

---

**5.0 MINOR REVISIONS  
TO THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN**

---



## 5.0 MINOR REVISIONS TO THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN

---

### 5.1 INTRODUCTION

The following section describes minor modifications made to the proposed City of Chico General Plan Update since release of the DEIR. Also included is a discussion of any changes to the environmental analysis in the DEIR as a result of these minor modifications.

### 5.2 MINOR CHANGES AND EDITS TO THE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

#### SECTION 1 – INTRODUCTION

Modifications to the introduction section were limited to minor textual changes that do not change the intent or requirements of the section in any appreciable manner. Also included in the modifications were minor clarifications to the process followed during preparation of the proposed General Plan Update. However, none of the modifications to Section 1.0 would affect the physical environment, nor would they change any requirement, plan, or program presented in the proposed General Plan Update. Therefore, these changes have no effect on the environmental effect of implementation of the proposed General Plan Update.

#### SECTION 2 – SUSTAINABILITY

Modifications to the Introduction, Sustainability Components, Issues and Considerations, Citizen Participation, and Fostering Partnerships subsections were limited to minor textual changes that do not alter the intent or requirements of the section. Included in these changes was expansion of the definition of the term *social equity*. However, according to the CEQA Guidelines, social and economic effects of a given project are not considered environmental impacts. Therefore, this change does not affect the environmental impacts discussed in the Draft EIR.

Modifications to Section 2 also included minor textual changes to several goals and policies, including modification of the following:

- Action SUS-1.2.1
- Action SUS-1.3.1
- Action SUS-1.3.2
- Policy SUS-1.4
- Action SUS-1.5.1
- Policy SUS-2.1
- Policy SUS-2.2
- Action SUS-3.1.1
- Action SUS-3.3.1
- Policy SUS-3.4
- Action SUS-3.4.1
- Goal SUS-4
- Policy SUS-4.1
- Action SUS-4.1.1
- Action SUS-4.1.2
- Action SUS-4.2.1
- Policy SUS-4.3
- Action SUS-4.3.1
- Action SUS-4.3.2
- Action SUS-4.3.3
- Policy SUS-5.1
- Action SUS-5.1.1
- Action SUS-5.2.1
- Action SUS-5.2.3
- Action SUS-5.2.4
- Goal SUS-6
- Policy SUS-6.1
- Policy SUS-6.2
- Action SUS-6.2.1
- Action SUS-6.2.2
- Policy SUS-6.3
- Action SUS-7.1.2
- Action SUS-7.2.1
- Action SUS-7.2.2

Changes to the goals, policies, and actions listed above constituted minor textual edits and clarifications that had little functional change to those goals, policies, and actions and would

## 5.0 MINOR REVISIONS TO THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN

therefore not result in any appreciable modification of the environmental impacts of the proposed General Plan Update as discussed in the DEIR.

Several additional changes were made to goals, policies, and actions that could, by their nature, cause a modification in the scope or effect of that given feature, resulting in some modification of the expected environmental impact(s) of the proposed General Plan Update. Those specific goals, policies, and actions that fall into this category are discussed below as well as the expected change in environmental impact that would occur as a result of these modifications.

**TABLE 5.0-1  
SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES TO SUSTAINABILITY GOALS, POLICIES, AND ACTIONS  
AND THEIR EXPECTED ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

Goal/Policy/Action	Changed or New	Modification Made	Environmental Effect
<b>Action SUS-1.3.3</b>	New	Require assignment of a Sustainability Coordinator.	<b>Negligible</b> – No functional change in the requirements of the General Plan Update.
<b>Action SUS-1.4.2</b>	New	Requires periodic update to the City's Diversity Action Plan.	<b>None</b> – Social/economic impacts are not a part of CEQA, pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines.
<b>Action SUS-1.5.3</b>	New	Develop a Chico Green Business Certification program.	<b>Negligible to Positive</b> – Such a program could result in a more coordinated response to sustainability issues as well as increased incentives for local businesses to incorporate sustainable design and practices into their operations, likely having a positive effect on the environment.
<b>Policy SUS-1.6</b>	New	Emphasize public health in planning and City policies and programs.	<b>Positive</b> – Emphasizing public health in City programs and policies, as well as during the planning process, would likely have a net benefit in regard to human health and hazards impacts (see Section 4.4 of the Draft EIR).
<b>Action SUS-2.2.1</b>	New	Enhanced web links between City sites and other agencies.	<b>Negligible to Positive</b> – Enhanced inter-agency Web connections would likely increase the effectiveness of the City website in educating residents and developers as to the inter-agency concerns of any projects, resulting in a possible environmental benefit.
<b>Policy SUS-3.2</b>	Changed	Add water usage to the existing requirement to reduce energy usage in municipal operations.	<b>Positive</b> – A mandate to reduce water usage will have a net benefit to water supply and water infrastructure impacts identified in the Draft EIR by reducing the quantity of water needed by City operations and buildings.

## 5.0 MINOR REVISIONS TO THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN

Goal/Policy/ Action	Changed or New	Modification Made	Environmental Effect
<b>Action SUS-3.3.2</b>	New	Explore reductions in consumption and increase reuse of City materials, vehicles, and equipment.	<b>Negligible to Positive</b> – Reuse of materials and equipment, as well as reductions in consumption, would likely have a positive effect on the environment, namely in the areas of solid waste capacity and hazardous materials (disposal versus reuse). However, maintaining City vehicles for longer periods may preclude the City’s ability to purchase vehicles with higher gas mileage and lower emissions than those currently in the inventory. This would likely result in a minor increase in air quality emissions over time. Given the relatively slow rate of innovation in gas mileage and emissions controls for vehicles, especially for heavy vehicles typically utilized by cities, this impact is expected to be negligible.
<b>Action SUS-3.3.3</b>	New	Monitor progress toward reducing the environmental impact of City operations.	<b>Negligible</b> – Monitoring City efforts toward reducing impacts is already a required feature of CEQA (see Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program). As such, this new action simply codifies a CEQA requirement in the General Plan, resulting in a negligible environmental effect.
<b>Goal SUS-5</b>	Changed	Change required reduction in “non-renewable resource” consumption to state “non-renewable energy.”	<b>Negligible</b> – While this change may appear to exclude non-energy resources from the implementation of this goal, the policies and action items under this goal were and remain focused entirely on energy resources alone. As such, changes to this goal would produce no functional change in the General Plan and would result in negligible modification of any environmental impacts (see Section 4.14 of the Draft EIR).
<b>Action SUS-5.1.3</b>	New	Monitor and improve public awareness of required energy conservation upgrades upon resale of homes.	<b>Positive</b> – See discussion under Action SUS-3.3.3 above. The same concept applies here.
<b>Action SUS-6.2.3</b>	Changed	Addition of requirement to revisit GHG reduction goals beyond 2020.	<b>Positive</b> – This change effectively extends the positive effects of Action SUS-6.2.3 beyond the threshold of the 2020 emission reduction goal. Extending the action beyond 2020 will have a net beneficial effect over time.
<b>Action SUS-7.1.3</b>	New	Reduce barriers to small animal keeping in residential districts.	<b>Negligible</b> – The effects of small animal keeping in residential areas is commonly considered to be analogous to the keeping of outdoor pets such as dogs. Furthermore, the modification of the Municipal Code called for in this action would not preclude the noise and odor restrictions

## 5.0 MINOR REVISIONS TO THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN

Goal/Policy/ Action	Changed or New	Modification Made	Environmental Effect
			codified in the proposed General Plan Update.

### SECTION 3 – LAND USE

Modifications to the Introduction, Planning for Future Needs, Issues and Considerations, Major Land Use Components, Land Use Designations and Diagram, and Development Potential subsections were limited to minor textual changes that do not alter the intent or requirements of the section. Therefore, this change does not affect the environmental impacts discussed in the Draft EIR.

Also modified was language regarding the proposed General Plan Update's compatibility with the requirements of the Butte County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC). Originally, inconsistencies were identified between the proposed General Plan Update and the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). However, changes to the Land Use Diagram have been made that call for the designation of appropriate airport overlay zones which conform to the requirements of the ALUC and the ALUCP. Therefore, this change represents a reduction in impact to local air traffic patterns and safety concerns for aircraft as well as persons and structures on the ground.

Modifications to Section 3 also included minor textual changes to several goals and policies, including modification of the following:

- Goal LU-1
- Policy LU-1.1
- Action LU-1.1.1
- Action LU-1.3.1
- Action LU-1.3.2
- Action LU-1.3.3
- Policy LU-2.1
- Action LU-2.2.2
- Action LU-2.3.1
- Action LU-2.3.3
- Policy LU-3.1
- Action LU-3.4.4
- Policy LU-4.1
- Action LU-4.1.1
- Action LU-4.2.3
- Action LU-5.1.2
- Action LU-5.1.4
- Action LU-6.1.2
- Action LU-7.1.3

Changes to the goals, policies, and actions listed above constituted minor textual edits and clarifications that had little functional change to those goals, policies, and actions and would therefore not result in any appreciable modification of the environmental impacts of the General Plan Update.

Several additional changes were made to goals, policies, and actions that could, by their nature, cause a modification in the scope or effect of that given feature, resulting in some modification of the expected environmental impact(s) of the General Plan Update. Those specific goals, policies, and actions that fall into this category are discussed below as well as the expected change in environmental impact that would occur as a result of these modifications.

## 5.0 MINOR REVISIONS TO THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN

**TABLE 5.0-2  
SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES TO LAND USE GOALS, POLICIES, AND ACTIONS  
AND THEIR EXPECTED ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

Goal/Policy/ Action	Changed or New	Modification Made	Environmental Effect
<b>Action LU-2.3.6</b>	New	Consider increasing City discretion regarding new or expanded large-format retail.	<b>Negligible</b> – Action only allows for consideration of large-format retail. No function change in zoning or land use would result.
<b>Policy LU-2.4</b>	Changed	Environmental review was added to methods to promote land use compatibility.	<b>Positive</b> – The addition of environmental review will ensure that impacts related to land use compatibility would be addressed throughout the entitlement process.
<b>Policy LU-2.5</b>	Changed	Now requires protection of all areas with known sensitive resources, not just open space.	<b>Positive</b> – This change increases the scope of protection for sensitive resources offered previously, resulting in reduced potential for impacts to these resources in the future.
<b>Action LU-2.5.1</b>	Changed	Property owners must conduct environmental studies on properties in the Resources Constraint Overlay and must conform to CEQA requirements.	<b>Positive</b> – This change strengthens the protection for resources within the Resource Constraint Overlay and ensures compliance with CEQA, resulting in reduced potential impacts from future development.
<b>Policy LU-2.6</b>	Changed	Pedestrian/bicycle routes are acceptable uses within 100-foot agricultural buffers.	<b>Negligible</b> – The use of pedestrian/bicycle paths in agricultural buffers will likely have no effect on agricultural resources and will have no greater environmental effect during installation than other features allowed under this policy (i.e., roadways).
<b>Action LU-2.7.2</b>	Changed	Reclassified as Policy LU-2.8. No other changes.	<b>None</b> – Reclassifying this action to a policy does not change the physical requirements of the action/policy, nor would it change any expected environmental effect.
<b>Policy LU-3.2</b>	Changed	Neighborhood serving centers are no longer required to include housing opportunities, nor are they required to be served by transit. However, they can include cultural uses.	<b>Negligible</b> – The exclusion of a requirement for housing opportunities in neighborhood serving centers could potentially reduce the number of homes available in the city. Therefore, no change in significance is expected in any impacts identified in the DEIR.  The exclusion of a requirement for transit service at neighborhood serving centers would not preclude those centers from being served by transit; it would only allow neighborhood serving centers to exist without transit service. Therefore, this change would not affect any environmental impacts identified in the DEIR and no change in significance is anticipated (see Section 4.5 of the DEIR).
<b>Action LU-4.1.2</b>	Changed	Development fees also vary by	<b>Negligible</b> – Fees are a function of the

## 5.0 MINOR REVISIONS TO THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN

Goal/Policy/Action	Changed or New	Modification Made	Environmental Effect
		location, not just development type.	business of the City and will therefore have negligible impact on effects to the environment from the General Plan Update.
<b>Action LU-4.2.2</b>	Changed	Reclassified as Policy LU-4.3.	<b>None</b> – Reclassifying this action to a policy does not change the physical requirements of the action/policy, nor would it change any expected environmental effect.
<b>Policy LU-4.3</b>	Changed	Renumbered to Policy LU-4.4 due to reclassification of Action LU-4.2.2 to Policy LU-4.3.	<b>None</b> – Changing the number of this policy does not change the physical requirements of the policy, nor would it change any expected environmental effect.
<b>Action LU-5.1.4</b>	Changed	Addition of on-street parking and public art to options for streetscape enhancement.	<b>Negligible</b> – The inclusion of on-street parking could increase parking capacity in the Corridor Opportunity Sites. This change would be consistent with the goal of revitalizing these sites and no change in significance is expected in any impacts identified in the DEIR.
<b>Policy LU-6.1</b>	Change	Name change from Diamond Match SPA to Barber Yard SPA.	<b>None</b> – Only the name of the Special Planning Area has changed. As such, no change in environmental effect would result.
<b>Action LU-6.2.1</b>	Change	Detailed land use planning must be completed before development.	<b>Positive</b> – The prior version of this action could potentially allow development to progress without concentrated land use planning in an SPA. This change would ensure that such planning is conducted prior to development, helping to ensure that land use conflicts and thus environmental effects are minimized prior to site disturbance.  Other textual changes were made to this action; however, they represent minor clarifications and different verbiage choices and would thus have no effect on potential environmental impacts.
<b>Action LU-6.2.3</b>	Change	Name change from Diamond Match SPA to Barber Yard SPA.	<b>None</b> – Only the name of the Special Planning Area has changed. As such, no change in environmental effect would result.
<b>Action LU-6.2.4</b>	Change	Action now concerns integrated open space of any size, not just “significant” amounts. Also, wildfire hazards must be addressed.	<b>Positive</b> – Planning in the Doe Mill/Honey Run SPA would a greater amount of open space, resulting in potential preservation of more open space than was directed under the previous version of this action. Likewise, wildland fire risk would be considered, reducing the chance for wildland fire hazards (see Section 4.4, Impact 4.4.1).

## 5.0 MINOR REVISIONS TO THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN

Goal/Policy/Action	Changed or New	Modification Made	Environmental Effect
<b>Action LU-6.2.6</b>	Change	Planning in the South Entler SPA must avoid designated FEMA flood zones.	<b>Positive</b> – Avoidance of FEMA flood zones ensures that structures would not be placed in these zones, reducing potential flooding impacts (see Section 4.9, Impact 4.9.4).
<b>Goal LU-7</b>	Changed	Ranchaero Airport added to list of airports to protect.	<b>Positive</b> – Including consideration of Ranchaero Airport would reduce potential land use conflicts, noise impacts, and safety impacts of land uses adjacent to or in the vicinity of Ranchaero Airport.
<b>Policy LU-7.1</b>	Changed	Ranchaero Airport added to list of airports to protect.	<b>Positive</b> – Including consideration of Ranchaero Airport would reduce potential land use conflicts, noise impacts, and safety impacts of land uses adjacent to or in the vicinity of Ranchaero Airport.
<b>Action LU-7.1.4</b>	Deleted	Request for revision of the ALUCP deleted.	<b>Negligible</b> – This action was made moot by coordination between the City and the ALUC as well as inclusion of airport overlay zones in the General Plan Update. As such, this action is superfluous and was deleted.

### SECTION 4 – CIRCULATION

Modifications to the Introduction, Issues and Considerations, Transportation and Planning Context, and Multimodal Circulation System subsections were limited to minor textual changes that do not alter the intent or requirements of the section, that is, except for a portion of the Issues and Considerations subsection titled Sustainable Circulation Plan. A discussion of the results of the City’s greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions inventory and transportation’s impact on GHG emissions was added. However, this change and the changes to the subsections listed above have no functional change on the environmental impacts of the General Plan Update.

One substantive change was made to Table CIRC-2, in which the Hicks Lane Realignment was omitted from the list of roadway connections for future study. The omission of this potential improvement would have little change on existing circulation conditions, and the fact that construction would not be expected on this portion of roadway would mean that environmental impacts from such construction would not occur. As such, the deletion of this particular improvement from Table CIRC-2 of the General Plan Update would have little or no effect on the environment.

Modifications to Section 4 also included minor textual changes to several goals and policies, including modification of the following:

- Action CIRC-1.1.1
- Policy CIRC-1.3
- Policy CIRC-1.4
- Action CIRC-1.6.1
- Action CIRC-1.6.2
- Policy CIRC-2.2
- Action CIRC-3.6.1
- Policy CIRC-4.2
- Action CIRC-4.3.2
- Action CIRC-5.3.1
- Goal CIRC-6
- Policy CIRC-6.2
- Action CIRC-7.1.1
- Action CIRC-8.2.1
- Goal CIRC-9

## 5.0 MINOR REVISIONS TO THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN

- Policy CIRC-9.3

Changes to the goals, policies, and actions listed above constituted minor textual edits and clarifications that had little functional change to those goals, policies, and actions and would therefore not result in any appreciable modification of the environmental impacts of the General Plan Update.

Several additional changes were made to goals, policies, and actions that could, by their nature, cause a modification in the scope or effect of that given feature, resulting in some modification of the expected environmental impact(s) of the General Plan Update. Those specific goals, policies, and actions that fall into this category are discussed below as well as the expected change in environmental impact that would occur as a result of these modifications.

**TABLE 5.0-3  
SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES TO CIRCULATION GOALS, POLICIES, AND ACTIONS  
AND THEIR EXPECTED ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

Goal/Policy/ Action	Changed or New	Modification Made	Environmental Effect
<b>Action CIRC-2.2.4</b>	New	Work with the Chico Unified School District to improve safe routes to schools.	<b>Positive</b> – Coordination with the Chico Unified School District regarding safe school routes will increase student safety to and from school, reducing potential transportation safety impacts (see Section 4.5, Impacts 4.5.5 and 4.5.6, of the DEIR).
<b>Action CIRC-3.1.2</b>	New	Enhance connectivity of bike facilities.	<b>Positive</b> – Improvements to bike facilities can result in more incentives for residents and visitors to use bike facilities and thus use their motor vehicles less, resulting in incremental decreases in vehicle emissions and a lessening of traffic loads.
<b>Policy CIRC-4.3</b>	Changed	Streets near schools added to roadways that should include safe pedestrian elements. On-street parking added to list of potential enhancements.	<b>Negligible to Positive</b> – Adding roadways near schools to those considered by this policy will increase the opportunities for this policy to be enacted, resulting in an environmental benefit to pedestrian safety.
<b>Policy CIRC-5.2</b>	Changed	Employment centers added to areas to be served by a central city transit route.	<b>Positive</b> – Enhanced service areas for a transit route would increase the number of properties served by such a route and thus increase the number of potential riders, resulting in a beneficial effect on transit use and traffic loading.
<b>Action CIRC-8.1.1</b>	Changed	Included shared parking as a possible method for reducing trips.	<b>Positive</b> – Including more options for reducing vehicle trips would have a beneficial effect on the number of spaces required and thus the amount of impervious surfaces (paving) required for parking spaces. Likewise, reduced trips would result in less expansion of roadways/transportation modes, resulting in incrementally fewer environmental impacts that result from such expansions.

## 5.0 MINOR REVISIONS TO THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN

Goal/Policy/ Action	Changed or New	Modification Made	Environmental Effect
<b>Action CIRC-8.1.2</b>	Changed	Availability of nearby on-street parking and parking facilities also to be considered in required changes to the Municipal Code parking requirements.	<b>Positive</b> – See CIRC-8.1.1 above.
<b>Action CIRC-8.2.2</b>	New	Preferred parking for renewable energy vehicles and electric vehicle charging stations to be included in new public parking facilities.	<b>Positive</b> – These types of features help to promote alternative-fueled vehicle use and thus a reduction in vehicle emissions in the city, incrementally reducing air quality impacts from such emissions (see Section 4.6 of the DEIR).
<b>Action CIRC-9.1.2</b>	Changed	Action now only considers existing employer trip reduction programs.	<b>Negligible</b> – New programs are addressed in a new Action, discussed below. Therefore, no functional change is made by omitting new programs from this action.
<b>Action CIRC-9.1.3</b>	New	New employers of 100 or more persons must implement a Travel Demand Management Plan.	<b>Positive</b> – The implementation of such programs will have the net result of reducing single-occupancy vehicle trips, resulting in benefits to air quality from reduced vehicle emissions.

### SECTION 5 – COMMUNITY DESIGN

Modifications to the Introduction, Issues and Considerations, and Community Design Concepts subsections were limited to minor textual changes that do not alter the intent or requirements of the section. As such, these changes do not affect the environmental impacts discussed in the Draft EIR.

## 5.0 MINOR REVISIONS TO THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN

Modifications to Section 5 also included minor textual changes to several goals and policies, including modification of the following:

- Action CD-1.2.1
- Action CD-2.1.3
- Action CD-2.1.4
- Action CD-2.2.1
- Action CD-2.3.3
- Action CD-2.4.1
- Action CD-3.4.1
- Action CD-4.1.1
- Action CD-4.1.2
- Action CD-5.1.1
- Goal CD-6
- Policy CD-6.2

Changes to the goals, policies, and actions listed above constituted minor textual edits and clarifications that had little functional change to those goals, policies, and actions and would therefore not result in any appreciable modification of the environmental impacts of the General Plan Update.

Several additional changes were made to goals, policies, and actions that could, by their nature, cause a modification in the scope or effect of that given feature, resulting in some modification of the expected environmental impact(s) of the General Plan Update. Those specific goals, policies, and actions that fall into this category are discussed below as well as the expected change in environmental impact that would occur as a result of these modifications.

**TABLE 5.0-4  
SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES TO COMMUNITY DESIGN GOALS, POLICIES, AND ACTIONS  
AND THEIR EXPECTED ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

Goal/Policy/ Action	Changed or New	Modification Made	Environmental Effect
<b>Policy CD-2.1</b>	Changed	Other open spaces now to be linked to walkable grid street layout.	<b>Negligible to Positive</b> – This change increases the scope of the policy, allowing for additional linkages between pedestrian features and open spaces. This change would have a net benefit on public awareness for open spaces but could also bring more persons into contact with sensitive biological and hydrological resources. However, the true effect of this change is limited and any such effects would be minor.
<b>Action CD-2.1.1</b>	Changed	Creek access removed from required circulation and access features.	<b>Negligible</b> – Omitting creek access would have little functional change on the pedestrian nature of grid-based street patterns. Therefore, little change in environmental effect would occur.
<b>Policy CD-2.4</b>	Changed	Policy now includes design of roads, lighting, and landscaping as appropriate methods for protecting viewsheds.	<b>Positive</b> – This change would add to the potential methods that can be utilized to protect viewsheds, resulting in increased effectiveness of the policy and increased protection of viewsheds.
<b>Action CD-2.4.2</b>	New	Requires low light levels in foothill settings.	<b>Positive</b> – Requiring low lighting in foothill areas will reduce any lighting or glare impacts from development in these areas (see DEIR Section 4.13).

## 5.0 MINOR REVISIONS TO THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN

Goal/Policy/ Action	Changed or New	Modification Made	Environmental Effect
<b>Action CD-2.4.4</b>	New	Minimize block length in foothill developments.	<b>Positive</b> – Reducing block length would likely result in increased walkability and greater pedestrian safety, as pedestrians are less likely to cross mid-block.
<b>Action CD-2.4.4</b>	Deleted	Requirement to minimize highly visible or intrusive structures deleted (replaced by new action above).	<b>Negative</b> – Deleting this action removes barriers to such development in foothill areas. However, the new Action CD-2.4.4 as well as the effects of changes to Policy 2.4 and the actions associated with it will offset this negative effect, ensuring that aesthetic impacts would not be worsened.
<b>Action CD-6.1.1</b>	Changed	The location of two artistic gateway features was changed slightly.	<b>Negligible</b> – Changing the location of such features, but not the total number of features, would not functionally change the effectiveness of such features in improving aesthetics.

### SECTION 6 – DOWNTOWN

Modifications to the Vision as well as the Introduction, Downtown Vision Illustration and Concepts, and Downtown Land Use Diagram subsections were limited to minor textual changes that do not alter the intent or requirements of the section. As such, these changes do not affect the environmental impacts discussed in the Draft EIR.

The Downtown Vision Illustration and Concepts subsection does include a new subsection describing the illustration and its purpose, but this new subsection provides a clarification and has no functional bearing on the physical requirements of the General Plan Update. Therefore, no change in the environmental impacts of the General Plan Update would occur.

Modifications to Section 6 also included minor textual changes to several goals and policies, including modification of the following:

- Action DT-1.1.1
- Policy DT-1.5
- Action DT-1.5.1
- Action DT-1.5.2
- Policy DT-2.1
- Action DT-2.3.1
- Action DT-2.3.2
- Action DT-3.2.1
- Action DT-3.3.2
- Action DT-3.5.1
- Action DT-3.5.2
- Policy DT-3.6
- Policy DT-3.7
- Action DT-3.7.2
- Policy DT-4.1
- Action DT-4.2.2
- Action DT-4.3.1
- Goal DT-5
- Action DT-5.1.2
- Action DT-6.2.2
- Action DT-6.2.4
- Action DT-6.3.1
- Policy DT-7.1
- Action DT-7.1.1
- Action DT-7.1.2
- Policy DT-7.3
- Action DT-8.1.1
- Action DT-8.1.2

Changes to the goals, policies, and actions listed above constituted minor textual edits and clarifications that had little functional change to those goals, policies, and actions and would

## 5.0 MINOR REVISIONS TO THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN

therefore not result in any appreciable modification of the environmental impacts of the General Plan Update.

Several additional changes were made to goals, policies, and actions that could, by their nature, cause a modification in the scope or effect of that given feature, resulting in some modification of the expected environmental impact(s) of the General Plan Update. Those specific goals, policies, and actions that fall into this category are discussed below as well as the expected change in environmental impact that would occur as a result of these modifications.

**TABLE 5.0-5  
SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES TO DOWNTOWN GOALS, POLICIES, AND ACTIONS  
AND THEIR EXPECTED ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

Goal/Policy/ Action	Changed or New	Modification Made	Environmental Effect
<b>Action DT-1.3.2</b>	New	City to meet with downtown property owners, businesses, residents, etc., to discuss solutions to Downtown policy issues.	<b>None</b> – The purpose of this group meeting is to support implementation of the Downtown Element. As such, it would have no functional change in the requirements of the General Plan Update and the environmental effects of the element will not likely change.
<b>Action DT-1.3.3</b>	Changed	Chico Unified School District added to school entities with which the City must consult.	<b>Positive</b> – Providing an additional method for the Chico Unified School District to coordinate with the City would likely result in reduced environmental impacts related to schools and student load (see Section 4.12 of the DEIR).
<b>Action DT-2.4.1</b>	New	Promote intensified use and reuse of existing above-ground suites.	<b>Positive</b> – Reuse of existing structures typically results in fewer environmental impacts than demolition of an existing building and construction of new spaces.
<b>Policy DT-3.1</b>	Changed	Sidewalks, open spaces, and other pedestrian amenities added to possible enhancements to the pedestrian environment.	<b>Positive</b> – Increasing the methods through which the pedestrian environment will be enhanced allows for greater flexibility and a greater potential for these enhancements to be implemented, resulting in greater safety for pedestrians as well as enhanced walkability.
<b>Action DT-3.1.1</b>	Changed	Pedestrian pathways added to features to which the Design Guidelines Manual is applied.	<b>Negligible</b> – Design typically does not affect the environmental impact of such features. However, some benefit may be seen to walkability from application of standards.
<b>Action DT-5.1.4</b>	Changed	Subsidies for downtown transit uses expanded to residents of downtown.	<b>Positive</b> – By extending transit subsidies for residents, transit ridership will likely be increased and vehicle trips reduced, resulting in reductions in vehicle emissions and traffic loading overall.

**SECTION 7 – ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

Modifications to the Vision as well as the Introduction and Issues and Considerations subsections were limited to minor textual changes that do not alter the intent or requirements of the section. As such, these changes do not affect the environmental impacts discussed in the Draft EIR.

Modifications to Section 7 also included minor textual changes to several goals and policies, including modification of the following:

- Goal ED-1
- Action ED-1.4.2
- Policy ED-2.1
- Policy ED-1.2
- Action ED-1.4.3
- Action ED-2.1.1
- Policy ED-1.3
- Action ED-1.5.2
- Action ED-2.1.2
- Action ED-1.4.1
- Goal ED-2

Changes to the goals, policies, and actions listed above constituted minor textual edits and clarifications that had little functional change to those goals, policies, and actions and would therefore not result in any appreciable modification of the environmental impacts of the General Plan Update.

Several additional changes were made to goals, policies, and actions that could, by their nature, cause a modification in the scope or effect of that given feature, resulting in some modification of the expected environmental impact(s) of the General Plan Update. Those specific goals, policies, and actions that fall into this category are discussed below as well as the expected change in environmental impact that would occur as a result of these modifications.

**TABLE 5.0-6  
SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT GOALS, POLICIES, AND ACTIONS  
AND THEIR EXPECTED ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

Goal/Policy/ Action	Changed or New	Modification Made	Environmental Effect
<b>Action ED-1.2.3</b>	Changed	Environmental review added to types of assistance to be granted to shovel-ready sites.	<b>Negligible</b> – Environmental review is a required step regardless of the assistance given to a particular property/project. As such, this change will have little functional effect on environmental impacts.
<b>Action ED-1.2.5</b>	Changed	Non-profit organizations and CARD are added to potential strategic partnerships.	<b>Negligible</b> – While such partnerships can foster greater economic conditions in the city, the effect on the environment is limited to reduced vehicle miles due to shorter commutes for residents who would work more locally. However, given the geographically isolated location of the city, this benefit would likely be limited.

## 5.0 MINOR REVISIONS TO THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN

Goal/Policy/Action	Changed or New	Modification Made	Environmental Effect
Action ED-1.2.6	Deleted	Proposed research park deleted from the General Plan.	<b>Negligible</b> – While a research park would no longer be a planned development in the city following this change, it would not preclude another use from being constructed in that location. Therefore, the environmental effects remain approximately the same.
Action ED-1.2.8	Deleted	Mandated support for the Chico Municipal Airport deleted.	<b>Negligible</b> – This action was re-codified as Policy ED-1.7. No functional change was made by reclassifying this action as a policy.
Action ED-1.2.8	New	Promote local agricultural production and distribution.	<b>Positive</b> – Increased local agricultural production and distribution would reduce the number of vehicle miles required to deliver goods and services to local residents, thus incrementally reducing emissions.
Action ED-1.3.3	New	Update Economic Development Strategy to highlight renewable, recyclable, and local resources.	<b>Positive</b> – The reuse of existing local resources as well as recycling would reduce the number of vehicle miles required to deliver goods and services to local residents, thus incrementally reducing emissions.
Action ED-1.3.4	New	Conduct outreach to local businesses and development for greater regulatory efficiency.	<b>Negligible</b> – While such actions may make the administration of the City run more efficiently, this would have little functional effect on the environment.
Policy ED-1.4	Changed	Base-level employment goals and long-term sustainability added to considerations for allocating public funds.	<b>Negligible</b> – Sustainability in this case refers to longevity and not the concepts of sustainable development. As such, this policy would have limited effect on the environment other than some minor reductions in impacts that would occur if businesses left the city and vacant properties were either demolished or renovated for new uses.
Action ED-1.4.5	New	Invest local resources to retain, expand, and add new base-level employers in Chico.	<b>Negligible to Positive</b> – More employers in the city would reduce the potential for residents to travel outside the city for work, resulting in fewer vehicle miles traveled over all and thus reduced vehicle emissions. However, given the city's isolated geographic location, this benefit would be limited.
Action ED-1.4.6	New	Use technology to support City economic goals.	<b>Negligible</b> – Some very limited benefits may be seen in the realm of reduced paper and other physical resource use which would reduce the amount of solid waste handled in the city. However, this would be severely limited and would thus not have a significant environmental impact.

## 5.0 MINOR REVISIONS TO THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN

Goal/Policy/ Action	Changed or New	Modification Made	Environmental Effect
<b>Action ED-1.4.7</b>	New	Attract and promote regional and other major sporting events.	<b>Negligible</b> – While sports events can have an economic benefit, economic impacts are not considered environmental impacts.
<b>Policy ED-1.7</b>	New	Support operation of Chico Municipal Airport.	See Action ED-1.2.8 above.
<b>Action ED-1.8.1</b>	New	Conduct a regional economic development summit.	<b>None</b> – While such events can have an economic benefit, economic impacts are not considered environmental impacts.
<b>Action ED-1.8.2</b>	New	Encourage increased State/Silver Dollar Fair Board use of the fairgrounds.	<b>None</b> – While such events can have an economic benefit, economic impacts are not considered environmental impacts.
<b>Policy ED-1.9</b>	New	Encourage residents and visitors to support local businesses.	<b>Negligible</b> – While such actions can have an economic benefit, economic impacts are not considered environmental impacts.
<b>Action ED-1.9.1</b>	New	Implement a “buy local” campaign.	See Policy ED-1.9 above.
<b>Policy ED-2.1</b>	Deleted	Maintenance of Chico’s prominence as the regional retail center deleted.	<b>Negligible</b> – While this policy might have had an economic benefit, and while its removal may have a similar negative impact, economic impacts are not considered environmental impacts.
<b>Action ED-2.1.1</b>	Deleted	Mandate to ensure an adequate supply of retail land deleted.	See Policy ED-2.1 above.
<b>Policy ED-3.1</b>	Changed	Projects that support infill, mixed-use, and redevelopment added to consideration for Opportunity Sites.	<b>Negligible to Positive</b> – This change would result in a greater potential for Opportunity Sites to include these types of features, reducing the construction of new structures, increasing the reuse of old structures, and limiting sprawl.

Note:

1. Since Policy ED-2.1 was deleted, remaining policies and actions under Goal ED-2 were renumbered accordingly.

### SECTION 9 – PARKS, PUBLIC FACILITIES, AND SERVICES

Modifications to the Vision as well as the Issues and Considerations and Parks, Public Facilities, and Services Context subsections were limited to minor textual changes that do not alter the intent or requirements of the section. As such, these changes do not affect the environmental impacts discussed in the Draft EIR. Table PPFS-2 was modified to include calculations for the acreage and number of parks needed to meet the build-out population. However, these calculations do not change the requirements of the element and thus have no environmental effect.

Modifications to Section 9 also included minor textual changes to several goals and policies, including modification of the following:

- Action PPFS-1.1.9
- Action PPFS-4.2.1
- Action PPFS-5.1.2
- Action PPFS-2.1.2
- Action PPFS-4.2.3
- Action PPFS-5.3.1
- Action PPFS-2.1.3
- Action PPFS-5.1.1
- Action PPFS-5.3.2

## 5.0 MINOR REVISIONS TO THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN

- Policy PPFS-5.4
- Policy PPFS-6.2
- Action PPFS-6.3.1
- Goal PPFS-7
- Policy PPFS-7.1
- Action PPFS-7.1.2
- Action PPFS-8.1.1
- Action PPFS-8.1.2
- Action PPFS-8.1.4
- Action PPFS-8.1.6

Changes to the goals, policies, and actions listed above constituted minor textual edits and clarifications that had little functional change to those goals, policies, and actions and would therefore not result in any appreciable modification of the environmental impacts of the General Plan Update.

Several additional changes were made to goals, policies, and actions that could, by their nature, cause a modification in the scope or effect of that given feature, resulting in some modification of the expected environmental impact(s) of the General Plan Update. Those specific goals, policies, and actions that fall into this category are discussed below as well as the expected change in environmental impact that would occur as a result of these modifications.

**TABLE 5.0-7  
SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES TO PARKS, PUBLIC FACILITIES, AND SERVICES GOALS, POLICIES, AND ACTIONS  
AND THEIR EXPECTED ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

Goal/Policy/Action	Changed or New	Modification Made	Environmental Effect
<b>Policy PPFS-2.1</b>	Changed	Habitat protection added to potential uses for greenways and other open spaces for public use.	<b>Positive</b> – Adding habitat protection to the use of greenways and open space for public use will ensure that this use will likely reduce any impacts to habitats within those areas.
<b>Action PPFS-2.1.4</b>	Changed	Non-profit organizations also to be consulted during the environmental review process.	<b>Negligible</b> – Consultation with all interested parties and responsible agencies is a required part of CEQA review. This change merely restates this requirement, resulting in little actual change to environmental impacts.
<b>Action PPFS-3.1.1</b>	Changed	Promotion of walking, biking, transit, or carpooling to schools added.	<b>Positive</b> – Greater uses of these modes of transportation would reduce the number of vehicles taking children to school, resulting in fewer vehicle emissions.
<b>Policy PPFS-5.1</b>	Changed	Tehama aquifer also to be protected under the Chico Planning Area.	<b>Positive</b> – By clarifying that there are two main aquifers under the city, not just one, the potential for greater protection of these aquifers is created.
<b>Action PPFS-5.1.4</b>	New	Include development standards that protect groundwater recharge areas.	<b>Positive</b> – Protection of recharge areas would help reduce drawdown of the aquifer and the resultant need for new and deeper wells.

## 5.0 MINOR REVISIONS TO THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN

Goal/Policy/Action	Changed or New	Modification Made	Environmental Effect
<b>Action PPFS-5.4.2</b>	New	Replace water-intensive City landscaping and irrigation systems with drought-tolerant and water-efficient systems.	<b>Positive</b> – Increasing the use of drought-tolerant landscaping and efficient irrigation can reduce the water demand of City properties, resulting in less water use overall, reduced groundwater use, and other similar benefits.
<b>Goal PPFS-6</b>	Changed	Natural aquifers added to systems to be protected by a comprehensive stormwater management system.	<b>Positive</b> – Consideration of the effect of stormwater on aquifers would decrease potential negative impacts on the aquifer.
<b>Action PPFS-7.1.4</b>	Deleted	Exploration of a Cultural and Performing Arts Center deleted.	<b>Negligible</b> – Social impacts are not considered environmental impacts.
<b>Policy PPFS-7.2</b>	New	Support improved health and social services.	<b>Negligible to Positive</b> – Implementation of this policy could result in greater public health, though its effect is mostly administrative rather than physical.
<b>Action PPFS-8.1.5</b>	New	Provide recycling bins and collection on City property.	<b>Positive</b> – Making recycling bins available on City property would incrementally reduce the amount of solid waste sent to landfills.
<b>Action PPFS-8.1.7</b>	New	Amend the Municipal Code to apply solid waste and recycling standards to commercial and industrial customers.	<b>Positive</b> – This new action would expand the scope of the City's current recycling/solid waste requirements, resulting in less solid waste sent to landfills.

### SECTION 10 – OPEN SPACE AND ENVIRONMENT

Modifications to the Vision as well as the Introduction and Issues and Considerations subsections were limited to minor textual changes that do not alter the intent or requirements of the section. As such, these changes do not affect the environmental impacts discussed in the Draft EIR.

Modifications to Section 10 also included minor textual changes to several goals and policies, including modification of the following:

- Policy OS-1.1
- Action OS-1.1.2
- Action OS-1.1.3
- Action OS-1.1.4
- Action OS-1.2.1
- Goal OS-2
- Policy OS-2.1
- Action OS-2.1.1
- Action OS-2.1.2
- Policy OS-2.3
- Policy OS-2.4
- Action OS-2.5.1
- Action OS-3.1.1
- Action OS-3.1.2
- Policy OS-3.2
- Action OS-3.2.3
- Action OS-3.2.4
- Action OS-3.3.1
- Action OS-3.3.2
- Action OS-3.3.4
- Policy OS-4.1
- Action OS-4.1.1
- Action OS-4.1.3
- Policy OS-5.3
- Policy OS-5.4
- Policy OS-6.1
- Action OS-6.1.1

## 5.0 MINOR REVISIONS TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Changes to the goals, policies, and actions listed above constituted minor textual edits and clarifications that had little functional change to those goals, policies, and actions and would therefore not result in any appreciable modification of the environmental impacts of the General Plan Update.

Several additional changes were made to goals, policies, and actions that could, by their nature, cause a modification in the scope or effect of that given feature, resulting in some modification of the expected environmental impact(s) of the General Plan Update. Those specific goals, policies, and actions that fall into this category are discussed below as well as the expected change in environmental impact that would occur as a result of these modifications.

**TABLE 5.0-8  
SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES TO OPEN SPACE AND ENVIRONMENT GOALS, POLICIES, AND ACTIONS  
AND THEIR EXPECTED ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

Goal/Policy/ Action	Changed or New	Modification Made	Environmental Effect
<b>Action OS-1.1.1</b>	Changed	Areas that contain sensitive habitat and species also to be protected from development.	<b>Positive</b> – By expanding the scope of this action beyond just open space, the potential for protection of sensitive species or habitats is increased.
<b>Action OS-1.1.5</b>	New	Remove non-native species in Bidwell Park and City greenways.	<b>Positive</b> – The removal of non-native invasive species will not only add potential habitat for native species, but will also prevent the spread of these non-native species to sensitive habitats.
<b>Policy OS-1.3</b>	New	Reduce excessive nighttime light and glare.	<b>Positive</b> – Implementation of this goal as well as its two actions would reduce impacts due to light and glare (see Section 4.13, Impact 4.13.4, of the DEIR).
<b>Action OS-1.3.1</b>	New	Consider adoption of a dark sky ordinance.	See Policy OS-1.3 above.
<b>Action OS-1.3.22</b>	New	Seek community cooperation to reduce existing light pollution.	See Policy OS-1.3 above.
<b>Action OS-2.2.2</b>	New	Expand the greenway system.	<b>Positive</b> – Expansion of greenways and open space can have beneficial impacts to habitats and species as well as provide recreational opportunities and other potential benefits to public health.
<b>Action OS-2.4.2</b>	New	Update the Design Guidelines to address viewshed issues in the foothills.	<b>Positive</b> – Updating design guidelines in this manner would potentially reduce impacts to viewsheds from development (see Section 4.13 of the DEIR).
<b>Action OS-3.1.3</b>	New	Continue enforcement of illegal discharges to Chico’s creeks.	<b>Negligible</b> – As this policy mandates continuance of a program already in place, no further environmental benefit beyond that already seen as a result of the program would occur.

## 5.0 MINOR REVISIONS TO THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN

Goal/Policy/ Action	Changed or New	Modification Made	Environmental Effect
<b>Action OS-3.1.7</b>	New	Improve operation and maintenance of the Five-Mile flood control system.	<b>Positive</b> – Such an action would not only reduce potential flooding impacts in the event of a severe storm, but improved maintenance would result in improvements in water quality, management of sediment, and improvements to fish habitats.
<b>Action OS-3.2.1</b>	Changed	Impacts to groundwater recharge areas can also be avoided through open space preservation and runoff management.	<b>Positive</b> – This change increases the available methods allowed to protect groundwater recharge areas, resulting in a greater likelihood of success for such efforts.
<b>Action OS-3.2.2</b>	New	Identify and map groundwater recharge areas.	<b>Negligible</b> – While detailed mapping will enhance the efforts to protect groundwater recharge areas, it would not change the actual physical requirements of the General Plan for these areas.
<b>Action OS-3.2.5</b>	New	Oppose regional sales and transfers of local groundwater.	<b>Negligible</b> – This new action concerns local groundwater entitlements. However, hydrological connection between groundwater used in a given location and its final destination once used is tenuous and no direct connection is proven.
<b>Action OS-3.3.5</b>	New	Enforce state water conservation requirements.	<b>Negligible</b> – While this action may enhance local enforcement of state requirements, it would not affect the actual physical requirements of those regulations.
<b>Action OS-4.1.5</b>	Changed	Enforce no-burn regulations as well as the residential leaf pick-up program.	<b>Negligible</b> – While this action may enhance local enforcement of no-burn regulations, it does not establish any new physical restrictions on burning.
<b>Action OS-4.1.6</b>	New	Provide a well-connected circulation system with complete streets features.	<b>Positive</b> – Complete streets concepts, such as enhanced transit and pedestrian facilities and traffic calming techniques, have benefits for both traffic congestion and air quality emissions.
<b>Policy OS-4.3</b>	Changed	Not only provide a Climate Action Plan, but also update it periodically.	<b>Positive</b> – As greenhouse gas planning is an ever-developing field, updating the Climate Action Plan periodically will ensure that best available science is applied to the City's Climate Action Plan.
<b>Action OS-5.2.1</b>	Changed	Explore public uses in agricultural buffers.	<b>Negligible</b> – Public uses in agricultural buffers will likely have no effect on agricultural resources and will have no greater environmental effect during installation than other features allowed in such buffers (such as roadways).

## 5.0 MINOR REVISIONS TO THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN

Goal/Policy/Action	Changed or New	Modification Made	Environmental Effect
Action OS-6.1.3	New	Consider a tree planting program.	<b>Negligible</b> – While tree planting has proven benefits to air quality as well as public health, a requirement to consider such a program is not a requirement to enact a program. Therefore, the benefit cannot be assumed to occur.

### SECTION 11 – CULTURAL RESOURCES AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION

Modifications to the Introduction and Regulatory Context subsections were limited to minor textual changes that do not alter the intent or requirements of the section. Included in these modifications was a brief discussion of the role of CEQA; however, no changes to the requirements of the element were included. As such, these changes do not affect the environmental impacts discussed in the Draft EIR.

Modifications to Section 11 also included minor textual changes to several goals and policies, including modification of the following:

- Goal CRHP-1
- Policy CRHP-1.1
- Action CRHP-1.1.3
- Action CRHP-1.1.6
- Action CRHP-1.1.11
- Goal CRHP-2
- Policy CRHP-2.3
- Goal CRHP-3
- Action CRHP-3.1.5

Changes to the goals, policies, and actions listed above constituted minor textual edits and clarifications that had little functional change to those goals, policies, and actions and would therefore not result in any appreciable modification of the environmental impacts of the General Plan Update.

Several additional changes were made to goals, policies, and actions that could, by their nature, cause a modification in the scope or effect of that given feature, resulting in some modification of the expected environmental impact(s) of the General Plan Update. Those specific goals, policies, and actions that fall into this category are discussed below as well as the expected change in environmental impact that would occur as a result of these modifications.

**TABLE 5.0-9  
SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES TO CULTURAL RESOURCES AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION GOALS,  
POLICIES, AND ACTIONS AND THEIR EXPECTED ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

Goal/Policy/Action	Changed or New	Modification Made	Environmental Effect
Action CRHP-1.1.10	Changed	City to use the California Historical Resources Information System to identify qualified cultural consultants, not an internal City process. Also require consultants to meet the minimum standards of the Secretary of the Interior.	<b>Positive</b> – This change would strengthen the qualifications required of a cultural consultant in the City, ensuring greater potential protection of cultural resources during the planning process.
Action CRHP-2.4.3	New	Implement the Diversity Action plan.	<b>Negligible</b> – Diversity is a social function and thus not an environmental effect.

## 5.0 MINOR REVISIONS TO THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN

Goal/Policy/ Action	Changed or New	Modification Made	Environmental Effect
<b>Action CRHP-3.1.2</b>	New	Consult with the Northeast Information Center during preparation of a Cultural Resources Management Plan.	<b>Negligible to Positive</b> – Increased coordination between local agencies and the City can have a positive effect on cultural resources protection. However, consultation with such entities is already a requirement of CEQA and state law. Therefore, the effect of this action is limited.
<b>Action CRHP-3.1.3</b>	Changed	Identical changes as those shown for Action CRHP-1.1.10 above.	See Action CRHP-1.1.10 above.
<b>Action CRHP-3.1.7</b>	New	Continue to support education conferences on Historic Preservation and Native American Resource Preservation.	<b>Negligible to Positive</b> – Public education can increase awareness of cultural resources. However, as these conferences are already held and this action would simply continue programs already undertaken by the City, little change from the existing cultural setting is expected.

### SECTION 12 – SAFETY

Modifications to the Vision as well as the Issues and Considerations and Safety Context subsections were limited to minor textual changes that do not alter the intent or requirements of the section. As such, these changes do not affect the environmental impacts discussed in the Draft EIR.

## 4.0 MINOR REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT EIR

Modifications to Section 12 also included minor textual changes to several goals and policies, including modification of the following:

- Action S-1.1.2
- Goal S-2
- Policy S-2.1
- Action S-2.1.2
- Action S.2.1.3
- Action S-2.1.4
- Policy S-3.1
- Action S-4.1.1
- Policy S-4.3
- Action S-5.1.1
- Action S-5.3.1
- Policy S-5.4
- Action S-5.4.1
- Action S-5.4.3
- Action S-5.5.1
- Policy S-7.1
- Goal S-8

Changes to the goals, policies, and actions listed above constituted minor textual edits and clarifications that had little functional change to those goals, policies, and actions and would therefore not result in any appreciable modification of the environmental impacts of the General Plan Update.

Several additional changes were made to goals, policies, and actions that could, by their nature, cause a modification in the scope or effect of that given feature, resulting in some modification of the expected environmental impact(s) of the General Plan Update. Those specific goals, policies, and actions that fall into this category are discussed below as well as the expected change in environmental impact that would occur as a result of these modifications.

**TABLE 5.0-10  
SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES TO SAFETY GOALS, POLICIES, AND ACTIONS  
AND THEIR EXPECTED ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

Goal/Policy/ Action	Changed or New	Modification Made	Environmental Effect
<b>Policy S-1.2</b>	New	Support public education, adaptation, and emergency response services in response to the long-term effects of climate change.	<b>Positive</b> – Addition of this policy provides a framework through which City emergency response will consider the effects of climate change, ensuring that adequate planning is undertaken for events that could occur as climate change progresses.
<b>Action S-2.1.5</b>	Changed	Inclusion of state flood hazard data on the City's flood hazard maps deleted.	<b>Negligible</b> – Deleting the requirement for state flood hazard data on the City's flood hazard maps would not preclude the inclusion of Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood maps or any other similar requirement of the General Plan Update for flood hazard mitigation, limiting the physical effect of deleting this action.

## 5.0 MINOR REVISIONS TO THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN

Goal/Policy/ Action	Changed or New	Modification Made	Environmental Effect
<b>Action S-4.3.5</b>	Changed	Consideration of sprinkler ordinance limited to nonresidential structures.	<b>Negligible</b> – As this action only mandates consideration of a sprinkler ordinance, not the actual adoption of such an ordinance, it is not certain that such an ordinance would be adopted. Furthermore, it is unlikely any sprinkler ordinance, following public process, would require new residential structures to include sprinklers. As such, the physical impact of this change on fire hazards is limited.
<b>Action S-5.1.2</b>	New	Maintain adequate police staffing.	<b>Negligible</b> – While this action would require adequate staffing, the environmental effects of increases in staffing as a result of the General Plan Update were addressed in the DEIR (see Section 4.12, Impact 4.12.2.1). As the DEIR assumed the increase, the method for any staffing increase is irrelevant.
<b>Action S-5.5.2</b>	Deleted	Adoption of a security design ordinance deleted.	<b>Negligible</b> – Inclusion of security design principles is already required by Policy S-5.5 and Action S-5.5.1, as well as existing policies and actions in other elements of the General Plan Update. As such, the omission of a Security Design Ordinance would have little physical effect on safety design in new development in the city.
<b>Action S-7.1.2</b>	Changed	Union Pacific Railroad added to agencies to develop and disseminate education materials on railroad crossing hazards.	<b>Positive</b> – Including Union Pacific in development of educational materials should enhance the effectiveness and accuracy of such materials, incrementally increasing safety awareness.
<b>Policy S-8.2</b>	New	Reduce the use of hazardous and toxic materials by City operations.	<b>Positive</b> – By reducing the amount of such materials used by the City, the amount transported to, stored in, and used in Chico would be reduced, incrementally reducing safety and health hazards of such activities.

### SECTION 13 – NOISE

Modifications to the Vision as well as the Introduction and Issues and Considerations subsections were limited to minor textual changes that do not alter the intent or requirements of the section. As such, these changes do not affect the environmental impacts discussed in the Draft EIR.

The discussion of airport noise in regard to the ALUCP and the ALUC was updated according to the changes outlined above for Section 3, Land Use, above. As with the land use ramifications, the modified discussion in the Noise Element clarified that consistency with the ALUC and ALUCP have been established, reducing potential noise impacts to sensitive receptors and thus having a beneficial environmental impact over the previous version of the General Plan Update.

## 5.0 MINOR REVISIONS TO THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN

Also added to the Issues and Considerations subsection was language describing the noise generation of California State University, Chico. However, this additional text did not change the function or intent of the General Plan Update and thus no change in environmental effect is expected.

Modifications to Section 13 also included minor textual changes to several goals and policies, including modification of the following:

- Policy N-1.5
- Action N-2.2.1
- Action N-2.2.2

Changes to the goals, policies, and actions listed above constituted minor textual edits and clarifications that had little functional change to those goals, policies, and actions and would therefore not result in any appreciable modification of the environmental impacts of the General Plan Update.

Several additional changes were made to goals, policies, and actions that could, by their nature, cause a modification in the scope or effect of that given feature, resulting in some modification of the expected environmental impact(s) of the General Plan Update. Those specific goals, policies, and actions that fall into this category are discussed below as well as the expected change in environmental impact that would occur as a result of these modifications.

**TABLE 5.0-10  
SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES TO NOISE GOALS, POLICIES, AND ACTIONS  
AND THEIR EXPECTED ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

Goal/Policy/ Action	Changed or New	Modification Made	Environmental Effect
<b>Action N-2.1.1</b>	Changed	Berms as a potential method for noise mitigation deleted.	<b>Negligible</b> – The action still includes allowance for “other methods,” which would allow berms if the situation called for it. As such, there is little functional change in the requirements of the action.
<b>Action N-2.2.3</b>	Changed	Noise-reducing pavement and speed reductions added to features that could be used to mitigate noise from state highways.	<b>Negligible</b> – While calling out these specific methods may increase awareness of these types of methods, the action does not require their use. Therefore, the physical effect of the action remains the same.

### 5.3 CEQA RAMIFICATIONS OF GENERAL PLAN UPDATE MODIFICATIONS

CEQA Guidelines, Section 15088.5 discusses the requirements imposed on a lead agency in the event that new information or changes to the proposed project occur following release of the Draft EIR and prior to certification of the EIR. According to Section 15088.5, an EIR must be recirculated for public comment in the event that significant new information is added to the EIR. According to Section 15088.5(a), significant new information requiring recirculation includes:

- 1) A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.

## 5.0 MINOR REVISIONS TO THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN

---

- 2) A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.
- 3) A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the project, but the project's proponents decline to adopt it.
- 4) The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.

The modifications to the General Plan Update discussed above do not present a new project alternative, nor are any new mitigation measures presented. Likewise, sufficient evidence does not exist from comments received on the Draft EIR and the whole of the public record that the Draft EIR is in any way fundamentally and basically inadequate.

In regard to changes in environmental impacts, refer to **Tables 5.0-1** through **5.0-10** above. As shown in those tables and the discussion in Section 5.2 above, none of the changes made to the General Plan Update following release of the Draft EIR for public comment would result in any appreciable change in environmental impacts. None of the impacts identified in the Draft EIR would be more significant than what was originally stated, nor would any new impacts occur that were previously unidentified. As such, the EIR need not be recirculated, pursuant to the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5(a).

