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1.0 Introduction and Project Description

1.1 Introduction

The City of San Joaquin has proposed the City of San Joaquin General Plan Update and Sphere of Influence Expansion Project. Prior to adoption, the City must identify potential environmental impacts of the Project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines. The Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for this project has been prepared to fulfill these CEQA requirements.

The City of San Joaquin is the lead agency. The City Council is responsible for certification of the EIR, approval of the proposed General Plan Update, and applying to the Fresno Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) for the SOI Expansion. As stated in the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR is an "informational document" intended to "inform public agency decision-makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effects of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project." The City must consider information in the EIR and respond to each significant effect identified. As defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064, a "significant effect on the environment" is:

"... a substantial or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance. An economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. A social or economic change related to a physical change may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant."

The EIR is a Program EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168. An EIR on a program action such as adoption of a general plan contains a less detailed assessment of impacts than would an EIR on a specific development project. CEQA Guidelines Section 15146(b) states that an EIR on a general plan should focus on secondary effects expected to follow adoption, but the EIR need not be as detailed as an EIR on the specific projects that might follow.

Discretionary approval of individual projects such as subdivision maps, rezones, or use permits may rely on the program EIR only to the extent that the EIR provides sufficient site-specific information. Each individual project may be subject to preparation of an initial study to verify that no different or additional significant impacts from those identified in this EIR would result from the individual project.

1.2 Project Location and Physical Setting

San Joaquin is located within the San Joaquin Valley (36° 36' 08" N, 120° 10' 17" W), in Fresno County as shown on Figure 1-1. The City is approximately 32 miles southwest of Fresno, 22 miles east of Interstate 5, and 30 miles west of Highway 99. Fresno County’s economy is largely based on agriculture, and agriculture and related activities have been essential to the existence and growth of San Joaquin. The City is at an elevation of approximately 170 feet above sea level and is surrounded by agricultural uses.
Figure 1-1: Project Location
In 2010, San Joaquin's population was 4,001 [2010 U.S. Census]. The California Department of Finance estimated a population of 4,029 in the City as of January 1, 2013. Twenty-year projections for San Joaquin provided by the Fresno Council of Governments estimate a 1.8% average annual growth rate, achieving a 2030 population of 5,398 persons. The 2010 Census reports that San Joaquin's ethnic composition is approximately 97% Hispanic, 3% White non-Hispanic, and 0.3% Asian.

The physical area addressed by the General Plan is the San Joaquin Planning Area, generally coterminal with the expanded SOI which includes the existing City limits, the City's existing SOI, and the proposed SOI expansion area. The City-owned wastewater treatment plant is also included in the Planning Area, and is located 1.5 miles west of the City in Fresno County.

1.3 Project Description

The General Plan Update and Sphere of Influence Expansion Project consists of an update to the City of San Joaquin General Plan and expansion of the San Joaquin Sphere of Influence (SOI). The Project includes preparation of a land use plan for the existing City as well as the SOI expansion area to guide long-term development, including residential, commercial, industrial and public facility land uses. The San Joaquin General Plan Update will be considered for adoption by the San Joaquin City Council to include initiation of the proposed SOI expansion to the Fresno LAFCo. LAFCo is charged to review and approve any expansion of the SOI in a separate public hearing process.

Future development within the Project area would occur under policies of the San Joaquin General Plan and regulations of the Zoning Ordinance. Future projects may require the processing of tentative tract maps and/or tentative parcel maps, site plan reviews, conditional uses permits or other land use entitlements. Project specific environmental assessments will be required pursuant to CEQA. As new areas outside the City are proposed for development, the City will process annexations through Fresno LAFCo. This process includes the rezoning of proposed development sites consistent with the General Plan. Rezoning of unincorporated land would only become effective upon annexation.
General Plan Update

California law requires each city to adopt a general plan for the “physical development of the ... City and any land outside its boundaries which ... bears relation to its planning” (Government Code Section 65300). The general plan expresses the community’s development goals and embodies public policy relative to the distribution of future public and private land use. The law requires a plan to contain seven mandatory elements; the general plan may also contain optional elements to address locally important issues.

The City’s existing General Plan was adopted in 1996. The Update of the San Joaquin General Plan incorporates into the adopted General Plan the San Joaquin 2040 Community Plan (2040 Plan) prepared by the Cal Poly School of City and Regional Planning (June 2011); recommendations of the Valley Blueprint Integration Program; recommendations of the City of San Joaquin Mobility and Revitalization Plan; and recommendations of the City of San Joaquin Model Energy Efficient Plan for Rural Housing.

The General Plan consists of the following elements:

- Land use;
- Transportation and Circulation;
- Housing;
- Conservation;
- Open Space;
- Safety;
- Noise;
- Economic;
- Public Facilities and Services;
- Community Design; and
- Health

The General Plan elements contain discussions of planning related issues. Each discussion of the issues is followed by the City’s goals, objectives, policies, and implementation measures which address the issues identified. The time frame or “planning horizon” for the General Plan is 20 years after adoption.

The General Plan establishes four primary land use designations listed below and described in the Land Use Element:

Residential
- Low Density Residential (LDR) 1.0 – 7.9 units/acre
- Density Residential (MDR) 8.0 – 19.9 units/acre
- High Density Residential (HDR) 20.0 – 30.0 units/acre

Commercial
- Neighborhood Commercial (NC)
- Community Commercial (CC)
- Central Business District (CBD)

Industrial (I)
Public Facility (PF)
The General Plan intensifies residential land uses by introducing moderate increases in densities. Mixed-use projects with a residential component are allowed in all commercial land use categories. Infill is encouraged prior to annexing new territory to the City.

**Sphere of Influence Expansion**

An SOI is a boundary outside the City’s jurisdiction that designates a municipality’s probable future urban area within which annexations can take place; the SOI is generally considered a 20-year horizon. SOIs provide for efficient services while discouraging urban sprawl and the premature conversion of agricultural and open space lands. SOI boundaries prevent overlapping jurisdictional boundaries and the duplication of services. The Fresno LAFCo is given the authority and responsibility to determine spheres of influence for all local governmental agencies in Fresno County (Government Code Section 56425).

The proposed Project includes a proposed expansion of the City of San Joaquin SOI shown in Figure 1-2 and summarized as follows:

- Approximately 112 acres south of the City would be removed from the existing SOI;
- Approximately 1,171 acres of new land would be added to the SOI for urban expansion purposes;
- Approximately 76 acres would be added to the SOI for the existing WWTP and future expansion.

This results in a net addition of 1,135 acres to the San Joaquin SOI. According to Fresno LAFCo, the existing San Joaquin SOI contains 962 acres. The proposed expansion would bring the total SOI to 2,097 acres.

**Determinants of Change**

The proposed land use plan for the Planning Area, shown in Figure 1-3, includes the 1,135 acre SOI expansion area. Table 1-1 presents existing land use within the existing City and the existing SOI, while Table 1-2 shows the General Plan land use designations for the existing City and the proposed SOI expansion area.

The land use inventory includes developed and undeveloped land. There are approximately 270 acres of vacant or agricultural land within the City limits with an additional 232 acres of agricultural land in the existing SOI outside the City limits.

The anticipated population holding capacity of the General Plan as depicted on the Land Use Plan is approximately 7,500 in the existing City, and 10,500 in the proposed SOI, for a total in the Planning Area of approximately 18,000. This estimate is based on professional judgment where build out of a General Plan is 65 to 75% of the maximum population calculations. The reduced build out reflects the need for infrastructure, market conditions, technology, building codes, financing availability, federal or state policy, and community’s needs. The calculation of these estimates is presented in Table 4-3 of the Land Use Element.
Table 1-1
Land Use Acreage within the Existing City and Existing Sphere of Influence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Existing City Limits</th>
<th>Existing SOI Outside City Limits</th>
<th>Existing SOI Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Facility</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Water Treatment Plant¹</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Right-of-Way</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>731</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹The Wastewater Treatment Plant is within the City limits but not within the SOI.

Table 1-2
Land Use Designations by Acreage within the Existing City and Proposed Sphere of Influence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Plan Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Existing City Limits</th>
<th>Proposed SOI Outside City Limits</th>
<th>Proposed SOI Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Business District</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Commercial</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Density Residential</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Facility</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Treatment Plant¹</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Right-of-Way</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>731</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,387</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹The Wastewater Treatment Plant is proposed to be included within the proposed SOI and constitutes two parcels totaling 76 acres.
1.4 Project Objectives

General Plan goals and policies define the growth potential for the City, its direction and its character. Development of the General Plan is based on the guiding principles reflected in each of the Elements’ goals, objectives, policies, and implementation programs:

- Development is responsible for avoiding or mitigating its economic and environmental impacts unless the City finds the development provides a demonstrated community benefit.
- The City is committed to maintain and enhance the City’s compact land use pattern.
- The City is committed to maintaining and enhancing the City’s infrastructure to meet the community’s needs.
- The City is committed to provide for housing opportunities that serve a variety of income levels.
- The City is committed to provide a cohesive aesthetic and community identity.
- The City is committed to maintain and enhance the Central Business District as the core commercial area, mixed use area and community gathering location of the City.
- The City is committed to provide for the housing, employment, commercial, processing, and distribution needs of the region’s agricultural industry.
- The City is committed to working with governments, educational institutions, and businesses within the region to provide services and resources to support residences, businesses and industries.
- The City is committed to identifying and implementing opportunities for conserving and enhancing resources.
- The City is committed to provide for walking and biking that is safe, attractive, and provides access to the entire City.
- The City is committed to maintaining and enhancing a sustainable and diverse economy.
- The City is committed to being flexible and innovative when working with projects that add benefits to the community.

1.5 EIR Organization

The EIR is organized into the following chapters:

Chapter 1 – Introduction and Project Description. This chapter provides an introduction to the EIR, including organization of the EIR and the public review process. The Project Description (CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15124 & 15125) provides a description of the project, including the physical setting, background of the project, project objectives, project characteristics and intended uses of the EIR.
Chapter 2 – Summary. (CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15123). This chapter provides an overview of the General Plan, of the areas of controversy, a summary of the identified impacts with mitigation measures, and a summary of alternatives.

Chapter 3 – Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures (CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15126). Each topical section in this EIR presents information in four parts.
Chapter 4 – CEQA Considerations. As required by CEQA (CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15126.2, 15126.6, 15130), this chapter presents alternatives to the project, unavoidable adverse impacts, irreversible impacts, short-term versus long-term productivity, growth inducement, and cumulative impacts.

Chapter 5 – References and List of Preparers (CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15129).

Environmental Impact Methodology

Each environmental topic area is discussed in the following format:

Environmental Setting: A description of the environmental setting and/or local conditions as they relate to each environmental topic.

Regulatory Framework: Identifies policies, plans and regulations that are applicable to the Project.

Standards of Significance: The criteria for determining significance are thresholds that can be quantitative (traffic, air quality, noise) or qualitative (aesthetic, cultural resources). Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines provides guidance for assessing the significance of potential environmental impacts. Standards for determining levels of significance used to characterize the Project in this EIR are:

- **No Impact**: The impact would cause no change or a minor/insignificant change in the environment. No mitigation is required.

- **Less than Significant Impact**: The impact would cause no substantial change in the environment, or the impact is less than significant as defined by the applicable thresholds of significance. Either no mitigation is required or recommended mitigation reduces impacts to less-than-significant levels.

- **Potentially Significant Impact**: A potentially significant impact is defined as a significant, or potentially significant, adverse effect on the environment. Typically mitigation is available to reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

- **Significant and Unavoidable Impact**: An impact is considered to be significant and unavoidable when it results in a substantial adverse effect on the environment for which no mitigation and no alternative has been identified as feasible to reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

Impact Analysis: Each chapter describes potential impacts and whether or not impacts are considered significant prior to mitigation.

Mitigation Measures: Project-specific mitigation measures are identified to reduce impacts to the degree feasible. Explanatory text is included, as necessary, to describe the effects of each mitigation measure (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4 and 15370).
Impact after Mitigation: A brief discussion of the level of impact of the proposed Project following the implementation of required or recommended mitigation measures (CEQA Guidelines Sections 15126.2 and 15126.4).

1.6 Public Scoping and Comment

To define the scope of the EIR, the City distributed a Notice of Preparation (NOP) to the State Clearinghouse, city, county and state agencies; other public agencies; and interested private organizations and individuals. The purpose of the NOP was to identify agency and public concerns regarding potential impacts of the proposed project. The 30-day comment period began on September 20, 2013, and ended on October 18, 2013. Written comments received during the NOP review period are included in Appendix B.

The Draft EIR is distributed for a 45-day public comment period. Following this period, all comments and the City’s responses will be incorporated into a Final EIR prior to certification of the document by the City of San Joaquin. The Final EIR will include comments received, written responses to comments, necessary corrections or other changes to the EIR text, and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for implementation of mitigation measures described in the Draft EIR.

1.7 Areas of Controversy

The areas of controversy identified during the development of the General Plan include:

- Loss of prime agricultural land/Williamson Act contracts
- Sphere of Influence boundaries
- Location of commercial uses
- Mix of medium density and low density residential

1.8 Intended Uses of the EIR

The City will review subsequent implementation projects for consistency with the Program EIR and prepare appropriate environmental documentation. Subsequent projects may include the following:

- Rezoning of properties and consideration of conditional use permits and other land use permits;
- Annexation of land;
- Approval of development plans, including tentative maps;
- Approval of development agreements;
- Approval and funding of public improvements projects;
- Acquisition of property.

The following lead, responsible, and trustee agencies may use this Program EIR in considering this Project as well as approval of subsequent implementation activities. These agencies may include, but are not limited to:
- Fresno Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo)
- Fresno Council of Governments (Fresno COG)
- County of Fresno
- Golden Plains Unified School District
- Fresno County Fire Protection District
- Fresno County Sheriffs’ Office
- Caltrans Office of Transportation Planning District 6
- Westside Mosquito Abatement District
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife
- James Irrigation District
- San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District

If the City finds that, pursuant to Section 15152 of the CEQA Guidelines, no new effects could occur or new mitigation measures would be required, the City can approve a subsequent project as being within the scope of this Program EIR, and no new environmental documentation would be required.

1.9 Preparers of the EIR

The City of San Joaquin is the lead agency for the preparation of the EIR and the document reflects the independent judgment of the City. This Draft EIR was prepared by following consultants under contract to the City:

Land Use Associates
286 W. Cromwell
Fresno CA 93711

Hauge Brueck Associates, LLC
2233 Watt Ave., Suite 230
Sacramento, CA 95825
2.0 Summary

2.1 General Plan Overview

The project under consideration is the General Plan update for the City of San Joaquin and expansion of the Sphere of Influence (SOI). The General Plan provides a basis to guide future development and decision-making via land use designations, goals, objectives, policies, and implementation measures. The General Plan addresses build-out of the City as a whole. Build-out would occur at some unspecified time in the future, depending upon the rate at which growth proceeds.

The SOI is adopted by the Fresno Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) and identifies the probable future urban boundary of the City. Within the SOI, annexations to the City can take place in accordance with LAFCo law and Fresno LAFCo policies and procedures. The General Plan Update identifies policies to encourage phased, contiguous growth of the City in a manner that will result in a more compact urban area and preserve open space and agricultural land.

As proposed, the General Plan Update would expand the SOI and restructure the General Plan land use designations and land use map. The Agricultural land use designation is eliminated and agricultural areas are designated as low-density residential, public facility, and industrial uses. The General Plan also revises the consistency zones of the land use designations, identifies new commercial and residential designations and characteristics of those zones, including mixed-uses, and updates the goals, objectives, policies, and implementation measures of each General Plan Element.

The General Plan increases the population holding capacity as discussed in the Land Use Element. The projected population holding capacity (build-out of the General Plan) as depicted by the General Plan land use map is approximately 10,170 persons. The build-out of the area within the proposed SOI is approximately 14,160 persons. As shown in Table 2-1, the estimated build-out of the General Plan Area is therefore approximately 24,330 persons.

2.2 Summary of Significant Unavoidable Impacts

Based on the data and conclusions of this Program EIR, the Project will result in the following significant project-level and cumulative impacts that cannot be fully mitigated:

- Agricultural Resources - Loss of Important Farmlands (project level and cumulative)
- Air Quality – Impacts to air quality (project level and cumulative)

CEQA requires that a lead agency neither approve nor carry out a project unless significant environmental effects have been reduced to an acceptable level, if possible. If environmental impacts are identified as significant and unavoidable, the City may still approve the project if it believes that social, economic, or other benefits outweigh the unavoidable impacts. The City Council would then be required to adopt a statement of overriding considerations pursuant to Sections 15093 and 15126 (b) of the CEQA Guidelines.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Plan Designation</th>
<th>Dwelling Units Per Gross Acre(s)</th>
<th>Density Persons/ Gross Acre $^1$</th>
<th>Gross Acres</th>
<th>Maximum Dwelling Units $^2$ $^3$</th>
<th>Maximum Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LDR- Low-Density Residential</td>
<td>1.0 to 7.9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>5,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDR- Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>8.0 to 19.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDR-Residential High Density</td>
<td>20.0 to 30.0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>2,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD-Central Business District</td>
<td>20.0 to 30.0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC-Community Commercial</td>
<td>20.0 to 30.0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC-Neighborhood Commercial</td>
<td>8.0 to 19.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-Industrial</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF-Public Facilities</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Railroad</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (Within Existing City)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>4,480</td>
<td>10,170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sphere of Influence Designation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDR- Low-Density Residential</td>
<td>1.0 to 7.9 units/acre</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>9,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDR- Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>8.0 to 19.0 units/acre</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>2,340</td>
<td>3,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC-Community Commercial</td>
<td>20.0 to 30.0 units/acre</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-Industrial</td>
<td>0 units/acre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF-Public Facilities</td>
<td>0 units/acre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Railroad</td>
<td>0 units/acre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>0 units/acre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (Within SOI)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1311</td>
<td>5,920</td>
<td>14,160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWTP</td>
<td>0 units/acre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (City Owned in County)</td>
<td>0 units/acre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (Within General Plan Area)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2,020</td>
<td>10,400</td>
<td>24,330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^1$ Population density calculated using 4.5 persons per household for residential uses, based upon 2010 Census.

$^2$ Assumed number of residents per unit: 2.14 for primary unit and 1 for second unit.

$^3$ Assumed 25% of land required for roads, parking, and landscaping.
2.3 Potential Areas of Controversy

The CEQA Guidelines require that potential areas of controversy be identified in the Summary. Areas of potential controversy for the proposed Project are:

- Conversion of prime farmland to urban uses;
- Impacts to air quality;
- Impacts to utility and service systems;
- Growth inducing impacts.

2.4 Summary of Alternatives

The CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126) require that an EIR describe and evaluate alternatives to the project or to the location of the project, which could eliminate significant adverse impacts of the project or reduce them to a level of insignificance. In addition to the Project, the following alternatives are evaluated in the CEQA Considerations Section of this EIR (see Section 4.0).

Alternative 1: No Project. The No Project Alternative assumes that the General Plan Update and SOI expansion would not be implemented and that existing zoning would remain unchanged. Current agricultural and rural uses would remain the same in the SOI expansion area. The No Project alternative would result in the continued implementation of the existing San Joaquin 1996 General Plan to build-out. Build-out under this alternative would result in a population of approximately 6,465 persons by 2030 based on 3% average annual growth.

While the existing General Plan land use map contains sufficient land for expansion over the next 10 years, most new residential and commercial growth beyond that time would require incremental general plan amendments for implementation. In keeping with State LAFCo law, the SOI could be reviewed every five years for adequacy.

The No Project Alternative would avoid or reduce most potential impacts that would occur under the proposed Project. Existing agricultural uses in the SOI expansion area would continue, and existing Williamson Act contracts would remain. Economic development opportunities for the City of San Joaquin would be reduced with the No Project Alternative, including the creation of new jobs, improvements to transportation systems, and generation of sales tax.

Alternative 2: Reduced SOI Alternative. Under the Reduced SOI Alternative, the SOI would be expanded generally in a northerly direction, rather than to the northwest and west. The alternative would expanded the SOI boundary by 440 acres less than the proposed project.

Under the Reduced SOI Alternative, development of the City would proceed in accordance with a reduced urban boundary compared to the proposed project. The general plan would require amendment in the new SOI area to designate appropriate urban land uses. The Reduced SOI Alternative is estimated to provide sufficient land for expansion over the next 20 years or longer, reducing or eliminating the need for SOI expansion requests in the interim. In keeping with State LAFCo law, the SOI could be reviewed every five years for adequacy.
The Reduced SOI Alternative would avoid or reduce many potential impacts that would occur under the proposed Project. Economic development opportunities for the City would be reduced with this alternative, including the creation of new jobs, improvements to transportation systems, and generation of sales tax.

Environmentally Preferred Alternative. No Project would be the preferred alternative as it would avoid or reduce impacts compared to the proposed Project. This alternative would not, however, meet the Project objectives, including providing for housing opportunities and enhancing economic growth.

When the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project alternative, CEQA requires that a selection be made among remaining alternatives. The Reduced SOI alternative reduces overall environmental impacts compared to the proposed project while meeting Project objectives and is environmentally preferred. Less farmland would be converted with this alternative. Due to reduction in vehicle trips, the Reduced SOI Alternative has the potential to reduce air quality impacts. The Reduced SOI Alternative reduces many of the impacts identified with the proposed Project and would not result in any new or previously unidentified impact.

2.5 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts identified during the course of this environmental analysis on the proposed General Plan and SOI Expansion are summarized in this section. This summary is intended as an overview to be used in conjunction with a thorough reading of the EIR. While implementation of the General Plan Update would have a number of potentially significant impacts, the majority of such impacts resulting from build-out would be less than significant due to implementation of proposed policies and programs. These policies and programs in the General Plan Update were designed to address important environmental resources in San Joaquin and to avoid or minimize impacts to these resources. As a result, the General Plan Update is largely "self-mitigating" which has reduced the requirement for additional mitigation measures.

2.5.1 Aesthetics

a. Substantial Adverse Effect on a Scenic Vista. Development of the Project in compliance with the goals, policies and community design guidelines of the San Joaquin General Plan Update will preserve areas with scenic qualities and natural beauty, integrate new homes into open space and agricultural areas, and include landscaping that complements the urban setting. The potential impact to scenic vistas is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

b. Substantially Damage Scenic Resources within a State Scenic Highway. There are no designated or eligible state scenic highways in or near the City of San Joaquin. As a result, there will be no impact to visual resources within a State Scenic Highway. No mitigation measures are required.

c. Substantially Degrade Existing Visual Character or Quality. The conversion of agricultural land uses and new residential, commercial, and other urban land uses will alter the visual character of the area. Urbanization will occur as planned within the General Plan and in accordance with the Community Design Element to reflect the existing community character and community. The potential impact to visual resources is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.
d. **Create New Source of Substantial Light or Glare.** Lighting associated with urban development does not generally create hazards or nuisance effects, but provides accent, direction, and security. The General Plan addresses lighting by establishing standards in the Design Guidelines that require hoods or shields on lighting fixtures and the use of low-glare building materials. Impacts related to new sources of light or glare are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

2.5.2 **Agricultural and Forestry Resources**

a. **Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.** The Project could ultimately result in the loss of approximately 1,457 acres of Prime Farmland and Farmlands of Statewide Importance. The loss of productive agricultural land resulting from implementation of the Project will be irreversible. This is a potentially significant impact.

**Mitigation:**

1. In its consideration of future development projects in the planning area, the San Joaquin City Council will determine on a case by case basis if the proposed development is timely and appropriate and if the conversion of the agricultural land to urban uses in the Project area is consistent with the goals and policies of the San Joaquin General Plan. In making its decision, the City may consider other factors important to the community, such as population growth, economic development, and creation of employment opportunities. In the event the proposed development is determined to be inconsistent with General Plan policies to prevent the premature conversion of agricultural lands, the Council shall mitigate the loss of such agricultural lands in one or more of the following ways:

   a. The acquisition of conservation easements on agricultural land located elsewhere in Fresno County.
   b. Participation in a “Mitigation Fee and Deduction” program to offset the impacts of development on agricultural land, if such a program has been implemented by the City of San Joaquin under a Joint Powers Agreement.
   c. Contribution of required funds to a nonprofit agricultural land trust whose primary purpose is the preservation of agricultural land, if such an organization has been formed at the time development is proposed.
   d. Implement appropriate and feasible mitigation recommended in the Farmland Conservation Program administered by Council of Fresno County Governments (COG).
   e. Participation in any other conservation program acceptable to the City of San Joaquin including, but not limited to, transferable development credits, and transfer of development rights.

**Level of Significance after Mitigation:** With the incorporation of the recommended mitigation measure, this impact remains a significant unavoidable impact.
b. **Conflict with Existing Zoning for Agricultural Use or a Williamson Act Contract.** There are nine parcels subject to the Williamson Act in the SOI Expansion Area which make up approximately 50 percent of the expanded SOI. Use of these parcels as designated by the General Plan could only occur with non-renewal or cancelation of the subject Williamson Act contracts. Policies of the General Plan Update support continued agriculture within the SOI and also encourage a compact urban form and other measures to conserve agricultural land. Even with these procedures in place, however, the impact to lands under contract is expected to be significant and unavoidable.

**Mitigation:** Mitigation measure 1 would reduce the impacts of individual contract cancelations, but not to a level less than significant. No addition measures are available.

c. **Conflict with Existing Zoning for Forest Lands or Timberlands.** There are no forest lands, timberlands or timber harvesting operations in or near San Joaquin. There will be no impact to such resources. No mitigation measures are required.

d. **Loss of Forest Land or Conversion of Forestland to Non-Forest Use.** There are no forest lands, timberlands or timber harvesting operations in or near San Joaquin. There will be no impact to these resources. No mitigation measures are required.

e. **Other Changes to Existing Environment.** General Plan policy protects agricultural land within the City and Sphere of Influence by maintaining growth in a centralized pattern that avoids creation of agricultural pockets surrounded by urban development. Growth can continue from the existing core of the City without isolating agricultural uses and avoiding pressure on agricultural pockets to convert to urban uses. Impacts will be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

2.5.3 **Air Quality**

a. **Conflict with Applicable Air Quality Plan.** In relation to carbon monoxide and ozone, the General Plan includes policies and objectives that reduce vehicle emissions through transportation design, alternative transportation methodologies and programs, implementation of TCM programs, and energy conservation. The General Plan also includes objectives and policies regarding particulate matter and the control and reduction of particulates, particularly during construction. This will ensure new development addresses particulates and provides control measures in accordance with the SJVAPCD. Further, policies require CEQA impact analysis and mitigation for all new development with review by the SJVAPCD. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

b. **Violation of Air Quality Standards or Substantially Contribute to an Existing or Projected Air Quality Violation.** Implementation of General Plan objectives and policies will help reduce existing air quality violations in the air basin; however, additional growth and development will ultimately contribute to air quality violations as construction, energy consumption, and vehicle travel emit pollutants. Mitigation of impacts as and careful development planning will help reduce pollutant levels, but this impact is potentially significant due to the “extreme non-attainment” ozone classification.
Mitigation:

The following energy conservation measures shall be incorporated into project building plans unless the applicant provides evidence that incorporation of a specific measure is infeasible:

1. All construction shall exceed the California Title 24 Energy Code for all relevant applications by 10% for the hotel construction and by 5% for all commercial and industrial construction.

2. Passive solar cooling/heating design elements shall be included in building designs where feasible. Design elements that maximize the use of natural lighting shall be utilized where feasible.

3. Energy efficient technical and design features in new construction shall be required. New development must include provisions of the installation of energy efficient appliances and lighting.

4. Installation of low nitrogen oxide emitting and/or high efficiency water heaters shall be required in new construction. Use solar or low-emission water heaters (beyond Rule 4902) is recommended.

5. To reduce daily ROG, NOX and PM10 emissions during winter days from combined project sources, only advanced combustion or natural gas fireplaces shall be allowed. The developer is encouraged to install LPG fireplaces, pellet stoves or EPA-Certified wood-burning fireplaces or stoves. (Note: EPA-Certified fireplaces and fireplace inserts are 75 percent effective in reducing emissions from this source, while natural-gas/LPG fireplaces are nearly 100 percent effective in reducing emissions and have virtually no potential for odor or nuisance.

6. The proposed Project shall comply with all applicable Regulations and Rules established by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, including, but not limited to: Regulation IV: Prohibitions; Rule 4901: Wood Burning Fireplaces and Wood Burning Heaters; Regulation IV: Prohibitions; Rule 4902: Residential Water Heaters; and Regulation VII: Fugitive PM10 Prohibitions; as well as the Indirect Source Review (ISR) (Rule 9510) and the Administrative ISR Fee Rule (Rule 3180).

7. All material excavated, graded or otherwise disturbed shall be sufficiently watered to prevent fugitive dust emissions. Watering shall occur at least twice daily with complete coverage, preferably in the morning and after work is done for the day, or as necessary. The developer shall be responsible for watering in the event of high winds or watering needs after normal working hours.

8. Water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used during construction to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site. The frequency of watering shall be increased when wind speeds exceed 15 miles per hour if soils are not completely wet. If wind speeds increase to the point that the dust control measures cannot prevent dust from leaving the site, construction activities shall be suspended.
9. A person or persons shall be designated by the contractor or builder to monitor the dust control program and to order increased watering, as necessary, to prevent transport of dust offsite. Such monitoring responsibilities shall include holiday and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The contractor shall provide the name and telephone number of such person to the SJVAPCD and the City Building Official prior to commencement of construction activities.

10. All disturbed areas on the site, including storage piles, which are not being actively utilized for construction purposes, shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water, chemical stabilizer/suppressant, covered with a tarp or other suitable cover or vegetative ground cover.

11. All on-site unpaved roads and off-site unpaved access roads shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water at least 3 times daily or chemical stabilizer/suppressant.

12. The accumulation of mud or dirt shall be expeditiously removed from adjacent public streets at the end of each workday. The use of dry rotary brushes is expressly prohibited except where preceded or accompanied by sufficient wetting to limit the visible dust emissions. Use of blower devices is expressly forbidden. Within urban areas, track out shall be immediately removed when it extends 50 or more feet from the site.

13. Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard. Trucks transporting fill material/soil to and from the site shall be tarped from the point of origin. Gravel pads shall be installed at all access points to prevent tracking of mud onto public roads. Utilize wheel washers for all exiting trucks, or wash off all trucks and equipment prior to leaving the site as needed.

14. On-site vehicles shall be limited to a speed (15 mph) that does not generate fugitive dust on unpaved roads. Land clearing, grading, earthmoving or excavation activities shall be suspended when winds exceed 20 miles per hour.

15. After clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation is completed, the disturbed area shall be treated by watering, re-vegetating, or by spreading soil binders until the area is paved or otherwise developed so that dust generation will not occur. Soil stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation.

Level of Significance after Mitigation: Implementation of these mitigation measures will lessen impacts, however, project impacts will remain significant and unavoidable.

C. Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase of a Criteria Pollutant. Although implementation of General Plan objectives and policies will help reduce the existing air quality violations, ultimate buildout will cumulatively contribute to air pollutant levels. Mitigation of impacts as and careful development planning will help reduce the pollutant levels, but this impact is potentially significant due to the current pollutant levels. With mitigation measures listed in b., the impacts will be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.
d. **Expose Sensitive Receptors to Pollutant Concentrations.** Policies require careful siting of industrial uses away from sensitive receptors and likewise the location of sensitive receptors away from odor and pollutant-causing uses. This will reduce the potential for impacts to sensitive receptors and land use conflicts. Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

e. **Creation of Objectionable Odors.** In accordance with the objectives and policies of the General Plan Update, new development would include site- and project-specific analysis and mitigation. Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

### 2.5.2 Biological Resources

a. **Substantial Adverse Effect on Species through Habitat Modifications.** Since policies require biological surveys, mitigation and coordination with CDFW and USFWS prior to construction, these studies, coordination, and mitigation will ensure species protection and mitigation in accordance with state and federal law and under the approval of CDFW and USFWS. Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

b. **Substantial Adverse Effect on Sensitive Natural Community.** If such communities or habitat occur in areas to be developed, a significant impact would occur. To address this, the General Plan Conservation Element includes objectives and policies that require biological surveys be conducted prior to development and coordination with CDFW and USFWS to protect special status species and habitat. Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

c. **Substantial Adverse Effect on Wetlands.** The General Plan Conservation Element includes objectives and policies that would require appropriate mitigation if wetlands or waters are identified on a project site. Compliance with this mitigation would be part of the CEQA process and would mitigate impacts resulting from individual development. Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

d. **Substantial Interference with Movement of Species or Use of Nursery Sites.** The General Plan Conservation Element includes objectives and policies that require preservation of trees and provide mitigation for tree loss resulting from new development. Policies have been developed to protect special status species and their habitats, including migration corridors and nesting areas. Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

e. **Conflict with Local Policies or Ordinances.** Since the General Plan Update establishes objectives and policies regarding biological resources, and replaces previous programs with those based on current state and federal regulations, the General Plan update would not result in a conflict. Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

f. **Conflict with Conservation Plans.** There are no adopted habitat conservation plans in San Joaquin and there would be no impact. No mitigation measures are required.
2.5.5 Cultural Resources

a-b. Substantial Adverse Change in Historical and Archeological Resources. The City shall require that a qualified archaeologist redirect the ground-disturbing activity in the vicinity of a discovery, and/or implement such other measures as may be necessary to avoid or minimize harm to the discoveries. Suspension of ground disturbance in the vicinity of the discovery shall not resume until a qualified archaeologist has evaluated the discoveries to determine whether it may be a historical resource pursuant to CEQA, and has developed an appropriate recordation, preservation and/or removal and curation program. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Government Code §65352.3 requires local governments to consult with tribes prior to the adoption or amendment of a general plan or specific plan. Local tribes were contacted from a list provided by the Native American Heritage Commission. No comments were received during the tribal consultation process.

c. Destroy a Unique Paleontological Resource or Unique Geological Feature. Federal and State laws require that in the event that fossils are encountered during development, work shall cease in the vicinity and the findings examined by a qualified paleontologist. As provided in the CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5(f) for archaeological resources, work could continue on other parts of the project site while unique resource mitigation (if necessary) takes place. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

d. Disturb Human Remains. Federal and State law require that if human remains are encountered during excavation or other site construction activities, work shall be halted in the vicinity of the remains and the Fresno County Coroner contacted. In the event that the remains are Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted to determine the necessary procedures for protection of remains as provided in CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5(e). Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

2.5.6 Geology and Soils

a-i, ii Exposure to Loss, Injury, Death from Rupture of Known Earthquake Fault or from Strong Seismic Ground Shaking. Due to the City’s distance from active faults, ground shaking in the City would be minimal. In addition, new structures would be required to be built in compliance with the California Building Code which would further minimize loss due to earthquake activity. Therefore, the risks associated with fault rupture and seismic ground shaking are less than significant. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

a-iii Exposure to Loss, Injury, Death from Seismic-related Ground Failure. General Plan Safety Element objectives and policies regarding seismic safety require geotechnical and soils engineering reports with preliminary design layouts and grading plans to identify hazardous soil conditions and the appropriate building standards to mitigate such hazards. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.
a-iv Exposure to Loss, Injury, Death from Landslides. The City is not located within the landslide hazard area on the Fresno County General Plan Landslide Hazards and Areas of Subsidence map (2009). There is little risk of landslide due to the level topography. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

b. Result in Substantial Erosion or Loss of Topsoil. Due to the topography, the risk of substantial erosion is low. In addition, certain construction and industrial activities undertaken in the City would require compliance with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), under which a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would be implemented and monitored. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

c. Location on an Unstable Geological Unit or Soil. The City is located within a deep subsidence area and subsidence can cause structural, roadway, and infrastructure damage. The General Plan Safety Element requires geotechnical and soils engineering reports with preliminary design layouts and grading plans to identify hazardous soil conditions and appropriate building standards to mitigate such hazards. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

d. Location on Expansive Soils. According to the Fresno County Hazard Management Plan (2008), the City of San Joaquin does not contain soils of moderately-high or high expansion potential. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

e. Inadequate Soils for Wastewater Disposal Systems. The City operates a wastewater treatment and collection system. All development would be required to connect to the City system and new development proposals are not anticipated to rely on septic systems. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

2.5.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

a. Generate Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Either Directly or Indirectly, that may have a Significant Impact on the Environment. Goals and policies within the General Plan Update which would result in a more compact urban form, provide transportation alternatives, and lead to a sustainable development pattern would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. No mitigation measures are required.

b. Conflict with any Applicable Plan, Policy, or Regulation of an Agency Adopted for the Purpose of Reducing the Emissions of Greenhouse Gases. The City does not have a Climate Action Plan; however, the General Plan Conservation Element establishes objectives and policies to develop a Climate Action Plan and set emissions-reduction goals consistent with AB 32. Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required

2.5.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

a-b Hazard to the Public or the Environment through Transport, Use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials, Foreseeable Upset and Accident of Release of Hazardous Materials. The General Plan focuses industrial land uses along the existing railroad corridor and the southeast corner of the City. By including industrial uses along the railroad corridor, the General Plan creates a land use buffer between the railroad and residential uses.
New industrial developments that would produce hazardous materials would be subject to City environmental review and approval, as well as state and federal regulations. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

c. **Hazardous Materials Near a School.** If a new school is proposed in the City, the facility and site would be evaluated by the school district through the environmental review process to ensure either that the school site was not located near a hazardous site or that appropriate mitigation measures were in place. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

d. **Location on a List of Hazardous Material Sites.** Hazardous materials sites in San Joaquin include the two monitoring well clusters in the southern portion of the City monitored for high nitrate levels and the underground petroleum storage tank sites along Colorado Avenue. Future development projects in the City would be required to submit environmental analysis and would be subject to environmental review. If hazardous substances are identified, appropriate planning and mitigation would be required prior to development approval. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

e. **Location Near an Airport Land Use Plan.** There are no public airports located near the City of San Joaquin and the City is not located within an airport land use plan area. There would be no impact. No mitigation measures are required.

f. **Location Near a Private Airstrip.** The privately operated San Joaquin Airport is located approximately one mile west of the City. The General Plan includes expansion of the Sphere of Influence beyond the westernmost City limit, bringing the airport within one-half mile of the Sphere of Influence. Neither the City nor proposed Sphere of Influence would encroach into the area near the airport and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

f. **Impaired Implementation of Emergency Plan.** Policies require the emergency response plan be updated and maintained annually to ensure community safety, response times, and event mitigation implementation. The General Plan does not include new barriers to community evacuation or emergency response. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

g. **Exposure to Loss, Injury or Death Due to Wildland Fires.** The Fresno-Kings Pre-Fire Management Plan identifies the City as a non-wildland area. The mixture of urban and agricultural uses and lack of wildland non-developed area in or near the City indicates that the City is not located in a high-risk area for wildland fire. This impact is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

**2.5.9 Hydrology and Water Quality**

a. **Violate Water Quality Standards or Waste Discharge Requirements.** Implementation of groundwater protection programs under the General Plan will avoid contamination of groundwater sources and assist the City in meeting water quality standards.
In addition, certain construction and industrial activities would require compliance with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), under which a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPP) would be prepared, implemented and monitored. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

b. Deplete Groundwater Supplies or Interfere with Groundwater Recharge. Policies would expand and enhance groundwater supplies by utilizing existing storm water basins for recharge, installing new percolation ponds in growth areas, protecting areas of groundwater recharge from potentially degrading land uses and disposal methods and continuing water conservation programs. Combined with growth management strategies, water supplies would not be jeopardized by growth under the General Plan. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

c. Alter the Existing Drainage Pattern to Result in Substantial Erosion or Siltation. Policies establish that new projects are subject to approval of drainage plans, construction of facilities, and payment of drainage impact fees. Implementation of the policies and implementation measures in the draft General Plan, along with the NPDES requirements, would reduce the amount of erosion and siltation occurring from new development under the General Plan. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

d. Alter the Existing Drainage Pattern to Increase the Rate or Amount of Surface Runoff. Objectives and policies establish that new projects and developments are subject to approval based on availability of adequate flood control facilities and require new development to provide funding for additional flood control and drainage facilities and infrastructure. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

e. Create or Contribute Runoff Water Exceeding Capacity of Stormwater Drainage. The General Plan includes the objectives and policies related to stormwater as summarized in Section 3.9.4.c. These goals, objectives, and policies establish that new projects and developments are subject to approval based on availability of adequate flood control facilities and require new development to provide funding for additional flood control and drainage facilities and infrastructure. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

f. Substantially Degrade Water Quality. The General Plan includes measures to protect water quality. As city boundaries expand, improper abandonment of wells presents a significant risk of contaminating the city’s community water supply. Also, individual septic systems should be properly destroyed as a measure to protect groundwater. This a potentially significant impact.

Mitigation:

1. As new development occurs, the City shall, in cooperation with the Fresno County Environmental Health Division, require the safe and proper closure and/or destruction of abandoned water wells and individual septic disposal systems.

Level of Significance after Mitigation: With the incorporation of the recommended mitigation measure, impacts will be reduced to less than significant.
g-i Place Housing or Structures within a 100-year Flood Hazard Area, that would Impede or Redirect Flood Flows, or Expose People or Structures to a Risk of Loss, Injury, or Death. The entire City is located outside FEMA flood hazard zone “A.” Therefore, any new housing or designation of residential land uses on the General Plan would be at minimal risk for flooding. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

j. **Hazards Due to Seiche, Tsunami, or Mudflow.** The City is located inland and at a relatively flat elevation; therefore, there is little risk of inundation by tsunami or mudflow. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

### 2.5.10 Land Use and Planning

a. **Physically Divide an Established Community.** The General Plan land use diagram does not physically divide the community. Incompatible land uses are not proposed in the land use diagram and no new physical divisions such as airports, roads and railroads are proposed in the General Plan. There would be no impact. No mitigation measures are required.

b. **Conflict with Applicable Land Use Plan, Policy, or Regulation.** In some cases, changes proposed in the General Plan include land use standards that promote General Plan policies but are not in compliance with the specific text of the Zoning Ordinance. Following adoption of the General Plan, the City intends to amend the zoning ordinance to be consistent with the General Plan. Impacts are less than significant.

LAFCo is a responsible agency under CEQA whose role is to consider changes of spheres of influence and annexations. A responsible agency complies with CEQA by considering the environmental analysis prepared by the lead agency and by reaching its own conclusions on whether and how to approve the project.

Prior to, or in conjunction with an SOI update, LAFCo is required to conduct a Municipal Service Review (MSR), a comprehensive review of an agency’s ability to provide municipal service(s) within its current boundaries and its SOI.

The standards for SOI review are contained in Section 330 of LAFCo’s *Commission Policies, Standards, and Procedures Manual*. Implementation of policies, standards, and procedures contained within the *Manual* will prevent a conflict with applicable policy or regulations and reduce potential impacts to **less than significant**.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation measures are required.

c. **Conflict with Applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan.** There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans applicable to the City of San Joaquin. There would be no impact. No mitigation measures are required.
2.5.11 Mineral Resources

a-b Loss of Known Mineral Resource or Locally-Important Mineral Resource Recovery Site. There are no designated Mineral Resource Zones in San Joaquin or within the proposed SOI. There would be no impact. No mitigation measures are required.

2.5.12 Noise

a. Exposure to Noise Levels in Excess of Standards Established in the Local General Plan or Noise Ordinance. While development would result in permanent increases in ambient noise levels above levels, new noise is anticipated to be similar in intensity to existing noise levels. Additionally, the Community Development Department will review all new development proposals to determine conformance with City policies and regulations that mitigate noise impacts. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

b. Exposure to or Generation of Excessive Ground borne Vibration or Noise Levels. The General Plan contains objectives and policies that would mitigate noise impacts resulting from implementation of the Plan. Industrial uses are generally designated in the southeast and eastern periphery of the planning area to avoid land use conflicts such as incompatible noise levels. Construction activity also has the potential to cause groundborne vibration and temporary excessive noise levels. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

c-d Permanent, Temporary, or Periodic Increase in Ambient Noise Levels. Future development will generate temporary impacts from construction noise. Construction operations would temporarily subject adjacent areas to noise levels perceptibly different from existing noise levels. Construction noise would be temporary and confined to relatively small areas at any one time. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

e. Exposure to Excessive Noise Levels from an Airport. There are no public airports within two miles of the City and no impact due to noise level exposure caused by a public airport would occur. No mitigation measures are required.

f. Exposure to Excessive Noise Levels from a Private Airstrip. The San Joaquin airport is located one mile west of the City; however this is a small private airport. Since there are no plans to extend the City limits further west than the existing westernmost boundary, noise impacts resulting from proximity to the airport would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

2.5.13 Population and Housing

a. Induce Substantial Population Growth. Due to the location of the City within a largely agricultural area and at a distance from major cities, San Joaquin is not likely to become a major commuter city or to see extreme growth rates within a short period; however, estimates for growth are subject to change and population growth rates may exceed current as economic and other factors change. Although it is unlikely that the City will achieve buildout within the next 20 years, the General Plan anticipates growth and prepares the City for growth beyond the planning period. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.
b-c. Displace Substantial Numbers of Existing Housing. Since the General Plan does not eliminate housing and provides more opportunities for housing of all types, the impact of the General Plan is beneficial and less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

2.5.14 Public Services

Substantial Adverse Physical Impacts Due to Maintaining Acceptable Service Levels

a. Fire Protection. As the City nears buildout (24,330 persons), the demand for an additional fire station may be warranted. Property maintenance enforced through General Plan policies will reduce the potential and severity of wildland fires. However, without an increase in fire protection service, the increase in population will result in increased demand that cannot be met at current service levels. Impacts are potentially significant.

Mitigation:

1. Developers of proposed projects in the planning area shall pay Public Facilities Impact Fees for proposed developments as established by the City of San Joaquin in accordance with the requirements of State law.
2. All proposed development in the planning area shall comply with applicable, current requirements under the Uniform Building Code, Uniform Fire Codes, and City Standards.
3. Developers of proposed projects in the planning area shall be individually evaluated and impact on fire service mitigated through standard requirements for fire flow, hydrant placement, sprinklerization, and developer provision of new equipment where necessary.
4. San Joaquin shall ensure that adequate fire protection services are in available concurrent with construction in newly developing areas.

Level of Significance After Mitigation - With the incorporation of mitigation measures, potential environmental impacts will be reduced to less than significant.

b. Law Enforcement. Increases in urbanization may lead to an increase in demand for law enforcement. This will require additional budget, law enforcement personnel, and coordination with the Fresno County Sheriff Department. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

c. Schools. Since schools currently experience overcrowding, new development will exacerbate an existing problem. Implementation of General Plan policies, payment of school impact fees as allowed by State law, and continued coordination with the Golden Plains Unified School District will reduce these potential impacts. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

d. Parks. The population increase allowed by the General Plan will result in an increased demand for parks and will increase the variety of recreational demand sought by the community. General Plan objectives and policies seek to expand recreational resources in the City and provide high-quality recreational experiences that meet the needs of various members of the community.
The provision of additional parks and the increase in variety of park amenities will address demand as a result of increased population. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

e. Other public facilities. The General Plan land use diagram includes “Public Facility” land uses such as government offices, parks, and other public facilities. Demand for additional government buildings or other public facilities outside of those discussed above is not anticipated. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

2.5.15 Recreation

a-b Increase Use of Existing Recreational Facilities or Require Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities. The population increase allowed by the General Plan will result in an increased demand for parks, and increase the variety of recreational demand sought by the community. General Plan objectives and policies seek to expand recreational resources in the City and provide high-quality recreational experiences that meet the needs of various members of the community. Implementation of these programs will increase the recreational opportunities in the City to alleviate demand on existing parks and recreational facilities resulting from increased development and population. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

2.5.16 Transportation and Traffic

a. Conflict with an Applicable Plan, Ordinance or Policy Establishing Measures of Effectiveness for the Performance of the Circulation System. A minimum of LOS D is established by General Plan policy. Currently, intersections and roadways in the City operate at LOS B or better. Buildout under the General Plan has the potential to substantially increase traffic levels; however, new development proposals will be required to include traffic studies with an evaluation of traffic impacts and the provision of mitigation measures that reduce impacts to a less than significant level. With implementation of General Plan policies, potential traffic impacts from new developments are reduced to less than significant and will maintain traffic levels above LOS D. No mitigation measures are required.

b. Conflict with an Existing Congestion Management Plan. Ultimate buildout can accommodate 24,330 persons in the City. Although it is highly unlikely that ultimate buildout will occur within the next 20 years, the General Plan provides opportunities for growth, which will contribute to additional vehicle traffic. General Plan objectives and policies include alternative transportation and land use planning to support the CMP which will result in less than significant impacts. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

c. Result in Change in Air Traffic Patterns. There are no airports within the City or the SOI expansion area. Buildout of the General Plan would not alter existing air traffic patterns. There would be no impact. No mitigation measures are required.
d. **Increase Hazards due to Design Features.** The General Plan does not include specific roadway design features, but does include goals, objectives, and policies in relation to transportation design and safety. With implementation of goals, objectives, and policies, the General Plan would not increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible use.

A specific concern is the active railroad tracks within the community, including several at-grade crossings. The California Public Utilities Commission has jurisdiction over the safety of rail crossings in California. The State grants the PUC exclusive power on the design, alteration, or closing of crossings. New developments may increase traffic volumes not only on streets and at intersections, but also at at-grade crossings. This includes considering pedestrian circulation patterns or destinations with respect to railroad right-of-way and compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. This is a potentially significant impact.

**Mitigation:**

1. In its consideration of future development projects in the planning area, the San Joaquin City Council will determine on a case by case basis if the proposed development will impact existing at-grade crossings. In consultation with the California Public Utilities Commission, the City shall require such measures as improvements to existing at-grade crossings due to increased traffic volumes, pedestrian safety, and continuous vandal resistant fencing or other appropriate barriers to limit access onto the railroad right-of-way.

**Level of Significance after Mitigation:** With the incorporation of the recommended mitigation measure, impacts will be reduced to less than significant.

e. **Result in Inadequate Emergency Access.** The General Plan does not propose land uses that would physically divide the community or cause a circulation barrier that would substantially affect emergency access. Since existing development generally follows a grid pattern, implementation of General Plan policies would continue to support accessible streets as new development occurs under the General Plan. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

f. **Conflict with Adopted Policies, Plans, or Programs Regarding Public Transit.** Implementation of General Plan objectives and policies will ensure transit, pedestrian, and bicycle access and safety throughout buildout of the General Plan. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

2.5.17 **Utilities and Service Systems**

a. **Exceed Wastewater Treatment Requirements.** General Plan objectives and policies address new development by requiring analysis of wastewater treatment needs and unique treatment requirements. New development will be required to assess and fund additional or special treatment needs prior to implementation. The General Plan includes policies to address treatment needs of new development as well as policies to address growth in relation to wastewater treatment expansion. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.
b. **Require the Construction of New Water or Wastewater Treatment Facilities or Expansion of Existing Facilities.** General Plan policies require new developments to assess and fund water facility expansion and provide water infrastructure and that these impacts are addressed through the environmental process. General Plan policy addresses the environmental impacts of infrastructure expansion and ensures that treatment systems and capacity are available. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

c. **Construction or Expansion of Stormwater Drainage Facilities.** General Plan objectives and policies establish that new developments are subject to approval based on availability of adequate flood control facilities and requires new development to provide funding for additional flood control and drainage facilities and infrastructure. They also require stormwater to be captured onsite to avoid impacts to existing drainage control facilities. Therefore, General Plan policy controls the growth rate through these objectives and policies so as not to significantly impact stormwater management systems. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

d. **Sufficient Water Supplies Available.** The General Plan includes policies requiring new developments to assess impacts on existing water supply capacity and expansion of facilities. Combined with the growth management strategies, water supplies would not be jeopardized by growth under the General Plan. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

e. **Adequate Wastewater Treatment Capacity.** General Plan objectives and policies address wastewater treatment capacity and maintenance. New development will be required to assess and fund additional capacity prior to implementation. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

f. **Sufficient Landfill Capacity and Regulatory Compliance.** General Plan policies establish that new projects are subject to approval based on availability of adequate solid waste services and facilities and requires new development to provide additional facilities should demand exceed capacity. These policies also require recycling to reduce waste quantities. Therefore, the General Plan controls the growth rate through these objectives and policies so as not to significantly impact solid waste service. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

g. **Federal, State, and Local Statutes and Regulations Related to Solid Waste.** As discussed above, the General Plan includes objectives and policies to ensure compliance with regulations related to solid waste. Impacts are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.
3.1 Aesthetics

3.1.1 Environmental Setting

The City of San Joaquin is located in Fresno County within the San Joaquin Valley of California. The City is approximately 30 miles southwest of the City of Fresno and is located between Interstate 5 and State Highway 99. The City lies at an elevation of approximately 170 feet and is surrounded by agricultural uses. The City limits comprise 1.1 square mile and the Sphere of Influence comprises approximately 1.5 square miles. There are no California designated or eligible scenic highways located in or near the City.

Land within the City is primarily urbanized with scattered vacant lots along Colorado Avenue and agricultural land within the western, eastern and southern City limits. Agricultural land surrounds the City. Existing development includes residential, commercial, industrial, agricultural, and public facilities, including parks and a school. Industrial uses are focused in the southeast corner of the City, while commercial uses are primarily focused along Colorado Avenue and the center of the City. Residential uses comprise the main development type in the City.

The City’s design characteristics vary within and between the City’s residential neighborhoods and non-residential districts. The downtown area is characterized by street trees, decorative crosswalks, sidewalks and one and two story structures. Mature residential neighborhoods are characterized by larger lots, landscaping, and in general are well-maintained. New residential neighborhoods have fewer trees and generally include a curvilinear street pattern uncharacteristic of older neighborhoods or the downtown core.

Commercial uses are primarily limited to the downtown and to Colorado Avenue, including the Marketplace on Manning Avenue. Outside the downtown, commercial uses are auto-oriented with parking lots and large setbacks. Industrial uses are focused in the area west of Colorado Avenue along the railroad tracks to Manning Avenue and are characterized by a range of structure types, sizes, ages, and maintenance levels. The rural and suburban transition areas are located southwest and west of the City and include a mix of agricultural uses such as barns, farmhouses, and packing sheds. The primary travelways through the City (Manning and Colorado Avenues) lack sidewalks and street trees which affects the visual character of the City.

Existing sources of glare include window reflection, architectural coatings, glass, and other reflective surfaces. Nighttime illumination consists of streetlights, lighted signs, security lighting, and vehicle headlights.

3.1.2 Regulatory Framework

State Scenic Highway System - The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) administers the California Scenic Highway Program. The goal of the program is to preserve and protect scenic highway corridors from changes that would affect the aesthetic value of land adjacent to highways. There are no scenic highways in the vicinity of the project area.
3.1.3 Impact Evaluation Criteria

The following thresholds of significance are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. For purposes of this EIR, the Project may have a significant adverse impact associated with aesthetics/visual resources if it would do any of the following:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state or county designated scenic highway or county designated scenic road.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings which are open to public view.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

3.1.4 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation

3.1.4.a Substantial Adverse Effect on a Scenic Vista

The topography of the Project area is level and there are no outstanding features. The Project will not result in the obstruction of federal, state or locally classified scenic vistas, or formally classified scenic resources such as a scenic highway or state scenic area. The Project would not damage scenic resources, including trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.

Development of the Project in compliance with the goals, policies and community design guidelines of the San Joaquin General Plan Update will preserve areas with scenic qualities and natural beauty, integrate new homes into open space and agricultural areas, and include landscaping that complements the urban setting. The potential impact to scenic vistas is less than significant.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation measures are required.

3.1.4.b Substantially Damage Scenic Resources within a State Scenic Highway

There are no designated or eligible state scenic highways in or near the City of San Joaquin. As a result, there will be no impact to visual resources within a State Scenic Highway.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation measures are required.

3.1.4.c Substantially Degrade Existing Visual Character or Quality

Buildout of the General Plan would result in new structures and expansion of urban features within San Joaquin. The Community Design Element includes objectives, policies and programs to enhance the aesthetic quality and community identity of the City that are included in the General Plan Update (Appendix A) and summarized below:
CD 1.1.1 The City shall encourage public art in new and existing developments to enhance the visual image and local heritage of San Joaquin.

CD 1.1.2 The City supports a mural program for public plazas and parks.

CD 1.2.1 The City shall encourage and support clearly marked, attractive and appropriate gateways into the City. Focus gateway developments at the intersections of Manning, Colorado, Sutter, Elm, Placer and Main.

CD 1.3.1 The City shall encourage the survey and documentation of relevant cultural and historic resources.

CD 1.5.1a Create residential design guidelines to ensure that future development and reconstruction in and around existing residential neighborhoods will be compatible in scale and design.

CD 3.1.1a Create a Community Design Guidelines document that outlines specific details needed in the design of new construction in the downtown core in the short-term planning period.

CD 3.3.1 The City shall identify and promote a cohesive and attractive architectural style that enhances the community identity.

CD 3.3.2 New development shall include architectural details such as (but not limited to) awnings, balconies, arcades, and patios that reflect appropriate architectural styles. "Southwestern" and "Spanish colonial" styles may be considered.

CD 3.4.1 The City shall maintain streetscape guidelines pertaining to pavement patterns, surface treatments, landscaping, bike lanes, and sidewalks to enhance the attractiveness and safety of the streets.

Implementation of General Plan policies will occur with new development leading to a gradual overall increase in the quality of construction. Central to this improvement is the site plan review procedure which incorporates architectural review. Over the long-term, the net results of the General Plan will be to substantially upgrade the appearance of existing structures, streets, and public facilities, and stimulate the construction of attractive new development.

Construction activities could temporarily result in unsightly conditions in the areas affected; because such effects would be short-lived, they would not constitute a significant adverse effect.

The conversion of agricultural land uses and the expansion of residential, commercial, and other urban land uses will alter the visual character of the area. The developed City will expand and adjacent areas outside the City, but within the Sphere of Influence may experience increased urbanization; however, urbanization will occur as planned within the General Plan and in accordance with the Community Design Element to reflect the existing community character and community. The potential impact to visual resources is less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

3.1.4.d Create New Source of Substantial Light or Glare

The expansion of residential and commercial land use designations within the City and Sphere of Influence and reduction in agricultural land use area will increase light sources from homes, streetlights, and vehicles. The Community Design Element includes objectives, policies and programs in relation to lighting that are included in the General Plan Update (Appendix A) and summarized below:
CD 4.1.1 The city shall implement a lighting ordinance to improve lighting in neighborhoods.
CD 4.1.1.b Identify dangerous or poorly lit alleys in the City and locate funding to place lighting in the vicinity.
CD 5.4.1 Lighting shall be designed to maintain views of the night sky.
CD 5.4.1.a Design Guidelines shall be developed that include lighting and glare standards. These standards shall require hoods or shields on outdoor lighting fixtures to focus light downward. Building materials that reduce glare shall be encouraged.

Each development project potentially results in an incremental contribution to a cumulative light and glare impact and loss of night sky views. New urban development would result in low level light and glare from streetlights, security and parking lot lights, and reflective material. Light and glare would be typical of new urban development and would be controlled by the City’s entitlement process required for new development.

Lighting associated with urban development does not generally create hazards or nuisance effects, but provides accent, direction, and security. The General Plan addresses lighting by establishing standards in the Design Guidelines that require hoods or shields on lighting fixtures and the use of low-glare building materials. Impacts related to new sources of light or glare are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.
3.2 Agricultural and Forestry Resources

3.2.1 Environmental Setting

Agricultural uses are located within and adjacent to the City and San Joaquin can be characterized as an agricultural production area. Within the City limits there are 230 acres in agriculture; these lands are primarily zoned for residential uses. Within the SOI expansion area, there are over 1,500 acres of land used for agriculture. Soils include Merced Clay, Merced Clay Loam, and Altaslough Clay Loam (NRCS, 2010). These are Class III, non-alkaline soils with high water retention rates and low percolation rates. Basic soil types for the Planning Area are shown on Figure 3.2-1.

Soils in San Joaquin are ideal for agriculture. According to the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, agricultural lands within the City’s Planning Area are primarily prime farmland (approximately 1,457 acres) with three smaller areas (approximately 67 acres) of farmland of local importance, and two areas of farmland of statewide importance (approximately 23 acres). Farmland designations in the San Joaquin Planning Area are shown in Figure 3.2-2.

Since the early 1950s, Fresno County has been the leading agricultural county in the United States in the value of farm products. The Fresno County Agriculture Commissioner’s 2011 Annual Crop Report indicated that the gross production value of agricultural products in the County increased from $2.27 billion in 1987 to $6.88 billion in 2011.

Conversion of agricultural land to urban uses is an important public policy issue in Fresno County. Since most of the County’s 15 cities are at least partially surrounded by agricultural soils, new growth often brings about the conversion of agriculture to urban uses. A common issue is the transitional nature of farmland on city fringes.

While California has made the protection of farmland a statewide priority, local governments (counties and cities) have been given the responsibility to carry out the bulk of such protection. Policies and action programs of county and city governments vary widely in how much priority they give to farmland protection, highlighting California’s decentralized approach to the management of urban growth. Long range planning documents (e.g., general plans) adopted by most cities in Fresno County typically include goals and policies aimed at balancing the preservation of agricultural land with the increasing demands for urbanization.

3.2.2 Regulatory Framework

Federal Government. The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) is the nation’s leading agency in conserving natural resources on private lands. The NRCS rates the agricultural suitability of soils in terms of Land Use Compatibility Classification System and the Storie Index. The Land Use Compatibility Classification System shows the suitability of soils for most types of field crops according to their limitations, risk of damage when used and the way they respond to treatment. The Storie Index expresses the suitability of soils for general intensive farming, based on characteristics of the soil. Based on the Storie Index, soils can be classified from Grade 1, considered excellent and very well suited to general intensive farming, to Grade 6, soils and miscellaneous areas not suited to farming.
Figure 3.2-1
Basic Soil Types in the San Joaquin Planning Area
Figure 3.2-2
Farmland Designations in the San Joaquin Planning Area
State of California. The California Department of Conservation established the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) to identify critical agricultural lands and track conversion of these lands to other uses. Agricultural resources are separated into the following major categories:

- **Prime Farmland**: Lands with the best combination of physical and chemical features and able to sustain long term production of agricultural crops. This land must have been used to produce irrigated crops at some time during the two update cycles prior to the mapping date.

- **Farmland of Statewide Importance**: Lands similar to Prime Farmland but with minor shortcomings such as greater slopes or less ability to store soil moisture. This land must have been used to produce irrigated crops at some time during the two update cycles prior to the mapping date.

- **Farmland of Local Importance**: Lands of importance to the local agricultural economy, as determined by each county’s board of supervisors and a local advisory committee.

- **Unique Farmland**: Lands with lesser quality soils used to produce leading agricultural crops. Includes non-irrigated orchards or vineyards.

- **Grazing Land**: Lands on which existing vegetation is suited to livestock grazing. This category was developed in cooperation with the California Cattlemen's Association and U.C. Cooperative Extension.

**California Land Conservation Act (Williamson Act).** A primary tool to preserve agricultural lands is the California Land Conservation Act (LCA), or Williamson Act. The act provides tax incentives to landowners who voluntarily enter into a long-term contract with cities or counties to maintain their farmlands. Under the contract, lands are prohibited from being developed to urban uses for ten years. The contract is automatically renewed each year to maintain the 10-year time horizon. To remove lands from the contract, a land owner must file a notice of non-renewal. Once a notice has been processed, assessed value is incrementally increased to reach market rates when the contract expires 10 years after the notice of non-renewal is filed. If a landowner desires to terminate a contract prior to the end of the non-renewal period, contract cancellation is an option under limited conditions set forth in Government Code Section 51280 et seq. Parcels subject to the Williamson Act in the San Joaquin Planning Area are shown in Figure 3.2-3.

Farmland Security Zones (FSZ) require a 20-year contract and greater restrictions on cancellation. There are no lands within a FSZ in the project area.
Figure 3.2-3
Parcels Subject to the Williamson Act in the San Joaquin Planning Area

Williamson Act Designations
- Fresno County Williamson 2013
- Fresno County Parcel (No Williamson)
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**Fresno LAFCO.** The Project requires the approval of an SOI Expansion from the Fresno LAFCO. LAFCOs discourage urban sprawl and encourage the preservation of open-space and prime agricultural lands (California Government Code sections 56301, and 56300(a)). The state law that regulates LAFCOs defines “Prime Agricultural Land” as land currently used for the purpose of producing an agricultural commodity for commercial purposes, land left fallow under a crop rotational program, or land enrolled in an agricultural subsidy or set-aside program (Cortese\Knox\Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 - California Government Code sections 56016 and 56064).

LAFCO may include Williamson Act contracted lands within an SOI expansion, but only after making certain findings. Williamson Act lands may not be included within an annexation unless the city has adopted procedures to administer lands subject to the Act (Government Code Sections 51296.3, 56426, 56426.5, 56749 and 56856.5). In order to annex and administer Williamson Act lands as part of an overall urban development strategy, San Joaquin must first adopt such procedures.

**Fresno County.** The Fresno County General Plan contains a number of policies to support the goal of long-term preservation and protection of agricultural resources. For example, Policy LU-A.1 states that new development should be located within existing urban areas. Policies LU-A.12 and LU-A.13 protects agricultural activities from encroachment of incompatible land uses. Policy LU-A.14 enables the county to condition permits for residential development adjacent to agricultural areas by recording a Right-to-Farm Notice. Policies LU-A.15, LU-A.16, LU-A.20 and LU-B.14 also provide direction for the County to consider establishing several agricultural conservation programs, including setting up criteria to determine which lands should receive priority funding for land conservation easements, establishing an agricultural mitigation fee program to help offset development on agricultural lands, and participation in the Agricultural Land Stewardship Program Fund.

A primary tool for conserving farmland is agricultural zoning applied by Fresno County. The AE (Exclusive Agriculture) district ensures that agriculture will remain viable by restricting the minimum parcel size (20-160 acres) and limiting use to agriculture and related activities. Figure 3.2-4 shows existing Fresno County zoning within and surrounding the San Joaquin Planning Area.

The County Agricultural Commissioner’s Office utilizes various regulations to minimize agricultural impacts on adjacent non-agricultural properties, including issuance of pesticide application permits, providing agricultural land use recommendations on development projects, and providing a range of educational programs and services.

**City of San Joaquin.** The City’s existing general plan has limited policies to support preservation of agricultural lands. The General Plan Update includes goals, objectives and policies for the preservation of agricultural land that would minimize impacts to agricultural resources.

**Right-to-Farm.** Local agencies, including Fresno County and the Fresno LAFCO, utilize right-to-farm ordinances as a condition of project approval. The right-to-farm ordinance helps protect farming operations and allows farmers to conduct normal operations (harvest crops, till soil, or spray crops) without interference from nearby land owners. The ordinance generally takes the form of a deed restriction on newly annexed or developed property notifying the owner of the right to farm on adjacent agricultural land. A right-to-farm policy is included in the San Joaquin General Plan Update.
Figure 3.2-4
Existing Fresno County Zoning Within and Surrounding the San Joaquin Planning Area
3.2.3 Impact Evaluation Criteria

The following thresholds of significance are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. For purposes of this EIR, the Project may have a significant adverse impact associated with agricultural and forestry resources if it would do any of the following:

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

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

3.2.4 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation

3.2.4.a Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project converts farmland designated as “prime,” “unique” or “farmland of statewide importance” to non-agricultural uses.

Since all but 45 acres of the land in agricultural production within the City and SOI expansion area are designated prime farmland, conversion of the land to urban uses will result in the loss of approximately 1,457 acres of prime farmland at buildout.

Objectives, policies and programs regarding urban growth and conversion of agricultural land are included in the General Plan Update (Appendix A) and summarized below:

LU 1.4.1 The City shall encourage infill development prior to annexing new territory.
LU 1.4.2 New annexations require the City Council find that overriding considerations exist concerning land availability, affordable housing, economic development, or physical constraints, which preclude additional infill development.
LU 1.4.2a The City shall update its sphere of influence to accommodate the land area and rate of urban expansion compatible with the policies of this General Plan.
LU 1.4.3 Urban expansion shall not exceed the capacity of the City and other local agencies to provide the services and facilities required consistent with the goals of this General Plan.
LU 1.5.1 The City shall not expand its boundary onto prime farmland unless a finding is made that more than 50 percent of the perimeter of the land directly surrounding it is urbanized.
CON 6.1.1 The City shall promote growth in a compact form.
CON 6.1.2 Encourage developers to take advantage of the maximum densities allowed in the General Plan.
CON 6.1.3 Encourage farmland preservation by mitigating the loss of prime farmland.
CON 6.1.4 First priority is given to development of vacant, underdeveloped, and/or redevelopable land where urban services are or can be made available.
CON 6.1.5 Ensure that land conversion to urban uses is based on preservation of agricultural lands, protecting the City from leapfrog development, and delays development until urban development is needed.
CON 6.1.6 The protection of agricultural lands from premature conversion to urban use will be reinforced by the City monitoring and reviewing extension of sewer and water lines.
CON 6.2.1 The City shall work with Fresno County to ensure willing landowners outside the Planning Area are given Williamson Act Contracts in order to create a virtual growth boundary.
CON 6.3.1a Adopt a Right to Farm Ordinance that includes buffers to support agricultural uses of agricultural lands adjacent to urban uses.

Policies and programs of the San Joaquin General Plan Update serve to partially mitigate potential impacts to agriculture lands from new growth and development. Under these policies, adjacent and nearby agricultural lands within the Sphere of influence are preserved, while providing for logical growth of the City. The premature conversion of producing agricultural lands to urban uses is discouraged. Steps to curb conversion of these lands include the use of Williamson Act contracts and "right to farm" covenants.

The policies of the plan update support Fresno County General Plan objectives and policies which protect agricultural lands by maintaining large agricultural parcel sizes and preventing the development of these parcels until it is appropriate to be annexed into the City for development.

The City opposes untimely urban development in the unincorporated areas of its Sphere of Influence. The City also requires a "right to farm" covenant to be recorded for all development adjacent to producing agricultural lands in order to provide notice to future owners and protect the farming activities. Leapfrog development is discouraged, and the fill of existing vacant lands is encouraged over development on the peripheral of the county. Development of peninsulas of urban development into agricultural lands is also discouraged.

The Project could ultimately result in the loss of approximately 1,457 acres of Prime Farmland and Farmlands of Statewide Importance. The loss of productive agricultural land resulting from implementation of the Project will be irreversible. This is a potentially significant impact.

Mitigation:

3.2.1 In its consideration of future development projects in the planning area, the San Joaquin City Council will determine on a case by case basis if the proposed development is timely and appropriate and if the conversion of the agricultural land to urban uses in the Project area is consistent with the goals and policies of the San Joaquin General Plan. In making its decision, the City may consider other factors important to the community, such as population growth,
economic development, and creation of employment opportunities. In the event the proposed development is determined to be inconsistent with General Plan policies to prevent the premature conversion of agricultural lands, the Council shall mitigate the loss of such agricultural lands in one or more of the following ways:

a. The acquisition of conservation easements on agricultural land located elsewhere in Fresno County.
b. Participation in a “Mitigation Fee and Deduction” program to offset the impacts of development on agricultural land, if such a program has been implemented by the City of San Joaquin under a Joint Powers Agreement.
c. Contribution of required funds to a nonprofit agricultural land trust whose primary purpose is the preservation of agricultural land, if such an organization has been formed at the time development is proposed.
d. Implement appropriate and feasible mitigation recommended in the Farmland Conservation Program administered by Council of Fresno County Governments (COG).
e. Participation in any other conservation program acceptable to the City of San Joaquin including, but not limited to, transferable development credits, and transfer of development rights.

Level of Significance after Mitigation: With the incorporation of the recommended mitigation measure, this impact remains a significant unavoidable impact.

3.2.4.b Conflict with Existing Zoning for Agricultural Use or a Williamson Act Contract

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.

As shown on Figure 3.2-3, there are nine parcels subject to the Williamson Act in the SOI Expansion Area which make up approximately 50 percent of the expanded SOI. There are no Williamson Act contracts in the existing City limits. Of the nine parcels, six would be designated Low Density Residential with some areas of Park (Public Facility), Medium Density Residential, and Neighborhood Commercial. The remaining three parcels located in the southwest portion of the SOI expansion area would be designated Industrial. Use of these parcels as designated by the General Plan could only occur with non-renewal or cancellation of the subject Williamson Act contracts.

According to Fresno County records, no notices of non-renewal have been filed on these contracts. Under state law, if a landowner desires to terminate a contract prior to the end of the non-renewal period, contract cancellation is an option under limited circumstances and conditions set forth in Government Code (GC) Section 51280 et seq. In such cases, landowners may petition the county for Williamson Act contract cancellation. The landowner petition must contain a proposal for a specified alternative use for the property, and a list of all government agencies known to have permit authority related to the proposed use (GC Section 51282(e)).

The legislative authority may grant tentative approval for cancellation of a Williamson Act contract only if it makes the required findings that the cancellation is in the public interest or that the cancellation is consistent with the Act. If the required findings are met, the landowner is required to pay a cancellation fee equal to 12.5 percent of the cancellation valuation (unrestricted fair market value) of the property as
determined by the County Assessor (GC Section 51283(b)). In order to find that the cancellation is consistent with the purposes of the Williamson Act, the legislative authority must find:

1. That the cancellation is for land on which a notice of non-renewal has been served;
2. That cancellation is not likely to result in the removal of adjacent lands from agricultural use;
3. That cancellation is for an alternative use which is consistent with the applicable provisions of the city or county general plan;
4. That cancellation will not result in discontiguous patterns of urban development; and
5. That there is no proximate, non-contracted land which is both available and suitable for the proposed use or that development of the contracted land would provide more contiguous patterns of urban development (GC Section 51282(b)).

In order to find that the cancellation is in the public interest, the legislative authority must find:

1. That other public concerns substantially outweigh the objectives of the Williamson Act; and,
2. That there is no proximate, non-contracted land which is both available and suitable for the proposed use or, that development of the contracted land would provide more contiguous patterns of urban development (GC Section 51282(c)).

In order to consider contract cancellation, the legislative authority must hold a public hearing on the landowner's petition for cancellation, and if approved, record with the county recorder a certificate of tentative cancellation. With payment of the cancellation fee, the cancelation is final.

The City may adopt procedures for implementation of the Williamson Act and could, on this basis, annex and manage contracts within the City limits. Policies of the General Plan Update support continued agriculture within the SOI and also encourage a compact urban form and other measures to conserve agricultural land. Even with these procedures in place, however, the impact to lands under contract is expected to be significant and unavoidable.

**Level of Significance before Mitigation:** Significant unavoidable impact

**Mitigation:** Mitigation measure 3.1 would reduce the impacts of individual contract cancelations, but not to a level less than significant. No addition measures are available.

Environmental Analysis: *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.*

**3.2.4.c Conflict with Existing Zoning for Forest Lands or Timberlands**

A significant impact would be one that converts forest land to non-timber harvest uses; conflict with existing zoning for forest land use; or involve other changes in the existing environment, which could result in conversion of forest land to non-timber harvest use.

There are no forest lands, timberlands or timber harvesting operations in or near San Joaquin. There will be no impact to such resources.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation measures are required.
3.2.4.d Loss of Forest Land or Conversion of Forestland to Non-Forest Use

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project results in the loss of forest and or conversion of forest and to non-forest use.

There are no forest lands, timberlands or timber harvesting operations in or near San Joaquin. There will be no impact to these resources.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

3.2.4.e Other Changes to Existing Environment

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project involves other changes in the existing environment that due to their location or nature could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest use.

Land adjacent to the SOI expansion area consists of parcels designated and zoned for agriculture by Fresno County. Expansion of the urban area with urban uses to the edge of the SOI has the potential to indirectly affect adjacent agricultural operations.

Goal 1 of the Land Use Element includes the following objective and policy to avoid farmland conversion outside the urban area:

LU 1.5: Objective – To preserve prime agricultural land outside the City boundary.
LU 1.5.1: Policy – The City shall not expand its boundary onto prime farmland unless a finding is made that more than 50 percent of the perimeter of the land directly surrounding it is urbanized.

This policy protects agricultural land within the City and Sphere of Influence by maintaining growth in a centralized pattern that avoids creation of agricultural pockets surrounded by urban development. Growth can continue from the existing core of the City without isolating agricultural uses and avoiding pressure on agricultural pockets to convert to urban uses. Impacts will be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.
3.3 Air Quality

3.3.1 Environmental Setting

Climate is characterized as inland Mediterranean, averaging over 260 sunny days per year with warm, dry summers and cool winters. Average high temperatures range from 99°F in July to 54°F in January. The average precipitation varies between 7 and 18 inches per year with an average of about 9 inches.

The Project lies within the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin, for which the State of California has delegated air quality management responsibility to the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD). The Basin is characterized by a bowl-shaped topography that collects pollutants. Low wind speeds and low inversion layers are conducive to high carbon monoxide and PM10 pollutant levels. High temperatures and cloudless skies experienced during Valley summers provide ideal conditions for ozone to form through photochemical reactions. PM10 levels are highest during late fall and early winter when inversions are the lowest and mixing of the air is weakest.

The San Joaquin Air Basin is currently a non-attainment area for Ozone, PM10 (state only), and PM2.5 (federal and state). The Valley was initially classified as "serious nonattainment" for the 1997 eight-hour ozone federal standard; however, the EPA approved Valley reclassification to "extreme nonattainment" in May 2010. According to the nearest monitoring stations to the City (Fresno-Drummond Street station, Tranquility monitoring station, and Fresno-Hamilton and Winery station), air pollutant levels exceeded state and federal PM2.5 and Ozone standards from 2007 to 2009. In addition, air pollutant levels exceeded state PM10 standards from 2007 to 2009.

3.3.2 Regulatory Framework

Air quality is regulated by several agencies including the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the California Air Resources Board (CARB), and the SJVAPCD. Each of these agencies develops rules and/or regulations to attain the goals or directives imposed upon them through legislation. Although EPA regulations may not be superseded, both State and local regulations may be more stringent. In general, air quality evaluations are based upon air quality standards developed by the federal government and several State agencies. Emissions limitations are then imposed upon individual sources of air pollutants by local agencies, such as the SJVAPCD. Mobile sources of air pollutants are largely controlled through federal and State agencies, while most stationary sources are regulated by the SJVAPCD.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

The EPA is responsible for implementing the Federal Clean Air Act (FCAA), which passed in 1970 and was last amended in 1990 to form the basis for the national air pollution control effort. The FCAA required the EPA to establish primary and secondary National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), and reassess, at least every five years, whether adopted standards are adequate to protect public health based on current scientific evidence.

The FCAA also required each state to prepare an air quality control plan referred to as a State Implementation Plan (SIP). The Federal Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 (FCAA) added requirements for states with nonattainment areas to revise their SIPs to incorporate additional control measures to reduce air pollution. The SIP is periodically modified to reflect the latest emissions inventories, planning
documents, and rules and regulations of the air basins as reported by their jurisdictional agencies. The EPA has responsibility to review all state SIPs to determine conformance to the mandates of the FCAAA and determine if implementation will achieve air quality goals. If the EPA determines a SIP to be inadequate, a Federal Implementation Plan (FIP) may be prepared for the nonattainment area that imposes additional control measures. Failure to submit an approvable SIP or to implement the plan in the mandated timeframe may result in sanctions being applied to transportation funding and stationary air pollution sources in the air basin.

**California Air Resources Board (CARB)**

CARB is responsible for coordination and oversight of state and local air pollution control programs and for implementing the California Clean Air Act (CCAA). The CCAA requires that all air districts in the state endeavor to achieve and maintain the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAAQS) by the earliest practical date. The act specifies that districts should focus particular attention on reducing the emissions from transportation and area-wide emission sources, and provides districts with the authority to regulate indirect sources.

The CARB is primarily responsible for developing and implementing air pollution control plans to achieve the NAAQS. The CARB is primarily responsible for statewide pollution sources and produces a major part of the SIP. However, local air districts are still relied on to provide additional strategies for sources under their jurisdiction. The CARB combines local district data and submits the completed SIP to the EPA.

Other CARB duties include monitoring air quality (in conjunction with air monitoring networks maintained by air pollution control and air quality management districts), establishing the CAAAQS (which in many cases are more stringent than the NAAQS), determining and updating area designations and maps, and setting emissions standards for new mobile sources, consumer products, small utility engines, and off-road vehicles.

**Regional Regulations**

**San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District**

The SJVAPCD attains and maintains air quality conditions in Fresno County through a comprehensive program of planning, regulation, enforcement, technical innovation, and promotion of the understanding of air quality issues. The clean air strategy of the SJVAPCD includes the preparation of plans for the attainment of ambient air quality standards, adoption and enforcement of rules and regulations concerning sources of air pollution, and issuance of permits for stationary sources of air pollution. The SJVAPCD also inspects stationary sources of air pollution and responds to citizen complaints, monitors ambient air quality and meteorological conditions, and implements programs and regulations required by the FCAA and the CCAA. In January of 2002, the SJVAPCD released a revision to the previously adopted guidelines document. This revised Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts (GAMAQI) is an advisory document that provides lead agencies, consultants, and project applicants with uniform procedures for addressing air quality in environmental documents. The GAMAQI contains the following applicable components:

- Criteria and thresholds for determining whether a project may have a significant adverse air quality impact;
• Specific procedures and modeling protocols for quantifying and analyzing air quality impacts;
• Methods available to mitigate air quality impacts; and
• Information for use in air quality assessments and EIRs that will be updated more frequently such as air quality data, regulatory setting, climate, topography, etc.

**Air Quality Regulations.** Primary air quality regulations of the District include:

*Regulation VIII* (Fugitive PM$_{10}$ Prohibitions) Rules 8011-8081 are designed to reduce PM$_{10}$ emissions predominantly dust/dirt) generated by construction and demolition activities, road construction, bulk materials storage, paved and unpaved roads, carryout and track out, landfill operations, etc.

*Rule 4002* (National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants) Prior to any demolition activity, an asbestos survey of existing structures may be required to identify any asbestos containing building material (ACBM). Any identified ACBM having the potential for disturbance must be removed by a certified asbestos contractor.

*Rule 4102* (Nuisance) This rule applies to any source operation that emits air contaminants or other materials. In the event that the project or construction of the project creates a public nuisance, it could be in violation and be subject to District enforcement action.

*Rule 4103* (Open Burning) This rule regulates the use of open burning and specifies the types of materials that may be open burned.

*Rule 4601* (Architectural Coatings) This rule limits volatile organic compounds from architectural coatings by specifying storage, clean up and labeling requirements.

*Rule 4641* (Cutback, Slow Cure, and Emulsified Asphalt, Paving and Maintenance Operations) If asphalt paving will be used, then paving operations of this project will be subject to Rule 4641.

*Rule 4901* (Wood Burning Fireplaces and Wood Burning Heaters) This rule limits PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ emissions from residential development. Specifically:

- No person shall install a wood burning fireplace in a new residential development with a density greater than two units per acre.
- No person shall install more than two EPA Phase II Certified wood burning heaters per acre in any new residential development with a density equal to or greater than three units per acre.
- No person shall install more than one wood burning fireplace or wood burning heater per unit in any new residential development with a density equal to or less than two units per acre.

*Rule 9510* (indirect Source Review). The SJVAPCD adopted Rule 9510 and Rule 3180 to mitigate construction, area, and operational emissions created by development. Any of the following projects require an application to be submitted unless the projects have mitigated emissions of less than two tons per year each of NOX and PM$_{10}$. Projects that are at least:

- 50 residential units;
- 2,000 square feet of commercial space;
- 9,000 square feet of educational space;
- 10,000 square feet of government space;
- 20,000 square feet of medical or recreational space;
- 25,000 square feet of light industrial space;
- 39,000 square feet of general office space;
- 100,000 square feet of heavy industrial space;
- Or, 9,000 square feet of any land use not identified above.

**Air Quality Plans.** The SJVAPCD submitted the 1991 Air Quality Attainment Plan in compliance with the requirements set forth in the CCAA. In addition, the CCAA requires a triennial assessment of the extent of air quality improvements and emission reductions achieved through the use of control measures. As part of this assessment, the attainment plan must be reviewed and, if necessary, revised to correct for deficiencies in progress and to incorporate new data or projections. The CCAA requirement for the first triennial progress report and revisions of the 1991 Air Quality Attainment Plan was first fulfilled with the preparation and adoption of the 1995-1997 Triennial Progress Report and Plan Revision. Triennial reports were also prepared for 1995-1997, 1997-1999, and 1999-2001 in compliance with the CCAA.

In an effort to reach attainment for ozone, the SJVAPCD submitted the 1994 Ozone Attainment Demonstration Plan. This plan stresses ozone attainment and focuses on strategies reducing NOx and ROG air emissions by promoting active public involvement, enforcement of compliance with rules and regulations, public education in both the public and private sectors, development and promotion of transportation and land use programs designed to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in the region, and implementation of stationary and mobile source control measures.

In addition to the above mentioned items, the SJVAPCD has submitted numerous plans with respect to ozone, PM$_{10}$, and CO in compliance with the FCAA and CCAA, as listed below:

- 1992 Federal Attainment Plan for Carbon Monoxide;
- Revised 1993 Rate of Progress Plan, November 1994;
- Revised Post-1996 Rate of Progress Plan, September 1995;
- 1997 PM$_{10}$ Attainment Demonstration Plan, May 1997;
- 2000 Ozone Rate of Progress Report, April 2000;
- 2000 PM$_{10}$ Attainment Plan Progress Report, August 2000;
- 2001 Update to Ozone Attainment Plan;
- Amended 2002-2005 Rate of Progress Plan, December 2002;
- 2003 PM$_{10}$ Plan, June 2003, Amended December 2003, Amended May 2005;
- 2004 One-Hour Extreme Ozone Attainment Demonstration Plan, Adopted October 2004;
  - Amended October 2005;
- 2005 Indirect Source Review, Adopted December 2005;
- 2006 PM$_{10}$ Plan, Adopted February 2006;
- 2007 PM$_{10}$ Maintenance Plan, Adopted September 2007;
- 2007 Ozone Plan, Adopted April 2007; and
- 2008 PM2.5 Plan, Adopted April 2007

The principal factors that affect air quality in and around Fresno County are: (a) the sink effect, atmospheric subsidence, temperature inversions and low wind speeds; (b) automobile and truck travel and (c) increases in mobile and stationary pollutants generated by local urban growth.
Ozone Emissions - The most severe air quality problem in the SJVAB is ozone which can cause eye irritation and impair respiratory functions. Accumulations of ozone depend heavily on weather patterns and thus vary substantially from year to year. Ozone is produced through photochemical reactions involving reactive organic compounds (ROG) and nitrogen oxides (NOx). Numerous small sources throughout the region are responsible for most of the ROG and NOx emissions in the Basin.

Suspended PM Emissions – Common sources of particulate include demolition, construction, agricultural operations, traffic and other localized sources such as fireplaces. Very small particulate can cause direct lung damage or can contain absorbed gases that may be harmful when inhaled.

Carbon Monoxide (CO) - Because CO is emitted primarily by motor vehicles and is non-reactive, ambient CO concentrations normally follow the distribution of traffic. CO concentrations are also influenced by meteorological factors such as wind speed and atmospheric mixing. CARB has found CO standards in Fresno County in attainment of federal and State standards.

Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2) - The major source of nitrogen dioxide (NO2), essential to the formation of photochemical smog, is fuel combustion. NO2 increases respiratory disease and irritation and may reduce resistance to certain infections. The standards for NO2 are being met in the SJVAB and the District does not expect that the standards will be exceeded in the future.

Sulfur Dioxide (SO2) - The major source of sulfur dioxide (SO2) is combustion of high-sulfur fuels. In humid atmospheres, sulfur oxides can react with vapor to produce sulfurous acid, a component of acid rain. SO2 can irritate the lungs, damage vegetation and materials and reduce visibility. The standards for SO2 are being met in the SJVAB and the District does not expect that the standards will be exceeded in the near future.

Lead (Pb) - Gasoline-powered engines are a major source of airborne lead, although leaded fuel is no longer available. Ambient lead levels have dropped dramatically as the percentage of motor vehicles using unleaded gasoline continues to increase. The standards for lead are being met in the SJVAB and the District does not expect that the standards will be exceeded in the future.

3.3.3 Impact Evaluation Criteria

The following thresholds of significance are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. For purposes of this EIR, the Project may have a significant adverse impact associated with aesthetics/visual resources if it would do any of the following:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

3.3.4 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation

3.3.4.a Conflict with Applicable Air Quality Plan

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project conflicts with or obstructs implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

The SJVAPCD rulebook provides air quality rules and regulations and contains more than 150 rules. In addition, SJVAPCD has published the Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts (SJVAPCD 2002) and the Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts – Technical Document (SJVAPCD 2002). They are advisory documents providing uniform procedures for air quality in CEQA documents.

The "San Joaquin Valley Transportation Control Measure Program Final Report" serves as a basis for choosing measures that may be utilized in meeting air quality standards. Transportation Control Measures are aimed at requiring major traffic generators to provide information and make alternative forms of transportation available to employees and/or customers. The private automobile will continue to be a vital part of the transportation system. TCMs such as rideshare, mass transit, park and ride facilities, bicycle and walking reduce the pollution problem in the San Joaquin Valley.

The SJVAPCD also utilizes the California State Implementation Plan (SIP) for Carbon Monoxide, the 2012 and 2008 PM$_{2.5}$ Plans, the 2007 PM$_{10}$ Maintenance Plan, the 2004 Extreme Ozone Demonstration Plan, the 2007 Ozone Plan, 2009 RACT SIP, and is currently preparing a new revoked 1-hour ozone standard for submission to the EPA.

Objectives, policies and programs related to air quality and air pollutants are included in the General Plan Update (Appendix A) and summarized below:

**Con 5.1.1**
The City shall determine project air quality impacts and implement appropriate mitigation for significant environmental impacts during CEQA review.

**Con 5.1.3**
The City shall submit project CEQA documentation to the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District for CEQA comments and review of the air quality analysis.

**Con 5.3.1**
The City shall work with Caltrans and the Regional Transportation Planning Agency to minimize air quality, mobility, and social impacts of large scale transportation projects on existing neighborhood.

**Con 5.3.1a**
Coordinate land use and transportation plans to meet federal, state, and local air quality requirements.

**Con 5.4.1**
Industrial development projects shall be located an adequate distance from sensitive receptors to minimize health risks from toxic air pollutants.

**Con 5.4.2**
The City shall require residential development projects and projects categorized as sensitive receptors to be located an adequate distance from existing and potential sources of toxic emissions such as freeways, major arterials, and industrial sites.
CIR 2.6.1 The City encourages alternatives to the use of the automobile including:
- Walking
- Ride Share
- Park-and-ride lots
- Bicycling
- Mass Transit
- Trip reduction programs
- Telecommunications

CIR 2.6.4 The City shall implement the TCM programs relevant to the City of San Joaquin developed by the SJVUAPCD.

CIR 2.6.5 The City encourages measures to increase the capacity of the existing road network prior to constructing more capacity. Measures may include street widening, pedestrian improvements, bicycle facilities, and transit improvements.

CIR 2.6.9 In the evaluation of transportation solutions consider significant costs and benefits, including non-market or indirect impacts, such as improving mobility options, reducing air pollution, reducing GHG emissions and health benefits achieved with reduced emissions.

CIR 2.6.10 Reduce GHG emissions from municipal fleet operations by purchasing or leasing high MPG, low carbon fuel, hybrid or all-electric vehicles, and/or by using an external car sharing program in lieu of city/county fleet.

In relation to carbon monoxide and ozone, the General Plan includes policies and objectives that reduce vehicle emissions through transportation design, alternative transportation methodologies and programs, implementation of TCM programs, and energy conservation. The General Plan also includes objectives and policies regarding particulate matter and the control and reduction of particulates, particularly during construction. This will ensure new development addresses particulates and provides control measures in accordance with the SJVAPCD. Further, policies require CEQA impact analysis and mitigation for all new development with review by the SJVAPCD. Impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

3.3.4.b Violation of Air Quality Standards or Substantially Contribute to an Existing or Projected Air Quality Violation

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project violates any air quality standard or contributes substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. The San Joaquin Air Basin is currently a non-attainment area for Ozone, $PM_{10}$ (state only), and $PM_{2.5}$ (state and federal).

The General Plan expands the urbanized area by designating residential land uses on agricultural land and by expanding the Sphere of Influence and potential urban area surrounding the City’s core. New development and the associated increase in pollutants from energy consumption, motorized vehicle use, construction, and other actions can contribute to existing air quality violations.
The General Plan objectives and policies include requirements to: provide adequate analysis and mitigation of air quality impacts resulting from new development; coordinate local and regional air quality programs, integrate land use and transportation planning with air quality regulations and requirements; site sensitive receptors and industrial uses appropriately; and reduce particulate emissions from construction, grading, excavation, and demolition. The Circulation Element also includes objectives, policies, and implementation measures to reduce vehicle pollutants and meet air quality standards.

The environmental assessment process required under CEQA is by far the most important tool for local government to communicate with other agencies and the public on the air quality impacts of development within a community. When specific projects are proposed on property in the SOI area a project specific CEQA evaluation, including an air quality impact assessment, will be required. It is recommended that San Joaquin’s update to their general plan include additional goals and policies that will require developers to make it easier and more attractive for people to use transit, bicycle, or walk.

Air Quality Guidelines for General Plans (Air Quality Guidelines) is a guidance document and resource for cities and counties to use to address air quality in their general plans. It includes goals, policies, and programs for adoption in general plans to reduce vehicle trips, reduce miles traveled, and improve air quality. The SJVAPCD believes that implementing the goals and programs suggested in the Air Quality Guidelines will result in a win-win situation: cities, counties, and developers save money through more efficient land use and transportation systems, and the public benefits from a more livable community and better air quality. While developing the document, the SJVAPCD found that many Valley general plans already contain goals and policies that support improved air quality. To obtain full benefit from adopted goals and policies, the SJVAPCD suggests cities and counties proceed rapidly with strong implementation programs.

Implementation of these objectives and policies will help reduce existing air quality violations in the air basin; however, additional growth and development will ultimately contribute to air quality violations as construction, energy consumption, and vehicle travel emit pollutants. Mitigation of impacts as and careful development planning will help reduce pollutant levels, but this impact is potentially significant due to the “extreme non-attainment” ozone classification.

Mitigation:

The following energy conservation measures shall be incorporated into project building plans unless the applicant provides evidence that incorporation of a specific measure is infeasible:

3.3.1 All construction shall exceed the California Title 24 Energy Code for all relevant applications by 10% for the hotel construction and by 5% for all commercial and industrial construction.

3.3.2 Passive solar cooling/heating design elements shall be included in building designs where feasible. Design elements that maximize the use of natural lighting shall be utilized where feasible.

3.3.3 Energy efficient technical and design features in new construction shall be required. New development must include provisions of the installation of energy efficient appliances and lighting.
3.3.4 Installation of low nitrogen oxide emitting and/or high efficiency water heaters shall be required in new construction. Use solar or low-emission water heaters (beyond Rule 4902) is recommended.

3.3.5 To reduce daily ROG, NOX and PM10 emissions during winter days from combined project sources, only advanced combustion or natural gas fireplaces shall be allowed. The developer is encouraged to install LPG fireplaces, pellet stoves or EPA-Certified wood-burning fireplaces or stoves. (Note: EPA-Certified fireplaces and fireplace inserts are 75 percent effective in reducing emissions from this source, while natural-gas/LPG fireplaces are nearly 100 percent effective in reducing emissions and have virtually no potential for odor or nuisance.

3.3.6 The proposed Project shall comply with all applicable Regulations and Rules established by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, including, but not limited to: Regulation IV: Prohibitions; Rule 4901: Wood Burning Fireplaces and Wood Burning Heaters; Regulation IV: Prohibitions; Rule 4902: Residential Water Heaters; and Regulation VIII: Fugitive PM10 Prohibitions; as well as the Indirect Source Review (ISR) (Rule 9510) and the Administrative ISR Fee Rule (Rule 3180).

The following are appropriate mitigation measures that would reduce exhaust emissions during construction:

3.3.6 All material excavated, graded or otherwise disturbed shall be sufficiently watered to prevent fugitive dust emissions. Watering shall occur at least twice daily with complete coverage, preferably in the morning and after work is done for the day, or as necessary. The developer shall be responsible for watering in the event of high winds or watering needs after normal working hours.

3.3.7 Water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used during construction to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site. The frequency of watering shall be increased when wind speeds exceed 15 miles per hour if soils are not completely wet. If wind speeds increase to the point that the dust control measures cannot prevent dust from leaving the site, construction activities shall be suspended.

3.3.8 A person or persons shall be designated by the contractor or builder to monitor the dust control program and to order increased watering, as necessary, to prevent transport of dust offsite. Such monitoring responsibilities shall include holiday and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The contractor shall provide the name and telephone number of such person to the SJVAPCD and the City Building Official prior to commencement of construction activities.

3.3.9 All disturbed areas on the site, including storage piles, which are not being actively utilized for construction purposes, shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water, chemical stabilizer/suppressant, covered with a tarp or other suitable cover or vegetative ground cover.

3.3.10 All on-site unpaved roads and off-site unpaved access roads shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water at least 3 times daily or chemical stabilizer/suppressant.
3.3.11 The accumulation of mud or dirt shall be expeditiously removed from adjacent public streets at the end of each workday. The use of dry rotary brushes is expressly prohibited except where preceded or accompanied by sufficient wetting to limit the visible dust emissions. Use of blower devices is expressly forbidden. Within urban areas, track out shall be immediately removed when it extends 50 or more feet from the site.

3.3.12 Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard. Trucks transporting fill material/soil to and from the site shall be tarped from the point of origin. Gravel pads shall be installed at all access points to prevent tracking of mud onto public roads. Utilize wheel washers for all exiting trucks, or wash off all trucks and equipment prior to leaving the site as needed.

3.3.13 On-site vehicles shall be limited to a speed (15 mph) that does not generate fugitive dust on unpaved roads. Land clearing, grading, earthmoving or excavation activities shall be suspended when winds exceed 20 miles per hour.

3.3.14 After clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation is completed, the disturbed area shall be treated by watering, re-vegetating, or by spreading soil binders until the area is paved or otherwise developed so that dust generation will not occur. Soil stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation.

3.3.15 The developer shall coordinate with the local transit operator to explore the feasibility of extending transit service to the Project site.

Level of Significance after Mitigation: Implementation of these mitigation measures will lessen impacts, however, project impacts will remain significant and unavoidable.

3.3.4.c Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase of a Criteria Pollutant

A significant impact would occur if the Project results in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. The San Joaquin Air Basin is currently non-attainment for Ozone, PM_{10} (state only), and PM_{2.5} (state and federal).

The General Plan expands the urbanized area by designating residential land uses on agricultural land and by expanding the Sphere of Influence. New development and the associated increase in pollutants from energy consumption, motorized vehicle use, construction, and other actions can contribute to ozone, PM_{10} and PM_{2.5} pollutant levels.

Ultimate buildout of the General Plan will increase the population from 4,029 persons to 24,330 persons and allow for increases in commercial and industrial land use. The expansion of population and commercial and industrial activities will result in increased vehicle use and construction activities. Although implementation of General Plan objectives and policies will help reduce the existing air quality violations, ultimate buildout will cumulatively contribute to air pollutant levels. Mitigation of impacts as and careful development planning will help reduce the pollutant levels, but this impact is potentially significant due to the current pollutant levels. With mitigation measures listed in section 3.3.4.b, the impacts will be less than significant.
Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

3.3.4.d Expose Sensitive Receptors to Pollutant Concentrations

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project exposes sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentration.

General Plan objectives and policies related to air pollutants and sensitive receptors are listed in section 3.3.4.a. These policies include the requirement for air quality impact analysis and mitigation for significant impacts with submission to the SJVAPCD for review. This ensures the SJVAPCD is actively included in the CEQA process and has an opportunity to respond and comment on the analysis.

Policies require careful siting of industrial uses away from sensitive receptors and likewise the location of sensitive receptors away from odor and pollutant-causing uses. This will reduce the potential for impacts to sensitive receptors and land use conflicts. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

3.3.4.e Creation of Objectionable Odors

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project creates objectionable odors impacting a substantial number of people.

New industrial land uses have the potential to create objectionable odors. Odors are regulated under SJVAPCD’s Regulation IV, Prohibitions; Rule 4102 - Nuisance:

“A person shall not discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other materials which cause injury, detriment, nuisance or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public or which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such person or the public or which cause or have a natural tendency to cause injury or damage to business or property.”

General Plan objectives and policies related to air pollutants and sensitive receptors are listed in section 4.3.a. Policies require careful siting of industrial uses away from sensitive receptors. This will reduce the potential for impacts to sensitive receptors and land use conflicts.

The General Plan locates industrial uses primarily in the southeast portion of the City and along the railroad. Low density residential and commercial uses are located adjacent to the industrial area in the southeast corner and low and medium density residential, commercial, and public facilities are located adjacent to the railroad industrial corridor. Farmland surrounds the industrial area in the southeast; however residences are located on these parcels and would be considered sensitive receptors in the development process. In accordance with the objectives and policies listed above, new development would include site- and project-specific analysis and mitigation. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.
3.4 Biological Resources

3.4.1 Environmental Setting

The San Joaquin Valley was originally a grassland. Agricultural activities have eliminated original native grasses and riparian growth associated with original river and stream systems. Cultivated crops and other introduced plants have replaced wild species of vegetation. Much of the urban area is covered by impervious surfaces such as streets, buildings and parking. Some areas in the County that have not been converted to urban or agricultural uses still support unique biological features such as freshwater and alkaline vernal pools.

The City’s habitat currently includes mostly annual/ruderal grassland, cropland, or urban habitat.

- Annual/ruderal grassland habitat is found in open pastures and along roadways and fields and consists mainly of non-native annual plant species that have become naturalized and effectively excluded the growth of native grasses. There is minimal annual grassland habitat in the City because most has been converted to agricultural or urban uses.

- Cropland habitat is used for cultivation of annual or short-lived crops and is a dynamic landscape feature that is regularly altered or disturbed throughout the year, which typically does not support native flora. Croplands provide food and cover for a variety of resident and migratory wildlife species. Approximately one-third of land in the City limits is cropland.

- Urban habitat typically lacks native plants as it is replaced by ornamental trees and shrubs, and does not support diverse populations of animals, although a variety of birds utilize urban habitat. Urban habitat characterizes a large portion of the City.

The James Irrigation District operates several canals in the area. These canals are located along Elm Ave., South Ave., Sutter Ave., Springfield Ave., El Dorado Ave., and on property located between Sutter and El Dorado Avenues. Fresno Slough is located west and southwest of the City and the James Bypass is located east of the City.

Special-status species in San Joaquin include Swainson’s hawk (Buteo swainsoni), mountain plover (Charadrius montanus), burrowing owl (Athene cunicularia), great egret (Ardea alba), long-eared owl (Asio otus), white-headed woodpecker (Picoides albolarvatus), Le Conte’s thrasher (Toxostoma lecontei), Fresno kangaroo rat (Dipodomys nitratoides exilis), San Joaquin kit fox (Vulpes macrotis mutica), and Munz’s tidy tips (Layia munzii) (2040 Community Plan Background Report Section 8, 2011). The San Joaquin area’s indigenous wildlife is limited due to the expansion of agricultural activities during the past century and urbanization since 1920. The San Joaquin area is located within the historical ranges of the San Joaquin Kit Fox and Blunt Nosed Leopard Lizard.

3.4.2 Regulatory Framework

Federal and state regulations have been implemented to ensure the long-term protection of the environment and natural resources, and include:
Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. 1251-1376);
Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act (33 U.S.C. 401 et seq.);
Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetlands (May 24, 1977);
National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.);
Federal Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1531-1543);
Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661-666);
California Environmental Quality Act (P.R.C. 21000 et seq.);
California Endangered Species Act (California Fish and Game Code 2050 et seq.);
Native Plant Protection Act (California Fish and Game Code 1900-1913);
Fish and Wildlife Protection and Conservation (California Fish and Game Code);
Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (16 U.S.C. 703-711);
Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 USC 668).

Wetlands and Other Waters of the United States - The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) has jurisdiction over Waters of the United States under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Waters of the United States may include interstate lakes, rivers, streams, mudflats, natural ponds, tributaries to Waters of the United States, and adjacent wetlands. Wetlands under USACE jurisdiction are determined using technical criteria for hydrology, soil, and vegetation described in the Corps’ Wetland Delineation Manual. Lands, including pasture as defined by the U. S. Natural Resource Conservation Service are subject to regulation under Section 404 if the land use changes from agricultural to an urban use.

Placement of fill into jurisdictional waters requires issuance of a permit by the USACE as well as state water quality certification pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act. The Regional Water Quality Control Board is the state agency charged with implementing water quality certification in California.

Any project-related activity with the potential to substantially divert or obstruct the natural flow or substantially change the bed, channel or bank of any river, stream or lake may require issuance of a Streambed Alteration Agreement pursuant to Sections 1600-1616 of the California Fish and Game Code.

Special-Status Species - Special-status plant and wildlife species have been afforded protection by federal and state resource agencies and organizations. These species are generally considered rare, threatened, or endangered due to declining or limited populations. Special-status species include:

- Plants and animals that are legally protected or proposed for protection under the California Endangered Species Act or Federal Endangered Species Act;
- Plants and animals defined as endangered or rare under CEQA (Section 15380);
- Animals designated as species of special concern by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) or California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG);
- Animals listed as “fully protected” in the California Fish and Game Code (Sections 3511, 4700, 5050, and 5515); and
- Plants listed in the California Native Plant Society’s (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants of California.
Federal Endangered Species Act - The Federal Endangered Species Act (Act) recognized that many species of fish, wildlife, and plants are in danger of extinction. Biological assessments are required under Section 7 of the Act if listed species or critical habitat may be impacted by construction activity conducted by, or subject to issuance of a permit from, a federal agency. Section 7 also requires every federal agency to consult with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) or National Marine Fisheries Service on a proposed action if the agency determines that its action may affect an endangered or threatened species.

Section 9 of the Act prohibits the “take” of any fish or wildlife species listed under the Act as endangered or threatened. Section 10 allows for the “incidental take” of endangered and threatened species by non-Federal entities following approval of a “conservation plan” that specifies the impacts likely to result from the taking and the measures the permit applicant will undertake to minimize and mitigate such impacts.

Migratory Bird Treaty Act - The Migratory Bird Treaty Act makes it unlawful to take, possess, purchase, or barter any migratory bird listed in 50 CFR Part 10, including feathers or other parts, nests, eggs, or products, except as allowed by implementing regulations.

Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act - This act specifically protects Bald and Golden Eagles from harm or trade.

California Endangered Species Act - The California Endangered Species Act establishes a State policy to conserve, restore, and enhance any endangered or threatened species and its habitat. State agencies must consult with the Department of Fish and Game to determine if a proposed project is likely to jeopardize the existence of any endangered or threatened species. The Fish and Game Code allows the “take” of a species listed as threatened or endangered by the California Endangered Species Act. The state Department of Fish and Game may issue a permit to authorize take for scientific, educational or management purposes, or take that is incidental to otherwise lawful activities.

California Fish and Game Code Native Plant Protection Policy - The goals described in Chapter 10 of the California Native Plant Protection Policy are as follows:

- For purposes of this Chapter, a “native plant” means a plant that grows in a wild uncultivated state that is normally found native to the plant life of this state.
- No person shall import, take, possess, or sell, except as incident to the possession or sale of the real property on which the plant is growing, any native plant, or any part or product thereof, which the commission determines to be an endangered native plant or a rare native plant.
- All state departments and agencies shall utilize their authority in furtherance of the purposes of this chapter by carrying out programs for the conservation of endangered or rare native plants.

3.4.3 Impact Evaluation Criteria

The following thresholds of significance are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. For purposes of this EIR, the Project may have a significant adverse impact associated with biological resources if it would do any of the following:
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

3.4.4 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation

3.4.4.a Substantial Adverse Effect on Species through Habitat Modifications

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project has a substantial adverse effect on species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special status species.

Special Status Wildlife

Special-status species in San Joaquin include:

- Swainson’s hawk (Buteo swainsoni) Status: CDFW Threatened
- Mountain plover (Charadrius montanus) Status: CDFW Species of Special Concern
- Burrowing owl (Athene cunicularia) Status: CDFW Species of Special Concern
- Great egret (Ardea alba) Migratory species
- Long-eared owl (Asio otus) Status: CDFW Species of Special Concern
- White-headed woodpecker (Picoides albolarvatus)
- Le Conte’s thrasher (Toxostoma lecontei) Status: CDFW Species of Special Concern
- Fresno kangaroo rat (Dipodomys nitratoides exilis) Status: USFWS and CDFW Endangered
- San Joaquin kit fox (Vulpes macrotis mutica) Status: USFWS Endangered/CDFW Threatened
Special Status Plants

Plant species that are listed as endangered or threatened under the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) or California Endangered Species Act (CESA), or plant species that are proposed or candidates for listing as endangered or threatened, are protected by law and are considered special-status species. Plant species, which may not be listed as endangered, threatened, candidate, or proposed species under FESA or CESA, may be considered rare if assigned a rarity code by the California Native Plant Society (CNPS). The CNPS lists five categories of rarity (Lists 1A, 1B, 2, 3, and 4). Under CEQA, impact analyses are mandatory for List 1 and 2 species, but not for all List 3 and 4 species as some do not meet the definitions of the Federal Native Plant Protection Act or the California Endangered Species Act; however, List 3 and 4 impacts to these species are generally considered in most CEQA analyses and are recommended by the CNPS (2001). Special-status plant species in San Joaquin include Munz’s tidy tips (Layia munzii) listed as CNPS 1B.2.

San Joaquin contains potentially suitable habitat for a number of rare, threatened, or endangered wildlife and plant species. The special-status wildlife and plant species that may occur within the City are listed in the 2040 Community Plan Background Report Section 8. Existing mapping available through the State delineates locations of special status species. If special-status wildlife or plant species are determined to occur within proposed development areas, the loss of individuals or occupied or designated critical habitat of these species could be a significant impact.

Objectives, policies and programs related to biological resources are included in the General Plan Update (Appendix A) and summarized below:

CON 1.1 Maintain endangered, special-status species, wetlands, and waters of the United States through appropriate mitigation measures.

CON 1.1.1 The City shall require a biological survey be prepared by a qualified biologist for proposed development areas that may contain endangered, special-status species, wetlands, and waters of the United States.

CON 1.1.2 Coordinate with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and other appropriate agencies to protect endangered or special status species including their habitats, migration corridors, and nesting areas.

CON 1.1.2a In the event that endangered or special-status species are identified within the City, the developer shall implement mitigation to maintain the species including their habitats, migration corridors, and nesting areas.

CON 1.2.1 The City shall require development projects to preserve trees when feasible.

General Plan Conservation Element Policies have been developed to protect special status species and their habitats. These policies call for biological surveys, mitigation and coordination with CDFW and USFWS prior to development. Preservation of trees within new development and mitigation for tree loss will ensure maintenance of habitat.

Since policies require biological surveys, mitigation and coordination with CDFW and USFWS prior to construction, these studies, coordination, and mitigation will ensure species protection and mitigation in accordance with state and federal law and under the approval of CDFW and USFWS. Impacts would be less than significant.
Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

3.4.4.b Substantial Adverse Effect on Sensitive Natural Community

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project has a substantial adverse effect on any riparian or other sensitive natural community. Sensitive vegetation communities are natural communities and habitats that are either unique, of relatively limited distribution in the region, or of particularly high wildlife value. However, these communities may or may not necessarily contain special-status species. Sensitive natural communities are usually identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations. The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) ranks sensitive communities as ‘threatened’ or ‘very threatened’ and keeps records of their occurrences in its Natural Diversity Database. Sensitive plant communities are also identified by CDFW on their List of California Natural Communities. In addition, streams, lakes, and riparian vegetation that are subject to jurisdiction by the CDFW under Sections 1600-1616 of the California Fish and Game Code are also regulated as sensitive communities. Impacts to sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the CDFW or the USFWS must be considered and evaluated under CEQA.

Sensitive wildlife habitats are defined as habitats that provide high suitability for foraging and breeding for state or federal species of special concern and California fully protected species; and important resting, foraging, and breeding habitat for migratory birds and other native wildlife. A sensitive native plant community is defined here as any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS; or a plant community that is considered to be a quality example characteristic of or unique to the area. If such communities or habitat occur in areas to be developed, a significant impact would occur.

To address this, the General Plan Conservation Element includes objectives and policies, included those listed in section 3.4.4.a. Policies require biological surveys be conducted prior to development and coordination with CDFW and USFWS to protect special status species and habitat. Mitigation is required to maintain special-status species or habitat identified in the biological surveys. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

3.4.4.c Substantial Adverse Effect on Wetlands

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project has a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulate the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States, including wetlands, under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) (33 USC 1344). Waters of the United States are defined in Title 33 CFR Part 328.3(a) and include a range of wet environments such as lakes, streams, wetlands, sloughs, wet meadows, or natural ponds. Section 404 of the CWA requires a federal license or permit before dredged or fill material may be discharged into waters of the United States, unless the activity is exempt from Section 404 regulation (e.g., certain farming and forestry activities). Section 401 of the CWA (33 U.S.C. 1341) requires any applicant for a federal license or permit to conduct any activity that may result in a discharge of a pollutant into waters of the United States to obtain a certification from the state in which the discharge originates or would originate, or, if appropriate, from the interstate water pollution control agency having jurisdiction over the affected
waters at the point where the discharge originates or would originate. The responsibility for the protection of water quality in California rests with the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).

Any development project that will result in a net loss of wetlands or other waters of the U.S. will be subject to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 permit process, pursuant to the Clean Water Act, and to RWQCB Section 401 Water Quality Certification is significant. Fresno Slough is located west of the City adjacent to the Wastewater Treatment Plant, but no other surface waters are currently identified in the area.

To address this, the General Plan Conservation Element includes objectives and policies, including those listed in section 3.4.4.a. Before project approval, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers would require appropriate mitigation if wetlands or waters are identified on the project site. Compliance with this mitigation would be part of the CEQA process and would mitigate impacts resulting from individual development. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation measures are required.

### 3.4.4.d Substantial Interference with Movement of Species or Use of Nursery Sites

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project interferes substantially with the movement of fish or wildlife species, established wildlife corridors, or use of native wildlife nursery sites.

A migration corridor is defined as any habitat that experiences recurrent wildlife movement for a given species or population and that is essential to dispersal or completion of their life cycle. Croplands provide habitat for a variety of resident and migratory wildlife species. If active nest sites occur within a development area, noise and visual disturbance associated with construction activities occurring during the nesting season may lead to nest abandonment and nest failure. Construction activities could destroy active nest sites. This impact would be significant.

To address this, the General Plan Conservation Element includes goals, objectives, policies, and programs (see section 3.4.4.a). Development projects will be required to preserve trees when feasible, and provide mitigation for tree loss resulting from new development. Policies have been developed to protect special status species and their habitats, including migration corridors and nesting areas. These policies call for biological surveys and mitigation and coordination with CDFW and USFWS prior to development. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation measures are required.

### 3.4.4.e Conflict with Local Policies or Ordinances

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project conflicts with adopted local policies addressing biological resources, such as those contained in the General Plan, or local ordinances addressing biological resources.

Since the General Plan Update establishes goals, objectives, policies, and implementation measures regarding biological resources, and replaces previous programs with those based on current state and federal regulations, the General Plan update would not result in a conflict. Impacts would be less than significant.
Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

3.4.4.f Conflict with Conservation Plans

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project conflicts with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan. There are no adopted habitat conservation plans in San Joaquin and there would be no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.
3.5 Cultural Resources

3.5.1 Environmental Setting

According to the 2040 Community Plan Background Report Section 12.1, there are no historic sites or buildings in the City listed on the National Register of Historic Places. No known archaeological sites have been identified in the Planning Area; however, historical structures of local significance are located in the City.

Archaeological Context. For the southern San Joaquin Valley, cultural history is best viewed in relation to a framework of prehistoric periods proposed by professor David A. Fredrickson that he believed were applicable to California as a whole:

Paleo-Indian Period (10,000 B.C. to 6000 B.C.) - This Period saw the first entry and spread of humans into California.

Lower Archaic Period (6000 B.C. to 3000 B.C.) - The beginning of this Period coincides with climatic change to generally drier conditions that brought about the drying up of lakes

Middle Archaic Period (3000 B.C. to 1000 B.C.) - This Period begins when the climate became similar to present-day. Hunting is an important source of food and there is population growth and expansion.

Upper Archaic Period (1000 B.C. to A.D. 500) - There is evidence of regular, sustained trading between groups.

Emergent Period (A.D. 500 to 1800) - This Period is distinguished by the advent of technological and social changes. In the latter portion of this Period, trading become highly regularized and sophisticated.

The inhabitants of the Project area were the Southern Valley Yokuts. Taken together, eighteenth-century Valley Yokuts may have numbered 40,000, making them the largest ethnic group in California. Tribes consisted of as many as 350 individuals living in one or more villages. The Southern Valley Yokuts possessed a subsistence system that exploited the lake-marsh-prairie ecosystem. They lived in permanent villages on high ground near watercourses and subsisted by fishing, hunting, and collecting.

3.5.2 Regulatory Framework

Federal, state, and local governments have developed laws and regulations designed to protect significant cultural resources that may be affected by proposed projects.

National Historic Preservation Act - The National Historic Preservation Act protects cultural resources eligible to be listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), composed of districts, sites, structures, architecture, archaeology, and culture significant to American History.
California Office of Historic Preservation - Generally, a resource is considered "historically significant" if it meets one or more of the following criteria for listing on the California Register:

- Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage.
- Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.
- Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

California Historic Register Act - The law creates several categories of properties that may be eligible for the California Register. Certain properties are included in the program automatically, including properties listed in the National Register of Historic Places; properties determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places; and certain classes of State Historical Landmarks.

Native American Heritage Commission - When the existence of, or the probable likelihood, of Native American human remains are identified within a project, a lead agency shall work with the appropriate Native Americans as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission.

Tribal Consultation - Government Code §65352.3 requires local governments to consult with tribes prior to the adoption or amendment of a general plan or specific plan.

CEQA - Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines provides guidance for determining the significance of impacts to archaeological and historical resources, including criteria for evaluating the importance of cultural resources:

- The resource is associated with events that have made a contribution to the broad patterns of California history;
- The resource is associated with the lives of important persons from our past;
- The resource embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method construction, or represents the work of an important individual or possesses high artistic values; or
- The resource has yielded, or may be likely to yield, important information in prehistory or history.

CEQA emphasizes avoidance of archaeological and historical resources as the preferred means of reducing potential significant effects. If avoidance is not feasible, an excavation program or some other form of mitigation must be developed to mitigate the impacts.

California Health and Safety Code, Section 7050.5 (b) - California Health and Safety Code, Section 7050.5 (b) requires that construction be stopped in the vicinity of discovered human remains. If the remains are identified as Native American, the coroner must contact the California Native American Heritage Commission.
California Public Resources Code 21083.2 - If an archaeological resource does not meet the definition of a "historical resource" as defined by CEQA, it may meet the definition of a "unique archaeological resource." An archaeological resource is "unique" if it: a) contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information; b) has a special and particular quality as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type; or c) is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historical event or person.

3.5.3 Impact Evaluation Criteria

The following thresholds of significance are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. For purposes of this EIR, the Project may have a significant adverse impact associated with cultural resources if it would do any of the following:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

3.5.4 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation

3.5.4. a-b Substantial Adverse Change in Historical and Archeological Resources

A significant impact would be one that would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of historical or archeological resources.

For the purposes of CEQA, an historical resource is a resource listed in, or determined eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources. When a project will impact a site, it needs to be determined whether the site is an historical resource, which is defined as any site which:

(A) Is historically or archeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political or cultural annals of California; and

(B) Meets any of the following criteria:

1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
2. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.
There are no designated historical landmarks or registered historical resources and no known archaeological sites in San Joaquin. Build-out of the General Plan would result in the construction of new buildings and infrastructure and the potential modification of existing buildings and structures to reflect new land use designations. Ground disturbing activities have the potential to impact cultural and historical resources. General Plan objectives and policies designed to protect these resources include:

CD 1.3.1 The City shall encourage the survey and documentation of relevant cultural and historic resources.
CD 1.3.1a Maintain documentation of contributing cultural and historic resources and make the list available to the community.

These policies seek to identify and maintain historic and cultural resources, and the General Plan would not result in land use changes that would affect the status of historic structures; however the potential remains to disturb undiscovered buried archaeological resources. Development leading to build-out of the General Plan may disturb or otherwise adversely impact unknown archaeological resources.

Government Code §65352.3 requires local governments to consult with tribes prior to the adoption or amendment of a general plan or specific plan. In accordance with government code requirements, a list of tribal contacts was provided by the Native American Heritage Commission. Information on the General Plan Update was provided to the Table Mountain Rancheria, the Big Sandy Rancheria of Mono Indians, the Cold Springs Rancheria of Mono Indians, the Santa Rosa Rancheria, and the Dumna Wo-Wah Tribal Government. No comments were received during the tribal consultation process.

Federal and State laws require that if previously unknown and unrecorded archaeological resources are discovered during ground-disturbing activity, the City will require the builder or contractor to suspend work in the vicinity of the discovery and immediately notify the historic preservation officer. The City shall require that a qualified archaeologist redirect the ground-disturbing activity in the vicinity of the discovery, and/or implement such other measures as may be necessary to avoid or minimize harm to the discoveries, pending the results of evaluation. Suspension of ground disturbance in the vicinity of the discovery shall not resume until a qualified archaeologist has evaluated the discoveries to determine whether it may be a historical resource pursuant to CEQA, and has developed an appropriate recordation, preservation and/or removal and curation program. Impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

3.5.4. c Destroy a Unique Paleontological Resource or Unique Geological Feature

A significant impact would be one that would destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature.

There are no known paleontological resources and no unique geological features in San Joaquin. The potential for discovery of paleontological resources in this area is low due to previous agricultural disturbance in the area and lack of evidence of paleontological resources in the vicinity; however, implementation of the General Plan would allow future construction, and the associated ground disturbing activities have the potential to impact unknown, paleontological resources.
Federal and State laws require that in the event that fossils are encountered during development, work shall cease in the vicinity and the findings examined by a qualified paleontologist who shall assess their significance, and offer recommendations for any further investigation or mitigation measures. As provided in the CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5(f) for archaeological resources, work could continue on other parts of the project site while unique resource mitigation (if necessary) takes place. Impacts are less than significant.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation measures are required.

3.5.4.d Disturb Human Remains

A significant impact would be one that would disturb human remains.

There are no established cemeteries or known human burial sites in San Joaquin that would be affected by the General Plan. The potential for discovery of human remains in this area is low due to previous agricultural ground disturbance in the area; however, implementation of the General Plan would allow future construction, and the associated ground disturbing activities have the potential to impact unknown, buried human remains.

Federal and State law require that if human remains are encountered during excavation or other site construction activities, work shall be halted in the vicinity of the remains and the Fresno County Coroner contacted to determine whether or not investigation of the cause of death is required. In the event that the remains are Native American in origin, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted to determine the necessary procedures for protection and preservation of remains, including reburial, as provided in CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5(e). Impacts are less than significant.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation measures are required.
3.6 Geology and Soils

3.6.1 Environmental Setting

Soils found in the area include Merced Clay (moderately saline), Merced Clay (slightly saline), Merced Clay Loam, and Merced Clay Loam (slightly saline) (NRCS, 2013). These are Class III, non-alkaline soils with high water retention rates and low percolation rates. The soils in San Joaquin are ideal for agricultural activities, although some protection from erosion is required.

According to the 2040 Community Plan Background Report, Section 10, there are no known active faults within the City and the nearest active fault is the Coalinga Fault, located approximately 40 miles southwest of San Joaquin. The San Andreas Fault is located 50 miles west and the Owens Valley Fault is located approximately 100 miles to the east. The Clovis Fault in Fresno County is located five miles east of Clovis. The San Andreas Fault has the greatest potential for a significant earthquake.

As discussed in Chapter 2 of the General Plan, the City is located in the V1 Seismic Zone, distinguished by a granitic base and a thin layer of sedimentary rock. Although ground shaking associated with this type of rock formation is high, due to the City’s distance from active faults, ground shaking in the City would be minimal.

The risk of liquefaction in the City is low due to distance from active faults and area soils which are often too coarse or too high in clay content to liquefy. However, the City is located in an area of deep subsidence which remains a significant issue in relation to structural, roadway, and infrastructure damage.

3.6.2 Regulatory Framework

The State of California provides minimum standards for building design through the California Building Standards Code (California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 24). The California Uniform Building Code (UBC) is based on the Uniform Building Code (UBC) and has been modified for California conditions with numerous more detailed and/or more stringent regulations. State regulations and engineering standards related to geology, soils, and seismicity are reflected in the City of San Joaquin building standards. Construction and design would be required to comply with the latest standards at the time of construction.

The UBC requires preparation of a geotechnical study to identify site-specific conditions. The results of such geotechnical studies provide design criteria that ensure structural integrity and public safety of proposed development, particularly during seismic events. Issues addressed include seismic design, slope protection, and ongoing engineering/geotechnical review, as well as site preparation, grading, and foundation design, as stipulated in the UBC and local building regulation.

The recommendations of the geologic and soils reports must be incorporated in the design of foundations and buildings. Earthquake-resistant design and materials are required to meet or exceed the current seismic engineering standards of the UBC Seismic Zone 3 or 4 requirements, depending on the location.
3.6.3 Impact Evaluation Criteria

The following thresholds of significance are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. For purposes of this EIR, the Project may have a significant adverse impact associated with geology and soils if it would do any of the following:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
   i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.
   ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?
   iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
   iv) Landslides?

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-8 of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

3.6.4 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation

3.6.4. a-i, ii Exposure to Loss, Injury, Death from Rupture of Known Earthquake Fault or from Strong Seismic Ground Shaking

A significant impact would occur if the Project results in exposure of people or structures to loss, injury or death from rupture of a known earthquake fault. A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project results in exposure of people or structures to loss, injury or death from strong seismic ground shaking.

Objectives, policies and programs regarding seismic safety are included in the General Plan Update (Appendix A) and summarized below:

S 1.1.1a: The City will maintain updated maps of faults and subsidence within 200 miles of San Joaquin.

S 1.1.1c: Work with the James Irrigation District to collect and analyze information regarding ground water levels and quality to avoid subsidence.
S 1.1.2: The City shall require geotechnical and soils engineering reports to be prepared in conjunction with the preparation of preliminary design layouts and grading plans. These studies will determine areas of hazardous soil conditions as required under the building codes standards. These reports will include data on potential geological hazards including seismic shaking, shrink-swell, and other hazardous soil conditions.

S 1.1.2a: The City shall develop emergency plans to be followed in the event of earthquakes or other natural disasters.

Due to the City’s distance from active faults, ground shaking in the City would be minimal. In addition, new structures would be required to be engineered and built in compliance with the California Building Code which would further minimize loss due to earthquake activity. Geotechnical and soils engineering reports with preliminary design layouts and grading plans will identify hazardous soil conditions and the appropriate building standards associated with such hazards. Therefore, the risks associated with fault rupture and seismic ground shaking are less than significant. Impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

3.6.4. a-iii Exposure to Loss, Injury, Death from Seismic-related Ground Failure

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project results in exposure of people or structures to loss, injury or death from seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.

General Plan Safety Element goals, objectives, policies and programs regarding seismic safety listed in 3.6.a-i require geotechnical and soils engineering reports with preliminary design layouts and grading plans to identify hazardous soil conditions and the appropriate building standards to mitigate such hazards. Impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

3.6.4. a-iv Exposure to Loss, Injury, Death from Landslides

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project results in exposure of people or structures to loss, injury or death from landslides.

The City is not located within the landslide hazard area on the Fresno County General Plan Landslide Hazards and Areas of Subsidence map (2009). There is little risk of landslide due to the level topography. Impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

3.6.4.b Result in Substantial Erosion or Loss of Topsoil

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project results in erosion of the loss of topsoil.
Areas of high erosion hazard generally correspond to areas of steep slopes. Soils found in San Joaquin have potential for erosion; however the topography is relatively flat and substantial water-induced erosion is not prevalent. Due to the topography, the risk of substantial erosion is low.

In addition, certain construction and industrial activities undertaken in the City would require compliance with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), under which a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would be implemented and monitored. Implementation of the policies in the draft General Plan along with the NPDES requirements would reduce the amount of erosion occurring from new development under the General Plan. Impacts are less than significant.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation measures are required.

### 3.6.4.c Location on an Unstable Geological Unit or Soil

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project results in landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse due to a location on an unstable geologic unit or soils.

The City is located within a deep subsidence area and subsidence can cause structural, roadway, and infrastructure damage. The General Plan Safety Element requires geotechnical and soils engineering reports with preliminary design layouts and grading plans to identify hazardous soil conditions and appropriate building standards to mitigate such hazards. By carefully tracking and planning, the City can avoid geological hazards resulting from subsidence. As pumping of groundwater increases, the potential for subsidence likewise increases; however, the geotechnical and soils engineering reports required with preliminary design layouts reduces the potential for subsidence impacts. Impacts are less than significant.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation measures are required.

### 3.6.4.d Location on Expansive Soils

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project results in substantial risk to life or property due to location on expansive soil. According to the Fresno County Hazard Management Plan (2008), the City of San Joaquin does not contain soils of moderately-high or high expansion potential. Impacts are less than significant.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation measures are required.

### 3.6.4.e Inadequate Soils for Wastewater Disposal Systems

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project results in placement of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available on appropriate soils. The City operates a wastewater treatment and collection system serving residential, commercial, industrial, and public facilities. Expansion of the urban area would include expansion of the sewer system. All development would be required to connect to the City system and new development proposals are not anticipated to rely on on-site septic systems. Impacts are less than significant.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation measures are required.
3.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

3.7.1 Environmental Setting

There are two categories of greenhouse gas emission sources in the City - municipal emissions and private emissions. Municipal emissions include, but are not limited to: City buildings, city infrastructure, and the city fleet of approximately ten vehicles. Private emissions include, but are not limited to: transportation (vehicle miles traveled), residential uses (electricity, water, natural gas), and commercial and industrial uses (energy, water, chemical processing, tilling, etc.). Currently, there are no LEED certified buildings or green building ordinances in San Joaquin.

In 2010, the SJVAPCD formally adopted the Zero Equivalency Policy for Greenhouse Gases which establishes a zero equivalency level at 230 metric tons of CO₂e (carbon dioxide equivalent) per year for stationary source projects exempt from CEQA. Currently there are no formally adopted quantitative thresholds of significance for project-related GHGs. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) suggests in its CEQA guidance the following significance thresholds: no threshold for GHG emitted during project construction, and 1,100 metric tons of CO₂e per year for project operation.

3.7.2 Regulatory Framework

Efforts devoted to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction and climate change research and policy have increased dramatically in recent years. In 2002, with the passage of Assembly Bill 1493 (AB 1493), California launched an innovative and proactive approach to dealing with GHG emissions and climate change at the state level. AB 1493 requires the Air Resources Board (ARB) to develop and implement regulations to reduce automobile and light truck GHG emissions; these regulations were applied to automobiles and light trucks beginning with the 2009 model year.

On June 1, 2005, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed Executive Order S-3-05 to reduce California’s GHG emissions to: 1) 2000 levels by 2010, 2) 1990 levels by the year 2020, and 3) 80% below the 1990 levels by the year 2050. In 2006, this goal was further reinforced with the passage of Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. AB 32 sets the same overall GHG emissions reduction goals while further mandating that ARB create a plan that includes market mechanisms, and implement rules to achieve “real, quantifiable, cost-effective reductions of greenhouse gases.”

Executive Order S-20-06 further directs state agencies to begin implementing AB 32, including the recommendations made by the state’s Climate Action Team. Climate change and GHG reduction is also a concern at the federal level; however, at this time, no legislation or regulations have been enacted specifically addressing GHG emissions reductions and climate change.

Project construction emissions and project operations would not exceed SJVAPCD thresholds of significance. In addition, Regulation VIII measures would be implemented, further decreasing potential emissions. The Project would not significantly contribute to the emission of GHGs.

The SJVAPCD has adopted its Guidance for Valley Land Use Agencies in Addressing GHG Impacts for New Projects under CEQA (SJVAPCD 2009). The guidance provides initial screening criteria for climate change analyses, as well as draft guidance for the determination of significance.
3.7.3 Impact Evaluation Criteria

The following thresholds of significance are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. For purposes of this EIR, the Project may have a significant adverse impact associated with greenhouse gas emissions if it would do any of the following:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

3.7.4 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation

3.7.4.a Generate Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Either Directly or Indirectly, that may have a Significant Impact on the Environment

Greenhouse gases (GHGs) that have the ability to absorb energy radiating away from the earth include water vapor, carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride. These GHGs affect the thermal balance of the atmosphere between incoming solar radiation and outgoing thermal radiation, and, hence, the temperature of the atmosphere. Natural processes and human activities emit GHGs. Except for water vapor, the listed GHGs are subject to regulation by the State of California and the federal government.

The primary climate change legislation in California is AB 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. AB 32 focuses on reducing GHG emissions in California. AB 32 requires that GHGs emitted in California be reduced to 1990 levels by the year 2020, and Executive Order S-3-05 states the goal of further reducing GHGs emissions to a level 80% lower than 1990 emissions by 2050.

ARB approved the Climate Change Scoping Plan (Scoping Plan) in December 2008. The Scoping Plan “proposes a comprehensive set of actions designed to reduce overall GHG emissions in California, improve our environment, reduce our dependence on oil, diversify our energy sources, save energy, create new jobs, and enhance public health.” A Mandatory Reporting Regulation has been in effect since December 2008, and a Cap-and-Trade Program is currently in the process of early implementation.

Objectives, policies and programs addressing greenhouse gas emissions are included in the General Plan Update (Appendix A) and summarized below:

CON 4.1.1 The City shall permit installation of solar panels on all roofs.
CON 4.1.2 The City shall pursue local generation of 35 percent of its total City energy demand in the long-term planning period.
CON 4.2.1 The City shall encourage development that reduces the amount of per-capita energy consumption by 10 percent from 2013 Building Standards.
CON 4.4.1 The City shall be an example to the region by encouraging the building of energy efficient and resource conserving buildings.
CON 4.4.1a The City shall encourage the building of at least one building that meets green building standards, i.e. LEED.
CON 5.1.1  The City shall determine project air quality impacts and implement appropriate mitigation for significant environmental impacts during CEQA review.

CON 5.3.1b  Develop a multi-modal transportation system when feasible.

CON 5.7.1  The City shall work with the energy providers and developers on voluntary programs to encourage the use of energy efficient designs and equipment.

CON 5.7.1a  Identify opportunities to increase energy efficiency of public buildings and increase distributed generation.

CON 6.1  Develop a Climate Action Plan (CAP) and set emissions-reduction goals consistent with AB 32

CIR 2.5.2  The City will encourage strategies that reduce VMT, GHGs, and criteria air pollutants.

CIR 2.6.1  The City shall encourage alternatives to the use of the automobile including the following programs:

- Ride Share
- Park-and-ride lots
- Bicycling
- Mass Transit
- Trip reduction programs
- Fleet operators alternative fuel program
- Traffic Flow improvements
- Telecommunications
- Alternative work schedules

CIR 2.6.5:  The City shall implement new TCM programs developed by the SJVAPCD and are relevant to the community of San Joaquin.

1. Make reductions in vehicle-miles traveled (VMT) a high-priority criteria in evaluation of policy, program, and project alternatives.
2. Implement transportation planning procedures that consider demand management solutions equally with strategies to increase capacity.
3. Accelerate workshops and meetings and other venues with regional transportation partners to plan collaboratively, and determine responsibilities and authority for implementation and, if need be, enforcement of new GHG reduction requirements, as each agency or entity contains different strengths and capabilities that may be utilized.
4. Provide continual educational opportunities for residents, businesses, and others to help them recognize the critical connection between urban development and vehicle travel patterns, its contribution to climate change, and its essential role in combating it.
5. Reduce GHG emissions from municipal fleet operations by purchasing or leasing high MPG, low carbon fuel, hybrid or all-electric vehicles, or by using an external car sharing program in lieu of city/county fleet.
6. The criteria for the design of San Joaquin’s streets may address the convenience, safety, and attractiveness for motor vehicles, pedestrians, and bicycles.
Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

3.7.4.b Conflict with any Applicable Plan, Policy, or Regulation of an Agency Adopted for the Purpose of Reducing the Emissions of Greenhouse Gases

The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32) is the “applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.” ARB’s Scoping Plan, derived from AB 32, includes the following elements directly relevant to the Project:

- Expanding and strengthening existing energy efficiency programs as well as building and appliance standards; and
- Establishing targets for transportation-related GHG emissions for regions throughout California and pursuing policies and incentives to achieve those targets.

The City does not have a Climate Action Plan; however, the General Plan Conservation Element establishes objectives and policies to develop a Climate Action Plan and set emissions-reduction goals consistent with AB 32. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.
3.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

3.8.1 Environmental Setting

The State Water Resources Control Board Geotracker GAMA Database identifies three monitoring locations within the City including a four-well cluster monitored for high nitrate levels located south of 12th Street; a cluster of three water supply wells monitored for high nitrate levels located at the southeast city limit near Colorado Avenue; and a seven-well cluster of water supply wells located at Colusa and Springfield Avenues which is not currently monitored (http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/gama/gamamap/public/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=City+of+San+Joaquin%2C+CA).

The California Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor map identifies the Golden Plains Elementary School located on Manning Avenue just outside the City’s Sphere of Influence as a site investigated due to past agricultural use. No chemicals were found above background levels and no further action was needed (http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/) EnviroStor also identifies five leaking underground fuel tank cleanup (LUFT) sites and one spill leak investigation and cleanup site, all of which are monitored by the California State Water Resources Control Board. According to Geotracker, two of the sites are closed and cleanup is complete (AgriPro and West Side Pump Company) and three remain open (D’s Minimart, Union 76, and Suburban Propane). In addition, a permitted underground storage tank at the Circle K Store and an open site assessment at the West Hills Oil Company (petroleum leak identified and cleaned in 2004), both on Colorado Avenue, are also listed by Geotracker.

The California Department of Toxic Substances Control does not identify any active sites on its hazardous waste and substances list (Cortese List) in the City. EnviroStor lists three sites near San Joaquin, none of which are located within the City limits or existing Sphere of Influence. The Bombing Target site is located adjacent to the Sphere; however, the General Plan designates this area as industrial.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Potential Contaminants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin Airport</td>
<td>23600 Manning Ave. (outside City and SOI)</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Pesticides (rinse waters, waste, containers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin Disposal Site</td>
<td>Manning and Yolo (outside City and SOI)</td>
<td>Referred to Regional Water Quality Control Board</td>
<td>None Specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bombing Target Site</td>
<td>Yuba and Springfield (adjacent to eastern SOI)</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Explosives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The San Joaquin Airport is located on 35 acres at Levee Road and Manning Avenue, approximately 1.5 miles west of the City directly north of the City’s wastewater treatment plant. The small private airport operates one runway.
The Fresno County Fire Protection District provides fire protection service in the City. The nearest CALFIRE fire station is located in nearby Tranquility. The Fresno-Kings Pre-Fire Management Plan identifies the City as a non-wildland, non-urban area.

The railroad line as well as Colorado and Manning Avenues can be used to transport hazardous materials.

3.8.2 Regulatory Framework

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) - Under RCRA, individual states may implement their own hazardous waste programs. In California, the California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal EPA) and the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) regulate the generation, transportation, storage, and disposal of hazardous waste.

California Code of Regulations, Section 65962.5 - The California Code of Regulations Section 65962.5 requires that information about the location of hazardous materials be reported on the Hazardous Waste and Substances List or Cortese List. DTSC is responsible for maintaining the list. The Cortese List is similar to the Superfund list regulated by the federal government.

Business Plan Act (California Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans & Inventory Law of 1985) - The Business Plan Act requires that any business that handles hazardous materials prepare a business plan, which must include the following:

- Details, including floor plans, of the facility and business conducted at the site.
- An inventory of hazardous materials that are handled or stored on site.
- An emergency response plan.
- A safety and emergency response training program for new employees with annual refresher courses.

Unified Program (Unified Hazardous Waste and Hazardous Materials Management Regulatory Program) - The Unified Program has six elements: hazardous waste generators and hazardous waste on-site treatment; underground storage tanks; aboveground storage tanks; hazardous materials release response plans and inventories; risk management and prevention programs; and Uniform Fire Code hazardous materials management plans and inventories. The local agency responsible for implementation of the Unified Program is called the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA), and the Fresno County Environmental Health Division is designated the CUPA.

Hazardous Materials Transportation Regulations - The State of California regulates the transportation of hazardous waste originating in the state and passing through the state. The two state agencies with primary responsibility for enforcing federal and state regulations and responding to hazardous materials transportation emergencies are the California Highway Patrol and Caltrans.

California Emergency Services Act - California has developed an Emergency Response Plan to coordinate emergency services provided by federal, state, and local government. The plan is administered by the State Office of Emergency Services (OES).
California Accidental Release Prevention Program (CalARP) - CalARP was created to prevent the accidental release of regulated substances. If a business has more than the listed threshold quantity of a substance, an accidental release prevention program must be implemented and a risk management plan may be required.

3.8.3 Impact Evaluation Criteria

The following thresholds of significance are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. For purposes of this EIR, the Project may have a significant adverse impact associated with greenhouse gas emissions if it would do any of the following:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?
3.8.4 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation

3.8.4. a-b Hazard to the Public or the Environment through Transport, Use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials; Foreseeable Upset and Accident of Release of Hazardous Materials

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project produces a substantial risk to the public from routine transportation, use, or disposal of hazardous material. A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project releases hazardous materials into the environment, creating significant hazards to the public or the environment.

The General Plan focuses industrial land uses along the existing railroad corridor and the southeast corner of the City. By including industrial uses along the railroad corridor, the General Plan creates a land use buffer between the railroad and residential uses. New industrial developments that would produce hazardous materials would be subject to City environmental review and approval. The railroad line and Manning and Colorado Avenues would continue to be potential hazardous material transport routes, as are major roadways and railways throughout the state and nation. The General Plan does not expressly indicate hazardous materials will be transported along these routes or that new industrial uses will produce hazardous materials; however, there is potential that such materials may be transported, used, or created in these areas. To address this, objectives, policies and programs that address hazardous materials are included in the General Plan Update (Appendix A) and summarized below:

S 4.1.1b Provide incentives for property owners wishing to clean up and develop contaminated sites including expedited permitting, reduced fees, and increased allowable densities in the short-term planning period.
S 6.2.1 The City shall annually review and revise its emergency response plan to ensure it is up to date.
S 6.3.1 The City shall create and implement a program to facilitate the education of community members annually about potential risks citywide including but not limited to fire, flood, earthquake, and hazardous materials events.
S 6.3.1b Conduct appropriate staff training that addresses emergency readiness, first aid, evacuation routes, and critical facilities in the short-term planning period.

Impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

3.8.4.c Hazardous Materials Near School

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project emits or handles hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

The General Plan focuses industrial land uses along the existing railroad corridor and the southeast portion of the City. By including industrial uses along the railroad corridor, the General Plan creates a land use buffer between the railroad and sensitive uses. The railroad line and Manning and Colorado Avenues would continue to be potential hazardous material transport routes, as are major roadways.
and railways throughout the state and nation. There are no hazardous waste sites in the City or the Sphere of Influence other than the two well clusters monitored for high nitrate levels in the southern portion of the City and the underground petroleum storage tank sites along Colorado Avenue that have resulted from accidental spills at gas stations and businesses.

San Joaquin Elementary School is located on 9th Street near the central area of the City and is within one-quarter mile of the railroad tracks and the underground storage tank sites along Colorado Avenue. This is an existing condition that would not change with the General Plan. If a new school is proposed in the City, the facility and site would be evaluated by the school district through the environmental review process to ensure either that the school site was not located near a hazardous site or that appropriate mitigation measures were in place. Impacts are less than significant.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation measures are required.

### 3.8.4.d Location on a List of Hazardous Material Sites

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project is located on a hazardous materials site.

Hazardous materials sites in San Joaquin include the two monitoring well clusters in the southern portion of the City monitored for high nitrate levels and the underground petroleum storage tank sites along Colorado Avenue. High nitrate levels in the water supply affect drinking water quality but working or residing on land with high nitrate levels will not pose a potential risk unless well water is consumed. Petroleum within the drinking water supply can pose a health threat from identified sites that will require cleaning and monitoring. These sites are located within the central core of the City along Colorado Avenue on property utilized for gas stations and other commercial uses. The General Plan does not indicate these sites would be re-designated or utilized for purposes other than the existing ones.

Future development projects in the City would be required to submit environmental analysis and would be subject to environmental review. If hazardous substances are identified, appropriate planning and mitigation would be required prior to development approval. Impacts are less than significant.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation measures are required.

### 3.8.4.e Location Near Airport Land Use Plan

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project results in a location near a public airport.

There are no public airports located near the City of San Joaquin and the City is not located within an airport land use plan area. There would be no impact.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation measures are required.

### 3.8.4.f Location Near Private Airstrip

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project results in safety hazards due to proximity of a private airstrip.
The privately operated San Joaquin Airport is located approximately one mile west of the City and directly north of the City’s wastewater treatment plant. The airport operates one runway, which runs north/south. The General Plan includes expansion of the Sphere of Influence beyond the westernmost City limit, bringing the airport within one-half mile of the Sphere of Influence. Neither the City nor proposed Sphere of Influence would encroach into the area near the airport and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

### 3.8.4.g Impaired Implementation of Emergency Plan

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project impairs implementation of or physically interferes with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

To maintain and improve the City’s emergency response, objectives, policies, and programs are contained in the General Plan Update (Appendix A) and summarized below:

- **S 5.1.1** The City shall continue to work on response time with all corresponding agencies.
- **S 5.2.1** The City shall ensure that the health care center, critical facilities, and emergency response system are capable of operating post disaster.
- **S 6.1.1a** Continue participation in an ongoing Fresno County program, the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan and ensure that the plan addresses the potential increase in natural disasters because of climate change.
- **S 6.2.1** The City shall annually review and revise its emergency response plan to ensure it is up to date.
- **S 6.3.1b** Conduct appropriate staff training that addresses emergency readiness, first aid, evacuation routes, and critical facilities in the short-term planning period.

Policies require the emergency response plan be updated and maintained annually to ensure community safety, response times, and event mitigation implementation. The General Plan does not include new barriers to community evacuation or emergency response. Impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

### 3.8.4.h Exposure to Loss, Injury or Death Due to Wildland Fires

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project exposes people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

To protect the City from wildfire hazards, objectives, policies, and programs are contained in the General Plan Update (Appendix A) and summarized below:

- **S 2.1.1** The City shall require safe levels of property maintenance for fire protection.
- **S 2.1.1a** Establish an inspection and enforcement system to reduce potential for urban fire on under-maintained lots in the short-term planning period.
S2.1.1d The City will evaluate the potential affects of climate change, including increased droughts and potential for increased fires, when planning for urban and wildfire hazards.

S2.1.2 Residential properties of five acres or less shall be mowed and excess debris raked and removed.

S2.1.3 For Commercial and Industrial property of five acres or less, the City requires that property shall be disked entirely unless landscaped. If property is landscaped the property shall be mowed and excess debris raked and removed.

S2.1.4 For property five acres or larger, the City requires that property shall be disked entirely unless landscaped. If property is landscaped the property shall be mowed and excess debris raked and removed.

The Fresno-Kings Pre-Fire Management Plan identifies the City as a non-wildland area. The mixture of urban and agricultural uses and lack of wildland non-developed area in or near the City indicates that the City is not located in a high-risk area for wildland fire. Combined with the General Plan policies listed above to ensure actions are implemented to reduce wildfire risk, this impact is less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.
3.9 Hydrology and Water Quality

3.9.1 Environmental Setting

San Joaquin is located in the southern San Joaquin Valley Basin and Kings River Subbasin. The San Joaquin Valley Basin covers an area of 976,000 acres. The Kings Subbasin is defined by the San Joaquin and Kings Rivers and is drained by the Kings, Kaweah, Tule, and Kern Rivers, which ultimately flow into the Tulare drainage basin. The Department of Water Resources identified the Kings River Subbasin as being in critical condition of overdraft.

The Subbasin is an important aquifer for the region. Groundwater generally flows to the southwest and the average water table is at approximately 1,000 feet with the deepest points extending 9,000 feet below the surface. Total groundwater storage estimates are 93,000,000 acre-feet at a depth of 1,000 feet or less. Groundwater wells in the area average 1,200 feet below ground surface. Since 1960, water levels have steadily declined due to drought and increased reliance on groundwater.

The City is located within FEMA flood hazard zone “A”, defined as areas subject to inundation by the 1 percent annual chance flood event, and requires the purchase of flood insurance (FEMA, FIRM Map, 060055 and 2040 Community Plan Background Report Section 10). The City is also at risk of flooding as a result of dam failure at Little Panoche Dam (Fresno County General Plan). There is also risk of localized flooding along Colorado Avenue and the railroad tracks as illustrated in the 2040 Community Plan Background Report, Figure 10-7.

The City’s Storm Drainage Master Plan divides the City into seven geographic zones, of which four are currently developed. Southern storm water drainage lines run along Main Street to the west of the City and along Colorado Avenue to the irrigation ditches north and west of the City limits. A pump station releases storm runoff into the irrigation ditches. The irrigation ditches may overflow during periods of heavy rainfall, causing runoff to overflow back into the City. Water runs to three ponding basins, Basins A and B and a temporary basin in the City’s industrial park. Basin A is designed to handle a 10-year storm and includes a pump to transfer water from the basin into an adjacent canal operated by the James Irrigation District. Basin B can accommodate a 100-year storm.

The James Irrigation District operates several canals in the area located along Elm Avenue, South Avenue, Sutter Avenue, Springfield Avenue, El Dorado Avenue, and on property located between Sutter and El Dorado Avenues. Fresno Slough is located west and southwest of the City and the James Bypass is located east of the City.

3.9.2 Regulatory Framework

Federal Laws and Regulations

Federal Clean Water Act. The U.S. EPA is the lead Federal agency responsible for water quality management. The Clean Water Act (CWA) of 1972 is the primary federal law that governs and authorizes water quality control activities by the EPA as well as the states. The Clean Water Act employs a variety of regulatory and non-regulatory tools to reduce direct pollutant discharges into waterways, finance municipal wastewater treatment facilities, and manage polluted runoff. The CWA is administered through the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers’ (USACE) regulatory program.
Under Section 401 of the CWA, an applicant for a Section 404 permit to discharge, dredged or fill material into waters of the United States must first obtain a certificate from the appropriate State agency stating that the fill is consistent with the State’s water quality standards and criteria. In California, the authority to either grant water quality certification or waive the requirement is delegated by the State to the nine regional water quality control boards (RWQCBs).

Section 303(d) of the CWA requires that the State develop a total maximum daily load (TMDL) for each of the listed pollutants. The TMDL is the amount of loading that the water body can receive and still be in compliance with water quality objectives. The EPA must either approve a TMDL prepared by the State or, if it disapproves the State’s TMDL, issue its own. National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit limits for listed pollutants must be consistent with the waste load allocation prescribed in the TMDL.

The CWA requires states to adopt water quality standards for all surface waters of the United States. Section 304(a) requires the EPA to publish advisory water quality criteria that accurately reflect the latest scientific knowledge on the effects on health and welfare that may be expected from the presence of pollutants in water. Where multiple uses exist, water quality standards must protect the most sensitive use.

**US EPA Storm Water Run-off.** The US EPA has promulgated regulations for permitting storm water discharges from industrial sites (including construction sites that disturb five acres or more) and from municipal storm sewer systems serving a population of 100,000 people or more. These “Phase I” regulations require operators of medium and large storm sewer systems to obtain storm water permits. EPA “Phase II” regulations require permits for storm water discharges from small storm sewer systems and from construction sites disturbing between one and five acres of land. This General Permit regulates storm water discharges from small storm systems. Phase II of the municipal permit system (known as the NPDES General Permit for Small MS4s) requires small municipal areas of less than 100,000 persons to develop stormwater management programs. The RWQCBs in California are responsible for implementing the NPDES permit system (see additional information below).

Federal regulations allow two permitting options for storm water discharges (individual permits and general permits). The California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) elected to adopt a statewide general permit for small storm sewer systems in order to efficiently regulate numerous storm water discharges under a single permit. Under the General Permit, the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) issues permits for activities, including construction activities, which may cause impacts on surface water and groundwater.

**Flooding.** The National Flood Insurance Program is administered by the Federal Insurance Administration, a component of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The FEMA’s National Flood Insurance Program publishes maps that identify areas at risk from potential flooding. Flood hazards are identified for areas subject to flooding from 100 and 500-year storm events. The State of California is located within FEMA Region IX based in Oakland.
State Laws and Regulations

The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) is responsible for developing statewide water quality policy and exercises the powers delegated to the State by the federal CWA. Other State agencies with jurisdiction over water quality regulation in California include the California Department of Health Services (DHS) for drinking water regulations, the California Department of Pesticide Regulation, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and the Office of Environmental Health and Hazard Assessment.

Regional authority for planning, permitting, and enforcement is delegated to the nine Regional Water Resources Control Boards (RWQCBs). The regional boards are required to formulate and adopt water quality control plans for all areas in the region and establish water quality objectives in the plans. San Joaquin is within the jurisdiction of the Central Valley RWQCB.

The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act is California’s statutory authority for the protection of water quality. Under the act, the State must adopt water quality policies, plans, and objectives that protect the State’s waters for the use and enjoyment of the people. The act sets forth the obligations of the SWRCB and RWQCBs to adopt and periodically update water quality control plans (Basin Plans). Basin Plans are the regional water quality control plans required by both the CWA and Porter-Cologne Act in which beneficial uses, water quality objectives and implementation programs are established for each of the nine regions in California.

Storm Water Quality Management Program. Each city in California is required to prepare and adopt a Storm Water Quality Management Program (SWQMP). The program is intended to implement and enforce a series of Best Management Practices (BMPs) designed to reduce the discharge of pollutants from municipal storm drain systems to the maximum extent practicable, to protect water quality, and to satisfy the appropriate water quality requirements of the CWA.

Urban Water Management Planning Act. The California Urban Water Management Planning Act requires that each urban water supplier, providing water for municipal purposes either directly or indirectly to more than 3,000 customers or supplying more than 3,000 acre-feet of water annually, shall prepare, update and adopt an urban water management plan at least once every five years on or before December 31, in years ending in five and zero.

AB 610 and SB 221. Under the provisions of AB 610, water supply assessments are required to be furnished to local governments for inclusion in any environmental documentation for certain projects. A partial list includes: a residential development of more than 500 units, a shopping center or business employing more than 1,000 people or having more than 500,000 square feet of floor space, an office building employing more than 1,000 and containing more than 250,000 square feet of floor space, and a mixed use project containing any of the above.

Water supply is also the topic of SB 221. It requires water agencies to verify a sufficient water supply to support any proposed residential subdivision (i.e., tentative map) of over 500 dwelling units. When approving a qualifying subdivision tentative map, the city or county must include a condition requiring a sufficient water supply.
Construction Site Storm Water Runoff Control. Dischargers whose projects disturb one or more acres of soil or whose projects disturb less than one acre but are part of a larger common plan of development that in total disturbs one or more acres, are required to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity. The Construction General Permit requires development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP must list BMPs the discharger will use to protect storm water runoff and the placement of BMPs. Additionally, the SWPPP must contain a monitoring program.

Use of the Aquifer. It is noted that while the statutes listed above regulate water quality matters or are intended to insure water adequate water supplies as part of the project approval process, no state statute controls or regulates ground water pumping; moreover, water rights in the aquifer underlying the San Joaquin Valley have not been adjudicated.

3.9.3 Impact Evaluation Criteria

The following thresholds of significance are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. For purposes of this EIR, the Project may have a significant adverse impact associated with hydrology and water quality if it would do any of the following:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

3.9.4 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation

3.9.4.a Violate Water Quality Standards or Waste Discharge Requirements

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project violates water quality standards or water discharge requirements.

There are no surface waters in the City of San Joaquin other than irrigation and drainage canals, ditches, and basins. Groundwater quality is addressed in objectives and policies of the General Plan Update (Appendix A) and summarized below:

**CON 3.1.1** The City shall develop a systematic mechanism that collects data and shares and receives information on the state of its groundwater supply.

**CON 3.2.1** The City shall collaborate with other local and regional agencies and municipalities to develop and implement programs that protect and enhance local and regional groundwater quality.

**CON 3.2.2** The City shall implement programs as feasible to protect local groundwater quality.

Potential implementation programs would include utilizing existing storm water basins for recharge, installing new percolation ponds in new growth areas, protecting areas of groundwater recharge from potentially degrading land uses and disposal methods, promoting activities that combine stormwater control and water recharge, and continuing water conservation programs. Implementation of groundwater protection programs under the General Plan throughout buildout will avoid contamination of groundwater sources and will assist the City in meeting water quality standards.

The Health Element also contains objectives and policies regarding water quality as summarized below:

**HE 2.1.1b** Implement the elements of the Joint Groundwater Management Plan (2010) addressing on-going groundwater monitoring and information sharing.

**HE 2.2.2** Collaborate with regional water agencies to share information as outlined in the Upper Kings Basin Integrated Regional Water Management Plan.

**HE 2.2.4** Support the development and implementation of the James Irrigation District Joint Groundwater Management Plan.

**HE 2.2.6** The City shall adopt the Drinking Water Source Assessment and Protection Program BMPs as developed by the California Department of Health Services.

In addition, certain construction and industrial activities undertaken in the City would require compliance with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), under which a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPP) would be prepared, implemented and monitored. Implementation of the policies and implementation measures in the draft General Plan, along with the NPDES requirements, would reduce the amount of pollutants in runoff from new development. Impacts are less than significant.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation measures are required.
3.9.4.b Deplete Groundwater Supplies or Interfere with Groundwater Recharge

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project depletes groundwater supplies or interferes substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level.

Buildout of the General Plan during the planning period will increase the demand for water and water service. The City’s three operational wells have a capacity of 3,500 gallons per minute (gpm). The City’s total water usage for the past ten years has fluctuated between 152 million gallons (MG) and 262 MG. The average water use for the last five years has been 175 gallons per capita per day (gpcd). The Fresno COG estimates the City population will increase to 5,398 in the next 20 years which would increase annual demand to 344 MG, an increase of approximately 30 percent. The City’s current wells are designed to meet existing demand through 2018. The City’s Water Master Plan includes a total of six wells at buildout. Although current contingency capacity (approximately 2,400 gpm) is expected to handle average and maximum day demands through 2030, the City cannot accommodate maximum day demands plus fire flow at the present contingency capacity. Fire flow demand will exceed total capacity (3,500 gpm from the three existing operational wells) by 2025. Peak hour demand will exceed contingency capacity within 20 years (2040 Community Plan Background Report Section 7).

Objectives, policies and programs related to water supply are included in the General Plan Update (Appendix A) and summarized below:

PFS-2.1.1 The City shall condition approval of new development projects on the availability of adequate water supply and infrastructure to serve the new development.

PFS-2.1.2 New development projects shall pay impact fee assessments or construct facilities sufficient to fund additional water system capacity and infrastructure needed to service the new development.

PFS 2.1.4 Growth inducing projects will be reviewed for environmental impacts that such development may have upon the existing water sources and distribution facilities. The advent of water metering provides an opportunity to intensify water conservation and efficiency in buildings and landscapes through education and water use regulations in the Municipal Code and Water Master Plan.

PFS-2.3.1 The City shall promote water conservation and reduced water demand in its operations and in existing and new development.

PFS-2.3.2 Require water-conserving facility and building design in new construction and retrofit projects in the short-term planning period.

PFS 2.3.4 The City shall encourage residents, business owners, and developers to conserve water by providing incentives or rebates to retrofit existing non-conserving measures with more efficient technology when feasible.

CON 2.1 Maintain a level of water use in the City that is 20% below the water use recorded in 2009.

CON 2.2 Implement California Urban Water Conservation Council’s Best Management Practices.

CON 2.2.1 The City shall manage its water supply, distribution infrastructure, and regulations in a way that maximizes water conservation.
CON 2.2.2 The City shall meter residential, commercial, and industrial water use as required by California Water Code (§525b).

CON 2.3.2 The City shall continue to conform to the Department of Water Resource's Model Landscape Water Use Ordinance and adopt more stringent outdoor water use policies where feasible.

Policies would expand and enhance groundwater supplies by utilizing existing storm water basins for recharge, installing new percolation ponds in growth areas, protecting areas of groundwater recharge from potentially degrading land uses and disposal methods, promoting activities that combine stormwater control and water recharge, and continuing water conservation programs. Combined with the growth management strategies in the Public Facilities and Services Element, water supplies would not be jeopardized by growth under the General Plan. Impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

3.9.4.c Alter the Existing Drainage Pattern to Result in Substantial Erosion or Siltation

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project alters the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.

The topography in the San Joaquin area is relatively flat and new development is not likely to result in substantial grading unless berms, underground facilities, or other onsite design and engineering proposed such changes. Ponding can occur within the City during rain events; however, this indicates that off-site erosion and siltation is not common.

Objectives, policies and programs related to drainage are included in the General Plan Update (Appendix A) and summarized below:

PFS-4.1.1 The City shall budget for flood control and drainage facility maintenance and repair.

PFS-4.2.1 The City shall require new development projects to maintain adequate flood control and drainage facility capacity to serve the development.

PFS-4.2.2 New development projects shall be subject to impact fee assessments sufficient to fund additional flood control and drainage facilities and infrastructure, an ongoing program.

PFS 4.2.3 Development projects shall capture stormwater drainage beyond existing flows on or near the site using site drainage techniques such as swales.

These policies establish that new projects are subject to approval of drainage plans, construction of facilities, and payment of drainage impact fees. In addition, certain construction and industrial activities undertaken in the City would require compliance with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), under which a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would be prepared, implemented and monitored. Implementation of the policies and implementation measures in the draft General Plan, along with the NPDES requirements, would reduce the amount of erosion and siltation occurring from new development under the General Plan. Impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.
3.9.4.d Alter the Existing Drainage Pattern to Increase the Rate or Amount of Surface Runoff

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project alters the existing drainage pattern of the site or area or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site.

Additional growth and development will increase the amount of impervious surface coverage and increase stormwater runoff in the City. If not addressed, increased runoff can result in flooding, particularly given the relatively flat topography of the City. The General Plan includes objectives and policies related to stormwater summarized in Section 4.9.c.

These objectives and policies establish that new projects and developments are subject to approval based on availability of adequate flood control facilities and require new development to provide funding for additional flood control and drainage facilities and infrastructure. Therefore, the General Plan, through objectives and policies, limits significant impacts to stormwater management systems and would not contribute to substantial alteration to drainage patterns that could cause off-site flooding. Impacts are less than significant.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation measures are required.

3.9.4.e Create or Contribute Runoff Water Exceeding Capacity of Stormwater Drainage

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project creates or contributes runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.

As discussed above, additional growth and development will increase the amount of impervious surface coverage and increase the amount of stormwater runoff in the City. Existing stormwater drainage lines consist of lines along Main Street to the west of the City and along Colorado Avenue to the irrigation ditches north and west of the City limits. Four of the seven geographic zones identified in the City’s Storm Drainage Master Plan are developed and are served by retention basins A and B as well as a temporary basin in the City’s industrial park. The City purchased land for a new permanent basin on Colorado Avenue, north of Fifth Street, for future system expansion when needed in the future.

The General Plan includes the objectives and policies related to stormwater as summarized in Section 3.9.4.c. These goals, objectives, and policies establish that new projects and developments are subject to approval based on availability of adequate flood control facilities and require new development to provide funding for additional flood control and drainage facilities and infrastructure. Impacts are less than significant.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation measures are required.
3.9.4.f Substantially Degrade Water Quality

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project substantially degrades water quality.

Please refer to Impacts 3.9.4.a, 3.9.4.b, 3.9.4.c, and 3.9.4.e. As discussed in these impacts, the General Plan includes measures to protect water quality.

As city boundaries expand, community services are provided to areas originally served only by individual domestic and agricultural wells. Improper abandonment of such wells presents a significant risk of contaminating the city's community water supply. For this reason, when development occurs, it is important to ensure the safe and proper destruction of all abandoned water wells. Also as development occurs, community services are provided to areas originally served only by individual on-site sewage disposal systems. Individual septic systems should be properly destroyed as a measure to protect groundwater. This a potentially significant impact.

Mitigation:

1. As new development occurs, the City shall, in cooperation with the Fresno County Environmental Health Division, require the safe and proper closure and/or destruction of abandoned water wells and individual septic disposal systems.

Level of Significance after Mitigation: With the incorporation of the recommended mitigation measure, impacts will be reduced to less than significant.

3.9.4.g-i Place Housing or Structures within a 100-year Flood Hazard Area, that would Impede or Redirect Flood Flows, or Expose People or Structures to a Risk of Loss, Injury, or Death

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project places housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map. A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project places structures within a 100-year flood hazard area, which would impede or redirect flood flows. A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project exposes people or structures to risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding.

Figure 3.9-1 shows the Flood Hazard Boundary map for San Joaquin and surrounding areas. Zone “A” designates those areas subject to flooding in a 100-year event. The entire City is located outside FEMA flood hazard zone “A.” Therefore, any new housing or designation of residential land uses on the General Plan would be at minimal risk for flooding.

To address flooding risks, the General Plan Safety Element includes objectives and policies as summarized below:

S 3.1.1 The City shall maintain roadways and drainage systems to prevent localized flooding.

S 3.2.1a Require new developments to employ design standards to minimize risks from flooding and dam inundation
With these policies, the risk of flooding is not eliminated, but it is actively reduced. Impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

3.9.4.j Hazards Due to Seiche, Tsunami, or Mudflow

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project causes hazards of inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

The City is located inland and at a relatively flat elevation; therefore, there is little risk of inundation by tsunami or mudflow. The nearest major watercourses are the Fresno Slough to the west and the James Bypass to the east, both located over two miles from the City. Impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.
Figure 3.9-1: Flood Hazard Boundary Map

FEMA Flood Zones
Fresno County DFIRM

- A - 100yr flood zone. No base flood elevations determined
- X - Outside floodplain
3.10 Land Use and Planning

3.10.1 Environmental Setting

The City of San Joaquin is located in Fresno County approximately 30 miles southwest of the City of Fresno and between Interstate 5 and State Highway 99. The City is at an elevation of approximately 170 feet and is surrounded by agricultural uses. The City limits comprise approximately 1.1 square miles and the Sphere of Influence (SOI) comprises approximately 1.6 square miles.

Like other Valley communities in the early 1900s, San Joaquin grew adjacent to the railroad with the original town laid out at right angles to the Southern Pacific. Colorado Avenue, one of two major arterial streets in the community, bisects the city and runs parallel to the Southern Pacific tracks. Many major commercial and industrial activities are found on Colorado Avenue.

The second major arterial, Manning Avenue, is typified by industrial activities. Most industrial uses are located west of the Southern Pacific tracks along Railroad Avenue and at the intersection of Manning and Colorado at the south end of the community.

Existing land uses within the City and SOI are shown below. Agricultural parcels are legally permitted uses within residential, industrial, and commercial zoned areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Existing City Limits</th>
<th>Existing SOI Outside City Limits</th>
<th>Existing SOI Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Facility</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Water Treatment Plant(^1)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Right-of-Way</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>731</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>252</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) The Wastewater Treatment Plant is within the City limits but not within the SOI.
The General Plan update proposes the land use distribution shown below. The SOI boundary would increase as would the distribution of commercial, industrial, public facility, and residential uses.

**Table 3.10-2**

Land Use Designations by Acreage within the Existing City and Proposed Sphere of Influence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Plan Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Existing City Limits</th>
<th>Proposed SOI Outside City Limits</th>
<th>Proposed SOI Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Business District</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Commercial</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Density Residential</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Facility</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Treatment Plant¹</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Right-of-Way</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>731</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,387</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The Wastewater Treatment Plant is proposed to be included within the proposed SOI and constitutes two parcels totaling 76 acres.

**3.10.2 Regulatory Framework**

**State of California.** State law requires each city to prepare a comprehensive, long term general plan to guide its future. The general plan must cover a local jurisdiction’s entire planning area and address the broad range of issues associated with development. When establishing its planning area, cities are encouraged to use the SOI as a starting point as this boundary represents “the probable physical boundaries and service area” of the city. Although there is no direct requirement that the sphere and the planning area match, the former provides a convenient measure of the city’s region of interest. For the update of the San Joaquin General Plan, the planning area boundary is the same as the proposed SOI.

**Fresno LAFCo.** California Government Code Section 56841(g) requires Local Agency Formation Commissions to consider the consistency of proposals for annexation, detachment, or incorporation. A prerequisite to annexation to a city is a tax sharing agreement between the city and county. All fifteen incorporated cities within Fresno County have a “Memorandum of Understanding” with Fresno County setting out an agreement for tax sharing.

Each agreement includes “Standards for Annexation” which lists the criteria which each municipality must meet in order to annex territory consistent with the tax sharing agreement. These provisions include measures that assure that annexations are orderly, leapfrog development is avoided, and that urban growth is logical and efficient.

3.10.2
Fresno LAFCo has the statutory responsibility to adopt an SOI for each city within Fresno County. An SOI is a planning boundary outside of a municipality’s city limits that designates the jurisdiction’s probable future boundary and service area. State law also requires LAFCo to review and update, as necessary, the adopted SOIs of agencies every five years. Within the SOI, LAFCo will consider proposals for annexation based on growth projections, a phased program of annexation, existing developable vacant land, impacts to agricultural land, urban service availability, and the demonstrated likelihood of imminent development.

The proposed Project includes proposed expansion of the San Joaquin SOI as follows:

- Approximately 112 acres south of the City would be removed from the existing SOI;
- Approximately 1,171 acres of new land would be added to the SOI for urban expansion purposes;
- Approximately 76 acres would be added to the SOI for the existing WWTP and future expansion.

This results in a net addition of 1,135 acres to the San Joaquin SOI. According to Fresno LAFCo, the existing San Joaquin SOI contains 962 acres. The proposed expansion would bring the total SOI to 2,097 acres.

**Fresno County General Plan.** The Fresno County General Plan establishes policies for the development of the County and the protection of the County’s open space, agricultural and historical resources. The County General Plan establishes the basis for subsequent planning efforts, such as preparation of unincorporated community plans, specific plans, and special studies dealing with unique planning issues. The plan seeks to protect productive agricultural land and promote compact growth by directing most new urban development to existing cities that have infrastructure to accommodate such growth. Primary tools used by Fresno County in this effort are administration of the Williamson Act; application of exclusive agricultural zoning with large minimum parcel sizes (AE-20, AE-40, etc.) within the unincorporated portion of a city’s SOI; and, in cooperation with LAFCO and the individual cities, adoption of a “Memorandum of Understanding” including “Standards for Annexation.”

**San Joaquin General Plan.** The City of San Joaquin General Plan serves as a policy guide for determining the appropriate physical development and character of the City. The current General Plan was adopted in 1996. The Update of the San Joaquin General Plan incorporates the adopted General Plan with the San Joaquin 2040 Community Plan (2040 Plan) prepared by the Cal Poly School of City and Regional Planning (June 2011); recommendations of the Valley Blueprint Integration Program; recommendations of the City of San Joaquin Mobility and Revitalization Plan; and recommendations of the City of San Joaquin Model Energy Efficient Plan for Rural Housing.

The General Plan contains the following elements: Land use; Transportation and Circulation; Housing; Conservation; Open Space; Safety; Noise; Economic; Public Facilities and Services; Community Design; and Health. The General Plan intensifies residential land uses by introducing moderate increases in densities. Mixed-use with a residential component is allowed in all commercial land use categories. Infill is encouraged prior to annexing new territory to the City.

The time frame or “planning horizon” for the General Plan is 20 years after adoption. Pertinent goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan update are listed by impact area in the Draft EIR.
Development in the planning area will be regulated by the San Joaquin General Plan, the Zoning Ordinance, subdivision regulations, and other regulatory and policy documents. New development will require approval by the City of a number of regulatory mechanisms for implementation. These include:

- Zone District Changes (prezoning and rezoning)
- Tentative parcel maps or tract maps
- Conditional Use Permits
- Site Plan Review
- Final Subdivision Maps
- Annexation of territory (LAFCO approval)

At a minimum, development proposals within the planning area will be required to be consistent with the following criteria:

- The proposed development is consistent with the General Plan.
- The proposed development can be adequately served by City infrastructure, including water, wastewater collection and treatment, drainage, streets, and parks without requiring extensions or expansion beyond those which the developer is required to provide.
- The proposed development can be provided with adequate law enforcement and fire protection.
- The property can be annexed to the City. Annexation of any portion of the planning area is subject to the approval of the Fresno LAFCO, in accordance with Section 56650 et. seq. of the California Government Code.

**Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)/Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS).** RTPs, required by State and Federal regulations, are transportation funding documents developed by Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs). The RTP establishes goals, identifies needs, and estimates funding for transportation improvement projects. As an MPO, the Fresno Council of Governments (COG) has prepared an RTP with a 25-year horizon that must be updated every four years; the RTP update is now under preparation.

SB 375 adopted by the State in 2008 requires that RTPs include a “Sustainable Communities Strategy” (SCS) that considers land uses, housing allocation goals, the regional transportation network, farmland conservation, and a forecasted development pattern for the region, which, when integrated with the transportation network, will achieve greenhouse gas reduction targets established by the Air Resources Board for the San Joaquin Valley (5% by 2020 and 10% by 2035). As a component of the RTP, the SCS is also under preparation by the Fresno COG.

COG is obliged by SB 375 to model “forecasted development patterns” to ensure that they meet the greenhouse gas reduction targets. COG developed a range of development pattern scenarios to be modeled:

- Scenario “A” was based on public input conducted by the COG and would focus future growth to cities and unincorporated communities on the west side of Fresno County.
• Scenario “B” was developed to reflect current planning assumptions after outreach to the cities and Fresno County about their growth plans and planning assumptions. Scenario B included adopted General Plans and also included the draft General Plan updates underway, including Fresno, Clovis, Reedley, and San Joaquin.

• Scenario “C” was developed largely at the request of community-based organizations who expressed that Fresno and Clovis plans were not ‘ambitious’ enough to make a significant impact on environmental issues. Growth from the unincorporated foothill area near Millerton was transferred to downtown Fresno to increase the feasibility of transit.

• A fourth scenario, “D,” was proposed by community-based organizations to shift foothill growth to downtown Fresno and also to smaller cities south of the Fresno urban area.

On November 21, 2013, the Fresno COG Policy Board voted to adopt Scenario “B” and move it forward as the SCS component of the RTP. This includes the proposed San Joaquin General Plan which was included in Scenario “B” following consultation between COG and the City. The RTP/SCS is under preparation and environmental review and is expected to be adopted in 2014.

San Joaquin Valley Blueprint. Scenario “B” and the SCS will closely mirror the San Joaquin Valley Blueprint, an 8-county effort to form a preferred vision for future development throughout the Valley to the year 2050. On April 1, 2009, the San Joaquin Valley Regional Policy Council took the following actions: 1) adopted a list of Smart Growth principles to be used as the basis of Blueprint planning in the San Joaquin Valley; and 2) adopted the Blueprint Growth Scenario to serve as the guidance for local jurisdictions as they update their general plans. The San Joaquin Valley Blueprint places emphasis on preservation of agricultural land, protection of environmental resources, and more transportation infrastructure that crosses county boundaries. The number of dwellings per acre for all new residential construction to the year 2050 should average 6.8 units under the preferred alternative. It is understood that the major metropolitan areas such as Fresno, Bakersfield and Modesto will have higher densities and that smaller cities in the Valley may have somewhat lower densities to achieve this overall density.

3.10.3 Impact Evaluation Criteria

The following thresholds of significance are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. For purposes of this EIR, the Project may have a significant adverse impact associated with land use and planning quality if it would do any of the following:

a) Physically divide an established community?

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the General Plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?
3.10.4 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation

3.10.4.a Physically Divide an Established Community

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project physically divided an established community.

Development in the City of San Joaquin is centered around the railroad track, which is the primary physical division on the City. The pattern of development in the City primarily places commercial, high-density, and medium-density uses near the center of the City and along the railroad track, while low-density residential uses are located on the periphery, with the exception of industrial uses in the southeast periphery.

The potential for physical division would result from community divisions resulting from land use classifications. The current pattern of development would continue in the same design, with current agricultural areas on the periphery and Sphere of Influence designated for future low-density residential and industrial uses. Objectives, policies, and programs to guide future urban growth and development are included in the General Plan Update (Appendix A) and summarized below:

LU 1.2.1 The City shall encourage development to locate on existing parcels within the City and adjacent to existing development.
LU 1.4.1 The City shall encourage infill development prior to annexing new territory.
LU 1.4.3 Urban expansion shall not exceed the capacity of the City and other local agencies to provide the services and facilities required consistent with the goals of this General Plan.
LU 1.6 Expansion of the City shall be phased to create a physical form and character that improves community functions, serves the needs of the residents, decreases dependency on non-renewable resources and utilizes renewable resources like solar and wind while protecting natural resources.
LU 2.1.1 The City shall establish a distinctive central commercial district.
LU 2.2.1 The City shall provide incentives for mixed-use development providing street-level businesses along Main Street between Colorado Avenue and Nevada Avenue.
LU 2.3.5 Mixed-use centers shall be located in proximity to existing neighborhoods that balance vehicle, bike, and pedestrian circulation, maximize on-street vehicle parking and minimize off-street parking.
LU 2.5.5 Industrial development shall be compatible with the surrounding area including mitigation for noise, odors, and potential releases of hazardous materials.

The General Plan land use diagram does not physically divide the community. Goals, policies and implementation measures require that growth be controlled and expand first by utilizing vacant land within developed portions of the City and then through careful expansion of uses around the built environment as designated on the land use diagram. Incompatible land uses are not proposed in the land use diagram and no new physical divisions such as airports, roads and railroads are proposed in the General Plan. There would be no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.
3.10.4.b Conflict with Applicable Land Use Plan, Policy, or Regulation

A significant impact would occur if the project conflicts with the City of San Joaquin General Plan or City of San Joaquin Zoning Ordinance, or with policies of other responsible agencies.

In some cases, changes proposed in the General Plan include land use standards that promote General Plan policies but are not in compliance with the specific text of the Zoning Ordinance. For example, the General Plan increases residential density so that density limits identified in the Zoning Ordinance for the R-2 and R-3 districts are exceeded. The General Plan also includes higher densities that require creation of an R-4 residential zone. Similarly, the General Plan identifies a commercial core area called the “Central Business District” and includes goals and policies for development in this area, including provision for mixed-uses. These areas and uses are not identified in the Zoning Ordinance and should be included to specify where these commercial uses are permissible and what development requirements and limits apply. Objectives, policies and programs related to land use and zoning are included in the General Plan Update (Appendix A) and summarized below:

LU 1.1.1a: Amend the zoning ordinance for R-2 zones such that the minimum density is four units per acre and the maximum density is 8 units per acre.
LU 1.1.1b: Amend the zoning ordinance for R-3 zones such that the minimum density is eight units per acre and the maximum density is 20 units per acre.
LU 1.1.1c: Amend the zoning ordinance to create an R-4 zone designation with a minimum density of 20 units per acre and a maximum density of 30 units per acre in the short-term planning period.
LU 1.1.1d: Amend the Zoning Code and the Zoning Map to allow increased residential and commercial densities along Main Street and Colorado Avenue.
LU 2.1.1a: Amend the zoning ordinance to create a Central Business District on Main Street between Colorado Avenue and California Avenue.
LU 2.2.2a: Amend the zoning ordinance to allow for a distinctive “Central Commercial” zone on Main Street between Colorado Avenue and California Avenue.
LU 2.3.7a: Amend the zoning ordinance to allow for mixed-use projects.
LU 5.1.1a: Streamline provisions in City zoning to eliminate incompatibilities and promote orderly and structured growth.

Adoption of the General Plan Update will reduce conflicts and provide greater direction when compared to the existing General Plan. Land use impacts will be reduced and the plan update provides objectives and policies that are more sustainable and environmentally responsible. The plan update provides direction for amendments to the zoning ordinance to achieve consistency with the General Plan. The City expects to update the zoning ordinance within the next 12-18 months.

Fresno LAFCo. LAFCo is a responsible agency under CEQA whose role is to consider changes of spheres of influence and annexations. A responsible agency complies with CEQA by considering the environmental analysis prepared by the lead agency and by reaching its own conclusions on whether and how to approve the project.

Prior to, or in conjunction with an SOI update, LAFCo is required to conduct a Municipal Service Review (MSR) for each agency. A MSR is a comprehensive review of an agency’s ability to provide municipal service(s) to those persons and businesses within its current boundaries and its SOI.
Per the Act, the Commission is to prepare a written statement of its determinations with respect to each of the following:

1. Growth and population projections for the affected area.
2. Present and planned capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services, including infrastructure needs or deficiencies.
3. Financial ability of agencies to provide services.
4. Status of, and opportunities for, shared facilities.
5. Accountability for community service needs, including governmental structure and operational efficiencies.
6. Any other matter related to effective or efficient service delivery, as required by commission policy.

The standards for SOI review are contained in Section 330 of LAFCo’s Commission Policies, Standards, and Procedures Manual. Primary requirements of SOI review include:

1. Prior to a city submitting an application to update its sphere of influence, the city and Fresno County shall meet to discuss the proposed boundaries of the sphere and explore methods to reach agreement on development standards and planning and zoning requirements within the sphere to ensure the logical and orderly development of areas within the sphere.
2. In determining the sphere of influence, the Commission shall prepare a written statement of its determinations with respect to those items set forth in policy section 330, which are summarized as follows:
   a. The present and planned land uses in the area, including agricultural and open-space lands.
   b. The present and probable need for public facilities and services in the area.
   c. The present capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services that the agency provides or is authorized to provide.
   d. The existence of any social or economic communities of interest in the area.

3. For a city that provides public services related to sewers, municipal and industrial water, or fire protection, the present and probable need for those public services of any disadvantaged unincorporated communities within the existing sphere of influence.
4. Upon determination of a sphere of influence, the Commission shall adopt that sphere and review and update, as necessary, the adopted sphere not less than once every five years.
5. The Commission requests that a sphere of influence update be comprehensive and based on historical growth patterns, using a twenty to twenty-five year projection, prepared with a city general plan update for the community.

With regard to item No. 3, above, LAFCo has adopted procedures for "disadvantaged unincorporated communities" (DUCs) when considering annexation, an SOI amendment or MSR. A DUC means an inhabited territory with an annual median household income less than 80% of the statewide annual median household income, with at least 15 dwelling units at a density not less than one unit per acre. Cities and special districts are required to identify DUCs within and contiguous to their boundaries. There are no DUCs within or contiguous to the existing or proposed San Joaquin SOI.
A legacy community is a geographically isolated community that meets DUC criteria, is at least 50 years old, and is beyond the adopted SOI of any city. When approving an updated sphere of influence, the city is required to identify any legacy community within one mile of the existing or proposed SOI. There are no DUCs within one mile of the proposed expansion of the San Joaquin SOI. The community of Tranquility, which may qualify as a legacy community, is approximately 2.5 miles northwest of the proposed SOI expansion area and therefore does not meet LAFCo criteria.

Implementation of policies contained within LAFCo’s Commission Policies, Standards, and Procedures Manual will prevent a conflict with applicable policy or regulations and reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

3.10.4.c Conflict with Applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project conflicts with a conservation plan.

There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans applicable to the City of San Joaquin. There would be no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.
3.11 Mineral Resources

3.11.1 Environmental Setting

In the San Joaquin planning area, information indicates that no significant mineral deposits are present, and there is little likelihood for their presence. According to the 2040 Community Plan Background Report, there are no mineral resource claims in the City of San Joaquin; most mineral claims in the general area are located west of Interstate 5.

3.11.2 Regulatory Framework

The California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology is responsible for the classification and designation of areas that contain, or could contain, significant mineral resources.

3.11.3 Impact Evaluation Criteria

The following thresholds of significance are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. For purposes of this EIR, the Project may have a significant adverse impact associated with mineral resources if it would do any of the following:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local General Plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

3.11.4 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation

3.11.4. a-b Loss of Known Mineral Resource or Locally-Important Mineral Resource Recovery Site

The state legislature adopted the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) in 1975, which designated Mineral Resource Zones (MRZ) for areas possessing minerals, which are of statewide or regional significance. A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project results in the loss of availability of a mineral resource of value to the region and state, or result in a loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.

There are no designated Mineral Resource Zones in San Joaquin or within the proposed SOI. There would be no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.
3.12 Noise

3.12.1 Environmental Setting

The main noise sources in the City are transportation related noises along Colorado and Manning Avenues and the railroad. Noise contours, based on traffic volumes of approximately 1,100 vehicle per day, show noise levels ranging from 70 decibels (dB) on the roadway to 60 dB adjacent to the roadway. Noise generated from the railroad right-of-way may exceed 95 dBA. Trucks and farm equipment on local truck routes or operating near residential areas generate noise levels, on average, of 65 dBA.

Most residential areas are located away from these noise corridors; however, there are some residences, a medical facility, and other sensitive uses located adjacent to these roadways. State standards for noise levels generally limit noise levels in sensitive areas, such as residential neighborhoods, to between 60 and 65 dBA CNEL. Limits for other sensitive uses, such as schools and churches, is generally 70 dBA CNEL.

The San Joaquin Airport, a private airstrip with one runway, is located one mile west of the City.

Acoustic Terminology

A-Weighted Decibel (dBA): The sound pressure level in decibels as measured on a sound level meter using the A-weighting filter network. The A-weighting filter de-emphasizes very low and very high frequency components of sound in a manner similar to the response of the human ear and correlates with subjective reactions to noise.

Ambient Noise Level: The normal or existing level of environmental noise at a given location.

Day-Night Level (Ldn): The energy average of the A-weighted sound levels occurring during a 24-hour period, with 10 dB added to the A-weighted sound levels occurring from 10:00 PM to 7:00 AM to account for increased sensitivity of some individuals to noise during nighttime hours.

Decibel (dB): A unit describing the amplitude of sound.

Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL): The energy average of the A-weighted sound levels occurring during a 24-hour period with 5 dB added to the A-weighted sound levels occurring from 7:00 PM to 10:00 PM and 10 dB added to the A-weighted sound levels from 10:00 PM to 7:00 AM.

Equivalent Sound Level (Leq): The equivalent steady state sound level which in a stated period of time would contain the same acoustical energy.

Ldn and CNEL values rarely differ by more than 1 dB and are considered to be equivalent.

When using the “A” weighted filtering system to best reflect sensitivity of the human ear, sound levels are expressed as dBA. In terms of community response, it is generally valid that a change in noise of at least 5 dBA is required before any noticeable change in community response would be expected. A 10 dBA change in noise level is perceived as being a doubling in loudness and would likely result in an adverse public reaction. Commonly encountered noise levels include:

3.12-1
- Quiet residential interior -- 45 dBA
- Outdoors, near major street -- 65 dBA
- Outdoors, near major freeway -- 85 dBA
- Accelerating motorcycle a few feet away -- 110 dBA
- Threshold of pain -- 130 dBA

On this scale, the normal range of human hearing extends from about 10 dBA to about 140 dBA.

3.12.2 Regulatory Framework

State of California. The State of California General Plan Guidelines provide guidance for the acceptability of projects within specific CNEL/Ldn contours. Recommended noise criteria for various land uses are provided in the guidelines. For example, school uses are considered to be "normally acceptable" in areas where exterior noise levels do not exceed 70 dBA CNEL/Ldn. Development is typically considered "normally unacceptable" in areas exceeding 70 dBA CNEL/Ldn. The guidelines also present adjustment factors that may be used to derive noise standards that reflect the noise control goals of the community, the particular community's sensitivity to noise, and the community's assessment of the relative importance of noise pollution.

City of San Joaquin. Noise is regulated in San Joaquin by the General Plan Noise Element and the Zoning Ordinance.

3.12.3 Impact Evaluation Criteria

The following thresholds of significance are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. For purposes of this EIR, the Project may have a significant adverse impact associated with noise if it would do any of the following:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local General Plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?
3.12.4 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation

3.12.4.a Exposure to Noise Levels in Excess of Standards Established in the Local General Plan or Noise Ordinance

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project exposes people to or generates noise exceeding the standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.

As development takes place over time, noise impacts similar to existing noise levels in the City will occur. In the long-term, noise associated with vehicles on major streets will increase with potential adverse impacts on adjacent residential uses. In the short-term, ambient noise will increase during construction of individual projects. Noise sources within and adjacent to the planning area would also be generated by agricultural operations, commercial activity, and industrial related noise. In the urban area, noise generation and exposure to noise is generally of greatest concern for residential land uses, schools, libraries, hospitals, and other uses that are sensitive to disturbance from noise.

Noise generated from industrial and/or commercial facilities is controlled indirectly by Federal and State employee health and safety regulations (OHSA and Cal-OSHA), but exterior noise emissions from such operations have the potential to exceed locally acceptable standards at nearby noise-sensitive land uses. The primary noise concern in the planning area is increased local automobile traffic and heavy trucks on major roadways. Groundborne vibrations are not expected.

While development would result in permanent increases in ambient noise levels above levels existing without the Project, new noise is anticipated to be similar in intensity to existing noise levels. Additionally, the Community Development Department will review all new development proposals to determine conformance with City policies and regulations that mitigate noise impacts. When a proposed project may result in noise sensitive land uses being exposed to high noise levels, an acoustical analysis is required to be submitted as part of the entitlement application.

Objectives, policies and programs related to noise are included in the General Plan Update (Appendix A) and summarized below:

N 1.2.1 The City shall require that all proposed development incorporate design elements to minimize adverse noise impacts on surrounding land uses.

N 1.2.2 The City shall ensure multi-family residences and hotels comply with state interior noise insulation standards in cases where they fall within the 60 dB (CNEI or Ldn) noise exposure contours.

N 1.3.1 The City shall enforce statewide vehicle noise regulations of illegal or faulty exhaust systems.

N 1.1.1a Conduct an acoustical analysis to determine existing noise levels at the site of proposed development.

N 1.2.1a Incorporate strategic project design and site planning such as setbacks, earthen berms and building orientation where mitigation measures are required.

N 1.3.1b Establish a program of regular enforcement of vehicle noise regulations.

LU 2.5.5 Industrial development shall be compatible with the surrounding area including mitigation for noise, odors, and potential releases of hazardous materials.
Impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

3.12.4.b Exposure to or Generation of Excessive Ground borne Vibration or Noise Levels

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project exposes people to or generates excessive groundborne vibration or noise levels.

The draft General Plan contains goals, objectives and policies that would mitigate noise impacts resulting from implementation of the Plan as discussed in 3.12.4.a. Industrial uses are generally designated in the southeast and eastern periphery of the planning area to avoid land use conflicts such as incompatible noise levels. New residential uses are not proposed within the vicinity of the railroad, which is the primary source of groundborne vibration in the City. Construction activity also has the potential to cause groundborne vibration and temporary excessive noise levels. Impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

3.12.4.c-d Permanent, Temporary, or Periodic Increase in Ambient Noise Levels

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project causes a substantial permanent or temporary periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the proposed Project.

Increased traffic and industrial operations can lead to increases in ambient noise levels. Noise Element objectives and policies ensure that noise levels are appropriate for the designated area, that traffic noise is reduced to maintain existing ambient noise levels, and that sensitive receptors are adequately shielded from high ambient noise levels, primarily due to the existing railroad:

Future development will generate temporary impacts from construction noise which includes noise from operation of earthmoving, grading and paving equipment and trucks. Construction operations would temporarily subject adjacent areas to noise levels perceptibly different from existing noise levels. Noise impacts from construction could cause some nuisance effects to residents near the construction site. Noise sensitive uses located adjacent to sites where new development takes place could be exposed to temporary, intermittent noise levels of 70 to 90 dBA that occur as a result of typical construction. Construction noise would be temporary and confined to relatively small areas at any one time. Impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

3.12.4.e Exposure to Excessive Noise Levels from an Airport

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project exposes people to excessive noise levels due to airports.
There are no public airports within two miles of the City and no impact due to noise level exposure caused by a public airport would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

3.12.4.f Exposure to Excessive Noise Levels from a Private Airstrip

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project exposes people to excessive noise levels due to a private airstrip.

The San Joaquin airport is located one mile west of the City; however this is a small private airport with one runway that does not experience heavy use and is not designed to accommodate large airplanes or large volumes of air traffic. Since there are no plans to extend the City limits further west than the existing westernmost boundary, noise impacts resulting from proximity to the airport would be less than significant. Impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.
3.13 Population and Housing

3.13.1 Environmental Setting

In 1980, San Joaquin had 1,930 residents. By 1990, the population had grown to 2,311, an average annual growth rate of 2%. The City's population was 4,001 persons in 2010. Average annual population growth between 1990 and 2010 was nearly 2.6%. The California Department of Finance estimates a population of 4,029 in the City as of January 1, 2013. Fresno COG has estimated a 2030 population of 5,398 persons for San Joaquin, a 1.8% annual growth rate.

The 2010 Census reports that San Joaquin's ethnic composition is approximately 75.4% Hispanic, 13.6% Asian, 10% White non-Hispanic, 0.6% Black and 0.4% American Indian.

The 2010 Census identified 976 housing units of which 85 (8.7%) were vacant. The majority of units (599, or 61.4%) were detached single-family, followed by duplexes (144, or 14.8%) and three or four-unit structures (109, or 11.2%). There were 37 5-9 unit structures, four 20+ unit structures, 36 attached single unit homes, and 47 mobile homes. The majority of housing units were constructed between 1970 and 2000 (65.4%). The number of owner-occupied units (450 units) and renter-occupied units (441 units) is nearly equal.

The 2040 Community Plan Background Report discusses housing within the City and found that the number of units in need of repair declined from 117 units in 1999 to 78 units in 2010. Likewise, the number of units in need of demolition decreased from 11 in 1999 to 0 in 2010.

3.13.2 Regulatory Framework

San Joaquin General Plan. The City of San Joaquin General Plan serves as a policy guide for determining the appropriate physical development and character of the City. The General Plan intensifies residential land uses by introducing moderate increases in densities. Mixed-use with a residential component is allowed in all commercial land use categories. Infill is encouraged prior to annexing new territory to the City.

3.13.3 Impact Evaluation Criteria

The following thresholds of significance are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. For purposes of this EIR, the Project may have a significant adverse impact associated with population and housing if it would do any of the following:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
3.13.4 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation

3.13.4.a Induce Substantial Population Growth

A significant impact would result if the proposed Project induces substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly.

The current population of 4,021 persons is anticipated to increase to 5,398 persons by 2030. This is a slower growth rate than has occurred in previous decades, but higher than the current growth rate. The General Plan proposes uses that will accommodate this projected growth and anticipates future growth beyond the current planning period.

The population holding capacity at build-out of the General Plan for the existing city limits is approximately 10,170 persons. The build-out of the area within the proposed SOI expansion area is approximately 14,160 persons for a total estimated build-out of the General Plan area of approximately 24,330 persons. These estimates are the maximum potential population in consideration of existing structures constructed at a lower density and in consideration that mixed-use development is a new concept for the City and may not achieve the densities estimated.

Although the maximum population limits allowed by the mix of land uses established in the General Plan (24,330 people) exceeds the estimated population during the planning period (5,398 people), this does not indicate that the population will expand to the maximum capacity allowed by the General Plan within the planning period. Other factors, particularly economic factors and economic growth, drive the growth rate and demand for housing. Objectives, policies and programs related to population and housing are included in the General Plan Update (Appendix A) and summarized below:

LU 1.1.1 The City’s Land Use Diagram and Zoning Map shall have appropriate designations to achieve an average net residential density of ten dwelling units per acre.

LU 1.2.1 The City shall encourage development to locate on existing parcels within the City and adjacent to existing development.

LU 1.4.2 New annexations require the City Council find that overriding considerations exist concerning land availability, affordable housing, economic development, or physical constraints, which preclude additional infill development.

LU 1.4.3 Urban expansion shall not exceed the capacity of the City and other local agencies to provide the services and facilities required consistent with the goals of this General Plan.

LU 1.6 Expansion of the City shall be phased to create a physical form and character that improves community functions, serves the needs of the residents, decreases dependency on non-renewable resources and utilizes renewable resources like solar and wind while protecting natural resources.

LU 1.7 To achieve a sustainable balance between environmental, economic, and social benefits with the area's natural resources.

While the land use designations and uses allowed within those designations provides for enough housing to meet and exceed projected growth in the planning period, policies and objectives guide and stabilize the potential growth to maintain structure. Due to the location of the City within a largely agricultural area and at a distance from major cities, San Joaquin is not likely to become a major
commuter city or to see extreme growth rates within a short period; however, estimates for growth are subject to change and population growth rates may exceed current levels and increase substantially as economic and other factors change. Although it is unlikely that the City will achieve buildout within the next 20 years, the General Plan anticipates growth and prepares the City for growth beyond the planning period. Impacts are less than significant.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation measures are required.

3.13.4. b-c Displace Substantial Numbers of Existing Housing

A significant impact would result if the proposed Project displaces substantial numbers of existing housing or existing people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

The General Plan does not include the removal of existing housing units. The overall area designated for residential use increases with the General Plan as residential land uses displace agricultural uses. Most of the 220 acres currently designated as agriculture within the City, are re-designated for low-density residential use. Portions of the “Central Business District” established in the updated General Plan replace some areas identified as “residential” in the previous General Plan; however, the central business district allows for mixed-uses, including medium- and high-residential units within the commercial area. Medium- and high-density residential uses are also allowed in the “Community Commercial” designation, further expanding the potential for residential uses.

Since the General Plan does not eliminate housing and provides more opportunities for housing of all types, the impact of the General Plan is beneficial and less than significant. Impacts are less than significant.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation measures are required.
3.14. Public Services

3.14.1 Environmental Setting

Fire Protection. The Fresno County Fire Protection District provides fire protection service in the City. The District operates 13 staffed fire stations and five district paid call firefighter stations. In cooperation with CALFIRE, the County provides 48 on-duty firefighters per day. The Fresno-Kings Pre-Fire Management Plan (2009) identifies the City as a non-wildland, non-urban area. The nearest fire station, District Station 95, is located in nearby Tranquility, approximately four miles northeast of the City. Average response times is 13.9 minutes compared to national standard target response times of five minutes for 90% of calls (2040 Community Plan Background Report). This is due to the rural nature of the District and distance of the service area from the station.

Police Protection. San Joaquin contracts with the Fresno County Sheriff's Office for law enforcement services. The Sheriff's Office Area 1 substation is located on Manning Avenue west of Colorado Avenue. This substation patrols an area of over 2,400 square miles in western Fresno County. Personnel includes one lieutenant, three sergeants, three community service officers, two robbery/property detectives, and 32 deputy sheriffs. The men and women assigned to Area 1 provide 24-hour patrol and detective services, crime prevention, vehicle abatement, contract school deputy, as well as a host of community liaison functions. The City receives 10 hours of law enforcement services per day which equates to approximately 0.8 full time equivalent officers. This results in approximately 0.22 officers per 1,000 residents, which is lower than the County or State; however, the crime rate in San Joaquin is generally low.

Schools. The City is served by the Golden Plains Unified School District which operates four elementary schools and one high school. The high school is located four miles from San Joaquin in Tranquility. The elementary schools are located in San Joaquin (San Joaquin Elementary School), and in the communities of Cantua, Helm, and Tranquility. Elementary schools serve students in kindergarten through 8th grade and Tranquility High School serves students in grades 9 through 12. San Joaquin Elementary was constructed in 1950 and designed to accommodate up to 400 students; however, in the last decade, the school has served over 800 students annually and temporary buildings have been constructed onsite to accommodate the growing student body.

Parks. San Joaquin provides two outdoor park and recreation facilities. Peter Rusconi Park is approximately 0.6 acres located in the center of the community and provides a skate park, basketball courts, and picnic areas with a covered community barbecue pit. The second facility is the Sports Park of 11 acres which includes a baseball diamond, joint use facility (soccer/football), tot lot, and walking trail. The San Joaquin Elementary School playground also provides an important recreational facility on approximately 15 acres. The campus includes four baseball diamonds, basketball courts, and a kindergarten play area.

The City provides a Senior Activity Center on Colorado Avenue of approximately 1,200 square feet which includes meeting rooms. The City also owns the 7,100 square foot Leo Cantu Community Center with activity rooms, a day care facility, and a center for residents to access public and non-profit services.
The City owns the San Joaquin Veterans Memorial Hall of approximately 6,200 square feet that includes a stage, commercial kitchen, conference room/meeting room, bar, and media room. Meals are provided Tuesdays and Thursdays by the Salvation Army and Waterford Foundation.

**Other Public Facilities.** A branch of the Fresno County Public Library is located in San Joaquin on Main Street. The library is open six days per week with limited afternoon and evening hours and provides internet access, printers, copiers, and fax machines for public access.

### 3.14.2 Regulatory Framework

The State of California has enacted AB 2925 - School Development Fees, which requires school districts to present a fee justification study in order to collect development impact fees within its jurisdiction.

State regulations and standards pertaining to fire protection are contained in the adopted portions of the Uniform Fire Code, the Uniform Building Code and standards set by the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA).

Passed in 1975, the Quimby Act (California Government Code Section 66477) authorizes local agencies to establish ordinances requiring new developments to pay in-lieu fees or dedicate lands for park and recreation facilities to serve proposed development.

### 3.14.3 Impact Evaluation Criteria

The following thresholds of significance are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. For purposes of this EIR, the Project may have a significant adverse impact associated with public services if it would do any of the following:

1. **Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services?**

   - Fire protection?
   - Police protection?
   - Schools?
   - Parks?
   - Other public facilities?
3.14.4 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation

3.14.4.a Substantial Adverse Physical Impacts Due to Maintaining Acceptable Service Levels

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project requires construction of new public service facilities or expansion of such service facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, and other public services.

New development in the City, with a City buildout population capacity of 24,330 compared with the current population of just over 4,000, will result in increased demand for public services, including law enforcement, fire protection, schools and parks. The available capacity to support the increased demand for each of these services is discussed in the following sections.

Fire Protection.

Growth is anticipated to be low during the planning period, with only 1.8% growth annually. This estimate is higher than the existing growth rate and may decrease or increase during the planning period. While the projected population increase during the planning period is approximately 5,400 persons, the General Plan maximum population allows for 24,330 persons. Using the Department of Finance projection of approximately 5,400 persons, the population growth will slightly increase the demand for fire protection services. As the City nears buildout (24,330 persons), the demand for an additional fire station within the City may be warranted; however, it is not likely the population rate will grow quickly enough to reach buildout during the planning period.

Objectives, policies and programs related to fire protection are included in the General Plan Update (Appendix A) and summarized below:

- S 2.1.1 The City shall require safe levels of property maintenance for fire protection.
- S 2.1.1a Establish an inspection and enforcement system to reduce potential for urban fire on under-maintained lots in the short-term planning period.
- S 2.1.1c Promote fire extinguisher installation in structures.

Property maintenance enforced through these policies will reduce the potential and severity of wildland fires. However, without an increase in fire protection service, the increase in population will result in increased demand that cannot be met at current service levels. Impacts are potentially significant.

Mitigation:

- 13.14.1 Developers of proposed projects in the planning area shall pay Public Facilities Impact Fees for proposed developments as established by the City of San Joaquin in accordance with the requirements of State law.
- 13.14.2 All proposed development in the planning area shall comply with applicable, current requirements under the Uniform Building Code, Uniform Fire Codes, and City Standards.
13.14.3 Developers of proposed projects in the planning area shall be individually evaluated and impact on fire service mitigated through standard requirements for fire flow, hydrant placement, sprinklerization, and developer provision of new equipment where necessary.

13.14.4 The City of San Joaquin shall ensure that adequate fire protection services are in available concurrent with construction in newly developing areas.

Level of Significance After Mitigation - With the incorporation of mitigation measures, potential environmental impacts will be reduced to less than significant.

Law Enforcement.

Increases in urbanization through additional residential units and expansion of commercial and industrial development may lead to an increase in demand for law enforcement. Objectives, policies and programs related to police protection are included in the General Plan Update (Appendix A) and summarized below:

PFS-6.1.1 Maintain a ratio of 0.9 police officers per 1,000 residents on a full-time equivalent basis.

PFS-6.1.1a All new development shall be evaluated to determine the additional service demands for police protection, and subject to impact fees sufficient to meet the cost of providing these new services in the short-term planning period.

PFS-6.1.2b The City shall review and refine its agreement with the Fresno County Sheriff Department as reports dictate in the short-term planning period.

PFS-6.1.3a The City shall continue to participate in regional gang prevention and enforcement coalitions in the short-term planning period.

PFS-6.1.2 Crime rates and patterns within the City shall be monitored and periodically analyzed to identify unmet needs and refine police services in the short-term planning period.

PFS-6.1.3 The City shall collaborate with local, regional, and statewide agencies to address crime and community safety.

These policies require adequate officer to resident ratios be maintained and that crime will be evaluated periodically to determine if additional or modified protection is needed as the City experiences growth and as regional changes occur. This will require additional budget, law enforcement personnel, and coordination with the Fresno County Sheriff Department. Impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Schools.

Increased population growth will result in increased demand for school services. The Golden Plains Unified School District operates four elementary schools and one high school. The high school is located six miles from San Joaquin in the community of Tranquility. The elementary schools are located in the communities of Cantua, Helm, Tranquility and in the City of San Joaquin (San Joaquin Elementary School). San Joaquin Elementary was designed to accommodate up to 400 students; however, in the last decade, the school has served over 800 students annually and temporary buildings have been constructed onsite to accommodate the growing student body (2040 Community Plan Background.
Report). Additional population will add to the existing school overcrowding and the need for additional school facilities can be anticipated. According to the Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor database, Golden Plains Unified School District owns 20 acres (APN 033-020-47S) south of Manning Avenue between El Dorado and Sutter Avenues within the SOI (this site was investigated for pesticide contaminants and no toxic levels were found).

Objectives, policies and programs related to schools are included in the General Plan Update (Appendix A) and summarized below:

PFS-7.1.1 The City shall coordinate efforts to improve K-12 education services and facilities with the Golden Plains Unified School District.

PFS-7.1.1a: The City shall support and facilitate efforts by the Golden Plains Unified School District to expand its educational facilities in San Joaquin, including the construction of an additional school facility in the City in the short-term planning period.

Since schools currently experience overcrowding, new development will exacerbate an existing problem creating a potentially significant impact. Implementation of General Plan policies, payment of school impacts fees as allowed by State law, and continued coordination with the Golden Plains Unified School District will reduce these potential impacts. Impacts are less than significant.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation measures are required.

**Parks.**

The population increase allowed by the General Plan will result in an increased demand for parks and will increase the variety of recreational demand sought by the community. With a target of 3 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents (Objective LU 6.2), the City would need 30.6 acres of parkland at City buildout and 73 acres of parkland at ultimate buildout of the City and Sphere of Influence. The General Plan proposes approximately 16.8 acres of parkland within the City (excluding the school) and at least 7.5 acres of parkland within the Sphere of Influence.

Objectives, policies and programs related to parks are included in the General Plan Update (Appendix A) and summarized below:

**LU 4.1** Distribute park space so every resident resides within one-quarter mile of park space or a recreational area.

**OS 1.1.1** New developments shall undergo a review process to ensure open space needs of current and future residents are met.

**OS 1.1.1a** Use the Quimby Act to require the dedication of at least three acres of park space per thousand residents, or the payment of in-lieu fees to pay for future open space dedication. A mixture of park space dedication and reduced in-lieu fees is permissible, an ongoing program.

**OS 1.1.2a** Target vacant lots that would serve well as playlots or miniparks, and develop as such with a dedicated share of gathered in-lieu fees.

**OS 1.3.1a** Establish a park on the northwestern edge of the City, north of the planned unit development in the short-term planning period.
OS 1.3.1b Establish parks on the eastern and northeastern edges of the City, so that future growth towards the City Limit is near park space in the short-term planning period.

OS 2.2.1 Prioritize the creation of sport and multi-use fields near the school and residential areas.

OS 2.4.1 The City shall develop a plan for the creation of a community plaza in the City’s multiuse business core.

LU 6.2.1a The City shall develop a Park Master Plan that addresses the park needs and revenue sources for development in the intermediate-term planning period.

OS 3.1.1 The City shall continue to work with other governmental agencies, such as the School District, County and State in the development of shared recreational facilities when possible.

OS 3.1.4 The City shall develop impact fees and/or other funding sources to help pay for recreational improvements in the community.

Each of these objectives and policies seeks to expand recreational resources in the City and provide high-quality recreational experiences that meet the needs of various members of the community. The provision of additional parks and the increase in variety of park amenities will address demand as a result of increased population. Impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Other public facilities.

The General Plan land use diagram includes “Public Facility” land uses such as government offices, parks, and other public facilities. The General Plan combines the previous designations of “Open Space” and “Public Facility” into the new “Public Facility” designation and changes the overall area dedicated for public facilities and open space/parks from approximately 95 acres to 64 acres. Demand for additional government buildings or other public facilities outside of those discussed above is not anticipated.

In terms of other public facilities, the General Plan contains the following policies with regard to libraries:

PFS-7.1.3 The City shall coordinate efforts to maintain and expand library services with the Fresno County Public Library District.

PFS-7.1.3a The City shall collaborate with the Fresno County Public Library District to ensure that adequate services and service hours are provided to all residents, an ongoing program.

PFS-7.1.3b The City shall facilitate funding improvements to support library operations in San Joaquin, potentially including sources such as developer fees, tax credits, grants, contributions, or other resources that are compatible with other City budget needs in the short-term planning period.

Impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.
3.15 Recreation

3.15.1 Environmental Setting

The City's open space includes three recreation areas totaling 13.46 acres. The City provides one park near the geographic center of the City. The Peter Rusconi Park is approximately 0.6 acres and provides a skate park, basketball courts, and picnic areas with a covered community barbecue pit.

The second facility is the Sports Park of 11 acres. The park includes a baseball diamond, joint use facility (soccer/football), tot lot, and walking trail.

The third facility in the community is the San Joaquin Elementary School playground. This facility is approximately 15 acres, includes four baseball diamonds, basketball courts, and a kindergarten play area.

The City provides a Senior Activity Center of approximately 1,200 square feet and includes meeting rooms and is the City's Council Chambers. The City owns the 7,100 ft. Leo Cantu Community Center. The center has activity rooms and includes a day care facility. The purpose of the center is to provide a physical location for San Joaquin residents to access public and non-profit services. Indoor recreation activities now have a facility for such activities as recreational and educational classes, public meeting space for non-profit and public organizations and youth programs. The annual haunted house and voting occurs at the center. The Sheriff Activity League provides summer youth activities. The San Joaquin Resource Center of approximately 1,400 square feet and provides meeting rooms and a distance-learning center. The City owns the San Joaquin Veterans Memorial Hall of approximately 6,200 square feet and includes a stage, commercial kitchen, conference room/meeting room, bar, and media room. Meals are provided Tuesdays and Thursdays by the Salvation Army and Waterford Foundation.

3.15.2 Regulatory Framework

Quimby Act

Passed in 1975, the Quimby Act (California Government Code Section 66477) authorizes local agencies to establish ordinances requiring new developments to pay in-lieu fees or dedicate lands for park and recreation facilities to serve proposed development.

3.15.3 Impact Evaluation Criteria

The following thresholds of significance are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. For purposes of this EIR, the Project may have a significant adverse impact associated with recreation if it would do any of the following:

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?
3.15.4 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation

3.15.4 a-b Increase Use of Existing Recreational Facilities or Require Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project substantially increases the use of existing recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration would occur or be accelerated. A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project includes recreational facilities or requires construction of such facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

San Joaquin City Park is a 1.2-acre park that includes a young children’s play area, a basketball court, a skate park, and a covered barbecue pit and picnic area. The 8.6-acre Elementary School playground is composed primarily of four baseball diamonds, as well as four basketball courts and a kindergarten play area. The third recreation area is an area on the northeast edge of the City compromised of a 0.15-acre play structure and grass hillside with benches next to a 3.5-acre baseball diamond. There is also a senior activity center that provides meals and activities for seniors. The City is developing a 7,100 square foot community center that will include a daycare facility and activity rooms for indoor recreation, meeting places, and education programs.

The population increase allowed by the General Plan will result in an increased demand for parks, and increase the variety of recreational demand sought by the community. With a target of 3 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents (Objective LU 6.2), the City would need 30.6 acres of parkland at City buildout and 58.5 acres of parkland at ultimate buildout of the City and Sphere of Influence.

Objectives, policies and programs related to parks and recreation are included in the General Plan Update (Appendix A) and summarized below:

LU 6.2.1a The City shall develop a Park Master Plan that addresses the park needs and revenue sources for development in the intermediate-term planning period.
LU 4.1 Distribute park space so every resident resides within one-quarter mile of park space or a recreational area.
OS 1.1 Allocate additional park space and recreational areas to achieve three acres of open space per thousand residents.
OS 1.1.1a Use the Quimby Act to require the dedication of at least three acres of park space per thousand residents, or the payment of in-lieu fees to pay for future open space dedication. A mixture of park space dedication and reduced in-lieu fees is permissible, an ongoing program.
OS 1.1.2a Target vacant lots that would serve well as playlots or miniparks, and develop as such with a dedicated share of gathered in-lieu fees. Ideal lots are those near residences that are over a quarter mile from open space, or have a busy street separating them from open space, an ongoing program. The City shall consider requiring pocket parks for all new development either by updating existing landscape requirement per the zoning code or by amending the zoning code to include a “pocket park” requirement.
OS 1.3.1a Establish a park on the northwestern edge of the City, north of the planned unit development in the short-term planning period.

OS 1.3.1b Establish parks on the eastern and northeastern edges of the City, so that future growth towards the City Limit is near park space in the short-term planning period.

OS 2.4.1a Pursue development of a community plaza with visitor and resident serving vendors in the vacant parcel at the western corner of the intersection of Main Street and Nevada Avenue.

OS 3.1.1 The City shall continue to work with other governmental agencies, such as the School District, County and State in the development of shared recreational facilities when possible.

OS 3.1.4 The City shall develop impact fees and/or other funding sources to help pay for recreational improvements in the community.

Each of these objectives and policies seeks to expand recreational resources in the City and provide high-quality recreational experiences that meet the needs of various members of the community. The provision of additional parks and the increase in variety of park amenities will address demand as a result of increased population. Implementation of these programs will increase the recreational opportunities in the City to alleviate demand on existing parks and recreational facilities resulting from increased development and population. Impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.
3.16 Transportation and Traffic

3.16.1 Environmental Setting

San Joaquin is located between Interstate 5 and Highway 99. The primary north/south roadways linking San Joaquin to other parts of the Valley are Colorado Avenue and Main Street to Placer Avenue. The primary east/west roadways linking San Joaquin to the Valley and State Route 99 and Interstate 5 are Manning Avenue, State Route 145 and State Route 41.

Colorado and Manning Avenues are designated arterials. Colorado Avenue passes through the center of the City parallel to the railroad tracks and is a two-lane roadway with Class II bicycle lanes on each side of the road. These Class II bicycle lanes do not extend along the road’s entire length within the City limits. The posted speed limit is 35 miles per hour. Manning Avenue runs east/west connecting the City to Interstate 5 and State Route 99. Manning is a two-lane roadway with Class II bicycle lanes on each side of the road that do not extend along the road’s entire length within the City limits. The posted speed limit is 35 miles per hour.

Collector streets include Main Street, Sutter Street, Elm Avenue, Placer Avenue, 9th Street and California Avenue. Truck routes are designated on Placer, Sutter, Manning and Colorado Avenues. Street layouts consist of a grid pattern in the downtown area and a mixture of looped street and cul-de-sacs in other portions of the City. Road surface conditions are judged to be fair, with many streets exhibiting potholes and deteriorating pavement.

The 2040 Community Plan Background Report identifies the Level of Service (LOS) at the city’s busiest intersections. The intersection of Manning and Colorado has four-way stop sign control. The highest daily count on either roadway is 1,100 vehicles and the LOS at this intersection is “B.” At the intersection of Placer Avenue and Colorado (a two-way stop sign controlled intersection), the Average Daily Traffic (ADT) on Colorado Avenue is 1,100 vehicles per day while the ADT on Placer Avenue is 1,588 vehicles per day. The resulting LOS at the intersection is “B.”

The Fresno County Rural Transit Agency (FCRTA) provides public transit service to San Joaquin through San Joaquin Transit (SJT). Transit services operate under a Dial-A-Ride model. The Planning Area is served by the Union Pacific Railroad and the San Joaquin Valley Railroad for freight services. No passenger service is available.

3.16.2 Regulatory Framework

The State has adopted Level of Service (LOS) “C” as the LOS threshold standard for traffic operations on State highways.

The Transportation and Circulation Element of the Fresno County General Plan addresses the circulation improvements needed to provide adequate capacity for future land uses in the County. The Element establishes a hierarchy of transportation routes with typical development standards described for each roadway category. The County also includes additional standards, plans and programs that apply to the evaluation of transportation impacts of the Project.
The Regional Transportation Mitigation Fee (RTMF) is a component of the Measure "C" Extension that was approved by Fresno County voters in 2006. The RTMF is intended to ensure that future development contributes its fair share towards the costs of infrastructure to mitigate cumulative indirect regional transportation impacts of new growth in a manner consistent with the provisions of the Mitigation Fee Act. Projects within San Joaquin will be subject to the RTMF as determined by Fresno COG.

3.16.3 Impact Evaluation Criteria

The following thresholds of significance are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. For purposes of this EIR, the Project may have a significant adverse impact associated with transportation and traffic if it would do any of the following:

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, 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?

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

3.16.4 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation

3.16.4.a Conflict with an Applicable Plan, Ordinance or Policy Establishing Measures of Effectiveness for the Performance of the Circulation System

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project conflicts with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.

Objectives, policies and programs related to traffic are included in the General Plan Update (Appendix A) and summarized below:

CIR 1.1.2 Require traffic studies that evaluate traffic impacts and mitigation of traffic impacts to less than significant levels for new projects.
CIR 4.1  Maintain Level of Service D or better on roadways during non-peak traffic hours.
CIR 4.2.1 Truck traffic will be limited to Colorado and Manning Avenues.
CIR 4.2.2 Use traffic calming methods in residential neighborhoods to reduce cut-through traffic.
CIR 4.3.1 The City shall plan and design streets utilizing effective and appropriate procedures that integrate pedestrian and bicycle facilities into transportation projects, providing alternatives to the use of the automobile.

A minimum of LOS D is established by General Plan policy. Currently, intersections and roadways in the City operate at LOS B or better. Buildout under the General Plan has the potential to substantially increase traffic levels; however, new development proposals will be required to include traffic studies with an evaluation of traffic impacts and the provision of mitigation measures that reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Caltrans District 6 has expressed concern with the State Route 45 and Manning Avenue intersection located approximately five miles east of the City. Growth within San Joaquin will cumulatively impact this intersection. The requirement for traffic studies on new development proposals with an evaluation of traffic impacts and the provision of mitigation measures will reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

With implementation of General Plan policies, potential traffic impacts from new developments are reduced to less than significant and will maintain traffic levels above LOS D.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

3.16.4.b Conflict with an Existing Congestion Management Plan

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project conflicts with an applicable congestion management program.

Since roadways and intersections in the City operate at LOS B or better, a congestion management plan has not been established. In 2009, the Council of Fresno County Governments adopted the Congestion Management Process (CMP). According to the CMP, a portion of Highway 145 east of San Joaquin is anticipated to operate at LOS E or F during PM Peak hours by 2030. Policies in the General Plan do not conflict with the CMP; rather they support alternative transportation and mixed-use development strategies included in the CMP.

Ultimate buildout can accommodate 24,330 persons in the City. Although it is highly unlikely that ultimate buildout will occur within the next 20 years, the General Plan provides opportunities for growth, which will contribute to additional vehicle traffic. General Plan objectives and policies include alternative transportation and land use planning to support the CMP which will result in less than significant impacts. Impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

3.16.4.c Result in Change in Air Traffic Patterns

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project results in a change in air traffic patterns.
There are no airports within the City or the SOI expansion area. Buildout of the General Plan would not alter existing air traffic patterns. There would be no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

3.16.4.d  Increase Hazards due to Design Features

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project substantially increases hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses.

The General Plan does not include specific roadway design features, but does include goals, objectives, and policies in relation to transportation design and safety which are summarized below:

- **CIR 4.3.1**  The City shall plan and design streets utilizing effective and appropriate procedures that integrate pedestrian and bicycle facilities into transportation projects, providing alternatives to the use of the automobile.
- **CIR 4.4.1**  The City, recognizing the high costs of upgrading the street system, will give priority to upgrades of those streets where traffic volumes are high, joint funding is available, private or assessment district funds are available or public safety is a factor.
- **CIR 4.4.3**  Access from residential development onto arterials and collectors should when possible be avoided.
- **CIR 4.4.4**  To encourage walkability, designs shall de-emphasize the use of block walls where they create barriers to pedestrian access. Where block walls are required for residential development for noise control or other purposes, direct pedestrian and bicycle entry to the major street is encouraged to allow access to sidewalks, bike lanes, schools, and parks. Such “breaks in the wall” should be located every 300 to 400 feet along the major street.
- **CIR 5.1.2**  The City shall pursue safety improvements at all railroad crossings.
- **CIR 5.3.1**  The City shall collaborate with the Golden Plains Unified School District to implement and maintain the Safe Routes to School program.

A specific concern is the railroad tracks in the community, including several at-grade crossings. The California Public Utilities Commission has jurisdiction over the safety of rail crossings in California. The State grants the PUC exclusive power on the design, alteration, or closing of crossings. New development may increase traffic impacts at at-grade crossings. This includes pedestrian circulation patterns or destinations with respect to railroad right-of-way and compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. This is a potentially significant impact.

Mitigation:

1. In its consideration of future development projects in the planning area, the San Joaquin City Council will determine on a case by case basis if the proposed development will impact existing at-grade crossings. In consultation with the California Public Utilities Commission, the City shall require such measures as improvements to existing at-grade crossings due to increased traffic volumes, pedestrian safety, and continuous vandal resistant fencing or other appropriate barriers to limit access onto the railroad right-of-way.
**Level of Significance after Mitigation:** With the incorporation of the recommended mitigation measure, impacts will be reduced to *less than significant*.

**3.16.4.e Result in Inadequate Emergency Access**

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project results in inadequate emergency access.

The General Plan includes the following policies:

- **CIR 2.5.1e** Implement development standards that encourage new residential subdivisions to be laid out in grid or modified grid pattern to create direct routes to surrounding development and limit long loop roads and cul-de-sacs.

- **S 5.1.1** The City shall continue to work on response time with all corresponding agencies.

The General Plan does not propose land uses that would physically divide the community or cause a circulation barrier that would substantially affect emergency access. Since existing development generally follows a grid pattern, implementation of General Plan policies would continue to support accessible streets as new development occurs under the General Plan. Impacts are *less than significant*.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation measures are required.

**3.16.4.f Conflict with Adopted Policies, Plans, or Programs Regarding Public Transit**

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project conflicts with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

Objectives, policies and programs related to public transit, biking and pedestrian facilities that will improve public transit and alternative transportation within the community are included in the General Plan Update (Appendix A) and summarized below:

- **CIR 1.2.1** The City shall facilitate the implementation of bus shelters or other facilities near multi-family residential land uses and major activity centers.

- **CIR 2.1** Maintain a fixed route bus system to serve San Joaquin and provide access to surrounding cities.

- **CIR 2.2** Maintain a citywide bikeway network linking residential neighborhoods with the Central Business District.

- **CIR 2.5.1** The City shall maintain a continuous network of sidewalks and crosswalks throughout the City.

- **CIR 2.6.1** The City shall encourage alternatives to the use of the automobile including the following programs:
  - Ride Share
  - Park-and-ride lots
  - Bicycling
  - Mass Transit
  - Trip reduction programs
  - Fleet operators alternative fuel program
  - Traffic Flow improvements
- Telecommunications
- Alternative work schedules

CIR 3.1.2 Encourage the maintenance of a dial-a-ride service to ensure accessibility for handicapped and special needs individuals, an ongoing activity.

CIR 3.3 The City will support regional efforts to implement improved bus service that encourages residents to utilize public transportation and rideshare services and decreases dependency on single-occupancy vehicles.

Implementation of these objectives and policies under the General Plan will ensure transit, pedestrian, and bicycle access and safety throughout buildout of the General Plan. Impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.
3.17 Utilities and Service Systems

3.17.1 Environmental Setting

San Joaquin’s water supply consists entirely of groundwater and no water is purchased from other sources or purveyors. The groundwater supply serves all users within the City, including residential, commercial, and industrial uses. Two wells, Well 3 at the City Corporation yard, and Well 5 at Cherry and Colusa Streets, are currently in production, with design discharges of 1,200 gpm and 1,100 gpm, respectively. Wells 1 and 2 were abandoned. In 2010, Well 4 was taken off line due to a suspected E. coli contamination.

The City’s operating wells have a theoretical pumping capacity of 2,300 gallons per minute (gpm) and one of the wells is equipped with an emergency backup generators to maintain capacity in the event of an electrical power failure. The City has no water storage capacity. The City’s Water Master Plan includes a total of six wells at full build-out (2040 Community Plan Background Report, 2011).

The City’s water distribution system consists primarily of lines 4 to 6 inches in diameter. New minimum standards require 6 to 12 inch diameter pipes. Some of the piping is more than 50 years old requires repair or replacement.

Water from the City’s active wells is routinely tested in accordance with the State requirements. Pumped groundwater is chlorinated prior to distribution, but requires no other pretreatment to meet minimum water quality requirements.

The City’s total water usage for the past ten years has fluctuated between 152 million gallons (MG) and 262 MG (2040 Community Plan Background Report, 2011). The average water use for the last five years has been 175 gallons per capita per day (gpcd). In 2009, the City consumed 0.705 million gallons of water per day (mgd), or approximately 489 gallons per minute (gpm), which translates to a usage rate of approximately 169 gpcd. Total annual City water use is projected to increase nearly 67% by 2030, from approximately 273 million gallons in 2010 to over 456 million gallons in 2030 (2040 Community Plan Background Report Section 7, 2011). Over half of household water consumption is used for landscape irrigation (2040 Community Plan Background Report, 2011).

As discussed in the 2040 Community Plan Background Report Section 7, (2011), the City generated approximately 121 million gallons of wastewater in 2009, averaging 0.332 million gallons per day (mgd) in 2009. Between 2000 and 2010, wastewater generation averaged between 0.212 and 0.376 mgd. Recent per-capita wastewater generation has averaged 81 gallons per capita per day. Total wastewater volume in 2030 is projected to be approximately 211 million gallons annually, or 0.578 mgd.

The City owns and operates a sewage wastewater treatment plant. The plant provides primary and secondary treatment of wastewater, and is located on the south side of Manning Avenue, just east of the Fresno Slough, approximately 3/4 miles west of the city limits. The treated effluent is pumped into unlined disposal ponds for re-absorption. The plant’s design capacity is approximately 0.5 mgd and an average daily flow of 0.273 mgd.
Wastewater is collected from users through a series of sewer pipes and mains distributed throughout the City. Most of the collection system consists of 6 and 8 inch pipes, although current minimum standards require at least 8-inch pipe. The main line to the Manning Life Station is 16 inches and the force main to the wastewater treatment plant is 10 inches. The collection system also utilizes three lift stations, each consisting of two pumps, to move sewage toward the treatment facility.

Existing stormwater drainage lines consist of lines along Main Street to the west of the City and along Colorado Avenue to the irrigation ditches north and west of the City limits. Four of the seven geographic zones identified in the City's Storm Drainage Master Plan are developed and are served by retention basins A and B as well as a temporary basin in the City's industrial park. The City purchased land for a new permanent basin on Colorado Avenue, north of Fifth Street, for future system expansion when needed in the future. The relatively flat topography of the City makes it difficult to dispose of excess stormwater runoff. Increased development and impervious surface coverage will increase the amount of stormwater runoff as the City grows.

Refuse Collection for the City of San Joaquin is provided by a private carrier under contract with the City. Current service consists of one residential pick-up per week; commercial service varies from one or more pick-ups per week. The American Avenue Landfill, owned and operated by Fresno County, is located just over five miles northeast of the City on American Avenue and serves San Joaquin as well as surrounding communities and unincorporated areas. The facility is permitted to receive up to 2,200 tons of waste per day and as of 2005, approximately 90 percent of the facility's ultimate capacity remained. The facility is expected to continue operation through at least 2031 (2040 Community Plan Background Report, 2011). The City sent a total of 2,071 tons of waste to the landfill in 2008, resulting in a per-capita disposal rate of 2.8 pounds per person per day (ppd) and meeting target rates of 2.9 ppd set by CalRecycle (2040 Community Plan Background Report, 2011).

3.17.2 Regulatory Framework

In 2001, the California legislature enacted SB 610 and SB 221 to ensure coordination between land use planners and water agencies. SB 610 requires the CEQA lead agency considering a project of 500 residential units or greater (or its equivalent) to obtain a water supply assessment from a water purveyor with the ability to serve the project. The water supply assessment must consider the availability of water to serve the project in addition to the existing and likely future obligations of the water purveyor in single dry, multiple dry, and normal water years. SB 610 requires the lead agency to consider the water supply assessment and circulate it with its CEQA document for the project.

SB 221, on the other hand, requires local agencies to obtain a water supply verification from a water purveyor capable of serving the project prior to issuing a tentative map for 500 or more residential units (or its equivalent). The water supply verification must ensure that sufficient water supplies are available to serve the project in single dry, multiple dry, and normal water years.

The Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) authorizes the United States Environmental Protection Agency to set national standards for drinking water to protect against both naturally-occurring and human-made contaminants. These standards set enforceable maximum contaminant levels in drinking water and require particular methods for treating water to remove contaminants for all water providers in the United States, except for private wells serving fewer than 25 people. In California, the State Department of Public Health conducts most enforcement activities.
3.17.3 Impact Evaluation Criteria

The following thresholds of significance are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. For purposes of this EIR, the Project may have a significant adverse impact associated with utilities and service systems if it would do any of the following:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

3.17.4 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation

3.17.4.a Exceed Wastewater Treatment Requirements

A significant impact would occur if wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board would be exceeded.

The increase in population and residential, commercial, and industrial land uses will result in an increased demand for wastewater services. If facilities are not designed to meet the capacity and if new facilities are not constructed to accommodate the additional volume, treatment requirements may not be met. Objectives, policies and programs related to wastewater infrastructure are included in the General Plan Update (Appendix A) and summarized below:

**PFS-3.1.1** The City shall monitor its wastewater demand and capacity, and manage supply and infrastructure in a manner to meet anticipated demand.

**PFS-3.1.5** New development shall establish that downstream wastewater infrastructure capacity is sufficient to accommodate new demand, and where sufficient capacity does not exist, provide additional facilities to accept additional wastewater demand, an ongoing program.

**PFS 3.1.7** Development projects shall be assessed a sewer capacity and connection fee for expansion of trunk lines and treatment plant facility improvements and expansion.
PFS 3.1.8 Wastewater treatment facilities/distribution system expansion/improvements shall precede or be concurrent with all growth generating projects.

The objectives and policies address new development by requiring analysis of wastewater treatment needs and unique treatment requirements. New development will be required to assess and fund additional or special treatment needs prior to implementation. The General Plan includes policies to address treatment needs of new development as well as policies to address growth in relation to wastewater treatment expansion. Impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

3.17.4.b Require the Construction of New Water or Wastewater Treatment Facilities or Expansion of Existing Facilities

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project caused the construction of water or wastewater systems that could cause a significant effect on the environment.

Buildout of the General Plan will increase the number of housing units and commercial and industrial facilities and will increase the demand for water and wastewater service into areas not currently served by such infrastructure. New development will require new pipelines, pumping stations, and other infrastructure which can affect the environment. Ultimate buildout will require new or expanded capacity as discussed in Impact 3.17.4.a, d, and e, which may also impact the environment.

Objectives, policies and programs related to water and wastewater infrastructure are included in the General Plan Update (Appendix A) and summarized below:

PFS-2.1 Expand pumping and storage capacity to meet projected maximum day demand plus fire flow.

PFS-2.1.1 The City shall condition approval of new development projects on the availability of adequate water supply and infrastructure to serve the new development.

PFS-2.1.2 New development projects shall pay impact fee assessments or construct facilities sufficient to fund additional water system capacity and infrastructure needed to service the new development.

PFS 2.1.4 Growth inducing projects will be reviewed for environmental impacts that such development may have upon the existing water sources and distribution facilities. The advent of water metering provides an opportunity to intensify water conservation and efficiency in buildings and landscapes through education and water use regulations in the Municipal Code and Water Master Plan.

PFS 2.1.7 Development projects shall be assessed a water capacity fee for importation and distribution facilities.

PFS-3.1 Plan for wastewater facility and infrastructure expansion to adequately serve future demand.

PFS-3.1.3 The City shall condition approval of new development projects on the availability of adequate wastewater collection and treatment capacity to serve the new development.

PFS-3.1.4 New development projects shall be subject to impact fee assessments sufficient to fund additional wastewater system capacity and infrastructure.
PFS-3.1.5 New development shall establish that downstream wastewater infrastructure capacity is sufficient to accommodate new demand, and where sufficient capacity does not exist, provide additional facilities to accept additional wastewater demand, an ongoing program.

The policies require new developments to assess and fund water facility expansion and provide water infrastructure and that these impacts are addressed through the environmental process. General Plan policy addresses the environmental impacts of infrastructure expansion and ensures that treatment systems and capacity are available. Impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

3.17.4.c Construction or Expansion of Stormwater Drainage Facilities

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project requires the construction or expansion of stormwater drainage systems that could cause a significant effect on the environment.

Objectives, policies and programs related to stormwater are included in the General Plan Update (Appendix A) and summarized below:

PFS-4.1.1 The City shall budget for flood control and drainage facility maintenance and repair.

PFS-4.2.1 The City shall require new development projects to maintain adequate flood control and drainage facility capacity to serve the development.

PFS-4.2.2 New development projects shall be subject to impact fee assessments sufficient to fund additional flood control and drainage facilities and infrastructure, an ongoing program.

PFS 4.2.3 Development Projects shall capture stormwater drainage beyond existing flows on or near the site using site drainage techniques such as swales.

These objectives and policies establish that new projects and developments are subject to approval based on availability of adequate flood control facilities and requires new development to provide funding for additional flood control and drainage facilities and infrastructure. They also require stormwater to be captured onsite to avoid impacts to existing drainage control facilities. Therefore, General Plan policy controls the growth rate through these objectives and policies so as not to significantly impact stormwater management systems. Impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

3.17.4.d Sufficient Water Supplies Available

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project impacts the water supply entitlements serving the project.

Buildout of the General Plan will increase the number of housing units and commercial and industrial facilities in the City and will increase the demand for water and water service. The City's three operational wells have a current capacity of 3,500 gallons per minute (gpm). The City's total water usage for the past ten years has fluctuated between 152 million gallons (MG) and 262 MG (2040 Community Plan Background Report Section 8, 2011).
Average water use for the last five years has been 175 gallons per capita per day (gpcd). Fresno COG estimates the population will increase to 5,398 in the next 20 years, which would increase demand to 344 MG, which is an increase of approximately 26 percent. As discussed in the setting above, the City’s current wells are designed to meet existing demand through 2018. The City’s Water Master Plan includes a total of six wells at full buildout. Although current contingency capacity (approximately 2,400 gpm) is expected to handle average and maximum day demands through 2030, the City cannot accommodate maximum day demands plus fire flow at the present contingency capacity. Fire flow demand will exceed total capacity (3,500 gpm from the three existing operational wells) by 2025. Peak hour demand will exceed contingency capacity within 20 years (2040 Community Plan Background Report Section 7).

Objectives, policies and programs related to water supply are included in the General Plan Update (Appendix A) and summarized below:

PFS-2.1.1 The City shall condition approval of new development projects on the availability of adequate water supply and infrastructure to serve the new development.

PFS-2.1.2 New development projects shall pay impact fee assessments or construct facilities sufficient to fund additional water system capacity and infrastructure needed to service the new development.

PFS 2.1.4 Growth inducing projects will be reviewed for environmental impacts that such development may have upon the existing water sources and distribution facilities. The advent of water metering provides and opportunity to intensify water conservation and efficiency in buildings and landscapes through education and water use regulations in the Municipal Code and Water Master Plan.

PFS-2.1.9 The City shall monitor its water consumption and manage supply and infrastructure to meet anticipated demand.

PFS-2.3.1 The City shall promote water conservation and reduced water demand in its operations and in existing and new development.

PFS-2.3.2: Require water-conserving facility and building design in new construction and retrofit projects in the short-term planning period.

CON 2.1 Maintain a level of water use in the City that is 20% below the water use recorded in 2009.

CON 2.2.2 The City shall meter residential, commercial, and industrial water use as required by California Water Code (§525b).

CON 2.3.2 The City shall continue to conform to the Department of Water Resource’s Model Landscape Water Use Ordinance and adopt more stringent outdoor water use policies where feasible.

The General Plan includes policies requiring new developments to assess impacts on existing water supply capacity and expansion of facilities. Policy would be implemented that seeks to expand and enhance groundwater recharge to maintain the groundwater supply. This would include utilizing existing storm water basins for recharge, installing new percolation ponds in new growth areas, protecting areas of groundwater recharge from potentially degrading land uses and disposal methods, promoting activities that combine stormwater control and water recharge, and continuing water conservation programs. Combined with the growth management strategies in the Public Facilities and Services Element, water supplies would not be jeopardized by growth under the General Plan. Impacts are less than significant.
Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

3.17.4.e Adequate Wastewater Treatment Capacity

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project results in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments.

The increase in population and residential, commercial, and industrial land uses will result in an increased demand for wastewater services. If new facilities are not constructed to accommodate the additional volume, existing capacity may be exceeded. The City owns and operates a wastewater treatment plant. The plant provides primary and secondary treatment of wastewater, and is located on the south side of Manning Avenue just east of the Fresno Slough, approximately 3/4 miles west of the city limits. The plant’s design capacity is approximately 0.5 mgd with an average daily flow of 0.273 mgd. Population growth to 5,398 persons is expected within the next 20 years. This translates to a 34 percent population increase and extrapolates to a daily flow of 0.37 mgd, which is within the existing facility capacity. Ultimate build out of the General Plan (24,330 persons) would increase daily flows to approximately 1.37 mgd which substantially exceeds the existing system capacity.

Objectives, policies and programs related to wastewater capacity are included in the General Plan Update (Appendix A) and summarized below:

- PFS-3.1 Plan for wastewater facility and infrastructure expansion to adequately serve future demand.
- PFS-3.1.1 The City shall monitor its wastewater demand and capacity, and manage supply and infrastructure in a manner to meet anticipated demand.
- PFS-3.1.3 The City shall condition approval of new development projects on the availability of adequate wastewater collection and treatment capacity to serve the new development.
- PFS-3.1.4 New development projects shall be subject to impact fee assessments sufficient to fund additional wastewater system capacity and infrastructure.

The objectives and policies address capacity and capacity maintenance. New development will be required to assess and fund additional capacity prior to implementation. Impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

3.17.4.f Sufficient Landfill Capacity and Regulatory Compliance

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project affects the ability of a landfill to accommodate project needs.

Buildout of the General Plan will increase the number of housing units and commercial and industrial facilities in the City. The American Avenue Landfill is permitted to receive up to 2,200 tons of waste per day and has an estimated lifespan to the Year 2031. Per-capita disposal rates in the City are approximately 2.8 pounds per person per day.
Based on a population of 4,029 persons, the current waste generated by the City is estimated at 5.6 tons per day (2,044 tons per year). Fresno COG estimates the population will increase to 5,398 in the next 20 years, which would increase waste to 8 tons per day, or 2,758 tons per year.

Refuse collection is operated through contract and funded by users through service fees. Expansion of service would be accommodated through new customer fees and other City funds designated for expansion of recycling programs. Objectives, policies and programs related to solid waste are included in the General Plan Update (Appendix A) and summarized below:

PFS-5.1.1 The City shall participate in State-mandated waste reduction, diversion, mitigation, recycling, reporting or other programs related to reducing solid waste disposal volumes.

PFS 5.2.2 The City of San Joaquin will continue to participate with the County of Fresno, the WSWPC and other Fresno County Cities in developing effective joint regional programs.

PFS 5.2.3 The City will continue local programs such as in-house reduction programs, waste audits for selected city agencies, participate in regional waste exchange and in joint purchase pools for the participating jurisdictions.

PFS 5.2.4 The City will continue working with Western Waste in the development of programs that reduce the waste stream to the American Avenue Landfill.

PFS-5.2.8 The City shall support regulatory approval of the American Avenue landfill facility past its current license period unless substantial and unmitigated environmental impacts are identified.

PFS-5.2.9 The City shall condition approval of new development projects on the availability of adequate solid waste collection, disposal, and diversion/recycling resources to serve the new development.

PFS-5.2.11 New development shall include on-site recycling facilities and an ongoing, regular program of pickup and disposal from the site. For residential developments, recycling and solid waste disposal facilities and pickup schedules shall be aligned to simplify use for residents in the short-term planning period.

Policies establish that new projects are subject to approval based on availability of adequate solid waste services and facilities and requires new development to provide additional facilities should demand exceed capacity. These policies also require recycling to reduce waste quantities, the establishment of service to new development, and impact fees or development conditions to address solid waste generation. Therefore, the General Plan controls the growth rate through these objectives and policies so as not to significantly impact solid waste service. Impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

3.17.4.g Federal, State, and Local Statutes and Regulations Related to Solid Waste

A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project does not comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations relating to solid waste.
As discussed in Impact 3.17.4.f, the General Plan includes objectives and policies to ensure compliance with regulations related to solid waste. Since the City currently diverts only 10.7% of its waste from landfills, the objectives and policies in the General Plan continue and expand existing waste diversion programs and require participation in new programs. Impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.
4.0 CEQA Considerations

4.1 Alternatives to the Project

in accordance with Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines, the EIR must analyze a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed Project. Alternatives are considered in an EIR to assist the public and decision-makers in considering the environmental consequences of a proposed Project. The range of alternatives considered in an EIR is governed by the rule of reason. CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126(d) states: “Alternatives to the Proposed Action. Describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the Project, or to the location of the Project, which could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the Project and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.”

The CEQA Guidelines provide the following direction for the analysis of alternatives:

- The EIR must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives which are infeasible.
- Describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the Project, or to the location of the Project that would be feasible to attain most of the basic objectives of the Project but avoid or substantially lessen significant effects.
- Evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.
- The specific alternative of “No Project” shall be evaluated along with its impact.
- If the environmentally superior alternative is the “No Project” alternative, identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

The anticipated means for implementation of the alternatives can influence the assessment and/or probability of impacts for those alternatives. For example, a project may have the potential to generate significant impacts, but considerations in project design may also avoid or reduce such impacts.

The alternatives analysis is presented as a comparative analysis to the proposed project and assumes that all applicable mitigation measures proposed for the project would apply to each alternative. The following alternatives analysis compares the potential significant environmental impacts of two alternatives with those of the proposed project.

The overall vision of the San Joaquin General Plan Update and SOI Expansion Draft EIR project can be summarized by the following objectives:

- Development is responsible for avoiding or mitigating its economic and environmental impacts unless the City finds the development provides a demonstrated community benefit.
- The City is committed to maintain and enhance the City’s compact land use pattern.
- The City is committed to maintaining and enhancing the City’s infrastructure to meet the community’s needs.
- The City is committed to provide for housing opportunities that serve a variety of income levels.
- The City is committed to provide a cohesive aesthetic and community identity.
- The City is committed to maintain and enhance the Central Business District as the core commercial area, mixed use area and community gathering location of the City.
- The City is committed to provide for the housing, employment, commercial, processing, and
distribution needs of the regions agricultural industry.

- The City is committed to working with governments, educational institutions, and businesses within the region to provide services and resources to support residences, businesses and industries.
- The City is committed to identifying and implementing opportunities for conserving and enhancing resources.
- The City is committed to provide for walking and biking that is safe, attractive, and provides access to the entire City.
- The City is committed to maintaining and enhancing a sustainable and diverse economy.
- The City is committed to being flexible and innovative when working with projects that add benefits to the community.

4.1.1 No Project Alternative

The purpose of analyzing a No Project Alternative is to allow decision makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed Project with the impacts of not approving the Project. The No Project analysis discusses existing conditions as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the Project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.

In certain instances, the No Project alternative means "no build" wherein the existing environmental setting is maintained. However, where failure to proceed with the proposed Project will not result in preservation of existing environmental conditions, the analysis should identify the practical result of the Project's non-approval; in this case, implementation of the existing general plan under the current SOI.

The No Project Alternative assumes that the General Plan Update and SOI expansion would not be implemented and that existing zoning designations for the planning area would remain unchanged. Current agricultural and rural residential uses would remain the same in the SOI expansion area. This "No Project" alternative would result in the continued implementation of the existing City of San Joaquin 1996 General Plan to build-out. Build-out under this alternative would result in a population of approximately 6,465 persons by 2030 based on 3% annual growth.

Evaluation of the No Project Alternative

Aesthetics. Under the No Project Alternative, the SOI expansion area would remain in agricultural uses; existing aesthetic characteristics would remain unchanged in this area. Development under the existing general plan would result in urbanization and associated aesthetic impacts within the current SOI. Neither the proposed Project nor this alternative would result in significant impacts to visual resources. Under this alternative, the general appearance of the area would not change and existing landforms would not be substantially altered.

Agricultural Resources. Development would be restricted to the existing SOI, significantly limiting the amount of farmland converted to urban uses. The productive agricultural land not now designated for urban development would potentially remain in agricultural production. Existing Williamson Act Contracts in the SOI expansion area would not be terminated. Under this alternative, it is likely that the conversion of agricultural land would slow but continue over time, as land is designated for urbanization through general plan amendments and subsequent incremental expansion of the SOI.
Air Quality. Under the No Project Alternative, no grading or construction would occur in the SOI expansion area. Thus, this Alternative would not generate fugitive dust or other pollutant emissions associated with construction activities. Under the No Project Alternative, no new residential or commercial development would occur in the SOI expansion area, and new traffic trips would be substantially reduced in keeping with land uses designated on the existing general plan.

As such, this alternative would reduce the Project’s significant air quality impacts associated with long-term operation, but not to a level less than significant.

Biological Resources. Even though no development would occur within the SOI expansion area, this alternative would retain agricultural uses and biological impacts will continue to occur as a result of agricultural operations. Accordingly, the No Project alternative does not reduce impacts to biological resources to the level of “no impact.”

Cultural Resources. Under the No Project Alternative, grading and construction activities would not occur in the SOI expansion area. The EIR concluded that project impacts related to archaeological, paleontological, and historical resources could potentially be significant; however, with mitigation, these impacts would be less than significant. Under the No Project Alternative, continued farming operations in the SOI expansion area and continued urban development under the existing general plan could impact as yet unidentified subsurface resources.

Geology, Soils, and Mining. Under the No Project Alternative, no urban development will take place within the SOI expansion area; given that the expansion area would continue in agriculture, fewer residents and workers would be exposed to potential seismic ground shaking.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Implementation of the No Project Alternative would keep the SOI in its existing condition. As such, new hazards to the public or the environment would not be created through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Although impacts from hazardous materials would be reduced, the potential use of hazardous materials would still exist since agricultural operations utilize a number of chemicals and pesticides.

Hydrology and Water Quality. The No Project Alternative would have a reduced effect on the aquifer compared to the proposed Project. With a reduced population holding capacity, overall domestic water demand would be also be reduced.

Under the No Project Alternative, no grading, construction of new structures and infrastructure, or drainage improvements would occur in the SOI expansion area. Project impacts related to drainage, runoff and water quality could be significant; however, with implementation of accepted practices, these impacts would be less than significant. Under the No Project Alternative, because no development would occur, no improvements to water quality or drainage patterns would occur. Under this alternative, impacts on hydrology and water quality would be substantially reduced compared to the proposed Project.

Land Use, Population, and Housing. Under the No Project Alternative, existing farmland would remain undeveloped in the SOI expansion area. Potential future development consistent with the existing general plan would remain a constraint on operations of the Kearney Center, as urban uses would create land use compatibility problems such as pesticide drift, dust generation, and vandalism.
The No Project Alternative would generate no new employment in the SOI expansion area nor would it extend services that might be used by other development. Therefore, there would be no population growth directly resulting from the project. Existing rural residential uses would remain and there would be no displacement of housing or persons.

**Noise.** Because no urban development would occur in the SOI expansion area, Project impacts from noise would be substantially reduced. The No Project Alternative would generate less traffic than the proposed Project and correspondingly lower noise levels.

**Public Services/Utilities.** Under the No Project Alternative, the SOI expansion area would not be annexed into the city and would remain under the jurisdiction of Fresno County. Water supply and wastewater treatment would be handled through private systems on-site instead of being provided through extension of municipal water and sewer lines. Under this alternative, public services/utilities impacts are less than under the proposed Project and would be in keeping with the reduced population holding capacity of the existing general plan.

**Traffic.** The No Project Alternative would substantially reduce traffic impacts because no new development would occur in the SOI expansion area and urbanization would be in keeping with the reduced population holding capacity of the existing general plan.

**Conclusions**

Under the No Project alternative, no General Plan Update or SOI expansion would take place. Development of the City would proceed in accordance with the adopted San Joaquin General Plan and existing SOI. While the existing General Plan land use map contains sufficient land for expansion over the next 10 years, most new residential and commercial growth beyond that time would require incremental general plan amendments for implementation. In keeping with State LAFCo law, the SOI could be reviewed every five years for adequacy.

The No Project Alternative would avoid or reduce most of the potential impacts that would occur under the proposed Project. Existing agricultural uses in the SOI expansion area would continue, and existing Williamson Act contracts in the area would remain. Economic development opportunities for the City of San Joaquin would be reduced with the No Project Alternative, including the creation of new jobs, improvements to transportation systems, and generation of sales tax.

**Relationship to Project Objectives**

This alternative would not achieve all of the Project objectives.

**4.1.2 Reduced SOI Alternative**

Under the Reduced SOI Alternative, the SOI would be expanded generally in a northerly direction, rather than to the northwest towards Tranquility. That boundary, shown in Figure 4-1, would expanded the SOI boundary by 440 acres less than the proposed project.
Evaluation of the Reduced SOI Alternative

Aesthetics. The Reduced SOI alternative would reduce impacts to site aesthetics by leaving greater amounts of open space in agriculture. Neither the proposed Project nor the Reduced SOI Alternative would result in significant impacts to views or visual resources within a scenic highway. Under this alternative, the general appearance of the area would not change and the existing landforms would not be substantially altered.

Agricultural Resources. Under the Reduced SOI alternative, land use compatibility issues would be reduced compared to the proposed project. The change of use from farmland to urban would be significantly reduced by an estimated 440 acres, thus preserving more agricultural land. Williamson Act Contracts in the reduced SOI expansion area would be terminated, but the number of such contract terminations would be reduced.

Air Quality. Air quality degradation from the Reduced SOI alternative would be proportionately less because of lower traffic volumes. As such, this alternative would reduce the Project’s significant air quality impacts associated with long-term operation, but not to a level less than significant. There would be no appreciable change to air quality impacts from a cumulative perspective. Grading and construction would be substantially less than with the proposed Project.

Biological Resources. Even though less development would occur with the Reduced SOI Alternative, biological impacts will continue to occur as a result of agricultural operations. Accordingly, the Reduced SOI Alternative does not reduce impacts to biological resources to the level of “no impact.”

Cultural Resources. Grading and construction activities would be reduced under this alternative. The EIR concluded that project impacts related to archaeological, paleontological, and historical resources could potentially be significant; however, with mitigation, these impacts would be less than significant. Under the Reduced SOI Alternative, increased urban development under the expanded SOI and general plan could impact as yet unidentified subsurface resources.

Geology, Soils, and Mining. Similar to the proposed Project, this alternative would have minimal impacts on geology and soils.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Although impacts from hazardous materials would be reduced through a smaller urban area, the potential use of hazardous materials would still exist since agricultural operations utilize a number of chemicals and pesticides.

Hydrology and Water Quality. There would be a reduction in per capita water use estimated at 20-30% for this alternative owing to a reduced urban footprint. Wastewater generation would be approximately equal to the proposed project. An estimated 440 acres of agriculture would remain in production compared to the proposed project. Surface drainage would be less impacted compared to the proposed project with development of fewer acres.

The amount of impermeable surface would be reduced. Project impacts related to drainage, runoff and water quality would be less than significant. Under this alternative, impacts on hydrology and water quality would be reduced compared to the proposed Project.
Land Use, Population, and Housing. In order for the Reduced SOI alternative to accommodate the same population as the proposed Project, residential densities would have to be increased to an estimated average of 10-12 units/acre. While diversity and choice in the housing market could be increased, there is the issue whether such densities could be supported by the market or by planned infrastructure in a smaller Valley community. It is more likely that densities would be realized at the 5-6 unit/acre range and that the Reduced SOI alternative would have a smaller population holding capacity. Employment opportunities in commercial areas would also be reduced compared to the proposed project as there would be fewer acres of planned industrial and commercial development.

Noise. The Reduced SOI alternative would result in fewer noise impacts compared to the proposed project due to less urban development. Noise attenuation would still be required adjacent to major roads for new development.

Public Services/Utilities. Demands for public services would be benefitted by reduced acres of development and resulting economies of scale, but impacts to police protection, fire protection, parks and recreation, and schools would be approximately equal to the proposed project. Under this alternative, public services/utilities impacts are less than under the proposed Project and would be in keeping with the reduced population holding capacity of the planning area.

Traffic. Implementation of the Reduced SOI alternative could reduce traffic impacts in the community on surrounding roadways and intersections by reducing the amount of land planned for residential, commercial, and industrial growth.

Conclusions

Under the Reduced SOI Alternative, development of the City would proceed in accordance with a reduced urban boundary compared to the proposed project. The general plan would require amendment in the new SOI area to designate appropriate urban land uses. The Reduced SOI Alternative is estimated to provide sufficient land for expansion over the next 20 years or longer, reducing or eliminating the need for SOI expansion requests in the interim. In keeping with State LAFCo law, the SOI could be reviewed every five years for adequacy.

The Reduced SOI Alternative would avoid or reduce most of the potential impacts that would occur under the proposed Project. Economic development opportunities for the City would be reduced with this alternative, including the creation of new jobs, improvements to transportation systems, and generation of sales tax.

Relationship to Project Objectives

This alternative would achieve the Project objectives, although not to the extent of the proposed Project.
Summary of Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>No Project</th>
<th>Reduced SOI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology, Soils, &amp; Mining</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazards</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use, Population &amp; Housing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 = Similar impact to the proposed Project  
+ = Greater impact than the proposed Project  
- = Less impact than the proposed Project

Environmentally Preferred Alternative

Of the alternatives, No Project would be the preferred alternative as it would avoid or reduce impacts compared to the proposed Project. This alternative would not, however, meet the Project Objectives. When the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project alternative, CEQA requires that a selection be made among remaining alternatives.

The Reduced SOI alternative reduces overall environmental impacts compared to the proposed project while meeting Project objectives and is environmentally preferred. Less farmland would be converted with this alternative. Due to reduction in vehicle trips, the Reduced SOI Alternative has the potential to reduce air quality impacts. The volume of stormwater would be reduced with this alternative as would the demand for public services and utilities. The Reduced SOI Alternative reduces many of the impacts identified with the proposed Project and would not result in any new or previously unidentified impact.

4.2 Growth-Inducing Impacts

In order to comply with CEQA, an EIR must discuss the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d)). A given project may induce growth beyond its own boundaries by removing obstacles to population growth, for example by providing water service to an area where none exists, or by creating an amenity that attracts new population or economic activity. In accordance with Section 15126.2(d), this discussion of growth-inducing impacts
does not assume that growth is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment. Induced growth is considered a significant impact only if it affects the ability of agencies to provide needed public services or if it can be demonstrated that the potential growth is some other way significantly affects the environment.

The update of the San Joaquin General Plan and expansion of the SOI is growth inducing on several levels. The general plan would accommodate population growth to approximately 24,000 persons, significantly increasing the current population of 4,000. To the extent that additional lands would be planned and zoned for development, the general plan update is growth inducing.

Although the project further supports continued growth in the San Joaquin area, several project aspects act to limit the potential for strong growth inducement.

- City of San Joaquin, Fresno County, and LAFCo policies and procedures combine to ensure that growth is contiguous and phased and that urban services must be available to serve development.

- The City requires that individual projects pay for their contribution to impacts to roads, schools and other facilities.

The effects of induced growth are discussed in various sections of the EIR. The identified policies and programs of the General Plan Update ensure that the project effects are mitigated to the greatest extent feasible.

4.3 Significant Irreversible Impacts

CEQA Sections 21100(b)(2) and 21100.1(a) require that EIRs prepared for the adoption of a plan, policy, or ordinance of a public agency must include a discussion of significant irreversible environmental changes of the Project. The proposed Project would likely result in or contribute to the following irreversible environmental changes:

- Conversion of existing undeveloped agricultural land to urban land uses, thus precluding other alternate land uses in the future.
- Increased ambient noise.
- Irreversible commitment of municipal resources to the provision of services and operations of infrastructure for future urban and suburban development.
- Irreversible consumption of goods and services associated with the future population.
- Increased traffic volumes on existing roadways.
- Degradation of air quality.
- Irreversible consumption of energy and natural resources.

4.4 Significant and Unavoidable Environmental Effects

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(b) requires an EIR to discuss unavoidable significant environmental effects, including those that can be mitigated but not reduced to a level of insignificance. In addition, Section 15093(a) of the CEQA Guidelines allows the decision-making agency to determine if the benefits of a proposed Project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts of implementing the
Project. The City of San Joaquin can approve a Project with unavoidable adverse impacts if it prepares a “Statement of Overriding Considerations” setting forth the specific reasons for making such a judgment. The following is a listing of significant and unavoidable impacts.

**Agricultural Resources**

The Project would convert Prime Farmland to non-agricultural use. The Project would conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use and has the potential to contribute to a cumulative loss of agricultural lands on adjacent property.

**Air Quality**

The Project would violate air quality standards or contribute substantially to existing or projected air quality violations for ROG and NOx emissions. The Project could generate greenhouse gas emissions that could cumulatively contribute to global warming and climate change.

### 4.5 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Section 15130 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that cumulative impacts be discussed when they are significant. Cumulative impacts occur when two or more individual effects together create a considerable environmental impact or compound or increase other impacts (Section 15355). The discussion of cumulative effects is not required to be as detailed as the impact analysis for the project; the severity of cumulative effects and the likelihood of their occurrence, however, must be examined. The applicable standards for adequacy of this examination are “practicality and reasonableness.”

In addition to the General Plan Update, the following development areas were considered in the cumulative analysis:

- Development consistent with the Fresno County General Plan for agriculture, rural, unincorporated community, and industrial areas surrounding San Joaquin
- Implementation of the City of Kerman General Plan

The cumulative impacts analysis is also required to examine reasonable options for mitigating or avoiding significant cumulative effects of a proposed project. The Guidelines point out, that with some projects, the only feasible mitigation for cumulative impacts may be the adoption of ordinances or regulations rather than the imposition of conditions on a project-by-project basis. Ordinance or policy mitigation is more suitable for plan-level rather than development-level projects.

**Aesthetics**

The landscape on the fringes of San Joaquin has been changing over the years from one of predominately agriculture to urban uses. Although the urban environment that is ultimately built could be aesthetically pleasing to many, these cumulative changes will significantly degrade the existing visual character and quality of the area. Based on the standards of significance, the proposed Project individually would have a less than significant aesthetic impact as concluded in this EIR.
However, ultimate impacts of the proposed project in combination with other projects identified in this section are significant, and the project’s incremental contribution to this impact is itself cumulatively considerable and thus significant. This impact cannot be mitigated to a less than cumulatively considerable level and is unavoidable.

**Agricultural Resources**

The Central Valley’s population is expected to more than double by the year 2040 to almost 10 million people. According to the American Farmland Trust, nearly 900,000 acres of Central Valley farmland would be converted to urban uses, most of it high quality farmland. The cumulative loss of farm land, together with other foreseeable regional development that results in loss of farmland, would be significant and unavoidable, and the Project’s contribution would be cumulatively considerable.

**Air Quality**

Even though overall air quality has improved in the Valley, attainment of air quality standards will become more difficult as population growth continues. Proposed development in San Joaquin will result in new homes and new retail uses. The amount of mobile and stationary emissions would be substantially greater than under existing conditions. The Project would contribute to air quality degradation and impede the region’s ability to attain air quality standards. The cumulative air quality impacts of the Project, together with other foreseeable development throughout the San Joaquin Valley air basin, would be cumulatively considerable and as such significant and unavoidable.

**Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Global Climate Change.** The cumulative increase in Greenhouse Gas (GHG) concentrations in the atmosphere has resulted in and will continue to result in increases in global average temperature and associated shifts in climatic and environmental conditions. The Project would contribute to greenhouse gas emissions by allowing for greater development in the Project area than currently exists. The cumulative greenhouse gas emission and global climate change impacts of the Project, together with other foreseeable worldwide development, would be cumulatively considerable and as such significant and unavoidable.

**Biological Resources**

According to the EIR, it is unlikely that Project implementation would result in significant adverse impacts to plant and wildlife species. As a result, the Project effects on biological resources would be a less than significant cumulative impact.

**Cultural Resources**

It is unlikely that development of the Project will have an effect on archaeological or other cultural resources in the vicinity. While grading and other construction activities have the potential to impact cultural resources, compliance with recommended policy reduces the project specific impact to a less than significant level. Development in other urban areas in the vicinity of San Joaquin would also be subject to appropriate mitigation and federal and State laws protecting cultural resources. Because build out of the Project will include compliance with federal and State laws to ensure protection of archaeological and cultural resources, no significant cumulative impact would occur.
Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources

New developments would be affected to varying degrees by geologic and soil related hazards. However, both geologic and soil-related hazards are site-specific. Development in the San Joaquin area will continue to expose people and property to seismic hazards and adverse soil conditions. Compliance with federal, State and local regulations addressing building construction would reduce the project level impacts to less than significant. Cumulative development projects would also be subject to local planning, building and engineering regulations. As a result, seismic and soils hazards would be a less than significant cumulative impact. As there are no known mineral resources in the San Joaquin area, cumulative effects to mineral resources would also be less than significant.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

As discussed in the EIR, while there would be an increase in local population and employment, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact related to hazards and hazardous materials due to local, state and federal regulations. These regulations would also apply to development countywide, thereby reducing the potential for cumulative impacts to a less than significant level.

Hydrology and Water Quality

As development occurs within the proposed Project area, an increase in storm water runoff will result in potential impact to surface and groundwater quality. However, as discussed in the EIR, project level water quality and flooding impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level through compliance with existing regulations and proposed policies contained in the General Plan Update. Other cumulative development would also result in additional storm water runoff. Compliance with these regulations will reduce the potential for cumulative hydrological and water quality impacts to less than significant and the proposed project would, therefore, result in a less than significant cumulative impact.

Planned development in the San Joaquin area will generate cumulative demand for water which will be provided through groundwater sources. As discussed in the EIR, the proposed Project would not result in depletion of groundwater supplies. Because the Project will use groundwater, it will contribute to cumulative groundwater impacts resulting from new development throughout the region. In consideration of General Plan policies requiring conservation, the project’s contribution to cumulative water impacts is considered to be less than cumulatively considerable.

Water supplies in the future may be affected by the effects of global climate change. It is anticipated that the winter snow season could be shortened, thereby affecting snowpack in the Sierra Nevada. According to a California Climate Change Center report (Our Changing Climate: Assessing the Risks to California), the snowpack portion of water supply could potentially decline by 70 to 90% by the end of the 21st century. This phenomenon could lead to changes in the amount of surface and ground water and could result in significant challenges to securing an adequate water supply. Potential impacts specific to the San Joaquin area water supply sources are not known at this time. With conservation, implementation of smart growth techniques and reclamation/recycling to reduce water supply demands, cumulative impacts of the project and related projects are considered less than cumulatively considerable in the context of global warming.
Land Use, Population, and Housing

The land use analysis of the proposed project found that the Project would not conflict with established land uses or conflict with adopted land use or habitat plans or policies. Since the project would not result in a land use impact, the project would also not contribute to a cumulative land use impact.

Growth will occur in San Joaquin and in other nearby cities and unincorporated communities in Fresno County. The City of San Joaquin is required by State law to use the General Plan process, as well as other planning processes such as utility master plans, to plan for and control future growth. As a result, there would not be a cumulative impacts associated with unplanned growth and the proposed Project would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact.

Noise

Noise levels from the Project are not expected to exceed standards of the San Joaquin Noise Element. This is a less than significant Project impact and, therefore, the Project would contribute to less than significant cumulative impacts.

Public Services, Recreation, and Utilities/Service Systems

Police and fire protection services, educational, and park and recreational services and facilities already exist or are provided in the San Joaquin area. The proposed Project includes General Plan policies for the provision of adequate fire protection, law enforcement, educational facilities, and park and recreational services and facilities to off-set Project impacts. Therefore, no cumulative impacts are anticipated.

Demands for wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal will arise from approval of the proposed Project requiring expansion, improvements, and modifications by the City for increased flows above current permitted flows at the wastewater treatment plant. In the context of cumulative development, however, each community must plan for the expected increase in wastewater and will be subject to regulations of local, state, and federal agencies. As a result, implementation of the Project would not contribute to impacts which are cumulatively considerable.

As discussed in the EIR, the American Avenue landfill has capacity until at least 2030, and is planning for additional expansions to meet the regional demand for solid waste disposal. The cumulative population growth within the County was considered when evaluating the lifespan of the facility and planning for future expansions. Accordingly, the project’s contribution to cumulative solid waste impacts is considered to be less than cumulatively considerable.

The project would avoid a significant project-level impact associated with the wasteful use of energy by complying with State regulations. Similarly, other jurisdictions in Fresno County are required to meet State regulations in regard to energy conservation, such as required by Title 24. As a result, the project’s contribution to cumulative impacts related to the use and transmission of electricity and natural gas is considered to be less than cumulatively considerable.
Traffic

The Project would generate an increase in traffic that will affect circulation conditions on local and regional roadways. Considering General Plan policies, traffic impacts of the Project can be reduced to less than significant levels. The cumulative increase in traffic generation, however, together with other foreseeable regional development that results in additional traffic generation, would be significant and unavoidable, and the Project’s contribution would be cumulatively considerable.

4.6  EFFECTS NOT FOUND TO BE SIGNIFICANT

Based on project analysis by City staff and responses to the Notice of Preparation, the potential impacts of the project on the following impact areas were considered not to be significant as a result of project implementation:

- **Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing.** Growth will occur primarily on land in agriculture. Code enforcement may result in the removal of housing but this process is independent of the general plan update process.
- **Inadequate emergency access.** Roads will be improved to provide for adequate emergency access.
- **Rail, waterborne, or air traffic impacts.** There are no rail, waterborne, or airport facilities in the project vicinity that will be adversely affected by the project.
- **Energy and mineral resources.** There are no energy or mineral resources located in the planning area.
- **Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.** There are no known emergency response or evacuation plans in the site vicinity which the project would affect.
- **Communication systems.** Communication systems will be extended as development occurs.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Location

The City of San Joaquin is located within California’s San Joaquin Valley, within the County of Fresno as shown on Figure 1-1 Regional Location. The City of San Joaquin is approximately 30 miles north of the City of Huron, 22 miles north of the City of Lemoore, seven miles northwest of City of Helm, 22 miles east of Interstate 5, five miles southeast of the community of Tranquility, 17 miles south of the City of Mendota, 32 miles southwest of the City of Fresno, and 15 miles southwest of the City of Kerman.

1.2 Community History

Like many communities in the San Joaquin Valley, the original town site was laid out at right angles to the railroad. Between 1915 and 1920 Valley Farms Land Company installed a complete sewer system. The City was incorporated in 1920 as a general law city and serves the surrounding rural area.

San Joaquin has seen stabilization in the ethnic make-up of the community over the past few decades. San Joaquin is a diverse ethnic community with a primarily Hispanic population. Original settling families live in San Joaquin and continue their productive agricultural traditions.
1.3 Planning Background

The City adopted its first General Plan in 1973, with no adopted long-range guide prior to that date. Revisions and amendments to the General Plan have been made since its adoption. The history of these amendments is documented below in Table 1.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09/10/1973</td>
<td>73-12</td>
<td>Adopted General Plan of the City of San Joaquin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/25/1982</td>
<td>82-9</td>
<td>Adopted Housing Element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/23/1991</td>
<td>91-09</td>
<td>Amendment to Housing Element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/10/1992</td>
<td>92-30</td>
<td>Revised Housing Element for General Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/9/1993</td>
<td>93-04</td>
<td>Amendment to Housing Element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/8/1994</td>
<td>94-10</td>
<td>Adopted a revised Housing Element and General Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/10/1994</td>
<td>84-16</td>
<td>General Plan Amendment No. 98-01 to change land use designation from Open Space and Neighboring Commercial to Community Commercial for Property Located North of Colorado Avenue, Corner of Sutter and Elm Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/24/1998</td>
<td>98-49</td>
<td>General Plan Amendment No. 01-01 to change land use designation from Qusai/Public Offices to Light Manufacturing on Parcel 3 of Parcel Map No. 97-10 located at 21962 Railroad Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/13/2000</td>
<td>00-10</td>
<td>Approved General Plan Amendment No. 08-01 for APN# 33-020-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/25/2001</td>
<td>01-16</td>
<td>City Council General Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/24/2003</td>
<td>03-15</td>
<td>Amendment to the Housing Element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/2/2006</td>
<td>06-28</td>
<td>Approved a Negative Declaration for the Central Valley Development, Inc., General Plan Amendment, Rezoning and TTM 5645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/9/2008</td>
<td>08-35</td>
<td>Approved General Plan Amendment No. 08-01 for APN# 33-020-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/9/2008</td>
<td>08-36</td>
<td>Approved General Plan Amendment No. 08-02 for APN# 033-141-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/2009</td>
<td>09-54</td>
<td>Adopted the 2008-2013 Housing Element Amendment of the General Plan and related Negative Declaration under CEQA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2013 update of the City of San Joaquin General Plan incorporates into the adopted General Plan, the City of San Joaquin 2040 Community Plan (2040 Plan) prepared by the Cal Poly School of City and Regional Planning, dated June 2011, recommendations of the Valley Blueprint Integration Program, recommendations of the City of San Joaquin Mobility, Revitalization Plan, and recommendations of the City of San Joaquin: Model Energy Efficient Plan for Rural Housing and recommendations of the City of San Joaquin Government Operations Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory August 2012.

1.4 Functions of the General Plan

Under the body of statutory and case law that has evolved in California, including guidelines issued by the State Office of Planning and Research, the General Plan for the City of San Joaquin functions as a
“constitution” in much the same way as a state or national constitution. The General Plan reflects the City’s long-range aspirations of physical form, long-range aspiration of amenities and is the basis of the City’s developmental regulations, codes, plans, development guidelines, and programs necessary to implement the General Plan.

The General Plan has three basic functions:

1. To enable the City Council to express agreement on development policies;
2. To establish clear guidance in judging whether projects proposed by public agencies and private developers are consistent with goals and policies of the General Plan; and
3. To allow for and provide the basis for making intelligent changes to the General Plan as time and changing circumstances may dictate, while being true to its guiding principals.

The principal characteristics of the General Plan are that it is comprehensive, long-range and general. It is comprehensive in that it embraces all aspects of existing and future physical development of the City, both public and private. It is long-range in that it presents a view of the physical character envisioned for the long-term (20+ years) and to be achieved within the next 20 years (Plan Horizon). It is general in that the General Plan accommodates innovation and flexibility required to achieve the Plan’s goals through public and private actions.

No matter how many elements a general plan contains, the law dictates equal weight and value to each element. This means each goal, objective, policy, and implementation measure of the general plan shall be consistent and work together.

1.5 State General Plan Definitions

Government Code § 65302 states that, "The general plan shall consist of a statement of development policies and shall include a diagram or diagrams and text setting forth objectives, principles, standards, and plan proposals." The nature of a plan depends on how a local government defines and applies the plan's development policies. The following definitions from the State’s General Plan Guidelines, provided in the Volume II Glossary, are restated below to assist the reader in understanding the General Plans terms:

Development Policy: A development policy is a general plan statement that guides action. Development policies include goals, objectives, principles, policies, plan proposals and standards. Therefore, with regard to general plans, "policy" has both a specific and general meaning.

Diagram: A diagram is a graphic expression of a general plan's development policies. The diagram must be consistent with the text of the general plan. The diagram must also have the same long-term view as the rest of the general plan. A diagram is not regulatory in nature as is a zoning ordinance map. Rather, it along with the general plan text, provides a rational basis for planning-related regulations.

Goal: A goal is a direction-setter. It is an ideal future end, condition or state that relates to the public health, safety or general welfare toward which planning and planning implementation measures are directed. For the purposes of the general plan, a goal is a general expression of community values. A goal is not quantifiable or time dependent.

Implementation Measure: An implementation measure is an action, procedure, program or technique that carries out general plan policy.

Objective: An objective is a specified end, condition or state that is an intermediate step toward attaining
a goal. It should be achievable and, when possible, measurable and time-specific. An objective may only pertain to one particular aspect of a goal or it may be one of several successive steps toward goal achievement. Consequently, there may be more than one objective for each goal.

**Plan Proposal:** A plan proposal is a description of how development policies affect an area. Local governments often express plan proposals in the form of a general plan diagram.

**Policy:** A policy is a specific statement that guides decision-making. It indicates a clear commitment of the local legislative body. A policy is based on a general plan's goals and objectives as well as the analysis of data.

**Standard:** A standard is a rule or measure establishing a level of quality or quantity that must be complied with or satisfied (Encyclopedia of Community Planning and Environmental Management). Standards define the abstract terms of goals, objectives and policies with concrete specifications.

### 1.6 The San Joaquin Planning Area

The physical area addressed by the General Plan is the San Joaquin Planning Area. The Planning Area includes the area within the city limits, the existing Sphere of Influence (SOI), the proposed SOI and the City owned wastewater treatment plant in the unincorporated territory of Fresno County. The Planning Area for the City of San Joaquin is shown on Figure 1-2.

### 1.7 Relation to Other Land Use Laws

The City implements the General Plan through development and adoption of ordinances, guidelines and standards. The General Plan focuses on policies to manage land development and capital infrastructure. A sample of City codes and regulations that implement the General Plan include: San Joaquin Municipal Code Title 15; Chapter 150 Building and Construction, Chapter 153 Subdivisions, and Chapter 154 Zoning.

### 1.8 Using the General Plan with Related Documents

Documents supportive of the General Plan are available at the City of San Joaquin City Hall and on the City of San Joaquin’s web site at www.cityofsanjoaquin.org.

A key supportive document is San Joaquin’s Zoning Ordinance. The Zoning Ordinance is the City's primary implementing mechanism for land use policies. The procedural sections set the requirements for preparing an application for such entitlements as change of zoning, planned development permit, conditional use permit, encroachment permit, variances, and site plan review.
Figure 1-2: City of San Joaquin Planning Area
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Additional supportive documents that contain municipal, county and regional information, policies and directions that support the implementation of the General Plan include:

1. County of Fresno's General Plan.
5. Parts of the 1988 Fresno County Hazardous Waste Management Plan as they pertain to the San Joaquin urban area.
6. The Fresno County Solid Waste Management Plan.
7. The Fresno County Agricultural Crop Report.
8. The Fresno County Regional Transportation Plan Update.
9. The Fresno County Measure C Expenditure Plan.
10. San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District's Serious Area PM$_{10}$ Plan.
11. San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District's Ozone Attainment Demonstration Plan.
12. Fresno County Traffic Volumes.
13. San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District's Air Quality Guidelines for General Plans.

1.9 Structure of the General Plan

The San Joaquin General Plan includes four volumes:

- Volume I San Joaquin’s Goals, Objectives, Policies and Implementation Measures
- Volume II San Joaquin’s Glossary, Plans, Programs and Guidelines
- Volume III San Joaquin’s Setting
- Volume IV San Joaquin’s Environmental Documentation

Volume I San Joaquin’s Goals, Objectives, Policies and Implementation Measures is the General Plan policy document for legal purposes. Volume I can be amended up to four times a year. Volume II through IV are reference documents that support and implement the General Plan goals, objectives, policies, and implementation measures contained in the first volume. Volumes II through IV may be amended and updated as needed. See Volume I’s Table of Contents for a detailed list of documents included within the General Plan’s four volumes.

Volume II consolidates supporting plans, programs, and guidelines in one location for ease of reference. The Glossary is the sole Glossary for the City, reducing the potential for conflicts in definitions.

Volume III describes the setting of the City of San Joaquin used for both the General Plan and environmental documentation. With each study, update to the General Plan, and environmental document, this setting is to be updated to reflect current conditions and additional detail on specific sites.

Volume IV contains the environmental analysis and documentation of the San Joaquin General Plan and subsequent project and planning environmental documents that tier from the General Plan. To streamline future environmental documentation new environmental documents will tier from the General Plan EIR, focusing on potential new significant impacts. Volume IV contains the City’s single Mitigation and Monitoring Program (MMRP). The MMRP shall be updated with each subsequent environmental document.
1.9.1 Required and Optional General Plan Elements

Section 65302 of the State Government Code specifies that the general plan shall consist of a statement of development policies and shall include a diagram or diagrams and text setting forth objectives, principles, standards, and plan proposals. The code requires that a general plan must address seven mandatory elements:

- Land use (Chapter 4);
- Transportation and Circulation (Chapter 5);
- Housing (Chapter 6); (adopted separately)
- Conservation (Chapter 7);
- Open Space (Chapter 8);
- Safety (Chapter 9); and
- Noise (Chapter 10).

Code § 65303 allows a city to include other elements that relate to its physical development. The City of San Joaquin includes the following optional elements:

- Economic (Chapter 11);
- Public Facilities and Services (Chapter 12);
- Community Design (Chapter 13); and
- Health (Chapter 14).

The General Plan elements contain discussions of planning related issues. Each discussion of the issues is followed by the City’s goals, objectives, policies, and implementation measures, which address the issues identified.

1.10 General Plan Planning Period

The time frame or “planning horizon” for the General Plan is 20 years after adoption. Utilizing a 20-year horizon between 2010 and 2030, this document relies on the 2010 U.S. Census as its official base upon which projections are built. This time horizon sets aside a block of time within which the City will have a rationale for making decisions regarding the priority, timing and funding of implementation measures to meet the changing needs of the City. While a 20-year period provides a crisp forecast for the feasibility and probability of implementing measures, the General Plan has no end date and the programs remain in effect until they are modified.

1.10.1 Implementation Measure Timing

General Plan implementation measures are prioritized to occur within three time frames. The City will evaluate the appropriateness of the time frames during updates of the General Plan based on current issues, financial feasibility, Federal and State law, and City priorities. Rather than assigning specific dates to implementation measures, the actions are prioritized into one of three planning horizons: short-term, intermediate-term, or long-term. Each year, the City will review the short-term, intermediate-term and long-term priorities and determine which will be moved into the short-term or intermediate-term planning periods, which will be retained, and which will be deferred to the long-term planning period. Some may be eliminated entirely due to changes in City policy direction.
Certain implementation measures, particularly those that are quantifiable, are “annual program” or “ongoing program”.

**Short-Term Planning Period**

The short-term planning period covers the first five years from the General Plan’s adoption.

**Intermediate-Term Planning Period**

The intermediate-term planning period is the second five years from General Plan adoption (year 5 through 10). Items prioritized for the intermediate-term period are speculative priorities.

**Long-Term Planning Period**

The long-term planning period follows the intermediate-term planning period and covers the last ten-year years of the General Plan’s horizon (year 10 through 20).

### 1.11 San Joaquin’s Guiding Principles

The City of San Joaquin’s guiding principles are listed below. These guiding principles are to be reflected in the General Plan’s goals, objectives, policies, and implementation programs.

- The San Joaquin General Plan reflects the character of the City and its history.
- The San Joaquin General Plan will be reviewed annually and updated as appropriate to remain current and relevant to the needs of the community.
- Development is responsible for avoiding or mitigating its economic and environmental impacts unless the City finds the development provides a demonstrated community benefit.
- The City is committed to maintain and enhance the City’s compact land use pattern.
- The City is committed to maintaining and enhancing the City’s infrastructure to meet the community’s needs.
- The City is committed to provide for housing opportunities that serve a variety of income levels.
- The City is committed to provide for a safe community.
- The City is committed to provide for a comfortable environment for our residents, business and industries.
- The City is committed to provide a cohesive aesthetic and community identity.
- The City is committed to maintain and enhance the Central Business District as the core commercial area, mixed use area and community gathering location of the City.
- The City is committed to provide for the housing, employment, commercial, processing, and distribution needs of the regions agricultural industry.
- The City is committed to working with governments, educational institutions, and businesses within the region to provide services and resources to support our residences, businesses and industries.
- The City is committed to identifying and implementing opportunities for conserving and enhancing its economic base.
- The City is committed to identifying and implementing opportunities for conserving and enhancing our resources.
- The City is committed to provide for walking and biking that is safe, attractive, and provides access to the entire City.
- The City is committed to maintaining and enhancing a sustainable and diverse economy.
• The City is committed to being flexible and innovative when working with projects that add benefits to the community.

1.12 San Joaquin’s General Plan Land Use

The General Plan Land Use is presented in Chapter 4, Land Use Element. The Land Use Diagram is presented in Figure 4-1. The existing SOI and proposed SOI are presented in Figure 4-2. The description of designated land uses are presented in Table 4-2. Please refer to these figures and table in Chapter 4.
2 Setting

The existing conditions of the City of San Joaquin are described in Volume III Setting. This section summarizes the setting described in Volume III. Based on the last census taken in 2010 and the land use analysis conducted by Cal Poly, the base year of the setting is 2010.

2.1 Land Use

The City of San Joaquin, similar to other communities in the San Joaquin Valley of the early 1900’s, grew adjacent to the railroad. The original town was laid out at right angles to the Southern Pacific. Lots were typically 25 feet wide by 150 feet in length. Colorado Avenue, one of two major arterial streets, bisects the city and runs parallel to the Union Pacific Railroad tracks. Major commercial and industrial activities are found on Colorado Avenue.

The newer sections of the City run diagonally to the older sections of the City forming a common grid system of roads. Manning Avenue, typified by industrial activities, is an arterial in the City. Most industrial activities are located west of the Union Pacific Railroad tracks along Railroad Avenue and at the intersection of Manning and Colorado at the south end of the community.

The 2010 Land Use Inventory, conducted by Cal Poly, included developed and undeveloped land as presented in Table 2-1 and existing land uses shown on Figure 2-1. As discussed in the City of San Joaquin 2040 Community Plan Background Report, there are approximately 40 acres of vacant land within the City and roads occupy approximately 106 acres within the City. Existing agricultural uses occupy approximately 230 acres in the City and approximately 460 acres in the SOI. The City owns the wastewater treatment plant located south of Manning Avenue, 1.5 miles southwest of the SOI in Fresno County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Designation</th>
<th>City Acres</th>
<th>City Percent</th>
<th>Sphere of Influence Acres</th>
<th>Sphere of Influence Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>158.52</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>158.52</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>230.95</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>462.95</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>25.02</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>25.02</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>46.09</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>46.09</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Facility</td>
<td>78.13</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>78.13</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>39.69</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>39.69</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Treatment Plant</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad</td>
<td>19.09</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>19.09</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>106.00</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>126.00</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>731.20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>962.20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2-1: 2010 Inventory of Land Uses

Source: Cal Poly Land Use Survey
Prepared by Hauge Brueck Associates, September 18, 2013
A land use inventory was conducted in early October 2010 to determine land uses and conditions of buildings within the City. The inventory results are:

- Residential land uses 22%
- Agricultural land uses 32%
- Roads 15%
- Public facilities land uses 11%
- Industrial land uses 6%
- Vacant land 6%
- Commercial land uses 3%
- Railroad 3%
- Open Space 1%

The majority of the commercial land is located near the intersection of Colorado Avenue and Main Street, with the majority of industrial uses in the southeastern part of the City.

The analysis suggests that the City can maintain a compact city form while accommodating anticipated population and job growth through development of vacant parcels, targeted densification of land uses and rezoning parcels. The goals, objectives, policies, and implementation measures of the General Plan consider the regulatory, environmental and social characteristics of the City to address the needs and wants of community members that were identified in public meetings.

2.2 Public Facilities and Services

2.2.1. Municipal Sewerage System

The City owns and operates a sewerage system as shown on Figure 2-2 Municipal Sewerage System, including a wastewater treatment plant located southwest of the City. The plant provides primary and secondary treatment of wastewater. The plant is located 1.5 miles west of the City off of Manning Avenue, just east of the Fresno Slough. The plant contains 48.85 acres of disposal ponds and its design capacity of approximately 0.5 million gallons per day (mgd). Current average daily flow is approximately 0.346 mgd.

The City’s sewage system consists of laterals, mains, manholes, and lift stations. Three lift stations, each consisting of two electric pumps, move sewage to the wastewater treatment plant. The City is served by 6- and 8-inch pipes. The main line to the Manning Lift Station is 16 inches and the force main to the wastewater treatment plant is 10 inches. Standards require a minimum 8-inch diameter pipe. The City’s sewer collection system is aged and some of the older portions of the system experience frequent blockages and require frequent maintenance. The large distance between manholes at some of these older portions of the sewer collection system make routine inspections and cleaning difficult. Some mains within the wastewater system are not adequately sloped and require additional maintenance, and may lead to failure during peak flows. The physical condition of some of these sewer lines is believed to be very poor, likely beyond their life expectancy and in need of a major upgrading in the older areas of the City.
Figure 2-2: Municipal Sewerage System
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2.2.2. Municipal Water System

The City operates a municipal water system as shown on Figure 2-3. The water system includes three active water wells (two running and one inactive) that have a theoretical pumping capacity of 3,500 gallons per minute. Well No. 3 at the City Corporation Yard (built in 1968), Well No. 4 at Main and California Streets (built in 1978) and Well No. 5 at Cherry Lane (built in 2006) supply water through the water distribution lines. At this time the City has no water storage capacity. The City’s Water Master Plan includes a total of six wells at build-out of the General Plan.

The City’s wells and water distribution system were constructed in 1920, upon City incorporation. Much of this original system exists in the older parts of town. The existing pipelines in these areas have become obsolete with age and are typically characterized by leaks, corrosion, and build-up. The pipes that are more than 40 years old have developed build-ups, which impede the water flow.

Water consumption in 2009 was approximately 0.705 mgd or 489 gallons per minute (gpm). Individual water meters are anticipated by 2020 in advance of state mandates for metering by 2025.

2.2.3. Municipal Flood Control And Drainage

The City manages a municipal flood control and drainage system as shown on Figure 2-4 Municipal Flood Control and Drainage System. Stormwater drainage lines run along Main Street to the west of the City and along Colorado Avenue to the irrigation ditches north and west of the city limits. The relatively flat topography of the City makes it difficult to dispose of excess surface runoff.

Four of the seven geographic zones identified in the City’s Storm Drainage Master Plan are developed and are served by retention basins A (3rd and California) and B (California between 1st and 5th) as well as a temporary basin in the City’s industrial park. Basin A can accommodate a 10-year storm and Basin B is designed for a 100-year storm. A pump located on Manning west of Sutter pumps storm drainage from a wet well during large storm events into an adjacent irrigation canal operated by the James Irrigation District. The City purchased land for a new permanent basin on Colorado Avenue, north of Fifth Street, for future system expansion when needed in the future.

2.2.4. Municipal Solid Waste Disposal

A private carrier under contract with the City provides refuse collection for the City. Current service consists of one residential pick-up per week, and commercial and industrial service varies from one or more pick-ups per week. Waste reduction programs available to residents include residential curbside recycling and organic material collection, composting facilities, commercial on-site recyclables pickup, school recycling programs, source reduction and education programs and hazardous waste handling programs.

The County landfill, American Avenue Landfill, is located approximately 6 miles to the northeast of the City on American Avenue and serves the surrounding communities and unincorporated area. The site is operated by the Fresno County Public Works Department and utilizes the trench disposal method of sanitary landfill. The landfill is permitted to receive up to 2,200 tons of waste per day and is expected to continue operation through at least 2031.
Figure 2-3: Municipal Water System
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Figure 2-4: Municipal Flood Control and Drainage System
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2.2.5. Police Protection

The City contracts with the Fresno County Sheriff’s Office for law enforcement services. The Sheriff facility located on Manning Avenue is used for shift changes and meetings and has no public access. The patrol area covers over 2,400 square miles of western Fresno County. Services available at this station include patrol and detective services, youth services, crime prevention, and community policing initiatives. Current contracts provide for 10 hours of police services daily, which equates to approximately 0.8 full-time equivalent officers or 0.22 officers per 1,000 residents.

The City of San Joaquin operates a Public Safety Camera Monitoring System for the purpose of creating a safer environment for residents and for those who work in and visit the City. The City has a policy that provides the guidelines for the placement, access, monitoring, use, storage, and retrieval of information from the camera system. The cameras may be used for detecting and deterring crime, to help safeguard against potential threats to the public, to help manage emergency response situations during natural and man-made disasters and to assist City officials in providing services to the community.

2.2.6. Fire Protection

CAL FIRE provides fire protection for the City with a station located in the community of Tranquility, approximately four miles northwest of the City. Average response time is 13.9 minutes. Structures within the City generally receive a rating of six on the Insurance Services Office (ISO) Fire Protection Rating Scale.

2.2.7. Schools

The City is served by the Golden Plains Unified School District. The School District operates four elementary schools and one high school (9-12). The high school is located approximately four miles northwest in the community of Tranquility. The elementary schools are located in the communities of Cantua, Helm, Tranquility and within the City of San Joaquin. San Joaquin Elementary School is located on Ninth Street and has a design capacity of 400 students. Since the 1998-99 school year, enrollment has exceeded 800 students annually, and temporary buildings have been located on the campus to address capacity needs.

2.2.8. Hospitals

The City of San Joaquin is not served by a local hospital. The City has a health clinic located at the intersection of Colorado Avenue and Twelfth Street. American Ambulance serves the City and is located within the City in a leased City owned building at Railroad Avenue near Main Street.

2.2.9. Recreational Facilities

The Community of San Joaquin has three outdoor open space recreational facilities. The City provides one park almost in the geographic center of the City. The Peter Rusconi Park is approximately 3/5 acres and provides a skate park, basketball courts, public restrooms, entertainment stand, and picnic areas with a covered community barbecue pit.

The second facility is the Sports Park of 11 acres. The park includes a baseball diamond, joint use facility (soccer/football), tot lot, and walking trail.

The third facility in the community is the San Joaquin Elementary School playground. This facility is approximately 15 acres, includes four baseball diamonds, basketball courts, and a kindergarten play area.
The City provides a Senior Activity Center of approximately 1,200 square feet and includes meeting rooms and is the City’s Council Chambers.

The City owns the 7,100 ft. Leo Cantu Community Center. The center has activity rooms and includes a day care facility operated by West Hills Community College (WHCC). The purpose of the center is to provide a physical location for San Joaquin residents to access public and non-profit services. Indoor recreation activities now have a facility for such activities as recreational and educational classes, public meeting space for non-profit and public organizations and youth programs. The annual haunted house and voting occurs at the center. The Sheriff Activity League provides summer youth activities.

The San Joaquin Resource Center of approximately 1,400 square feet and provides meeting rooms and a distance-learning center operated by WHCC.

The City owns the San Joaquin Veterans Memorial Hall of approximately 6,200 square feet and includes a stage, commercial kitchen, conference room/meeting room, bar, and media room. Meals are provided Tuesdays and Thursdays by the Salvation Army and Waterford Foundation. The site provides food distribution.

2.2.10. Public Utilities and Energy

Pacific Gas and Electric Co. provide electrical and natural gas services to the City. Verizon provides telephone service. Comcast and Sebastiancorp provide cable service.

2.2.11. Traffic and Circulation

The City of San Joaquin transportation and circulation system is shown on Figure 2-5 Traffic Circulation. The primary north/south roadways linking San Joaquin to the San Joaquin Valley are Colorado Avenue and Main Street/Placer Avenue. The primary east/west roadway linking the City to the San Joaquin Valley is Manning Avenue including access to; State Route 99, State Route 145, State Route 41 and Interstate 5.

The City’s arterials are Colorado Avenue and Manning Avenue. The City’s collector streets are: Main Street, Placer Avenue, California Avenue, Elm Avenue, Colusa Avenue, 5th Street, 9th Street, 12th Street, Railroad Avenue, Springfield Avenue, Sutter Avenue, Pine Avenue, and Nevada Avenue. Truck routes include Placer, Manning and Colorado Avenues.

The Union Pacific Railroad and the San Joaquin Valley Railroad for freight services serve the City.
2.3 Socio-Economic Data

2.3.1. Population

In 2010 the City of San Joaquin's population was 4,001 [2010 U.S. Census]. California Department of Finance estimates a total population of 4,029 in the City as of January 1, 2013, which is a 0.2% increase from 2012 estimates of 4,021 persons (Department of Finance Report E-1: City/County Population Estimates with Annual Percent Change, May 1, 2013). The City's population grew at about 2% a year from 1980 to 1990. Population growth in the 1990's ranged between 3 and 4% per year. Population growth rates between 2000 and 2010 averaged nearly 2% annually. Department of Finance 20-year projections for San Joaquin estimate a 1.8% annual growth rate, achieving a 2030 population projection of 5,398 persons.

The 2010 Census reports that the City of San Joaquin's ethnic composition is approximately 97.0% Hispanic, 0.3% Asian, 2.6% White non-Hispanic (extrapolated from Census data), 0.1% persons of two or more races, 0.0% Black and 0.0% American Indian.

2.3.2. Economics

Employment in the Planning Area is agricultural in nature and includes service and governmental sector employment. The economic issues facing San Joaquin are similar to communities on Fresno County's Westside.

2.4 Noise

Ambient noise levels in and around the City are typical of noise levels in a rural small-urbanized community that has a mixture of residential, commercial, and industrial land uses. These land uses tend to be quiet during night hours and produce moderate levels of noise from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m., primarily generated by motor vehicles. Noise levels seldom exceed 70 dbA. Noise generated from railroad operations may generate levels of 95 dbA or higher. On average a 65 dbA is generated from trucks and farm equipment on local truck routes or operating in areas adjacent to residential areas. The major sources of noise identified, including industrial noise, do not create problems for noise sensitive uses such as schools, or housing for the elderly.

2.5 Climate

San Joaquin's climate is semi-arid. The average precipitation varies between seven and 18 inches per year with an average of about nine inches. The Sierra Nevada Mountain Range precipitation may be as high as 60 inches per year. This mountain snow pack provides water for irrigation and water table recharge for the San Joaquin Valley.

Average temperatures range from 82 degrees in July to 46 degrees in January. High temperatures may reach between 100 and 110 degrees in the summer months. Prevailing winds are from the northwest and average 8.5 miles per hour.

San Joaquin considers climate related impacts on the City’s environment, infrastructure, and the public health and safety of its residents. Climate change as defined by the International Panel on Climate Change, is a change in the state of climate that can be identified by changes in the mean and/or the variables of its properties that persist for an extended period of time.
To measure these impacts, the State of California’s Office of Health Hazard Assessment in collaboration with the California Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) released a Climate Change Indicators report. This report explains climate-related impacts for California including the Central San Joaquin Valley.

According to this report, the City of San Joaquin may be susceptible to the following impacts as a result of climate change:

1. Lowered water supply resulting from decreased snowmelt runoff in the Sierras
2. Increased temperatures that may lead to an increase in heat related mortalities
3. Changes in habitat
4. Increased frequency or severity of storms
5. Reduced duration/extent of winter fog with warmer winter temperatures
6. Increased frequency of droughts

This list is not exhaustive but meant to serve as an example of potential impacts to the City.

2.6 Air Quality

The San Joaquin Valley has two major air quality problems: violation of state and federal standards for ozone and fine particulate matter (PM-10).

- Ozone irritates the lungs and aggravates respiratory ailments and cardiovascular disease. Ozone damages trees, agricultural crops and man-made materials such as rubber. The state ozone standards were exceeded on 25 days in 2012 at the Tranquillity monitoring station and 108 days in Fresno County. The high temperatures and cloudless skies experienced during valley summers provide ideal conditions for ozone to form through photochemical reactions.
- PM-10 aggravates chronic respiratory ailments such as asthma, emphysema, bronchitis and heart disease. In the past three years (2010-2012), the State PM-10 standard was exceeded between 19 and 32% of the time in the valley, with an annual average of approximately 25% of the time (CARM iADAM, 2013). PM-10 levels are highest during late fall and early winter when inversions are the lowest and mixing of the air is weakest.

Air quality problems are influenced by the topography and climate of the San Joaquin Valley. The mountains surrounding the Central Valley act as a bowl that trap polluted air in the valley when a climatic condition known as an inversion layer occurs. Inversion layers occur when temperature increases with elevation. This condition prevents air from rising and mixing, which causes air pollutants to build-up.

2.7 Earth Resources

2.7.1. Seismology

The immediate area is seismically stable. The closest active fault is the Coalinga Fault 40 miles to the west of the City. The San Andreas Fault is approximately 50 miles to the west, which poses the greatest potential for a major earthquake to cause significant damage. The Owens Valley Fault is approximately 100 miles to the east. Farther away are the White Wolf Fault and Edison Fault in Kern County. The mapped seismic zones are shown in Figure 2-6 Seismic Zones.

The City is in the V1 Seismic Zone. A granitic base and a thin layer of sedimentary rock on top distinguish this Zone. The potential for ground shaking is relatively high with this type of rock formation. Due to the distance of active faults from the City, it is likely that the effects would be minimal.
Figure 2-6
Seismic Zones

Sources: United States Geological Survey, ESRI StreetMap North America, California Spatial Information Library.
2.7.2. Topography

The City is located in the central area of the San Joaquin Valley, between the Sierra Nevada Mountains and the Coast Range. The San Joaquin Valley averages 50 miles in width from east to west and is 250 miles long from north to south. The City is situated in the Valley trough on flat terrain at an elevation of approximately 170 feet above sea level.

2.7.3. Soils

The soils in the San Joaquin area are Class II and III. San Joaquin area soils are Merced clay loam, Merced clay loam slightly saline, Merced clay slightly saline, and Merced clay moderately saline. These soils have a high water retention rate and a slow percolation rate. Most of the soils are considered prime farmland, although some limitations are present due to salinity and hydrology. Some protection from erosion is required. Soils in the San Joaquin area are well suited for field crops. Soils are susceptible to subsidence as a result of slow percolation rates and groundwater loss due to irrigation demand.

2.8 Biological Resources

2.8.1. Vegetation

The San Joaquin Valley was originally grassland. Agricultural activities have eliminated the native grasses and riparian growth associated with the original river and stream system. Cultivated crops and other introduced plants have replaced the wild species of vegetation.

2.8.2. Wildlife

The San Joaquin area's indigenous wildlife is limited due to the expansion of agricultural activities during the past century and urbanization since 1920. The City is located within the historical ranges of the San Joaquin kit fox and Blunt-nosed leopard lizard. There are no rare or endangered species of plants or animals within the San Joaquin Planning Area.

2.9 Cultural Resources

No known archaeological sites have been identified in the Planning Area. The State of California has no designated historical landmarks within the Planning Area. Historical structures and architecture of local significance are located in the city.
3 Administration of the General Plan

3.1 Responsibility for the General Plan

The responsibility for the initiation and policy direction of a city planning program rests with the City Council, the elected decision making body. The Planning Commission is an advisory board recommending policy; final authority rests with the City Council. In the case of the City of San Joaquin the City Council acts as the Planning Commission.

In the administration and interpretation of goals, objectives, policies and programs of the General Plan, it is understood that the Plan consists of the Land Use Diagram, the written Plan in Volume I, and the supportive documents listed or approved as part of the Plan in Volumes II through IV.

The complex nature of the General Plan will generate questions of interpretation by applicants, agencies and the public. As questions regarding the interpretation and application of the General Plan, the City will prepare written responses for review and approval by the City Council. These written responses are a body of official opinion and a public record for consistent application of policies and proposals of the General Plan. They will be a resource for annual reviews and plan amendments.

3.2 Zoning Consistency

State Law requires that the City zoning ordinance and zoning plan are consistent with the General Plan. This General Plan includes programs to modify the Zoning Code which should proceed upon adoption of the Plan. It is recommended that the City update its zoning codes and zoning map after each amendment to the General Plan to assure consistency with the General Plan and Land Use Diagram. The zoning code shall include provisions that allow existing non-conforming uses to continue.

3.3 Interpretation of General Plan Provisions

The San Joaquin General Plan comprises an integrated, consistent, and compatible statement of goals, objectives and policies for the City of San Joaquin. Projects are subject to review that demonstrates the project is consistent with General Plan Goals, Objectives, Policies and Programs.

The City Council is the body hearing appeals for interpretation of the General Plan. Appeals may go through the Planning Commission before City Council hearing. The General Plan is the City Council’s policy document and the City Council is the final arbiter.

3.4 Standards and Guidelines

General Plan elements contain standards that must be met by development projects or guidelines that should be met by development projects. Standards are identified by use of the words “shall”, “must”, or “will” that imply the standard is imperative and not subject to discretion. Guidelines are identified by use of the word “should” or “may” that signify a less rigid directive. Guidelines should be upheld in the design and approval of new development projects unless there are clear, specific, and compelling reasons to disregard them on a case-by-case basis.
3.5 Level of Detail

The General Plan includes integrated environmental mitigation measures, as many of its policies, standards, and guidelines are more detailed than might normally be the case. The Land Use Element varies slightly from the format used in the other elements in that it contains the Land Use Diagram and land use descriptions. The Circulation Element and Noise Element vary in that they include a circulation diagram and noise contours diagram that correlate with the land use maps. The Housing Element varies from the format used in other elements to satisfy guidelines administered by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).

3.6 General Plan Terminology

The General Plan is written in plain language to the extent possible. There are “terms of art” (i.e., statutorily assigned definitions and document-specific terms) in a technical planning document. The General Plan provides a glossary in Volume II to aid in the understanding of the document. The glossary establishes specific rules on the meaning of words in the General Plan and provides a hierarchy explaining how the definitions are established.

3.7 Maintaining and Updating the General Plan

3.7.1 Annual Maintenance

State law and local ordinance assign the primary responsibility for maintaining and updating the General Plan to the City Planning Commission, (State Government Code § 65103). According to § 65400(b) of the State’s Government Code, the City’s planning staff should “provide…an annual report to the legislative body (Planning Commission)…[on] the status of the plan and progress in its implementation.” The annual review should take place prior to the approval of the City budget each year to facilitate the appropriate allocation of funds to implement the General Plan. If funding is not available, the City Council may choose to modify the time frame for implementation until funding is available.

3.7.2 Updating and Amending the General Plan

Government Code § 65358(b) requires that the City may not amend the mandatory elements of the General Plan more than four times in one calendar year, although there are certain specified exceptions. The Housing Element must be updated periodically according to a schedule codified in State law (Government Code § 65588). Financing plans that back up mitigation fees that are adopted consistent with the General Plan (“nexus” studies and plans) must be reviewed after five years and annually thereafter per the requirements of Government Code § 66001.

The City is required to submit the General Plan Annual Progress Report (APR) in April of each year. The APR identifies recommended amendments to the General Plan. It is recommended that preparation of the annual budget and APR are jointly prepared during the first quarter of the year. Jointly preparing the budget and APR will identify the General Plan programs to be included in the fiscal year and allocate funds for implementation. Based on City priorities and available funding, the time frame for each program is to be adjusted as appropriate and the General Plan setting and build-out forecast should be updated.

3.7.3 Project Conformance

The need to amend the General Plan may be required by public or private development projects.
Applications for public or private development projects must be reviewed to demonstrate consistency with the General Plan. In carrying out this review, the City should compare the population density and building intensity proposed by the development project with the assumptions upon which this General Plan is based. The proposed project must be reviewed for its consistency with the land use designations and expressed goals, objectives, policies, programs and standards of the elements of the General Plan. If the project substantially exceeds the growth assumptions or is inconsistent with the General Plan’s goals, objectives, policies, programs, and standards, then either the General Plan should be amended or the project should be denied.

3.8 Federal and State Law and Regulations

The City of San Joaquin shall comply with the appropriate federal and state laws and regulations. Since federal and state laws change, they are not incorporated into the General Plan. The following provides a summary of selected federal and state regulations:

3.8.1 Air Quality

• Federal Clean Air Act – Establishes the overall national framework and regulation for attainment and maintenance of air quality standards, including the promulgation of federal air quality standards and setting requirements for air quality planning.

• State of California Air Pollution Control Laws (also known as the “Blue Book”) – This publication is updated annually and compiles air pollution control laws from various state legal codes. The California Air Resources Board (ARB) establishes statewide Ambient Air Quality Standards for criteria air pollutants, and requires the preparation of air quality plans under the California Air Quality Act.

• San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) – The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District is a public health agency whose mission is to improve the health and quality of life for all Valley residents through efficient, effective and entrepreneurial air quality-management strategies.

3.8.2 Biological Resources

• Federal Endangered Species Act of 1973 (FESA) – Provides for the protection of federally listed threatened and endangered plant and animal species.

• California Endangered Species Act (CESA) California Fish and Game (CDFG) Code §2050-2098 – Provides for the protection of state-listed threatened and endangered plant and animal species.

• California Native Plant Protection Act (Fish and Game Code §1900-1913) – Also known as the California Native Plant Protection Policy, provides for the protection of rare and endangered plants in the state.

• Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 (50 CFR 10.13), U.S. Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, and California Department of Fish and Game Code §3503, 3503.5, and 3513) – Provides for protection of nongame native birds including raptors, and their active nests. The Eagle Protection Act provides additional protection for Bald Eagles and Golden Eagles.

3.8.3 Water Quality

• Federal Clean Water Act (CWA) 40 CFR 404(b)(1) – Provides for protection of wetlands and jurisdictional waters (Waters of the United States).
• Water Quality Order 99-08-DWQ – National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity (General Permit) for projects which disturb one or more acres of soil or those that disturb less than one acre but are part of a larger plan.

• California State Water Resources Control Board, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board – This state agency establishes beneficial uses for surface water and water quality standards, including wastewater treatment requirements.

3.8.4 Cultural and Paleontological Resources

• National Register of Historic Places (Authorized under National Resources Preservation Act of 1966) and California Register of Historic Places (Public Resources Code (PRC) §5024.1) – Provides for listing and preservation of historic places that meet specific criteria.

• Protection of Archaeological Resources (PRC §21083.2) provides for protection of archaeological resources under CEQA.

• Protection of Paleontological Resources (PRC §5097.5) – Prohibits the excavation or removal of “vertebrate paleontological site or any other archaeological, paleontological or historical feature situated on public lands except with the express permission of the public agency having jurisdiction over such lands.”

• Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) (43 CFR Part 10) – Provides for the protection of Native American graves and cultural items.

3.8.5 Geology

• Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones Act of 1972 – Provides for disclosure of earthquake fault hazards and prohibits new construction in earthquake zones unless a comprehensive geologic study determines that there would be no structural hazard.

• California Division of Mines and Geology Guidelines (1997, Chapter 4) – Provides guidance to local agencies to protect against earth hazards through the publication of geologic hazard maps and guidance for the prevention of earthquake and earthquake-induced hazards such as landslides and soil liquefaction.

3.8.6 Agriculture

• Williamson Land Conservation Act (California Government Code Title 5 Division 1 Part 1 Chapter 7) – Provides for the protection of agricultural lands through a contract mechanism with the County to continue agricultural use of prime lands.

3.8.7 Housing and Building

• California Resources Code §65852.1 – Zoning variance, special use permit, or conditional use permit for a dwelling unit to be constructed for the sole occupancy of one adult or two adult persons 62 years or older.

• California Building Code – Sets building code requirements for structures and is subject to annual updates and adoption by the City Council.
4 Land Use Element

California Government Code § 65302(a) requires that every general plan shall include “a land use element which designates the proposed general distribution and general location and extent of the uses of the land for housing, business, industry, open space, including agriculture, natural resources, recreation, and enjoyment of scenic beauty, education, public buildings and grounds, solid and liquid waste disposal facilities, and other categories of public and private uses of land…The land use element shall include a statement of the standards of population density and building intensity recommended for the various districts and other territory covered by the plan.” This same section of code requires the land use element to identify areas that are subject to flooding. Section 65303 indicates that the land use element may also “address any other subjects which, in the judgment of the legislative body, relate to the physical development of the county or city”. Section 2762(a) of the State Public Resources Code requires that among a general plan’s land use designations, mineral zones, and mineral resource policies must also be considered.

The Land Use Element is a fundamental and consequential Element of the General Plan; it is the long-range vision of land use designations and distribution of housing, jobs, manufacturing, open space and public facilities. The General Plan allows the City to develop and enhance housing and job opportunities while maintaining a compact city form that encourages walkability and preserves valuable farmland. This element establishes the goals, objectives, policies and programs that provide the basis for zoning and development of public and private land within the City.

The Land Use Element and the Transportation and Circulation Element are closely integrated. The following planning and policy documents relate to or implement the Land Use Element.

City of San Joaquin Mobility and Revitalization Plan (2012). The City of San Joaquin Mobility and Revitalization Plan is a document prepared to identify a community vision, street design and circulation, and areas of growth, revitalization, and use.

4.1 Land Use - Goals, Objectives, Policies, and Programs

Goal LU 1: Maintain a compact city form.
Objective LU 1.1: To have an average net residential density in compliance with Chapter 6 the Housing Element.
Policy LU 1.1.1: The City’s Land Use Diagram and Zoning Map shall have appropriate designations to achieve the densities recommended in the Housing Element.
Program LU 1.1.1a: Amend the Zoning Code for R-2 zones such that the minimum density is four units per acre and the maximum density is 8 units per acre.
Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Short-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $50,000
Program LU 1.1.1b: Amend the Zoning Code for R-3 zones such that the minimum density is eight units per acre and the maximum density is 20 units per acre.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Short-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: Included in LU 1.1.1a

Program LU 1.1.1c: Amend the Zoning Code to create an R-4 zone designation with a minimum density of 20 units per acre and a maximum density of 30 units per acre in the short-term planning period.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Short-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: Included in LU 1.1.1a

Program LU 1.1.1d: Amend the Zoning Code and the Zoning Map to allow increased residential and commercial densities along Main Street and Colorado Avenue.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Short-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: Included in LU 1.1.1a

Objective LU 1.2: Projects should be developed on existing parcels within the City (infill development).

Policy LU 1.2.1: The City shall encourage development to locate on existing parcels within the City and adjacent to existing development.

Objective LU 1.3: Reduce motor vehicle dependency.

Policy LU 1.3.1: The City shall encourage commercial, business, and industrial uses to be in close proximity to supporting uses (restaurants, supply stores).

Policy LU 1.3.2: The City shall encourage residential uses to be in close proximity to public facilities, business, and commercial uses.

Policy LU 1.3.3: The City shall encourage alternative transportation by increasing the number of bicycle lanes, trails, and walking paths around the City.

Objective LU 1.4: The City shall manage the rate and amount of urban expansion.

Policy LU 1.4.1: The City shall encourage infill development prior to annexing new territory.

Policy LU 1.4.2: New annexations require the City Council find that overriding considerations exist concerning land availability, affordable housing, economic development, or physical constraints, which preclude additional infill development.
Program LU 1.4.2a: The City shall update its sphere of influence plan to accommodate the land area and rate of urban expansion compatible with the policies of this General Plan.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Short-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $30,000

Policy LU 1.4.3: Urban expansion shall not exceed the capacity of the City and other local agencies to provide the services and facilities required consistent with the goals of this General Plan.

Policy LU 1.4.4: To preserve prime agricultural land outside the City Planning Area.

Policy LU 1.4.5: Expansion of the City shall be phased to create a physical form and character that improves community functions, serves the needs of the residents, decreases dependency on non-renewable resources and utilizes renewable resources like solar and wind while protecting natural resources.

Policy LU 1.4.6: Expansion of the City should be in the direction of the community of Tranquility.

Goal LU 2: Maintain an economically vibrant community.

Objective LU 2.1: Designate commercial corridors on Main Street, Colorado Avenue, and Manning Avenue.

Policy LU 2.1.1: The City shall establish a distinctive central business district.

Program LU 2.1.1a: Amend the zoning ordinance to create a Central Business District on Main Street between Colorado Avenue and California Avenue.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Short-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: Included in LU 1.1.1a

Objective LU 2.2: To maintain a strong Central Business District.

Policy LU 2.2.1: The City shall encourage mixed-use development providing street-level businesses along Main Street between Colorado Avenue and California Avenue.

Program LU 2.2.1a: Establish programs that streamline mixed-use corridor projects, increase flexibility in development standards, and/or reduce impact or permit fees.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Short-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $25,000
Objective LU 2.3: To accommodate and encourage mixed-use commercial activities.

Policy LU 2.3.1: The City shall promote development of mixed-use commercial activities in commercial areas outside the CBD that accommodate pedestrian access to residential areas.

Policy LU 2.3.2: The City shall designate land for mixed-use commercial centers.

Policy LU 2.3.3: The City will promote the redevelopment of existing single-use centers into mixed-use centers.

Policy LU 2.3.4: The City will encourage residents to start and maintain home sourced businesses compatible with neighbors and in compliance with City regulations and standards.

Policy LU 2.3.5: Mixed-use centers shall be located in proximity to existing neighborhoods that balance vehicle, bike, and pedestrian circulation, maximize on-street vehicle parking and minimize off-street parking.

Policy LU 2.3.6: Mixed-use commercial development shall be compatible with the surrounding area.

Policy LU 2.3.7: New office and or commercial development may serve as buffers between residential uses and higher-intensity commercial and industrial uses.

Program LU 2.3.7a: Amend the zoning ordinance to allow for mixed-use projects.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Short-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: Included in LU 1.1.1a

Objective LU 2.4: The City shall encourage the development of industrial uses in the east and southeast portion of the City.

Policy LU 2.4.1: Designate industrial zoning in the east and southeast portion of the City.

Program LU 2.4.1a: Designate additional industrial zoning in the vicinity of the intersection of Manning Avenue and Colorado Avenue.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Short-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: Included in LU 1.1.1a

Objective LU 2.5: The City shall promote the retention and development of industrial activities.

Policy LU 2.5.1: The City shall assure that a variety of industrial parcel sizes are available to accommodate different types of industrial activities.

Policy LU 2.5.2: The City shall promote the diversification of industrial activities in order to provide employment opportunity in both the agricultural and non-agricultural sectors.
Policy LU 2.5.3: The City shall require adequate infrastructure and services for industrial uses.

Policy LU 2.5.4: Industrial development shall locate in areas accessible to major transportation corridors and provide adequate vehicle circulation internally and externally.

Policy LU 2.5.5: Industrial development shall be compatible with the surrounding area including mitigation for noise, vibration, odors, and potential releases of hazardous materials.

**Goal LU 3: Provide available diversified housing.**

Objective LU 3.1: Designate sufficient land for low-, medium-, high-density residential, and mixed-use areas that support sustainable and efficient housing.

Policy LU 3.1.1: The City shall amend its zoning map to have sufficient low-, medium-, and high-density residential areas to meet projected demand.

Program LU 3.1.1a: Designate high-density residential zones on blocks abutting the CBD.

Responsibility: City Council

Timeframe: Short-Term Planning Period

Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions

Estimated City cost: Included in LU 1.1.1a

Program LU 3.1.1b: Designate medium-density residential zones throughout the City.

Responsibility: City Council

Timeframe: Short-Term Planning Period

Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions

Estimated City cost: Included in LU 1.1.1a

**Goal LU 4: Provide citywide access to park space and recreational areas.**

Objective LU 4.1: Distribute park space so every resident resides within one-quarter mile of park space or a recreational area.

Policy LU 4.1.1: The City shall identify parcels for viable park space based on size and location.

Program LU 4.1.1a: Establish additional parks.

Responsibility: City Council

Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period

Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions

Estimated cost: $1,000,000

**Goal LU 5: Provide for compatible proximate land uses.**

Objective LU 5.1: Adjacent uses shall be compatible with each other.

Policy LU 5.1.1: Commercial and industrial development shall be compatible with surrounding uses through siting or mitigation.
Goal LU 6: To facilitate citizen participation and staff education in the implementation and updates of the General Plan, special plans, regulations, standards, and guidelines.

Objective LU 6.1: The City will hold public meetings and forums to receive input on the effectiveness of the City’s General Plan, special plans, regulations, standards, and guidelines.

Policy LU 6.1.1: The City will promote public participation in City development procedures.

Program LU 6.1.1.a: Clarify requirements for citizen input in the entitlement process, including notification areas, neighborhood meetings, and through the use of the City’s website for information:

- Display the Land Use Diagram, zoning map, and key policies in City offices the Council chambers, and City web site;
- Hold an annual general plan review and goal setting workshop with the public and City Council.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $5,000

Objective LU 6.2: Educate the community and City staff about the General Plan Elements, special plans, standards and guidelines including but not limited to:

- Transportation and circulation Element Goal CIR 3 – Carpooling information, collaborate with the school district to promote safe and efficient bicycle and pedestrian routes in compliance with the Safe Routes to School program.
- Conservation Element Policy CON 2.2.3 – promote water conservation, provide water conservation information in periodic water billings including use trends.
- Safety Element Objective S 6.3 – Risks and preparedness of the City for potential risks including but not limited to fire, flood, earthquake, and hazardous materials, emergency readiness, first aid, evacuation routes, critical facilities, Energy Assurance Plan and the Emergency Response Plan.
- Economic Element Goal E.1 – Maintain job training information and a partnership with West Hills Community College, Westside Institute of Technology and Proteus.
- Community Design element Goal CD.5 – Maintain information regarding solar panel and solar water heater use, installation, permitting and maintenance.

Policy LU 6.2.1: The City shall create and implement a program to facilitate the education of the community and staff annually focused on the General Plan Elements, special plans, standards, and guidelines identified in Objective LU 6.2.

Program LU 6.2.1a: Encourage partnerships between community groups to educate citizens and staff.
Program LU 6.2.1b: Conduct staff training that addresses the appropriate topics listed in Objective LU 6.2.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $5,000

Program LU 6.2.1c: Utilize libraries, the City website, and City hall to disperse information related to the General Plan Elements, special plans, standards, and guidelines.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $25,000

Program LU 6.2.1d: Hold one community outreach event per year focused on topics identified in Objective LU 6.2.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $5,000

4.2 Land Use Designations

The General Plan establishes five primary land use designations listed below and described in the following sections:

Residential
  Low Density Residential (LDR)
  Medium Density Residential (MDR)
  High Density Residential (HDR)

Commercial
  Neighborhood Commercial (NC)
  Community Commercial (CC)
  Central Business District (CBD)

Industrial (I)
Public Facility (PF)
Railroad (R)
4.2.1 Residential Land Use Designations

The General Plan provides three residential land use designations: Low Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, and High Density Residential. The General Plan makes the assumption that each gross acre of residential land includes 25% of single family and 10% of multi-family land reserved for streets. The Residential Land Use designations and its corresponding consistent zone district and density of units per gross acre of land are summarized in Table 4-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Designation</th>
<th>Consistent Zone District</th>
<th>Density Units/Gross Acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>R-1, R-2</td>
<td>1.0 – 7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>8.0 – 19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>R-4</td>
<td>20.0 – 30.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Low Density Residential (LDR)**

**Purpose and Extent of Uses**

The Low Density Housing designation accommodates single-family residential housing units on individual lots.

**Population Density and Building Intensity**

- Minimum to Maximum Density: 0.5 to 8.0 unit/gross acre
- Minimum Parcel Size: 5,000 sq. ft.
- Population Density: 36 persons/acre @ 4.5 persons/household
- Building Intensity: 40% of site area

**Consistent Zones**

- R1 Residential 1 Zone
- PD Planned Development Zone
- QP Quasi/Public Facilities Zone
- PR Parks and Recreation Facility Zone

The Planned Development Zone is available for application in Low Density areas and may be established for reasons that affect public health, safety, comfort and general welfare, orderly physical growth and development of the City.

Within the Planned Development Zone, Small Lot Density Housing may be allowed. Small Lot Density Housing is single-family detached or vertically (sidewall) attached housing each on a lot.

Government Code § 65915 requires cities to grant a density bonus of 25% of the maximum number of housing units otherwise allowed in areas designated for residential use. Other than the bonuses mandated by the State of California, density bonuses are not permitted in Low Density areas.

**Medium Density Residential (MDR)**

**Purpose and Extent of Uses**

The Medium Density Housing designation accommodates multiple-family residential structures. Allowable housing types include duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, condominiums, townhouses,
small lot density housing within Planned Development zones, and mobile homes in mobile home parks.

To reduce the cost of housing, increase efficiency, and provide the option to develop income property for owners who occupy one of the units as their primary residence, the City may consider allowing four units on a single lot, attached or detached and/or allow the option to purchase two or more lots that front on a common area, rather than a public street.

Population Density and Building Intensity
- Minimum to Maximum Density: 8.1 to 16.0 units/gross acre
- Minimum Parcel Size: 6,000 sq. ft. (1,500 sq. ft per unit)
- Population Density: 54.4 persons/acre @ 3.4 persons/household
- Building Intensity: 60% of site area

Consistent Zones
- R2 Residential 2 Zone
- R3 Residential 3 Zone
- PD Planned Development Zone
- QP Quasi/Public Facilities Zone
- PR Parks and Recreation Facility Zone

The Planned Development Zone is available for application in the Medium Density areas and may be established for reasons that affect public health, safety, comfort and general welfare, orderly physical growth and development of the City.

Within the Planned Development Zone, Small Lot Density Housing may be allowed. Small Lot Density Housing is single-family detached or vertically (sidewall) attached housing, each on a lot 1,500 sq. ft. to 6,000 sq. ft. with a maximum of 16 units per acre. The attached housing may include up to three single-family units that share at least one common sidewall with one or more adjacent units on separate lots.

Government Code § 65915 requires cities to grant a density bonus of 25% of the maximum number of housing units otherwise allowed in areas designated for residential use. Other than the bonuses mandated by the State of California, density bonuses are not permitted in Medium Density areas.

**High Density Residential (HDR)**

Purpose and Extent of Uses
The High Density Housing designation accommodates multiple-family residential structures. Allowable housing types include apartments, condominiums, and townhouses.

Population Density and Building Intensity
- Minimum to Maximum Density: 16.1 to 30.0 units/gross acre
- Minimum Parcel Size: 6,000 sq. ft.
- Population Density: 60.0 persons/acre @ 2.0 persons/household
- Building Intensity: 70% of site area

Consistent Zones
- R3 Residential 3 Zone
- R4 Residential 4 Zone (to be created)
PD Planned Development Zone  
QP Quasi/Public Facilities Zone  
PR Parks and Recreation Facility Zone

The Planned Development Zone is available for application in the High Density Housing areas and may be established for reasons that affect public health, safety, comfort and general welfare, orderly physical growth and development of the City.

Within the Planned Development Zone Live-Work Housing may be allowed. Live-Work Housing includes compatible non-residential uses consisting of a detached or attached single dwelling unit that includes a ground floor area dedicated for optional compatible non-residential use. The attached Live-Work Building may share a side or rear wall with an adjacent unit, on a single or separate lots.

Residential Development Policies and Standards

Projects within the High Density Housing designation shall be developed in accordance with the following development policies and standards:

1. The Extent and rate at which multi-family development is allowed to occur during a given year shall be governed by realistic demands in the housing market. Unsubstantiated local market potential for multi-family proposals may be grounds for project disapproval, even though multi-family use is called for by proposals depicted on the General Plan Diagram or as described in the General Plan text. The guiding factors may include building and land costs, market demand and preferences, trends, and local community stakeholder input. Stacked flats or garden apartments are not always the necessary design format. 18 dwellings per acre can be achieved with row houses with common sidewalls, in the form of duplexes, triplexes, or additional sidewall-attached units.

2. Multi-family projects shall include net site area developed as landscaped open space, including front side and rear yard areas required by the zoning ordinance. A percentage of net area, excluding required yards areas, shall be developed for the common recreation use of the tenants. Minimum facilities may be required for common recreation areas. Generally, multi-family housing can be designed to enclose shared space in the form of courtyards or other usable semi-private or private area for the exclusive use of the tenants and may include green space whenever possible.

3. Where multi story housing units are proposed adjacent to existing or planned Low Density areas, building elevations and the location of windows, balconies and air conditioning units above the first story shall be reviewed by the City to assure visual compatibility and residential privacy. Generally, housing can be designed for architectural compatibility with the surrounding structures, providing such houses reflect an acceptable and desired level of aesthetics and enhance the streetscape. Where existing housing does not meet these criteria, new housing can be designed for the desired architectural quality and urban form to establish a higher benchmark that may eventually improve the quality of new structures or existing homes during renovations.

4.2.2 Commercial Land Use Designations

The General Plan establishes three commercial land use designations: Central Business District, Community Commercial, and Neighborhood Commercial. These land use designations are described in the following sections.
Central Business District (CBD)

The Central Business District land use designation is reserved for the City’s primary commercial area, its central business district. A range of uses is allowed in this area including commercial establishments, business offices, restaurants, and mixed-use developments (commercial/residential/office). Allowable uses include banks, clothing stores, grocery outlets, restaurants, pharmacies, and barber shops/beauty parlors. Professional offices, medium density residential, high density residential and mixed-uses are allowed subject to review. Existing uses in 2013 are permitted uses in the CBD.

The CBD is the center for retail commercial, business, financial services, and mixed-uses. Policies within the CBD include:

1. Architectural review,
2. Landscaped corridors on Main Street and Colorado Avenue,
3. Landscaping for other streets within the CBD, such as Ninth and Nevada.
4. Encourage business and medically-related office development in the CBD.
5. The CBD is the primary location for mixed uses,
6. Shared parking is encouraged in the CBD with appropriate consideration for reduced parking requirements.

Building Intensity
- Minimum to Maximum Density: 16.1 to 30.0 units/gross acre
- Minimum Parcel Size: 6,000 sq. ft.
- Building Intensity: 100% of site area

Consistent Zones
- DTC  Downtown Commercial Zone (to be created)
- PD  Planned Development Zone
- QP  Quasi/Public Facilities Zone
- PR  Parks and Recreation Facility Zone

Community Commercial (CC)

This designation provides land for automobile dependent businesses and services. A range of uses is allowed in this area including commercial establishments, business offices, and mixed-use developments (commercial/residential/office). Allowable uses include motels, service stations, other auto related sales and services, wholesale outlets, building and lumber outlets, furniture warehouses, restaurants, electrical, plumbing and carpentry sales and services, banks, clothing stores, grocery outlets, restaurants, pharmacies, and barber shops/beauty parlors. Mixed-uses are allowed subject to review.

Specific development plans shall be prepared for projects within the CC to eliminate blight and assure that these areas make major contributions to the walkability and economic well-being of the community.

Building Intensity
- Minimum to Maximum Density: 16.1 to 30.0 units/gross acre
- Minimum Parcel Size: 6,000 sq. ft.
- Building Intensity: 65% of site area
Neighborhood Commercial

The Neighborhood Commercial land use designation provides for commercial uses intended to meet the everyday convenience needs of residents in the adjacent area. Permitted uses include convenience goods and personal services. Mixed-use development is allowed with a conditional use permit.

Building Intensity

- Minimum to Maximum Density: 8.1 to 16.0 units/gross acre
- Minimum Parcel Size: 6,000 sq. ft.
- Building Intensity: 65% of site area

Commercial Development Policies and Standards

The following development standards shall apply within commercial areas:

1. Commercial site boundaries adjacent to residential areas shall be visually screened with ornamental masonry walls and landscaping. Wall height is to be determined and approved as part of site plan review.
2. Outdoor storage areas shall be visually screened with ornamental fencing or walls and landscaping.
3. Shade trees shall be provided within off-street parking areas as determined by site plan review. The standard shall be a ratio of one tree per five linear spaces, placed along the line between parking bays, with trees at both ends of a line of parking spaces.
4. Street trees and frontage landscaping, with automatic irrigation, shall be provided for commercial sites outside the CBD, and may be required within the CBD. Tree canopies should not block business signage but placed to provide shade for pedestrians and achieve a cooling effect for commercial and residential buildings.
5. Drought tolerant plant materials are encouraged.
6. Encourage and support commercial centers with a full range of transportation options, including transit stops, biking and walking.
7. Structures shall be constructed to support and accommodate photovoltaic solar systems.
8. Structures shall incorporate energy efficient, water conserving, and renewable energy technologies as technologically and financially feasible.

4.2.3 Industrial Land Use Designation (I)

The General Plan establishes one industrial land use designation, Industrial. Light manufacturing is
intended for uses that by virtue of traffic, noise, vibration, and air quality may be considered compatible in proximity to residential use areas. Heavy manufacturing uses are intended for intensive manufacturing such as manufacture and processing or treatment of materials, distributing plant, plant milling, agricultural processing that by virtue of traffic, noise, vibration, and air quality are considered incompatible when in proximity to residential uses. Industrial uses are subject to City review to determine that the use is not detrimental to public health, safety and welfare.

**Industrial Development Policies and Standards**

The following development standards shall apply within industrial areas:

1. Industrial site boundaries adjacent to residential, commercial, public facilities areas shall be visually screened with ornamental masonry walls and landscaping. Wall height is to be determined and approved as part of the site plan review process.
2. Outdoor storage areas shall be visually screened with ornamental fencing or walls and landscaping.
3. Shade trees shall be provided within off-street parking areas as determined under site plan review. Generally, the standard shall be a ratio of one tree per five lineal spaces, placed along the line between parking bays, with trees at both ends of a line of parking spaces.
4. Street trees and frontage landscaping, with automatic irrigation, shall be provided.
5. Drought tolerant plant materials are encouraged.
6. Encourage and support alternative transportation options, which may include transit stops, biking and walking.
7. Structures shall incorporate energy efficient, water conserving, and renewable energy technologies as technologically and financially feasible.

**Building Intensity**

- Minimum parcel size: 7,000 sq. ft.
- Building Intensity: 50% of site area

**Consistent Zones**

- Light Manufacturing M1 (as a conditional use)
- Heavy Manufacturing M2 (as a conditional use)

**4.2.4 Public Facility Land Use Designation (PF)**

This category includes a broad set of uses such as park and recreation areas, public schools, government offices and service yards, drainage basins, churches and religious facilities. The PF land use designation includes a secondary designation to reflect the intended public facility use, for example; PF-S for a school site. The following is a list of the potential public facility uses:

- School facilities (S)
  - New site allocation will remain flexible because of the complexities involved in planning for new school facilities under state supervision, but should be built within City boundaries if feasible to ensure proximity to existing housing.
- City and County Government (G)
  - Government offices include administration, police, fire stations, and the Wastewater Treatment Facility.
• Park, Recreation, and Community facilities (P)
  o Park and recreation facilities are to be sited to be accessible to the residential areas within
    the City.
• Churches/Religious facilities (C)
  o Churches and religious facilities should be located along arterial and collector streets to
    allow for access from residential neighborhoods. The need for church sites should be
    considered during the process of reviewing subdivisions.
• Medical/Health Care facilities (M)
• Detention basin (D)
  o A detention basin designation is used when the site is a single use facility. A detention
    basin also used for park and recreation facilities will use the P designation.

Building Intensity
  Minimum Parcel Size: NA
  Building Intensity\(^1\) NA

Consistent Zones
  All zones

4.3 Distribution of Land Uses

4.3.1 Land Use Diagrams

The land use diagram designating land uses for land within the City boundary is displayed on Figure 4-1.
The General Plan Area diagram displaying land uses within the City boundary and proposed land use
designations within the proposed SOI is displayed on Figure 4-2.

For undeveloped and un-subdivided areas within the City boundary and Sphere of Influence, land use
designations are displayed as representative areas on the diagram of a size representing the acreage of the
Corresponding land use. At the time a land use entitlement is processed, the City evaluate the appropriate
location of each land use designation and will assign the land use to a defined area through a General Plan
amendment. Table 4-2 includes the Land Use Distribution by Acreage.

---

\(^1\) Indicates that there is no absolute limitation that remains constant for each development project. The practical
maximum extent of building intensity that may be permitted in any given circumstance will be determined primarily
by the combined effects of requirements for off-street parking, required yard areas, landscape open space, outdoor
utility area and outdoor storage area. The most intense commercial building intensity is allowed in the Central
Commercial area where there are no yard spaces required and where off-street parking requirements may be met on
another site or at a site provided by the City under-lieu parking fee requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. The
practical Maximum extent of building intensity will most likely be lowest on sites for such community facilities as
drainage basins and schools.

\(^2\) By their very nature, open space and recreation areas can be expected to exhibit the lowest practical levels of
building intensity of any group uses described in the General Plan. No standard of maximum extent is therefore
necessary or desirable.
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Table 4-2

Land Use Distribution by Acreage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Plan Land Use Designation</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Sphere of Influence</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Business District</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Commercial</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Density Residential</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Facility</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Treatment Plant</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2 Population Holding Capacity

The General Plan develops population projections based upon a methodology and a set of assumptions to determine the effects from future population growth. These assumptions and projections are used throughout the General Plan to determine public service and facility needs as well as social, economic, and environmental concerns that need to be addressed by the General Plan and in the environmental documentation.

The projected population maximum holding capacity (build-out of the General Plan) as depicted by the General Plan Diagram is approximately 10,170 persons. The build-out of the area within the Sphere of Influence is approximately 14,160 persons. The estimated build-out of the General Plan Area is approximately 24,300 persons. The calculation of these estimates is presented in Table 4-3 City of San Joaquin General Plan Area Population Holding Capacity. These estimates are the maximum potential population in consideration of existing structures constructed at a lower density and in consideration that mixed-use development is a new concept for the City and may not achieve the densities estimated.

The anticipated holding capacity of the General Plan is approximately 7,500 in the City, 10,500 in the proposed SOI, a total in the Planning Area of approximately 18,000. This approximation is based on professional judgment where build out of a General Plan is 65 to 75% of the allowed use by right population calculations. The reduced build out reflects the need for infrastructure, market conditions, technology, building codes, financing availability, federal or state policy, and the community’s needs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Plan Designation</th>
<th>Dwelling Units Per Gross Acre(s)</th>
<th>Density Persons/ Gross Acre$^3$</th>
<th>Gross Acres</th>
<th>Maximum Potential Dwelling Units$^4$</th>
<th>Maximum Population</th>
<th>Anticipated Holding Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LDR- Low-Density Residential</td>
<td>1.0 to 7.9 units/acre</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>4,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDR- Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>8.0 to 19.0 units/acre</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDR- Residential High Density</td>
<td>20.0 to 30.0 units/acre</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>1,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD-Central Business District</td>
<td>20.0 to 30.0 units/acre</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC-Community Commercial</td>
<td>20.0 to 30.0 units/acre</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC-Neighborhood Commercial</td>
<td>8.0 to 19.0 units/acre</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-Industrial</td>
<td>0 units/acre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF-Public Facilities</td>
<td>0 units/acre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Railroad</td>
<td>0 units/acre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>0 units/acre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL (Within City Boundaries)</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>665</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,480</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,500</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sphere of Influence Designation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Plan Designation</th>
<th>Dwelling Units Per Gross Acre(s)</th>
<th>Density Persons/ Gross Acre$^3$</th>
<th>Gross Acres</th>
<th>Maximum Potential Dwelling Units$^4$</th>
<th>Maximum Population</th>
<th>Anticipated Holding Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LDR- Low-Density Residential</td>
<td>1.0 to 7.9 units/acre</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>7,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDR- Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>8.0 to 19.0 units/acre</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>2,340</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>2,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC-Community Commercial</td>
<td>20.0 to 30.0 units/acre</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-Industrial</td>
<td>0 units/acre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF-Public Facilities</td>
<td>0 units/acre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Railroad</td>
<td>0 units/acre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>0 units/acre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWTP</td>
<td>0 units/acre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL (Within Sphere of Influence)</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,355</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,920</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,500</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL (Within General Plan Area)</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,020</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The maximum potential dwelling units and projected population for each General Plan land use designation is rounded to the nearest hundred. The total maximum potential dwelling units and projected population is rounded to the nearest thousand.*

---

$^3$ Population density calculated using 4.5 persons per household for residential uses, based upon 2010 Census.

$^4$ Assumed number of residents per unit: 2.14 for primary unit and 1 for second unit.

$^5$ Assumed 25% of land required for roads, parking, and landscaping.
4.4 Consistency with Other Plans

4.4.1 Difference Between “Planning Area” and “Sphere of Influence”

California Government Code § 65300 specifies that a city’s general plan shall address “any land outside its boundaries that in the planning agency’s judgment bears relation to its planning”. The area outside of the City’s current limits that bears relation to its boundaries is called the “planning area”. Both city limits and the planning area are shown on Figure 4-2. The planning area boundary extends beyond the city limits and beyond the City’s sphere of influence. The sphere of influence is determined by the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO). It is generally defined as “the probable ultimate physical boundary and service area” of the City. Since this sphere of influence is determined by LAFCO and may vary from time to time, it is not shown within the General Plan.

4.4.2 Overlap With County General Plan Land Use Element

The City’s application of land use designations to territories within the City’s planning area that are within the County’s jurisdiction is done for two purposes: (1) to communicate to the County the City’s desires for the development of land adjacent to its boundaries, and (2) to set forth the City’s intentions for the development of lands that could in the future be annexed to the City.

A comparison between the land use designation in the City’s planning area and the City’s land use designations for these same areas in the County’s General Plan Land Use Element reveal that there are a number of differences. A detailed listing or analysis of these differences is not warranted for the purposes of the City’s General Plan except in the case of lands that are designated by the County for mineral resources or are under a Williamson Act agricultural preserve contract.

State law does not require that the City’s planning area designations be consistent with the County General Plan’s land use designations. Instead, the law requires that the general plans should, according to State general plan guidelines, “include a discussion of the extent to which the general plan’s policies, standards, and proposals correspond to regional plans and the plans of adjoining communities”.

5 Circulation & Transportation Element

The Circulation and Transportation Element provides the policy framework for the regulation and development of the City’s transportation systems. California Government Code § 65302 lists this element as one of the seven mandatory elements required for a General Plan. This element focuses on the infrastructure used to transport people and goods within the City and throughout the region. The circulation element must correlate to the land use element and address major thoroughfares, transportation routes, terminals and other local public utilities and facilities.

Traditionally local transportation planning has emphasized the street and road network, which connects both the City internally and externally. Alternative transportation modes need to be pursued to address the issues of air quality, greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction, transit needs of the elderly and transportation costs for low-income residents. The City is required to comply with AB 1358, the California Complete Streets Act to plan for a balanced, multimodal transportation network that meets the needs of the users of the streets, roads, and highways for safe and convenient travel.

The City lies approximately 22 miles east of Interstate 5 and 22 miles west of Highway 99. The City has two arterial transportation corridors, Colorado Avenue and Manning Avenue. The City has a rail line that runs parallel to Colorado Avenue.

San Joaquin’s streets, sidewalks, and street parking are in good condition. The rail line divides the town, creating traffic connectivity and safety issues. The existing bike routes, public transportation, and traffic controls require improvements. To address the issues this element identifies infrastructure improvements along Colorado and Manning Avenues, implementation of a transit system, adding bicycle lanes, and improving the sidewalk network.

The following planning and policy documents relate to or implement the Circulation and Transportation Element.

City of San Joaquin Mobility and Revitalization Plan (2012). The City of San Joaquin Mobility and Revitalization Plan is a document prepared to identify a community vision, street design and circulation, and areas of growth, revitalization, and use.

Fresno County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2011. The Fresno County Regional Transportation Plan is a comprehensive assessment of all forms of transportation available in Fresno County and of needs for travel and goods movement projected into the future until the year 2035. The 2011 version of the Regional Transportation Plan is a reflection of the federal directives embodied in Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) and the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1991. The Policy Element of the RTP provides a general overview of the RTP and the Fresno County region, documents certain trends and assumptions made within the plan, and describes the regional planning process. It also sets forth the Fresno COG’s transportation goals, policies and objectives.
5.1 Circulation Systems & Transportation Programs

5.1.1 Streets and Roads

The City of San Joaquin is in the center of Fresno County's Westside, the County of Fresno is the number one County in the U.S. in agricultural production. The City of San Joaquin services the agricultural community as a trade, service and residential center. The street and road system that connects this community with the rest of the county and state serves the needs of agricultural commodity movement, farm labor, and farm services. The attractiveness of San Joaquin, with its low crime rate and moderate cost housing has its share of families who live in San Joaquin and work elsewhere. San Joaquin is one of the most affordable housing markets for single-family homes.

Functional Classification of Streets

The City of San Joaquin includes three types of streets in its functional classification of the City's roadway system: Arterials, Collectors, and Local. Outside the City limits, Manning Avenue and Colorado Avenue serve as arterials providing egress and ingress to the City. The functional classifications of the City's streets are:

**Arterials:** Arterials provide for mobility within the City, compromising the main network for traffic flow within the community. They connect the major transportation hubs of the City with each other and they connect the city with the highways and expressways that connect the community with other population centers. Their function is cross-town circulation.

Arterial streets operate at speeds between 30 and 45 miles per hour and are usually designated as four lane facilities. Maximum daily traffic capacity should be about 30,000 vehicles per day. While arterials are designed to not allow back-up driveways and indirect access, many older arterials do not meet all of the criteria.

Future arterials shall be four to six lanes divided facilities with 10-foot landscape easements.

**Collectors:** Collectors provide access and movement between residential, commercial and industrial areas. The function of collectors is to funnel traffic between local streets and arterials.

Collector streets operate at speeds between 25 and 30 miles per hour and are usually designated as two lane facilities. Maximum daily traffic capacity should be about 12,000 to 15,000 vehicles per day. While collectors are designed to not allow back-up driveways, many older collectors do allow back-up driveways.

Future collectors shall be four-lane divided facilities with 10-foot landscape easements and shall discourage vehicles backing out of residential development.

**Local:** Local streets provide direct access to abutting properties and connect with collectors and arterials. The function of local streets is to provide access from properties to the larger circulation system.
Local streets operate at a speed of 25 miles per hour and are usually designated as two lane facilities. Maximum daily traffic capacity should be about 2,000 vehicles per day.

The classification system of streets is not precise. Many older streets do not meet the City standards. Many streets serve a dual role. For clarification of how each street serves the circulation system and for funding allocation the classification of streets shown on Table 5-1 allows for a method to analyze the maintenance and expansion of the system.

### Table 5-1
City of San Joaquin’s Arterial and Collector System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manning Avenue</td>
<td>From west city limit to Placer Ave.</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Avenue</td>
<td>From Sutter Ave. to Springfield Ave.</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>From Manning Ave. to Placer Ave.</td>
<td>Collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter</td>
<td>From Colorado to Springfield Ave.</td>
<td>Collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elm Avenue</td>
<td>From Colorado Ave. to Placer Ave.</td>
<td>Collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer Avenue</td>
<td>From Elm Ave. to Colorado Ave.</td>
<td>Collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colusa Avenue</td>
<td>From Manning Ave. to Springfield Ave.</td>
<td>Collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Street</td>
<td>From Manning Ave. to California Ave.</td>
<td>Collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Avenue</td>
<td>From Elm Ave. to Placer Ave.</td>
<td>Collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield Avenue</td>
<td>From west city limit to Colorado Ave.</td>
<td>Collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Street</td>
<td>From California Ave. to Colorado Ave.</td>
<td>Collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th Street</td>
<td>From Arizona Ave. to Colorado Ave.</td>
<td>Collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Avenue</td>
<td>From Sutter Ave. to Manning Ave.</td>
<td>Collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada Avenue</td>
<td>From 5th Street to 12th Street</td>
<td>Collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Avenue</td>
<td>From Railroad Ave. to Manning Ave.</td>
<td>Collector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Level Of Service

Level of Service is one gage to evaluate the flow of traffic on any particular street as defined on Table 5-2. The arterials and collectors in the City of San Joaquin operate at levels A and B, with occasional performance at level C. San Joaquin does not face major traffic congestion problems.

### Table 5-2
Level of Service Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Operating Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Free flow of vehicles and low volumes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Stable flow moderate Volume of 50% or less of Capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Stable flow with volumes not exceeding 75%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Unstable flow with volumes of up to 90% of capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Unstable flow at street capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Forced flow and stop and go traffic, loss of capacity due to low speeds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planned Street Improvements and Studies

Planned projects are those projects that are listed in the City Budget, the Measure C Expenditure Plan, and the Regional Transportation Plan.
Financing Street Improvements

State and federal funds are limited and local funding cannot keep pace with current needs. The demand for other government services reduces the City’s ability to allocate funds to street projects. Street projects may require the combination of these revenue sources to fund needed improvements. Some funding options are listed below.

Developer Contributions: Funds provided by project proponents to avoid or mitigate project impacts.

Measure C: The local sales tax for streets.

TDA: Transportation Development Act Funds while available must be utilized for transit needs.

Gas Tax: The City receives State Gas Tax Funds.

Mitigation Fees: The City may require mitigation for new development that may fund street widening, bicycle paths, signalization and new roadway construction.

Motor Vehicle in Lieu: The City receives State Vehicle Registration Funds.

Assessment Districts: Assessment Districts financing is a common practice in the State. Property owners bear the cost of assessment districts. Cities do not impose assessment district unless there is a clear public safety issue involved and the council, with a 4/5s majority, votes for the district. A group of affected property owners can petition the city for an assessment district to fund street projects or other improvements in their area. If protest of the assessment district is raised, the proposed district can be put to a vote. Assessment district can, under certain conditions, utilize tax-exempt bonds.

ISTEA: Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) funds are requested by the City to improve its transportation facilities.

5.1.2 Goods Movement

Due to the agricultural base of the community, goods movement is an important factor to the local circulation system. To mitigate the impacts of truck traffic the following streets should be available to truck traffic (Truck Routes) while trucks on other streets should be discouraged.

- Manning Avenue,
- Placer Avenue, and
- Colorado Avenue.

The existing services provided by the Union Pacific Railroad and San Joaquin Valley Rail Company are promoted and supported. These services provide for the shipping and delivery of agricultural products and goods important to the community's economic wellbeing.

5.1.3 Public Transit

Public transit services provide transportation services to those who are not able or cannot afford private transportation. Public transit is important to a substantial segment of the community and should be monitored for its effectiveness and efficiency. Future transit opportunities including vanpools and carpools should be reviewed and taken advantage of when possible.

The City of San Joaquin is a member of the Fresno County Rural Transit Agency (FCRTA). The Joint
Powers Agency is composed of the 13 rural incorporated cities and the County of Fresno. FCRTA is responsible for overall coordination of intra-city and inter-city service for the rural public transit services. Under an inter-agency agreement with the City of San Joaquin, the FCRTA contracts with the Fresno County Economic Opportunities Commission (FCEOC) as the Rural Consolidated Transportation Service Agency (Rural CTSA). This Contract provides a publicly operated demand response wheelchair accessible transit service, Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. The Rural CTSA provides the Westside Corridor Service to Kerman and Fresno. The Westside Corridor Service is a wheelchair equipped service offered weekdays from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

5.1.4 Bicycle Facilities

The City of San Joaquin seeks funding for bicycle facilities for commuter and recreational activities. Street improvements will provide better conditions for bicyclists in the future. The City will construct Class I, Class II, Class III, and bike facilities, when feasible, to encourage multi-modal transit and create a safe and efficient network of bike lanes and shared roadways.

5.1.5 Pedestrian Facilities

Residents of the City will benefit by improved pedestrian facilities. Sidewalks and crosswalks shall be provided in new subdivisions and commercial developments. New street development shall take in to account the need for pedestrian facilities. The elderly, children and young mothers with infants benefit from a comprehensive strategy to provide sidewalks, street crossing and traffic lighting at appropriate intersections. Pedestrian improvements would enhance the CBD.

5.1.6 Transportation Control Measures (TCM)

TCMs are aimed at requiring major traffic generators to provide information and make alternative forms of transportation available to employees and/or customers. The private automobile will continue to be a vital part of the transportation system. TCMs such as rideshare, mass transit, park and ride facilities, bicycle and walking will reduce the pollution problem in the San Joaquin Valley.

5.2 Circulation Goals, Objectives, Policies, and Programs

Goal CIR 1: A transportation system that complements land uses.

Objective CIR 1.1: Place land uses with high levels of trip generation along arterials and collectors where safe vehicle access can be accommodated.

Policy CIR 1.1.1: The City shall promote retail and tourism land uses along Manning Avenue, Main Street, and Colorado Avenue.
Policy CIR 1.1.2: Require appropriate discretionary projects to perform traffic analysis that evaluate traffic impacts and implements actions that avoid or mitigate traffic impacts.

Objective CIR 1.2: Locate bus stops with shelters next to multi-family residential land uses and major activity centers.

Policy CIR 1.2.1: The City shall facilitate the implementation of bus shelters or other facilities near multi-family residential land uses and major activity centers.

Program CIR 1.2.1a: Update the Zoning Code to allow bus stops with shelters as a use by right in the appropriate zones.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Short-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Funds or Grants
Estimated City cost: Included in LU 1.1.1a.

Goal CIR 2: An environmentally sustainable and healthy transportation system.

Objective CIR 2.1: Maintain pedestrian, bicycle, and automobile system in compliance with Complete Street Guidelines.

Policy CIR 2.1.1: The City shall implement complete streets guidelines.

Program CIR 2.1.1a: Adopt complete streets guidelines that addresses pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, traffic calming, and street beautification.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $100,000

Objective CIR 2.2: Maintain a citywide bikeway network linking residential neighborhoods with the Central Business District.

Policy CIR 2.2.1: The City encourages bicycle use as a transportation alternative to reduce automobile use and pollution.

Policy CIR 2.2.2: The City requires bicycle path and bicycle lane development within the City.

Program CIR 2.2.2a: Establish a class II bicycle lane on Colorado Avenue from Elm Street to Manning Avenue.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $500,000

Program CIR 2.2.2b: Update the zoning code to require new development to construct and/or fund the projects share of new bike lanes.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Short-Term Planning Period
Objective CIR 2.3: Encourage bicycling by providing sufficient bicycle parking facilities.

Policy CIR 2.3.1: Bicycle parking shall be provided at 5% of total automobile parking spaces within High Density Residential, Commercial, and Industrial land uses.

Program CIR 2.3.1a: Update the Zoning Code to require bicycle parking within high density residential, commercial and industrial land uses.

Program CIR 2.3.1b: The City shall investigate and apply for state and federal funding for bicycle parking for high density residential, commercial, and industrial uses.

Program CIR 2.3.1c: Construct bicycle parking for high density residential, commercial, and industrial uses.

Objective CIR 2.4: Provide bicycle access throughout the City.

Policy CIR 2.4.1: The City shall develop a complete bike path system to provide access to major centers in the City.

Program CIR 2.4.1a: Construct a complete bike path system to provide access to major centers in the City.

Objective CIR 2.5: Provide an accessible and safe pedestrian system of sidewalks, crosswalks, and trails.
Policy CIR 2.5.1: The City shall maintain a continuous network of sidewalks, crosswalks, and trails throughout the City.

Program CIR 2.5.1a: The City shall investigate and apply for state and federal funding for expanding and maintaining the City’s network of sidewalks, crosswalks, and trails.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Short-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $10,000

Program CIR 2.5.1b: Improve sidewalks that are in poor quality and repair damaged sidewalks when feasible.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Funds or Grants
Estimated City cost: $500,000

Program CIR 2.5.1c: Install ADA required facilities for pedestrians and wheelchairs at intersections when feasible.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $500,000

Program CIR 2.5.1d: Work with Caltrans to install crosswalks at intersections crossing Main Street in the Central Business District.

Responsibility: City Council, Caltrans
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $15,000 annually

Policy CIR 2.5.2: In designing new streets, consideration shall be given to traffic calming tools, such as bulb-outs at intersections, strategically placed roundabouts, and textured cross walks, among others.

Policy CIR 2.5.3: These principals shall be applied to new commercial and multifamily development:

- Avoid large expanses of parking lot.
- Parking areas should be screened with smaller buildings set forward toward the street
- Create pedestrian plazas and walkways.
- Use trellises and/or shade trees along walkways and in parking lots.
- Provide direct pedestrian connections with adjacent commercial areas and residential neighborhoods.
Policy CIR 2.5.4: Require Planter strips on new residential streets of a sufficient width to allow for street trees between the curb and the sidewalk.

Policy CIR 2.5.5: The City encourages new residential subdivisions to be laid out in grid or modified grid pattern to create direct routes to surrounding development and limit long loop roads and cul-de-sacs.

Objective CIR 2.6: The reduction of VMT, GHGs, and criteria air pollutants to achieve air quality standards.

Policy CIR 2.6.1: The City encourages alternatives to the use of the automobile including:
- Walking
- Ride Share
- Park-and-ride lots
- Bicycling
- Mass Transit
- Trip reduction programs
- Telecommunications

Policy CIR 2.6.2: The City shall integrate technologies into street design that reduce energy consumption.

Policy CIR 2.6.3: The City shall collaborate with the private sector, regional, state, and federal agencies to reduce vehicular travel and meet air quality standards.

Policy CIR 2.6.4: The City shall implement the TCM programs relevant to the City of San Joaquin developed by the SJVUAPCD.

Policy CIR 2.6.5: The City encourages measures to increase the capacity of the existing road network prior to constructing more capacity. Measures may include street widening, pedestrian improvements, bicycle facilities, and transit improvements.

Policy CIR 2.6.6: Maintain transportation models and surveys to accurately reflect the use of modes of transportation.

Policy CIR 2.6.7: Reductions in vehicle-miles traveled (VMT) are a high-priority criterion in the evaluation of policies, programs, and project alternatives.

Policy CIR 2.6.8: Transportation planning procedures shall consider demand management solutions equally with strategies to increase capacity.

Policy CIR 2.6.9: In the evaluation of transportation solutions consider significant costs and benefits, including non-market or indirect impacts, such as improving mobility options, reducing air pollution, reducing GHG emissions and health benefits achieved with reduced emissions.

Policy CIR 2.6.10: Reduce GHG emissions from municipal fleet operations by purchasing or leasing high MPG, low carbon fuel (compressed natural gas [CNG]/biodiesel), hybrid or all-electric vehicles, and/or by using an external car sharing program in lieu of city/county fleet and encouraging walking and bicycling.

Policy CIR 2.6.11: Encourage and facilitate the development of car-sharing and related programs.
Policy CIR 2.6.12: Use street design improvements, such as visual narrowing techniques, to reduce speeding and increase pedestrian and bicyclist safety instead of adding speed bumps and other retrogressive elements.

Objective CIR 2.7: Develop a compact and pedestrian friendly built environment.

Policy CIR 2.7.1: The City shall prioritize infill development in the CBD.

Policy CIR 2.7.2: The City supports the development of vacant lots along Main Street.

Policy CIR 2.7.3: The City supports mixed-use developments providing street-level businesses that encourage walking.

Policy CIR 2.7.4: The City supports the development of short, walkable blocks with increased landscaping and reduced parking when feasible to allow for additional green space.

Policy CIR 2.7.5: The maximum block length is 400 feet.

Goal CIR 3: An accessible and affordable transportation system.

Objective CIR 3.1: The City supports a transportation program for low-income residents, youth, and the elderly.

Policy CIR 3.1.1: The City encourages equitable access to transit.

Policy CIR 3.1.2: The City encourages the maintenance of a dial-a-ride service to ensure accessibility for handicapped and special needs individuals.

Objective CIR 3.2: Maintain a fixed route bus system to serve San Joaquin and provide access to surrounding cities.

Policy CIR 3.2.1: The City shall pursue funding sources for operating fixed bus routes.

Program CIR 3.2.1a: The City shall investigate and apply for state and federal funding for fixed bus route operation.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Short-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $10,000

Objective CIR 3.3: Maintain carpool and vanpool programs that serve the residents and businesses of the City of San Joaquin.

Policy CIR 3.3.1: The City encourages carpool and vanpool programs.

Program CIR 3.3.1a: Facilitate the provision of vanpool services for farm workers commuting to and from Fresno in the short-term planning period.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $15,000

Objective CIR 3.4: The City supports regional efforts to implement improved bus service that encourages residents to utilize public transportation and rideshare services and decreases dependency on single-occupancy vehicles.
Goal CIR 4: An efficient transportation system.

Objective CIR 4.1: Maintain Level of Service D or better on roadways during non-peak traffic hours.

Objective CIR 4.2: Limit truck traffic to appropriate thoroughfares.

Policy CIR 4.2.1: Truck traffic will be directed to Colorado, Placer and Manning Avenues.

Program CIR 4.2.1a: Install signage that route trucks along Colorado, Placer and Manning Avenues.

Responsibility: City Council

Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period

Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions

Estimated City cost: $15,000

Policy CIR 4.2.2: Use traffic calming methods in residential neighborhoods to reduce cut-through traffic.

Program CIR 4.2.2a: Seek funding for the implementation of traffic calming on Elm Avenue and California Avenue.

Responsibility: City Council

Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period

Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions

Estimated City cost: $100,000

Objective CIR 4.3: The City will update its street design as necessary.

Policy CIR 4.3.1: The City shall plan and design streets utilizing effective and appropriate procedures that integrate pedestrian and bicycle facilities into transportation projects, providing alternatives to the use of the automobile.

Program CIR 4.3.1a Update the City’s street standards incorporating, as feasible, the following:

1. Implement California Complete Streets standards designed to accommodate multiple modes of mobility, increase pedestrian and bike safety, and improve aesthetics.

2. Implement street design standards that calm or slow motor vehicles through the design of the street section rather than retrofitting the street after construction. Refer to the draft CNU/ITE Street Design Manual created by the Institute for Transportation Engineers with support from the Federal Highway Administration and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

assessing how well an urban street serves the needs of all
of its users
(http://www.trb.org/Main/Blurbs/160228.aspx).
4. Implement separate LOS tables for transit, bicycles, and
pedestrians for use at multi-modal streets that measure
quantitative and qualitative metrics such as accessibility,
intersection crossing times, and other relevant and
contextual data. Determine appropriate LOS for each
mode, and develop context-sensitive LOS targets for
multiple circulation modes.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $50,000

Policy CIR 4.3.2: The City will integrate new technologies into street design were feasible
and cost effective.

Policy CIR 4.3.3: The City will integrate landscape design where feasible and cost
effective and the developer shall provide landscape maintenance
stratagems.

Policy CIR 4.3.4: The City will insure that new development pays a fair share contribution
to the upgrade and expansion of the circulation system.

Policy CIR 4.3.5: The City shall require new commercial, high density residential, and
industrial development to provide adequate parking through on-site
parking, off-site parking and joint efforts with the city and other
commercial projects.

Objective CIR 4.4: The City shall maintain its transportation Capital Improvement Plan.

Policy CIR 4.4.1: The City gives priority to upgrades of those streets where traffic volumes
are high, joint funding is available, private or assessment district funds
are available or public safety is a factor.

Policy CIR 4.4.2: Improvement of arterials and collectors will focus on solutions that are
low cost as opposed to a major capital outlay.

Policy CIR 4.4.3: Access from residential development onto arterials and collectors should
be avoided when feasible.

Policy CIR 4.4.4: To encourage walkability, designs shall de-emphasize the use of block
walls where they create barriers to pedestrian access. Where block walls
are required for residential development for noise control or other
purposes, direct pedestrian and bicycle entry to the major street is
couraged to allow access to sidewalks, bike lanes, schools, and parks.
Such “breaks in the wall” should be located every 300 to 400 feet along
the major street.

Goal CIR 5: A safe transportation system.

Objective CIR 5.1: Maintain a low number of accidents per capita on roadways.
Policy CIR 5.1.1: The City shall install and maintain signs along Manning Avenue that caution drivers about passing slow moving farm vehicles.

Policy CIR 5.1.2: The City shall pursue safety improvements as appropriate.

Program CIR 5.1.2a: The City shall pursue funding to add crossing guards to railroad crossings in the City.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $5,000

Program CIR 5.1.2b: The City shall construct crossing guards at railroad crossing in the City.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $750,000

Program CIR 5.1.2c: The City shall pursue the funding and realignment of Elm Street, including traffic calming components.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $5,000

Program CIR 5.1.2d: The City shall realign Elm Street and construct traffic calming components.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $750,000

Program CIR 5.1.2e: The City shall pursue funding to add a roundabout at Manning Avenue, 9th Street, and Pine Avenue.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $5,000
Program CIR 5.1.2f: The City shall add a roundabout at Manning Avenue, 9th Street, and Pine Avenue.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $350,000

Objective CIR 5.2: Provide a safe environment for cyclists and pedestrians.

Policy CIR 5.2.1: The City shall maintain signs that promote road sharing with cyclists and pedestrians.

Program CIR 5.2.1a: Install and maintain signs near the CBD and schools that slow traffic and inform drivers of pedestrians.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $50,000

Goal CIR 6 The City will provide a transportation system that serves the agricultural, industrial, and business needs of the City.

Objective CIR 6.1: The City will maintain the flow of goods and services within and outside the City.

Policy CIR 6.1.1: The City promotes the continued freight service on the Union Pacific rail line.
7 Conservation Element

7.1 Introduction

The City of San Joaquin is situated in the middle of one of the most bountiful agricultural valleys in the world. A key to San Joaquin's economic well-being and quality of life is the health and viability of the surrounding agricultural lands. An important issue that the City of San Joaquin has addressed throughout the General Plan is respect for the interaction between urban growth issues and agricultural resource protection.

Conservation is the planned management, preservation, and wise use of natural resources within the City and for areas adjacent to the City. The Conservation Element of the General Plan provides direction regarding the conservation, development, and utilization of natural resources within a community and surrounding area (Office of Planning Research [OPR], 2003). The City has focused on the conservation element, in order to become a model sustainable city in the San Joaquin Valley. For this reason, the Conservation Element includes traditional required and innovative non-required sections.

This element addresses the following aspects of conservation: biological resources, water conservation, energy conservation, green building, air quality, and greenhouse gases.

The following planning and policy documents relate to or implement the Conservation Element.

**City of San Joaquin Water Conservation Strategy (2009).** The City of San Joaquin Water Conservation Strategy was developed to ensure the City's compliance with funding requirements from the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for its wastewater treatment expansion project. This strategy includes a plan of actions that will result in measurable water savings for the City. Goals of the Strategy are to install water meters on all service accounts by 2020. Measures to achieve these goals include water meter installation, implementation of a watering schedule, classroom education, and installation of low-flow fixtures (faucets/toilets/showers).

Water conserving fixtures should meet EPA Water Sense and/or Smart Water Application Technologies (SWAT) guidelines. Products bearing the Water Sense label are at least 20% more efficient than average products in that category, provide measureable water savings, and achieve water efficiency through several technological options. SWAT is a coalition of water purveyors, equipment manufacturers, and irrigation practitioners that have developed a rating system to measure the efficiency of various water fixtures. If a product is not part of the EPA Water Sense system, then the City should use the SWAT ratings to determine what water-conserving fixture to install.

**City of San Joaquin Model Energy Efficiency Plan for Rural Housing (2013).** The City of San Joaquin Model Energy Efficiency Plan for Rural Housing was prepared to create a resource efficient and conserving affordable rural housing plan on a 19-lot site in the City, develop design guidelines for energy and water efficiency and conservation for buildings, sites, and streets, integrate these features within new and existing homes, and identify financing options for incorporating resource efficient and conserving measures into homes. Section 3 of the Final Report provides the City with detailed recommendations for integrating resource conserving and efficient design guidelines and/or standards for new construction and existing housing into the most relevant sections of the City’s Municipal Code.

**Groundwater Management Plan (2010).** The Groundwater Management Plan (GMP) was prepared for
the James Irrigation District and City of San Joaquin to better coordinate efforts, share data, and improve
regional management of groundwater resources. The purpose of the GMP is to develop consensus among
agency staff and stakeholders on groundwater condition, management, and problem-solving, develop
practical solutions for addressing issues, including overdraft, improve communications, document goals
and objectives for sustaining and improving groundwater, and provide feasible implementation.

7.1.1 Biological Resources

Lands within the City are in active agricultural production and urban use; therefore, natural plant and
animal life is minimal. The areas not converted to urban uses consist largely of non-native plant species
and grassland habitats.

7.1.2 Water Conservation

The importance of water conservation in California is essential to sustainability, particularly in the
Central Valley. Much of the economy in the Valley is attributed to water availability for agriculture. San
Joaquin, nestled in the heart of prime agricultural land, understands the importance of reducing water
consumption to protect valuable water supplies for urban and agricultural uses. The City understands the
water-energy nexus, or the connection between water use and energy use. When the City reduces water
consumption, the energy required to pump, treat, and deliver water in the City is reduced. By
implementing water conservation goals, objectives, and policies, the City can prioritize water
conservation projects that make them a model city for water conservation.

7.1.3 Energy Conservation

The Energy Conservation section of this Conservation Element aims to achieve energy consumption
within the City below 2013 building standards. This element includes actions that decrease consumption
of energy, reduce dependence on non-renewable energy sources and reduce greenhouse gas (GHG)
emissions.

7.1.4 Green Building

Buildings and the process of building require large amounts of energy and emit GHG emissions. The
Green Building section seeks to reduce the amount of resources used and reduce the amount of GHGs
emitted during construction and operation of facilities in the City.

7.1.5 Air Quality

The City is located in the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin, regulated by the San Joaquin Valley Air District.
Air quality issues relevant to the City include vehicle emissions, construction activity emissions, fugitive
dust, and odors. Goals, objectives, policies and implementation programs are established to keep criteria
air pollutant emissions low, reduce GHG emissions, and protect the health and safety of the residents of
San Joaquin.

7.2 Conservation Goals, Objectives, Policies, and Programs

Goal CON 1: A biodiversified community.

Objective CON 1.1: Maintain endangered, special-status species, wetlands, and waters of the United
States through appropriate mitigation measures.
Policy CON 1.1.1: The City shall require a biological survey be prepared by a qualified biologist for proposed development areas that may contain endangered, special-status species, wetlands, and waters of the United States.

Program CON 1.1.1a: Provide map and survey result updates to the California Natural Diversity Data Base (http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cnddb/), wetlands mapping and mapping of the Waters of the U.S. as information becomes available through studies and project review.

Responsibility: City staff
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: Development funds
Estimated City cost: None

Policy CON 1.1.2: Coordinate with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and other appropriate agencies to protect endangered or special-status species including their habitats, migration corridors, and nesting areas.

Program CON 1.1.2a In the event that endangered or special-status species are identified within the City, the developer shall implement mitigation to maintain the species including their habitats, migration corridors, and nesting areas.

Responsibility: City staff
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: Developer funds
Estimated City cost: None

Objective CON 1.2: Maintain existing trees within development projects, and where preservation is not feasible, require mitigation for the loss of removed trees.

Policy CON 1.2.1: The City shall require development projects to preserve trees when feasible.

Program CON 1.2.1a: Maintain a program to plant trees within the City.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $25,000

Objective CON 1.3: Preserve and enhance natural resources.

Policy CON 1.3.1: Native and drought tolerant plants shall be used when feasible in public and private landscaping to conserve water.

Program CON 1.3.1a: Development shall use native plants or other appropriate non-invasive, drought-tolerant plants wherever feasible to reduce maintenance and irrigation costs.

Responsibility: City staff
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: Development fees
Estimated City cost: None

Program CON 1.3.1b: Maintain a list of native, drought-tolerant, and non-invasive plants appropriate for use within the City.
Responsibility: City staff
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $5,000

Goal CON 2: Be a model city for water conservation in California’s Central Valley.

Objective CON 2.1: Maintain a level of water use per capita in the City that is below the water use recorded in 2010.
Policy CON 2.1.1: The City shall implement the City of San Joaquin Water Conservation Strategy.
Program CON 2.1.1a: Update the Water Conservation Strategy every five years.
Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Short-Term Planning Period
Funding: Grants, Water Fund
Estimated City cost: $25,000

Program CON 2.1.1b: Implement the Water Conservation Strategy implementation measures (water meters, low-flow showerheads, faucets, toilets, smart irrigation controls, efficient sprinkler heads and developing watering schedules for commercial and industrial properties and classroom education).
Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions, Water Fund
Estimated City cost: $1,700,000

Program CON 2.1.1c: Develop water efficiency standards for water use in the City and for the City to meet established targets.
Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions, Water Funds
Estimated City cost: $50,000

Program CON 2.1.1d: Locate and pursue funding sources for water conservation infrastructure and programs that promote conservation.
Responsibility: City staff
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions, Water Funds
Estimated City cost: $5,000
Program CON 2.1.1e: Monitor water use and energy consumption to measure the results of conservation programs.

Responsibility: City staff
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions, Water Funds
Estimated City cost: $10,000


Policy CON 2.2.1: The City shall manage its water supply, distribution infrastructure, and regulations in a way that maximizes water conservation.

Program CON 2.2.1a: Complete water audits of distribution systems using methodology consistent with that described in American Water Works Associations Water Audit and Leak Detection Guidebook, including annual prescreening and assessment of full-scale audit needs.

Responsibility: City staff
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions, Water Funds
Estimated City cost: $10,000

Program CON 2.2.1b: Public works will oversee water conservation programs in the City.

Responsibility: City staff
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Funds, Water Fund
Estimated City cost: $5,000

Policy CON 2.2.2: Promote the use of laundry to landscape greywater systems.

Policy CON 2.2.3: The City shall meter residential, commercial, and industrial water use as required by California Water Code (§525b).

Program CON 2.2.3a: The City shall install smart water meters on connections to the water distribution system, both new and existing.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions, Water Funds
Estimated City cost: Included in Con 2.1.1b
Program CON 2.2.3b: The City shall adopt commodity rates (by volume of use) for new connections and retrofit of existing connections.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions, Water Funds
Estimated City cost: $50,000

Policy CON 2.2.4: The City shall provide water conservation information, incentives, and assistance to residential and commercial users.

Program CON 2.2.4a: Provide water customers with support and incentives to improve their landscape water use efficiency.

Responsibility: City staff
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions, Water Funds
Estimated City cost: $10,000

Program CON 2.2.4b: Proactively notify customers whenever it appears possible that leaks exist on the customer's side of the meter.

Responsibility: City staff
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions, Water Funds
Estimated City cost: $10,000

Policy CON 2.2.5: The City shall encourage the adoption of efficient water appliances in City residences, businesses, and public facilities as required by state building regulations and codes.

Policy CON 2.2.6: Encourage the purchase and/or installation of ultra-low-flush (1.6 gallons or less) toilets in new and existing single-family and multi-family residences.

Policy CON 2.2.7: Encourage the purchase and/or installation of low-flow faucet and showerheads in new and existing residences.

Policy CON 2.2.8: The City shall continue to conform to the Department of Water Resource’s (DWR) Model Landscape Water Use Ordinance and adopt more stringent outdoor water use policies where feasible.

Policy CON 2.2.9: Implement and enforce DWR Model Landscape Water Use Ordinance.

Program CON 2.2.9a: Research methods for outdoor water conservation not included in DWR’s model landscape water use ordinance that can feasibly be implemented.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions, Water Funds
Estimated City cost: $50,000
Program CON 2.2.9b: The City may expand programs that enhance groundwater recharge in order to maintain the groundwater supply, including:

- Utilize existing storm water basins for recharge and install new percolation ponds in new growth areas.
- Protect areas of groundwater recharge from land uses and disposal methods that would degrade groundwater quality.
- Promote activities that combine stormwater control and water recharge.
- Continue and expand water conservation programs.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions, Water Funds
Estimated City cost: $100,000

Goal CON 3: Ensure groundwater quality through monitoring, protection, and enhancement.

Objective CON 3.1: Monitor groundwater quality.

Policy CON 3.1.1: The City shall maintain its systematic mechanism that collects data and shares and receives information on the state of its groundwater supply.

Program CON 3.1.1a: Participate in programs that gather groundwater quality data in coordination with James Irrigation District.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions, Water Funds
Estimated City cost: $25,000

Program CON 3.1.1b: Maintain the elements of the Joint Groundwater Management Plan (2010) with the on-going groundwater monitoring and information sharing.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Funds, Grants, and Water Fund
Estimated City cost: $30,000

Objective CON 3.2: Preserve and enhance groundwater quality.

Policy CON 3.2.1: The City shall collaborate with other local and regional agencies and municipalities to develop and implement programs that protect and enhance local and regional groundwater quality.
Program CON 3.2.1a: Collaborate with regional water agencies to share information as outlined in the Upper Kings Basin Integrated Regional Water Management Plan.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, Developer Contributions, and Water Fund
Estimated City cost: $5,000 annually

Program CON 3.2.1b: Work with the James Irrigation District to review available water quality data to identify areas with the potential for saline water intrusion and ways to protect those areas through saline reduction programs.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, Developer Contributions, and Water Fund
Estimated City cost: $5,000

Program CON 3.2.1c: Work with regional agencies and municipalities to target non-point source pollution and vulnerable recharge areas and develop programs to reduce the impacts of these pollution sources region-wide.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, Developer Contributions, and Water Fund
Estimated City cost: $5,000

Policy CON 3.2.2: The City shall implement programs as feasible to protect local groundwater quality.

Policy CON 3.2.3: Encourage local growers to incorporate proper wellhead protection into all new wells, and retrofit old wells with proper wellhead protection.

Policy CON 3.2.4: As appropriate locate recharge basins next to areas with water quality problems to blend water supplies and create a hydraulic barrier to impede movement of contaminant plumes.

Goal CON 4: Be an energy conservation leader in the Central Valley.

Objective CON 4.1: Increase the amount of distributed generation and renewable energy.

Policy CON 4.1.1: The City shall permit installation of solar panels on all roofs.

Program CON 4.1.1a: Amend development code to allow solar panels.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Short-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, Developer Contributions, and Water Fund
Estimated City cost: Included in LU 1.1.1a
Policy CON 4.1.2: Encourage development review and entitlement to prefer energy generation over aesthetics.

Policy CON 4.1.3: The City shall pursue local generation of 35% of its total City energy demand.

Program CON 4.1.3a: Work with energy providers to install solar generation facilities.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, Developer Contributions, and Water Fund
Estimated City cost: $5,000

Program CON 4.1.3b: The City shall conduct an analysis to identify opportunities for increased distributed energy generation in the City.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, Developer Contributions, and Water Fund
Estimated City cost: $25,000

Policy CON 4.1.4: The City shall pursue funding for the installation of solar panels in new and existing buildings.

Program CON 4.1.4a: Seek funds from federal, state, utilities, and private sources for the installation of solar panels on new and existing buildings.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, Developer Contributions, and Water Fund
Estimated City cost: $5,000

Objective CON 4.2: Decrease energy consumption in new and existing buildings.

Policy CON 4.2.1: The City shall encourage development that reduces the amount of per-capita energy consumption by 10% from the 2013 Building Standards.

Program CON 4.2.1a: Streamline the entitlement process for buildings with proper solar orientation for solar photovoltaic and solar hot water systems (where one axis of the building is at least 1.5 times longer than the other, and the longer axis is within 15 degrees of geographical east-west).

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Short-Term Planning Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, Developer Contributions, and Water Fund
Estimated City cost: Included in LU 1.1.1a
Program CON 4.2.1b: Participate in PG&E’s Local Government Partnership program or other rate-payer funded programs like a Regional Energy Network (REN) if and when a Fresno REND or other similar program is established.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, Developer Contributions, and Water Fund
Estimated City cost: $5,000

Objective CON 4.3: Encourage opportunities to procure renewable energy above and beyond utility procured renewable power.

Objective CON 4.4: Construct net zero carbon footprint buildings.

Policy CON 4.4.1: The City shall be an example to the region by encouraging the building of energy efficient and resource conserving buildings.

Policy CON 4.4.2: The City shall encourage the building of at least one building that meets green building standards, i.e. LEED.

Policy CON 4.4.3: The City will encourage at least 50% of new buildings and existing structure that undergo major renovations be net zero in line with Executive Order B-18-12. The City aims to reduce energy consumption in existing buildings.

Objective CON 4.5: Encourage the use of energy conservation features and alternative fuel for existing and new residential and commercial uses.

Policy CON 4.5.1: The City shall work with the energy providers and developers on voluntary programs to encourage the use of energy efficient designs and equipment.

Program CON 4.5.1a: Identify opportunities to increase energy efficiency of public buildings and increase distributed generation utilizing existing state-wide energy efficiency funding sources and programs like Energy Upgrade California, utility rebates and incentives, and Local Government Partnerships to increase building efficiency, reduce energy consumption, and increase on site renewable energy production.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Short-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $5,000 annually

Program CON 4.5.1b: Develop an energy management system for public buildings.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $35,000
**Policy CON 4.5.2:** Assist project applicants to identify energy and resource conserving alternatives and opportunities to fund those efforts.

**Policy CON 4.5.3:** Assist project applicants with rebate applications and filing processes for retrofit installations.

**Goal CON 5:** A community protected from air pollutants.

**Objective Con 5.1** The City will address air quality issues through CEQA analysis and by working with responsible agencies.

**Policy Con 5.1.1** The City shall determine project air quality impacts and implement appropriate mitigation for significant environmental impacts during CEQA review.

**Policy Con 5.1.2** The City shall encourage local and private groups to provide air quality education programs.

**Policy CON 5.1.3:** The City shall submit project CEQA documentation to the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District for CEQA comments and review of the air quality analysis.

**Policy CON 5.1.4:** The City shall require development projects to meet the City’s future Climate Action Plan goals.

**Objective CON 5.2:** The City shall coordinate local air quality programs with regional programs.

**Policy CON 5.2.1:** The City shall work with neighboring jurisdictions and affected agencies to address cross-jurisdictional and regional transportation and air quality issues.

**Objective CON 5.3:** Integrate land use planning, transportation planning, and air quality planning to make the most efficient use of public resources and to maintain a healthy environment.

**Policy CON 5.3.1:** The City shall work with Caltrans and the Regional Transportation Planning Agency to minimize air quality, mobility, and social impacts of large scale transportation projects on existing neighborhood.

**Program CON 5.3.1a:** Coordinate land use and transportation plans to meet federal, state, and local air quality requirements.

**Responsibility:** City Council

**Timeframe:** Ongoing Program

**Funding:** General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions

**Estimated City cost:** $5,000

**Program CON 5.3.1b:** Develop a multi-modal transportation system when feasible.

**Responsibility:** City Council

**Timeframe:** Long-Term Planning Period

**Funding:** General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions

**Estimated City cost:** $5,000,000
Objective CON 5.4: Site industrial development to minimize the health risks resulting from industrial toxic or hazardous air pollutant emissions.

Policy CON 5.4.1: Industrial development projects shall be located an adequate distance from sensitive receptors to minimize health risks from toxic air pollutants.

Policy CON 5.4.2: The City shall require residential development projects and projects categorized as sensitive receptors to be located an adequate distance from existing and potential sources of toxic emissions such as freeways, major arterials, and industrial sites.

Objective CON 5.5: Reduce particulate emissions from sources under the jurisdiction of the City.

Policy CON 5.5.1: The City shall work with the Air Quality District to reduce particulate emissions from construction, grading, excavation, and demolition to the extent feasible.

Policy CON 5.5.2: Include particulate matter control measures as conditions of approval for subdivision maps, site plans, and grading permits.

Goal CON 6: A community with a strong tradition of conserving adjacent agricultural land.

Objective CON 6.1: Protect agricultural land outside the City Planning Area from unnecessary development.

Policy CON 6.1.1: The City shall promote growth in a compact form.

Policy CON 6.1.2: Encourage developers to take advantage of the maximum densities allowed in the General Plan.

Policy CON 6.1.3: Encourage farmland preservation by mitigating the loss of prime farmland.

Policy CON 6.1.4: First priority is given to development of vacant, underdeveloped, and/or redevelopable land where urban services are or can be made available.

Policy CON 6.1.5: Ensure that land conversion to urban uses is based on preservation of agricultural lands, protecting the City from leapfrog development, and delays development until urban development is needed.

Policy CON 6.1.6: The protection of agricultural lands from premature conversion to urban use will be reinforced by the City monitoring and reviewing extension of sewer and water lines.

Policy CON 6.1.7: The City may provide incentives to encourage the planting and cultivation of both public and private gardens used for local food production.

Objective CON 6.2: The City shall avoid leapfrog developments.

Policy CON 6.2.1: The City shall work with Fresno County to ensure willing landowners outside the Planning Area are given Williamson Act Contracts in order to create a virtual growth boundary.

Objective CON 6.3: Promote responsible and sustainable agriculture.

Policy CON 6.3.1: The City supports the Right to Farm.
Program CON 6.3.1a: Adopt a Right to Farm Ordinance that includes buffers to support agricultural uses of agricultural lands adjacent to urban uses.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $35,000

Goal CON 7: A model city for greenhouse gas emissions.

Objective CON 7.1: Develop a Climate Action Plan (CAP) and set emissions-reduction goals consistent with AB 32.

Program CON 7.1.1a: Adopt a Climate Action Plan (CAP).

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Short-Term Planning Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $75,000

Program CON 7.1.1b: Seek funds to develop and implement a CAP.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Short-Term Planning Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $5,000
8 Open Space Element

The Open Space Element is a mandatory element, defined by Government Code § 65302(e). Open space is defined by the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) in the Community Plan Guidelines (2003) as land that can be utilized “for the preservation of natural resources”, “for the managed production of resources”, “for outdoor recreation”, and “for public health and safety”. San Joaquin currently has two types of open space: agricultural land outside of the urbanized area and park space/recreational facilities within the urbanized area.

The Open Space Element contains goals and objectives that reflect the community’s desires for open space, and policies and implementation programs that provide implementation strategies. A primary concern of residents is increasing the amount of park and recreational space available to meet community needs. This Element addresses these concerns and provides a guide for the development and management of open space facilities as the City grows.

The following planning and policy documents relate to or implement the Open Space Element.

City of San Joaquin Mobility and Revitalization Plan (2012). The City of San Joaquin Mobility and Revitalization Plan is a document prepared to identify a community vision, street design and circulation, and areas of growth, revitalization, and use, including park space.

8.1 Open Space

Open Space land is any parcel or area of land devoted to the following uses:

I. Open space for the preservation of natural resources, which includes wildlife habitat, areas for ecological and other scientific study purposes. The only notable feature of particular significance to the City is its relatively close proximity to the Fresno Slough. The Slough is a haven for ducks and pheasants. There are no other notable natural features within the City boundaries. However, agricultural vegetation is very important to the local landscape. The use of ornamental trees and shrubs are important fundamental parts of the urban landscape, providing shade and scenic accent and color.

II. Open space for the managed production of resources. For the City of San Joaquin, issues that are important in this category include food and fiber open space and areas required for ground water recharge. These issues are key in the planning area of this General Plan. The Status and Policies in this category are discussed throughout the Plan. The economic and social interests of the community are tied to the proper management of agricultural resources.

III. Open space for outdoor recreation includes areas suited for park and recreational purposes; areas that have scenic, historic and cultural values and areas that provide links between major recreational areas, such as bike trails, pedestrian and hiking trails and waterways.

IV. Open space for public health and welfare includes such issues as protecting water and air quality, the disposal of waste and protection of developed lands in the community from flooding.
8.2 Recreation

The City of San Joaquin owns and operates a number of recreational facilities as described in Section 2.2.9 Recreation Facilities.

8.2.1 Park and Recreation Standards

The recreational facility standards are based on recommended standards from the League of California Cities and the National Recreation and Park Association. Park types and acreage may reflect the mix and numbers of age groups, not just overall population, since those in the 3 to 18 year bracket tend to use facilities at more than twice the population above this group and close to 50% of the City’s population 18 years old or younger. The City may exceed the park standards to promote recreational activities, walking, and biking to reduce instances of obesity and reduce unhealthy air emissions.

Playlots

The playlot is a small area intended for children up to 0 or 5 years of age. It is essentially a substitute for the backyard and thus, normally provided in high-density area, such as apartments. Playlots are expensive to maintain and difficult to administer. Playlots serve an important function in urban recreation. The size of a playlot ranges between 2,500 square feet to 1 acre. A playlot may include play apparatus, a paved area for wheeled toys, benches, sand areas, a small wading or spray pool, and landscaping. Playlots should be located within a block, or near the center of, a higher density housing development. Children should not be required to cross a major arterial street to reach a playlot.

Mini-Parks

Mini-parks may serve children, seniors, or groups, depending on the needs in the neighborhood. The size and location are determined by the availability of land than any other factor. Mini-parks may feature children's play areas, skate parks, quiet game areas, landscaping, and some sports facilities such as multi-purpose courts if space allows. The typical size of a mini-park is one to three acres.

The mini-park offers other valuable effects. By using vacant lots and removing dilapidated structures, mini-parks can remove eyesores and hazards from the city. Additional visual quality can be afforded by providing a bright focal point for the neighborhood.

These sites are generally the most expensive to acquire, develop, and maintain in comparison with parks of a larger variety. Detailed development in small units, plus heavy maintenance due to intensive use, makes mini-parks expensive. Mini-parks will not meet the needs of an entire neighborhood.

Neighborhood Parks

A neighborhood park is usually defined as a general use park area of five to 20 acres developed to serve the recreation needs of a particular neighborhood within a community. Neighborhood parks seldom, if ever, include specialized amenities such as swimming pools, gymnasiums, etc., which would attract participation from outside the immediate neighborhood. The location and size of a neighborhood park involve three principal factors:
1. Neighborhood population,
2. Service area, and
3. Major physical boundaries.

The size of the park depends upon the population that resides within the service area of the park. The formula calls for a maximum service radius of one-half mile, which puts the park within a reasonable walking distance of potential park patrons. The population density within the park service area best determines the desirable size of the park. It is generally accepted that in an urban or semi-urban setting, at least 1,000 persons will reside within a one-half to one square mile area, if the area is considered a neighborhood unit. The extent of amenities for neighborhood parks also has a direct bearing on the size and character of the neighborhood park. The amenities recommended by national standards are intended to provide a park that will have an adequate scope of facilities to provide for recreation interests.

Typical Amenities include:

1. Children’s creative play area,
2. Group picnic area,
3. Multiple use game courts,
4. Lighting for night use and protection,
5. Off-street parking as needed,
6. Special court areas,
7. Open turf areas,
8. Individual picnic sites,

A recreation area of less than three acres in size is typically classified as a mini-park, pocket park or strip park. These parks are sometimes mistakenly referred to as neighborhood parks by lay people. The recommended national standard for neighborhood parks is 2.5 acres per 1,000 residents with a desirable size being five to 20 acres.

Community Parks

Community parks are leisure facilities planned to serve the recreational needs of many neighborhood areas. This type of facility is usually 20 to 50 acres in size and attracts drive-to clientele in contrast to the walk-to and bike-to characteristics of the neighborhood park.

These larger sites should, if possible, adjoin junior and senior high schools. They also encompass the activities formerly included in the "playfield." While the neighborhood sites should be designed to attract and serve entire neighborhood populations, the recreation facilities needed require more space than the neighborhood sites should accommodate. Other facilities may include a tennis complex, swimming pool, multi-purpose courts, community center, and adequate off-street parking. Parks of this type are best located on or near thoroughfares, easily accessible and distributed so they are within about one to three miles of each home. The increased mobility of teenagers, who heavily use community parks, tends to widen the radius of the service area. The recommended standard for community parks is 2.5 acres per 1,000 residents with a minimum size of 20 acres.

Regional Park

Regional parks are normally acquired to provide the urban dweller with an opportunity to get
away from noise and congestion of the city without having to travel a great distance. A central location is desirable but not always possible and the regional park is often located near or outside the city limits.

The minimum of 50 acres is required with 250 to 500 acres being more desirable. This park may feature wooded areas, varying topography and water features, picnic areas, boating and swimming, a nature center, hiking and riding trails, day camps, and some sports facilities on a less formal basis than community parks.

Large urban parks generally fall upon the county or regional authority. They should not, under any circumstances, take the place of neighborhood or community parks. The recommended standard for a regional park is five acres per 1,000 residents and a minimum size of 50 acres.

**Parkways**

These are essentially elongated parks with a road extending throughout their length. They are usually restricted to bicycle and pedestrian traffic. The parkway generally serves to connect large units in the park system or to provide a pleasant means of travel within the city and between the city and outlying areas.

The parkway may follow stream or river alignments, shorelines of large lakes, or natural wooded areas. A parkway's location and size are dependent upon the availability and location of these resources. Where these kinds of resources do not exist, it is recommended that a parkway effect be created through proper landscape design and planting. Although, no specific acreage standard is applicable, a minimum right-of-way of 300 feet is recommended; with portions being much wider for scenic vistas and other uses.

**Playfield**

A playfield is usually considered as a separate facility of 10 to 20 acres oriented to athletic use. Those uses accommodated by a facility of this nature are football, baseball, softball, and track and field. For this reason, a playfield is best located near a large industrial area.

Usually, by providing major athletic facilities at community parks and by utilizing high school athletic fields, the need for playfields can be met in most communities.

**Swimming Pool**

Swimming pools will draw from considerable distances, especially when there are not enough pools to serve the community.

It is desirable to include indoor or indoor-outdoor pools in junior and/or senior high schools, and these should be available for elementary school use so swimming can be taught at an early age.

In determining the number of pools required to serve a community, the standard of 15 square feet of water surface for every 3% of the population is recommended. This is the same as 450 square feet per 1,000 people. The configuration of the pool determines its exact water surface area, but the average 50-meter pool will be about 9,000 square feet, thus serving a population base of about 20,000. A 25-meter pool will serve about 10,000 persons.
8.3 Open Space Goals, Objectives, Policies, and Programs

Goal OS 1:  A community with an abundance of high quality accessible open space.

Objective OS 1.1:  Allocate additional park space and recreational areas to achieve three acres of open space per thousand residents.

Policy OS 1.1.1:  New development shall contribute its fair share of open space to meet the needs of current and future residents.

Policy OS 1.1.2:  Use the Quimby Act to require the dedication of at least one acre of park space per 1,000 residents, or the payment of in-lieu fees to pay for future open space dedication. A mixture of park space dedication and reduced in-lieu fees is permissible.

Objective OS 1.2:  Improve park infrastructure.

Policy OS 1.2.1:  Increase the appeal of existing parks by planting trees and by adding benches, picnic tables, water features using recycled water and other amenities.

Policy OS 1.2.2:  Use Quimby in-lieu fees, developer fees, park fees, grants, and general funds for improvements to the San Joaquin Sports Park.

Objective OS 1.3:  Achieve a high level of accessibility for parks and recreational areas.

Policy OS 1.3.1:  The City shall focus the creation of park space with the aim of bringing every residence within one-quarter mile of a park.

Program OS 1.3.1a:  Construct parks on the eastern, northeastern, and western edges of the City, so that future growth towards the City Limit is near park space.

Responsibility:  City Council  
Timeframe:  Long-Term Planning Period  
Funding:  General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions, Park Fees  
Estimated City cost:  $6,000,000

Objective OS 1.4:  Connect parks, recreational areas, and residential zones.

Policy OS 1.4.1:  Implement the Complete Streets Plan to promote pedestrian and bicycle travel in dedicated corridors that meet local needs. (See Transportation Element)

Goal OS 2:  Park and recreational facilities that meet a wide variety of public needs.

Objective OS 2.1:  Create spaces for families with young children.

Policy OS 2.1.1:  New facilities shall meet prevailing professional standards for park design.

Policy OS 2.1.2:  Focus the design of new parks to include such features as ADA compliance, restrooms, play structures, picnic tables and shaded areas to better serve the families of the City.

Objective OS 2.2:  Create spaces for youth, especially for after school activities.
Policy OS 2.2.1: Prioritize the creation of sport and multi-use fields near the school and residential areas.

Program OS 2.2.1a: Co-locate park space and recreational facilities with the development of the City’s new school.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions, Park Fees
Estimated City cost: $1,000,000

Policy OS 2.2.2: Encourage an edible schoolyard program in the open space adjacent to schools to educate the youth about healthy food alternatives and to highlight the City’s agricultural heritage.

Policy OS 2.2.3: The City shall recruit private developers to engage in a project such as a fitness center. The City shall support the creation of a recreational facility that would serve City residents as well as attract visitors to the area.

Objective OS 3.1: Achieve greater use of City facilities by the public.

Policy OS 2.3.1: The City shall promote both youth and adult sport leagues.

Program OS 2.3.1a: The City shall monitor how existing City owned facilities meet the needs of residents. Conduct a survey of residents to determine met and unmet parks and open space needs.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Funds, Grants
Estimated City cost: $15,000

Goal OS 3: Attractive and affordable park and recreation facilities.

Objectives OS 3.1: The City will provide park and recreation facilities and services to meet the demands of the City’s growth.

Policy OS 3.1.1: The City may include a diversity of scale of park and recreation facilities, including small “pocket parks” in neighborhoods.

Program OS 3.1.1a: The City shall develop a Park Master Plan that addresses the park needs and revenue sources for development.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Long-Term Planning Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions, Park Fees
Estimated City cost: $300,000

Objective OS 3.2: Share costs of new park space and recreational facilities with other agencies.

Policy OS 3.2.1: The City shall work with other governmental agencies, such as the School District, County and State in the development of shared recreational facilities when possible.
Policy OS 3.2.2: The City shall pursue grant and other opportunities wherever possible, such as those provided in the Park Development and Community.

Policy OS 3.2.3: The City will promote Landscape improvements in older areas of the community.

Objective OS 3.3: Minimize maintenance costs of parks.

Policy OS 3.3.1: The City shall utilize hardy trees and landscaping with low water and trimming requirements wherever feasible in public parks and spaces.
9 Safety Element

The Safety Element is a required element according to General Plan Guidelines published by the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR). The Safety Element addresses the protection of humans and property from natural and man-made hazards. Some of these hazards are naturally occurring, such as seismic, wildfire or geologic hazards. Others are related to human activity including risks related to developing in flood plains, increasing urban fire hazards through buildings and the storage, handling, and transport of hazardous materials. At a minimum, the Safety Element of a General Plan must address seismic, fire, flood, and geologic hazards as outlined under California Government Code §65302(g).

An important aspect of ensuring community safety is identifying hazards in and around a jurisdiction. Hazards are defined by the California State Hazard Mitigation Plan (CSHMP) as “an event or physical condition that has the potential to cause fatalities, injuries, property damage, infrastructure damage, agricultural losses, damage to the environment, interruption of business, or other types of harm or loss” (2010, p. 98). Hazards related to the elements presented in the General Plan have been identified in this background report and mapped when appropriate. Identifying hazards can help guide other sections of the General Plan and ensure that humans and property are protected from the hazards. Hazard identification can also guide local decisions related to zoning, subdivisions and other permits.

9.1 Fresno County Safety Element

When a county's safety element is sufficiently detailed and contains appropriate policies and programs, that County's cities may adopt the portion of that County's safety element that pertains to the city's planning area. Adoption of the County's safety element will satisfy requirements imposed by the State of California general planning law.

To the extent that the County General Plan Safety Element applies to the City of San Joaquin planning area, they are hereby incorporated by reference into the City of San Joaquin General Plan. The descriptions, goals and policies which follow supplement those contained in the County's Seismic Safety Element.

The City lies within a seismically stable region, although a number of faults have been found along the western edge of the Sierra Nevada Mountains, none are known to be active. The Coalinga Fault located 40 miles away is the nearest known active fault. The County of Fresno is located between two major fault lines. The City of San Joaquin is between the San Andreas Fault and the Owens Valley Fault. The Owens Valley Fault is 100 miles to the east and the San Andreas Fault is 50 miles to the west of the City. Other nearby faults include the White Wolf Fault and the Kern Front Fault and Edison Fault in Kern County.

The Five County Seismic Safety Element places the City of San Joaquin in the VI Seismic Zone. This Zone is characterized by a relatively thin layer sedimentary rock overlying a granite basement. The potential for amplification from ground shaking is high. However, the distance from active faults lessens the potential effects of seismic activity.

The greatest possibility of an earthquake creating major damage to the City of San Joaquin emanates from the San Andreas Fault. Based on the historical record of the San Andreas Fault an earthquake of magnitude 7 on the Richter Scale is possible in the next 50 years. There is some scientific data that speculates that an earthquake of greater than magnitude 8 on the Richter Scale is entirely possible.
Primary hazards due to shaking are considered minimal in the VI Seismic Zone. Secondary hazards from liquefaction, seiching, and subsidence are considered to be minimal or low.

9.2 Safety Goals, Objectives, Policies, and Programs

Goal S 1: A community where residents and property are safe from seismic and other geologic hazards.

Objective S 1.1: Maintain up-to-date information regarding seismic and geologic hazards.

Policy S 1.1.1: The City shall use new information regarding seismic and geologic hazards to maintain up to date maps.

Program S 1.1.1a: The City will maintain updated maps of faults and subsidence within 200 miles of San Joaquin.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $5,000

Program S 1.1.1b: Work with the James Irrigation District to collect and analyze information regarding groundwater levels to avoid subsidence.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $5,000

Policy S 1.1.2: The City shall require geotechnical and soils engineering reports to be prepared in conjunction with the preparation of preliminary design layouts and grading plans. These studies will determine areas of hazardous soil conditions as required under the building codes standards. These reports will include data on potential geological hazards including seismic shaking, shrink-swell, and other hazardous soil conditions.

Program S 1.1.2a: The City shall maintain emergency plans to be followed in the event of earthquakes or other natural disasters.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $5,000

Goal S 2: A community where residents and property are safe from urban and wildfire hazards.

Objective S 2.1: Maintain low incidence of urban fires.

Policy S 2.1.1: The City shall require safe levels of property maintenance for fire protection.
Program S 2.1.1a: Maintain the inspection and enforcement system to reduce potential for urban fire on under-maintained lots.
Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Planning Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $5,000

Policy S 2.1.2: For parcels within the City that property shall be disked entirely unless landscaped. If property is landscaped the property shall be mowed and excess debris raked and removed.

Goal S 3: A community where residents and property are safe from flooding.

Objective S 3.1: Reduce annual incidence of localized flooding.
Policy S 3.1.1: The City shall maintain roadways and drainage systems to prevent localized flooding.
Program S 3.1.1a: Check storm drains and roadways annually for flooding related maintenance.
Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $5,000

Objective S 3.2: Minimize risk of flooding in new developments.
Policy S 3.2.1: The City shall not approve projects that do not employ design standards to minimize the risk of loss of property or life due to flooding.
Policy S 3.2.2: Require new developments to employ design standards to minimize risks from flooding.
Program S 3.2.2a: Provide community members with information regarding flooding related design standards at the library and City Hall. Include information with all permitting packets.
Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $5,000

Goal S 4: A community where residents and property are safe from human made hazards.

Objective S 4.1: Reduce the number of hazardous sites in the City.
Policy S 4.1.1: The City shall encourage private owners of property to clean up hazardous sites.
Policy S 4.1.2: Assist property owners identify and secure funding for cleanup of hazardous sites.
Goal S 5: A community with reliable emergency response and health care capabilities.

Objective S 5.1: Improve emergency response time.
Policy S 5.1.1: The City shall continue to work on response time with all corresponding agencies.

Objective S 5.2: Maintain post-disaster operational emergency response and health care facilities.
Policy S 5.2.1: The City shall ensure that health care center, critical facilities, and emergency response system are capable of operating post disaster.

Program S 5.2.1a: Maintain the Emergency Implementation Plan.
- Responsibility: City Council
- Timeframe: Ongoing Program
- Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
- Estimated City cost: $5,000

Program S 5.2.1b: Coordinate with health center annually to review and align its disaster management plan with citywide disaster recovery plans.
- Responsibility: City Council
- Timeframe: Ongoing Program
- Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
- Estimated City cost: $5,000

Objective S 5.3: Improve access to high quality health care services for the community.
Policy S 5.3.1: The City shall encourage property owners to develop health care related facilities in the city.

Program S 5.3.1a: Incentivize health care related development through the reduction of permitting fees and accelerated permitting.
- Responsibility: City Council
- Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Program
- Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
- Estimated City cost: $10,000

Objective S 5.4: Increase transportation options for residents to healthcare outside the City.
Policy S 5.4.1: The City shall maintain options for the ability of residents to access low cost, reliable transportation to major health care centers in the region.

Program S 5.4.1a: Negotiate with a provider for an on-call shuttle service between the local health center and all health centers in Fresno.
- Responsibility: City Council
- Timeframe: Ongoing Program
- Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
- Estimated City cost: $5,000
Program S 5.4.1b: Identify funding sources for on-call shuttle services.
Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $5,000

Goal S 6: A community that, through planning and organization, can prevent, respond to, and recover from disasters.

Objective S 6.1: Plan for hazard mitigation in San Joaquin.
Policy S 6.1.1: The City shall participate in a hazard mitigation plan.
Program S 6.1.1a: Continue participation in the Fresno County Multi-jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan and ensure that the plan addresses the potential increase in natural disasters because of climate change, an ongoing program.
Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $5,000

Objective S 6.2: Maintain a current emergency response plan for the City.
Policy S 6.2.1: The City shall annually review and revise its emergency response plan to ensure it is up to date.
Program S 6.2.1a: Update the emergency response plan.
Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $5,000

Program S 6.2.1b: Identify critical facilities and educate community members about their services and location.
Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $5,000

Objective S 6.3: Educate the community about risks and preparedness in the City.
See LU 7.2 for policies and implementation programs.
10 Noise Element

Noise, defined as unwanted sound, is measured in decibels (dB) on a logarithmic scale. Noise varies in intensity according to distance from the source: as distance doubles, there is about a 6 dB reduction in loudness. Like distance, natural (like trees and hills) or manufactured (sound walls, for instance) barriers between the source and receptor can also reduce the intensity of noise. While some noises are minor nuisances, others can cause permanent damage to human hearing.

Since noise levels can pose a risk to public health, noise is a required element of the General Plan in the State of California. The first noise element guidelines were created in the Health and Safety Code §46050.1; subsequent changes to General Plan guidelines in 1984 (Chapter 1009, Statutes of 1984) outline the current noise element procedures. Noise is measured through modeling and/or noise sample collection. Current and projected noise levels are depicted on a noise contour map and then used as a guide in land use planning. In the City, the primary noise source is traffic along Colorado and Manning Avenues. Goals, objectives, policies and programs contained in this element aim to preserve the quiet rural character of the City as reported by community members without inhibiting activities related to economic development.

The following sources of noise shall be analyzed and quantified, as determined by the legislative body:

1. Highways;
2. Arterials and collector streets;
3. Passenger and freight on-line railroad operations;
4. Ground transit systems;
5. Aviation sources;
6. Local industrial plants; and
7. Other ground stationary noise sources.

Local response to development of the noise element should be based on the "shoe fits" doctrine and shall reflect the local situation and avoid or mitigate local noise concerns.

10.1 Noise Safety

The City of San Joaquin's planning area is expected to have a low to moderate increase in noise levels. As the City grows the primary source of noise level increases will come from increased vehicular activity. Construction projects will create short term and limited noise level increases. The increase will be due to construction equipment and related activities that will last only as long as an individual project is under construction.

The ambient noise levels experienced in the City of San Joaquin planning area is characteristic of a rural small city environment. Generally a mixture of residential, commercial and industrial activities tend to be quiet during night hours and produce moderate levels of noise from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Another major source of noise affecting the planning area is the Union Pacific railroad and the operations of the San Joaquin Valley Railroad on this line.

A primary benefit of rural small city life is a tranquil and relaxed environment. The San Joaquin planning area has no single major noise nuisance that disrupts that environment.
10.1.1 Noise Impact Definitions

**Short Term**

This type of noise can be defined as construction activities. Construction noise, while short term, can generate high, episodic levels. Equipment such as bulldozers, concrete mixers, portable generators, backhoes, air guns and other such equipment are examples of generators of short term high level noise producers. Table 10-1 lists typical construction equipment noise levels (information provided by the Environmental Protection Agency).

**Long Term**

This type of noise can be described as noise generated by such sources as vehicular sources, railroads, industrial plants. It involves long term increases in the ambient noise level of the planning area. Increased levels of long term noise created in the planning area will be dependent on the rate of growth in residential, commercial and industrial development.

Motor vehicle noise is characterized by a high number of individual events, which often create a sustained noise level. The most significant generator of noise in the City of San Joaquin is the two arterials that serve the City. Manning Avenue and Colorado Avenue are the two arterials that are the major inter-city routes connecting the City with other communities.

Railroads, unlike highway generated, noise tends to maintain a constant level and is periodic in nature. One additional impact generated by railroads is the vibrations experienced by buildings and persons in close proximity to the tracks. Railroad traffic produces sound exposure levels that range from 78 db(A) to 94 db(A) when measured 150 feet from the track.

Other noise sources in a community, such as industrial plants, commercial activity, population noise generated by human activity such as air conditioners, lawn mowers, radio, television, sports activities schools etc. are called fixed source.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10-1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Equipment Noise Levels</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Types of Construction Equipment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portable Air Compressor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Mix Truck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumatic Tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backhoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulldozer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 10-2

Traffic Noise Levels at Various Speeds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle Speed</th>
<th>At level ground, 100 feet from the edge of the road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Car at 20 mph</td>
<td>50 db(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Car at 40 mph</td>
<td>58 db(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Car at 60 mph</td>
<td>64 db(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single truck at 25 mph.</td>
<td>76 db(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single truck at 50 mph.</td>
<td>76 db(A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10-3

Traffic Noise Levels and Traffic Volumes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic Volume</th>
<th>For level ground and a constant speed of 60 miles per hour as measured 100 feet from the travel lane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Car</td>
<td>64 db(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 vehicles per hour</td>
<td>66 db(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000 vehicles per hour</td>
<td>71 db(A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10-4

Recommended Ambient Allowable Noise Level Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>7 A.M. to 10 P.M.</th>
<th>10 P.M. to 7 A.M.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critically Impacted Land Uses</td>
<td>Hospitals/Rest Homes</td>
<td>45 db(A)</td>
<td>40 db(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passive Recreation Areas</td>
<td>45 db(A)</td>
<td>45 db(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schools/Churches</td>
<td>45 db(A)</td>
<td>45 db(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Impacted Land Uses</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>50 db(A)</td>
<td>50 db(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Density Housing</td>
<td>50 db(A)</td>
<td>50 db(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>55 db(A)</td>
<td>50 db(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial</td>
<td>55 db(A)</td>
<td>55 db(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Office</td>
<td>55 db(A)</td>
<td>55 db(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retail Commercial</td>
<td>60 db(A)</td>
<td>55 db(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Noise Generators</td>
<td>Outdoor Active Recreation</td>
<td>70 db(A)</td>
<td>70 db(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Light Manufacturing</td>
<td>70 db(A)</td>
<td>65 db(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heavy Manufacturing</td>
<td>75 db(A)</td>
<td>70 db(A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Noise Levels should be measured at the property line, 36 inches above the ground.*

### 10.2 Noise Goals, Objectives, Policies, and Programs

**Goal N 1:** A healthy community free of noise nuisances and hazardous noise.

**Objective N 1.1:** Base land use decisions on compatibility and existing and projected noise levels.

**Policy N 1.1.1:** The City shall not permit development of noise sensitive uses within an unacceptable noise range of a major noise generator.

**Policy N 1.1.2:** Conduct an acoustical analysis to determine existing noise levels at the site of proposed development and use projected noise levels to determine impact on surrounding uses.

**Policy N 1.1.3:** The City shall not permit development of major noise generators within an unacceptable range of noise sensitive uses.

**Objective N 1.2:** Utilize design elements to minimize adverse noise impacts.
Policy N 1.2.1: The City shall require that proposed development incorporate design elements to minimize adverse noise impacts on surrounding land uses.

Policy N 1.2.2: The City shall ensure multi-family residences and hotels comply with state interior noise insulation standards in cases where they fall within the 60 dB (CNEL or Ldn) noise exposure contours.

Objective N 1.3: Reduce traffic noise levels.

Policy N 1.3.1: The City shall enforce statewide vehicle noise regulations of illegal or faulty exhaust systems.

Policy N 1.3.2: The City shall determine the significance of noise impacts due to new roadway improvements in the City.

Program N 1.3.2.a: Conduct acoustical analyses of the City to establish a baseline set of noise contours.

Responsibility: City Council

Timeframe: Short-Term Planning Program

Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions

Estimated City cost: $35,000
Figure 10-1. Acceptable Noise Exposure Levels by Land Use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Community Noise Exposure $L_{dn}$ or CNEL (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential - Low Density Single Family, Duplex, Mobile Homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential - Multi. Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient Lodging - Motels, Hotels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools, Libraries, Churches, Hospitals, Nursing Homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditoriums, Concert Halls, Amphitheaters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Arena, Outdoor Spectator Sports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds, Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Courses, Riding Stables, Water Recreation, Cemeteries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Buildings, Business Commercial and Professional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial, Manufacturing, Utilities, Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INTERPRETATION:**

- **Normally Acceptable**: Specified land use is satisfactory, based upon the assumption that any buildings involved are of normal conventional construction, without any special noise insulation requirements.

- **Conditionally Acceptable**: New construction or development should be undertaken only after a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements is made and needed noise insulation features included in the design. Conventional construction, but with closed windows and fresh air supply systems or air conditioning will normally suffice.

- **Normally Unacceptable**: New construction or development should generally be discouraged. If new construction or development does proceed, a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements must be made and needed noise insulation features included in the design.

- **Clearly Unacceptable**: New construction or development should generally not be undertaken.
11 Economic Element

The Economic Element is intended to maintain and enhance the economic character of the community while providing for a stable annual public budget. This is an optional element of the General Plan. The City is committed to economic development in order to continue to improve public services and to improve the overall quality of life in the community.

Population trends indicate that San Joaquin’s working-age population will double by 2040. It will be important to attract new employment opportunities in order to prevent out-migration of this working-age population. Residents express concern with the current lack of jobs, which demonstrates that San Joaquin’s economy is in need of diversification and stability. Policies attracting business and encouraging education of the workforce will improve existing conditions. Thus, the goals, objectives, policies, and programs in this element aim to support existing businesses and bring new industries to the City.

11.1 Economic Goals, Objectives, Policies, and Programs

Goal E 1: A well-educated and trained workforce.

Objective E 1.1: Expand adult education opportunities for residents.

Policy E 1.1.1: The City Administrator or designee shall promote job training opportunities.

Program E 1.1.1a: City administration shall maintain and update job training information and to coordinate these activities.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $5,000

Policy E 1.1.2: Maintain a partnership with West Hills Community College to provide educational opportunities to San Joaquin residents.

Program E 1.1.2a: Facilitate the use of City-owned buildings for adult education programs offered by West Hills Community College.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $5,000

Goal E 2: A Central Business District (CBD) that is the focus of economic activity.

Objective E 2.1: Promote activity and interest in the CBD through community events.

Policy E 2.1.1: Support the Farmer’s Market and facilitate other community events.
Program E 2.1.1a: Provide support to events within the CBD with use of City equipment, assistance with grant applications and staff support.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $15,000

Objective E 2.2: Attract new businesses to the CBD.

Policy E 2.2.1: The City shall promote the CBD as an attractive place for business to locate.

Program E 2.2.1a: Maintain an attractive appearance by implementing the design standards for the CBD.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $15,000

Program E 2.2.1b: The City will implement programs and coordinate with the Chamber of Commerce to promote the City and CBD.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $5,000

Goal E 3: A diverse and job-rich economy.

Objective E 3.1: Expand industrial activity, especially related to renewable energy generation.

Policy E 3.1.1: The City shall provide incentives and reduce obstacles to locating new businesses and industries, including renewable energy companies, to locate to the City of San Joaquin.

Program E 3.1.1a: City administration shall research, develop financing programs and assist companies with permitting processes.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $10,000

Objective E 3.2: The City will promote job-creating and job-retention activities.

Policy E 3.2.1 The City shall focus its efforts in economic development activities that provide and maximize long-term net revenues to the City.

Policy E 3.2.2 The City shall focus on the development of primary wage earner job opportunities, to strengthen the economic well being of the residents of the community.
Policy E 3.2.3 The City shall encourage flexibility in development standards to accommodate uses that provide a substantial economic benefit to the community, while protecting the general public and environmental health, safety and welfare of the community.

Policy E 3.2.4 In order to retain, expand and develop new businesses, the City shall prioritize infrastructure investments for infill sites as part of the annual General Plan review and budget process.

Policy E 3.2.5 The City shall work with businesses, employers, economic development groups, and educational institutions to develop greater employment opportunities for the residents of San Joaquin.

Program E 4.2.2a: The City shall maintain a list of commercial opportunities, incentives, and related programs to be provided to local and regional economic development officials, local businesses, and businesses investigating moving to the City. Components of a marketing plan as advocated by adopted policy may include the following topics:

- Land Resources – analysis of the supply of land for future commercial and industrial development.
- General Issues/Marketing – policies to ensure the City markets itself and works with complementary agencies and organizations (EOC, EDD, Chamber of Commerce, etc.) to further the City’s economic goals.
- Business Retention/Expansion – strategies to assist existing businesses to stay in San Joaquin and expand.
- Infrastructure/public services – policies to ensure that infrastructure systems and services are maintained as growth occurs.
- Agriculture – policies to promote the area’s agriculture industry, including agri-tourism.

Responsibility: City Council  
Timeframe: Ongoing Program  
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions  
Estimated City cost: $15,000

Goal E 4: A local commercial environment that meets the needs of residents.

Objective E 4.1: Retain existing commercial businesses.

Policy E 4.1.1: The City shall regularly communicate with the existing business community.

Program E 4.1.1a: Establish a forum for business owners to communicate their needs to the City.

Responsibility: City Council  
Timeframe: Ongoing Planning Program  
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions  
Estimated City cost: $5,000
Objective E.4.2: Promote new commercial activity.

Policy E.4.2.1: The City shall promote opportunities for residents to start a business.

Program E.4.2.1a: City administration shall provide information on existing business opportunities, business needs, business development programs, and ensure that this information is available.

Responsibility: City Council

Timeframe: Ongoing Planning Program

Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions

Estimated City cost: $5,000

Policy E.4.2.2: Live-work units, in which the unit is both a place to live and a place of business, are encouraged in the CBD and Community Commercial designations.
12 Public Facilities and Services Element

Public facilities and services provide the physical and virtual foundation upon which a community evolves. A functioning and capable physical infrastructure is a critical prerequisite for development and growth of a City and effective public services are crucial to providing a high quality of life for residents, as well as an attractive environment for ongoing economic development and prosperity.

The goal of the Public Facilities and Services Element is to provide a basis and orientation for City policy and program development. The identification of general policies and needs included in the Public Facilities and Services element contribute to neighborhood function, quality of life, and the community’s fundamental identity. The Public Facilities and Services Element is an optional component of a General Plan, according to General Plan Guidelines (2003) published by the State of California Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR).

OPR guidelines recommend that public facilities and services elements include an evaluation of current and future capacities of a wide variety of public infrastructure and support programs crucial to the City’s function and healthy growth. These analyses should consider other General Plan element findings, particularly those discussing projected changes in population, land uses and development intensity, but also including community design, conservation, and recreation, among others. The analysis should include consultation with service providers, analysis of equitable distribution of facilities and services and identification of potential implementation funding sources.

The following planning and policy documents relate to or implement the Public Facilities and Services Element.

City of San Joaquin Water Conservation Strategy (2009). The City of San Joaquin Water Conservation Strategy was developed to ensure the City’s compliance with funding requirements from the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for its wastewater treatment expansion project. This strategy includes a plan of actions that will result in measurable water savings for the City. Goals of the Strategy are to achieve a 20% reduction in water use by 2011 and to install water meters on all service accounts by 2020. Measures to achieve these goals include water meter installation, implementation of a watering schedule, classroom education, and installation of low-flow fixtures (faucets/toilets/showers).

City of San Joaquin Sewer Master Plan (1995). The City of San Joaquin Sewer Master Plan was developed to evaluate the adequacy of the City’s existing sewage collection system, recommend necessary improvements, and create a long range master plan to meet the projected needs in future growth areas. The Sewer Master Plan includes proposed sewer facilities showing pipeline locations, sizes, slopes, service areas, average design flow, and average pipe capacities and identifies existing [as of 1995] sewer facilities.

City of San Joaquin Water Master Plan (1995). The City of San Joaquin Water Master Plan was developed to define the existing (1995) water supply network, determine future water supply needs, develop and upgrade the existing water system to meet future needs, and to develop a capital improvement program. The Water Master Plan recommends construction of 12-inch main lines in Manning Avenue and Colusa Avenue, a 10-inch main in Manning Avenue, an 8-inch main in Fifth Street, a 6-inch main in Nevada Avenue, an additional emergency power generator at Well 4, and construction of a new well and pump in the City.
City of San Joaquin Storm Drainage Master Plan (1995). The City of San Joaquin Storm Drainage Master Plan was prepared to evaluate the City’s existing storm drainage system to identify problem areas, recommend necessary improvements, and develop a long range master plan to meet demands in the City’s future growth areas. The Storm Drainage Master Plan finds that non-master planned storm drain extensions, inlets, and other facilities should be constructed by the developer at their expense, but, within the developed areas, the City shall be responsible for improving and maintaining the drainage system. Improvements include new storm drains, manholes, inlets, outfall structures, pump facilities, basin excavation, and other related actions.

City of San Joaquin Sewer Management Plan (2008). The City of San Joaquin Sewer Management Plan was prepared to develop goals to properly manage, operate, and maintain the sanitary sewer collection system. The Sewer Management Plan includes: an operation and maintenance program; design and performance provisions; an overflow emergency response plan; a fats, oils, and grease control plan; system evaluation and capacity assurance plan; a communication program; and monitoring, modification, and audit programs.

Groundwater Management Plan (2010). The Groundwater Management Plan (GMP) was prepared for the James Irrigation District and City of San Joaquin to better coordinate efforts, share data, and improve regional management of groundwater resources. The purpose of the GMP is to develop consensus among agency staff and stakeholders on groundwater condition, management, and problem-solving, develop practical solutions for addressing issues, including overdraft, improve communications, document goals and objectives for sustaining and improving groundwater, and provide feasible implementation.

12.1 Municipal Sewerage System

The City owns and operates a sewage wastewater treatment plant as described in Section 2.2.1 Municipal Sewerage System. The City of San Joaquin has a Sewer System Plan. The objective of the Sewer Master Plan is to examine the needs and adequacy of the existing sewer system and future growth areas within the City’s Sphere of Influence. The Sewer Master Plan is incorporated as part of the General Plan in Volume II.

12.2 Municipal Water System

The City owns and operates a potable water system as described Section 2.2.2 Municipal Water system. The City of San Joaquin has a Water Master Plan. The objective of the Water Master Plan is to examine the needs of the water system. Elements of this study include defining the existing water supply network, determining future water supply needs, developing and upgrading the existing water system to meet future needs, and development of a capital improvement program. The Water Master Plan is incorporated as part of the General Plan in Volume II.

12.3 Municipal Flood Control and Drainage

The City operates a municipal storm drainage system as described in Section 2.2.3 Municipal Flood Control and Drainage. The Storm Drainage Master Plan is incorporated as part of the General Plan in Volume II.

12.4 Municipal Solid Waste Disposal

The City’s solid waste disposal is described in Section 2.2.4 Municipal Solid Waste Disposal. The Solid Waste element consists of policies and actions required to carry out the City of San Joaquin Source
Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE). The Element is incorporated as part of this General Plan document in Volume II. The Policies of the SRRE are consolidated below. A thorough review of Waste Reduction issues can be reviewed in the San Joaquin SRRE.

The SRRE is the local response to the California Integrated Waste Management act of 1989 (AB 939). The Goal of AB 939 is to divert 25% of solid waste from landfills by 1995 and 50% by 2000.

San Joaquin is currently diverting 10.7% of its waste from its landfills. The SRRE addresses policies that should meet the goals of the California Integrated Waste Management Act. The four main components of the SRRE are source reduction, recycling, composting, and special waste.

Under the SRRE the City of San Joaquin will address new mandated programs that the State of California has made the responsibility of all Cities. San Joaquin is asked to continue and expand existing waste diversion programs, initiate new programs and participate in areas that have not traditionally been the responsibility of the City.

In order to meet these responsibilities the City of San Joaquin joined with the County of Fresno and the Cities of Fresno County to develop source reduction programs. The County of Fresno will be the lead agency for programs, which require countywide participation. For programs that are based on the west side of the County, the West County Solid Waste Planning Committee (WSWPC) will be the lead entity for development of these programs.

While the WSWPC will coordinate development of source reduction, recycling, composting, and special waste programs, the City of San Joaquin is responsible for ultimate implementation. San Joaquin Solid Waste is disposed at American Avenue Landfill. The Landfill is owned and operated by the County of Fresno. Collection and hauling services are provided by Western Waste Industries. A curbside recycling program is provided by Western Waste.

12.5 Police Protection

The City of San Joaquin contracts with the Fresno county Sheriff’s Office for law enforcement services as described in Section 2.2.5 Police Protection.

12.6 Fire Protection

The City of San Joaquin contracts with CAL FIRE as described in Section 2.2.6 Fire Protection.

12.7 Schools

The City of San Joaquin is serviced by the Golden Plains Unified School District as described in Section 2.2.7 Schools.

12.8 Hospitals

The City of San Joaquin medical care services are described in Section 2.2.8 Hospitals.

12.9 Public Utilities and Energy

The City’s public utilities are described in Section 2.2.9 Public Utilities and Energy.
12.10 Public Facilities and Services Goals, Objectives, Policies, and Programs

**Goal PFS 1:** The City of San Joaquin shall maintain existing city infrastructure and develop new public facilities and services as needed

**Objective PFS 1.1** The City may seek opportunities for reducing infrastructure-related demand for non-renewable resources, and encourage the development and use of renewable resources to meet energy demands.

**Objective PFS 1.2** The City shall require that adequate public facilities and services are available. City fees or fee substitutions may address the costs of new development, including operational and maintenance costs external to, but reasonably attributable to the specific development as well as the environmental and social impacts of the development. When a new development generates significant public benefit, other financial means of covering the cost of new development may be used in lieu of fees.

**Policy PFS 1.2.1:** Applicants shall prepare an infrastructure and public services assessment as part of the annexation application process to determine infrastructure needs, feasibility, timing, and financing.

**Policy PFS 1.2.2:** The City shall form service partnerships with neighboring communities when appropriate to maximize the quality of services and reduce costs.

**Goal PFS 2:** Water supply and infrastructure sufficient to meet present and future demand.

**Objective PFS 2.1** Expand water pumping and storage capacity to meet projected maximum day demand plus fire flow utilizing energy efficient equipment.

**Policy PFS 2.1.1:** The City shall condition approval of new development projects on the availability of adequate water supply and infrastructure to serve the new development.

**Policy PFS 2.1.2:** New development projects shall pay impact fee assessments or construct facilities sufficient to fund additional water system capacity and infrastructure needed to service the new development.

**Policy PFS 2.1.3:** New development projects shall construct adequate on-site potable water distribution infrastructure.

**Policy PFS 2.1.4** Growth inducing projects will be reviewed for environmental impacts that such development may have upon the existing water sources and distribution facilities.

**Policy PFS 2.1.5** The City may consider providing incentives for developers to include water efficient technology and fixtures beyond what is required by state building codes and legislation to achieve additional water savings.

**Policy PFS 2.1.6** Water distribution system expansion/improvements shall precede or be concurrent with growth generating projects.

**Policy PFS 2.1.7** Use of drought-tolerant plant species and smart irrigation systems shall be promoted.
Policy PFS 2.1.8: Develop and deploy education and training programs in water conservation and efficiency strategies, techniques, and tools to help the community achieve water conservation goals and objectives, and implement related policies as well as highlight the energy-water use nexus.

Policy PFS 2.1.9: The City shall monitor its water consumption and manage supply and infrastructure to meet anticipated demand.

Program PFS 2.1.9a: City staff shall produce annual public reports of recorded water consumption, demand projections, and the state of infrastructure improvements in progress.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, Developer Contributions, and Water Funds
Estimated City cost: $10,000

Program PFS 2.1.9b: City staff shall review and revise the Water Master Plan.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Short-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, Developer Contributions, and Water Funds
Estimated City cost: $40,000

Objective PFS 2.2: Maintain water infrastructure in a state of good repair.

Policy PFS 2.2.1: The City shall budget for water system maintenance and repair.

Policy PFS 2.2.2: The City shall promote water conservation and reduced water demand in its operations and in existing and new development.

Policy PFS 2.2.3: Require water-conserving facility and building design in new construction and retrofit projects.

PFS 2.2.3a: Maintain a list of low-water-use and drought-tolerant plant species for use in new landscaping.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, Developer Contributions, and Water Funds
Estimated City cost: $20,000

Policy PFS 2.2.4: The City shall require new development to include water conservation design elements.

Policy PFS 2.2.5: The City shall encourage residents, business owners, and developers to conserve water by providing incentives or rebates to retrofit existing non-conserving measures with more efficient technology when feasible.

Goal PFS 3: Wastewater collection infrastructure and treatment facilities that meet present and future demand while ensuring water quality and protecting the environment.
Objective PFS 3.1: Plan for wastewater facility and infrastructure expansion to adequately serve future demand.

Policy PFS 3.1.1: The City shall monitor its wastewater demand and capacity, and manage supply and infrastructure to meet anticipated demand.

Policy PFS 3.1.2: The City shall assess and revise estimates of present and future wastewater demand on an annual basis.

Program PFS 3.1.2a: The City shall update its Wastewater Master Plan.
- Responsibility: City Council
- Timeframe: Short-Term Planning Period
- Funding: General Fund, Grants, Developer Contributions, and Wastewater Funds
- Estimated City cost: $40,000

Program PFS 3.1.2b: The City shall investigate possibilities to power the wastewater treatment plant using on-site renewable energy, i.e. ground mounted solar photovoltaic.
- Responsibility: City Council
- Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
- Funding: General Fund, Grants, Developer Contributions, and Wastewater Funds
- Estimated City cost: $50,000

Policy PFS 3.1.3: The City shall condition approval of new development projects on the availability of adequate wastewater collection and treatment capacity to serve the development.

Policy PFS 3.1.4: Development projects shall be subject to impact fee assessments sufficient to fund additional wastewater system capacity and infrastructure.

Policy PFS 3.1.5: New development shall establish that downstream wastewater infrastructure capacity is sufficient to accommodate new demand, and where sufficient capacity does not exist, provide additional facilities to accept additional wastewater demand, an ongoing program.

Policy PFS 3.1.6: New commercial and industrial development shall be subject to impact fee assessment or development conditions sufficient to address unique characteristics of wastewater generated by the development, including but not limited to fats, oils, and greases.

Policy PFS 3.1.7: Development projects shall be assessed a sewer capacity and connection fee for expansion of trunk lines and treatment plant facility improvements and expansion.

Policy PFS 3.1.8: Wastewater treatment facilities/distribution system expansion/improvements shall precede or be concurrent with all growth generating projects.

Goal PFS 4: Storm water management systems that minimize impacts of flooding, runoff, and strain on the wastewater system.
Objective PFS 4.1: Maintain flood control and drainage facilities in a state of good repair to preserve their function and capacity.

Policy PFS 4.1.1: The City shall budget for flood control and drainage facility maintenance and repair.

Objective PFS 4.2: Expand flood control and drainage capacity in tandem with new development in the City.

Policy PFS 4.2.1: The City shall require new development projects to maintain adequate flood control and drainage facility capacity to serve the development. New development projects shall be subject to impact fee assessments sufficient to fund additional flood control and drainage facilities and infrastructure.

Program PFS 4.2.1a: The City shall update its Storm Drainage Master Plan.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Short-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, Developer Contributions, and Wastewater Funds
Estimated City cost: $40,000

Policy PFS 4.2.2: Development projects shall pay their proportional cost of off-site ponding basins capable of recharge.

Policy PFS 4.2.3: Development Projects shall capture stormwater drainage beyond existing flows on or near the site using site drainage techniques such as swales.

Goal PFS 5: Environmentally sound and effective solid waste collection, management, diversion, and disposal resources.

Objective PFS 5.1: Comply with state mandates for diversion of waste materials through reduction, reuse, and recycling practices.

Policy PFS 5.1.1: The City shall participate in State-mandated waste reduction, diversion, mitigation, recycling, reporting or other programs related to reducing solid waste disposal volumes.

Program 5.1.1a: The City shall produce an annual report detailing its estimated diversion rate from public facilities and for all City residents.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $10,000

Policy PFS 5.1.2: The City shall provide recycling containers and garbage cans at public facilities, parks, and CBD.

Program PFS 5.1.2a: The City shall collect and pick up recycling at public buildings and events.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Objective PFS 5.2: Plan for waste collection, disposal, and recycling resources that meet present and future demands.

Policy PFS 5.2.1 The City of San Joaquin will pursue curbside recycling programs.

Policy PFS 5.2.2 The City of San Joaquin will continue to participate with other jurisdictions in developing effective joint regional programs.

Policy PFS 5.2.3 The City will continue local programs such as in-house reduction programs, waste audits, participate in regional waste exchange and in joint purchase pools for the participating jurisdictions.

Policy PFS 5.2.4 The City will continue working with waste hauler in the development of programs that reduce the waste stream to the American Avenue Landfill.

Program PFS 5.2.4a The City shall investigate the possibility to contract with the waste hauler to supply food-waste and/or composting bins to residents and business owners in the event waste hauler constructs or has use of a food-waste/composting facility.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $25,000

Policy PFS 5.2.5 The City will continue to participate in recycling educational programs and promotions.

Policy PFS 5.2.6 The City will continue to work with state and local government in the analysis and development of programs outlined in the SRRE.

Policy PFS 5.2.7 The City will support waste reduction strategies that will help the City meet greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction goals.

Policy PFS 5.2.8: The City shall support regulatory approval of the American Avenue landfill facility past its current license period unless substantial and unmitigated environmental impacts are identified.

Policy PFS 5.2.9: The City shall condition approval of new development projects on the availability of adequate solid waste collection, disposal, and diversion/recycling resources to serve the new development.

Policy PFS 5.2.10: New multi-family residential, industrial, and commercial development shall include on-site recycling facilities and an ongoing, regular program of pickup and disposal from the site.

Policy PFS 5.2.11: New commercial and industrial development shall be subject to impact fee assessment or development conditions sufficient to address unique characteristics of solid waste generated by the development.

Goal PFS 6: Safe and peaceful neighborhoods.

Objective PFS 6.1: Maintain police services to support existing low crime rates.

Policy PFS 6.1.1: Maintain an appropriate ratio of police officers to residents to keep the crime rate low.
Policy PFS 6.1.1a: New development shall guarantee that additional service demands for police protection are funded, subject to impact fees sufficient to meet the cost of providing these new services.

Policy PFS 6.1.2: The City shall budget for police services on an annual basis.

Program PFS 6.1.2a: Crime rates and patterns within the City shall be monitored and periodically analyzed to identify unmet needs and refine police services.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $10,000

Policy PFS 6.1.3: The City shall request call frequency, type, and response time reports from the Fresno County Sheriff Department monthly.

Policy PFS 6.1.4: The City shall review and refine its agreement with Fresno County Sheriff Department as reports dictate.

Policy PFS 6.1.5: The City shall collaborate with local, regional, and statewide agencies to address crime and community safety.

Program PFS 6.1.5a: The City shall continue to participate in regional gang prevention and enforcement coalitions.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $10,000

Objective PFS 6.2: Maintain fire protection services to support existing low fire rates.

Policy PFS 6.2.1: Maintain an appropriate ratio of fire personnel to residents to keep the fire rate low.

Policy PFS 6.2.1a: New development shall guarantee that additional service demands for fire protection are funded, subject to impact fees sufficient to meet the cost of providing these new services.

Policy PFS 6.2.2: The City shall budget for fire services on an annual basis.

Program PFS 6.2.2a: Fire rates and patterns within the City shall be monitored and periodically analyzed to identify unmet needs and refine fire services.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $10,000

Policy PFS 6.2.3: The City shall request call frequency, type, and response time reports from the Fire Department monthly.
Policy PFS 6.2.4: The City shall collaborate with local, regional, and statewide agencies to address fire and community safety.

Goal PFS 7: Educational opportunities for the community.

Objective PFS 7.1: Coordinate planning with partner agencies to improve the quality and availability of educational services and facilities within the City.

Policy PFS 7.1.1: The City shall coordinate efforts to improve K-12 education services and facilities with the Golden Plains Unified School District.

Policy PFS 7.1.2: The City shall support and facilitate efforts by the Golden Plains Unified School District to expand its educational facilities in San Joaquin, including development funded support of new facilities.

Policy PFS 7.1.3: The City supports the addition of high school courses to educational facilities within the City.

Policy PFS 7.1.4: The City shall coordinate efforts to improve the availability of adult vocational and job training services with the West Hills Community College District.

Policy PFS 7.1.5: The City supports the addition of local adult vocational and job training services provided by the Community College District, particularly as a component of new educational facilities established within the City.

Policy PFS 7.1.6: The City shall coordinate efforts to maintain and expand library services with the Fresno County Public Library District.

Policy PFS 7.1.7: The City shall collaborate with the Fresno County Public Library District to ensure that adequate services and service hours are provided to residents.

Policy PFS 7.1.8: Policy: The City supports funding improvements that support library operations in San Joaquin.
13 Community Design

The Community Design Element is an optional element of the General Plan that focuses on the aesthetic qualities of the built environment. This element provides a framework for development and maintenance to ensure that a positive community identity is preserved and enhanced, and the City is walkable, compact, and safe.

San Joaquin is a compact, family orientated community, an oasis serving the regional agricultural community defined by its cleanliness, walkability, safety, and friendliness. The City’s buildings reflect the architecture typical of the Central San Joaquin Valley. The desired community design enhances the sense of a village, focuses on family orientation, and celebrates the communities’ cultures.

The following planning and policy documents relate to or implement the Community Design Element.

City of San Joaquin Mobility and Revitalization Plan (2012). The City of San Joaquin Mobility and Revitalization Plan is a document prepared to identify a community vision, street design and circulation, and areas of growth, revitalization, and use.

13.1 Community Design Goals, Objectives, Policies, and Programs

Goal CD 1: A community with a strong positive identity.
Objective CD 1.1: Preserve and enhance existing community identity through public art.
Policy CD 1.1.1: The City shall encourage and support public art in new and existing developments to enhance the visual image and local heritage of San Joaquin.
Program CD 1.1.1a: Seek funds to contract citizens of San Joaquin to create public art pieces for public spaces.
Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $5,000

Policy CD 1.1.2: The City supports a mural program for public plazas and parks.
Objective CD 1.2: Enhance focal points and gateways into the City.
Policy CD 1.2.1: The City shall encourage and support clearly marked, attractive and appropriate gateways into the City. Focus gateway developments at the intersections of Manning, Colorado, Sutter, Elm, Placer and Main.
Program CD 1.2.1a: Prepare a design and plan for the City gateways.
Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $50,000
Policy CD 1.2.2: Support public/private partnerships to fund gateway improvements.

Objective CD 1.3: Recognize and celebrate the City’s cultural and historic resources.

Policy CD 1.3.1: The City shall encourage the survey and documentation of relevant cultural and historic resources.

Program CD 1.3.1a: Maintain documentation of contributing cultural and historic resources and make the list available to the community.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $5,000

Objective CD 1.4: Well maintained neighborhoods.

Policy CD 1.4.1: The City shall encourage community involvement in identifying and combating poor maintenance issues.

Program CD 1.4.1a: Establish a phone number and webpage for residents to use to report incidences of graffiti, trash dumping, overgrown weeds and abandoned vehicles in the short-term planning period.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $5,000

Program CD 1.4.1b: Work with existing community groups to create a maintenance task force to address graffiti and trash removal.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $5,000

Objective CD 1.5: Preserve and enhance the existing character of established residential neighborhoods.

Policy CD 1.5.1: New development in residential neighborhoods shall be compatible with the scale and character of the existing neighborhood.

Program CD 1.5.1a: Create residential design guidelines to ensure that future development and reconstruction in and around existing residential neighborhoods will be compatible in scale and design.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $50,000

Goal CD 2: A compact and accessible city.
Objective CD 2.1: Encourage road connectivity to ensure accessibility by appropriate modes of transportation.

Policy CD 2.1.1: The City shall ensure street networks are planned and interconnected.

Policy CD 2.1.2: Discourage cul-de-sac style road networks.

Policy CD 2.1.3: Prohibit blocks longer than 400 feet in length.

Objective CD 2.2: Provide safe access to pedestrians and bicycles on City maintained roads.

Policy CD 2.2.1: The City shall maintain street design guidelines that support pedestrian and bicycle access.

Policy CD 2.2.2: Discourage neighborhood streets that are wider than 40 feet.

Program CD 2.2.2a: Create a complete streets guide for street development that addresses bicycle lanes, sidewalks and crosswalks and sets standards for traffic calming.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $50,000

Policy CD 2.2.3: New residential projects with more than 10 units shall include bicycle and pedestrian paths to connect the development with the City’s street system.

Goal CD 3: A pedestrian-oriented and unique Central Business District (CBD).

Objective CD 3.1: Implement human-scale design in new construction in the CBD.

Policy CD 3.1.1: Development in the CBD shall include human scaled details such as clear storefront windows, entrances, awnings, balconies, arcades, and other architectural features that create an aesthetically pleasing pedestrian environment.

Program CD 3.1.1a: Create a Community Design Guidelines document that outlines specific details needed in the design of new construction in the downtown core in the short-term planning period.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $50,000

Objective CD 3.2: Promote development styles that encourage pedestrian activity and active street fronts.

Policy CD 3.2.1: Development of two and three story buildings in the CBD shall be encouraged.

Policy CD 3.2.2: Infill development located within the CBD shall be at least 22 feet for a two story building and a maximum of 45 feet in height to provide a safe and comfortable sense of enclosure and to enhance vibrancy.
Policy CD 3.2.3: Maintain a complete street-wall along the CBD.

Policy CD 3.2.4: There shall be a zero foot setback of buildings along the sidewalk of the CBD. New infill and reconstructed buildings shall be built at the property line to provide a continuous street-wall of building facades.

Policy CD 3.2.5: On-site parking in the CBD is to be located behind buildings.

Objective CD 3.3: Promote a cohesive architectural style.

Policy CD 3.3.1: The City shall identify and promote a cohesive and attractive architectural style that enhances the community identity.

Policy CD 3.3.2: New development shall include architectural details such as (but not limited to) awnings, balconies, arcades, and patios that reflect appropriate architectural styles. “Southwestern” and “Spanish colonial” styles may be considered.

Objective CD 3.4: Enhance attractiveness of streetscape.

Policy CD 3.4.1: The City shall maintain streetscape design guidelines pertaining to pavement patterns, surface treatments, landscaping, bike lanes, and sidewalks to enhance the attractiveness and safety of the streets.

Policy CD 3.4.2: New streetscape developments adhere to the design guidelines.

Policy CD 3.4.3: One large and climate-suitable tree shall be installed for every five vehicle parking spaces built to provide shade and aesthetic appeal.

Objective CD 3.5: Enhance the character of San Joaquin’s CBD.

Policy CD 3.5.1: The City shall include design details that enhance the unique small town character of the CBD.

Program 3.5.1a: Provide directional signage that reflects the amenities in the downtown area.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Long-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $200,000

Program 3.5.1b: Install street furniture that is cohesive in style and reflects the design themes in the community.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $75,000

Goal CD 4: A community that encourages safety through design

Objective CD 4.1: Improved street lighting.

Policy CD 4.1.1: The City shall implement a lighting ordinance to improve lighting and reduce energy consumption in neighborhoods.
Program CD 4.1.1.a: Map areas of poor illumination and seek to ameliorate with energy efficient lighting.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $25,000

Program CD 4.1.1.b: Identify dangerous or poorly lit alleys in the City and locate funding to place lighting in the vicinity.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $25,000

Program CD 4.1.1c: Investigate opportunities for energy efficiency improvement utilizing PG&E on-bill financing and other no and low interest loan programs.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $25,000

Objective CD 4.2: Encourage buildings that are designed for community safety through natural surveillance.

Policy CD 4.2.1: The City shall require a minimum standard of sight access in new commercial developments.
Policy CD 4.2.2: At least 60% of the façade on new commercial buildings permeable (entrances, windows, etc.).
Policy CD 4.2.3: The City shall encourage the establishment of a variety of uses in the CBD.
Policy CD 4.2.4: Allow sidewalk cafes in the CBD.
Policy CD 4.2.5: Encourage balconies on the second and third stories of mixed-use buildings in the CBD.

Objective CD 4.3: Improved pedestrian safety.

Program CD 4.3.1a: Maintain a database of pedestrian incidences and identify the most dangerous intersections in the City.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Ongoing Program
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $5,000

Goal CD 5: A community that achieves environmental sustainability through design.
Objective CD 5.1: Utilize passive and active solar design elements.

Policy CD 5.1.1: New buildings and remodels should utilize passive (e.g. window placement, overhangs, and thermal massing) and active (e.g. photovoltaic and solar hot water heating) design elements.

Program CD 5.1.1a: Include energy and water conservation examples in the community design guidelines for future remodeling and building.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $50,000

Objective CD 5.2: Promote xeriscaping.

Policy CD 5.2.1: The City shall promote drought tolerant residential and commercial landscaping.

Objective CD 5.3: Reduce stormwater runoff from streets and parking lots.

Policy CD 5.3.1: The City shall consult with a landscape architect to implement stormwater runoff reduction in street design and streetscaping.

Policy CD 5.3.2: The City shall encourage cisterns and rain barrels as acceptable means for property owners to collect and store rainwater.

Objective CD 5.4: Maintain views of the night sky.

Policy CD 5.4.1: Lighting shall be designed to maintain views of the night sky.

Program CD 5.4.1a: Design Guidelines shall be developed that include lighting and glare standards. These standards shall require hoods or shields on outdoor lighting fixtures to focus light downward. Building materials that reduce glare shall be encouraged.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $50,000
14 Health Element

The Health Element, adapted from the Fresno County Department of Public Health’s *Health Language Recommendations for Fresno County Community Plan* (HLRFCGP) is the long-range vision of approaches that enhance the health level of residents by promoting physical activity through the built environment and improving access to healthy food options. The City adopts the Fresno County vision which is to “improve access to healthier lifestyles” for residents (FCDPH, pg.2).

Central Valley residents are at high risk for health issues such as diabetes and obesity. Increasing daily exercise and improving diet are important steps a community can take to begin to combat these, and other, health issues. The City of San Joaquin can plan the built environment in a way that encourages physical activity and makes it easier and safer for residents to walk and bike. This may include planning for the provision of bike lanes, a complete sidewalk network, increased safety at intersections, and shorter, more pedestrian friendly blocks. The General Plan encourages the provision of fresh fruits and vegetables in the City. The goals, objectives, policies and programs of this Element consider the current regulatory, environmental and social environment in order to address the prescriptions of the “Get Fit Fresno County” program. Many of the following policies are adapted from the HLRFCGP.

The City established a community garden at the northwest side of Colorado and Ninth Street in 2011. The City promotes the community garden and provides seedlings for planting twice the year, spring and fall.

The City established two walking trails at the Sport Park. The trails are approximately one-quarter mile long starting on Eight Street at Colorado extending to Elm Street. These trails are the beginning of a Citywide walking trail system.

The City has established bike lanes on existing roads and is proceeding to identify and construct class I bike trails within the community.

The following planning and policy documents also relate to or implement the Health Element.

**City of San Joaquin Mobility and Revitalization Plan (2012).** The City of San Joaquin Mobility and Revitalization Plan is a document prepared to identify a community vision, street design and circulation, and areas of growth, revitalization, and use.

**Groundwater Management Plan (2010).** The Groundwater Management Plan (GMP) was prepared for the James Irrigation District and City of San Joaquin to better coordinate efforts, share data, and improve regional management of groundwater resources. The purpose of the GMP is to develop consensus among agency staff and stakeholders on groundwater condition, management, and problem-solving, develop practical solutions for addressing issues, including overdraft, improve communications, document goals and objectives for sustaining and improving groundwater, and provide feasible implementation.

**City Council Resolution No. 09-47 (2009).** The City Council of San Joaquin passed Resolution 09-47 advocating healthy eating and active living. The resolution can be found in Volume II of the General Plan.
14.1 Health Goals, Objectives, Policies, and Programs

Goal HE 1: Increased access to healthy food.
Objective HE 1.1: Encourage the provision of local fresh fruits and vegetables within the City.

Policy HE 1.1.1: The City encourages the provision of a wide variety of fresh fruits and vegetables for local consumption.
Policy HE 1.1.2: The City supports the expansion of the weekly farmers’ market to operate year-round with locally grown produce.
Policy HE 1.1.3: The City supports the California Civil Code §3482.5, “The Right To Farm Act”, adding no required minimum duration for active farming to allow for small-scale (less than one acre) private agricultural operations.
Policy HE 1.1.4: Encourage the inclusion of community gardens in new planned unit developments, potentially in the pocket parks identified in the Recreation Element.
Policy HE 1.1.5: Support the education of community members on the benefits of a healthy diet.
Policy HE 1.1.6: Support community outreach to educate community members and local business about the weekly farmers market and the benefits of eating fresh fruits and vegetables.
Policy HE 1.1.7: Support gardens within the City.

Goal HE 2: High quality water supply.

Water Quality is addressed in the Conservation Element, Goal 3.

Goal HE 3: A physically active community.
Objective HE 3.1: Increase the amount of high quality parks and open space in the City.

Policy HE 3.1.1: The City shall focus the creation of park space and/or a water feature in areas that ensure residents are within walking distance of a recreational feature.
Program HE 3.1.1a: Establish a joint-use agreement with the Golden Plains Unified School District to make grounds available to residents during after-school hours to use for physical activity.
Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $25,000

Policy HE 3.1.1b: Establish additional park space on the eastern and northeastern edges of the City.

Objective HE 3.2: Create additional park space and recreational areas to achieve three acres of open space per 1,000 residents.

Policy HE 3.2.1: New developments shall ensure open space needs of current and future residents are met.
Policy HE 3.2.2: The Quimby Act requires the dedication of at least three acres of park space per 1,000 residents, or the payment of in-lieu fees to pay for future open space dedication. A mixture of park space dedication and reduced in-lieu fees is permissible.

Policy HE 3.2.3: Support the inclusion of publically accessible open and park space in new Planned Unit Developments through increased densities, expedited permitting or reduced fees.

Objective HE 3.3: Improve accessibility to parks and open space.

Objective HE 3.4: Improve the quality and utility of existing parks through design and programming.

Policy HE 3.4.1: The City shall promote both youth and adult sport leagues.

Policy HE 3.4.2: Work with local community groups to establish sports leagues.

Policy HE 3.4.3: The City shall ensure that park space is well maintained and appropriately designed for use by all age groups.

Policy HE 3.4.4: Dedicate a portion of gathered in-lieu fees for improvements to the San Joaquin Sports Park.

Program HE 3.4.4a: Conduct an annual survey of residents to determine met and unmet parks and open space needs, an ongoing program.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $15,000

Program HE 3.4.4b: Periodically review City parks to ensure they meet the needs and desires expressed in annual community surveys.

Responsibility: City Council
Timeframe: Intermediate-Term Planning Period
Funding: General Fund, Grants, and Developer Contributions
Estimated City cost: $10,000
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This is a table summarizing the implementation programs by timeframe and cost. Ongoing programs are annual programs that are equal to the cost of $915,000. Short-term period programs are years zero through five and will cost $445,000. Intermediate-term programs are years six through 10 and will cost $8,170,000. Long-term programs are years 11 and beyond and will cost $11,550,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>On-going Annual</th>
<th>Short-term (Year 0 - 5)</th>
<th>Intermediate-term (Year 6 - 10)</th>
<th>Long-term (Year 11 - 20+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LU 1.1.1a</td>
<td>Amend the Zoning Code for R-2 zones such that the minimum density is four units per acre and the maximum density is 8 units per acre.</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>$915,000</td>
<td>$445,000</td>
<td>$8,170,000</td>
<td>$11,550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU 1.1.1b</td>
<td>Amend the Zoning Code for R-3 zones such that the minimum density is eight units per acre and the maximum density is 20 units per acre.</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU 1.1.1c</td>
<td>Amend the Zoning Code to create an R-4 zone designation with a minimum density of 20 units per acre and a maximum density of 30 units per acre in the short-term planning period.</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU 1.1.1d</td>
<td>Amend the Zoning Code and the Zoning Map to allow increased residential and commercial densities along Main Street and Colorado Avenue.</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU 1.4.2a</td>
<td>The City shall update its sphere of influence plan to accommodate the land area and rate of urban expansion compatible with the policies of this General Plan.</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU 2.1.1a</td>
<td>Amend the zoning ordinance to create a Central Business District on Main Street between Colorado Avenue and California Avenue.</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table B-1
### Implementation Program Summary with Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>On-going Annual</th>
<th>Short-term (Year 0 - 5)</th>
<th>Intermediate-term (Year 6 - 10)</th>
<th>Long-term (Year 11 - 20+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LU 2.2.1a</td>
<td>Establish programs that streamline mixed-use corridor projects, increase flexibility in development standards, and/or reduce impact or permit fees.</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU 2.3.7a</td>
<td>Amend the zoning ordinance to allow for mixed-use projects.</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU 2.4.1a</td>
<td>Designate additional industrial zoning in the vicinity of the intersection of Manning Avenue and Colorado Avenue.</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU 3.1.1a</td>
<td>Designate high-density residential zones on blocks abutting the CBD.</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU 3.1.1b</td>
<td>Designate medium-density residential zones throughout the City.</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU 4.1.1a</td>
<td>Establish additional parks.</td>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| LU 6.1.1a | Clarify requirements for citizen input in the entitlement process, including notification areas, neighborhood meetings, and through the use of the City’s website for information:  
  - Display the Land Use Diagram, zoning map, and key policies in City offices the Council chambers, and City web site;  
  - Hold an annual general plan review and goal setting workshop with the public and City Council. | Intermediate-term |                |                        |                                | $5,000                   |
<p>| LU 6.2.1a | Encourage partnerships between community groups to educate citizens and staff. | Ongoing        | $5,000         |                        |                                |                          |
| LU 6.2.1b | Conduct staff training that addresses the appropriate topics listed in Objective LU 6.2. | Ongoing        | $25,000        |                        |                                |                          |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>On-going Annual</th>
<th>Short-term (Year 0 - 5)</th>
<th>Intermediate-term (Year 6 - 10)</th>
<th>Long-term (Year 11 - 20+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LU 6.2.1c</td>
<td>Utilize libraries, the City website, and City hall to disperse information related to the General Plan Elements, special plans, standards, and guidelines.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU 6.2.1d</td>
<td>Hold one community outreach event per year focused on topics identified in Objective LU 6.2.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIR 1.2.1a</td>
<td>Update the Zoning Code to allow bus stops with shelters as a use by right in the appropriate zones.</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIR 2.1.1a</td>
<td>Adopt complete streets guidelines that addresses pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, traffic calming, and street beautification.</td>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIR 2.2.2a</td>
<td>Establish a class II bicycle lane on Colorado Avenue from Elm Street to Manning Avenue.</td>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIR 2.2.2b</td>
<td>Update the zoning code to require new development to construct and/or fund the projects share of new bike lanes.</td>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIR 2.3.1a</td>
<td>Update the Zoning Code to require bicycle parking within high density residential, commercial and industrial land uses.</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIR 2.3.1b</td>
<td>The City shall investigate and apply for state and federal funding for bicycle parking for high density residential, commercial, and industrial uses.</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIR 2.3.1c</td>
<td>Construct bicycle parking for high density residential, commercial, and industrial uses.</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIR 2.4.1a</td>
<td>Construct a complete bike path system to provide access to major centers in the City.</td>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>On-going Annual</td>
<td>Short-term (Year 0 - 5)</td>
<td>Intermediate-term (Year 6 - 10)</td>
<td>Long-term (Year 11 - 20+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIR 2.5.1a</td>
<td>The City shall investigate and apply for state and federal funding for expanding and maintaining the City’s network of sidewalks, crosswalks, and trails.</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIR 2.5.1b</td>
<td>Improve sidewalks that are in poor quality and repair damaged sidewalks when feasible.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIR 2.5.1c</td>
<td>Install ADA required facilities for pedestrians and wheelchairs at intersections when feasible.</td>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIR 2.5.1d</td>
<td>Work with Caltrans to install crosswalks at intersections crossing Main Street in the Central Business District.</td>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIR 3.2.1a</td>
<td>The City shall investigate and apply for state and federal funding for fixed bus route operation.</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIR 3.3.1a</td>
<td>Facilitate the provision of vanpool services for farm workers commuting to and from Fresno in the short-term planning period.</td>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIR 4.2.1a</td>
<td>Install signage that route trucks along Colorado, Placer and Manning Avenues.</td>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIR 4.2.2a</td>
<td>Seek funding for the implementation of traffic calming on Elm Avenue and California Avenue.</td>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B-1
Implementation Program Summary with Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>On-going Annual</th>
<th>Short-term (Year 0 - 5)</th>
<th>Intermediate-term (Year 6 - 10)</th>
<th>Long-term (Year 11 - 20+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIR 4.3.1a</td>
<td>Update the City’s street standards incorporating, as feasible, the following: 1. Implement California Complete Streets standards designed to accommodate multiple modes of mobility, increase pedestrian and bike safety, and improve aesthetics. 2. Implement street design standards that calm or slow motor vehicles through the design of the street section rather than retrofitting the street after construction. Refer to the draft CNU/ITE Street Design Manual created by the Institute for Transportation Engineers with support from the Federal Highway Administration and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 3. Recommend using multi-modal performance evaluation metrics rather than the more conventional AASHTO and ITE Manual criteria. The Transportation Research Board National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report 616: Multimodal Level of Service Analysis for Urban Streets provides a method for assessing how well an urban street serves the needs of all of its users (<a href="http://www.trb.org/Main/Blurbs/160228.aspx">http://www.trb.org/Main/Blurbs/160228.aspx</a>). 4. Implement separate LOS tables for transit, bicycles, and pedestrians for use at multi-modal streets that measure quantitative and qualitative metrics such as accessibility, intersection crossing times, and other relevant and contextual data. Determine appropriate LOS for each mode, and develop context-sensitive LOS targets for multiple circulation modes.</td>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIR 5.1.2a</td>
<td>The City shall pursue funding to add crossing guards to railroad crossings in the City.</td>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>Short-term (Year 0 - 5)</td>
<td>Intermediate-term (Year 6 - 10)</td>
<td>Long-term (Year 11 - 20+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIR 5.1.2b</td>
<td>The City shall construct crossing guards at railroad crossing in the City.</td>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIR 5.1.2c</td>
<td>The City shall pursue the funding and realignment of Elm Street, including traffic calming components.</td>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIR 5.1.2d</td>
<td>The City shall realign Elm Street and construct traffic calming components.</td>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIR 5.1.2e</td>
<td>The City shall pursue funding to add a roundabout at Manning Avenue, 9th Street, and Pine Avenue.</td>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIR 5.1.2f</td>
<td>The City shall add a roundabout at Manning Avenue, 9th Street, and Pine Avenue.</td>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIR 5.2.1a</td>
<td>Install and maintain signs near the CBD and schools that slow traffic and inform drivers of pedestrians.</td>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 1.1.1a</td>
<td>Provide map and survey result updates to the California Natural Diversity Data Base (<a href="http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cnddb/">http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cnddb/</a>), wetlands mapping and mapping of the Waters of the U.S. as information becomes available through studies and project review.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 1.1.2a</td>
<td>In the event that endangered or special-status species are identified within the City, the developer shall implement mitigation to maintain the species including their habitats, migration corridors, and nesting areas.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 1.2.1a</td>
<td>Maintain a program to plant trees within the City.</td>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 1.3.1a</td>
<td>Development shall use native plants or other appropriate non-invasive, drought-tolerant plants wherever feasible to reduce maintenance and irrigation costs.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>On-going Annual</td>
<td>Short-term (Year 0 - 5)</td>
<td>Intermediate-term (Year 6 - 10)</td>
<td>Long-term (Year 11 - 20+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 1.3.1b</td>
<td>Maintain a list of native, drought-tolerant, and non-invasive plants appropriate for use within the City.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 2.1.1a</td>
<td>Update the Water Conservation Strategy every five years.</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 2.1.1b</td>
<td>Implement the Water Conservation Strategy implementation measures (water meters, low-flow showerheads, faucets, toilets, smart irrigation controls, efficient sprinkler heads and developing watering schedules for commercial and industrial properties and classroom education).</td>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 2.1.1c</td>
<td>Develop water efficiency standards for water use in the City and for the City to meet established targets.</td>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 2.1.1d</td>
<td>Locate and pursue funding sources for water conservation infrastructure and programs that promote conservation.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 2.1.1e</td>
<td>Monitor water use and energy consumption to measure the results of conservation programs.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 2.2.1a</td>
<td>Complete water audits of distribution systems using methodology consistent with that described in American Water Works Associations Water Audit and Leak Detection Guidebook, including annual prescreening and assessment of full-scale audit needs.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 2.2.1b</td>
<td>Public works will oversee water conservation programs in the City.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 2.2.3a</td>
<td>The City shall install smart water meters on connections to the water distribution system, both new and existing.</td>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Included in CON 2.1.1b</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>On-going Annual</td>
<td>Short-term (Year 0 - 5)</td>
<td>Intermediate-term (Year 6 - 10)</td>
<td>Long-term (Year 11 - 20+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 2.2.3b</td>
<td>The City shall adopt commodity rates (by volume of use) for new connections and retrofit of existing connections.</td>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 2.2.4a</td>
<td>Provide water customers with support and incentives to improve their landscape water use efficiency.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 2.2.4b</td>
<td>Proactively notify customers whenever it appears possible that leaks exist on the customer's side of the meter.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 2.2.9a</td>
<td>Research methods for outdoor water conservation not included in DWR’s model landscape water use ordinance that can feasibly be implemented.</td>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 2.2.9b</td>
<td>The City may expand programs that enhance groundwater recharge in order to maintain the groundwater supply, including: • Utilize existing storm water basins for recharge and install new percolation ponds in new growth areas. • Protect areas of groundwater recharge from land uses and disposal methods that would degrade groundwater quality. • Promote activities that combine stormwater control and water recharge. • Continue and expand water conservation programs.</td>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 3.1.1a</td>
<td>Participate in programs that gather groundwater quality data in coordination with James Irrigation District.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 3.1.1b</td>
<td>Maintain the elements of the Joint Groundwater Management Plan (2010) with the on-going groundwater monitoring and information sharing.</td>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 3.2.1a</td>
<td>Collaborate with regional water agencies to share information as outlined in the Upper Kings Basin Integrated Regional Water Management Plan.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table B-1

Implementation Program Summary with Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>On-going Annual</th>
<th>Short-term (Year 0 - 5)</th>
<th>Intermediate-term (Year 6 - 10)</th>
<th>Long-term (Year 11 - 20+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CON 3.2.1b</td>
<td>Work with the James Irrigation District to review available water quality data to identify areas with the potential for saline water intrusion and ways to protect those areas through saline reduction programs.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 3.2.1c</td>
<td>Work with regional agencies and municipalities to target non-point source pollution and vulnerable recharge areas and develop programs to reduce the impacts of these pollution sources region-wide.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 4.1.1a</td>
<td>Amend development code to allow solar panels.</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Included in LU 1.1.1a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 4.1.3a</td>
<td>Work with energy providers to install solar generation facilities.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 4.1.3b</td>
<td>The City shall conduct an analysis to identify opportunities for increased distributed energy generation in the City.</td>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 4.1.4a</td>
<td>Seek funds from federal, state, utilities, and private sources for the installation of solar panels on new and existing buildings.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 4.2.1a</td>
<td>Streamline the entitlement process for buildings with proper solar orientation for solar photovoltaic and solar hot water systems (where one axis of the building is at least 1.5 times longer than the other, and the longer axis is within 15 degrees of geographical east-west).</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Included in LU 1.1.1a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 4.2.1b</td>
<td>Participate in PG&amp;E’s Local Government Partnership program or other rate-payer funded programs like a Regional Energy Network (REN) if and when a Fresno REN or other similar program is established.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Table B-1

Implementation Program Summary with Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>On-going Annual</th>
<th>Short-term (Year 0 - 5)</th>
<th>Intermediate-term (Year 6 - 10)</th>
<th>Long-term (Year 11 - 20+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CON 6.4.1a</td>
<td>Identify opportunities to increase energy efficiency of public buildings and increase distributed generation utilizing existing state-wide energy efficiency funding sources and programs like Energy Upgrade California, utility rebates and incentives, and Local Government Partnerships to increase building efficiency, reduce energy consumption, and increase on site renewable energy production.</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 6.4.1b</td>
<td>Develop an energy management system for public buildings.</td>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 5.3.1a</td>
<td>Coordinate land use and transportation plans to meet federal, state, and local air quality requirements.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 5.3.1b</td>
<td>Develop a multi-modal transportation system when feasible.</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 6.3.1a</td>
<td>Adopt a Right to Farm Ordinance that includes buffers to support agricultural uses of agricultural lands adjacent to urban uses.</td>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 7.1.1a</td>
<td>Adopt a Climate Action Plan (CAP).</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 7.1.1b</td>
<td>Seek funds to develop and implement a CAP.</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS 1.3.1a</td>
<td>Construct parks on the eastern, northeastern, and western edges of the City, so that future growth towards the City Limit is near park space.</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS 2.2.1a</td>
<td>Co-locate park space and recreational facilities with the development of the City’s new school.</td>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS 2.3.1a</td>
<td>The City shall monitor how existing City owned facilities meet the needs of residents. Conduct a survey of residents to determine met and unmet parks and open space needs.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table B-1

### Implementation Program Summary with Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>On-going Annual</th>
<th>Short-term (Year 0 - 5)</th>
<th>Intermediate-term (Year 6 - 10)</th>
<th>Long-term (Year 11 - 20+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OS 3.1.1a</td>
<td>The City shall develop a Park Master Plan that addresses the park needs and revenue sources for development.</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 1.1.1a</td>
<td>The City will maintain updated maps of faults and subsidence within 200 miles of San Joaquin.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 1.1.1b</td>
<td>Work with the James Irrigation District to collect and analyze information regarding groundwater levels to avoid subsidence.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 1.1.2a</td>
<td>The City shall maintain emergency plans to be followed in the event of earthquakes or other natural disasters.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 2.1.1a</td>
<td>Maintain the inspection and enforcement system to reduce potential for urban fire on under-maintained lots.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 3.1.1a</td>
<td>Check storm drains and roadways annually for flooding related maintenance.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 3.2.2a</td>
<td>Provide community members with information regarding flooding related design standards at the library and City Hall. Include information with all permitting packets.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 5.2.1a</td>
<td>Maintain the Emergency Implementation Plan.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 5.2.1b</td>
<td>Coordinate with health center annually to review and align its disaster management plan with citywide disaster recovery plans, an ongoing program.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 5.3.1a</td>
<td>Incentivize health care related development through the reduction of permitting fees and accelerated permitting.</td>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 5.4.1a</td>
<td>Negotiate with a provider for an on-call shuttle service between the local health center and all health centers in Fresno.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>On-going Annual</td>
<td>Short-term (Year 0 - 5)</td>
<td>Intermediate-term (Year 6 - 10)</td>
<td>Long-term (Year 11 - 20+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 5.4.1b</td>
<td>Identify funding sources for on-call shuttle services.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 6.1.1a</td>
<td>Continue participation in the Fresno County Multi-jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan and ensure that the plan addresses the potential increase in natural disasters because of climate change, an ongoing program.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 6.2.1a</td>
<td>Update the emergency response plan.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 6.2.1b</td>
<td>Identify critical facilities and educate community members about their services and location.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 1.3.2a</td>
<td>Conduct acoustical analyses of the City to establish a baseline set of noise contours.</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td></td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 1.1.1a</td>
<td>City administration shall maintain and update job training information and to coordinate these activities.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 1.1.2a</td>
<td>Facilitate the use of City-owned buildings for adult education programs offered by West Hills Community College.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 2.1.1a</td>
<td>Provide support to events within the CBD with use of City equipment, assistance with grant applications and staff support.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 2.2.1a</td>
<td>Maintain an attractive appearance by implementing the design standards for the CBD.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 2.2.1b</td>
<td>The City will implement programs and coordinate with the Chamber of Commerce to promote the City and CBD.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 3.1.1a</td>
<td>City administration shall research, develop financing programs and assist companies with permitting processes.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table B-1

**Implementation Program Summary with Cost**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>On-going Annual</th>
<th>Short-term (Year 0 - 5)</th>
<th>Intermediate-term (Year 6 - 10)</th>
<th>Long-term (Year 11 - 20+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| E 4.2.2a | The City shall maintain a list of commercial opportunities, incentives, and related programs to be provided to local and regional economic development officials, local businesses, and businesses investigating moving to the City. Components of a marketing plan as advocated by adopted policy may include the following topics:  
- Land Resources – analysis of the supply of land for future commercial and industrial development.  
- General Issues/Marketing – policies to ensure the City markets itself and works with complementary agencies and organizations (EOC, EDD, Chamber of Commerce, etc.) to further the City’s economic goals.  
- Business Retention/Expansion – strategies to assist existing businesses to stay in San Joaquin and expand.  
- Infrastructure/public services – policies to ensure that infrastructure systems and services are maintained as growth occurs.  
- Agriculture – policies to promote the area’s agriculture industry, including agri-tourism. | Ongoing | $15,000 |  |  |  |
| E 4.1.1a | Establish a forum for business owners to communicate their needs to the City. | Ongoing | $5,000 |  |  |  |
| E 4.2.1a | City administration shall provide information on existing business opportunities, business needs, business development programs, and ensure that this information is available. | Ongoing | $5,000 |  |  |  |
### Table B-1

Implementation Program Summary with Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>On-going Annual</th>
<th>Short-term (Year 0 - 5)</th>
<th>Intermediate-term (Year 6 - 10)</th>
<th>Long-term (Year 11 - 20+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PFS 2.1.9a</td>
<td>City staff shall produce annual public reports of recorded water consumption, demand projections, and the state of infrastructure improvements in progress.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS 2.1.9b</td>
<td>City staff shall review and revise the Water Master Plan.</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS 2.3.2a</td>
<td>Maintain a list of low-water-use and drought-tolerant plant species for use in new landscaping.</td>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS 3.1.2a</td>
<td>The City shall update its Wastewater Master Plan.</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS 3.1.2b</td>
<td>The City shall investigate possibilities to power the wastewater treatment plant using on-site renewable energy, i.e. ground mounted solar photovoltaic.</td>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS 4.2.1a</td>
<td>The City shall update its Storm Drainage Master Plan.</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS 5.1.1a</td>
<td>The City shall produce an annual report detailing its estimated diversion rate from public facilities and for all City residents.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS 5.1.2a</td>
<td>The City shall collect and pick up recycling at public buildings and events.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS 5.2.4a</td>
<td>The City shall investigate the possibility to contract with the waste hauler to supply food-waste and/or composting bins to residents and business owners in the event waste hauler constructs or has use of a food-waste/composting facility.</td>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS 6.1.2a</td>
<td>Crime rates and patterns within the City shall be monitored and periodically analyzed to identify unmet needs and refine police services.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS 6.1.5a</td>
<td>The City shall continue to participate in regional gang prevention and enforcement coalitions.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>On-going Annual</td>
<td>Short-term (Year 0 - 5)</td>
<td>Intermediate-term (Year 6 - 10)</td>
<td>Long-term (Year 11 - 20+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS 6.2.2a</td>
<td>Fire rates and patterns within the City shall be monitored and periodically analyzed to identify unmet needs and refine fire services.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 1.1.1a</td>
<td>Seek funds to contract citizens of San Joaquin to create public art pieces for public spaces.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 1.2.1a</td>
<td>Prepare a design and plan for the City gateways.</td>
<td>Intermediate-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain documentation of contributing cultural and historic resources and make the list available to the community.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 1.4.1a</td>
<td>Establish a phone number and webpage for residents to use to report incidences of graffiti, trash dumping, overgrown weeds and abandoned vehicles in the short-term planning period.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 1.4.1b</td>
<td>Work with existing community groups to create a maintenance task force to address graffiti and trash removal.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 1.5.1a</td>
<td>Create residential design guidelines to ensure that future development and reconstruction in and around existing residential neighborhoods will be compatible in scale and design.</td>
<td>Intermediate-</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 2.2.2a</td>
<td>Create a complete streets guide for street development that addresses bicycle lanes, sidewalks and crosswalks and sets standards for traffic calming.</td>
<td>Intermediate-</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 3.1.1a</td>
<td>Create a Community Design Guidelines document that outlines specific details needed in the design of new construction in the downtown core in the short-term planning period.</td>
<td>Intermediate-</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 3.5.1a</td>
<td>Provide directional signage that reflects the amenities in the downtown area.</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table B-1

### Implementation Program Summary with Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CD 3.5.1b</td>
<td>Install street furniture that is cohesive in style and reflects the design themes in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 4.1.1a</td>
<td>Map areas of poor illumination and seek to ameliorate with energy efficient lighting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 4.1.1b</td>
<td>Identify dangerous or poorly lit alleys in the City and locate funding to place lighting in the vicinity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 4.1.1c</td>
<td>Investigate opportunities for energy efficiency improvement utilizing PG&amp;E on-bill financing and other no and low interest loan programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 4.3.1a</td>
<td>Maintain a database of pedestrian incidences and identify the most dangerous intersections in the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 5.1.1a</td>
<td>Include energy and water conservation examples in the community design guidelines for future remodeling and building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 5.4.1a</td>
<td>Design Guidelines shall be developed that include lighting and glare standards. These standards shall require hoods or shields on outdoor lighting fixtures to focus light downward. Building materials that reduce glare shall be encouraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 3.1.1a</td>
<td>Establish a joint-use agreement with the Golden Plains Unified School District to make grounds available to residents during after-school hours to use for physical activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 3.4.4a</td>
<td>Conduct an annual survey of residents to determine met and unmet parks and open space needs, an ongoing program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 3.4.4b</td>
<td>Periodically review City parks to ensure they meet the needs and desires expressed in annual community surveys.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>On-going</th>
<th>Short-term (Year 0 - 5)</th>
<th>Intermediate-term (Year 6 - 10)</th>
<th>Long-term (Year 11 - 20+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate-term</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C  Future Considerations

The list of future considerations is a compilation of City Council, Planning Commission, or community identified desires, for future consideration by the City Council. When community members suggest policy recommendations, these recommendations will be added to this list for deliberation by the City Council during the annual General Plan review period or each time the General Plan is updated. This list is dynamic and new items will continue to be added throughout the life of the General Plan; however, items can be removed from the list at the Council’s discretion. When items are “approved” by the City Council, they will be developed into policies and/or implementation measures and included as part of General Plan amendment process.

1. **Evaluate whether there are needed revisions to the circulation map.** These revisions may include road route, road classification, transit, and pedestrian and bicycle trails.

2. **Evaluate the need for policies on aviation.** The General Plan Transportation Element may include policies that address aviation and helicopter operators.

3. **Evaluate the need update policies on public buildings and grounds.** The General Plan Public Services and Facilities Element may include policies that address public buildings and grounds.

4. **Evaluate the need for an indoor pool, amphitheater, and BMX Track in the City.**

5. **Evaluate if there are any policy changes after adoption of Energy Assurance Plan and update Volume II to include.**

6. **Evaluate if there are any policy changes after adoption of Sustainable Communities Strategy and update Volume II to include.**
Appendix D  Public Outreach

D.1 Introduction

This section describes the community planning process undertaken by the study team during the preparation of the City of San Joaquin Community Plan Update. This planning process involved three distinct and important steps (See Figure 2-1):

1. Gathering information by conducting a land use inventory, researching background information about the City, conducting personal interviews with stakeholders, distributing and collecting surveys, and holding community meetings;
2. Analyzing information from primary and secondary research to develop future directions for the City; and
3. Comparing alternative scenarios for the future of the City.

Figure D-1. The Community Planning Process.

Community Input

Gather Information

Where are we?

Analyze Information

Where do we want to be?

Compare Alternatives

How do we get there?

Create the San Joaquin General Plan!

Source: Cal Poly, 2010

Community feedback is an integral part of the community planning process. Community feedback was obtained through personal interviews with stakeholders, surveys of residents and community meetings. These outreach efforts are described in the community feedback section.

1 This appendix was prepared as part of the Cal Poly 2040 Community Plan dated June 2011.
D.2 Background Research and Fieldwork

Each Community Plan element is influenced by policies set at the local, regional and state level. These policies guide the community’s decision-making process concerning when, where, and how to grow, as well as determining what infrastructure is needed to serve growth. This section describes the formal research sources, organizations and fieldwork undertaken by members of the planning team.

D.2.1 Information Sources

Agencies with interests or responsibilities related to development and use of land in Fresno County were consulted to identify current land uses. The following agencies were consulted to establish policies and best practices:

- California Department of Conservation
- California Department of Education
- California Department of Finance
- California Department of Fish and Game
- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
- California Department of Housing and Community Development
- California Department of Public Health
- California Department of Resources, Recycling, and Recovery
- California Department of Transportation
- California Department of Water Resources
- California Office of Planning and Research
- California State Water Resources Control Board
- City of San Joaquin
- Federal Bureau of Investigation
- Federal Emergency Management Agency
- Fresno Council of Governments
- Fresno County Department of Public Works and Planning
- Fresno County Environmental Health Department
- Fresno County Sheriff’s Department
- Golden Plains Unified School District
- U.S. Access Board Guidelines
- U.S. Department of Energy
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

These agencies either report on activities (e.g., Department of Finance records current population and employment information) or guide local decision-making (e.g., the Local Agency Formation Commission determines if and when bordering areas can be annexed by the City).

D.2.2 Land Use Inventory

The planning team conducted a land use inventory in early October 2010 primarily to determine land uses and conditions of buildings within city limits. The inventory included a visual assessment of each parcel. A classification and coding system was adapted from Fairfax County, Virginia, to categorize the land uses. The condition of roads, sidewalks and trails were also noted. Figure 2-2, Figure 2-3 and Table 2-1 show the land uses in the City and its Sphere of Influence.
Figure D-2. City Land Use Inventory.

Figure D-3. Land Use Inventory for Sphere of Influence.

Table D-1. Land Use Designations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Sphere of Influence</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td>158.52</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>158.52</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td>230.95</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>506.95</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.02</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>25.02</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.09</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>46.09</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td>78.13</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>78.13</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.69</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>39.69</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.09</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>19.09</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td></td>
<td>106.00</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>126.00</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acreage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>710.20</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td><strong>962.20</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2010 Land Use Survey
D.3 Community Outreach

Community outreach was fundamental to the development of the Community Plan. Five community meetings were conducted by the study team. Additionally, two supplemental trips were made to the City. A number of surveys were collected throughout the process; the details of which follow in the general and economic survey sections and following chapters. The vast majority of adult community members were non-native English speakers, so Spanish translators were present at each meeting. The format of the community meetings is discussed in the following subsections.

D.3.1 Supplemental Trip 1: October 7, 2010

This supplemental community outreach effort was held at the San Joaquin Veteran’s Hall.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this trip was to introduce the planning studio to the City, and to encourage members of the City to participate in the upcoming meeting.

**Format**

A weekly Thursday night dinner is provided free of charge by local aid organizations (such as the Waterford Foundation and Salvation Army). Discussions with city staff brought to light that this weekly event saw participation in numbers approaching five hundred. Though no absolute count was made, estimates place the crowd at well over two hundred, with a majority being children.

A table was provided by the City on which team members placed clipboards with a general supplemental survey for individuals to fill out in Spanish or English as preferred. Candy was also provided to encourage children to bring their parents to the table. Team members who spoke Spanish aided community members in completing surveys. Twenty survey responses were collected that night. Additional surveys were given to the Mayor Pro Tem and head of the local **Promotoras** (the participatory arm of a regional community non-profit organization). Details of this survey are included in the Background Report.

D.3.2 Community Meeting 1: October 9, 2010

Community Meeting 1 was held at the San Joaquin Veteran’s Hall.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this meeting was to introduce the study team to the community, explain the Community Plan Process, record valuable input about the perceived state of the community and confirm initial feedback received from surveys. The combined feedback follows in the feedback section. Community members were asked to answer three questions:

• What do you like about your community?
• What does your community lack?
• What would make your community better?
Format

The first community meeting included a brief introduction of the study team, the purpose of the project, how this would be accomplished and an explanation of the final product (the update to the Community Plan). The meeting began with ten adult members of the community, but this number doubled as the meeting progressed. The language distribution witnessed at the first supplemental meeting held constant and most community members only spoke Spanish.

Two community member tables were established, along with one community leader table at which sat the Mayor, City Manager and Public Works Director, among others. A facilitator asked all groups three questions (translated in Spanish by the Mayor Pro Tem) and gave groups 15 minutes or more to respond to each question. Feedback and discussion ensued as the participants provided input. Answers were written on notepads for each of the three questions. One team leader for each group presented the answers to the entire gathering.

Feedback

This section discusses the common answers received in both surveys and community meetings. The team accumulated beneficial input that would help in determining the future vision for the City. Detailed descriptions of these answers follow in chapters under the community feedback sections and the input from community leaders follows in the stakeholder interviews section as well as later chapters. There was a range of different feedback but common answers throughout the surveys and Community Meeting 1 included:

Likes about the community:

- Everyone knows each other
- The farmer’s market and other community activities
- Everything is within walking distance
- A very low crime rate

Things the community lacks:

- A well-trained workforce to attract businesses
- A public transportation system
- Fast-food restaurants and shopping opportunities
- A youth center
- A 24-hour medical clinic
- Adequate school space
- A grocery store

Things to make the community better:

- More parks, trees, flowers and landscaping
- More employment opportunities and job training
- More public facilities (bathrooms, benches, etc.)
- More stores and entertainment opportunities
- Teen activities
- General maintenance and upkeep of streets and sidewalks
D.3.3 Supplemental Trip 2, November 2, 2010

The second supplemental trip coincided with a public festival in the City: *Día de los Muertos*.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this trip was to obtain additional information regarding economic forces, understand community design preference and to advertise the next community meeting.

**Format**

The main downtown street was closed off to vehicular traffic for the street festival. In Mexican culture, the *Día de los Muertos* is a popular holiday which honors the deceased members of the community. Offerings are made to the deceased in the form of candy, liquor and toys (for deceased children). The City began its own celebration in 2009 with three altars to the dead and a handful of street vendors offering assorted cultural foods and beverages. The altars are part of a design competition entered into by local community members. In 2010, the festival boasted nine altars, numerous street food vendors, cultural dances and disk music for participants to dance to on an improvised dance floor. Though no head count was made, it is estimated that community member participation reached several hundred for the event.

Team members, with assistance of the Mayor Pro Tem set up a booth with different materials to help facilitate discussion. The booth, consisting of a table and some easels displaying posters stood at one end of the festivities near the heart of the celebration, the cultural dance stage. This location placed outreach team members in direct interaction with attendees. Two Spanish posters with 24 pictures in all were used to conduct a visual preference survey (see Figure 2-4 and Figure 2-5). This visual tool asked participants to select the style they most preferred from three designs of houses, neighborhoods, sidewalks and other amenities.

Also, team members administered a survey which asked the following general economic, housing and shopping and entertainment questions:

- Are you satisfied with the job opportunities in San Joaquin?
- Are you interested in obtaining new job skills?
- Are you satisfied with the shopping opportunities in San Joaquin?
- Where do you purchase a majority of your household goods?

Additional survey forms were left with the *Promotoras* to conduct throughout the City. Collected surveys were to be returned to the team members at a later date.

**Feedback**

This section discusses the answers provided and preferences for the economic survey and visual preference survey, respectively.
**Economic Survey:**

41 surveys were collected from the *Día de los Muertos* festival. The proportion of answers to some of the more one-sided responses are as follows:

- 62.5% of respondents were not satisfied with the job opportunities in San Joaquin.
- 78.4% of respondents were interested in obtaining new job skills.
- 82.9% of respondents were not satisfied with the shopping opportunities in the City.
- 91.4% of respondents obtained a majority of their household goods in the City of Fresno.

Detailed examination of this survey is included in the Background Report.

**Visual Preference Survey:**

Over 80 individuals participated in the visual preference survey which was administered both during Supplemental Trip 2 and Community Meeting 2. The majority of participants were from the *Día de los Muertos* festival so while the participants were given equal opportunity to cite their preferences, the results from the second community meeting served merely to confirm conclusions which were already developing about preferences. Some of the more striking results are as follows:

- 62 percent of respondents preferred the Spanish colonial style of architecture over the Craftsman and ranch style homes.
- 62 percent of respondents preferred low density neighborhoods over medium and high density neighborhoods.
- 81 percent of respondents preferred the sidewalk with more treatments, amenities and arcades over a sidewalk with simple tree-scaping or a blank sidewalk without adornment.

A detailed discussion of this survey is included in the Background Report.
Figure D-4. Architectural Visual Preference Survey.

Note: English translation for the questions above are: “which architectural style do you prefer?”, “which type of street do you prefer?”, “which style house do you prefer?” and “which type of housing do you prefer?”
Figure D-5. Street Visual Preference Survey

Note: English translation for questions above are: “which style of crosswalk do you prefer?”, “which type of sidewalk do you prefer?”, “which bench style do you prefer?”, and “which style of lighting do you prefer?”
**D.3.4 Community Meeting 2: November 18, 2010**

Community Meeting 2 was held at the San Joaquin Veteran’s Hall.

**Purpose**

The purpose of Community Meeting 2 was to present the background research to the community and to gain insight into future directions for the City.

**Format**

The decision was made to hold Community Meeting 2 at a time and place where attendance would be higher than the first meeting. The meeting was held at the free Thursday night dinner. The meeting coincided with the Thanksgiving dinner offerings so attendance was much greater than expected. A vast majority of those in attendance were young children and all participants who were not city officials were Spanish speakers.

At the end of dinner, the City Manager introduced the team and let community members know that a presentation would occur to discuss the future of their community. Children were asked to draw how they wanted the City to look. Crayons and pencils were provided to young children so their parents and other adults could give full attention to the activities and presentation of the team.

The second community meeting included a gallery of stations, displaying visual preference surveys and maps. Participants were asked to perform assessments similar to the previous visual preference survey. Stations which were not purely visual preference surveys (stations which used maps) asked participants to identify specific locations within the City. Community members were instructed to place a sticker on locations in the City which were especially noisy, where they felt unsafe or were particularly malodorous, among other questions.

There was also a presentation which included a brief explanation of what step in the Community Plan update process had been reached; analysis of information. Over 30 attentive adult community members were counted at the beginning of the presentation. The presentation was 35 minutes in duration and discussed many of the general conclusions about each element of the Community Plan. These conclusions form much of the basis for this document and are discussed in the Background Report.

**D.3.5 City Council Meeting: January 25, 2011**

The City Council Meeting was held at the Senior Center, 21991 West Colorado Avenue.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this meeting was to present the total set of recommendations in the form of goals and objectives for each element to the City Council.

**Format**

The City Council Meeting is held monthly on the last Tuesday of the month. All but one City Council Member were in attendance, along with members of City staff and the Sheriff’s
department. Members of the public were welcome to attend, but none did.

The presentation to City Council was a run-through of the proposed goals and objectives that the Community Plan would be pursuing. Council members were given an opportunity to comment and were also provided with copies of the goals and objectives for comment after the meeting.

The goals and objectives were generally positively received by the Council and the feedback contributed to their update.

D.3.6 Community Meeting 3: February 2, 2011

Community Meeting 3 was held at the San Joaquin Veteran’s Hall from 6:00 pm to 8:30 pm.

Purpose

The purpose of Community Meeting 3 was to present the initial set of recommendations in the form of goals and objectives of the Community Plan to the residents of San Joaquin and to receive feedback.

Format

Community Meeting 3 was held in the San Joaquin Veteran’s Hall. Due in part to the City’s automated calling service, which announced the meeting to residents the previous night and paper flyer distribution announcing the meeting, there was high attendance. A total of 44 adult residents and four City officials participated.

There were also a number of children in attendance for whom accommodations were made. In an effort to minimize interference from children as occurred at the previous two community meetings, a children’s table was constructed at the back of the hall and youth were provided with coloring and writing instruments and closely supervised by multiple team members.

The meeting included a PowerPoint presentation conducted in Spanish. An English language table was available and supplied with a proctor to assist with translating the presentation for English speakers to facilitate their discussions. Four Spanish-speaking tables with no less than one team member and a translator facilitated table discussions. Translators were volunteers from California Polytechnic State University’s Modern Languages and Literatures Department. Each table had at least one facilitator and one note-taker.

The goals and objectives were presented in three themes: (a) public health and quality of life; (b) sustainability; and, (c) economic stability. In an effort to remove confusion surrounding terminology and to facilitate discussion, the terms “Goals” and “Objectives” were described using less formal, colloquial terminology. A discussion of the Goals and Objectives followed.

The meeting facilitator and table assistants distributed forms for each section of the presentation and discussion ensued. Sample forms are included in the Appendix. Each form reminded participants of the key points from the section presented and then asked the following three questions:

- What goals do you think were the most appropriate? Please list three.
- What goal was your least favorite? Why?
• Do you have any additional goals that you would like to be included? How would you go about achieving these goals?

Following the discussion for each section, participants were reminded of the goals the Community Plan would pursue which were related to the section and asked “How would you go about achieving these goals?” This question, and the feedback received contributed to the policies and programs associated with each goal and objective discussed in Chapters 6 through 16.

Feedback

Major themes that came out of these discussions were recounted towards the conclusion of the meeting. Discussion tables provided a list of major topics as follows:

Public Health and Quality of Life:
• Accessibility to youth programs
• Better regional transportation options
• Disaster preparedness opportunities
• Improve pedestrian access and lighting
• Improve the safety of the rail crossing
• More affordable housing
• Reduce robberies and other forms of petty crimes

Sustainability
• Increase green space and parks
• Install water meters on homes and businesses
• Invest in alternative energy infrastructure
• Make improvements to water quality and supply

Economic Stability
• Attract essential businesses to the City
• Extend the farmers market to operate through the entire year
• Improve the quality of schools
• Promote job creation opportunities
• Provide opportunities for adult education

Following table feedback, the meeting concluded with an announcement of Community Meeting 4 for the 16th of February at the Veteran’s Hall.

D.3.7 Community Meeting 4: February 16, 2011

Community Meeting 4 was held at the San Joaquin Veteran’s Hall from 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm.

Purpose

The purpose of Community Meeting 4 was to present three growth scenarios to the City that the project team developed through background research, feedback received at community meetings, and stakeholder interviews. The visuals provided at the meeting demonstrated the potential physical consequences of each scenario. The three scenarios presented included Current Trends, Moderate Growth, and Dynamic Growth. A more detailed discussion of these scenarios follows in Chapter 4, Alternatives.
Community Meeting 4 was held at the San Joaquin Veteran’s Hall. A similar strategy was employed to publicize the meeting with flyers and an automated call. The meeting was well attended by 30 San Joaquin adult residents and five City officials.

As with Community Meeting 3, the few children that attended were provided with a supervised table at the back of the hall. Two team members provided children with drawing instruments and games to minimize interference with the proceedings.

The meeting included a presentation conducted in Spanish. Four Spanish-speaking tables with no less than one team member and a translator facilitated table discussions. Volunteer translators were from California Polytechnic State University’s Modern Languages and Literatures Department as well as nearby communities. An English-speaking table was provided for non-Spanish speakers and the table was proctored by a team leader who read the script of the presentation in English for the table. Each table had at least one facilitator and one note-taker. An additional table was provided for City officials to give them an opportunity to comment on alternatives independent of other tables.

The presentation had three separate sections (one for each scenario). The Current Trends Scenario was followed by the Moderate Growth Scenario which was followed by the Dynamic Growth Scenario. Each scenario listed a series of defining characteristics of the scenario to help meeting participants understand what changes might be necessary if the City chose to pursue that scenario. The following are the lists of these defining characteristics provided to meeting participants to aid in conceptualization:

**Current Trends:**
- Buildings downtown would remain single-story
- Existing land use patterns continue
- Majority of the housing type would remain traditional
- San Joaquin would expand across current city limits

**Moderate Growth:**
- Industry development in the southeast
- Mix of apartments and traditional houses
- Plaza in downtown
- Shopping along Main Street with second floor residential
- Space reserved for new school
- Use vacant land (before making buildings taller)

**Dynamic Growth:**
- Additional land allocated for industrial and manufacturing
- Mix of high, medium and low density housing
- Shopping and job centers
- Small parks throughout town
- Three-story downtown with a mix of land use and activities

Conceptual maps were presented which showed the rough locations of different land uses under each scenario. Finally, the two more aggressive growth scenarios showed a 3-dimensional
rendering of the potential building massing on Main Street of their respective scenarios. The Current Trends Alternative projection showed the logical progression of development under current trends.

Following the presentation of each scenario, a scenario-specific slide was displayed which listed key considerations which would likely occur under that particular scenario. These considerations were meant only to facilitate conversation and were as neutral as feasible. The following are the considerations of each scenario which were displayed for meeting participants during table discussions:

**Current Trends:**
- Maintain low density housing
- Need to annex surrounding land and build on farmland
- Difficult to provide parks and services because the City is more spread out
- Requires high levels of energy and water use, which is costly

**Moderate Growth:**
- Loss of some agricultural land
- Higher density
- Rezoning of areas
- Preservation of most agricultural land
- Improve walkability by placing services close.
- Additional school capacity
- Could meet County employment levels

**Dynamic Growth:**
- Variety of activities downtown to shop, eat, and live
- Convenient to walk to school, work, and shopping
- Greater variety and affordability of housing
- Additional space dedicated to employment centers
- Houses are closer together

During table discussions for each scenario, table facilitators read the list of key considerations to their tables and then asked the following questions:

- What considerations concern you the most?
- What considerations do you like the most?
- What parts of this alternative did you like?
- What parts of this alternative did you not like?

Table members were given an opportunity to respond to these questions during discussion time for each scenario and were asked to write responses to questions. When the Dynamic Growth Scenario discussion had finished, the fourth and final discussion asked participants to identify the following:

- What idea did you hear in any of the alternatives that you are most excited about?
- What idea did you hear in any of the alternatives that you are most concerned about?
- Is there something you were hoping to see that you did not see presented?
Feedback from alternative growth scenario discussions was collected and a facilitator shared each
table’s preferences with the entire gathering. The content and detailed discussion of these
preferences follows in Chapter 5, Preferred Alternative.

D.3.8 Community Meeting 5: March 15, 2011

Community Meeting 5 was held at the San Joaquin Veteran’s Hall from 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm.

Purpose

The purpose of Community Meeting 5 was to present the preferred growth scenario to the City
which the Community Plan would be modeled around. This meeting gave the team an
opportunity to explain to community members the preferred scenario and allow participants at the
meeting to understand the potential consequences of the targeted growth that the plan would
recommend. This meeting was also the last opportunity to receive public feedback before the
draft document is submitted to the City.

Format

Community meeting 5 was held at the San Joaquin Veteran’s Hall. The meeting was publicized
similarly to previous meeting with flyers and an automated call. 17 adult community members
and 6 City officials participated.

As with Community Meetings 3 and 4, the few children who were in attendance were provided
with a supervised table at the back of the hall. Two team members provided children with
drawing instruments and games to minimize interference with the proceedings.

The meeting included a presentation conducted in Spanish. Two Spanish-speaking tables were
provided. One team member facilitated discussion and another team member took notes. There
was a greater proportion of English speakers in attendance than previous meetings, therefore two
tables were provided with no less than one team member facilitating discussion and taking notes.
These same facilitators read English scripts of the presentation to their respective tables. A
translator facilitated table discussions and helped present with volunteer translators coming from
California Polytechnic University’s Modern Languages and Literatures Department as well as
nearby communities. An additional table was provided for City officials to give them an
opportunity to comment independent of other tables.

Every participant was presented with a proposed land use map for the preferred growth scenario
which showed with colors and descriptive sentences the scenario’s recommended land use. This
aide is included in the Appendix. After the conclusion of the presentation, table facilitators asked
two basic questions from the worksheets: “what did you like about these ideas?” and “what don’t
you like about these ideas?” Participants were also given the opportunity to include objectives or
comments that might not have been addressed by the preferred scenario.

Feedback

In response to the first question “What did you like about these ideas?” responses were as
follows:

• 3-story buildings
Downtown mixed-use development
The location of manufacturing
The commercial corridor
New school or school improvements
Plaza or park were liked, but much interest in a plaza
Bike lanes
Alternative energy sources, particularly solar power
Green building standards; potential money savings in the long term
Liked that while the plan recommends a higher density downtown, there is still opportunity for detached houses on the outskirts

In response to the second question “What don’t you like about these ideas?” responses were as follows:

Do not like the multi-story housing; too noisy
Scenario did not address dirt alleyways
Focus is on main street, but neglects residential areas
Worried about expansion not addressing the current problems in the City

Additional comments were as follows:

The easiest improvements should be undertaken first
Fix the streets first, very bad drainage
Include more trees on sidewalks
Find a way to lower permitting costs
Find an alternative site for City Hall
Make conservation a priority

Facilitators from each table were given an opportunity to review what was discussed at their table with the Mayor Pro Tem who assisted with translation. The study team’s representative thanked those in attendance for their participation throughout the planning process and acknowledged the contributions of City Officials. The meeting concluded.

D.4 Stakeholder Interviews

To help identify Goals and Objectives for the City, interviews were conducted with major stakeholders of the City. Community Meeting 1 presented an opportunity to gain valuable input from community leaders. Interviews of the City’s stakeholders were conducted in San Joaquin, on November 18, 2010. Interviewees were asked the following questions, among others:

Do you rent or own your space?
What is the main advantage of this location?
What is the main disadvantage?

Feedback

Community leaders and stakeholders came to many of the same conclusions in interviews and Community Meeting 1. The common trends found in their inputs were as follows:
D.5 Meeting Instruments

The following instruments were utilized at the community meetings discussed in Chapter 2. All instruments were provided to participants in Spanish. Where an English-language equivalent was not made available, the text of the instrument has been translated and included in this appendix.

D.5.1 Community Meeting 1

“Bike Lane Design
Which bike lane do you prefer? (Choose one)
Separated from Traffic / Regular lane beside cars / Bicycle Alleyways”

- Keep the small town feel of the City
- Keep the crime rate low
- Increase the opportunities for businesses to thrive
- Develop more park land
- Create more jobs
- Create youth programs
“Tell us where there are roads that need improvement.”
Tell us where there are problems with safety, odors, or noise in San Joaquin. Or, indicate that there are none of these problems.
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Which type of park would you prefer in San Joaquin? Soccer fields, central plaza, baseball field, playground, picnic area, open fields, skate park, pathways with trees and plants, or community gardens.
D.5.2 Community Meeting 2

ENCUESTA DE SERVIOSSOS DE CIUDAD

ACERCA DE ESTA ENCUESTA
La Ciudad de San Joaquin está buscando maneras de mejorar los servicios para sus habitantes. Para lograr estas mejoras, necesitamos escucharte. Por favor responde esta pequeña encuesta. ¡Gracias por tu ayuda!

Conservación del Agua

1.) ¿Comprarías artículos de agua que consuman menos agua, si el gobierno te ayudara a pagarlos?
   Sí _____ No _____ ¿Por qué?

2.) ¿Estarías dispuesto a invertir un poco de dinero, para aprender del uso de agua en tu casa, y esto te ayudara a ahorrar dinero en un futuro?
   Sí _____ No _____ ¿Por qué?

3.) ¿El costo del agua debería de ser relativo a la cantidad de agua que se usa?
   Sí _____ No _____ ¿Por qué?

Conservación de la energía

4.) ¿Comprarías artículos electrodomésticos que consuman menos energía, si el gobierno o la compañía de luz te ayudara a pagarlos?
   Sí _____ No _____ ¿Por qué?

5.) ¿Estarías dispuesto a invertir un poco de dinero, para aprender el uso de energía en tu casa, y esto te ayudara a ahorrar dinero en un futuro?
   Sí _____ No _____ ¿Por qué?

6.) ¿Participarias en un programa que te preste dinero para instalar paneles solares?
   Sí _____ No _____ ¿Por qué?

7.) ¿Te comprometerías a reducir tu consumo de energía en un 10% (apagando las luces que no se necesitan, desconectando los aparatos electrónicos, utilizando menos agua, etc…)?
   Sí _____ No _____ ¿Por qué?

8.) ¿Qué tan importante consideras las siguientes medidas de conservación de agua?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Muy Importante</th>
<th>Importante</th>
<th>No Muy Importante</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tener artículos electrodomésticos que ahoren agua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aprender como puedo ahorrar agua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantas de agua eficientes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programas para reciclar el agua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uso mandatorio en nuevos edificios de accesorios que ayuden a reducir el uso del agua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Preguntas Adicionales

9.) ¿Cuáles de los siguientes programas educativos consideras que son los que más se necesitan en San Joaquin?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programa</th>
<th>Most Importante</th>
<th>Importante</th>
<th>No Muy Importante</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Más clases para los grados K-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Más clases para los grados 6-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clases de educación superior (grados 9-12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escuela nocturna de educación superior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clases GED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formación profesional y cursos de aprendizaje</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programas de Inglés</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cursos de los Colegios Comunitarios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cursos Universitarios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Otra: _____________________________________________________________

10.) Las áreas que considero las más ruidosas en San Joaquin son ______________

                                           ______________________________

                                           ______________________________

11.) Lo que me hace sentir más inseguro en San Joaquin es ______________

                                           ______________________________
City Services Survey

The City of San Joaquin is looking for additional ways to improve services to its residents. In order make these improvements, we need to hear from you! Please fill out this short survey about the various areas the City is considering addressing. Thanks for your help!

Water Conservation

1.) Would you purchase new water efficient appliances if the City helped pay for them?
   Yes___ No___ If so, why?

2.) Would you be willing to invest a little money now to learn how to save water in your home if it helped you save money over time?
   Yes___ No___ If so, why?

3.) Should the cost of water depend on the amount of water used per household?
   Yes___ No___ If so, why?

4.) Would you volunteer to cut your water use by 20% (turn off water while shaving or brushing teeth, etc)
   Yes___ No___ If so, why?

5.) Would you purchase new energy efficient appliances if the power company or city helped pay for them?
   Yes___ No___ If so, why?

6.) Would you be willing to invest a little money now to learn how your house uses energy if it helped you save money over time?
   Yes___ No___ If so, why?

7.) Should the cost of water change depending on the amount of water that is used?
   Yes___ No___ Why or Why not?

8.) How important are the following water conservation measures to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Most Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning about what you can do to save water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planting water efficient plants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water recycling programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requiring new development to include water efficient fixtures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having water saving appliances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAL POLY
### Additional Questions

9.) Which of the following types of education programs are most needed in San Joaquin?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Program</th>
<th>Most Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More classes for grades K-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More classes for grades 6-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school classes (grades 9-12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night high school classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job training and apprenticeship courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community college courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.) The most problematic noise sources in San Joaquin are _____________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

11.) The things that make me feel most unsafe in San Joaquin are _______________________

_________________________________________________________________________
Business Owner Interview

Date of Interview ____________________ Phone _____ In-person _____

Explain that you are graduate students at Cal Poly and that this survey is for academic purposes only. Their answers will remain anonymous.

**BASIC INFORMATION**

Name of business (optional)____________________________

Type of business____________________________

Number of years in this location____________________________

Number of full-time employees____________________________

Part-time employees____________________________

How many square feet/ acres does your business occupy? ______________________________

Do you feel this is adequate? ______________________________

**OWNERSHIP**

Is this business part of a chain or larger organization? ______________________________

Is it locally owned? ______________________________

Do you employ family members? # __________ Others? # __________

Are family member paid? ______________________________

**LOCATION**

Do you rent or own your space? ______________________________

Why did you choose your present location? (You can choose more than one)

- Affordable rent
- Proximity to targeted customers
- Other profitable businesses in area
- Good transportation access
- Available space or space appropriate for your type of business
- Other

What is the main advantage of this location?

What is the main disadvantage?

Have you ever considered moving your business?

If so, for what reason?

SUCCESS and SUPPORT

In the last two years has your sales volume gone up, down, neither?

Is there anything holding your business back?

If yes, what is it?

In your view, do current rules and regulations pose any problems to existing or new businesses?

Do you have a hard time finding people qualified for any of the positions in your business?

Is there any training that would improve current or perspective employee’s ability to perform job tasks?

Is there training you would like to receive?

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS SURVEY!
Business Owner Interview

Fecha de Entrevista ________________ Teléfono____ En personal____

Yo soy una estudiante en Cal Poly San Luis Obispo. Mi clase está ayudando la ciudad con la actualización del Plan General de San Joaquín, un documento requerido por el estado de California que guía desarrollo en la ciudad. Las respuestas serán anónimas.

Información Básica

Nombre de Negocio (opcional)____________________________________

Tipo de Negocio________________________________________________

Número de años en esta ubicación________________________________

Número de empleados de tiempo-completo___________________________

# De tiempo-parcial ______________________________________________

¿Cuánta área ocupa el negocio?___________________________________

¿El espacio es adecuado?_________________________________________

POSSESSION

¿El negocio es parte de una organización más grande o un grupo de negocios?

___________________________

¿Es posesión del negocio local? O hay otra organización afuera de la ciudad que tiene posesión?

___________________________

¿Usted tiene como empleados miembros de su familia? #______________ No Miembros de Familia? #____________________

¿Se pagan los miembros de familia?______________________________

UBICACIÓN

¿Usted renta o posee su espacio?________________________________

¿Por qué selecciono su ubicación presente? (Puede decir más que uno)

- Renta al alcance
- Localización a clientes deseados
- Otros negocios lucrativos en el área
- Buen acceso a transportación
- Espacio disponible o apropiado para su tipo de negocio
- Otro

Que es el provecho mayor de este ubicación? 

Que es el desventaja mayor? 

Ha considerado moverse su negocio? 

Si contesto sì, para que razón? 

**APOYO Y EXITO**

En los últimos dos años, su cantidad de ventas ha subido, bajado o mantenido? 

Hay algo que previene su negocio tener éxito? 

Si contesto sì, que es? 

En su opinión, la regulaciones y reglas corrientes causan alguna problema para negocios existentes o nuevos? 

Usted tiene dificultad encontrando personas calificadas para cualquiera de los posiciones en su negocio? 

Hay entrenamiento que mejoraría habilidades de empleados corrientes o nuevos para hacer las tareas del trabajo? 

Hay entrenamiento que usted le gustaría recibir? 

**GRACIAS PARA PARTICIPAR!!**
Please take a few moments to answer the following questions. Your responses will help City leaders address your concerns and hopes for San Joaquin. ALL RESPONSES ARE ANONYMOUS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How long have you lived in the City?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | Less than 1 year  
|   | 1-5 years  
|   | More than 5 years  
|   | I don’t live here  
| 2. What is your gender? |
|   | Male  
|   | Female  
| 3. Please place an “X” on the line next to your age group. |
|   | under 15  
|   | 15 to 24  
|   | 25 to 34  
|   | 35 to 44  
|   | 45 to 54  
|   | 55 to 64  
|   | 65 to 74  
|   | 75+  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Are you satisfied with job opportunities in San Joaquin?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | Yes  
|   | No  
| 5. What kinds of jobs do you want in San Joaquin? |
| 6. Are you employed or do you own your own business? |
|   | Yes  
|   | No  
| If yes, what is your job title or what type of work do you do? |
| 7. Where do you work? |
|   | I don’t work  
|   | In San Joaquin  
|   | Fresno County (Not SJ)  
|   | Outside Fresno County  
|   | Not sure  
| 8. Are you looking for work? |
|   | Yes  
|   | No  
| If yes, how long have you been looking? |
| 9. Do you do any work from your home (i.e. child care, repairs for neighbors, selling food, etc.)? |
|   | Yes  
|   | No  
| If yes, please specify the type of work |
| 10. Are you interested in obtaining new job skills? |
|   | Yes  
|   | No  
| If yes, what kind of skills would you like to learn? |

Why?
Housing

11. Fill in the number of people in your residence who are:
   - Immediate family
   - Relatives
   - No family relationship to you

12. Fill in the number of each type of room in your residence:
   - Bedrooms
   - Living rooms
   - Family rooms
   - Other (don’t count bathrooms or kitchen)

Dining and Shopping

13. Are you satisfied with dining opportunities in San Joaquin?
   - Yes
   - No

14. What type of restaurant does San Joaquin need?
   

15. Are you satisfied with shopping opportunities in San Joaquin?
   - Yes
   - No

16. Where do you purchase the majority of your household goods?
   - In San Joaquin
   - City of Fresno
   - Other city in Fresno County
   - Outside Fresno County

   Name of store:

17. Rate how important it is to have the following types of businesses in San Joaquin:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comments:

If you have any questions or concerns about this questionnaire, please call City staff member Lupe Estrada at (559) 693-4311.
Favor de tomar unos minutos para contestar las siguientes preguntas. Sus respuestas ayudara a los líderes de la Cuidad tratar sus dudas y esperanzas para San Joaquin. **TODOS RESPUESTOS SON ANTÓNIMOS.**

### Introducción

1. ¿Para cuanto tiempo ha vivido en la Cuidad de San Joaquin?
   - Menos que 1 año
   - 1-5 años
   - Mas que 5 años
   - No vivo aquí

2. ¿Cuál es su género?
   - Masculino
   - Femenino

### Empleo

4. ¿Está usted contento(a) con los oportunidades de empleo en San Joaquin?
   - Sí
   - No

5. ¿Cuáles tipos de trabajo quiere usted en San Joaquin?

6. ¿Está usted empleado(a) o es dueño de su propio negocio?
   - Sí
   - No

Si contesto sí, ¿qué es su título de trabajo o qué tipo de trabajo hace?

7. ¿Donde trabaja?
   - Yo no trabajo
   - En San Joaquin
   - Condado de Fresno (No SJ)
   - Afuera del condado de Fresno
   - No estoy seguro(a)

8. ¿Esta usted buscando trabajo?
   - Sí
   - No

Si contesto sí, ¿cuánto tiempo lleva buscando trabajo?
   - Menos que 3 meses
   - Entre 3 – 6 meses
   - Entre 6 – 12 meses
   - Mas que 12 meses

9. ¿Usted hace cualquier tipo de trabajo en su residencia (por ejemplo: cuidar niños, vender comida, arreglar cosas)?
   - Sí
   - No

Si contesto sí, ¿qué tipo de trabajo?

10. ¿Está usted interesado(a) en obtener nuevas habilidades de trabajo?
    - Sí
    - No

Si contesto sí, ¿qué tipos de habilidades le gustaría aprender?

¿Porque?__________________________
Vivienda

12. Escribe el número de personas en su residencia que se:
   _____ Familia tradicional
   _____ Parientes
   _____ Sin relación familiar

13. Escribe el número de cada tipo de habitación de su residencia:
   _____ Dormitorios / Recamaras
   _____ Salas
   _____ Otras (no cuente baños ni cocinas)

Restaurantes y Compras

14. ¿Está usted contento(a) con las opciones de restaurantes en San Joaquín?
   _____ Sí
   _____ No

15. ¿Qué tipo de restaurante necesita San Joaquín?

16. ¿Está usted contento(a) con los opciones de tiendas en San Joaquín?
   _____ Sí
   _____ No

17. ¿Donde compra usted la mayoría de sus utensilios domésticos?
   _____ En San Joaquín
   _____ Ciudad de Fresno
   _____ Afuera del condado de Fresno
   _____ Otra Ciudad

Nombre de tienda:

18. Favor de indicar la importancia de tener los siguientes tipos de negocios en San Joaquín:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Muy Importante</th>
<th>Poco Importante</th>
<th>Imparcial</th>
<th>No Importante</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ropa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferretero</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmacia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otro:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comentarios adicionales:

Si tiene alguna duda o pregunta de este cuestionario, favor de comunicarse con Lupe Estrada de la Ciudad a (559) 693-4311.
Salud Pública y Calidad de Vida

Mantener vecindarios tranquilos sin crimen

Preparaciones para los desastres y respuestas a las emergencias

- Crear un plan de respuesta emergencia en caso de desastres naturales
- Ensenar a la gente sobre la preparación para los desastres

Planificación de facilidades públicas adecuadas

- Mejorar sistemas para asegurar que tengamos un suministro adecuado y saludable de agua
- Minimizar el desperdicio que generamos
- Mejorar los cruces del ferrocarril y la seguridad de rutas a las escuelas.

Mejorar la calidad de la vida

- Promover la construcción de viviendas al alcance y de calidad
- Acceso conveniente a bienes y servicios.

Las Preguntas a considerar:

Que metas crees que son las mas adecuadas? Por favor haz una lista de tres

Que metas fueron tu menos favoritas? Por que?

Tienes mas metas que quisieras que se incluyeran? ¿Cómo haría usted para lograr estas metas?
Por favor, vea las recomendaciones otra vez y contarnos sus ideas de cómo lograr esas recomendaciones.

**Mantener vecindarios tranquilos sin crimen**

¿Cómo haría usted para lograr estas metas?

---

**Preparaciones para los desastres y respuestas a las emergencias**

- Crear un plan de respuesta emergencia en caso de desastres naturales
- Enseñar a la gente sobre la preparación para los desastres

¿Cómo haría usted para lograr estas metas?

---

**Planificación de facilidades públicas adecuadas**

- Mejorar sistemas para asegurar que tengamos un suministro adecuado y saludable de agua
- Minimizar el desperdicio que generamos
- Mejorar los cruces del ferrocarril y la seguridad de rutas a las escuelas.

¿Cómo haría usted para lograr estas metas?

---

**Mejorar la calidad de la vida**

- Promover la construcción de viviendas al alcance y de calidad
- Acceso conveniente a bienes y servicios.

¿Cómo haría usted para lograr estas metas?
Public Health and Quality of Life

Goals:

- Maintaining peaceful crime-free neighborhoods
- Focusing on disaster preparedness and emergency response
- Create a citywide emergency response plan for natural disasters
- Create and implement a program for public education about disaster preparedness

Planning for adequate public facilities

- Improving facilities to make sure that we have an adequate and healthy water supply
- Implementing systems to deal with or minimize the waste generated
- Improve the safety of the transportation system: by improving railroad crossings and routes to school
- Improve quality of life by providing quality affordable housing and convenient access to goods and services.

Questions to Consider

What goals do you think were the most appropriate? Please list three.

What goal was your least favorite? Why?

Do you have any additional goals that you would like to be included? How would you go about achieving these goals?
Maintaining peaceful crime-free neighborhoods

How would you go about achieving these goals?

Focusing on disaster preparedness and emergency response

- Create a citywide emergency response plan for natural disasters
- Create and implement a program for public education about disaster preparedness

How would you go about achieving these goals?

Planning for adequate public facilities

- Improving facilities to make sure that we have an adequate and healthy water supply
- Implementing systems to deal with or minimize the waste generated
- Improve the safety of the transportation system: by improving railroad crossings and routes to school

How would you go about achieving these goals?

Improve quality of life by providing quality affordable housing and convenient access to goods and services.

How would you go about achieving these goals?
Estabilidad Económica

- Más oportunidades educativas para adultos
  - Trabajar con West Hills Colegio Comunitario para proveer clases en la Cuidad.
  - Proveer mejor transportación a las oportunidades educativas en Fresno.
  - Proveer incentivos financieros a empleadores quienes entrenen sus empleos en habilidades valiosas.
- Identifique San Joaquin como un líder en conservación para atraer de inversión en la Ciudad
  - Crecer estándares de edificación que apoyan la identidad de San Joaquin como pueblo tranquilo y que también promueve conservación de recursos naturales.
  - Desarrollar una estrategia para promover los esfuerzos hacia conservación de la Cidad.
- Crear una ciudad económicamente vibrante con oportunidades de empleo, trabajos de sueldo mejor y con más tiendas y restaurantes.
  - Seguir apoyando el remate.
  - Atraer una compañía para construir una central eléctrica de energía solar.
  - Crear un centro de desarrollo y asistencia para negocios.
  - Proveer terreno suficiente para usos de terreno comercial e industrial.
  - Subrayar los beneficios de las carreteras cercanas para desarrollo económico.

Las Preguntas a considerar

¿Qué metas crees que son las más adecuadas? Por favor haga una lista de tres.

¿Qué metas fueron su menos favoritas? ¿Por que?

¿Tienes más metas que quisieras que se incluyeran? ¿Cómo haría usted para lograr estas metas?
Por favor, vea las recomendaciones otra vez y contarnos sus ideas de cómo lograr esas recomendaciones.

Más oportunidades educativas para adultos
  o Trabajar con West Hills Colegio Comunitario para proveer clases en la Cuidad.
  o Proveer mejor transportación a las oportunidades educativas en Fresno.
  o Proveer incentivos financieros a empleadores quienes entrenen sus empleos en habilidades valiosas.
¿Qué haría usted para lograr estas metas?

Identifique San Joaquin como un líder en conservación para atraer de inversión en la Ciudad
  o Crecer estándares de edificación que apoyan la identidad de San Joaquin como pueblo tranquilo y que también promueve conservación de recursos naturales.
  o Desarrollar una estrategia para promover los esfuerzos hacia conservación de la Ciudad.
¿Qué haría usted para lograr estas metas?

Crear una ciudad económicamente vibrante con oportunidades de empleo, trabajos de sueldo mejor y con mas tiendas y restaurantes.
  o Seguir apoyando el remate.
  o Atraer una compañía para construir una central eléctrica de energía solar.
  o Crear un centro de desarrollo y asistencia para negocios.
  o Proveer terreno suficiente para usos de terreno comercial e industrial.
  o Subrayar los beneficios de las carreteras cercanas para desarrollo económico.
¿Qué haría usted para lograr estas metas?
Economic Stability Goals and Recommendations

- More educational opportunities for adults
  - Partner with West Hills Community College to provide classes in town.
  - Provide better transportation to job training in Fresno.
  - Provide financial incentives to employers who train their employees in valuable skills.
- Identify San Joaquin as a leader in conservation in order to attract investment
  - Create building standards that support the small town feel of San Joaquin and that promote conservation of natural resources.
  - Develop a strategy for promoting the City’s efforts at conservation.
- Create an economically vibrant city with more job opportunities, better paying jobs and more shops and restaurants.
  - Continue to support the Farmers Market.
  - Attract a solar company to build a solar power plant.
  - Create a business assistance and development center.
  - Provide sufficient land for commercial and industrial uses.
  - Emphasize the benefits of the nearby highways for economic development.

Questions to Consider
What goals do you think were the most appropriate? Please list three.

What goal was your least favorite? Why?

Do you have any additional goals that you would like to be included? How would you go about achieving these goals?
More educational opportunities for adults
   - Partner with West Hills Community College to provide classes in town.
   - Provide better transportation to job training in Fresno.
   - Provide financial incentives to employers who train their employees in valuable skills.

What would you do to achieve these goals?


Identify San Joaquin as a leader in conservation in order to attract investment
   - Create building standards that support the small town feel of San Joaquin and that promote conservation of natural resources.
   - Develop a strategy for promoting the City's efforts at conservation.

What would you do to achieve these goals?


Create an economically vibrant city with more job opportunities, better paying jobs and more shops and restaurants.
   - Continue to support the Farmers Market.
   - Attract a solar company to build a solar power plant.
   - Create a business assistance and development center.
   - Provide sufficient land for commercial and industrial uses.
   - Emphasize the benefits of the nearby highways for economic development.

What would you do to achieve these goals?
Sostenibilidad

Metas:

- Un líder de la conservación de la energía en el valle central
  - Explorar programas de energía de alternativa
  - Explorar políticas para alentar alternativas de calefacción y refrigeración en su casa
- Una ciudad modelo para a reducción de las emisiones de gases de efecto invernadero
- Una ciudad modelo para la conservación del agua en el valle central
  - Adoptar y aplicar un Plan de Gestión del Agua
  - Implementación de California Urban Water Conservation Council’s mejorar prácticas de manejo.
  - Exceder los mandatos del estado para reducir el consumo de agua por habitante
  - Reducción de residuos sólidos mediante la reducción y la reutilización de productos

Las Preguntas a considerar

Que metas crees que son las más adecuadas? Por favor haz una lista de tres

Que metas fueron tu menos favoritas? Por qué?

Tienes más metas que quisieras que se incluyeran? ¿Cómo haría usted para lograr estas metas??
Por favor, vea las recomendaciones otra vez y contarnos sus ideas de cómo lograr esas recomendaciones.

Explorar políticas para alentar alternativas de calefacción y refrigeración en su casa

¿Cómo haría usted para lograr estas metas?

Una ciudad modelo para a reducción de las emisiones de gases de efecto invernadero

Mayor eficiencia energética de edificios y equipos

¿Cómo haría usted para lograr estas metas?

Una ciudad modelo para la conservación del agua en el valle central

Adoptar y aplicar un Plan de Gestión del Agua

Implementación de California Urban Water Conservation Council’s mejorar prácticas de manejo.

Exceder los mandatos del estado para reducir el consumo de agua por habitante

¿Cómo haría usted para lograr estas metas?

Reducción de residuos sólidos mediante la reducción y la reutilización de productos

¿Cómo haría usted para lograr estas metas?
Sustainability

Goals:

- An energy conservation leader in the Central Valley
  - Explore alternative energy programs
  - Explore policies to encourage alternative home heating and cooling systems

- A model city for greenhouse gas emissions reduction
  - More energy efficient buildings and appliances

- A model city for water conservation in the Central Valley
  - Adopt and implement an Urban Water Management Plan
  - Implement the California Urban Water Conservation Council’s Best Management Practices
  - Exceed state mandates to reduce per capita water usage

Questions to Consider

What goals do you think were the most appropriate? Please list three.

What goal was your least favorite? Why?

Do you have any additional goals that you would like to be included? How would you go about achieving these goals?
An energy conservation leader in the Central Valley
  o Explore alternative energy programs
  o Explore policies to encourage alternative home heating and cooling systems

How would you go about achieving these goals?
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

A model city for greenhouse gas emissions reduction
  o More energy efficient buildings and appliances

How would you go about achieving these goals?
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

A model city for water conservation in the Central Valley
  o Adopt and implement an Urban Water Management Plan
  o Implement the California Urban Water Conservation Council’s Best Management Practices
  o Exceed state mandates to reduce per capita water usage

How would you go about achieving these goals?
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

Solid waste reduction through reducing and reusing products

How would you go about achieving these goals?
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
Si continuamos con las tendencias actuales ....

CONSIDERACIONES CLAVES

- Anexar el terreno de alrededor y desarrollar terreno de alrededor
- Es difícil proveer parques y servicios por que la ciudad se dispensa
- Necesita niveles altas de energía y uso del agua, cual es costoso
- Mantener viviendas de baja densidad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>¿Qué es lo que le gusta de esta alternativa?</th>
<th>¿Qué es lo que no le gusta de esta alternativa?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If we continue with Current Trends....

Items to Consider:

- Need to annex surrounding land and build on farmland
- Difficult to provide parks and services because the City is more spread out
- Requires high levels of energy and water use, which is costly
- Maintain low density housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What do you like about this alternative?</th>
<th>What do you dislike about this alternative?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Si cambiamos ligeramente los patrones para el Crecimiento Moderado...

CONSIDERACIONES CLAVES
- Pérdida de unas tierras agrícolas
- Densidad más alta
- Reclasificación de áreas
- Preservación de la mayoría de tierra agrícola
- Mejorar la conveniencia de caminar por poner los servicios más cercanos
- Aumentar la capacidad de escuelas
- Posiblemente igualar los niveles del empleo del Condado

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>¿Qué es lo que le gusta de esta alternativa?</th>
<th>¿Qué es lo que no le gusta de esta alternativa?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If we change patterns slightly for Moderate Growth...

Items to Consider:
- Loss of some agricultural land
- Higher density
- Rezoning of areas
- Preservation of most agricultural land
- Improve walkability by making services closer.
- Additional school capacity
- Could meet County employment levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What do you like about this alternative?</th>
<th>What do you dislike about this alternative?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Si cambiamos los patrones de Crecimiento Dinámico ....

CONSIDERACIONES CLAVES
- Una variedad de actividades en el centro para comprar, comer y vivir
- Conveniencia de caminar al trabajo, a las escuelas y a los centros comerciales
- Viviendas más variadas y asequibles
- Espacio adicional dedicado a centros de empleo
- Viviendas más juntas
- Menos espacio para las jardines (y menos agua...) pero, más parques

¿Qué es lo que le gusta de esta alternativa?  ¿Qué es lo que no le gusta de esta alternativa?

If we change patterns for Dynamic Growth....

Items to Consider:
- Variety of activities downtown to shop, eat, and live
- Convenient to walk to school, work, and shopping
- Greater variety and affordability of housing
- Additional space dedicated to employment centers
- Houses are closer together
- Less yard personal yards space and lower water bill
- More space for parks

What do you like about this alternative?  What do you dislike about this alternative?
D.5.5 Community Meeting 5

Objetivos de la alternativa preferida son...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJETIVOS PARA EL USO DE TERRENO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• El centro de 3 pisos máximo y viviendas sobre tiendas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Corredor comercial por Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Manufacturero en el sureste de la Ciudad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nuevos parques con desarrollo futuro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uso mixto incluyendo 2-3 pisos cerca del Centro, residencias de 1 piso y terrenos pequeños, y residencias de 1 piso con terrenos más grandes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Asignar tierra para una nueva escuela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mejora de bancos y carriles de bicicleta y transportación pública</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mejora de parques existentes y capacidad de la escuela existente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No anexar tierra agrícola</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTROS OBJETIVOS

• Mejor calidad del agua y servicios públicos adecuados para el crecimiento de la población |
• Conservación del agua, energía y otros recursos naturales |
• Creación de energía solar e implementación de estándares de edificación sostenibles |

¿Qué le gusta de estos objetivos?

¿Qué no le gusta de estos objetivos?

Objectives of the Preferred Alternative are...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE OBJECTIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Downtown of 3-story maximum with housing and offices over shops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Commercial corridor along Colorado Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Manufacturing in the South East corner of town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New parks linked to future growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mixed housing including 2-3 stories near downtown, 2-story houses with small lots, and 1-story houses on larger lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Allocate land for new school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved sidewalks, bike lanes and public transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improvement of existing parks and existing school capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No annexation of agricultural land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHER POLICY OBJECTIVES

• More educational opportunities for adults |
• Improve water quality and continue to provide public services as the population grows |
• Conservation of water, energy and other natural resources |
• Implementation of solar energy generation and green building standards |

What do you like about this?

What don't you like about this?
Appendix E  General Plan Alternatives

E.1  Introduction

This chapter illustrates three alternatives envisioning different intensities, physical forms, and locales for future development in San Joaquin:

- Current Trends Alternative, assuming that future development densities remain unchanged from current levels;
- Moderate Growth Alternative, assuming a modest increase in development densities; and,
- Dynamic Growth Alternative, assuming a dramatic increase in development densities in the City.

The discussion of each alternative includes an explanation of its conceptual basis, key differentiators, densities, and potential development outcomes. Each alternative considered community input, projected growth, and the City’s opportunities and constraints for development.

Projected population levels are the same for each alternative, based on the assumption that population will continue to grow according to natural growth patterns. Employment levels, however, differ between alternatives to illustrate envisioned increases in the labor force participation rate associated with more intense development. Assumed population and employment levels for each growth alternative are shown in Table 4-1.

Table E-1. Growth Alternative Projections and Targets in San Joaquin, 2040

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Population Assumption</th>
<th>Employment Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Trends</td>
<td>7,118</td>
<td>1,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Growth</td>
<td>7,118</td>
<td>1,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic Growth</td>
<td>3,834</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cal Poly, 2011

E.2  Current Trends Alternative

The Current Trends Alternative projects land uses and development necessary to accommodate expected population and employment growth assuming that new development patterns match those already observed within the City. This alternative envisions that residential, commercial, and industrial densities will not significantly change in the future.

E.2.1 Conceptual Basis

The Current Trends Alternative designates land uses to accommodate projected population and economic growth through 2040. The projections in this model are based on historic trends in population and job growth in the City. Based on these calculations, San Joaquin will have approximately 7,118 residents and approximately 1,010 jobs in 2040. In order to accommodate this growth with the current land use patterns, the City will need an additional 164 acres of land dedicated for residential uses and 2 additional acres dedicated for commercial use. This would entail annexation of 115 acres in total. Figure 4-1 shows

1 This appendix was prepared as part of the Cal Poly 2040 Community Plan dated June 2011.
the current trends land use map; notice the two large parcels to the south of City limits that would be annexed for residential use.

**E.2.2 Land Uses**

*Residential Land Uses*

In order to accommodate the projected population growth for 2040, the City will need at least an additional 1,075 housing units. As Table 4-2 indicates, this model designates 321 acres for low density residential purposes and 71 acres for medium density residential purposes. Assuming that future development will be the same density as the existing average density for low and medium density residential (five and eight units/acre, respectively), 1,107 additional units can be developed on the designated residential land. Thus, the current trends model does not provide enough land to accommodate anticipated housing needs at existing densities without annexation of land adjacent to the City boundary within its sphere of influence.

*Table E-2. Residential Land Need under the Current Trends Alternative, 2040.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Designation</th>
<th>2040 Acreage</th>
<th>Avg. Density</th>
<th>Residential Potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>321.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>392</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2,174</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Number of Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Additional Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2040 Housing Need</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,075</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Over Target</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Cal Poly, 2011*
Figure E-1. Proposed Land Use Map for the Current Trends Alternative.

Source: Cal Poly, 2011
Commercial, Manufacturing, and Agricultural Land Uses

Trends in job growth for the City from 2002 to 2008 were used to extrapolate the number of jobs by industry in 2040. These extrapolations were then used to calculate the additional acreages of land needed to accommodate job growth by 2040. In particular, acreage needed for manufacturing and the commercial sectors of retail, office, and wholesale trade were analyzed. While agriculture is a dominant industry in the area, much of the agricultural lands fall outside the City boundaries for which the City does not have to set aside land. Table 4-3 shows allocation of land for major commercial land uses.

Manufacturing is allocated land for 101 jobs in 2040. This indicates that only eight acres of land need to be dedicated to manufacturing uses in the future. There are currently 60 acres designated for manufacturing use (46 acres in use and 14 vacant acres), thus there is no need to designate additional land for manufacturing uses. This large discrepancy between existing manufacturing land and manufacturing land needed for 2040 is a result of a significant decline in the number of manufacturing jobs in the past nine years. As a result of this decline, there is significantly more land capacity for manufacturing than needed.

Table E-3. Commercial Land Need under the Current Trends Alternative, 2040.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Manufacturing</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Wholesale Trade</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2040 Job Targets</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>1,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Percentage</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards for Jobs/Acre</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square Feet/Job</td>
<td>3,630</td>
<td>2,722.5</td>
<td>1,894</td>
<td>1,556</td>
<td>4,356</td>
<td>435,600</td>
<td>449,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040 Square Feet Required for Sector</td>
<td>366,479</td>
<td>274,859</td>
<td>191,206</td>
<td>314,125</td>
<td>879,549</td>
<td>131,932,321</td>
<td>133,958,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040 Total Acres Needed (details)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3029</td>
<td>3075</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Retail and office are each allocated land for 101 jobs and wholesale trade and ‘other’ are each allocated land for 202 jobs in 2040. Altogether, retail, office, wholesale trade and other (collectively referred to as ‘commercial’), are allocated land for 606 jobs and require a total of 38 acres of land. Since there are currently 36 acres designated for commercial use (25 acres in use and 11 vacant acres), two additional acres will need to be designated for commercial use in order to accommodate jobs under this scenario.
E.3 Moderate Growth Alternative

The Moderate Growth Alternative focuses growth within the City core and along Colorado Avenue. The growth is intended to favor economic expansion such as the creation of a more vibrant downtown, rather than simply planning for population growth or outward suburban expansion. The projected population for 2040, like each of the proposed alternatives, is assumed to be 7,118, based on natural growth.

E.3.1 Conceptual Basis

The intent of the Moderate Growth Alternative is to meet projected commercial and housing needs with the following characteristics:

- Two story development along Main Street from Colorado Avenue to California Avenue.
- Concentrated development in the downtown core and along Colorado Avenue, and infill vacant land on the west end of the City as needed.
- Commercial/manufacturing development in current locations.
- A Mixed-Use Corridor (residential above ground floor retail) along Main Street.
- Medium density two and three story residential housing adjacent to the downtown core.
- A new school site adjacent to new development in the western development area to address current overcrowding.
- A new park, plaza, or other open space downtown.

The primary goal of the Moderate Growth Alternative is to create an environment in which the City can improve the jobs/housing ratio and encourage economic growth. The Moderate Growth Alternative includes a denser downtown core meant to increase the economic viability of the area. Another element of the Moderate Growth Alternative is enhanced accessibility and improved alternative transportation infrastructure, including public transportation, walking, and bicycling.

The commercial/manufacturing corridor along Colorado Avenue would remain, and would be further developed to increase density so as to increase connectivity of the corridor. As the opportunity arises, the mixed-use corridor along Main Street would be redesigned to increase the density and to provide residential opportunities above commercial space. The medium density residential apartments adjacent to the downtown core are a means of increasing density in the area.

Under the Moderate Growth Alternative, the goal is focused redevelopment along Main Street in the Central Business District, minimizing the need for infrastructure expansion, which reduces costs and maximizes efficiency of existing public services. Under this alternative, the land along Main Street will consist of a mixed-use retail corridor, abutted by medium-density residential.

Areas of Focus

This Alternative includes mixed-use development along Main Street, which would increase the density and vibrancy of the downtown core. Flexible parking requirements would be provided as an incentive for developers who wish to utilize the maximum building height and increased density within the downtown core. Based on community input, two-story development would be encouraged. The commercial strip along Colorado Avenue would be preserved and its density increased in order to maintain a strong secondary strip where large-scale commerce may develop. The residential districts on both sides of the downtown core would increase in density to assist in the densification of the downtown core.

E.3.2 Land Uses
The proposed land use concept map is shown in Figure 4-2. Redevelopment in the Moderate Growth Alternative would occur in the downtown core on Main Street between Colorado Avenue and California Avenue, as well as surrounding areas to the southeast, east, and northwest of the downtown core. The proposed mixed-use downtown core would allow two-story buildings with ground floor retail and second story housing units. The new Community Plan land use designations proposed for the Moderate Growth Alternative are mixed-use and increasing allowable density of medium density residential. Table 4-4 illustrates the proposed land use designations, number of stories, and dwelling units and floor area ratio associated with the proposed land uses in the Moderate Growth Alternative.

*Table E-4. Proposed Residential Densities under the Moderate Growth Alternative.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Number of Stories</th>
<th>Residential Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8-20 DU/Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td>8-20 DU/Acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Cal Poly, 2011.*

Residential Land Uses

To accommodate the additional population of 3,000 people, the City will need to build 1,075 additional residential units. There are two main areas for additional residential growth: allowing mixed-use in existing commercial areas, and developing vacant and underutilized residential land within the City. The Moderate Growth Alternative designates 222 acres for low density residential use and 103 acres for medium density residential use. These areas account for a total potential increase of 2,869 units, 1,794 housing units over the required target to accommodate growth (Table 4-5). Under this scenario, San Joaquin has the ability to house its projected population by 2040 without expanding the City limits.
Figure E-2. Proposed Land Use Map for the Moderate Growth Alternative, 2040.

Source: Cal Poly, 2011.
Table E-5. Proposed Residential Acreages and Residential Potential under the Moderate Growth Alternative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Designation</th>
<th>2040 Acre</th>
<th>Maximum Units Per Acre</th>
<th>Residential Potential. Minimum</th>
<th>Residential Potential. Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>1,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>102.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>2,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>332</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,327</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,936</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Number of Units: 1,067
Total Additional Units Accommodated For: 2,869
2040 Housing Need: 1,075
Over Target: 1,794

Source: Cal Poly, 2011

Commercial, Manufacturing and Agricultural Land Uses

Commercial projections for the Moderate Growth Alternative analyze the square footage needed in order to accommodate job growth beyond the Current Trends Alternative. The additional growth originates from a job target set to meet existing County and State labor force participation rates. The same common standards for jobs per acre and percentage of jobs per commercial sector used for Existing Trends were applied to determine the amount of commercial acreage needed in 2040 under the Moderate Growth Alternative.

Commercial Acreage

Table 4-6 shows the commercial acreage required to meet the 2040 jobs target. To meet the target of 356 retail jobs, 190 office jobs, 475 wholesale trade jobs, and 285 other jobs, the City would need a total of 73 acres of commercial land. Given the 36 acres of vacant and existing commercial and commercially designated land, the City does not have sufficient commercial land dedicated to meet moderate growth land use designation requirements. An additional 37 acres are required.

Table E-6. Existing and Projected Commercial and Manufacturing Acreage under the Moderate Growth Alternative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Manufacturing</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 Acreage in Use</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Vacant Acres</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2040 Additional Acreage Needed</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cal Poly, February 2011

Manufacturing Acreage

Under the proposed moderate growth building intensity, San Joaquin would need a total of 70 acres of
manufacturing designated space to accommodate 831 jobs by 2040. Given the existing 60 acres of underutilized and vacant manufacturing land in the southeast, there would not be enough acres to accommodate the growth in manufacturing jobs by 2040. An additional ten acres are required.

Agriculture Acreage

To accommodate 237 jobs in agriculture, the City would need a total of 2,375 acres of agricultural space by 2040. Given that a majority of agricultural activities and employment occur outside of the City, further examination of the required acreage allotment would be unnecessary under the City’s Community Plan. Through increasing FARs and encouraging greater density downtown, the City could accommodate much of the job growth projected in the retail and services sectors.

E.3.3 Moderate Growth Alternative Sub-Areas

Two Story Mixed Use Downtown

Two primary features of the Main Street Sub-Area in the Moderate Growth Alternative are two-story buildings and mixed-use. The downtown core along Main Street, currently zoned commercial, contains many vacant parcels which could be developed to provide space for jobs and housing. Constructing two-story mixed-use buildings on vacant parcels in this corridor could yield space for retail jobs and 105 additional residential units. Shops offering goods and services desired by the community can be located on the first floor of the buildings, with residential units located on the second floor. Another opportunity for creating homes is adding a second floor to already existing commercial buildings downtown. The new buildings, other building improvements, landscaping and street furniture can be designed to maintain the local and rural character of the City. Existing businesses could benefit from an increase in pass by trips generated through higher densities along this corridor.

Medium Density Residential Housing

A tract of land in the southwest of the City, bordered on the west and south by Sutter and Manning, currently used for agriculture, will be medium density housing under the Moderate Growth Alternative. In a medium residential housing zone, there can be a variety of housing types including single and multi-family dwellings. By designating this tract as medium density residential, 557 housing units can be created. Another proposed feature of this area is the new elementary school, which would allow convenient access for elementary school age children.

Manufacturing

In the southern part of the City, there is an existing manufacturing zone that would be expanded by an additional 14 acres, which is enough acreage for 168 new manufacturing jobs. It is envisioned that the City would attract manufacturing uses that are complimentary to existing businesses in the area, predominately related to agriculture. The location of manufacturing on the main thoroughfare allows for more efficient commercial and manufacturing access to Interstate 5 and the City of Fresno.

E.4 Dynamic Growth Alternative

The Dynamic Growth Alternative proposes compact urban development, infill, and land uses that support job creation. The alternative focuses on several geographic areas including a downtown mixed-use core along Main Street, three neighborhood & highway-serving commercial centers, a commercial strip along Colorado Avenue, and an expanded manufacturing sector in the southeast region of the City. Similar to
the other alternatives, the projected population for San Joaquin in 2040 is 7,118. However, in contrast to
the previously-discussed alternatives, the Dynamic Growth Alternative plans for 3,834 jobs in 2040.

E.4.1 Conceptual Basis

The primary goal of the Dynamic Growth Alternative is to create a compact city and encourage economic
growth in the community by allocating land for ample job creation in various sectors. The City has a large
number of working age individuals who would benefit from job creation within the City. This alternative
targets an ideal jobs-to-labor force ratio of 90 percent.

Several strategies are used in order to accommodate this high number of jobs through strategic land use
designations, as shown in Figure 4-3. This Alternative will maximize infill opportunities throughout the
City, densify the residential zones where appropriate, provide additional commercial areas throughout the
City, and expand the manufacturing area in the southeast section of the City. A focal point of the
alternative is the three-story mixed use core in and around the current downtown area. This dense core
would provide space for commercial and retail jobs, office space, and residential, as well as an attractive
walkable city center and increased “sense of place.” An important benefit of this mixed-use zoning in the
downtown core is its flexibility of uses, which helps to accommodate real estate market demands and
minimize vacancy rates.

Outside the mixed-use core, housing densities would be increased from existing densities. The proposed
densities are highest in and around the downtown core, and the neighborhood and highway serving
commercial centers. Medium density residential is placed slightly beyond the commercial uses. A
relatively smaller amount of acreage is designated for low density, single-family homes, to be located in
the northern and northwest edges of the City.
Figure E-3. Proposed Land Use Map for the Dynamic Growth Alternative.

Source: Cal Poly, 2011
E.4.2 Dynamic Growth Alternative Sub-Areas

As shown in Figure 4-3, the Dynamic Growth Alternative emphasizes several areas for growth and redevelopment in the City including the mixed-use downtown core, the manufacturing area, the commercial zone west of Colorado Avenue, and a wide variety of housing types and densities. While no new land uses are proposed in this Alternative, the most striking changes in zoning are the introduction of mixed-use, increase in building heights in designated locations, and the overall increase in residential densities.

Downtown Core and High-Density Residential

The Dynamic Growth Alternative places a high emphasis on Downtown San Joaquin as the primary node of the community. The mixed-use Downtown Core is located in the same geographic area as the existing downtown core but includes the addition of mixed residential and commercial uses, zero-foot setbacks, and an option for three-story buildings. As proposed, the Downtown Core would grow slightly from its present-day footprint to include the area along Main Street between Colorado Avenue and California Avenue. The mixed uses would include residential, retail, and office uses, primarily in three-story buildings with retail uses on the ground floor and residential units in upper stories, along South Main Street and South 11th Street, between West Colorado Avenue and West California Avenue, along with additional high-density residential development in the areas immediately adjacent to the Downtown Core. Residential densities within and adjacent to the Downtown Core would be the highest in the City, at approximately 20-40 units per acre. This would result in a net increase of between 109 and 329 residential units and approximately 479,160 of additional square feet of commercial (office and retail) space within the Downtown Core.

Neighborhood and Highway-Serving Commercial Districts

The community commercial nodes, located in the southeast, southwest, and northwest corners of the City, are envisioned to be two and three-story mixed-use neighborhood commercial nodes with neighborhood and highway-serving retail, and commercial space for the jobs required in this alternative. These nodes are intended to provide commercial services to both community members and visitors passing by via the highway. They are located to maximize exposure to high traffic corridors as well as serve specific neighborhoods. These districts will be two- and three- stories in height, with a mix of commercial and office space.

Manufacturing Area

The Manufacturing Area is proposed for the southern portion of the City. This site is easily accessed by critical transportation corridors. Compared to the previous alternatives presented, the Dynamic Growth Alternative allocates the most amount of land to manufacturing uses in order to provide adequate room for job growth and development.

E.4.3 Land Uses

The Dynamic Growth Alternative focuses on job creation in the mixed use downtown core, majority medium-density housing throughout the City, neighborhood and visitor-serving commercial centers, and a manufacturing job center at the southeast edge of the City.
Table E-7. Proposed Densities under the Dynamic Growth Alternative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Number of Stories</th>
<th>Residential Density (Maximum Dwelling Units / Acre)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use Core</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30 DU/Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Core</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40 DU/Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20 DU/Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8 DU/Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Open Space</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residential Land Uses

To accommodate projected growth, it is estimated that the City will need 1,075 additional housing units during this period. The Dynamic Growth Alternative accommodates these needed units by increasing residential densities throughout most of the City, while retaining some lower-density areas on the periphery. The varying densities promote diversity of housing stock and costs. Overall, the Dynamic Growth Alternative provides the potential for 6,923 residential units on 349 acres within the current City boundaries. This allows for the development of 5,856 additional units by 2040. This acreage includes vacant land, underutilized parcels, and newly-zoned residential parcels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Designation</th>
<th>2040 Acre</th>
<th>Maximum Units Per Acre</th>
<th>Residential Potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>250.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>349.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,396</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Existing Number of Units: 1,067
- Total Additional Units Accommodated For: 5,856
- 2040 Housing Need: 1,075
- Over Target: 4,781

Manufacturing Land Uses

In light of the planned job growth under this alternative, it is estimated that 52 additional acres of manufacturing land should be zoned to accommodate the 1,342 jobs, bringing the total manufacturing zoned land to 112 acres, including reserves within the City’s sphere of influence.

Commercial Land Uses

Of the total 3,834 jobs targeted in this alternative, 45 percent are expected to be in commercial sectors, thus requiring land designation for retail, office, wholesale trade, and other commercial uses. Table 4-9 shows the required acreage for each type of commercial use. A total of 89 acres would be designated for various commercial uses.

Table E-9. Commercial Land Need under the Dynamic Growth Alternative.
Public Facilities, Recreation, and Open Space

The Dynamic Growth Alternative includes a number of new public facilities, recreation, and open space amenities, including an additional school, a public transit hub, and additional park space throughout the City. The Alternative designates space in the southwest portion of the City to build a new community school facility in partnership with Golden Plains Unified School District, while retaining the current school location near Downtown. With two public education facility sites within the City, the district will have flexibility to expand, remodel, or replace the current school facility without disrupting the current K-8 services provided to City residents, while also gaining the ability to add capacity at all grade levels in future years to accommodate additional population growth and student demand. These facilities could also include adult educational services including vocational training or local courses offered in conjunction with West Hills Community College District.

The Dynamic Growth Alternative also creates a designated transit hub facility in the Downtown Core, to support transit and alternative transportation services for local residents. In addition to supporting public transit agency service in the area, the transit facility would be available for use for a range of other transit and alternative transportation services, including shuttle services to regional employment and educational services, as well as public and/or private intercity bus services.

Finally, the Dynamic Growth Alternative sets a goal of ensuring that all City residents are within one-quarter mile of a public park. To achieve this goal, a number of additional park spaces would be created, including more traditional larger parks and a number of smaller “pocket” parks created by utilizing vacant land in existing residential neighborhoods. In new residential development, provision and maintenance of additional park space would be an integral requirement to the planning and approval of these projects.