policies seek to reduce GHG emission and reduce per capita energy consumption, establish a balanced and mixed use land use pattern, restrict sprawl, promote sustainable development practices, promote walkability, and reduce VMT. In June 2009, the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) published its “Model Policies for Greenhouse Gases in General Plans,” which includes over 350 policy suggestions, and provides a list of ten over-arching strategies that are recommended to be the core focus for local government action on climate change. In DEIR Table 3.5-4 are the top ten strategies identified by CAPCOA and corresponding proposed General Plan policies which aim to reduce GHG with a holistic approach, for example promote smart growth, jobs/housing balance, transit oriented development, infill development, transit and bicycle use, pedestrian friendly and walkability, green building, renewable energy, energy efficiency, urban forestry, and regional cooperation in GHG reduction, see DEIR Chapter 3.5: Climate Change.

Findings

The City finds that despite policies in the proposed General Plan, the proposed General Plan would result in a significant and unavoidable impact. Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in development of new housing and non-residential land uses supporting a larger population and more jobs. This development is projected to result in increased GHG emissions, thereby contributing to global climate change, including regional climate impacts. The City finds this increase in emissions under the proposed General Plan is outweighed by potential housing and job growth. Policies included in the proposed General Plan are expected to substantially reduce GHG emissions. The City finds that in order to be on track to reach the State’s emissions reduction goal for 2050, and still accommodate growth, action at the regional or State level will be necessary.

Noise

- g. **Impact 3.6-1** New development under the proposed General Plan could result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels.

Mitigation Measures

Given the uncertainty as to whether future noise impacts could be adequately mitigated for all individual projects, potential impacts related to substantial permanent increases in ambient noise related to traffic, railroads, and stationary sources are considered significant and unavoidable.

Policies

The following proposed policies would reduce Noise Impact 3.6-1:

- 9.4-a **Land Use Compatibility.** Ensure that new development is compatible with the noise environment, by continuing to use potential noise exposure as a criterion in land use planning.
- 9.4-b **Prevent Degradation of Noise Environment.** Protect public health and welfare by eliminating existing noise problems where feasible, maintaining an acceptable indoor and outdoor acoustic environment, and preventing significant degradation of the acoustic environment.

Decreasing noise magnitude at the source and limiting the times certain types and volumes of noise can occur are two of the approaches to noise attenuation taken in the City's Noise Control Ordinance.

- 9.4-c **Protect Residential Areas and Sensitive Uses.** Minimize excessive noise exposure in residential areas and in the vicinity of such uses as schools, hospitals, and senior care facilities.
- 9.4-d **Required Noise Analysis.** Use the noise and land use compatibility matrix (Table 9-1) and Future Noise Contours map (Figure 9-2) as review criteria for all new development. For proposed development located where projected noise exposure would be other than “normally acceptable,” and which require discretionary review, require that a noise analysis be conducted.

A required noise analysis should:

- Be prepared by a certified noise consultant or acoustical engineer;
 - Be funded by the applicant;
 - Include a representative, on-site day and night sound level measurement;
 - Include a delineation of current (measured) and projected (10 years) noise contours with and without the proposed project, ranging from 55 to 75 dBA (L_{dn}) within the proposed development site; and
 - Include a description of adequate and appropriate noise abatement measures where sound measurements exceed Table 9-1 standards for the proposed use.
- 9.4-e **Noise-Attenuating Features.** For all projects that have noise exposure levels other than “normally acceptable” and which require discretionary review, require site planning and architecture to incorporate noise-attenuating features. With mitigation, development should meet allowable outdoor and indoor noise exposure standards in Table 9-2. In particular, new residential, transient lodging, school, library, church, hospital, and convalescent home development should be designed to provide a suitable interior noise environment of no greater than 45 dB CNEL or L_{dn} .

Site planning measures include setbacks, building placement in relation to topography, and orientation of sensitive indoor and outdoor activity areas away from noise sources.

Building measures may include:

- Façades constructed substantial weight and insulation;

- Sound-rated windows and doors;
- Active cancellation;
- Acoustic baffling of vents for chimneys, fans, and gable ends;
- Ventilation system affording comfort under closed-window conditions;
- Double doors and heavy roofs with ceilings of two layers of gypsum board on resilient channels.

9.4-g **Noise-Sensitive Uses—Required Mitigation.** Do not allow new development of noise-sensitive uses where the noise level due to non-transportation noise sources will exceed the noise level standards of Table 9-3, as measured immediately within the property line of the new development, unless effective noise mitigation measures have been incorporated into the development design to achieve the standards specified in the table.

9.4-h **Non-Transportation Noise Sources—Required Mitigation.** Require mitigation of noise created by new proposed non-transportation noise sources so that it does not exceed the noise level standards of Table 9-3 as measured immediately within the property line of lands designated for noise-sensitive uses. Appropriate mitigation measures include:

- Dampen or actively cancel noise sources;
- Increase setbacks for noise sources from adjacent dwellings;
- Use soundproofing materials and double-glazed windows;
- Screen and control noise sources, such as parking and loading facilities, outdoor activities, and mechanical equipment;
- Use open space, building orientation and design, landscaping and running water to mask sounds; and
- Control hours of operation, including deliveries and trash pickup.

This policy does not apply to noise sources associated with agricultural operations on lands zoned for agricultural uses.

9.4-i **Noise Ordinance.** Continue to enforce the City Noise Control Ordinance and update as necessary.

The City's ordinance addresses a wide range of noise-generating activities, establishing community standards and providing a basis for enforcement.

9.4-j **Transportation Noise Buffers.** Where feasible, develop and implement noise reduction measures when undertaking improvements, extensions, or design changes to City streets. Measures may involve some combination of setbacks, earth berms, solid noise walls, placement of non-occupancy accessory structures or windowless building sites towards the noise source, and building insulation techniques.

Mitigation through the design and construction of a noise barrier (wall, berm, or combination wall/berm) is the most common way of alleviating traffic noise impacts. Noise barriers often have the disadvantage of unsightliness; however,

properly landscaped berms or walls shielded with climbing vines can, over time, become visual assets. The use of noise barriers should be minimized.

Findings

The City finds that noise resulting from vehicles, trains, and stationary operations are expected to increase as a result of the proposed General Plan. Increases are expected to occur both along existing roadways in developed areas and along new roadways in future growth areas, and in the vicinity of new stationary operations, particularly industrial uses. The City finds that additional vehicles traveling along local roadways outweighs potential impacts on existing and future land use resulting from noise. The actual level of impact will depend on the presence and location of existing or proposed land uses or barriers in relation to the noise source. The City will continue to implement its Noise Ordinance. In addition, the City will ensure that noise analysis and mitigation be conducted for individual projects (with project-specific data) that will, if possible, mitigate potential noise impacts to a less-than-significant level. However, given the uncertainty as to whether future noise impacts could be adequately mitigated for all individual projects, the City finds that potential impacts related to substantial permanent increases in ambient noise related to traffic, railroads, and stationary sources are considered significant and unavoidable.

B. Findings Regarding Impacts Reduced to a Less Than Significant Level

As authorized by California Public Resources Code Section 21081 and Sections 15091, 15092 and 15093 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, the City finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project, which mitigate or avoid certain significant environmental impacts.

Policies have been included in the General Plan to avoid or reduce to a level of insignificance those impacts that can be avoided or reduced. Based upon the EIR and the entire record before this City, the City finds that the mitigation measures identified in the FEIR and proposed General Plan policies are feasible and hereby incorporated into the proposed General Plan. The mitigation measures will reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.

C. Findings Regarding Significant and Irreversible Changes

CEQA Guidelines require the EIR to consider whether “uses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project may be irreversible since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or nonuse thereafter unlikely” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(c)). “Nonrenewable resource” refers to the physical features of the natural environment, for example land and waterways. Irretrievable commitments of non-renewable resources associated with the proposed Turlock General Plan include:

Air Quality

Increases in vehicle trips and traffic resulting from implementation of the proposed General Plan would potentially contribute to long-term degradation of air quality and atmospheric conditions in the region, other parts of California, and the Western United States. However, technological improvements in automobiles, as well as commercial and industrial machinery, may lower the rate of air quality degradation in the coming decades.

Agricultural Land and Open Space

Development under the proposed General Plan could result in the permanent conversion of approximately 1,986 acres of farmland to urban uses, 57 percent of which is classified as Prime Farmland. This conversion

has a wide array of impacts, ranging from habitat modifications to visual disruptions to new noise sources and stormwater drainage constraints. Overall, this represents a significant and irreversible environmental change.

Water Consumption

New development under the proposed General Plan will increase the demand for public water. It would place a greater demand on the city's Municipal Services Department, which derives its water from groundwater sources in the Turlock Sub-Basin of the San Joaquin Groundwater Basin, to increase its water capacity. After the city grows to a population that requires more than the annual sustainable rate of groundwater supply (approximately 24,550 acre-feet), anticipated to occur around 2017, the city will have to implement a new water supply system either involving surface water or treated shallow groundwater. This increased demand for public water represents an irreversible environmental change.

Energy sources

New development under the proposed General Plan would result in increased energy use, in the form of new buildings and transportation. Both residential and nonresidential development use electricity, natural gas, and petroleum products for power, lighting, heating, and other indoor and outdoor services; cars use both oil and gasoline. Use of these types of energy for new development would result in the overall increased use of nonrenewable energy resources. This represents an irreversible environmental change.

Construction related impacts

Irreversible environmental changes could also occur during the course of constructing development projects made possible by the proposed General Plan. New construction would result in the consumption of building materials, such as lumber, sand and gravel for construction. Some of these resources are already being depleted worldwide.

D. Findings Regarding Growth Inducing Impacts

The EIR must examine the potential growth-inducing impacts of the proposed General Plan. More specifically, CEQA Guidelines require that the EIR "discuss the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly" (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d)). This analysis must also consider the removal of obstacles to population growth, such as improvements in the regional transportation system.

Population

The Study Area will accommodate a maximum population of approximately 126,800 people at buildout, an increase of about 78 percent over the 2010 estimated population of 71,100. This represents an average annual growth rate of 2.9 percent, which is slightly higher than the rate of 2.6 percent experienced in the city over the last 20 years. The proposed General Plan accommodates 25 percent more residents than the No Project scenario, which allows for a population of 101,600 people. Growth projections for Turlock for 2030 range from around 104,000 total residents to 126,800 total residents (midpoint of 115,000), meaning that the proposed Plan accommodates the high end of the projection. The decision to create a General Plan that can accommodate the maximum level of projected growth is policy-based; it is quite possible that Turlock will not experience this maximum level of growth, and that therefore the full extent of urban development permitted under the proposed Plan would not be needed. The master planning and phasing policies included in the Plan allow for less population to be accommodated while still ensuring that new development areas are well-planned, cohesive, and compact.

Housing Units

Turlock currently contains some 24,400 housing units. Approximately 1,400 housing units have recently been approved or are under construction. The proposed General Plan accommodates 19,200 new residential units, beyond those in the pipeline. Together, this results in the potential for 45,000 housing units, an increase of 71 percent above existing and approved units. Approximately 58 percent of the housing units will be low-density single-family detached, 16 percent single family attached (low/medium density townhouses and duplexes), and the remaining 26 percent higher density multifamily and mixed-use residential.

Employment

Turlock currently has approximately 28,260 jobs. Total additional employment accommodated in the General Plan by new commercial, office, industrial, and mixed-use land designations could allow for 32,000 new jobs in Turlock. In sum, Turlock could accommodate up to 62,260 jobs under the General Plan, an increase of 113 percent. Similarly, the proposed General Plan accommodates 53 percent more jobs than the No Project scenario, which could support 49,130 jobs.

Jobs/Employment Balance

A city's jobs/employment ratio (jobs to employed residents) would be 1:1 if the number of jobs in the city equaled the number of employed residents. In theory, such a balance would eliminate the need for commuting. More realistically, a balance means that in-commuting and out-commuting are matched, leading to efficient use of the transportation system, particularly during peak hours. The current jobs/employment ratio in Turlock is 1.06, which is already very balanced. The proposed General Plan will add more jobs than population. By 2030, the jobs/employment ratio should improve to 1.19, with the potential for reducing out-commuting for work.

Indirect growth-inducing impacts such as those associated with job increases that might affect housing and retail demand in other jurisdictions over an extended time period are difficult to assess with precision, since future economic trends may be influenced by unforeseeable events, such as natural disasters and business and development cycles. Moreover, long-term changes in economic and population growth are often regional in scope; they are not influenced solely by changes or policies in Turlock.

Increase in Regional Housing Demand

As the employment base in Turlock increases, more people may be drawn to Turlock and surrounding areas, thereby increasing housing demand in both Turlock and other adjacent areas that are within commuting distance. Proposed new employment would primarily be located in central Turlock and in the Turlock Regional Industrial Park (TRIP), easily accessible from major transportation routes. Service to Turlock via regional bus service and potential future regional rail connections would also provide access to new jobs from other cities. In addition, the proposed General Plan has the potential to result in development of over 20,000 new housing units by the year 2030 at its maximum, which will help meet much of the increased housing need. Turlock's updated Housing Element, which addresses housing programs and how Turlock will accommodate its regional housing needs allocation, is part of the proposed General Plan. The Housing Element includes programs to address regional housing needs in the near term, and subsequent revisions will extend, modify, or add to these programs as needed to continue to respond to the City's "fair share" of regional housing needs, as required by law.

Growth Management

While Stanislaus County does not have a regional growth management policy in place, Turlock's proposed General Plan provides for the managed and orderly expansion of the city through its master planning system. With the delineation of master plans and phasing, and the policy that a subsequent master plan cannot proceed until 70 percent of building permits have been issued for the preceding one, the proposed General Plan seeks to ensure that new neighborhoods and employment centers are developed with the complete range of amenities, infrastructure, and land use mix to serve new residents and employees in a sustainable fashion. The master planning approach also helps prevent the premature conversion of farmland to urban uses and ensures that extension of services and utilities can be provided and financed.

While policies to regulate the location, pace, and timing of growth are included in the proposed General Plan, these will not restrict Turlock's ability to meet its housing need obligations or long-range growth projections by regional agencies. Key policies and strategies are described in Chapter 2: Project Description and Section 3.2: Land Use and Housing.

E. Findings Regarding Cumulative Impacts

CEQA requires that the EIR examine cumulative impacts. As discussed in CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(a)(1), a cumulative impact "consists of an impact which is created as a result of the combination of the project evaluated in the EIR together with other projects causing related impacts." Furthermore, the analysis of cumulative impacts need not provide the level of detail required of the analysis of impacts from the project itself, but shall "reflect the severity of the impacts and their likelihood of occurrence" (CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(b)).

In order to assess cumulative impacts, the EIR must analyze either a list of past, present, and probable future projects or a summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document. It is important to note that the proposed General Plan is essentially a set of projects, representing the cumulative development scenario for the reasonably foreseeable future in the Turlock Study Area. This future scenario incorporates the likely effects of surrounding regional growth.

By their nature, the air quality, transportation, noise, and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions analyses presented in Chapter 3: Settings, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures represent a cumulative analysis of the Study Area as a whole. As a result of adding the proposed General Plan to the regional land use and transportation baseline, the travel demand, level of service operations, and associated air quality and GHG emissions produced by the proposed project is the cumulative condition for CEQA purposes. Some cumulative impacts on agricultural resources, transportation, and noise are found to be significant; in addition, the cumulative effects on GHG emissions and air quality are found to be cumulatively significant, and the project's contribution cumulatively considerable.

Cumulative Effects on Water Quality

The proposed Project, in combination with regional growth and development, could increase impervious surfaces resulting in a greater chance of flood and potential impacts to water quality. However, due to the built-out nature of the Study Area, and the extensive Plan policies designed to improve stormwater management and reduce stormwater pollution, the proposed Project's contribution to this potentially significant cumulative impact is not cumulatively considerable.

Cumulative Effects on Birds and Animals

Increased noise, light, and habitat disturbance resulting from urban development both within the Study Area as well as in adjacent unincorporated areas could adversely affect biological resources such as migratory birds and other wildlife species. However, with applicable policies in place as described in the direct impact analysis in Chapter 3, the project's contribution to this potentially significant cumulative impact is not cumulatively considerable.

Cumulative Increases in Hazardous Materials

The increase in local population and employment could result in the increased use of hazardous household, commercial, and industrial materials, as well as a cumulative increase in exposure to risk associated with accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment. However, City, State, and federal regulations, such as those that control the production, use, and transportation of hazardous materials would apply to development countywide; therefore, the project's contribution to this potential cumulative impact is not cumulatively considerable.

Cumulative Effects on Historical Resources.

The accommodation of future growth also constitutes a (very low) likelihood that future development will encounter challenges associated with known and unknown historic resources. However, there is the possibility of cumulative impacts to historical resources in the future in the context of regional growth and development. The City of Turlock cannot be sure that all cumulative impacts on such historical resources can be mitigated to less than significant levels. Consequently, the proposed General Plan may have the potential to contribute to cumulative impacts to these historic resources. However, with implementation of proposed General Plan policies and state and federal law, the proposed Project's contribution to this significant cumulative impact is not cumulatively considerable.

F. Findings Regarding Alternatives to the Project

CEQA requires that an EIR describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the Project or to the location of the Project that could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the Project and to evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. Section 15126.6 (b) of the State CEQA Guidelines states that the "discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or to its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternative would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly." As more particularly set forth in the Final EIR, the Project was compared to the following alternatives:

- Alternative 1: Infill and development of master plan areas Southeast 1, 2, and 3 only;
- Alternative 2: Infill and development of master plan areas Southeast 1 through 5 only; and
- Alternative 3: No Project (1993 General Plan, partially updated in 2002)

The alternatives were rejected because the development potential does not meet the City's long term housing and economic needs nor achieve the proposed General Plan objectives related to the mix and balance of land uses or the urban form.

Alternative 1: Infill and development of master plan areas Southeast 1, 2, and 3 only

Alternative 1 fills in growth on infill sites and in master plan areas Southeast 1 (Morgan Ranch), Southeast 2, and Southeast 3 only—the equivalent of "Phase 1" of development of the proposed General Plan. This is

roughly the amount of new development that could take place before necessitating the construction of a new S.R. 99 interchange around Youngstown Road, in the southeast corner of the Study Area.

Alternative 1 could support a total of some 104,500 residents and 53,800 jobs, leading to a jobs/employed residents ratio of 1.29. The population that this alternative could support essentially meets Turlock's low-end population projection for 2030 of 106,000 residents. This alternative produces the fewest number of housing units, new residents, and jobs compared with the proposed project and Alternative 2, but more than the No Project alternative. The City finds that Alternative 1 is rejected as an alternative because it would not achieve the Project's objectives.

Alternative 2: Infill and development of master plan areas Southeast 1 through 5 only

Alternative 2 fills in growth on infill sites and in master plan areas Southeast 1 (Morgan Ranch), Southeast 2, Southeast 3, Southeast 4, and Southeast 5, filling out the Study Area boundary in the southeast. With the development of areas Southeast 4 and 5, a new freeway interchange at Youngstown Road, in the southeast corner of the Study Area, would be required, as would major upgrades to the potable water system. This alternative represents the maximum amount of residential development that could take place in Turlock under proposed density/intensity standards without moving west of S.R. 99.

Alternative 2 could support a total of approximately 114,800 residents and 57,700 jobs, leading to a jobs/employed residents ratio of 1.26. This alternative produces the greatest number of housing units, new residents, and jobs compared with the other alternatives, but less than the proposed project. This alternative would support the mid-point population projection for the city of 115,000 residents. The City finds that Alternative 2 is rejected as an alternative because it would not achieve the Project's objectives.

Alternative 3: No Project

The No Project Alternative assumes continuation of land development under the existing General Plan and the current Zoning Ordinance (which implements the General Plan). Similar to Alternative 2, this alternative would result in development of the full southeast quadrant of the Study Area, but with a different development pattern and lower overall densities and intensities. Even though it covers the same land area as Alternative 2, the No Project alternative would actually add the fewest number of new housing units and jobs of any alternative due to its lower overall density and intensity of development. Buildout under the No Project alternative would support 36,100 housing units, approximately 101,600 residents, and 49,100 jobs (a jobs/employed residents ratio of 1.21). Residential development under the No Project alternative falls short of meeting even the low end population projection for the City of 106,000 residents by 2030. The City finds that Alternative 3 is rejected as an alternative because it would not achieve the Project's objectives.

Environmentally Superior Alternative

CEQA Guidelines require the identification of an environmentally superior Alternative among the alternatives analyzed in an EIR. Alternative 1 has been selected as the environmentally superior alternative. Alternative 1 has the least impact, relative to the proposed General Plan, Alternative 2, and the No Project Alternative in five of the six environmental areas that have significant impacts: Traffic and Circulation, Agricultural Resources, Hydrology, Air Quality, and Noise.

The No Project Alternative results in the lowest amount of population growth, but due to its lower overall density and intensity of development, its larger urban development footprint results in greater development of agricultural land and the highest VMT and carbon emissions per service population of any of the

alternatives. It also does not include many of the policies that would ensure development of Complete Streets, greater energy efficiency and sustainable site design for new development, or others that reduce air pollution and carbon emissions. Additionally, the No Project Alternative would not support enough population to meet the low end population projection for Turlock in 2030, so it would not meet the city's future needs.

Alternative 1 has the lowest environmental impact overall, and the lowest amount of significant impacts, making it the environmentally superior alternative. While this is the case, by only accommodating the low end of Turlock's projected population growth, Alternative 1 could put more growth pressures on other cities in the region and unincorporated portions of Stanislaus and Merced counties.

Alternative 2 does a better job of meeting Turlock's anticipated growth needs, accommodating the projected midpoint of the city's population growth forecasts. Largely because it accommodates more population and jobs—resulting in more agricultural land converted and more vehicle miles traveled—Alternative 2 has a greater impact on the environment than Alternative 1, but not as high as the proposed Project. This alternative represents a “middle ground” between accommodating growth and minimizing impacts on the environment, but it is not environmentally superior.

The proposed General Plan would fully accommodate the maximum projected population and job growth in Turlock, and plans for its orderly, sequential development through a master planning process. The key difference between the proposed Plan and Alternatives 1 and 2 is the amount of population growth accommodated, manifested in where and how much land is urbanized. Specifically, the proposed Project includes a residential master plan area on the west side of SR 99. The inclusion of this master plan area represents a policy decision to allow growth to potentially take place in that area during this General Plan time period (in Phase II) versus leaving it for consideration in the next General Plan. It is possible that this last growth area would be required by 2030, but not a certainty.

Allowing growth in Turlock through contiguous responsible development relieves some of this pressure elsewhere in the region and ensures that Turlock plays its part in accommodating the San Joaquin Valley's growth in a sustainable, compact, urban form. The proposed General Plan achieves all plan objectives while establishing policies to reduce environmental impacts to, but overall it would have greater impacts on the environment than the alternatives due directly to its larger buildout population.

VI. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS AND BENEFITS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

A. Overriding Considerations

Pursuant to Public Resources Code § 21081, the City Council hereby finds that specific, overriding economic, legal, social, technological and other benefits of the Project outweigh significant effects on the environment as set forth in the Record. The significant, unavoidable impacts of the Project are determined to be “acceptable” in light of the important benefits of the project as described below. The Project benefits set forth herein would outweigh each and all of the Project's adverse, significant and unavoidable impacts. The City Council hereby adopts the following Statement of Overriding Considerations that explains why approval of the Project is warranted despite the six, previously described significant, adverse and unavoidable impacts.

B. Advancing Local Plans

A Statement of Overriding Considerations is warranted because the Project establishes and advances new community goals and policies to create a health vibrant city.

The State of California mandates that cities and counties in California adopt a comprehensive, long-term general plan for the physical development of the jurisdiction (Government Code 65300) and that it be periodically reviewed, and revised to be kept current (65103).

City Council Resolution 2009-063, passed and adopted on April 23, 2009, established the following vision statement for the General Plan:

“Turlock will grow sensibly and compactly, maintaining its small-town feel, while enhancing quality of life, meeting housing needs, and providing high quality jobs and recreation opportunities for its diverse population.”

The City Council and community vision is further articulated by 8 General Plan Themes:

1. Establish limits to urban growth that will maintain Turlock as a freestanding city surrounded by productive agricultural land.

The City’s identity, history, and economy derive from its site in the center of one of the richest agricultural regions in the country. Preserving farmland and maintaining Turlock as a free-standing community surrounded by farmland emerged as high priorities for residents. At the same time, new neighborhoods are needed to support the city’s growing population and the Westside Industrial Specific Plan adopted in 2002 as a 2,500-acre industrial job area. The General Plan balances these needs by both promoting infill development and planning for compact, mixed use neighborhoods that offer a high quality of life to new residents and are logical extensions of the current city limits. These two development strategies together can minimize conversion of prime agricultural land, one of the city’s greatest assets.

2. Maintain an economically and socially diverse population by promoting a greater variety of housing types citywide and a localized mix of housing types in some areas.

Numerous factors contribute to the need for Turlock to provide a wide variety of housing choices: changing demographics, an aging population, increasingly diverse family types, and the continued high cost of housing in California. Turlock residents come from many different household structures, circumstances, and income groups, and the General Plan calls for a more diverse housing stock to allow opportunities for all. Elderly persons, students, single-parent households, adults sharing housing, multifamily households and multigenerational households are household types that evolve from economic need or personal preference. Turlock’s economically and socially diverse population deserves a wide range of housing options.

3. Attract new businesses to Turlock to create well-paying jobs and maintain a good jobs/housing balance.

Population and economic growth in Turlock are intertwined. The city seeks to attract new industries and create jobs in order to boost revenue, remain competitive, attract new residents and provide opportunities for existing ones. The growing resident population demands increased goods and services, which in turn fuel economic growth. The General Plan takes a multi-pronged approach to economic development in order to achieve these goals: supporting the buildout of the Turlock Regional Industrial Park (TRIP) area,

drawing new businesses Downtown, identifying new industries to target, and building on existing assets such as California State University, Stanislaus.

4. Improve the local and regional circulation system to serve businesses and new residential development.

In order to foster balanced, sensible growth, it is critical that land use and transportation planning proceed hand in hand. Turlock's General Plan defines a comprehensive transportation network, emphasizing connectivity, logical spacing, multimodal service, and "right-sizing" of roads to match the travel demand generated by new homes and businesses in the city. Additionally, the plan identifies and responds to potential regional transportation developments, such as commuter and high speed rail, ensuring that Turlock residents can take full advantage of connections to the rest of the region and beyond.

5. Implement sustainable development and green building principles in City projects and new development projects. Foster development that encourages alternatives to auto use, especially for non-commute trips.

Issues of sustainability are addressed in elements throughout the General Plan: in Land Use, City Design, Circulation, Conservation, and more. By enabling alternatives to automobile travel and encouraging green building construction and sustainable site design, General Plan policies help achieve the increasingly important goals of protecting the natural environment and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Turlock's level topography makes it ideal for pedestrians and bicyclists. However, many destinations, such as shops, services, parks, and schools, are difficult or inconvenient to access from existing neighborhoods without a car. General Plan policies counter these trends by calling for the renewed use of traditional neighborhood street patterns and more provisions for bicycle use, including extension of the bicycle route system throughout the whole city. Related policies call for mixed use neighborhood centers, where services and amenities are easily accessible.

6. Revitalize and enhance older areas of Turlock. Create an economic and social balance among different city sectors. Enhance the County islands within the City limits, and annex them into the City if feasible.

While the General Plan expects Turlock's rapidly increasing population to require the development of new neighborhoods outside current city limits, it is an equal priority for current residents to maintain and improve Turlock's older neighborhoods and the Downtown. Numerous infill sites—including those in currently unincorporated County Islands—spread throughout the city's existing urban fabric offer opportunities to enhance the streetscape, raise property values, improve public services, and add housing and jobs close to where current residents live. Public realm improvements also help reduce crime and raise residents' quality of life, bringing greater socioeconomic balance to Turlock's various neighborhoods. Promoting infill development will also improve the economic viability of Downtown by increasing the number of residents who can walk there to enjoy central Turlock's historic charm and small-town ambiance.

7. Manage growth using the Master Planning process to implement General Plan policies and enhance Turlock's quality of life.

Growth management has been a key component of planning in Turlock since the early 1990s. The City's proactive approach to master planning, phasing, and service and infrastructure provision to new

development areas has distinguished it amongst Central Valley cities. The General Plan continues this planning tradition and strengthens it with a New Growth Areas and Infrastructure Element, which supports the City's area-wide planning, rezoning, and annexation policies. New master plan development areas are defined, with minimum and maximum densities, and the phasing of growth is established. This ensures that city services, public investment, and infrastructure can keep pace with development while still maintaining high standards for the existing urban area.

8. Provide a wide variety of recreation and cultural activities for all ages.

A key component of the General Plan is the enhancement of Turlock's park system and network of community and cultural facilities. While the City has built successful new parks in recent years, including popular sports facilities, the amount of projected population growth necessitates a new community park to serve the southeastern area of town. Turlock's existing parks will also be augmented by a system of multiuse linear parks and trails, linking new housing to neighborhood schools, parks, and shopping centers, providing space for walking/jogging for health and time with neighbors, and serving additional purposes of storm drainage and agricultural buffering.

C. Providing for Housing

A Statement of Overriding Considerations is warranted because the Project will accommodate nearly 45,000 new housing units to provide for community growth over the next 20 years, see DEIR Table 4.2-1: Comparison of Alternatives.

D. Providing for Jobs

A Statement of Overriding Considerations is warranted because the Project could potentially provide nearly 60,300 new employment opportunities over the next 20 years, see DEIR Table 4.2-1: Comparison of Alternatives.

E. Providing for Economic Development

A Statement of Overriding Considerations is warranted because the Project establishes a balanced land use pattern that will support revenue-generating uses to strengthen the local economy.

VII. CONCLUSION

The Turlock City Council hereby declares that the foregoing benefits provided to the public through approval and implementation of the Project outweighs the identified significant adverse environmental impacts of the Project that cannot be mitigated. The Turlock City Council finds that the Project benefits outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts identified in the EIR and, therefore, finds those impacts to be acceptable.

Exhibit B

City of Turlock General Plan

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Where a CEQA document has identified significant environmental effects, Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 requires adoption of a “reporting or monitoring program for the changes to the project which it has adopted or made a condition of a project approval to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment.” This Environmental Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been prepared to provide for the monitoring of mitigation measures required of the Turlock General Plan. The City of Turlock is the Lead Agency that must adopt the MMRP for development and operation of the project.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15097(d), “each agency has the discretion to choose its own approach to monitoring or reporting; and each agency has its own special expertise.” The Turlock General Plan and EIR were drafted in tandem as a part of a single cohesive, consistent, and mutually supportive process. As a part of the policy development of the Turlock General Plan, the City explicitly considered narrative policy, actions, and diagrammatic policies that could reduce environmental impacts associated with General Plan buildout. The City has, to the extent feasible, created a self-mitigating plan – one where the very design of the plan itself serves to reduce potential environmental impacts. Policies that would reduce or avoid environmental impacts are built into the General Plan and will be implemented and enforced through the application of the Turlock General Plan in land use and planning decisions. The monitoring plan for policies in the General Plan that would reduce or avoid impacts is the General Plan itself. The reporting program for these mitigating implementation policies is the City’s annual General Plan reporting process (see CEQA Guidelines Section 15097 (b)).

In addition, the EIR also identifies General Plan policy mitigation measures, in which the policy specifies working with or participating in the efforts of regional, state, and other regulatory agencies. In these circumstances, since the policy is included and addressed in the General Plan and thus becomes self-mitigating, the reporting program for these implementing policies is also the City’s annual General Plan reporting process. For example, for climate change Impact 3.5-2, mitigating policies include Policy 8.2-f, which points to participating in County efforts to update the Regional Transportation Plan and develop a Sustainable Communities Strategy. In this circumstance, it is not feasible for Turlock to meet the GHG reduction goal independently. However Policy 8.2-f specifically states that the City will complete the guide to lowering GHG emissions, and will participate with County and CARB efforts. Thus the impact is self-mitigating, and will also utilize the annual General Plan reporting process.

Therefore, as provided by CEQA, this document addresses only the mitigation measure that is separately identified in the EIR. Accordingly, this MMRP addresses a mitigation measure for hydrology Impact 3.12-1, the only impact that requires mitigation measures that extend beyond the General Plan implementing policies and are separately identified in the EIR. The City will coordinate monitoring and documenting

the implementation of this mitigation measure. Applicants of projects accommodated under the General Plan will be responsible for fully understanding and effectively implementing the mitigation measures contained within the MMRP. This report identifies both the responsible party for implementing the measure and the party responsible for monitoring the measure. The City is responsible for administration of the MMRP and for verifying that City staff members, applicants, or contractors have completed the necessary actions for each measure. This report will be kept on file with the City of Turlock's Planning Division.

All other mitigating implementation policies will be discussed annually in the General Plan reporting process.

1. Hydrology

- A. **Impact 3.12-1** Buildout of the proposed General Plan will lead to a water demand that exceeds the currently available and sustainable groundwater supply. (*Significant, Mitigable*)

B. **Proposed General Plan Policies that Reduce the Impact**

General Plan Policies 3.3-h through 3.3-q all improve the likelihood that the Regional Surface Water Supply Project (RSWSP) or other water supplies will be implemented before the time that groundwater demands exceeds 24,550 ac-ft per year (estimated to be the year 2017). However, because availability of water supplies is not completely assured, this impact is considered significant. The following policies shall be implemented to reduce Impact 3.12-1:

- 3.1-f Provide adequate public services. Ensure the adequacy of public services and facilities for all residents.**
- 3.3-h Water System Master Plan.** As needed, update the City's water master plan to estimate future water demands, identify an adequate supply of water to meet future demands, and identify how best to treat the water supply.
- 3.3-i Pursue Surface Water and Other Alternative Water Supply Sources.** Continue to pursue the use of treated surface water as a long term supply for municipal use, and evaluate other future water supply alternatives, including verifying the future water demands and evaluating the water supply strategies and funding strategies discussed above. (See conclusions in the section: Conclusions - Supply and Demand, under Water Demands, Supplies, and Distribution.) The RSWSP or some other methods should supply about 17,000 to 22,000 acre-feet per year of the City's estimated 2030 water demand of 37,220 acre-feet per year, and the ultimate buildout, including the entire TRIP, demand of 41,793 acre-feet per year. Surface water supplies (or other sources) will probably be needed by about the year 2017. Develop a new water supply project prior to construction of new development that generates a City-wide water demand above 24,550 acre feet per year from City wells, estimated to be the sustainable yield from the aquifer.
- 3.3-k Rate and Fee Studies.** Supplement the water system master plan with rate and fee studies to ensure adequate funds are collected through the City's water rates and development impact fees. Implement rate and fee increases as needed.
- 3.3-l Infrastructure Construction.** Design and construct water system infrastructure as needed to meet current and future water demands and system requirements.
- 3.3-m Conservation.** Continue to implement the comprehensive water conservation program for both new development and existing residences and businesses. Revise and improve the program as needed. Continue water conservation efforts, including the watering schedule, monitoring by Municipal Services staff, and advisory notices to households and businesses in violation of water

conservation standards. Continue to reduce per capita consumption through ongoing education and outreach efforts.

- 3.3-n **Recycled Water.** Continue and expand the use of recycled water from the Turlock Regional Water Quality Control Facility for non-potable purposes, including power plant cooling, landscape irrigation, agricultural irrigation, and other uses, including for use by the City of Turlock. Plan, design, and construct infrastructure needed to increase the use of recycled water.
- 3.3-o **Optimize Groundwater Recharge.** Establish requirements for appropriate BMPs in site planning of new development, so that natural drainage systems or groundwater recharge features are incorporated into developments. Participate in regional efforts to protect groundwater supplies and optimize groundwater recharge on a basin-wide basis.
- 3.3-p **Groundwater Related Coordination.** Support and cooperate with Regional (Turlock Groundwater Basin Management Association), County and State programs to protect valuable groundwater resources and facilitate groundwater recharge.
- 3.3-q **Reuse of Stormwater.** Continue to expand the use of storm water collected in detention basins for irrigation of public parks, street trees, and landscaping.

C. **Mitigation Measures**

The following measures shall be implemented, in addition to the Turlock General Plan policies listed above, to reduce significant impacts to the groundwater supply:

- Successfully implement the RSWSP by the time the groundwater demands exceeds 24,550 ac-ft per year (estimated to be the year 2017).
- Successfully identify and implement other potable water supply options by the time the groundwater demands exceeds 24,550 ac-ft per year (estimated to be the year 2017).
- Implement increased water conservation and/or increased use of recycled/nonpotable water within the City to reduce groundwater use and delay.

D. **Implementation and Monitoring Responsibility:**

- City of Turlock
- Project applicant
- Contractors

E. **Schedule**

- Plan approved by City prior to approval of discretionary development projects.
- Ongoing reporting, as appropriate.

F. Verifying Responsibility

- City of Turlock, Planning Division

BEFORE THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TURLOCK

IN THE MATTER OF ADOPTING A NEW } RESOLUTION NO. 2012-
GENERAL PLAN FOR THE CITY OF }
TURLOCK (GPA 2012-03) WITH THE }
PREFERRED LAND USE DIAGRAM }
DESCRIBED IN THE PUBLIC REVIEW }
DRAFT GENERAL PLAN AND ERRATA }
_____ }

WHEREAS, in Summer 2008 the City Council passed a Resolution affirming its intent to update the Turlock General Plan; and

WHEREAS, in October 2008 the City Council initiated the General Plan Update and the Environmental Impact Report to guide the effort; and

WHEREAS, in October 2008, the City entered into a Professional Services Agreement with Dyett and Bhatia, Urban and Regional Planners, to prepare an update of the Turlock General Plan and the Environmental Impact Report; and

WHEREAS, the General Plan Update effort has involved an extensive public participation and outreach program, including stakeholder interviews, five community meetings, meetings with special groups, and regular review by the Planning Commission and City Council to review data, reports, and options; and

WHEREAS, a draft General Plan was published in October 2011 for public review and comment; and

WHEREAS, on October 20, 2011, a public open house was held to receive community feedback; and

WHEREAS, the City staff and consultants considered numerous comments received on the draft General Plan, approved revisions to the draft General Plan, and forwarded the draft General Plan, as revised, to the Planning Commission and City Council for adoption; and

WHEREAS, the new General Plan meets legal adequacy requirements pursuant to California Government Code §§65300 – 65302; and

WHEREAS, a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) on the new General Plan was published on June 5, 2012 for a 45-day public review and comment period ending on July 20, 2012; and

WHEREAS, a Final EIR was published in August 23, 2012; and

WHEREAS, revisions to the General Plan were published in August 2012 in a Public Review Draft General Plan Errata, to ensure consistency with the Final EIR for

Planning Commission and City Council consideration; and

WHEREAS, the EIR evaluated the potential environmental impacts that could result from the approval of the Project, alternatives to the Project, and the self-mitigating General Plan implementing policies designed to mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts of the Project; and

WHEREAS, policies that would reduce or avoid environmental impacts are built into the General Plan and will be implemented and enforced through the application of the Turlock General Plan in land use and planning decisions. The monitoring plan for policies in the General Plan that would reduce or avoid impacts is the General Plan itself. The reporting program for these mitigating implementation policies is the City's annual General Plan reporting process; and

WHEREAS, for mitigation measures that extend beyond the General Plan implementing policies and are separately identified in the EIR, a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program has been developed in accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15097, and will be administered by the City; and

WHEREAS, after holding a public hearing on September 6, 2012, the Planning Commission recommended that the City Council adopt the new Turlock General Plan with the Alternative 1 Land Use Diagram described in the Draft Environmental Impact Report and provided its written recommendation to the Turlock City Council as transmitted in the City Council staff report; and

WHEREAS, on September 11, 2012 the City Council certified the Final EIR for the new Turlock General Plan, and adopted the "Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations" and "Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program" in accordance with CEQA Guidelines §§15091, 15093, and 15097; and

WHEREAS, on September 11, 2012 the City Council held a duly and properly noticed public hearing on the proposed new General Plan; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has considered the staff report, all public comments, and the proposed General Plan as set forth in this Resolution; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Turlock as follows:

1. The City Council hereby adopts the new Turlock General Plan with the Preferred Land Use Diagram described in the Public Review Draft General Plan and Errata, and all amendments for the development of the City shown in Exhibit A.

PASSED AND ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Turlock this 11th day of September 2012, by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
NOT PARTICIPATING:
ABSENT:

ATTEST:

Kellie E. Weaver, City Clerk,
City of Turlock, County of Stanislaus,
State of California

GPA 2012-02, REZONE 2012-03

LIST OF PROPERTIES WITHIN THE CITY OF TURLOCK THAT ARE AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN UPDATE AND CITYWIDE REZONE ACTION

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER	NAME OF PROPERTY OWNER	PROPERTY ADDRESS	CURRENT GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION	PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN LAND USE	CURRENT ZONING	PROPOSED ZONING
042001006000	38TH DIST AGRIC ASSOC	801 N SODERQUIST	LDR/HDR	PUB	R-L/R-H	P/S
042001007000	TURLOCK IRRIGATION DISTRICT	1601 W CANAL	LDR	PUB	R-L	P/S
042004016000	MC DONALD PAULINE H TR	71 ALMOND	MDR	HDR	R-M	R-H
042004022000	HENDRICKSON CLYDE	177 ALMOND	MDR	HDR	R-M	R-H
042004023000	HENDRICKSON ELEANOR	191 ALMOND	MDR	HDR	R-M	R-H
042004042000	LOPES RICHARD W TR	123 ALMOND	MDR	HDR	R-M	R-H
042005055000	PHILLIP CARNES	333 ALMOND	MDR	HDR	R-M	R-H
042010003000	CITY OF TURLOCK	1418 N GOLDEN STATE	CC	PUB	C-C	P/S
042010013000	YOUHANA EI ESTHER	1250 N GOLDEN STATE	HC	CC	C-H	C-C
042010014000	GULMON GARY & GULMON MARCELLA	600 20TH CENTURY	HC	CC	C-H	C-C
042010023000	CITY OF TURLOCK	1418 N GOLDEN STATE	CC	PUB	C-C	P/S
042011008000	GIANNELL ALFRED TRS & GIANNELL MARILYN M	141 20TH CENTURY	MDR	HDR	R-M	R-H
042011040000	GIANNELL ALFRED TRS & GIANNELL MARILYN M	145 20TH CENTURY	MDR	HDR	R-M	R-H
042027003000	WATCHOUS DOUGLAS D & WATCHOUS JOSETTE	1208 COLORADO	LDR	MDR/O	R-L	R-M/O
042027004000	VIERRA RHONDA DARLENE	1204 COLORADO	LDR	MDR/O	R-L	R-M/O
042027005000	STAVRIANOU DAKIS JOHN	1128 COLORADO	LDR	MDR/O	R-L	R-M/O
042028002000	CUAN MARTHA L	1104 COLORADO	LDR	HDR	R-L	R-H
0430160004000	CLEMENTS MARCUS D & DANIELLE	1201 FIFTH	LDR	HDR	R-L	R-H
0430160005000	PERRY JOSEPH D ET AL TRS	1233 FIFTH	LDR	HDR	R-L	R-H
043059001000	BORN CLINTON P TRS & BORN CATHY D	1137 FIFTH	PARK	MDR	R-L	R-M
0430600023000	SUNVISTA LLC	1309 FIFTH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
0430600024000	SUNVISTA LLC	1325 FIFTH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
044008003000	TREJO OSCAR JIMENEZ	117 S TULLY	I	HC	I	C-H
044008004000	BANK OF NEW YORK MELLON TRUSTEE	125 S TULLY	I	HC	I	C-H
044008005000	RAM AJAI & SURIYA TRS	133 S TULLY	I	HC	I	C-H
044008009000	2925 E WHITMORE AVE LLC	309 S TULLY	I	HC	I	C-H
044008010000	WIDDOWSON RICHARD B	317 S TULLY	I	HC	I	C-H
044008011000	BROWN BRADLEY R	319 S TULLY	I	HC	I	C-H
044008012000	BROWN BRADLEY R	325 S TULLY	I	HC	I	C-H
044008013000	BROWN BRADLEY R	333 S TULLY	I	HC	I	C-H
044008030000	BROWN BRADLEY R	441 S TULLY	I	HC	I	C-H
044008032000	GARCIA ANALICIA	449 S TULLY	I	HC	I	C-H
050002016000	BARRON CONCEPCION E	1014 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050002017000	LAO SCOTT	1036 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050002018000	MENDEZ PEDRO A & VIRGINIA TRS	413 DAVIS	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050002019000	DIAZ RAMON BARAJAS	405 DAVIS	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M

**GPA 2012-02, REZONE 2012-03
LIST OF PROPERTIES WITHIN THE CITY OF TURLOCK THAT ARE AFFECTED
BY THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN UPDATE AND CITYWIDE REZONE ACTION**

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER	NAME OF PROPERTY OWNER	PROPERTY ADDRESS	CURRENT GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION	PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN LAND USE	CURRENT ZONING	PROPOSED ZONING
050002020000	PAYNE JOHN G & PATSY J TRS	1074 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050002021000	ESTRADA JOHN A & CARMEN B TRS	1086 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050002022000	POLANCO IGNACIO & DE POLANCO MARIA MOLIN	1104 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050002048000	GUTIERREZ ANTONIO & DE GUTIERREZ MARGAR	418 S SODERQUIST	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050002049000	BAJWA BALDEV KAUR	430 S SODERQUIST	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050002050000	BAJWA SARDOOL SINGH & BALDEV KUAR	1108 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050002053000	LO JERRY & ELIZABETH	410 S SODERQUIST	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050002055000	SAHAGUN ELENA & ELIAS	1112 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050002056000	AGUILERA JOSE R ET AL	1106 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050002057000	ESCOBAR CARLOS ESCRIBA & ESCRIBA MARIA A	414 S SODERQUIST	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050003028000	ORTIZ ANGELINA	992 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050003029000	COLEMAN FRIEDA N	986 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050003030000	CHAHAL GURPARTAP & SATINDER	942 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050003031000	MIRANDA BEATRICE A	0 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050003032000	MICHAELS DAVID & DIANA	914 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050003041000	ESQUER ROSA ET AL	327 WEST	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050003042000	STANISLAUS COUNTY AFFORDABLE HOUSING C	337 WEST	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050018038000	FOSTER FRED A & FOSTER LUCRETIA J	1291 LANDER	LDR&HC	HC	R-L/C-H	C-H
050018039000	PRICKETT PHILIP & PRICKETT TRUDY	1341 LANDER	LDR&HC	HC	R-L/C-H	C-H
050018046000	BALLARD SHIRLEY A ET AL TRS	1241 LANDER	LDR&HC	HC	R-L/C-H	C-H
050018061000	ESQUIVEL JAIME & ELIZABETH G	1261 LANDER	LDR&HC	HC	R-L/C-H	C-H
050031064000	UTILITY SERVICE & ELECTRIC INC	711 LANDER	HDR&CC	HC	R-L/C-H	C-H
071005003000	CA STATE UNIVERSITY STANISLAUS	890 ZEERING	HDR/CO	HDR	R-H/C-O	R-H
071006014000	PHOENIX FAMILY LP	900 W MONTE VISTA	MDR	CC	R-M	C-C
071009034000	SNIDER SCOTT P TRS ET AL	105 W MINNESOTA	MDR	CC	R-M	C-C
071014005000	MIN LYN INVESTMENT LLC	811 W HAWKEYE	HC	CC	C-H	C-C
071014011000	M & B BRUNO FAMILY LP.	1828 DIVANIAN	HC	CC	C-H	C-C
071014012000	M & B BRUNO FAMILY LP.	1814 DIVANIAN	HC	CC	C-H	C-C
071014013000	ROACH DENNIS JAMES	1810 DIVANIAN	HC	CC	C-H	C-C
071015009000	CARVALHO ALBERT D ET AL TRS	100 PEDRAS	MDR	HDR	R-M	R-H
071015020000	HAMLOW RANCHES INC	1901 GEER	O	HDR	C-O	R-H
071066067000	SNIDER ROBIN COLETTE ET AL	4131 GEER	CC/O	HDR/CC	C-C/O	R-H/C-C
072010004000	BAL SUKHBIR	200 E MONTE VISTA	LDR	CC	R-L	C-C
072010005000	RON SEKHON	206 E MONTE VISTA	LDR	CC	R-L	C-C
072010006000	RON SEKHON	212 E MONTE VISTA	LDR	CC	R-L	C-C
072010007000	RON SEKHON	218 E MONTE VISTA	LDR	CC	R-L	C-C

Exhibit A
**GPA 2012-02, REZONE 2012-03
 LIST OF PROPERTIES WITHIN THE CITY OF TURLOCK THAT ARE AFFECTED
 BY THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN UPDATE AND CITYWIDE REZONE ACTION**

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER	NAME OF PROPERTY OWNER	PROPERTY ADDRESS	CURRENT GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION	PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN LAND USE	CURRENT ZONING	PROPOSED ZONING
072010050000	MOBASHERPOUR SAEED & LISA	107 HEDSTROM	LDR	O	R-L	C-O
072010051000	ALAHVERDI EDWARD & SWIDLANA	101 HEDSTROM	LDR	O	R-L	C-O
088007004000	ASSYRIAN AMERICAN CIVIC CLUB	2700 N GOLDEN STATE	HC	CC	C-H	C-C
088007005000	ASSYRIAN AMER CIV CLUB OF TURL	2618 N GOLDEN STATE	HC	CC	C-H	C-C
088007024000	ASSYRIAN AMER CIV CLUB OF TURL	2618 N GOLDEN STATE	HC	CC	C-H	C-C
088007025000	SANDHU KARNAIL S ET AL	2500 N GOLDEN STATE	HC	CC	C-H	C-C
089013011000	SUPHERB FARMS	400 DIANNE	PARK	I	IBP	I
089013020000	SUPHERB FARMS	300 DIANNE	BP	I	IBP (PD-135)	I (PD-135)
089015001000	TURLOCK CEMETERY ASSN	700 N TULLY	LDR	PUB	R-L	P/S
089018001000	MOUNTAIN VIEW DEVELOPMENT INC	300 N TULLY	CC	O	C-C (PD-234)	C-O
089018003000	WHITAKER RONALD & SANDRA	200 N TULLY	CC	LDR	C-C (PD-234)	R-L
089018030000	MOUNTAIN VIEW DEVELOPMENT INC	200 N TULLY	CC	O	C-C	C-O
089019006000	LILY M OSSO	1331 DIANNE	O&CC	CC	C-O&C-C	C-C

BEFORE THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TURLOCK

IN THE MATTER OF ADOPTING A NEW } RESOLUTION NO. 2012-
GENERAL PLAN FOR THE CITY OF }
TURLOCK (GPA 2012-03) WITH THE }
ALTERNATIVE 1 LAND USE DIAGRAM }
DESCRIBED IN THE DRAFT }
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, }
AMENDING GUIDING POLICY 3.1-G AND }
IMPLEMENTATION POLICY 3.1-P AS }
NEEDED, AND DIRECTING STAFF TO }
REVISE THE PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT }
GENERAL PLAN IN ACCORDANCE WITH }
THE ALTERNATIVE 1 LAND USE DIAGRAM, }
AS RECOMMENDED BY THE PLANNING }
COMMISSION }
_____ }

WHEREAS, in Summer 2008 the City Council passed a Resolution affirming its intent to update the Turlock General Plan; and

WHEREAS, in October 2008 the City Council initiated the General Plan Update and the Environmental Impact Report to guide the effort; and

WHEREAS, in October 2008, the City entered into a Professional Services Agreement with Dyett and Bhatia, Urban and Regional Planners, to prepare an update of the Turlock General Plan and the Environmental Impact Report; and

WHEREAS, the General Plan Update effort has involved an extensive public participation and outreach program, including stakeholder interviews, five community meetings, meetings with special groups, and regular review by the Planning Commission and City Council to review data, reports, and options; and

WHEREAS, a draft General Plan was published in October 2011 for public review and comment; and

WHEREAS, on October 20, 2011, a public open house was held to receive community feedback; and

WHEREAS, the City staff and consultants considered numerous comments received on the draft General Plan, approved revisions to the draft General Plan, and forwarded the draft General Plan, as revised, to the Planning Commission and City Council for adoption; and

WHEREAS, the new General Plan meets legal adequacy requirements pursuant to California Government Code §§65300 – 65302; and

WHEREAS, a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) on the new General Plan was published on June 5, 2012 for a 45-day public review and comment period ending on July 20, 2012; and

WHEREAS, a Final EIR was published in August 23, 2012; and

WHEREAS, revisions to the General Plan were published in August 2012 in a Public Review Draft General Plan Errata, to ensure consistency with the Final EIR for Planning Commission and City Council consideration; and

WHEREAS, the EIR evaluated the potential environmental impacts that could result from the approval of the Project, alternatives to the Project, and the self-mitigating General Plan implementing policies designed to mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts of the Project; and

WHEREAS, policies that would reduce or avoid environmental impacts are built into the General Plan and will be implemented and enforced through the application of the Turlock General Plan in land use and planning decisions. The monitoring plan for policies in the General Plan that would reduce or avoid impacts is the General Plan itself. The reporting program for these mitigating implementation policies is the City's annual General Plan reporting process; and

WHEREAS, for mitigation measures that extend beyond the General Plan implementing policies and are separately identified in the EIR, a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program has been developed in accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15097, and will be administered by the City; and

WHEREAS, after holding a public hearing on September 6, 2012, the Planning Commission recommended that the City Council adopt the new Turlock General Plan with the Alternative 1 Land Use Diagram described in the Draft Environmental Impact Report and provided its written recommendation to the Turlock City Council as transmitted in the City Council staff report; and

WHEREAS, on September 11, 2012 the City Council certified the Final EIR for the new Turlock General Plan, and adopted the "Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations" and "Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program" in accordance with CEQA Guidelines §§15091, 15093, and 15097; and

WHEREAS, on September 11, 2012 the City Council held a duly and properly noticed public hearing on the proposed new General Plan; and

WHEREAS, on September 11, 2012, the City Council considered a motion modifying Guiding Policy 3.1-g and Implementation Policy 3.1-p by adding the following language: "*Prior to proceeding with the planning, annexation and development of Southeast Master Plan 2, 70 percent of the building permits shall be issued for the Northeast Master Plan, East Tuolumne Master Plan, and Southeast Master Plan 1,*

calculated on a cumulative basis", and amends the General Plan as needed based upon the results of that motion; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has considered the staff report, all public comments, and the proposed General Plan as set forth in this Resolution.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Turlock as follows:

1. The City Council hereby adopts the new Turlock General Plan with the Alternative 1 Land Use Diagram described in the Draft Environmental Impact Report and directing staff to revise the Public Review Draft General Plan in accordance with the Alternative 1 Land Use Diagram, as recommended by the Planning Commission.
2. The City Council hereby adopts all amendments for the development of the City shown in Exhibit A.

PASSED AND ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Turlock this 11th day of September 2012, by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
NOT PARTICIPATING:
ABSENT:

ATTEST:

Kellie E. Weaver, City Clerk,
City of Turlock, County of Stanislaus,
State of California

GPA 2012-02, REZONE 2012-03

LIST OF PROPERTIES WITHIN THE CITY OF TURLOCK THAT ARE AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN UPDATE AND CITYWIDE REZONE ACTION

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER	NAME OF PROPERTY OWNER	PROPERTY ADDRESS	CURRENT GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION	PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN LAND USE	CURRENT ZONING	PROPOSED ZONING
042001006000	38TH DIST AGRIC ASSOC	801 N SODERQUIST	LDR/HDR	PUB	R-L/R-H	P/S
042001007000	TURLOCK IRRIGATION DISTRICT	1601 W CANAL	LDR	PUB	R-L	P/S
042004016000	MC DONALD PAULINE H TR	71 ALMOND	MDR	HDR	R-M	R-H
042004022000	HENDRICKSON CLYDE	177 ALMOND	MDR	HDR	R-M	R-H
042004023000	HENDRICKSON ELEANOR	191 ALMOND	MDR	HDR	R-M	R-H
042004042000	LOPES RICHARD W TR	123 ALMOND	MDR	HDR	R-M	R-H
042005055000	PHILLIP CARNES	333 ALMOND	MDR	HDR	R-M	R-H
042010003000	CITY OF TURLOCK	1418 N GOLDEN STATE	CC	PUB	C-C	P/S
042010013000	YOUHANA EI ESTHER	1260 N GOLDEN STATE	HC	CC	C-H	C-C
042010014000	GULMON GARY & GULMON MARCELLA	600 20TH CENTURY	HC	CC	C-H	C-C
042010023000	CITY OF TURLOCK	1418 N GOLDEN STATE	CC	PUB	C-C	P/S
042011008000	GIANNELL ALFRED TRS & GIANNELL MARILYN M	141 20TH CENTURY	MDR	HDR	R-M	R-H
042011040000	GIANNELL ALFRED TRS & GIANNELL MARILYN M	145 20TH CENTURY	MDR	HDR	R-M	R-H
042027003000	WATCHOU DOUGLAS D & WATCHOUS JOSETTE	1208 COLORADO	LDR	MDR/O	R-L	R-M/O
042027004000	VIERRA RHONDA DARLENE	1204 COLORADO	LDR	MDR/O	R-L	R-M/O
042027005000	STAVRIANOUDAKIS JOHN	1128 COLORADO	LDR	MDR/O	R-L	R-M/O
042028002000	CUAN MARTHA L	1104 FIFTH	LDR	HDR	R-L	R-H
043016004000	CLEMENTS MARCUS D & DANIELLE	1201 FIFTH	LDR	HDR	R-L	R-H
043016005000	PERRY JOSEPH D ET AL TRS	1233 FIFTH	LDR	HDR	R-L	R-H
043059001000	BORN CLINTON P TRS & BORN CATHY D	1137 FIFTH	PARK	MDR	R-L	R-M
043060023000	SUNVISTA LLC	1309 FIFTH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
043060024000	SUNVISTA LLC	1325 FIFTH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
044008003000	TREJO OSCAR JIMENEZ	117 S TULLY	I	HC	I	C-H
044008004000	BANK OF NEW YORK MELLON TRUSTEE	125 S TULLY	I	HC	I	C-H
044008005000	RAM AJAI & SURIYA TRS	133 S TULLY	I	HC	I	C-H
044008009000	2925 E WHITMORE AVE LLC	309 S TULLY	I	HC	I	C-H
044008010000	WIDDOWSON RICHARD B	317 S TULLY	I	HC	I	C-H
044008011000	BROWN BRADLEY R	319 S TULLY	I	HC	I	C-H
044008012000	BROWN BRADLEY R	325 S TULLY	I	HC	I	C-H
044008013000	BROWN BRADLEY R	333 S TULLY	I	HC	I	C-H
044008030000	BROWN BRADLEY R	441 S TULLY	I	HC	I	C-H
044008032000	GARCIA ANALICIA	449 S TULLY	I	HC	I	C-H
050002016000	BARRON CONCEPCION E	1014 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050002017000	LAO SCOTT	1036 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050002018000	MELENDEZ PEDRO A & VIRGINIA TRS	413 DAVIS	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050002019000	DIAZ RAMON BARAJAS	405 DAVIS	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M

**GPA 2012-02, REZONE 2012-03
LIST OF PROPERTIES WITHIN THE CITY OF TURLOCK THAT ARE AFFECTED
BY THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN UPDATE AND CITYWIDE REZONE ACTION**

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER	NAME OF PROPERTY OWNER	PROPERTY ADDRESS	CURRENT GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION	PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN LAND USE	CURRENT ZONING	PROPOSED ZONING
050002020000	PAYNE JOHN G & PATSY J TRS	1074 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050002021000	ESTRADA JOHN A & CARMEN B TRS	1086 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050002022000	POLANCO IGNACIO & DE POLANCO MARIA MOLIN	1104 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050002048000	GUTIERREZ ANTONIO & DE GUTIERREZ MARGAR	418 S SODERQUIST	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050002049000	BAJWA BALDEV KAUR	430 S SODERQUIST	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050002050000	BAJWA SARDOOL SINGH & BALDEV KUAR	1108 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050002053000	LO JERRY & ELIZABETH	410 S SODERQUIST	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050002055000	SAHAGUN ELENA & ELIAS	1112 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050002056000	AGUILERA JOSE R ET AL	1106 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050002057000	ESCOBAR CARLOS ESCRIBA & ESCRIBA MARIA A	414 S SODERQUIST	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050003028000	ORTIZ ANGELINA	992 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050003029000	COLEMAN FRIEDA N	986 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050003030000	CHAHAL GURPARTAP & SATINDER	942 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050003031000	MIRANDA BEATRICE A	0 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050003032000	MICHAELS DAVID & DIANA	914 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050003041000	ESQUER ROSA ET AL	327 WEST	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050003042000	STANISLAUS COUNTY AFFORDABLE HOUSING C	337 WEST	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050018038000	FOSTER FRED A & FOSTER LUCRETIA J	1291 LANDER	LDR&HC	HC	R-L/C-H	C-H
050018039000	PRICKETT PHILIP & PRICKETT TRUDY	1341 LANDER	LDR&HC	HC	R-L/C-H	C-H
050018046000	BALLARD SHIRLEY A ET AL TRS	1241 LANDER	LDR&HC	HC	R-L/C-H	C-H
050018061000	ESQUIVEL JAIME & ELIZABETH G	1261 LANDER	LDR&HC	HC	R-L/C-H	C-H
050031064000	UTILITY SERVICE & ELECTRIC INC	711 LANDER	HDR&CC	HC	R-L/C-H	C-H
071005003000	CA STATE UNIVERSITY STANISLAUS	890 ZEERING	HDR/CO	HDR	R-H/C-O	R-H
071006014000	PHOENIX FAMILY LP	900 W MONTE VISTA	MDR	CC	R-M	C-C
071009034000	SNIDER SCOTT P TRS ET AL	105 W MINNESOTA	MDR	CC	R-M	C-C
071014005000	MIN LYN INVESTMENT LLC	811 W HAWKEYE	HC	CC	C-H	C-C
071014011000	M & B BRUNO FAMILY LP.	1828 DIVANIAN	HC	CC	C-H	C-C
071014012000	M & B BRUNO FAMILY LP.	1814 DIVANIAN	HC	CC	C-H	C-C
071014013000	ROACH DENNIS JAMES	1810 DIVANIAN	HC	CC	C-H	C-C
071015009000	CARVALHO ALBERT D ET AL TRS	100 PEDRAS	MDR	HDR	R-M	R-H
071015020000	HAMLOW RANCHES INC	1901 GEER	O	HDR	C-O	R-H
071066067000	SNIDER ROBIN COLETTE ET AL	4131 GEER	CC/O	HDR/CC	C-C/O	R-H/C-C
072010004000	BAL SUKHBIR	200 MONTE VISTA	LDR	CC	R-L	C-C
072010005000	RON SEKHON	206 MONTE VISTA	LDR	CC	R-L	C-C
072010006000	RON SEKHON	212 MONTE VISTA	LDR	CC	R-L	C-C
072010007000	RON SEKHON	218 MONTE VISTA	LDR	CC	R-L	C-C

Exhibit A
GPA 2012-02, REZONE 2012-03
LIST OF PROPERTIES WITHIN THE CITY OF TURLOCK THAT ARE AFFECTED
BY THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN UPDATE AND CITYWIDE REZONE ACTION

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER	NAME OF PROPERTY OWNER	PROPERTY ADDRESS	CURRENT GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION	PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN LAND USE	CURRENT ZONING	PROPOSED ZONING
072010050000	MOBASHERPOUR SAEED & LISA	107 HEDSTROM	LDR	O	R-L	C-O
072010051000	ALAHVERDI EDWARD & SWIDLANA	101 HEDSTROM	LDR	O	R-L	C-O
088007004000	ASSYRIAN AMERICAN CIVIC CLUB	2700 N GOLDEN STATE	HC	CC	C-H	C-C
088007005000	ASSYRIAN AMER CIV CLUB OF TURL	2618 N GOLDEN STATE	HC	CC	C-H	C-C
088007024000	ASSYRIAN AMER CIV CLUB OF TURL	2618 N GOLDEN STATE	HC	CC	C-H	C-C
088007025000	SANDHU KARNAIL S ET AL	2500 N GOLDEN STATE	HC	CC	C-H	C-C
089013011000	SUPHERB FARMS	400 DIANNE	PARK	I	IBP	I
089013020000	SUPHERB FARMS	300 DIANNE	BP	I	IBP (PD-135)	I (PD-135)
089015001000	TURLOCK CEMETERY ASSN	700 TULLY	LDR	PUB	R-L	P/S
089018001000	MOUNTAIN VIEW DEVELOPMENT INC	300 TULLY	CC	O	C-C (PD-234)	C-O
089018003000	WHITAKER RONALD & SANDRA	200 TULLY	CC	LDR	C-C (PD-234)	R-L
089018030000	MOUNTAIN VIEW DEVELOPMENT INC	200 TULLY	CC	O	C-C	C-O
089019006000	LILY M OSSO	1331 DIANNE	O&CC	CC	C-O&C-C	C-C

BEFORE THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TURLOCK

IN THE MATTER OF AMENDING THE ZONING }	ORDINANCE NO. -CS
MAP OF THE CITY OF TURLOCK, CALIFORNIA, }	
ATTACHED TO TITLE 9 OF THE TURLOCK }	
MUNICIPAL CODE [REZONE 2012-03 }	
(TURLOCK GENERAL PLAN UPDATE - }	
CITYWIDE REZONE)] }	
_____ }	

WHEREAS, in Summer 2008, the City Council passed a Resolution affirming its intent to update the Turlock General Plan; and

WHEREAS, in October 2008, the City Council initiated the General Plan Update and the Environmental Impact Report to guide the effort; and

WHEREAS, in October 2008, the City entered into a Professional Services Agreement with Dyett and Bhatia, Urban and Regional Planners, to prepare an update of the Turlock General Plan and the Environmental Impact Report; and

WHEREAS, Dyett and Bhatia, community members, and staff have been working diligently since that time to complete the update of the General Plan; and

WHEREAS, the General Plan Update effort has involved an extensive public participation and outreach program, including stakeholder interviews, five community meetings, meetings with special groups, and regular review by the Planning Commission and City Council to review data, reports, and options; and

WHEREAS, a draft General Plan was published in October 2011 for public review and comment; and

WHEREAS, on October 20, 2011, a public open house was held to receive community feedback; and

WHEREAS, City staff and consultants considered numerous comments received on the draft General Plan, approved revisions to the draft General Plan, and forwarded the draft General Plan, as revised, to the Planning Commission and City Council for adoption; and

WHEREAS, the new General Plan meets legal adequacy requirements pursuant to California Government Code §§65300 – 65302; and

WHEREAS, a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) on the new General Plan was published on June 5, 2012 for a 45-day public review and comment period ending on July 20, 2012; and

WHEREAS, a Final EIR was published on August 23, 2012; and

WHEREAS, revisions to the General Plan were published in August 23, 2012 in a Public Review Draft General Plan Errata, to ensure consistency with the Final EIR for Planning Commission and City Council consideration; and

WHEREAS, the EIR evaluated the potential environmental impacts that could result from the approval of the Project, alternatives to the Project, and the self-mitigating General Plan implementing policies designed to mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts of the Project; and

WHEREAS, policies that would reduce or avoid environmental impacts are built into the General Plan and will be implemented and enforced through the application of the Turlock General Plan in land use and planning decisions. The monitoring plan for policies in the General Plan that would reduce or avoid impacts is the General Plan itself. The reporting program for these mitigating implementation policies is the City's annual General Plan reporting process; and

WHEREAS, for mitigation measures that extend beyond the General Plan implementing policies and are separately identified in the EIR, a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program has been developed in accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15097, and will be administered by the City; and

WHEREAS, on September 6, 2012, the Planning Commission recommended to the City Council that the Final EIR for the new Turlock General Plan be certified, and recommended adoption of the "Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations" and "Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program" in accordance with CEQA Guidelines §§15091, 15093, and 15097; and

WHEREAS, on September 6, 2012, the Planning Commission recommended the City Council adopt the new Turlock General Plan with the Alternative 1 Land Use Diagram and recommended modifying the timing policy for master plans; and

WHEREAS, on September 6, 2012, the Planning Commission recommended the City Council amend the Zoning Map attached to Title 9 of the Turlock Municipal Code in accordance with Rezone 2012-03 (Turlock General Plan Update – Citywide Rezone) as described in Exhibit A of the proposed ordinance; and

WHEREAS, on September 11, 2012, the City Council certified the Final EIR for the new Turlock General Plan, and adopted the "Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations" and "Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program" in accordance with CEQA Guidelines §§15091, 15093, and 15097; and

WHEREAS, on September 11, 2012, the City Council adopted the new Turlock General Plan; and

WHEREAS, State Law requires consistency between the General Plan designation and Zoning designation for properties within its jurisdiction; and

WHEREAS, the properties that would need to be rezoned to bring the Zoning Map into consistency with the new General Plan are identified in Exhibit A; and

WHEREAS, California Government Code §65863(b) states that no city shall reduce the residential density for any parcel to a lower residential density unless the city makes written findings supported by substantial evidence of both of the following:

- (1) The reduction is consistent with the adopted general plan, including the housing element; and
- (2) The remaining sites identified in the housing element are adequate to accommodate the jurisdiction's share of the regional housing need pursuant to §65584; and

WHEREAS, the rezoning action would accommodate approximately 184 more units than assumed in the currently adopted and certified City of Turlock 2007-14 Housing Element; and

WHEREAS, on September 11, 2012, the City Council held a duly and properly noticed public hearing on the proposed new General Plan (GPA 2012-03) and Citywide Rezone 2012-03; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has considered the staff report, all public comments, and the proposed General Plan (GPA 2012-03) and Citywide Rezone 2012-03 as set forth in this Resolution; and

WHEREAS, the City Council found and determined as follows:

1. That the proposed rezoning is consistent with the new General Plan.
2. That the proposed site is suitable for the type of potential development.
3. That the site is suitable for the intensity of the proposed use.
4. That the proposed rezoning will not cause substantial environmental damage.
5. That the public necessity, convenience and general welfare require the proposed amendment.

BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Turlock as follows:

SECTION 1. HOUSING ELEMENT FINDINGS: The Turlock City Council hereby finds that the proposed Citywide Rezone 2012-03:

- (1) is consistent with the proposed new Turlock General Plan, including the adopted and certified City of Turlock 2007-14 Housing Element; and
- (2) will not reduce the number of units identified in the adopted and certified City of Turlock 2007-14 Housing Element; therefore, there are adequate sites to accommodate the jurisdiction's share of the regional housing need pursuant to §65584.

SECTION 2. CHANGE TO ZONING MAP. The Zoning Map of the City of Turlock is hereby amended to rezone multiple parcels as identified in Exhibit A.

SECTION 3. VALIDITY. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, word, or phrase, of this ordinance is held to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid for any reason, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remainder of this ordinance. The Turlock City Council hereby declares that they would have passed this ordinance, and each section, subsection, sentence, clause, word, or phrase thereof, irrespective of the fact that one or more section, subsection, sentence, clause, word, or phrase be declared invalid or unconstitutional.

SECTION 4. ENACTMENT. This ordinance shall become effective and be in full force on and after thirty (30) days of its passage and adoption. Prior to the expiration of fifteen (15) days from the passage and adoption thereof, this ordinance shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation printed and published in the County of Stanislaus, State of California, together with names of the members of the City Council voting for and against the same.

PASSED AND ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Turlock this 25th day of September, 2012, by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
NOT PARTICIPATING:
ABSENT:

Signed and approved this ____ day of September, 2012.

JOHN S. LAZAR, Mayor

ATTEST:

Kellie E. Weaver, City Clerk,
City of Turlock, County of Stanislaus,
State of California

GPA 2012-02, REZONE 2012-03

LIST OF PROPERTIES WITHIN THE CITY OF TURLOCK THAT ARE AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN UPDATE AND CITYWIDE REZONE ACTION

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER	NAME OF PROPERTY OWNER	PROPERTY ADDRESS	CURRENT GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION	PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN LAND USE	CURRENT ZONING	PROPOSED ZONING
042001006000	38TH DIST AGRIC ASSOC	801 N SODERQUIST	LDR/HDR	PUB	R-L/R-H	P/S
042001007000	TURLOCK IRRIGATION DISTRICT	1601 W CANAL	LDR	PUB	R-L	P/S
042004016000	MC DONALD PAULINE H TR	71 ALMOND	MDR	HDR	R-M	R-H
042004022000	HENDRICKSON CLYDE	177 ALMOND	MDR	HDR	R-M	R-H
042004023000	HENDRICKSON ELEANOR	191 ALMOND	MDR	HDR	R-M	R-H
042004042000	LOPES RICHARD W TR	123 ALMOND	MDR	HDR	R-M	R-H
042005055000	PHILLIP CARNES	333 ALMOND	MDR	HDR	R-M	R-H
042010003000	CITY OF TURLOCK	1418 N GOLDEN STATE	CC	PUB	C-C	P/S
042010013000	YOUHANAIE ESTHER	1250 N GOLDEN STATE	HC	CC	C-H	C-C
042010014000	GULMON GARY & GULMON MARCELLA	600 20TH CENTURY	HC	CC	C-H	C-C
042010023000	CITY OF TURLOCK	1418 N GOLDEN STATE	CC	PUB	C-C	P/S
042011008000	GIANNELL ALFRED TRS & GIANNELL MARILYN M	141 20TH CENTURY	MDR	HDR	R-M	R-H
042011040000	GIANNELL ALFRED TRS & GIANNELL MARILYN M	145 20TH CENTURY	MDR	HDR	R-M	R-H
042027003000	WATCHOUS DOUGLAS D & WATCHOUS JOSETTE	1208 COLORADO	LDR	MDR/O	R-L	R-M/O
042027004000	VIERRA RHONDA DARLENE	1204 COLORADO	LDR	MDR/O	R-L	R-M/O
042027005000	STAVRIANOUDAKIS JOHN	1128 COLORADO	LDR	MDR/O	R-L	R-M/O
042028002000	CUAN MARTHA L	1104 COLORADO	LDR	HDR	R-L	R-H
043016004000	CLEMENTS MARCUS D & DANIELLE	1201 FIFTH	LDR	HDR	R-L	R-H
043016005000	PERRY JOSEPH D ET AL TRS	1233 FIFTH	LDR	HDR	R-L	R-H
043059001000	BORN CLINTON P TRS & BORN CATHY D	1137 FIFTH	PARK	MDR	R-L	R-M
043060023000	SUNVISTA LLC	1309 FIFTH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
043060024000	SUNVISTA LLC	1325 FIFTH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
044008003000	TREJO OSCAR JIMENEZ	117 S TULLY	I	HC	I	C-H
044008004000	BANK OF NEW YORK MELLON TRUSTEE	125 S TULLY	I	HC	I	C-H
044008005000	RAM AJAI & SURIYA TRS	133 S TULLY	I	HC	I	C-H
044008009000	2925 E WHITMORE AVE LLC	309 S TULLY	I	HC	I	C-H
044008010000	WIDDOWSON RICHARD B	317 S TULLY	I	HC	I	C-H
044008011000	BROWN BRADLEY R	319 S TULLY	I	HC	I	C-H
044008012000	BROWN BRADLEY R	325 S TULLY	I	HC	I	C-H
044008013000	BROWN BRADLEY R	333 S TULLY	I	HC	I	C-H
044008030000	BROWN BRADLEY R	441 S TULLY	I	HC	I	C-H
044008032000	GARCIA ANALICIA	449 S TULLY	I	HC	I	C-H
050002016000	BARRON CONCEPCION E	1014 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050002017000	LAO SCOTT	1036 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050002018000	MENDEZ PEDRO A & VIRGINIA TRS	413 DAVIS	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050002019000	DIAZ RAMON BARAJAS	405 DAVIS	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M

**GPA 2012-02, REZONE 2012-03
LIST OF PROPERTIES WITHIN THE CITY OF TURLOCK THAT ARE AFFECTED
BY THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN UPDATE AND CITYWIDE REZONE ACTION**

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER	NAME OF PROPERTY OWNER	PROPERTY ADDRESS	CURRENT GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION	PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN LAND USE	CURRENT ZONING	PROPOSED ZONING
050002020000	PAYNE JOHN G & PATSY J TRS	1074 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050002021000	ESTRADA JOHN A & CARMEN B TRS	1086 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050002022000	POLANCO IGNACIO & DE POLANCO MARIA MOLIN	1104 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050002048000	GUTIERREZ ANTONIO & DE GUTIERREZ MARGAR	418 S SODERQUIST	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050002049000	BAJWA BALDEV KAUR	430 S SODERQUIST	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050002050000	BAJWA SARDOOL SINGH & BALDEV KUAR	1108 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050002053000	LO JERRY & ELIZABETH	410 S SODERQUIST	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050002055000	SAHAGUN ELENA & ELIAS	1112 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050002056000	AGUILERA JOSE R ET AL	1106 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050002057000	ESCOBAR CARLOS ESCRIBA & ESCRIBA MARIA A	414 S SODERQUIST	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050003028000	ORTIZ ANGELINA	992 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050003029000	COLEMAN FRIEDA N	986 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050003030000	CHAHAL GURPARTAP & SATINDER	942 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050003031000	MIRANDA BEATRICE A	0 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050003032000	MICHAELS DAVID & DIANA	914 HIGH	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050003041000	ESQUER ROSA ET AL	327 WEST	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050003042000	STANISLAUS COUNTY AFFORDABLE HOUSING C	337 WEST	LDR	MDR	R-L	R-M
050018038000	FOSTER FRED A & FOSTER LUCRETIA J	1291 LANDER	LDR&HC	HC	R-L/C-H	C-H
050018039000	PRICKETT PHILIP & PRICKETT TRUDY	1341 LANDER	LDR&HC	HC	R-L/C-H	C-H
050018046000	BALLARD SHIRLEY A ET AL TRS	1241 LANDER	LDR&HC	HC	R-L/C-H	C-H
050018061000	ESQUIVEL JAIME & ELIZABETH G	1261 LANDER	LDR&HC	HC	R-L/C-H	C-H
050031064000	UTILITY SERVICE & ELECTRIC INC	711 LANDER	HDR&CC	HC	R-L/C-H	C-H
071005003000	CA STATE UNIVERSITY STANISLAUS	890 W ZEERING	HDR/CO	HDR	R-H/C-O	R-H
071006014000	PHOENIX FAMILY LP	900 W MONTE VISTA	MDR	CC	R-M	C-C
071009034000	SNIDER SCOTT P TRS ET AL	105 W MINNESOTA	MDR	CC	R-M	C-C
071014005000	MIN LYN INVESTMENT LLC	811 W HAWKEYE	HC	CC	C-H	C-C
071014011000	M & B BRUNO FAMILY LP.	1828 DIVANIAN	HC	CC	C-H	C-C
071014012000	M & B BRUNO FAMILY LP.	1814 DIVANIAN	HC	CC	C-H	C-C
071014013000	ROACH DENNIS JAMES	1810 DIVANIAN	HC	CC	C-H	C-C
071015009000	CARVALHO ALBERT D ET AL TRS	100 PEDRAS	MDR	HDR	R-M	R-H
071015020000	HAMLOW RANCHES INC	1901 GEER	O	HDR	C-0	R-H
071066067000	SNIDER ROBIN COLETTE ET AL	4131 GEER	CC/O	HDR/CC	C-C/C-O	R-H/C-C
072010004000	BAL SUKHBIR	200 MONTE VISTA	LDR	CC	R-L	C-C
072010005000	RON SEKHON	206 MONTE VISTA	LDR	CC	R-L	C-C
072010006000	RON SEKHON	212 MONTE VISTA	LDR	CC	R-L	C-C
072010007000	RON SEKHON	218 MONTE VISTA	LDR	CC	R-L	C-C

Exhibit A

**GPA 2012-02, REZONE 2012-03
LIST OF PROPERTIES WITHIN THE CITY OF TURLOCK THAT ARE AFFECTED
BY THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN UPDATE AND CITYWIDE REZONE ACTION**

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER	NAME OF PROPERTY OWNER	PROPERTY ADDRESS	CURRENT GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION	PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN LAND USE	CURRENT ZONING	PROPOSED ZONING
072010050000	MOBASHERPOUR SAEED & LISA	107 HEDSTROM	LDR	O	R-L	C-O
072010051000	ALAHVERDI EDWARD & SWIDLANA	101 HEDSTROM	LDR	O	R-L	C-O
088007004000	ASSYRIAN AMERICAN CIVIC CLUB	2700 N GOLDEN STATE	HC	CC	C-H	C-C
088007005000	ASSYRIAN AMER CIV CLUB OF TURL	2618 N GOLDEN STATE	HC	CC	C-H	C-C
088007024000	ASSYRIAN AMER CIV CLUB OF TURL	2618 N GOLDEN STATE	HC	CC	C-H	C-C
088007025000	SANDHU KARNAIL S ET AL	2500 N GOLDEN STATE	HC	CC	C-H	C-C
089013011000	SUPHERB FARMS	400 DIANNE	PARK	I	IBP	I
089013020000	SUPHERB FARMS	300 DIANNE	BP	I	IBP (PD-135)	I (PD-135)
089015001000	TURLOCK CEMETERY ASSN	700 TULLY	LDR	PUB	R-L	P/S
089018001000	MOUNTAIN VIEW DEVELOPMENT INC	300 TULLY	CC	O	C-C (PD-234)	C-O
089018003000	WHITAKER RONALD & SANDRA	200 TULLY	CC	LDR	C-C (PD-234)	R-L
089018030000	MOUNTAIN VIEW DEVELOPMENT INC	200 TULLY	CC	O	C-C	C-O
089019006000	LILY M OSSO	1331 DIANNE	O&CC	CC	C-O&C-C	C-C