

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

45 FREMONT, SUITE 2000
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-2219
VOICE AND TDD (415) 904-5200
FAX (415) 904-5400

Th5b**RECORD PACKET COPY**

February 14, 2002

TO: Commissioners and Interested Persons

FROM: Tami Grove, Deputy Director
Charles Lester, Central Coast District Manager
Rick Hyman, Deputy Chief Planner, Central Coast District
Kelly Cuffe, Coastal Planner, ReCAP team
Michael Nowak, Coastal Planner, ReCAP team
Elizabeth A. Fuchs, AICP, Manager, Statewide Planning Unit

RE: ***Report on the Monterey County LCP Periodic Review-REVISED***

This is a status report update on the progress and direction of the Commission's Periodic Review of the implementation of the Monterey County Certified Local Coastal Program (LCP) pursuant to Section 30519.5 of the Coastal Act.

Background

Under the California Coastal Act of 1976, development projects in the unincorporated portions of Monterey County are regulated through local government implementation of a certified Local Coastal Plan (LCP), which is the primary mechanism for achieving the resource protection goals of the Coastal Act. Section 30519.5 of the Coastal Act requires that the Commission periodically review every certified LCP to determine whether they are being implemented effectively in conformity with the Coastal Act. Section 30519.5 gives the Commission an opportunity to identify beneficial changes to an LCP, based on an evaluation of local implementation and in light of changed environmental, social and economic circumstances that may have occurred since an LCP was first certified. The Periodic Review process allows for the incorporation of new knowledge into an LCP and the adjustment of existing policies, programs, and implementation practices, informed by lessons learned about what works in the coastal management process. In short, the Periodic Review process is critical to the success of coastal management in California.

On December 9, 1998, the Commission adopted priorities for the Periodic Review and update of certified LCPs and designated Monterey County as one of its top five priority LCPs identified for review.

On May 9, 2001, the Commission voted to initiate the Periodic Review of the Monterey County LCP under the FY 2001/02 work program for the Commission's Regional Cumulative Assessment Project (ReCAP) through the Coastal Zone Management Act Section 309 Enhancement Grants program.



California Coastal Commission
March 2002 Meeting in Monterey

Staff: RH/CKC/MN/LF Approved by: *E. FUCHS*
C:\TEMP\Monterey Co Periodic Review rpt 2.14.02.doc

Project Startup and Public Participation

In December 2001 the California Coastal Commission (CCC) assembled a team to begin the Monterey County Periodic Review. The Commission staff developed a work plan for the initial stages of the Periodic Review process that is designed to coordinate with the County's General Plan Update process to the extent possible. It is the County's intention that its new General Plan will serve as a new Local Coastal Program (LCP). The County began a General Plan update process in 1999 and has prepared background information and solicited public input. This parallel Periodic Review process is an excellent opportunity for the Commission and County to reflect on the successes and failures of the current LCP and to work cooperatively together to make needed improvements through the LCP amendments that will be processed as part of the General Plan update.

CCC staff developed a multi-pronged process for obtaining input on issues that the public believes are important for the Commission to evaluate as part of the Periodic Review. Actions that have been or will be taken during this project start-up phase include:

- CCC staff has begun to review all of its post-certification material including notes and comments on locally-issued coastal permits.
- CCC staff reviewed public comments garnered through workshops conducted in late 1999 and summer 2001 by the County staff for the General Plan Update and have extracted those comments specifically dealing with coastal resource issues in the four land use planning areas within the coastal zone.
- CCC Staff attended public meetings in Big Sur and Moss Landing where CCC staff announced the Periodic Review process and the opportunity for public input and were on hand to answer questions of the Periodic Review process.
- CCC staff, with assistance from County staff, has compiled names of interested persons (including individuals from local governments, state and federal agencies and the general public) for an initial mailing list. Notices regarding the initiation of the Periodic Review process, along with a public comment form for soliciting public input, have been either mailed or emailed to everyone on the list to date. Responses to this initial mailing are being collected via email, regular mail, and fax.
- CCC staff is also coordinating with County staff in order to attend public meetings where both the General Plan Update and the Commission's Periodic Review will be discussed. CCC staff will attend Land Use Advisory Committee meetings (North County, Carmel Unincorporated/Carmel Highlands, Del Monte Forest, and Big Sur) in February and March to introduce the Periodic Review, discuss the process and provide opportunities for public input.
- CCC staff will attend two "open houses" sponsored by Monterey County planning staff during the month of March. The purpose of these open house meetings is to provide the public an informal opportunity to become familiar with the General Plan Update and Periodic Review process, prior to formal public hearings. CCC staff will be attending other local committee meetings as opportunities arise.
- CCC staff, with assistance from County staff, will also print notices in local newspapers to solicit public input throughout our review process as well as through the public hearing process for this meeting.

- Commission staff is expanding use of the Commission's website to facilitate public involvement for the Periodic Review process. A Periodic Review web-page, developed during previous recap efforts (www.coastal.ca.gov/recap/rctop.html), will be modified to include general information, reports and data generated during the Monterey County Periodic Review process as well as information on other Periodic Reviews already completed (i.e., San Luis Obispo, Monterey Bay Regional project, Sand City pilot project).
- Finally, an internet address has been set up specifically for the Monterey County Periodic Review (MCOreview@coastal.ca.gov) and is available for people to provide ongoing written comments and feedback as the review proceeds.

Summary of Issue Scoping To Date

As previously described, CCC staff is in the midst of the issue scoping process. Some of the most frequent comments raised during the public workshops that the County held related to:

- protection of sensitive habitats (most notably Monterey pine forest, riparian and coastal dune habitat);
- protection of water quality;
- groundwater overdraft, seawater intrusion, and water availability;
- traffic impacts and capacity of Highway One;
- the amount, location and intensity of development;
- protection of scenic resources of the county;
- protection of agricultural lands, prevent conversion to non-agricultural uses;
- carrying capacity of the land;
- loss of Monterey pine forest and impacts of pitch canker disease.

A full summary of the issues made known to date are shown in **Attachment A** along with their source.

This Hearing

This hearing is an opportunity for the public and Commissioners to discuss or suggest topics of particular interest for the Periodic Review.

Next Steps

Staff is requesting continued input from the general public, other agency staff and other interested parties regarding the main issues the Periodic Review should evaluate, as described above. Comments are encouraged to be sent no later than March 15, 2002. Staff will use this input, as well as analysis of actions on permits, appeals and LCP amendments, to determine which specific issues and implementation problems to evaluate in the Periodic Review.

Staff will then spend the bulk of the next several months analyzing the issues raised and drafting recommended program improvements where appropriate. As information becomes available, CCC staff will collaborate with County staff, especially where the results of the analysis will be useful to the General Plan update.

A complete draft Periodic Review report is targeted for public release in the fall of 2002. Public hearings before the Commission are tentatively scheduled for December 2002.

Attachment A: Summary of Issue Scoping

Attachment B: Issue Scoping Questionnaire

Summary of Issue Scoping: Attachment A

Monterey County Local Coastal Plan Periodic Review – Issues List

Index to abbreviations:

Geographic Areas

- (CW) = County-wide
- (NC) = North County
- (DMF) = Del Monte Forest
- (CC) = Carmel Coastal
- (BS) = Big Sur

Source of Comments

- (A) = Article (newspaper, periodical, etc.)
- (C) = Coastal Commission action on coastal permit appeals in Monterey County
- (P) = Public Input (mail, fax, e-format, phone etc.)
- (R) = Monterey County Roundtable Meetings (11/99-12/99 & Community Workshops Summer 2001)
- (S) = Staff review of post-certification material, etc.
- (FC) = Federal Consistency Summaries of Actions in Monterey County

WATER QUALITY

- Update non-point source pollution prevention policies (CW)(S)
- Review appropriate Land Use Plan (LUP) designation for Watertek (wastewater treatment plant) (NC)(S)
- Current water supply availability relative to existing population and planned growth ; link growth with water availability (SW) (R)
- Water quality protection; nitrate contamination; seawater intrusion (CW)(R)
- Groundwater recharge and water quality protection through preservation of wetlands, riparian areas and aquifer recharge areas (CW) (R)
- Consideration of new/alternate technologies for water supply and wastewater treatment in remote or rural areas (BS)(R)
- Overdraft in Carmel River aquifer - withdrawals exceeding state standards (CC)(A)
- Flood Control District management of water resources: possible use of flushing flows to maintain water quality & sediment supply to the coast (NC)(S)
- Dredging of Tembladero Slough with respect to water quality and aquatic habitat (NC)(S)
- Dredging and dredge disposal at Moss Landing Harbor, Old Salinas River Channel and Tembladero Slough - upland disposal, offshore disposal (NC)(S)
- Cumulative impacts of development and restoration projects in Elkhorn Slough watershed (NC)(S)

- Watershed site coverage limits designed to protect water quality in areas of special biological significance (e.g., Pescadero Watershed site coverage limits) (DMF)(S)
- Effect of golf course management practices on water quality (DMF)(S)
- Water quality of all coastal watersheds between the San Luis Obispo/Monterey county line and the Carmel River (BS)(CC)(P)
- Review Non-Point Source Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Phase II requirements for reducing non-point source stormwater runoff - do they apply? Are there adequate implementation policies (e.g. requiring on-site retention/mgt. of runoff, enhanced engineering solutions such as treatment units, or enhanced "natural" systems such as created wetlands, ponds, & filter strips) (DMF)(S)
- Need non-point source discharge standards in LCP (CC)(S)
- Beach closures and implications for water quality and public access – Stillwater Cove (CC)(S)
- Impact of landslide materials on water quality (review/incorporate CHMP recommendations) (BS)(S)
- Use of septic systems and impacts on water quality from septic system failure (BS)(S)
- Compliance with Clean Water Act/Regional Board water quality protection policies (CW)(P)

ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE HABITATS

- Update mapping of environmentally sensitive habitats (CW)(S)
- Update endangered species list and maps of critical habitat areas (CW) (S)
- Update list of sensitive plant/animal species for dune habitat areas (CW) (S)
- ESHA designations (BS)(S)
- Incorporate method to continually update info on endangered species and habitat areas classified as ESHA (CW)(S)
- Uniformly treat and protect central coast maritime chaparral as an environmentally sensitive habitat (CW)(S)
- Establish management protocols for maritime chaparral & conservation easements (NC)(S)
- Review Monterey pine classification as a sensitive species and provide methodology to deal with protection, loss, and removal/handling of material infected with pitch canker (CW)(S)
- In lieu fees, mitigation bank, preservation of seed stocks as possible ways for mitigating removal/loss of Monterey pine – incorporate information from latest research (DMF)(S)
- Consider biological need for connectivity of habitat types (CW)(S)
- Review measures for allowing Monterey pine removal throughout County's coastal zone (CW)(S)
- Review "landmark tree" protection (NC)(CC)(S)

- Review adequacy of tree removal and replacement policies in all land use plan areas; utilize consistent approach (CW)(S)
- Non-native tree removal when it serves as habitat (Policy 32) (DMF)(S)
- Consider preference for natural vs. hard structures within and adjacent to riparian channels, evaluate where such structures are permitted; include requirement to consider and analyze alternatives to hard structures (CW)(S)
- Do not allow lighting shining out on the Sanctuary waters (CW)(S)
- Protect sensitive habitat on Moss Landing Island beach and dunes (NC)(S)
- Clarify that no new parcels should be created that have no building site outside of sensitive habitat areas (NC)(S)
- Review appropriate LUP designation for Long Valley acquisition area (NC)(S)
- Adequacy of LUP designations in areas with current wetland delineations (especially for Moro Cojo Slough); assess and revise accordingly (NC)(S)
- Shoreline Management Plan for Moss Landing (NC)(S)
- Consider potential for beach nourishment landward of Moss Landing north and south spit (NC)(S)
- Ensure appropriate mitigation (e.g., one-to-one mitigation and/or requirement of in-lieu fees) for unavoidable development in environmentally sensitive habitat (e.g., maritime chaparral and oak woodland) (NC)(S)
- Cumulative impact of fire management requirements on sensitive habitat areas (e.g., fire clearing buffers in maritime chaparral and Monterey pine forest habitats) (CW) (S)
- Protect Pescadero Canyon (DMF)(S)
- Require biotic report recommendations to be consistent with all applicable plan policies (CW)(S)
- Re-evaluate the build-out capacity & perform analyses of resource trends and conditions (for forests, water quality, shoreline access, ESHA, sensitive species, coastal bluffs, uplands, watersheds, dunes etc.) in DMF (DMF)(S)
- Evaluate natural and agricultural resources threatened by development as well as natural causes; e.g., Monterey Pine Pitch Canker, seawater intrusion, and degradation of water quality, loss of ecological services, fragmentation of habitats, forests (CW)(R)
- Development in sensitive habitat areas only allowed if development is dependent on the habitat (BS)(S)
- Limit building in environmentally sensitive areas (CW)(R)
- Del Monte Forest management is important (CW)(R)
- Destruction of the coast (CW)(R)
- Loss of biomass (CW)(R)
- Noise pollution (CW)(R)
- Loss of permeable surfaces (CW)(R)
- Invasive species in Big Sur area leading to biological problems (BS)(R)
- Ensure adequate setbacks to avoid new development too close to streams; review buffer policy where there is no riparian vegetation (CW) (S)

- Conflicts between California Department of Forestry rules for road construction vs. LCP policies to minimize/avoid environmental impacts (BS)(P)
- Impacts on the coastal zone from reuse of land at the former Fort Ord. This includes development in the areas west of Highway one (an area of deferred certification) as well as portions of Fort Ord outside of Commission's jurisdiction. (NC)(S)
- Consider and evaluate use of habitat conservation plans and multi-species habitat protection programs (NCCP) in coordination with habitat protection policies in LCP for purpose of preserving, protecting and enhancing sensitive habitat areas consistent with Coastal Act requirements. [CD-016-94](NC)(FC)(CW)(S)
- Continue coordination with Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) on the Elkhorn Slough Watershed Management project which is designed to reduce high levels of pesticides found in the Elkhorn Slough Watershed by controlling sediments from agricultural land and reduce the degradation of wetlands and riparian habitats resulting from sedimentation deposition. The project includes the use of BMPs recommended by the U.S. EPA to protect wetland and riparian habitats. Evaluate success of program. [CD-051-98](NC)(FC)
- Protect sensitive species (e.g., snowy plover, smith's blue butterfly) from predation of non-native predators [CD-061-93](NC)(FC)
- Incorporation of GIS technology into biological, archaeological and geologic/geotechnical reports --to deal with temporal and spatial components of data, base maps, scales and projections, and locating by latitude/longitude for certain species & resource locations (CW)(S)
- Resource management and environmentally sensitive protection policies should be consistent throughout the coastal zone (CW)(S)
- Impacts of polluted runoff into creeks/rivers that support or have historically supported Steelhead runs (CW)(S)
- Tidal scour & channel widening in Elkhorn Slough and other tidal wetlands in North County (NC)(S)
- Management practices of planting invasive species along Highway One corridor (e.g., planting iceplant along Hwy 1 in Fort Ord corridor to inhibit blowing sand) (NC)(S)
- Restoration of previously mined dune areas in Del Monte Forest (DMF)(S)
- Individual Forest Management Plans vs. Regional Forest Management Plans to form consistent management approach to protect and preserve forest resources (DMF)(S)
- Evaluate appropriate land use designations for areas in Del Monte Forest (DMF)(S)
- Cumulative impact analysis of forest composition, health and coverage since certification of LCP (DMF)(S)
- Impacts from beach grooming (CC)(S)
- Examine whether setbacks for protecting terrestrial ESHA are needed (i.e. dune buckwheat, and various upland habitats/species, etc.) (BS)(S)

- Consider all known habitat, current or historical, for Federally listed species such as Smith's blue butterfly, south-central steelhead trout, red-legged frog, etc that occurs within the coastal zone between the SLO/Monterey county line and the Carmel River. (BS, CC)(P)
- Consultation and coordination with Federal and State land managers within the coastal zone to ensure maximum resource and habitat protection. (CW)(P)
- Effects of commercial livestock grazing on sensitive resources and habitat within the coastal zone; necessary steps to protect from degradation. (CW)(P)
- Consider effective stormwater ordinances/controls to prevent degradation of fish habitat (e.g. increased stream flows during/after storm events)(S)
- Appropriate buffers to protect/preserve biological integrity and ecologic function of streams (CW) (S)
- Protection of fish and wildlife habitat areas/wildlife corridors (CW)(S)
- Protection of Monarch Butterfly over-wintering sites in Monterey County (CW)(P)
- Need more "wild" areas free from human use (no touch areas). Public access should be promoted with good facilities in selected locations and limited in other places (e.g., wetlands). (CW)(P)

MARINE RESOURCES (COMMERCIAL & RECREATIONAL FISHING, BOATING)

- Update land use plan to recognize existing facilities built since certification in Moss Landing Area (e.g., Monterey Bay Aquarium Research Institute (MBARI) and Moss Landing Marine Labs (MLML)) and review appropriate land use designations for these facilities. (NC)(S)
- Include new MLML school site near cemetery and evaluate reuse/restoration of original site on Moss Landing Island (NC)(S)
- Consider appropriate sites for public parking in Moss Landing area and on Moss Landing Island (NC)(S)
- Harbor dredging and potential impacts of upland, beach and offshore disposal and consider potential beneficial reuse of dredge disposal materials. (NC)(S)
- Replacement of Sandholdt Pier in Moss Landing (NC)(S)
- Appropriate beach renourishment locations based on Shoreline Management Plan for Moss Landing (NC)(S)
- Potential disruption of habitat values from use of personal water craft (CW)(S)
- Address conflicts among research, fishing & recreation, parking, and public access through a comprehensive plan update for Moss Landing (NC)(S)
- Continued access at Stillwater Cove for recreational boating and diving (DMF)(S)
- Review kelp harvesting impact (DMF)(S)
- Protection of marine resources through implementation of adequate water quality policies (CW)(S)
- Impacts to marine resources from runoff (including golf courses) (DMF)(S)

- Assess impacts of Caltrans sediment management practices to minimize adverse impacts to marine resources – recommendations from Coast Highway Management Plan (BS)(S)

COASTAL HAZARDS (GEOLOGICAL HAZARDS, FLOODING, SEISMIC)

- Establish shoreline structure requirements (materials, evaluation of alternatives, avoid blocking access, etc.) where allowed (NC)(BS)(DMF)(S)
- Review Fire management requirements (CW)(S)
- May need to identify “lifetime” restrictions on rebuilds, establish requirements for other types of alterations (e.g., remodels, relocation, partial or complete demolition, etc)(CW)(S)
- Establish required format or specific items that must be included in geologic/geotechnical reports so that the key questions regarding shoreline protective devices can be readily provided and reviewed (CW)(S)
- Review armoring standards for new development consistent with Coastal Act policy 30253 and for existing development consistent with 30235. (CW)(S)
- Minimize impacts from geologic hazards by requiring erosion controls best management practices (BMPs) (NC)(S)
- Management of flows in major rivers to maintain littoral sediment supply & water quality (NC)(S)
- Review whether private golf courses should be considered “public recreation facilities” and whether they should be provided same protection by Coastal Act as that granted to facilities open to the public (DMF)(S)
- Assess cumulative impacts of development in Pescadero Canyon watershed (CC)(S)
- Assess impacts of Caltrans sediment management practices to minimize geologic hazards along Highway One – recommendations from Coast Highway Management Plan (BS)(S)
- Apply policy requiring easements on steep slopes greater than (25% or 30%) countywide (CW)(S)
- Review progress toward preparing required Watershed restoration area plans (North County 2.5.3.C.4.b) (NC)(S)

AGRICULTURE

- Protect viable prime agricultural land not currently designated Agricultural Preservation or Agricultural Conservation (i.e., re-designate lands as necessary per policy 2.6.3.1 of NC LUP) (NC)(S)
- Review appropriate land use designations for Triple M Ranch to reflect agricultural use and training facility (NC)(S)

- Preservation of agricultural lands – agriculture is the primary industry of the County and needs to be preserved; conversion of agricultural lands is an important concern due to importance of agriculture to the area's economy; evaluate trends in conversion of agricultural lands (CW)(R)
- Assess if County followed LUP policies for agriculture buffers (CW)(S)
- Increased agricultural buffers near schools to reduce potential health effects due to spraying (CW)(A)
- Ensure subdivisions and lot line adjustments do not adversely impact grazing (BS)(C)
- Clarify the Commission and County's regulatory responsibility regarding agriculture under the Coastal Act (CW)(S)
- Recognize existing programs for on-site agriculture practices (e.g., managing agricultural activities, grading, etc.) to ensure resource protection. (CW)(S)
- Economic incentive process for developing, certifying and implementing particular management practices that are consistent with LCP resource protection policies (CW)(S)
- Mechanism in permitting process to address issues with regards to potential conversion of agricultural lands (e.g., during grading evaluations, well drilling application process, etc.) (CW)(S)
- Impacts of grazing management on native plant species diversity and coverage (CW)(S)
- Direct and indirect effect on agriculture from exempt activities, including construction of agricultural roads, grazing activities, and types of development on agricultural lands (CW)(S)
- Runoff requirements for agriculture –appropriate buffers for specific geographic units (that share certain physical characteristics –wind patterns, type of agricultural chemicals used, etc). May lead to different buffer distances & requirements within buffers for different areas (CW)(S)
- Limits of agricultural development/activity based on slope to reduce sediment erosion (NC)(S)
- Dilemma of taking agricultural lands out of production in place of residential development to reduce water demands (which may lead to conversion of agriculture to residential use) (NC)(S)
- Low(er) water-demand crop production to reduce agricultural water consumption (NC)(S)
- Agricultural overdraft of groundwater in North County, and subsequent salinity intrusion (NC)(S)
- Conversion of agricultural land due to road construction & pressure for development (BS)(S)

PUBLIC ACCESS/RECREATION

- Include continuous public trails (paths, sidewalks) through Moss Landing (determine route along Moss Landing Road or atop Salinas River dike, across Highway 1 Bridge and through North Harbor area. – coordinate with Moss Landing Harbor District, Dept. of Public Works and others) (NC)(S)
- Private lands are becoming public – private landowners are being bought out by state/feds.(BS)(P)
- Open Space areas – some areas considered open space are actually the most intensely used property in the area and require more services (BS)(R)
- Protection of coastal resources and public access is a local planning issue (CW)(R)
- Consider improvement of public access & parking near El Sur Ranch & in Del Monte Forest (BS)(DMF)(S)
- Review/consider policies to implement the California Coastal Trail (e.g. acquisition/installation), standards for trail by segment, access/resource conflicts (e.g., dune trails) (CW)(S)
- Assess policies for public access including parking in lodge areas and signage for trails: (1) ensure that all requirements have been met; (2) identify any areas where additional access desired; (3) ensure appropriate trigger mechanisms (DMF)(S)
- Consider extension of bluff trail to Del Mar parking lot, 2nd restroom at south end of beach, parking restrictions along scenic areas (CC)(S)
- Evaluate adequacy of signage for existing trails (BS)(S)
- Consider public access easements across private lands to either the beach or other public lands within the coastal zone a priority of the LCP.(BS)(P)

SCENIC & VISUAL RESOURCES

- Consider appropriate designation of permanent open space areas in Oak Hills (NC)(S)
- Consider establishing conservation and scenic easement management program (NC)(S)
- Consider including scenic easements over developments that should not become taller through future additions (BS)(S)
- Review application of policies regarding ridgetop development (CW)(S)
- Viewshed issues – evaluate signs and lighting in Big Sur area (BS)(R)
- Overall highway 1 design theme (Big Sur 4.1.3.B.4; being done as part of coastal highway management plan) (BS)(S)
- Assess the impacts of enclaves that permit development in viewshed and review interpretation of viewshed policies (BS)(C)

- Coordinate with Coast Guard regarding federal consistency authority over any proposed future antennae on the communications tower at Pt. Sur Light Station. [CD-100-98](BS)(FC)
- Consider requiring utilities to be placed underground in immediate coastal areas (CW)(S)
- Evaluate the public benefit of extending "critical viewshed" type policies to rural areas beyond Big Sur (NC)(S)
- Review potential for agricultural lands to become estates without agricultural use (NC)(S)
- Assess increased night lighting (NC)(S)
- Evaluate visual impacts of lost forest canopy from distant as well as local views (DMF)(S)
- Determine if community character policies are coordinated with Carmel-by-the-Sea's (CC)(S)
- Assess view policies to include public views from the ocean (CC)(S)
- Analyze cumulative impacts and assess permit decisions associated with vegetation screening for blocking views (BS)(S)
- Consider scenic and visual resources as seen not only from roads and highways but also from public access foot and equestrian trails on public lands within the coastal zone. Of particular concern is the area between the San Luis Obispo/Monterey county line and the Carmel River. (BS, CC)(P)
- Cumulative effects of cellular towers; evaluate new technologies for their ability to reduce visual impacts (CW) (S)

ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

- Consider adding historic resource protection policies (NC)(CC)(DMF)(S)
- Consider all known archaeological sites within the coastal zone between the SLO/Monterey County line and the Carmel River. (BS,CC)(P)

ENERGY & INDUSTRIAL RESOURCES

- Note Duke Energy ownership of Moss Landing Power Plant, change in operation and configuration of power generating units and tank farm removal (NC)(S)
- Mining activities in Big Sur [CD-018-88](BS)(FC)
- Oil and gas leases located in Big Sur area; potential impacts due to highly erodible soils, threatened species and protection of recreational and scenic resources [CD-043-83](BS)(FC)
- Consider impacts of cooling technologies on Elkhorn Slough in light of dry cooling feasibility (CW)(S)
- Review energy demand and supply (NC)(S)
- Review marine Resource mitigations impact (NC)(S)
- Review appropriateness of mining of white sands (CC)(S)

- Energy and industrial resources should only be allowed after careful review relative to environment, traffic, water use, and quality of life issues (CW)(P)

DEVELOPMENT & PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE

- Revisit County's proposed policy on short-term rental use and ensure consistency with definition of dwelling (CW)(S)
- Assess update of water supply policy and hence allowed buildout based on North Monterey County Hydrogeologic Study (NC)(S)
- Address conflict between policies supporting Highways 1 & 156 widenings and not allowing wetland fill (NC)(S)
- Review Portrero Road Special Treatment area (5.2.1.G) (NC)(S)
- Analyze designated areas for/not for timber harvest (CC)(BS)(S)
- Review designations of Odello-West and Williams in light of State Parks acquisition (map, 4.4.3.b.2, 4.4.3.E.4) (CC)(S)
- Reevaluate existing use and available capacity of Moss Landing County Sanitation District wastewater system (5.2.3 and Implementation Plan appendices) (NC)(S)
- Consider limitations on timeshares (CC)(BS)(S)
- Assess protection of groundwater supply from new wells in Cal-Am service area (CC)(S)
- Review conversions of visitor-serving facilities [A-3-MCO-98-083](CW)(C)
- Transfer of water credits – evaluate accuracy in tracking amount used (CW)(A)
- Review height limits in Otter Cove (BS)(S)
- Review Rural Community Center designation for Gorda so that it corresponds to the actual existing built –up commercial and administrative complex. (BS)(S)
- Compact development/revitalization – should be a means to develop inside the cities before allowing out in rural areas; urban sprawl issue: lack of required infill, encourage increased density in urban areas to avoid urban sprawl (CW)(R)
- Affordable housing (CW)(R)
- Consider appropriate limits on hotel development (CW)(R)
- Redefine caretaker units – definition needs to be reviewed and modified if needed. Need more flexibility to allow more caretaker units (BS)(R)
- Transfer of Development Credits (BS)(R)
- Consider how the Endangered Species Act may impact water supply (CW)(S)
- Assess conversion of residential workshops to commercial enterprises (BS)(P)
- Assess land use densities & building intensities standards (BS)(C)
- Avoid sewage outfall discharges from impacting marine resources. [CD-028-84](NC)(FC)
- Assess methods to prevent overuse and preserve the natural resources and the carrying capacity of the beach and Sycamore Canyon Road. [CD-047-97](BS)(FC)

- Support County's growth management strategy- growth control/manage where growth (CW)(S)
- Assess Flood control district projects potential degradation of habitat (CW)(S)
- Develop adequate review of Certificates of Compliance (COCs) and assess cumulative impacts of COCs (CW)(S)
- Review home size limitations (CW)(S)
- Need for Monterey County to address uncertified areas (i.e., Fort Ord, Malpas Beach, Yankee Beach)(CW)(S)
- Review private wells in urban service areas (CW)(S)
- Review adequacy of policies to prevent groundwater supply overdraft (NC)(S)
- Assess transportation planning – consider Hwy 1 bypass alternative (NC)(S)
- Assess controls on fertilizers/pesticides used in agriculture (NC)(S)
- Consider recommendation that drainage channels not be hardened (NC)(S)
- Review agricultural setbacks from riparian vegetation (NC)(S)
- Assess adequacy of roads, water, sewer for buildout (DMF)(S)
- Evaluate impacts of demolition of historic homes and loss of community character (CC)(S)
- Existing development and future development adding pressure to widen remote roads (BS)(S)
- Landslide debris management: roadside storage volume vs. visual; coordinate w/Coast Highway Management Program recommendations (should be adopted end of 2003)(BS)(S)

ROAD CAPACITY & LAYOUT

- Consider providing parallel parking along Highway One for Monastery Beach (revise 3.1.3.6) (CC)(C)
- Consider deleting the option for a new bridge south of existing Sandholdt bridge and for Harbor expansion in this area (5.2.1.H.4) (NC)(S)
- Review Hwy 68 traffic counts in policy 106 and update if necessary (DMF)(S)
- External growth issues – growth pressures from outside the County are driving new development. Tourism and special events impact infrastructure (i.e., roads)(CW)(R)
- Traffic congestion, air quality due to increase in traffic, road capacity (CW)(R)
- Illegal grading rampant especially for roads (BS)(P)
- Consider non-motorized transportation modes for access and recreational resources [CC-030-01](NC)(FC)
- Pursue LUP directive to review capacity of Highway One (policy 4.1.2.1) (BS)(S)
- Evaluate the purpose to improve capacity of Highway 1 & improve safety. Consider impacts on sensitive habitat areas [CC-048-88](DMF)(FC)
- Consider Hwy 68 & 1 interchange improvement (NC)(S)
- Consider impacts of access roads altering circulation patterns (DMF)(S)

IMPLEMENTATION PROCEDURES

- Update what recommended plans and services have and have not been accomplished (e.g., comprehensive natural resource and water basin management plan, comprehensive wetland management plan, etc.) (NC)(S)
- Regional coordination of plans – local cities don't coordinate their plans w/County and regional plans (CW)(R)
- Consistent applications of regulations – amendments to the General Plan are not being applied in a consistent manner (CW)(R)
- Review condition compliance methodology and implementation, improve enforcement of County permit requirements (CW)(A)
- Assess County drafting of LCP resolution wording, to ensure key language referencing Coastal Act is present (CW)(S)
- Review County submittal of all easement documents (CW)(S)
- Review County determination of permits deemed not appealable, but may actually be appealable & visa versa (CW)(S)
- Review issuance of variances without corresponding coastal permit (CW)(S)
- Determine if County is providing sufficient background & detail on LCP amendment submittal (CW)(S)
- Review County issued permits that may be in Coastal Commission original jurisdiction (CW)(S)
- Review and determine if the County is sending all permits (CW)(S)
- Determine if the County is requiring easements along riparian corridors (CW)(S)
- Review exemptions of work from permit requirement, and any use of mechanized equipment in stream areas (NC)(S)
- Consider including more specific findings that illustrate lot line adjustment permits in sensitive areas are consistent w/LCP policies (CC)(S)
- Consider requiring latitude/longitude extent in permits, and the requirement for consultants to follow either CCC or county mapping conventions (CW)(S)
- Assess takings analysis requirements and actual takings findings that the County makes (CW)(S)
- Review temporary events regulations (DMF)(S)
- County should have pre-application meetings on site, prior to applications having to be filed; county should send project referrals to the Coastal Commission early on in the process. Condition terms should be defined (e.g. building envelop). (CW)(P)

ENFORCEMENT

- No enforcement of development conditions (e.g., drainage, signage) (BS)(R)
- Permit processing & enforcement – pay planners better and retain them longer (BS)(R)
- Coastal Act Enforcement policies (CW)(P)

MISCELLANEOUS

- Review and ensure multiple definitions are internally consistent and consistent with those in the County Code as well (e.g., structure includes fencing in Carmel Area policy 2.2.4.9 but not in Title 20) (CW)(S)
- Allowing the public the opportunity to participate in the process is of utmost importance. (BS,CC)(P)

**PUBLIC INPUT OPPORTUNITY FOR
PERIODIC REVIEW OF
MONTEREY COUNTY LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM**

The California Coastal Commission, in cooperation with Monterey County, is initiating a Periodic Review of Monterey County's Local Coastal Program (LCP). The California Coastal Act provides that the Commission periodically review the implementation of local coastal programs to determine whether the LCP is effectively carrying out the goals and policies of the Coastal Act. The review will focus on implementation of the LCP and resource changes occurring in the coastal zone since 1988, the year when the Coastal Commission certified the LCP and the County began issuing coastal development permits.

The Commission is seeking public input to help identify the priority issues concerning implementation of the LCP coastal management issues in Monterey County. At this time the public is invited to comment on which of the following topics should be part of the review:

- Maximizing Public Access and Visitor-Serving Recreation
- Protecting Environmentally Sensitive Habitats (e.g. wetlands, dunes, stream corridors, etc.)
- Preserving Agricultural Lands and Scenic Resources
- Planning for New Development and Assuring Adequate Public Services
- Maintaining and Enhancing Coastal Water Quality
- Avoiding Coastal and Shoreline Hazards
- Supporting Commercial Fishing and Recreational Boating
- Providing for Appropriate Coastal Industrial and Energy Development
- Protecting Archaeological Resources
- Enhancing LCP Procedures and Public Participation

This review is expected to take one year. If you would like to submit any comments, please use the attached Public Comment Form and return to us by fax or US Mail as soon as possible. You are welcome to distribute this flyer and Public Comment Form to anyone else that may be interested in providing comment. Please let us know, on the attached form provided, if you would like to receive subsequent announcements about public meetings and/or information throughout the Periodic Review process.

For more information, comments, or questions,
please contact the following Coastal Commission staff:

Rick Hyman,
Kelly Cuffe
or Michael Nowak

Central Coast District Office
725 Front Street, Suite 300
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Ph 831-427-4863
Fx 831-427-4877

Tania Pollak
or Liz Fuchs

Headquarters Office
45 Fremont Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94105

Ph 415-904-5200
Fx 415-904-5400

Or email us at MCOreview@coastal.ca.gov

**PUBLIC COMMENT FORM FOR
PERIODIC REVIEW OF
MONTEREY COUNTY LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM**

NAME: _____
REPRESENTING: _____

Would you like us to send you announcements about future public meetings: ! Yes ! No
If yes, please indicate notification preference and provide mailing and/or email address:

Please check the following topic areas that you believe should be a priority issue to be considered during the Periodic Review process and include any comments in the space following each issue area. To help us better determine emerging issues in specific geographic areas of the County, we ask that you also identify the geographic area(s) to which your comments apply (e.g., Big Sur, Carmel Coastal, Del Monte Forest, North County, or county-wide).

- ☐ Coastal Water Quality –
- ☐ Scenic and Visual Resources –
- ☐ Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (marine, dunes, riparian, coastal wetlands) –
- ☐ Archaeological & Historical Resources –
- ☐ Marine Resources –
- ☐ Energy & Industrial Resources –
- ☐ Coastal & Shoreline Hazards (geological/seismic hazards, flooding, etc.) –
- ☐ New Development & Public Infrastructure (water, sewer, roads, etc.) –
- ☐ Agricultural Lands –

Continued on next page.

- ☐ Commercial fishing and Recreational Boating –
- ☐ Public Access and Visitor Serving Recreation –
- ☐ LCP Procedures and Public Participation Opportunities –
- ☐ Other (please describe) –

Please submit form to: California Coastal Commission, MCO Recap, 725 Front Street, Santa Cruz, CA 95060.
Or fax to 831-427-4877. You may also email comments to MCOREview@coastal.ca.gov.

You are welcome to submit additional information to us on any issue at the address listed above.

