

Cities of Coalinga, Firebaugh, Fresno, Mendota, Reedley, and Selma. The plan was prepared in accordance with the requirements of the California State Aeronautics Act.

The 30-day public review and comment period on these documents concluded on August 13, 2018. Documents related to these items were available for review during regular office hours at the Fresno Council of Governments Office located at 2035 Tulare Street, Suite 201, in downtown Fresno and online at <http://fresnocounty.airportstudy.com/>. A public meeting was also held on the Draft ALUCP Update and environmental documentation on Monday, August 6th from 5:30-7:00 pm at Fresno Yosemite International Airport, Terminal Conference Room, 5175 E. Clinton Way, Fresno CA. No formal comments were received at the public meeting.

However, four sets of comments were received in total. Coffman Associates (consultant) worked with ALUC staff to draft responses to each comment received. Those comments and responses were attached for Commission review. ALUC staff continued to work with the City of Fresno and the consultant to resolve remaining city concern over expansion of the AIAs around Fresno Air Terminal and Fresno Chandler Downtown Airports up to the Monday, October 1st Commission meeting, with a resolution to the City of Fresno's AIA concerns in process. The California Airport Land Use Handbook allows development of an Urban Core designation within Zone 6 of an airport. ALUC staff and the consultant developed urban designation proposals to accommodate the city's transit-oriented development plans along corridors for Kings Canyon, California, Shaw and the downtown urban core. Updated maps of the AIAs that include these urban designations for FAT and Chandler airports were handed out at the meeting.

In addition, a proposal was discussed between staff, the consultant and the City of Fresno regarding ideas that may expedite ALUC Consistency review. The ALUC meets every other month which is a concern for the city of Fresno as it slows down consistency reviews on their plan amendments. Therefore, with ALUC approval, the attached Consistency Determination Request Form was developed to aid staff in reviewing Consistency Finding requests. Staff had discussed its use with the Commission during the meeting.

At the Fresno County ALUC's August meeting the Commission voted to move the date of ALUCP adoption to the October 1, 2018 meeting from its original date of September 11, 2018. After considering the staff report on this item and reviewing the attached comments and responses, the ALUC may consider adopting, by resolution, the Draft Fresno County ALUCP. They had also considered tabling the adoption to provide time for additional edits. Due to late breaking issues that the staff and consultant were still resolving, staff did not have the final edited document pages for ALUC review at the time of agenda publication.

Commissioner Duarte asked two questions. One, has the consultant weighed in on this for the alternatives that relate to language proposed in the ALUC update? Secondly, has Caltrans weighed in on the urban designation proposals as requested by the City of Fresno?

Ms. Veenendaal responded that the consultant had been on the phone, participating with her in each of the meetings with the City of Fresno, and it was their idea to create these urban designations. Caltrans was briefed on the urban designation idea and thought it was an innovative approach, expressing support of it. They did want to see the maps and a joining policy included in the plan regarding these designated reasons for why they were designated. This means that the ALUC cannot adopt the Airport Land Use Compatibility plan today, it will have to be moved to another meeting.

A motion was made by Commissioner Remy and seconded by Commissioner Yrigollen to re-open the hearing on the adoption of the ALUCP. A vote was called for and the motion carried.

Sofia Pagoulatos explained that the City of Fresno completely supports the revision of the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. Ms. Pagoulatos also explained the reasons for urban designations.

Commissioner Duarte expressed concern with the request to exempt Kearney Boulevard which comes into the flight pattern south and west of the airport, because of the high densities in that particular area.

That was the only spot he identified, and the ALUC does not have control over in keeping the densities low.

Ms. Veenendaal clarified two additional comments.

Ms. Pagoulatos expressed two concerns regarding the interim period between when the ALUC adopts this new plan, prior to the City of Fresno obtaining a finding of consistency. She stated that it seems that the plan and the Caltrans guidelines say all projects must receive a finding of consistency during that period. For the City of Fresno if a "project" is a plan amendment/re-zone that would not be a problem for to the City of Fresno. But if a "project" means every development permit, every conditional use permit, and every building that comes into the City of Fresno for a planning approval, the work put into gaining findings of consistency would be cumbersome for both the City of Fresno and ALUC. The only creative idea Ms. Pagoulatos can think of is that the Commissioners meet more frequently.

Commissioner Duarte asked if the projects Ms Pagoulatos is referring to regarding reviews of consistency are generally the same projects that would need to go before the planning commission and then the Council? If so, she would be correct. Ms. Pagoulatos stated that more than just those types of projects would be referred to the ALUC.

Commissioner Duarte stated that he is reluctant to defer any (ALUC) action of the commission to an administrative process. More discussion would have to take place at a later date on this topic. The Commission asked if a consent agenda could be use to process Findings of Consistency. Legal Counsel will report back on this inquiry at the next meeting.

Commissioner Duarte recommended approval of the City of Fresno's urban designations within the AIAs, except for those along the California corridor. Legal Counsel recommended that the Commission formally conclude the consideration of any information events or testimony with the public or staff presentation when the Commission concludes the receipt of such information or testimony.

A motion was made by Commissioner Duarte and seconded by Commissioner Remy to conclude this portion of the hearing, and stated that the ALUC will look for a recommendation for final adoption to be considered at the December 3, 2018 meeting. A vote was called for and the motion carried.

3. Public Presentation

None

4. Other Business

A. Items from Staff

1. 2018-19 Fiscal Year Meetings Schedule (please mark your calendars):

- December 3, 2018
- February 4, 2019
- April 1, 2019
- June 3, 2019

Brenda Veenendaal gave a reminder about the dates of the meetings.

B. Items from Members

Commissioner Rapada said that a correction to the minutes of August 6, 2018 agenda needed to be made because he was marked absent when he did attend the meeting.

5. **ADJOURN**

A motion was made by Commissioner Rapada and seconded by Commissioner Yrigollen to adjourn the meeting at 3:30 p.m. A vote was called for and the motion carried.