

Exhibit O

RECEIVED

MAY 14 2019

Name: Summer Cip

To: The Fresno City Planning Commission

Attn: Will Tackett

Re: EA No. T-6212 for public hearing on 5/15/19 and any hearings regarding this project in the future
I am requesting this paper be read and considered.

From: Ginger Rainey

7108 W. Rialto Ave.

Fresno Ca. 93723

I am a resident of Fresno County. I live on approx. 2 ½ acres close to the proposed development. I have resided on this property for 40 years. I am not in agreement with this proposed development.

Here are my reasons why I do not approve of this project:

1. Design/layout: According to the map of the development, I only see one way in and one way out (maybe I am looking at the map incorrectly?). The lot size looks very small. Small lots might be good for the developer financially, but humans are not meant to be “packed in like sardines”. People need space.
2. Water and pollution: Both water and pollution issues are big problems here in the valley. Fresno just keeps on building as the answer to that problem.
3. Infrastructure: At the last Planning commission meeting (5/8/19 ID19-1609) a similar project for apartments in this area was not approved, due to the fact that the infrastructure is not developed yet in this area. The areas roads are congested now because the city of Fresno has already allowed development without the proper infrastructure in place.

The proposed project site is not planted in Almonds as stated. The almond trees were removed some time ago.

Just to the north boundary line of this proposed development (and owned by the same developer) there used to be a landmark/old growth stand of trees (Firs, Pines, Oaks, Eucalyptus), but they were all cut down. Everyone in the area loved those trees. The trees were very old, but not diseased, what a waste, that area would have made a very nice park for the area. The trees were home to a lot of wildlife. The raptors and migratory birds that nested in those trees are protected birds when they are nesting and restrictions are placed on developing during that time. Those trees were filtering and cleaning our heavily polluted air for us.

Respectfully,

Ginger Rainey

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "G. Rainey". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

RECEIVED

MAY 14 2019

Name: Summerlip

To: The Fresno City Planning Commission

Attn: Will Tackett

Re: EA No. T-6212 for public hearing on 5/15/19 and any future hearings on this matter.

From: Jon Endara of the West Shaw Acres Homeowners Association.

7108 W. Rialto Ave.

Fresno, Ca. 93723

Eighty-four lots on 14.4 acres is around 6,000 sq. feet per lot. With five feet on each side, and twenty foot set-backs, plus sidewalks and lights and utilities it gets even smaller. You rightfully said no to an apartment project at Barstow and Grantland and this project presents the same problems. Proper planning would not be under 6,000 sq. ft. lots next to the sphere of influence line, and next to 2 ½, 5, 10, and 20 acre properties. The project does not state the square footage of proposed homes, but to fit on that small size of lot there would have to be multi-story homes. This will create massive traffic problems which will hurt the environment, add stress and anxiety for motorists that already suffer as it is. Worries about water will also stress current residents. No park is included and the large trees that would have made a nice park were cut down, much against homeowners wishes. Safety is another issue. Streets will be more crowded, again, leading to more pollution. This project belongs in an urban area, closer to freeway 99, or the lots need to be bigger. Association members realize development is coming, but should not be 84 lots on 14.41 acres. We are asking for a modification to less density before approval.

Under aesthetics:

D. New sources of light, glare and noise is not less than significant. It is a significant impact. Residents currently have beautiful views of the stars above. My street (Rialto Ave.) has underground utilities and don't have street lights.

Under Air quality:

We rarely have foggy winters anymore(because of climate change). If these characteristics are conducive to air pollutants, then this should be addressed.

Under land use and planning:

Goal # 8: There is nothing "healthy or attractive" about homes on less than 6,000 sq. ft. lots in a rural area. It does not fit in with neighborhoods close to the project site. It is not healthy to put a lot of individuals in a small area. There are not any medical services in that area. Individuals could "die" trying to get or receive emergency medical services, with more population and inadequate roads in poor shape.

XXI Mandatory findings of significance:

The project does have a negative effect, and cumulative effect because of past projects, current projects, and proposed future projects. Traffic congestion, which in turn effects air pollution and the health of everyone living in Fresno. The wind blows all the dust and pollution over the whole city of Fresno. One in five children have asthma, same with the elderly.

In conclusion; if this project is allowed to continue the number of homes should be reduced. Lot size does not fit in with long-time surrounding neighborhoods. Eight to nine thousand sq. ft. lots are more appropriate.

Respectfully,



We must act fast to survive Earth's collision course with climate change



BY GEORGE BURMAN

The phrase *in extremis* is a nautical term that describes a situation in which two vessels are on a collision course and have reached a point when no action by either vessel can possibly avoid the collision. Some maneuvering can reduce the severity of the impact, possibly saving some lives, but the collision is unavoidable.

Human civilization is in extremis. We are on a collision course with the past and present actions we have made to fuel the Industrial Revolution, two world wars (and numerous "limited" wars), industrial-size agriculture, and a fast-paced, self-indulgent lifestyle. Sadly, only a small fraction of the humans living today have benefited from these actions, but the vast majority, essentially all, of humans living today, and who will be living in future generations, will suffer from what is happening.

Just as tragic are the consequences to non-human life: the decimation of forests and grasslands; extinction of birds, insects and mammals; the death of the corals and plankton that are the basis for the food chains in the oceans that feed us and give us oxygen. Virtually all living things on the planet are helpless passengers trapped in the steerage holds of the ship headed for destruction.

As was depicted in the movie "Titanic," the captain and officers of the ship could see the disaster looming before them, but



MATT DUNHAM AP Photo

Extinction Rebellion climate change protesters briefly block a road in London on Thursday. The nonviolent protest group seeks negotiations with the government on its demand to make slowing climate change a top priority.

they denied that there was a problem. At first, they thought the lookouts just imagined seeing an iceberg, then the iceberg wasn't that big, then it couldn't damage the ship, then the ship was unsinkable. And so the denial and delusion went on, even as the stern was 100 feet in the air and the bow pointed to the bottom. That is what I think of when I see United States senators on the floor of the capitol saying that climate change is just a liberal fantasy.

Well, that "liberal fantasy" has already warmed the Earth by 1 degree Celsius since the beginning of the Industrial Revolution. Many poo-poo this number; "Just 1°C? That's nothing to worry about!" Well, we can see the effects of 1°C warming by just looking at what has already occurred: Two "500-year" storms hitting Houston within months of each other; unprecedented flooding in the Midwest that recently occurred; historic amounts of snow

and ice across the United States; loss of sea ice in the Arctic to a degree never before seen; glaciers melting across the globe; hurricanes devastating Puerto Rico and the Gulf states; flooding from sea level rise in Miami occurring on an almost daily basis; a tropical cyclone (i.e. hurricane) striking southeast Africa with a ferocity never before seen; the list goes on and on.

If those things seem bad, just wait. The average global temperature is projected to rise by 2°C by 2030, even if we were to stop all burning of fossil fuels by that year. With the attitudes of most of the world's leadership, it is impossible that we will be able to eliminate use of fossil fuels in 10 years. More than 190 nations signed on to the Paris Climate Accords in 2017, yet none of them are on track to reach the goals they agreed to. The United States (one of the larger carbon polluters), has withdrawn from the agreement completely. Our political

leaders are like the officers on the bridge of the Titanic, denying that the iceberg is a threat. Instead of trying to slow the ship to minimize damage, we are going full throttle toward destruction. We seem hell-bent on ensuring that the global temperature will rise by 3-4°C by 2050, maybe by 5-6°C by 2100. Under those conditions, sea levels will rise by more than 200 feet, and much of North America, Europe, Africa, Australia and South America will be under sea water or parched by drought. The regions that provide our food, the oxygen we breathe, and the water we drink will be unrecognizable. The human species might not be extinct, but human civilization will no longer exist.

Even though the collision is inevitable and is already occurring, we don't have to continue at all-ahead flank speed. We can slow our use of fossil fuels, we can do some things to remove carbon from the atmosphere, we can use food sources that

WARMING OF THE EARTH BY 1 DEGREE CELSIUS SINCE THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION HAS RESULTED IN UNPRECEDENTED STORMS, FLOODING AND MELTING OF SEA ICE.

aren't built on the very top of the food chain, and we can change our lifestyles. We really don't have much choice in the matter, since all those things will inevitably happen once we are trying to survive in a 3°C or 4°C warmer world. But, we can decide to do those things sooner, rather than later, and hope we can preserve a world that our children and grandchildren can live in.

It won't be easy. It won't be fun. It won't be like a class project to see what it would be like to go without meat for a month, or to walk everywhere for a couple of weeks. It won't be just a handful of motivated people sacrificing while the rest of the world goes on with business as usual. It won't be just the people in one town, or one state or one country completely changing their of life to reduce the destruction of a 2°C warmer planet. It will take the whole planet. The environment will continue to degrade, but just not as fast. This will have to continue for decades, but, it took decades for things to get this bad, and the laws of physics don't go any faster in reverse. This is not a pretty picture, but all the other pictures I can imagine are worse.

I am 79. In my remaining years, I probably will not have to experience the horrors that I have suggested here. I could easily sit back and say, well, that is going to be tough for someone to fix. But I fear for my children and grandchildren, and for all the children and grand-

children of my community, my state, my country and my world.

So, what can be done? Student demonstrations and protests are helping to focus attention on the problem, but they don't solve the problem. Seeing an elementary school class make posters about the plight of sea turtles increases the students' awareness but doesn't directly save any turtles. What is needed is for us to support political leaders who are not climate deniers and who will promote legislation that will reduce fossil fuel use drastically in the next decade, and completely by 2050. Support means contributing to their campaigns and then to show up and vote! These leaders need to have the courage to stand up to the pressures of the manufacturing, automobile, oil, and industrial-scale agriculture industries who will cry that anything limiting their business-as-usual practices will devastate the economy. Well, the economy is going to be devastated before we get to a 3°C warmer world, and not just in the United States.

It will be worldwide devastation, so the things listed above need to be done on a worldwide basis. It will be a frightening, difficult trip, but what choice do we have?

George Burman of Fresno is retired Navy veteran with 30 years of service, a retired high school teacher and a charter member of the Central Valley chapter of the U. S. Green Building Council.

The Fresno Bee



Fresno, Valley get failing grades for air quality

BY CARMEN GEORGE
cgeorge@fresnobee.com

Fresno and surrounding central San Joaquin Valley cities are at the top of a U.S. ranking for being the most polluted American cities, according to an annual report released Tuesday night by the American Lung Association.

California counties in the Valley region to receive a failing "F" grade in the State of the Air

THE REPORT LISTS "FRESNO-MADERA-HANFORD" AS THE MOST POLLUTED FOR YEAR-ROUND PARTICLE POLLUTION.

2019 report include Fresno, Kern, Kings, Madera, Mariposa, Merced and Tulare.

Will Barrett, director of clean air advocacy for the American Lung Association in California, said during a Tuesday news conference that progress has been slower in the Valley than other parts of the state in addressing air pollution.

John Balmes, a UC San Francisco professor and member of the California Air Resources Board, said Valley residents need to keep San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District board mem-

bers' "feet to the fire" to mitigate air pollution issues.

Jaime Holt, spokeswoman for the Valley air district, said the region has seen "significant improvement" in air quality over the past few years, "however, we agree that everyone needs to keep this issue top of mind."

"We've worked very hard to make sure everyone in the Valley understands that this is a key issue," Holt said.

Former Sen. Fran Pavley, the

environmental policy director for the USC Schwarzenegger Institute, recalled attending an event at Fresno State when she was a student there alongside hundreds wearing gas masks to show concern about poor air quality. She said that concern continues today.

"Fresno is a wonderful place," Pavley said, "but it takes all hands on deck to effect change."

SOOT, OZONE READINGS

The annual State of the Air report, now in its 20th year, used data from 2015 to 2017, the most current quality-assured data available. During those years, the report reads, "more cities had high days of ozone and short-term particle pollution compared to 2014-2016

SEE AIR POLLUT'

FROM PAGE 1A

AIR POLLUTION

and many cities measured increased levels of year-round particle pollution."

The report lists "Fresno-Madera-Hanford" as the most polluted for year-round particle pollution.

"This metro area now officially includes Kings County," the report continues, "the county with the highest year-round levels of particle pollution in the nation. This ties the highest year-round levels ever for Kings County, and for the metro area."

Particle pollution is often called soot, while ground level ozone is often called smog, explained Janice Nolen, assistant vice president of national policy for the American Lung Association.

Bakersfield tops the list for unhealthy particle pollution days, and Los Angeles-Long Beach for unhealthy ozone days.

Other Valley cities to rank in the top five for either annual particle pollution, unhealthy particle pollution days, or unhealthy ozone days include Visalia and Sacramento-Roseville.

VALLEY CHALLENGES

Balmes, who has been doing research in the Valley, talked about some of the region's challenges. Beyond the Valley's problematic topography - a bowl surrounded by mountain ranges that traps pollution in - he highlighted transportation-related pollution sources, including from major highways and railways. While people like to

blame agriculture for the problem, he said, it's "more of a climate change problem."

Balmes said the Valley is "particularly vulnerable" to start with, and is now threatened further by increased wildfire danger and warmer temperatures.

Air quality is also affected by the region's growing population. Balmes said many Valley residents drive older vehicles because they can't afford newer ones that are better for the environment.

The report states that the federal administration is contributing to worsening air quality.

"Unfortunately, this Administration has focused on steps to roll back or create loopholes in core healthy air protections put in place to comply with the Clean Air Act. ... Not only has this Administration targeted specific Clean Air Act safeguards for rollbacks, it has also sought to weaken the scientific review and undermine the basis for current and future protections."

More than 4 in 10 Americans - approximately 43.3 percent of the population - live in counties that have unhealthy ozone and/or particle pollution, the report states, and more than 141 million people are exposed to unhealthy air.

The full report can be read online at Lung.org/sota.

Carmen George:
559-441-6386,
[@CarmenGeorge](https://twitter.com/CarmenGeorge)