Good afternoon Drew,

I have a number of data requests/questions/comments on the GP land use chapter and a few left over from the previous meeting. Because I have a significant number of them I figured it would be better for me to submit via email for response when the City has that information available- I don't want to take up the whole meeting tomorrow on this.

Data Requests:

1. Periodic Fee Study referenced in policy ED-5D
2. Annual economic development progress reports- Policy ED-1-i; pg 2-22
3. Anything showing bi-annual monitoring of economic trends-- pg 2-21 policy ED-1-c
4. Anything evidencing the City's progress "monitoring the effectiveness of impact fee waivers for industrial development." - Policy ED-1-j, pg 2-22
5. All APRs for housing element and general plan
6. Documents evidencing City tracking of the implementation of "diverse housing"-- UF-1-d
7. Annual progress updates referenced in policy UF-12, pg 3-17
8. New development code listed in policy UF-12-F; pg 3-18

Questions for City:

1. What resources were utilized in SB244 analysis-- were any people spoken with? Who?
2. How will the City promote park access for all?
3. What is the status of the housing committee?
4. How does the City prioritize addressing resolution of existing public facility deficiencies? What communities/types are prioritized first and why?--- see pg 58 OPR guidelines on prioritizing public facilities
5. What is the status of the City MEIR?
6. Where is the City in the process of all the neighborhood planning areas that are listed-- are these being implemented? Have been implemented? Or is this for future planning?
7. Why make park zoning dual designation if City is already lacking sufficient parks?-- see pg 55 OPR guidelines re vulnerable community park access
8. Was any population data utilized in the land use analysis as recommended by OPR guidelines pg 54
9. What land use designations provide for by-right shelters, support facilities, transitional housing, and how many acres are zoned for it and where?
10. How does the City define "underutilized sites" for policy LU-2-b?
11. Status of implementation of policies LU-5-H, LU-7-D, D-7-a
Some generalized comments:

1. SB 244 analysis is deficient
   1. fails to identify the functionality of existing facilities including septic systems. Lack of understanding of how well these systems are working prevents a determination on what infrastructure investments are necessary
   2. There is no description of the communities, description of existing infrastructure other than a tally of numbers of houses connected into systems. Analysis of flooding must be done by speaking with residents about flooding issues in the community. Analysis of system conditions must be done by discussing with residents in the community. Any residential well usage should be evaluated for water quality. City should be using the information in the OPR guidelines on this-- this SB244 analysis fails to meet the requirements and especially fails to meet the purposes behind SB244.

2. SB1000 will require EJ policies throughout-- there is essentially no discussion of intentional investment in disadvantaged communities or EJ in this chapter.

3. Policy 13 will starve DUCs of resources and only further disadvantage those communities

4. There is very little park zoning in DACs in the City especially compared to north Fresno

5. Same with commercial/office

6. Meanwhile, no industrial or production is in North Fresno-- inequitable distribution of environmental burdens

7. The City should be looking at the OPR guidelines when developing these policies and it doesn't seem as if that was done.

In regard to the questions-- it would be great if I could meet with you or some planning staff to discuss the questions in more detail as I suspect we won't have time to go over them in the workshops and I know they will require some advanced research to answer. Let me know when you or staff could meet.

Thanks,

Mariah

--

"Justice is what love looks like in public"-- Cornel West