

DRAFT  
Minutes

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE – REFINEMENT GROUP  
Thursday, October 7, 2004, 12:00 to 5:00 PM  
at the former Leadership Institute, 2354 Garden Road, Monterey

Those present: Bob Perkins, Mike Caplin, Brian Finegan, Alfred Diaz-Infante, Tom Rowley, Ralph Riva, Tom Carvey, Rick Smith, Christopher Bunn Jr., Sheri Damon, Luann Meador

- I) Public Comment Period (Public Comment for issues not on the agenda)  
Public comment: none
  
- II) Approval of agenda for October 7, 2004  
Public comment: none  
Additions to agenda:
  - Add V (A) cover letter for 12 Guiding Objectives (GO's): a draft was distributed
  - Add VI (A) Board of Supervisors presentation
  - Add VI (B) Cost recovery for binders
  
- III) Approval of minutes of September 30, 2004  
Public comment: none
  
- IV) 1982 Plan Analysis (Chapter 1)  
Public comment: none  
A new handout was distributed, titled "1982 Policy Matrix Choices 10/04/04"  
The first page is a structured list of possible choices, alphanumerically labeled  
The group began work on page 17, Goal 7.
  
- V) Cover letter for distribution of RG work to the mayors  
Public comment: none  
Brian Finegan distributed copies of a proposed cover letter. There was discussion about the format of the letter, and suggestions were made. Brian Finegan will bring an edited copy to next week's meeting.
  
- VI) Review of the 12 Guiding Objectives  
Public comment: none  
Tom Carvey distributed copies of the Guiding Objectives Correlation
  - (A) Preparation for presentation to the Board of supervisors  
There was discussion about who would present various aspects of the Refinement Group's work at the Board of Supervisors meeting in which the staff will report on their progress on the General Plan.  
  
The following assignments were made:
    - Slope policy: Brian Finegan
    - Ridgeline development: Brian Finegan
    - Native vegetation: Jay Brown and Mike Caplin
    - Minimum parcel size: Christine Kemp
    - Water supply: Nancy Isakson
    - Erosion and water quality: Nancy Isakson

Circulation: Kurt Gollnick  
Concurrency of infrastructure: Brian Finegan  
Ag element, Ag land classification: Bob Perkins, Chris Bunn  
Housing mix: Alfred Diaz-Infante and Juan Uranga  
Secondary units: Christine Kemp and Sheryl McKenzie  
Financing of infrastructure: Brian Finegan  
Viewshed: Brian Finegan

(B) Cost recovery for printing of second printing of 24 RG binders  
Kurt Gollnick offered to pay half of the copying bill.

- VII) Agenda building for next meeting  
Public comment: none  
Add an "Other Business" section to the agenda  
Board of Supervisors presentations: reports from the assigned persons  
Cover letter for mayors' packets  
Review of 12 GO matrix  
Continue 1982 Plan, Chapter 1
- VIII) Adjournment to meeting of Thursday, October 14, 2004 from 12:00 to 5:00 p.m. at the Salinas Chamber of Commerce, 119 E. Alisal Street, Salinas



**1982 Policy Matrix Choices** – 10/04/04

<b>1982 General Plan Goal</b>	<b>Policy</b> (or Objective w/o supporting policy)	<b>Current Practice &amp; Implementation</b>	<b>Worked? Not Worked? Not Needed?</b>	<b>Proposed Change of Policy Direction</b>	<b>Belongs in Which Mandatory Element?</b>
<b><i>Goal Statement</i></b>	<b><i>Policy Statement</i></b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. County practice currently follows this policy – <i>reasonably closely.</i></li> <li>2. County practice follows this policy <i>in an approximate fashion.</i></li> <li>3. County practice does not follow this policy <i>i.e., does not have practice that addresses this policy</i></li> <li>4. County practices <i>are governed by other jurisdictional bodies therefore County should not make it's own policy in this area</i>_____</li> <li>5. County has current practice <i>which is counter to this policy</i></li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Worked – <i>reasonably well – no major objections</i></li> <li>B. Worked – <i>Current practice works as implemented but <u>would not work</u> if policy was literally applied as written because</i>_____</li> <li>C. Not Worked <i>as applied but <u>would work</u> if practiced as goal was written because</i>_____</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. No change in policy – <i>is reasonably OK</i></li> <li>b. No change in current <u>practice</u>, <i>but revise policy language to be consistent with current practice because</i>_____</li> <li>c. Change policy wording <i>to:</i>_____</li> <li>d. Change policy wording <i>to follow policy in RG GPU</i>_____</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Land use</li> <li>ii. Circulation</li> <li>iii. Housing</li> <li>iv. Conservation</li> <li>v. Open space</li> <li>vi. Noise</li> <li>vii. Safety</li> </ol>

1982 General Plan Goal	Policy (or Objective w/o supporting policy)	Current Practice & Implementation	Worked?  Not Worked?  Not Needed?	Proposed Change of Policy Direction	Belongs in Which Mandatory Element?
			D. Not Worked – <i>because</i> _____  E. Not Needed – <i>because</i> _____	e. Delete this policy <i>because</i> _____ –	

Note: Choices can be used in free form but some choices will logically follow from the previous selection

**1982 General Plan – Chapter 1 Natural Resources** 10/4/04

<b>1982 General Plan Goal</b>	<b>Policy</b> (or Objective w/o supporting policy)	<b>Current Practice &amp; Implementation</b>	<b>Worked? Not Worked? Not Needed?</b>	<b>Proposed Change of Policy Direction</b>	<b>Belongs in Which Mandatory Element?</b>
<i>1 GOAL TO RETAIN THE CHARACTER AND NATURAL BEAUTY OF MONTEREY COUNTY BY THE PRESERVATION, CONSERVATION, AND MAINTENANCE OF OPEN SPACE WITHIN CONSTITUTIONAL CONSTRAINTS.</i>	1.1.1 Open space land use designations shall be used, as needed for compliance with the goals, objectives, and policies of this Plan.	County practice does not follow this policy i.e., does not have practice that addresses this policy	Not Worked – because open space is not listed in the 1982 plan. There is no “open space” text in the 1982 plan in the Land Use section, nor in the maps.	Delete this policy because open space designations can be achieved through other means, e.g. Williamson Act, scenic easements.	Open Space
	1.1.2 Open space land use designations shall be used as needed to preserve the physical and natural features contributing to the County's outstanding natural	County practice does not follow this policy and does not have a practice that addresses this policy.	Not Worked – because open space is not listed in the 1982 plan. There is no “open space” text in the 1982	Delete this policy because open space designations an be achieved through other means: Williamson Act, scenic easements.	Open Space

1982 General Plan Goal	Policy (or Objective w/o supporting policy)	Current Practice & Implementation	Worked? Not Worked? Not Needed?	Proposed Change of Policy Direction	Belongs in Which Mandatory Element?
	beauty.		plan in the Land Use section, nor in the maps.		
	1.1.3 Landowners shall be encouraged voluntarily to restrict the development potential of property through grants of conservation easements, Williamson Act contracts, or other appropriate protections in areas designated for open space uses such as agriculture and resource conservation.	County practice follows this policy in an approximate fashion.	Not Worked as applied but <u>would work</u> if practiced as goal was written.	Change policy wording to reinforce the voluntary nature of the policy as opposed to the current practice which is often mandatory.	Open Space
<i>2 GOAL TO PROVIDE FOR THE CONSERVATION, UTILIZATION, AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE COUNTY'S MINERAL RESOURCES IN</i>	2.1.1 The County shall work in conjunction with the State Division of Mines and Geology to inventory lands containing valuable mineral deposits and identify on- and off-site	County practice follows this policy in an approximate fashion because it has designated mineral extraction areas on the 1982 General Plan map and allows mineral	Worked – Current practice works as implemented but <u>would not work</u> if policy was literally applied as	No change in current <u>practice</u> , but revise policy language to be consistent with current practice	Land Use, Conservation element.

1982 General Plan Goal	Policy (or Objective w/o supporting policy)	Current Practice & Implementation	Worked? Not Worked? Not Needed?	Proposed Change of Policy Direction	Belongs in Which Mandatory Element?
<i>KEEPING WITH SOUND CONSERVATION PRACTICES AND TECHNIQUES</i>	land uses that would be incompatible with mineral extraction activities.	extraction in various zoning designations.	written because that would require the County to literally inventory <u>all</u> properties for <u>all</u> unspecified mineral types		
	2.1.2 The County shall designate land use categories which will protect potentially significant mineral deposits from land uses which would permanently preclude mineral extraction.	County practice follows this policy in an approximate fashion because it has designated mineral extraction areas on the 1982 General Plan map and allows mineral extraction in various zoning designations.	Worked – Current practice works as implemented but <u>would not work</u> if policy was literally applied as written because that would require the County to literally inventory <u>all</u> properties for <u>all</u> unspecified	No change in current <u>practice</u> , but revise policy language to be consistent with current practice	Land Use, Conservation.

1982 General Plan Goal	Policy (or Objective w/o supporting policy)	Current Practice & Implementation	Worked? Not Worked? Not Needed?	Proposed Change of Policy Direction	Belongs in Which Mandatory Element?
			mineral types		
	2.2.1 <u>Existing</u> mining operations shall be inventoried and off-site incompatible land uses identified.	County practice follows this policy in an approximate fashion.	Worked – Current practice works as implemented but <u>would not work</u> if policy was literally applied as written because County uses a system of buffer zones to isolate incompatible uses.	No change in current <u>practice</u> , but revise policy language to be consistent with current practice. Suggest that: The County shall develop a buffer policy addressing the above 5 points below: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Purpose: protect existing use</li> <li>2. New use provides buffer</li> <li>3. New use maintains buffer</li> <li>4. Terminate when no longer needed</li> <li>5. Include a broad category of specifics and minimum requirements to avoid conflict of uses.</li> </ol>	Land Use, Conservation.

1982 General Plan Goal	Policy (or Objective w/o supporting policy)	Current Practice & Implementation	Worked?  Not Worked?  Not Needed?	Proposed Change of Policy Direction	Belongs in Which Mandatory Element?
				Also see RG AG-1.4	
	2.2.2 The County shall designate land use categories which will protect existing mining operations from incompatible land uses.	County practice follows this policy in an approximate fashion.	Worked – Current practice works as implemented but <u>would not work</u> if policy was literally applied as written because County uses a system of buffer zones to isolate incompatible uses.	No change in current <u>practice</u> , but revise policy language to be consistent with current practice. Suggest that: The County shall develop a buffer policy addressing the above 5 points below: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Purpose: protect existing use</li> <li>2. New use provides buffer</li> <li>3. New use maintains buffer</li> <li>4. Terminate when no longer needed</li> <li>5. Include a broad category of specifics and minimum requirements to avoid conflict of uses.</li> </ol>	Land use, conservation

1982 General Plan Goal	Policy (or Objective w/o supporting policy)	Current Practice & Implementation	Worked? Not Worked? Not Needed?	Proposed Change of Policy Direction	Belongs in Which Mandatory Element?
				Also see RG AG-1.4	
	2.3.1 A mining and reclamation plan shall be required for all proposed mineral extraction operations.	County practice currently follows this policy – reasonably closely.	F. Worked – reasonably well – no major objections	f. No change in policy – is reasonably OK	Land Use, Conservation
	2.3.2 Mining operators shall be required to furnish the County with all information needed to make an environmental assessment of the proposed mineral extraction operation.	County practice currently follows this policy – reasonably closely.	G. Worked – reasonably well – no major objections	g. No change in policy – is reasonably OK	Land use, conservation
	Objective 2.4 Support efforts to conserve raw mineral resources through recycling.	<b>This objective has not yet been completed.</b>			
<i>3 GOAL TO PROMOTE THE</i>	3.1.1 Erosion control procedures shall be	County practice currently follows this	H. Worked – reasonably	h. No change in policy – is reasonably OK	Conversation

<b>1982 General Plan Goal</b>	<b>Policy</b> (or Objective w/o supporting policy)	<b>Current Practice &amp; Implementation</b>	<b>Worked? Not Worked? Not Needed?</b>	<b>Proposed Change of Policy Direction</b>	<b>Belongs in Which Mandatory Element?</b>
<i>CONSERVATION OF SOILS AS A VALUABLE NATURAL RESOURCE.</i>	established and enforced for all private and public construction and grading projects.	policy – reasonably closely.	well – no major objections		
	3.1.2 The County shall support and encourage existing special district, state, and federal soil conservation and restoration programs within its borders.	County practices are governed by other jurisdictional bodies therefore County should not make it's own policy in this area	Not needed	Delete this policy	Conservation

1982 General Plan Goal	Policy (or Objective w/o supporting policy)	Current Practice & Implementation	Worked? Not Worked? Not Needed?	Proposed Change of Policy Direction	Belongs in Which Mandatory Element?
	3.1.3 In the absence of more detailed site specific studies, determinations of soil suitability for particular land uses shall be made according to the Soil Conservation Service's Soil Survey of Monterey County.	6. County practice currently follows this policy – reasonably closely.	I. Worked – reasonably well – no major objections	i. Change policy wording to use the Soil Conservation Survey latest Farm Land Mapping product.	Conservation
	3.2.1 A slope map shall be produced to identify areas in the County where slope poses severe constraints for particular land uses.	County practice follows this policy in an approximate fashion. County has prepared maps to exclude development on slopes exceeding 25/30%.	Not Worked as applied but <u>would work</u> if practiced as goal was written ie more emphasis should be on the actual geotechnical condition not just slope percentage.	Change policy wording to preventing <u>soil erosion</u> and not limiting land use. Policy should be rewritten to read: 3.2.1 A slope map shall be produced to identify areas in the County where slope poses risk of severe soil erosion.	Conservation
	3.2.2 Lands having a prevailing slope above	County practice follows this policy in	Not Worked as applied but	No change in policy – is reasonably OK	Conservation

1982 General Plan Goal	Policy (or Objective w/o supporting policy)	Current Practice & Implementation	Worked? Not Worked? Not Needed?	Proposed Change of Policy Direction	Belongs in Which Mandatory Element?
	30% shall require adequate special erosion control and construction techniques.	an approximate fashion.	<u>would work</u> if practiced as goal was written because with rare exceptions Current practice is to preclude development and require conservation easements on land over 25/30%.	Implement the policy as written. Allow development on slopes over 30% as stated in the policy if soil erosion is not a factor.	
	3.2.3 Lands having a high erosion potential as identified in the Soil Survey shall require adequate erosion control methods for agricultural uses.	County practice follows this policy in an approximate fashion. In part, current practice has been implemented through Title 21 and through the RWQCB	Not Worked in some cases. Current policy has not been uniformly applied or enforced.	Change policy wording to “For new <u>and expanded Ag</u> uses, lands identified as having a high erosion potential as identified in the soil survey shall require erosion control methods for new or expanded uses. The soil survey map should be updated.	Conservation

1982 General Plan Goal	Policy (or Objective w/o supporting policy)	Current Practice & Implementation	Worked? Not Worked? Not Needed?	Proposed Change of Policy Direction	Belongs in Which Mandatory Element?
	<p>3.2.4 Except in areas designated as medium or high density residential or in areas designated as commercial or industrial where residential use may be allowed, the following formula shall be used in the calculation of maximum possible residential density for individual parcels based upon slope:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Those portions of parcels with cross-slope of between zero and 19.9 percent shall be assigned 1 building site per each 1 acre.</li> <li>* Those portions of parcels with a cross-slope of between 20 and 29.9</li> </ul>	<p>County practice currently follows this policy – reasonably closely.</p>	<p>Not Worked – because the policy has put pressure on prime farmland. And therefore hasn’t achieved the objective as stated.</p> <p>Soils on 30% slopes are valuable, but not prime farmland, while</p>	<p>Change policy wording to “In order to reduce the pressure on our most valuable farmland and encourage the greater use of slopes to meet housing needs, the County should encourage greater use of slopes.</p> <p>Cross slope should not be used to determine development density, but could be properly used to decide when geotechnical studies are needed to develop slopes safely.”</p>	<p>Land Use; Conservation</p>

1982 General Plan Goal	Policy (or Objective w/o supporting policy)	Current Practice & Implementation	Worked? Not Worked? Not Needed?	Proposed Change of Policy Direction	Belongs in Which Mandatory Element?
	<p>percent shall be assigned 1 building site per each 2 acres.</p> <p>* Those portions of parcels with a cross-slope of 30 percent or greater shall be assigned zero building sites.</p> <p>* The density for a particular parcel shall be computed by determining the cross-slope of the various portions of the parcel applying the assigned densities listed above according to the percent of cross-slope and by adding the densities derived from this process. The maximum density derived by the procedure shall be used as one of the factors in</p>				

<b>1982 General Plan Goal</b>	<b>Policy</b> (or Objective w/o supporting policy)	<b>Current Practice &amp; Implementation</b>	<b>Worked? Not Worked? Not Needed?</b>	<b>Proposed Change of Policy Direction</b>	<b>Belongs in Which Mandatory Element?</b>
	<p>final determination of the actual density that shall be allowed on a parcel.</p> <p>Where an entire parcel would not be developable because of plan policies, an extremely low density of development should be allowed.</p>				
<p><i>4 GOAL TO PRESERVE AND ENHANCE ALL VIABLE AGRICULTURAL LANDS.</i></p>	<p>4.1.1 The Important Farmlands Inventory, developed by the USDA Soil Conservation Service and the California Department of Conservation and accepted by various County agencies, shall be used to identify important agricultural lands in the County.</p>	<p>County practice follows this policy in an approximate fashion.</p>	<p>Not Worked – because Maps are used as stated in the policy, but are often out of date or inaccurate. E.g. 1982 plan farmland map was very out-of-date.</p>	<p>Change policy wording to ensure that maps are updated and current. Use the current Soil Conservation Service map as the basis. Mapping may be corrected based on site-specific analysis. Current practice allows an Agricultural Viability study to confirm or refute the state mapping.</p>	<p>Conservation</p>

1982 General Plan Goal	Policy (or Objective w/o supporting policy)	Current Practice & Implementation	Worked? Not Worked? Not Needed?	Proposed Change of Policy Direction	Belongs in Which Mandatory Element?
	4.1.2 The County shall establish agricultural zoning districts on prime farmlands, farmlands of statewide importance, unique farmlands, and farmlands of local importance.	County practice follows this policy in an approximate fashion.	<p>Has not worked because the County has established zoning districts based on the criteria in the policy, which are not entirely accurate.</p> <p>Has been over-inclusive in that land that is not prime farmland has been protected. Cities have annexed ag lands.</p> <p>Affordable housing prices have been inflated through the over-</p>	Change policy wording to incorporate current Soil Conservation Service Farmlands Mapping. Allow site-specific Agricultural Viability Study to supersede state mapping if maps are incorrect.	

1982 General Plan Goal	Policy (or Objective w/o supporting policy)	Current Practice & Implementation	Worked? Not Worked? Not Needed?	Proposed Change of Policy Direction	Belongs in Which Mandatory Element?
			inclusive policy.		
	4.1.3 All farmlands designated as prime, of statewide importance, unique, or of local importance shall be protected from incompatible uses on adjacent lands.	County practice follows this policy in an approximate fashion.	Not Worked as applied but <u>would work</u> if practiced as goal was written. Hard rule of 200 foot buffers are the current practice.	Change policy wording to follow policy in RG GPU RG buffer policy. See RG LU-9.4 and AG-1.4.	Land Use
	4.2.1 The County shall establish agricultural zoning districts for grazing and related purposes.	County practice currently follows this policy – reasonably closely  Permanent grazing is to protect exclusive grazing lands in Monterey County.	Not Worked as applied but <u>would work</u> if practiced as goal was written. because there are currently 2 designations: “rural grazing” and “permanent grazing”. The distinction between the 2 designations is	Change policy wording to Combine the 2 designations. Allow clustering in all grazing definitions, and redefine those areas which are not truly grazing areas to another land use category (e.g. rural countryside). Revise policy to incorporate current practice allowing site-specific Agricultural Viability Study to zoning classification.	Land Use

1982 General Plan Goal	Policy (or Objective w/o supporting policy)	Current Practice & Implementation	Worked? Not Worked? Not Needed?	Proposed Change of Policy Direction	Belongs in Which Mandatory Element?
			not clear and is not supported by agricultural practice. Additionally, the current “zoning districts” are often used out of their current designations.		
5 GOALS TO CONSERVE AND ENHANCE THE WATER SUPPLIES IN THE COUNTY AND ADEQUATELY PLAN FOR THE DEVELOPMENT AND PROTECTION OF THESE RESOURCES AND THEIR RELATED RESOURCES FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS.	5.1.1 Vegetation and soil shall be managed to protect critical watershed areas.	County practices are governed by other jurisdictional bodies therefore County should not make it’s own policy in this area. Much of this comes under the control of the water management agencies. In practice, the water agencies are superseded by Fish and Game and NOA fisheries.	Worked – Current practice works as implemented but <u>would not work</u> if policy was literally applied as written because County would be creating duplicative ordinances potentially	No change in current <u>practice</u> , but revise policy language to be consistent with current practice by eliminating potential overlapping responsibilities	

1982 General Plan Goal	Policy (or Objective w/o supporting policy)	Current Practice & Implementation	Worked? Not Worked? Not Needed?	Proposed Change of Policy Direction	Belongs in Which Mandatory Element?
		<p>There is currently minimum oversight by the County due to overlapping jurisdictions of state, federal and county agencies. This is a RWQC area.</p> <p>Agencies try to manage water, Are there critical watersheds?</p> <p>Cf Goal 35.</p> <p>Note: Other than the Pescadero watershed, the RG is unaware of any other areas designated as “critical watershed areas.”</p>	conflicting with other jurisdictions.		
	5.1.2 Land use and development shall be accomplished in a manner to minimize	County practice follows this policy in an approximate fashion.	Worked – Current practice works as implemented	No change in current <u>practice</u> , but revise policy language to be consistent with current	Conservation

1982 General Plan Goal	Policy (or Objective w/o supporting policy)	Current Practice & Implementation	Worked? Not Worked? Not Needed?	Proposed Change of Policy Direction	Belongs in Which Mandatory Element?
	runoff and maintain groundwater recharge in vital water resource areas.	This policy is currently implemented through the Monterey County Water Resources Agency (MCWRA), which regulates on-and off-site drainage.	but <u>would not work</u> if policy was literally applied as written because County would be creating duplicative ordinances potentially conflicting with other jurisdictions.	practice by eliminating potential overlapping responsibilities.	
	5.2.1 Owners of property adjacent to waterways or responsible agencies shall be encouraged to maintain healthy vegetation along the drainage course, or provide other suitable means of preventing bank erosion or siltation.	County has current practice which is counter to this policy	Not Worked as applied but <u>would work</u> if practiced as goal was written because land owners are prevented from doing work within the riparian corridor to establish healthy	Change policy wording to ensure that to the extent possible, the County shall allow land owners to maintain the riparian corridor to establish healthy vegetation or provide other suitable means for preventing bank erosion or siltation.	Conservation

1982 General Plan Goal	Policy (or Objective w/o supporting policy)	Current Practice & Implementation	Worked?  Not Worked?  Not Needed?	Proposed Change of Policy Direction	Belongs in Which Mandatory Element?
			vegetation or provide other suitable means for preventing bank erosion or siltation.		
	5.2.2 The County shall establish special procedures for land use, building locations, grading operations, and vegetation removal adjacent to all waterways and significant water features.	County practice follows this policy in an approximate fashion.  The County has established procedures, but has gone beyond what is needed to conserve and enhance the water supply as stated in the goal.	Not Worked as applied but <u>would work</u> if practiced as goal was written.  .	Change policy wording to clarify that limit its application to only those procedures needed to enhance the water supply as stated in the goal.	Conservation
	Objective 5.3 Promote the use of public water reservoirs for multiple purposes, where appropriate, i.e., water conservation,	County practice follows this policy in an approximate fashion.	Not Worked – because of the policies of MPWMD. Has worked in some other areas	Change policy wording to include actual policy language. Fundamental problem may be that County may not have authority to implement	Conservation

1982 General Plan Goal	Policy (or Objective w/o supporting policy)	Current Practice & Implementation	Worked? Not Worked? Not Needed?	Proposed Change of Policy Direction	Belongs in Which Mandatory Element?
	flood control, recreation, and hydroelectric generation.			this goal.	
6 GOAL TO PROMOTE ADEQUATE, REPLENISHABLE WATER SUPPLIES OF SUITABLE QUALITY TO MEET THE COUNTY'S VARIOUS NEEDS.	6.1.1 Increased uses of groundwater shall be carefully managed, especially in areas known to have ground water overdrafting.	County practice follows this policy in an approximate fashion. This policy is currently in practice. It is currently managed through various entities, such as the B-8 Overlay District, the MPWMD and the MCWRA.  The County has established procedures, but has gone beyond what is needed to manage ground water in areas known have ground water overdrafting.	Worked – reasonably well – no major objections in areas <u>known</u> to have overdrafting.  Not Worked as applied but <u>would work</u> if practiced as goal was written ie applied to known areas of overdrafting only.	Change policy wording to to be rewritten to ensure that the policy is only applied in areas <u>proven</u> to have ground water overdrafting.	Conservation

1982 General Plan Goal	Policy (or Objective w/o supporting policy)	Current Practice & Implementation	Worked?  Not Worked?  Not Needed?	Proposed Change of Policy Direction	Belongs in Which Mandatory Element?
	6.1.2 Water conservation measures for all types of land uses shall be encouraged.	County practice currently follows this policy reasonably closely.	Worked reasonably well; no major objections	No change in policy; it is reasonably workable. There are, however, many jurisdictions involved in this policy.  Work stopped at this point on 6-23-04.	
7 GOAL TO PRESERVE THE DIVERSITY AND CONSERVE THE EXTENT OF THE COUNTY'S NATIVE VEGETATION.	7.1.1 Development shall be carefully planned in, or adjacent to, areas containing limited or threatened plant communities, and shall provide for the conservation and maintenance of the plant communities.	A study is currently required, and the plant communities must be maintained. 1. County practice currently follows this policy – <i>reasonably closely</i> .	B. Worked – <i>Current practice works as implemented but would not work if policy was literally applied as written because the word “limited”</i>	d. Change policy wording to follow RG policies in goals ER-1 and ER-2, which focus on protecting designated Critical Habitat for <u>listed</u> threatened or endangered species.	iv. Conservation

1982 General Plan Goal	Policy (or Objective w/o supporting policy)	Current Practice & Implementation	Worked?  Not Worked?  Not Needed?	Proposed Change of Policy Direction	Belongs in Which Mandatory Element?
			could be applied to protect species that are not listed and do not require protection.		
	7.1.2 The County shall encourage the protection of limited or threatened plant communities through dedications of permanent conservation easements and other appropriate means.	2. County practice follows this policy in an approximate fashion.	D. Not worked, because protective measures are unilaterally imposed, not encouraged. The inclusion of the terms “limited” and “plant communities” allow protection for species that are not listed as threatened or endangered.	d. Change policy wording to follow RG GPU policies in goals ER-1 and ER-2, which focus on protecting designated Critical Habitat for <u>listed</u> threatened or endangered species.	iv. Conservation
	7.2.1 Landowners and developers shall be encouraged to preserve the integrity of existing terrain and natural vegetation in visually sensitive areas such as hillsides and ridges.	2. County practice follows this policy in an approximate fashion.	D. Not worked, because protective measures are unilaterally imposed, not encouraged. In addition, it is not consistent with Goal 7 or Objective 7.2.	d. Change policy wording to follow RG GPU policies under Goal ER-9, particularly ER-9.5 and ER-9.6.	iv. Conservation

1982 General Plan Goal	Policy (or Objective w/o supporting policy)	Current Practice & Implementation	Worked? Not Worked? Not Needed?	Proposed Change of Policy Direction	Belongs in Which Mandatory Element?
	7.2.2 Native and native compatible species, especially drought resistant species, shall be utilized to the extent possible in fulfilling landscaping requirements imposed as conditions of discretionary permits.	1. County practice currently follows this policy – <i>reasonably closely</i> .	A. Worked – <i>reasonably well – no major problems.</i>	a. No change in policy – <i>is reasonably okay.</i>	iv. Conservation
8 GOAL TO ENCOURAGE THE CONSERVATION OF FORESTS AND WOODED AREAS AS ESSENTIAL ECONOMIC, NATURAL, AND AESTHETIC RESOURCES.	8.1.1 The timber harvest plan shall provide for selective, sustained yield harvesting and reforestation, as appropriate. Such plans may provide the opportunity for conjunctive use of timber land for public recreation.	4. County practices <i>are governed by other jurisdictional bodies therefore County should not make its own policy in this area.</i>	E. Not needed	e. Delete this policy	n/a
	8.1.2 All commercial harvesting of trees shall be in keeping with the resource-protection	4. County practices <i>are governed by other jurisdictional bodies therefore County</i>	E. Not needed	e. Delete this policy	n/a

1982 General Plan Goal	Policy (or Objective w/o supporting policy)	Current Practice & Implementation	Worked? Not Worked? Not Needed?	Proposed Change of Policy Direction	Belongs in Which Mandatory Element?
	goals, objectives, and policies of this General Plan.	<i>should not make its own policy in this area.</i>			
	8.1.3 Commercial timber harvesting in the County shall be in compliance with all applicable state and federal laws.	1. County practice currently follows this policy – <i>reasonably closely.</i>	A. Worked – <i>reasonably well</i> – <i>no major objections</i>	a. No change in policy – <i>is reasonably OK</i>	iv. Conservation
	8.1.4 Small-scale milling operations shall be permitted subject to compatibility with resource protection policies and the peace of adjacent residences.	6. Unknown	F. Unknown	a. No change in policy – <i>is reasonably OK</i>	i. Land Use
	<i>Objective</i> 8.2 Encourage conservation of native trees as a component for attaining broad conservation and open space goals.	This is a “hanging objective” with no policies to support it.  1. County practice currently follows this policy – <i>reasonably closely.</i>	D. Not worked, because conservation measures are unilaterally imposed, not encouraged.	d. Change policy wording <i>to follow</i> RG GPU policies ER-2.11 through ER-2.15.	iv. Conservation  Work stopped at this point on 10-7-04