

DRAFT
Minutes

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE – REFINEMENT GROUP

Thursday, October 21, 2004, 11:00 to 4:00 PM
at the Monterey County Association of Realtors
201-A Calle del Oaks, Del Rey Oaks

Those present: Jay Brown, Mike Caplin, Norm Kolpin, Brian Finegan, Christopher Bunn Jr., Tom Carvey, Sheryl McKenzie, Pete Scudder, Nancy Isakson, Gwen Miller, Aaron Johnson, Sheri Damon, Tom Rowley, Luann Meador, Chris Steinbruner, Christine Kemp, Kurt Gollnick

- I) Public Comment Period (Public Comment for issues not on the agenda)
Public comment: none
- II) Approval of agenda for October 21, 2004
Public comment: none
Agenda approved as e-mailed m/s/c
- III) Approval of minutes of September 30, 2004 and October 7, 2004
Public comment: none
Both sets of minutes approved as e-mailed m/s/c
- IV) 1982 Plan Analysis (Chapter 1)
Public comment: none
The group discussed and worked through the 1982 Plan Analysis Matrix (see following pages for minutes).
- V) Coastal Element
Public comment: none
Mike Caplin distributed copies of the Coastal Element, formatted with double strikeout to indicate subcommittee strikeouts and double underline to indicate subcommittee additions. Mike tracked changes.
Goal CZ-1: Discussion over language of goal. Change to, “Ensure conformity with the provisions of the Coastal Act and the 12 Guiding Objectives of the General Plan.”

Policy CZ-1.1: Discussion. Add to 1st sentence the area specific policies, the coastal wide policies, and applicable policies of the General Plan.
Discussion over the Peninsula cities that have coastal access.
Delete entire 2nd paragraph.

Policy CZ-1.2 discussion over the highlighted sections, a, b, c, etc. These policies are interrelated and need to be checked for consistency with the RG work. Each subcommittee should take the ones that apply to them. Assignments:
Land Use: Sheryl McKenzie
Circulation: Kurt Gollnick
ERME: Brian Finegan
Health and Safety: Nancy Isakson
Harbor Facilities: Kurt Gollnick
Discussion deferred until the above reports are received.

Policy CZ-1.3: checked last sentence with RG LU-12.3

Policy CZ-1.4: Checked with RG AD-2. Mike will check the last sentence's reference to Section 30500 et seq of the Coastal Act.

Policy CZ-1.5: discussion of what constitutes a minor remodel.
Reference to RG LU-9.1 (B) on secondary units.

Policy CZ-1.6: Approved as is on Mike's handout.

Policy CZ-1.7: delete last sentence.

Worked stopped at Policy CZ-1.7.

VI) Reports on presentations to the Board of Supervisors

Public comment: none

Assignments from the Oct. 7, 2004 draft minutes were reviewed.

Presentations were assigned to individuals as follows:

Slope policy: Brian Finegan

Ridgeline development: Brian Finegan

Native vegetation: Jay Brown and Mike Caplin (endangered species to Jay, Chapparal to Mike Caplin. Mike will e-mail Jay the handout on Maritime Chapparal).

Minimum parcel size: Christine Kemp

Water supply: Nancy Isakson

Nancy distributed a handout titled "Re: General Plan Update – Water Supply issues. Discussion about Nancy's handout, suggested changes. To supply references to the RG work, footnotes were suggested. Formatting will use subject headings and footnotes. m/s/c to do so in all the presentations.

Erosion and water quality: Nancy Isakson

Circulation: Kurt Gollnick

Concurrency of infrastructure: Brian Finegan. Aaron Johnson was added to this subcommittee.

Ag element, Ag land classification: Bob Perkins, Chris Bunn

Housing mix:

100% Affordable Overlay: Alfred Diaz-Infante and Juan Uranga. Gwen Miller was added to this committee.

Secondary units: Christine Kemp and Sheryl McKenzie

Financing of infrastructure (fair share): Brian Finegan

Viewshed: Brian Finegan

A handout entitled "GPU Questions for Board of Supervisors" was distributed and discussed.

VII) Review of the 12 Guiding Objectives

Public comment: none

The 12 Guiding Objective Matrix was distributed. Tom Carvey will make the clarifications that were suggested several weeks ago and will distribute via e-mail. Tom will e-mail Jay Brown the suggested changes to the matrix from a few weeks ago.

- VIII) Other Business
Presentations to the community in Spanish. A committee of Aaron Johnson, Jay Brown, Tom Carvey and Alfred Diaz-Infante was formed to translate the executive summaries into Spanish.

- IX) Agenda building for next meeting
Add: maps, questions for Supervisors, Presentations to Supervisors

- X) Adjournment to meeting of Thursday, October 28, 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

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

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

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>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 beauty.	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 plan in the Land Use section, nor in the maps.	Delete this policy because open space designations can be achieved through other means: Williamson Act, scenic easements.	Open Space
	1.1.3 Landowners shall be encouraged voluntarily to restrict the development	County practice follows this policy in an approximate fashion.	Not Worked as applied but <u>would work</u> if practiced as	Change policy wording to reinforce the voluntary nature of the policy as opposed to the current	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?
	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.		goal was written.	practice which is often mandatory.	
<i>2 GOAL TO PROVIDE FOR THE CONSERVATION, UTILIZATION, AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE COUNTY'S MINERAL RESOURCES IN KEEPING WITH SOUND CONSERVATION PRACTICES AND TECHNIQUES</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 land uses that would be incompatible with mineral extraction activities.	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 mineral types	No change in current <u>practice</u> , but revise policy language to be consistent with current practice	Land Use, Conservation element.
	2.1.2 The County shall designate land use categories which will protect potentially	County practice follows this policy in an approximate fashion because it has	Worked – Current practice works as implemented	No change in current <u>practice</u> , but revise policy language to be consistent with current	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?
	significant mineral deposits from land uses which would permanently preclude mineral extraction.	designated mineral extraction areas on the 1982 General Plan map and allows mineral extraction in various zoning designations.	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 mineral types	practice	
	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"> 1. Purpose: protect existing use 2. New use provides buffer 3. New use maintains buffer 4. Terminate when no longer needed 5. Include a broad category of 	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?
				<p>specifics and minimum requirements to avoid conflict of uses. Also see RG AG-1.4</p>	
	<p>2.2.2 The County shall designate land use categories which will protect existing mining operations from incompatible land uses.</p>	<p>County practice follows this policy in an approximate fashion.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Purpose: protect existing use 2. New use provides buffer 3. New use maintains buffer 4. Terminate when no longer needed 5. Include a broad category of specifics and minimum requirements to avoid conflict of uses. <p>Also see RG AG-1.4</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?
	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.	This objective has not yet been completed.			
<i>3 GOAL TO PROMOTE THE CONSERVATION OF SOILS AS A VALUABLE NATURAL RESOURCE.</i>	3.1.1 Erosion control procedures shall be established and enforced for all private and public construction and grading projects.	County practice currently follows this policy – reasonably closely.	H. Worked – reasonably well – no major objections	h. No change in policy – is reasonably OK	Conversation

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?
	3.1.2 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
	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	Not Worked as applied but <u>would work</u> if practiced as goal was written ie more	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	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?
		on slopes exceeding 25/30%.	emphasis should be on the actual geotechnical condition not just slope percentage.	be produced to identify areas in the County where slope poses risk of severe soil erosion.	
	3.2.2 Lands having a prevailing slope above 30% shall require adequate special erosion control and construction techniques.	County practice follows this policy in an approximate fashion.	Not Worked as applied but <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%.	No change in policy – is reasonably OK Implement the policy as written. Allow development on slopes over 30% as stated in the policy if soil erosion is not a factor.	Conservation
	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	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?
				map should be updated.	
	<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"> * Those portions of parcels with cross-slope of between zero and 19.9 percent shall be assigned 1 building site per each 1 acre. * Those portions of parcels with a cross-slope of between 20 and 29.9 percent shall be assigned 1 building site per each 2 acres. * Those portions of parcels with a cross- 	<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>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 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>				

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><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>
	<p>4.1.2 The County shall establish agricultural zoning districts on prime farmlands, farmlands of statewide importance, unique farmlands, and farmlands of local importance.</p>	<p>County practice follows this policy in an approximate fashion.</p>	<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</p>	<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.</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?
			lands. Affordable housing prices have been inflated through the over-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.		
<p><i>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.</i></p>	<p>5.1.1 Vegetation and soil shall be managed to protect critical watershed areas.</p>	<p>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. There is currently minimum oversight by the County due to overlapping jurisdictions of state, federal and county agencies. This is a</p>	<p>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 conflicting with other jurisdictions.</p>	<p>No change in current <u>practice</u>, but revise policy language to be consistent with current practice by eliminating potential overlapping responsibilities</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>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>			
	<p>5.1.2 Land use and development shall be accomplished in a manner to minimize runoff and maintain groundwater recharge in vital water resource areas.</p>	<p>County practice follows this policy in an approximate fashion. This policy is currently implemented through the Monterey County Water Resources Agency (MCWRA), which regulates on-and off-site drainage.</p>	<p>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 conflicting with other jurisdictions.</p>	<p>No change in current <u>practice</u>, but revise policy language to be consistent with current practice by eliminating potential overlapping responsibilities.</p>	<p>Conservation</p>
	<p>5.2.1 Owners of</p>	<p>County has current</p>	<p>Not Worked as</p>	<p>Change policy wording</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?
	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.	practice which is counter to this policy	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 vegetation or provide other suitable means for preventing bank erosion or siltation.	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.	
	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	County practice	Not Worked –	Change policy wording	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?
	5.3 Promote the use of public water reservoirs for multiple purposes, where appropriate, i.e., water conservation, flood control, recreation, and hydroelectric generation.	follows this policy in an approximate fashion.	because of the policies of MPWMD. Has worked in some other areas	to include actual policy language. Fundamental problem may be that County may not have authority to implement 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
	6.1.2 Water conservation measures	County practice currently follows this	Worked reasonably well;	No change in policy; it is reasonably workable.	

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?
	for all types of land uses shall be encouraged.	policy reasonably closely.	no major objections	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</i> because the word “limited” could be applied to protect species that are not listed and do not require protection.	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
	7.1.2 The County shall encourage the protection of limited or	2. County practice follows this policy in an approximate	D. Not worked, because protective measures are	d. Change policy wording to follow RG GPU policies in goals	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?
	threatened plant communities through dedications of permanent conservation easements and other appropriate means.	fashion.	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.	ER-1 and ER-2, which focus on protecting designated Critical Habitat for <u>listed</u> threatened or endangered species.	
	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
	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	8.1.1 The timber harvest plan shall provide for selective, sustained yield harvesting	4. County practices <i>are governed by other jurisdictional bodies therefore County should not make its</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?
AS ESSENTIAL ECONOMIC, NATURAL, AND AESTHETIC RESOURCES.	and reforestation, as appropriate. Such plans may provide the opportunity for conjunctive use of timber land for public recreation.	<i>own policy in this area.</i>			
	8.1.2 All commercial harvesting of trees shall be in keeping with the resource-protection goals, objectives, and policies of this General Plan.	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
	8.1.3 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 – 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	This is a “hanging objective” with no policies to support it. 1. County practice currently follows this	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

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?
	space goals.	policy – <i>reasonably closely</i> .			
9GOAL TO CONSERVE THE ABUNDANCE AND DIVERSITY OF THE COUNTY'S WILDLIFE	9.1.1 Development shall be carefully planned in areas known to have particular value for wildlife and, where allowed, shall be located so that the reasonable value of the habitat for wildlife is maintained.	Work began here 10-21-04 Planned development so that reasonable value is maintained. 1. County practice currently follows this policy – reasonably closely.	B. Worked – Current practice works as implemented but <u>would not work</u> if policy was literally applied as written because the county restricts the application only to federally endangered species.	b. No change in current <u>practice</u> , but revise policy language to be consistent with current practice because the policy is over-broad and could be applied to common wildlife.	iv. Conservation
	9.1.2 Development shall be carefully planned in areas having high value for fish and wildlife reproduction.	2. County practice follows this policy <i>in an approximate fashion</i> .	New designation: Current practice worked as implemented in the past, but as now applied, it is not working because it defers land use decisions to federal agencies.	c. Change policy <i>wording to include only critical habitat areas (see RG definition of critical habitat)</i> . d. Refer to RG policies ER-2.5 and 2.7	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?
	9.2.1 Land use practices which could result in siltation and pollution of inland and marine waters shall be carefully managed in order to assure a clean and productive habitat.	2 and 4. County practices <i>are governed by other jurisdictional bodies; therefore, the County should not make its own policy in this area because as of 1/1/05 jurisdiction is with RWQB.</i>	D. Not Worked – <i>because it hasn't been carefully managed or uniformly applied.</i>	d. Change policy wording to <i>follow policy in RG GPU</i> See RG ER-3.1, 3.2, 3.3	iv. Conservation
	9.2.2 Projects that modify or otherwise impact inland waters and waterways shall be referred to appropriate agencies for review, recommendations, and appropriate conditional permits.	1. County practice currently follows this policy – <i>reasonably closely.</i>	A. Worked – <i>reasonably well – no major objections</i>	a. No change in policy – <i>is reasonably OK</i>	iv. Conservation
<i>9.3 is a “hanging objective” having no policies with which it is associated.</i>	<i>Objective</i> 9.3 Provide for scientific, educational, commercial, and recreational uses of fish and wildlife, where appropriate.	2. County practice follows this policy <i>in an approximate fashion.</i> The County currently applies this objective through the imposition of conservation easements.	A. Worked – <i>reasonably well – no major objections</i>	c. Change policy wording to <i>apply only to public lands.</i>	iv. Conservation
10 GOAL TO PROTECT AND CONSERVE THE QUALITY OF THE OCEAN AND	10.1.1 The California Department of Fish and Game shall be consulted and appropriate	2. County practice follows this policy <i>in an approximate fashion.</i>	A. Worked – <i>reasonably well – no major objections</i>	c. Change policy wording to <i>delete reference to California Fish and Game. The appropriate agency shall</i>	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?
MARINE ENVIRONMENTS AND TO PROVIDE FOR REASONABLE DEVELOPMENT OF MARINE-RELATED ACTIVITIES.	measures taken to control direct and indirect discharges of harmful substances into marine waters.		B. Worked – Current practice works as implemented but <u>would not work</u> if policy was literally applied as written because Fish and Game is not always the appropriate agency. M/s/c to eliminate the language “no major objections” wherever it occurs.	<i>be consulted.</i> d. Change policy wording to <i>follow policy in RG GPU ER-4.1, 4.2.</i>	
	10.1.2 Special restrictions shall be placed on activities that adversely affect the County's remaining estuaries, salt marshes, sloughs, and river and stream mouth areas.	1. County practice currently follows this policy – <i>reasonably closely.</i>	A. Worked – <i>reasonably well</i>	a. No change in policy – <i>is reasonably OK</i>	iv. Conservation
	10.1.3 All new and/or	2. County practice	A. Worked –	e. Delete this policy	iv.

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>expanding wastewater discharges into the coastal waters of Monterey County shall require a permit from the Health Department. Applicants for such permits shall be required to submit, at a minimum, the following information and studies:</p> <p>a) Three years monitoring records identifying the existing characteristics of the proposed wastewater discharge. Particular areas of concern include toxic chemicals, inorganic heavy metals, bacteria, and other indicators prescribed as threats to the health and safety of coastal waters, or</p> <p>b) Provide comprehensive projections of the proposed wastewater discharges; both quantitative and qualitative</p>	<p>follows this policy <i>in an approximate fashion.</i></p>	<p><i>reasonably well</i></p>	<p>because it belongs in an ordinance, not a general plan policy.</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?
	<p>characteristics must be Specific figures for the indicators identified in a)</p> <p>must be included in the projections.</p> <p>c) Provide complete information on levels of treatment proposed at the treatment facility to remove those indicators mentioned in a). This information shall also include reliability and efficiency date of the proposed treatment.</p> <p>d) Provide a comprehensive monitoring plan for testing of wastewater for indicators identified in a).</p> <p>e) Perform oceanographic studies to determine the most suitable location and methods for discharge into the ocean.</p> <p>f) Perform tests of ocean waters at the</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>proposed discharge site and surrounding waters to establish baseline or background levels of toxic chemicals, heavy metals, bacteria and other water quality indicators.</p> <p>These tests must be performed no more than one year prior to submittal of the proposal.</p> <p>Historical data may not be substituted for this requirement.</p> <p>g) Perform toxicity studies to determine the impacts of the proposed wastewater discharges on marine life, as well as on recreational uses of the coastal waters.</p> <p>h) Identify and analyze alternative methods of wastewater disposal.</p> <p>This shall include hydrogeologic studies of the applicant's</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>groundwater basin to determine the water quality problems in that area and if onsite disposal will have an adverse impact on groundwater quality. The data and results of requirements a) through h) must be submitted to the County's Chief of Environmental Health for evaluation and approval. A wastewater discharge permit shall be issued only if the above information demonstrates that the proposed wastewater discharge will not degrade marine habitats; will not create hazardous or dangerous conditions; and will not produce levels of pollutants that exceed any applicable state or federal water quality standards.</p>				
	10.2.1 The County shall	1. County practice	A. Worked –	a. No change in policy –	i. 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?
	allow for reasonable development of those harbor facilities for commercial fishing and recreational boating which are compatible with over all conservation policies, particularly those relating to preservation of wetlands.	currently follows this policy – <i>reasonably closely</i> .	<i>reasonably well</i>	<i>is reasonably OK</i>	
	10.2.2 The County shall encourage the further growth and development of aquaculture as an economic, research, and educational activity in the coastal zone, consistent with overall conservation policies.	1. County practice currently follows this policy – <i>reasonably closely</i> .	A. Worked – <i>reasonably well</i>	a. No change in policy – <i>is reasonably OK</i>	i. Land use
	10.2.3 The County shall oppose all offshore oil drilling and related activities off the California coast, where it can be shown these activities pose significant or potential hazards to the marine and coastal	1. County practice currently follows this policy – <i>reasonably closely</i> .	A. Worked – <i>reasonably well</i>	a. No change in policy – <i>is reasonably OK</i>	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?
	environments, resources, or air quality.				
	10.3.1 Public access shall be provided to the shoreline, in accordance with state approved Local Coastal Programs.	1. County practice currently follows this policy – <i>reasonably closely.</i>	C. Not Worked <i>as applied but would work if practiced as policy was written because in some instances, public access does not result from the “offer to dedicate.”</i> <i>M/s/c to find and replace every place that C. says “goal was written” to “policy was written.”</i>	a. No change in policy – <i>is reasonably OK</i>	i. Land Use
	10.3.2 The natural shoreline processes, including bluff erosion, sand transport, and tidal flushing, shall not be adversely altered by dredging, filling, or construction of shoreline structures.	2. County practice follows this policy in <i>an approximate fashion.</i>	A. Worked – <i>reasonably well</i>	c. Change policy <i>wording to allow for protection of coastal structures and lands.</i>	iv. Conservation
	<i>Objective</i>	1. County practice	A. Worked –	a. No change in this	iv.

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?
	10.4 Encourage oceanographic research in Monterey County.	currently follows this policy – <i>reasonably closely</i> .	<i>reasonably well</i>	policy – <i>is reasonably OK</i>	Conservation
<i>11 GOAL TO CONSERVE NATURAL HABITATS FOR NATIVE PLANT AND ANIMAL SPECIES AND TO PROMOTE PRESERVATION OF RARE AND ENDANGERED PLANT AND ANIMAL SPECIES.</i>	11.1.1 The California Native Plant Society shall be consulted and appropriate measures shall be taken to protect rare and endangered plant species and their habitats.	<u>Work ended here on 10-21-04</u>			