

**MONTEREY COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION**

<b>Meeting: July 19, 2006; 9:00 AM</b>	<b>Agenda Item No.: 1</b>
<b>Project Description:</b> Begin review of the draft 2006 General Plan Update (GPU):	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Receive staff report providing an overview of the draft 2006 General Plan Update; and</li> <li>2. Establish format, dates, and times for public hearings on the draft GPU, Area Plans, Agricultural Winery Corridor Plan (AWCP), and draft environmental impact report (EIR).</li> </ol>	
<b>Project Location:</b> Countywide	<b>APN:</b> Countywide
<b>Planning Number:</b> PLN050045	<b>Name:</b> Monterey County
<b>Plan Area:</b> Countywide	<b>Flagged and staked:</b> NO
<b>Zoning Designation:</b> Countywide	
<b>CEQA Action:</b> Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) being prepared with the project	
<b>Department:</b> Resource Management Agency, Planning Department	

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends that the Planning Commission:

1. Receive the staff report providing an overview of the draft 2006 General Plan Update.
2. Establish the format including some dates and times for public hearings on the draft GPU, Area Plans, Agricultural Winery Corridor Plan (AWCP), and draft environmental impact report (EIR).

**SUMMARY:** This item is a continued discussion from June 28, 2006 on the 2006 General Plan Update. **Exhibit A** provides an overview of the draft GPU. The draft GPU is based on policy direction from the Board of Supervisors, and a summary of the initial direction is included as **Exhibit B**.

**OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT:** All County land use departments have been involved in the GPU process including: County Counsel, Resources Management Agency (Planning, Public Works, Housing and Redevelopment), Environmental Health, Parks, Water Resource Agency, Agricultural Commission, and Fire Agencies.

*Mike Novo, Interim Director  
Planning & Building Inspection Department*

Prepared by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Alana Knaster, Deputy Director RMA  
(831) 755-5322; knastera@co.monterey.ca.us  
Dated: July 14, 2006

\_\_\_\_\_  
Carl P. Holm, AICP, Senior Planner  
(831) 755-5103; [holmcp@co.monterey.ca.us](mailto:holmcp@co.monterey.ca.us)

Attachments:    Exhibit A            Overview  
                         Exhibit B            GP Policy Matrix

cc:            Planning Commission; County Counsel; Environmental Health, Water Resources, Public Works, Environmental Resource Policy, Ag Commissioner, Parks, Fire, Alana Knaster; Mike Novo; Carl Holm; Carol Allen; File.

**EXHIBIT A**  
**OVERVIEW**  
**2006 DRAFT GENERAL PLAN**

**A. BOARD DIRECTION**

The Board directed staff to update policies from the 1982 General Plan, incorporate some of the concepts from the last version of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century General Plan (GPU3) regarding focusing growth in cities and community areas, and incorporate the property owner requests and special treatment area designations accepted by the Board. State Law requires a General Plan to include seven (7) elements, and the Board also requested to include Agricultural and Economic Elements as well. While Area Plans for inland areas are being updated at this time, the Board deferred consideration of the Coastal Land Use Plans to a later date.

The process adopted by the Board included the following steps:

- Review the 1982 General Plan and Area Plans based upon staff experience during the past 20 years with respect to inconsistencies and implementation difficulties.
- The Board noted that the 12 Guiding Objectives were conceptually acceptable for providing guidance, but they were not to be written “in stone”. Hence they do not appear in the Draft Plan.
- Develop a series of workshops during which staff from all of the land use departments would present policy options for each of the key General Plan issues that were controversial during the review of GPU3 to obtain clear Board direction. **Exhibit B** tracks the policy decisions made by the Board during the workshop process that occurred between January and July 2005.
- Return with draft language for the Board to consider to ensure that the text was consistent with the policy direction. A separate series of workshops were held between August 2005 and February 2006.
- Amend existing Area Plans to remove policies that are redundant or inconsistent with the new policy language. One exception was policies pertaining to biological resources that are protective of species unique to a particular area. The Board has not yet reviewed the changes in the Draft Area Plans.
- Prepare an Agricultural and Winery Corridor Plan (AWCP) ahead of or concurrent with the general plan. This plan was to be designed so that the County could implement this plan even if the 2006 general plan update is not completed. The Board has not yet reviewed this draft AWCP.
- Prepare an EIR including separate analysis of the AWCP.
- Conduct consultations with local Native American tribes consistent with SB18.
- Conduct City-County Consultations consistent with State Law.
- Obtain recommendations from the Planning Commission on the Draft General Plan and EIR.
- Return to the Board with any proposed changes to the Draft Plan and the Final EIR by the end of October 2006.

## B. SUMMARY OF ELEMENTS

### Land Use Element

The Board endorsed the concept of drafting policies that direct growth where there are population centers. In addition, the Plan is intended to emphasize the need to maintain adequate levels of services and facilities (LU-1.4). Clustering is encouraged in several policies (LU-1.8 and LU-1.11) where services can be better obtained and to also help conserve resources.

In order to meet anticipated future housing needs at all levels and to provide housing near jobs based on possible constraints, the draft 2006 General Plan creates three tiers where development would be directed:

- Cities (12). Similar to the 1982 GP, the plan continues to encourage development toward cities as the primary areas for development. Future growth of cities is addressed in LU-2.17. The Board decided not to establish firm urban limit lines, but did support the protection of farmlands and indicated its willingness to work with the cities to set firm boundaries and then subsequently oppose inappropriate changes in spheres of influence and annexations. The intent is to allow cities to determine how they want to grow, but to do so in a manner that is consistent with the goals and policies of the County (e.g.; protecting agricultural operations).
- Community Areas (7). Since limiting development to cities would not likely meet the population and housing demands anticipated over the next 20 years, the Plan establishes Community Areas where the heaviest concentration of growth exists and that are further developed with infrastructure within the unincorporated County. Community Plans will establish detail land use guidelines (similar to a specific plan) subsequent to GP. Where a specific plan has been adopted, considered an established CP (Fort Ord, Butterfly Village) where a CP overlay designation will be applied to the zoning maps.
- Rural Centers (11). This plan also establishes a third tier called Rural Centers in order to provide adequate space due to development constraints (e.g.; flooding) within Community Areas and to also distribute populations around the County to provide housing closer to employment thereby reducing travel times. The intent is to allow limited development with an improvement/financing plan for infrastructure as an area that could grow into a future Community Area.

Community Area boundaries were designated by the Board at one of the General Plan workshops with the exception of Chualar. The Board set maximum acreage for the future Chualar Community Area rather than boundaries to provide for community and property owner input in the development of a feasible plan. The boundary of Pajaro was limited to the boundary of the current Redevelopment Area in light of flooding and water supply constraints. While the Board has not specifically reviewed the draft Rural Center boundaries, they provided guidance to consider at existing development patterns, known land use designations, and proposed policies (e.g. agricultural buffers).

Growth outside of Community Areas or Rural Centers would be governed by a residential evaluation system. This system will be developed through ordinance, but is intended to provide a quantitative approach to considering projects. Staff discussed several comparable systems with the Board in

developing this policy including the current Carmel Valley Subdivision review process, and the point system utilized by Morgan Hill for all of its land use entitlements (LU- 1.14, LU-2.12 and LU-2.13).

#### *Land Use Designations.*

Board direction was to use the existing land use designations of the 1982 General Plan, as currently amended. In addition, the draft 2006 General Plan was to incorporate Property Owner Requests and Special Treatment Areas accepted for consideration by the Board of Supervisors in November 2002. The plan includes 29 changes under the Property owner request and 14 Special Treatment Areas (STA). There are also four (4) Study Areas identified to consider for a possible STA later, and 2002 Property Owner Requests located within designated Community Areas were deferred until such time as a Community Plan is completed. No new property owner requests were considered as part of the 2006 General Plan Update.

#### Housing Element

Housing Elements are mandated by the State to be updated every five years. Since the current Housing Element was approved and certified by the State for the 2003-2008 planning cycle, the Board elected to make no changes at this time. The Board did not endorse the concept of designating properties with a 100% affordable housing overlay (GPU3), but rather to include a policy requiring that the County establish a program separate from the GPU for encouraging affordable housing. The residential evaluation system and the impending adoption of revised policies for the affordable housing program are intended to create preferential treatment for projects that would exceed minimal requirements for affordable housing considering the appropriate constraints regarding availability of services and resource protection.

#### Circulation Element

The Board endorsed an level of service (LOS) D for County roads and intersections with several exceptions noted in C-1.1. The only exception to this is the existing program located within the Carmel Valley Master Plan, which establishes LOS C. This decision was based in part on information presented by staff with respect to the cost of upgrading roads, additional road width requirements, and traffic speed models that contrasted the relative difference between setting and LOS C versus LOS D.

#### Conservation and Open Space Element

With some minor changes, the Board re-affirmed existing policies with respect to “ridgeline” development. Policy regarding development on slopes was amended to require a permit process for development on slopes exceeding 25% countywide as contrasted with the current 30% slope policy (25% in North County). The purpose of this policy and other policies is to address development on highly erosive soils.

General Plan policies on plants and animal species is limited to those on State and Federal threatened and endangered lists with the exception of Area Plans (noted below) that provided existing provisions unique for that area. Some clarification was included to help address removal of invasive and toxic plants.

The GPU acknowledges existing trails and is sufficient to enable funding for some of the widely supported proposed trails that are currently in the planning stages. After extensive public debate about the General Plan trails policy, the Board adopted clear prohibition pertaining to trails that may impact agricultural operations and limiting dedication to being a voluntary action.

#### Agriculture Element

The Board endorsed a strong policy exempting specific Routine and Ongoing Agriculture uses from many of the policies of the General Plan on lands zoned Agriculture. These exemptions do not apply to rural residential zoning where small agricultural activity is allowed. The intent of this Element is to promote the viability of the agricultural industry in the County by not overburdening agricultural operations with layers of approval processes.

#### Safety Element

There is strong policy direction with respect to addressing development in flood prone areas. In addition, the Board endorsed in whole the recommendations of the County fire districts for revised policies on fire protection in the Plan.

The noise hazards section is updated from 1982. Final policy guidance will be provided through the EIR process including identification of the appropriate criteria for recommended policies. It is anticipated that this section will be amended to be consistent with the EIR analysis.

#### Public Services Element

The primary focus of this element is in the policies pertaining to Adequate Public Facilities and Services (APFS). The Board and staff spent several workshops discussing how to ensure that there was sufficient Technical, Managerial and Financial (TMF) capability for the operation of any of the on-site facilities that would be allowed in a project. Water, wastewater, drainage facilities have been key concerns of staff and the public during the past decade. The General Plan sets a standard of concurrency that the Board believes addresses those concerns (PS-1.1 through PS-1.6).

This element also provides greater specificity regarding how long term water supply is evaluated.

Table PS-1 is a summary of all of the policies in the element. It emphasizes that property owners in Rural Lands should not expect the same level of services that would be afforded in Community Areas or Rural Centers.

#### Area Plans

No changes were made to Area Plan boundaries. The area plans have been reduced in size to include only those policies that are unique for a particular area. Other issues are addressed by policies of the General Plan to ensure consistent application county-wide.

Main differences of note include:

Trees in Cachagua and Carmel Valley (retain existing lists)

Trails in North County and Greater Monterey Peninsula (retain existing maps)  
Traffic in Carmel Valley (retain monitoring trigger)

Agricultural Winery Corridor Plan

The Winery Corridor Plan is included in the General Plan similar to the Area Plans. It provides detail policy (including limits/numbers) to encourage development of winery related uses along the established corridor. The General Plan EIR will evaluate the impacts of the Corridor Plan with the intent of establishing a ministerial process or more expedited review process for specific applications.

**EXHIBIT B  
POLICY MATRIX  
GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

<b>LAND USE ELEMENT (March 31, 2005)</b>		
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>ACTION/NOTES</b>	<b>GP POLICY</b>
<b>1982 LAND USE PATTERN</b>		
Retain the basic 1982 pattern and density (land use designations and zoning). - Include all property owner requests previously endorsed by the Board (approx. 20). - Include the study areas and special treatment areas identified in GPU3. - Continue use of Area Plans	<i>Accept 5-0</i> Clarify that Area/Coastal Plans rule above General Plan due to level of specificity.	Land Use Map
Develop a scoring system for the evaluation of future development outside of Community Areas as a means of better meeting the goals and objectives of the General Plan.	<i>Accept 4-1.</i> Concern over how scoring would take place, but willing to review options and decide later. Consistent with recommendation for area outside Community Areas (below).	LU 2.12 & 2.13
<b>CITY CENTER GROWTH (URBAN LIMIT LINES)</b>		
Encourage City-Centered Growth - Identify Urban Limit Lines (ULL). - Strongly oppose city growth outside of the ULL.	<i>Accept 5-0.</i> Concept OK, needs more specifics: - Clarify that limits based primarily on City's 20-year growth plans. - Want to see criteria to allow expansion beyond limits.	LU 2.15-2.19
<b>COMMUNITY AREAS</b>		
Emphasize/Establish Community Areas. - Pajaro - Castroville. - Boronda. - Chualar. - East Garrison/Fort Ord - Rancho San Juan (RSJ). - Moss Landing. Establish Future Study Areas. - Pine Canyon. - San Lucas.	<i>Accept 4-1.</i> Determine boundaries similar to ULL (apply same standards City and County) Clarify Pine Canyon (King City) Include Future Study Areas as Community Areas. Amend density range from 5-25 to 5-30.	LU 2.20-2.27
<b>OUTSIDE COMMUNITY AREAS</b>		
Allow Limited Development - Single family homes on legal	<i>Accept 5-0.</i> Clarify how State density bonus	LU 2.10 LU 2.38-2.43

**EXHIBIT B**  
**POLICY MATRIX**  
**GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

<p>lots of record.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Secondary units not subject to density limits.</li> <li>- One accessory structure (senior unit, caretaker unit, guesthouse) not subject to density limits</li> </ul>	<p>law applies.</p> <p>Bullet points 2 and 3 area actually one component. Secondary units should refer to senior and caretaker units. Regulations should reduce limitations (size limit) and allow rental.</p> <p>Clarify components to consider (e.g. water). They must have essential services.</p>	
<p>Establish Rural Centers as areas for future development based upon existing development patterns and potential for infrastructure improvements. Areas to be considered as Rural Centers would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Prunedale</li> <li>- Las Lomas</li> <li>- River Road between Pine Canyon and Las Palmas</li> <li>- Carmel Valley from Highway 1 to the end of the 4-lane portion of Carmel Valley Road</li> <li>- San Benancio/Corral de Tierra</li> <li>- Del Monte Forest</li> <li>- Lockwood</li> <li>- Pleyto</li> </ul>	<p>Accept 4-1.</p> <p>Identify boundaries/limits (same as Community Areas and ULL. Clarify Pine Canyon here is Salinas.</p> <p>Consider other areas to add to list for possible future consideration (e.g. Bradley). Look at what areas have to offer versus constraints and consider where services are.</p>	<p>LU 2.28-2.37</p>
<p>Establish Criteria for Subdivisions Outside Community Areas:</p> <p>a. All projects except single family homes on legal lots of record and “special needs” housing projects constructed consistent with state law must also provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- One or more of the following amenities open to the public: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public open space or recreation space,</li> <li>• Community</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><i>Accept 5-0</i></p> <p>Coordinate these two recommendations.</p> <p>Concern express relative to order of magnitude when subdivision criteria required. Should not be for a minor sub.</p> <p>Need to expand list (water quality, floodplain, slopes, habitat, etc.)</p> <p>Establish minimums for each issue</p>	<p>LU 1.17-1.21, 2.37</p>

**EXHIBIT B  
POLICY MATRIX  
GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>center</li> <li>• Community garden</li> <li>• Day care facilities,</li> <li>• After school center</li> <li>• Senior center.</li> <li>- Infrastructure and Finance Study that demonstrates that there are adequate public services and facilities to serve the project including availability of public water and sewer.</li> <li>- Demonstrably high quality design (energy efficiency)</li> </ul>		
<p>Identify the types of issues to include as part of a ranking system to be established by ordinance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Development located in on near one of the following Rural Centers</li> <li>b. Infrastructure (water, wastewater, roads) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Existing conditions</li> <li>- Proposed improvements</li> </ul> </li> <li>c. Special Needs Housing</li> <li>d. Employment Opportunities</li> <li>e. Use of Transfer Development Credits (TDC)</li> <li>f. Resource Protection <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Public Viewshed</li> <li>- Scenic Roads/Highways</li> <li>- Open Space</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		LU 2.13

**EXHIBIT B  
POLICY MATRIX  
GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

<b>AGRICULTURAL ELEMENT (April 1, 2005)</b>		
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>ACTION/NOTES</b>	<b>GP POLICY</b>
<b>FORTY ACRE MINIMUM</b>		
Continue 1982 land use designations with amendments and Board approved property owner requests.	<i>Accept 4-1.</i> Consistent with scoring system action under 1982 Land Use Pattern	Land Use Map
<b>WINERY CORRIDOR</b>		
Establish designated winery corridors along portions of: - River Road/Arroyo Seco/Central Avenue - Metz Road - Jolon Road	<i>Accept 5-0.</i> Incorporate work started under GPU3. OK with concept provided start Winery Corridor Plan now and process concurrently with GPU. Coordinate contract with EIR consultant for both. Look at cumulative impacts Interested in financing.	AG 4.2
Require preparation of a Winery Corridor Plan(s) that establishes development and implementation guidelines including but not limited to: - Number of Wineries/Tasting Rooms - Minimum Lot sizes - Allowed Auxiliary Structures and Uses (bed and breakfast, deli/restaurant, etc.) - Design Guidelines (buildings, on-site and off-site signs, etc.) - Expedited Process. - Infrastructure Financing.		AG 4.3
<b>AGRICULTURAL BUFFERS</b>		
Use 1982 Policy language that requires buffers of sufficient size to protect agricultural land/operations and that are dedicated in perpetuity. Specific criteria, including buffers for annexations, would be established by ordinance following completion of the General Plan.	<i>Tentative Acceptance 5-0 to come back.</i> Emphasis on flexibility. Dedicate for a long enough period to protect ag operations: - Valuable land (ground is a resource) = provide permanent buffers. - Edges where there will be growth (e.g. NE edge of Salinas) = temporary buffers. Create mechanism so that if ag no longer viable, then be able to dissolve buffer even if recorded as permanent. Decision to be reviewed by the Board.	AG 1.2

**EXHIBIT B  
POLICY MATRIX  
GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

<b>CLUSTERING OF RESIDENTIAL UNITS ON AGRICULTURAL LANDS</b>		
<p>Create a program to allow additional residential units above current zoning if they are clustered to accommodate additional residences for families of landowners. Said program needs to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Address requirements for operation and maintenance of infrastructure (water, wastewater, roads, drainage) with cost estimates into the future.</li> <li>- Require a deed restriction for a minimum of 30 years.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Tentative Acceptance 4-1.</i> Concept OK but need lots more detail (# lots allowed, tracking ownership, deed restriction on resale, etc.) Look to see where it fits.</p> <p><i>NOTE: See Conservation and Open Space Element for follow up discussion</i></p>	<p>AG 1.6-1.7</p>
<b>DECISION MAKERS</b>		
<p>Utilize the Agricultural Advisory Committee as a Land Use Advisory Committee (LUAC) to review all projects involving agricultural issues.</p>	<p><i>Accept 5-0.</i> Include structure how appointed in GP. Include procedure how/what goes to them.</p>	<p>AG-1.8</p>
<b>AGRICULTURAL VIEWSHED</b>		
<p>Establish policy that agricultural operations are considered part of the acceptable viewshed in Monterey County</p>	<p><i>Accept 5-0.</i></p>	<p>AG-5.1 LU-1.6</p>
<b>ROUTINE AND ONGOING ACTIVITIES</b>		
<p>Establish a 3-tier approach to routine and on-going agricultural activities.</p> <p>Tier I: Activities normally associated with agricultural operations that do not require any County review or permits.</p> <p>Tier II: Activities (conversion, slopes issues, drainage problems, quasi agricultural uses) that require a ministerial permit or an administrative permit that is subject to staff review only.</p> <p>Tier III: Major activities (slopes over 30%, large processing facilities, truck stops, etc) that require a discretionary permit with a public hearing.</p>	<p><i>Accept 5-0.</i> Devil will be in details of the list. Need definition of uncultivated (timeframe). Separate use of greenhouses where soil dependant versus not soil dependant. Slope issues depend on soil type (e.g. Aromas sand).</p>	<p>AG 3.1-3.3</p>

**EXHIBIT B  
POLICY MATRIX  
GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

<b>HABITAT PROTECTION</b>		
Limit designation of environmentally sensitive areas to those areas and species on adopted state and federal lists/regulations as rare, endangered, or threatened and define how it applies through listing routine and ongoing-agricultural activities.	<i>Accept 5-0.</i>	AG 5.2

**EXHIBIT B  
POLICY MATRIX  
GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

<b>HOUSING (June 16, 2005)</b>		
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>ACTION/NOTES</b>	<b>GP POLICY</b>
Retain the current Inclusionary Housing Ordinance requirement that 20% of new residential lots or units be deed restricted and that of the 20%, 6% are required to be affordable to very low income, 6% to low income and 8% to moderate income.	<i>Accept 5-0.</i>	ordinance
Require a mandatory 10% contribution for Workforce Level (up to 180% of median income) housing for projects of 10 or more units/lots to be developed under a separate "Workforce Housing Ordinance" which would allow the restrictions to include equity-sharing provisions. The Adopted Housing Element would be revised accordingly.	<i>Reject 5-0.</i>  Enough for developers to be required to provide 20% inclusionary. Not mandatory, but voluntary (create incentives).  Reference City of Salinas program	N/A
Retain the existing policy contained in the Housing Element that encourages employers to voluntarily assist in the production of employee housing.	<i>Accept 5-0.</i>	H-5.3
OPTION - Although not recommended at this time, the Board may also wish to consider adding a program to the Housing Element in the future requiring the County to develop a new employee housing program that includes a contribution from new job creating development to a County-wide housing trust.	<i>Reject 5-0.</i>	N/A
<b>AFFORDABLE HOUSING OVERLAY</b>	<i>Reject Recommendation 5-0.</i>	H-3.8 LU-2.14
Remove the Affordable Housing Overlay program that is currently contained in the Housing Element (Policy H-3.8) since the same objectives can be achieved by implementing the Affordable Housing Developer Incentive Program, which will incorporate the current State Density Bonus provisions, without creating a new governmental	Keep Overlay Program, return with framed recommendation. Criteria based: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Close to Work</li> <li>- Allow in any designation, but not just anywhere (e.g. not prime Ag)</li> <li>- Avoid environmental issues (ESHA/ Elkhorn Slough, no LOS F)</li> </ul>	

**EXHIBIT B  
POLICY MATRIX  
GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

program.		
<b>HOUSING ALLOCATION SYSTEM</b>	<i>Accept 5-0.</i>	<i>N/A</i>
Do not include a housing allocation system in the Housing Element as it may affect certification of the Element by the State and could limit overall affordable housing production.	No Allocation	
<b>TARGET LOCATIONS FOR HOUSING PRODUCTION</b>	<i>Accept 5-0.</i>	Part of next (2008-2013) HE Planning Cycle
Once the GPU is adopted, amend the Housing Element to be consistent with the growth pattern established in the Land Use Element.		
<b>INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIRED TO BE IN PLACE WITH HOUSING PRODUCTION</b>	<i>Accept 5-0.</i>	H-2.2
Retain the existing policy language in the adopted Housing Element to require that public services and infrastructure be provided concurrently with housing production.	No relaxation of infrastructure requirements. Waive infrastructure requirement for affordable units.  Case-by-Case waiver as long as not a hazard. Use criteria concurrent with Housing Overlay.  Look at Refinement Group language for concurrent	
<b>SECONDARY UNIT PROGRAM</b>	<i>Accept 5-0.</i>	H-4.7
Retain the existing policy language in the adopted Housing Element which states that the County shall allow secondary units in conformance with State law and consistent with Community and Specific Plans to provide additional housing opportunities.	Clarify to follow State Law County-wide.  Investigate equity sharing versus perpetuity and bring back for separate discussion.	

**EXHIBIT B  
POLICY MATRIX  
GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

<b>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (June 16 and 20, 2005)</b>		
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>ACTION/NOTES</b>	<b>GP POLICY</b>
<p><b>OEDC RECOMMENDATIONS</b></p> <p>That the goals and policies recommended by the Overall Economic Development Commission (OEDC) be the basis for the Economic Element in the next draft of the general plan.</p>	<p><i>Accept 5-0</i></p>	<p>ED Element</p>
<p><b>SPECIAL TREATMENT</b></p> <p>That the implementation program of the general plan incorporate “special treatment” for projects providing significant economic benefit to the County (e.g., 100 or more new jobs, priority for hiring from within the County, higher paying, professional jobs, employee benefits, housing participation, etc.) by way of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fee reductions or waivers</li> <li>• Use of development agreements</li> <li>• Priority processing</li> <li>• Expedited hearing processes</li> </ul>	<p><i>Accept Concept 5-0. Need to work on detail at implementation/ordinance level.</i></p> <p>Change as “Handling” or to reflect incentive program</p> <p>Flexibility for small business - omit reference to 100 jobs. No # or significantly less than 100. “Significant # of new jobs”</p>	<p style="color: red;">Implementation Program</p>
<p><b>IMPACT SURCHARGE</b></p> <p>That a surcharge be added to tickets to special events and attractions to mitigate the impact of those events on the County’s road system and public safety services.</p>	<p><i>Reject 5-0. Remove from consideration.</i></p> <p>Applies only to unincorporated areas, which creates unfair burden not shared by events in cities.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION TO AFFORDABLE HOUSING</b></p> <p>That the Board discuss and give preliminary direction on general plan policy for employer contribution to affordable housing programs.</p>	<p>N/A. Addressed under housing element.</p> <p>Encourage but do not mandate.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>LIVING WAGE</b></p> <p>OPTION - That the Board discuss and give preliminary direction on general plan policy for a “living wage” program.</p>	<p><i>Reject 5-0. Remove from consideration.</i></p> <p>Complicated on a good day. Models in Berkley, San Francisco, Santa Cruz. More regulatory versus policy. SB975 (2003) – Prevailing Wage</p>	<p>N/A</p>

**EXHIBIT B**  
**POLICY MATRIX**  
**GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

<b>BIG BOX RETAILERS</b>	<i>Reject 4-1 Remove from consideration.</i>	<i>N/A</i>
Discuss and give preliminary direction on general plan policy for “big box” retailers in the County.	Issue with defining “big box”. Consider SB1056 (requires independent fiscal analysis.  May want an ordinance later in time.	

**EXHIBIT B  
POLICY MATRIX  
GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

<b>INFRASTRUCTURE – WATER (May 19, 2005)</b>		
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>ACTION/NOTES</b>	<b>GP POLICY</b>
<b>DEVELOPMENT OF WATER RESOURCES</b>	<i>Accept 5-0 with Modifications</i>	
Coordinate and collaborate with all agencies responsible for the management of existing and new water resources.		PS-3.6
Develop a program to eliminate overdraft in its water basins through a variety of strategies to be included in a Capital Improvement Program (CIP) including water banking, groundwater and aquifer recharge and recovery, desalination, pipelines to new supplies and a variety of conjunctive use techniques (consistent with Health and Safety Regulations).		PS-3.7
As part of an overall conservation strategy and to improve water quality, the County shall encourage taking development on erosive soils out of production.	Clarify applies to Ag production. Jeopardizes taking Ag land out of production.  Need supportive language. In No. Co. some farm on 30% slopes that should not be farmed.  Allow to develop with cluster and preserve habitat.  Create reward to put land back to the way it was (habitat).	PS-3.8
The County Building Division shall establish guidelines that integrate National Greenbook construction materials and fixtures that contribute to increased levels of water conservation.	Remove reference to Greenbook. Do not have to follow by law and may include items we do not want.	N/A
Water recycling including dual plumbing shall be for outdoor irrigation only. A cross-connection control program to provide regulatory oversight is needed.		PS-3.9
The use of grey water for commercial landscaping purposes	Incorporate cisterns.	PS-3.10

**EXHIBIT B  
POLICY MATRIX  
GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

shall require a discretionary permit.		
<b>FLOOD MANAGEMENT</b>	<i>Bring Back with Revised Language</i>	
<p>County Flood Management Program shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mapping of floodplain and high risk areas</li> <li>• Establish policies to keep intensive uses out of flood prone areas</li> <li>• Establish mitigation measures and design requirements to reduce flood risks</li> <li>• Incorporate local and regional flood management plans and facilities</li> <li>• Construct flood prevention facilities where fundable</li> <li>• Employ both structural and non-structural solutions to maintain floodplain functions of sedimentation, deposition, water filtering and flood water absorption</li> </ul>	<p>Clarify “non-agricultural”</p> <p>Make language more inclusive for economic development.</p> <p>Reduce versus eliminate flood risks</p> <p>Comply and consistent with FEMA (reference)</p> <p>Indemnify County – liability exposure (3<sup>rd</sup> Party)</p> <p>Storm water retention ponds either dry or floods. Can be an amenity of done correctly.</p>	S-2.6, 3.7
<p>Develop runoff performance standards that result in an array of site planning and design techniques. These techniques should reduce storm flows, capture and recharge runoff water. Design and construction of facilities should reduce peak storm flows and provide water quality benefits.</p>	<p>“Shall” rather than “should”</p> <p>Water from cities not currently addressed. Ag down stream impacted by contaminated water from Cities.</p> <p>Need purification before possibly goes into fields.</p> <p>Make sure water as clean as possible when it gets to Monterey Bay.</p>	S-3.5
<b>DRAINAGE AND EROSION</b>	<i>Consensus with Comments</i>	
<p>Inventory areas of the County that have a high probability of erosion, sedimentation and chemical pollution.</p>	<p>“chemical pollution” = pollutants</p>	S-3.6
<p>Require erosion management plans for development in these areas.</p>		S-3.7
<p>Require drainage improvements as a condition of project approval.</p>	<p>Consistent with storm water control (Flood Management)</p>	S-3.1

**EXHIBIT B  
POLICY MATRIX  
GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

<b>INFRASTRUCTURE – WATER QUALITY (May 19 + 24, July 7, 2005)</b>		
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>ACTION/NOTES</b>	<b>GP POLICY</b>
<b>PRIVATE WELLS FOR DOMESTIC USES (Existing lots of record)</b>	<i>Accept 5-0 (5/24/05)</i>	
All new wells for domestic uses located in consolidated materials ( <u>i.e. hard rock areas</u> ) must meet minimum quantity requirement of 3 gpm after a 72-hour pump test. <del>In hydrogeologic areas where data has been previously developed, the pump test may be reduced. If the pump test is less than 3 gpm, then the Division of Environmental Health may consider site specific data that provides a reasonable assurance that a long-term water supply will be available.</del>	Recovery = 2.5 times pumping. 90-95% recovery required.  <i>Recommendation revised 7/7/05</i> Generalize policy language with detail (3 gpm) in regulation/ordinance.	PS-2.6
Bulk hauled water is not considered an approvable supply for new construction.		PS-3.5
<del>As a baseline, new development on existing lots of record must have a determination of water quality via a one time biological and chemical analysis of primary and secondary constituents. A noticing process would be required so that future owners of the lot would be informed of the water quality. Other Requirement of deed notice if standards are exceeded. Other counties currently require this initial biological and chemical constituent test. Staff will work with County Counsel and the Board of Realtors to develop the most reliable approach for ensuring notice to future owners regarding the potential exceedance of standards.</del>	Concept OK.  Need Details to be worked out  Disclosure of sales  <i>Recommendation revised 7/7/05</i> Baseline should be defined as the point when a well is developed.  Need to define “long-term” water supply.	PS-2.6
Continue the requirement that construction of a well on any lot with an onsite wastewater system, which is within a water system’s service area, must be a minimum of 2.5 acres.	Does not apply (exception) to existing legal lots of record as long as the well meets the set back requirement from the well (and vice versa)	PS-2.5 PS-3.4

**EXHIBIT B  
POLICY MATRIX  
GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

<b>WATER SYSTEMS</b>	<i>Accept concept. Come back with more detailed language “dumb it down”</i>	
Consolidation of new development water systems with existing utilities would be <u>encouraged</u> <del>required</del> in community areas and rural centers. <u>The County shall also encourage the</u> <del>In all other planning areas, the formation of new mutual water systems would be discouraged by requiring the</del> creation of satellite systems owned and operated by existing entities (i.e., PUC Utilities, Community Service Districts) where feasible with the appropriate Technical, Managerial and Financial, (TMF) feasibility assurances.	“recommended” , “encouraged”  <i>Recommendation revised 7/7/05</i> .	PS-2.1, 2.4
<del>To assure water quality and improved basin wide management of groundwater resources, water system owners and purveyors must retain all water rights for new lots created through minor and standard subdivisions.</del>	Delete. Good idea but needs work. Has repercussions. Retool or drop.  Individual cannot break away from mutual system.  <i>Recommendation deleted 7/7/05</i>	
<b>LAND USE PERMITTING</b>		
The County shall continue to require that new development have a long term sustainable water supply <u>in order for a project to be approved.</u> <del>This shall not be a factor in determining a project complete, but will be a critical factor in determining whether a project may be approved.</del> <u>The County shall also continue its policy of considering a project complete once the applicant submits a hydrogeologic report or otherwise complies with the requirement to submit information regarding adequacy and quality of the water supply.</u>	Do not want to get away from it.  <i>Recommendation revised 7/7/05</i> .	PS-3.1
Long Term Sustainable Supply should be determined on a basin by basin basis. <u>Examples based upon</u>	<i>Recommendation revised 7/7/05</i> Policy is to develop criteria to	PS 3.3, 3.5

**EXHIBIT B  
POLICY MATRIX  
GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

<p><u>current information are as follows:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Projects in Zone 2C shall be considered to have a long term sustainable supply</li> <li>- Projects in basins under the purview of the Pajaro Water Management Agency shall be evaluated in terms of the implementation of that agency's CIP</li> <li>- Projects in the area managed by the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District shall be governed by State Order 9510</li> <li>- The Seaside Basin shall be considered not to have a long term supply at this time</li> <li>- Long term supply in the Toro Basin (t.b.d.)</li> </ul>	<p>evaluate long-term supply. No basin specific criteria.</p> <p>List = ordinance.</p>	
<p>As part of the determination of long term supply for individual projects, the County shall <del>evaluate</del> <del>encourage</del> the reduction of water usage on a property in the permitting process. For the purpose of determining baseline, documented water usage for 10 out of the past 20 years shall be calculated. A <u>range minimum of from 20% to 30% savings over baseline shall be required.</u> <u>is proposed as appropriate for achieving savings to a basin that has water supply deficiencies.</u></p>	<p>Issue with setting formula.</p> <p>Concern over regulating too much.</p> <p>Provide escape to encourage running water.</p> <p><i>Recommendation revised 7/7/05</i></p> <p>How can we issue credit for those using conservation?</p> <p>Saving 20-30% not only reason to develop</p> <p>Define 20 years as sequential or years selected by choice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Consider wet and dry years.</li> <li>- Residentially zoned</li> <li>- where high/severe erosion over 10-15 year record.</li> <li>- Not prime Ag lands</li> <li>- Not Springfield Terrace</li> <li>- Not where severe environmental damage (upper Elkhorn and Moro Coho).</li> </ul> <p><i>Idea: Create one flat ag credit that takes things like conservation into account so we do not encourage</i></p>	<p>PS-3.2</p>

**EXHIBIT B  
POLICY MATRIX  
GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

	<i>conversion or wasted water to try to bump up water use numbers.</i>	
Water quality shall be a key additional determinant of long-term sustainable supply.		PS-3.3, 3.4
A will serve letter from an existing water purveyor verifying that financial and infrastructure commitments have been completed will also be required.		Ordinance later.
In Community Areas, regional impacts may be addressed via impact fees tied to a CIP for new development.		PS-3.7
Outside Community Areas: a. <del>Require</del> <u>Encourage</u> connection to a water system or establishment of a satellite to an existing water system that has the appropriate TMF. b. Regional impacts may be address via impact fees tied to a CIP for new development. However, outside community areas the CIP shall have Tier2 priority.	Encourage, not require.  Concern of hold outs stopping ability to meet intent.  <i>Recommendation revised 7/7/05.</i>	PS 3.3, 3.4
<b>WASTEWATER TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL</b>		
Require new development to consolidate wastewater collection, treatment and disposal systems of services, connecting to existing systems where feasible. <del>The county shall not allow the use of package plants when connection to a regional facility is feasible.</del>	Outside Community Areas: SF lots of record do not need to install septic before building a house.  <i>Recommendation revised 7/7/05.</i>	PS-4.5 PS-4.6
Proof of wastewater sewage feasibility prior to deeming the application for development complete. Wastewater requires all TMF requirements to be evaluated and completed satisfactorily.		PS-4.1, 4.7
Wastewater facilities must be built and approved prior to the issuance of building permits.	Clarify procedure. Septic is wastewater treatment, but that is not intent.  Larger projects	PS-4.2

**EXHIBIT B**  
**POLICY MATRIX**  
**GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

	<p>Could connect to regional + pay fee to meet intent</p> <p><i>July 7, 2005</i>  Overly strict to tie with building permit.  Concurrent with development, not prior to permits.</p>	
<p>Wet weather storage for treated sewage effluent of 120 days is required (current policy).</p>	<p><i>Recommendation revised 7/7/05.</i></p>	<p>PS-4.7</p>
<p>A minimum lot size of one acre will be required for septic systems <u>that are served by a water system.</u></p>	<p>If also includes well, min 2.5 acres</p> <p><i>Recommendation revised 7/7/05</i>  Make sure policy does not preclude clustering.  Water system = 2 or more (multiple) hook ups.</p>	<p>PS-4.8</p>
<p><b>SOLID WASTE</b></p> <p><del>The county shall adopt the Landfill Buffer Zoning Ordinance. The General Plan should clearly indicate the need for appropriate buffers between landfills and development. A subsequent ordinance will implement this principle.</del></p>	<p>Would not encourage new subdivision within buffer.</p> <p><i>Recommendation revised 7/7/05.</i></p>	<p>PS-6.4  PS-6.5</p>

**EXHIBIT B  
POLICY MATRIX  
GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

<b>INFRASTRUCTURE – PARKS (May 5, 2005)</b>		
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>ACTION/NOTES</b>	<b>GP POLICY</b>
<b>PARK DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES.</b>	<i>Accept 5-0 with clarification by the Board.</i>	PS-11.1 PS-11.7 PS-11.10
Establish park acquisition and development guidelines based upon acreage, population, parkland ratios and consideration of natural resource values to provide adequate park and recreation facilities for existing and future residents. In cooperation with other park and public lands agencies, seek an equitable geographic distribution of neighborhood, community and regional park facilities that will be commensurate with the needs of the surrounding residents. Encourage park development that includes interpretive and recreational services, including youth camping. Ensure broad public participation in the development of these guidelines.	Approximately 25% of county land consists of Federal, State and local parks.  Need to look for appropriateness in deficient areas (e.g.; Big Sur more than enough parks).  Provide detail whether there is enough or we need more in Areas Plans. Designate priorities.  Need to look at NE Salinas for regional use for heavy population area.  Include policies relative to maintenance and upkeep.	
<b>JOINT USE OF PARK AND RECREATION FACILITIES.</b>		PS-11.4 PS-11.13
Encourage full utilization of park and recreation facilities owned and/or operated by other agencies. Utilize, where feasible, appropriate County funding sources and make County parks and recreation facilities available through special operating agreements.		
<b>PARK ACCESSIBILITY.</b>		PS-11.2
Work to ensure accessibility of County parks and recreation facilities to all County residents, to the maximum extent practicable, in terms of affordability, physical access and hours of operation.		
<b>PARK ACQUISITION PRIORITIES.</b>		PS 11.7
Give priority to acquisition of land for new parks and development of parks in deficient areas and in rapidly		

**EXHIBIT B  
POLICY MATRIX  
GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

<p>growing areas. After evaluation of regional needs, identify locations where park acquisition should be pursued if willing property owners are identified. If Fort Hunter-Liggett is closed, seek acquisition of the Old Hacienda and the northern Lake San Antonio area to join the separated portions of the existing park.</p>		
<p><b>PARK ACQUISITION MECHANISMS.</b></p>		<p>PS 11.9</p>
<p>Utilize a wide range of mechanisms to acquire parkland, including a variety of funding sources such as land donations, public conveyances from other agencies and development impact fees. Pursuant to the authority granted by the state Subdivision Map Act, apply conditions on residential subdivision projects to provide park and recreation land and facilities at the time of development or pay in-lieu development impact fees in proportion to the extent of the need created by the development.</p>		
<p><b>PARK MANAGEMENT PLANS.</b></p>		<p>PS 11.11</p>
<p>Adopt park management plans for all County park and recreational areas and facilities, emphasizing protection of environmental resources on these lands. Distinguish between parks for more active use and parks and open space areas rich in biological resources suitable for more passive enjoyment and stewardship of those resources. Ensure that new facilities are not opened to public use until adequate facility management is provided.</p>		
<p><b>PARKS IN COMMUNITY AREAS.</b></p>		<p>PS 11.14</p>
<p>Through the community planning process, ensure that each Community Area includes adequate sites for park</p>		

**EXHIBIT B**  
**POLICY MATRIX**  
**GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

and recreation facilities.		
----------------------------	--	--

**EXHIBIT B  
POLICY MATRIX  
GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

<b>DEFINITIONS - INFRASTRUCTURE (July 21, 2005)</b>		
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>ACTION/NOTES</b>	
	<i>Accept Approach 5-0</i>	
ADEQUATE PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES (APFS)		
CONCURRENCY (Subdivisions)	Need proof of access as part of application. Construct prior to occupancy (also allow financial guarantee - strong condition), assure “and insure” prior to recording map.	
CONCURRENCY (Other Development)	7-7-05; break down. Run on = confusing.  7-21-05; What is “other”? Make sure not SFR.  “Adequate” PFS inconsistent with “deficiency”. Leave as PFS.	
APFS IMPROVEMENTS (Direct On-Site)	Delete “fully”	
APFS IMPROVEMENTS (Direct Off-Site)	Delete “fully”	
APFS IMPROVEMENTS (Indirect Off-Site)	“Cumulative” instead of “incremental”	
FAIR SHARE		
ENCOURAGE	Delete	
LONG-TERM WATER SUPPLY	Re-work with plainer English (“damaging economical extraction”, significant unavoidable..”) <p>Look at language from GRA and USGS (letter submitted). “Proven sustainability”</p> <p>How does this fit in if paying into a fee program like Zone 2A or 2C?</p> <p>Creates a different standard between cities and County that is not fair</p>	

**EXHIBIT B**  
**POLICY MATRIX**  
**GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

	20 years OK.	
--	--------------	--

**EXHIBIT B  
POLICY MATRIX  
GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

<b>INFRASTRUCTURE – CIRCULATION (May 5, 2005)</b>		
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>ACTION/NOTES</b>	<b>GP POLICY</b>
<b>LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS) PERFORMANCE STANDARDS</b>	<p><i>Accept 5-0, except LOS and subject to returning with a definition of “fair share”.</i></p> <p>Question of LOS C versus LOS D and the impact on roads countywide. Not 1 size fits all. Need to use Areas Plans to determine appropriate level of service. Want to see modeling for LOS C, and then may determine want to change to LOS D.</p> <p>Public works is lead to determine the “fair share”. Carmel Valley Road is a model for other areas.</p> <p>Need definition of region versus subregion.</p> <p>Concern with trying to get an existing LOS F to a LOS C.</p> <p>Concur with using the level of planning to establish the level of financing.</p>	
<p>LOS C is the standard with specified exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rural/Agricultural Lands: LOS D where necessary to directly support urban development within the Community Areas.</li> <li>• Community Areas: LOS D or where a lower LOS may be determined through the Community Plan process.</li> <li>• State Highways and Regional Corridors: LOS D (All State Highways, G 12-Highway One to 101, Salinas to Marina Corridor, and G16-Highway One to Carmel Rancho Blvd)</li> <li>• Existing LOS D or E Roads: Where LOS has already degraded to LOS D or E no further degradation in LOS will be allowed.</li> <li>• Carmel Valley Road: CVMP Policy 39.3.2.1.</li> </ul>		C-1.1
<p>LOS standard is anticipated for buildout of the General Plan.</p>		
<b>CIRCULATION AND LAND USE</b>		
<p>New development will be required to construct improvements to mitigate project specific impacts to local, subregional, and regional circulation infrastructure.</p>		C-1.2
<p>New development will be required to contribute its fair share towards cumulative mitigation of the General Plan for local, subregional, and regional circulation infrastructure.</p>	C-1.3	
<b>FAIR SHARE</b>		
<p>The County shall implement circulation impact fees for areas of benefit based on a capital</p>	C-1.4	

**EXHIBIT B  
POLICY MATRIX  
GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

<p>improvement programs for the individual areas. Areas of benefit may include community areas, geographic areas, and/or sub-regional corridors.</p>		
<p>The Circulation impact fees shall be based on a prorata fair share of the cost of the improvements within the areas of benefit and be consistent with Government Code § 66000.</p>		C-1.4
<p>The County will seek participation from cities when development within the cities impacts the County circulation infrastructure.</p>		C-1.8
<p><b>REGIONAL ROADS</b></p>		
<p>The County shall support TAMC in the creation of additional mechanisms to provide resources for circulation infrastructure.</p>		C-1.6
<p>The County shall continue to encourage TAMC to include improvements to other County roads that serve regional corridors.</p>		C-1.7
<p><b>INFRASTRUCTURE CONCURRENCY</b></p>		C-1.4
<p>Level of service standards must be maintained by new development through completion of project specific mitigation, advancement of regional improvements, and /or through the contribution of a fair share fee for regional, subregional, and local improvements (mitigations) that are included in a fully funded capital improvement program.</p>		

**EXHIBIT B  
POLICY MATRIX  
GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

<b>CONSERVATION/OPEN SPACE (April 19 ad 26, 2005)</b>		
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>ACTION/NOTES</b>	<b>GP POLICY</b>
<b>RIDGELINE DEVELOPMENT</b>		
Prohibit creation of new lots where building envelopes would create ridgeline development.	<i>Accept 5-0</i> (as refined). First two items continue existing conditions.	OS 1.5, 1.6
Require a use permit for ridgeline development on existing lots that evaluates if an alternative exists. Establish criteria (building height, lighting, landscaping and berming) to consider if no alternative exists.	How we segregate viewpoints is important and needs to be spelled out. Do not include views from public trails or ocean. Rather than generally saying	OS 1.4
Refine the current definition of ridgeline development common public viewing area and significant adverse visual impact for clarity.	“private streets” clarify/list 17-Mile Drive and ant others (if any) that apply. Look only at private roads that are open to the general public.	Definitions
Define Public Viewshed and Common Public Viewpoints.	Keep definitions short.	Definitions
<b>SLOPES</b>		
Restrict development on slopes over 25% throughout the County, except for certain ongoing and routine agricultural activities on lands designated Farmland and Permanent Grazing or approved environmental restoration.	<i>Accept 5-0.</i> See text changes Discussion of 25% versus 30%. Determined as long as not prohibiting, will to have one common threshold for entire County that establishes when we	OS 3.5
Establish development criteria <del>that may be more restrictive</del> (to be adopted by ordinance) that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Addresses erosion control, soil types, visual mitigation and drainage;</li> <li>- Clarifies requirements for geotechnical and geological reports including erosion and bank protection; and</li> <li>- Addresses unique circumstances on existing lots that would make development impossible except by a use permit.</li> </ul>	want to take a closer look.	OS 3.3
Retain the County’s current slope/density formula to calculate the maximum possible residential		OS 3.7

**EXHIBIT B  
POLICY MATRIX  
GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

density for <u>subdividing</u> individual parcels based on slope.		
<b>TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT CREDITS (TDC)</b>		
Establish a county-wide, voluntary, TDC program that provides incentives to direct development away from areas we do not want to see developed (viewshed, agriculture, sensitive habitat) or to increase development of affordable housing.	<i>Accept 5-0.</i> General idea to have this tool is good, but needs more detail to consider. Develop criteria and then come back to see if it is acceptable.	LU 1.9
<b>TRAILS</b>		
Recognize the value of trails in Monterey County but without any designation of potential new trails. Encourage cooperation between public agencies and the public in the creation of trails. No requirement other than that required by the Subdivision Map Act for landowners to dedicate trails or trail easements except through a voluntary program.	<i>Accept 5-0.</i> Provide map of existing trails to the Board. Add (loud and clear): No trails shall infringe on ag operations relative to “pure foods” as required under the National Food Safety Act. Incorporate flexibility if laws change.	OS 1.10
Establish policy that requires minimizing or mitigating development that is visible from public trails, except for agricultural operations.		OS 1.9
<b>HABITAT PROTECTION</b>		
<del>Limit designation of environmentally sensitive areas to those areas and species on adopted state and federal lists/regulations as rare, threatened or endangered</del> <u>Follow State and Federal regulations for protection of designated critical habitats</u> except in the Coastal zone, which shall be governed by the Coastal Act.	<i>Accept 5-0.</i> Change sensitive habitat to “critical” habitat Clearly say limit to State and Federal lists, do not imply. Consider impact to small family farm. Some actions noted cannot be done for a small operation. What is criteria and how much will it cost?	OS 5.3
Establish threshold levels of impacts in agricultural areas as part of routine and ongoing agricultural operations	What is behind the policy? Provide State/Fed lists versus County list	OS 5.4
Establish a process for review and analysis of onsite resources prior to conversion of uncultivated agricultural lands to cultivated lands.	Outline how NRCS program functions for consideration by the Farm Bureau and how the Salinas project (surface water quality) will	OS 5.3, 5.4
Establish a “no net loss” policy	apply to habitat.	N/A

**EXHIBIT B  
POLICY MATRIX  
GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

County-wide where new development that cannot avoid sensitive habitat (as regulated) must provide for on-site or offsite mitigation.	Provide list of invasives for sense of what is included.	
Mirror NRCS Salinas Valley Permit Coordination Program		AG 1.11
Establish a fee waiver program for environmental restoration projects.		OS 5.15
Establish policies and procedures that encourage the exclusion and control or eradication of invasive exotic plants and <del>other organisms</del> <u>animals</u> .		OS 5.14
<b>PROTECTED TREES</b>		
Identify Landmark and Protected Trees in each Area Plan <del>based on native trees</del> <u>as</u> historically and naturally occurring in each different Planning Area.	<i>Accept 5-0.</i>	OS 5.8
Develop a comprehensive forest management approach to the long-term sustainability of the different forest resources in the different planning areas.		OS 5.10
Provide a policy to establish regulations creating one standard forestry reporting requirement county-wide.		OS 5.9
<b>CLUSTERING</b>		
Encourage clustering to maximize access to infrastructure, reduce impacts to <del>sensitive</del> <u>critical</u> habitat and avoid <u>development on slopes/ridgelines</u> Countywide.	<i>Accept 5-0.</i> First recommendation county-wide, second is response to ag clustering presented 4/1/05. In some areas, may want policy that clustering is required (e.g. Elkhorn Slough area). Other permissible instances include preserving prime ag land. Limit where ag clustering program may apply. More related to grazing lands rather than prime farmlands.	LU 1.8, LU 8.3 OS 1.8, 3.7, 5.3, 6.5, 7.5, 8.4
Create a program to allow subdividing large agricultural lands into minimum 1 acre lots to accommodate additional residences for families of landowners provided: - The number of lots does not exceed the allowable density otherwise established by zoning. - Developable lots are		AG 1.7

**EXHIBIT B  
POLICY MATRIX  
GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

<p>clustered in order to maximize agricultural use of remaining land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Provide evidence of ability to operate and maintain infrastructure (water, wastewater, roads, drainage) with cost estimates into the future.</li><li>- Record a deed restriction on the agricultural parcel to prevent further subdivision for a minimum of 30 years.</li></ul>		
---	--	--

**EXHIBIT B  
POLICY MATRIX  
GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

<b>DEFINITIONS (June 20, 2005)</b>		
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>ACTION/NOTES</b>	
<b>APPROACH</b>	<i>Accept Approach 5-0</i>	
Current definitions contained in the MCGP be retained except where those definitions are unclear or may lead to an inconsistency with the Board's policy direction.	Include section that lists acronyms used.  Reference where definitions come from.	
Where definitions of terms exist in County, State or Federal regulation that those definitions be used except where those definitions may be unclear or lead to an inconsistency with the Board's policy direction.	Keep within State and Federal definitions where applicable.	
Additional definitions be developed only as needed to bring clarity to policies in the General Plan consistent with Board's policy direction.		
Definitions be written to be simple, direct and short to assure clarity of the term and not to be regulatory or an explanation of policy or regulation.		

**EXHIBIT B  
POLICY MATRIX  
GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

<b>AREA PLANS (July 21, 2005)</b>		
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>ACTION/NOTES</b>	
That area plans continue to be utilized as refinements to the Monterey County General Plan.	<p><i>Accept Approach 5-0</i></p> <p>Concern for ability to integrate GPU3 concepts of Community Areas and Rural Centers with Area Plans.</p>	
That the current area plans be used as the base documents for the general plan update and that they be updated in light of the Board's direction on general plan issues.		
That the work done by various citizens' advisory committees during the preparation of past iterations of GPU be considered in the update of the area plans.		
That the update of the Coastal Land Use Plans be deferred until completion of the General Plan Update.		

**EXHIBIT B  
POLICY MATRIX  
GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

<b>ADMINISTRATION (June 20, 2005)</b>		
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>ACTION/NOTES</b>	<b>GP POLICY</b>
<b>PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT</b>	<p>DELETE ADMINISTRATION ELEMENT FROM THE GENERAL PLAN</p> <p>Concept ideas good, but prefer to address individually with resolutions and not by GP policy.</p>	N/A
Recognize that effective public involvement is vital to a successful planning program.		
Amend the County's legal noticing requirements to be made consistent with State law while maintaining current practices.		
<b>COMPOSITION AND ROLE OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION</b>		
Retain the current role, composition and method of appointment of the Planning Commission.		
<b>ZONING ADMINISTRATOR, MINOR SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE AND SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE</b>		
Discontinue the Zoning Administrator (ZA), Minor Subdivision Committee (MSC), and Subdivision Committee (SC) as hearing bodies.		
Create a Development Review Committee (DRC) in lieu of the ZA/ MSC/ SC, to be the decision making body on those discretionary land use permits that require a public hearing not being heard by the Planning Commission. The DRC composition would include the Director of Planning and Building Inspection, Director of Public Works, General Manager of the Water Resources Agency, and Director of Environmental Health or their designees and a member of the Planning Commission.		
Continue the ZA position as the specifically identified point of authority within the Planning and Building Inspection Department on zoning code development,		

**EXHIBIT B  
POLICY MATRIX  
GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

<p>amendments, administration, training and interpretation.</p>		
<p>The newly created Resource Management Agency would establish a staff-level interdepartmental review committee to review complex projects prior to setting the project for a hearing before the DRC or PC. The function of this committee would parallel the tasks embodied in the minor and major subdivision committees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Review conditions and mitigation measures for their appropriateness and consistency;</li> <li>b) Address problems with project design from the perspective of each agency</li> </ul>		
<b>DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND BUILDING INSPECTION ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITY</b>		
<p>Continue having the Director of P&amp;BI, in consultation with the other land use departments, be the decision making entity for those discretionary land use permits not requiring a public hearing.</p>		
<b>LAND USE ADVISORY COMMITTEES</b>		
<p>Continue use of LUACs to provide recommendations on a range of land use issues consistent with the guidelines currently in place. The Agricultural Advisory Committee would serve as the LUAC for permits on agricultural activities and facilities.</p>		
<p>Provide that focused groups such as the Pajaro Redevelopment Area Citizens Advisory Subcommittee, Castroville Redevelopment Area Citizens Advisory Subcommittee and Boronda Redevelopment Area Citizens Advisory Committee serve as the LUACs for their respective</p>		

**EXHIBIT B  
POLICY MATRIX  
GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

areas.		
<b>COMMITMENT TO A ROUTINE GP REVIEW CYCLE</b>		N/A
Require an annual report of the implementation and administration of the General Plan.		
Establish a five year cycle to review and update the General Plan as needed.		
<b>GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT PROCESS</b>		
Develop a specific process for general plan amendments recognizing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The right of an individual to apply;</li> <li>b. The need to collectively review plan amendments in a comprehensive, cumulative and timely manner; and,</li> <li>c. A need for an early assessment of plan amendment requests to determine the suitability of the request and provide early feedback to applicants before embarking on an extensive, expensive amendment process.</li> </ul>		
Develop criteria for evaluating amendments consistently. Amendments should be considered if: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. There is a demonstrable error or oversight in the adopted plan; or,</li> <li>b. There is a clear change of facts or circumstances; or,</li> <li>c. The amendment better carries out the overall goals and policies of the general plan and there is a significant public benefit to the amendment.</li> </ul>		
Periodically review and update various regulations and codes		

**EXHIBIT B  
POLICY MATRIX  
GENERAL PLAN POLICIES**

consistent with amendments to the general plan.		
<b>COMMITMENT TO MAINTAIN/ENHANCE GIS</b>		
Maintain and enhance the County's GIS as a tool to assist in decision making and permit processing.		
<b>APPEALS</b>		
Continue the current use of de novo appeals processes.		
Create a process to seek agreement between the parties to an appeal prior to the first public hearing on an appeal.		