

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|--|---|-----------------------|
| <i>Dunes and Coastal Strand (cont.)</i> | | | |
| | | <p>Policy C-OSRC-5f(2): On dunes/coastal strand, carry-out the following activities to preserve native vegetation:</p> <p>(2) Post signs which explain the importance of limiting public access to protect plant communities.</p> <p>(Existing LCP Revised)</p> | |
| <i>Riparian</i> | | | |
| <p>9. Prohibit construction of permanent structures within riparian areas as defined, or 100 feet from the lowest line of riparian vegetation, whichever is greater, except development dependent on the resources in the riparian habitat, including public recreation facilities related to the resource. Any development shall be allowed only if it can be sited and designed to prevent impacts which would significantly degrade such areas, and shall be compatible with the continuance of the riparian habitat. The riparian area or 100 foot wide buffer zone should generally be maintained in a natural, undisturbed state. Trails and access may be permitted if studies determine no long-term adverse impacts would result from their construction, maintenance, and public use. Trails should be made of porous materials.</p> | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-5c(1): Along both sides of riparian corridors, as defined in this Local Coastal Plan, establish streamside conservation areas measured on each side of the channel as: a) within riparian habitat as determined by the Permit Sonoma or a qualified resource specialist, b) 100 feet from the landward edge of riparian vegetation as defined by Permit Sonoma or a qualified resource specialist, or c) 100 feet (200 feet for the Russian River) out from the top of the bank on each side of the stream, whichever is farthest from the channel centerline. Where there is more than one bank on a side of the stream and the top-of-bank measurement approach is used, the measurement shall be from the top of the higher bank on that side. (GP2020 Revised) (Existing LCP Revised: Recommendation 9 on page 28)</p> | Same |
| <p>10. Require erosion-control measures for projects affecting the riparian corridor.</p> | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-8a: Coastal Development Permits shall be subject to the following requirements for reducing erosion and erosion control:</p> <p>(1) Projects shall be designed so that structures and roads are not located on slopes of 30 percent or greater.</p> <p>(2) Erosion control measures shall be incorporated as part of projects involving construction or grading near waterways or on lands with slopes over 10 percent.</p> | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|--|---|-----------------------|
| <i>Riparian (cont.)</i> | | | |
| | | <p>(3) A soil conservation program shall be incorporated as part of projects which could increase erosion of waterways or hillsides.</p> <p>(4) New roads and driveways for residential, ranch, and timber harvest uses shall be designed and constructed to retain natural vegetation and topography to the extent feasible.</p> <p>(5) Improvements near waterways or in areas with a high risk of erosion as noted in the <i>Sonoma County Soil Survey</i> shall be designed and constructed to retain natural vegetation and topography to the extent feasible.</p> <p>(GP2020) (Existing LCP Revised: Recommendation 49 on page 31, Recommendations 11-12 on page 38, Recommendation 40 on page 31, Recommendations 52-53 on page 32, and Recommendation 11 on page 54)</p> | |
| <p>11. Prohibit the removal of vegetation except commercial timber, subject to an approved timber harvest plan, from the riparian corridor unless it is shown to be essential to continued viability of the wetland.</p> | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-5c(2): Allowable uses and development within any streamside conservation area shall be limited to uses and methods described in Habitat Development Guidelines where it can be sited, designed, and shown that construction, operation, and maintenance of the use or development would not result in significant, long-term adverse impacts on the functions and values of the riparian habitat. (Existing LCP Revised: Recommendations 9-13 on pages 28-29)</p> | Same |
| <p>12. Prohibit filling, grading, dredging, excavation or construction in the watercourse of a riparian corridor unless it is shown that such action will maintain the value of the area as a habitat for wildlife and aquatic organisms and is compatible with continued viability of the habitat.</p> | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-5c(2): Allowable uses and development within any streamside conservation area shall be limited to uses and methods described in Habitat Development Guidelines where it can be sited, designed, and shown that construction, operation, and maintenance of the use or development would not result in significant, long-term adverse impacts on the functions and values of the riparian habitat. (Existing LCP Revised: Recommendations 9-13 on pages 28-29)</p> | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|--|---|---|
| <i>Riparian (cont.)</i> | | | |
| 13. Prohibit pesticide and herbicide application in a riparian protection zone of 100 feet above the lowest line of streamside vegetation, or within riparian areas as defined, whichever is greater. | REM | Policy C-OSRC-5c(2): Allowable uses and development within any streamside conservation area shall be limited to uses and methods described in Habitat Protection Guidelines where it can be sited, designed, and shown that construction, operation, and maintenance of the use or development would not result in significant, long-term adverse impacts on the functions and values of the riparian habitat. (Existing LCP Revised: Recommendations 9-13 on pages 28-29) | Revised to account for County authority |
| 14. Encourage special range management practices which protect riparian areas. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-5c(2): Allowable uses and development within any streamside conservation area or Riparian Corridor shall be limited to uses and methods described in Habitat Development Guidelines where it can be sited, designed, and shown that construction, operation, and maintenance of the use or development would not result in significant, long-term adverse impacts on the functions and values of the riparian habitat. (Existing LCP Revised: Recommendations 9-13 on pages 28-29) Policy C-OSRC-5d(7): In cooperation with resource agencies, require landowners to erect wildlife-passable fencing around springs, seeps, and ponds located on grazing land as a condition of permit approval and to develop watering areas outside of wetlands and riparian corridors. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 15. Encourage development of livestock watering areas away from the riparian corridor. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-5d(7): In cooperation with resource agencies, require landowners to erect wildlife-passable fencing around springs, seeps, and ponds located on grazing land as a condition of permit approval and to develop watering areas outside of wetlands and riparian corridors. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| <i>Wetlands (Marshes, Ponds, Reservoirs, Seeps)</i> | | | |
| 16. Encourage restoration of marshlands where feasible. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-5d(8): Where wetlands fill or development impacts are permitted in conformity with the Coastal Act and any applicable Local Coastal Plan policies, require mitigation measures to compensate for the temporal and functional loss of affected wetlands and associated habitat. | More detailed |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|--|---|-----------------------|
| <i>Wetlands (Marshes, Ponds, Reservoirs, Seeps) (cont.)</i> | | | |
| | | <p>Mitigation must meet the criteria in the Habitat Protection Guidelines, Appendix E-5.</p> <p>In order of preference, compensatory mitigation may include on-site restoration of degraded wetlands, off-site restoration of degraded wetlands, acquisition of offsite areas of equal or greater biological productivity, or creation of tidal wetlands. Adverse impacts shall be mitigated at a ratio of at least 4:1 for all types of wetlands. If no appropriate restoration site is available, wetland mitigation credit may be purchased, prior to disturbing wetlands, at a resource agency-approved mitigation bank whose service area includes Sonoma County's coastal zone.¹ (New)</p> | |
| <p>17. Exclude all motor vehicles from wetlands. Pedestrian and equestrian traffic should be directed to specific areas with facilities provided to eliminate adverse impacts on biological resources.</p> | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-5d(6): In Wetlands, the following uses and activities shall be prohibited:</p> <p>(1) Motor vehicles.</p> <p>(Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |
| <p>18. Prohibit filling, grading, diking, dredging, and construction in wetlands, except under special conditions delineated in the Coastal Act Section 30233. All projects must maintain or enhance the functional capacity of the wetland or estuary. Dredging, when consistent with the provisions of the Coastal Act and where necessary for the maintenance of the tidal flow and continued viability of the wetland habitat, should be subject to the following conditions:</p> | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-5d(5): Diking, filling, draining, and dredging of coastal waters, wetlands, and estuaries shall be permitted only in accordance with other applicable provisions of this Local Coastal Program, where there is no feasible less environmentally damaging alternative, and where feasible mitigation measures have been provided to minimize adverse environmental effects, and shall be limited to uses and methods described in Habitat Protection Guidelines, Appendix E-5. The more specific permissible use provisions of this policy shall control over the more general use provisions for other types of ESHA identified in Policies C-OSRC-5b(7) and C-OSRC-5e(4). (New)</p> | Same |

¹ The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers maintains an index of approved wetland mitigation banks. The index is available via the agency's San Francisco District website at: <http://www.spn.usace.army.mil/Missions/Regulatory/Mitigation-Banks/Approved-Banks-for-the-San-Francisco-Regulatory-Di/>

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|---|---|-----------------------|
| <i>Wetlands (Marshes, Ponds, Reservoirs, Seeps) (cont.)</i> | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prohibit dredging in breeding and nursery areas and during periods of fish migration and spawning. • Limit dredging to the smallest area feasible. • Require protective measures for dredging and excavation such as silt curtains, diapers, and weirs to protect water quality. • Remove structures as soon as possible once they have served their purpose. <p>Dredge spoils should not be deposited in areas subject to tidal influence or in areas where public access would be significantly adversely affected, as well as certain environmentally sensitive areas.</p> | | | |
| <p>19. Minimize construction on land adjacent to wetlands during maximum seasons of breeding bird activity (March 1 to July 1).</p> | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-5d(5): Diking, filling, draining, and dredging of coastal waters, wetlands, and estuaries shall be permitted only in accordance with other applicable provisions of this Local Coastal Program, where there is no feasible less environmentally damaging alternative, and where feasible mitigation measures have been provided to minimize adverse environmental effects, and shall be limited to uses and methods described in Habitat Protection Guidelines, Appendix E-5. The more specific permissible use provisions of this policy shall control over the more general use provisions for other types of ESHA identified in Policies C-OSRC-5b(7) and C-OSRC-5e(4). (New)</p> | Same |
| <p>20. Prohibit discharge of wastewater into any wetland unless such discharge maintains or enhances the functional capacity of the wetland and maintains the quality of the receiving water.</p> | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-5d(6): In wetlands, the following uses and activities shall be prohibited:</p> <p>(3) Discharge of stormwater or wastewater unless it maintains or enhances wetland function and receiving water quality.</p> <p>(Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|---|--|-----------------------|
| <i>Wetlands (Marshes, Ponds, Reservoirs, Seeps) (cont.)</i> | | | |
| 21. Prohibit grazing or other agricultural uses in designated coastal wetlands. On watershed lands, a fence should be constructed on the outer edge of the wetland. | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-5d(6): In Wetlands, the following uses and activities shall be prohibited:</p> <p>(4) Agricultural activities, including grazing.</p> <p>Policy C-OSRC-5d(7): In cooperation with resource agencies, require landowners to erect wildlife-passable fencing around springs, seeps, and ponds located on grazing land as a condition of permit approval and to develop watering areas outside of wetlands and riparian corridors. (Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |
| 22. Prohibit the diking or filling of seasonal wetlands for the purpose of conversion to agriculture or to accommodate development of any kind. | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-5d(6): In Wetlands, the following uses and activities shall be prohibited:</p> <p>(2) Diking, filling, and dredging, except in accordance with Policy C-OSRC-5d(5). (Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |
| 23. Encourage the fencing of springs, seeps, and pond areas surrounded by lands used for grazing. Water for livestock should be piped outside of the wetland for use by livestock. | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-5d(7): In cooperation with resource agencies, require landowners to erect wildlife-passable fencing around springs, seeps, and ponds located on grazing land as a condition of permit approval and to develop watering areas outside of wetlands and riparian corridors. (Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |
| 24. Prohibit the removal of vegetation from wetlands unless it is shown to be essential to the habitat viability. | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-5d(6): In Wetlands, the following uses and activities shall be prohibited:</p> <p>(5) Removal of vegetation except where necessary to maintain plant, fish and wildlife habitat. (Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |
| 25. Prohibit construction of agricultural, commercial, industrial and residential structures within 100 feet of wetlands. | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-5d(6): In wetlands, the following uses and activities shall be prohibited:</p> <p>(6) Construction of agricultural, commercial, industrial, and residential structures:</p> <p>(a) Within 100 feet.</p> <p>(b) Between 100 to 300 feet, unless it would not have an adverse impact on the wetland. (Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|---|--|-----------------------|
| Wetlands (Marshes, Ponds, Reservoirs, Seeps) (cont.) | | | |
| 26. Between 100 and 300 feet of wetlands, prohibit construction of agricultural, commercial, industrial and residential structures unless an environment assessment finds the wetland would not be affected by such construction. | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-5d(6): In wetlands, the following uses and activities shall be prohibited:</p> <p>(6) Construction of agricultural, commercial, industrial, and residential structures:</p> <p>(a) Within 100 feet.</p> <p>(b) Between 100 to 300 feet, unless it would not have an adverse impact on the wetland.</p> <p>(Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |
| 27. Prohibit new water diversions from streams that feed wetlands without establishing limits on diversion sufficient to protect the wetland. | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-5d(6): In Wetlands, the following uses and activities shall be prohibited:</p> <p>(7) New water diversions from streams which feed wetlands.</p> <p>(Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |
| Bodega Harbor Tideflats | | | |
| 28. Prohibit motor vehicles. | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-5d(4): In Bodega Harbor Tideflats, the following uses and activities shall be prohibited:</p> <p>(1) Motor vehicles.</p> <p>(Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |
| 29. Recommend periodic closing of portions of the tide flats on the west side of the harbor to shellfish harvesting. A rotation system allowing opening of each section of the tide flats every three to five years has been suggested. The County should request evaluation of this proposal by the Department of Fish and Game. | REV | <p>Other Initiative C-OSRC-5: Recommend that the California Department of Fish and Wildlife carry-out the following activities to preserve Bodega Harbor Tideflats:</p> <p>Establish a system in which sections of the tideflats on the west side of Bodega Harbor are open to shellfish harvesting on a rotating basis of every three to five years; and</p> <p>(Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |
| 30. Encourage more restrictive bag and possession limits and gear restrictions for ghost shrimp (<i>Callinassa californiensis</i>), mud shrimp (<i>Upogebia pugettensis</i>), and blood worms (<i>Urechis caupo</i>). | REV | <p>Other Initiative C-OSRC-5: Recommend that the California Department of Fish and Wildlife carry-out the following activities to preserve Bodega Harbor Tideflats:</p> <p>(2) Establish more restrictive bag and possession limits and gear restrictions for ghost shrimp (<i>Callinassa californiensis</i>), mud shrimp (<i>Upogebia pugettensis</i>), and blood worms (<i>Urechis caupo</i>).</p> <p>(Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|---|---|------------------------|
| <i>Bodega Harbor Tideflats (cont.)</i> | | | |
| 31. Enforce leash laws to minimize the effects of domestic animals on marine mammal and shorebird populations on the tide flats. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Law enforcement action |
| 32. Prohibit discharge of effluents in tide flat areas. | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-5d(4): In Bodega Harbor Tideflats, the following uses and activities shall be prohibited:</p> <p>Discharge of effluent, including those of land- and boat-based origins.</p> <p>(Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |
| 33. Prohibit dredging and filling in tide flat areas, except under special conditions delineated in the Coastal Act. The impact of dredging on the surrounding biota can be minimized by restricting operations to winter months. | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-5d(4): In Bodega Harbor Tideflats, the following uses and activities shall be prohibited:</p> <p>(2) Dredging and filling, except in accordance with Policy C-OSRC-5e(5).</p> | Same |
| <i>Rocky Intertidal, Including Sea Bird Rookeries</i> | | | |
| 34. Generally prohibit the development of groins, breakwaters, piers, sea walls, pipelines or other structures in the rocky intertidal areas. These structures or other such construction that alters natural shoreline processes shall be permitted in other resource areas only when required to serve coastal-dependent uses or to protect existing structures or public beaches in danger from erosion and when designed to eliminate or mitigate adverse impacts on local shorelines and supply. Existing marine structures causing water stagnation contributing to pollution problems and fish kills should be phased out or upgraded where feasible. | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-5e(2): At rocky intertidal coastline, the following uses and activities shall be prohibited:</p> <p>(2) Development of groins, breakwaters, piers, sea walls, pipelines, or other structures which alter natural shoreline processes. Existing structures causing water pollution or fish mortality shall be phased-out or upgraded where feasible. (Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |
| 35. Prohibit vehicles in rocky intertidal areas. | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-5e(2): At rocky intertidal coastline, the following uses and activities shall be prohibited:</p> <p>(1) Motor vehicles.</p> <p>(Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|---|---|--|
| Rocky Intertidal, Including Sea Bird Rookeries (cont.) | | | |
| 36. Designate important rocky intertidal areas as Marine or Ecological Reserves. Encourage maintenance of such areas by appropriate public agencies or private groups. | REV | <p>Program C-OSRC-4: Request that the State Department of Parks and Recreation carry-out the following activities to preserve rocky intertidal coastline:</p> <p>(1) Designate important rocky intertidal areas as a Marine Reserve or Ecological Reserve, and encourage public agencies or private groups to maintain these areas.</p> <p>(Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |
| 37. Designate the offshore, mouth, and banks of the Estero Americano as an ecological reserve. Sonoma County should act as the "lead public agency" to preserve this areas as a representative of the coastal estuarine environment of Northern California. | REV | <p>Program C-OSRC-4: Request that the State Department of Parks and Recreation carry-out the following activities to preserve rocky intertidal coastline:</p> <p>(2) Designate the mouth and banks of the Estero Americano and offshore area as an Ecological Reserve and representative of the coastal estuarine environment of Northern California;</p> <p>(Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |
| 38. Encourage utilization of the public shoreline at Salt Point State Park, Kruse Ranch, and the non-historic areas of Fort Ross Park to remove some pressure on the underwater resources at Stillwater Cove. | REV | <p>Program C-OSRC-4: Request that the State Department of Parks and Recreation carry-out the following activities to preserve Rocky Intertidal Coastline:</p> <p>(3) Encourage use of the public shoreline at Salt Point State Park, Kruse Ranch, and the non-historic areas of Fort Ross State Park to reduce pressure on the marine resources at Stillwater Cove Regional Park.</p> <p>(Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |
| 39. Prohibit public access to offshore rocks which are designated as seabird rookeries and nesting areas, and to habitats of seals and sea lions. | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-5e(3): Public access to Offshore Rocks and onshore nesting/rookery areas used by seabirds to breed or nest or which provide habitat for seals and sea lions shall be prohibited.</p> <p>(Existing LCP Revised: Recommendation 39 on page 31)</p> | Same |
| Coastal Bluffs | | | |
| 40. Require erosion and sediment control measures for excavation, grading, and construction operations in coastal permits for areas adjacent to coastal bluffs. | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-10b: Review projects for environmental impact and land use conflicts and consider the following minimum factors when approving mining permits: topsoil salvage; vegetation, fisheries and wildlife impacts; noise impacts; erosion control; roadway</p> | CCC already requires for Coastal Permits; replaced by Policies OSRC-10b, 10c, 10d, and 10f |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|---|--|-----------------------|
| <i>Coastal Bluffs (cont.)</i> | | | |
| | | conditions and capacities; reclamation and bonding; air quality impacts; energy consumption; engineering and geological surveys; aggregate supply and replenishment; drainage; and the need for economical aggregate materials. (GP2020) | |
| 41. Prohibit the removal of sand or rock materials from any part of the bluffs except for road maintenance. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-5f(4): At coastal bluffs, the following uses and activities shall be prohibited: (1) Removal of sand or rock except that necessary for road maintenance. (Existing LCP Revised: Recommendations 40-44 on page 31) | Same |
| 42. Minimize the removal of native plant species from the coastal bluff area. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-5f(13): On coastal bluffs, public access in areas used by birds for nesting or resting, and removal of native plant species shall be minimized. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 43. Prohibit all off-road non-authorized motor vehicle traffic on bluff areas in order to limit compaction, erosion, and destruction of plants. Equestrian traffic should be directed to areas where the subsequent compaction and erosion do not adversely affect the stability of the bluffs. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-5f(4): At coastal bluffs, the following uses and activities shall be prohibited: (2) Public access off established steps, trails, or paths; and motor vehicles. Equestrian use shall be restricted to areas where ground compaction and erosion from use of horses would not have an adverse impact on bluff stability. (Existing LCP Revised: Recommendations 40-44 on page 31) | Same |
| 44. Minimize recreational use of bluff sites known to be used by birds as nesting or roosting areas. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-5f(13): On coastal bluffs, public access in areas used by birds for nesting or resting and removal of native plant species shall be minimized. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 45. Design access points (stairways or trails) which pass through coastal bluff habitat to minimize erosion and disruption of bluff vegetation. Public access must be limited to the trailway corridor. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-5f(3): The following guidelines shall be used for developing public access on Coastal Bluffs: (1) Steps, trails, and paths shall be sited and designed so as to minimize erosion and disruption to vegetation. (Existing LCP Revised: Recommendations 40-44 on page 31) | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|--|--|-----------------------|
| <i>Coastal Bluffs (cont.)</i> | | | |
| <p>46. Develop surfaced paths along cliff tops, and paths or steps down cliff faces in bluff areas with heavy recreational use. In areas of moderate use, paths can be constructed of local material.</p> | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-5f(3): The following guidelines shall be used for developing public access on Coastal Bluffs:</p> <p>(2) In areas of heavy recreational use, surfaced steps, trails, and paths shall be constructed.</p> <p>(Existing LCP Revised: Recommendations 40-44 on page 31)</p> | Same |
| <p>47. Prohibit development within 100 feet of a bluff edge except as described in Environmental Hazards Recommendation 2.</p> | REV | <p>Policy C-PS-2i: Applications for new development or redevelopment on coastal bluff property shall be required to include a site-specific coastal bluff erosion hazards report from a licensed Geotechnical Engineer, Engineering Geologist, or Geophysicist that establishes a geologic setback line for proposed new temporary (e.g., gazebos and portable spas) and permanent (e.g., roads, driveways, water lines, drainage improvements, and septic systems and leachfields) structures and infrastructure. This setback shall be no less than 100 feet and shall establish where on the bluff top stability can reasonably be assured for the economic life of the development (no less than 100 years). All new structures for human occupancy and infrastructure located on a bluff top shall be setback to ensure that it will not be endangered by coastal bluff erosion, retreat, and collapse; and thereby avoid the need for shoreline protection devices during the economic life of the development. The effect of any existing shoreline protective devices shall not be factored into the required stability analysis.</p> <p>The coastal bluff erosion hazards report shall take the following factors into account in establishment of the geologic setback line:</p> <p>(1) Proposed extent of grading and site preparation.</p> <p>(2) Proposed plans for construction of roads, driveways, foundations, water lines, drainage improvements, and septic systems and leachfields.</p> <p>(3) Maximum coastal bluff retreat projected to occur within the economic life of the development (100 years). The projected coastal bluff retreat shall be calculated considering the specific</p> | More detailed |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|--|--|--|
| <i>Coastal Bluffs (cont.)</i> | | | |
| | | geologic and hydrologic conditions on the site; historic coastal bluff retreat data; projections for future sea level rise according to the most up-to-date science; and existing and projections for changes in storm frequency, magnitude, and duration due to climate change. (New) | |
| <i>Grassland-Coastal Prairie</i> | | | |
| 48. Encourage agricultural management practices which minimize soil erosion, sedimentation and siltation. | REV | Other Initiative C-OSRC-9: Encourage agricultural land owners to work closely with the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) and local Resource Conservation Districts to reduce soil erosion and encourage soil restoration. (GP2020) (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 49. Include in coastal permits erosion and sediment control measures for excavation, grading and construction operations. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-8a: Coastal Development Permits shall be subject to the following requirements for reducing erosion and erosion control: (1) Projects shall be designed so that structures and roads are not located on slopes of 30 percent or greater. This requirement is not intended to make any existing parcel unbuildable if the requirements of County Health and Building Codes can be met. (2) Erosion control measures shall be incorporated as part of projects involving construction or grading near waterways or on lands with slopes over 10 percent. (3) A soil conservation program shall be incorporated as part of projects which could increase erosion of waterways or hillsides. (4) New roads and driveways for residential, ranch, and timber harvest uses shall be designed and constructed to retain natural vegetation and topography to the extent feasible. (5) Improvements near waterways or in areas with a high risk of erosion as noted in the <i>Sonoma County Soil Survey</i> shall be designed and constructed to retain natural vegetation and topography to the extent feasible. (GP2020) (Existing LCP Revised: Recommendation 49 on page 31, Recommendations 11-12 on | CCC already requires for Coastal Permits; replaced by Policies OSRC-6j, 8b, 8c, 8d |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|---|---|---|
| <i>Grassland-Coastal Prairie (cont.)</i> | | | |
| | | page 38, Recommendation 40 on page 31, Recommendations 52-53 on page 32, and Recommendation 11 on page 54) | |
| 50. Provide areas for public observation of local cormorant population on Bodega Head and Stump Beach. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-5f(5): Carry-out the following activities to preserve coastal terrace prairie: (1) At Bodega Head and Stump Beach, sites shall be developed for the public to observe cormorants and other seabirds; and (2) At Stillwater Cove County Park, use of the upland area for habitat education activities shall be encouraged. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 51. Encourage use of the upland area of Stillwater Cove County Park as a suitable area for educational facilities concerning coastal grassland or prairie. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-5f(5): Carry-out the following activities to preserve Coastal Terrace Prairie: (2) At Stillwater Cove County Park, use of the upland area for habitat education activities shall be encouraged. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| <i>Coastal Woodland</i> | | | |
| 52. Include erosion and sediment control measures in coastal permits. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-8a: Coastal Development Permits shall be subject to the following requirements for reducing erosion and erosion control: (1) Projects shall be designed so that structures and roads are not located on slopes of 30 percent or greater. This requirement is not intended to make any existing parcel unbuildable if the requirements of County Health and Building Codes can be met. (2) Erosion control measures shall be incorporated as part of projects involving construction or grading near waterways or on lands with slopes over 10 percent. (3) A soil conservation program shall be incorporated as part of projects which could increase erosion of waterways or hillsides. (4) New roads and driveways for residential, ranch, and timber harvest uses shall be designed and constructed to retain natural vegetation and topography to the extent feasible. | CCC already requires for Coastal Permits; replaced by Policies OSRC-6g, 8a, 8b, and Other Initiative OSRC-9 |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|--|--|-----------------------|
| <i>Coastal Woodland (cont.)</i> | | | |
| | | <p>(5) Improvements near waterways or in areas with a high risk of erosion as noted in the Sonoma County Soil Survey shall be designed and constructed to retain natural vegetation and topography to the extent feasible. (GP2020) (Existing LCP Revised: Recommendation 49 on page 31, Recommendations 11-12 on page 38, Recommendation 40 on page 31, Recommendations 52-53 on page 32, and Recommendation 11 on page 54)</p> | |
| <p>53. Minimize disruption to vegetation in all grading operations, placement of fills, or construction of structures.</p> | <p>REV</p> | <p>Policy C-OSRC-8a: Coastal Development Permits shall be subject to the following requirements for reducing erosion and erosion control:</p> <p>(1) Projects shall be designed so that structures and roads are not located on slopes of 30 percent or greater. This requirement is not intended to make any existing parcel unbuildable if the requirements of County Health and Building Codes can be met.</p> <p>(2) Erosion control measures shall be incorporated as part of projects involving construction or grading near waterways or on lands with slopes over 10 percent.</p> <p>(3) A soil conservation program shall be incorporated as part of projects which could increase erosion of waterways or hillsides.</p> <p>(4) New roads and driveways for residential, ranch, and timber harvest uses shall be designed and constructed to retain natural vegetation and topography to the extent feasible.</p> <p>(5) Improvements near waterways or in areas with a high risk of erosion as noted in the <i>Sonoma County Soil Survey</i> shall be designed and constructed to retain natural vegetation and topography to the extent feasible. (GP2020) (Existing LCP Revised: Recommendation 49 on page 31, Recommendations 11-12 on page 38, Recommendation 40 on page 31, Recommendations 52-53 on page 32, and Recommendation 11 on page 54)</p> | <p>More detailed</p> |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|--|---|-----------------------|
| Pygmy Forest | | | |
| 54. Prohibit construction of permanent structures except for those necessary for scientific and educational uses of this particular habitat. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-5f(8): In Mendocino Pygmy Cypress Forest, the following uses and activities shall be prohibited: (2) Construction of permanent structures, except where necessary for scientific and educational uses. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 55. Prohibit off-road motor vehicles, except for those required for management or emergency use in the forest area. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-5f(8): In Mendocino Pygmy Cypress Forest, the following uses and activities shall be prohibited: (1) Motor vehicles, except for those required for management or emergency use. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| Windbreaks | | | |
| 56. Promote retention and proper management of existing windbreaks which are predominantly east-west oriented and do not block extensive coastal views. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-4c: Existing tree windbreaks which are oriented predominantly east-west and do not block or interrupt views to the coast shall be retained; and development of new tree windbreaks which would block or interrupt views to the coast shall be discouraged. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 57. Discourage new windbreaks that would interrupt coastal views. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-4c: Existing tree windbreaks which are oriented predominantly east-west and do not block or interrupt views to the coast shall be retained; and development of new tree windbreaks which would block or interrupt views to the coast shall be discouraged. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| Rare or Endangered Plants and Animals | | | |
| 58. Protect designated sites of rare or endangered plants. Prior to any development in or adjacent to designated sites, conduct precise botanical surveys to determine the distribution of any rare or endangered plants. Botanical surveys should be conducted during natural blooming season of species in question. Development should be sited and designed and constructed to prevent impacts of grading, paving, construction of roads or | REV | Policy C-OSRC-5a(1): Permit applications for development which could have an impact on biological resources shall be accompanied by a detailed biological resources assessment, as required under Policy C-OSRC-5b(3). Biological resources include, but are not limited to, special status plant or animal species and their habitats, coastal dunes, beaches, tidepools, wetlands, estuaries, lagoons, streams and creeks, riparian habitat, oak and other native tree woodlands, and native grasslands. (New) Policy C-OSRC-5b(3): A biological resource assessment shall be required for any project which could impact biological resources. The biological resource | More detailed |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|--|--|-----------------------|
| <i>Rare or Endangered Plants and Animals (cont.)</i> | | | |
| structures, runoff, and erosion from significantly degrading rare or endangered plant habitats, and shall be compatible with the continuance of such habitat areas. | | assessment shall be performed by a qualified biologist and shall meet criteria described in Appendix E-2, Biological Resource Assessment Requirements. Permit Sonoma may require additional site specific information. (New) | |
| 59. Assure compliance with the Federal Endangered Species Act of 1973 and the California Endangered Species Act of 1970 as amended. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Not Necessary |
| <i>Osprey Nest Sites</i> | | | |
| 60. Limit recreational activities near identified osprey nesting sites to low intensity passive recreation. These limitations are especially important during May through July when incubation takes place. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-5f(10): At, around, and near osprey nest sites, the following shall be prohibited: Recreational activities shall be limited to low-intensity passive recreation, particularly during the period of egg incubation in May to July and activities should be further limited. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 61. Protect osprey nesting sites located along the Willow Creek, Freezeout Creek and Russian River uplands from disturbance by logging activities. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-5f(10): Osprey nest sites located adjacent to Willow Creek, Freezeout Creek, and Russian River shall be protected from disturbance by timber harvesting activities. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 62. Prohibit removal of snags and dead tops of live trees in areas surrounding identified osprey sites. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-5f(10): At, around, and near osprey nest sites, the following shall be prohibited: (2) Removal of snags and dead tops of live trees. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 63. Prohibit removal of osprey nests. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-5f(10): At, around, and near osprey nest sites, the following shall be prohibited: (1) Removal of osprey nests. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 64. Prohibit development of structures and avoid development of new roads if at all possible within the nesting site areas. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-5f(10): At, around, and near osprey nest sites, the following shall be prohibited: (3) Development of new structures and roads. | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|--|--|---|
| <i>Heron Rookeries</i> | | | |
| 65. Prohibit public access in areas of identified heron rookeries. Access to Penny Island should be limited to low intensity usage for scientific and educational purposes. Scientific and educational use should be managed so as not to interfere with heron nesting. (February to mid-July). | REV | Policy C-OSRC-5f(12): At offshore rocky and intertidal egret or heron rookeries, the following uses and activities shall be prohibited: (1) Public access. (3) On Penny Island, uses other than low intensity scientific and educational uses, managed so as not to interfere with nesting activity (February to mid-July). (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 66. Prohibit new development (construction of structures or roads) within 600 feet of a rookery. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-5f(12): At offshore rocky and intertidal egret or heron rookeries, the following uses and activities shall be prohibited: (2) Construction of structures or roads within 600 feet. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| <i>Spotted Owl Territory</i> | | | |
| 67. Minimize impacts of development near identified Spotted Owl nesting and breeding areas. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. Related policies include: C-OSRC-5b(1), C-OSRC-5b(2), and C-OSRC-5b(4) | Listed Species, Habitat protected as ESHA |
| <i>Anadromous Fish Streams</i> | | | |
| 68. Maintain flows in streams identified as anadromous fish habitat at a minimum flow level as required to continue their use as an anadromous fish spawning area. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-5c(5): To protect fishery resources and minimize impacts on water supply, projects which would limit in-stream flows shall comply with State Water Resources Control Board’s Policy for Maintaining Instream Flows in Northern California Coastal Streams, adopted under Resolution 2013-0035, effective February 4, 2014 (23 CCR Section 2921). (New) | Same |
| 69. Stop all stream diversions when stream flow falls below minimum flow standards until stream flows return to levels above the minimum standards. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-5c(5): To protect fishery resources and minimize impacts on water supply, projects which would limit in-stream flows shall comply with State Water Resources Control Board’s Policy for Maintaining Instream Flows in Northern California Coastal Streams, adopted under Resolution 2013-0035, effective February 4, 2014 (23 CCR Section 2921). (New) | Same |
| 70. Prohibit dredging in all anadromous fish streams. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-5c(6): In Anadromous Fish Streams (Chinook and Coho Salmon Habitat), the following uses and activities shall be prohibited: | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|--|---|-----------------------|
| Anadromous Fish Streams (cont.) | | | |
| | | (1) Dredging. (2) Dams and other structures which would prevent upstream migration of anadromous fish unless other measures are used to allow fish to bypass these structures. (Existing LCP Revised) | |
| 71. Prohibit dams or other structures which would prevent upstream migration of anadromous fish in streams designated as "anadromous fish habitat" unless other measures are used to allow fish to bypass these obstacles. Any bypass measures should be approved by the Department of Fish and Game. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-5c6): In Anadromous Fish Streams (Chinook and Coho Salmon Habitat), the following uses and activities shall be prohibited: (1) Dredging. (2) Dams and other structures which would prevent upstream migration of anadromous fish unless other measures are used to allow fish to bypass these structures. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| Marine Mammal Haul-Out Grounds | | | |
| 72. Limit recreational activities near and prohibit disturbance of designated areas used for harbor seal and sea lion hauling-out grounds to passive recreation to insure continued viability of these habitats. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-5e(5): Disturbance of marine mammal haul-out grounds shall be prohibited and recreational activities near these areas shall be limited to passive recreation. Disturbance of areas used by harbor seals and sea lions shall be avoided. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 73. Encourage annual monitoring by the Department of Fish and Game of designated marine mammal hauling-out grounds to determine the condition of hauling out grounds and to take counts of mammals for long term management of marine mammals. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-5e(6): Encourage the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to monitor Marine Mammal Haul-Out Grounds on an annual basis to determine their condition and level of use by marine mammals; and to incorporate this information into its management plan for marine mammals. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| Kelp Beds | | | |
| 74. To the extent consistent with all applicable provisions of law, including but not limited to Section 30260 of the Coastal Act, encourage the appropriate State and Federal jurisdictions to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor the size and habitat viability of kelp beds and their associated fisheries resources. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-5e(7): Encourage the pertinent state and federal agencies to carry-out the following activities to preserve kelp beds: (1) Monitor the size and viability of the kelp beds for all ecological functions including fish habitat; (2) Regulate and monitor activities such as sewage disposal, dredging, and renewable energy development, and | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|--|--|-----------------------|
| <i>Kelp Beds (cont.)</i> | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor and regulate activities such as sewage disposal, dredging, and renewable energy development which may adversely affect near shore marine water quality and thus kelp resources. • Prohibit petroleum and other forms of energy development which may significantly impact the environment through normal operations or accidents (oil spills, well blowouts, etc.). | | <p>other projects which could degrade nearshore marine water quality and hence have an adverse impact on kelp habitat;</p> <p>(3) Prohibit petroleum and other forms of energy development which may have a significant impact on kelp beds as a result of normal operations or accidents (e.g., oil spills and well blow-outs); and</p> <p>(4) Require applicants for commercial or industrial kelp harvesting to conduct studies, in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, of the specific sites or areas proposed for kelp harvesting. The studies shall identify measures that could be implemented following harvest to restore these sites to their pre-harvest condition, including identification of reference sites and performance standards for determining restoration success. Require any authorized harvesting to be conducted consistent with the recommendation of approved studies, including site restoration measures. (Existing LCP Revised)</p> | |
| 75. Require specific site investigations prior to any kelp harvesting. | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-5e(7): Encourage the pertinent state and federal agencies to carry-out the following activities to preserve kelp beds:</p> <p>(4) Require applicants for commercial or industrial kelp harvesting to conduct studies, in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, of the specific sites or areas proposed for kelp harvesting. The studies shall identify measures that could be implemented following harvest to restore these sites to their pre-harvest condition, including identification of reference sites and performance standards for determining restoration success. Require any authorized harvesting to be conducted consistent with the recommendation of approved studies, including site restoration measures. (Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|--|---|---|
| <i>Open Water</i> | | | |
| 76. Prohibit construction of new structures, and dredging, filling or diking in open water except in accordance with Section 30233 of the 1976 Coastal Act. Open water shall be defined in a manner consistent with the Commission's Wetlands Guidelines. | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-5d(5): Diking, filling, draining, and dredging of coastal waters, wetlands, and estuaries shall be permitted only in accordance with other applicable provisions of this Local Coastal Program, where there is no feasible less environmentally damaging alternative, and where feasible mitigation measures have been provided to minimize adverse environmental effects, and shall be limited to uses and methods described in Habitat Protection Guidelines, Appendix E-5. The more specific permissible use provisions of this policy shall control over the more general use provisions for other types of ESHA identified in Policy C-OSRC-5b(7) and C-OSRC-5e(4). (New)</p> <p>Policy C-OSRC-5d(6): In wetlands, the following uses and activities shall be prohibited:</p> <p>(2) Diking, filling, and dredging, except in accordance with Policy C-OSRC-5d(5). (Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |
| 77. Prohibit dredging during periods of fish migration and spawning, and limit dredging to the smallest area feasible. | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-5d(5): Diking, filling, draining, and dredging of coastal waters, wetlands, and estuaries shall be permitted only in accordance with other applicable provisions of this Local Coastal Program, where there is no feasible less environmentally damaging alternative, and where feasible mitigation measures have been provided to minimize adverse environmental effects, and shall be limited to uses and methods described in Habitat Development Guidelines, Appendix E-5. The more specific permissible use provisions of this policy shall control over the more general use provisions for other types of ESHA identified in Policy C-OSRC-5b(7) and C-OSRC-5e(4). (New)</p> | Same |
| <i>Designated Sanctuary Preservation and Conservation Areas</i> | | | |
| 78. Implement Sanctuary-Preservation and Conservation Area limitations in order to assure special consideration and protection for unique resources of the coastal zone. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Policy for implementing policies, regulations, and standards is not necessary |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|--|--|-----------------------|
| <i>Archaeological Resources</i> | | | |
| 79. Require an archaeological study when proposed projects are within designated archaeological site areas, and require implementation of reasonable mitigation measures when recommended by the study. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-14d: Refer applications for coastal development permits to the Northwest Information Center at Sonoma State University to determine if the project site may contain archaeological or historic resources. If a site is likely to have archaeological resources, a field survey and an archaeological resources report that contains the results of the survey and includes appropriate mitigation measures shall be required. If the site is likely to have historic resources, a field survey and an historic resources report that contains an evaluation of whether the historic resources are significant under state and federal criteria shall be required. (GP2020) (Existing LCP Revised: Recommendations 79-80 on page 34) | Same |
| 80. Continue to send all projects subject to CEQA to Sonoma State Anthropology Laboratory for review. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-14d: Refer applications for coastal development permits to the Northwest Information Center at Sonoma State University to determine if the project site may contain archaeological or historic resources. If a site is likely to have archaeological resources, a field survey and an archaeological resources report that contains the results of the survey and includes appropriate mitigation measures shall be required. If the site is likely to have historic resources, a field survey and an historic resources report that contains an evaluation of whether the historic resources are significant under state and federal criteria shall be required. (GP2020) (Existing LCP Revised: Recommendations 79-80 on page 34) | Same |

DEVELOPMENT / HOUSING

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|--|---|--|
| <i>Subsidies</i> | | | |
| <p>1. Encourage the use of subsidy programs administered by the Housing Authority for conservation and production of affordable housing.</p> | REV | <p>Policy C-LU-5a: Continue all existing County and Community Development Commission sponsored funding programs, including but not limited to Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME, Low/Moderate Income Housing Asset Funds (LMIHAF), and County Fund for Housing (CFH) funding programs. Continue to require that at least 30 percent of the units assisted with County funds be affordable to extremely-low income households. Evaluate these existing programs in view of changing housing needs and policies, and seek opportunities for program expansion and more efficient use of limited resources. (New: HCD certified General Plan 2014 Housing Element Policy HE-1a)</p> | Replaced with current programs |
| <i>Permit Requirements</i> | | | |
| <p>2. Require in housing projects of 11 or more units that a minimum of 15 percent of the units (not less than one) be affordable. Such units would be subject to resale or rental controls.</p> | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Consistent with Inland Housing Element |
| <p>3. Require developers of housing projects of five to ten units to provide either of the following: (a) 15 percent of the units to be affordable, or (b) pay a fee of six percent of the market price to a special coastal zone site acquisition and development fund to be administered by the Housing Authority.</p> | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Previous fee policy option not implemented |
| <p>4. Encourage a mix of lower and moderate-income units and rental and sale units, when affordable housing provisions are required. The exact proportions will be determined on a project-specific basis by the Director of the Permit and Resource Management Department.</p> | REV | <p>Policy C-LU-5i: Encourage a mix of low and moderate income housing units, and rental and sale units. Encourage diverse unit design including visitability and universal design. (Existing LCP Revised per HCD certified General Plan 2014 Housing Element)</p> | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|--|--|--|
| Permit Requirements (cont.) | | | |
| 5. Prohibit conversion of rental units currently providing lower and moderate-income housing opportunities to condominiums unless the conversion provides a greater affordable housing opportunity. | REV | Policy C-LU-5p: Prohibit conversion of rental units currently providing low and moderate income housing opportunities unless the conversion provides a greater affordable housing opportunity. (Existing LCP) | Same |
| 6. Prohibit the demolition of housing for persons of low and moderate income unless such demolition would be coupled with subsequent reconstruction of replacement housing of comparable rental value. | REV | Policy C-LU-5o: Prohibit the demolition of housing for persons of low and moderate income, unless such demolition would be coupled with subsequent reconstruction of replacement housing of comparable rental value. Demolition may be permitted in advance of the replacement housing if the Director determines that the removal of the unit(s) is necessary to protect public health and safety. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| Incentives | | | |
| 7. Provide density bonuses and housing opportunities for housing projects which meet the minimum criteria established in General Plan Housing Element Policy HE-2g and HE1-c, both as modified by the Coastal Plan, and Coastal Plan Housing "Incentives" section. | REV | Policy C-LU-5b: Continue the County's existing density bonus programs, including the state density bonus program and the County's programs. Continue to evaluate these programs in view of changing housing needs and policies, and expand or modify as needed to increase opportunities for housing. (New: HCD certified General Plan 2014 Housing Element Policy HE-1b) | Same |
| 8. Allow second rental units as specified in the Coastal Zoning Ordinance. | REV | Policy C-LU-5r: Allow Accessory Dwelling Units as specified in the Coastal Zoning Ordinance. (Existing LCP) | Same |
| 9. Include in the Zoning Ordinance provisions for the waiver of nonconforming use restrictions for low or moderate-income units, if the owner is willing to accept resale or rental controls. | REV | Policy C-LU-5i: Encourage a mix of low and moderate income housing units, and rental and sale units. Encourage diverse unit design including visitability and universal design. (Existing LCP Revised per HCD certified General Plan 2014 Housing Element) | Previous policy not implemented into Zoning Code |
| General | | | |
| 10. Concentrate housing production efforts in areas where public sewer and water service is available. | RET | Policy C-LU-5m: Concentrate housing production efforts in areas where public sewer and water service are available. (Existing LCP) | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|--|--|-----------------------|
| <i>General (cont.)</i> | | | |
| 11. Encourage development of employer provided or subsidized affordable housing for employees. | RET | Other Initiative C-LU-2: Encourage development of employer provided or subsidized affordable housing for employees. (Existing LCP) | Same |
| 12. Prescribe rental and resale controls on a project specific basis subject to the approval of the Director of Housing. | REV | Policy C-LU-5k: Require long-term Affordable Housing Agreement for affordable housing units. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |

DEVELOPMENT / LAND USE

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|---|--|-----------------------|
| <i>General</i> | | | |
| <p>1. Prior to submittal of the implementation program, designate the principal permitted uses for each land use category in the Land Use Plan, including any desired changes in the uses presently identified for the resource area land use designations. The designated uses shall be reviewed for consistency with the policies of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act and approved.</p> | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Completed program |
| <p>2. Designate as within rural community boundaries: land within the existing residential subdivision boundaries of Jenner, Rancho del Paradiso, West Beach, Sereno del Mar, Gleasons Beach, Carmet, and Salmon Creek.</p> | REV | Policy C-LU-2j: Continue to designate as Rural Communities the lands within existing residential subdivisions Jenner, Rancho del Paradiso, West Beach, Sereno del Mar, Gleason Beach, Carmet, and Salmon Creek. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| <p>3. Designate the Timber Cove rural community boundary as the subdivision, the Timber Cove Inn, and existing developed areas adjacent to the subdivision south to the Fort Ross Store area.</p> | REV | Policy C-LU-2k: Continue to designate as Rural Communities the Timber Cove, Timber Cove Inn, and existing developed areas adjacent to the subdivision south to and including the Fort Ross Store. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| <p>4. Designate as within rural community boundaries the existing developed areas at Duncans Mills, Valley Ford and Stewarts Point. Stewarts Point and Duncans Mills Rural Community boundaries may be changed in the future to reflect Historic District boundaries.</p> | REV | Policy C-LU-2l: Continue to designate as Rural Communities existing developed areas at Duncans Mills, Valley Ford and Stewarts Point. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| <p>5. Designate as within urban service boundaries those lands shown inside the urban service boundaries on the General Plan Land Use Maps for Bodega Bay and The Sea Ranch.</p> | REV | Policy C-LU-2i: Continue to identify Urban Service Area Boundaries on the Land Use Maps for The Sea Ranch North (Figure C-LU-1a), The Sea Ranch South (Figure C-LU-1b), and Bodega Bay (Figure C-LU-1j). (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|---|---|--|
| <i>General (cont.)</i> | | | |
| <p>6. Designate as rural those lands shown outside the urban service and rural community boundaries on the Land Use Maps.</p> | <p>REM</p> | <p>No specific corresponding policy identified. Related policies presented below.</p> <p>Policy C-LU-2j: Continue to designate as Rural Communities the lands within existing residential subdivisions Jenner, Rancho del Paradiso, West Beach, Sereno del Mar, Gleason Beach, Carmet, and Salmon Creek. (Existing LCP Revised)</p> <p>Policy C-LU-2k: Continue to designate as Rural Communities the Timber Cove, Timber Cove Inn, and existing developed areas adjacent to the subdivision south to and including the Fort Ross Store. (Existing LCP Revised)</p> <p>Policy C-LU-2l: Continue to designate as Rural Communities existing developed areas at Duncans Mills, Valley Ford and Stewarts Point. (Existing LCP Revised)</p> | <p>Same</p> |
| <p>7. Limit expansion and formation of public sewer services to within designated urban service boundaries. Existing facilities outside of the Sea Ranch Urban Service Boundary may continue to be served, but no expansion is permitted.</p> | <p>REV</p> | <p>Policy C-PF-2b: A public water or wastewater district shall not be formed or expanded except where assessment for, and provision of, the service would not induce new development inconsistent with the Local Coastal Plan in accordance with California Coastal Act Section 30254. New development within the service boundary of a public water or wastewater district shall be required to connect to the district for water or wastewater service. (New)</p> <p>Policy C-PF-2e: Extension of public sewer services outside of the boundary of The Sea Ranch and Bodega Bay Urban Service Areas shall be avoided. Exceptions to this policy shall be considered, to the extent allowed by law, only:</p> <p>(1) Where necessary to resolve a public health hazard resulting from existing development (i.e., contamination of land, surface water, or groundwater resulting from failure of an existing septic system or other wastewater management system); or</p> | <p>Replaced by specific policies in Public Facilities and Services Element</p> |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|---|--|---|
| <i>General (cont.)</i> | | | |
| | | <p>(2) Where appropriate to allow for development of public park or recreation facilities.</p> <p>A Coastal Permit shall be required for extension of public sewer services outside of an Urban Service Area.</p> <p>Where several failing septic systems or other health and safety problems which pose a significant hazard to human health and safety exist outside an Urban Service Area that could be addressed by extension of public sewer service, use Outside Service Area Agreements which limit the use of existing development. The evaluation should assure sufficient capacity to serve existing connections and potential buildout in the existing Urban Service Area.</p> <p>A Coastal Permit shall be required for extension of public sewer services outside of an Urban Service Area. (GP2020 Revised)</p> | |
| <p>8. Allow service extensions to public parklands although they may not be within urban boundaries, only where consistent with General Plan Policies PF-1d and PF-1e.</p> | <p>REV</p> | <p>Policy C-LU-2m: Water and sewer service extensions to public parklands outside of Urban Service Areas may be allowed only where consistent with the Public Facilities and Services and Public Access Elements. (Existing LCP Revised)</p> | <p>More detailed</p> |
| <p>9. Allow residential development on existing legally subdivided lots if water, septic and other applicable regulations are met.</p> | <p>REM</p> | <p>No specific corresponding policy identified. Related policies presented below.</p> <p>Policy C-PF-2a: Growth and development shall be planned in accordance with existing water and wastewater treatment and disposal capacities and facilities in accordance with California Coastal Act. Development, including land divisions, shall be prohibited unless adequate water and wastewater treatment and disposal capacities and facilities exist to accommodate such development. In acting on any Coastal Permit, determine that adequate capacity is available and reserved in the system to serve Coastal Act priority land uses (i.e., coastal-dependent uses, agriculture, essential public services,</p> | <p>Replaced by specific policies in Land Use and Public Facilities and Services Element</p> |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|---|---|---|
| <i>General (cont.)</i> | | | |
| | | and public recreation; see Land Use Element, Table C-LU-2). In areas with limited service capacity, new development for a non-priority use, including land divisions, not specified above shall only be allowed if adequate capacity remains for Coastal Act priority land uses. (GP2020) | |
| 10. Require that land divisions and development proposals outside urban service boundaries conform to the resource capabilities of the land as recommended in the Resources chapter. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. Related policies presented below. Policy C-PF-2a: Growth and development shall be planned in accordance with existing water and wastewater treatment and disposal capacities and facilities in accordance with California Coastal Act. Development, including land divisions, shall be prohibited unless adequate water and wastewater treatment and disposal capacities and facilities exist to accommodate such development. In acting on any Coastal Permit, determine that adequate capacity is available and reserved in the system to serve Coastal Act priority land uses (i.e., coastal-dependent uses, agriculture, essential public services, and public recreation; see Land Use Element, Table C-LU-2). In areas with limited service capacity, new development for a non-priority use, including land divisions, not specified above shall only be allowed if adequate capacity remains for Coastal Act priority land uses. (GP2020) | Replaced by specific policies in Public Facilities and Services Element |
| 11. Allow new and expanded commercial development consistent with the Coastal Plan within urban service and rural community boundaries if water, septic and other applicable regulations are met. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. Related policies presented below. Policy C-PF-2a: Growth and development shall be planned in accordance with existing water and wastewater treatment and disposal capacities and facilities in accordance with California Coastal Act. Development, including land divisions, shall be prohibited unless adequate water and wastewater treatment and disposal capacities and facilities exist to accommodate such development. In acting on any Coastal Permit, | Allowed by Land Use. Policy replaced by specific policies in Public Facilities and Services Element |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|---|---|--|
| <i>General (cont.)</i> | | | |
| | | determine that adequate capacity is available and reserved in the system to serve Coastal Act priority land uses (i.e., coastal-dependent uses, agriculture, essential public services, and public recreation; see Land Use Element, Table C-LU-2). In areas with limited service capacity, new development for a non-priority use, including land divisions, not specified above shall only be allowed if adequate capacity remains for Coastal Act priority land uses. (GP2020) | |
| 12. Provide for commercial development only within designated urban service and rural community boundaries except where consistent with development recommendations in the visitor serving facilities section. | REV | Policy C-LU-2n: Provide for commercial development only within designated Urban Service Areas and Rural Community boundaries, except where development proposed for areas beyond these boundaries would be consistent with the Public Facilities and Services and Public Access Elements. (Existing LCP Revised) | More detailed |
| 13. Only coastal dependent industrial land uses are appropriate along the Sonoma Coast. Locate such uses in urban service areas able to accommodate them. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. Related policies presented below. Policy C-LU-2f: Fishing related industrial uses that require public services shall be located near Bodega Bay. Other fishing related commercial and industrial uses shall be considered coastal dependent uses. (GP2020) Policy C-PF-2p: Where existing or planned public works facilities can accommodate only a limited amount of new development, services to coastal dependent land use, essential public services and basic industries, public recreation, commercial recreation, and visitor-serving land uses shall not be precluded by other development in accordance with California Coastal Act Sections 30222 and 30254. The use of private lands suitable for visitor-serving commercial recreational facilities designed to enhance public opportunities for coastal recreation shall have priority over private residential, general industrial, or general commercial development, but not over agriculture or coastal-dependent industry. (New) | Replaced by Commercial Fishing Land Use designation criteria |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|---|--|--|
| <i>General (cont.)</i> | | | |
| 14. Apply site and design guidelines contained in the visual section to development in urban areas and coastal zone scenic view sheds. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. Related policies presented below. Policy C-OSRC-4b: The Coastal Design Guidelines (Appendix A-1) shall be used for new development throughout the coast except where more restrictive community design guidelines have been adopted. (Existing LCP Revised: Recommendations 4-25 on pages 173-180) | Replaced by specific policies in Open Space and Resource Conservation Element |
| 15. Encourage Coastal Conservancy projects or other programs to protect certain lands having high public benefit. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. Related policies presented below. Other Initiative C-OSRC-2: Support voluntary programs for habitat restoration and enhancement, hazardous fuel management, removal and control of invasive exotics, native plant revegetation, treatment of woodlands affected by sudden oak death, use of fencerows and hedgerows, and management of biotic habitat. (GP2020) Other Initiative C-OSRC-3: Support acquisition of conservation easements or fee title by the Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District of designated ESHA. (GP2020) | Expanded for all protection and restoration projects |
| 16. Encourage consolidations of lots in high hazard areas and visually or environmentally sensitive areas. | REV | Policy C-PS-2e: Encourage the consolidation of lots and new structures in high hazard areas. (Existing LCP Revised) | Replaced by specific policies in Public Safety and Open Space and Resource Conservation Elements |
| <i>The Sea Ranch</i> | | | |
| 16. Enforce the Height, Site, and Bulk Guidelines adopted pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 30610.6 (e) (see Appendix B). Incorporate these Guidelines into The Sea Ranch Design Review process. | REV | Policy C-LU-3a: The Height, Site, and Bulk Guidelines for The Sea Ranch adopted pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 30610.6 (e) shall be applied to all new development subject to design review. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 17. Allow Oceanic Properties, Inc. 300 additional residential units and up to 100 lodge units on the conditions that: | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Project already completed |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|---|--|---|
| <i>The Sea Ranch (cont.)</i> | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fifteen percent of the total 300 are constructed affordable housing units. • Intersection improvements at Highway 1 and Halcyon, Deer Trail and the Lodge entrance are constructed as recommended in the Transportation section. • Two accessways in Units 34-A and 36 are improved as recommended in the Access section. • Sites which would accommodate 100 units for the purpose of transfer programs are designated. | | | |
| <i>Bodega Bay</i> | | | |
| 18. Prohibit development on Sensitive and Hazardous lands unless the project can be accomplished according to criteria specified in the preceding Sensitive and Hazardous Areas discussion. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Sensitive & Hazardous designation removed |
| 19. Prohibit further residential land divisions west of Eastside Road due to the unstable nature of the area's surface and bedrock geology. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Covered by Public Safety Element policies |
| 20. Stage development and annexation to the Public Utilities District in accordance with the phased Land Use Plans. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | No longer phased Land Use Plan |
| 21. Require PUD service to all new development within the Urban Service Boundary. | REV | Policy C-LU-4a: All new development within the Urban Service Area Boundary of Bodega Bay shall be served by the Bodega Bay Public Utility District. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 22. Encourage provision of affordable new housing units. | REV | Policy C-LU-4b: Encourage the provision of new affordable housing units by the following means: 1) designate the primary residential area south of old town Bodega Bay as a Housing Opportunity Area, and 2) provide areas for temporary vehicle camping in RVs for transient fishermen on lands designated Commercial Fishing. (Existing LCP Revised) | More detailed |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|---|---|---|
| Bodega Bay (cont.) | | | |
| 23. Explore possible sites for temporary vehicle camping. | REV | Policy C-LU-4b: Encourage the provision of new affordable housing units by the following means: 1) designate the primary residential area south of old town Bodega Bay as a Housing Opportunity Area, and 2) provide areas for temporary vehicle camping in RVs for transient fishermen on lands designated Commercial Fishing. (Existing LCP Revised) | More detailed |
| 24. Implement Stage II of the Bodega Bay Land Use Plan only upon resolution of present traffic and water constraints. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Bodega bay bypass no longer being developed |
| 25. Relate new development to water capacities: If adequate water is not available, develop a building permit allocation system to limit development, and pursue development of additional water supplies. | REV | No specific corresponding policy identified. Policy C-PF-2a: Growth and development shall be planned in accordance with existing water and wastewater treatment and disposal capacities and facilities in accordance with California Coastal Act. Development, including land divisions, shall be prohibited unless adequate water and wastewater treatment and disposal capacities and facilities exist to accommodate such development. In acting on any Coastal Development Permit, determine that adequate capacity is available and reserved in the system to serve Coastal Act priority land uses (i.e., coastal-dependent uses, agriculture, essential public services, and public recreation). In areas with limited service capacity, new development for a non-priority use, including land divisions, not specified above shall only be allowed if adequate capacity remains for Coastal Act priority land uses. (New) Policy C-PF-2p: Where existing or planned public works facilities can accommodate only a limited amount of new development, services to coastal dependent land use, essential public services and basic industries, public recreation, commercial recreation, and visitor-serving land uses shall not be precluded by other development in accordance with | More detailed |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|---|--|--|
| <i>Bodega Bay (cont.)</i> | | | |
| | | <p>California Coastal Act Sections 30222 and 30254. The use of private lands suitable for visitor-serving commercial recreational facilities designed to enhance public opportunities for coastal recreation shall have priority over private residential, general industrial, or general commercial development, but not over agriculture or coastal-dependent industry. (New)</p> <p>Policy C-LU-4c: New development proposed within the Bodega Bay Urban Service Area shall require the applicant to provide evidence in the form of a letter from Bodega Bay Public Utility District of an adequate water supply to serve the development. If an adequate water supply is not available to serve all planned development, development shall be limited by implementing a system for allocating building permits according to the available water supply, or the development shall be contingent upon provision of additional water supplies. (Existing LCP Revised)</p> | |
| <p>26. Insure that adequate water capacity is reserved to serve the first three priority developments listed below as they are proposed in the Phase I development plan for Bodega Bay, by requiring that if water supplies do not prove adequate to all land uses designated in the Phase I plan, a minimum of 30 percent of the projected available amount shall be reserved for the designated priority uses. A similar standard shall be applied to Phase II development if necessary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • moderate expansion of marina facilities and fishing-related commercial facilities • local serving commercial facilities • affordable housing projects (50 units) | <p>REM</p> | <p>No specific corresponding policy identified. Related policies presented below.</p> <p>Policy C-PF-2a: Growth and development shall be planned in accordance with existing water and wastewater treatment and disposal capacities and facilities in accordance with California Coastal Act. Development, including land divisions, shall be prohibited unless adequate water and wastewater treatment and disposal capacities and facilities exist to accommodate such development. In acting on any Coastal Development Permit, determine that adequate capacity is available and reserved in the system to serve Coastal Act priority land uses (i.e., coastal-dependent uses, agriculture, essential public services, and public recreation). In areas with limited service capacity, new development for a non-priority use, including land divisions, not specified above shall only be allowed if adequate capacity remains for Coastal Act priority land uses. (New)</p> | <p>Updated for future development with Public Facilities and services Policies</p> |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|---|--|------------------------------|
| <i>Bodega Bay (cont.)</i> | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bodega Harbor and other existing residential commitments expanded general commercial and residential uses | | <p>Policy C-PF-2p: Where existing or planned public works facilities can accommodate only a limited amount of new development, services to coastal dependent land use, essential public services and basic industries, public recreation, commercial recreation, and visitor-serving land uses shall not be precluded by other development in accordance with California Coastal Act Sections 30222 and 30254. The use of private lands suitable for visitor-serving commercial recreational facilities designed to enhance public opportunities for coastal recreation shall have priority over private residential, general industrial, or general commercial development, but not over agriculture or coastal-dependent industry. (New)</p> <p>Policy C-LU-4c: New development proposed within the Bodega Bay Urban Service Area shall require the applicant to provide evidence in the form of a letter from Bodega Bay Public Utility District of an adequate water supply to serve the development. If an adequate water supply is not available to serve all planned development, development shall be limited by implementing a system for allocating building permits according to the available water supply, or the development shall be contingent upon provision of additional water supplies. (Existing LCP Revised)</p> | |
| 27. Require completion of the Porto Bodega Study prior to any land use changes in the area. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Porto Bodega Study completed |
| 28. Allow a tourist commercial project in the Recreation-Scenic Design category in Bodega Bay if it can meet visual design guidelines, preserve on site trees for wildlife habitat and mitigate adverse traffic impacts. Any proposed project is to be considered only in connection with a comprehensive development plan for the complete Loop Road area. | REV | Policy C-LU-4e: A Commercial Tourist (CT) land use category has been applied on the parcels occupied by the Bodega Harbor Inn (Assessors Parcels 100-080-070, 100-080-016 and 100-080-017) only to accommodate the historic and ongoing use of the property as a 15-unit motel. To ensure compatibility with the surrounding residential area, no other uses permitted in the CT Zone are allowed and any structures that exceed 16 feet | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|---|---|---|
| <i>Bodega Bay (cont.)</i> | | | |
| <p>a) Allow a land use designation of "Visitor Serving Commercial" and a zoning of "CT - Tourist Commercial" on Assessors Parcels 100-080-25 and 100-080-15 only to accommodate the historic and ongoing use of the property as a 15-unit motel. To insure compatibility with the surrounding residential area, other uses permitted within the Tourist Commercial District shall not be permitted, nor any structures permitted to exceed a 16 ft. height. Design Review should be required on any new construction outside of the existing building footprints.</p> | | <p>in height shall not be permitted. Design review shall be required on any new construction outside of the existing building footprints. (Existing LCP Revised)</p> | |
| <p>29. Consider requiring intersection improvements at Highway 1 and Eastside and/or Bay Flat Roads in conjunction with development along Eastside Road.</p> | REV | <p>Policy C-LU-4f: Consider requiring intersection improvements at State Highway 1 and Eastside Road and/or Bay Flat Road as a condition of approval of development along Eastside Road. (Existing LCP)</p> | Same |
| <p>30. Require a precise development plan for any development in the area south of Taylor Tract, except that a single family subdivision at 4 units per acre with 15 percent affordable units shall not require a precise development plan. The precise development plan may include a variety of housing types in accordance with Core Area Design Guidelines.</p> | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Single Family subdivision being developed in area |
| <p>31. Require a master plan of the entire Tides complex (both sides of Highway 1) prior to approval of any new or expanded uses. The master plan should provide a parking solution for the total development, maximum hillside development of 104 units, and a minimum of 16 units of affordable employee housing all conforming to Coastal Plan Design Guidelines. If a reduction in the intensity of use is necessary, that reduction should be from Commercial or transient housing, not employee housing or necessary parking.</p> | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Plan no longer necessary |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|---|--|--|
| <i>Bodega Bay (cont.)</i> | | | |
| 32. Require traffic improvements including signalization, left turn lanes, and improved access from the Bayside parking lot in connection with any new or expanded uses at the Tides. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | No longer necessary |
| 33. Encourage the formation of a Bodega Bay Municipal Advisory Council. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | No longer necessary |
| <i>Outer Continental Shelf Development</i> | | | |
| 34. Delay the entire lease sale so that all pertinent studies may be completed and included. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | No longer necessary, Designated as Marine Sanctuary, Offshore drilling is prohibited |
| 35. Delete the Bodega Basin from Lease Sale #53. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | No longer necessary, Designated as Marine Sanctuary, Offshore drilling is prohibited |
| 36. Delete the Point Arena Basin from Lease Sale #53. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | No longer necessary, Designated as Marine Sanctuary, Offshore drilling is prohibited |
| 37. Require a Coastal Plan Amendment for any proposed on-shore facility to support off-shore oil and gas exploration or development. Any such amendment shall not be effective until a majority of the electors in Sonoma County, in a general or special election, approve the proposed amendment, unless such amendment is approved by the Commission pursuant to Section 30515 of the Coastal Act. | REV | Policy C-LU-1a: A Local Coastal Plan Amendment shall be required for any proposed onshore facility to support offshore oil and gas exploration or development. Any such amendment shall not be effective until a majority of the electors in Sonoma County, in a general or special election, approve the proposed amendment, unless such amendment is approved by the California Coastal Commission pursuant to Section 30515 of the California Coastal Act. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |

DEVELOPMENT / TRANSPORTATION

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|--|---|---|
| Highway 1 Safety, Capacity and Access Improvements | | | |
| 1. Encourage construction of the long bypass (Alternate 4) around Bodega Bay from Lucas Wharf to south of Bay Hill Road. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Bodega Bay Bypass is no longer being considered |
| 2. Consider the shorter new Bodega Bay bypass (Alternate 3) alignment from Lucas Wharf to south of Eastside Road as a second option in lieu of no bypass. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Bodega Bay Bypass is no longer being considered |
| 3. Initiate a plan line study for bypass routes. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Bodega Bay Bypass is no longer being considered |
| 4. Construct intersection improvements illustrated on Figure VII-4 to increase the capacity and safety of Highway 1 through Bodega Bay. | REV | <p>Policy C-CT-4k: Construct improvements such as realignment, signalization, roundabouts, turn restrictions, one-way streets, and traffic calming at the following intersections to improve safety at the following intersections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Bay Flat Road/Bodega and Cypress Dunes Campgrounds (Sonoma Coast State Beach) (2) Bay Flat Road/Eastshore Road (3) State Highway 1/Eastside Road (4) State Highway 1/Taylor Street (5) State Highway 1/ Bay Hill Road <p>(Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |
| 5. Encourage continued maintenance and minor improvements along Bay Hill Road. | RET | <p>Policy C-CT-4o: Repair and maintain Bay Hill Road to provide a safe access to homes and farmlands east of Bodega Bay.</p> <p>(Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |
| 6. Implement transportation improvement recommendations for Jenner illustrated on Figure VII-5. Implementation should include consultations with the community. | REV | <p>Policy C-CT-4m: Construct the following sets of road improvements to increase the capacity and safety of State Highway 1 in Jenner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) State Highway 1 - from western property line of assessor's parcel number (APN) 099-150-013 (10990 State Highway 1) to 200 feet from intersection with Burke Avenue; and Burke Avenue - 200 feet: road realignment and widening, curbing, turn lane for parking and Burke Avenue, one-way parking circulation, and parking restrictions. | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|---|---|--------------------------|
| Highway 1 Safety, Capacity and Access Improvements (cont.) | | | |
| | | <p>(2) State Highway 1 - about eastern bank of Jenner Creek to about opposite northern property line of APN 099-113-012 (10469 Riverside Drive); Riverside Drive - about 65 feet; and 65 Willig Drive - about 80 feet: road widening, turn lanes, and parking restrictions.</p> <p>(3) Intersection of Highway 1 and 116 – Roundabout, minor realignment to provide more sight distance and/or signalization to improve safety. Consider minor realignment consistent with protection of Coastal resources.</p> <p>(Existing LCP Revised)</p> | |
| 7. Replace Highway 1 bridges over Salmon Creek and the Russian River and include citizens in the planning process. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Bridges already replaced |
| 8. Provide turn lanes at the following Sea Ranch intersections: Priority I (short range 0-5 years): The Stables and North Recreation Center entrance, Annapolis Road, Longmeadow Road, Moonraker and Whalebone Reach. Priority II (Oceanic implementation if and when additional units are constructed in potential development areas and at the Lodge, when Lodge Road is relocated. Some of these roads are not yet constructed): Lodge entrance, Deer Trail and Halcyon: Priority III (longer range 5-20 years): Leeward Spur, Deerfield Road, Breaker Reach, Vantage Road, Pine Meadow, Whitebluff Road, Headlands Reach, Navigators Reach, and Lodge Entrance and Halcyon if developer does not improve. | REV | <p>Policy C-CT-4n: Provide turn lanes at The Sea Ranch intersections listed below. An intersection improvement of lower priority could be constructed before an intersection improvement of higher priority if funding is available.</p> <p>(1) Priority I</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Stables and North Recreation Center entrance (already widened) Annapolis Road Longmeadow Road Moonraker and Whalebone Reach <p>(2) Priority II</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lodge Entrance <p>(3) Priority III</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leeward Spur Deerfield Road Breaker Reach Vantage Road Pine Meadow Whitebluff Road Headlands Reach Navigators Reach Lodge Entrance and Halcyon <p>(Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|--|---|--|
| <i>Highway 1 Safety, Capacity and Access Improvements (cont.)</i> | | | |
| 9. Encourage continued highway safety improvements such as striping, marking and signing. | REV | <p>Policy C-CT-4q: Implement the following capacity and safety improvements along State Route 1:</p> <p>(1) Where visibility and prevailing traffic speeds create potential hazards, consider measures to enhance safety and maintain public access. Remove parking areas or small turnouts where safety is increased by removal, except where these parking areas and turnouts are associated with an existing or future coastal access point.</p> <p>(2) Restrict turning movements at parking areas where necessary to promote safe entry and exit.</p> <p>(3) Construct turning lanes and entry improvements at parking areas listed in The Public Access Plan.</p> <p>(Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |
| 10. Eliminate parallel parking at hazardous locations. | REV | <p>Policy C-CT-4q: Implement the following capacity and safety improvements along State Route 1:</p> <p>(1) Where visibility and prevailing traffic speeds create potential hazards, consider measures to enhance safety and maintain public access. Where no other practical measures are available, consider eliminating parallel parking and small turnouts to minimize risk to public safety.</p> <p>(Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |
| 11. Implement turning lanes and entry improvements at parking areas as specified in Table VII-8. | REV | <p>Policy C-CT-4q: Implement the following capacity and safety improvements along State Route 1:</p> <p>(3) Construct turning lanes and entry improvements at parking areas listed in The Public Access Plan.</p> <p>(Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |
| 12. Develop turning lanes according to standards illustrated in Figure VII-6. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | No longer necessary; standards are out-of-date |
| 13. Encourage road improvements on Highway 116-River Road, Bodega Highway and Petaluma-Valley Ford Road to improve east-west access to Highway 1. | RET | <p>Policy C-CT-4p: Encourage safety improvements on State Highway 116-River Road, Bodega Highway and Petaluma-Valley Ford Road to improve safety on east-west roads that connect State Highway 1. (Existing LCP)</p> | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|---|--|-----------------------|
| Parking Improvements – General | | | |
| 14. Mitigate environmental and visual impacts in parking lot development or expansion. | REV | <p>Policy C-PA-4a: Encourage new parking facilities in conjunction with development of new public access facilities. Parking may be developed in phases as use levels increase. At public access facilities, provide the maximum parking capacity that does not reduce public safety or significantly impact the environment. (New)</p> <p>Policy C-PA-4b: Locate parking areas to directly connect with trails if possible. In locating new, large parking lots, consider the landward (east) side of State Highway 1 to reduce impacts to ocean views if safe trail crossings of the highway can be provided. (New)</p> <p>Policy C-PA-4c: When feasible locate parking in areas screened from public view. (Existing LCP Revised)</p> | More detailed |
| 15. Locate parking areas to provide wide accessibility to coastal beaches rather than consolidating parking facilities. | REV | <p>No specific corresponding policy identified. Related policy presented below.</p> <p>Policy C-PA-4b: Locate parking areas to directly connect with trails if possible. In locating new, large parking lots, consider the landward (east) side of State Highway 1 to reduce impacts to ocean views if safe trail crossings of the highway can be provided. (New)</p> | More detailed |
| 16. Close small, poorly located turnouts. | REV | <p>Policy C-CT-4q: Implement the following capacity and safety improvements along State Route 1:</p> <p>(1) Where visibility and prevailing traffic speeds create potential hazards, consider measures to enhance safety and maintain public access. Where no other practical measures are available, consider eliminating parallel parking and small turnouts to minimize risk to public safety.</p> <p>(Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |
| 17. Restrict turning movements at parking areas where necessary to promote safe entry and exit. | REV | <p>Policy C-CT-4q: Implement the following capacity and safety improvements along State Route 1:</p> <p>(2) Restrict turning movements at parking areas where necessary to promote safe entry and exit.</p> <p>(Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|---|---|---|
| Parking Improvements – General (cont.) | | | |
| 18. Institute one-way circulation patterns in small, narrow parking areas. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Parking plans must be approved with project |
| 19. Develop new parking facilities in conjunction with development of new parklands and public accessways. | REV | Policy C-PA-4a: Encourage new parking facilities in conjunction with development of new public access facilities. Parking may be developed in phases as use levels increase. At public access facilities, provide the maximum parking capacity that does not reduce public safety or significantly impact the environment. (New) | Same |
| 20. Develop new parking lots and other recreational support facilities (such as public restrooms) generally on the landward side of Highway 1. | REV | Policy C-PA-4b: Locate parking areas to directly connect with trails if possible. In locating new, large parking lots, consider the landward (east) side of State Highway 1 to reduce impacts to ocean views if safe trail crossings of the highway can be provided. (New) | Same |
| 21. Develop a parking management program for Bodega Bay commercial areas. | REV | Program C-LU-3: Consider developing a parking management program for Bodega Bay commercial areas. (New) | Same |
| Parking Improvements – Specific | | | |
| 22. Consider expanding parking opportunities in the Salmon Creek Beach area by providing signs to direct overflow parking from the South Salmon Creek parking lot to the existing Dunes contact station lot and by moving the Salmon Creek Parks Headquarters and developing that area for parking. | REV | Policy C-PA-3a: Implement the Public Access Plan as the set of primary policies for development of public access on the Sonoma County coast. (Existing LCP Revised) Appendix B, Bodega Bay SubArea 9, I-16: (2) Parking improvements for South Salmon Creek Beach identified by State Parks include: 1) expanding the South Salmon Creek parking lot; 2) constructing new parking lots further south along State Highway 1 and developing an alternative access to those lots; 3) moving the State Parks headquarters and using that area for parking and beach access; and 4) providing signs at both the Bean Avenue entrance to the South Salmon Creek parking lot and at the entrance to the Dunes Campground directing vehicles to an existing parking lot at the Dunes kiosk for overflow parking. | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|---|---|-----------------------|
| <i>Parking Improvements – Specific (cont.)</i> | | | |
| <p>23. Allow expansion of the South Salmon Creek Bean Avenue parking lot or other new lots further south and a new access road to these lots only if impacts on the fragile dunes can be adequately mitigated.</p> | REV | <p>Policy C-PA-3a: Implement the Public Access Plan as the set of primary policies for development of public access to on the Sonoma County coast. (Existing LCP Revised)</p> <p>Appendix B, Bodega Bay SubArea 9, I-16:</p> <p>(2) Parking improvements for South Salmon Creek Beach identified by State Parks include: 1) expanding the South Salmon Creek parking lot; 2) constructing new parking lots further south along State Highway 1 and developing an alternative access to those lots; 3) moving the State Parks headquarters and using that area for parking and beach access; and 4) providing signs at both the Bean Avenue entrance to the South Salmon Creek parking lot and at the entrance to the Dunes Campground directing vehicles to an existing parking lot at the Dunes kiosk for overflow parking.</p> | Same |
| <p>24. Implement the other short range parking improvements specified in Table VII-8; as a lower priority the long range improvements specified in Table VII-8.</p> | REV | <p>No specific corresponding policy identified. Related policy presented below.</p> <p>Policy C-PA-4a: Encourage new parking facilities in conjunction with development of new public access facilities. Parking may be developed in phases as use levels increase. At public access facilities, provide the maximum parking capacity that does not reduce public safety or significantly impact the environment. (New)</p> | More detailed |
| <p>25. Close the small, poorly located turnouts specified in Table VII-9.</p> | REV | <p>Policy C-CT-4q: Implement the following capacity and safety improvements along State Route 1:</p> <p>(1) Where visibility and prevailing traffic speeds create potential hazards, consider measures to enhance safety and maintain public access. Where no other practical measures are available, consider eliminating parallel parking and small turnouts to minimize risk to public safety.</p> <p>(Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|---|---|---|
| <i>Bikeways - Pedestrian Walks – Transit</i> | | | |
| 26. Pursue bikeway projects as part of Highway 1 and Highway 116 road improvement projects. | REV | No specific corresponding policy identified. Related policy presented below. Program C-PA-2: Encourage the provision of transit, bicycle and pedestrian pathways, and other vehicle use reduction measures to reduce vehicle use to and between public and private access facilities on the coast to reduce the number of vehicles on State Highway 1 and the demand for parking spaces. (New) | Same |
| 27. Pursue bikeway funding for bicycle lane construction projects and to correct identified hazards for bicyclists. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Same |
| 28. Where off-road facilities are not feasible, provide adequate shoulder width to accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians on Highway 1 through Sonoma County. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Sonoma County Bike and Ped plan Incorporated to document by reference with design and maintenance standards |
| 29. Where engineering problems or gradient differences prevent standard four foot shoulders, a minimum of two foot shoulders on both sides of travel lanes is acceptable for bicyclists. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Design and Maintenance standards incorporated |
| 30. Provide periodic bicycle turn-out lanes along Highway 1. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Safety improvements identified in Circulation and Transit Element |
| 31. Include four foot wide striped shoulders on both sides of travel lanes of the proposed new Bridgehaven and Salmon Creek bridges. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | No longer necessary; bridges already constructed |
| 32. Provide off-road bicycle lanes through The Sea Ranch. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | California Coastal Trail will travel through the Sea Ranch |
| 33. Encourage Cal-Trans to cut and clear weed growth alongside Highway 1 at the earliest feasible date annually to improve safety for bicyclists. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | More detailed |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|---|--|--|
| <i>Bikeways - Pedestrian Walks – Transit (cont.)</i> | | | |
| 34. Construct the sidewalk projects illustrated on Figures VII-4 and VII-5 in Bodega Bay and Jenner. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Bodega Bay Bicycle and Pedestrian Trail incorporates sidewalks in Bodega Bay. Other policies on safety improvements identified in Circulation and Transit Element |
| 35. Encourage a bay front promenade in Bodega Bay. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Bodega Bay Bicycle and Pedestrian Trail incorporates project |
| 36. Encourage implementation of daily transit service between Santa Rosa and Point Arena, and explore the possibility of a bus originating in Santa Rosa. | REV | No specific corresponding policy identified. Related policy presented below. Policy C-CT-2a: Provide efficient, affordable public transportation service in and to the Coastal Zone and require expansion of alternative modes of transportation where opportunities are identified (New) | Same |
| 37. Reinvestigate the feasibility of implementing transit service along the South Sonoma Coast. | REV | No specific corresponding policy identified. Related policy presented below. Policy C-CT-2a: Provide efficient, affordable public transportation service in and to the Coastal Zone and require expansion of alternative modes of transportation where opportunities are identified (New) | Same |

DEVELOPMENT / VISUAL RESOURCES

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|--|--|-----------------------|
| View Protections | | | |
| 1. Prevent development (including buildings, structures, fences, paved areas, signs, and landscaping) from obstructing views of the shoreline from coastal roads, vista points, recreation areas, and beaches. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-1c: Development (including buildings, structures, fences, paved areas, signs, and landscaping) shall be prohibited from obstructing views of the coastline from coastal roads, bikeways, Vista Points, recreation areas, and beaches. (Existing LCP Revised) | More detailed |
| 2. Prohibit development which will significantly degrade the scenic qualities of major views and vista points. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-1b: Development which will significantly degrade the scenic qualities of Scenic Landscape Units and views and from Vista Points shall be prohibited. (Existing LCP Revised) | More detailed |
| 3. Except in rural community and urban service areas, require a minimum setback of 100 feet from the right-of-way along scenic corridors and greater where possible. However, permit a 50 foot setback when sufficient screening exists to shield the structure from public view. Where the General Plan policies and standards are more restrictive than the above standards, development shall comply with the General Plan or Coastal Plan policies, whichever are more restrictive, provided that no development shall be approved which does not comply with Coastal Plan policies. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-2c: Outside of rural communities and urban service areas, the minimum setback of a new structure from a Scenic Corridor shall be 30 percent of the depth of the lot to a maximum of 200 feet from the centerline of the road. (Existing LCP Revised) | More detailed |
| Alteration of Landforms | | | |
| 4. Minimize visual destruction of natural landforms caused by the cutting, filling, and grading for building sites, access roads and public utilities by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concentrating development on level areas so that steeper hillsides are left undisturbed. • Prohibiting new development which requires grading, cutting, or filling that would significantly and permanently alter or destroy the appearance of natural landforms | REV | Policy C-OSRC-4b: The Coastal Design Guidelines (Appendix A-1) shall be used for new development throughout the coast except where more restrictive community design guidelines have been adopted. (Existing LCP Revised: Recommendations 4-25 on pages 173-180) (See Appendix A-1, Coastal Design Guidelines, Section 1.1, Development, <i>Grading and Topography</i> .) | More detailed |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|---|---|-----------------------|
| Alteration of Landforms (cont.) | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restoring landforms as completely as possible after any permitted temporary alteration during construction, timber harvesting, or mineral extraction • Constructing roads, buildings, and other structural improvements to fit the natural topography • Sharing private roads and driveways | | | |
| Landform Guidelines | | | |
| <p>5. Minimize visual impact of development on hillsides by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requiring construction or grading to follow the natural contours of the landscape • Prohibiting development and grading on hillsides with grades more than 30 percent • Designing structures to fit hillside sites rather than altering the landform to accommodate buildings designed for level sites • Concentrating development near existing vegetation • Promoting roof angles and colors which blend with hillsides | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-4b: The Coastal Design Guidelines (Appendix A-1) shall be used for new development throughout the coast except where more restrictive community design guidelines have been adopted. (Existing LCP Revised: Recommendations 4-25 on pages 173-180)</p> <p>(See Appendix A-1, Coastal Design Guidelines, Section 1.1, Development, <i>Design and Siting</i>, and <i>Grading and Topography</i>.)</p> | More detailed |
| <p>6. Minimize the visual impacts of development on terraces by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prohibiting development in open fields in rural areas • Minimizing the number of structures and clustering them near existing natural or man-made vertical features • Designing structures to be in scale with the rural character of the region | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-4b: The Coastal Design Guidelines (Appendix A-1) shall be used for new development throughout the coast except where more restrictive community design guidelines have been adopted. (Existing LCP Revised: Recommendations 4-25 on pages 173-180)</p> <p>(See Appendix A-1, Coastal Design Guidelines, Section 1.1, Development, <i>Design and Siting</i>, and <i>Grading and Topography</i>.)</p> | More detailed |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|---|---|-----------------------|
| Landform Guidelines (cont.) | | | |
| 7. Minimize the visual impact of development on ridges by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prohibiting development in rural areas that projects above the ridgeline silhouette • Locating development adjacent to existing vegetation • Prohibiting the removal of tree masses which destroy the silhouette of the ridgeline form | REV | Policy C-OSRC-4b: The Coastal Design Guidelines (Appendix A-1) shall be used for new development throughout the coast except where more restrictive community design guidelines have been adopted. (Existing LCP Revised: Recommendations 4-25 on pages 173-180) (See Appendix A-1, Coastal Design Guidelines, Section 1.1, Development, <i>Design and Siting.</i>) | More detailed |
| 8. Minimize the visual impact of development on inland valleys by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concentrating development within existing communities • Requiring development outside of communities to be located on the edge of the valley or within existing tree clusters leaving the valley floor and agricultural land open | REV | Policy C-OSRC-4b: The Coastal Design Guidelines (Appendix A-1) shall be used for new development throughout the coast except where more restrictive community design guidelines have been adopted. (Existing LCP Revised: Recommendations 4-25 on pages 173-180) (See Appendix A-1, Coastal Design Guidelines, Section 1.1, Development, <i>Design and Siting.</i>) | More detailed |
| Natural Landscape Compatibility | | | |
| 9. Locate and design development to fit the setting and to be subordinate to the pre-existing character of the site. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-4b: The Coastal Design Guidelines (Appendix A-1) shall be used for new development throughout the coast except where more restrictive community design guidelines have been adopted. (Existing LCP Revised: Recommendations 4-25 on pages 173-180) (See Appendix A-1, Coastal Design Guidelines, Section 1.1, Development, <i>Grading and Topography.</i>) | More detailed |
| Community Compatibility | | | |
| 10. Design structures to be compatible with existing community characteristics. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-4b: The Coastal Design Guidelines (Appendix A-1) shall be used for new development throughout the coast except where more restrictive community design guidelines have been adopted. (Existing LCP Revised: Recommendations 4-25 on pages 173-180) | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|---|--|-----------------------|
| Community Compatibility (cont.) | | | |
| | | (See Appendix A-1, Coastal Design Guidelines, Section 1.2, <i>Residential Building Design</i> .) | |
| 11. Relate structures in size and scale to adjacent buildings. | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-4b: The Coastal Design Guidelines (Appendix A-1) shall be used for new development throughout the coast except where more restrictive community design guidelines have been adopted.</p> <p>(Existing LCP Revised: Recommendations 4-25 on pages 173-180)</p> <p>(See Appendix A-1, Coastal Design Guidelines, Section 1.2, <i>Residential Building Design</i>.)</p> | Same |
| 12. Locate and design all development to minimize the impacts of noise, light, glare, and odors on adjacent properties and the community at large. | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-4b: The Coastal Design Guidelines (Appendix A-1) shall be used for new development throughout the coast except where more restrictive community design guidelines have been adopted.</p> <p>(Existing LCP Revised: Recommendations 4-25 on pages 173-180)</p> <p>(See Appendix A-1 Coastal Design Guidelines, Section 1.1, Development, <i>Minimize Development Impacts</i>.)</p> | More detailed |
| Utilities | | | |
| 13. Require that all new distribution line extensions be placed underground. | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-4b: The Coastal Design Guidelines (Appendix A-1) shall be used for new development throughout the coast except where more restrictive community design guidelines have been adopted.</p> <p>(Existing LCP Revised: Recommendations 4-25 on pages 173-180)</p> <p>(See Appendix A-1, Coastal Design Guidelines, Section 1.1, Development, <i>Utility Lines</i>.)</p> | Same |
| Vegetation | | | |
| 14. Discourage the removal of significant trees except through legitimate logging operations. | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-1g: The following standards shall be used in addition to those of Policy C-OSRC-1f for new subdivisions within Scenic Landscape Units, other Major Views, and views from Vista Points:</p> | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|---|--|-----------------------|
| <i>Vegetation (cont.)</i> | | | |
| | | <p>(3) Building sites and roads are to be constructed to preserve significant tree stands and significant oak trees. (GP2020 / Existing LCP Revised)</p> <p>Policy C-OSRC-4b: The Coastal Design Guidelines (Appendix A-1) shall be used for new development throughout the coast except where more restrictive community design guidelines have been adopted. (Existing LCP Revised: Recommendations 4-25 on pages 173-180)</p> <p>(See Appendix A-1, Coastal Design Guidelines, Section 1.1, Development, <i>Design and Siting</i>.)</p> | |
| 15. Locate and design new development to minimize tree removal. | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-1g: The following standards shall be used in addition to those of Policy C-OSRC-1f for new subdivisions within Scenic Landscape Units, other Major Views, and views from Vista Points:</p> <p>(3) Building sites and roads are to be constructed to preserve significant tree stands and significant oak trees. (GP2020 / Existing LCP Revised)</p> <p>Policy C-OSRC-4b: The Coastal Design Guidelines (Appendix A-1) shall be used for new development throughout the coast except where more restrictive community design guidelines have been adopted. (Existing LCP Revised: Recommendations 4-25 on pages 173-180)</p> <p>(See <i>Appendix A-1, Coastal Design Guidelines, Section 1.1, Development, Design and Siting</i>.)</p> | Same |
| 16. Prohibit removal of windbreaks unless required because of the disease. | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-4c: Existing tree windbreaks which are oriented predominantly east-west and do not block or interrupt views to the coast shall be retained; and development of new tree windbreaks which would block or interrupt views to the coast shall be discouraged. (Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|---|---|-----------------------|
| <i>Vegetation (cont.)</i> | | | |
| | | <p>Policy C-OSRC-4b: The Coastal Design Guidelines (Appendix A-1) shall be used for new development throughout the coast except where more restrictive community design guidelines have been adopted. (Existing LCP Revised: Recommendations 4-25 on pages 173-180)</p> <p>(See Appendix A-1, Coastal Design Guidelines, Section 1.1, Development, <i>Design and Siting</i>.)</p> | |
| <p>17. Prohibit the planting of vegetation west of Highway 1 which could block coastal views.</p> | <p>REV</p> | <p>Policy C-OSRC-1c: Development (including buildings, structures, fences, paved areas, signs, and landscaping) shall be prohibited from obstructing views of the coastline from coastal roads, bikeways, Vista Points, recreation areas, and beaches. (Existing LCP Revised)</p> <p>Policy C-OSRC-4b: The Coastal Design Guidelines (Appendix A-1) shall be used for new development throughout the coast except where more restrictive community design guidelines have been adopted. (Existing LCP Revised: Recommendations 4-25 on pages 173-180)</p> <p>(See Appendix A-1, Coastal Design Guidelines, Section 1.1, Development, <i>Landscape Design</i>.)</p> | <p>Same</p> |
| <p>18. Encourage the use of appropriate native plants for landscaping. A Native Plant List for the Sonoma County Coast will be made available at Sonoma County PRMD.</p> | <p>REV</p> | <p>Policy C-OSRC-4b: The Coastal Design Guidelines (Appendix A-1) shall be used for new development throughout the coast except where more restrictive community design guidelines have been adopted. (Existing LCP Revised: Recommendations 4-25 on pages 173-180)</p> <p>(See Appendix A-1, Coastal Design Guidelines, Section 1.1, Development, <i>Landscape Design</i>.)</p> | <p>More detailed</p> |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|---|---|-----------------------|
| <i>Vegetation (cont.)</i> | | | |
| | | <p>Policy C-OSRC-5a(5): The use of native plant species in landscaping shall be encouraged. The use of native or compatible non-native, non-invasive species for landscaping where consistent with fire safety shall be required. The use of invasive exotic plant species shall be prohibited. (GP2020 Revised)</p> <p>Other Initiative C-OSRC-6: Promote and enhance the use of native plants and reduce non-native invasive plants in common areas and on private lots. Support property owners in their efforts to identify and eradicate non-native invasive plants and planting native plants. (New)</p> | |
| <p>19 Require design review for all new development in Urban and Rural Community Service areas. This requirement may be waived by the Director of PRMD on parcels not visible from and east of Highway 1.</p> | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-4a: Design review shall be required for all new development outside of Urban Service Areas and Rural Community Boundaries. The Director of Permit Sonoma may waive this requirement on parcels not visible from and east of State Highway 1. (Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |
| <i>Procedure</i> | | | |
| <p>20. Require design review for:</p> <p>A. All new development within designated scenic view shed areas as depicted on the Coastal Visual Resource Maps (incorporated herein by reference and on file in County PRMD. The following criteria shall be used in evaluating the projects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. New structures proposed within a scenic view shed area shall, to the maximum extent feasible, be designed and sited to preserve existing views of the ocean and shoreline as viewed from scenic corridor routes. 2. New structures proposed within a scenic view shed area shall, to the maximum extent feasible, be screened from scenic corridor route view by existing topography and vegetation. | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-1f: Development within Scenic Landscape Units, Major Views, and views from Vista Points shall be required to meet the Scenic View Guidelines in addition to all other applicable design guidelines. In the case of conflict, the most restrictive design standards shall apply. (GP2020 / Existing LCP Revised)</p> <p>(See Appendix D: Scenic Resources)</p> <p>Policy C-OSRC-1g: The following standards shall be used in addition to those of Policy C-OSRC-1f for new subdivisions within Scenic Landscape Units, other Major Views, and views from Vista Points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Building envelopes shall be established for new residential structures so that they are located in the least visually | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|---|---|-----------------------|
| <i>Procedure (cont.)</i> | | | |
| <p>3. Development authorized within scenic view shed areas shall be subject to the condition that neither topography nor vegetation shall be altered or removed if doing so would expose the development to view from any scenic corridor route.</p> <p>4. New structures shall not be located on ridgelines or prominent hilltops, as viewed from scenic corridor routes, unless screened by existing topography and/or vegetation.</p> <p>5. Agricultural structures are exempted from scenic view protection policies if they are to be located landward of scenic corridor routes from which there are ocean or river views.</p> <p>6. Development proposed upon a parcel mapped in more than one view shed rating category shall, whenever feasible, be located within the area with the lowest view rating.</p> <p>7. Any satellite dish that requires a building permit shall be sited so that it is not visible from scenic corridor routes.</p> <p>8. Subdivisions proposals within scenic view shed areas shall be subject to the following: a) lots shall be clustered where potential visual impacts can be reduced (unless clustering is prohibited in agricultural districts), b) building envelopes shall be established so that residences are located upon the least visually sensitive areas, and c) driveways and access roads are hidden from public view whenever feasible.</p> <p>B. All new projects in areas mapped as Outstanding and Above Average View Areas on the Coastal Visual Resource Maps (incorporated herein by reference and on file in the County Planning Department). The following</p> | <p>REV</p> | <p>sensitive areas, and height limitations shall be established if necessary to further mitigate visual impacts.</p> <p>(2) Lots shall be clustered to reduce visual impacts where consistent with the Land Use Element.</p> <p>(3) Building sites and roads are to be constructed to preserve significant tree stands and significant oak trees.</p> <p>(4) Driveways and access roads shall be hidden from view from public roads and use areas where practical. (GP2020 / Existing LCP Revised)</p> <p>No specific corresponding policy identified. Related policies presented below.</p> | <p>Same</p> |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|---|---|-----------------------|
| <i>Procedure (cont.)</i> | | | |
| <p>criteria relate to landform and vegetation categories identified on the View shed Composition Maps, and shall be used in evaluating the projects. Figures on Figure VII-10 graphically depict a number of the View shed Protection Criterion and policies.</p> <p>Hillside/Woodland Location</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Locate structures within or behind existing wooded areas such that they are screened from scenic corridor routes. 2. Retain existing trees to the maximum extent possible when locating structures. Removal of tree masses, which would interrupt or destroy ridgeline or hilltop silhouettes, is prohibited. Permits shall specify that existing vegetative screening shall not be pruned or removed if doing so would render the structure more visible from a scenic corridor route. 3. In order to ensure structures are integrated well into the landscape and to minimize the incidence of unsightly erosion scars, the applicant shall demonstrate that the amount of grading proposed is the minimum necessary to site the structure. <p>Cliffs and Bluffs Location</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Locate structures within or behind existing tree cover such that they are screened from scenic corridor routes. When there is limited opportunity to screen proposed structures from scenic corridor routes, design review shall ensure that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) the structure's design compliments and is in scale with the surrounding environment. b) if possible, structures shall be screened by using alternative siting or existing landforms, | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-1f: Development within Scenic Landscape Units, Major Views, and views from Vista Points shall be required to meet the Scenic View Guidelines in addition to all other applicable design guidelines. In the case of conflict, the most restrictive design standards shall apply. (GP2020 / Existing LCP Revised)</p> <p>(See Appendix D: Scenic Resources)</p> <p>Policy C-OSRC-4b: The Coastal Design Guidelines (Appendix A-1) shall be used for new development throughout the coast except where more restrictive community design guidelines have been adopted. (Existing LCP Revised: Recommendations 4-25 on pages 173-180)</p> <p>(See Appendix A-1, Coastal Design Guidelines, Section 1.1, Development, <i>Design and Siting</i>, and <i>Grading and Topography</i>.)</p> | More detailed |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>Procedure (cont.)</i> | | | |
| <p>c) when no other measures to screen development from scenic corridor routes are feasible, a landscape design is developed that relies upon native tree and shrub species to (1) screen the structure but not grow to block ocean or coastline views, (2) integrate the man-made and natural environments, and (3) effectively screen the structure from the scenic corridor route within 5 years.</p> <p>Terrace/Grassland Location</p> <p><i>Inland Valley Location</i></p> <p>1. Locate structures near existing vegetation or topographic relief to screen them from the scenic corridor routes. When there is limited opportunity to screen proposed structures from scenic corridor routes, design review shall ensure that:</p> <p>a) the structure's design complements and is in scale with the surrounding environment and existing community characteristics.</p> <p>b) if possible, structures shall be screened by using alternative siting or existing landforms,</p> <p>c) when no other measures to screen development from scenic corridor routes are feasible, a landscape design is developed that relies upon native tree and shrub species to: (1) screen the structure but not, over time, grow to block ocean or coastline views from scenic corridor routes, (2) integrate the man and natural environments, and (3) effectively screen the structure from the scenic corridor route within 5 years.</p> | | | |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>Procedure (cont.)</i> | | | |
| <p>Terrace/Woodland Location</p> <p>1. Locate structures within or behind existing wooded areas such that they are screened from scenic corridor routes.</p> <p>2. Retain existing trees to the maximum extent possible when locating structures. Permits shall specify that existing vegetative screening shall not be pruned or removed if doing so will render the structure more visible from a scenic corridor route.</p> <p>Hillside/Grassland Location</p> <p>1. Locate structures near existing vegetation or topographic relief to maximize screening from the scenic corridor routes. When there is limited opportunity to screen proposed structures from scenic corridor routes, design review shall ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the structure's design compliments and is in scale with the surrounding environment and existing community characteristics. b) if possible, structures shall be screened by using alternative siting or existing landforms, c) when no other measures to screen development from scenic corridor routes are feasible, a landscape design is developed that relies upon native tree and shrub species to: (1) screen the structure but not grow to block ocean or coastline views, (2) integrate the man-made and natural environments and, (3) effectively screen structures from the scenic corridor route within 5 years. <p>2. When structures are proposed near ridgelines or prominent hilltops where there is insufficient</p> | | | |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|---|--|--|
| <i>Procedure (cont.)</i> | | | |
| <p>vegetation to screen them from scenic corridor routes, they shall be located and designed so that they do not project above ridgeline or hilltop silhouettes.</p> <p>3. In order to ensure structures are integrated well into the landscape and to minimize the incidence of unsightly erosion scars, the applicant shall demonstrate that the amount of grading proposed is the minimum necessary to site the structure.</p> | | | |
| <p>21. Require compliance with community design guidelines, when applicable, or the overall Coastal Zone Design Guidelines.</p> | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-4b: The Coastal Design Guidelines (Appendix A-1) shall be used for new development throughout the coast except where more restrictive community design guidelines have been adopted. (Existing LCP Revised: Recommendations 4-25 on pages 173-180)</p> | Not necessary |
| <p>22. Apply Coastal Zone Design Guidelines to all new coastal zone development in areas described in 19. and 20. except Bodega Harbour subdivision and The Sea Ranch. The guidelines apply to Badaga Bay town with the amendments described in 26.</p> | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-4b: The Coastal Design Guidelines (Appendix A-1) shall be used for new development throughout the coast except where more restrictive community design guidelines have been adopted. (Existing LCP Revised: Recommendations 4-25 on pages 173-180)</p> | Same |
| <p>23. Encourage formation of local design review committees to apply the Coastal Zone Design Guidelines.</p> | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Design review committees formed and then disbanded |
| <p>24. Encourage adoption of local design criteria to augment or replace the Coastal Zone Design Guidelines, subject to County Design Review Committee review and approval.</p> | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-4b: The Coastal Design Guidelines (Appendix A-1) shall be used for new development throughout the coast except where more restrictive community design guidelines have been adopted. (Existing LCP Revised: Recommendations 4-25 on pages 173-180)</p> | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|---|---|-----------------------|
| Design Guidelines | | | |
| <p>25. Coastal Zone Design Guidelines</p> <p>General. Design and site structures to preserve unobstructed broad views of the ocean from Highway 1 and to minimize visual impacts. Cluster structures to the maximum extent feasible.</p> <p>Height. Limit residential building height to 16 feet west of Highway 1. However, an increase in height, to a maximum of 24 feet, is permissible if (1) the structure is no higher than 16 feet above the corridor route grade directly across from the building site, and (2) the structure will not affect views to the ocean or be out of character with surrounding structures.</p> <p>Limit building height to 24 feet east of Highway 1. However, an increase in height to a maximum of 35 feet is permissible if (1) the structure is no higher than 24 feet above the corridor route grade directly across from the building site, and (2) the structure will not affect water views, or be out of character with surrounding structures.</p> <p>Height for residential structures is measured as the vertical distance from the average level of the highest and lowest point of that portion of the lot covered by the building to the topmost point of the roof. (See Figure VII-11.) Where these requirements conflict with the height, site, and bulk criteria of Appendix B (Bane Bill), for those properties listed, the requirements of Appendix B shall be followed.</p> <p>Bulk. Keep buildings in scale with their natural and man-made setting.</p> <p>Siting. Utilize natural landforms and vegetation for screening. Minimize the alteration of natural landforms caused by grading, cutting, or filling. Prescribe building envelopes for lots west of Highway 1 in Timber Cove and other appropriate areas.</p> | <p>REV</p> | <p>Policy C-OSRC-4b: The Coastal Design Guidelines (Appendix A-1) shall be used for new development throughout the coast except where more restrictive community design guidelines have been adopted. (Existing LCP Revised: Recommendations 4-25 on pages 173-180)</p> <p>(See Appendix A-1, Coastal Design Guidelines)</p> | <p>More detailed</p> |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>Design Guidelines (cont.)</i> | | | |
| <p>Building Materials and Color. Use natural materials and earth colors which blend with the vegetative cover of the site unless the building is a historic reproduction, in which case colors should be in keeping with the historic style. Encourage use of non-reflective exterior surfaces. Encourage composition shingle and shake roofs in harmonizing colors with the building exterior. Dark colors are preferred. Discourage tar and gravel roofs. Discourage metal window frames unless they are bronze anodized aluminum or baked enamel. Encourage dark and non-reflective driveway materials. To maintain natural drainage flows, the use of impervious material should be minimized.</p> <p>Architectural Form. Encourage traditional architectural styles of the coast in older development areas and contemporary styles in newer subdivisions. Encourage pitched roofs and relate roof slopes to existing nearby buildings. Relate the architectural shape and style of new buildings to existing nearby structures and natural features. Design accessory buildings to be consistent with the main building architectural character, materials, and finishes.</p> <p>Landscaping. Use indigenous plant materials in areas visible from public roads. Protect existing vegetation where possible. Utilize plant materials to integrate the man-made and natural environments and to screen and soften the visual impact of new development. Use landscaping to screen parking areas from public view. Landscape, grade, and fill areas as soon as possible to minimize soil erosion.</p> <p>Fences. Discourage property line fences to minimize visual disruption of the natural terrain. Design fences as extensions of the main house. Materials should be the same as, or complimentary to, the building. Six foot fences are intended to be used only for screening of service yards, etc., and for privacy purposes.</p> | | | |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>Design Guidelines (cont.)</i> | | | |
| <p>Commercial. Design buildings which are compatible with the predominant design of existing buildings in the area and are of wood or shingle siding. Buildings should employ natural or earth colors, and use pitched, non-reflective roofs unless they are historic reproductions. Require that exterior lighting be functional, subtle, and architecturally integrated with the building style, materials, and colors. Limit maximum height to 24 feet unless the greater height will not have effect on coastal views and there are overriding considerations. Height for commercial structures is measured as the vertical distance between the average level of the highest and lowest point of that portion of the lot covered by the building to the topmost point of the roof. Screen parking areas from view through use of plantings, design, and siting.</p> <p>In Bodega Bay, reflect the nautical character of the harbor with wooden exteriors, stained or painted white or subdued earth colors. For heavy, commercial structures, permit textured metal in subdued colors with proper architectural detailing and landscaping to add visual interest and soften building lines.</p> <p>Agricultural Structures. Locate large agricultural structures out of public view when possible. Encourage designs and materials which blend with the natural vegetative cover.</p> <p>Signs. Relate signs to their surroundings in terms of size, shape, color, texture, and lighting so that they are complimentary to the overall design of the building and are not in visual competition with other conforming signs in the area. Insure that signing is subtle, unobtrusive, vandal proof and weather resistant, and if lighted, not unnecessarily bright. Avoid using struts, braces, kickbacks, or guy wires to support signs.</p> | | | |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|---|--|-----------------------|
| <i>Design Guidelines (cont.)</i> | | | |
| <p>26. Bodega Bay Core Area (includes Taylor Tract and the residential area between Taylor Tract, Highway 1 and the proposed bypass). In addition to the Coastal Zone Design Guidelines, the following guidelines will be applied to Badaga Bay development. (Where conflicts occur, these guidelines supersede the general guidelines).</p> <p>General. Site and design structures to take advantage of bay views without blocking views of neighboring structures.</p> <p>Architectural Form. Encourage traditional building forms of coast buildings including Greek Revival, Salt Box, and simple cottage styles similar to existing homes. Encourage pitched roofs. Flat roofs may be appropriate where compatible with existing structures. Where a building is between two existing structures, the design should act as a transition between the two existing structures.</p> <p>Height. Limit building height to 16 feet except that in major developments up to 15% of the units may exceed the height limit. Height for residential structures is measured as the vertical distance from the average level of the highest and lowest point of that portion of the lot covered by the building to the topmost point of the roof. (See Figure VII-11.) Where these requirements conflict with the height, site, and bulk criteria of Appendix B (Bane Bill), for those properties listed, the requirements of Appendix B shall be followed.</p> <p>Fences. Discourage property line fences over three feet in height and encourage traditional picket fences.</p> <p>Materials and Colors. Encourage wood board or shingle siding. Encourage painted exteriors in colors similar to those existing in the town of Badaga Bay (i.e., rust, red, white, green, beige, brown, gray, yellow,</p> | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-4d: New development located within Bodega Bay outside of the Bodega Bay Core Area shall be consistent with the following Bodega Bay Non-Core Design Guidelines (Appendix A-2) in addition to the Coastal Design Guidelines (Appendix A-1). In the case of conflict, these community specific guidelines shall supersede the Coast Community Design Guidelines:</p> <p>(1) The exterior of structures shall be designed to reflect the nautical character of the harbor with wooden exteriors, stained or painted white or subdued earth colors.</p> <p>(2) For heavy commercial structures, textured metal in subdued colors with proper architectural detailing and landscaping shall be encouraged to add visual interest and soften building lines. (Existing LCP Revised)</p> <p>Policy C-OSRC-4e: New development located within the Bodega Bay Core Area shall be consistent with the Bodega Bay Core Design Guidelines in addition to the Coastal Design Guidelines (Appendix A-2). (Existing LCP Revised) In the case of conflict, the Bodega Bay Core Area Design Guidelines shall supersede the Coast Community Design Guidelines.</p> <p>(See Appendix A-1, Design Guidelines; and Appendix A-2, Bodega Bay Design Guidelines)</p> | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|---|--|-----------------------|
| <i>Design Guidelines (cont.)</i> | | | |
| <p>and blue). Other colors must be approved by the Design Review Committee. Natural wood exteriors may be intermixed but should not dominate the new development area. Encourage wood trim windows painted in a contrasting, harmonizing color.</p> <p>Streets. Encourage minimum paved street widths consistent with circulation, safety, and parking requirements to provide a sense of continuity between the new development and the original town.</p> <p>Pedestrian Access. Require separated bike paths and walkways on one side of the street in new development areas.</p> | | | |
| <p>27. Bodega Harbor. Continue to enforce Design Guidelines and Construction Regulations for Bodega Harbor Subdivision. Where homes within view corridors do not meet Bodega Harbor height, bulk and location conditions, the County Design Review Committee will review proposed plans for conformance with Coastal Plan view protection objectives.</p> | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-4f: For The Sea Ranch, Timber Cove, Bodega Harbour, and Sereno del Mar, the applicable community-specific design guidelines in addition to the Coastal Design Guidelines (Appendix A) shall be used. In the case of conflict, community specific design guidelines shall supersede the Coastal Design Guidelines. (New)</p> <p>(See Appendix A-1, Design Guidelines; and Appendix A-2, Bodega Bay Design Guidelines)</p> | Not necessary |
| <p>28. The Sea Ranch. Continue to enforce The Sea Ranch Design Guidelines, incorporating the specified Height, Site, and Bulk Criteria provided for in Section 30610.6 (d) of the Public Resources Code. If a proposed residence does not meet the Height, Site and Bulk Criteria, the County may issue a variance as allowed in the adopted Height, Site and Bulk Criteria.</p> | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-4f: For The Sea Ranch, Timber Cove, Bodega Harbour, and Sereno del Mar, the applicable community-specific design guidelines in addition to the Coastal Design Guidelines (Appendix A) shall be used. In the case of conflict, community specific design guidelines shall supersede the Coastal Design Guidelines. (New)</p> <p>(See Appendix A-1, Design Guidelines; and Appendix A-3, Height, Site, and Bulk Criteria for The Sea Ranch)</p> | Same |

ENVIRONMENT / ENVIRONMENTAL HAZARDS

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|--|---|-----------------------|
| <i>Geologic Hazards</i> | | | |
| <p>1. Anticipate the effects of, and develop a plan in response to a major earthquake generated along the San Andreas fault zone.</p> | <p>REM</p> | <p>No specific corresponding policy identified.</p> | <p>Same</p> |
| <p>2. Prohibit development within 100 feet of a bluff edge or within any area designated unstable to marginally stable on Hazards maps unless a registered engineering geologist reviews and approves all grading, site preparation, drainage, leachfield and foundation plans of any proposed building and determines there will be no significant impacts. The engineering geologist report shall contain, at a minimum, the information specified in the Coastal Administrative Manual.</p> | <p>REV</p> | <p>No specific corresponding policy identified.</p> <p>Policy C-PS-2i: Applications for new development or redevelopment on coastal bluff property shall be required to include a site-specific coastal bluff erosion hazards report from a licensed Geotechnical Engineer, Engineering Geologist, or Geophysicist that establishes a geologic setback line for proposed new temporary (e.g., gazebos and portable spas) and permanent (e.g., roads, driveways, water lines, drainage improvements, and septic systems and leachfields) structures and infrastructure. This setback shall be no less than 100 feet and shall establish where on the bluff top stability can reasonably be assured for the economic life of the development (no less than 100 years). All new structures for human occupancy and infrastructure located on a bluff top shall be setback to ensure that it will not be endangered by coastal bluff erosion, retreat, and collapse; and thereby avoid the need for shoreline protection devices during the economic life of the development. The effect of any existing shoreline protective devices shall not be factored into the required stability analysis.</p> <p>The coastal bluff erosion hazards report shall take the following factors into account in establishment of the geologic setback line:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Proposed extent of grading and site preparation. (2) Proposed plans for construction of roads, driveways, foundations, water lines, drainage improvements, and septic systems and leachfields. | <p>More detailed</p> |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|---|--|-----------------------|
| <i>Geologic Hazards (cont.)</i> | | | |
| | | (3) Maximum coastal bluff retreat projected to occur within the economic life of the development (100 years). The projected coastal bluff retreat shall be calculated considering the specific geologic and hydrologic conditions on the site; historic coastal bluff retreat data; projections for future sea level rise according to the most up-to-date science; and existing and projections for changes in storm frequency, magnitude, and duration due to climate change. (New) | |
| 3. Enforce the requirements of the Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone Act for protection from fault rupture hazard. | REV | No specific corresponding policy identified. Related policy presented below. Policy C-PS-2d: Structures intended for human occupancy as defined in the Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones Act and related Administrative Code provisions shall be prohibited within 50 feet of the surface trace of any fault in Earthquake Fault Zones. (GP2020) | More detailed |
| 4. Design and construct all structures for human occupancy, including mobile homes, in accordance with Zone 4 standards of the Uniform Building Code. | RET | Policy C-PS-2a: Design and construct all structures for human occupancy, including mobile homes, in accordance with Zone 4 standards of the Uniform Building Code. (Existing LCP) | Same |
| 5. Enforce the geologic provisions of Chapter 70 of the Uniform Building Code. | RET | Policy C-PS-2b: Enforce the geologic provisions of Chapter 70 of the Uniform Building Code. (Existing LCP) | Same |
| 6. Require engineering geologic reports in accordance with the Permit and Resource Management Department geologic review procedure. | REV | Policy C-PS-2f: A site-specific geologic hazards report prepared by a licensed Geotechnical Engineer, Engineering Geologist, or Geophysicist shall be required for development projects proposed within Geologic Hazard Areas, as shown in Figures C-PS-1a-c and C-PS-2a-c . A geologic hazards report shall also be prepared where a site evaluation conducted for a Coastal Permit, building permit or grading permit application has identified that such a report is required. The geologic hazards report shall include the following information: (a) Description of the types and locations of the geologic hazards on the project site. | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|---|--|---|
| <i>Geologic Hazards (cont.)</i> | | | |
| | | <p>(b) Analyses of the risks of human injury and property damage from geologic hazards associated with the proposed development, including but not limited to site preparation, grading, installation of septic systems, installation of drainage and road improvements, construction of foundations, and construction of buildings and structures.</p> <p>(c) Design, siting, and construction mitigation measures for the proposed development to minimize the potential for collapse; debris falling on occupants or pedestrians; failure of critical mechanical or electrical systems; releases of large quantities of hazardous or toxic materials; and substantial economic loss from geologic hazards.</p> <p>(d) Certification from the Geotechnical Engineer, Engineering Geologist, or Geophysicist that the risks of human injury and property damage from geologic hazards associated with the proposed development have been mitigated to an acceptable level. (New)</p> | |
| 7. Encourage grazing practices of steep slopes which mitigate erosion problems. | REM | <p>No specific corresponding policy identified. Related policy presented below.</p> <p>Other Initiatives C-AR-3:</p> <p>C. Work with the State Department of Parks and Recreation to take the following actions regarding managing agricultural land in State Park Units:</p> <p>(4) Monitor grazing and improve range management practices in cooperation with ranchers and the Natural Resource Conservation Service.</p> <p>Other Initiative C-OSRC-9: Encourage agricultural land owners to work closely with the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) and local Resource Conservation Districts to reduce soil erosion and encourage soil restoration. (GP2020) (Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Replaced by Policy C-OSRC-8a and C-OSRC-8b |
| 8. Encourage resource use where suitable on lands which are hazardous to development and other uses. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Incorporated as Land Use Designation Criteria |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|--|--|--|
| <i>Geologic Hazards (cont.)</i> | | | |
| 9. Prohibit new dwellings within designated Tsunami Hazard Zones. | REV | Policy C-PS-3h: New dwellings shall be prohibited in Tsunami Hazard Zones. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| <i>Flooding</i> | | | |
| 10. Prohibit construction of structures within 100 feet of the top of any embankment, natural or man-made which defines a channel, except where flood hazard has been found to be remote in review by the Sonoma County Water Agency. Where this policy conflicts with General Plan Public Safety Policy PS- 2n, the more restrictive of the two shall apply. | REV | Policy C-PS-3f: Construction of structures within 100 feet of the top of any natural or manmade embankment which defines a channel shall be prohibited, except where Permit Sonoma finds the flood hazard risk to life and property has been minimized. Reductions to building setbacks in 100-year floodplains shall be avoided. Where this policy conflicts with C-OSRC-5c(2) of the Open Space and Resource Conservation Element, the more restrictive of the two shall apply. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 11. Grade and construct in such a manner as to minimize: (a) ponding or accumulation of storm water not necessary for silt control, or groundwater recharge enhancement, (b) alterations to the natural drainage system, and (c) siltation of adjacent or downstream water courses. | REM | <p>No specific corresponding policy identified. Related policy presented below.</p> <p>Policy C-WR-1g: Approvals for new development and redevelopment shall ensure water quality impacts from construction are minimized by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limiting the project footprint, phasing grading activities, implementing soil stabilization and pollution prevention measures, and preventing unnecessary soil compaction; Limiting land disturbance from construction (e.g., clearing, grading, and cut-and-fill), especially in erosive areas (including steep slopes, unstable areas, and erosive soils); Requiring soil stabilization Best Management Practices be implemented over disturbed areas as soon as feasible; Requiring that grading plans include measures to avoid soil erosion and sedimentation of stormwater to the maximum extent feasible; Requiring as a condition of grading permit approval for all new development, regardless of the area of land to be disturbed, that soil stabilization and | Updated for more current grading best management practices |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|--|---|---|
| <i>Flooding (cont.)</i> | | | |
| | | <p>erosion control measures be installed in erosive areas of construction sites (e.g., steep slopes, unstable areas, and erosive soils);</p> <p>Requiring a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan be prepared and implemented for all new development in or adjacent to Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas on sites that drain directly to surface waters, regardless of the area of land to be disturbed;</p> <p>Requiring inspection of construction sites to verify implementation of approved erosion control plans and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans; and</p> <p>Requiring BMPs be implemented for constructing, maintaining, and repairing roads and trails in County parks, including stabilizing erosion, clearing vegetation, resurfacing, and removing slide debris. (New) (Model LCP)</p> | |
| 12. Design new residential developments to minimize both volume and velocity of surface runoff and soil erosion. | REV | Policy C-WR-1c: Post-development peak storm water runoff discharge rates shall not exceed the estimated pre-development rate. | Revised to change language from "minimized" to "not exceeding pre-development runoff rates." More detailed |
| <i>Fire Hazards</i> | | | |
| 13. Require fire management plans with applications for subdivisions and for new or expansion of existing recreational facilities in non-urban areas, including the development of State and County park holdings. Such plans should include, but not be limited to, adequate water storage, adequate ingress and egress for emergency vehicles and occupant evacuation, and building siting to minimize fire hazard. | REV | Policy C-PS-5e: Fire management plans shall be required for subdivisions and for new or expanded recreational facilities in non-urban areas, including development of California Department of Parks and Recreation and Sonoma County Regional Parks holdings. Such plans shall include, but not be limited to, adequate water storage, adequate ingress and egress for emergency vehicles and occupant evacuation, and building siting to minimize fire hazards. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|---|---|--|
| <i>Fire Hazards (cont.)</i> | | | |
| 14. Support the Division of Forestry and local fire districts in creation and maintenance of a complete pre-suppression fire plan (fuel breaks, fire breaks, control burning, water development) for fire prevention. | REV | Policy C-PS-5a: Encourage continued operation of California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection programs for fuel breaks, brush management, controlled burns revegetation, and fire roads; however, brush clearing and controlled burns shall not take place in designated Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHAs) or other sensitive habitats. (Existing LCP Revised) | Revised to address where the Fire Protection programs shall not take place Same |
| 15. Urge the State Department of Parks and Recreation, and the County Regional Parks Department to continue efforts to educate the public to fire hazards and fire prevention. | REV | Other Initiative C-PS-8: Encourage the California Department of Parks and Recreation, and the Sonoma County Regional Parks Department to continue efforts to educate the public about fire hazards and fire prevention. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 16. Encourage private individuals and communities to construct small-scale water impoundments for back-up use in fires and for back-up non-potable demand in coastal communities. Agricultural Extension Service advice and credit assistance now available to farmers and ranchers should be made available to those interested in such construction. | REV | Policy C-PS-5h: Encourage private individuals and communities on the Sonoma coast to construct small-scale water storage facilities for back-up use in the case of fire and for back-up non-potable water demand. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 17. Require any construction to comply with the standards prescribed by comprehensive Building Codes and Fire Prevention Codes which give special consideration to different degrees of hazard. | REV | Program C-PS-14: Continue to adopt revisions to the California Fire and Building Codes and other standards which address fire safety as they are approved by inspection organizations and the State of California. Review, revise, and/or adopt existing or new local Codes, ordinances, and Fire Safe Standards to reflect contemporary fire safe practices. (GP2020) | Same |
| 18. Insure the safety of grazing lands and forest areas from wildland fire by the continued use of agricultural and forestry burning procedures and regulations. | REV | Policy C-PS-5a: Encourage continued operation of California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection programs for fuel breaks, brush management, controlled burns revegetation, and fire roads; however, brush clearing and controlled burns shall not take place in designated Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHAs) or other sensitive habitats. (Existing LCP Revised) | Revised to include new Fire protection program methods as opposed to previous burning procedure and regulations and to address where program will not take place geographically in ESHAs Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|--|--|---|
| <i>Fire Hazards (cont.)</i> | | | |
| 19. Regulate the use of spark retarding devices on all equipment. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | No regulation authority identified. Updated Fire suppression systems requirements |

ENVIRONMENT / RESOURCES

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|---|---|--|
| <i>Land Use</i> | | | |
| <p>1. Encourage compatible, resource-related uses on designated resource lands. Such uses should not conflict with resource production activities. Residential, civic, and commercial uses should be located in existing communities or commercial centers as shown on the Land Use Plan. Some low-intensity visitor serving uses may be appropriate on resource lands if they are compatible with the resource use of the land.</p> | REV | <p>No specific corresponding policy identified.</p> <p>Related policies presented below.</p> <p>Policy C-LU-6a: Encourage the development and expansion of visitor-serving and local-serving commercial uses within urban service areas and rural community boundaries where water supply and wastewater disposal requirements can be met. (Existing LCP Revised)</p> <p>Policy C-LU-6b: Limit new visitor-serving commercial development to areas within designated urban service areas and rural community boundaries except for the lowest intensity development (i.e., guest ranches, and bed and breakfast inns, vacation rentals, and agricultural farmstays). (Existing LCP Revised)</p> | <p>Same</p> <p>All Uses must be compatible with the primary resource use of the site</p> |
| <p>2. Allow up to four residential units per resource parcel, consistent with the maximum residential density, for the purpose of housing family members and employees. All housing units should be clustered in relation to the environmental features and the management conditions of the ranch.</p> | REV | <p>No specific corresponding policy identified.</p> <p>Related policies presented below.</p> <p>Policy C-AR-5a: Allow up to four residential units per agricultural parcel, consistent with the maximum residential density, for the purpose of housing family members and agricultural employees. All housing units should be grouped together on the parcel to maximize environmental protections and promote efficient agricultural operations. (Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |
| <p>3. Require that the land divisions on designated resource lands be permitted only for development related to the pursuit of either agriculture or forestry, as appropriate. Utilize mechanisms to assure the long-term retention of such parcels for resource use.</p> | REV | <p>No specific corresponding policy identified.</p> <p>Related policies presented below.</p> <p>Policy C-AR-1a: The following criteria shall be used for approval of subdivisions on land designated Land Extensive Agriculture or Diverse Agriculture:</p> <p>(1) It is consistent with California Coastal Act which requires that</p> <p>(a) the maximum amount of agricultural land shall be maintained in agricultural production,</p> | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|---|---|-----------------------|
| <i>Land Use (cont.)</i> | | | |
| | | <p>(b) agricultural conversions shall be limited and evaluated on a case-by-case basis, and (c) land divisions outside existing developed areas shall be permitted only where 50 percent of the usable parcels in the area have been developed and the created parcels would be no smaller than the average size of surrounding parcels.</p> <p>(2) It does not diminish the productivity of the agricultural land.</p> <p>(3) The resulting parcels for agricultural use shall each be of a size that can support a viable agricultural operation per California Coastal Act Section 30241.5.</p> <p>(4) An open space or agricultural easement shall be applied to the parcels which remain in agricultural use. (New)</p> | |
| <p>4. Establish resource compatibility and continued productivity as primary considerations in parcel design and development siting. Implement General Plan Policies AR-4c and AR-4d to establish Agricultural setbacks and apply the provisions of the 'Right to Farm' ordinance.</p> <p><i>AR-4c: Protect agricultural operations by establishing a buffer between the agricultural land use and the residential use at the urban fringe adjacent to an agricultural land use category. Buffers shall generally be defined as a physical separation of 100' to 200' and/or may be a topographic feature, a substantial tree stand, water course or similar feature. In some circumstances a landscaped berm may provide the buffer. The buffer shall occur on the parcel for which a permit is sought and shall favor protection of the maximum amount of farmable land.</i></p> <p><i>ARC-4d: Apply the provisions of the "Right to Farm" Ordinance to all lands designated within agricultural land use categories.</i></p> | REV | <p>Policy C-AR-1c: Agricultural compatibility and productivity shall be the primary considerations in parcel design and siting of development for subdivisions on lands designated Land Extensive Agriculture or Diverse Agriculture. (Existing LCP Revised)</p> <p>Policy C-AR-3b: Protect agricultural operations by establishing a buffer between an agricultural use on land in the Agriculture land use category and residential development, except for caretaker, agricultural employee, and farm related units. The buffer shall occur on the parcel to be occupied by the residential development and may include one or more of the following: a physical separation of 100 to 200 feet, landscaped berm, topographic feature, substantial tree stand, water course, or similar feature. The type, design, and location of the buffer shall be based on the type, size, and characteristics of the adjacent agricultural operations so as to protect the maximum feasible amount of agricultural land. (Existing LCP Revised)</p> <p>Policy C-AR-3c: Apply the provisions of the Right to Farm Ordinance (Appendix C) to all lands designated Land Extensive Agriculture and Diverse Agriculture. (Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|---|---|---|
| <i>Land Use (cont.)</i> | | | |
| <p>5. Implement minimum parcels sizes and other zoning standards, to promote the productive and wise use of resources, as shown in the zoning district recommendations, Table IV-4. Any land divisions outside of designated rural community or urban service area boundaries and not otherwise regulated by the provisions of Table IV-4 shall be permitted only where 50 percent of the useable parcels in the market area of the parcel have been developed and the created parcel would be no smaller than the average size of the surrounding parcels.</p> | REV | <p>Policy C-AR-1e: Implement minimum parcel sizes and other zoning standards to promote the productive and wise use of resources, as shown in Table C-AR-2.</p> <p>Minimum Parcel Size and Maximum Residential Density by Agricultural Land Use Category. Any land divisions outside of designated Rural Community or Urban Service Area boundaries and not otherwise regulated by the provisions of Policy C-AR-1a or Table C-AR-2 shall be permitted only where 50 percent of the useable parcels in the market area of the parcel have been developed and the created parcel would be no smaller than the average size of the surrounding parcels.</p> <p>(Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |
| <p>6. Place all land designated in the Coastal Plan for agricultural or timber use in an Agricultural Preserve or Timber Preserve where the landowner desires to sign a contract and the minimum requirements can be met. Where parcels do not qualify for inclusion in the Agricultural Preserve or Timber Preserve programs, or where the landowner is not interested in signing a contract, a large minimum lot size Agricultural or Resource Zoning district (consistent with Table IV-4) shall be applied. Large parcels not suited for a productive resource use and designated Sensitive and Hazardous or Recreation-Scenic Design on the Land Use Plan, or agricultural parcels falling entirely within Sanctuary-Preservation or Conservation designations on Open Space Maps should also be zoned to a large minimum lot size Agricultural or Resource Zoning district (consistent with Table IV-4).</p> | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Outdated policy, current Williamson Act contract criteria and standards apply |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|---|--|---|
| <i>Land Use (cont.)</i> | | | |
| <p>7. Implement the following changes for entering into Agricultural Preserve (Williamson Act) contracts:</p> <p>Parcel Size. The minimum parcel size eligible for a Williamson Act contract should be 100 acres for dairy, sheep, beef cattle, or oat hay operations (Type II contracts). Contracts already in existence would not be affected by a new minimum size requirement. Non-contracted contiguous parcels under the same ownership would be required to be assembled into parcels that do meet the acreage requirements. Parcels under the same ownership that are not contiguous, but are located sufficiently close to one another to be operated as one unit, may be awarded a contract provided the contract limits future residential development to only of the parcels, subject to the density limitations of the combining district. Parcels below the minimum size and under separate ownership may be eligible if the owners can show that the income of the parcel qualifies it as self-sustaining unit.</p> <p>Other requirements. All other agricultural preserve requirements should stay the same, except for the coastal policy setting restrictive minimum parcel sizes and residential densities to control potential land division and residential development.</p> | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Outdated policy, current Williamson Act contract criteria and standards apply |
| <p>8. Utilize the Open Space Easement Act for designated Open Space and Sensitive and Hazardous lands to provide reasonable taxation.</p> | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Not necessary; Sensitive and Hazardous land use designation removed |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|---|---|--|
| <i>Land Use (cont.)</i> | | | |
| 9. Incorporate the compatible uses into a revision of the resource zoning districts, specifying the uses exempt and subject to coastal permits. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Incorporated into Coastal Zoning Ordinance |
| 10. Exempt timber harvesting from coastal permit requirements only where regulated by the Forest Practice Act and the California Department of Forestry. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-9a: A Coastal Permit shall not be required for timber harvesting in accordance with a timber harvest plan submitted pursuant to the provisions of the Z'berg-Nejedly Forest Practices Act of 1973 and regulated by the Forest Practices Act and the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 11. Amend the Grading Ordinance to provide for a simple administrative procedure to control the grading of new ranch roads in conjunction with agricultural and timber management activities. Add rural ranch road standards to the Grading Ordinance. Exempt roads approved as part of a Timber Harvest Plan. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Outdated policy, current Grading Ordinance applies |
| 12. Enforce the amended Grading Ordinance. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Policy for ordinance enforcement not necessary |
| <i>Resource Management</i> | | | |
| 13. Promote a high level of agricultural and forestry management practices which protect environmental values to help insure the long term use and conservation of coastal resources. | REV | No specific corresponding policy identified. Related policies presented below. Timber Harvest Plans Policy C-OSRC-9c: Review all timber harvest plans for compatibility with Local Coastal Plan policies and economic viability of the industry. (GP2020) Policy C-OSRC-9d: Where applicable, comment on timber harvest plans in support of increased protection of Class III streams. (GP2020) Policy C-OSRC-9e: Review timber harvest plans adjacent to designated Riparian Corridors and request that clear cutting not occur within streamside conservation areas. Where clear cutting | More detailed |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|---|---|---|
| <i>Resource Management (cont.)</i> | | | |
| | | <p>along designated Riparian Corridors is approved by the applicable state or federal agency, ensure that at least 50 percent of the overstory canopy and at least 50 percent of the understory vegetation be retained. (GP2020)</p> <p>Other Initiative C-AR-5: Work with local Resource Conservation Districts and agricultural associations to encourage and promote sustainable and organic agriculture that uses management practices which conserve energy and protect water and soil, uses organic pesticides, and produces locally grown and processed agricultural products, to help ensure the long-term use and conservation of coastal resources. (Existing LCP Revised)</p> | |
| <p>14. Allow the use of controlled burning to improve grazing land when proper permits have been obtained.</p> | REV | <p>Policy C-PS-5a: Encourage continued operation of California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection programs for fuel breaks, brush management, controlled burns revegetation, and fire roads; however, brush clearing and controlled burns shall not take place in designated Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHAs) or other sensitive habitats. (Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |
| <p>15. Recommend to the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Services, United States Department of Agriculture, that fencing of riparian vegetation for stream protection be a priority coastal practice where needed for bank stabilization in the Agricultural Conservation Program. Another priority coastal practice which should be funded is the fencing of the steep slopes along the high cliffs north of Russian Gulch and south of Fort Ross to prevent overgrazing.</p> | REV | <p>No specific corresponding policy identified.</p> <p>Related policies presented below.</p> <p>Policy C-OSRC-5a(2): Fencing or walls shall be prohibited within riparian habitat and on bluffs, except where necessary for public safety, wildfire risk abatement, habitat protection, or restoration. Fencing or walls that do not permit the free passage of wildlife shall be prohibited. Wildlife-passable fencing should generally be no more than 40 inches tall (up to 6 feet to contain horses) and no lower than 16 inches from the ground (as low as 10 inches where sheep, goats, or predation is a concern). Wooden rail, mesh, or chain link is preferred over wire fence tops, which are less visible to and more likely to result in wildlife collisions and entanglements. Where wire cannot be</p> | More detailed Updated best management practices |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|---|---|--|
| <i>Resource Management (cont.)</i> | | | |
| | | avoided, the top two wires should be at least 12 inches apart, and the top and bottom wires should not be barbed. (New) Policy C-OSRC-5d(7): In cooperation with resource agencies, require landowners to erect wildlife-passable fencing around springs, seeps, and ponds located on grazing land as a condition of permit approval and to develop watering areas outside of wetlands and riparian corridors. (Existing LCP Revised) | |
| 16. Promote use of sensitive soils as watershed and wildlife habitat. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Too general, not necessary; sensitivity of habitats are considered in designation criteria |
| <i>State Parks</i> | | | |
| 17. Prepare a long range resource element of each Park Unit General Plan as a basis for lease agreements. | REV | Other Initiative C-AR-3: Work with the State Department of Parks and Recreation to take the following actions regarding managing agricultural land in State Park Units: (1) Prepare a long-term plan for managing grazing lands and use the plan as a basis for grazing leases; (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 18. Retain in agricultural production land not currently needed for public use, as compatible with the General Plan Resource Element of the park unit. | REV | Other Initiative C-AR-3: Work with the State Department of Parks and Recreation to take the following actions regarding managing agricultural land in State Park Units: (2) Retain in agricultural production land not needed for public use that is compatible with and protective of the resource values and recreation uses; (Existing LCP Revised) | SAME |
| 19. Grant long-term leases (five to twenty years) on State lands, providing incentives to improve the quality of range. | REV | Other Initiative C-AR-3: Work with the State Department of Parks and Recreation to take the following actions regarding managing agricultural land in State Park Units: (3) Grant long-term grazing leases which are protective of sensitive habitats and include incentives to improve range quality; (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|---|--|---|
| <i>State Parks (cont.)</i> | | | |
| 20. Monitor grazing and improve range management practices on State land leased for grazing in cooperation with the ranchers and the Soil Conservation Service. | REV | <p>Other Initiative C-AR-3: Work with the State Department of Parks and Recreation to take the following actions regarding managing agricultural land in State Park Units:</p> <p>(4) Monitor grazing and improve range management practices in cooperation with ranchers and the Natural Resource Conservation Service. (Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |
| 21. Enforce the leash laws at coastal parks and beaches with fines for those who disregard the law. If dog predation of coastal livestock cannot be effectively controlled in some areas, designate public areas which prohibit dogs directly adjacent to vulnerable grazing lands. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Same |
| <i>Other Programs</i> | | | |
| 22. Continue the County predatory animal control program, using humane methods that have a reasonable assurance of affecting predators while not affecting other wildlife. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Not necessary to have policy calling for continuing program, and program not addressed in GP2020; Predatory Animal Control Program is cooperative effort of Wildlife Services, an agency of USDA, California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA), and County Agricultural Commissioner's Office |
| 23. Promote Coastal Conservancy projects on the Sonoma coast involving the restoration of key areas where recreational, natural, or scenic values can be enhanced. | REM | <p>No specific corresponding policy identified. Related other initiative presented below.</p> <p>Other Initiative C-OSRC-2: Support voluntary programs for habitat restoration and enhancement, hazardous fuel management, removal and control of invasive exotics, native plant revegetation, treatment of woodlands affected by sudden oak death, use of fencerows and hedgerows, and management of biotic habitat. (GP2020)</p> | More detailed |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|---|---|---|
| <i>Other Programs (cont.)</i> | | | |
| <p>24. Encourage ranchers and dairy farmers to utilize best management practices to minimize water pollution through the 208 Program. The Soil Conservation Service has the technical expertise to assist in voluntary compliance.</p> | REV | <p>Program C-WR-1: Develop and provide educational, outreach, or technical assistance programs focusing on water quality for owners and operators of agricultural operations and timberlands. Inform owners and operators of agricultural lands, including vineyards, orchards, row crops, grazing, ranches, and dairies, about the Agricultural Commissioner’s Best Management Practices for erosion and sediment control, including on-site retention of storm water, maintenance of natural sheetflow and drainage patterns, and avoidance of concentrated runoff, particularly on slopes greater than 35 percent; and for protection of streams and other surface waters from the effects of livestock grazing. (New)</p> <p>Policy C-WR-11: Ensure that agricultural operations reduce non-point source pollution through the development and implementation of County-approved ranch plans and farm plans that demonstrate how the applicant intends to avoid, minimize, or mitigate the impact to water quality from agriculture. (GP2020)</p> | More detailed |
| <p>25. Support amendments to the forest practice rules to meet the goals of the 208 Program.</p> | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Not appropriate to include policy that calls for supporting amendment of federal or state rules; Section 208 of federal Clean Water Act of 1972 requires all states to assess damages to water quality from nonpoint source pollution and to develop either regulatory or non-regulatory programs to control them |
| <p>26. Formalize the County's review of Timber Harvest Plans with submittal of written comments to the California Department of Forestry in the coastal zone.</p> | REV | <p>Policy C-OSRC-9c: Review all timber harvest plans for compatibility with Local Coastal Plan policies and economic viability of the industry. (GP2020)</p> | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|--|--|-----------------------|
| <i>Other Programs (cont.)</i> | | | |
| | | <p>Policy C-OSRC-9d: Where applicable, comment on timber harvest plans in support of increased protection of Class III streams. (GP2020)</p> <p>Policy C-OSRC-9e: Review timber harvest plans adjacent to designated Riparian Corridors and request that clear cutting not occur within streamside conservation areas. Where clear cutting along designated Riparian Corridors is approved by the applicable state or federal agency, ensure that at least 50 percent of the overstory canopy and at least 50 percent of the understory vegetation be retained. (GP2020)</p> | |
| 27. Request the Board of Forestry to consider enforcing Special Treatment Area stocking and clear cutting standards on all forest lands in the Coastal Zone. | REV | <p>Other Initiative C-OSRC-10: Request that the State Board of Forestry consider developing and enforcing Special Treatment Area stocking and clear cutting standards on all forest lands in the Coastal Zone. (Existing LCP Revised)</p> | Same |

HARBOR

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|--|---|---|
| <i>Dock and Berthing Facilities</i> | | | |
| 1. Encourage marina expansion up to 300 new berths in conjunction with the Phase I Land Use Plan. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | No longer necessary, 300 berths have already been developed |
| 2. Encourage development of support facilities for the fishing industry including fish processing in areas designated fishing commercial on the Land Use Plan. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-6a: Encourage the development of support facilities and the provision of support services for the commercial fishing industry, including fish processing, in areas designated Marine Industrial on the Land Use Plan Map. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 3. Total marina development shall be restricted to a possible maximum of 700 berths in conjunction with the Phase II Land Use Plan for Bodega Bay. Expansion beyond the 300 new berths in Phase I shall be approved only in conjunction with Phase II, and only after 1) review of the harbor operations, with special emphasis on whether activities not dependent upon a harbor location can be relocated to preclude or minimize the need for additional dredging and filling; 2) determination of whether adequate appropriate locations for dredge spoils disposal exist and whether other environmental constraints can be successfully observed in the utilization of such sites; and 3) an assessment of the adequacy of the fisheries resources to support the additional pressure anticipated to result from such expansion, performed in conjunction with appropriate management agencies, demonstrates that the resources are adequate and would not be expected to be harmed by such increased effort. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-6b: Marina development in Bodega Bay will be reviewed based on the following: 1) a review of the Bodega Harbor operations, with special emphasis on whether activities that do not depend on a harbor location can be relocated to preclude or minimize the need for additional dredging and filling; and 2) an assessment of the adequacy of the fisheries resources to support such expansion; and 3) that the resources would not be harmed by increasing the availability of berths for the commercial fishing industry. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|--|--|--|
| <i>Dock and Berthing Facilities (cont.)</i> | | | |
| 4. Institute measures to control pollution of Bodega Harbor in connection with any marina expansion. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Marina already expanded |
| 5. Encourage development of the following services and facilities at Spud Point Marina: Ice and Fuel; gear storage; gear loading; fish off-loading; electricity and fresh water outlets; pump-out stations; and laundry and washrooms. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-6c: Encourage the development of additional support facilities and the provision of additional support services at Spud Point Marina necessary to adequately serve the commercial fishing industry. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 6. Develop a mooring plan for Bodega Harbor. | RET | Program C-OSRC-5: Develop a mooring plan for Bodega Harbor. (Existing LCP) | Same |
| <i>Recreational Boating</i> | | | |
| 7. Modify the boat launching ramp at Doran Park so that it serves only small boats. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Recreational boating policies have been updated Proposed improvements to public access facilities have been updated and in Public Access Plan |
| 8. Encourage private operators to accommodate additional demand for boat launching facilities particularly for the "mosquito fleet". | REV | Policy C-PA-6a: Encourage public and private harbor and marina operators to accommodate existing and future demand for recreational and commercial boating facilities. (New) | More detailed |
| 9. Development of a nine-berth marina at the Bodega Harbor Yacht Club for recreational boats shall be allowed only if, upon appropriate site-specific investigation, it can be demonstrated that the area that would need to be dredged constitutes open coastal waters and that therefore the use would be appropriate under Section 30233 of the Coastal Act, that there is no feasible less environmentally damaging alternative, that all appropriate mitigation measures are required, and that the project would maintain or enhance the functional capacity of the estuary. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Marina has already been developed |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|--|--|----------------------------------|
| Recreational Boating (cont.) | | | |
| 10. Provide for hand launching of car-top boats including inflatables and kayaks at Stillwater, Gerstle, and Timber Coves. Continue to use Fort Ross for hand launching until historic facilities in the cove (beach) area are open to the public. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Hand launch facilities developed |
| 11. Encourage continuation of private boat rentals and launch facilities at Timber Cove, River's End, Bridgehaven, and Russian River campgrounds. | REV | Policy C-PA-6b: Encourage continuing the existing boat rental and launch facilities at the coast and coastal waterways and providing additional facilities that provide new recreational opportunities compatible with natural resources. (New) | Same |
| 12. Reserve up to 20 percent of the berths at Spud Point Marina for recreational boats. | REV | Policy C-PA-1g: Use the Public Access Plan as the guide for determination of undeveloped (passive) park needs in the Coastal Zone, including County Regional Open Space Parks, Regional Trails, and State Parks in order to support coastal recreation. (New) (See Appendix B, Bodega Bay SubArea 9, I-23) | Same |
| Dredging and Filling - General | | | |
| 13. Dredge only in the winter months when many animal species appear to be least sensitive to turbidity. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-6d: Dredging shall be required to occur only in the winter, when most marine and estuarine animals are not migrating or spawning and are least sensitive to turbidity. (Existing LCP Revised: Recommendation 77 on page 34 and Recommendation 13 on page 123) | Same |
| 14. Transport spoils to sites outside the harbor. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-6e: The deposition of fill or dredge spoils in Bodega Harbor shall be prohibited, except according to Section 30233 of the California Coastal Act. (Existing LCP Revised) | More detailed |
| 15. Prohibit disposition of fill or spoils in Bodega Harbor except in accordance with Section 30233 of the Coastal Act. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-6e: The deposition of fill or dredge spoils in Bodega Harbor shall be prohibited, except according to Section 30233 of the California Coastal Act. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|--|--|---|
| <i>Dredging and Filling – General (cont.)</i> | | | |
| 16. Prohibit deposition of spoils in Bodega Bay (outside the harbor), east of a line extending from the tip of Tomales Point, to the tip of Bodega Head since Bodega Bay is an important crab nursery area. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-6f: The deposition of dredge spoils shall be prohibited outside Bodega Harbor in Bodega Bay east of the line extending from the tip of Tomales Point, to the tip of Bodega Head. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 17. Comply with recommendations in Chapter 3 concerning diking, dredging, and filling. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-5d(5): Diking, filling, draining, and dredging of coastal waters, wetlands, and estuaries shall be permitted only in accordance with other applicable provisions of this Local Coastal Program, where there is no feasible less environmentally damaging alternative, and where feasible mitigation measures have been provided to minimize adverse environmental effects, and shall be limited to uses and methods described in Habitat Protection Guidelines, Appendix E-5. The more specific permissible use provisions of this policy shall control over the more general use provisions for other types of ESHA identified in Policies C-OSRC-5b(7) and C-OSRC-5e(4). (New) | Not necessary for policy to call for compliance with other policies |
| 18. Require approval of a detailed reclamation plan for disposal sites prior to any dredging. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-6g: Approval of a detailed reclamation plan shall be required for a dredge spoils disposal site prior to commencing any dredging that would generate dredge spoils to be disposed of at that site. (Existing LCP Revised) | More detailed |
| <i>Dredging and Filling - New Airport Disposal Site</i> | | | |
| 19. Require that any disposal project at the new airport site be designed and implemented to protect groundwater resources and potential domestic supplies. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-6i: Any dredge spoils disposal project shall be designed and implemented to protect groundwater resources and existing and potential domestic water supplies, and to be consistent with all policies of this Local Coastal Plan for protection of wetlands and other Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA). (Existing LCP Revised) | More detailed |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|--|--|--|
| <i>Dredging and Filling - New Airport Disposal Site (cont.)</i> | | | |
| 20. Protect the drainage and riparian corridor at the new airport site. Diked ponds for disposal must avoid the riparian area and assure that no spoils would be deposited in the drainage and that no runoff would enter the drainage or the freshwater wetland area. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-6k: Riparian corridors at dredge disposal sites shall be protected. Diked ponds for disposal of dredge spoils shall be sited and designed to avoid the riparian area, such that no dredge spoils would be deposited in the drainage and no runoff would enter the drainage or the freshwater wetland; and to be consistent with all policies of this Local Coastal Plan for protection of wetland and other Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHAs). (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 21. Limit operation of construction equipment across the drainage between the disposal ponds to one haul road. Following spoils disposal, this road should be removed and the area regraded to natural drainage contours and seeded for quick establishment of vegetation. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-6l: At upland disposal sites, the operation of construction equipment across drainages between dredge spoils disposal ponds shall be limited to one haul road. Following the disposal of dredge spoils and consistent with all policies of this Local Coastal Plan for protection of wetland and other Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHAs), the road shall be removed, the area shall be regraded to natural drainage contours, and vegetation shall be re-established. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 22. Route the spoils conveyance pipe line to this site from Bodega Harbor along the right of way of existing roads except for the final crossing north to the site. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-6j: Route the dredge spoils conveyance pipeline to upland disposal sites from Bodega Harbor along the right-of-way of existing roads, where possible. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 23. Implement a reclamation plan for the site that will assure rapid recovery, minimize visual impacts and improve the wildlife habitat. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-6m: A reclamation plan shall be implemented for any upland disposal site which assures rapid re-establishment of vegetation, minimize visual impacts, and improve wildlife habitat, consistent with all policies of this Local Coastal Plan for protection of wetland and other Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHAs). (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 24. Prohibit disposal of dredge spoils from maintenance dredging on this site. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Site insufficient for dredge spoils, no longer needed other locations have been selected to dispose of dredge spoils |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|--|--|--|
| <i>Dredging and Filling - Old Airport Disposal Site</i> | | | |
| 25. Reclaim and restore the Old Airport Site to the maximum extent feasible following each maintenance dredging. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-6p: The Old Airport Disposal Site shall be reclaimed and restored to the maximum extent feasible following each maintenance dredging. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 26. Protect the rare plants in the marsh south of the site during the course of construction. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-6o: The rare plants in the marsh south of the Old Airport Disposal Site shall be protected during the course of any construction on the site. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 27. Require a full evaluation of the potential visual, water quality, and reclamation problems associated with raising the dikes to accommodate a large one-time disposal prior to approving such a plan. | REV | Policy C-OSRC-6n: Prior to approval of a plan for a large, one-time dredge spoils disposal at the Old Airport Disposal Site, a full evaluation shall be required of the potential visual, water quality, and reclamation issues associated with raising the dikes to accommodate the dredge spoils. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| <i>Dredging and Filling - Off-Shore Disposal</i> | | | |
| 28. Initiate the process of designating an off-shore dredge spoils disposal site. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Offshore site designated, San Francisco Deep Ocean Disposal Site |

HISTORIC RESOURCES

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|---|--|--|
| <p>1. Establish boundaries and rezone as Historic Districts the areas of Stewarts Point, Plantation, Fort Ross and Duncans Mills during the Implementation Stage.</p> | <p>REM</p> | <p>No specific corresponding policy identified.</p> | <p>Duncans Mills Historic District already established</p> <p>Planning decided not to establish Stewarts Point, Plantation, and Fort Ross Historic Districts, although some properties are designated Historic Landmarks</p> |
| <p>2. In addition to those individual sites incorporated into the four historic districts named in Recommendation 1, determine which of the historic resource sites identified in Appendix A are eligible for county landmark status and rezone to HD the worthy sites during the Implementation Stage.</p> | <p>REV</p> | <p>Policy C-OSRC-14a: Refer proposals for County Historic Landmark designation and rezoning to the Historic Combining District to the Sonoma County Landmarks Commission. (GP2020)</p> <p>Policy C-OSRC-14b: The Sonoma County Landmarks Commission shall review Historic Resource Surveys and Evaluations and make recommendations for designation of buildings, structures, sites, cemeteries, features, or objects as County Historic Landmarks. (GP2020)</p> <p>Policy C-OSRC-14c: Refer lists of historic buildings, structures, sites, cemeteries, features, and objects proposed for designation as County Historic Landmarks to the Sonoma County Landmarks Commission for its recommendation. (GP2020)</p> <p>Other Initiative C-OSRC-13: Encourage, support, and pursue grant funding for the preparation and periodic updating of Historic Resource Surveys. (GP2020)</p> | <p>Project already completed; general intent carried forward through Policies C-OSRC-14a, C-OSRC-14b, C-OSRC-14c, and Other Initiative C-OSRC-13</p> |
| <p>3. Refer all coastal permits within the Stewarts Point, Plantation, Fort Ross, and Duncans Mills areas to the Sonoma County Landmarks Commission for their comments and recommendations.</p> | <p>REM</p> | <p>No specific corresponding policy identified. Related policy presented below.</p> <p>Policy C-OSRC-14e: Refer applications for development permits that involve the removal, demolition, or alteration of a building, structure, site, cemetery, feature, or object identified in an Historic Resource Survey to the Sonoma County Landmarks Commission for review and mitigation, with the exception of such projects within The Sea Ranch, which shall be referred to the Sea Ranch Design Committee. Measures for removal or demolition may include reuse, relocation, preparation of "as-built" drawings, and photo-documentation. (GP2020)</p> | <p>Duncans Mills Historic District already established</p> <p>Planning decided not to establish Stewarts Point, Plantation, and Fort Ross Historic Districts, although some properties are designated Historic Landmarks</p> |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|--|---|--|
| <p>4. Refer all coastal permits on historic resource sites listed in the historic resources inventory to the Sonoma County Landmarks Commission for their comments and recommendations.</p> | <p>REV</p> | <p>No specific corresponding policy identified.</p> <p>Policy C-OSRC-14e: Refer applications for development permits that involve the removal, demolition, or alteration of a building, structure, site, cemetery, feature, or object identified in an Historic Resource Survey to the Sonoma County Landmarks Commission for review and mitigation, with the exception of such projects within The Sea Ranch, which shall be referred to the Sea Ranch Design Committee. Measures for removal or demolition may include reuse, relocation, preparation of "as-built" drawings, and photo-documentation. (GP2020)</p> | <p>Duncans Mills Historic District already established</p> <p>Planning decided not to establish Stewarts Point, Plantation, and Fort Ross Historic Districts, although some properties are designated Historic Landmarks</p> |

RECREATION / RECREATION FACILITIES

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|--|--|---|
| <i>General</i> | | | |
| 1. Prepare a long range General Plan for each State and County park unit in conjunction with park development planning. | REV | Program C-PA-1: Prepare a long-range plan or Master Plan for each State or County Park or Preserve consistent with priorities in the Public Access Element in conjunction with park development planning. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 2. Expand the existing reservation system to include all State and County campsites. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Not appropriate to include in LCP |
| 3. Encourage limited one night camping in State and County day use areas to help prevent camping along roadways and Highway 1 on peak weekends. Day use areas for such limited overnight camping should be large with restrooms and not located immediately west of Highway 1. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Based on consultation with State and County Parks staff |
| 4. Encourage the provision of low cost accommodations where appropriate, including tent or small vehicle campgrounds, hike-in and primitive campgrounds, hostel and sleeping cabin facilities. Utilize existing structures where feasible. | REV | Policy C-PA-3h: Encourage a range of accommodations in parks, including the provision of low cost accommodations where appropriate, including tent or small vehicle campgrounds, hike-in and primitive campgrounds, and hostel and sleeping cabin facilities. Use existing buildings and structures for these accommodations where feasible. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 5. Encourage provision of overflow camping for bicyclists and hikers at campgrounds where hostels are not feasible. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Based on consultation with State and County Parks staff |
| 6. Locate campgrounds, whenever possible, in areas that have already been disturbed. Campgrounds should be small and sited in unobtrusive locations. Provide separate walk-in, tent, and recreational vehicle camping areas. | REV | Policy C-PA-3i: Locate campgrounds, whenever possible, in areas that have already been disturbed by prior uses and consequently where cultural and biotic resources are typically limited. Campgrounds should be sited in a manner that protects visual resources and consistent with County development standards. Provide separate walk-in, tent, and recreational vehicle camping areas. (Existing LCP Revised) | More detailed |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|--|--|---|
| <i>General (cont.)</i> | | | |
| 7. Design parking and restroom facilities to serve only the planned intensity of recreation development. | REV | No specific corresponding policy identified. Related policy presented below. Policy C-PA-3n: Provide restrooms at significant recreational areas to protect coastal resources and public health and safety. Consider use patterns and the proximity of other nearby public restrooms when determining facility needs. (Existing LCP Revised) | More detailed |
| 8. Relate intensity of planned development to available water supplies. | REV | Policy C-PA-3j: Relate intensity of planned public access facilities to available water supply and available septic or sewer capacity. (Existing LCP Revised) | More detailed |
| 9. Locate parking in visually screened areas. | REV | Policy C-PA-4c: When feasible locate parking in areas screened from public view. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 10. Provide adequate drainage of surface water through the use of grasscrete and the use of paving only where necessary. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. Related policy presented below. Policy C-WR-1b: New development and redevelopment shall include measures to minimize post-development changes in the runoff flow regime, control pollutant sources, and, where necessary, remove pollutants. Such measures shall take into account existing site characteristics that affect runoff (such as topography, drainage, vegetation, soil conditions, natural hydrologic features, and infiltration conditions). In addition, these measures should be considered early in site design planning and through alternative analysis. Such measures include, but may not be limited to the following: (4) Plan, site, and design development to maintain or enhance on-site infiltration of runoff, where appropriate and feasible. Minimize the installation of impervious surfaces, especially directly-connected impervious areas, and, where feasible, increase the area of pervious surfaces in re-development, to reduce runoff. (Model LCP) | Replaced by policies in Water Resources Element |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|--|--|---|
| General (cont.) | | | |
| 11. Encourage State Parks to take immediate action, including adequate staffing and necessary physical measures, to protect the natural and cultural resources of new acquisitions. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Not necessary to include in LCP |
| 12. Allow park residences in areas visible to the public where necessary for security reasons and when visual concerns are mitigated. | REV | Policy C-PA-3k: Allow park residences in areas visible to the public where necessary for security reasons and when impacts on views are mitigated. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 13. Improve the interpretation of historical and natural features along the coast. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Not necessary to include in LCP |
| 14. Encourage the provision of private recreation facilities where appropriate. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| 15. Allow extension of sewer service to public parklands only where consistent with General Plan Policies PF-1d and PF-1e. | REV | Policy C-PA-3l: Allow extension of sewer service to parklands only where consistent with policies of the Public Facilities and Services Element of this Local Coastal Plan. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 16. Provide bicycle racks or locked storage areas at State and County park beaches and other developed parklands. | REV | Policy C-PA-3s: Provide bicycle racks or locked bicycle storage areas at State and County Regional Parks, beaches, and other developed parklands. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| Public Recreation - Gualala Point County Park | | | |
| 17. Encourage the development of the trail recommended in the Access Plan on adjacent property. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| Salt Point State Park Unit - Kruse Ranch | | | |
| 18. Develop horseback riding and hiking trails east of Highway 1. Consider designation of this area as a State wilderness. | REV | No specific corresponding policy identified. Related policy presented below. Policy C-PA-3a: Implement the Public Access Plan as the set of primary policies for development of public access on the Sonoma County coast. (New) (See Appendix B, Salt Point SubArea 4, D-6.) | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|---|--|--|
| <i>Salt Point State Park Unit - Kruse Ranch (cont.)</i> | | | |
| 19. Reconstruct the Kruse barn, the old Wells Fargo Office, hotel, and store structure, subject to research of authenticity. Adaptive reuse for interpretive or informational purposes, or as a youth hostel, should be pursued. The trailer should be located out of sight at the proposed park support service area to the south, or relocated out of view of Highway 1 at this location and used as a park security residence. | REV | Policy C-PA-3a: Implement the Public Access Plan as the set of primary policies for development of public access on the Sonoma County coast. (New) (See Appendix B, Salt Point SubArea 4, D-6.) | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| 20. Encourage the development of the trails recommended in the Access Plan. | REV | Policy C-PA-3a: Implement the Public Access Plan as the set of primary policies for development of public access on the Sonoma County coast. (New) | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| <i>Salt Point State Park Unit - Salt Point State Park</i> | | | |
| 21. Develop two types of facilities, each to accommodate 30-60 persons, east of the highway: a campground oriented toward horseback riding, and a campground oriented toward hike-in camping. These campsite areas should be accessible to the public only by horseback or hiking. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| 22. Designate new and existing trails with signs and provide interpretation of the natural environment. Designate the trail from the intersection of the existing riding and hiking trail and Highway 1 to the bluff in a westerly direction. Designate specific trails in this and other locations where use now occurs in an informal manner, to help preserve the park's sensitive resources. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| 23. Encourage the development of trails recommended in the Access Plan and various facilities approved by the Coastal Commission. | REV | No specific corresponding policy identified. Related policy presented below. Policy C-PA-3a: Implement the Public Access Plan as the set of primary policies for development of public access on the Sonoma County coast. (New) (See Appendix B, Salt Point SubArea 4, D-6.) | More detailed Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|--|--|---|
| <i>Stillwater Cove County Regional Park</i> | | | |
| 24. Encourage the acquisition and the development of trails recommended in the Access Plan and the proposed development of 30 campsites and the day use facilities approved by the Coastal Commission. | REV | No specific corresponding policy identified. Related policy presented below. Policy C-PA-1a: Implement the Public Access Plan as the set of primary policies for acquisition of public access on the Sonoma County coast. (Existing LCP Revised) (See Appendix B, Timber cove/Fort Ross Subarea 5, E-4.) | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| 25. Encourage acquisition of a trail easement or land acquisition along Stockoff Creek to the ridge and Salt Point State Park, and acquisition of a scenic easement along the trail corridor. | REV | Policy C-PA-1a: Implement the Public Access Plan as the set of primary policies for acquisition of public access on the Sonoma County coast. (Existing LCP Revised) (See Appendix B, Timber cove/Fort Ross Subarea 5, E-4.) | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| <i>Fort Ross State Historic Park Unit - Call Ranch</i> | | | |
| 26. Encourage the development of trails recommended in the Access Plan. If Kolmer Gulch and Windermere Point are not made available for public recreation or visitor-serving use, these areas should also be acquired by State Parks. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. Related policy presented below. Policy C-PA-3a: Implement the Public Access Plan as the set of primary policies for development of public access on the Sonoma County coast. (New) (See Appendix B, Timber cove/Fort Ross Subarea 5, E-15.) | Kolmer Gulch and Windermere Point already acquired by State and made available for public use |
| <i>Fort Ross State Historic Park Unit - Fort Ross State Historic Park and Eckert Ranch</i> | | | |
| 27. Review the proposed realignment of Highway 1 and construction of a scenic overlook in relation to maintaining the rural character of the road. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| 28. Review the proposed visitor center and parking expansion, and tree and structure removal for visual, environmental, and historical impacts. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Project already completed |
| 29. Consider relocating Fort Ross School to the State Park. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | school already relocated to State Park |
| 30. Encourage the development of trails recommended in the Access Plan, and coordinate trails connecting the parking, fort, and day use areas with other coastal trails. | REV | Policy C-PA-3a: Implement the Public Access Plan as the set of primary policies for development of public access on the Sonoma County coast. (New) (See Appendix B, Timber cove/Fort Ross Subarea 5, E-14.) | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|---|--|---|
| <i>Fort Ross State Historic Park Unit - Fort Ross State Historic Park and Eckert Ranch (cont.)</i> | | | |
| 31. Eliminate boat launching and motorboats from Fort Ross Cove as soon as historic facilities in the Cove (beach) area are open to the public. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | boat launching and motorboats already eliminated from Fort Ross Cove |
| 32. Pursue acquisition east of Highway 1 as shown on the general development plan. Timberland could be leased for managed forest use. The lower slopes are appropriate for personnel housing and an administration center. Camping would not be exposed to the highway and could be located here. The picnic areas proposed at the orchard site, logging site, and the scenic overlook on Fort Ross Road are desirable uses for the Fort Ross uplands. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| 33. Consolidate, define, and substantially reduce day and overnight use facilities on the coastal terrace south of the fort. Such facilities must be visually screened, not block coast views and meet other environmental recommendations. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| 34. Develop the small group camp east of the highway. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| <i>Sonoma Coast State Beach Unit - North Jenner Beach</i> | | | |
| 35. Consider providing about 15 primitive campsites under the willows for hikers and cyclists. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| 36. Provide one parking area and restrooms between Jenner and Russian Gulch. A good location is east of Highway 1 (not on State property) just north of Manni Gulch where there is access to the expansive beach. Eliminate other roadside parking areas north of Manni Gulch and maintain a ranch style fence to keep vehicles off the bluffs. Continue to utilize vista turn outs south of Manni Gulch. | REV | Policy C-PA-3a: Implement the Public Access Plan as the set of primary policies for development of public access on the Sonoma County coast. (New) (See Appendix B, High Cliffs/Muniz/Jenner Subarea 6, F-6.) | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|---|--|---|
| <i>Sonoma Coast State Beach Unit - North Jenner Beach (cont.)</i> | | | |
| 37. Construct a trail from parking area to No Dog Beach, including safe shoreline access to double cove. | REV | Policy C-PA-3a: Implement the Public Access Plan as the set of primary policies for development of public access on the Sonoma County coast. (New) (See Appendix B, High Cliffs/Muniz/Jenner Subarea 6, F-6.) | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| <i>Sonoma Coast State Beach Unit - Jenner State Parks Building</i> | | | |
| 38. Consider rehabilitating the building and utilizing it as an un-staffed coastal public information center with changing exhibits to provide information on State, County and private parks, campgrounds and accessways. Include public restrooms. | REM | Policy C-PA-3a: Implement the Public Access Plan as the set of primary policies for development of public access on the Sonoma County coast. (New) (See Appendix B, High Cliffs/Muniz/Jenner Subarea 6, F-10.) | Building now open seasonally as visitor center |
| <i>Sonoma Coast State Beach Unit - Penny Island</i> | | | |
| 39. Designate Penny Island and the marsh at Goat Rock a State reserve or natural preserve. | REV | Policy C-PA-1a: Implement the Public Access Plan as the set of primary policies for acquisition of public access on the Sonoma County coast. (Existing LCP Revised) (See Appendix B, Pacific View/Willow Creek Subarea 8, H-3.) | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| <i>Sonoma Coast State Beach Unit - Willow Creek</i> | | | |
| 40. Develop a trail from the Goat Rock area along the southern ridge to the upper Willow Creek, with hike-in campsites at the end of the trail. Hikers could utilize Willow Creek Road to Bridgehaven, then hike along the highway back to Goat Rock. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| 41. Provide camping and day use access to the Russian River from Willow Creek Road. Reclaim the borrow pit in this area. | REV | Policy C-PA-3a: Implement the Public Access Plan as the set of primary policies for development of public access on the Sonoma County coast. (New) (See Appendix B, Pacific View/Willow Creek Subarea 8, H-10.) | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| 42. Restore and expand the Willow Creek ranch buildings as a hostel, administrative facility and/or environmental education facility. Development should be in keeping with the historic character of the existing structures. | REV | Policy C-PA-3a: Implement the Public Access Plan as the set of primary policies for development of public access on the Sonoma County coast. (New) (See Appendix B, Pacific View/Willow Creek Subarea 8, H-9.) | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|--|--|---|
| <i>Sonoma Coast State Beach Unit - Willow Creek (cont.)</i> | | | |
| 43. Limit vehicle access to the southern portion of Willow Creek to low intensity day use facilities near Willow Creek Road. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| <i>Sonoma Coast State Beach Unit - Sonoma Coast State Beach</i> | | | |
| 44. Encourage development of a visitor center in the vicinity of Salmon Creek or the Bodega Dunes campground. Interpretive facilities and material should include warning of the hazards of the Sonoma coast. | REV | Policy C-PA-3a: Implement the Public Access Plan as the set of primary policies for development of public access on the Sonoma County coast. (New) (See Appendix B, Bodega Bay Subarea 9, I-1.) | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| 45. Encourage development of a nature trail west of Highway 1 at the Salmon Creek marsh. | REV | Policy C-PA-3a: Implement the Public Access Plan as the set of primary policies for development of public access on the Sonoma County coast. (New) (See Appendix B, Bodega Bay Subarea 9, I-1.) | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| 46. Complete State beach inholdings to the degree possible at Pacific View Estates and parcels 101-13-11, 2 and 3. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| 47. Encourage the development of trails recommended in the Access Plan and parking facilities recommended in the Transportation section. | REV | Policy C-PA-3a: Implement the Public Access Plan as the set of primary policies for development of public access on the Sonoma County coast. (New) (See Appendix B, Bodega Bay Subarea 9.) | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| <i>Sonoma Coast State Beach Unit - Bodega Dunes Campground</i> | | | |
| 48. Utilize techniques such as boardwalks to minimize impacts of foot traffic across the dunes in more heavily used areas. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| 49. Encourage acquisition of the five parcels near the Roppolo well to protect the dunes from development. | REV | Policy C-PA-1a: Implement the Public Access Plan as the set of primary policies for acquisition of public access on the Sonoma County coast. (Existing LCP Revised) (See Appendix B, Bodega Bay Subarea 9, I-17.) | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|---|---|---|
| <i>Sonoma Coast State Beach Unit - Bodega Dunes Campground (cont.)</i> | | | |
| 50. Provide a hostel to serve the south coast. | REV | Policy C-PA-3a: Implement the Public Access Plan as the set of primary policies for development of public access on the Sonoma County coast. (New) (See Appendix B, Bodega Bay Subarea 9, I-17) | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| <i>Sonoma Coast State Beach Unit - Bodega Head</i> | | | |
| 51. Limit development to improvement of existing facilities, such as improved parking, restroom, and picnic facilities. Trails for sightseeing and diving access should also be considered. | REV | Policy C-PA-3a: Implement the Public Access Plan as the set of primary policies for development of public access on the Sonoma County coast. (New) (See Appendix B, Bodega Bay Subarea 9, I-18.) | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| 52. Encourage development of the trail recommended in the Access Plan. | REV | Policy C-PA-3a: Implement the Public Access Plan as the set of primary policies for development of public access on the Sonoma County coast. (New) (See Appendix B, Bodega Bay Subarea 9, I-18.) | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| 53. All fencing except that needed to prevent access to the Hole in the Head should be removed. Continuation of salmon-rearing program in the pond should be considered. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| <i>Westside County Park and Doran County Park</i> | | | |
| 54. Follow recommendations of "Preliminary Master Plan, Doran Park, and Westside Park." | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| 55. Acquire parcels designated sensitive and hazardous on the Bodega Bay Land Use Plan, on the west side of the loop road west of Highway 1, to protect them from development. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| <i>Sonoma Coastal Trail</i> | | | |
| 56. Encourage a coastal trail along the beach, the coastal terrace, the uplands, the ridge roads, or the highway to connect public and private recreation areas and access trails with communities and commercial services. | REV | Policy C-PA-2a: Provide a safe, continuous walking and hiking trail as close to the ocean as possible. Where it is not feasible to locate the trail along the shoreline due to natural landforms or legally authorized development that prevents passage at all times, inland bypass trail segments located as close | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|--|---|---|
| <i>Sonoma Coastal Trail (cont.)</i> | | | |
| | | to the shoreline as possible should be used. Shoreline trail segments that may not be passable at all times, or that are not passable by bicycles, should be augmented by inland alternative routes that are passable and safe for pedestrians and bicycles. (New) | |
| 57. Encourage increased provision of facilities for storing bicycles and camping equipment at campgrounds designed for bicyclists and hikers. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| 58. Provide reduced rates for campers arriving by bicycle or foot. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| <i>Private Recreation - The Sea Ranch</i> | | | |
| 59. Encourage the addition of a club house, maintenance facility and an additional nine holes at The Sea Ranch Golf Course. | REV | Policy C-PA-3a: Implement the Public Access Plan as the set of primary policies for development of public access on the Sonoma County coast. (New) (See Appendix B, The Sea Ranch South Subarea 2, B-6.) | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| <i>Call Ranch</i> | | | |
| 60. Encourage development of a modest size, auto-accessible and walk-in campground, without hook-ups for recreational vehicles. The campground should be in conjunction with public parking and access to Kolmer Gulch beach and with the demonstration forest. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| <i>River's End</i> | | | |
| 61. Continue public day use and camping at the beach. Encourage upgrading of facilities. | REV | Policy C-PA-3a: Implement the Public Access Plan as the set of primary policies for development of public access on the Sonoma County coast. (New) (See Appendix B, High Cliffs/Muniz/Jenner Subarea 6, F-8.) | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| <i>Duncans Mills Campground</i> | | | |
| 62. Encourage additional campsites, particularly as part of plan to provide a hostel or other low cost indoor accommodations. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|--|--|---|
| <i>Duncans Mills Campground (cont.)</i> | | | |
| 63. Continue public day use of the beach, including parking. Should the nature trail along the marsh on the north side of Highway 116 be opened for commercial use or expanded, a coastal permit will be necessary. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| <i>Casini Ranch Family Campground</i> | | | |
| 64. Encourage additional campsites and camper services. Any development plans should include prohibition of camping between the river and the riparian vegetation on the beach as currently occurs. | REV | Policy C-PA-3a: Implement the Public Access Plan as the set of primary policies for development of public access on the Sonoma County coast. (New) (See Appendix B, The High Cliffs/Muniz/Jenner Subarea 6, G-4.) | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| 65. Continue public day use, including parking. | REV | Policy C-PA-3a: Implement the Public Access Plan as the set of primary policies for development of public access on the Sonoma County coast. (New) (See Appendix B, The High Cliffs/Muniz/Jenner Subarea 6, G-4.) | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| <i>Bodega Bay Trailer Park</i> | | | |
| 66. Encourage upgrading of existing facilities. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Public Access Plan has been updated in consultation with State Parks and County Parks |
| <i>Bodega Harbor Golf Course</i> | | | |
| 67. Encourage the addition of a pro shop and parking. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Pro shop already constructed |

RECREATION / SHORELINE ACCESS

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|--|---|-----------------------|
| 1. Adopt the Access Plan as the primary policy on access to the Sonoma County shoreline. | REV | Policy C-PA-1a: Implement the Public Access Plan as the set of primary policies for acquisition of public access on the Sonoma County coast. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 2. Require an offer of access dedication as a condition of any coastal permit if an accessway is shown on the property in the Access Plan. | REV | Policy C-PA-1d: Require dedication of a public access easement, right of way, or fee title as a Condition of Approval for a Coastal Permit for new development requested on property along the alignment of the California Coastal Trail or containing a planned access facility described in the Public Access Plan, for new development located between the first public road and the shoreline (i.e., west of the first public road); and for any new development located east of the first public road. The dedication shall be reviewed and approved by the Sonoma County Regional Parks Department as sufficient to support the planned public access facility. The dedication shall be granted to the County of Sonoma or a State agency. (Existing LCP Revised) | More detailed |
| 3. Protect areas where public prescriptive rights may exist by investigating the possibility of prescriptive rights on coastal permits. In order to approve a coastal permit, a finding must be made that the project will not interfere with established prescriptive rights. In many cases an offer of dedication will be required in order to make this finding. Many of the potentially prescriptive access points have been recommended for acquisition. | REV | Policy C-PA-1e: Protect areas where public prescriptive rights to the coast may exist by identifying all known routes historically used by the public in the project area when processing Coastal Permits or where public prescriptive rights to the coast appear to be threatened. Work with the California Coastal Commission to ensure that any access rights that the public may have acquired are preserved. To approve either a permit or Coastal Permits for private development on lands that may have public prescriptive rights to the coast or where these rights appear to be threatened, the following actions must be taken: (1) A finding made that the project would not interfere with public prescriptive rights to the coast. (2) Formalization of the public prescriptive rights to the coast, which may involve development of new or expanded improvements. | More detailed |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|---|---|-----------------------|
| | | <p>(3) Dedication of an access easement or fee title as a condition of project approval.</p> <p>Provide appropriate assistance with State or private legal action to acquire access easements to access corridors for which prescriptive rights to the Sonoma County coast may exist. (Existing LCP Revised)</p> | |
| <p>4. Implement the Access Plan Acquisition Priorities as follows:</p> <p><i>Acquisition Priority I:</i> Begin efforts to acquire immediately through purchase, permit requirements, or other negotiations as required.</p> <p><i>Acquisition Priority II:</i> Require an offer of dedication as a condition of any coastal permit. When all Priority I accessways have been acquired, positive steps toward purchasing Priority II accessways should be taken.</p> <p><i>Acquisition Priority III:</i> Require an offer of dedication as a condition of any coastal permit. Only when all Priority I and II accessways have been acquired should positive steps toward purchasing Priority III accessways be taken. Offers of dedication for some Priority III accessways may never be exercised because adequate access is provided by private owners or it is determined to be not in the public's interest to open access.</p> | <p>REV</p> | <p>Policy C-PA-1b: Implement the Acquisition Priorities for the Public Access Plan as follows:</p> <p>(1) <i>Acquisition Priority I:</i> Begin or continue efforts to acquire through purchase, permit requirements, donation, or other negotiations as necessary to implement the Public Access Plan.</p> <p>(2) <i>Acquisition Priority II:</i> Require an offer of dedication or dedication of an easement as a condition of any Coastal Permit.</p> <p>When all available Priority I properties have been acquired, take positive steps toward acquiring Priority II properties. If a time sensitive Priority II property is available, consider pursuing it before all Priority I properties have been acquired.</p> <p>(3) <i>Acquisition Priority III:</i> Require an offer of dedication or dedication of an easement as a condition of any Coastal Permit. Offers of dedication for some Priority III properties may never be exercised because adequate access is provided by private owners, there is inadequate funding, or it is determined to not be in the public's interest to open access.</p> <p>When all available Priority I and II properties have been acquired, take steps toward acquiring Priority III properties. If a time sensitive Priority III property is available, consider pursuing it before all Priority I and II properties have been acquired. (Existing LCP Revised)</p> | <p>Same</p> |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised (REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|---|---|-----------------------|
| <p>5. Implement the Access Plan Development Priorities as follows:</p> <p><i>Development Priority I:</i> Encourage each agency or association owning or operating designated accessways to allocate funds immediately and develop Priority I accessways within their purview.</p> <p><i>Development Priority II:</i> Encourage each agency or association owning or operating designated accessways to allocate funds and develop Priority II accessways only when all Priority I and II accessways within their purview have been developed.</p> <p><i>Development Priority III:</i> Encourage each agency or association owning or operating designated accessways to allocate funds and develop Priority III accessways only when all Priority I and II accessways within their purview have been developed.</p> | <p>REV</p> | <p>Policy C-PA-3b: All proposed public access in the Public Access Plan has been designated from the highest to lowest priority for development as Development Priority I, II, or III. The emphasis for development priority is different than that for acquisition priority. Developing accessways distant from existing developed access points are given higher priority. Public safety and the costs of development and operation are principal concerns.</p> <p>Implement the Development Priorities for the Public Access Plan as follows:</p> <p>(1) <i>Development Priority I:</i> Encourage each agency or entity owning or operating designated public access facilities to prioritize available funds towards developing Priority I public access facilities within their purview;</p> <p>(2) <i>Development Priority II:</i> Encourage each agency or entity owning or operating designated public access facilities to prioritize available funds towards developing Priority II public access facilities only when all Priority I public access facilities within their purview have been developed or if funding specific to a site becomes available; or</p> <p>(3) <i>Development Priority III:</i> Encourage each agency or entity owning or operating designated public access facilities to prioritize available funds towards developing Priority III public access facilities only when all Priority I and II public access facilities within their purview have been developed. (Existing LCP Revised)</p> | <p>Same</p> |
| <p>6. Require a coastal permit for all new accessways, which must be reviewed in two years. Conduct public hearings for review of coastal permits for accessways if there is evidence of resource degradation or significant public interest. Any diminishment or closure as a result of such review shall automatically be reviewed by the State Coastal Commission.</p> | <p>REV</p> | <p>Policy C-PA-3d: Require a Coastal Permit for all new public or private access facilities. (Existing LCP Revised)</p> <p>Policy C-PA-3e: Conduct public hearing for review of the Coastal Permit for an existing coastal access trail if there is evidence of degradation of resources in the area of the facility or significant public interest in the facility. Any proposal to reduce or close an existing public coastal access point or trail as a result of such review shall be reviewed by the California Coastal Commission. (Existing LCP Revised)</p> | <p>Same</p> |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|--|---|------------------------------|
| 7. Utilize the Development Criteria for Access Facilities in designing and constructing new or expanded accessways. | REV | Policy C-PA-3f: Use the California Coastal Commission’s <i>Standards and Recommendations for Accessway Location and Development</i> (2007 or successor document in designing and constructing new or expanded public access facilities and other recreation facilities where appropriate. (New) | Same |
| 8. Conduct visual analysis prior to siting parking areas for accessways. | REV | Policy C-PA-3g: Conduct visual analysis prior to siting parking areas for accessways. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |

RECREATION / VISITOR-SERVING FACILITIES

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|--|--|-----------------------|
| <i>General</i> | | | |
| 1. Encourage the development and expansion of visitor serving and commercial facilities within urban service and rural community boundaries where coastal requirements, including water provision and waste disposal, can be met. | REV | Policy C-LU-6a: Encourage the development and expansion of visitor-serving and local-serving commercial uses within urban service areas and rural community boundaries where water supply and wastewater disposal requirements can be met. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 2. Limit new commercial development to areas within designated urban service and rural community boundaries except for the lowest intensity development (guest ranches and bed and breakfast accommodations). | REV | Policy C-LU-6b: Limit new visitor-serving commercial development to areas within designated urban service areas and rural community boundaries except for the lowest intensity development (i.e., guest ranches, and bed and breakfast inns, vacation rentals, and agricultural farmstays). (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 3. Consider modest scale expansion of existing visitor serving and commercial facilities outside of urban service and rural community boundaries where other coastal requirements can be met. | REV | Policy C-LU-6d: Consider modest scale expansion of existing visitor-serving and local-serving commercial uses outside of urban service areas and rural community boundaries where water supply and wastewater disposal requirements can be met. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 4. Encourage, where appropriate, the provision of modest size and scale accommodations with minimal impacts on the coastal environment, including bed and breakfast accommodations in existing homes, rental of second homes, guest ranches, inns, and motels. Guest ranches should be compatible with continued ranch operations. | REV | Policy C-LU-6e: Encourage the provision of modest scale overnight accommodations which have minimal impacts on the coastal environment, including bed and breakfast accommodations in existing homes, guest ranches, inns, and motels. Guest ranches in agricultural areas shall be compatible with continued ranch operations and be limited to the allowable residential density. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 5. Develop a visitor information system to publicized existing services and facilities. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Not necessary |
| 6. Provide public restrooms and drinking water facilities where needed and appropriate as part of visitor and local serving commercial development. | REV | Policy C-LU-6c: Provide public restrooms and drinking water facilities where needed and appropriate as part of visitor and local-serving commercial development. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|--|--|-----------------------|
| <i>General (cont.)</i> | | | |
| 7. Provide for new and expand existing commercial facilities in Bodega Bay, as shown on the land use plan, and including the expansion of Chanslor Ranch. | REV | Policy C-LU-6r: Encourage new and expansion of existing commercial uses in Bodega Bay. Encourage expansion of Chanslor Ranch consistent with continued agricultural use if water supply and wastewater treatment and disposal requirements can be met. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 8. Consistent with land use designations and zoning, encourage expansion of overnight accommodations and modest scale visitor-serving commercial uses at The Sea Ranch Lodge, and local serving commercial services on Annapolis Road. | REV | Policy C-LU-6f: Encourage expansion of overnight accommodations and other visitor-serving commercial uses; and local-serving commercial uses on Annapolis Road. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 9. Consistent with land use designations and zoning, encourage expansion of the Stewarts Point General Store and use of the house west of the store as a bed and breakfast accommodation. Limited additional visitor-serving development should be designed to complement the existing historic character. | REV | Policy C-LU-6g: Encourage development of limited visitor-serving and local-serving commercial uses at Stewarts Point designed to complement the historic character of the community. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 10. Consistent with land use designations and zoning, encourage modest expansion of existing or certain new visitor-serving facilities east of Highway 1 near the Ocean Cove Store. Appropriate new facilities would be: campgrounds or modest scale overnight accommodations, and a public horse stable. | REV | Policy C-LU-6h: Encourage modest scale expansion of existing or certain new visitor-serving commercial uses east of State Highway 1 near the Ocean Cove Store including overnight accommodations and a public horse stable. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 11. Limit development west of Highway 1 at Ocean Cove to strictly controlled day use such as boat launching and picnicking. Any development proposals should include erosion control measures and rehabilitation to the bluffs at the cove, and provisions for pedestrian safety on Highway 1. Adaptive reuse of the barn should be pursued. Provide day use parking for such development east of Highway 1 at Ocean Cove. | REV | Policy C-LU-6i: Limit development west of State Highway 1 at the Ocean Cove Resort to a strictly controlled day use area and campground. Any development proposals should include provisions for pedestrian safety on State Highway 1, erosion control measures, rehabilitating the degraded bluffs at the cove, and if needed the provision of parking for development consistent with Policy LU-6h. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV) | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|---|--|--|---|
| <i>General (cont.)</i> | | | |
| 12. Provide improved landscaping as part of any Salt Point Lodge expansion. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Not necessary; landscaping is reviewed as part of design review |
| 13. Consistent with land use designations and zoning, encourage modest expansion of existing inn facilities and development of a public horse stable at the Stillwater Cove Ranch. | REV | Policy C-LU-6k: Encourage modest scale expansion of existing inn facilities and development of a public horse stable at the Stillwater Cove Ranch. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 14. Limit expansion at the Timber Cove Inn to improved parking facilities and coastal access. | REV | Policy C-LU-6l: Limit expansion at the Timber Cove Inn to improved parking and public access facilities. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 15. Continue the operation of the Timber Cove Boat Landing while encouraging screening and design improvements. | REV | Policy C-LU-6m: Encourage provision of screening and other design improvements at the Timber Cove Boat Landing. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 16. Consistent with land use designations and zoning, allow limited visitor or commercial development, including development of a small emergency automobile repair facility in the vicinity of the Fort Ross store. Any expansion should be subject to strict design controls to preserve the area's scenic character. | REV | Policy C-LU-6n: Allow limited new or expansion of existing visitor or local-serving commercial uses, in the vicinity of the Fort Ross Store, subject to design controls review to preserve the area's scenic character. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 17. Consistent with land use designations and zoning, encourage provision of modest scale and cost overnight accommodations, as well as other expanded visitor and commercial services at Duncans Mills. | REV | Policy C-LU-6p: Encourage provision of overnight accommodations of modest scale and cost and expansion of other visitor and local-serving commercial services uses at Duncans Mills. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 18. Consistent with land use designations and zoning, encourage a modest infilling of visitor and local serving commercial services in Jenner if water and septic regulations can be met. | REV | Policy C-LU-6o: Encourage a modest infill of visitor and local-serving commercial development in Jenner if water supply and wastewater treatment and disposal requirements can be met. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |

| Existing LCP Policy | Removed (REM), Retained (RET), or Revised REV | Proposed LCP Policy | Reason for REV or REM |
|--|---|---|---|
| <i>General (cont.)</i> | | | |
| 19. Encourage landscaping and design improvements at the Bridgehaven Resort. If any expansion occurs, boat rentals and launching, and day use facilities are the most appropriate uses subject to strict design guidelines. | REV | Policy C-LU-6q: Encourage expansion of the Bridgehaven Resort, by adding boat rentals and launching and day use facilities subject to design review. Require public access as a condition of for approval of any Coastal Permit for expansion of uses at the resort. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |
| 20. Consistent with land use designations and zoning, allow development of a new visitor-serving facility at Pacific View Estates only if transfer of development potential to another, more suitable site is not possible. Any such facility must meet water and septic regulations, minimize visual impacts through clustering and design, be modest in scale, and not create traffic impacts beyond levels expected from the original development proposal. | REM | No specific corresponding policy identified. | Pacific View Estates is significantly constrained. Most parcels in public ownership |
| 21. Consistent with land use designations and zoning, encourage modest expansion of commercial services in Valley Ford if water and septic regulations can be met. | REV | Policy C-LU-6s: Encourage modest expansion of commercial uses in Valley Ford if water supply and wastewater treatment and disposal requirements can be met. (Existing LCP Revised) | Same |