SEASIDE LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM 2013

FORA CONSISTENCY

COVER LETTER
March 1, 2013

Michael A. Houlemand Jr., Executive Officer
Fort Ord Reuse Authority
920 2nd Ave., Suite A
Marina, CA 93933

RE: Request for Consistency Determination of the City of Seaside Local Coastal Program with the Fort Ord Base Reuse Plan in Accordance with FORA Master Resolution, Article 8.01.020

Dear Mr. Houlemand:

The City of Seaside (City) requests that the Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA) adopt a finding that the City of Seaside Local Coastal Program (LCP) is consistent with the Fort Ord Base Reuse Plan (BRP).

The LCP is the contract between the City and the State specifying how the City will protect California’s coastal resources. The LCP consists of two major parts: the Land Use Plan (LUP) and the Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP) which includes a zoning ordinance and maps. The LCP applies to only those lands that fall within the California Coastal Zone. The only land in the coastal zone that is also under the jurisdiction of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan is land located in the State Route 1 right-of-way, which is under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans).

In February 2011, the City Council adopted an Ordinance approving the LCP for the City of Seaside and authorized the City Manager to submit certified copies of the LCP and implementing Ordinance amending the Seaside General Plan and Municipal Code to the Coastal Commission for its review and certification. Coastal staff presented the LCP with recommended modifications to the Commission at its December 13, 2012 Meeting. The Commission unanimously approved the LCP with the modifications.

On January 9, 2013, the Seaside Planning Commission held a public hearing to consider the modifications that were made to the LCP by the CCC and recommended that the City Council approve the modified LCP and adopt an Ordinance amending the Seaside General Plan and Seaside Municipal to incorporate the changes to the Land Use Map of the General Plan and the Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP) of the LCP as Title 18 of the Seaside Municipal Code. On February 7, 2013, the City Council voted unanimously to approve the first reading of an ordinance that amends and approves a proposed map amendment to the land use map of the Seaside General Plan and proposed text and map amendments to the Seaside Municipal Code in its consideration of accepting the modifications that have been made to the LCP by the California Coastal Commission. The City Council made no changes to the LCP or the ordinance as it was introduced.
On February 2013, the City Council held a second reading and unanimously adopted Resolution No. 2013-14 accepting the modified LCP and authorizing the City Manager to submit the LCP and implementing Ordinance No. 203-01 amending the Seaside General Plan and Municipal Code to the Coastal Commission for final certification.

Based on the attached reports and consistency analysis matrix, the City finds the Local Coastal Program to be consistent with the Fort Ord Base Reuse Plan, and requests that FORA concur with this determination and certify the project.

The attached submittal package was prepared in accordance with FORA Master Resolution Article 8.01.020 and instructions received from FORA staff. The submittal package includes two complete hard copies containing the following requested documents:

- Exhibit A: Consistency Analysis Table
- Supplemental Consistency Determination checklist – Seaside
- Memorandum containing website links to documents
- Letter dated December 19, 2012 regarding California Coastal Commission Action on Seaside Local Coastal Program Amendment Number 1-11 (LUP Update and IP Certification)
- Planning Commission Packet for January 9, 2013 Public Hearing to consider recommendation to City Council to adopt modified Local Coastal Program and Addendum to the Negative Declaration
- City Council Packet for February 7, 2013 Public Hearing to consider adoption of 1) modified Local Coastal Program (First Reading) and 2) Addendum to the Negative Declaration
- City Council Packet for February 21, 2013 Continued Public Hearing to consider adoption of modified Local Coastal Program (Second Reading)
- Addendum to the previously adopted Negative Declaration/Initial Study
- Previously adopted Negative Declaration -November 18, 2010
- Coastal Zone Area and Subarea Map as modified
- Coastal Zone Land Use Designations as modified
- Coastal Commission Staff Report for the December 13, 2013 Coastal Commission Meeting
Seaside Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan and Coastal Implementation Plan as modified.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me or Rick Medina, Senior Planner, (831) 899-6727 or rmedina@ci.seaside.ca.us.

Sincerely,

John Dunn
City Manager

Cc: Diana A. Ingersoll, P. E., Deputy City Manager- Resource Management Services
Lisa Brinton, Community and Economic Development Services Manager
Rick Medina, Senior Planner
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of Seaside Local Coastal Program</th>
<th>CONSISTENCY WITH FORT ORD REUSE PLAN AND MASTER RESOLUTION CHAPTER 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FORA Master Resolution</td>
<td>City of Seaside Local Coastal Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 8 Sections 8.02.020 (a) to (t)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Natural Resources**

(a) Prior to approving any development entitlements, each land use agency shall act to protect natural resources and open spaces on Fort Ord territory by including the open space and conservation policies and programs of the Reuse Plan, applicable to the land use agency, into their respective general, area, and specific plans.

The Local Coastal Program (LCP) applies to only those lands that fall within the California Coastal Zone. In addition, the only land in the coastal zone that is also under the jurisdiction of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan is land located in the State Route 1 right-of-way, which is under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). The LCP is the contract between the City and the State specifying how the City will protect California's coastal resources. The LCP consists of two major parts: the Land Use Plan (LUP) and the Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP) which includes a zoning ordinance and maps.

The portion of the City of Seaside Coastal Zone that is within Fort Ord territory is limited to approximately 146 acres of Caltrans right-of-way, which is designated in the LCP for Coastal Transportation Corridor land uses. Principal permitted uses are motorized and non-motorized forms of transportation. No development entitlements are granted with the adoption of the LCP. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.

1. Each land use agency shall review each application for a development entitlement for compatibility with adjacent open space land uses and require suitable open space buffers to be incorporated into the development plans of any potentially incompatible land uses as a condition of project approval.

See (a) above. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.

2. When buffers are required as a condition of approval adjacent to Habitat Management areas, the buffer shall be designed in a manner consistent with those guidelines set out in the Habitat Management Plan. Roads shall not be allowed within the buffer area adjacent to Habitat Management areas except for restricted access maintenance or emergency access roads.

LCP Policy NCR-CZ 1.2B established the protection of Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHAs). The LCP-CIP established setbacks to limit development in and to protect these areas. The LCP does not propose construction of new roads or infrastructure. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>FORA Master Resolution</strong></th>
<th><strong>City of Seaside Local Coastal Program</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 8 Sections 8.02.020 (a) to (t)</td>
<td>As noted above, the LCP is the contract between the City and the State specifying how the City will protect California’s coastal resources. The LCP consists of two major parts: the Land Use Plan (LUP) and the Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP) which includes a zoning ordinance and maps. The Coastal Commission conditionally adopted the modified LCP on December 13, 2012. In addition, any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Each land use agency shall include policies and programs in their respective applicable general, area, and specific plans that will ensure consistency of future use of the property within the coastal zone through the master planning process of the California Department of Parks and Recreation, if applicable. All future use of such property shall comply with the requirements of the Coastal Zone Management Act and the California Coastal Act and the coastal consistency determination process.</td>
<td>The LCP contains numerous policies and development standards to ensure the protection of environmentally sensitive areas. LCP-LUP Policies PAR-CA-1.1.A to 1.4.A establish requirements for the creation, promotion, maintenance of public access and recreation in the coastal zone. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Monterey County shall include policies and programs in its applicable general, area, and specific plans that will ensure that future development projects at East Garrison are compatible with the historic context and associated land uses and development entitlements are appropriately conditioned prior to approval.</td>
<td>The East Garrison area of Monterey County is outside of the Seaside city limits. The LCP covers only those areas within the Seaside’s jurisdiction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Each land use agency shall include policies and programs in their respective applicable general, area, and specific plans that shall limit recreation in environmentally sensitive areas, including, but not limited to, dunes and areas with rare, endangered, or threatened plant or animal communities to passive, low intensity recreation, dependent on the resource and compatible with its long term protection. Such policies and programs shall prohibit passive, low-density recreation if the Board finds that such passive, low-density recreation will compromise the ability to maintain an environmentally sensitive resource.</td>
<td>The only portion of the City of Seaside Coastal Zone that is within Fort Ord territory is designated for Coastal Transportation Corridor land uses, which primarily allows motorized and non-motorized forms of transportation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Historic Preservation

<p>| (e) Each land use agency shall include policies and programs in their respective applicable general, area, and specific plans that shall encourage land uses that are compatible with the character of the surrounding districts or neighborhoods and discourage new land use activities which are potential nuisances and/or hazards within and in close proximity to residential areas. Reuse of property in the Army urbanized footprint should be encouraged. | The LCP does not address this specific item. As noted above, the only portion of the City of Seaside Coastal Zone that is within Fort Ord territory is designated for Coastal Transportation Corridor land uses, which primarily allows for motorized and non-motorized forms of transportation. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance. |
| (f) Each land use agency with jurisdiction over property in the Army urbanized footprint shall adopt the cultural resources policies and programs of the Reuse Plan concerning historic preservation, and shall provide appropriate incentives for historic preservation and reuse of historic property, as determined by the affected land use agency, in their respective applicable general, area, and specific plans. | LCP Policy LUD-CZ 3.7.A addresses Cultural Resources, which requires that archaeological resource be identified and protected; requires a Phase I Archaeological Study; and requires mitigation as a condition of development that would adversely impact any archaeological or paleontological resources. The portion of the City of Seaside Coastal Zone that is within Fort Ord territory is limited to Caltrans right-of-way that is State Highway One and designated for Coastal Transportation Corridor land uses. Any |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORA Master Resolution Chapter 8 Sections 8.02.020 (a) to (t)</th>
<th>City of Seaside Local Coastal Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>future projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(g) The County of Monterey shall amend the Greater Monterey Peninsula Area Plan and designate the Historic East Garrison Area as an historic district in the County Reservation Road Planning Area. The East Garrison shall be planned and zoned for planned development mixed uses consistent with the Reuse Plan. In order to implement this aspect of the plan, the County shall adopt at least one specific plan for the East Garrison area and such specific plan shall be approved before any development entitlement shall be approved for such area.

The East Garrison area of Monterey County is outside of the Seaside city limits. The LCP covers only those areas within the city of Seaside’s jurisdiction.

**Water, Sewage, Drainage & Waste**

(h) Each land use agency shall include policies and programs in their respective applicable general, area, and specific plans that shall support all actions necessary to ensure that sewage treatment facilities operate in compliance with waste discharge requirements adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board.

The LCP does not address this specific item. The LCP is the contract between the City and the State specifying how the City will protect California's coastal resources. The LCP does not propose construction of new sewage treatment facilities or coastal development that would increase the demand on wastewater treatment facilities on lands covered under the Reuse Plan. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.

(i) Each land use agency shall adopt the following policies and programs:

1. A solid waste reduction and recycling program applicable to Fort Ord territory consistent with the provisions of the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989, Public Resources Code Section 40000 et seq.

2. A program that will ensure that each land use agency carries out all action necessary to ensure that the installation of water supply wells comply with State of California Water Well Standards and well standards established by the Monterey County Health Department.

3. A program that will ensure that each land use agency carries out all actions necessary to ensure that distribution and storage of potable and non-potable water comply with State Health Department regulations.

(j) Each land use agency shall include policies and programs in their respective applicable general, area, and specific plans to address water supply and water conservation. Such policies and programs shall include the following:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORA Master Resolution Chapter 8 Sections 8.02.020 (a) to (t)</th>
<th>City of Seaside Local Coastal Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Identification of, with the assistance of the Monterey County Water Resources Agency and the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District, potential reservoir and water impoundment sites and zoning of such sites for watershed use, thereby precluding urban development.</td>
<td>The LCP does not address this specific item. The coastal land under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan is not suitable for a potential reservoir or water impoundment site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Commence working with appropriate agencies to determine the feasibility of developing additional water supply sources, such as water importation and desalination, and actively participate in implementing the most viable option or options.</td>
<td>LCP Policy NCR-CZ 3.1.A addresses the provision of potable water supply and requires the City to participate in local and regional efforts to secure a safe and adequate/sustainable supply of water. LCP Policy NCR–CZ 3.2.A requires the City to support regional efforts to develop an alternative water supply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Adoption and enforcement of a water conservation ordinance which includes requirements for plumbing retrofits and is at least as stringent as Regulation 13 of the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District, to reduce both water demand and effluent generation.</td>
<td>The LCP does not propose any coastal development on lands under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan that would result in an increased water demand or effluent generation. LCP Policy NCR-CZ 3.1.B requires that all new development, changes of ownership and changes of use within the Coastal Zone meet or exceed MPWMD Efficiency Standards. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Active participation in the support of the development of reclaimed or recycled water supply sources by the water purveyor and the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency to ensure adequate water supplies for the territory within the jurisdiction of the Authority.</td>
<td>LCP Policy 3.3.B requires all new development, changes of ownerships and expansion of use receive a water permit to meet or exceed Monterey Peninsula Water District’s water efficiency standards, which ensure water conservation. The LCP does not propose any coastal development on lands under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan that would require a water permit. However, any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Promotion of the use of on-site water collection, incorporating measures such as cisterns or other appropriate improvements to collect surface water for in-tract irrigation and other non-potable use.</td>
<td>The LCP does not address this specific item. The coastal land under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan is not suitable for on-site water collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Adoption of policies and programs consistent with the Authority’s Development and Resource Management Plan to establish programs and monitor development at territory within the jurisdiction of the Authority to assure that it does not exceed resource constraints posed by water supply.</td>
<td>LCP Policy NCR-CZ 3.1.A addresses the provision of potable water supply and requires the City to participate in local and regional efforts to secure a safe and adequate/sustainable supply of water. LCP Policy NCR-CZ 3.1.C requires that water use in the City be monitored to ensure the availability of water to fulfill goals of the LCP-LUP. LCP Policy NCR-CZ 3.1.D requires the demonstration of safe, adequate, and sustainable water supply prior to approval of any development located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Adoption of appropriate land use regulations that will ensure that development entitlements will not be approved until there is verification of an assured long-term water supply for such development entitlements.</td>
<td>The LCP does not propose any coastal development on lands under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan that would directly or indirectly increase water demand. LCP Policy NCR-CZ 3.1.D requires the demonstration of safe, adequate, and sustainable water supply prior to approval of any development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORA Master Resolution</td>
<td>City of Seaside Local Coastal Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 8 Sections 8.02.020 (a) to (t)</td>
<td>consistency with Fort Ord Reuse Plan and Master Resolution Chapter 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 28, 2013</td>
<td>February 28, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Participation in the development and implementation of measures that will prevent seawater intrusion into the Salinas Valley and Seaside groundwater basins.

LCP Policy NCR-CZ 3.1.A addresses the provision of potable water supply and requires the City to participate in local and regional efforts to secure a safe and adequate/sustainable supply of water. LCP Policy NCR-CZ 3.2.A requires the City to continue to support regional efforts to develop an alternative water supply for the City.

9. Implementation of feasible water conservation methods where and when determined appropriate by the land use agency, consistent with the Reuse Plan, including: dual plumbing using non-potable water for appropriate functions; cistern systems for roof-top run-off; mandatory use of reclaimed water for any new golf courses; limitation on the use of potable water for golf courses; and publication of annual water reports disclosing water consumption by types of use.

The LCP does not propose any coastal development on lands under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan that would increase the water demand. LCP Policy 3.3.B requires all new development, changes of ownerships and expansion of use receive a water permit to meet or exceed Monterey Peninsula Water District’s water efficiency standards, which ensure water conservation. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.

(k) Each land use agency shall include policies and programs in their respective applicable general, area, and specific plans that will require new development to demonstrate that all measures will be taken to ensure that storm water runoff is minimized and infiltration maximized in groundwater recharge areas. Such policies and programs shall include:

1. Preparation, adoption, and enforcement of a storm water detention plan that identifies potential storm water detention design and implementation measures to be considered in all new development, in order to increase groundwater recharge and thereby reduce potential for further seawater intrusion and provide for an augmentation of future water supplies.

LCP Policy LUD-CZ 3.1.C requires all development in the Coastal Zone prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The LCP is the contract between the City and the State specifying how the City will protect California’s coastal resources. Any future projects will be reviewed for appropriate compliance.

2. Preparation, adoption, and enforcement of a Master Drainage Plan to assess the existing natural and man-made drainage facilities, recommend area-wide improvements based on the approved Reuse Plan, and develop plans for the control of storm water runoff from future development. Such plans for control of storm water runoff shall consider and minimize any potential for groundwater degradation and provide for the long term monitoring and maintenance of all storm water retention ponds.

LCP Policy LUD-CZ 3.1.C requires all development in the Coastal Zone prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be reviewed for appropriate compliance.

(l) Each land use agency shall adopt policies and programs that ensure that all proposed land uses on the Fort Ord territory are consistent with the hazardous and toxic materials clean-up levels as specified by state and federal regulation.

The LCP does not address this specific item. The LCP does not propose any coastal development on lands under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan that would increase the use, transport or handling of hazardous and toxic materials. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.
### City of Seaside Local Coastal Program

**CONSISTENCY WITH FORT ORD REUSE PLAN AND MASTER RESOLUTION CHAPTER 8**

**February 28, 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORA Master Resolution</th>
<th>City of Seaside Local Coastal Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 8 Sections 8.02.020 (a) to (t)</td>
<td>The LCP does not address this specific item. The LCP does not propose any coastal development on lands under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan that are contaminated with unexploded ordnance and explosives. However, any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Traffic & Circulation**

(m) Each land use agency shall adopt and enforce an ordinance acceptable to the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) to control and restrict excavation or any soil movement on those parcels of the Fort Ord territory, which were contaminated with unexploded ordnance and explosives. Such ordinance shall prohibit any digging, excavation, development, or ground disturbance of any type to be caused or otherwise allowed to occur without compliance with the ordinance. A land use agency shall not make any substantive change to such ordinance without prior notice to and approval by DTSC.

---

(n) Each land use agency shall include policies and programs in their respective applicable general, area, and specific plans that will help ensure an efficient regional transportation network to access the territory under the jurisdiction of the Authority, consistent with the standards of the Transportation Agency of Monterey County. Such policies and programs shall include:

1. Establishment and provision of a dedicated funding mechanism to pay for the fair share of the impact on the regional transportation system caused or contributed by development on territory within the jurisdiction of the Authority.

2. Support and participate in regional and state planning efforts and funding programs to provide an efficient regional transportation effort to access Fort Ord territory.

---

(o) Each land use agency shall include policies and programs in their respective applicable general, area, and specific plans that ensure that the design and construction of all major arterials within the territory under the jurisdiction of the Authority will have direct connections to the regional network consistent with the Reuse Plan. Such plans and policies shall include:

1. Preparation and adoption of policies and programs consistent with the Authority’s Development and Resource Management Plan to establish programs and monitor development to assure that it does not exceed resource constraints posed by transportation facilities.

2. Design and construction of an efficient system of arterials in order to connect to the regional transportation system.

3. Designate local truck routes to have direct access to regional and national truck routes and to provide adequate movement of goods into and out of the territory under the jurisdiction of the Authority.

---

The LCP Coastal Transportation Corridor land use designation ensures protection of right-of-way within essential public transportation corridors.

LCP Policy LUD-CZ 3.8.A only allows development where adequate circulation and parking is provided; prohibits development that would interfere with the future uses of Coastal Transportation Corridor; encourages non-motorized and other alternative forms of transportation in all new development; and permits the maintenance of existing highway, landscaping, and drainage facilities with the State Route 1 corridor with a coastal development permit. Expansion of capacity or widening or realigning State Route 1 would require an amendment to the LCP.
### Fire Protection

(p) Each land use agency shall include policies and programs in their respective applicable general, area, and specific plans to provide regional bus service and facilities to serve key activity centers and key corridors within the territory under the jurisdiction of the Authority in a manner consistent with the Reuse Plan.

The LCP does not address this specific item. The LCP does not propose any coastal development on lands under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan that would result in increased demand for bus service. The Coastal Transportation Corridor land use designation protects right-of-way within essential public transportation corridors. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.

(q) Each land use agency shall adopt policies and programs that ensure development and cooperation in a regional law enforcement program that promotes joint efficiencies in operations, identifies additional law enforcement needs, and identifies and seeks to secure the appropriate funding mechanisms to provide the required services.

The LCP does not address this specific item. The LCP does not propose any coastal development on lands under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan that would increase the demand on regional law enforcement services. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.

### Jobs/Housing Balance

(t) Each land use agency shall include policies and programs in their general, area, and specific plans that will ensure compliance with the 1997 adopted FORA Reuse Plan jobs/housing balance provisions. The policies and programs for the provision of housing must include flexible targets that generally correspond with expected job creation on the former Fort Ord. It is recognized that, in addressing the Reuse Plan jobs/housing balance, such flexible targets will likely result in the availability of affordable housing in excess of the minimum 20% local jurisdictional inclusionary housing figure, which would result in a range of 21% - 40% below market housing. Each land use agency should describe how their local inclusionary housing policies, where applicable, address the Reuse Plan jobs/housing balance provisions.

The LCP does not address this specific item. The LCP does not propose any coastal development on lands under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan that would increase the housing or jobs. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.

### Other Consistency Considerations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORA Master Resolution Chapter 8 Sections 8.02.020 (a) to (t)</th>
<th>City of Seaside Local Coastal Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each land use agency shall ensure that its projects, programs, and policies are consistent with the Highway One Scenic Corridor design standards as such standards may be developed and approved by the Authority Board.</td>
<td>LCP Policy NCR-CZ 2.1.A identifies State Highway One as a scenic/visual corridor. LCP Policy NCR-CZ 2.1.B establishes protection of such corridors. Highway One Design Guidelines are incorporated into the LCP-CIP. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each land use agency shall ensure that its projects, programs, and policies are consistent with FORA’s prevailing wage policy, section 3.03.090 of the FORA Master Resolution.</td>
<td>The LCP does not address this specific item. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORA Master Resolution</td>
<td>City of Seaside Local Coastal Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 8 Sections 8.02.020 (a) to (t)</td>
<td>CONSISTENCY WITH FORT ORD REUSE PLAN AND MASTER RESOLUTION CHAPTER 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Natural Resources**

(a) Prior to approving any development entitlements, each land use agency shall act to protect natural resources and open spaces on Fort Ord territory by including the open space and conservation policies and programs of the Reuse Plan, applicable to the land use agency, into their respective general, area, and specific plans.

The Local Coastal Program (LCP) applies to only those lands that fall within the California Coastal Zone. In addition, the only land in the coastal zone that is also under the jurisdiction of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan is land located in the State Route 1 right-of-way, which is under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). The LCP is the contract between the City and the State specifying how the City will protect California’s coastal resources. The LCP consists of two major parts: the Land Use Plan (LUP) and the Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP) which includes a zoning ordinance and maps.

The LUP contains policies regarding the protection of Natural Resources. Policies NCR-CZ 1.1.A CZ 1.1.B and CZ 1.1.C promote sustainable development, the sustainability of biological productivity and the protection of natural coastal resources.

The portion of the City of Seaside Coastal Zone that is within Fort Ord territory is limited to approximately 146 acres of Caltrans right-of-way, which is designated in the LCP for Coastal Transportation Corridor land uses. Principal permitted uses are motorized and non-motorized forms of transportation. No development entitlements are granted with the adoption of the LCP. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.

1. Each land use agency shall review each application for a development entitlement for compatibility with adjacent open space land uses and require suitable open space buffers to be incorporated into the development plans of any potentially incompatible land uses as a condition of project approval.

See (a) above. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.

LCP Policy NCR-CZ 1.2B established the protection of Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA). The LCP-CIP established setbacks to limit development in and to protect these areas. The LCP does not propose construction of new roads or infrastructure. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.

2. When buffers are required as a condition of approval adjacent to Habitat Management areas, the buffer shall be designed in a manner consistent with those guidelines set out in the Habitat Management Plan. Roads shall not be allowed within the buffer area adjacent to Habitat Management areas except for restricted access maintenance or emergency access roads.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORA Master Resolution Chapter 8 Sections 8.02.020 (a) to (t)</th>
<th>City of Seaside Local Coastal Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b) Each land use agency shall include policies and programs in their respective applicable general, area, and specific plans that will ensure consistency of future use of the property within the coastal zone through the master planning process of the California Department of Parks and Recreation, if applicable. All future use of such property shall comply with the requirements of the Coastal Zone Management Act and the California Coastal Act and the coastal consistency determination process.</td>
<td>As noted above, the LCP is the contract between the City and the State specifying how the City will protect California’s coastal resources. The LCP consists of two major parts: the Land Use Plan (LUP) and the Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP) which includes a zoning ordinance and maps. The Coastal Commission conditionally adopted the modified LCP on December 13, 2012. In addition, any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Monterey County shall include policies and programs in its applicable general, area, and specific plans that will ensure that future development projects at East Garrison are compatible with the historic context and associated land uses and development entitlements are appropriately conditioned prior to approval.</td>
<td>The East Garrison area of Monterey County is outside of the Seaside city limits. The LCP covers only those areas within the Seaside’s jurisdiction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Each land use agency shall include policies and programs in their respective applicable general, area, and specific plans that shall limit recreation in environmentally sensitive areas, including, but not limited to, dunes and areas with rare, endangered, or threatened plant or animal communities to passive, low intensity recreation, dependent on the resource and compatible with its long term protection. Such policies and programs shall prohibit passive, low-density recreation if the Board finds that such passive, low-density recreation will compromise the ability to maintain an environmentally sensitive resource.</td>
<td>The only portion of the City of Seaside Coastal Zone that is within Fort Ord territory is designated for Coastal Transportation Corridor land uses, which primarily allows motorized and non-motorized forms of transportation. The LCP contains numerous policies and development standards to ensure the protection of environmentally sensitive areas. LCP-LUP Policies PAR-CA-1.1.A to 1.4.A establish requirements for the creation, promotion, maintenance of public access and recreation in the coastal zone. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Historic Preservation**

| (e) Each land use agency shall include policies and programs in their respective applicable general, area, and specific plans that shall encourage land uses that are compatible with the character of the surrounding districts or neighborhoods and discourage new land use activities which are potential nuisances and/or hazards within and in close proximity to residential areas. Reuse of property in the Army urbanized footprint should be encouraged. | The LCP does not address this specific item. As noted above, the only portion of the City of Seaside Coastal Zone that is within Fort Ord territory is designated for Coastal Transportation Corridor land uses, which primarily allows motorized and non-motorized forms of transportation. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance. |

| (f) Each land use agency with jurisdiction over property in the Army urbanized footprint shall adopt the cultural resources policies and programs of the Reuse Plan concerning historic preservation, and shall provide appropriate incentives for historic preservation and reuse of historic property, as determined by the affected land use agency, in their respective applicable general, area, and specific plans. | LCP Policy LUD-CZ 3.7.A addresses Cultural Resources, which requires that archaeological resource be identified and protected; requires a Phase I Archaeological Study; and requires mitigation as a condition of development that would adversely impact any archaeological or paleontological resources. The portion of the City of Seaside Coastal Zone that is within Fort Ord territory is limited to Caltrans right-of-way that is State Highway One and designated for Coastal Transportation Corridor land uses. Any...
## FORA Master Resolution
Chapter 8 Sections 8.02.020 (a) to (t) vs. City of Seaside Local Coastal Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORA Master Resolution</th>
<th>City of Seaside Local Coastal Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>future projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The East Garrison area of Monterey County is outside of the Seaside city limits. The LCP covers only those areas within the city of Seaside’s jurisdiction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Water, Sewage, Drainage & Waste

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORA Master Resolution</th>
<th>City of Seaside Local Coastal Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water, Sewage, Drainage &amp; Waste</td>
<td>The LCP does not address this specific item. The LCP is the contract between the City and the State specifying how the City will protect California’s coastal resources. The LCP does not propose construction of new sewage treatment facilities or coastal development that would increase the demand on wastewater treatment facilities on lands covered under the Reuse Plan. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Each land use agency shall include policies and programs in their respective applicable general, area, and specific plans that shall support all actions necessary to ensure that sewage treatment facilities operate in compliance with waste discharge requirements adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board.</td>
<td>The LCP does not address this specific item. The Local Coastal Program (LCP) is the contract between the City and the State specifying how the City will protect California’s coastal resources. The LCP does not propose any coastal development on lands under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan that would result in an increase in solid waste disposal services, or water supply. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Each land use agency shall adopt the following policies and programs:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. A solid waste reduction and recycling program applicable to Fort Ord territory consistent with the provisions of the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989, Public Resources Code Section 40000 et seq.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. (2) A program that will ensure that each land use agency carries out all action necessary to ensure that the installation of water supply wells comply with State of California Water Well Standards and well standards established by the Monterey County Health Department.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A program that will ensure that each land use agency carries out all actions necessary to ensure that distribution and storage of potable and non-potable water comply with State Health Department regulations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j) Each land use agency shall include policies and programs in their respective applicable general, area, and specific plans to address water supply and water conservation. Such policies and programs shall include the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORA Master Resolution Chapter 8 Sections 8.02.020 (a) to (t)</td>
<td>City of Seaside Local Coastal Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Identification of, with the assistance of the Monterey County Water Resources Agency and the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District, potential reservoir and water impoundment sites and zoning of such sites for watershed use, thereby precluding urban development.</td>
<td>The LCP does not address this specific item. The coastal land under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan is not suitable for a potential reservoir or water impoundment site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Commence working with appropriate agencies to determine the feasibility of developing additional water supply sources, such as water importation and desalination, and actively participate in implementing the most viable option or options.</td>
<td>LCP Policy NCR-CZ 3.1.A addresses the provision of potable water supply and requires the City to participate in local and regional efforts to secure a safe and adequate/sustainable supply of water. LCP Policy NCR–CZ 3.2.A requires the City to support regional efforts to develop an alternative water supply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Adoption and enforcement of a water conservation ordinance which includes requirements for plumbing retrofits and is at least as stringent as Regulation 13 of the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District, to reduce both water demand and effluent generation.</td>
<td>The LCP does not propose any coastal development on lands under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan that would result in an increased water demand or effluent generation. LCP Policy NCR-CZ 3.1.B requires that all new development, changes of ownership and changes of use within the Coastal Zone meet or exceed MPWMD Efficiency Standards. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Active participation in the support of the development of reclaimed or recycled water supply sources by the water purveyor and the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency to ensure adequate water supplies for the territory within the jurisdiction of the Authority.</td>
<td>LCP Policy 3.3.B requires all new development, changes of ownerships and expansion of use receive a water permit to meet or exceed Monterey Peninsula Water District’s water efficiency standards, which ensure water conservation. The LCP does not propose any coastal development on lands under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan that would require a water permit. However, any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Promotion of the use of on-site water collection, incorporating measures such as cisterns or other appropriate improvements to collect surface water for in-tract irrigation and other non-potable use.</td>
<td>The LCP does not address this specific item. The coastal land under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan is not suitable for on-site water collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Adoption of policies and programs consistent with the Authority’s Development and Resource Management Plan to establish programs and monitor development at territory within the jurisdiction of the Authority to assure that it does not exceed resource constraints posed by water supply.</td>
<td>LCP Policy NCR-CZ 3.1.A addresses the provision of potable water supply and requires the City to participate in local and regional efforts to secure a safe and adequate/sustainable supply of water. LCP Policy NCR-CZ 3.1.C requires that water use in the City be monitored to ensure the availability of water to fulfill goals of the LCP-LUP. LCP Policy NCR-CZ 3.1.D requires the demonstration of safe, adequate, and sustainable water supply prior to approval of any development located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Adoption of appropriate land use regulations that will ensure that development entitlements will not be approved until there is verification of an assured long-term water supply for such development entitlements.</td>
<td>The LCP does not propose any coastal development on lands under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan that would directly or indirectly increase water demand. LCP Policy NCR-CZ 3.1.D requires the demonstration of safe, adequate, and sustainable water supply prior to approval of any development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORA Master Resolution Chapter 8 Sections 8.02.020 (a) to (t)</td>
<td>City of Seaside Local Coastal Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Participation in the development and implementation of measures that will prevent seawater intrusion into the Salinas Valley and Seaside groundwater basins.</td>
<td>LCP Policy NCR-CZ 3.1.A addresses the provision of potable water supply and requires the City to participate in local and regional efforts to secure a safe and adequate/sustainable supply of water. LCP Policy NCR-CZ 3.2.A requires the City to continue to support regional efforts to develop an alternative water supply for the City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Implementation of feasible water conservation methods where and when determined appropriate by the land use agency, consistent with the Reuse Plan, including: dual plumbing using non-potable water for appropriate functions; cistern systems for roof-top run-off; mandatory use of reclaimed water for any new golf courses; limitation on the use of potable water for golf courses; and publication of annual water reports disclosing water consumption by types of use.</td>
<td>The LCP does not propose any coastal development on lands under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan that would increase the water demand. LCP Policy 3.3.B requires all new development, changes of ownerships and expansion of use receive a water permit to meet or exceed Monterey Peninsula Water District’s water efficiency standards, which ensure water conservation. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k) Each land use agency shall include policies and programs in their respective applicable general, area, and specific plans that will require new development to demonstrate that all measures will be taken to ensure that storm water runoff is minimized and infiltration maximized in groundwater recharge areas. Such policies and programs shall include:</td>
<td>LCP Policy LUD-CZ 3.1.C requires all development in the Coastal Zone prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The LCP is the contract between the City and the State specifying how the City will protect California’s coastal resources. Any future projects will be reviewed for appropriate compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Preparation, adoption, and enforcement of a storm water detention plan that identifies potential storm water detention design and implementation measures to be considered in all new development, in order to increase groundwater recharge and thereby reduce potential for further seawater intrusion and provide for an augmentation of future water supplies.</td>
<td>LCP Policy LUD-CZ 3.1.C requires all development in the Coastal Zone prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be reviewed for appropriate compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Preparation, adoption, and enforcement of a Master Drainage Plan to assess the existing natural and man-made drainage facilities, recommend area-wide improvements based on the approved Reuse Plan, and develop plans for the control of storm water runoff from future development. Such plans for control of storm water runoff shall consider and minimize any potential for groundwater degradation and provide for the long term monitoring and maintenance of all storm water retention ponds.</td>
<td>The LCP does not address this specific item. The LCP does not propose any coastal development on lands under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan that would increase the use, transport or handling of hazardous and toxic materials. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(l) Each land use agency shall adopt policies and programs that ensure that all proposed land uses on the Fort Ord territory are consistent with the hazardous and toxic materials clean-up levels as specified by state and federal regulation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### City of Seaside Local Coastal Program

#### CONSISTENCY WITH FORT ORD REUSE PLAN AND MASTER RESOLUTION CHAPTER 8

**February 28, 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORA Master Resolution</th>
<th>City of Seaside Local Coastal Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 8 Sections 8.02.020 (a) to (t)</td>
<td>The LCP does not address this specific item. The LCP does not propose any coastal development on lands under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan that are contaminated with unexploded ordnance and explosives. However, any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Traffic & Circulation

**(m) Each land use agency shall adopt and enforce an ordinance acceptable to the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) to control and restrict excavation or any soil movement on those parcels of the Fort Ord territory, which were contaminated with unexploded ordnance and explosives. Such ordinance shall prohibit any digging, excavation, development, or ground disturbance of any type to be caused or otherwise allowed to occur without compliance with the ordinance. A land use agency shall not make any substantive change to such ordinance without prior notice to and approval by DTSC.**

The LCP does not address this specific item. The LCP does not propose any coastal development on lands under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan that are contaminated with unexploded ordnance and explosives. However, any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.

**Traffic & Circulation**

**(n) Each land use agency shall include policies and programs in their respective applicable general, area, and specific plans that will help ensure an efficient regional transportation network to access the territory under the jurisdiction of the Authority, consistent with the standards of the Transportation Agency of Monterey County. Such policies and programs shall include:**

1. Establishment and provision of a dedicated funding mechanism to pay for the fair share of the impact on the regional transportation system caused or contributed by development on territory within the jurisdiction of the Authority.
2. Support and participate in regional and state planning efforts and funding programs to provide an efficient regional transportation effort to access Fort Ord territory.

The LCP Coastal Transportation Corridor land use designation ensures protection of right-of-way within essential public transportation corridors.

LCP Policy LUD-CZ 3.8.A only allows development where adequate circulation and parking is provided; prohibits development that would interfere with the future uses of Coastal Transportation Corridor; encourages non-motorized and other alternative forms of transportation in all new development; and permits the maintenance of existing highway, landscaping, and drainage facilities with the State Route 1 corridor with a coastal development permit. Expansion of capacity or widening or realigning State Route 1 would require an amendment to the LCP.

**(o) Each land use agency shall include policies and programs in their respective applicable general, area, and specific plans that ensure that the design and construction of all major arterials within the territory under the jurisdiction of the Authority will have direct connections to the regional network consistent with the Reuse Plan. Such plans and policies shall include:**

1. Preparation and adoption of policies and programs consistent with the Authority’s Development and Resource Management Plan to establish programs and monitor development to assure that it does not exceed resource constraints posed by transportation facilities.
2. Design and construction of an efficient system of arterials in order to connect to the regional transportation system.
3. Designate local truck routes to have direct access to regional and national truck routes and to provide adequate movement of goods into and out of the territory under the jurisdiction of the Authority.

LCP Policy LUD-CZ 3.8.A only allows development where adequate circulation and parking is provided. LCP Policy LUD-CZ 3.8.A only allows development where adequate circulation and parking is provided; prohibits development that would interfere with the future uses of Coastal Transportation Corridor; encourages non-motorized and other alternative forms of transportation in all new development; and permits the maintenance of existing highway, landscaping, and drainage facilities with the State Route 1 corridor with a coastal development permit. Expansion of capacity or widening or realigning State Route 1 would require an amendment to the LCP. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORA Master Resolution</th>
<th>City of Seaside Local Coastal Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter 8 Sections 8.02.020 (a) to (t)</strong></td>
<td><strong>February 28, 2013</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(p)</strong> Each land use agency shall include policies and programs in their respective applicable general, area, and specific plans to provide regional bus service and facilities to serve key activity centers and key corridors within the territory under the jurisdiction of the Authority in a manner consistent with the Reuse Plan.</td>
<td>The LCP does not address this specific item. The LCP does not propose any coastal development on lands under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan that would result in increased demand for bus service. The Coastal Transportation Corridor land use designation protects right-of-way within essential public transportation corridors. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(q)</strong> Each land use agency shall adopt policies and programs that ensure development and cooperation in a regional law enforcement program that promotes joint efficiencies in operations, identifies additional law enforcement needs, and identifies and seeks to secure the appropriate funding mechanisms to provide the required services.</td>
<td>The LCP does not address this specific item. The LCP does not propose any coastal development on lands under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan that would increase the demand on regional law enforcement services. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire Protection</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Local Coastal Program (LCP) does not address this specific item. The LCP does not propose any coastal development on lands under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan that would increase the demand on regional fire protection services. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(r)</strong> Each land use agency shall include policies and programs in their respective applicable general, area, and specific plans that ensure development of a regional fire protection program that promotes joint efficiencies in operations, identifies additional fire protection needs, and identifies and seeks to secure the appropriate funding mechanisms to provide the required services.</td>
<td>The LCP does not address this specific item due to the limited resources located on coastal land under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(s)</strong> Each land use agency shall include policies and programs in their respective applicable general, area, and specific plans that will ensure that native plants from on-site stock will be used in all landscaping except for turf areas, where practical and appropriate. In areas of native plant restoration, all cultivars, including, but not limited to, manzanita and ceanothus, shall be obtained from stock originating on Fort Ord territory.</td>
<td>The LCP does not address this specific item. The LCP does not propose any coastal development on lands under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan that would increase the demand on regional fire protection services. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jobs/Housing Balance</strong></td>
<td><strong>The LCP does not address this specific item. The LCP does not propose any coastal development on lands under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan that would increase the housing or jobs. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(t)</strong> Each land use agency shall include policies and programs in their general, area, and specific plans that will ensure compliance with the 1997 adopted FORA Reuse Plan jobs/housing balance provisions. The policies and programs for the provision of housing must include flexible targets that generally correspond with expected job creation on the former Fort Ord. It is recognized that, in addressing the Reuse Plan jobs/housing balance, such flexible targets will likely result in the availability of affordable housing in excess of the minimum 20% local jurisdictional inclusionary housing figure, which would result in a range of 21% - 40% below market housing. Each land use agency should describe how their local inclusionary housing policies, where applicable, address the Reuse Plan jobs/housing balance provisions.</td>
<td>The LCP does not address this specific item. The LCP does not propose any coastal development on lands under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan that would increase the housing or jobs. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Consistency Considerations</strong></td>
<td><strong>The LCP does not address this specific item. The LCP does not propose any coastal development on lands under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan that would increase the demand on regional fire protection services. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORA Master Resolution</td>
<td>City of Seaside Local Coastal Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 8 Sections 8.02.020 (a) to (t)</td>
<td>LCP Policy NCR-CZ 2.1.A identifies State Highway One as a scenic/visual corridor. LCP Policy NCR-CZ 2.1.B establishes protection of such corridors. Highway One Design Guidelines are incorporated into the LCP-CIP. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each land use agency shall ensure that its projects, programs, and policies are consistent with the Highway One Scenic Corridor design standards as such standards may be developed and approved by the Authority Board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each land use agency shall ensure that its projects, programs, and policies are consistent with FORA’s prevailing wage policy, section 3.03.090 of the FORA Master Resolution.</td>
<td>The LCP does not address this specific item. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Natural Resources

(a) Prior to approving any development entitlements, each land use agency shall act to protect natural resources and open spaces on Fort Ord territory by including the open space and conservation policies and programs of the Reuse Plan, applicable to the land use agency, into their respective general, area, and specific plans.

The Local Coastal Program (LCP) applies to only those lands that fall within the California Coastal Zone. In addition, the only land in the coastal zone that is also under the jurisdiction of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan is land located in the State Route 1 right-of-way, which is under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). The LCP is the contract between the City and the State specifying how the City will protect California's coastal resources. The LCP consists of two major parts: the Land Use Plan (LUP) and the Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP) which includes a zoning ordinance and maps.

The portion of the City of Seaside Coastal Zone that is within Fort Ord territory is limited to approximately 146 acres of Caltrans right-of-way, which is designated in the LCP for Coastal Transportation Corridor land uses. Principal permitted uses are motorized and non-motorized forms of transportation. No development entitlements are granted with the adoption of the LCP. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.

1. Each land use agency shall review each application for a development entitlement for compatibility with adjacent open space land uses and require suitable open space buffers to be incorporated into the development plans of any potentially incompatible land uses as a condition of project approval.

See (a) above. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.

2. When buffers are required as a condition of approval adjacent to Habitat Management areas, the buffer shall be designed in a manner consistent with those guidelines set out in the Habitat Management Plan. Roads shall not be allowed within the buffer area adjacent to Habitat Management areas except for restricted access maintenance or emergency access roads.

LCP Policy NCR-CZ 1.2B established the protection of Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA). The LCP-CIP established setbacks to limit development in and to protect these areas. The LCP does not propose construction of new roads or infrastructure. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of Seaside Local Coastal Program</th>
<th>FORA Master Resolution Chapter 8 Sections 8.02.020 (a) to (t)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b) Each land use agency shall include policies and programs in their respective applicable general, area, and specific plans that will ensure consistency of future use of the property within the coastal zone through the master planning process of the California Department of Parks and Recreation, if applicable. All future use of such property shall comply with the requirements of the Coastal Zone Management Act and the California Coastal Act and the coastal consistency determination process.</td>
<td>As noted above, the LCP is the contract between the City and the State specifying how the City will protect California’s coastal resources. The LCP consists of two major parts: the Land Use Plan (LUP) and the Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP) which includes a zoning ordinance and maps. The Coastal Commission conditionally adopted the modified LCP on December 13, 2012. In addition, any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Monterey County shall include policies and programs in its applicable general, area, and specific plans that will ensure that future development projects at East Garrison are compatible with the historic context and associated land uses and development entitlements are appropriately conditioned prior to approval.</td>
<td>The East Garrison area of Monterey County is outside of the Seaside city limits. The LCP covers only those areas within the Seaside’s jurisdiction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Each land use agency shall include policies and programs in their respective applicable general, area, and specific plans that shall limit recreation in environmentally sensitive areas, including, but not limited to, dunes and areas with rare, endangered, or threatened plant or animal communities to passive, low intensity recreation, dependent on the resource and compatible with its long term protection. Such policies and programs shall prohibit passive, low-density recreation if the Board finds that such passive, low-density recreation will compromise the ability to maintain an environmentally sensitive resource.</td>
<td>The only portion of the City of Seaside Coastal Zone that is within Fort Ord territory is designated for Coastal Transportation Corridor land uses, which primarily allows motorized and non-motorized forms of transportation. The LCP contains numerous policies and development standards to ensure the protection of environmentally sensitive areas. LCP-LUP Policies PAR-CA-1.1.A to 1.4.A establish requirements for the creation, promotion, maintenance of public access and recreation in the coastal zone. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Historic Preservation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of Seaside Local Coastal Program</th>
<th>FORA Master Resolution Chapter 8 Sections 8.02.020 (a) to (t)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(e) Each land use agency shall include policies and programs in their respective applicable general, area, and specific plans that shall encourage land uses that are compatible with the character of the surrounding districts or neighborhoods and discourage new land use activities which are potential nuisances and/or hazards within and in close proximity to residential areas. Reuse of property in the Army urbanized footprint should be encouraged.</td>
<td>The LCP does not address this specific item. As noted above, the only portion of the City of Seaside Coastal Zone that is within Fort Ord territory is designated for Coastal Transportation Corridor land uses, which primarily allows motorized and non-motorized forms of transportation. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Each land use agency with jurisdiction over property in the Army urbanized footprint shall adopt the cultural resources policies and programs of the Reuse Plan concerning historic preservation, and shall provide appropriate incentives for historic preservation and reuse of historic property, as determined by the affected land use agency, in their respective applicable general, area, and specific plans.</td>
<td>LCP Policy LUD-CZ 3.7.A addresses Cultural Resources, which requires that archaeological resource be identified and protected; requires a Phase I Archaeological Study; and requires mitigation as a condition of development that would adversely impact any archaeological or paleontological resources. The portion of the City of Seaside Coastal Zone that is within Fort Ord territory is limited to Caltrans right-of-way that is State Highway One and designated for Coastal Transportation Corridor land uses. Any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORA Master Resolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 8 Sections 8.02.020 (a) to (t)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of Seaside Local Coastal Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>future projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(g) The County of Monterey shall amend the Greater Monterey Peninsula Area Plan and designate the Historic East Garrison Area as an historic district in the County Reservation Road Planning Area. The East Garrison shall be planned and zoned for planned development mixed uses consistent with the Reuse Plan. In order to implement this aspect of the plan, the County shall adopt at least one specific plan for the East Garrison area and such specific plan shall be approved before any development entitlement shall be approved for such area.

The East Garrison area of Monterey County is outside of the Seaside city limits. The LCP covers only those areas within the city of Seaside’s jurisdiction.

### Water, Sewage, Drainage & Waste

(h) Each land use agency shall include policies and programs in their respective applicable general, area, and specific plans that shall support all actions necessary to ensure that sewage treatment facilities operate in compliance with waste discharge requirements adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board.

The LCP does not address this specific item. The Local Coastal Program (LCP) is the contract between the City and the State specifying how the City will protect California's coastal resources. The LCP does not propose construction of new sewage treatment facilities or coastal development that would increase the demand on wastewater treatment facilities on lands covered under the Reuse Plan. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.

(i) Each land use agency shall adopt the following policies and programs:

1. A solid waste reduction and recycling program applicable to Fort Ord territory consistent with the provisions of the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989, Public Resources Code Section 40000 et seq.

2. (2) A program that will ensure that each land use agency carries out all action necessary to ensure that the installation of water supply wells comply with State of California Water Well Standards and well standards established by the Monterey County Health Department.

3. A program that will ensure that each land use agency carries out all actions necessary to ensure that distribution and storage of potable and non-potable water comply with State Health Department regulations.

The LCP does not address this specific item. The Local Coastal Program (LCP) is the contract between the City and the State specifying how the City will protect California’s coastal resources. The LCP does not propose any coastal development on lands under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan that would result in an increase on solid waste disposal services, or water supply. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.

(j) Each land use agency shall include policies and programs in their respective applicable general, area, and specific plans to address water supply and water conservation. Such policies and programs shall include the following:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORA Master Resolution Chapter 8 Sections 8.02.020 (a) to (t)</th>
<th>City of Seaside Local Coastal Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Identification of, with the assistance of the Monterey County Water Resources Agency and the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District, potential reservoir and water impoundment sites and zoning of such sites for watershed use, thereby precluding urban development.</td>
<td>The LCP does not address this specific item. The coastal land under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan is not suitable for a potential reservoir or water impoundment site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Commence working with appropriate agencies to determine the feasibility of developing additional water supply sources, such as water importation and desalination, and actively participate in implementing the most viable option or options.</td>
<td>LCP Policy NCR-CZ 3.1.B addresses the provision of potable water supply and requires the City to participate in local and regional efforts to secure a safe and adequate/sustainable supply of water. LCP Policy NCR-CZ 3.2.A requires the City to support regional efforts to develop an alternative water supply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Adoption and enforcement of a water conservation ordinance which includes requirements for plumbing retrofits and is at least as stringent as Regulation 13 of the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District, to reduce both water demand and effluent generation.</td>
<td>The LCP does not propose any coastal development on lands under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan that would result in an increased water demand or effluent generation. LCP Policy NCR-CZ 3.1.C requires that all new development, changes of ownership and changes of use within the Coastal Zone meet or exceed MPWMD Efficiency Standards. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Active participation in the support of the development of reclaimed or recycled water supply sources by the water purveyor and the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency to ensure adequate water supplies for the territory within the jurisdiction of the Authority.</td>
<td>LCP Policy 3.3.B requires all new development, changes of ownership and expansion of use receive a water permit to meet or exceed Monterey Peninsula Water District's water efficiency standards, which ensure water conservation. The LCP does not propose any coastal development on lands under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan that would require a water permit. However, any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Promotion of the use of on-site water collection, incorporating measures such as cisterns or other appropriate improvements to collect surface water for in-tract irrigation and other non-potable use.</td>
<td>The LCP does not address this specific item. The coastal land under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan is not suitable for on-site water collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Adoption of policies and programs consistent with the Authority’s Development and Resource Management Plan to establish programs and monitor development at territory within the jurisdiction of the Authority to assure that it does not exceed resource constraints posed by water supply.</td>
<td>LCP Policy NCR-CZ 3.1.A addresses the provision of potable water supply and requires the City to participate in local and regional efforts to secure a safe and adequate/sustainable supply of water. LCP Policy NCR-CZ 3.1.C requires that water use in the City be monitored to ensure the availability of water to fulfill goals of the LCP-LUP. LCP Policy NCR-CZ 3.1.D requires the demonstration of safe, adequate, and sustainable water supply prior to approval of any development located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Adoption of appropriate land use regulations that will ensure that development entitlements will not be approved until there is verification of an assured long-term water supply for such development entitlements.</td>
<td>The LCP does not propose any coastal development on lands under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan that would directly or indirectly increase water demand. LCP Policy NCR-CZ 3.1.D requires the demonstration of safe, adequate, and sustainable water supply prior to approval of any development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORA Master Resolution</td>
<td>City of Seaside Local Coastal Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter 8 Sections 8.02.020 (a) to (t)</strong></td>
<td><strong>LCP Policy NCR-CZ 3.1.A addresses the provision of potable water supply and requires the City to participate in local and regional efforts to secure a safe and adequate/sustainable supply of water. LCP Policy NCR-CZ 3.2.A requires the City to continue to support regional efforts to develop an alternative water supply for the City.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Participation in the development and implementation of measures that will prevent seawater intrusion into the Salinas Valley and Seaside groundwater basins.</td>
<td><strong>The LCP does not propose any coastal development on lands under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan that would increase the water demand. LCP Policy 3.3.B requires all new development, changes of ownerships and expansion of use receive a water permit to meet or exceed Monterey Peninsula Water District’s water efficiency standards, which ensure water conservation. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Implementation of feasible water conservation methods where and when determined appropriate by the land use agency, consistent with the Reuse Plan, including: dual plumbing using non-potable water for appropriate functions; cistern systems for roof-top run-off; mandatory use of reclaimed water for any new golf courses; limitation on the use of potable water for golf courses; and publication of annual water reports disclosing water consumption by types of use.</td>
<td><strong>LCP Policy LUD-CZ 3.1.C requires all development in the Coastal Zone prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The LCP is the contract between the City and the State specifying how the City will protect California’s coastal resources. Any future projects will be reviewed for appropriate compliance.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k) Each land use agency shall include policies and programs in their respective applicable general, area, and specific plans that will require new development to demonstrate that all measures will be taken to ensure that storm water runoff is minimized and infiltration maximized in groundwater recharge areas. Such policies and programs shall include:</td>
<td><strong>LCP Policy LUD-CZ 3.1.C requires all development in the Coastal Zone prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be reviewed for appropriate compliance.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Preparation, adoption, and enforcement of a storm water detention plan that identifies potential storm water detention design and implementation measures to be considered in all new development, in order to increase groundwater recharge and thereby reduce potential for further seawater intrusion and provide for an augmentation of future water supplies.</td>
<td><strong>The LCP does not address this specific item. The LCP does not propose any coastal development on lands under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan that would increase the use, transport or handling of hazardous and toxic materials. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Preparation, adoption, and enforcement of a Master Drainage Plan to assess the existing natural and man-made drainage facilities, recommend area-wide improvements based on the approved Reuse Plan, and develop plans for the control of storm water runoff from future development. Such plans for control of storm water runoff shall consider and minimize any potential for groundwater degradation and provide for the long term monitoring and maintenance of all storm water retention ponds.</td>
<td><strong>The LCP does not address this specific item.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(l) Each land use agency shall adopt policies and programs that ensure that all proposed land uses on the Fort Ord territory are consistent with the hazardous and toxic materials clean-up levels as specified by state and federal regulation.</td>
<td><strong>The LCP does not address this specific item.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Traffic & Circulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORA Master Resolution</th>
<th>City of Seaside Local Coastal Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(m) Each land use agency shall adopt and enforce an ordinance acceptable to the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) to control and restrict excavation or any soil movement on those parcels of the Fort Ord territory, which were contaminated with unexploded ordnance and explosives. Such ordinance shall prohibit any digging, excavation, development, or ground disturbance of any type to be caused or otherwise allowed to occur without compliance with the ordinance. A land use agency shall not make any substantive change to such ordinance without prior notice to and approval by DTSC.</td>
<td>The LCP does not address this specific item. The LCP does not propose any coastal development on lands under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan that are contaminated with unexploded ordnance and explosives. However, any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n) Each land use agency shall include policies and programs in their respective applicable general, area, and specific plans that will help ensure an efficient regional transportation network to access the territory under the jurisdiction of the Authority, consistent with the standards of the Transportation Agency of Monterey County. Such policies and programs shall include:</td>
<td>The LCP Coastal Transportation Corridor land use designation ensures protection of right-of-way within essential public transportation corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Establishment and provision of a dedicated funding mechanism to pay for the fair share of the impact on the regional transportation system caused or contributed by development on territory within the jurisdiction of the Authority.</td>
<td>LCP Policy LUD-CZ 3.8.A only allows development where adequate circulation and parking is provided; prohibits development that would interfere with the future uses of Coastal Transportation Corridor; encourages non-motorized and other alternative forms of transportation in all new development; and permits the maintenance of existing highway, landscaping, and drainage facilities with the State Route 1 corridor with a coastal development permit. Expansion of capacity or widening or realigning State Route 1 would require an amendment to the LCP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Support and participate in regional and state planning efforts and funding programs to provide an efficient regional transportation effort to access Fort Ord territory.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(o) Each land use agency shall include policies and programs in their respective applicable general, area, and specific plans that ensure that the design and construction of all major arterials within the territory under the jurisdiction of the Authority will have direct connections to the regional network consistent with the Reuse Plan. Such plans and policies shall include:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Preparation and adoption of policies and programs consistent with the Authority’s Development and Resource Management Plan to establish programs and monitor development to assure that it does not exceed resource constraints posed by transportation facilities.</td>
<td>LCP Policy LUD-CZ 3.8.A only allows development where adequate circulation and parking is provided. LCP Policy LUD-CZ 3.8.A only allows development where adequate circulation and parking is provided; prohibits development that would interfere with the future uses of Coastal Transportation Corridor; encourages non-motorized and other alternative forms of transportation in all new development; and permits the maintenance of existing highway, landscaping, and drainage facilities with the State Route 1 corridor with a coastal development permit. Expansion of capacity or widening or realigning State Route 1 would require an amendment to the LCP. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Design and construction of an efficient system of arterials in order to connect to the regional transportation system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Designate local truck routes to have direct access to regional and national truck routes and to provide adequate movement of goods into and out of the territory under the jurisdiction of the Authority.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Fire Protection

(p) Each land use agency shall include policies and programs in their respective applicable general, area, and specific plans to provide regional bus service and facilities to serve key activity centers and key corridors within the territory under the jurisdiction of the Authority in a manner consistent with the Reuse Plan.

The LCP does not address this specific item. The LCP does not propose any coastal development on lands under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan that would result in increased demand for bus service. The Coastal Transportation Corridor land use designation protects right-of-way within essential public transportation corridors. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.

(q) Each land use agency shall adopt policies and programs that ensure development and cooperation in a regional law enforcement program that promotes joint efficiencies in operations, identifies additional law enforcement needs, and identifies and seeks to secure the appropriate funding mechanisms to provide the required services.

The LCP does not address this specific item. The LCP does not propose any coastal development on lands under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan that would increase the demand on regional law enforcement services. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.

### Jobs/Housing Balance

(t) Each land use agency shall include policies and programs in their general, area, and specific plans that will ensure compliance with the 1997 adopted FORA Reuse Plan jobs/housing balance provisions. The policies and programs for the provision of housing must include flexible targets that generally correspond with expected job creation on the former Fort Ord. It is recognized that, in addressing the Reuse Plan jobs/housing balance, such flexible targets will likely result in the availability of affordable housing in excess of the minimum 20% local jurisdictional inclusionary housing figure, which would result in a range of 21% - 40% below market housing. Each land use agency should describe how their local inclusionary housing policies, where applicable, address the Reuse Plan jobs/housing balance provisions.

The LCP does not address this specific item. The LCP does not propose any coastal development on lands under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan that would increase the housing or jobs. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.

## Other Consistency Considerations
## City of Seaside Local Coastal Program
### CONSISTENCY WITH FORT ORD REUSE PLAN AND MASTER RESOLUTION CHAPTER 8
**February 28, 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORA Master Resolution Chapter 8 Sections 8.02.020 (a) to (t)</th>
<th>City of Seaside Local Coastal Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each land use agency shall ensure that its projects, programs, and policies are consistent with the Highway One Scenic Corridor design standards as such standards may be developed and approved by the Authority Board.</td>
<td>LCP Policy NCR-CZ 2.1.A identifies State Highway One as a scenic/visual corridor. LCP Policy NCR-CZ 2.1.B establishes protection of such corridors. Highway One Design Guidelines are incorporated into the LCP-CIP. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each land use agency shall ensure that its projects, programs, and policies are consistent with FORA’s prevailing wage policy, section 3.03.090 of the FORA Master Resolution.</td>
<td>The LCP does not address this specific item. Any future coastal projects located under the jurisdiction of the Reuse Plan will be subject to the Caltrans design and review process and reviewed for appropriate compliance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SEASIDE LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM 2013

FORA CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION

Supplemental Consistency Determination Checklist
Supplement checklist for City of Seaside Consistency Determination submittals to FORA

BASE REUSE PLAN – LAND USE ELEMENT

Land Use Goal: Promote the highest and best use of land through orderly, well-planned, and balanced development to ensure educational and economic opportunities as well as environmental protection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective A: Establish a range of permissible housing densities for the Fort Ord area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Land Use Policy A-1: The [jurisdiction] shall provide variable housing densities to ensure development of housing accessible to all economic segments of the community. Residential land uses shall be categorized according to the following densities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFD Low Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFD Medium Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFD High Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Infill Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Development Mixed Use District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See BRP Programs below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program A-1.1: Amend the [jurisdiction]’s General Plan and Zoning Code to designate former Fort Ord land at the permissible residential densities consistent with the Fort Ord Reuse Plan and appropriate to accommodate the housing types desired for the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consistency determinations with Seaside General Plan & zoning code were made on the following dates: 11/20/98, 12/11/98, 8/10/01, 9/13/02, 12/10/04, 10/8/10, & 11/18/11. Seaside General Plan consistency determination on 12/10/04 completed this program. Subsequent consistency determinations made refinements. The 2004 amendment re-arranged land uses to recognize the Ord Community uses and U.S. Army land swap, and altered the specific locations of residential uses.
### Objective B: Ensure compatibility between residential development and surrounding land uses.

**Residential Land Use Policy B-1:** The [jurisdiction] shall encourage land uses that are compatible with the character of the surrounding districts or neighborhoods and discourage new land use activities which are potential nuisances and/or hazards within and in close proximity to residential areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program B-2.1: The [jurisdiction] shall revise zoning ordinance regulations on the types of uses allowed in the [jurisdiction's] districts and neighborhoods, where appropriate, to ensure compatibility of uses in the Fort Ord planning area.</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Complete ■</th>
<th>Consistency determinations with Seaside zoning code were made on the following dates: 12/11/98, 8/10/01, &amp; 9/13/02.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program B-2.2: The [jurisdiction] shall adopt zoning standards for the former Fort Ord lands to achieve compatible land uses, including, but not limited to, buffer zones and vegetative screening.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Complete ■</td>
<td>Municipal Code Section 17.30.020 addresses fences, walls, and screening, and additional standards apply to certain zoning districts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objective C: Encourage highest and best use of residential land to enhance and maximize the market value of residential development and realize the economic opportunities associated with redevelopment at the former Fort Ord.

**Residential Land Use Policy C-1:** The City of Marina shall provide opportunities for developing market-responsive housing in the Fort Ord planning area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program C-1.1: The City of Seaside shall develop an agreement with the U.S. Army to implement the reconfiguration of the POM Annex community.</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Complete ■</th>
<th>The reconfigured POM Annex is shown on the 2004 Seaside General Plan land use map. City/Army agreement to swap Stillwell Kidney site for land near Lightfighter Drive, approved by City 11/15/07.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program C-1.2: The City of Seaside shall zone and consider development of a golf course community in the New Golf Course Community District totaling 3,365 units. The district includes the existing 297-unit Sun Bay apartment complex on Coe Road and 3,068 new housing units within the remainder of this District. The City of Seaside shall replace the remaining residential stock in the New Golf</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Complete ■</td>
<td>POM Annex reconfiguration is complete, but most POM residential land is west of General Jim Moore Boulevard (North-South Road). Existing SunBay and Brostrom housing and new Seaside Highlands and Seaside Resort subdivisions are within the New Golf Course Community. 2004 Seaside General Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program C-1.3: The City of Seaside shall assist the U.S. Army to reconfigure the POM Annex. The reconfigured POM Annex should include approximately 805 existing units on 344 acres east of General Jim Moore Boulevard and an additional 302 acres of surrounding, vacant land that is intended to be developed for housing to replace the existing POM Annex housing west of North-South Road.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Complete ■</td>
<td>POM Annex reconfiguration is complete, but most POM residential land is west of General Jim Moore Boulevard (North-South Road).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program C-1.4: The City of Seaside shall prepare a specific plan to provide for market-responsive housing in the University Village District between the CSUMB campus and Gigling Road. This is designated a Planned Development Mixed Use District to encourage a vibrant village with significant retail, personal and business services mixed with housing.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Incomplete ●</td>
<td>This specific plan has not been completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program C-1.5: The City of Seaside shall amend its zoning ordinance to allow new residential development in the Planned Residential Extension Districts that provides a direct extension of the city’s existing residential area west of the former Fort Ord properties.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Complete ■</td>
<td>The Planned Residential Extension areas are shown as R-8 on the Seaside Zoning Map, consistent with the areas immediately west of General Jim Moore Boulevard. Consistency determinations for Seaside zoning on 12/11/98, 8/10/01 &amp; 9/13/02.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective D: Provide public facilities and services that will support revitalization of existing Army housing and new housing construction on the former Fort Ord.**

**Residential Land Use Policy D-1:** The [jurisdiction] shall implement the Public Services and Capital Improvement Program in the Fort Ord Reuse Plan to support residential development. See BRP Program below

| Program D-1.1: The [jurisdiction] shall cooperate with FORA and provide adequate public facilities and services | No | Ongoing ▲ | FORA routinely coordinates with the jurisdictional agencies on provision of public |
that will support residential revitalization and new housing construction at the former Fort Ord.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Objective E: Coordinate the location, intensity and mix of land uses with alternative transportation goals and transportation infrastructure.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Land Use Policy E-1:</strong> The [jurisdiction] shall make land use decisions that support transportation alternatives to the automobile and encourage mixed-use projects and the highest-density residential projects along major transit lines and around stations. See BRP Programs below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Program E-1.1: The City of Seaside shall prepare a specific plan for the University Village mixed-use planning district and incorporate provisions to support transportation alternatives to the automobile. | No | Incomplete 

This specific plan has not been completed. |
| Program E-1.2: The [jurisdiction] shall encourage CSUMB in the preparation of its master plan to designate high-density residential development near convenience corridors and public transportation routes. | No | Complete 

CSUMB has completed a master plan that includes high density housing (for students and faculty) generally at the north edges of the campus. Much of the housing is near the University Villages (Dunes) Specific Plan area, which includes the intermodal corridor. |
| Program E-1.3: The [jurisdiction] shall encourage the development of an integrated street pattern for new developments which provides linkages to the existing street network and discourages cul-de-sac’s or dead-end streets. | No | Ongoing 

The City has opened several streets that connect the established parts of the city to the Fort Ord lands, including Broadway Avenue after the base closed, and Hilby Avenue and San Pablo Avenue in 2012. Military Avenue is open for pedestrian and bicycle access to Coe Avenue. The Seaside Highlands subdivision included connecting streets with several connections to Coe Avenue. |
| **Residential Land Use Policy E-2:** The [jurisdiction] shall encourage neighborhood retail and convenience/specialty retail land use in residential neighborhoods. See BRP Programs below |
| Program E-2.1: The [jurisdiction] shall designate convenience/specialty retail land use on its zoning map and | No | Complete 

The Seaside zoning map includes a Community Commercial designation at Monterey |
provide standards for development within residential neighborhoods.

Road/Coe Avenue and Mixed Use Commercial along Lightfighter Drive and Gigling Road. Consistency determinations for Seaside zoning on 12/11/98, 8/10/01 & 9/13/02.

**Residential Land Use Policy E-3:** In areas of residential development, the [jurisdiction] shall provide for designation of access routes, street and road rights-of-way, off-street and on-street parking, bike paths and pedestrian walkways.

Program E-3.1: The [jurisdiction] shall delineate adequate circulation rights-of-way to and within each residential area by creating circulation rights-of-way plan lines. See BRP Programs below

The City of Seaside utilizes primarily existing rights-of-way to provide access to residential areas. The City opened connections from existing residential areas to General Jim Moore Boulevard in 2012. The 2004 Seaside General Plan includes a new State Route 1 interchange to serve the golf course area.

Program E-3.2: The [jurisdiction] shall prepare pedestrian and bikeway plans and link residential areas to commercial development and public transit.

No Incomplete

The City of Seaside adopted its Bikeways Transportation Master Plan in 2007. The TAMC Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan includes planned pedestrian improvements in Seaside. However, the City of Seaside does not have its own pedestrian plan.

**Objective F:** Balance economic development needs with the needs of the homeless population in the community. The City of Marina shall proactively work with the Coalition of Homeless Service Providers and its member agencies to provide housing related services to the homeless populations which the agencies serve, to successfully integrate such programs into Fort Ord, especially the city’s 12th Street and Abrams Park housing areas.

**Residential Land Use Policy F-1:** The [jurisdiction] shall strive to meet the needs of the homeless population in its redevelopment of the former Fort Ord.

Program F-1.1: The [jurisdiction] shall develop guidelines to facilitate and enhance the working relationship between FORA and local homeless representatives. See BRP Programs below

A coalition for homeless services providers met periodically with FORA between 1998 and 2005 (approx.). However, the coalition no longer meets with FORA on a regular basis, and specific guidelines have not been developed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program F-1.2: The [jurisdiction] shall conduct outreach to homeless service providers and nonprofit low income housing developers to determine homeless needs in the community</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Ongoing ▲</th>
<th>The City’s Resource Management Services Department provides public information and liaisons with a variety of housing and homeless services groups.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program F-1.3: The [jurisdiction] shall support development of a standard format for the contracts between FORA and homeless service providers that must be submitted to the Federal Housing and Urban Development Agency with this reuse plan.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Incomplete●</td>
<td>This document has not been developed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective G: Improve access for people with disabilities by creating a barrier-free environment.**

**Residential Land Use Policy G-1:** The [jurisdiction] shall support broad design standards and accessible environments in developing the Fort Ord planning area.

| Program G-1.1: The [jurisdiction] shall identify focused areas and develop inclusionary zoning to encourage group homes and flexibility in household size and composition. | No | Complete ■ | Municipal Code Chapter 17.31 and Chapter 17.32 establish the city’s affordable housing and inclusionary housing programs. The city last adopted its Housing Element in 2011 and the Housing Element addresses programs and sites suitable for affordable housing and group homes. Consistency determination on 11/18/11. |

**PROGRAM G-1.2 MISSING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program G-1.3: The [jurisdiction] shall inventory those existing public facilities on former Fort Ord lands that warrant reduction in barriers and develop a long-term program to implement reduction in barriers.</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Ongoing ▲</th>
<th>The City of Seaside is subject to and complies with the requirements of the Americans with Disability Act to ensure development projects provide adequate access.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete ■</td>
<td>There are no known accessibility barriers at operational public facilities on the former Fort Ord.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective H: Provide General Plan consistency between land use and housing elements.**

**Residential Land Use Policy H-1:** The [jurisdiction] shall incorporate policies in its Housing Element consistent with Fort Ord policies for residential lands.

See BRP Programs below
Program H-1.1: The [jurisdiction] shall revise its housing element to incorporate and address the policy direction in this plan, including but not limited to issues regarding additional housing stock, opportunities for affordable housing, and provisions for housing displacement.

| Program I-1.1: The [jurisdiction] shall support FORA in the preparation of regional urban design guidelines, including a scenic corridor design overlay area, to govern the visual quality of areas of regional importance. |
|---|---|
| No | Ongoing ▲ | The city last adopted its Housing Element in 2011 and the Housing Element addresses housing at Fort Ord. The Housing Element includes policies and programs to conserve existing affordable housing and homeless shelters. Consistency determination on 11/18/11. |

### Objective I: Provide for Community Design principles and guidelines to ensure quality of life for Fort Ord residents and surrounding communities.

#### Residential Land Use Policy I-1: The [jurisdiction] shall support FORA in the preparation of regional urban design guidelines, including a scenic corridor design overlay area, to govern the visual quality of areas of regional importance.

| Program I-1.1: The [jurisdiction] shall prepare design guidelines for implementing development on former Fort Ord lands consistent with the regional urban design guidelines (to be prepared by FORA) and the General Development Character and Design Objectives of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan Framework. |
|---|---|
| No | Incomplete ● | The City of Seaside has a design review process and a Highway 1 Design Overlay Zone but has not prepared generally-applicable guidelines. |

#### Residential Land Use Policy I-2: The City of Seaside shall adhere to the General Development Character and Design Objectives of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan Framework.

| Program I-2: The City of Seaside shall adhere to the General Development Character and Design Objectives of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan Framework. |
|---|---|
| No | Ongoing ▲ | The City of Seaside has a design review process that considers applicable standards and guidelines. |

### COMMERCIAL LAND USE

#### Objective A: Designate sufficient area for a variety of commercial centers to meet the retail and business needs of the Fort Ord community.

#### Commercial Land Use Policy A-1: The City of Seaside shall allocate land in commercial and office categories adequate to provide goods and services for the needs of its citizens, other Fort Ord jurisdictions and their trade areas. Commercial land use shall be designated as follows:

- Regional Retail Gateway Regional Entertainment District (Polygon 15)
  43.78 acres, .25 FAR, 476,764 square feet

| Program A-1: The City of Seaside shall allocate land in commercial and office categories adequate to provide goods and services for the needs of its citizens, other Fort Ord jurisdictions and their trade areas. Commercial land use shall be designated as follows: |
|---|---|
| No | See BRP Program below | See BRP Program below |
### Objective A: Establish commercial and visitor-serving designations within suitable former Fort Ord land.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commercial Land Use Policy A-1:</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program A-1: Amend the [jurisdiction’s] General Plan and Zoning Code to designate former Fort Ord land at the permissible commercial densities consistent with the Fort Ord Reuse Plan and appropriate to accommodate the commercial activities desired for the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2004 Seaside General Plan designates a variety of commercial land uses, in a density approximately matching the policy’s list. The 2004 amendment re-arranged land uses to recognize the Ord Community uses and U.S. Army land swap, and not all of the specific parcel references are valid. Consistency determinations with Seaside General Plan & zoning code: 11/20/98, 12/11/98, 8/10/01, 9/13/02, 12/10/04, 10/8/10, & 11/18/11.

### Objective B: Establish visitor-serving hotel and golf course designations within suitable former Fort Ord land.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commercial Land Use Policy B-1:</th>
<th>See BRP Program below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visitor-serving uses shall be designated as follows:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program B-1: Amend the [jurisdiction’s] General Plan and Zoning Code to designate visitor-serving uses at the allowable densities consistent with the Fort Ord Reuse Plan and appropriate to accommodate the commercial activities desired for the community.

No | Complete

The 2004 Seaside General Plan includes visitor-serving uses, including the existing golf courses and an approved hotel, consistent with the Fort Ord Reuse Plan land use concept. The 2004 amendment re-arranged land uses to recognize the Ord Community uses and U.S. Army land swap.
swap, and not all of the specific parcel references are valid. Consistency determinations with Seaside General Plan & zoning code: 12/11/98 & 12/10/04.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commercial Land Use Policy B-2: The [jurisdiction] shall not include nor allow card rooms or casinos for gambling as acceptable land uses on the former Fort Ord.</th>
<th>See BRP Program below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program B-2.1: The [jurisdiction] shall amend the [jurisdiction’s] General Plan and Zoning Code to prohibit card rooms or casinos as or conditionally permitted land uses on the former Fort Ord.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Land Use Policy B-3: The [jurisdiction] shall prepare design guidelines for implementing hotel development on former Fort Ord lands consistent with the regional urban design guidelines (to be prepared by FORA) and the General Development Character and Design Objectives of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan Framework.</td>
<td>See BRP Program below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program B-3.1: The [jurisdiction] shall review each hotel proposal for consistency with the regional urban design guidelines and the General Development Character and Design Objectives of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan Framework.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective C:** Ensure that various types of commercial land use categories are balanced, and that business and industry enhance employment opportunities in and self-sufficiency of Fort Ord communities.

**Commercial Land Use Policy C-1:** The [jurisdiction] shall encourage a strong and stable source of city revenues by providing a balance of commercial land use types on its former Fort Ord land, while preserving the area’s community

See BRP Program below
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program C-1.1: The [jurisdiction] shall amend its zoning map to provide for commercial land use types and densities consistent with the Land Use Concept in the Fort Ord Reuse Plan in order to encourage employment opportunities and self-sufficiency.</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>The Seaside zoning map designates a variety of commercial land uses, in a density approximately matching the BRP Land Use Concept. Consistency determinations with Seaside zoning code: 12/11/98, 8/10/01, &amp; 9/13/02.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Objective D: Encourage commercial development in close proximity to major residential areas and transportation routes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commercial Land Use Policy D-1: The [jurisdiction] shall allow a mix of residential and commercial uses to decrease travel distances, encourage walking and biking and help increase transit ridership.</th>
<th>See BRP Programs below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Program D-1.1: The City of Seaside shall allow for a balance of neighborhood and convenience commercial designations in the University Village Planned Development Mixed Use District to serve the CSUMB population and Community Park in Polygon 18.

Program D-1.2: The [jurisdiction] shall designate convenience/specialty retail land use on its zoning map and provide textual (and not graphic) standards for development within residential neighborhoods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program D-1.1: The City of Seaside shall allow for a balance of neighborhood and convenience commercial designations in the University Village Planned Development Mixed Use District to serve the CSUMB population and Community Park in Polygon 18.</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>The 2004 Seaside General Plan includes a Mixed Use designation for this area. The community park has been relocated elsewhere.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program D-1.2: The [jurisdiction] shall designate convenience/specialty retail land use on its zoning map and provide textual (and not graphic) standards for development within residential neighborhoods.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>The City of Seaside includes a Community Commercial zone district, but does not have specific regulations for inclusion within residential neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objective E: Provide for adequate access to commercial developments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commercial Land Use Policy E-1: The [jurisdiction] shall coordinate the location and intensity of commercial areas at the former Fort Ord with transportation resources and in a manner which offers convenient access.</th>
<th>See BRP Program below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Program E-1.1: The [jurisdiction] shall coordinate with FORA and the Transportation Agency of Monterey County to address existing regional transportation needs and to implement the long-range circulation strategy for the former Fort Ord as specified in the Reuse Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program E-1.1: The [jurisdiction] shall coordinate with FORA and the Transportation Agency of Monterey County to address existing regional transportation needs and to implement the long-range circulation strategy for the former Fort Ord as specified in the Reuse Plan.</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Ongoing</th>
<th>Development proposals and allocation of their associated impact fees are coordinated with FORA and TAMC to address regional transportation needs and opportunities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Commercial Land Use Policy E-2: In areas of commercial development, the [jurisdiction] shall provide for designation of access routes, street and road rights- | See BRP Programs below |
of-way, off-street and on-street parking, bike paths and pedestrian walkways.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program E-2.1: The [jurisdiction] shall delineate adequate circulation rights-of-way to and within each commercial area by creating circulation right-of-way plan lines.</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Complete ■</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The City of Seaside utilizes primarily existing rights-of-way to provide access to commercial areas. The City opened connections from existing residential areas to General Jim Moore Boulevard in 2012. The 2004 Seaside General Plan includes a new State Route 1 interchange to serve the golf course area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program E-2.2: The [jurisdiction] shall prepare pedestrian and bikeway plans and link commercial development to residential areas and public transit.</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Incomplete ●</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The City of Seaside adopted its Bikeways Transportation Master Plan in 2007. Seaside does not have a pedestrian plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program E-2.3: The [jurisdiction] shall preserve sufficient land at the former Fort Ord for right-of-ways [sic] to serve long-range commercial build-out.</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Complete ■</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preservation of adequate right-of-way to serve additional development in the future is verified through the consistency determination process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective F: Provide for Community Design principles and guidelines for commercial development at the former Fort Ord.**

**Commercial Land Use Policy F-1:** The [jurisdiction] shall support FORA in the preparation of regional urban design guidelines, including a scenic corridor design overlay area, to govern the visual quality of areas of regional importance.

See BRP Programs below (listed under Policy F-2)

**Commercial Land Use Policy F-2:** The [jurisdiction] shall adhere to the General Development Character and Design Objectives of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan Framework for commercial development at the former Fort Ord.

See BRP Programs below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program F-1.1: The [jurisdiction] shall prepare design guidelines for implementing commercial development on former Fort Ord lands consistent with the regional urban design guidelines (to be prepared by FORA) and the General Development Character and Design Objectives of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan Framework.</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Ongoing ▲</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The City of Seaside has a Highway 1 Design Overlay Zone but has not prepared design guidelines applicable to commercial areas outside the Highway 1 corridor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program F-1.2: The [jurisdiction] shall review each commercial development proposal for consistency with the regional urban design guidelines and the General Development Character and Design Objectives of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan Framework.</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Ongoing ▲</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The City of Seaside has a design review process that considers a project's conformance to the applicable standards and guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Recreation/Open Space Land Use

### Objective A: Encourage land uses that respect, preserve and enhance natural resources and open space at the former Fort Ord.

#### Recreation/Open Space Land Use Policy A-1:
The [jurisdiction] shall protect irreplaceable natural resources and open space at former Fort Ord.

| Program A-1.1: The [jurisdiction] shall identify natural resources and open space, and incorporate it into its General Plan and zoning designations. | No | Complete ■ | The Seaside General Plan includes open space areas. Consistency determinations with Seaside General Plan: 12/11/98 & 12/10/04. |

#### Recreation/Open Space Land Use Policy A-2:
The [jurisdiction] shall encourage the provision of public open space lands as part of all types of development including residential, commercial and institutional.

| Program A-2.1: As part of review of development projects, the [jurisdiction] shall evaluate and provide for the need for public open space. | No | Complete ■/Ongoing ▲ | The Seaside General Plan includes open space areas. Primary consistency determinations with Seaside General Plan: 12/11/98 & 12/10/04. |

### Objective B: Use open space as a land use link and buffer.

#### Recreation/Open Space Land Use Policy B-1:
The [jurisdiction] shall link open space areas to each other.

| Program B-1.2: The [jurisdiction] shall create an open space plan for the former Fort Ord showing the linkage of all open space areas within the [jurisdiction] and linking to open space and habitat areas outside [jurisdiction]. | No | Incomplete ● | An Open Space Plan has not been completed to date. |

#### Recreation/Open Space Land Use Policy B-2:
The [jurisdiction] shall use open space as a buffer between various types of land use.

| Program B-2.1: The [jurisdiction] shall review each development project at the former Fort Ord with regard to the need for open space and buffers between land uses. | No | Complete ■/Ongoing ▲ | Chapter 8 of the FORA Master Resolution section 8.02.030 (a)(4) and (a)(6), states that the FORA Board will withhold a finding of consistency if the underlying jurisdiction’s development entitlement conflicts or is incompatible with open space, recreational, or habitat management areas, or implementation of the 1997 Habitat Management Plan. Marina |
| Program B-2.2: The [jurisdiction] shall encourage clustering of all types of land uses, where appropriate, to allow for a portion of each project site to be dedicated as permanent open space. | No | Complete ■/ Ongoing ▲ | The City of Seaside General Plan includes parks and recreation; habitat management; and recreational commercial designations, which are primarily open space uses. The Seaside Highlands and Seaside Resort projects both include open space areas with clustered development. At the Main Gate area, the City has concentrated commercial development north of Lightfighter Drive while designating the area to the south for open space. Primary FORA Consistency Determinations with Seaside General Plan & zoning code: 12/11/98 & 12/10/04. |
| Program B-2.3: The [jurisdiction] shall designate open space areas, wherever possible, on the perimeter of all development undertaken at the former Fort Ord. | No | Complete ■ | Refer to Program B-2.2. |
| Program B-2.4: The [jurisdiction] shall designate a fire-resistant buffer between BLM lands and residential land use. | No | Complete ■/ Ongoing ▲ | FORA is signatory to the 1997 Habitat Management Plan (HMP). The HMP requires firebreaks between BLM and lands adjacent to BLM on former Fort Ord. FORA has complied with these HMP requirements and will ensure Seaside’s compliance through the FORA Consistency Determination review process described in section 8.02.030 (a)(6) of the FORA Master Resolution. |
**Objective C: Reserve sufficient lands for community and neighborhood parks and recreation facilities in the Fort Ord area and adjacent communities.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recreation/Open Space Land Use Policy C-1</th>
<th>See BRP Programs below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program C-1.1: The [jurisdiction] shall designate sufficient area for projected park and recreation facilities at the former Fort Ord.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaside</td>
<td>The City of Seaside General Plan reserves portions of Fort Ord under three categories: parks and open space; habitat management; and recreational commercial, each of which preserves open space for a specific type of use. Seaside General Plan Policy COS-1.1 and related programs establish park and open space requirements. Primary consistency determinations with Seaside General Plan &amp; zoning code: 12/11/98 &amp; 12/10/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program C-1.2: The City of Seaside shall use the following recreation standards established for Fort Ord reuse and based on existing Seaside Community Standards:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide and equip neighborhood parks at the rate of two park acres per 1,000 people and community parks at the rate of one acre per 1,000 people.</td>
<td>The Seaside General Plan establishes the required ratios of parkland per 1,000 residents. The 2015 demand for parkland is affected by the rate of residential development. FORA Consistency Determinations with Seaside General Plan: 12/11/98 &amp; 12/10/04.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2015 demand for park area: 24 acres of neighborhood parks, 12 acres of community parks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Full build-out demand for park area: 31 acres of neighborhood parks, 16 acres of community parks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program C-1.3: The City of Seaside shall designate land uses for the following park locations and acreages:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community Park in housing area (Polygon 18): 50 acres.</td>
<td>The City of Seaside has re-located some of its open space and recreation parcels compared to the BRP Land Use Concept and the specific designation in this program; some of these</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Neighborhood Park near new golf course community (Polygon 15): 10 acres.
- Neighborhood Park serving University Village Area (Polygon 20e): 5 acres.
- Neighborhood Park with Recreation Center (Polygon 20h): 10 acres.
- Community Park with equestrian/trailhead access to BLM: (Polygon 24): 25 acres.

changes are related to the reconfiguration of the Ord Community and the land swap with the U.S. Army.

The 2004 Seaside General Plan includes the following changes compared to the list in this Program: Polygon 18 is designated for a regional park; The 10 acres of Polygon 15 designated for park (the Drumstick parcel) is designated for Regional Commercial; Polygon 20h is now Military Enclave; and FORA Consistency Determinations with Seaside General Plan: 12/11/98 & 12/10/04. The 2004 consistency determination included the changes noted above.

Seaside has provided parkland within Polygon 20g (Soper Park, 4 acres) and open space walking trails in Polygon 20a (Seaside Highlands) and expanded the park in Polygon 24, for an approximately equal amount of total parkland.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recreation/Open Space Land Use Policy C-2:</th>
<th>See BRP Programs below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The [jurisdiction] shall provide sufficient resources to operate and maintain the park facilities at the former Fort Ord.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program C-2.1:</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Ongoing ▲</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The [jurisdiction] shall provide in the annual budget for a minimal recreation program at the time that each park is developed. The [jurisdiction] should also provide a budget for a complete recreation and park maintenance program when the population to be served by the park reaches one thousand residents.</td>
<td>Jurisdictions complete this program on an ongoing basis as projects and parks are developed. To date, park improvements associated with Seaside Highlands have been completed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program C-2.2:</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Ongoing ▲</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each park in [jurisdiction] should be developed and recreation equipment should be in place when approximately 50% of the residential dwelling units</td>
<td>Jurisdictions complete this program on an ongoing basis as projects and parks are developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that will be served by the park have been constructed and occupied.

### Recreation/Open Space Land Use Policy C-3:
The City of Seaside shall coordinate land use designations for parks and recreation with adjacent uses and jurisdictions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program C-3.1:</th>
<th>The City of Seaside shall include protection criteria in its plan for the community park in the Seaside Residential Planning Area (Polygon 24) for the neighboring habitat protection area in Polygon 25. Creation of this park will also require consideration of existing high-power electric lines and alignment of the proposed Highway 68 connector to General Jim Moore Boulevard.</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Incomplete</th>
<th>Neither the park plan nor the protective criteria have been prepared to date.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program C-3.2:</td>
<td>The 50-acre community park in the University Planning Area (Polygon 18) should be sited, planned and managed in coordination with neighboring jurisdictions (CSUMB and County of Monterey).</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>Polygon 18 is now designated as High Density Residential. Seaside has provided other parkland within Polygon 20g (Soper Park, 4 acres) and open space walking trails in Polygon 20a (Seaside Highlands) and expanded the park in Polygon 24, for an equal amount of total parkland. Consistency determinations with Seaside General Plan 12/10/04.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program C-3.3:</td>
<td>The City of Seaside shall attempt to work out a cooperative park and recreation facilities agreement with MPUSD and CSUMB.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>An agreement has not been prepared or approved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objective D: Retain open space to enhance the appearance of special areas that serve as primary gateways to the Fort Ord area.

### Recreation/Open Space Land Use Policy D-1:
The [jurisdiction] shall protect the visual corridor along State Highway 1 to reinforce the character of the regional landscape at this primary gateway to the former Fort Ord and the Monterey Peninsula.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program D-1.1:</th>
<th>The [jurisdiction] shall designate the State Highway 1 corridor along the former Fort Ord as a special design district in its zoning code.</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>FORA has prepared Highway 1 design guidelines. The City of Seaside has a design review process and a Highway 1 Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program D-1.2: The [jurisdiction] shall develop special design standards for the State Highway 1 Special Design District textual (and not graphic) and establish a hierarchy of gateways as a part of these standards to help define the Fort Ord community and signify a sense of entry and threshold into the community.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Complete ❑</td>
<td>See above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program D-1.3: The City of Seaside shall designate the retail and open space areas along the Main Gate area (Polygon 15), the South Village mixed-use area (Polygon 20e), and a strip 500 feet wide (from the Caltrans Row) along State Highway 1 (Polygons 20a and 20h) as Special Design Districts to convey the commitment to high-quality development to residents and visitors.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Incomplete ❏</td>
<td>These areas have not been designated as Special Design Districts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program D-1.4: For this Special Design District, the [jurisdiction] shall provide for such features as setbacks and buffers, height limits, architectural quality, landscaping and pedestrian access, as well compatibility with surrounding areas as a part of the design standards.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Complete ❑</td>
<td>See above. The Projects at Main Gate Specific Plan provides a 100 to 200 foot buffer area between the development and State Route 1, and limits heights to 40 feet within 300 feet of State Route 1. The Specific Plan includes architectural, landscape and pedestrian provisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program D-1.5: The City of Seaside shall develop a coordinated building and landscape design plan in conjunction with FORA and CSUMB representatives to create a “grand entry” at the main gate entrance area and shall work with the State Department of Parks and Recreation to create a secondary entry. The landscape plan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Complete ❑</td>
<td>FORA Consistency Determination for The Projects at Main Gate Specific Plan: 10/08/10. The City coordinated with FORA and CSUMB in preparing the specific plan. The specific plan addresses the goals laid out in BRP Program D-1.5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
shall enhance and reinforce the regional character of the main entrance area.

**INSTITUTIONAL LAND USE**

*Objective A: Encourage proper planning on and adjacent to public lands so that uses on these lands are compatible.*

**Institutional Land Use Policy A-1:** The [jurisdiction] shall review and coordinate with the universities, colleges and other school districts or entities, the planning of both public lands designated for university-related uses and adjacent lands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program A-1.1: The City of Seaside shall request to be included in the master planning efforts undertaken by the California State University and shall take an active role to ensure compatible land uses into [sic] transition between university lands and non-university lands.</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Ongoing ▲</th>
<th>CSUMB adopted a campus master plan in 2007. The jurisdictions participate in regular coordination meetings held by CSUMB regarding land use.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program A-1.2: The City of Seaside shall designate the land surrounding the CSUMB Planning Area for compatible use, such as Planned Development Mixed Use Districts, to encourage use of this land for a university and research oriented environment and to prevent the creation of pronounced boundaries between the campus and surrounding communities.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Complete ■</td>
<td>The 2004 Seaside General Plan includes Mixed Use designations for the land to the south of CSUMB. FORA Consistency Determinations with Seaside General Plan &amp; zoning code occurred on 12/10/04.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program A-1.3: The City of Seaside shall review its zoning ordinance regulations on the types of uses allowed in areas adjacent to the CSUMB Planning Area District to promote compatibility of uses and adopt zoning standards to provide a suitable transition of land use types, density, design, circulation and roadways to the areas designated for university-related uses.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Complete ■</td>
<td>The City has adopted design and streetscape standards for the Mixed Use Commercial zone district to ensure pedestrian-oriented streetscapes in the areas near CSUMB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program A-1.4: The City of Seaside shall minimize the impacts of land uses which may be incompatible with public lands, such as a regional retail and entertainment use in the Gateway Regional Entertainment District located at the western entrance of the CSUMB campus. The City shall</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Incomplete ●</td>
<td>The City adopted the Projects at Main Gate Specific Plan in August 2010. Coordination with Marina and CSUMB is not documented in the specific plan; however, both raised significant issues in comment letters on the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
coordinate the planning of this site with CSUMB and the City of Marina.

**Objective B: Consider special needs of schools in developing land and infrastructure.**

**Institutional Land Use Policy B-1:** The [jurisdiction] shall provide a (compatible and) safe environment for schools serving (former) Fort Ord areas when planning land use and infrastructure improvements.

| Program B-1.1: The [jurisdiction] shall review all planning and design for Fort Ord land use and infrastructure improvements in the vicinity of schools [sic] ensure appropriate compatibility including all safety standards for development near schools, as a condition of project approval. | No | Ongoing ▲ | Projects are routed to appropriate agencies for review. |
| | | | |
| Program B-1.2: The City of Seaside shall inform the Monterey Peninsula Unified School District of all proposed land use and infrastructure improvements which may impact school and college sites. | No | Ongoing ▲ | Projects are routed to appropriate agencies for review. |

**Objective C: Encourage highest and best use of institutional lands associated with military enclave redevelopment at the former Fort Ord.**

**Institutional Land Use Policy C-1:** The City of Seaside shall encourage opportunities for developing market-responsive housing in the POM Annex Military Enclave District at the former Fort Ord.

| Program C-1.1: The City of Seaside shall develop an agreement with the U.S. Army to implement the reconfiguration of institutional land use related to the POM Annex community. | No | Complete ■ | The reconfigured POM Annex is shown on the 2004 Seaside General Plan land use map. City/Army agreement to swap Stillwell Kidney site for land near Lightfighter Drive, approved by City RDA 11/15/07. |

**Objective D: Provide for Community Design principles and guidelines for institutional development at the former Fort Ord.**

**Institutional Land Use Policy D-1:** The [jurisdiction] shall support FORA in the preparation of regional urban design guidelines, including a scenic corridor design overlay area, to govern the visual quality of areas of regional importance.

<p>| | | | |
| | | | |
| <strong>Institutional Land Use Policy D-2:</strong> The [jurisdiction] shall adhere to the General Development Character and Design Objectives of the Fort Ord Reuse | | | See BRP Programs below |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program D-2.1: The [jurisdiction] shall prepare design guidelines for implementing institutional development on former Fort Ord lands consistent with the regional urban design guidelines (to be prepared by FORA) and the General Development Character and Design Objectives of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan Framework.</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Ongoing ▲</th>
<th>The City of Seaside has a Highway 1 Design Overlay Zone but has not prepared design guidelines applicable to areas outside the Highway 1 corridor.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program D-2.2: The [jurisdiction] shall review each institutional development proposal for consistency with the regional urban design guidelines and the General Development Character and Design Objectives of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan Framework.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Complete ■</td>
<td>The City of Seaside has a design review process that considers a project's conformance to the applicable standards and guidelines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**BASE REUSE PLAN - CIRCULATION ELEMENT**

Goal: Create and maintain a balanced transportation system, including pedestrian ways, bikeways, transit, and streets, to provide for the safe and efficient movement of people and goods to and throughout the former Fort Ord.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIRCULATION – STREETS AND HIGHWAYS</th>
<th>Is the policy/program applicable to the subject action? (Y/N)</th>
<th>Completion status, per Reassessment Report</th>
<th>Notes from Reassessment Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base Reuse Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives, Policies, &amp; Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective A:</strong> An efficient regional network of roadways that provides access to the former Fort Ord.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Streets and Roads Policy A-1</strong>: FORA and each jurisdiction with lands at former Fort Ord shall coordinate with and assist TAMC in providing funding for an efficient regional transportation network to access former Fort Ord and implement FORA’s Development and Resource Management Plan (DRMP).</td>
<td>See BRP Programs below</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program A-1.1: Each jurisdiction through FORA’s DRMP, shall fund its “fair share” of “on-site,” “off-site” and “regional” roadway improvements based on the nexus analysis of the TMC regional transportation model. The nexus is described in the Public Facilities Improvement Plan, Volume 3 of the Reuse Plan, as amended from time to time. The nexus has been updated to reflect TMC’s re-prioritizing of improvements in the network and is reported in the “Fort Ord Regional Transportation Study,” prepared by TMC, January 6, 1997.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ongoing ▲</td>
<td>The transportation nexus study improvement program, and fee allocations were updated in 2005. FORA adopted a basewide Development Fee Schedule in 1999 and Community Facilities District Special Tax in 2002 to implement its financing program. The fee is paid for each development project as permits are issued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program A-1.3: Each jurisdiction, through FORA’s DRMP shall participate in a regional transportation financing mechanism if adopted by TMC, as provided in 3.11.5.3(a) of the DRMP. If not, FORA will collect and contribute Fort Ord’s “fair share” to construction of a roadway arterial network in and around the former Fort Ord. FORA’s participation in the regional improvements program</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>See above, for Program A-1.1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
constitutes mitigation of FORA’s share of cumulative impacts.

| Program A-1.4: In order for FORA to monitor the transportation improvements and to prevent development from exceeding FORA’s level of service standards, each jurisdiction shall annually provide information to TAMC and FORA on approved projects and building permits within their jurisdiction (both on the former Fort Ord and outside the former base), including traffic model runs, traffic reports, and environmental documents. |
| No | Ongoing ▲ | Seaside provides annual development forecasts to FORA as part of FORA’s annual Capital Improvement Program preparation process. |

**Objective B: Provide direct and efficient linkages from former Fort Ord lands to the regional transportation system.**

**Streets and Roads Policy B-1:** FORA and each jurisdiction with lands at former Fort Ord shall design all major arterials within former Fort Ord to have direct connections to the regional network (or to another major arterial that has a direct connection to the regional network) consistent with the Reuse Plan circulation framework.

| Program B-1.1: Each jurisdiction shall coordinate with FORA to design and provide an efficient system of arterials consistent with Figures 4.2-2 (in the 2015 scenario) and Figure 4.2-3 (in the buildout scenario) in order to connect to the regional transportation network. |
| No | Complete ■ | All arterial roadways planned or constructed at Fort Ord connect to the regional network. No arterial roadways are proposed that are not included in the Fort Ord Reuse Plan. |

| Program B-1.2: Each jurisdiction shall identify and coordinate with FORA to designate local truck routes to have direct access to regional and national truck routes and to provide adequate movement of goods into and out of former Fort Ord. |
| No | Incomplete ● | The City has not adopted truck routes. General Plan Policy 3.17 prohibits trucks from residential streets (other than for local delivery). |

**Objective C: Provide a safe and efficient street system at the former Fort Ord.**

**Streets and Roads Policy C-1:** Each jurisdiction shall identify the functional purpose of all roadways and design the street system in conformance with Reuse Plan design standards.

| Program C-1.1: Each jurisdiction shall assign classifications |
| No | Complete ■ | The 2004 Seaside General Plan designates the |
(arterial, collector, local) for each street and design and construct roadways in conformance with the standards provided by the Reuse Plan (Table 4.2-4 and Figure 4.2-4). The functional purpose of each street, and includes cross-sections for several typical streets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program C-1.2: Each jurisdiction shall preserve sufficient right-of-way for anticipated future travel demands based on buildout of the FORA Reuse Plan.</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>The 2004 Seaside General Plan designates street rights-of-way anticipated to serve Fort Ord at build-out. LCP further ensures that state route 1 right-of-way is designated within the Coastal Transportation Corridor.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program C-1.3: Each jurisdiction shall assign an appropriate threshold performance standard for its roadway system in order to measure the impacts of future growth on the system.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>2004 Seaside General Plan Policy C-1.2 establishes an acceptable level of service of LOS C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program C-1.4: Each jurisdiction shall design and construct the roadway network consistent with the phasing program identified in the Fort Ord Business and Operations Plan (Appendix B of the Reuse Plan).</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Regional roadway phasing is determined by TAMC and FORA based on anticipated funding, and is carried out by the appropriate entity accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program C-1.5: Each jurisdiction shall designate arterials and roadways in commercially zoned areas as truck routes.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>The City has not adopted truck routes. General Plan Implementation Plan C-1.7.1: discourages truck routes in residential area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Streets and Roads Policy C-2:** Each jurisdiction shall provide improvements to the roadway network to address high accident locations.

| Seaside | program C-2.1: Each jurisdiction shall collect accident data, identify and assess potential remedies at high accident locations and implement improvements to lower the identified high accident rates. | No | Ongoing | Jurisdictions are required to implement this program under state law. |

**Objective D: Provide an adequate supply of on-street parking.**

**Streets and Roads Policy D-1:** Each jurisdiction shall provide a program of on-street parking.

| See BRP Programs below | Program D-1.1: Each jurisdiction shall provide on-street parking, as appropriate, with design and construction of all | No | Complete | The typical street cross sections in the 2004 Seaside General Plan include room for parking. |
| Program D-1.2: Each jurisdiction shall provide adequate parking in urban areas for persons with disabilities, either as on-street parking on urban roadways or as on-site parking. | No | Ongoing ▲ | The City of Seaside is subject to and complies with the requirements of the Americans with Disability Act to ensure development projects provide adequate access. |
| Program D-1.3: Each jurisdiction shall evaluate all new development proposals for the need to provide on-street parking as a part of the overall on-street parking program. | No | Ongoing ▲ | On-street parking is evaluated in areas where on-street parking is desired, such as residential areas and mixed use business districts. |

**CIRCULATION – TRANSIT**

**Objective A: Provide convenient and comprehensive bus service.**

**Transit Policy A-1:** Each jurisdiction with lands at former Fort Ord shall coordinate with MST to provide regional bus service and facilities to serve the key activity centers and key corridors within former Fort Ord.

**Program A-1.1:** Each jurisdiction shall identify key activity centers and key corridors, coordinate with MST to identify bus routes that could serve former Fort Ord, and support MST to provide service responsive to the local needs.

**Program A-1.2:** Each jurisdiction shall develop a program to identify locations for bus facilities, including shelters and turnouts. These facilities shall be funded and constructed through new development and/or other programs in order to support convenient and comprehensive bus service.

**Program A-1.3:** Each jurisdiction shall identify the need for transit/paratransit services for the elderly and disabled and coordinate with and support MST to implement the needed transit services.

| See BRP Programs below | Complete ■/Ongoing ▲ | 2004 Seaside General Plan Policy C-3.3 encourages transit-oriented development in key areas of the City where transit service is provided. | Local jurisdictions coordinate the location of transit stops with MST. The City does not specifically collect fees for development of transit facilities, although transit facilities can be included within the requirements for frontage improvements. | Local jurisdictions coordinate the provision of special transit services with MST Seaside General Plan Implementation Plan C-3.2.1 encourages the provision of transit services for special needs populations. |

**Objective B: Promote passenger rail service that addresses transportation needs for the former Fort Ord.**

**Transit Policy B-1:** Each jurisdiction shall support TAMC and other agencies to provide passenger rail service that addresses transportation needs for former Fort Ord.

<p>| See BRP Program below | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program B-1.1: Each jurisdiction shall support TAMC and other agencies to assess the need, feasibility, design and preservation of rights-of-way for passenger rail service that addresses transportation needs at former Fort Ord.</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Ongoing</th>
<th>Local agencies participate in this effort through their representation on the TMC. Board of Directors. LCP designates the Highway 1 corridor as Coastal Transportation Corridor, which would allow the development of rail service.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective C: Promote intermodal connections that address the transportation needs for the former Fort Ord.</td>
<td>Transit Policy C-1: Each jurisdiction shall support the establishment of intermodal centers and connections that address the transportation needs at former Fort Ord.</td>
<td>See BRP Program below</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program C-1.1: Each jurisdiction shall coordinate with and support TAMC and MST to identify the need, location, and physical design of intermodal centers and regional and local transportation routes to connect with the intermodal centers.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Local agencies participate in this effort through their representation on the TMC Board of Directors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRCULATION – PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLES</td>
<td>(Draft)</td>
<td>(Draft)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective A: Provide a pedestrian system that supports the needs of Fort Ord residents, employees, students, and visitors.</td>
<td>Pedestrian and Bicycles Policy A-1: Each jurisdiction shall provide and maintain an attractive, safe and comprehensive pedestrian system.</td>
<td>See BRP Program below</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program A-1.1: Each land use jurisdiction shall prepare a Pedestrian System Plan that includes the construction of sidewalks along both sides of urban roadways, sidewalks and pedestrian walkways in all new developments and public facilities, crosswalks at all signalized intersections and other major intersections, where warranted, and school safety features. This plan shall be coordinated with adjacent land use jurisdictions, FORA, and appropriate school entities.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>The City of Seaside has not adopted a pedestrian plan. 2004 Seaside General Plan Implementation Plan C-3.4.2 calls for complete pedestrian facilities within the City, focusing on new development and key existing areas. The TMC plan referenced below also identifies pedestrian improvement projects in Seaside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective B: Provide a bicycle system that supports the needs of Fort Ord residents, employees, students, and visitors.</td>
<td>Pedestrian and Bicycles Policy B-1: Each jurisdiction shall provide and maintain an attractive, safe and comprehensive bicycle system.</td>
<td>See BRP Programs below</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program B-1.1: Each jurisdiction shall prepare a Bicycle System Plan that includes an overall bicycle network consistent with the Reuse Plan (Figure 4.2-6) and local bicycle networks with the appropriate class of bikeways for each functional class of roadway. The Bicycle System Plan shall include appropriate design standards to accommodate bicycle travel and secure bicycle parking facilities at public and private activity centers. This plan shall be coordinated with adjacent land use jurisdictions, FORA, and appropriate school entities.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Complete ■</td>
<td>The City of Seaside adopted its Bikeways Transportation Master Plan in 2007. The plan meets state guidelines for bicycle plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program B-1.2: Each jurisdiction shall review new development to provide bicycle system facilities consistent with the Reuse Plan and the Bicycle System Plan concurrently with development approval.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ongoing ▲</td>
<td>Local jurisdictions include a review of transportation improvements in their development review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CIRCULATION – TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT

**Objective A: Deemphasize the need for vehicle travel to and within the former Fort Ord.**

**Transportation Demand Management Policy A-1: TDM programs shall be encouraged.**

<p>| Program A-1.1: Promote TDM programs at work sites. Specific measures that can be pursued at the work site include: compressed work weeks, staggered/flexible work hours, telecommuting, on-site ridesharing, public transit subsidies, guaranteed ride home, bicycle facilities, and parking pricing. | No | Ongoing ▲ | 2004 Seaside General Plan Implementation Plan C-2.2.2 encourages TDM programs. |
| Program A-1.2: Promote TDM programs in residential developments, retail centers, and other activity centers. | No | Ongoing ▲ | See above |
| Program A-1.3: Require new development to incorporate design features that will strengthen TDM programs. | No | Ongoing ▲ | See above |
| Program A-1.4: Enforce CMP trip reduction programs. | No | Ongoing ▲ | MBUAPCD has such requirements such as monitoring holding time at signal lights. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIRCULATION – LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>TAMC addresses this through carrying capacity on roads.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Objective A: A transportation system that supports the planned land use development patterns.**

**Land Use and Transportation Policy A.1:** Each jurisdiction with lands at former Fort Ord shall coordinate land use and transportation planning both internally and with adjacent jurisdictions consistent with the Reuse Plan circulation framework.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program A.1-1: Each jurisdiction shall support development of a travel demand model covering lands at former Fort Ord to help evaluate the relationship between land use and transportation system.</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Ongoing ▲</th>
<th>TAMC maintains a traffic model that local jurisdictions can utilize in their transportation planning.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Program A-1.2: Each jurisdiction with lands at former Fort Ord shall require new developments to conduct a traffic analysis to determine impacts on traffic conditions, require measures such as TDM programs and traffic impact fees to mitigate these impacts. | No | Ongoing ▲ | Each jurisdiction has defined standards as to when a traffic impact analysis is required. Traffic impact analysis and mitigation, as needed, is also required for all applicable development projects under CEQA. |

**Land Use and Transportation Policy A.2:** The transportation system to serve former Fort Ord lands shall be designed to reflect the needs of surrounding land uses, proposed densities of development, and shall include streets, pedestrian access, bikeways and landscaping as appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seaside</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Program A.2-1: Each jurisdiction with lands at former Fort Ord shall develop transportation standards for implementation of the transportation system, including but not limited to, rights-of-way widths, roadway capacity needs, design speeds, safety requirements, etc. Pedestrian and bicycle access shall be considered for all [sic] incorporation in all roadway designs. | No | Ongoing ▲ | Each jurisdiction’s public works department has design standards for transportation facilities. Local standards are typically based on the Caltrans Highway Design Manual, which incorporates standards and guidelines for all types of roadways and includes guidance for non-motorized access. TAMC also oversees regional facilities. |
BASE REUSE PLAN - RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE ELEMENT

Goal: Establish a unified open space system which preserves and enhances the health of the natural environment while contributing to the revitalization of the former Fort Ord by providing a wide range of accessible recreational experiences for residents and visitors alike.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base Reuse Plan</th>
<th>Objectives, Policies, &amp; Programs</th>
<th>Is the policy/program applicable to the subject action? (Y/N)</th>
<th>Completion status, per Reassessment Report</th>
<th>Notes from Reassessment Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Objective A: Integrate the former Fort Ord’s open spaces into the larger regional open space system, making them accessible as a regional resource for the entire Monterey Peninsula.

Recreation Policy B-1: The [jurisdiction] shall designate a Scenic Corridor adjacent to Highway 1 to preserve and enhance the State Highway 1 viewshed.

| Recreation Policy B-1.1: The [jurisdiction] shall establish guidelines for minimum landscaping standards within the corridor which incorporate a regional landscape theme with regards to permitted plantings, as well as other design features. | Yes | Complete □ | FORA has adopted Highway 1 design guidelines (see above). The City of Seaside has a design review process and a Highway 1 Design Overlay Zone. The LCP-CIP identifies that the Coastal Transportation Corridor would be subject to Caltrans and TMC and/or Southern Pacific Railroad Standards, as applicable. |

| Program B-1.2: The City of Seaside shall require that all development within the Regional Retail and Golf Course Housing Districts incorporate landscape buffers adequate to visual intrusion into the State Highway 1 Scenic Corridor. | No | Ongoing ▲ | See above. FORA Consistency Determination with The Projects at Main Gate Specific Plan: 10/8/10 FORA's development entitlement consistency determination process provides a mechanism for more specifically evaluating |
Recreation Policy B-2: The City of Seaside shall establish landscape gateways into the former Fort Ord along major transportation corridors with the intent of establishing a regional landscape character.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective C: Promote the goals of the Habitat Management Plan through the sensitive siting and integration of recreation areas which enhance the natural community.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Policy C-1: The [jurisdiction] shall establish an oak tree protection program to ensure conservation of existing coastal live oak woodlands in large corridors within a comprehensive open space system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective D: Establish a system of community and neighborhood parks which provide recreation opportunities reflective of local community standards.

| Recreation Policy D-1: The [jurisdiction] shall designate and locate park facilities to adequately serve the current and projected population of [the jurisdiction] within the former Fort Ord for both active recreation as well as to provide for passive uses such as scenic vistas, fish and wildlife habitat, and nature study. | No | Ongoing ▲ | The Seaside General Plan provides for numerous recreational and open space areas, and requires a minimum ratio of parks to residents. |
| Recreation Policy D-2: The City of Seaside shall develop | No | Ongoing ▲ | The City of Seaside General Plan reserves |
active parkland within the former Fort Ord within the 2015 time frame which reflects the adopted City of Seaside standard of 2 acres of neighborhood parkland and 1 acre of community parkland per 1,000 population.

portions of Fort Ord under three categories: parks and open space; habitat management; and recreational commercial, each of which preserves open space for a specific type of use. Seaside General Plan Policy COS-1.1 and related programs establish park and open space requirements. The Seaside General Plan establishes the required ratios of parkland per 1,000 residents. The 2015 demand for parkland is affected by the rate of residential development.

| Recreation Policy D-3: The [jurisdiction] shall maximize use of existing former military recreation facilities as a catalyst for creation of quality parks and recreation opportunities | No | Ongoing ▲ | Seaside has refurbished the Soper Field park on Coe Avenue and reconstructed much of the Black Horse and Bayonet golf courses. All of these former U.S. Army facilities are in use. |
| Recreation Policy D-4: The [jurisdiction] shall develop a plan for adequate and long-term maintenance for every public park prior to construction. | No | Incomplete ● | The parks identified in the BRP have not been constructed. |

**Objective E: Create opportunities for economic revitalization of the former Fort Ord through encouragement of commercial recreation opportunities in appropriate settings.**

**Recreation Policy E-1:** The City of Seaside shall identify an appropriate amount of commercial recreation opportunity sites in compatible settings to ensure that these recreation opportunities are realized. These uses will be considered compatible land uses where identified.  

Program E-1.1: The City of Seaside shall designate the existing golf course as a recreation opportunity site, and to be operated as a commercial venture.  

No | Complete ■ | The Seaside General Plan includes two large commercial recreation sites. The golf courses are designated for commercial recreation and the City has a lease for operation of the golf courses. |

**Recreation Policy F-1:** The City of Seaside shall reserve sufficient space within key transportation arterials to

No | Complete ■ | Pedestrian and bicycle trails have been accommodated within the General Jim Moore
accommodate paths for alternative means of transportation.

Note: There are no associated Programs for this Policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recreation Policy F-2: The [jurisdiction] shall encourage the development of alternative means of transportation for recreation and other travel.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program F-2.1: The [jurisdiction] shall adopt a Comprehensive Trails Plan, and incorporate it into its General Plan. This Trail Plan will identify desired hiker/biker and equestrian trails within the portion of the former Fort Ord within [jurisdiction’s] jurisdiction, create a trail hierarchy, and coordinate trail planning with other jurisdictions within Fort Ord boundaries in order to improve access to parks, recreational facilities and other open space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective G: Use open space wherever possible to create an attractive setting for the former Fort Ord’s new neighborhoods and institutions.

| Recreation Policy G-1: The [jurisdiction] shall use incentives to promote the development of an integrated, attractive park and open space system during the development of individual districts and neighborhood’s [sic] within the former Fort Ord (to encourage recreation and the conservation of natural resources). | No | Incomplete ● | No park development incentives are known to have been developed. |

| Recreation Policy G-2: The [jurisdiction] shall encourage the creation of private parks and open space as a component of private development within the former Fort Ord. | No | Incomplete ● | No programs to encourage private park development are known. |

| Recreation Policy G-3: The [jurisdiction] shall adopt landscape standards to guide development of streetscapes, parking lots, government facilities, institutional grounds, and Boulevard right-of-way. There is ample room to accommodate a trail on the east side of Monterey Road. The trail shown on Military Avenue (outside Fort Ord) would need to be accommodated on the street/sidewalk, but the connection to Coe Avenue has been constructed. | No | Complete ■/ Ongoing ▲ | The City of Seaside has a design review process and a Highway 1 Design Overlay Zone. The Highway 1 Design Overlay requires substantial |
other public and semi-public settings within the former Fort Ord.

| Recreation Policy G-4: The [jurisdiction] shall coordinate the development of park and recreation facilities with neighboring jurisdictions including the City of Marina, City of Seaside, Monterey County, CSUMB, California State Parks, Monterey Peninsula Regional Parks District, and the Bureau of Land Management. | No | Incomplete ● | There are no known programs for coordination of parklands. |

| Objective H: Promote environmental education. |  |

| Recreation Policy H-1: The [jurisdiction] shall work with educational and environmental institutions and organizations to create opportunities for environmental learning experiences on [jurisdiction’s] habitat management lands. | No | Ongoing ▲ | The jurisdictions are required through deed restrictions to implement the HMP, which includes educational programs. At this point no specific programs are in place. |
Goal: Promote the protection, maintenance and use of natural resources, with special emphasis on scarce resources and those that require special control and management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSERVATION - SOILS AND GEOLOGY</th>
<th>(Draft)</th>
<th>(Draft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base Reuse Plan</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Objectives, Policies, &amp; Programs</strong></td>
<td>Is the policy/program applicable to the subject action? (Y/N)</td>
<td>Completion status, per Reassessment Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective A: Prevent soil transport and loss caused by wind and water erosion and promote construction practices that maintain the productivity of soil resources.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soils and Geology Policy A-1:</strong> In the absence of more detailed site-specific information, the [jurisdiction] shall use the Natural Resources Conservation Service’s Soil Survey of Monterey County in determining the suitability of soil for particular land uses.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ongoing ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soils and Geology Policy A-2:</strong> The [jurisdiction] shall require developers to prepare and implement erosion control and landscape plans for projects that involve high erosion risk. Each plan shall be prepared by a registered civil engineer or certified professional in the field of erosion and sediment control and shall be subject to the approval of the public works director for the [jurisdiction]. The erosion component of the plan must at least meet the requirements of Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPPs) required by the California State Water Resources Control Board.</td>
<td></td>
<td>See BRP Programs below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program A-2.1: The [jurisdiction] shall develop and make available a list and description of feasible and effective erosion control measures for various soil conditions within the [jurisdiction] to be used by all future development at former Fort Ord.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ongoing ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program A-2.2: The [jurisdiction] shall develop and make available a list of recommended native plant and non-invasive non-native plant species, application rates, and planting procedures suitable for erosion control under various soil, slope, and climatic conditions that may be encountered in the [jurisdiction’s] sphere of influence.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ongoing ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program A-2.3: The [jurisdiction] shall develop and make available a list and description of feasible and effective engineering and design techniques that address the soil limitations characteristic of the former Fort Ord to be used by all future development at the former Fort Ord.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ongoing ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soils and Geology Policy A-3:</strong> Through site monitoring, the [jurisdiction] shall ensure that all measures included in the developer’s erosion control and landscape plans are properly implemented.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ongoing ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soils and Geology Policy A-4:</strong> The [jurisdiction] shall continue to enforce the Uniform Building Code to minimize erosion and slope instability problems.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ongoing ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soils and Geology Policy A-5:</strong> Before issuing a grading permit, the [jurisdiction] shall require that geotechnical reports be prepared for developments proposed on soils that have limitations as substrates for construction or engineering purposes, including limitations concerning slope and soils that have piping, low-strength, and shrink-swell potential. The [jurisdiction] shall require that engineering and design techniques be recommended and implemented to address these limitations.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ongoing ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program A-5.1: See Program A-2.3 above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program A-5.2: The [jurisdiction] shall designate areas with severe soil limitations, such as those related to piping, low-strength, and shrink-swell potential, for open space or</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Complete ■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
similar use if adequate measures cannot be taken to ensure the structural stability of these soils. This shall be designated at the project-specific level through a geotechnical study.

Soils and Geology Policy A-6: The [jurisdiction] shall require that development of lands have a prevailing slope above 30% include implementation of adequate erosion control measures.

| Program A-6.1: The [jurisdiction] shall prepare and make available a slope map to identify locations in the study area where slope poses severe constraints for particular land uses. | No | Ongoing ▲ | The jurisdictions establish policies for development on slopes and grading standards, which entail the development of topographic data for the sites of proposed development projects. |
| Program A-6.2: The [jurisdiction] shall designate areas with extreme slope limitations for open space or similar use if adequate erosion control measures and engineering and design techniques cannot be implemented. | No | Ongoing ▲ | See Program A-6.1 above |

Objective B: Provide for mineral extraction and reclamation activities that are consistent with the surrounding natural landscape, proposed future land uses, and soil conservation practices.

Soils and Geology Policy B-1: The [jurisdiction] shall identify areas of highly valuable mineral resources within the former Fort Ord, based on the State of California Division of Mines and Geology’s mineral resource “classification-designation” system, and provide for the protection of these areas.

<p>| Program B-1.1: If the [jurisdiction] determines that valuable mineral resources warranting protection are contained within the former Fort Ord, the [jurisdiction] shall designate these areas in a mineral resource or similar land use category that would afford them protection; these areas shall also be zoned in a district consistent with this designation. | No | Ongoing ▲ | No valuable mineral resources warranting protection are known to have been discovered. In the event they are discovered, the requirements of this program will remain in effect. |
| Program B-1.2: On property titles in the affected mineral | No | Ongoing ▲ | Not applicable at present (see Program B-1.1) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soils and Geology Policy B-2:</th>
<th>The [jurisdiction] shall protect designated mineral resource protection areas from incompatible land uses.</th>
<th>See BRP Programs below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program B-2.1: If so provided, the [jurisdiction] shall specify in its mineral resource protection zoning district a requirement that provides sufficient buffers between mining activities and incompatible land uses.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ongoing ▲ Not applicable at present, but could occur in the future (see Program B-1.1 above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program B-2.2: If so provided, the [jurisdiction] shall specify in its mineral resource protection zoning district those uses that are deemed compatible with mining activities.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ongoing ▲ Not applicable at present, but could occur in the future (see Program B-1.1 above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soils and Geology Policy B-3:</td>
<td>Prior to granting permits for operation, the [jurisdiction] shall require that mining and reclamation plans be prepared for all proposed mineral extraction operations.</td>
<td>See BRP Programs below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program B-3.1: The [jurisdiction] shall develop and make available a list of issues to be considered and mitigated in mining and reclamation plans, including, but not limited to, the following: buffering, dust control, erosion control, protection of water quality, noise impacts, access, security, and reclamation.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ongoing ▲ Not applicable at present, but could occur in the future (see Program B-1.1 above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soils and Geology Policy B-4:</td>
<td>The [jurisdiction] shall require the posting of bonds for new mining permits if it determines that such a measure is needed to guarantee the timely and faithful performance of mining and reclamation plans.</td>
<td>Ongoing ▲ Not applicable at present, but could occur in the future (see Program B-1.1 above)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective C: Strive to conserve soils that rare species or plant communities are dependent on or strongly associated with.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soils and Geology Policy C-1:</th>
<th>The [jurisdiction] shall support and encourage existing state and federal soil conservation and restoration programs within its borders.</th>
<th>Ongoing ▲ The jurisdictions address soils conservation through the CEQA process, grading ordinance, and compliance with state and federal programs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soils and Geology Policy C-2:</td>
<td>The [jurisdiction] shall consider the compatibility</td>
<td>See BRP Program below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with existing soil conditions of all habitat restoration, enhancement, and preservation programs undertaken within the [jurisdiction].

| Program C-2.1: The [jurisdiction] shall require that the land recipients of properties within the former Fort Ord implement the Fort Ord Habitat Management Plan. | No | Ongoing ▲ | Deed restrictions require implementation and compliance with HMP habitat management requirements. Marina is a signatory to the 1997 HMP. FORA reviews legislative land use decisions and development entitlements for conflicts and compliance with the 1997 as part of its Consistency Determination process described in Chapter 8 of its Master Resolution. |

**CONSERVATION - HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

**Objective A: Protect and preserve watersheds and recharge areas, particularly those critical for the replenishment of aquifers.**

**Hydrology and Water Quality Policy A-1:** At the project approval stage, the [jurisdiction] shall require new development to demonstrate that all measures will be taken to ensure that runoff is minimize and infiltration maximized in groundwater recharge areas.

| Program A-1.1: The [jurisdiction] shall develop and make available a description of feasible and effective best management practices and site drainage designs that shall be implemented in new development to ensure adequate stormwater infiltration. | Yes | Ongoing ▲ | See BRP Programs below

| LCP Policy NCR-CZ 4.1.A requires the City to adopt adequate stormwater pollution prevention and Low Impact Development strategies. LCP Policy LUD-CZ 3.1.D and LCP-CIP 2.7.G requires preparation of Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans, Low Impact Development, Best management Practicess, maintenance of BMPs, compliance with the City’s Phase II NPDES permit requirements, preparation of Construction Pollution Prevention Plans and post-construction runoff plans. Incorporation of these standards into projects is commonly required under CEQA |
Program A-1.2: A Master Drainage Plan should be developed for the Fort Ord property to assess the existing natural and man-made drainage facilities, recommend area-wide improvements based on the approved Reuse Plan and develop plans for the control of storm water runoff from future development, including detention/retention and enhanced percolation to the ground water. This plan shall be developed by the FORA with funding for the plan to be obtained from future development. All Fort Ord property owners (federal, state, and local) shall participate in the funding of this plan. Reflecting the incremental nature of the funding source (i.e., development), the assessment of existing facilities shall be completed first and by the year 2001. This shall be followed by recommendations for improvements and an implementation plan to be completed by 2003.

| Objective B: Eliminate long-term groundwater overdrafting as soon as practicably possible. |
| Hydrology and Water Quality Policy B-1: The [jurisdiction] shall ensure additional water to critically deficient areas. |
| See BRP Programs below |

<p>| Program B-1.1: [This program was removed based on the listing of modifications to the Reuse Plan approved by the FORA Board on June 13, 1997]. | No | Not Applicable | Program Removed |
| Program B-1.2: The [jurisdiction] shall work with FORA and the MCWRA to determine the feasibility of developing additional water supply sources for the former Fort Ord, such as water importation and desalination, and actively participate in implementing the most viable option(s). | No | Ongoing ▲ | The local jurisdictions are participating in Marina Coast Water District's development of the Fort Ord Water Augmentation project, a component of the Regional Urban Water Augmentation Program (RUWAP). The Monterey County Water Resources Agency has an oversight role in the protection of groundwater resources. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program B-1.3: The [jurisdiction] shall adopt and enforce a water conservation ordinance developed by the Marina Coast Water District.</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Complete ■/Ongoing ▲</th>
<th>Chapter 13.18 of the municipal code is a water conservation ordinance based on the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program B-1.4: The [jurisdiction] shall continue to actively participate in and support the development of “reclaimed” water supply sources by the water purveyor and the MRWPCA to insure adequate water supplies for the former Fort Ord.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ongoing ▲</td>
<td>Local jurisdictions are participating in the efforts to implement a Recycled Water Project proposed by the MCWD; agency agreements are not yet in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program B-1.5: The [jurisdiction] shall promote the use of on-site water collection, incorporating measures such as cisterns or other appropriate improvements to collect surface water for in-tract irrigation and other non-potable use.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Incomplete ●</td>
<td>Seaside’s water conservation ordinances do not include these measures. On-site water collection is not appropriate within the Coastal Transportation Corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program B-1.6: The [jurisdiction] shall work with FORA to assure the long-range water supply for the needs and place for the reuse of the former Fort Ord.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ongoing ▲</td>
<td>The local jurisdictions are participating in the development of a regional water project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program B-1.7: The [jurisdiction], in order to promote FORA's DRMP, shall provide FORA with an annual summary of the following: 1) the number of new residential units, based on building permits and approved residential project, within its former Fort Ord boundaries and estimate, on the basis of the unit count, the current and projected population. The report shall distinguish units served by water from FORA's allocation and water from other available sources; 2) estimate of existing and projected jobs within its Fort Ord boundaries based on development projects that are on-going, completed, and approved; and 3) approved projects to assist FORA’s monitoring of water supply, use, quality, and yield.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ongoing ▲</td>
<td>FORA requests this information from the jurisdictions as part of its annual development forecast.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hydrology and Water Quality Policy B-2:** The [jurisdiction] shall condition approval of development plans on verification of an assured long-term water supply for the projects. | No | Ongoing ▲ | Improvements allowed within the Coastal Transportation Corridor would not result in an increased demand for water. Annual use of up
to 6,600 acre-feet of water is considered sustainable at the former Fort Ord. At present, annual water use is about 2,200 acre-feet. Each jurisdiction’s development review process (including mandatory water supply assessment under CEQA, for applicable projects) provides a mechanism for this Policy to be met. FORA’s development entitlement consistency determination process supplies an additional level of oversight for this requirement.

**Objective C: Control nonpoint and point water pollution sources to protect the adopted beneficial uses of water.**

**Hydrology and Water Quality Policy C-1:** The [jurisdiction] shall comply with all mandated water quality programs and establish local water quality programs as needed.

<p>| Program C-1.1: The [jurisdiction] shall comply with the nonpoint pollution control plan developed by the California Coastal Commission and the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), pursuant to Section 6217 of the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act Reauthorization Amendments of 1990, if any stormwater is discharged into the ocean. | Yes | Ongoing ▲ | Regulatory enforcement by the State Water Resources Control Board and City inspections and CEQA monitoring ensure compliance with this program. See also Program A-1.1 above. |
| Program C-1.2: The [jurisdiction] shall comply with the General Industrial Storm Water Permit adopted by the SWRCB in November 1991 that requires all storm drain outfalls classified as industrial to apply for a permit for discharge. | Yes | Ongoing ▲ | See Program C-1.1 above |
| Program C-1.3: The [jurisdiction] shall comply with the management plan to protect Monterey Bay’s resources in compliance with the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, as amended, and its implementing regulations. | Yes | Ongoing ▲ | See Program C-1.1 above |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program C-1.4: The [jurisdiction] shall develop and implement a surface water and groundwater quality monitoring program that includes new domestic wells, to detect and solve potential water quality problems, including drinking water quality.</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Ongoing ▲</th>
<th>This program has not been developed by the jurisdictions; however, the Marina Coast Water District, the water purveyor for the former Fort Ord, monitors water quality, including drinking water.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program C-1.5: The [jurisdiction] shall support the County in implementing a hazardous substance control ordinance that requires that hazardous substance control plans be prepared and implemented for construction activities involving the handling, storing, transport, or disposal of hazardous waste materials.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Complete ■</td>
<td>Chapter 8.50 of the municipal code addresses hazardous waste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program C-1.6: The [jurisdiction] shall develop a program to identify wells that contribute to groundwater degradation. The City shall require that these wells be repaired or destroyed by the property owner according to state standards. These actions shall be reviewed and approved by the Monterey County Environmental Health Department (MCEHD).</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ongoing ▲</td>
<td>The Marina Coast Water District monitors wells and coordinates with the local jurisdictions to repair and destroy wells in accordance with state standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hydrology and Water Quality Policy C-2:** At the project approval stage, the [jurisdiction] shall require new development to demonstrate that all measures will be taken to ensure that on-site drainage systems are designed to capture and filter out urban pollution.

| Program C-2.1: The City/County shall develop and make available a description of feasible and effective measures and site drainage designs that will be implemented in new development to minimize water quality impacts. | Yes | Ongoing ▲ | The LCP-CIP includes special development standards that provide feasible and effective measures to minimize construction and post-construction runoff. See also Program A-1.1. |

**Hydrology and Water Quality Policy C-3:** The MCWRA and the [jurisdiction] shall cooperate with MCWRA and MPWMD to mitigate further seawater intrusion based on the Salinas Valley Basin Management Plan.

| Program C-3.1: The [jurisdiction] shall continue to work with the MCWRA and the MPWMD to estimate the | No | Ongoing ▲ | Improvements allowed within the Coastal Transportation Corridor would not result |
current safe yield within the context of the Salinas Valley Basin Management Plan for those portions of the former Fort Ord overlying the Salinas Valley and the Seaside groundwater basins to determine available water supplies.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program C-3.2: The [jurisdiction] shall work with MCWRA and MPWMD to determine the extent of seawater intrusion into the Salinas Valley and Seaside groundwater basins in the context of the Salinas Valley Basin Management Plan, and shall participate in implementing measures to prevent further intrusion.</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Ongoing ▲</th>
<th>Improvements allowed within the Coastal Transportation Corridor would not result in an increased demand for water. Seawater intrusion is monitored by the Monterey County Water Resources Agency. The jurisdictions enable monitoring and sharing of data as applicable.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology and Water Quality Policy C-4: The [jurisdiction] shall prevent siltation of waterways, to the extent feasible.</td>
<td>See BRP Programs below</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program C-4.1: The [jurisdiction], in consultation with the Natural Resources Conservation Service, shall develop a program that will provide, to every landowner, occupant, and other appropriate entities information concerning vegetation preservation and other best management practices that would prevent siltation of waterways in or downstream of the former Fort Ord.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Incomplete ●</td>
<td>This program has not been developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology and Water Quality Policy C-5: The [jurisdiction] shall support all actions necessary to ensure that sewage treatment facilities operate in compliance with waste discharge requirements adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ongoing ▲</td>
<td>Improvements allowed within the Coastal Transportation Corridor would not result in an increased demand for sewage treatment facilities. The jurisdictions construct and operate much of the wastewater conveyance infrastructure that leads to the regional wastewater treatment plant, and coordinate with the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency regarding system capacity and demands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology and Water Quality Policy C-6: In support of Monterey Bay’s national marine sanctuary designation, the [jurisdiction] shall support all actions</td>
<td>See BRP Programs below</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
required to ensure that the bay and intertidal environmental will not be adversely affected, even if such actions would exceed state and federal water quality requirements.

Program C-6.1: The [jurisdiction] shall work closely with other Fort Ord jurisdictions and the CDPR to develop and implement a plan for stormwater disposal that will allow for the removal of the ocean and outfall structures and end the direct discharge of stormwater into the marine environment. The program must be consistent with State Park goals to maintain the open space character of the dunes, restore natural landforms, and restore habitat values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hydrology and Water Quality Policy C-7: The [jurisdiction] shall condition all development plans on verifications of adequate wastewater treatment capacity.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yes Complete

LCP Policy LUD-CZ 3.1.D requires the consolidation and/or elimination of storm drain outfalls where feasible. FORA has removed the outfall structures and prepared a Storm Water Master Plan in 2005.

Hydrology and Water Quality Policy C-7: The [jurisdiction] shall condition all development plans on verifications of adequate wastewater treatment capacity.

<p>| Conservation - Biological Resources |
|---|---|
| Objective A: Preserve and protect the sensitive species and habitats addressed in the Installation-wide Habitat Management Plan (HMP) for the former Fort Ord in conformance with its resources conservation and habitat management requirements and with the guidance provided in the HMP Implementing/Management Agreement. |
| Biological Resources Policy A-1: The [jurisdiction] shall ensure that the habitat management areas are protected from degradation due to development in, or use of, adjacent parcels within its jurisdiction |
| See BRP Programs below |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program A-1.2: The [jurisdiction] shall coordinate with BLM in the design and siting of barriers sufficient to prevent unauthorized vehicle access to the habitat management lands from adjacent parcels. Gates shall be installed at appropriate points in the barrier to allow for emergency access and BLM and other appropriate agencies shall be provided keys to the gates. The [jurisdiction] shall maintain, repair, and replace, or cause to be maintained, repaired or replaced, the barrier as necessary in perpetuity.</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Ongoing ▲</th>
<th>Deed restrictions require implementation and compliance with HMP habitat management requirements. MOA and HMP Implementing/Management Agreement with FORA also requires compliance with HMP requirements.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program A-1.3: The [jurisdiction] shall require stormwater drainage plans for all developments adjacent to the habitat management areas to incorporate measures for minimizing the potential for erosion in the habitat management areas due to stormwater runoff.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ongoing ▲</td>
<td>Each jurisdiction's development review process (including mandatory assessment of impacts on hydrology and biological resources under CEQA, for applicable projects) provides a mechanism for this Policy to be met. Regulatory agency compliance regarding storm water runoff, as well as FORA's development entitlement consistency determination process, provide additional levels of oversight for this requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources Policy A-2: The City shall ensure that measures are taken to prevent degradation and siltation of the ephemeral drainage that passes through the Planned Residential Extension District and Community Park in Polygon 24.</td>
<td>See BRP Programs below</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program A-2.1: The City shall require preparation of erosion control plans for proposed developments in vicinity of the ephemeral drainage that specifically address measures for protecting the drainage.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Complete ■</td>
<td>LCP-CIP special development standards require the preparation of Construction Pollution Prevention Plans, which is also referred to as an Erosion Control and Sediment Plan. Seaside’s development review process (including mandatory assessment of impacts on hydrology and biological resources under CEQA, for applicable projects) provides a mechanism for this Program to be met. Regulatory agency compliance regarding storm water runoff, as</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Biological Resources Policy A-3:
The City shall protect the coastal zone west of State Highway 1 from habitat degradation due to increased public access.

**Program A-3.1:** The City shall abide by the habitat protection measures outlined in the State Parks Public Works Plan prepared by the State Department of Parks and Recreation for the Fort Ord Dunes State Park.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The California Department of Parks and Recreation completed the Fort Ord Dunes State Park Master Plan in September 2004. The City obtained the “Drumstick” parcel from State Parks and has designated it for commercial development. The City does not have jurisdiction over any lands on which the Fort Ord Dunes Master Plan is currently applicable.

### Biological Resources Policy A-4:
Where possible, the [jurisdiction] shall encourage the preservation of small pockets of habitat and populations of HMP species within and around developed areas.

**Program A-4.1:** The [jurisdiction] shall require project applicants who propose development in undeveloped natural lands to conduct reconnaissance-level surveys to verify the general description of resources for the parcel provided in the biological resource documents prepared for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The information gathered through these reconnaissance-level surveys shall be submitted as a component of the project application package.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The LCP contains numerous policies and development standards to ensure the proposed of biological resources. In addition, any improvements to the State Route 1 Coastal Transportation Corridor would be under the jurisdiction of Caltrans and subject to their design and review process, which would ensure protection of biological resources. Reconnaissance-level surveys are typically required as part of the CEQA process, or as a mitigation measure of the CEQA process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program A-4.2: The [jurisdiction] shall encourage project applicants to incorporate small pockets of habitat containing HMP species and/or habitat amidst the development, where feasible.</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Ongoing ▲</th>
<th>Not appropriate within the Coastal Transportation Corridor. Each jurisdiction’s development review process provides a mechanism for this Program to be pursued. FORA’s development entitlement consistency determination process for each individual project provides an additional level of oversight for this requirement. The Seaside Resort project has provided mitigation for an area of Monterey Spineflower.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program A-4.3: Where development will replace existing habitat which supports sensitive biological resources, the [jurisdiction] shall encourage attempts to salvage some of those resources by collecting seed or cuttings of plants, transplanting vegetation, or capturing and relocating sensitive wildlife species.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ongoing ▲</td>
<td>Minimal habitat is located within the Coastal Transportation Corridor. LCP policies and development standards provide protection for sensitive biological resources. In addition, any improvements proposed within the Coastal Transportation Corridor would be subject to Caltrans design and review process, which would also ensure appropriate measures for direct and indirect impacts sensitive biological resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Biological Resources Policy A-8:** The [jurisdiction] shall protect the coastal zone west of State Highway 1 from habitat degradation due to increased public access.

| Program A-8.1: The [jurisdiction] shall abide by the habitat protection measures outlined in the State Parks Public Works Plan prepared by the State Department of Parks and Recreation for the Fort Ord Dunes State Park. | No | Complete | The California Department of Parks and Recreation completed the Fort Ord Dunes State Park Master Plan in September 2004. The City obtained the “Drumstick” parcel from State Parks and has designated it for commercial development. The City does not have jurisdiction over any lands on which the Fort Ord Dunes Master Plan is currently applicable. |
**Objective B: Preserve and protect sensitive species and habitat not addressed in the HMP.**

**Biological Resources Policy B-1:** The [jurisdiction] shall strive to avoid or minimize loss of sensitive species listed in Table 4.4-2 that are known or expected to occur in areas planned for development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program B-1.1: Where the City has reason to suspect that they may occur on a proposed development site, the [jurisdiction] shall require directed, seasonally-timed surveys for sensitive species listed in Table 4.4-2 as an early component of site-specific development planning.</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Ongoing ▲</th>
<th>No development is proposed within the State Route 1 Coastal Transportation Corridor. Any future improvements proposed within the corridor right-of-way would be under Caltrans jurisdiction and subject to their design and review process, which would include surveys. Reconnaissance-level surveys are typically required as part of the CEQA process, or as a mitigation measure of the CEQA process.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program B-1.2: If any sensitive species listed in Table 4.4-2 are found in areas proposed for development, all reasonable efforts should be made to avoid habitat occupied by these species while still meeting project goals and objectives. If permanent avoidance is infeasible, a seasonal avoidance and/or salvage/relocation program shall be prepared. The seasonal avoidance and/or salvage/relocation program for these species should be coordinated through the CRMP.</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Ongoing ▲</th>
<th>See Program B-1.1 above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Biological Resources Policy B-2:** As site-specific development plans for a portion of the Reconfigured POM Annex Community (Polygon 20c) and the Community Park in the University Planning Area (Polygon 18) are formulated, the City shall coordinate with Monterey County, California State University, FORA and other interested entities in the designation of an oak woodland conservation area connecting the open space lands of the habitat management areas on the south of the landfill polygon (8a) in the north.

| Program B-2.1: For lands within the jurisdictional limits of the City that are components of the designated oak woodland conservation area, the City shall ensure that those areas are managed to maintain or enhance habitat values | No | Incomplete ● | An oak woodland conservation area has not been designated. |
existing at the time of base closure so that suitable habitat is available for the range of sensitive species known or expected to use these oak woodland environments. Management measures shall include, but not limited to maintenance of a large, contiguous block of oak woodland habitat, access control, erosion control and non-native species eradication. Specific management measures should be coordinated through the CRMP.

| Program B-2.2: For lands within the jurisdictional limits of the City that are components of the designated oak woodland conservation area, the City shall monitor, or cause to be monitored, those areas in conformance with the habitat management compliance monitoring protocol specified in the HMP Implementing/Management Agreement and shall submit annual monitoring reports to the CRMP. | No | Incomplete | An oak woodland conservation area has not been designated and, therefore, no monitoring has occurred. |

| Biological Resources Policy B-3: The [jurisdiction] shall preserve, enhance, restore, and protect coastal and vernal ponds, riparian corridors, and other wetland areas. | See BRP Programs below |

| Program B-3.1: The [jurisdiction] shall require, prior to any development activities within the watersheds of riparian drainages, vernal pools, or other important wetlands in the habitat management areas or other habitat conservation areas, a watershed management plan be prepared to assure that such activities do not adversely affect the flow to or water quality of those drainages, ponds or wetlands. | No | Ongoing | Compliance requirement is not triggered. There are no wetlands identified at development sites approved by Seaside within the former Fort Ord. |

| Program B-3.2: The [jurisdiction] shall evaluate areas proposed for new development during the site planning process to determine whether wetlands occur. In the event wetlands are present, the [jurisdiction] shall require that they either be avoided or replaced so that there is no net loss to wetland resources as a result of development on the | No | Ongoing | See above |
Wetlands replacement/mitigation plan should be coordinated through the CRMP.

**Objective C: Avoid or minimize disturbance to natural land features and habitats through sensitive planning, siting and design as new development is proposed in undeveloped lands.**

**Biological Resources Policy C-1:** The [jurisdiction] shall encourage that grading for projects in undeveloped lands be planned to complement surrounding topography and minimize habitat disturbance.

Program C-1.1: The [jurisdiction] shall encourage the use of landform grading techniques for 1) projects involving major changes to the existing topography, 2) large projects with several alternative lot and roadway design possibilities, 3) projects with known geological problem areas, or 4) projects with potential drainage problems requiring diverters, dissipaters, debris basins, etc.

Yes | Ongoing ▲ | Each jurisdiction’s development review process (including design review for consistency with applicable adopted design guidelines) provides a mechanism for this Policy to be met. Compliance with CEQA/NEPA requirements provides additional protections, including impact avoidance and incorporation of necessary mitigation measures regarding potential impacts on geology, aesthetics, and biological resources, among others. FORA’s development entitlement consistency determination process supplies an additional level of oversight for this requirement.

**Biological Resources Policy C-2:** The [jurisdiction] shall encourage the preservation and enhancement of oak woodland elements in the natural and built environments. Refer to Figure 4.4-1 for general location of oak woodlands in the former Fort Ord.

Program C-2.1: The City shall adopt an ordinance specifically addressing the preservation of oak trees. At a minimum, this ordinance shall include restrictions for the removal of oaks of a certain size, requirements for obtaining permits for removing oaks of the size defined, and specifications for relocation or replacement of oaks removed.

No | Incomplete● | The City’s tree ordinance, Chapter 8.54 of the municipal code, does not specifically address oak trees or oak woodland.
Program C-2.2: When reviewing project plans for developments within oak woodlands, the [jurisdiction] shall cluster development wherever possible so that contiguous stands of oak trees can be maintained in the non-developed natural land areas.

Program C-2.3: The City shall require project applicants to submit a plot plan of the proposed development which: 1) clearly shows all existing trees (noting location, species, age, health, and diameter), 2) notes whether existing trees will be retained, removed or relocated, and 3) notes the size, species, and location of any proposed replacement trees.

Program C-2.4: The [jurisdiction] shall require the use of oaks and other native plant species for project landscaping. To that end, the [jurisdiction] shall require collection and propagation of acorns and other plant material from former Fort Ord oak woodlands be used for restoration areas or as landscape plants. However, this program does not exclude the use of non-native plant species.

Program C-2.5: The [jurisdiction] shall provide the following standards for plantings that may occur under oak trees; 1) planting may occur within the dripline of mature trees, but only at a distance of five feet from the trunk and 2) plantings under and around oaks should be selected from the list of approved species compiled by the California Oaks Foundation (see Compatible Plants Under and Around Oaks).

Program C-2.6: The [jurisdiction] shall require that paving within the dripline of preserved oak trees be avoided whenever possible. To minimize paving impacts, the surfaces around tree trunks should be mulched, paving materials should be used that are permeable to water, aeration vents should be installed in impervious pavement.
and root zone excavation should be avoided. protections, including impact avoidance and incorporation of necessary mitigation measures regarding potential impacts on biological resources such as trees, among others. FORA's development entitlement consistency determination process supplies an additional level of oversight for this requirement.

**Biological Resources Policy C-3:** Lighting of outdoor areas shall be minimized and carefully controlled to maintain habitat quality for wildlife in undeveloped natural lands. Street lighting shall be as unobtrusive as practicable and shall be consistent in intensity throughout development areas adjacent to undeveloped natural lands.

| Program C-3.1: The [jurisdiction] shall review lighting and landscape plans for all development adjacent to habitat conservation and corridor areas, or other open space that incorporates natural lands to ensure consistency with Policy C-3. | Yes | Ongoing ▲ | Each jurisdiction’s development review process (including design review for consistency with applicable adopted outdoor lighting guidelines and other design guidelines) provides a mechanism for this Program to be met. Compliance with CEQA/NEPA requirements provides additional protections, including impact avoidance and incorporation of necessary mitigation measures regarding potential lighting impacts on sensitive receptors. FORA’s development entitlement consistency determination process supplies an additional level of oversight for this requirement. |

**Objective D: Promote awareness and education concerning biological resources on the former Fort Ord.**

**Biological Resources Policy D-1:** The [jurisdiction] shall require project applicants to implement a contractor education program that instructs construction workers on the sensitivity of biological resources in the vicinity and provides specifics for certain species that may be recovered and relocated from particular development areas.

| Program D-1.1: The [jurisdiction] shall participate in the | No | Ongoing ▲ | Contractor education programs are frequently |
preparation of a contractor education program with other Fort Ord land use jurisdictions. The education program should describe the sensitivity of biological resources, provide guidelines for protection of special status biological resources during ground disturbing activities at the former Fort Ord, and outline penalties and enforcement actions for take of listed species under Section 9 of the Endangered Species Act and Section 2080 of the Fish and Game Code.

| Program D-1.2: The [jurisdiction] shall provide project applicants specific information on the protocol for recovered and relocation of particular species that may be encountered during construction activities. | No | Ongoing ▲ | This requirement is routinely addressed through the CEQA process by means of identifying a project’s required mitigation measures and establishing a mitigation monitoring and reporting program. Under CEQA, these elements are required to be understood and agreed-to by project proponents. |

**Biological Resources Policy D-2:** The [jurisdiction] shall encourage and participate in the preparation of educational materials through various media sources which describe the biological resources on the former Fort Ord, discuss the importance of the HMP and emphasize the need to maintain and manage the biological resources to maintain the uniqueness and biodiversity of the former Fort Ord.

| Program D-2.1: The [jurisdiction] shall develop interpretive signs for placement in habitat management areas. These signs shall describe the resources present, how they are important to the former Fort Ord, and ways in which these resources are or can be protected. | No | Incomplete | Not appropriate within the Coastal Transportation Corridor. Interpretive signs have not been installed. |

| Program D-2.2: The [jurisdiction] shall coordinate production of educational materials through the CRMP process. | No | Ongoing ▲ | The BLM has posted educational materials on its Fort Ord National Monument website. |

| Program D-2.3: Where development will be adjacent to habitat management areas, corridors, oak woodlands, or other reserved open space, the [jurisdiction] shall require | No | Ongoing ▲ | Public information or brochures are frequently required as a condition of approval or for compliance with CEQA mitigation measures. |
project applicants to prepare a Homeowner’s Brochure which describes the importance of the adjacent land areas and provides recommendations for landscaping, and wildfire protection, as well as describes measures for protecting wildlife and vegetation in adjacent habitat areas (i.e., access controls, pet controls, use of natives in the landscape, etc.)

### Objective E: Develop strategies for interim management of undeveloped natural land areas.

**Biological Resources Policy E-1:** The [jurisdiction] shall develop a plan describing how it intends to address the interim management of natural land areas for which the [jurisdiction] is designated as the responsible party.

- **Program E-1.1:** The [jurisdiction] shall submit to the USFWS and CDFG, through CRMP, a plan for implementation of short-term habitat management for all natural lands, including consideration of funding sources, legal mechanisms and a time table to provide for prompt implementation of the following actions to prevent degradation of habitat:
  - Control of off-road vehicle use in all undeveloped natural land areas.
  - Prevent any unauthorized disturbance in all undeveloped natural land areas, but especially in designated conservation areas and habitat corridors.
  - Prevent the spread of non-native, invasive species that may displace native habitat.

  - **Status:** No
  - **Completion:** Incomplete
  - **Note:** An implementation plan has not been completed.

- **Program E-1.2:** For natural lands areas under [jurisdiction] responsibility with partial or no HMP resource conservation or management requirements, the [jurisdiction] shall annually provide the BLM evidence of successful implementation of interim habitat protection measures specified in Program E-1.1.

  - **Status:** No
  - **Completion:** Incomplete
  - **Note:** Annual monitoring reports have not been submitted to BLM.
### Biological Resources Policy E-2

The [jurisdiction] shall monitor activities that affect all undeveloped natural lands, including but not limited to conservation areas and habitat corridors as specified and assigned in the HMP.

**Program E-2.1:** The [jurisdiction] shall conduct Land Use Status Monitoring in accordance with the methods prescribed in the Implementing Agreement for Fort Ord land under [jurisdiction] responsibility that has any natural lands identified by the baseline studies. This monitoring will provide data on the amount (in acres) and location of natural lands (by habitat type) disturbed by development since the date of land transfer for as long as the Implementing Agreement is in effect.

No | Incomplete | Annual reports have not been prepared. Individual managers (i.e. University of California, California Department of Parks and Recreation) engage in monitoring.

### CONSERVATION - AIR QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective A: Protect and improve air quality.</th>
<th>Resp. Entity</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality Policy A-1:</strong> Each jurisdiction shall participate in regional planning efforts to improve air quality.</td>
<td>See BRP Programs below</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program A-1.1:** Each jurisdiction shall continue to cooperate with the MBUAPCD in carrying out the regional Air Quality Management Plan.

Yes | Ongoing ▲ | Each jurisdiction is in communication with the Air District. The Coastal Transportation Corridor ensures that the State Route 1 right-of-way is designated for motorized and non-motorized forms of transportation. Any future improvements would be under the jurisdiction of Caltrans and subject to the design and review process, which would ensure consistency with the AQMP.

**Program A-1.2:** Each jurisdiction shall coordinate with the TAMC to carry out the Congestion Management Plan.

Yes | Ongoing ▲ | The jurisdictions coordinate with TAMC on an ongoing basis. The Coastal Transportation Corridor ensures that the State Route 1 right-of-way is designated for motorized and non-motorized forms of transportation. Any future...
Air Quality Policy A-2: Each jurisdiction shall promote local efforts to improve air quality.

| Program A-2.1: Each jurisdiction shall use the CEQA process to identify and avoid or mitigate potentially significant project specific and cumulative air quality impacts associated with development. As a Responsible Agency, the MBUAPCD implements rules and regulations for many direct and area sources of criteria pollutants and toxic air contaminants. | Yes | Ongoing ▲ | Identification, avoidance, and mitigation (as needed) of air quality impacts is a mandatory element of all projects that are subject to CEQA/NEP. This applies to General Plan and zoning changes as well as individual development projects. **Any improvements within the Coastal Transportation Corridor would be under Caltrans jurisdiction.**

| Program A-2.2: Each jurisdiction shall use the Transportation Demand Management Ordinance and similar transportation measures to encourage commute alternatives. | No | Ongoing ▲ | 2004 Seaside General Plan Implementation Plan C-2.2.2 encourages TDM programs. |

Air Quality Policy A-3: Integrate the land use strategies of the California Air Resources Board’s The Land Use – Air Quality Linkage – How Land Use and Transportation Affect Air Quality, into local land use decisions.

| Program A-3.1: Each jurisdiction shall plan and zone properties, as well as review development proposals to promote the Land Use – Air quality linkage. This linkage includes, but is not limited to, enhancement of Central Business Districts, compact development patterns, residential densities that average above seven dwelling units per acre, clustered employment densities and activity centers, mixed use development, and integrated street patterns. | No | Complete ■ | The jurisdictions prepare and adopt general plan policies, specific plans, and design guidelines that support land use patterns consistent with this Program. Each jurisdiction's development review process (including design review for consistency with applicable adopted policies, specific plans, and design guidelines) provides a mechanism for this Program to be met. Compliance with CEQA requirements provides additional protections, including impact avoidance and |
incorporation of necessary mitigation measures regarding air quality impacts. FORA's consistency determination process supplies an additional level of oversight for this requirement, particularly at the legislative action stage before development entitlements for individual projects are considered.

| Program A-3.2: Each jurisdiction shall zone high density residential and employment land uses to be clustered in and near activity centers to maximize the efficient use of mass transit. | No | Complete ■ | See Program A-3.1 above. |

| CONSERVATION - Cultural Resources |  |

**Objective A: Identify and protect all cultural resources at the former Fort Ord.**

**Cultural Resources Policy A-1:** The [jurisdiction] shall ensure the protection and preservation of archaeological resources at the former Fort Ord.

| Program A-1.1: The jurisdiction shall conduct a records search and a preliminary archaeological surface reconnaissance as part of environmental review for any development project(s) proposed in a high archaeological resource sensitivity zone. | Yes | Ongoing ▲ | Improvements proposed within the Coastal Transportation Corridor would be subject to CEQA/NEPA. Potential impacts on archaeological resources are a required subject area under the CEQA/NEPA review process and are by means of identifying a project’s potential impacts, required mitigation measures and establishing a mitigation monitoring and reporting program. Under CEQA/NEPA, these elements are required to be understood and agreed-to by project proponents. |

| Program A-1.2: The [jurisdiction] shall require that all known and discovered sites on the former Fort Ord with resources likely to be disturbed by a proposed project be analyzed by a qualified archaeologist with local expertise, recommendations made to protect and preserve resources | Yes | Ongoing ▲ | See Program A-1.1 above. |
and, as necessary, restrictive covenants imposed as a condition of project action or land sale.

| Program A-1.3: As a contractor work specification for all new construction projects, the [jurisdiction] shall include that during construction upon the first discovery of any archaeological resource or potential find, development activity shall be halted within 50 meters of the find until the potential resources can be evaluated by a qualified professional archaeologist and recommendations made. | Yes | Ongoing ▲ | In order for a development project to be in compliance with CEQA during the construction phase, all construction-relevant mitigation measures (including those relating to avoiding and minimizing impacts on archaeological resources) must be conveyed to, and carried out by, construction personnel. |

**Cultural Resources Policy A-2:** The [jurisdiction] shall provide for and/or support protection of Native American cultural properties at the former Fort Ord.

| Program A-2.1: The [jurisdiction] shall coordinate with the California Native American Heritage Commission and California Native American points of contact for this region to identify traditional cultural properties located on former Fort Ord lands. | Yes | Ongoing ▲ | Consultation with tribal representatives is required for general plan amendments and is performed by jurisdictional staff or their consultants as needed to avoid or minimize potential impacts to cultural resources. Notification of the California Native American Heritage Commission and a cultural resources investigation is typically required as part of the CEQA/NEPA process. These processes screen for the presence of sacred lands. |

| Program A-2.2: If traditional cultural properties are found to exist on the [jurisdiction’s] lands at the former Fort Ord, the jurisdiction shall ensure that deeds transferring Native American traditional properties include covenants that protect and allow Native Americans access to these properties. These covenants will be developed in consultation with interested Native American groups, the State Historic Preservation Officer, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. Leases will contain clauses that require compatible use and protection as a condition of the lease. | No | Ongoing ▲ | The Esselen Nation did not receive Federal recognition or lands through the PBC process conducted for Former Fort Ord lands. No traditional cultural lands have been officially identified to date. |

See BRP Programs below
**Objective B:** Preserve and protect historically significant resources at the former Fort Ord.

**Cultural Resources Policy B-1:** The [jurisdiction] shall provide for the identification, protection, preservation, and restoration of the former Fort Ord’s historically and architecturally significant resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program B-1.1: The [jurisdiction] shall seek funding that can be used to rehabilitate, restore, and preserve existing historic resources at the former Fort Ord.</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Ongoing ▲</th>
<th>The jurisdictions seek grant funding for a variety of purposes, including the preservation of structures.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program B-1.2: The [jurisdiction] shall maintain historic buildings at the former Fort Ord in accordance with local and state historic preservation standards and guidelines, and condition their sale or transfer with protective covenants. These covenants will be developed in consultation with the SHPO, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and interested parties.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ongoing ▲</td>
<td>Buildings proposed for demolition are required to be screened for historic significance in accordance with Department of Parks and Recreation guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program B-1.3: The City shall regulate the demolition of buildings of architectural or historic importance at the former Fort Ord and make sure that such demolition does not occur without notice and hearing. Wherever possible, the City shall encourage the moving of buildings proposed to be demolished when other means for their preservation cannot be found.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ongoing ▲</td>
<td>The CEQA process (State law) requires impact avoidance and mitigation—including possible relocation of historic buildings—to occur, or to be determined infeasible, before demolition can be approved by a jurisdiction. CEQA also requires public notification of proposed projects and, in the case of significant impacts such as demolition of historic buildings, requires an Environmental Impact Report with associated public hearings. Each jurisdiction’s development review process provides additional mechanisms requiring public notice and hearings. First is the determination of the structure being an eligible historic resource.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### BASE REUSE PLAN – NOISE ELEMENT

Goal: To protect people who live, work, and recreate in and around the former Fort Ord from the harmful effects of exposure to excessive noise; to provide noise environments that enhance and are compatible with existing and planned uses; and to protect the economic base of the former Fort Ord by preventing encroachment of incompatible land uses within areas affected by existing or planned noise-producing uses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noise</th>
<th>Base Reuse Plan Objectives, Policies, &amp; Programs</th>
<th>Is the policy/program applicable to the subject action? (Y/N)</th>
<th>Completion status, per Reassessment Report</th>
<th>Notes from Reassessment Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Objective A</strong>: Ensure that application of land use compatibility criteria for noise and enforcement of noise regulations are consistent throughout the Fort Ord Planning area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Noise Policy A-1</strong>: The City shall coordinate with the other local entities having jurisdiction within the former Fort Ord in establishing a consistent set of guidelines for controlling noise.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>See BRP Programs below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program A-1.1: The City shall adopt the land use compatibility criteria for exterior community noise shown in Table 4.5-3 for application in the former Fort Ord.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2004 Seaside General Plan Table N-2 presents the City’s noise criteria. The City’s noise criteria are 5 to 10 dBA higher for three categories of land use (residential, schools, industrial) compared to Fort Ord Reuse Plan Table 4.5-3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program A-1.2: The City shall adopt a noise ordinance to control noise from non-transportation sources, including construction noise, that incorporates the performance standards shown in Table 4.5-4, for application in the former Fort Ord.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>Seaside Municipal Code Chapter 9.12 controls noise in Seaside. The Chapter does not include specific noise performance standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Objective B</strong>: Ensure through land use planning that noise environments are appropriate for and compatible with existing and proposed land uses based on noise guidelines provided in the noise element.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>See BRP Programs below</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program B-1.1: The [jurisdiction] shall develop and implement a program that identifies currently developed areas that are adversely affected by noise impacts and implement measures to reduce these impacts, such as constructing noise barriers and limiting the hours of operation of the noise sources.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>The jurisdictions investigate noise effects of proposed projects on existing development through the environmental review process, consistent with general plan policies, but do not proactively address existing noise issues at existing developments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program B-1.2: Wherever practical and feasible, the [jurisdiction] shall segregate sensitive receptors, such as residential land uses, from noise generators through land use.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>The 2004 Seaside General Plan land use map places most residential uses at a distance from State Route 1. Future/new residential land uses adjacent to General Jim Moore Boulevard could experience street noise above desirable levels, but it is expected noise attenuation would be identified and required at the project design phase. No noise-generating land uses are adjacent to schools or residential areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise Policy B-2:</strong> By complying with the noise guidelines presented in Tables 4.5-3 and 4.5-4, the City shall ensure that new development does not adversely affect existing or proposed uses.</td>
<td></td>
<td>See BRP Programs below</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program B-2.1: See description of Program A-1.1 above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program B-2.2: See description of Program A-1.2 above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise Policy B-3:</strong> The City shall require that acoustical studies be prepared by qualified acoustical engineers for all new development that could result in noise environments above noise range I (normally acceptable environment), as defined in Table 4.5-3. The studies shall identify the mitigation measures that would be required to comply with the noise guidelines, specified in Tables 4.5-3 and 4.5-4, to ensure that existing or proposed uses will not be adversely affected. The studies should be submitted prior to accepting development applications as complete.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>Any improvements proposed in the Coastal Transportation Corridor would be subject to Caltrans design and review process, which would ensure compliance with this policy. The jurisdictions prepare noise studies as part of the environmental review of projects. The noise studies are based on each jurisdiction’s noise standards, which vary from those of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan (see Program A-1.1 and A-1.2 above), however, found to be consistent under the General Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise Policy B-4:</strong> The City shall enforce the State Noise Insulation Standards (California Administrative Code, Title 24) which require that interior sound levels of 45 dB-Ldn be achieved for new multi-family dwelling, condominium, hotel, and motel uses.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ongoing ▲</td>
<td>The jurisdictions all maintain an internal standard of 45 dB-Ldn (a 24-hour weighted average that is a commonly used noise metric). This standard is typically enforced through standard design measures at the plan check (building permit) stage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise Policy B-5:</strong> If, through site planning or the architectural layout of buildings, it is not feasible or practicable to comply with the noise guidelines presented in Tables 4.5-3 and 4.5-4, the City shall require the following, as conditions to approval: that noise barriers be provided for new development to ensure that the noise guidelines are met; or that acoustical treatments be provided for new buildings to ensure that interior noise levels would be reduced to less than 45 dB-Ldn.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ongoing ▲</td>
<td>The jurisdictions all maintain an internal standard of 45 dB-Ldn.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise Policy B-6:</strong> If the ambient day-night average sound level (DNL) exceeds the normally acceptable noise range for residential uses (low density single family, duplex, and mobile homes; multi-family; and transient lodging), as identified in Table 4.5-3, new development shall not increase ambient DNL in residential areas by more than 3 dBA measured at the property line. If the ambient DNL is within the normally acceptable noise range for residential uses, new development shall not increase the ambient DNL by more than 5 dBA measured at the property line.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ongoing ▲</td>
<td>These standards match common noise thresholds for environmental review, and are implemented by the jurisdictions. Any improvements proposed in the Coastal Transportation Corridor would be subject to Caltrans design and review process, which would ensure compliance with this policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise Policy B-7:</strong> If the ambient DNL exceeds the normally acceptable noise range for commercial (office buildings and business, commercial, and professional uses) or industrial (industrial, manufacturing, utilities, and agriculture) uses, as identified in Table 4.5-3, new development in commercial or industrial areas shall not increase the ambient DNL by more than 5 dBA measured at the property line.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ongoing ▲</td>
<td>Any improvements proposed in the Coastal Transportation Corridor would be subject to Caltrans design and review process, which would ensure compliance with this policy. These standards match common noise thresholds for environmental review, and are implemented by the jurisdictions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise Policy B-8:</strong> If the ambient DNL exceeds the normally acceptable noise range for light industrial uses, as identified in Table 4.5-3, new development in light industrial areas shall not increase the ambient DNL by more than 5 dBA measured at the property line.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ongoing ▲</td>
<td>Any improvements proposed in the Coastal Transportation Corridor would be subject to Caltrans design and review process, which would ensure compliance with this policy. These standards match common noise thresholds for environmental review, and are implemented by the jurisdictions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
acceptable noise range for public or institutional uses (passively and actively used open spaces; auditoriums, concert halls, and amphitheaters; schools, libraries, churches, hospitals and nursing homes; golf courses, riding stables, water recreation areas, and cemeteries), as identified in Table 4.5-3, new development shall not increase ambient Ldn by more than 3 dBA measured at the property line.

| Noise Policy B-9: The City shall require construction contractors to employ noise-reducing construction practices. | Yes | Ongoing ▲ | Transportation Corridor would be subject to Caltrans design and review process, which would ensure compliance with this policy. These standards match common noise thresholds for environmental review, and are implemented by the jurisdictions. Any improvements proposed in the Coastal Transportation Corridor would be subject to Caltrans design and review process, which would ensure compliance with this policy. Seaside Municipal Code Chapter 9.12 controls noise in Seaside, including construction noise. |
Goal: To prevent or minimize loss of human life and personal injury, damage to property, and economic and social disruption potentially resulting from potential seismic occurrences and geologic hazards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAFETY -- SEISMIC AND GEOLOGIC HAZARDS</th>
<th>(Draft)</th>
<th>(Draft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Reuse Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives, Policies, &amp; Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the policy/program applicable to the subject action? (Y/N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion status, per Reassessment Report</td>
<td></td>
<td>Notes from Reassessment Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective A: Protect and ensure public safety by regulating and directing new construction (location, type, and density) of public and private projects, and critical and sensitive facilities away from areas where seismic and geologic hazards are considered likely predictable so as to reduce the hazards and risks from seismic and geologic occurrences.**

**Seismic and Geologic Hazards Policy A-1:** The [jurisdiction] shall develop standards and guidelines and require their use in new construction to provide the greatest possible protection for human life and property in areas where there is a high risk of seismic or geologic occurrence.

Program A-1.1: The [jurisdiction] shall regularly update and make available descriptions and mapping of seismic and geologic hazard zones and associated risk factors for each, including feasible and effective engineering and design techniques that address the seismic and geologic hazard zone characteristics of the former Fort Ord. Seismic and geology hazard zones should include areas and risk factors associated with ground-shaking, ground rupture, ground failure and landslides susceptibility, liquefaction and tsunamis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program A-1.1</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Ongoing ▲</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each jurisdiction adopts the current version of the California Building Code every three years, including requirements for the design of each building to the appropriate seismic design category. Seismic design categories are determined by a combination of spectral response acceleration, soil type, and occupancy type. The State Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey and the United States Geological Survey issue maps and data used by engineers to assess seismic conditions for the appropriate design of buildings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program A-1.2: The [jurisdiction] shall establish setback requirements for new construction, including critical and sensitive facilities, for each seismic hazard zone with a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program A-1.2</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Incomplete ●</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Alquist-Priolo Act requires fault line setbacks for occupied buildings; however, there are no Alquist-Priolo faults within Fort Ord.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
minimum of 200 feet setback to a maximum of one quarter (1/4) mile setback from an active seismic fault. Critical and sensitive buildings include all public or private buildings essential to the health and safety of the general public, hospitals, fire and police stations, public works centers, high occupancy structures, schools, or sites containing or storing hazardous materials.

The Reliz, Ord Terrace, and Seaside Faults cross portions of Fort Ord, but are not included within the Alquist-Priolo program. The City of Seaside has not adopted a fault zone setback requirement.

Seismic and Geologic Hazards Policy A-2: The [jurisdiction] shall use the development review process to ensure that potential seismic or geologic hazards are evaluated and mitigated prior to construction of new projects.

| Program A-2.1: | The [jurisdiction] shall require geotechnical reports and seismic safety plans when development projects or area plans are proposed within zones that involve high or very high seismic risk. Each plan shall be prepared by a certified geotechnical engineer and shall be subject to the approval of the Planning Director for the City of Seaside | Yes | Ongoing ▲ | Any improvements proposed in the Coastal Transportation Corridor would be subject to Caltrans design and review process, which would ensure compliance with this policy. The CEQA/NEPA process requires project- and site-specific identification, avoidance, and mitigation of seismic-related risks and impacts. This issue is then addressed at a more detailed level at the plan check (building permit) stage under applicable building code requirements. Conformance with both of these regulatory mechanisms, as needed, is ensured through state law and the individual jurisdiction’s enforcement and inspection procedures. |
| Program A-2.2: Through site monitoring, the [jurisdiction] shall ensure that all measures included in the project’s geotechnical and seismic safety plans are properly implemented and a report shall be filed and on public record prepared by the Planning Director and/or Building Inspector confirming such. | Yes | Ongoing ▲ | See above |
| Program A-2.3: The [jurisdiction] shall continue to update and enforce the Uniform Building Code to minimize | No | Ongoing ▲ | The jurisdictions enforce building codes through their plan check and building |
Seismic and Geologic Hazards Policy A-3: The City shall designate areas with severe seismic hazard risk as open space or similar use if adequate measures cannot be taken to ensure the structural stability of habitual [sic] buildings and ensure the public safety.

Program A-3.1: As appropriate, the City should amend its General Plan and zoning maps to designate areas with severe seismic hazard risk as open space if not [sic] other measures are available to mitigate potential impacts.

Seismic and Geologic Hazards Policy B-1: The [jurisdiction] shall develop an inventory of critical and sensitive buildings and structures on the former Fort Ord, including all public or private buildings essential to the health and safety of the general public, hospitals, fire and police stations, public works centers, high occupancy structures, school, or sites containing or storing hazardous materials.

Program B-1.1: The [jurisdiction] shall evaluate the ability of critical and sensitive buildings to maintain structural integrity as defined by the Uniform Building Code (UBC) in the event of a 6.0 magnitude or greater earthquake. The Public Works Director shall inventory those existing facilities determined to be unable to maintain structural integrity, and make recommendations for modifications and a schedule for compliance with the UBC. The [jurisdiction] shall implement these recommendations in accordance with the schedule.

Objective B: Promote public safety by inventorying and regulating renovation of existing structures, including critical or sensitive facilities at the former Fort Ord to current seismic safety standards.

No

Incomplete

The Ord Terrace and Seaside faults extend into Fort Ord at General Jim Moore Boulevard. These areas are designated for Medium Density Residential Development. See above.

Objective C: Protect, ensure, and promote public safety through public education regarding earthquake preparedness and post-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Seismic and Geologic Hazards Policy C-1</strong></th>
<th><strong>See BRP Program below</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The [jurisdiction] shall, in cooperation with other appropriate agencies, create a program of public education for earthquakes which includes guidelines for retrofitting of existing structures for earthquake protection, safety procedures during an earthquake, necessary survival material, community resources identification, and procedures after an earthquake.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program C-1.1: The [jurisdiction] shall prepare and/or make available at City Hall libraries and other public places, information and educational materials regarding earthquake preparedness.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY – FIRE, FLOOD, AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>(Draft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective A: Protect public safety by minimizing the risk from fire hazards especially wildfire in grassland and wooded areas in the Fort Ord region.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire, Flood, and Emergency Management Policy A-2:</strong> The [jurisdiction] shall reduce fire hazard risks to an acceptable level by inventorying and assigning risk levels for wildfire hazards and regulating the type, density, location, and/or design and construction of new developments, both public and private.</td>
<td>See BRP Programs below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program A-1.1: The [jurisdiction] shall incorporate the recommendations of the [jurisdiction’s] Fire Department for all residential, commercial, industrial, and public works projects to be constructed in high fire hazard areas before a building permit can be issued. Such recommendations shall be in conformity with the current applicable Uniform Building Code Fire Hazards Policies. These recommendations should include standards of road widths, road access, building materials, distances around structures, and other standards for compliance with the UBC Fire Hazards Policies.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each jurisdiction includes the appropriate fire department in the review of development and building proposals. Note that the Uniform Building Code is superseded by the California Building Code (including the California Fire Code).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire, Flood, and Emergency Management Policy A-2:</strong> The [jurisdiction] shall provide fire suppression water system</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each jurisdiction includes the appropriate fire department in the review of development and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
guidelines and implementation plans for existing and acquired former Fort Ord lands equal to those recommended in the Fort Ord Infrastructure Study (FORIS Section Table 4.1.8) for fire protection water volumes, system distribution upgrades, and emergency water storage.

### Fire, Flood, and Emergency Management Policy A-3

The [jurisdiction] shall develop in cooperation with other Fort Ord jurisdictions and the surrounding communities fire protection agencies, a fire management plan to ensure adequate staff levels, response time, and fire suppression operations in high fire hazard areas of the former Fort Ord. The fire management plan shall also include a fire “fuel management program” in conjunction with (the County of Monterey) and the Bureau of Land Management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program A-3.1</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Ongoing ▲</th>
<th>The jurisdictions are participants in the State Master Mutual Aid Agreement and/or the Monterey County Fire Chiefs Association In County Mutual Aid Plan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The [jurisdiction] shall develop with appropriate fire protection agencies, a mutual and/or automatic fire aid agreement to assure the most effective response.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program A-3.2</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Ongoing ▲</th>
<th>The City's Fire Department presents fire safety, fire prevention, and other safety programs to schools and organizations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The [jurisdiction] shall develop a public education program on fire hazards and citizen responsibility, including printed material, workshops, or school programs, especially alerting the public to wildfire dangers, evacuation routes, fire suppression methods, and fuel management including methods to reduce fire hazards such as bush clearing, roof materials, plant selection, and emergency water storage guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fire, Flood, and Emergency Management Policy A-4

The [jurisdiction] shall evaluate the need for additional fire station and fire suppression facilities and manpower within areas of the former Fort Ord which the [jurisdiction] plans to annex in order to provide acceptable fire/emergency response time.

| No | Ongoing ▲ | The City’s Broadway fire station and the Presidio of Monterey’s fire station on General Jim Moore Boulevard provide adequate first response for most areas of Fort Ord within the City. The Main Gate Specific Plan notes the need for a new fire station in north Seaside. The environmental review of development projects will include an assessment of the need for |
### Objective B: Protect public safety by minimizing the risk from flooding and develop policies and implementation programs which will protect people from flooding.

**Fire, Flood, and Emergency Management Policy B-1:** The [jurisdiction] shall identify areas within the former Fort Ord that may be subject to 100-year flooding (in the Salinas River Bluffs area) and restrict construction of habitable building structures in this area.

| No | Complete ▼ | No parts of Seaside within Fort Ord are designated as 100-year flood zones. |

### Objective C: Promote public safety through effective and efficient emergency management preparedness.

**Fire, Flood, and Emergency Management Policy C-1:** The [jurisdiction] shall develop an emergency preparedness and management plan, in conjunction with the (City of Seaside, City of Marina, the County of Monterey), and appropriate fire, medical, and law enforcement agencies.

**Program C-1.1:** The [jurisdiction] shall identify city emergency evacuation routes and emergency response staging areas with those of the (City of Seaside, City of Marina, and the County of Monterey), and shall adopt the Fort Ord Evacuation Routes Map (See Figure 4.6-2) as part of the [jurisdiction’s] emergency response plans.

| No | Complete ▼ | See BRP Programs below |

**Program C-1.2:** The [jurisdiction] shall establish a community education program to train volunteers to assist police, fire, and civil defense personnel during and after a major earthquake, fire, or flood.

| No | Ongoing ▲ | The Central Coast Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) Association provides training for citizens and community organizations in Monterey County. |

**Program C-1.3:** The [jurisdiction] shall identify a “critical facilities” inventory, and in conjunction with appropriate emergency and disaster agencies, establish guidelines for operations of such facilities during an emergency.

| No | Incomplete ● | The City of Seaside has not prepared an inventory or operations plan for critical facilities. |
**SAFETY – HAZARDOUS AND TOXIC MATERIALS SAFETY**

**Objective A:** Ensure the timely and complete compliance by the U. S. Army with the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study and associated remedial action ROD as part of the land transfer process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazardous and Toxic Materials Safety Policy A-1:</th>
<th>See BRP Programs below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Program A-1.1: The [jurisdiction] shall monitor and report to the public all progress made on the RA-ROD.

| | No | Ongoing ▲ |
|-----------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| This function is overseen by the U.S. Army’s Base Reuse and Closure (BRAC) office. The jurisdiction maintains communications with the BRAC office. |

Program A-1.2: The [jurisdiction] shall make timely reviews of the Army’s RA-ROD implementation progress and report to the public the Army’s compliance with all of the federal Environmental Protection Agency's rules and regulations governing munitions waste remediation including treatment, storage, transportation, and disposal.

| | No | Ongoing ▲ |
|-----------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| This function is overseen by the U.S. Army’s Base Reuse and Closure (BRAC) office. The jurisdiction maintains communications with the BRAC office. |

Program A-1.3: All construction plans for projects in the City/County shall be reviewed by the Presidio of Monterey, Directorate of Environmental and Natural Resources Management (DENR), to determine if construction is planned within known or potential OE areas unless an alternative mechanism is approved by the City/County and DENR.

| | No | Ongoing ▲ |
|-----------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| The jurisdictions coordinate with the DENR for review of plans within Fort Ord. Note: “OE” refers to ordnance and explosives. |

Program A-1.4: Before construction activities commence on any element of the proposed project, all supervisors and crews shall attend an Army sponsored OE safety briefing. This briefing will identify the variety of OE that are expected to exist on the installation and the actions to be taken if a suspicious item is discovered.

| | No | Complete ■ |
|-----------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Municipal Code Chapter 15.34 requires excavation/digging permits and delivery/explanation of safety notices to all workers involved in the digging or excavation. |

**Objective B:** Protect and ensure public safety during the remediation of hazardous and toxic materials sites on the former Fort Ord.
including clearance, treatment, transport, disposal, and/or closure of such sites containing ordnance and explosives, landfills, above and below ground storage facilities, and buildings with asbestos and/or lead base paint.

**Hazardous and Toxic Materials Safety Policy B-1:** The [jurisdiction] shall monitor implementation procedures of the RA-ROD and work cooperatively with the U. S. Army and all contractors to ensure safe and effective removal and disposal of hazardous materials, ensure compliance with all applicable regulations and hazardous materials and provide for the protection of the public during remediation activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program B-1.1: The [jurisdiction] shall develop and make available a list of the locations and timeframe for remediation of buildings scheduled for renovation which contain asbestos and/or lead base paint.</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Ongoing ▲</th>
<th>The jurisdictions do not maintain a list or timetable for remediation of such buildings. However, levels of asbestos and lead-based paint in buildings that are anticipated to be rehabilitated for reuse are relatively low in comparison to the WWII-era buildings, most of which will be demolished.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program B-1.2: The [jurisdiction] shall ensure public safety for asbestos and/or lead paint removal by reviewing remediation plans and determining that such remediation is being conducted by licensed and certified asbestos abatement and building demolition contractors.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ongoing ▲</td>
<td>Lead removal is subject to regulations overseen by DTSC and asbestos removal is subject to permitting by the Air District. Jurisdictional building departments ensure compliance through permit conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program B-1.3: The [jurisdiction] shall develop and make available a list of the locations and timeframe for remediation of those site containing ordnance and explosive (OE) and shall work cooperatively with responsible agencies, including the Bureau of Land Management, in notification, monitoring, and review of administrative covenants for the reuse or closure of such OE sites.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ongoing ▲</td>
<td>This function is overseen by the U.S. Army’s Base Reuse and Closure (BRAC) office. The jurisdiction maintains communications with the BRAC office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program B-1.4: The [jurisdiction] shall require, by resolution, permits from all hazardous remediation contractors for the transport of hazardous material, including ordnance and explosives, through City streets.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Seaside Municipal Code Chapter 8.50 addresses hazardous materials transport and permits. Transporters of such materials are exempt from disclosure if the shipment is accompanied by...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The permit will require disclosure of the type, volume, risk factor, transport routes and any other such information deemed necessary by the City for protection of the public safety.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazardous and Toxic Materials Safety Policy B-2:</th>
<th>The [jurisdiction] shall monitor implementation procedures of the RA-ROD and work cooperatively with the U. S. Army and all contractors and future users/operators of landfill or hazardous materials storage sites at the former Fort Ord.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program B-2.1:</td>
<td>The [jurisdiction] shall develop and make available a list of the locations and timeframe for remediation of landfill or hazardous materials storage sites, including closure and post-closure activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program B-2.2:</td>
<td>The [jurisdiction] shall review and make public its review of administrative covenants on remediation of landfills or hazardous materials storage to ensure that landfill closure or hazardous materials storage and restoration activities are complete and in compliance with all applicable regulations, that liability responsibilities are identified to entities intending to use the landfill, and that such uses are consistent with the administrative covenants and all post closure activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See BRP Programs below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This function is overseen by the U.S. Army’s Base Reuse and Closure (BRAC) office. The jurisdiction maintains communications with the BRAC office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DTSC and BRAC make final determinations on completion and compliance on hazardous materials site restoration. The jurisdictions are in communication regarding the status of clean-up operations. The jurisdictions receive written determinations from DTSC and BRAC and keep them on file for public review upon request.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective C: Ensure public safety in the future handling of hazardous materials on land at the former Fort Ord.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous and Toxic Materials Safety Policy C-1: The [jurisdiction] shall require hazardous materials management and disposal plans for any future projects involving the use of hazardous materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program C-1.1:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Memorandum containing website links to documents
MEMORANDUM

City of Seaside
Resource Management Services

Date: February 28, 2013

To: Steve Endsley, Acting Assistant Executive Officer/Director of Planning and Finance

From: Rick Medina, Senior Planner

Subject: Web link for City of Seaside Local Coastal Program 2013

This memorandum is part of the City of Seaside’s submittal for a FORA consistency determination for City of Seaside Local Coastal Program (LCP). An Initial Study and Negative Declaration for LCP was prepared and certified in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

Interested persons/agencies can access all documents which have been included in the FORA Consistency Determination Package for City of Seaside Local Coastal Program on the City’s website (http://www.ci.seaside.ca.us/index.aspx?page=191#HE). Posted documents include:
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Coastal Commission Letter dated December 19, 2012
December 19, 2012

Diana Ingersoll  
City of Seaside Resource Management Services  
440 Harcourt Avenue  
Seaside, CA  9393

Subject: Coastal Commission Action on Seaside Local Coastal Program Amendment No. 1-11 (LUP Update and IP Certification)

Dear Ms. Ingersoll,

At its meeting of December 13, 2012 in San Francisco, the Coastal Commission took action on Seaside LCP Amendment No. 1-11 (LUP Update and IP Certification). The Commission approved the proposed amendments to both the LUP and IP, if modified as suggested. A copy of the adopted findings and suggested modifications is enclosed.

This letter formally transmits to you the Commission’s resolution of certification and adopted findings pursuant to Section 13544 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations. Pursuant to Section 13544, effective certification of LCP Amendment No. 1-11, whereby the City may begin issuing coastal development permits subject to this amendment, will occur after:

1. The City, by action of the City Council: (a) acknowledges receipt of this resolution of certification, including the suggested modifications; (b) accepts and agrees to the modifications and takes whatever formal action is required to satisfy the modifications (e.g., implementation of ordinances); and (c) agrees to issue coastal development permits subject to the approved amendment.
2. The Commission’s Executive Director reports to the Commission his determination that the City’s actions are legally adequate and the Commission does not object to the Executive Director’s determination.
3. Notice of the certification of the LCP amendment is filed with the Secretary of the Resources Agency.

Coastal Commission staff will take care of items #2 and #3 above, following completion of item #1 by the City. Note that the Commission’s regulations provide that the Commission’s action of certification with the suggested modifications shall expire six months from the date of the Commission’s action, or on June 13, 2013.

Please let me know if I can assist you in any way in completing action on this LCP amendment, or if you have any questions. Thanks for all your help during this process.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mike Watson  
Coastal Planner  
Central Coast District Office

Enclosure
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Planning Commission Public Notices for January 9, 2013
Public Hearing
NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Planning Commission of the City of Seaside will conduct a public hearing to consider the following application:

1. **City of Seaside Local Coastal Program.** The City requests that the Planning Commission consider an Addendum to the approved Negative Declaration and provide a recommendation to the City Council on the revised Local Coastal Program (LCP) as modified and conditionally approved by the California Coastal Commission. The LCP is a comprehensive long-range planning document prepared by cities and counties for areas within the coastal zone as required by the California Coastal Act of 1976. The Coastal Act is intended to ensure that coastal areas of California are developed in a manner responsive to public objectives. The LCP consists of: 1) Coastal Land Use Plan (LUP) and; 2) a Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP), consisting of zoning ordinance and maps, which together meet the Coastal Act requirements and implement its provisions and policies within the City. The City approved a draft of the LCP on February 3, 2011 and submitted the document to the Commission for formal review. Recommended revisions were made and approved by the Coastal Commission on December 13, 2012. The City of Seaside’s Coastal Zone encompasses approximately 237 acres of land that extend from the Pacific Ocean to the terminus of the Canyon Del Rey Creek, and is bounded on the southwest by the City of Monterey and on the northwest by the Pacific Ocean. The City of Sand City and Canyon Del Rey Boulevard border most of the south and east portion of the coastal zone, with the exception of a section of the Highway 1 right-of-way that was located on the former Fort Ord, which is also located within the Coastal Zone. Pursuant to Section 15164 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, an addendum has been prepared to the Negative Declaration that was adopted on November 18, 2010, to address minor modifications made to the draft LCP.

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that the public hearing will be held on **Wednesday, January 9, 2013 at 7:00 p.m.** (or as soon thereafter as the agenda permits) in the City Council Chambers at City Hall, 440 Harcourt Avenue, Seaside, CA. Any and all interested persons are welcome to attend the public hearing and be heard. The meeting agenda and complete project file and plans can be reviewed at the Planning Division Office in City Hall or online at [http://www.ci.seaside.ca.us/](http://www.ci.seaside.ca.us/) for the scheduled meeting date. Written comments will be accepted up to the close of the public hearing and will be given equal weight as oral comments.

NOTE: In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, The City of Seaside does not discriminate against persons with disabilities. Both Seaside City Hall and the Council Chambers are accessible facilities. The City Council Chambers is equipped with a portable microphone and assisted listening devices are available upon request. Should you require assistance in order to participate, please contact the Office of the City Clerk (831) 899-6707 at least three days in advance of the event to make necessary arrangements. If you need assistance in speaking on a specific item noted on the agenda, please inform staff as to which item you would like to comment on and the microphone will be brought to you.

CITY OF SEASIDE

/S/

Publish no later than Thursday, December 27, 2012
DATE: December 21, 2012

TO: ADJACENT PROPERTY OWNERS WITHIN 300-FOOT RADIUS

FROM: Planning Division

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Planning Commission of the City of Seaside, State of California, will hold a public hearing to consider the following application:

1. **City of Seaside Local Coastal Program.** The City requests that the Planning Commission consider an Addendum to the approved Negative Declaration and provide a recommendation to the City Council on the revised Local Coastal Program (LCP) as modified and conditionally approved by the California Coastal Commission. The LCP is a comprehensive long-range planning document prepared by cities and counties for areas within the coastal zone as required by the California Coastal Act of 1976. The Coastal Act is intended to ensure that coastal areas of California are developed in a manner responsive to public objectives. The LCP consists of: 1) Coastal Land Use Plan (LUP) and; 2) a Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP), consisting of zoning ordinance and maps, which together meet the Coastal Act requirements and implement its provisions and policies within the City. The City approved a draft of the LCP on February 3, 2011 and submitted the document to the Commission for formal review. Recommended revisions were made and approved by the Coastal Commission on December 13, 2012. The City of Seaside’s Coastal Zone encompasses approximately 237 acres of land that extend from the Pacific Ocean to the terminus of the Canyon Del Rey Creek, and is bounded on the southwest by the City of Monterey and on the northwest by the Pacific Ocean. The City of Sand City and Canyon Del Rey Boulevard border most of the south and east portion of the coastal zone, with the exception of a section of the Highway 1 right-of-way that was located on the former Fort Ord, which is also located within the Coastal Zone. Pursuant to Section 15164 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, an addendum has been prepared to the Negative Declaration that was adopted on November 18, 2010, to address minor modifications made to the draft LCP.

   **Location Map identifying the Costal Zone Boundaries shown on Page 2 and Page 3 of notice.**

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that the public hearing will be held on **Wednesday, January 9, 2013 at 7:00 p.m.** (or as soon thereafter as the agenda permits) in the City Council Chambers at City Hall, 440 Harcourt Avenue, Seaside, CA. Any and all interested persons are welcome to attend the public hearing and be heard. The meeting agenda and complete project file and plans can be reviewed at the Planning Division Office in City Hall or online at [http://www.ci.seaside.ca.us/](http://www.ci.seaside.ca.us/) for the scheduled meeting date. Written comments will be accepted up to the close of the public hearing and will be given equal weight as oral comments.

**NOTE:** In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, The City of Seaside does not discriminate against persons with disabilities. Both Seaside City Hall and the Council Chambers are accessible facilities. The City Council Chambers is equipped with a portable microphone and assisted listening devices are available upon request. Should you require assistance in order to participate, please contact the Office of the City Clerk (831) 899-6707 at least three days in advance of the event to make necessary arrangements. If you need assistance in speaking on a specific item noted on the agenda, please inform staff as to which item you would like to comment on and the microphone will be brought to you.

Rick Medina. Senior Planner
Location Map

Laguna Grande Subarea, Roberts lake Subarea, Del Monte Beach Subarea, and Beach Subarea

Figure 1-2a
Coastal Zone Subareas
Location Map

Highway 1 Subarea
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Planning Commission Agenda and Staff Report for January 9, 2013 Public Hearing
AGENDA

CITY OF SEASIDE
Planning Commission

REGULAR MEETING
City Hall
440 Harcourt Avenue
January 9, 2013
7:00 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL
   _______ PAUL MUGAN (Chair)
   _______ AMY TAKETOMO (Vice-Chair)
   _______ MARY CLAYPOOL
   _______ MICHAEL LECHMAN
   _______ JOHN OWENS
   _______ JOHN ROBINSON

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   A. Regular Meeting of December 12, 2012

4. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON AND VICE-CHAIRPERSON FOR 2013 CALENDAR YEAR

5. PUBLIC COMMENT
   Anyone wishing to address the Planning Commission on matters not on the agenda and within its jurisdiction may come forward to state the matter on which they wish to speak. Matters not appearing on the agenda will not receive action at this meeting, but may be referred to staff or to a future meeting for discussion. Comments will be limited to three minutes, or as otherwise established by the Planning Commission.

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS
   A. City of Seaside Local Coastal Program. The City requests that the Planning Commission consider an Addendum to the approved Negative Declaration and provide a recommendation to the City Council on the revised Local Coastal Program (LCP) as modified and conditionally approved by the California Coastal Commission. The LCP consists of: 1) Coastal Land Use Plan (LUP) and; 2) a Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP), consisting of zoning ordinance and maps, which together meet the Coastal Act requirements and implement its provisions and policies within the City of Seaside. Pursuant to Section 15164 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, an addendum has been prepared to the Negative Declaration that was adopted on November 18, 2010, to address minor modifications made to the draft LCP.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), the City of Seaside does not discriminate against persons with disabilities and is an accessible facility. Any person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation to be able to participate in this meeting is asked to contact the office of the City Clerk at thubbard@ci.seaside.ca.us or 899-6707, no fewer than two business days prior to the meeting to allow for reasonable arrangements.

The City Council Chambers is equipped with a portable microphone for anyone unable to come to the podium. Assisted listening devices are also available upon request.

Agenda related writings or documents provided to the Planning Commission are available for public inspection during the meeting or may be requested from the office of the City Clerk.
7. OLD BUSINESS

A. Consideration of Public Review Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Collections at Monterey Bay Resort Project in Sand City:
City staff will provide update on the formulation of the City's public review comments on the DEIR that has been circulated for public review for a 342 room visitor serving coastal hotel/resort located west of SR1 (HWY 1) and north of Tioga Avenue in Sand City.

8. REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS AND CITY STAFF

This is a time specifically set aside for members of the Planning Commission and the City staff to make brief comments of general interest to the commission, make requests that items be added to future Planning Commission meeting agendas as necessary, and report on committee assignments.

9. ADJOURNMENT AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEXT MEETING

Next Scheduled Meeting

Wednesday, January 23, 2013
City Hall Council Chambers
440 Harcourt Ave
7:00pm

****************************

Staff reports for agendized items are available on the Thursday preceding the scheduled meeting at the Planning Division office in the Seaside City Hall (440 Harcourt Avenue, Seaside, CA 93955) or by contacting planning staff at (831) 899-6737. An audiotape of the proceedings may be obtained or reviewed by contacting the Planning Division at (831) 899-6737.

The Planning Commission’s decision can be appealed to the City Council if an appeal is submitted in writing and filed within seven (7) calendar days of the date of the decision as outlined in Seaside Municipal Code Chapter 17.66.
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MEETING DATE: January 9, 2013
FIRST HEARING DATE: May 26, 2010
DATE DEEMED COMPLETE: N/A
CONTINUED FROM: N/A
APPLICATION NO.: Local Coastal Program
OWNERS / APPLICANTS: City of Seaside
PROPERTY ADDRESS: The City of Seaside coastal zone encompasses approximately 237 acres extending from the Pacific Ocean to the terminus of Canyon Del Rey Creek bounded by the Pacific Ocean to the northwest, the City of Monterey on the southwest and City of Sand City and Canyon Del Rey Boulevard on the south and east, with the exception of a section of the Highway 1 right-of-way that was located on the former Fort Ord which is also located within City’s Coastal Zone.

ASSESSOR’S PARCEL NUMBER: N/A
LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM LAND USES:
Existing: Open Space Areas, Visitor-Serving Commercial, Shopping Center/General Commercial, Heavy Commercial
Proposed: Coastal Parks and Open Space (CPOS), Coastal Visitor Serving Commercial (CVSC), Coastal Visitor Serving Recreation (CVSR), Coastal Regional Commercial (CCR), Coastal Heavy Commercial (CCH), Coastal Mixed-Use/West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (CMX/WBUVSP), and Coastal Transportation Corridor (CTC).

ZONING CLASSIFICATION: Existing: Open Space –Recreation (OSR) and Regional Commercial (CRG) with Coastal Zone (CZ) overlay
Proposed: Coastal Parks and Open Space (CPOS), Coastal Visitor Serving Commercial (CVSC), Coastal Visitor Serving Recreation (CVSR), Coastal Regional Commercial (CCR), Coastal Heavy Commercial (CCH), Coastal Mixed-Use/West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (CMX/WBUVSP), and Coastal Transportation Corridor (CTC).

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: Existing: Park and Open Space (POS) and Regional Commercial (RGC)
Proposed: Coastal Parks and Open Space (CPOS), Coastal Visitor Serving Commercial (CVSC), Coastal Visitor Serving Recreation (CVSR), Coastal Regional Commercial (CCR), Coastal Heavy Commercial (CCH), Coastal Mixed-Use/West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (CMX/WBUVSP), and Coastal Transportation Corridor (CTC).

CEQA DETERMINATION: Negative Declaration
FLAGGED AND STAKED: N/A
PURPOSE:

The purpose of this item is to provide an opportunity for the Planning Commission to consider the Addendum to the adopted Negative Declaration, review the City of Seaside Local Coastal Program (LCP) as modified and conditionally approved by the California Coastal Commission staff, receive a presentation on the modified LCP from staff, receive public testimony, and provide a recommendation to the City Council on the adoption of the LCP and the corresponding addendum to the Negative Declaration as modified. The intent is to comply with the California Coastal Act and obtain local permit authority, including amending the policies in the city’s certified Coastal Land Use Plan and adoption of an Implementing Ordinance (Coastal Implementation Plan).

ISSUES:

1) Consistency with General Plan and Zoning Ordinance
2) Environmental Review

OPTIONS:

1) Adopt Resolution (Exhibit A-1) recommending that the City Council consider the Addendum to the adopted Negative Declaration for the Local Coastal Program update and adopt Resolution (Exhibit A-2) recommending that the City Council adopt the Local Coastal Program as modified and conditionally approved by the California Coastal Commission, and an Ordinance to include the Coastal Implementation Plan, as modified and conditionally approved by the California Coastal Commission, as part of the Seaside Municipal Code; or

2) Continue the Public Hearing to January 23, 2013, to allow for additional time to evaluate any new information introduced into the public record.

RECOMMENDATION:

Receive a presentation on the LCP, hear public testimony, provide comments and adopt the following Resolutions:

A. Adopt Resolution provided as Exhibit “A-1” recommending that the City Council consider the Addendum to the approved Negative Declaration (Exhibit B) for the proposed update to the Local Coastal Program; and adopt the Seaside Local Coastal Program as modified and conditionally approved by the California Coastal Commission.

B. Adopt Resolution provided as Exhibit “A-2” recommending that the City Council adopt an ordinance to amend the Seaside Municipal Code and General Plan Land Use Map to implement the policies and land use regulations for the Seaside Local Coastal Program as modified and conditionally approved by the California Coastal Commission.

EXHIBITS:

Exhibit “A-1”: Draft Resolution recommending that the City Council consider the Addendum to the approved Negative Declaration (Exhibit B) for the proposed update to the Local Coastal Program; and adopt the Seaside Local Coastal Program as modified and conditionally approved by the California Coastal Commission.

Exhibit “A-2”: Draft Resolution recommending that the City Council adopt an ordinance to amend the Seaside Municipal Code and General Plan Land Use Map to implement the policies and land use regulations for the Seaside Local Coastal Program as modified and conditionally approved by
the California Coastal Commission.
Exhibit “B”: Addendum to the Negative Declaration/Initial Study
Exhibit “C”: Coastal Zone Area and Subarea Map as modified
Exhibit “D”: Coastal Zone Land Use Designations as modified
Exhibit “E”: Seaside Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan and Coastal Implementation Plan as modified
Exhibit “F”: Coastal Commission Staff Report for the December 13, 2013 Coastal Commission meeting.

STAFF CONTACT: Rick Medina, Senior Planner and Lisa Brinton, Project Manager
CITY OF SEASIDE

PLANNING COMMISSION

STAFF REPORT

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Diana Ingersoll, Deputy City Manager – Resource Management Services

BY: Rick Medina, Senior Planner
    Lisa Brinton,

DATE: January 9, 2013

ITEM: City of Seaside Local Coastal Program, Planning Commission consideration of the City of Seaside Local Coastal Program as modified and conditionally approved by the California Coastal Commission. Project Sponsor/Applicant: City of Seaside.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this item is to provide an opportunity for the Planning Commission to consider the Addendum to the approved Negative Declaration for the proposed Local Coastal Program (LCP) update, review the City of Seaside LCP as modified and conditionally approved by the California Coastal Commission, receive a presentation on the modified LCP, receive public testimony, and provide recommendation to the City Council on the adoption of the modified LCP and corresponding addendum to the Negative Declaration as modified. The intent is to comply with the California Coastal Act and obtain local permit authority, including amending the policies in the city’s certified Coastal Land Use Plan and adoption of an Implementing Ordinance (Coastal Implementation Plan).

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission receive a presentation on the Addendum to the Negative Declaration and modifications to the LCP, hear public testimony, provide comments and adopt the following Resolutions on the proposed update to the Seaside LCP:

A. Adopt Resolution provided as Exhibit “A-1” recommending that the City Council consider the Addendum to the adopted Negative Declaration for the proposed update to the Local Coastal Program (Exhibit “B”) and adopt the Seaside Local Coastal Program as modified and conditionally approved by the California Coastal Commission.

B. Adopt Resolution provided as Exhibit “A-2” recommending that the City Council adopt an ordinance to amend the Seaside Municipal Code and General Plan Land Use Map to
implement the updated policies and land use regulations of the Seaside Local Coastal Program as modified and conditionally approved by the California Coastal Commission.

BACKGROUND

The City of Seaside is mandated by the California Coastal Act of 1976 to prepare a Local Coastal Program (LCP) for the area of the City that lies within its coastal zone boundary. The City of Seaside’s coastal zone encompasses approximately 237 acres of land as shown in Exhibit “C”. The LCP is the contract between the City and the State specifying how the City will protect California’s coastal resources. The LCP consists of two major parts: The Land Use Plan (LUP) and the Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP).

For the past four years, the City has been working with Pacific Municipal Consultants (PMC), Planning Consultant, and the Coastal Commission to obtain local permit authority in the coastal zone through the adoption of a certified LCP. In February 2011, the City Council adopted a resolution adopting the proposed LCP Update for the City of Seaside and authorized the City Manager to submit certified copies of the LCP and implementing Ordinance amending the Municipal Code to the California Coastal Commission (CCC). Certified copies of the LCP were part of the LCP Amendment application submitted in June 2011. Minor modifications were made to the LCP and additional requested information was submitted to California Coastal Commission staff in October 2011. The application was accepted as complete by California Coastal Commission staff in March 2012.

As part of California Coastal Commission staff’s review, modifications were made to the LCP to strengthen its compliance with the California Coastal Act. The LCP with modifications went before the California Coastal Commission on December 13, 2012, where the commission unanimously approved the LCP with modifications recommended by the Coastal staff. The LCP with modifications noted in strikeout and underline is included as an exhibit to the Coastal Commission staff report for the December 13, 2012 California Coastal Commission meeting (Exhibit “E”).

The LCP as modified is the result of a coordinated effort between City staff, planning consultants and coastal commission staff to update the LCP to be consistent with current City documents, environmental legislation and policy, and Coastal Commission direction. A copy of the LCP included as Exhibit “F”. An Addendum to the previously approved Negative Declaration has been prepared for the modified LCP pursuant to Section 15164 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (Exhibit “B”).

The LCP as modified must be approved by Planning Commission and adopted by the City Council and then re-submitted to the California Coastal Commission for final approval/certification. In the future, the LCP may be amended in accordance with California Code of Regulations and Public Resources Code.

Local Permitting
With the certified LCP, the City of Seaside would then assume the responsibility for issuing coastal development permits (CDPs) for development within the coastal zone. In authorizing coastal development permits, the City must make a finding that the proposed development conforms to the certified LCP. Consistent with the provisions of the Coastal Act, the Coastal Commission will retain original permit jurisdiction over certain specified lands, such as any submerged lands, tidelands and public trust land. The Commission will also retain the authority to hear appeals of the City's CDP decisions, review and approve any amendments to the certified LCP, and review the LCP at least every five years to ensure proper implementation and continued compliance with the Coastal Act.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

On August 5, 2010, a Notice of Intent to adopt a Negative Declaration for the LCP was distributed for public review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. Since the Negative Declaration was adopted, the Coastal Commission has recommended additional modifications to LCP. The revisions were determined not to result in new significant impacts or result in a substantial increase in the severity of previously analyzed effects, and no new or additional mitigation measures were warranted. Conversely, the LCP modifications serve to strengthen the environmental protection policies of the LCP. Therefore, staff determined that the Addendum provides sufficient documentation and analysis of the changes to the LCP consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(1). The Addendum is provided for consideration in Exhibit “B”.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The modified LCP would update the 1983 Land Use Plan of the City of Seaside (certified by the California Coastal Commission on October 12, 1983), and provide standards and guidelines (i.e., The CIP) to implement the land use plan. These two components taken together constitute the LCP. The LCP applies to the Seaside coastal zone area as illustrated in Exhibit “C”.

Coastal commission staff recommended modifications to the LCP during the LCP Amendment Application process. The recommended modifications strengthen consistency with the California Coastal Act and the City’s General Plan, correct minor typographical errors, incorporate applicable sections of referenced documents, and update the City of Seaside’s coastal zone boundaries to reflect the Mello Act and to include existing Highway 1 right-of-way that is within the coastal zone along the former Fort Ord. Modifications to the LCP are described in detail in the coastal commission staff report for the December 13, 2012 California Coastal Commission hearing, which is included as Exhibit “E”. Key modifications are summarized below.

Boundary Modifications

The boundaries were modified to reflect the Mello Act and to include existing Highway 1 right-of-way that is within the coastal zone along the former Fort Ord as shown in Exhibit “C” and LUP Figures 1-2a and 1-2b. These modifications resulted in an increase in land area within the Laguna Grande Subarea (+3.17 acres) and a decrease in land area within the Del Monte Subarea (-2.82 acres) for a net increase of 0.35 acres. In addition, approximately 146 acres of Highway 1
right-of-way was added to the north. A summary of the changes in subarea acreages as a result of the boundary modifications is provided in Table 1.

### Table 1
**Summary of Coastal Zone Boundaries Revisions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subareas</th>
<th>Original LCP</th>
<th>Revised LCP</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Grande</td>
<td>42.45</td>
<td>45.62</td>
<td>+3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts Lake</td>
<td>22.26</td>
<td>22.26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach</td>
<td>17.46</td>
<td>17.46</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Monte</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>-2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>90.96</td>
<td>91.31</td>
<td>+0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added CTC North</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>146.16</td>
<td>+146.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90.96</td>
<td>237.47</td>
<td>+146.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the boundaries of the City’s territory within the coastal zone were discussed and reviewed with CCC staff on numerous occasions during the preparation of the LCP document, the comments regarding boundary adjustment were not presented to the City until July 2012.

### Land Use Modifications

As a result of the boundary modifications described above and the need to maintain consistency with the Coastal Act and the 2004 Seaside General Plan, revisions were made to the LCP land use designations as shown in Exhibit “D” and also included as LUP Figures 2-10a and 2-10b. These modifications include the addition of the following land use designations: Coastal Transportation Corridor (CTC) (158.54 acres); Coastal Regional Commercial (CCRG) (1.64 acres); and Coastal Heavy Commercial (CCH) (0.98 acres). In addition, the amount of land designated for Coastal Parks and Open Space (CPOS) and Coastal Visitor-Serving Recreation (CVSR) land uses increased, while the amount of land designated for Coastal Visitor-Serving Commercial (CVSC) and Coastal Mixed Use/West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (MX/WBUVSP) land uses decreased. These adjustments were made for the following reasons:

1. Correction of mapping errors; and
2. Need for consistency with the 2004 Seaside General Plan; and
3. Coastal staff requests

A summary of the changes to land use designation acreages is provided in Table 2 below.
Table 2
Summary of Land Use Revisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Designations</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Original LCP</td>
<td>Revised LCP</td>
<td>Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Parks and Open Space (CPOS)</td>
<td>57.05</td>
<td>59.41</td>
<td>+2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Visitor-Serving Commercial (CVSC)</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>-3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Visitor-Serving Recreation (CVSR)</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>+0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Heavy Commercial (CCH)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>+0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Regional Commercial (CCRG)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>+1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Transportation Corridor (CTC)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>158.54</td>
<td>+158.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Mixed Use/West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (CMX/WBUVSP)</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-5.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Land Use Plan Policy Modifications

Modifications made to LCP-LUP policies provide for broad protection of natural resource areas, coastal resources, visual resources, water supply, and water quality; reduce risks associated with natural hazards; provide for public access and parks; and provide more specific general permit considerations for land use development. The boundary revisions expanded the area subject to LCP policies. The modifications to the policies are generally described below.

- **Hazards** - Additional policies are proposed to address threats from a tsunami, require analysis of wave uprush/shoreline erosion in new development, and to refine outfall maintenance provisions.

- **Water Quality** - Policies were modified to effectively address new Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) requirements associated with the pending update to the statewide Phase II Stormwater Permit.

- **Land Use** - Suggested modifications refined density/intensity and setback standards in order to adequately buffer adjacent resources to ensure they are protected.

- **Public Access and Recreation** - Modifications increased hours of available parking, consolidated and, where feasible, eliminated storm water outfalls on area beaches, and to protect lower-cost visitor opportunities.

- **Transportation and Circulation** - Modifications addressed transportation capacities, to protect the former railroad right-of-way for the specific purpose of re-establishing light rail service and multi-modal transportation options (trails, etc.), to encourage alternative forms of transportation (e.g., hiking and biking), to require adequate parking and circulation in all new development, and to provide for maintenance and repair of existing transportation facilities in Seaside.
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- Public Services - Modifications protect coastal priority uses, to ensure that adequate long-term and sustainable water supplies are available for development, and to ensure that water services are publicly managed.

- Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA) - Modifications provide additional detail for addressing cumulative impacts and appropriate acreage replacement ratios for unavoidable direct impacts.

- Cultural Resources – Modifications round out archaeological protections.

- Visual Resources – Modifications refine protected views, particularly related to primary view corridors associated with Highway 1 and the City’s lakes.

These policy modifications are described in detail within the coastal commission staff report for the December 13, 2012 hearing, which is included as Exhibit “E”.

Coastal Implementation Plan Modifications
Modifications to the LCP-CIP included incorporating large referenced sections of the Seaside Municipal Code into the document (i.e., parking standards, sign standards) and making revisions to ensure consistency with the LUP as modified. These modifications included coastal staff’s recommended revisions to the development standards which are described in detail within the coastal commission staff report for the December 13, 2012 hearing, which is included as Exhibit “E”.

The LCP as modified resulted in a stream-lined, user-friendly document that is consistent with current local and state policy.

STAFF ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Statutory Requirements of a Local Coastal Plan

The California Coastal Act of 1976 requires that each coastal city and county prepare a local coastal program that establishes the kind, location, and intensity of land and water uses appropriate to its portion of the coastal zone. The LCP must be adopted by the City, then be reviewed and approved (certified) by the California Coastal Commission (CCC).

Required Contents

This LCP has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of California Coastal Act (PRC 3000 et. seq.). As prescribed by law, the LCP includes (a) land use plans, (b) zoning ordinances, (c) zoning district maps, and (d) within sensitive coastal resource areas, other implementing actions, which, when taken together, meet the requirements of, and implement the provisions and policies of the California Coastal Act (PRC 30108.6).

The precise content of each local coastal program shall be determined by the local government, consistent with Section 30501, in full consultation with the commission and with full public participation. (Coastal Act Section 30500 (c))
As prescribed by law, the proposed LCP includes the following:

- Written policies that provide direction for decision-makers, property owners, and the public regarding the types and intensities of land uses that are most suited to each coastal area and a land use map that shows generally the uses that are appropriate in each area. (LUP).

- Relevant portions of the local government’s zoning code, which regulates land uses, zoning maps that show which zoning rules apply to each area, and procedural requirements that govern which types of projects require a coastal permit, how a coastal permit can be obtained, and the opportunities for public participation in coastal permit review (CIP).

**Adopted Local Coastal Program Conformance**

The LCP as modified would provide greater clarification as to the location and intent of the Coastal Districts and greater consistency with the Coastal Act. The proposed land use plan would result in an overall de-intensification of land uses around Roberts Lake, Laguna Grande and the Beach subareas. Specifically:

**Zoning Ordinance Conformance**

**Existing:** Open Space – Recreation (OSR) and Regional Commercial (CRG) with Coastal Zone (CZ) overlay; **Proposed:** Coastal Parks and Open Space (CPOS), Coastal Visitor Serving Commercial (CVSC), Coastal Visitor Serving Recreation (CVSR), Coastal Regional Commercial (CCR), Coastal Heavy Commercial (CCH), Coastal Mixed-Use/West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (CMX/WBUVSP).

The proposed CIP would be the zoning ordinance for the proposed land use plan. Certification of the LCP would replace 17.24.070 - CRG Coastal Zone Standards and 17.28.030 - Coastal Zone (CZ) Overlay Zone with the proposed CIP (Title 18).

Implementation actions would require minor modifications to the City of Seaside Zoning Ordinance (Title 17 of the Seaside Municipal Code) to identify Title 18 as the zoning for areas within the coastal zone.

**Seaside General Plan Conformance**

**Existing:** Park and Open Space (POS) and Regional Commercial (RGC); **Proposed:** Coastal Parks and Open Space (CPOS), Coastal Visitor Serving Commercial (CVSC), a Coastal Visitor Serving Recreation (CVSR), Coastal Regional Commercial (CCR), Coastal Heavy Commercial (CCH), Coastal Mixed-Use/West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (CMX/WBUVSP).

LUP policies and land use designations have been updated to be consistent with the City’s 2004 General Plan. The LUP establishes land use designations, general development criteria and policies that regulate development in the Coastal Zone. The City’s General Plan and the Land Use Element in particular may contain more precise development limits for specific properties. Should a conflict exist, the land use intensity that is most protective of coastal resources shall
take precedence. However, in no case shall the policies of the LUP be interpreted to allow a development to exceed a development limit established by the General Plan or its implementing ordinances.

Implementation actions would require minor modifications to the City of Seaside General Plan. It is noted that amendments to a local general plan for the purpose of developing a certified local coastal program shall not constitute an amendment of a general plan for purposes of Section 65358 of the Government Code (frequency limited to 4 times a year) (Section 30500, Coastal Act 2009 update).

PUBLIC NOTICE

A notice of the proposed action was published in the Monterey County Weekly a minimum of 10 days in advance of this hearing consistent with the Municipal Code. Additionally, the item appeared upon the agenda for this meeting, which was posted at City Hall and designated posted locations in the City a minimum of 72-hours prior to the public hearing.

CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis, staff recommends consideration of the Addendum to the adopted Negative Declaration and adoption of the Local Coastal Program as modified and conditionally approved by the California Coastal Commission. The Local Coastal Program, as modified, complies with the intent of the Seaside General Plan, requirements of Title 17 of the Seaside Municipal Code and the California Coastal Act of 1976, as amended.

NEXT STEPS

Should the Planning Commission approve Staff’s recommendation, Staff will present the adopted resolutions to the City Council. The City Council will consider the adoption of the ordinance and a resolution acknowledging consideration of the Addendum to the Negative Declaration and certifying the LCP as modified by the California Coastal Commission. Upon City Council’s approval, the California Coastal Commission staff will prepare the official Seaside Coastal Map for certification. The Seaside LCP (with modification and official map) and the Addendum will be submitted to the California Coastal Commission for final approval/certification. Upon certification of the LCP and Map, the City will have permit authority over the Seaside Coastal Zone.

ATTACHMENTS

Exhibit “A-1”: Draft Resolution recommending that the City Council consider the Addendum to the approved Negative Declaration for the proposed update to the Local Coastal Program; and adopt the Seaside Local Coastal Program as modified and conditionally approved by the California Coastal Commission.

Exhibit “A-2”: Draft Resolution recommending that the City Council adopt an ordinance to amend the Seaside Municipal Code and General Plan Land Use Map to implement the policies and land use regulations for the Seaside Local Coastal Program as modified and conditionally approved by the California Coastal Commission.
Exhibit “B”: Addendum to the Negative Declaration/Initial Study (Click to access Hyperlink for document)

Exhibit “C”: Coastal Zone Area and Subarea Map as modified (Click to access Hyperlink for document)

Exhibit “D”: Coastal Zone Land Use Designations as modified (Click to access Hyperlink for document)

Exhibit “E”: Seaside Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan and Coastal Implementation Plan as modified. (Click to access Hyperlink for document)

Exhibit “F”: Coastal Commission Staff Report for the December 13, 2013 Coastal Commission meeting. (Click to access Hyperlink for document)
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FORA CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION

Planning Commission Resolution 13-01 recommending that the City Council adopt Addendum to previously adopted NegativeDeclaration
RESOLUTION NO. 13-01

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SEASIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL CONSIDER THE ADDENDUM TO THE APPROVED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE PROPOSED LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM UPDATE; AND ADOPT THE SEASIDE LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM AS MODIFIED AND CONDITIONALLY APPROVED BY THE CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION.

WHEREAS, the City of Seaside has circulated a proposed Negative Declaration for the City of Seaside Local Coastal Program (LCP); and

WHEREAS, the preparation of the LCP is intended to protect and enhance the resources of the coastal zone, consistent with the goals of the California Coastal Act, as well as the expressed goals of the citizenry; and

WHEREAS, on September 30, 2010, a notice of availability of the proposed LCP Update was provided pursuant to Section 13515(c) of the California Code of Regulations, mailed to all property owners located within 300 feet from the City of Seaside Coastal Zone Boundary, published in the Monterey Weekly, and posted at locations within the Coastal Zone Area; and

WHEREAS, the Notice of Intent to adopt a Negative Declaration was circulated for a 30-day public review period ending on Tuesday, September 7, 2010 pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines; and

WHEREAS, a total of six comments letters were received in response to the Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration and have been entered into the public record; and

WHEREAS, it is the responsibility of the Planning Commission to consider and weigh the merits of the application and public input in relation to the policies, standards and intent of the Seaside General Plan and Seaside Municipal Code in making a recommendation to the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the Seaside Planning Commission considered oral comments and written information concerning the proposed Negative Declaration at a duly noticed public hearing held on October 13, 2010; and

WHEREAS, the City Council considered oral comments and written information concerning the proposed Negative Declaration and approved the adoption of the Negative Declaration at a duly noticed public hearing held on November 18, 2010 (Resolution 10-70); and

WHEREAS, the City adopted the proposed LCP Update and authorized the City Manager to submit certified copies of the LCP and implementing Ordinance amending the
P.C Resolution No. 13-01
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Seaside Municipal codes to the California Coastal Commission at a duly noticed public hearing held on February 3, 2011 (Resolution 11-08); and

WHEREAS, the City Council adopted the Coastal Implementation Program of the local coastal program as Title 18 of the Seaside Municipal Code at a duly noticed public hearing held on February 3, 2011 (Ordinance 994); and

WHEREAS, as part of the California Coastal Commission staff’s review, modifications were made to the LCP to make it more consistent with the California Coastal Act; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 13544 of the Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations the LCP with modifications went before the California Coastal Commission on December 13, 2012, where the commission unanimously, conditionally approved the LCP with modifications recommended by staff

WHEREAS, the Seaside Planning Commission considered the Addendum to the approved Negative Declaration for the modifications made by the Coastal Commission staff to the City of Seaside Local Coastal Program (LCP) at a duly noticed public hearing held on January 9, 2013; and

WHEREAS, the Seaside Planning Commission reviewed the City of Seaside Local Coastal Program (LCP) as modified and conditionally approved by the California Coastal Commission; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission adopts the following findings in support of its recommendation to the City Council to consider the Addendum to the negative declaration for the proposed update to the Local Coastal Program; and to consider the Seaside Local Coastal Program as modified and conditionally approved by the California Coastal Commission:

1) The California Coastal Act requires coastal communities to manage the conservation and development of coastal resources through a comprehensive planning and regulatory program called the Local Coastal Program.

2) The preparation of the proposed Seaside LCP is necessary to comply with the Coastal Act and transfer coastal development permitting authority from the Coastal Commission to the City of Seaside.

3) The certification of the City’s Local Coastal Program is necessary to ensure that scenic and visual qualities of the coastal areas shall be considered and protected as a resource of public importance and that development shall be designed and sited to preserve views to and along the scenic coastal areas, to minimize the alteration of natural land forms, to be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas, and, where feasible, restore and enhance visual quality in visually degraded areas.
P.C. Resolution No. 13-01
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4) The impacts of new development on water quality can be minimized through the use of best management practices in the design, construction, and use of that development.

5) The LCP will serve to: 1) preserve existing open space within the coastal zone boundary for the protection of significant environmental resources; 2) provide for avoidance of geologic, fire, and flood hazards; 3) provide for the preservation of watersheds and viewsheds; 4) enable the provision of public recreation; and 5) access to the communities designated coastal resources and open space areas.

6) The Addendum to the adopted Negative Declaration for the Seaside Local Coastal Program found no new or significant impacts caused by the LCP modifications.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, based on aforementioned findings, the Planning Commission hereby recommends that City Council adopt the Seaside Local Coastal Program as modified and conditionally approved by the California Coastal Commission, attached to the January 9, 2013 Planning Commission Staff Report as Exhibit “F” and herein incorporated by reference, and authorize the City Manager to submit to the California Coastal Commission for final approval and certification.

Evidence: The Addendum to the adopted Negative Declaration for the Seaside Local Coastal Program dated December 27, 2012, provided as Exhibit “B” to the January 9, 2013 Planning Commission Staff Report and herein incorporated by reference, will not create any new significant noise, traffic, or other conditions or situations that may be objectionable or detrimental to other permitted uses in the vicinity or adverse to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or welfare of the City.

PASSED AND ADOPTED at the regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Seaside, State of California, on the 5th day of January, 2013 by the following vote:

AYES: M. Lechman, P. Mugan, J. Owens, J. Robinson
NOES: None
ABSENT: A. Taketomo
ABSTAIN: None

Paul Mugan, Chairperson

ATTEST:

Planning Commission Secretary
SEASIDE LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM 2013

FORA CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION

Planning Commission Resolution 13-02 recommending that the City Council adopt Ordinance amending the Seaside Municipal Code and Seaside General Plan for the implementation of the Seaside Local Coastal Program Update
RESOLUTION NO. 13-02

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SEASIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPT AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE SEASIDE MUNICIPAL CODE AND GENERAL PLAN LAND USE MAP TO IMPLEMENT THE UPDATED POLICIES AND LAND USE REGULATIONS OF THE SEASIDE LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM AS MODIFIED AND CONDITIONALLY APPROVED BY THE CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION.

WHEREAS, the City of Seaside has circulated a proposed Negative Declaration for the City of Seaside Local Coastal Program (LCP); and

WHEREAS, the preparation of the LCP is intended to protect and enhance the resources of the coastal zone, consistent with the goals of the California Coastal Act, as well as the expressed goals of the citizenry; and

WHEREAS, on a September 30, 2010, a notice of availability of the proposed LCP Update was provided pursuant to Section 13515(c) of the California Code of Regulations, mailed to all property owners located within 300 feet from the City of Seaside Coastal Zone Boundary, published in the Monterey Weekly, and posted at locations within the Coastal Zone Area; and

WHEREAS, the Notice of Intent to adopt a Negative Declaration was circulated for a 30-day public review period ending on Tuesday, September 7, 2010 pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines; and

WHEREAS, a total of six comments letters were received in response to the Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration and have been entered into the public record; and

WHEREAS, it is the responsibility of the Planning Commission to consider and weigh the merits of the application and public input in relation to the policies, standards and intent of the Seaside General Plan and Seaside Municipal Code in making a recommendation to the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the Seaside Planning Commission considered oral comments and written information concerning the proposed Negative Declaration at a duly noticed public hearing held on October 13, 2010; and

WHEREAS, the City considered oral comments and written information concerning the proposed Negative Declaration and approved the adoption of the Negative Declaration at a duly noticed public hearing held on November 18, 2010 (Resolution 10-70); and

WHEREAS, the City Council adopted the proposed LCP Update and authorized the City Manager to submit certified copies of the LCP and implementing Ordinance amending
the Seaside Municipal codes to the California Coastal Commission at a duly noticed public hearing held on February 3, 2011 (Resolution 11-08); and

WHEREAS, the City Council adopted the Coastal Implementation Program of the Local Coastal Program as Title 18 of the Seaside Municipal Code at a duly noticed public hearing held on February 3, 2011 (Ordinance 994); and

WHEREAS, as part of the California Coastal Commission staff’s review, modifications were made to the LCP to make it more consistent with the California Coastal Act; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 13544 of the Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations the LCP with modifications went before the California Coastal Commission on December 13, 2012, where the commission unanimously approved the LCP with modifications recommended by staff.

WHEREAS, the Seaside Planning Commission considered the Addendum to the approved Negative Declaration for the modifications made by the Coastal Commission staff to the City of Seaside Local Coastal Program (LCP) at a duly noticed public hearing held on January 9, 2013; and

WHEREAS, the Seaside Planning Commission reviewed the City of Seaside Local Coastal Program (LCP) as modified and conditionally approved by the California Coastal Commission at a duly noticed Public Hearing held on January 9, 2013; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission adopts the following findings in support of its recommendation to the City Council to adopt an ordinance to amend the Seaside Municipal Code and General Plan land use map to implement the updated policies and land use regulations of the Seaside Local Coastal program as modified and conditionally approved by the California Coastal Commission:

1) The California Coastal Act requires coastal communities to manage the conservation and development of coastal resources through a comprehensive planning and regulatory program called the Local Coastal Program.

2) The preparation of the proposed Seaside LCP is necessary to comply with the Coastal Act and transfer coastal development permitting authority from the Coastal Commission to the City of Seaside.

3) The certification of the City’s Local Coastal Program is necessary to ensure that scenic and visual qualities of the coastal areas shall be considered and protected as a resource of public importance and that development shall be designed and sited to preserve views to and along the scenic coastal areas, to minimize the alteration of natural land forms, to be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas, and, where feasible, restore and enhance visual quality in visually degraded areas.

4) The impacts of new development on water quality can be minimized through the use of best management practices in the design, construction, and use of that development.
5) The LCP will serve to: 1) preserve existing open space within the coastal zone boundary for the protection of significant environmental resources; 2) provide for avoidance of geologic, fire, and flood hazards; 3) provide for the preservation of watersheds and viewsheds; 4) enable the provision of public recreation; and 5) access to the communities designated coastal resources and open space areas.

6) The Addendum to the adopted Negative Declaration for the Seaside Local Coastal Program found no new or significant impacts caused by the LCP modifications.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, based on aforementioned findings, the Planning Commission hereby recommends that City Council adopt an ordinance to adopt the Seaside Local Coastal Program as modified and conditionally approved by the California Coastal Commission, attached to the January 9, 2013 Planning Commission Staff Report as Exhibit “F” and herein incorporated by reference, and authorize the City Manager to submit to the California Coastal Commission for final approval and certification.

Evidence: The Addendum to the adopted Negative Declaration for the Seaside Local Coastal Program dated December 2012, provided as Exhibit “B” to the January 9, 2013 Planning Commission Staff Report and herein incorporated by reference, will not create significant noise, traffic, or other conditions or situations that may be objectionable or detrimental to other permitted uses in the vicinity or adverse to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or welfare of the City.

Evidence: The certification of the City's Local Coastal Program will be consistent with the 2004 Seaside General Plan and California Coastal Act 1976.

PASSED AND ADOPTED at the regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Seaside, State of California, on the 9th day of January, 2013, by the following vote:

AYES: M. Lechman, P. Mugan, J. Owens, J. Robinson
NOES: None
ABSENT: A. Taketomo
ABSTAIN: None

Paul Mugan, Chairperson

ATTEST: 

Planning Commission Secretary
SEASIDE LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM 2013

FORA CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION

City Council Public Notices for February 7, 2013
NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the City Council of the City of Seaside will conduct a public hearing to consider the following application:

1. **Amendment to the Seaside General Plan and Seaside Municipal Code to adopt a modified City of Seaside Local Coastal Program.** The City of Seaside requests consideration of an Addendum to the previously approved Negative Declaration prepared for the Local Coastal Program (LCP); approval of a modified Local Coastal Program (LCP) prepared pursuant to the authority contained in the Coastal Act and Title 14, Division 5.5 of the Code of California Regulations (CCR); and adoption of the following amendments to the Seaside General Plan and Seaside Municipal Code:

   A. Adoption of minor text and map amendments to the 2004 Seaside General Plan Land Use Element and Land Use Map to apply a Coastal Zone overlay and to refer to the Seaside Local Coastal Program as modified by the California Coastal Commission for policies and land use regulations within the Seaside Coastal Zone; and

   B. Adoption of an Ordinance approving minor text and map amendments to the Seaside Municipal Code to add Title 18 establishing the modified Local Coastal Program Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP) as the governing Zoning Map, zoning district regulation development standards for all development within the Seaside Coastal Zone; and approving text and map amendments to Title 17 of the Seaside Municipal Code to refer to Title 18 of the Seaside Municipal Code for zoning, allowed uses, and development requirements within the Seaside Coastal Zone.

**Project Description**

The Local Coastal Program (LCP) is a comprehensive long-range planning document prepared by cities and counties for areas within the coastal zone as required by the California Coastal Act of 1976. The Coastal Act is intended to ensure that coastal areas of California are developed in a manner responsive to public objectives. The LCP consists of: 1) Coastal Land Use Plan (LUP) and; 2) a Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP), consisting of zoning ordinance and maps, which together meet the Coastal Act requirements and implement its provisions and policies within the City. The City approved a draft of the LCP on February 3, 2011 and submitted the document to the Coastal Commission for formal review and certification. Recommended modifications (as reviewed by City staff) were made to the LCP and CIP by the Coastal Commission staff and were conditionally approved by the Coastal Commission on December 13, 2012, pursuant to Section 13544 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations. Finally, and certification of the LCP by the Coastal Commission is dependent upon the City Council accepting and agreeing to the recommended modifications to the LCP as conditionally approved by the Coastal Commission. In accordance with the Coastal Act, the City may begin issuing coastal development permits upon final approval and certification of the LCP by the Coastal Commission.

The City of Seaside's Coastal Zone encompasses approximately 237 acres of land that extend from the Pacific Ocean to the terminus of the Canyon Del Rey Creek, and is bounded on the southwest by the City of Monterey and on the northwest by the Pacific Ocean. The City of Sand City and Canyon Del Rey Boulevard border most of the south and east portion of the coastal zone, with the exception of a section of the Highway 1 right-of-way that was located on the former Fort Ord, which is also located within the Coastal Zone.

**Environmental Review**

To address minor modifications made to the Local Coastal Program by the Coastal Commission staff and conditionally approved by the Coastal Commission, the City of Seaside has prepared an Addendum to the previously approved Negative Declaration (November 18, 2010) pursuant to Section 15164 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. The Addendum and previously approved Negative Declaration/Initial Study are available for review in the Planning Division at Seaside City Hall, 440 Harcourt Avenue, Seaside, CA.

**NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN** that the public hearing will be held on **Thursday, February 7, 2013 at 7:00 pm** (or as soon thereafter as the Agenda permits) in the City Council Chambers at City Hall, 440 Harcourt Avenue, Seaside, California. Any and all interested persons are welcome to appear at the hearing and be heard concerning the proposed project. For information on the proposed Local Coastal Program and/or Coastal Implementation Plan and the Addendum to the previously adopted Negative Declaration, contact Rick Medina, Senior Planner, in the Planning Division at (831) 899-6737 or visit [http://www.ci.seaside.ca.us/](http://www.ci.seaside.ca.us/) for the scheduled meeting date.

/S/
Toula Hubbard
City Clerk

Publish no later than Thursday, January 24, 2013
PUBLIC HEARING LEGAL NOTICE

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the City Council of the City of Seaside will conduct a public hearing to consider the following application:

1. **Amendment to the Seaside General Plan and Seaside Municipal Code to adopt a modified City of Seaside Local Coastal Program.** The City of Seaside requests consideration of an Addendum to the previously approved Negative Declaration prepared for the Local Coastal Program (LCP); approval of a modified Local Coastal Program (LCP) prepared pursuant to the authority contained in the Costal Act and Title 14, Division 5.5 of the Code of California Regulations (CCR); and adoption of the following amendments to the Seaside General Plan and Seaside Municipal Code:

   A. Adoption of minor text and map amendments to the 2004 Seaside General Plan Land Use Element and Land Use Map to apply a Coastal Zone overlay and to refer to the Seaside Local Coastal Program as modified by the California Coastal Commission for policies and land use regulations within the Seaside Coastal Zone; and

   B. Adoption of an Ordinance approving minor text and map amendments to the Seaside Municipal Code to add Title 18 establishing the modified Local Coastal Program Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP) as the governing Zoning Map, zoning district regulation development standards for all development within the Seaside Coastal Zone; and approving text and map amendments to Title 17 of the Seaside Municipal Code to refer to Title 18 of the Seaside Municipal Code for zoning, allowed uses, and development requirements within the Seaside Coastal Zone.

**Project Description**

The Local Coastal Program (LCP) is a comprehensive long-range planning document prepared by cities and counties for areas within the coastal zone as required by the California Coastal Act of 1976. The Coastal Act is intended to ensure that coastal areas of California are developed in a manner responsive to public objectives. The LCP consists of a: 1) Coastal Land Use Plan (LUP) and; 2) a Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP), consisting of zoning ordinance and maps, which together meet the Coastal Act requirements and implement its provisions and policies within the City. The City approved a draft of the LCP on February 3, 2011 and submitted the document to the Coastal Commission for formal review and certification. Recommended modifications (as reviewed by City staff) were made to the LCP and CIP by the Coastal Commission staff and were conditionally approved by the Coastal Commission on December 13, 2012, pursuant to Section 13544 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations. Final approval and certification of the LCP by the Coastal Commission is dependent upon the City Council accepting and agreeing to the recommended modifications to the LCP as conditionally approved by the Coastal Commission. In accordance with the Coastal Act, the City may begin issuing coastal development permits upon final approval and certification of the LCP by the Coastal Commission.

The City of Seaside's Coastal Zone encompasses approximately 237 acres of land that extend from the Pacific Ocean to the terminus of the Canyon Del Rey Creek, and is bounded on the southwest by the City of Monterey and on the northwest by the Pacific Ocean. The City of Sand City and Canyon Del Rey Boulevard border most of the south and east portion of the coastal zone, with the exception of a section of the Highway 1 right-of-way that was located on the former Fort Ord, which is also located within the Coastal Zone. Location map of coastal boundaries is shown on Page 3 and Page 4 of notice.
Environmental Review

To address minor modifications made to the Local Coastal Program by the Coastal Commission staff and conditionally approved by the Coastal Commission, the City of Seaside has prepared an Addendum to the previously approved Negative Declaration (November 18, 2010) pursuant to Section 15164 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. The Addendum and previously approved Negative Declaration/Initial Study are available for review in the Planning Division at Seaside City Hall, 440 Harcourt Avenue, Seaside, CA.

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that the public hearing will be held on Thursday, February 7, 2013 at 7:00 pm (or as soon thereafter as the Agenda permits) in the City Council Chambers at City Hall, 440 Harcourt Avenue, Seaside, California. Any and all interested persons are welcome to appear at the hearing and be heard concerning the proposed project. For information on the proposed Local Coastal Program and/or Coastal Implementation Plan and the Addendum to the previously adopted Negative Declaration, contact Rick Medina, Senior Planner, in the Planning Division at (831) 899-6737 or visit http://www.ci.seaside.ca.us/ for the scheduled meeting date.

/S/
Toula Hubbard
City Clerk
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SEASIDE LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM 2013

FORA CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION

City Council Agenda and Staff Report for February 7, 2013
AGENDA

CITY OF SEASIDE
CITY COUNCIL

REGULAR MEETING
440 Harcourt Avenue
Thursday, February 7, 2013
7:00 p.m.

PLEASE TURN OFF YOUR CELL PHONES UPON ENTERING THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS

ITEM

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL – ESTABLISHMENT OF QUORUM

CITY COUNCIL
Ralph Rubio
Ian N. Oglesby
Dennis J. Alexander
Alvin Edwards
David R. Pacheco
Mayor
Mayor Pro Tem
Council Member
Council Member
Council Member

3. INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

4. REVIEW OF AGENDA

If there are any items that arose after the 72-hour posting deadline, this is the point in the meeting where a vote may be taken to add the item to the agenda. [A 2/3-majority vote is required.]

5. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Oral communications provides members of the public an opportunity to address the City Council/Successor Agency on matters within its jurisdiction. At this time any person may comment on any item, which is not on the agenda. Please state your name and address for the record. Action will not be taken on an item that is not on the agenda. If it requires action, it will be referred to staff and/or placed on the next agenda. In order that all interested parties have an opportunity to speak, please limit comments to a maximum of three (3) minutes. Any member of the public may comment on any matter listed on this agenda at the time the matter is being considered by the Members.
6. **PRESENTATIONS**

   A. **RECOGNITION OF MARK MCCLAIN AS MONTEREY BAY CHAPTER OF THE INTERNATIONAL CODE COUNCIL’S 2012 BUILDING OFFICIAL OF THE YEAR**

   PURPOSE: This presentation has been scheduled to recognize the City of Seaside Building Official, Mark McClain, as the Monterey Bay Chapter of International Code Council’s Building Official of the Year for 2012.

   RECOMMENDATION: City Council recognize Mark McClain.

7. **PUBLIC AGENCY COMMENTS**

   *This is a time specifically set aside for representatives of public agencies to make brief comments of general interest to the City Council and the community.*

8. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

   *The Consent Calendar includes routine items that can be approved with a single motion and vote. A member of the City Council/Successor Agency or a member of the public may request that any time be pulled from the Consent Calendar for separate consideration.*

   **A. MINUTES**
   1) December 20, 2013, 7:00 pm, Regular City Council Meeting
   2) January 15, 2013; 7:00 pm, Special City Council Meeting

   RECOMMENDATION: City Council review and approve minutes.

   **B. APPROVE AND FILE CITY CHECKS**

   PURPOSE: It is requested that the City Council approve and file the accounts payable and wired payments made during the period of January 8, 2013 through January 28, 2013. In addition, approval of the payroll and benefits checks, direct deposits and wired payments related to the period of January 10, 2013 and January 24, 2013 is requested. Total Accounts Payable and Payroll for the above referenced period is $1,606,361.03.

   RECOMMENDATION: City Council approve and file the attached checks.

   **C. RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING CHECK SIGNERS FOR ACCOUNTS AT Rabobank, N.A.**

   PURPOSE: City Council review and adopt a resolution authorizing the check signers for the City of Seaside accounts at Rabobank, N.A.

   RECOMMENDATION: City Council adopt resolution.
8. **CONSENT CALENDAR (continued)**

D. **CITY COUNCIL CONSIDER RESOLUTION APPROVING REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETINGS DATES IN 2013 CALENDAR YEAR**

**PURPOSE:** Consider approving regular City Council meeting schedule for 2013 Calendar Year.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Review and consider adopting resolution approving the proposed Regular Meeting schedule for 2013.

E. **CONTRACT AGREEMENT WITH PACIFIC MUNICIPAL CONSULTANTS (PMC) FOR ADMINISTRATION OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM**

**PURPOSE:** Consider entering into a professional services agreement with Pacific Municipal Consultants (PMC) for administration of the City’s Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Adopt resolution authorizing the City Manager to execute a Professional Services Agreement with PMC for an amount not to exceed Twenty-Four Thousand Nine Hundred Fifty Dollars ($24,950).

F. **STATEMENT OF CONSISTENCY OF HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE COUNTY OF MONTEREY ANNUAL PLAN WITH THE CITY OF SEASIDE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG) FIVE-YEAR CONSOLIDATED PLAN (2010-2015)**

**PURPOSE:** Consider adoption of a resolution finding that the Housing Authority of the County of Monterey’s (HACM) Annual Plan is consistent with the City’s CDBG Five-Year Consolidated Plan (2010-2015) (Consolidated Plan). A Statement of Consistency is required as part of HACM’s submission of it Annual Plan to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

**RECOMMENDATION:** Adopt the attached resolution finding HACM’s Annual Plan to be consistent with the Consolidated Plan and authorizing the City Manager to execute a Statement of Consistency for submission to HUD with HACM’s Annual Plan.

G. **AUTHORIZE THE FIRE CHIEF TO FILE AN ADDENDUM TO THE SAFER GRANT AWARDED ON APRIL 7, 2011 FOR THE PURPOSE OF EXTENDING THE PERFORMANCE PERIOD UNTIL DECEMBER 6, 2013.**

**PURPOSE:** The performance period for the FEMA FY 2010 Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response (SAFER) Grant is April 7, 2011 to April 6, 2013. It is estimated that on April 6, 2013 the balance of grant funds available will be $204,208.75. By filing an amendment we are asking for approval to expend the balance of funds thereby extending the performance period until December 6, 2013.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Authorize the Fire Chief to file an addendum to the SAFER Grant awarded on April 7, 2011, for the purpose of extending the performance period until December 6, 2013.
9. BUSINESS ITEMS

A. FOLLOW UP PERTAINING TO THE JANUARY 15, 2013 CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM NO. 8A, REGARDING THE CONTRACT FOR SHARED SERVICES WITH THE CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE AND THE CITY OF SEASIDE.

PURPOSE: Provide additional information to the City Council, pertaining to the January 15, 2013 City Council Agenda Item No. 8A, regarding the contract for Shared Services with the City of Pacific Grove and the City of Seaside, as requested.

RECOMMENDATION: City Council authorize the City Manager to enter into an agreement with the City of Pacific Grove for expanding Shared Police Services with the City of Pacific Grove.

B. CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENT TO CONTRACT FOR SHARING SERGEANT SERVICES WITH THE CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE

PURPOSE: Authorize the City Manager to enter into an agreement with the City of Pacific Grove to contract for Seaside Law Enforcement Sergeants to provide first line supervisor services in the City of Pacific Grove, effective February 9, 2013.

RECOMMENDATION: Consider contract for shared police services and consider adopting resolution.

C. MONTEREY PENINSULA REGIONAL WATER AUTHORITY (MPRWA) ADDITIONAL FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTION

PURPOSE: Consider approval of the additional financial contribution to support the City’s participation in the Monterey Peninsula Regional Water Authority.

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended that the City Council approve the City’s additional financial contribution based on the increased Budget for the Monterey Peninsula Regional Water Authority.

D. CONSIDERATION OF A RESOLUTION ADOPTING FEES AND FINES RELATED TO THE ABANDONED RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY REGISTRATION ORDINANCE, THE ADMINISTRATIVE CITATIONS ORDINANCE AND PLAN REVIEW AND BUILDING PERMIT RENEWALS

PURPOSE: Consider adoption of fees and fines for the Abandoned Residential Property Registration Ordinance (SMC Chapter 8.29), the Administrative Citations Ordinance (SMC Chapter 2.56) that the City Council adopted on February 17, 2011 and Building Code Adoption (SMC Chapter 15.04), specifically plan review and building permit renewal fees adopted on March 17, 2011.

RECOMMENDATION: Adopt resolution approving proposed fees and fines.
10. PUBLIC HEARING

A. CONSIDERATION AND ADOPTION OF THE CITY OF SEASIDE’S LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM AND CORRESPONDING AMENDMENTS TO THE SEASIDE GENERAL PLAN AND SEASIDE MUNICIPAL CODE [FIRST READING]

PURPOSE: Provide the City Council with an opportunity to review and consider adoption of the California Coastal Commission’s (CCC) recommended modifications to the City of Seaside’s Local Coastal Program (LCP) and the adoption of corresponding amendments to the Seaside General Plan Land Use Map and the Seaside Municipal Code (SMC) for the implementation of the Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP) to be included as Title 18 to the SMC.

RECOMMENDATION: Receive a presentation and hear public testimony in its consideration of the following actions:

1). Adopt a resolution approving an Addendum to the Negative Declaration that was previously adopted by the City Council for the Local Costal Program on November 18, 2010, and,

2). Introduce first reading of an ordinance amending the Seaside General Plan and Seaside Municipal Code (SMC) to implement the policies and land use designations of the Local Coastal Program (LCP) through the adoption of a Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP).

3). Adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager to submit a certified copy of the Addendum to the previously adopted Negative Declaration and the ordinance amending the Seaside General Plan and Seaside Municipal Code (SMC) to implement the policies and land use designations of the modified Local Coastal Program (LCP) to the California Coastal Commission for final approval and certification.

11. MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL COMMENTS AND REPORTS ON COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

This is a time specifically set aside for members of the City Council, the City Manager and City Attorney to make brief comments of general interest to the community, make requests that items be added to future City Council meeting agendas as necessary and report on committee assignments.

12. ADJOURNMENT

Next Regularly Scheduled Meeting
February 21, 2013
Seaside City Hall
7:00 p.m. [Regular Meeting]
CITY OF SEASIDE
STAFF REPORT

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council

FROM: John Dunn, City Manager

BY: Diana Ingersoll, Deputy City Manager - Resource Management Services
    Lisa Brinton, Community and Economic Development Services Manager
    Rick Medina, Senior Planner

DATE: February 7, 2013

SUBJECT: CONSIDERATION AND ADOPTION OF THE CITY OF SEASIDE’S LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM AND CORRESPONDING AMENDMENTS TO THE SEASIDE GENERAL PLAN AND SEASIDE MUNICIPAL CODE [FIRST READING]

PURPOSE

The purpose of this item is to provide the City Council with an opportunity to review and consider adoption of the California Coastal Commission’s (CCC) recommended modifications to the City of Seaside’s Local Coastal Program (LCP) and the adoption of corresponding amendments to the Seaside General Plan Land Use Map and the Seaside Municipal Code (SMC) for the implementation of the Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP) to be included as Title 18 to the SMC..

RECOMMENDATION

It is requested that the City Council receive a presentation and hear public testimony in its consideration of the following actions:

1) Adopt a resolution approving an Addendum to the Negative Declaration that was previously adopted by the City Council for the Local Costal Program on November 18, 2010 (Exhibit “A”), and,

2) Introduce first reading of an ordinance (Exhibit “B”) amending the Seaside General Plan and Seaside Municipal Code (SMC) to implement the policies and land use designations of the Local Coastal Program (LCP) through the adoption of a Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP).

3) Adopt a resolution (Exhibit “C”) authorizing the City Manager to submit a certified copy of the Addendum to the previously adopted Negative Declaration and the ordinance amending the Seaside General Plan and Seaside Municipal Code (SMC) to implement the policies and land use designations of the modified Local Coastal Program (LCP) to the California Coastal Commission for final approval and certification.
BACKGROUND

Local Coastal Program

The City of Seaside is mandated by the California Coastal Act of 1976 to prepare a Local Coastal Program (LCP) for the area of the City that lies within its coastal zone boundary. The City of Seaside’s coastal zone encompasses approximately 237 acres of land as shown in Exhibit “F”. The LCP is the contract between the City and the State specifying how the City will protect California’s coastal resources. The LCP consists of two major parts: The Land Use Plan (LUP) and the Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP).

For the past four years, the City has been working with Pacific Municipal Consultants (PMC), Planning Consultant, and the California Coastal Commission (CCC) to obtain local permit authority in Seaside’s coastal zone through the adoption of a certified LCP. In February 2011, the City Council adopted an Ordinance approving an LCP for the City of Seaside and authorized the City Manager to submit certified copies of the LCP and implementing Ordinance amending the Seaside General Plan and Seaside Municipal Code (SMC) to the CCC for its review and certification. Certified copies of the LCP were submitted to the CCC in June 2011. Minor modifications were made to the LCP and additional requested information was submitted to CCC staff in October 2011. The application was accepted as complete by CCC staff in March 2012.

As part of the CCC staff’s review of the LCP, modifications were made to the LCP by CCC staff to strengthen its consistency with the California Coastal Act and enhance its protection of public resources. The LCP with the CCC staff recommended modifications went before the Commission on December 13, 2012, where the Commission unanimously approved the LCP with the modifications. The LCP with the Coastal Commission modifications noted in strikeout for text that was removed and an underline for text that was added was included as an exhibit to the CCC staff report for the December 13, 2012 California Coastal Commission meeting and is provided as Exhibit “H”.

A copy of the LCP with the recommended modifications incorporated is included as Exhibit “I”. An Addendum (Exhibit “D”) to the previously adopted Negative Declaration has been prepared to address the modifications that have been made to the LCP pursuant to Section 15164 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

On January 9, 2013, the Planning Commission considered the Addendum to the previously adopted Negative Declaration for the update to the LCP and the revised LCP in accordance with the modifications that were made to the LCP by the CCC on December 13, 2012. The Commission voted unanimously to recommend that the City Council approve the Addendum and adopt an Ordinance amending the Seaside General Plan to include the coastal zone designations as an overlay on the land use map and the SMC to adopt the revised LCP and incorporate the CIP as Title 18 of the SMC.

The LCP as modified will not become effective for implementation until the City, by action of the City Council: (a) acknowledges receipt of the suggested modifications to the LCP by the CCC; (b) accepts and agrees to the modifications and takes whatever formal action is required to
satisfy the modifications (e.g., implementation of ordinances); (c) agrees to issue coastal development permits subject to the approved modifications. The Coastal Act requires that the City’s adoption of the suggested modifications be completed within six months of the Coastal Commission’s action.

Local Permitting

With a certified LCP, the City of Seaside would then assume the responsibility for issuing coastal development permits (CDPs) for development within the coastal zone. In authorizing coastal development permits, the City must make a finding that the proposed development conforms to the certified LCP. Consistent with the provisions of the Coastal Act, the CCC will retain original permit jurisdiction over certain specified lands, such as any submerged lands, tidelands and public trust land. The CCC will also retain the authority to hear appeals of the City’s CDP decisions, review and approve any amendments to the certified LCP, and review the LCP at least every five years to ensure proper implementation and continued compliance with the Coastal Act. The LCP may be amended in accordance with California Code of Regulations and Public Resources Code.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

On August 5, 2010, a Notice of Intent to adopt a Negative Declaration for the LCP was distributed for public review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. Since the Negative Declaration was adopted, the CCC has recommended additional modifications to the LCP. The revisions were determined not to result in any new significant impacts nor result in any substantial increase in the severity of previously analyzed effects that would result in any new or additional mitigation measures being warranted. Conversely, the LCP modifications serve to strengthen the environmental protection policies of the LCP. Therefore, staff determined that the Addendum provides sufficient documentation and analysis of the changes to the LCP so as to not require the preparation of a subsequent Negative Declaration consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(1). The Addendum is provided for the City Council’s consideration as Exhibit “D”. The previously adopted Negative Declaration is provided as Exhibit “E”. In accordance with the Section 15164(d) of the CEQA Guidelines, the City Council shall consider the Addendum together with the adopted negative declaration prior to making its decision on the approval of the modified LCP.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The modified LCP would update the 1983 LUP of the City of Seaside (certified by the California Coastal Commission on October 12, 1983), and provide regulations and development standards (CIP) to implement the land use plan. These two components taken together constitute the LCP. The LCP applies to the City of Seaside coastal zone area as illustrated in Exhibit “F”.

CCC staff recommended modifications to the LCP during the LCP Amendment Application process. The recommended modifications will serve to:

- strengthen the consistency of the LCP goals, polices, and land use designations with the California Coastal Act and the City’s General Plan,
• corrects minor typographical errors, incorporates applicable sections of referenced City documents (i.e. Seaside General Plan, Seaside Municipal Code, Local Biological Program and Surveys), and
• updates the City of Seaside’s coastal zone boundaries to reflect the Mello Act and to include existing Highway 1 right-of-way in the City of Seaside on the former Fort Ord. Modifications to the LCP are described in detail in the CCC staff report for the December 13, 2012 California Coastal Commission hearing, which is included as Exhibit “H”. Key modifications are summarized below.

Boundary Modifications

The boundaries were modified to reflect the Mello Act and to include existing Highway 1 right-of-way that is within the coastal zone along the former Fort Ord as shown in Exhibit “F” and LUP Figures 1-2a and 1-2b. These modifications resulted in an increase in land area within the Laguna Grande Subarea (+3.17 acres) and a decrease in land area within the Del Monte Subarea (-2.82 acres) for a net increase of 0.35 acres. In addition, approximately 146 acres of Highway 1 right-of-way was added to the north. A summary of the changes in subarea acreages as a result of the boundary modifications is provided in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subareas</th>
<th>Original LCP</th>
<th>Revised LCP</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Grande</td>
<td>42.45</td>
<td>45.62</td>
<td>+3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts Lake</td>
<td>22.26</td>
<td>22.26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach</td>
<td>17.46</td>
<td>17.46</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Monte</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>-2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>90.96</td>
<td>91.31</td>
<td>+0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added CTC North</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>146.16</td>
<td>+146.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90.96</td>
<td>237.47</td>
<td>+146.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the boundaries of the City’s territory within the coastal zone were discussed and reviewed with CCC staff on numerous occasions during the preparation of the LCP document, the comments regarding boundary adjustment were not presented to the City staff by the CCC staff until July 2012.

Land Use Modifications

Land uses were modified to provide a distinct separation between the coastal boundaries of the community and areas of the community located outside of the coastal boundaries.
Modifications to the LCP revised the layout of land uses as shown in Exhibit "C" and are also included visually as LUP Figures 2-10a and 2-10b. These modifications resulted in the proposed addition of the following Coastal Zone land use designations to the LCP: Coastal Transportation Corridor (CTC) (158.54 acres); Coastal Regional Commercial (CCRG) (1.64 acres); and Coastal Heavy Commercial (CCH) (0.98 acres). In addition, the amount of land designated for Coastal Parks and Open Space (CPOS) and Coastal Visitor-Serving Recreation (CVSR) land uses increased, while the amount of land designated for Coastal Visitor-Serving Commercial (CVSC) and Coastal Mixed Use/West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (CMX/WBUVSP) land uses decreased. A summary of the changes to land use designation acreages is provided in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Designations</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Original LCP</td>
<td>Revised LCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Parks and Open Space (CPOS)</td>
<td>57.05</td>
<td>59.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Visitor-Serving Commercial (CVSC)</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Visitor-Serving Recreation (CVSR)</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Heavy Commercial (CCH)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Regional Commercial (CCRG)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Transportation Corridor (CTC)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>158.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Mixed Use/West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (CMX/WBUVSP)</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Land Use Plan Policy Modifications**

Modifications made to LUP policies provide for broad protection of natural resource areas, coastal resources, visual resources, water supply, and water quality; reduce risks associated with natural hazards; provide for public access and parks; and provide more specific general permit considerations for land use development. The boundary revisions expanded the area subject to LUP policies. The modifications to the policies are generally described below.

- **Hazards** - Additional policies are proposed to address threats from tsunami, require analysis of wave uprush/shoreline erosion in new development, and to refine outfall maintenance provisions.

- **Water Quality** - Policies were modified to effectively address new Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) requirements associated with the pending update to the statewide Phase II Storm Water Permit.

- **Land Use** - Suggested modifications refined density/intensity and setback standards in order to adequately buffer adjacent resources to ensure they are protected.
• Public Access and Recreation - Modifications increased hours of available parking, consolidated and, where feasible, eliminated storm water outfalls on area beaches, and to protect lower-cost visitor opportunities.

• Transportation and Circulation - Modifications addressed transportation capacities, to protect the former railroad right-of-way for the specific purpose of re-establishing light rail service and multi-modal transportation options (trails, etc.), to encourage alternative forms of transportation (e.g., hiking and biking), to require adequate parking and circulation in all new development, and to provide for maintenance and repair of existing transportation facilities in Seaside.

• Public Services - Modifications protect coastal priority uses, to ensure that adequate long-term and sustainable water supplies are available for development, and to ensure that water services are publicly managed.

• Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA) - Modifications provide additional detail for addressing cumulative impacts and appropriate acreage replacement ratios for unavoidable direct impacts.

• Cultural Resources – Modifications round out archaeological protections.

• Visual Resources – Modifications refine protected views, particularly related to primary view corridors associated with Highway 1 and the City’s lakes.

These policy modifications are described in detail within the CCC staff report for the December 13, 2012 hearing, which is included as Exhibit “H”.

Coastal Implementation Plan Modifications

Modifications to the CIP included incorporating large referenced sections of the Seaside Municipal Code into the document (i.e., parking standards, sign standards) and making revisions to ensure consistency with the LUP as modified. These modifications included coastal staff’s recommended revisions to the development standards which are described in detail within the CCC staff report for the December 13, 2012 hearing, which is included as Exhibit “H”.

The LCP as modified resulted in a stream-lined, user-friendly document that is consistent with current local and state policy.

STAFF ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Statutory Requirements of a Local Coastal Plan
The California Coastal Act of 1976 requires that each coastal city and county prepare a LCP that establishes the kind, location, and intensity of land and water uses appropriate to its portion of the coastal zone. The LCP must be adopted by the City, then be reviewed and approved (certified) by the California Coastal Commission (CCC).

Required Contents
This LCP has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of California Coastal Act (PRC 3000 et. seq.). As prescribed by law, the LCP includes (a) land use plans, (b) zoning ordinances, (c) zoning district maps, and (d) within sensitive coastal resource areas, other implementing actions, which, when taken together, meet the requirements of, and implement the provisions and policies of the California Coastal Act (PRC 30108.6).

The precise content of each local coastal program shall be determined by the local government, consistent with Section 30501, in full consultation with the commission and with full public participation. (Coastal Act Section 30500 (c))

As prescribed by law, the proposed LCP includes the following:

- Written policies that provide direction for decision-makers, property owners, and the public regarding the types and intensities of land uses that are most suited to each coastal area and a land use map that shows generally the uses that are appropriate in each area. (LUP).

- Relevant portions of the local government’s zoning code, which regulates land uses, provides zoning maps that show which zoning rules apply to each area and the procedural requirements that govern which types of projects require a coastal permit, describe how a coastal permit can be obtained, and the outlines the opportunities for public participation in coastal permit review (CIP).

**Adopted Local Coastal Program Conformance**

The LCP as modified would provide greater clarification as to the location and intent of the City’s Coastal Districts and greater consistency with actual on-the-ground conditions. The proposed land use plan would result in an overall de-intensification of land uses around Roberts Lake, Laguna Grande Lake and the Beach subareas. Specifically:

**Zoning Ordinance Conformance**

**Existing**: Open Space –Recreation (OSR) and Regional Commercial (CRG) with Coastal Zone (CZ) overlay; **Proposed**: Coastal Parks and Open Space (CPOS), Coastal Visitor Serving Commercial (CVSC), Coastal Visitor Serving Recreation (CVSR), Coastal Regional Commercial (CCRG), Coastal Heavy Commercial (CCH), Coastal Mixed-Use/West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (CMX/WBUVSP).

The proposed CIP would be the zoning ordinance for the proposed land use plan. Certification of the LCP would replace 17.24.070 - CRG Coastal Zone Standards and 17.28.030 - Coastal Zone (CZ) Overlay Zone with the proposed CIP (Title 18).

Implementation actions would require minor modifications to the City of Seaside Zoning Ordinance (Title 17 of the Seaside Municipal Code) to identify Title 18 as the zoning code for areas within the coastal zone.
Seaside General Plan Conformance

Existing: Park and Open Space (POS) and Regional Commercial (RGC); Proposed: Coastal Parks and Open Space (CPOS), Coastal Visitor Serving Commercial (CVSC), a Coastal Visitor Serving Recreation (CVSR), Coastal Regional Commercial (CCRG), Coastal Heavy Commercial (CCH), Coastal Mixed-Use/West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (CMX/WBUVSP).

Land use designations have been updated to be consistent with the City’s 2004 General Plan. The LUP establishes land use designations, general development criteria and policies that regulate development in the Coastal Zone. The City’s General Plan and the Land Use Element, in particular, may contain more precise development limits for specific properties. Should a conflict exist, the land use intensity that is most protective of coastal resources shall take precedence. However, in no case shall the policies of the LUP be interpreted to allow a development to exceed a development limit established by the General Plan or its implementing ordinances. Implementation actions would require minor modifications to the City of Seaside General Plan. It is noted that amendments to a local general plan for the purpose of developing a certified local coastal program shall not constitute an amendment of a general plan for purposes of Section 65358 of the Government Code (frequency limited to 4 times a year) (Section 30500, Coastal Act 2009 update).

PUBLIC NOTICE
A notice of the proposed action was published in the Monterey County Weekly on Thursday, January 24, 2013, a minimum of ten (10) days in advance of this hearing consistent with the Municipal Code. The notice was also posted at various locations within the City’s Coastal boundaries and at designated posted locations within the City a minimum of ten (10) days prior to the public hearing. Additionally, a notice was sent via email to the municipal jurisdictions that abut the City’s coastal boundaries and mailed to adjacent property owners on Thursday, January 24, 2013 a minimum of ten (10) days prior to the public hearing.

RECOMMENDATION
The LCP, as modified, complies with the intent of the Seaside General Plan, requirements of Title 17 of the Seaside Municipal Code, and the California Coastal Act of 1976, as amended. Based on the analysis, staff recommends that the City Council take action to approve the Addendum to the previously adopted Negative Declaration, introduce the first reading of an Ordinance amending the Seaside General Plan Land Use designations and Seaside Municipal Code to implement the policies and land use regulations of the proposed Local Coastal Program (LCP), and adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager to submit certified copies of the Addendum and implementing ordinance for the LCP to the CCC for final approval and certification.

NEXT STEPS
If the City Council approves the Addendum to the Negative Declaration and accepts and agrees to the modifications made to the LCP per the recommendations of the CCC (with modification and official map), the City will then submit an application to the Fort Ord Reuse Authority to receive a consistency determination for the proposed amendment to the Seaside General Plan
Land Use Map and the FORA Land Use Map to identify the portion of the Highway 1 right-of-way that lies within the City's coastal zone boundary as Coastal Transportation Corridor (CTC). Upon receiving the determination of consistency from the FORA board, the modified LCP will be submitted to the CCC for final certification.

Upon certification of the LCP and Map, the City will have coastal permit authority over its lands within the City of Seaside Coastal Zone.

ATTACHMENTS

Exhibit “A”:
Resolution recommending that the City Council adopt the Addendum to the approved Negative Declaration for the proposed update to the Local Coastal Program; and

Exhibit “B”:
Draft Ordinance to amend the Seaside Municipal Code and General Plan Land Use Map to implement the policies and land use regulations for the Seaside Local Coastal Program as modified and conditionally approved by the California Coastal Commission.

Exhibit “C”:
Resolution recommending that the City Council formally accept and agree to the suggested modifications made to the LCP by the California Coastal Commission for the adoption of a Local Coastal Program.

Exhibit “D”:
Addendum to the previously adopted Negative Declaration/Initial Study (Click to access document)

Exhibit “E”:
Previously adopted Negative Declaration - November 18, 2010 (Click to access document)

Exhibit “F”:
Coastal Zone Area and Subarea Map as modified (Click to access document)

Exhibit “G”:
Coastal Zone Land Use Designations as modified (Click to access document)

Exhibit “H”:
Coastal Commission Staff Report for the December 13, 2013 Coastal Commission meeting (Click to access document)

Exhibit “T”:
Seaside Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan and Coastal Implementation Plan as modified. (Click to access document)

Reviewed for Submission to the City Council by:

John Dunn, City Manager
SEASIDE LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM 2013

FORA CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION

City Council Resolution No. 2013-12 adopting Addendum to previously adopted Negative Declaration
RESOLUTION NO. 2013-12

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SEASIDE,
STATE OF CALIFORNIA, APPROVING AN ADDENDUM TO A
PREVIOUSLY APPROVED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE CITY
OF SEASIDE LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the City of Seaside has circulated a proposed Negative Declaration for
the City of Seaside Local Coastal Program (LCP); and

WHEREAS, the preparation of the LCP is intended to protect and enhance the
resources of the coastal zone, consistent with the goals of the California Coastal Act, as well
as the expressed goals of the citizenry; and

WHEREAS, on August 5, 2010, a notice of availability of the proposed LCP
Update was provided pursuant to Section 13515(e) of the California Code of Regulations,
mailed to all property owners located within 300 feet from the City of Seaside Coastal
Zone Boundary, published in the Monterey Weekly, and posted at locations within the
Coastal Zone Area; and

WHEREAS, a total of six written comment letters were received in response to the
Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration and have been entered into the public
record; and

WHEREAS, the Seaside Planning Commission considered oral comments and
written information concerning the proposed Negative Declaration at a duly noticed public
hearing held on October 13, 2010 and recommended that the City Council adopt a Negative
Declaration for the Update to the LCP; and

WHEREAS, the City Council considered oral comments and written information
concerning the proposed Negative Declaration and adopted the Negative Declaration at a
duly noticed public hearing held on November 18, 2010 (Resolution 10-70); and

WHEREAS, the City adopted the proposed LCP Update and authorized the City
Manager to submit certified copies of the LCP and implementing Ordinance amending the
Seaside Municipal codes to the California Coastal Commission at a duly noticed public
hearing held on February 3, 2011 (Resolution 11-08); and

WHEREAS, the City Council adopted the Coastal Implementation Program of the
local coastal program as Title 18 of the Seaside Municipal Code at a duly noticed public
hearing held on February 3, 2011 (Ordinance 994); and

WHEREAS, as part of the California Coastal Commission staff’s review of the
LCP modifications were made to the LCP by the Coastal Commission staff to strengthen
its consistency with the California Coastal Act; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 13544 of the Title 14 of the California Code of
Regulations, the LCP with the recommended modifications was approved by the
California Coastal Commission board on December 13, 2012; and
WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 15164 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, the City of Seaside has prepared an Addendum to the previously approved Negative Declaration to address the minor modifications that have been to the modified LCP; and

WHEREAS, at a duly noticed public hearing held on January 9, 2013, the Seaside Planning Commission considered the Addendum that has been prepared to the previously adopted Negative Declaration to address the minor modifications made by the Coastal Commission to the City of Seaside LCP and recommended that the City Council consider the Addendum to the previously approved Negative Declaration and adopt findings approving the Addendum; and

WHEREAS, it is the responsibility of the City Council to consider and weigh the merits of the application and public input in relation to the policies, standards and intent of the Seaside General Plan and Seaside Municipal Code in making its decision on the Addendum to the previously approved Negative Declaration and modifications to the LCP; and

WHEREAS, the City Council considered oral comments and written information concerning the proposed Addendum to the previously approved Negative Declaration and modified LCP at a duly noticed public hearing held on February 7, 2013; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the City Council adopts the following findings in support of its action to adopt the Addendum to the LCP as modified and conditionally approved by the California Coastal Commission:

1) The California Coastal Act requires coastal communities to manage the conservation and development of coastal resources through a comprehensive planning and regulatory program called the Local Coastal Program.

2) The preparation of the LCP is necessary to comply with the Coastal Act and transfer coastal development permitting authority from the Coastal Commission to the City of Seaside.

3) The certification of the LCP is necessary to ensure that scenic and visual qualities of the coastal areas shall be considered and protected as a resource of public importance and that development shall be designed and sited to preserve views to and along the scenic coastal areas, to minimize the alteration of natural land forms, to be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas, and, where feasible, restore and enhance visual quality in visually degraded areas.

4) The impacts of new development on water quality can be minimized through the use of best management practices in the design, construction, and use of that development.
5) The LCP will serve to: 1) preserve existing open space within the coastal zone boundary for the protection of significant environmental resources; 2) provide for avoidance of geologic, fire, and flood hazards; 3) provide for the preservation of watersheds and viewsheds; 4) enable the provision of public recreation; and 5) access to the communities designated coastal resources and open space areas.

6) The Addendum to the adopted Negative Declaration for the modified LCP found no new or any significant impacts which may result from the modifications made to the LCP.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, based on aforementioned findings, the City Council hereby determines that the Addendum to the previously adopted Negative declaration provides sufficient documentation and analysis of the modifications made by the Coastal Commission to the LCP consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(1) and conditionally approved by the California Coastal Commission on December 13, 2012, attached to the February 7, 2013 City Council Staff Report as Exhibit “T” and herein incorporated by reference, and authorizes the City Manager to submit to the Addendum to the California Coastal Commission for final approval and certification with the modified LCP.

Evidence: The Addendum to the adopted Negative Declaration for the Seaside Local Coastal Program dated December 27, 2012, provided as Exhibit “D” to the February 7, 2013 City Council staff report and herein incorporated by reference, will not create any new significant noise, traffic, or other conditions or situations that may be objectionable or detrimental to other permitted uses in the vicinity or adverse to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or welfare of the City.

PASSED AND ADOPTED at the regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Seaside, State of California, duly held on the 7th day of February, 2013, by the following vote:

AYES: CITY COUNCIL: Rubio, Pacheco, Edwards and Alexander
NOES: CITY COUNCIL: None
ABSENT: CITY COUNCIL: Oglesby
ABSTAIN: CITY COUNCIL: None

Ralph Rubio, Honorable Mayor
City of Seaside

Dimitria M. Hubbard, City Clerk
SEASIDE LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM 2013

FORA CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION

City Council Agenda and Staff Report for February 21, 2013
AGENDA

CITY OF SEASIDE
CITY COUNCIL
SUCCESSOR AGENCY TO THE
REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

SPECIAL MEETING
440 Harcourt Avenue
Thursday, February 21, 2013
6:00 p.m.

PLEASE TURN OFF YOUR CELL PHONES UPON ENTERING THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL – ESTABLISHMENT OF QUORUM

CITY COUNCIL
Ralph Rubio Mayor
Ian N. Oglesby Mayor Pro Tem
Dennis J. Alexander Council Member
Alvin Edwards Council Member
David R. Pacheco Council Member

AGENCY BOARD
Ralph Rubio Chair
Ian N. Oglesby Vice Chair
Dennis J. Alexander Agency Member
Alvin Edwards Agency Member
David R. Pacheco Agency Member

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
4. **CLOSED SESSION**

As permitted by Government Code Section 54956 et seq., the (City Council, Airport Commissioners, Marina Abrams B Non-Profit Corporation, and Redevelopment Agency Members) may adjourn to a Closed or Executive Session to consider specific matters dealing with litigation, certain personnel matters, property negotiations or to confer with the City's Meyers-Millas-Brown Act representative.

A. **PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE 54957.6 – CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATORS**

Agency Negotiators: Daphne Hodgson, Deputy City Manager – Administrative Services; Vicki Myers, Chief of Police; Roberta Greathouse, Personnel Services Manager; Donna Williamson, Legal Counsel

Employee Organizations:
1. Seaside Management Employees and Supervisors Association (SMESA)
2. Seaside Police Officers Association (POA)
3. Seaside City Employees Association (LIUNA)
4. Seaside Public Safety Management Association (SPSMA)

Agency Negotiator: John Dunn, Interim City Manager

Unrepresented Employees:
1. Confidential Exempt
2. Confidential Non-Exempt
3. Executive Management Employees

B. **Conference with Legal Counsel - Existing Litigation**

Pursuant to California Government Code Section 54956.9 (a)

1. City of Seaside v. City of Sand City et al. Monterey County Superior Court Case No. M120996

C. **Conference with Property Negotiators - Pursuant to California Government Code Section 54956.8**

1. Property: 1 McClure Way
   Negotiating Party: David Beckham, Seaside Resort Development, LLC
   Negotiator(s): John Dunn, Executive Director
   Terms: Price and/or Terms of Payment

5. **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

Oral communications provides members of the public an opportunity to address the City Council/Successor Agency on matters within its jurisdiction. At this time any person may comment on any item, which is not on the agenda. Please state your name and address for the record. Action will not be taken on an item that is not on the agenda. If it requires action, it will be referred to staff and/or placed on the next agenda. In order that all interested parties have an opportunity to speak, please limit comments to a maximum of three (3) minutes. Any member of the public may comment on any matter listed on this agenda at the time the matter is being considered by the Members.
6. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

The Consent Calendar includes routine items that can be approved with a single motion and vote. A member of the City Council/Successor Agency or a member of the public may request that any time be pulled from the Consent Calendar for separate consideration.

**A. MINUTES**

1. February 7, 2013; 5:30 pm, Special Successor Agency/City Council Meeting
2. January 14, 2013; 3:00 pm, Special City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION: Approve minutes.

**B. APPROVE AND FILE AGENCY CHECKS**

PURPOSE: Agency Board approve and file the accounts payable and wired payments made during the period of January 29, 2013 through February 11, 2013. In addition, approval of the payroll and benefits checks, direct deposits and wired payments related to the period of February 7, 2013 is requested. Total Accounts Payable and Payroll for the above referenced period is $15,492.78.

RECOMMENDATION: Approve and file the attached checks.

7. **ADJOURNMENT**

Next Regularly Scheduled City Council Meeting
Thursday, March 7, 2013
Seaside City Hall
7:00 p.m.

*City Council/Successor Agency/Oversight Board meetings held in the City Council Chambers are broadcast live to all Seaside residents who subscribe to Comcast cable television service on Channel 25 as well as to U-verse subscribers on Channel 99 on the date and time of the scheduled meeting. Meetings are also available through live streaming at: http://cyp.telvue.com/player?id=701629&video=52314&noplayskin=1&width=400&height=300

Meeting videos are also available on demand through the City’s website: http://www.ci.seaside.ca.us/index.aspx?page=358. Video on Demand is generally available starting the Monday following the meeting date.

Pursuant to the City of Seaside’s Ordinance No. 538, except by affirmative majority vote of the City Council, no agenda items shall be taken up after ten-thirty p.m.*
CITY OF SEASIDE
STAFF REPORT

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council
FROM: John Dunn, City Manager
BY: Diana Ingersoll, Deputy City Manager - Resource Management Services
    Lisa Brinton, Community and Economic Development Services Manager
    Rick Medina, Senior Planner

DATE: February 21, 2013

SUBJECT: ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE CITY OF SEASIDE
LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM UPDATE AND AN ORDINANCE FOR
THE ADOPTION OF AMENDMENTS TO THE SEASIDE GENERAL
PLAN AND SEASIDE MUNICIPAL CODE FOR THE INCORPORATION
OF THE COASTAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN INTO THE SEASIDE
MUNICIPAL CODE [SECOND READING]

PURPOSE

The purpose of this item is for the City Council to:

1. Adopt a Resolution accepting modifications made by the California Costal Commission
   (CCC) to the City of Seaside’s Local Coastal Program (LCP) and authorizing the City
   Manager to submit certified copies of the modified LCP and implementing Ordinance
   amending the Seaside General Plan and Seaside Municipal Code associated with the
   approval of the LCP to the CCC for certification; and

2. Adopt an Ordinance approving a map amendment to the Land Use Element of the
   Seaside General Plan to include the land use designations of the LCP as an overlay on the
   land use map and approving text and map amendments to the Seaside Municipal Code to
   include the land use regulations and Zoning Map of the Coastal Implementation Program
   as Title 18 of the Seaside Municipal Code (SMC) as was introduced by the City Council
   on February 7, 2013.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the City Council hold its second reading on the proposed Ordinance, hear
public testimony, and take the following actions on the approval of the modified LCP and the
proposed amendments that must occur to the Seaside General Plan and Seaside Municipal Code
in connection with the approval of the LCP:
1) Adopt a resolution (Exhibit “A”) accepting modifications made by the California Coastal Commission to the City of Seaside’s Local Coastal Program (LCP) and authorizing the City Manager to submit to the CCC a certified copy of the modified Local Coastal Program (LCP) for final approval and certification.

2) Adopt an Ordinance (Exhibit “B”) amending the Seaside General Plan Land Use Map to include the land use designations of the LCP as an overlay on the land use map and adopting text and map amendments to the Seaside Municipal Code (SMC) to include the policies and land use designations of the Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP) of the LCP as Title 18 of the Seaside Municipal Code (SMC).

BACKGROUND

At their February 7, 2013 meeting, the City Council introduced the proposed Ordinance, heard public testimony and adopted the Addendum to the adopted Negative Declaration. This item is now being considered for a second reading and adoption of a resolution (Exhibit “A”) accepting modifications made by the California Coastal Commission to the City of Seaside’s Local Coastal Program (LCP) and an Ordinance (Exhibit “B”) amending the Seaside General Plan Land Use Map.

Local Coastal Program

The City of Seaside is mandated by the California Coastal Act of 1976 to prepare a Local Coastal Program (LCP) for the area of the City that lies within its coastal zone boundary. The City of Seaside’s coastal zone encompasses approximately 237 acres of land as shown in Exhibit “D”. The LCP is the contract between the City and the State specifying how the City will protect California’s coastal resources. The LCP consists of two major parts: The Land Use Plan (LUP) and the Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP).

For the past four years, the City has been working with Pacific Municipal Consultants (PMC), Planning Consultant, and the California Coastal Commission to obtain local permit authority in Seaside’s coastal zone through the adoption of a certified LCP. In February 2011, the City Council adopted an Ordinance approving a LCP for the City of Seaside and authorized the City Manager to submit certified copies of the LCP and implementing Ordinance amending the Seaside General Plan and Municipal Code to the Coastal Commission for its review and certification. Certified copies of the LCP were submitted to the Coastal Commission in June 2011. Minor modifications were made to the LCP and additional requested information was submitted to California Coastal Commission staff in October 2011. The application was accepted as complete by California Coastal Commission staff in March 2012.

As part of the California Coastal Commission staff’s review of the LCP, modifications were made to the LCP by Coastal Commission staff to strengthen its consistency with the California Coastal Act and enhance its protection of public resources. The LCP with the CCC staff recommended modifications went before the Commission on December 13, 2012, where the Commission unanimously approved the LCP with the modifications. The LCP with the Coastal Commission modifications noted in strikeout for text that was removed and an underline for text that was added was included as an exhibit to the Coastal Commission staff report for the December 13, 2012 California Coastal Commission meeting and is provided as Exhibit “F”.
On January 9, 2013, the Seaside Planning Commission held a public hearing to consider the modifications that were made to the LCP by the CCC and recommended that the City Council approve the modified LCP and adopt an Ordinance amending the Seaside General Plan and Seaside Municipal to incorporate the changes to the Land Use Map of the General Plan and the Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP) of the LCP as Title 18 of the Seaside Municipal Code. On February 7, 2013, the City Council voted unanimously to approve the first reading of an ordinance that amends and approves a proposed map amendment to the land use map of the Seaside General Plan and proposed text and map amendments to the Seaside Municipal Code in its consideration of accepting the modifications that have been made to the LCP by the California Coastal Commission. The City Council made no changes to the LCP or the ordinance as it was introduced. A copy of the LCP with the recommended modifications incorporated is included as Exhibit “G”.

Local Permitting

With a certified LCP, the City of Seaside would then assume the responsibility for issuing coastal development permits (CDPs) for development within the coastal zone. In authorizing coastal development permits, the City must make a finding that the proposed development conforms to the certified LCP. Consistent with the provisions of the Coastal Act, the CCC will retain original permit jurisdiction over certain specified lands, such as any submerged lands, tidelands and public trust land. The CCC will also retain the authority to hear appeals of the City’s CDP decisions, review and approve any amendments to the certified LCP, and review the LCP at least every five years to ensure proper implementation and continued compliance with the Coastal Act. The LCP may be amended in accordance with California Code of Regulations and Public Resources Code.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

On August 5, 2010, a Notice of Intent to adopt a Negative Declaration for the LCP was distributed for public review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. Subsequent to the adoption of the Negative Declaration by the City Council on November 18, 2010, the CCC recommended additional modifications/revisions to the LCP. Pursuant to Section 15164(b) of the CEQA Guidelines, an Addendum has been prepared to the previously adopted Negative Declaration to determine that the modifications/revisions that have been made to the LCP by the CCC would not result in any new significant impacts, would not result in any substantial increase in the severity of previously analyzed effects, nor result in any new or additional mitigation measures being warranted. The Planning Commission in their review of the Addendum on January 9, 2013 recommended the City Council to consider approval. Based on this recommendation, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 2013-12 on February 7, 2013 accepting that the Addendum provided sufficient documentation and analysis of the modifications/revisions that were made to the LCP. The preparation of a subsequent Negative Declaration consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(1) is not required. The Addendum is provided as Exhibit “C”.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The modified LCP would update the 1983 LUP of the City of Seaside (certified by the California Coastal Commission on October 12, 1983), and provide regulations and development standards (CIP) to implement the land use plan. These two components taken together constitute the LCP. The LCP applies to the City of Seaside coastal zone area as illustrated in Exhibit “D”.

Coastal Commission staff recommended modifications to the LCP during the LCP Amendment Application process. The recommended modifications strengthen the consistency of the LCP goals, policies, and land use designations with the California Coastal Act and the City’s General Plan, corrects minor typographical errors, incorporates applicable sections of referenced City documents (i.e. Seaside General Plan, Seaside Municipal Code, Local Biological Program and Surveys), and updates the City of Seaside’s coastal zone boundaries to reflect the Mello Act and to include existing Highway 1 right-of-way in the City of Seaside on the former Fort Ord. The Highway 1 right-of-way that is within the City of Seaside coastal zone along the former Fort Ord is situated between the City’s city limit line beginning at Light Fighter Drive to the north and the terminus with the City’s city limit line with Sand City at the Highway 1/Fremont Boulevard off ramp to the south. Modifications to the LCP are described in detail in the CCC staff report for the December 13, 2012 California Coastal Commission hearing, which is included as Exhibit “F”. Key modifications are summarized below.

Boundary Modifications

The boundaries were modified to reflect the Mello Act and to include existing Highway 1 right-of-way that is within the coastal zone along the former Fort Ord as shown in Exhibit “D” and LUP Figures 1-2a and 1-2b. These modifications resulted in an increase in land area within the Laguna Grande Subarea (+3.17 acres) and a decrease in land area within the Del Monte Subarea (-2.82 acres) for a net increase of 0.35 acres. In addition, approximately 146 acres of Highway 1 right-of-way was added to the north. A summary of the changes in subarea acreages as a result of the boundary modifications is provided in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subareas</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Original LCP</td>
<td>Revised LCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Grande</td>
<td>42.45</td>
<td>45.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts Lake</td>
<td>22.26</td>
<td>22.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach</td>
<td>17.46</td>
<td>17.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Monte</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>5.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>90.96</td>
<td>91.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added CTC North</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>146.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90.96</td>
<td>237.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although the boundaries of the City’s territory within the coastal zone were discussed and reviewed with CCC staff on numerous occasions during the preparation of the LCP document, the comments regarding boundary adjustment were not presented to the City until July 2012.

Land Use Modifications

Land uses were modified to provide a distinct separation between the coastal boundaries of the community and areas of the community located outside of the coastal boundaries. Modifications to the LCP revised the layout of land uses as shown in Exhibit “E” and are also included visually as LUP Figures 2-10a and 2-10b. These modifications resulted in the addition of the following Coastal Zone land use designations: Coastal Transportation Corridor (CTC) (158.54 acres); Coastal Regional Commercial (CCRG) (1.64 acres); and Coastal Heavy Commercial (CCH) (0.98 acres). In addition, the amount of land designated for Coastal Parks and Open Space (CPOS) and Coastal Visitor-Serving Recreation (CVSR) land uses increased, while the amount of land designated for Coastal Visitor-Serving Commercial (CVSC) and Coastal Mixed Use/West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (MX/WBUVSP) land uses decreased. A summary of the changes to land use designation acreages is provided in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Designations</th>
<th>Original LCP</th>
<th>Revised LCP</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Parks and Open Space (CPOS)</td>
<td>57.05</td>
<td>59.41</td>
<td>+2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Visitor-Serving Commercial (CVSC)</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>-3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Visitor-Serving Recreation (CVSR)</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>+0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Heavy Commercial (CCH)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>+0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Regional Commercial (CCRG)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>+1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Transportation Corridor (CTC)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>158.54</td>
<td>+158.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Mixed Use/West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (CMX/WBUVSP)</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-5.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Land Use Plan Policy Modifications

Modifications made to LUP policies provide for broad protection of natural resource areas, coastal resources, visual resources, water supply, and water quality; reduce risks associated with natural hazards; provide for public access and parks; and provide more specific general permit considerations for land use development. The boundary revisions expanded the area subject to LUP policies. The modifications to the policies are generally described below.
• Hazards - Additional policies are proposed to address threats from tsunami, require analysis of wave uprush/shoreline erosion in new development, and to refine outfall maintenance provisions.

• Water Quality - Policies were modified to effectively address new Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) requirements associated with the pending update to the statewide Phase II Storm Water Permit.

• Land Use - Suggested modifications refined density/intensity and setback standards in order to adequately buffer adjacent resources to ensure they are protected.

• Public Access and Recreation - Modifications increased hours of available parking, consolidated and, where feasible, eliminated storm water outfalls on area beaches, and to protect lower-cost visitor opportunities.

• Transportation and Circulation - Modifications addressed transportation capacities, to protect the former railroad right-of-way for the specific purpose of re-establishing light rail service and multi-modal transportation options (trails, etc.), to encourage alternative forms of transportation (e.g., hiking and biking), to require adequate parking and circulation in all new development, and to provide for maintenance and repair of existing transportation facilities in Seaside.

• Public Services - Modifications protect coastal priority uses, to ensure that adequate long-term and sustainable water supplies are available for development, and to ensure that water services are publicly managed.

• Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA) - Modifications provide additional detail for addressing cumulative impacts and appropriate acreage replacement ratios for unavoidable direct impacts.

• Cultural Resources – Modifications round out archaeological protections.

• Visual Resources – Modifications refine protected views, particularly related to primary view corridors associated with Highway 1 and the City’s lakes.

These policy modifications are described in detail within the coastal commission staff report for the December 13, 2012 hearing, which is included as Exhibit “F”.

Coastal Implementation Plan Modifications

Modifications to the CIP included incorporating large referenced sections of the Seaside Municipal Code into the document (i.e., parking standards, sign standards) and making revisions to ensure consistency with the LUP as modified. These modifications included coastal staff’s recommended revisions to the development standards which are described in detail within the coastal commission staff report for the December 13, 2012 hearing, which is included as Exhibit “F”.

The LCP as modified resulted in a stream-lined, user-friendly document that is consistent with current local and state policy.
STAFF ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Statutory Requirements of a Local Coastal Plan

The California Coastal Act of 1976 requires that each coastal city and county prepare a LCP that establishes the kind, location, and intensity of land and water uses appropriate to its portion of the coastal zone. The LCP must be adopted by the City, then be reviewed and approved (certified) by the CCC.

Required Contents

This LCP has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of California Coastal Act (PRC 3000 et. seq.). As prescribed by law, the LCP includes (a) land use plans, (b) zoning ordinances, (c) zoning district maps, and (d) within sensitive coastal resource areas, other implementing actions, which, when taken together, meet the requirements of, and implement the provisions and policies of the California Coastal Act (PRC 30108.6).

The precise content of each local coastal program shall be determined by the local government, consistent with Section 30501, in full consultation with the commission and with full public participation. (Coastal Act Section 30500 (c))

As prescribed by law, the proposed LCP includes the following:

- Written policies that provide direction for decision-makers, property owners, and the public regarding the types and intensities of land uses that are most suited to each coastal area and a land use map that shows generally the uses that are appropriate in each area. (LUP).

- Relevant portions of the local government’s zoning code, which regulates land uses, zoning maps that show which zoning rules apply to each area, and procedural requirements that govern which types of projects require a coastal permit, how a coastal permit can be obtained, and the opportunities for public participation in coastal permit review (CIP).

Adopted Local Coastal Program Conformance

The LCP as modified would provide greater clarification as to the location and intent of the Coastal Districts and greater consistency with actual on-the-ground conditions. The proposed land use plan would result in an overall de-intensification of land uses around Roberts Lake, Laguna Grande and the Beach subareas. Specifically:

Zoning Ordinance Conformance

Existing: Open Space – Recreation (OSR) and Regional Commercial (CRG) with Coastal Zone (CZ) overlay; Proposed: Coastal Parks and Open Space (CPOS), Coastal Visitor Serving Commercial (CVSC), Coastal Visitor Serving Recreation (CVSR), Coastal Regional Commercial (CCR), Coastal Heavy Commercial (CCH), Coastal Mixed-Use/West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (CMX/WBUVSP).
The proposed CIP would be the zoning ordinance for the proposed land use plan. Certification of the LCP would replace 17.24.070 - CRG Coastal Zone Standards and 17.28.030 - Coastal Zone (CZ) Overlay Zone with the proposed CIP (Title 18).

Implementation actions would require minor modifications to the City of Seaside Zoning Ordinance (Title 17 of the Seaside Municipal Code) to identify Title 18 as the zoning for areas within the coastal zone.

**Seaside General Plan Conformance**

**Existing:** Park and Open Space (POS) and Regional Commercial (RGC); **Proposed:** Coastal Parks and Open Space (CPOS), Coastal Visitor Serving Commercial (CVSC), a Coastal Visitor Serving Recreation (CVSR), Coastal Regional Commercial (CCRG), Coastal Heavy Commercial (CCH), Coastal Mixed-Use/West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (CMX/WBUVSP).

Land use designations have been updated to be consistent with the City’s 2004 General Plan. The LUP establishes land use designations, general development criteria and policies that regulate development in the Coastal Zone. The City’s General Plan and the Land Use Element in particular may contain more precise development limits for specific properties. Should a conflict exist, the land use intensity that is most protective of coastal resources shall take precedence. However, in no case shall the policies of the LUP be interpreted to allow a development to exceed a development limit established by the General Plan or its implementing ordinances.

Implementation actions would require minor modifications to the City of Seaside General Plan Land Use Map. It is noted that amendments to a local general plan for the purpose of developing a certified local coastal program shall not constitute an amendment of a general plan for purposes of Section 65358 of the Government Code (frequency limited to 4 times a year) (Section 30500, Coastal Act 2009 update).

**PUBLIC NOTICE**

A notice of the proposed action was published in the Monterey County Weekly on Thursday, January 24, 2013, a minimum of 10 days in advance of this hearing consistent with the Municipal Code, and posted at various locations within the City’s Coastal boundaries. Additionally, a notice was sent via email to the municipal jurisdictions that abut the City’s coastal boundaries on Thursday, January 24, 2013 and was posted at City Hall and designated posted locations in the City a minimum of 10 days prior to the public hearing.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The LCP, as modified, complies with the intent of the Seaside General Plan, requirements of Title 17 of the Seaside Municipal Code and the California Coastal Act of 1976, as amended. Based on the analysis, staff recommends that the City Council take action to adopt a resolution (Exhibit “A”) accepting modifications made by the CCC to the City of Seaside’s Local Coastal Program (LCP) and authorizing the City Manager to submit to the CCC a certified copy of the modified LCP for final approval and certification; and adopt the second reading of an Ordinance approving a map amendment to the Land Use Element of the Seaside General Plan to include the land use designations of the LCP as an overlay on the land use map and adopting text and map
amendments to the Seaside Municipal Code to include the land use regulations and Zoning Map of the Coastal Implementation Program as Title 18 of the Seaside Municipal Code (SMC). The proposed modification and ordinance was introduced for first reading and public comment was heard at the City Council meeting held on February 7, 2013.

NEXT STEPS
If the City Council accepts and agrees to the modifications made to the LCP per the recommendations of the CCC (with modification and official map), the City will then submit an application to the Fort Ord Reuse Authority to receive a consistency determination to amend the Seaside General Plan Land Use Map and the FORA Land Use Map to identify the portion of the Highway 1 right-of-way that lies within the City’s coastal zone boundary as Coastal Transportation Corridor (CTC). Upon receiving the determination of consistency from the FORA board, the modified LCP will be submitted to the CCC for final certification.

Upon certification of the LCP and Map, the City will have coastal permit authority over its lands within the City of Seaside Coastal Zone.

ATTACHMENTS
Exhibit “A”: Resolution recommending that the City Council formally accept and agree to the suggested modifications made to the Local Coastal Program (LCP) by the California Coastal Commission (CCC) and authorize the City Manager to submit certified copies of the LCP and implementing ordinance for the LCP to the CCC for final certification.

Exhibit “B”: Ordinance amending the Seaside General Plan Land Use Map to include the land use designations of the LCP as an overlay on the land use map and amending the text and map of the Seaside Municipal Code (SMC) to include the policies and land use designations of the Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP) of the LCP as Title 18 of the Seaside Municipal Code (SMC).

Exhibit “C”: Addendum to the previously adopted Negative Declaration/Initial Study (Click to access Hyperlink)

Exhibit “D”: Coastal Zone Area and Subarea Map as modified (Click to access Hyperlink)

Exhibit “E”: Coastal Zone Land Use Designations as modified (Click to access Hyperlink)

Exhibit “F”: Coastal Commission Staff Report for the December 13, 2013 Coastal Commission meeting. (Click to access Hyperlink)

Exhibit “G”: Seaside Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan and Coastal Implementation Plan as modified. (Click to access Hyperlink)

Reviewed for Submission to the City Council by:

John Dunn, City Manager
SEASIDE LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM 2013

FORA CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION

City Council Ordinance No. 2013-01 adopting amendment to the Seaside Municipal Code and Seaside General Plan for implementation of the Local Coastal Program
CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SEASIDE
ORDINANCE NO. 2013-01

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SEASIDE
APPROVING A GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT UPDATING THE LAND USE
MAP AND SEASIDE MUNICIPAL CODE AMENDMENT TO INCLUDE THE
COASTAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN OF THE LOCAL COASTAL
PROGRAM AS TITLE 18 OF THE SEASIDE MUNICIPAL CODE FOR THE
ADOPTION OF THE PROPOSED LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM.

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SEASIDE DOES ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. General Purpose and Findings.

1. The California Coastal Act requires coastal communities to manage the conservation and
development of coastal resources through a comprehensive planning and regulatory program
called the Local Coastal Program.

2. The preparation of the proposed Seaside Local Coastal Program is necessary to comply with
the Coastal Act and transfer coastal development permitting authority from the Coastal
Commission to the City of Seaside.

3. The certification of the City's Local Coastal Program is necessary to ensure that scenic and
visual qualities of the coastal areas shall be considered and protected as a resource of public
importance and that development shall be designed and sited to preserve views to and along
the scenic coastal areas, to minimize the alteration of natural land forms, to be visually
compatible with the character of surrounding areas, and, where feasible, restore and enhance
visual quality in visually degraded areas.

4. The impacts of new development on water quality can be minimized through the use of best
management practices in the design, construction, and use of that development.

5. The Local Coastal Program will serve to: 1) preserve existing open space within the coastal
zone boundary for the protection of significant environmental resources; 2) provide for
avoidance of geologic, fire, and flood hazards; 3) provide for the preservation of watersheds
and viewsheds; 4) enable the provision of public recreation; and 5) access to the communities
designated coastal resources and open space areas.

Section 2. Pursuant to the California Coastal Act the City of Seaside has prepared a Local
Coastal Program that would update the 1983 Coastal Land Use Plan (LUP) of the City of Seaside
that was certified by the Coastal Commission on October 12, 1983.
Section 3. The preparation of the Local Coastal Program (LCP) is intended to protect and enhance the resources of the coastal zone, consistent with the goals of the California Coastal Act, as well as the expressed goals of the citizenry and provide for a Coastal Implementation Plan to provide tools to implement the updated Coastal Land Use Plan.

Section 4. It is the responsibility of the Planning Commission to consider and weigh the merits of the application and public input in relation to the policies, standards and intent of the Seaside General Plan and Seaside Municipal Code in making a recommendation to the City Council.

Section 5. On October 13, 2010, the Seaside Planning Commission considered oral comments and written information concerning the proposed revised Local Coastal Program and Negative Declaration at a duly noticed public hearing and recommended that the City Council adopt an Ordinance amending the 2004 Seaside General Plan to include the coastal zone designations as an overlay on the land use map and amending the Seaside Municipal Code (SMC) to adopt the revised Local Coastal Program and incorporate the Coastal Improvement Program as Title 18 of the SMC.

Section 6. On November 18, 2010, the City Council held a duly noticed public hearing notice to consider the adoption of a Negative Declaration and introduce the first reading of the Ordinance adopting the revised Local Coastal Program and incorporating the Coastal Implementation Program as Title 18 of the SMC.

Section 7. On February 3, 2011, the City Council held a duly noticed public hearing to adopt Ordinance 994 to update the 2004 Seaside General Plan land use map to include the land use designations of the Local Coastal Program as a coastal overlay and to incorporate the Coastal Implementation Program as Title 18 of the SMC.

Section 8. In June of 2011 the City of Seaside submitted an application to the California Coastal Commission for the certification of the Updated Local Coastal Program; and

Section 9. In March 2012 the City’s application for the certification of its Updated Local Coastal Program application was deemed complete by the California Coastal Commission pursuant to the requirements of the Coastal Act

Section 10. On December 13, 2012, the California Coastal Commission approved the City of Seaside’s Local Coastal Program Amendment No. 1-11 with modifications.

Section 11. On January 9, 2013, the Seaside Planning Commission considered the Addendum that has been prepared to the previously adopted Negative Declaration to address the modifications that were made by the CCC to the LCP and found no new or any significant impacts which may result from the modifications made to the LCP by the CCC on December 13, 2012.
Section 12. On January 9, 2013, the Seaside Planning Commission voted unanimously to recommend that the City Council approve the Addendum and adopt an Ordinance amending the 2004 Seaside General Plan to include the coastal zone designations on the revised LCP as an overlay on the land use map and amending the Seaside Municipal Code (SMC) to adopt the revised LCP and incorporate the Coastal Improvement Program of the LCP as Title 18 of the SMC.

Section 13. On February 7, 2013, the City Council conducted a legally noticed public hearing to introduce the first reading of proposed amendments to the Seaside General Plan and Seaside Municipal Code in its consideration of accepting the modifications that have been made to the LCP by the California Coastal Commission.

Section 14. On February 21, 2013, the City Council conducted a legally noticed public hearing to hold the second reading of the proposed amendments to the Seaside General Plan and Seaside Municipal Code in its consideration of accepting the modifications that have been made to the LCP by the California Coastal Commission.

Section 15. It is the responsibility of the City Council to consider and weigh the merits of the application and public input in relation to the policies, standards and intent of the Seaside General Plan and SMC in consideration of the modified LCP and the adoption of an Ordinance amending the Seaside General Plan land use map and the SMC to include the Coastal Implementation Program as Title 18 of the SMC.

Section 16. The City Council makes the following findings and determinations in connection with the revised LCP and amendment to the Seaside General Plan land use map and the SMC to include the Coastal Implementation Program as Title 18 of the SMC.

A. Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), City staff prepared an Initial Study of the potential environmental effects of the proposed revised Local Coastal Program and amendment to the SMC to include the Coastal Implementation Program as Title 18 of the SMC.

B. Based on the findings contained in the Initial Study, City Staff determined that there was no substantial evidence that the project would have a significant effect on the environment and Negative Declaration was prepared. Thereafter, City staff provided notice of public comment period and the intent to adopt the Negative Declaration.

C. On November 18, 2010, the City Council reviewed the Negative Declaration and all comments received regarding the Negative Declaration and, based on the whole record before it, determined that: (i) the Negative Declaration was prepared in compliance with CEQA Guidelines; and (ii) that there was no substantial evidence that the revised Local Coastal Program and Coastal Implementation Program will have a significant effect on the environment.
D. Subsequent to the adoption of the Negative Declaration by the City Council, the California Coastal Commission has recommended additional modifications to LCP. The revisions were determined not to result in any new significant impacts or result in a substantial increase in the severity of previously analyzed effects, and no new or additional mitigation measures were warranted. Conversely, the LCP modifications serve to strengthen the environmental protection policies of the LCP. Therefore, pursuant to Section 15164 of the California Environmental Quality Act, an Addendum has been prepared to the previously approved Negative Declaration to provide sufficient documentation and analysis that the modifications to the LCP will not result in any substantial changes which will require major revisions of the previously approved Negative Declaration.

E. On January 9, 2013, the Seaside Planning Commission considered and voted unanimously to recommend that the City Council approve the Addendum and adopt an Ordinance amending the 2004 Seaside General Plan to include the coastal zone designations on the revised LCP as an overlay on the land use map and amending the Seaside Municipal Code (SMC) to adopt the revised LCP and incorporate the Coastal Improvement Program of the LCP as Title 18 of the SMC.

F. On February 7, 2013, the City Council reviewed the Addendum to the previously adopted Negative Declaration and all comments received regarding the Addendum to the previously adopted Negative Declaration and previously adopted Negative Declaration and, based on the whole record before it, determined that: (i) the Addendum to the previously adopted Negative Declaration was prepared in compliance with CEQA Guidelines; and (ii) that there was no substantial evidence that the modifications to the Local Coastal Program and the Coastal Implementation Program will have a significant effect on the environment.

G. The City Clerk of the City of Seaside shall serve as the custodian of records for the Initial Study, adopted Negative Declaration, the Addendum to the Negative Declaration, and all other materials which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the City Council’s decision will be based. These documents are available for public review in the Resource Management Services Department Planning Division located at 440 Harcourt Avenue, Seaside, California.

Section 17. The City Council finds that the modified Local Coastal Program and Coastal Implementation Program is consistent with the 2004 Seaside General Plan because it provides zoning designations and land uses that are consistent with the General Plan Land Use Element and Map and implementation policies and programs specified in the 2004 Seaside General Plan.
Section 18. Based on the findings contained in Sections 1 through 17, the City Council hereby amends the Seaside General Plan and Seaside Municipal Code to include the Coastal Implementation Plan of the revised Local Coastal Program as Title 18 of the SMC as follows:

A. Except as otherwise provided in Paragraph B of this Section, all provisions of existing Title 17, including but not limited to Section 17.24.070 (Regional Commercial (CRG) Coastal Zone Standards), Section 17.24.080 – Automotive Retail (CA) Zone Standards, Section 17.26 – Special Zone Purposes Zones, Section 17.28.030 (Coastal Zone Overlay Zone), and Section 17.52.082 (Coastal Development Permit) are hereby deleted from Title 17.

B. The text and Zoning Map of the Seaside Municipal Code and Land Use Map of the General Plan shall be amended to include the provisions of Title 18 (Coastal Implementation Plan – Coastal Zoning Ordinance – Title 18, Section 18.10), attached hereto as Attachment 1.

Section 19. The deletion of those sections of Title 17 specified in Paragraph A of Section 16 of this Ordinance and the addition of Title 18, Section 18.10, shall be declared to be declarative of law within 30-days from the adoption of the second reading for the Ordinance.

Section 20. Pursuant to the California Coastal Commission regulations, the Seaside General Plan Amendment and amendment to the Seaside Municipal Code (SMC) to include the Coastal Implementation Program as Title 18 of the SMC will take effect automatically upon Coastal Commission approval as provided in the Public Resources Code.

Section 21. Severability. The provisions of this Ordinance shall be severable, and if any clause, sentence, paragraph, subdivision, section, or part of this Ordinance shall be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such judgment not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder thereof but shall be confined in its operation to the clause, sentence, paragraph, subdivision, section, or part thereof directly involved in the controversy in which such judgment shall have been rendered.

Section 22. Legal Construction. The provisions of this Ordinance shall be construed as necessary to effectively carry out its purposes, which are hereby found and declared to be in furtherance of public health, safety, and welfare.

Section 23. Publication. The City Clerk is directed to publish this Ordinance in a manner and in the time required by law.

INTRODUCED by the City Council of the City of Seaside on the 7th day of February 2013.
PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Seaside on the 21st day of February 2013 by the following roll call vote:

AYES: COUNCIL MEMBERS: Alexander, Edwards, Oglesby, Pacheco, Rubio

NOES: COUNCILMEMBERS: None

ABSENT: COUNCILMEMBERS: None

ABSTAIN: COUNCILMEMBERS: None

APPROVED:

Ralph Rubio, Mayor

ATTEST:

Dimitria M. Hubbard, City Clerk
SEASIDE LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM 2013

FORA CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION

City Council Resolution No. 2013-14 adopting a Local Coastal Program
RESOLUTION NO. 2013-14

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SEASIDE,
STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING A LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the City Council established a goal of completing the Local Coastal Program
to fulfill its requirements under the California Coastal Act and to restore permitting authority to the
City; and

WHEREAS, the preparation of the LCP is intended to protect and enhance the resources of
the coastal zone, consistent with the goals of the California Coastal Act, as well as the expressed
goals of the citizenry; and

WHEREAS, on August 5, 2010, a notice of availability of the proposed LCP Update was
provided pursuant to Section 13515(c) of the California Code of Regulations, mailed to all
property owners located within 300 feet from the City of Seaside Coastal Zone Boundary,
published in the Monterey Weekly, and posted at locations within the Coastal Zone Area; and

WHEREAS, a total of six written comment letters were received in response to the Notice
of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration and have been entered into the public record; and

WHEREAS, the Seaside Planning Commission considered oral comments and written
information concerning the proposed Negative Declaration and LCP at a duly noticed public
hearing held on October 13, 2010 and recommended that the City Council adopt a Negative
Declaration for the Update to the LCP and the LCP; and

WHEREAS, the City Council considered oral comments and written information
concerning the proposed Negative Declaration and LCP and adopted the Negative Declaration at a
duly noticed public hearing held on November 18, 2010 (Resolution 10-70) and introduced the first
reading of an Ordinance for the adoption of a Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP); and

WHEREAS, the City Council at a duly noticed public hearing held on February 3, 2011
(Resolution 11-08) adopted the proposed LCP Update and authorized the City Manager to submit
certified copies of the LCP and implementing Ordinance (CIP) amending the Seaside Municipal
codes to the California Coastal Commission for approval and certification; and

WHEREAS, the City Council Code at a duly noticed public hearing held on February 3,
2011 (Ordinance 994) adopted the Coastal Implementation Program (CIP) of the local coastal
program as Title 18 of the Seaside Municipal; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 13544 of the Title 14 of the California Code of
Regulations, the California Coastal Commission considered the City's draft CIP and LCP and on
December 13, 2012, voted to approve the document with the recommended modifications made
by the California Coastal Commission staff; and
WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 15164(b) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, the City of Seaside has prepared an Addendum to the previously adopted Negative Declaration to address and analyze the modifications that have been to the modified LCP; and

WHEREAS, at a duly noticed public hearing held on January 9, 2013, the Seaside Planning Commission considered the Addendum that has been prepared to the previously adopted Negative Declaration to address the modifications that were made by the CCC to the LCP and recommended that the City Council consider the Addendum to the previously adopted Negative Declaration and adopt findings approving the Addendum and modifications to the LCP; and

WHEREAS, it is the responsibility of the City Council to consider and weigh the merits of the application and public input in relation to the policies, standards and intent of the Seaside General Plan and Seaside Municipal Code in making its decision on the Addendum to the previously adopted Negative Declaration and adoption of the LCP as modified; and

WHEREAS, the City Council considered oral comments and written information concerning the Addendum to the previously adopted Negative Declaration and modified LCP at a duly noticed public hearing held on February 7, 2013, and acted to approve Resolution 2013-12 accepting the findings and evidence that was included in the Addendum as sufficient to not require the preparation of a subsequent Negative Declaration and introduced the first reading of an Ordinance for the adoption of amendments to the Seaside General Plan Land Use Map and text and map amendments to the Seaside Municipal Code to include the land use regulations and Zoning Map of the Coastal Implementation Program as Title 18 of the Seaside Municipal Code (SMC); and

WHEREAS, on February 21, 2013, the City Council held a duly noticed public hearing at a regular meeting of the City Council to consider the adoption of the Ordinance incorporating the changes to the Seaside General Plan Land Use Map and the text and map amendments to the SMC to include the Coastal Implementation Program of the LCP under Title 18 of the SMC.

NOW, THEREFORE, the City Council of the City of Seaside does resolve as follows:

1. Adopts the Ordinance amending the City of Seaside General Plan Land Use Map to reflect the modifications that were made to the Coastal Zone Area and Subarea Maps and Coastal Zone Land Use designations by the California Coastal Commission to maintain consistency between the Seaside General Plan and Seaside Zoning Code; and the Seaside Municipal Code to incorporate the Coastal Implementation Plan, as modified by the California Coastal Commission, under Title 18 of the Seaside Municipal Code.

2. Directs City staff to forward the modified Local Coastal Plan, provided as Exhibit “G” to the February 21, 2013 City Council staff report and herein incorporated by reference, to the California Coastal Commission for final certification upon the adoption of the Ordinance at second reading.
PASSED AND ADOPTED at the regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Seaside, State of California, duly held on the 21st day of February, 2013, by the following vote:

AYES: COUNCIL MEMBERS: Alexander, Edwards, Oglesby, Pacheco, Rubio

NOES: COUNCILMEMBERS: None

ABSENT: COUNCILMEMBERS: None

ABSTAIN: COUNCILMEMBERS: None

Ralph Rubio, Honorable Mayor
City of Seaside

ATTEST:

Dimitria M. Hubbard, City Clerk
SEASIDE LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM 2013

FORA CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION

Exhibit D: Addendum to the previously adopted Negative Declaration
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1.0 BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

1.1 BACKGROUND

An Initial Study/Negative Declaration (IS/ND) for the proposed City of Seaside Local Coastal Program Update (LCP) was prepared and circulated for public review in August 2010 (State Clearinghouse No. 2010081016). On November 18, 2010, the Seaside City Council approved the Negative Declaration for the proposed LCP (Resolution No. 10-70). On February 3, 2011, the City Council adopted Ordinance No. 994, which adopted the proposed LCP and authorized the submittal of certified copies of the LCP and implementing ordinance amending the Municipal Code to the California Coastal Commission (CCC). The document was submitted to CCC staff for review in June 2011.

1.2 PURPOSE OF THE ADDENDUM

This Addendum to the Negative Declaration for the City of Seaside Local Coastal Program Update project (State Clearinghouse No. 2010081016) has been prepared primarily in response to modifications recommended by CCC staff prior to final certification by the Coastal Commission. Most of the proposed revisions are intended to make the document more consistent with the Coastal Act and General Plan, correct minor typographical errors, and update the coastal zone boundaries based on current map data. The revisions resulted in technical changes to the policies, development standards, and figures within the LCP that were previously analyzed in the Initial Study. The revisions occur in both the Land Use Plan (LUP) and Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP) portions of the LCP.

Within respect to the Initial Study, the revisions slightly modified the project area boundary and subareas to be consistent with the Mello Act and to reflect the City of Seaside’s incorporation of Highway 1 right-of-way that was formerly Fort Ord military land within the coastal zone. The revisions also slightly modified the allowable land use designations noted in the Initial Study, resulting in the addition of three land use designations: Coastal Transportation Corridor (CTC), Coastal Regional Commercial (CCRG), and Coastal Heavy Commercial (CCH). In addition, the maximum floor area ratio (FAR) for Coastal Visitor-Serving Commercial (CVSC) was reduced by one-half. These revisions were made in response to CCC staff comments and to correct a mapping error to ensure consistency with existing circumstances on the ground.

The purpose of this Addendum is to identify whether the LCP amendments create the potential for any significant new information or impacts that were not identified within the Initial Study/Negative Declaration circulated for public review in August 2010 as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (California Public Resources Code 2100 et seq.) and in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations 15000 et seq.).
1.3 **TYPE OF DOCUMENT**

CEQA requires state and local government agencies to consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they retain discretionary authority, even after an EIR (or negative declaration) has been certified. As noted below, certain circumstances require additional CEQA documentation.

1516. Subsequent EIRs and Negative Declarations

(a) When an EIR has been certified or a negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

(1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;

(2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

(3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:

(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;

(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;

(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or

(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

(b) If changes to a project or its circumstances occur or new information becomes available after adoption of a negative declaration, the lead agency shall prepare a subsequent EIR if required under subdivision (a). Otherwise the lead agency shall
determine whether to prepare a subsequent negative declaration, an addendum, or no further documentation.

(c) Once a project has been approved, the lead agency's role in project approval is completed, unless further discretionary approval on that project is required. Information appearing after an approval does not require reopening of that approval. If after the project is approved, any of the conditions described in subdivision (a) occurs, a subsequent EIR or negative declaration shall only be prepared by the public agency which grants the next discretionary approval for the project, if any. In this situation, no other responsible agency shall grant an approval for the project until the subsequent EIR has been certified or subsequent negative declaration adopted.

(d) A subsequent EIR or subsequent negative declaration shall be given the same notice and public review as required under Section 15087 or Section 15072. A subsequent EIR or negative declaration shall state where the previous document is available and can be reviewed.

15164. Addendum to an EIR or Negative Declaration

(a) The lead agency or responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred.

(b) An addendum to an adopted negative declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred.

(c) An addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the final EIR or adopted negative declaration.

(d) The decision making body shall consider the addendum with the final EIR or adopted negative declaration prior to making a decision on the project.

(e) A brief explanation of the decision not to prepare a subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 should be included in an addendum to an EIR, the lead agency's findings on the project, or elsewhere in the record. The explanation must be supported by substantial evidence.

The City of Seaside (City), as the lead agency, has determined that an Addendum is the appropriate document for the revised LCP. As described in Section 2.0 of this Addendum, none of the conditions described above under Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines have occurred. The proposed revisions to the LCP do not represent a substantial change in circumstances that would introduce new potentially significant environmental impacts which were not previously considered and do not increase the severity of potentially significant environmental impacts previously considered in the Initial Study/Negative Declaration, and no mitigation would be necessary.
ADDENDUM TO THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION

This Addendum is an informational document to be used in the local planning and decision-making process; it does not recommend approval or denial of the proposed project. The City of Seaside will consider this Addendum with the adopted Negative Declaration and forward the document to the CCC to be included as part of the Commission’s project review package.
ADDENDUM TO THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION

2.0 SUMMARY OF REVISIONS

The revisions to the LCP resulted in changes to boundaries (both the City of Seaside’s coastal zone boundaries and subareas boundaries within the coastal zone), land uses allowed within the City’s coastal zone, policies provided in the Land Use Plan (LUP), and development standards provided in the Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP). These revisions are described in more detail below.

2.1 BOUNDARY REVISIONS

Boundary revisions affected both the overall City of Seaside coastal zone boundary and the subarea boundaries within the City’s coastal zone. During CCC staff’s review of the proposed LCP update, it came to their attention that the 1983 coastal zone boundary needed to be updated to reflect more accurate state mapping data and the Mello Act. These revisions resulted in changes to the boundaries of the Del Monte and Laguna Grande subareas, and added area north of the subareas along Highway 1 to the City’s coastal zone, as shown in Figures 2a and 2b and summarized in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subareas</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Original LCP</th>
<th>Revised LCP</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Grande</td>
<td>42.45</td>
<td>45.62</td>
<td>+3.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts Lake</td>
<td>22.26</td>
<td>22.26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach</td>
<td>17.46</td>
<td>17.46</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Monte</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>-2.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>90.96</td>
<td>91.31</td>
<td>+0.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added CTC North</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>146.16</td>
<td>+146.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90.96</td>
<td>237.47</td>
<td>+146.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The modifications to the boundaries resulted in an increase in land area within the Laguna Grande Subarea (+3.17 acres) and a decrease in land area within the Del Monte Subarea (-2.82 acres) for a net increase of 0.35 acres. In addition, approximately 146 acres of Highway 1 right-of-way was added to the north.

Although the boundaries of the City’s territory within the coastal zone were discussed and reviewed with CCC staff on numerous occasions during the preparation of the LCP document, the comments regarding boundary adjustment were not presented to the City until July 2012. City staff immediately began working with CCC staff to make the necessary revisions within the LCP document.
2.2  LAND USE REVISIONS

Revisions to the LCP slightly modified the layout of land uses as shown in Figures 3a and 3b and summarized in Table 2.

Table 2
Summary of Land Use Revisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Designations</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Original LCP</th>
<th>Revised LCP</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Parks and Open Space (CPOS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.05</td>
<td>59.41</td>
<td>+2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Visitor-Serving Commercial (CVSC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>-3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Visitor-Serving Recreation (CVSR)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>+0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Heavy Commercial (CCH)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>+0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Regional Commercial (CCRG)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>+1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Transportation Corridor (CTC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>158.54</td>
<td>+158.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Mixed Use/West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (CMX/WBUVSP)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-5.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These revisions resulted in the addition of the following one land use designation, Coastal Transportation Corridor (CTC) (158.54 acres). In addition, after public review of the LUP but prior to submitting the LCP amendment application to CCC Staff, City staff identified a mapping issue that was inconsistent with the General Plan designations and existing uses, which resulted in the addition of two new coastal land uses: Coastal Regional Commercial (CCRG) (1.64 acres), and Coastal Heavy Commercial (CCH) (0.98 acres). All of the new land uses are described below.

- **Coastal Regional Commercial (CCRG):** Regional commercial uses are defined as large-scale commercial development with retail, entertainment, and/or service uses of a scale and function to serve a regional market. These uses are allowed where existing regional commercial uses are developed within the coastal zone. Permitted regional commercial uses include general, grocery, and outdoor retail; shopping center; health and fitness facilities; and restaurants with table service. The maximum FAR is 1.0:1.

- **Coastal Heavy Commercial (CCH):** Heavy commercial uses are intended for subregional commercial activities such as auto and truck repair, contractor yards, warehousing, and light manufacturing. These uses are permitted where existing heavy commercial uses are developed within the coastal zone (i.e., near railroad right-of-way adjacent to the Sand City boundary). The maximum FAR is 0.5:1.
• Coastal Transportation Corridor (CTC): The City of Seaside maintains the Highway 1 right-of-way and the former Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way as essential public transportation corridors. Principal permitted uses of the corridors are for motorized and non-motorized forms of transportation. The former Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way is reserved for possible light rail, bus rapid transit route, or other non-motorized forms of transportation, including pedestrian and/or bicycle paths.

As summarized in Table 2, the amount of land designated for Coastal Parks and Open Space (CPOS) and Coastal Visitor-Serving Recreation (CVSR) land uses increased, while the amount of land designated for Coastal Visitor-Serving Commercial (CVSC) and Coastal Mixed Use/West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (MX/WBUVSP) land uses decreased. A summary of the land use revisions by subarea is provided below.

**Laguna Grande Subarea** - Within the Laguna Grande Subarea, the boundary modification resulted in a slight change in the shape of the area designated for Coastal Visitor-Serving Commercial (CVSC) and Coastal Parks and Open Space (CPOS) land uses; however, there was no substantial increase or decrease in land area of either land use. In addition, the maximum FAR for Coastal Visitor-Serving Commercial (CVSC) was reduced from 3.0:1 to 1.5:1.

**Roberts Lake Subarea** - Within the Roberts Lake Subarea, all of the land designated for Coastal Visitor-Serving Commercial (CVSC) land use was modified to only allow Coastal Parks and Open Space (CPOS) land uses. Land designated for CPOS land use along the southwestern edge of the lake was modified to allow Coastal Visitor-Serving Recreation (CVSR) land uses. The Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way, where the existing bike trail is located, was designated CTC within this subarea, as noted above.

**Beach Subarea** - Within the Beach Subarea, the Highway 1 right-of-way was designated CTC. In addition, vegetative areas within the Highway 1 right-of-way that were previously identified as ruderal have been modified to be designated Coastal Dune Scrub, a potential environmentally sensitive habitat area (ESHA) (LCP Figure 2-2).

**Del Monte Subarea** - Within the Del Monte Subarea, where the coastal zone boundary bisects an existing shopping center, land use designations were revised by City staff to be consistent with the existing General Plan designations. This revision resulted in a portion of the land designated for Coastal Mixed Use/West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (CMX/WBUVSP) land uses being modified to allow for Coastal Regional Commercial (CCR) and Coastal Heavy Commercial (CCH) land uses. In addition, the Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way was designated CTC within this subarea, as noted above. The CMX/WBUVSP designation is no longer applicable and no longer part of the LCP.

The Highway 1 right-of-way added north of the subareas would be designated for CTC land uses; however, no development is proposed. This area is also under Caltrans jurisdiction, and the railroad right-of-way designated for CTC land uses is under the
jurisdiction of Union Pacific Railroad and the Transportation Agency of Monterey County (TAMC). Although this boundary adjustment resulted in a net increase in land within the City of Seaside coastal zone (primarily north of the main portion of the city), the land added to the coastal zone is already developed (as Highway 1). The City of Seaside LCP proposes no development or other improvements in this area. Any future roadway improvements would be subject to policies of the Coastal Act, as well as Caltrans review.

2.3 Policy Revisions

LCP policy revisions provide for broad protection of natural resource areas, coastal resources, visual resources, water supply, and water quality; reduce risks associated with natural hazards; provide for public access and parks; and provide more specific general permit considerations for land use development. The boundary revisions would expand the area subject to LCP policies. These are described in great detail within the CCC staff report for the December 13, 2012 hearing.

2.4 Development Standards Revisions

Revisions made to the Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP) consisted primarily of physically including large sections of the Seaside Municipal Code. Whereas the initial draft of the CIP incorporated those sections of the Municipal Code by reference and provided citations, CCC staff requested that the applicable code language be included directly within the CIP.
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3.0 ANALYSIS OF LCP REVISIONS

The following analysis documents that the revisions to the various chapters of the LCP would not result in substantial changes to the assumptions or conclusions contained in the City of Seaside LCP Update Initial Study/Negative Declaration (IS/ND), as adopted.

Based on the information below, the LCP would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects that would require the preparation of a subsequent Initial Study/Negative Declaration or an EIR.

3.1 PREVIOUS EVALUATION OF THE LCP'S ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

The adopted IS/ND identified that the proposed LCP would have no impact on agricultural resources, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, and utilities/service systems.

The IS/ND analyzed the proposed LCP for potential impacts to the following: aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology/soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, land use/planning, recreation, transportation/traffic, and mandatory findings of significance. It was determined that the proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment, no mitigation was necessary, and a Negative Declaration was prepared.

3.2 EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS FROM LCP REVISIONS

The revisions made to the LCP have adjusted coastal zone boundaries, modified the land areas of allowed land uses, and strengthened policies and development standards. The analysis below provides an assessment of the net effect of the revisions on the analysis contained within the adopted IS/ND.

3.2.1 AESTHETICS

Previous LCP Impact

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed update to the LCP includes specific goals, policies, and implementation measures to consider and protect visual resources consistent with Section 30251 of the California Coastal Act. Because the policies of the proposed LCP would strengthen existing scenic resource policies and because the policies have been specifically designed to consider and protect visual resources and, where feasible, enhance visual quality in visually degraded areas within the coastal zone, implementation of the proposed LCP would result in a beneficial impact to aesthetic and visual resources. The impact was considered to be less than significant.
ADDENDUM TO THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Net Effect of LCP Revisions

Although the boundaries would increase the total area within the coastal zone, no development is proposed on the land to be added that could cause aesthetic impacts. In addition, expanding the boundaries also expands the area that would enjoy greater visual protection under LCP policies.

The revisions to the land uses would result in a decrease in overall development potential due to a decrease in land area designated for Coastal Visitor-Serving Commercial (CVSC) and Coastal Mixed Use/West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (CMX/WBUVSP). Conversely, the revisions will result in an increase in land designated for Coastal Parks and Open Space (CPOS) and Coastal Visitor-Serving Recreation (CVSR) land uses as summarized in Table 2 above. Although there would be an increase in Coastal Regional Commercial (CCRG), Coastal Heavy Commercial (CCH), and Coastal Transportation Corridor (CTC) land use, no new development is proposed within these land uses.

The revisions to LCP policies that affect natural coastal resources would serve to strengthen protection of visual resources. Specifically, modifications were made to explicitly state that Highway 1 views are important and must be protected, require in-the-field observations at the time development is proposed, and identify and incorporate design elements such as shape, lighting, color, and texture into new development to ensure visual resources are adequately protected. The revisions to the development standards would provide additional regulation of development, including but not limited to siting of structures, mass, lot coverage, orientation, height limits, lighting, and color, which would ensure views from common public viewing areas are protected. These policies would also ensure that development fits in with the natural environment and that new sources of lighting do not project onto neighboring properties or affect sensitive habitats.

Based on the analysis above, the revisions to the LCP would not result in new or intensified effects on scenic vistas or resources, nor contribute to the degradation of visual character of the area. The conclusions of the adopted negative declaration would not change.
3.2.2 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Previous LCP Impact

NO IMPACT. The City of Seaside coastal zone does not contain farmland, agricultural land, or forestland.

Net Effect of LCP Revisions

The area added to the City’s coastal zone is developed as existing urban land uses (i.e., highway right-of-way) and does not contain any farmland, agricultural land, or forestland. Therefore, the revised LCP would result in no impact to agricultural land, farmland, or forest resources.

3.2.3 AIR QUALITY

Previous LCP Impact

NO IMPACT. The LCP is not growth inducing or traffic inducing and will not directly or indirectly result in construction activity, nor does it introduce any components that would expose receptors to objectionable odors. Implementation of the LCP would formalize new policies that would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD) 2008 Air Quality Plan, as the LCP would not result in additional growth beyond what is already planned for in the City’s General Plan.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT. The LCP does not influence the amount of planned growth in population and households. It would be consistent with the MBUAPCD 2008 Air Quality Plan and further reduce the potential for state and federal ozone standards to be exceeded in the future. In addition, the proposed LUP includes a sustainability policy requiring that any new development promote environmental sustainability, which is essential to reducing impacts from air pollution.

Net Effect of LCP Revisions

As noted above, the revisions to the land uses would result in a decrease in overall development potential within the coastal zone due to a decrease in Coastal Visitor-Serving Commercial (CVSC) and Coastal Mixed Use/West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (MX/WBUVSP) land uses as summarized in Table 2 above. Although there would be an increase in Coastal Regional Commercial (CCR), Coastal Heavy Commercial (CCH), and Coastal Transportation Corridor (CTC) land uses, no new development is proposed within these land use categories. Therefore, there would be no increase in emissions as a result of land use changes. The land use revisions were made to reflect existing and permitted uses. No revisions to the sustainability policy were made.
The revised LCP would not conflict with the air quality plan, violate any air quality standards, result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutants, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, or create objectionable odors. Therefore, the proposed project would continue to have no impact and less than significant impacts to air quality as previously analyzed.

### 3.2.4 Biological Resources

#### Previous LCP Impact

**No Impact** Chapter 8.54 of the City of Seaside Municipal Code provides regulations that control the removal, protection, and preservation of trees within the city. The proposed LCP would not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources or with any applicable habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

**Less than Significant Impact** The policies and implementation strategies in the proposed LCP are designed to be consistent with federal, state, and local policies and ordinances protecting biological resources. Specifically, the proposed LCP is consistent with the California Coastal Act, which includes measures to define and protect sensitive coastal species, environmentally sensitive habitat areas (ESHA), riparian habitat, and wetlands. Because the policies of the proposed LCP would strengthen existing biological resource policies and because the policies have been specifically designed to consider and protect species and habitat and, where feasible, enhance biological functioning quality in degraded areas within the coastal zone, implementation of the proposed LCP would result in a beneficial impact to biological resources.

**Net Effect of LCP Revisions**

Although the revised LCP would increase the land area within the coastal zone, no development is proposed on the land to be added. The vegetation areas within the Highway 1 right-of-way that were previously identified as ruderal have been modified to be designated Coastal Dune Scrub, a potential environmentally sensitive habitat area (ESHA) (LCP Figure 2-2). This area is within the jurisdiction of Caltrans, and any transportation-related development proposed within the right-of-way would be subject to subsequent environmental review. LCP policies ensure protection of biological resources, including ESHA. Extending the boundaries and identifying this potential ESHA would ensure that biological resources are protected into the future.

The revisions to land uses would result in a decrease in overall development potential and an increase in land designated for Coastal Parks and Open Space (CPOS) and Coastal Visitor-Serving Recreation (CVSR) land uses as summarized in Table 2 above. These land use revisions would reduce development potential and serve to further protect biological resources.
The revisions to LCP policies that affect natural coastal resources would strengthen protection of biological resources. Revisions to LCP policies that affect natural habitat areas provide greater protection of natural coastal resources, environmentally sensitive habitat areas (ESHAs), wetlands, marine resources, and the Canyon del Rey Watershed. In addition, revisions to policies under “Water Quality” indirectly provide greater protection of biological resources by providing further protection from stormwater pollution. Revisions to LCP policies that affect land use and development require development to make greater consideration for the protection of natural habitat areas, including ESHAs, wetlands, marine resources, watersheds, and water quality.

The revisions to the development standards would provide additional guidance for development, including but not limited to siting of structures, massing, lot coverage, orientation, height limits, lighting, and color, which would ensure protection and enhancement of the nearby biological resources. These modifications ensure that a 50-foot setback is required adjacent to the lakes; however, this setback can be reduced if biological evidence indicates a lesser setback is appropriate. In no case is the setback allowed to go below 25 feet and must take into consideration changes in sea level conditions. Certain public access trail enhancements are allowed within the setback area. Modifications were made to directly address dune stabilization or dune habitat enhancement to improve habitat values for native dune plant and animal species. The City is also required to update and amend the LCP once the Wetlands Management and Enhancement Program is updated.

Based on the analysis above, the LCP revisions would not result in a substantial adverse effect on any special-status species (including migratory fish or wildlife), riparian habitat, wetland habitat, or other sensitive natural community. The revisions would also not conflict with policies protecting biological resources or an adopted habitat conservation plan. Therefore, the proposed project would continue to result in no impacts and less than significant impacts to biological resources as previously analyzed.

3.2.5 Cultural Resources

Previous LCP Impact

Less than Significant Impact. This LCP recognized the importance of cultural resources and provided a policy to ensure protection of these resources. The proposed LCP was consistent with and works in partnership with City policies and state and federal laws, where applicable, to honor, identify, and protect cultural resources. Specifically, LCP Policy LUD-CZ 2.11 states that mitigation would be required as a condition of development where it would adversely impact any archaeological or paleontological resources as identified by the State Historic Preservation Officer. Because the policy has been specifically designed to preserve and protect cultural and paleontological resources within the City’s coastal zone, implementation of the proposed LCP would result in a less than significant impact to these resources.
Net Effect of LCP Revisions

Although the modified boundaries would increase the land area within the coastal zone, no development is proposed on the land to be added. Revisions to LCP policies resulted in Policy LUC-CZ 2.11 being renumbered as LUC-CZ 3.7.A and modified the policies to provide greater protection of cultural resources by requiring the City to identify and protect archaeological resources within the city and requiring a Phase I Archaeological Study, performed by a registered professional archaeologist, to determine whether significant archeological resources may be present when excavation activities are proposed. These revisions would provide greater protection of cultural resources over a broader area; therefore, the changes would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical, archaeological, and/or paleontological resource or result in the disturbance of human remains. The proposed project would continue to result in less than significant impacts to cultural resources as previously analyzed.

3.2.6 Geology/Soils

Previous LCP Impact

Less than Significant Impact. Implementation of the LCP would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving earthquake, ground shaking, or seismic-related ground failure. The LCP included specific policies intended to minimize adverse impacts of any future development within the coastal zone associated with earthquake and other hazards consistent with provisions of the City’s adopted Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) and the California Coastal Act. In addition, the LCP includes specific policies intended to minimize adverse impacts of any future development within the coastal zone associated with geologic hazards and soils. These policies require that proposed development include an analysis of hazards or hazardous constraints associated with the project, any necessary mitigation measures, a determination that the site is suitable for the proposed development and that it will be safe from hazards, and a demonstration of adequate water and sewage treatment.

Net Effect of LCP Revisions

The revisions to LCP policies that affect natural coastal resources would strengthen protection of people and property from risks associated with earthquake, ground shaking, or seismic-related ground failure and other natural hazards. Revisions to LCP policies under “Natural Hazards” provide greater protection from natural hazards such as geologic, flooding, sea level rise, tsunamis, and ocean storm and surge. Revisions to development standards provide more detailed guidance for development with regard to placement, lot coverage, and setbacks to ensure protection from natural hazards.

The modifications require that a geotechnical report be prepared by a licensed engineer must include an analysis of wave uprush and shoreline erosion processes in
order to establish the appropriate long-term setbacks that will ensure the safety and protection of any permitted structures over the life of the development without reliance on seawalls, deep caisson foundation, or similar engineered structures. The modifications further identify the conditions that must be considered in the report, including a seasonally eroded beach, high tide, long-term sea level rise projections, and the 100-year storm. The modifications also explicitly require identification of economic lifetime and expectations for decommissioning development when hazardous conditions dictate. These revisions would ensure that potential impacts associated with geology and soils remain less than significant as previously analyzed.

3.2.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Previous LCP Impact

Less than Significant Impact. The LCP re-integrated the policies and implementation tools scattered within the City’s General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, and other City documents into an up-to-date, streamlined, user-friendly document that would allow the City to efficiently address future planning on specific parcels and coastal resources and access. The LCP also incorporated new material to address timely and relevant coastal issues. The proposed LCP does not anticipate any additional population growth beyond what is anticipated in the City’s General Plan, nor would it result in new construction activity. As a result, implementation of the LCP policies would not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly. The proposed LCP does not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Specifically, the proposed LCP is consistent with the intent and environmental protection mandates of the adopted Local Coastal Plan, the City of Seaside Zoning Ordinance, the City of Seaside General Plan, and the California Coastal Act as described in the Land Use/Planning section of the Initial Study.

Net Effect of LCP Revisions

As noted previously, the revisions to LCP land uses would result in a decrease in overall development potential as summarized in Table 2 above. Although there would be an increase in Coastal Regional Commercial (CCRG), Coastal Heavy Commercial (CCH), and Coastal Transportation Corridor (CTC) land uses, no new development is proposed within these developed land use categories. The land use revisions were made to reflect existing and permitted uses. Implementation of the revised LCP would not generate new or additional greenhouse gas emissions that would have a significant impact on the environment or conflict with policies adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions. Therefore, the proposed project would continue to be considered as having a less than significant impact on greenhouse gas emissions as previously analyzed.
3.2.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Previous LCP Impact

**No Impact.** The LCP includes a policy that requires future proposed development to be consistent with applicable goals and actions outlined in the City of Seaside Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) (adopted September 2005). Implementation of the LCP would not involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Because implementation of the LCP does not involve the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, the project would not create reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. The LCP does not involve siting of projects on hazardous material sites. Implementation of the proposed LCP would not result in hazardous emissions or an airport safety hazard for people residing or working in the City’s coastal zone.

**Less than Significant Impact.** Action 3.22 of LCP Policy NCR-CZ 5.2 requires that all new construction in areas susceptible to fires is completed using fire-resistant design techniques that will limit damage caused by wildfires consistent with the provisions of the City’s adopted LHMP.

Net Effect of LCP Revisions

The revised coastal zone boundary would add land to the coastal zone in the northern portion of the city. However, this area is within the Highway 1 right-of-way and is not considered a hazardous site, and no development is proposed in this corridor.

Although there would be an increase in land area designated for Coastal Regional Commercial (CCRG), Coastal Heavy Commercial (CCH), and Coastal Transportation Corridor (CTC) land uses, which are sometimes associated with the use or transport of hazardous material, no new development is proposed within these previously developed areas. The land use revisions were made to reflect existing and permitted uses. Therefore, there would be no increased potential for exposure to hazardous materials as a result of the land use changes.

The revisions to LCP policies that affect natural coastal resources would strengthen protection from risks associated with natural hazards. Revisions to LCP policies under “Natural Hazards” provide greater protection from natural hazards such as geologic, flooding, sea level rise, tsunamis, and ocean storms and surge. Revisions to development standards provide more detailed guidance to ensure protection from natural hazards. These revisions would ensure that potential impacts associated with natural hazards remain less than significant, as previously analyzed.
3.2.9 Hydrology/Water Quality

Previous LCP Impact

No Impact. The LCP does not locate any residential uses beyond those anticipated in the City’s adopted General Plan and West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan. Implementation of the LCP would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The LCP includes specific policies meant to ensure any future development is consistent with state and City regulations. LCP policies also are intended to protect and, where feasible, enhance water quality consistent with the California Coastal Act.

Less than Significant Impact. The LCP includes specific policies intended to protect and, where feasible, enhance water supply consistent with the California Coastal Act. Several LCP policies are intended to prevent future development from resulting in erosion, flooding, or pollution impacts associated with drainage alteration and to ensure flood control mechanisms are in place consistent with state and local policies, including the California Building Code and the Coastal Act.

Net Effect of LCP Revisions

The revisions to the coastal zone boundaries would increase the total impervious surface area within the coastal zone (from inclusion of the transportation corridor). However, this increase would be due to existing development (roadways) and not the addition of new development. The policy revisions under natural coastal resources ensure adequate water supply, adoption of adequate stormwater pollution prevention and Low Impact Development strategies, and protection and prevention of flooding. The policy revisions require development to have greater consideration for the watershed and water quality, water supply, and conservation than previous policies.

Modifications were made to address the recently adopted Post-Construction Stormwater Management Requirements (September 6, 2012), and similarly adopt and implement the recommendations of the City’s soon-to-be revised Wetlands Management, Enhancement, and Restoration Program. Modifications require development and re-development to reduce sources of and/or treat pollution before it enters the storm drain system and ultimately the City’s coastal waterways for the City to seek opportunities to consolidate and/or eliminate beach discharge facilities and outfalls where possible. The City is required to continue to participate in the regional Water Quality Control Board Stormwater regulation program, improvement and comply with final management requirement of that program. Additional modifications to natural hazard policies require tsunami threats be addressed via siting and design measures that minimize and mitigate flood hazards to the maximum extent possible, including by designing all habitable space above the maximum flood elevation and development of a Tsunami Preparedness Plan that includes identifying susceptible areas, preparation of response policies/practices, deployment of an early warning system, identification of evacuation routes, and public education for mitigating the
hazards associated with a tsunami. Previous mentioned modifications would further address flooding hazards associated sea level rise.

Implementation of the revised LCP would not violate water quality standards or water discharge requirements, substantially deplete groundwater supplies or alter existing drainage patterns, create or contribute runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing drainage systems, place housing within 100-year floodplain or structures within a 100-year floodplain that would impede flood flows, or expose people or structures to risk associated with flooding or inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Therefore, the revised LCP would continue to result in no impacts and less than significant impacts to hydrology and water quality, as previously analyzed.

### 3.2.10 LAND USE/PLANNING

**Previous LCP Impact**

**No Impact.** Implementation of the policies of the LCP would not divide an established community or conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

**Less than Significant Impact.** The LCP does not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Specifically, the LCP is consistent with the intent and environmental protection mandates of the adopted Local Coastal Plan, the City of Seaside Zoning Ordinance, the City of Seaside General Plan, and the California Coastal Act.

**Net Effect of LCP Revisions**

The addition of land area to the City’s coastal boundary would not divide an established community because the changes were made to reflect the City of Seaside’s current city limits. The land use revisions would not result in new development that would conflict with existing land use plans because the changes were made to make the document more consistent with the General Plan. The revised policies and development standards would make the document more consistent with the Coastal Act and tie certain requirements directly to the Municipal Code to ensure that any development proposed is consistent with the requirements both of the Coastal Act and of the City of Seaside. Therefore, potential impacts to land use/planning would remain less than significant, as previously analyzed.

### 3.2.11 MINERAL RESOURCES

**Previous LCP Impact**

**No Impact.** According to the Seaside General Plan, there are no mineral resources identified within Seaside. The proposed LCP would not result in a loss of availability of a known mineral resource or locally important mineral resource recovery site.
Net Effect of LCP Revisions

The area added to the coastal zone boundary is primarily located within the Highway 1 right-of-way between the Del Monte Boulevard and Lightfighter Drive off-ramps. No mineral resources or locally important mineral resource recovery sites are located within the right-of-way or other existing developed areas to be added to the coastal zone. Therefore, the revised LCP would continue to have no impact on mineral resources.

3.2.12 Noise

Previous LCP Impact

No Impact. Implementation of the policies of the LCP would not result in exposure of persons to noise in excess of established standards, excessive vibration, or excessive airport noise levels and would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the City’s coastal zone.

Net Effect of LCP Revisions

The revised land uses would result in less development potential compared to the previous LCP, and no new development is proposed, as previously analyzed. Implementation of the revised policies would continue to result no impact relative to noise.

3.2.13 Population and Housing

Previous LCP Impact

No Impact. The LCP does not accommodate growth beyond what is anticipated by the City’s adopted General Plan. Implementation of the LCP would not induce population growth or displace existing housing or people.

Net Effect of LCP Revisions

The revised land uses would result in less potential development than the previous LCP, and no development is proposed, as previously analyzed. Implementation of the revised LCP would not induce population growth or displace existing housing or people and would continue to have no impact on population and housing.

3.2.14 Public Services

Previous LCP Impact

No Impact. Implementation of the LCP would not accommodate additional population growth beyond what has been anticipated by the General Plan. Implementation of the policies within the LCP would not result in substantial adverse
physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered
governmental facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental
facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in
order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance
objectives for any of the public services. Therefore, no impact is expected to public
services causing the need for new governmental facilities.

Net Effect of LCP Revisions

The revised land uses and policies would result in less potential development than the
previous LCP, and no development is proposed, as previously analyzed. Modifications
acknowledge water resource problems and ensures that development demonstrate
the availability of adequate long-term supplies for development. Modifications also
require demonstrating adequate wastewater revised. Implementation of the revised
LCP would not result in a substantial adverse physical impact associated with the
provision of public services, consistent with the previous analysis.

3.2.15 Recreation

Previous LCP Impact

No Impact. Implementation of the LCP would not accommodate additional
population growth beyond what has been anticipated by the General Plan. Therefore,
implementation of the policies within the LCP would not increase the use of public
parks such that deterioration of facilities would occur or be accelerated.

Less than Significant Impact. The LCP contains several policies maximizing coastal
recreational opportunities and beach/park/trail/recreation access, consistent with the
mandate of the California Coastal Act. LCP Policy PAR-CZ 1.7 requires that the City
explore development of a Peninsula Visitors Center at a location within, or at a
compatible location adjacent to, the Seaside coastal zone. The LCP does not propose
any specific development, and details of future facilities cannot be known at this time.
Any future construction or expansion of recreational facilities would require
independent environmental analysis consistent with the proposed LCP, CEQA, and
other state and local requirements.

Net Effect of LCP Revisions

The revised land uses would increase the amount of land designated for Coastal Parks
and Open Space (CPOS) and Coastal Visitor-Serving Recreation (CVSR), which would
increase recreation opportunities within the coastal zone. The revised LCP policies and
development standard provide more detailed guidance to ensure the provision for
greater recreation opportunities and public access, and the management of and
improvements to these facilities. Modifications were made that require that public
access and recreation amenities (i.e. Monterey Bay Recreation Trail) be managed in a
manner that will ensure those amenities can adapt to changes in sea level rise and
shoreline configuration; to ensure lower cost visitor and recreational facilities are protected, encouraged, and provided; and to protect the railroad right-of-way with an emphasis on expanding alternative forms of transportation (i.e. light rail, bus rapid transit, pedestrian and bicycle transport). As with the previous LCP, no development is proposed, and future construction or expansion of recreational facilities would require independent environmental analysis. Therefore, the proposed project’s impact to recreation would remain less than significant, as previously analyzed.

3.2.16 Transportation and Traffic

Previous LCP Impact

**No Impact.** Implementation of the LCP would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, a substantial increase in hazards related to a design feature or incompatible uses, or inadequate emergency access, nor would it conflict with policies or plans supporting alternative transportation. Policies of the LCP are specifically designed to encourage, maximize, and protect pedestrian and bicycle connectivity (refer to LUP Policies PAR-CZ 1.1–7).

**Less than Significant.** Implementation of the LCP would not accelerate additional population growth beyond what has been anticipated in the General Plan. Therefore, implementation of the policies within the LCP would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. Any future development allowed under the LCP land use designations would be required to undergo independent environmental analysis consistent with CEQA and City policies at the time of proposal.

Net Effect of LCP Revisions

The revised land uses would result in less potential development than the previous LCP, and no specific development is proposed. The revised LCP policies continue to encourage, maximize, and protect pedestrian and bicycle connectivity. In addition, the inclusion of the Coastal Transportation Corridor (CTC) ensures the protection of existing rights-of-way that serve as essential public transportation corridors, including potential light rail, bus rapid transit, or other non-motorized forms of transportation, which would be consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan. Therefore, the revised LCP would continue to result in no impacts and less than significant impacts to traffic and transportation, as previously analyzed.

3.2.17 Utilities/Service Systems

Previous LCP Impact

**No Impact.** Implementation of the proposed LCP would not accommodate additional population growth beyond what has been anticipated in the General Plan. Implementation of the policies within the LCP would not exceed wastewater treatment
requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board, require the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities, exceed service capacity, or affect solid waste disposal needs. For any future development within Seaside’s coastal zone, LCP Policy LUD-CZ 2.6 outlined the general permit considerations for water/wastewater consistent with regional and local requirements. Specifically, this policy requires that prior to the approval of any new development within the coastal zone, adequate water and sewage treatment facility capacity shall be demonstrated consistent with the provisions and requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Any future development within Seaside’s coastal zone will be required to be evaluated for compliance with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste at the time of proposal.

Net Effect of LCP Revisions

The proposed project would not result in development that would increase the demand for utilities and service systems beyond that anticipated in the General Plan. Revisions to LCP policies renumbered Policy LUD-CZ 2.6 as LUC-CZ 3.4.A. Also, Policies LUD-CZ 3.3.A and LUD-CZ 3.3.B provide additional considerations for future potential development with regard to water resources and utilities, and water supply/water conservation. Implementation of the revised LCP still requires that prior to the approval of any development within the coastal zone, adequate water and sewage treatment facility capacity be demonstrated consistent with the provisions and requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and that an evaluation for compliance with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste be conducted at the time of proposal. Therefore, the revised LCP would continue to have no impact on utilities/service system, as previously analyzed.

3.2.18 Mandatory Findings of Significance

Previous LCP Impact

Less than Significant. Based on the evaluation in the Initial Study, the LCP would either have no impact or have a less than significant impact in all environmental issue areas.

Net Effect of LCP Revisions

The specific revisions to the LCP would not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. The revised LCP would either have no impact or have a less than significant impact in all environmental issue areas, and none of these impacts would be considered cumulatively considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past, current, and probable future projects. In addition, the revised LCP would not have any environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse
effects on human beings. Therefore, the LCP as revised would continue to result in mandatory findings of significance that are considered less than significant.

4.0 CONCLUSION

The LCP revisions result in a document that strengthens consistency with the California Coastal Act and the City’s General Plan, corrects minor typographical errors, and updates the City of Seaside’s coastal zone boundaries to reflect the Mello Act and to include existing Highway 1 right-of-way that is within the coastal zone along the former Fort Ord.

These revisions would not result in new significant impacts or result in a substantial increase in the severity of previously analyzed effects, and no new or additional mitigation measures are warranted. Conversely, the LCP revisions resulting from CCC staff’s review serve to strengthen the environmental protection policies of the LCP.

Based on these findings, and consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(1), the City of Seaside has determined that this Addendum provides sufficient documentation and analysis of the changes to the LCP.
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NOTICE OF INTENT
NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the City of Seaside has prepared a Negative Declaration, pursuant to the requirements of CEQA, for the City of Seaside Local Coastal Program (LCP). The project area encompasses the Coastal Zone within the City of Seaside. The Initial Study and proposed Negative Declaration, as well as referenced documents, are available for review at the Planning Division of the Resource Management Services, 440 Harcourt Avenue, Seaside, CA 93955. The Initial Study and proposed Negative Declaration will be considered at the regular meeting of the City of Seaside Planning Commission, to be held on October 13, 2010 at 7:00 P.M. at the Seaside City Hall Council Chambers, located at 440 Harcourt Avenue, Seaside, CA 93955. An additional copy for public review is available at the Seaside Branch Library, 550 Harcourt Avenue, Seaside, CA 93955. In accordance with time limits mandated by State law, written comments on this Negative Declaration and Initial Study will be accepted from:

Begins – Thursday August 5, 2010  Ends – Tuesday September 7, 2010

Project Description: The City of Seaside is mandated by the California Coastal Act of 1976 to prepare a Local Coastal Program (LCP) for the area of the City that lies within the Coastal Zone boundary. The LCP consists of two major parts: The Land Use Plan (LUP) and the Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP). The LUP designates the kinds, location, and intensity of land and water uses, and presents applicable resource protection and development policies to accomplish the policies of the Coastal Act. The LCP must be adopted by the City, then reviewed and approved (certified) by the California Coastal Commission (CCC). The LCP may be amended in accordance with California Code of Regulations and Public Resources Code.
FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION CONTACT:

Rick Medina, Senior Planner  
City of Seaside  
Resource Management Services – Planning Division  
440 Harcourt Avenue  
Seaside, CA 93955  
Ph: (831) 899-6727

For reviewing agencies: The City of Seaside requests that you review the enclosed materials and provide any appropriate comments related to your agency’s area of responsibility. The space below may be used to indicate that your agency has no comments or to state brief comments.

Distribution: (see below)

    ___ No Comments provided
    ___ Comments noted below
    ___ Comments provided in separate letter

COMMENTS: _____________________________________________
    _____________________________________________
    _____________________________________________

Return to: Rick Medina, Senior Planner
        City of Seaside
        Resource Management Services – Planning Division
        440 Harcourt Avenue
        Seaside, CA 93955

From: Agency Name: _________________________________

Contact Person: _________________________________

Phone Number: _________________________________
DISTRIBUTION

1. Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG)
2. California Coastal Commission (CCC), Central Coast District Office
3. California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), Central Region 4 Office
4. Del Rey Oaks, City of
5. Marina, City of
6. Monterey, City of
7. Sand City, City of
8. Seaside, City of-City Attorney
9. Seaside, City of-City Engineer
10. Seaside, City of-Branch Library
11. Seaside, City of-Fire Department
12. Seaside/Sand City, Cities of-Chamber of Commerce
13. Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD)
14. Monterey County Agricultural Commissioner
15. Monterey County Clerk’s Office
16. Monterey County Health Department, Environmental Health Division
17. Monterey County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo)
18. Monterey County Resource Management Agency (MCRMA), Planning Department
19. Monterey County Water Resources Agency (MCWRA)
20. Monterey County Agricultural and Historic Conservancy, Inc
21. Monterey County Supervisor, District 4-Jane Parker
22. Monterey Peninsula Unified School District (MPUSD)
23. Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District (MPRPD)
24. Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency (MRWPCA)
25. Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), Central Coast Region
26. Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC)
PROPOSED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
Project Name: City of Seaside Local Coastal Program

This Negative Declaration is comprised of this form along with the Initial Study that includes the Environmental Checklist Form.

1. **California Environmental Quality Act Negative Declaration Findings:**

   This Negative Declaration reflects the decision-making body’s independent judgment and analysis, and; that the decision-making body has reviewed and considered the information contained in this Negative Declaration and the comments received during the public review period, and; on the basis of the whole record before the decision-making body (including this Negative Declaration) that there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment.

2. **Required Mitigation Measures:**

   None.

3. **Critical Project Design Elements That Must Become Conditions of Approval:**

   None.

**ADOPTION STATEMENT:** This Negative Declaration was adopted and the above CEQA findings made by the:

City of Seaside City Council

On ____________, 2010

Ralph Rubio, Mayor
INITIAL STUDY
INITIAL STUDY

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>City of Seaside Local Coastal Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Location:</td>
<td>Coastal Zone within the City of Seaside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner/Applicant:</td>
<td>City of Seaside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APN(s):</td>
<td>Multiple; Coastal Zone within the City of Seaside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage of Property:</td>
<td>Approximately 90 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Designation:</td>
<td>Park and Open Space (POS) and Regional Commercial (RGC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Classification:</td>
<td>Open Space – Recreation (OSR) and Regional Commercial (CRG) with Coastal Zone (CZ) overlay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Agency:</td>
<td>City of Seaside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Person:</td>
<td>Rick Medina, Senior Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Seaside,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resource Management Services – Planning Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>440 Harcourt Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seaside, CA 93955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone: (831) 899-6727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:rmedina@ci.seaside.ca.us">rmedina@ci.seaside.ca.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>PMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barb Kinison Brown, Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ashley Hefner, Assistant Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Prepared:</td>
<td>August 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preparation of the City of Seaside Local Coastal Program (LCP) (City’s coastal zone), to protect and enhance the resources of the coastal zone, consistent with the goals of the California Coastal Act, as well as the expressed goals of the citizenry. The LCP consists of two major parts: The Land Use Plan (LUP) and the Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP). The LUP designates the kinds, location, and intensity of land and water uses, and presents applicable resource protection and development policies to accomplish the policies of the Coastal Act. The CIP provides development regulations for specific coastal zone activities and development needed to carry out the LUP.

Public Agency Comment Period: Thursday August 5, 2010 through Tuesday September 7, 2010
This page intentionally left blank
A. PROJECT LOCATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

PROJECT LOCATION

The City of Seaside is situated on the Monterey Bay in Monterey County, California, adjacent to the cities of Monterey, Del Rey Oaks, and Sand City and the Pacific Ocean, approximately 71 miles southwest of the City of San Jose and 16 miles west of the City of Salinas. Refer to Figure 1.

The City of Seaside coastal zone area, the area to be governed by the City of Seaside Local Coastal Program (LCP), is located roughly in the southwestern corner of the city. Surrounding the coastal zone area is the Pacific Ocean to the north, the City of Seaside to the east, and the City of Monterey to the south and west. Refer to Figure 2.

The Seaside coastal zone encompasses approximately 90 acres of land that extends from the Pacific Ocean to the terminus of the Canyon Del Rey Creek on the southeastern portion of Laguna Grande. The coastal zone is completely bounded to the southwest by the City of Monterey and to the northwest by the Pacific Ocean. Sand City and Canyon Del Rey Boulevard border most of the south and east portions of the coastal zone.

The Seaside coastal zone contains approximately 500 feet of beach frontage along the Pacific Ocean. A former estuarine complex, composed of Roberts Lake at the center and Laguna Grande to the south, makes up the vast portion of the City's coastal zone area. Highway 1 separates the beach from Roberts Lake, although they are connected by an outfall located at the foot of Humboldt Street and by the seawall adjacent to the Monterey Beach Hotel, Del Monte Boulevard and the abandoned Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way separate Roberts Lake from Laguna Grande. The Seaside portion of the Monterey Bay Coastal Recreation Trail runs along a portion of the railroad right-of-way, around Roberts Lake and along the coastline through the Beach Subarea. This section is part of an 18-mile coastal rail-trail that extends from Pacific Grove to Castroville. Several commercial businesses are located along the northeastern portion of Del Monte Boulevard.

Existing land uses within the coastal zone area include park/open space and commercial uses. Habitats within the coastal zone area include marine, coastal dune scrub, estuarine, emergent wetland, coastal oak woodland, park, urban, and ruderal habitats. The coastal zone area comprises four subareas — the Laguna Grande, Roberts Lake, Beach, and Del Monte subareas — which are illustrated in Figure 2 briefly described below.

Laguna Grande Subarea

The Laguna Grande Subarea comprises approximately 42 acres of land and extends from Del Monte Boulevard to Fremont Avenue on the southeastern portion of Laguna Grande. Laguna Grande is located directly across from Seaside City Hall. The subarea is bordered on the northwest by the Embassy Suites and Holiday Inn Express, on the southwest by Monterey’s city boundary, and on the southeast by Fremont Boulevard. A mixture of commercial businesses occupies the northeastern corner. Laguna Grande is largely emergent wetland and is the receiver of sediment that has been collected by Canyon Del Rey Creek, which enters Laguna Grande on the southeast side of the subarea, comprised mostly of undeveloped parkland. The Laguna Grande Subarea’s primary land uses are as a city park as well as a regional park for the Monterey Peninsula. Two hotels and a restaurant are located on relatively small portions of the subarea, along Del Monte and Canyon Del Rey Boulevards. Saint Seraphim’s parish, of the Russian Orthodox Church, is located at the intersection of Canyon Del Rey Boulevard and Francis Avenue.
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Roberts Lake Subarea

The Roberts Lake Subarea comprises approximately 21 acres of land located in the central portion of the coastal zone across from the Embassy Suites and Holiday Inn Express hotels. It is bordered on the southeast by Del Monte Boulevard, on the northeast by Canyon Del Rey Boulevard, on the northwest by Highway 1, and on the southwest by the La Quinta Inn on Roberts Avenue. Historic public use of Roberts Lake includes model boat racing, bird watching, and recreational fishing. The lake’s primary uses are as an open space for bird watching as well as a connection to the Monterey Peninsula Recreational Trail (Monterey Bay Coastal Recreation Trail) that makes up the perimeter of the subarea. The majority of the subarea is a paved visitor parking lot, and bordering this lot is the emergent wetland that is Roberts Lake. The area north of Roberts Lake along the south and east of Highway 1 consists of coastal dune scrub habitat.

Beach Subarea

The Beach Subarea consists of approximately 500 feet of beach frontage along the Pacific Ocean. The subarea is bordered by the Pacific Ocean to the north and west and four paved areas to the south and east, the beach visitor parking lot, the Monterey Bay trail system, Sand Dunes Drive, and Highway 1. The primary use of the subarea is as an open space and recreational resource for the City of Seaside. The beach is well used by surfers, picnickers, joggers, beachcombers, and nature enthusiasts year-round. The area also offers a respite for travelers along the Recreation Trail. The areas in between the visitor parking lot, the Monterey Bay Coastal Recreation Trail, Sand Dunes Drive that runs parallel to Highway 1, and other dune scrub habitat adjacent to the subarea are dominated by Alaskan ice plant. Within the subarea, the degradation of the sand dune environment from recreational use has resulted in the loss of dune vegetation and movement of the dunes by the wind, which has caused increased sedimentation and water quality problems within Roberts Lake and Laguna Grande (City of Seaside 2002). However, there is an effort to balance recreational uses of the beach with preservation of fragile habitat. On the northeastern portion of the dune area which connects to State Parks land, designated trails have been identified and revegetation efforts are under way.

Del Monte Subarea

The Del Monte Subarea encompasses roughly 9 acres of urban area along Del Monte Boulevard from its intersection with Canyon Del Rey (Highway 218) to its intersection with West Broadway Avenue to the northeast. The Roberts Lake and Laguna Grande subareas are to the southwest, and the Beach Subarea is to the northeast on the opposite side of Highway 1 and the Monterey Bay Coastal Recreation Trail. The Del Monte Subarea includes the Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way, which is to become the future location of a multimodal transit hub. In 2010, the West Broadway Urban Village (WBUV) Specific Plan was adopted, which includes the Del Monte Subarea. The goal of the Specific Plan is to revitalize and enhance the Del Monte Boulevard and West Broadway Avenue urban areas through creation of a pedestrian-friendly Urban Village. The Specific Plan envisions the subarea to be an active mixed-use commercial corridor that promotes connectivity and provides supporting uses to the future multimodal transit station and the existing and planned hotels on Canyon Del Rey Boulevard. Current land uses in the Del Monte Subarea include commercial and light industrial uses. The unique and valued qualities of the Del Monte Subarea area include its central location to the downtown area of the City of Seaside as well as its proximity to coastal resources.
B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed City of Seaside Local Coastal Program (LCP) for the City's coastal zone would update the 1983 Land Use Plan (LUP) of the City of Seaside (certified by the California Coastal Commission on October 12, 1983), and provide tools (Coastal Implementation Plan – CIP) to implement the land use plan. These two components taken together constitute the LCP.

Project Objectives

The intent of the proposed LCP is to update and organize policies and implementation tools to better protect and enhance the resources of the coastal zone, consistent with the goals of the California Coastal Act as well as the expressed goals of the citizenry. To accomplish this, the proposed LCP has re-integrated the policies and implementation tools currently scattered among the General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, and other City documents in an effort to provide an up-to-date, streamlined, user-friendly document that would allow the City to efficiently address future planning of the coast's resources on specific parcels, preserve coastal resources, and improve access. Key aspects of the LCP update include the following:

- The intent of relevant general goals as put forward in the 1983 LUP is maintained, while remaining consistent with Coastal Act policies.

- The City's LUP has been individualized rather than prepared as a joint document with the City of Monterey as it was in 1983.

- Policies have been updated to be consistent with the City's 2004 General Plan.

- The goals established by the West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (WBUVSP) are incorporated into the Del Monte Subarea of the coastal zone.

- Policies that are outdated or do not make sense based on the current land use policies have been identified and discarded.

- Redundancy is eliminated and consistency is maintained throughout the document and across other City documents.

- Policies and programs have been added or expanded in response to changing community needs and issues.

- A Users Guide has been created to assist planners and the public with policy guidance and implementation for the coastal zone.

- Coastal zone policies have been organized by geographic subarea so they are easier to find and implement.

- New coastal policies and strategies have been included to address gaps in the current LUP, emerging issues and challenges, and new (or anticipated) state requirements, including those addressing climate change and sea level rise.

- Relevant and up-to-date policies have been incorporated as necessary to guide sustainable planning in the City's coastal zone.
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Project Characteristics

The City of Seaside LUP coastal zone area consists of several proposed land use designations, as follows. Refer to Figure 3.

- **Coastal Parks and Open Space (CPOS):** This designation is appropriate in areas where the City wants to protect and preserve natural resources and habitat, views, and other visual amenities and protect people and property from natural and man-made hazards. This designation also identifies existing or planned parkland. Public use areas include the sandy beach, access ways, parks, trails, walkways, and other recreational amenities that are publicly owned or over which easements are required as a condition of development. The maximum floor area ratio (FAR) within this designation is 0.01:1.

- **Coastal Visitor-Serving Commercial (CVSC):** Principal permitted visitor-serving commercial uses include hotels/motels, food service, retail establishments, visitor/traveler support services (such as visitor information centers), and recreational-related commercial uses. The maximum FAR is 1.0:1, except that hotels are allowed a maximum FAR of 3.0:1.

- **Coastal Visitor-Serving Recreation (CVSR):** Principal permitted visitor-serving recreation uses include recreational equipment rental centers (such as bicycle, boat, and other recreational equipment) and visitor-serving support services (such as visitor information centers). Commercial uses such as hotels/motels, restaurants, and retail establishments are not allowed. However, counter food service (such as a snack bar) which is ancillary to a primary permitted use is permissible. The maximum FAR is 0.5:1.

- **Coastal Mixed Use/West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (CMX/WBUVSP):** Seaside has developed a Mixed Use category as a way to promote pedestrian and transit-oriented activity centers that have a mixture of residential, commercial, office, and civic uses. This designation is appropriate in the Del Monte Subarea to be consistent and compatible with the West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan. The City may consider identification and development of transit parking or transit supporting uses as a component of mixed use within the coastal zone. This category is intended to accommodate a well-integrated mix of high-intensity residential, commercial, office, and civic uses. Housing densities range from 30 to 60 dwelling units per gross acre. Under this designation, residential and commercial uses may be developed on the same parcel (i.e., residential above commercial). The maximum FAR is 2.0:1.

BACKGROUND

The City of Seaside is mandated by the California Coastal Act of 1976 to prepare a Local Coastal Program (LCP) for the area of the city that lies within its coastal zone boundary. The LCP is the contract between the City and the State of California specifying how the City will protect California's coastal resources.

In the early 1980s, the City of Seaside completed the first step in the process of completing its LCP. The City’s existing LUP and related text and mapping were adopted and certified by the Coastal Commission in October of 1983. The City must now complete the second step of the process to obtain the permitting authority in the coastal zone.
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In 2004, the City incorporated applicable goals and policies from the LUP into the General Plan as a part of an overall General Plan Update. These actions were followed in December 2007 by a comprehensive update of the City’s Zoning Ordinance, which included the creation of a Coastal Overlay District and incorporation of development standards from the LUP in the various appropriate sections of the Zoning Ordinance.

Due to the age of the LUP, the document has numerous gaps in strategies to address current or emerging issues. In addition, the goals, policies, and development standards of the LCP are currently segmented into sections of the General Plan and Municipal Code as part of recent updates to those documents.

California Coastal Act

The California Coastal Act (California Public Resources Code Sections 30000 et seq.) was enacted by the State Legislature in 1976 to provide long-term protection of California’s coastline. The Coastal Act contains policies that address public access to the coast, coastal recreation, the marine environment, coastal land resources, and coastal development of various types, including energy facilities, ports, and other industrial development. Jurisdictions within a certain distance of the coast, called the coastal zone, are subjected to these policies.

The Coastal Act grants the State the authority to permit development within the coastal zone until such time as local jurisdictions complete, and the Coastal Commission certifies, the LCP.

Local Coastal Program (LCP)

The Coastal Act outlines a partnership between the state and local governments to manage the conservation and development of coastal resources. The City’s portion of this partnership is described in the LCP. The LCP incorporates the goals and policies of the Coastal Act into the City’s regulations and identifies the location, type, densities, and development standards for future development in the coastal zone.

As identified earlier, the LCP consists of two major parts: the Land Use Plan (LUP) and the Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP). The LUP designates the kinds, location, and intensity of land and water uses, and presents applicable resource protection and development policies to accomplish the policies of the Coastal Act. The CIP is the zoning/implementation plan for the LUP and includes the relevant portions of the local government’s zoning code, which regulates land uses and establishes appropriate height, bulk, and setback requirements for structures. The CIP also contains zoning maps that show which zoning rules apply to areas within the coastal zone. In addition, the CIP contains procedural requirements that govern which types of projects require a coastal permit, how a coastal permit can be obtained, and the opportunities for public participation in coastal permit review.

The LCP must be adopted by the City, then be reviewed and approved (certified) by the California Coastal Commission (CCC). The LCP may be amended in accordance with the California Code of Regulations and Public Resources Code.

Local Permitting

With the certified LCP, the City of Seaside would then assume the responsibility for issuing coastal development permits (CDPs) for development, which will increase convenience and shorten processing time for local property owners and developers to obtain permits. In authorizing coastal development permits, the City must make a finding that the proposed development
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conforms to the certified LCP. Consistent with the provisions of the Coastal Act, the Coastal Commission will retain original permit jurisdiction over certain specified lands, such as any submerged lands, tidelands, and public trust land. The CCC will also retain the authority to hear appeals of the City's CDP decisions, review and approve any amendments to the certified LCP, and review the LCP at least every five years to ensure proper implementation and continued compliance with the Coastal Act.

C. PROJECT APPROVALS AND CERTIFICATIONS

This Initial Study/Negative Declaration provides the environmental information and analysis and primary California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documentation necessary for the City of Seaside and the California Coastal Commission to adequately consider the effects of the proposed project. The City, as the lead agency, will consider the project at the local level. Approvals being sought include adoption of the LCP by the City of Seaside City Council. The CCC is a responsible agency and has approval authority for certification of the LCP. Upon City approval of the LCP and its environmental review, the CCC would have final certification authority.

FUTURE APPROVALS

Future approvals for any development within the coastal zone area would require:

1. Authorization by the City of Seaside for a Coastal Development Permit pursuant to regulations outlined in Article 3 – Coastal Development Permit Ordinance of the CIP;

2. Additional site planning and related permits;

3. CEQA compliance separate from this environmental review;

4. Other approvals may include, but are not limited to, the following:
   - Subdivision Maps
   - Tentative Maps
   - Site Development Plans
   - Demolition Permits
   - Utility Plans
   - Construction Phasing and Duration
   - Architectural and Site Plan Review
   - Landscaping and Lighting Plans
   - Grading and Building Permits
   - All other related development permits
## III. Project Consistency with Other Applicable Local and State Plans and Mandated Laws

Use the list below to indicate plans applicable to the project and verify their consistency or non-consistency with project implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Description</th>
<th>Consistency Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Plan/Area Plan</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality Control Plan</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Mgmt. Plan</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Land Use Plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAFCo Annexation Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City of Seaside General Plan (2004)

**CONSISTENT:** For analysis refer to the discussion in Section VI.9, Land Use/Planning.

West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (2008)

**CONSISTENT:** For analysis refer to the discussion in Section VI.9, Land Use/Planning.

Air Quality Management Plan (2008)

**CONSISTENT:** For analysis refer to the discussion in Section VI.3, Air Quality.

Water Quality Control Plan (1994)

**CONSISTENT:** For analysis refer to the discussion in Section VI.8, Hydrology/Water Quality.
IV. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED AND DETERMINATION

A. Factors

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, as discussed within the checklist on the following pages.

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use/Planning
- Transportation/Traffic
- Agriculture Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources
- Public Services
- Air Quality
- Geology/Soils
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

Some proposed applications that are not exempt from CEQA review may have little or no potential for adverse environmental impact related to most of the topics in the Environmental Checklist; and/or potential impacts may involve only a few limited subject areas. These types of projects are generally minor in scope, located in a non-sensitive environment, and are easily identifiable and without public controversy. For the environmental issue areas where there is no potential for significant environmental impact (and not checked above), the following finding can be made using the project description, environmental setting, or other information as supporting evidence.

☐ Check here if this finding is not applicable

FINDING: For the above referenced topics that are not checked off, there is no potential for significant environmental impact to occur from construction, operation, or maintenance of the proposed project and no further discussion in the Environmental Checklist is necessary.

EVIDENCE: This project would not affect the categories not checked above, as follows:

B. Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☒ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment there would not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Barb Kinison Brown for Rick Medina
Signature
August 5, 2010
Date

Rick Medina
Printed Name
Senior Planner
Title
EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on project-specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take into account the whole action involved, including offsite as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) Once the City has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less-than-significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration (Section 15063(c)(1)(D)). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

   a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

   b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

   c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures, which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to previously prepared or outside documents should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7) Supporting information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
V. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

8) The explanation of each issue should identify:
   a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
   b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

9) The determination of whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment is a critical step in the CEQA process. Consistent with CEQA Statutes Section 21083 (Significance Guidelines) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15065 (Mandatory Findings of Significance), significance levels as provided in the checklist are generally defined as follows:

   - **Potentially Significant Impact** applies where there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. The CEQA Guidelines define “significant effect” as “…a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic and aesthetic significance. An economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. A social or economic change related to a physical change may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant” (CEQA Guidelines, 15382).

   - **Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated** applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The EIR must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.

   - **Less than Significant Impact** applies where the project creates no significant impacts, only less than significant impacts.

   - **No Impact** applies where a project does not create an impact in that category. “No Impact” answers need to be adequately supported by information, which shows that the impact simply does not apply to project.
V. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. AESTHETICS

Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Analysis and Conclusions

a–d) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed update to the LCP includes specific goals, policies, and implementation measures to consider and protect visual resources consistent with Section 30251 of the California Coastal Act as identified in Table 1.1, below.

### Table 1.1
**VISUAL RESOURCE POLICY CONSISTENCY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COASTAL ACT PROVISION POLICIES</th>
<th>LUP Chapter/Page</th>
<th>Related LUP Policy Number</th>
<th>CIP Development Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 30251 Scenic and visual qualities</td>
<td>2/2.11-2.13</td>
<td>NCR-CZ 2.1-2.2</td>
<td>Section 2.7.D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The scenic and visual qualities of coastal areas shall be considered and protected as a resource of public importance. Permitted development shall be sited and designed to protect views to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas, to minimize the alteration of natural land forms, to be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas, and, where feasible, to restore and enhance visual quality in visually degraded areas. New development in highly scenic areas such as those designated in the California Coastline Preservation and Recreation Plan prepared by the Department of Parks and Recreation and by local government shall be subordinate to the character of its setting.</td>
<td>2/2.31</td>
<td>LUD-CZ 2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/3.2</td>
<td>NCR-LG 2.1-2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/3.6</td>
<td>LUD-LG 2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/4.2</td>
<td>NCR-RL 2.1-2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/4.6</td>
<td>LUD-RL 2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/5.3</td>
<td>NCR-B 2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/5.6</td>
<td>LUD-B 2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because the policies of the proposed LCP will strengthen existing scenic resource policies and because the policies have been specifically designed to consider and protect visual resources and, where feasible, enhance visual quality in visually degraded areas within the coastal zone, implementation of the proposed LCP will result in a beneficial impact to aesthetic and visual resources, and the impact is considered to be less than significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.

Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (Ref: 1,2)

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (Ref: 1,2,4)

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? (Ref: 1,2,4)

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? (Ref: 1,2)

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use? (Ref: 1,2)

Analysis and Conclusions

a-e) Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract? Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production? Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?

No Impact. The City of Seaside coastal zone does not contain farmland, agricultural land, or forest land.
3. **AIR QUALITY**

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

**Would the project:**

- a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Ref: 1,8) 

- b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

- c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

- d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Ref: 1,2)

- e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Ref: 1,2)

### Analysis and Conclusions

**a)** Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

**No Impact.** Implementation of the proposed LCP would formalize new policies that would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD) 2008 Air Quality Plan, as it would not result in additional growth beyond what is already planned for in the City’s General Plan.

**b, c)** Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

**Less than Significant Impact.** As noted in a) above, the LCP does not influence the amount of planned growth in population and households. It would be consistent with the MBUAPCD 2008 Air Quality Plan and further reduce the potential for future exceedances of state and federal ozone standards. In addition, the proposed LUP includes a sustainability policy which requires that any new development promote environmental sustainability which is essential to reducing impacts to air pollution (*Policy NCR-CZ 1.1*).

**d, e)** Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

**No Impact.** The proposed project is an update to an LCP. The project is not growth-inducing or traffic-inducing, nor does it introduce any components that would expose receptors to objectionable odors.
VI. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (Ref: 1,2,4,10)

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (Ref: 1-4,10)

Analysis and Conclusions

a,b, d) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

Less than Significant Impact. The policies and implementation strategies in the proposed LCP are designed to be consistent with federal, state, and local policies and ordinances protecting biological resources. Specifically the proposed LCP is consistent with the California Coastal Act,
which includes measures to define and protect sensitive coastal species and Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA). See Table 4.1 below.

**Table 4.1**

**Habitat and Species Policy Consistency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COASTAL ACT PROVISION POLICIES</th>
<th>LUP Chapter/Page</th>
<th>Related LUP Policy Number</th>
<th>CIP Development Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 30230 Marine resources; maintenance</strong></td>
<td>2/2.2–2.7</td>
<td>NCR-CZ 1.1–1.7</td>
<td>Section 2.7C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine resources shall be maintained, enhanced, and where feasible, restored. Special protection shall be given to areas and species of special biological or economic significance. Uses of the marine environment shall be carried out in a manner that will sustain the biological productivity of coastal waters and that will maintain healthy populations of all species of marine organisms adequate for long-term commercial, recreational, scientific, and educational purposes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Section 30231 Biological productivity; water quality** | 2/2.2–2.10 | NCR-CZ 1.8  NCR-CZ 1.9  NCR-CZ 1.10  NCR-CZ 1.11 | Section 2.7C  Section 2.7G |
| The biological productivity and the quality of coastal waters, streams, wetlands, estuaries, and takes appropriate to maintain optimum populations of marine organisms and for the protection of human health shall be maintained and, where feasible, restored through, among other means, minimizing adverse effects of waste water discharges and entrainment, controlling runoff, preventing depletion of ground water supplies and substantial interference with surface waterflow, encouraging waste water reclamation, maintaining natural vegetation buffer areas that protect riparian habitats, and minimizing alteration of natural streams. |

Because the policies of the proposed LCP will strengthen existing biological resource policies and because the policies have been specifically designed to consider and protect species and habitat and, where feasible, enhance biological functioning quality in degraded areas within the coastal zone, implementation of the proposed LCP will result in a beneficial impact to biological resources.

c) **Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?**

**Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed update to the LCP includes specific policies intended to consider and protect riparian habitat wetlands within the coastal zone consistent with provisions of the California Coastal Act. Specific policies include NCR-CZ 1.1 through 1.7 identified in Table 4.1 above and policies listed in Table 4.2 below.
### Table 4.2
Riparian and Wetland Policy Consistency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COASTAL ACT PROVISION POLICIES</th>
<th>LUP Chapter/Page</th>
<th>Related LUP Policy Number</th>
<th>CIP Development Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 30233 Diking, filling or dredging: continued movement of sediment and nutrients (a) The dike, filling, or dredging of open coastal waters, wetlands, estuaries, and lakes shall be permitted in accordance with other applicable provisions of this division, 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 the following: (i) New or expanded port, energy, and coastal-dependent industrial facilities, including commercial fishing facilities. (ii) Maintaining existing, or restoring previously dredged, depths in existing navigational channels, turning basins, vessel berthing and mooring areas, and boat launching ramps. (iii) In open coastal waters, other than wetlands, including streams, estuaries, and lakes, new or expanded boating facilities and the placement of structural piling for public recreational piers that provide public access and recreational opportunities. (iv) Incidental public service purposes, including but not limited to, burying cables and pipes or inspection of piers and maintenance of existing intake and outfall lines. (v) Mineral extraction, including sand for restoring beaches, except in environmentally sensitive areas. (vi) Restoration purposes. (vii) Nature study, aquaculture, or similar resource dependent activities. (b) Dredging and spoils disposal shall be planned and carried out to avoid significant disruption to marine and wildlife habitats and water circulation. Dredge spoils suitable for beach replenishment should be transported for these purposes to appropriate beaches or into suitable long shore current systems. (c) In addition to the other provisions of this section, dikeing, filling, or dredging in existing estuaries and wetlands shall maintain or enhance the functional capacity of the wetland or estuary. Any alteration of coastal wetlands identified by the Department of Fish and Game, including, but not limited to, the 19 coastal wetlands identified in its report entitled, &quot;Acquisition Priorities for the Coastal Wetlands of California,&quot; shall be limited to very minor incidental public facilities, restorative measures, nature study, commercial fishing facilities in Bodega Bay, and development in</td>
<td>2/2.8 2/2.9-10</td>
<td>NCR-CZ 1.10  NCR-CZ 1.11</td>
<td>Section 2.7  Section 3.2G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
already developed parts of south San Diego Bay, if otherwise in accordance with this division. For the purposes of this section, "commercial fishing facilities in Bodega Bay" means that not less than 80 percent of all boating facilities proposed to be developed or improved, where the improvement would create additional berths in Bodega Bay, shall be designed and used for commercial fishing activities.

d) Erosion control and flood control facilities constructed on watercourses can impede the movement of sediment and nutrients that would otherwise be carried by storm runoff into coastal waters. To facilitate the continued delivery of these sediments to the littoral zone, whenever feasible, the material removed from these facilities may be placed at appropriate points on the shoreline in accordance with other applicable provisions of this division, where feasible mitigation measures have been provided to minimize adverse environmental effects. Aspects that shall be considered before issuing a coastal development permit for these purposes are the method of placement, time of year of placement, and sensitivity of the placement area. (Amended by: Ch. 673, Stats. 1978; Ch. 43, Stats. 1982; Ch. 1167, Stats. 1982; Ch. 454, Stats. 1983; Ch. 294, Stats. 2006.)

Because the policies of the proposed LCP will strengthen existing biological resource policies and because the policies have been specifically designed to consider and protect riparian habitat and sensitive communities and, where feasible, enhance biological functioning quality in degraded areas within the coastal zone, implementation of the proposed LCP will result in a beneficial impact to biological resources.

e) Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

**No Impact.** Chapter 8.54 of the City of Seaside Municipal Code provides regulations that control the removal, protection, and preservation of trees within the city. The proposed LCP would not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

f) Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

**No Impact.** The proposed LCP would not conflict with the provisions of any applicable habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.
5. **Cultural Resources**

Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis and Conclusions**

a-d) *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?* Will the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5? Will the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature? Will the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

**Less than Significant Impact.** This proposed LCP recognizes the importance of cultural resources and provides a policy to ensure protection of these resources. The proposed LCP is consistent with and works in partnership with City policies and state and federal laws, where applicable, to honor, identify, and protect cultural resources. Specifically, **Policy LUD-CZ 2.11** states that mitigations will be required as a condition of development where it would adversely impact any archaeological or paleontological resources as identified by the State Historic Preservation Officer.

Because the policy has been specifically designed to preserve and protect cultural and paleontological resources within the City's coastal zone, implementation of the proposed LCP will result in a less than significant impact to these resources.
6. GEOLOGY/SOILS

Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death, involving:

   i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

   ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

   iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

   iv) Landslides?

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

Analysis and Conclusions

a) Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death, involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, and/or landslides?

Less than Significant Impact. Implementation of the proposed LCP will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving earthquake, ground shaking, or seismic-related ground failure. The proposed update to the LCP includes specific policies intended to minimize adverse impacts of any future development within the coastal zone associated with earthquake and other hazards consistent with provisions of the City’s adopted Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) and the California Coastal Act. Specific policies include those listed in Table 6.1 below.
VI. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

TABLE 6.1
GEOLOGIC HAZARDS POLICY CONSISTENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COASTAL ACT PROVISION POLICIES</th>
<th>LUP Chapter/Page</th>
<th>Related LUP Policy Number</th>
<th>CIP Development Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 30253 Minimization of adverse impacts New development shall do all of the following: (a) Minimize risks to life and property in areas of high geologic, flood, and fire hazard.</td>
<td>2/2.15−2.18, 2/2.34−2.36</td>
<td>NCR-CZ 5.1−5.2, LUD-CZ 2.7−2.8</td>
<td>Section 2.7E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b−e) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? Would the project be located on expansive soil, creating substantial risks to life or property? Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed update to the LCP includes specific policies intended to minimize adverse impacts of any future development within the coastal zone associated with geologic hazard and soils. Specific policies include LUD-CZ 2.8 − General Permit Considerations for Development Subject to Natural Hazards and LUD-CZ 2.6 − General Permit Considerations for Water Supply/Wastewater. These policies require that proposed development include an analysis of hazards or hazardous constraints associated with the project, any necessary mitigation measures, a determination that the site is suitable for the proposed development and that it will be safe from hazards, and a demonstration of adequate water and sewage treatment.

7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with the Incorporated Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis and Conclusions

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed LCP re-integrates the policies and implementation tools currently scattered among the city’s General Plan, Zoning Ordinance and other city documents into an up-to-date, stream-lined, user-friendly document that would allow the City to efficiently address future planning on specific parcels, coastal resources and access. The LCP also incorporates new material to address timely and relevant coastal issues.

The proposed LCP does not anticipate any additional population growth beyond what is anticipated in the City’s General Plan. Implementation of the policies will not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly. The proposed LCP does not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Specifically, the proposed LCP is consistent with the intent and environmental protection mandates of the
adopted Local Coastal Plan, the City of Seaside Zoning Ordinance, the City of Seaside General Plan and the California Coastal Act as described in the Land Use/Planning section of this Initial Study. Future development allowed under the proposed LCP land use designations (such as visitor-serving commercial) will be required to undergo independent environmental analysis including an evaluation of potential greenhouse gas emissions consistent with CEQA and City policies at the time of proposal.

8. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials? (Ref: 1,9)

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (Ref: 1,9)

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (Ref: 1,2,9)

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (Ref: 1,9)

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the area? (Ref: 1,2,3,9)

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the area? (Ref: 1,2,3)

g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Ref: 1,2,3,11)

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

Analysis and Conclusions

a, b) Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials? Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?
VI. Environmental Checklist

No Impact. Implementation of the proposed LCP will not involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Because implementation of the proposed LCP does not involve the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, the project would not create reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

c, d) Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

No Impact. The proposed LCP does not involve siting on hazardous material sites. Implementation of the proposed LCP will not result in hazardous emissions.

e, i) For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the area? For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the area?

No Impact. Implementation of the policies of the proposed LCP will not result in an airport safety hazard for people residing or working in the City’s coastal zone.

g) Would the project impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

No Impact. The proposed update to the LCP includes Policy NCR-CZ 5.2, which requires that future proposed development be consistent with applicable goals and actions outlined in the City of Seaside Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) (adopted September 2005). Policy NCR-CZ 5.2 outlines applicable LHMP goals and policies.

h) Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

Less than Significant Impact. Action 3.22 of Policy NCR-CZ 5.2 requires that all new construction in areas susceptible to fires is completed using fire-resistant design techniques that will limit damage caused by wildfires consistent with the provisions of the City’s adopted LHMP. For example, Class A roofing materials are required for all homes in areas susceptible to fires.
9 **Hydrology/Water Quality**

_Would the project:_

| a) | Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? (Ref: 1,2,8) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| b) | Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| c) | Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or situtation on- or off-site? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| d) | Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| e) | Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| f) | Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| g) | Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (Ref: 1,2,3) | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| h) | Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| i) | Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of a failure of a levee or dam? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| j) | Inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**Analysis and Conclusions**

_a)_  _Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?_

**No impact.** Implementation of the proposed LCP will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The proposed update to the LCP includes specific policies meant to ensure any future development is consistent with state and City regulations. LCP policies also are intended to protect and, where feasible, enhance water quality consistent with the California Coastal Act. Specific policies include those listed in Table 9.1 below.
### Table 9.1
**Water Quality Policy Consistency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COASTAL ACT PROVISION POLICIES</th>
<th>LUP Chapter/Page</th>
<th>Related LUP Policy Number</th>
<th>CIP Development Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 30231 Biological productivity; water quality</td>
<td>2/2.8, 2/2.9-2.10, 2/2.14, 2/2.31, 2/2.34-35, 3/3.3, 4/4.3</td>
<td>NCR-CZ 1.10, NCR-CZ 1.11, NCR-CZ 4.1, LUD-CZ 2.3, LUD-CZ 2.7, NCR-LG 4.1, NCR-RL 4.1</td>
<td>Section 2.7B, Section 2.7C, Section 2.7G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level?

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed update to the LCP includes specific policies intended to protect and, where feasible, enhance water supply consistent with the California Coastal Act. Specific policies include those listed in Table 9.2 below.

### Table 9.2
**Water Supply Policy Consistency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COASTAL ACT PROVISION POLICIES</th>
<th>LUP Chapter/Page</th>
<th>Related LUP Policy Number</th>
<th>CIP Development Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 30254 Public works facilities</td>
<td>2/2.13-2.14, 3/3.3</td>
<td>NCR-CZ 3.1-3.3, NCR-LG 3.1</td>
<td>Section 2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COASTAL ACT PROVISION POLICIES</th>
<th>LUP Chapter /Page</th>
<th>Related LUP Policy Number</th>
<th>CIP Development Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 30236 Water supply and flood control</td>
<td>2/2.8</td>
<td>NCR-CZ 1.10</td>
<td>Section 2.7E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channelizations, dams, or other substantial alterations of rivers and streams shall incorporate the best mitigation measures feasible, and be limited to (1) necessary water supply projects, (2) flood control projects where no other method for protecting existing structures in the flood plain is feasible and where such protection is necessary for public safety or to protect existing development, or (3) developments where the primary function is the improvement of fish and wildlife habitat. (Section 30237 [Repealed by Ch. 286, Stats. 2004.])</td>
<td>2/2.15</td>
<td>NCR-CZ 5.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/2.34</td>
<td>LUD-CZ 2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/2.35–36</td>
<td>LUD-CZ 2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/3.3</td>
<td>LUD-CZ 2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/4.3</td>
<td>NCR-LG 5.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/5.3</td>
<td>NCR-RL 5.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NCR-B 4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### c-f) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? Would the project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality? 

### Less than Significant Impact. The proposed LCP has several policies intended to prevent future development from resulting in erosion, flooding, or pollution impacts associated with drainage alteration. These measures are specifically outlined in Policy LUD-CZ 2.7 – General Permit Considerations for Water Quality. Additional policies regarding water quality and flood control have been identified in Tables 9.1 and 9.2 above.

### g) Would the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? 

### No Impact. The proposed LCP does not locate any residential uses beyond those anticipated in the City's adopted General Plan and West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan.

### h) Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows? 

### Less than Significant Impact. The proposed LCP has specific policies to ensure flood control mechanisms are in place consistent with state and local policies including the California Building Code and the Coastal Act (refer to Table 9.2 above). Specifically, Policy LUD-CZ 2.8 – General Permit Considerations for Development Subject to Natural Hazards requires that all development proposed within an area that is subject to ocean wave, tsunami, or flooding shall be adequately set back from the area of hazard. Structural safety will be assured for a minimum project life of a 75-year period without the need for any shoreline structures.

### i, j) Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of a failure of a levee or dam or Inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?
Less than Significant Impact. The proposed LCP has specific policies to ensure flood control mechanisms are in place consistent with state and local policies including the California Building Code and the Coastal Act (refer to Table 9.2 above). Specifically, policies NCR-CZ 5.2 – Protection from Natural Hazards and LUD-CZ 2.8 – General Permit Considerations for Development Subject to Natural Hazards ensure that all new development in areas of high geotechnical and flood hazard be sited, designed, and sized to minimize risk to life, property, and the environment from natural disaster.

10. LAND USE/PLANNING

Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community? (Ref: 1,2,3)

Potential Significantly Impact: □
Less Than Significant Impact: □
Less Than Significant Impact: □
No Impact: □

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Potential Significantly Impact: □
Less Than Significant Impact: □
Less Than Significant Impact: □
No Impact: □

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? (Ref: 1,2,3,10)

Potential Significantly Impact: □
Less Than Significant Impact: □
Less Than Significant Impact: □
No Impact: □

Analysis and Conclusions

a) Would the project physically divide an established community?

No Impact. Implementation of the policies of the proposed LCP will not divide an established community.

b) Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed LCP re-integrates the policies and implementation tools currently among the City’s General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, and other City documents into an up-to-date, streamlined, user-friendly document that would allow the City to efficiently address future planning on specific parcels, coastal resources, and access. The LCP also incorporates new material to address timely and relevant coastal issues.

The proposed LCP does not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Specific, the proposed LCP is consistent with the intent and environmental protection mandates of the adopted Local Coastal Plan, the City of Seaside Zoning Ordinance, the City of Seaside General Plan, and the California Coastal Act as described below.
Adopted Local Coastal Program Conformance

Existing: Open Space Areas, Visitor-Serving Commercial, Shopping Center/General Commercial, Heavy Commercial

Proposed: Coastal Parks and Open Space (CPOS), Coastal Visitor-Serving Commercial (CVSC), Coastal Visitor-Serving Recreation (CVSR), Coastal Mixed-Use/West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (CMX/WBUVSP)

The minor proposed modifications would provide greater clarification as to the location and intent of the coastal districts and greater consistency with actual on-the-ground conditions. The proposed land use plan would result in an overall de-intensification of land uses around the Roberts Lake and Beach subareas. Specifically:

- The addition of "Coastal" to the district titles would distinguish coastal zoning districts from other districts in the city.
- The addition of "Visitor-Serving" to the commercial districts within the coastal zone would clarify the intent of these districts to accommodate visitors, tourists, and guests.
- Designation of the beach area and the area around Roberts Lake (currently designated in the 1983 LCP as Visitor-Serving Commercial) as Coastal Parks and Open Space would provide greater protection of the beach and dune areas, and reflect the City's desire to keep those areas free from commercial development.
- Designation of the small area southwest of Roberts Lake currently occupied by the boat house (currently designated in the 1983 LCP as Visitor-Serving Commercial) as Coastal Visitor-Serving Recreation would limit the commercial uses of the parcel exclusively to small recreational support uses.
- Designation of a small area on the northeast side of Roberts Lake would provide a more appropriate location for opportunities for Visitor-Serving Commercial use than those currently identified on the beach and the dune area of Roberts Lake.
- Minor expansion southward of the commercial area along the east side of Laguna Grande reflects the current use as an expanded parking area.
- The addition of a CMX/WBUVSP district is consistent with the pending West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan.

Zoning Ordinance Conformance

Existing: Open Space – Recreation (OSR), Regional Commercial (CRG) with Coastal Zone (CZ) overlay

Proposed: Coastal Parks and Open Space (CPOS), Coastal Visitor-Serving Commercial (CVSC), Coastal Visitor-Serving Recreation (CVSR), Coastal Mixed-Use/West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (CMX/WBUVSP)

The proposed CIP would be the zoning ordinance for the proposed land use plan. Certification of the LCP would replace 17.24.070 – CRG Coastal Zone Standards and 17.28.030 – Coastal Zone (CZ) Overlay Zone with the proposed CIP (Title 18).

Implementation actions would require minor modifications to the City of Seaside Zoning Ordinance (Title 17 of the Seaside Municipal Code) to identify Title 18 as the zoning for areas within the coastal zone.
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Seaside General Plan Conformance

Existing: Park and Open Space (POS), Regional Commercial (RGC)

Proposed: Coastal Parks and Open Space (CPOS), Coastal Visitor-Serving Commercial (CVSC), Coastal Visitor-Serving Recreation (CVSR), Coastal Mixed-Use/West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (CMX/WBUVSP)

LUP policies have been updated to be consistent with the City's 2004 General Plan. The LUP establishes land use designations, general development criteria, and policies that regulate development in the coastal zone. The City's General Plan, and the Land Use Element in particular, may contain more precise development limits for specific properties. Should a conflict exist, the land use intensity that is most protective of coastal resources shall take precedence. However, in no case shall the policies of the LUP be interpreted to allow a development to exceed a development limit established by the General Plan or its implementing ordinances.

Implementation actions would require minor modifications to the City of Seaside General Plan. It is noted that amendments to a local general plan for the purpose of developing a certified local coastal program shall not constitute an amendment of a general plan for purposes of Section 65358 of the Government Code (frequency limited to four times a year) (Section 30500, Coastal Act 2009 update).

Coastal Act Conformance

The proposed LCP has been designed to be consistent with the provisions of the California Coastal Act. A summary table is included in the LUP of the LCP (Policy Summary Table, page US.6) that identifies specific Coastal Act policies and identifies the relevant LUP chapters and related policy numbers that carry out the identified policy. Specific land use policies that are consistent with the California Coastal Act are listed in Table 10.1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 10.1</th>
<th>LAND USE POLICY CONSISTENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COASTAL ACT PROVISION POLICIES</strong></td>
<td><strong>LUP Chapter/Page</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 30240 Environmentally sensitive habitat areas; adjacent developments</td>
<td>2/2.2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Environmentally sensitive habitat areas shall be protected against any significant disruption of habitat values, and only uses dependent on those resources shall be allowed within those areas.</td>
<td>2/2.30-2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Development in areas adjacent to environmentally sensitive habitat areas and parks and recreation areas shall be sited and designed to prevent impacts which would significantly degrade those areas, and shall be compatible with the continuance of those habitat and recreation areas. (Amended by Ch. 285, Stats. 1991.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 30222 Private lands; priority of development purposes</td>
<td>2/2.27, 4/4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The use of private lands suitable for visitor-serving commercial recreational facilities designed to enhance public opportunities for coastal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The proposed Local Coastal Program complies with the intent of the Seaside General Plan, requirements of Title 17 of the Seaside Municipal Code, and the California Coastal Act of 1976, as amended.

c) Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

No Impact. The proposed LCP does not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

11. Mineral Resources

Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (Ref: 1,2,3)

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? (Ref: 1,2,3)

Analysis and Conclusions

a, b) Will the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

No Impact. According to the Seaside General Plan, there are no mineral resources identified within the City of Seaside. The proposed LCP would not result in a loss of availability of a known mineral resource or locally important mineral resource recovery site.

12. Noise

Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or of applicable standards of other agencies? (Ref: 1-4)
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? (Ref: 1-4) □ □ □ □ ✗

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Ref: 1-4) □ □ □ □ ✗

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? ✗

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the annexation area to excessive noise levels? (Ref: 1-4) □ □ □ □ ✗

i) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the annexation area to excessive noise levels? (Ref: 1-4) □ □ □ □ ✗

**Analysis and Conclusions**

a) Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or of applicable standards of other agencies?

**No Impact.** Implementation of the policies of the proposed LCP will not result in exposure of persons to noise in excess of established standards.

b) Would the project result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

**No Impact.** Implementation of the proposed LCP will not result in exposure of persons to excessive vibration.

c) Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

**No Impact.** Implementation of the proposed LCP will not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the City's coastal zone.

d) Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

**No Impact.** Implementation of the policies of the proposed LCP will not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the City's coastal zone.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the annexation area to excessive noise levels?
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No Impact. Implementation of the policies of the proposed LCP will not result in exposure of persons to excessive airport noise levels.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the annexation area to excessive noise levels?

No Impact. Implementation of the policies of the proposed LCP will not result in exposure of persons to excessive airport noise levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. POPULATION/HOUSING

Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (Ref: 1,2,3)

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Ref: 1,2,3)

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Ref: 1,2,3)

Analysis and Conclusions

a) Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

No Impact. The proposed LCP does not accommodate growth beyond what is anticipated by the City's adopted General Plan. Implementation of the proposed LCP will not induce population growth.

b) Will the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact. Implementation of the proposed LCP will not displace existing housing.

c) Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact. Implementation of the proposed LCP will not displace people.
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### 14. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Fire protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Police protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Schools?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Parks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Other public facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis and Conclusions**

a–e) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental needed to maintain acceptable performance objectives for fire protection, police protection, school, parks, or other public facilities?

**No Impact.** Implementation of the proposed LCP will not accommodate additional population growth beyond what has been anticipated by the General Plan. Implementation of the policies within the proposed LCP will not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services. Therefore, no impact to public services causing the need for new governmental facilities is expected.

### 15. RECREATION

Would the project:

- a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (Ref: 1, 2, 3, 4)

- b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

**Analysis and Conclusions**

a) Would the project increase the use of existing parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

**No Impact.** Implementation of the proposed LCP will not accommodate additional population growth beyond what has been anticipated by the General Plan. Therefore, implementation of
the policies within the proposed LCP will not increase the use of public parks such that deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed LCP contains several policies maximizing coastal recreational opportunities and beach/park/trail/recreation access, consistent with the mandate of the California Coastal Act (refer to the proposed LCP LUP Policy Summary Table, page UG.6). Policy PAR-CZ 1.7 requires that the City explore development of a Peninsula Visitors Center at a location within, or at a compatible location adjacent to, the Seaside coastal zone. The LCP does not propose any specific development, and details of future facilities cannot be known at this time. Any future construction or expansion of recreational facilities would require independent environmental analysis consistent with the proposed LCP, CEQA and other state and local requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentialy Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. ■ TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks? (Ref: 1-4)

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (Ref: 1-4)

e) Result in inadequate emergency access? (Ref: 1-4)

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? (Ref: 1-4)
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Analysis and Conclusions

a,b) Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? Would the project conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

Less than Significant. Implementation of the proposed LCP will not accommodate for additional population growth beyond what has been anticipated by the General Plan. Therefore, implementation of the policies within the proposed LCP will not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. Any future development allowed under the proposed LCP land use designations (such as visitor serving commercial) will be required to undergo independent environmental analysis consistent with CEQA and city policies at the time of proposal.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?

No Impact. Implementation of the proposed COSE Consolidation and Update will not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

No Impact. Implementation of the proposed LCP will not result in a substantial increase in hazard related to a design feature or incompatible uses.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

No Impact. Implementation of the proposed LCP will not result in inadequate emergency access.

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

No Impact. Implementation of the proposed LCP will not conflict with policies or plans supporting alternative transportation. Policies of the LCP are specifically designed to encourage, maximize and protect pedestrian and bicycle connectivity (refer to LUP policies PAR-CZ 1.1-7).
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17. UTILITIES/SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (Ref: 1-3, 8)

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Ref: 1-3, 8)

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Ref: 1-3)

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (Ref: 1-3, 8)

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? (Ref: 1-3, 8)

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? (Ref: 1-3)

g) Comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (Ref: 1-3)

Analysis and Conclusions

α–e) Will the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? Will the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? Will the project require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? Are there sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? Will the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

No Impact. Implementation of the policies within the proposed LCP will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board, require the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities, or exceed service capacity.

For any future development within Seaside’s coastal zone, Policy LUD-CZ 2.6 outlines the general permit considerations for water/wastewater consistent with regional and local requirements. Specifically, this policy requires that prior to the approval of any new development within the coastal zone, adequate water and sewer treatment facility capacity shall be demonstrated
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consistent with the provisions and requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board.

i, g) Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? Comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

No Impact. Implementation of the proposed LCP will not accommodate additional population growth beyond what has been anticipated by the General Plan. Implementation of the policies within the LCP will not affect solid waste disposal needs. Any future development within Seaside’s coastal zone will be required to be evaluated for compliance with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste at the time of proposal.
VII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:

a) Have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment; substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species; cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels; threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community; substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species; or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

b) Have possible environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable. “Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of an individual project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects?

c) Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Analysis and Conclusions

α-c) Would the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment; substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species; cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels; threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community; substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species; or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? Would the project have possible environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable. “Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of an individual project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects? Would the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Less than Significant. Based on the evaluation in this Initial Study, the proposed LCP would either have no impact or have a less than significant impact in all environmental issue areas.

Assessment of Fee

The State Legislature, through the enactment of Senate Bill (SB) 1535, revoked the authority of lead agencies to determine that a project subject to CEQA review had a “de minimis” (minimal) effect on fish and wildlife resources under the jurisdiction of the Department of Fish and Game. Projects that were determined to have a de minimis effect were exempt from payment of the filing fees.
SB 1335 has eliminated the provision for a determination of de minimis effect by the lead agency; consequently, all land development projects that are subject to environmental review are now subject to the filing fees, unless the California Department of Fish and Game determines that the project would have no effect on fish and wildlife resources.

To be considered for determination of "no effect" on fish and wildlife resources, development applicants must submit a form requesting such determination to the Department of Fish and Game. Forms may be obtained by contacting the department by telephone at (916) 631-0606 or through the department's website at www.dfg.ca.gov.

**Conclusion:** The project would be required to pay the fee.
IX. REFERENCES AND SOURCES

1. City of Seaside, Proposed Local Coastal Program. 2010


3. City of Seaside, Seaside General Plan EIR. January 2004


Comments Received on Proposed Negative Declaration
September 9, 2010

Rick Medina
City of Seaside
440 Harcourt Avenue
Seaside, CA 93955

Subject: Local Coastal Program
SCH#: 201008126

Dear Rick Medina:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Negative Declaration to selected state agencies for review. The review period closed on September 7, 2010, and no state agencies submitted comments by that date. This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

Please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process. If you have a question about the above-named project, please refer to the ten-digit State Clearinghouse number when contacting this office.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Director, State Clearinghouse
Letter No. 2 – California State Parks, Monterey Peninsula District

Rick,
I have reviewed the MND draft and have the following suggested changes:

II. Project Description and Environmental Setting
Beach Subarea

The Beach Subarea consists of approximately 7 acres sand dunes and beach including 500 feet of beach frontage along Monterey Bay. The Beach Subarea is bordered by the Pacific Ocean to the west, State Park owned beach and dune areas to the north in Sand City, the Highway 1 freeway managed by Caltrans to the East, and the Monterey Beach Resort Property in the City of Monterey to the south. 4-paved areas to the south and east. All property within the Subarea is public property. Most of the dunes and beach areas in the
Subarea are owned by the California Department of Parks and Recreation and managed as the Seaside Beach area of Monterey State Beach. The remainder of the property is owned by the City of Seaside and consist of undeveloped and developed road and utility rights of way. Existing developments within the subarea include the Monterey State Beach Coastal Access Parking Lot, the Monterey Bay Recreational Trail, Sand Dunes Drive, and the Robert’s Lake storm drain system. The primary use of the subarea is an open space and recreation resource for the public. The beach is well used by surfers, picnickers, joggers, beachcombers, and nature enthusiasts year-round. The area also serves a rest area for travelers using Highway 1 and the Recreational Trail.
Undeveloped portions of the subarea have been restored to native coastal scrub habitat by State Parks or are active beach areas incapable of supporting terrestrial vegetation. The State Beach property provides significant native plant and wildlife habitat in addition to its primary purpose as a public recreation area.

I deleted the comments about African ice plan since it was removed in 1993 and the degraded dune environment since it has been restored. Please let me know if you have any questions about these changes. Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments.

Ken Gray
District Services Manager
California State Parks - Monterey District
2211 Garden Road
Monterey, CA 93940
Phone (831) 649-2862
Fax (831) 647-6239
kgray@parks.ca.gov
Okay, I just had a few questions:

1. The plan identifies view impact areas that are within Monterey. What controls Monterey's actions in this regard?

2. I didn't see any mention of the Light rail, which passes through the Roberts Lake subarea.

3. It appears that some policies seek to expand parking next to the beach that is within Monterey.

4. I didn't see any sea level rise protection requirements in Beach Subarea – only Robert's Lake subarea.

Thanks again for the opportunity to comment.

Elizabeth Caraker, AICP
Principal Planner
Planning, Engineering, and Environmental Compliance
City of Monterey
580 Pacific Street
Monterey, CA 93940
831.646.1739

>>> <RMedina@cl.seaside.ca.us> 07/06/2010 3:29 PM >>>
Elizabeth,
We would welcome the receipt of your comments on the Draft LCP at this time. Just want to let you know that we would be preparing an Initial Study on the update in case you have any CEQA related comments.

Rick Medina
Senior Planner
(831) 899-6726
rmedina@cl.seaside.ca.us

>>> "Elizabeth Caraker" <Caraker@cl.monterey.ca.us> 7/6/2010 3:24 PM >>>
So, you weren't interested in our comments on the LCP admin draft?

Elizabeth Caraker, AICP
Principal Planner
Planning, Engineering, and Environmental Compliance
City of Monterey
580 Pacific Street
Monterey, CA 93940
831.646.1739

>>> <RMedina@cl.seaside.ca.us> 07/06/2010 3:22 PM >>>
August 24, 2010

Rick Medina
Senior Planner
City of Seaside
Planning Division
440 Harcourt Ave.
Seaside, CA 93955

SUBJECT: ND FOR CITY OF SEASIDE LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM

Dear Mr. Medina:

LandWatch Monterey County reviewed the environmental document for the Local Coastal Program and has the following comments:

1. **Project Description.** Description of the project varies throughout the document as does the impact analyses. The project as described on pp. 1 and 9 includes the Land Use Plan (LUP) and the Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP). According to the project description, the LUP designates the kinds, location and intensity of land and water uses and presents resource protection and development policies consistent with requirements of the Coastal Act. The CIP provides development regulations for coastal zone activities and development needed to carry out the LUP. The LUP includes land for development including Coastal Visitor-Serving Commercial and Recreation and the Coastal Mixed Use/West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (p. 9). Many of the impact assessments evaluate the project in terms of this project description, e.g., agriculture, air quality, and biological resources.

However, under discussion of Greenhouse Gas Emissions (p. 29), the document states the proposed LCP re-integrates the policies and implementation tools currently scattered among the city’s General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, etc. and that implementation of the policies will not generate GHG emissions. Here, it appears that based on the impact analysis, the project is the re-integration of policies and implementation tools. Under the discussion of traffic, the Initial Study states, “Therefore, implementation of the policies within the proposed LCP will not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.” Again, it appears that the impact analysis is based on a project description related to implementation policies rather than land uses.

The project description and impact analyses should be consistent throughout. If the environmental document intends to rely on environmental documents prepared for the
Seaside General Plan and the Urban Village Specific Plan, CEQA requirements for subsequent use of environmental impact reports should be addressed. Regardless, the impacts of proposed land uses should be identified.

2. **Air Quality**. The Initial Study finds the project consistent with the 2008 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) “as it would not result in additional growth beyond what is already planned for in the City’s General Plan.” Consistency of a project is based on population forecasts included in the AQMP, not general plan buildout population. AMBAG should be contacted for a consistency determination.

3. **Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG)**. The document states, “The proposed LCP does not anticipate any additional population growth beyond what is anticipated in the City’s General Plan”. The impact on GHG emissions of the City’s General Plan should be identified. The document continues, “Future development allowed under the proposed LCP land use designations...will be required to undergo independent environmental analysis...”. There is sufficient information in the project description to calculate GHG emissions. This analysis cannot be differed to a later time.

4. **Water Supply**. The Initial Study finds that the impact on water supply would be less than significant based on the following criterion (CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G): “b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficient in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted?)” The document’s finding states, “The proposed update to the LCP includes specific policies intended to protect and, were feasible, enhance water supply consistent with the California Coastal Act. “However, none of the LCP policies address the project’s impact in relationship to the current Cease and Desist Order and Seaside Basin adjudication requirements. Additionally, the Initial Study does not address the following criterion related to water supply: “Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?” (CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G, XVII. d).

5. **Traffic**. The Initial Study finds the traffic impacts to be less than significant, i.e., “Implementation of the proposed LCP will not accommodate additional population growth beyond what has been anticipated by the General Plan. Therefore, implementation of the policies within the proposed LCP will not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. Any future development allowed under the proposed LCP land use designation...will be required to undergo independent environmental analysis consistent with CEQA and city policies at the time of proposal.” (p. 43). The Initial Study fails to address existing levels of service that already exceed acceptable levels and fails to identify project level or cumulative impacts. A traffic analysis based on project land uses cannot
be deferred to a later time.

6. Finally, the document states that the City completed the first step in the process of completing the LCP which was certified by the Coastal Commission in 1983. It continues, "The City must now complete the second step of the process to obtain the permitting authority in the coastal zone." Since the project is an update of the LCP and adoption of a CIP, the document should explain what the second step of the process includes.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the document.

Sincerely,

Amy L. White
Executive Director
September 7, 2010

Mr. Rick Medina, Senior Planner
City of Seaside
Resource Management Services – Planning Division
440 Harcourt Avenue
Seaside, California 93955

SUBJECT: Comments on the Draft Negative Declaration for the City of Seaside Local Coastal Program

Dear Mr. Medina:

The Transportation Agency for Monterey County is the Regional Transportation Planning Agency and Congestion Management Agency for Monterey County. Transportation Agency staff has reviewed the Draft Negative Declaration for the City of Seaside Local Coastal Program.

The project proposes to protect and enhance the resources of the coastal zone, consistent with the goals of the California Coastal Act, as well as the expressed goals of the citizenry, consisting of two major parts: the Land Use Plan to designate the location and kinds of land and water uses; and the Coastal Implementation Plan to provide development regulations for specific coastal zone activities.

Transportation Agency staff offers the following comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for your consideration:

Multi-Modal Transit Station

1. The Transportation Agency is in the process of planning a Multi-Modal Transit Station located at the intersection of Del Monte Boulevard and Contra Costa Street to connect local area buses from Monterey-Salinas Transit with proposed light rail service. The light rail service would operate via the existing Monterey Branch Line and continue through Marina. The document notes that the Del Monte Subarea of the proposed Local Coastal Program includes the future location of the multi-modal transit hub as well as the West Broadway Urban Village. Transportation Agency staff worked closely with the City during the design of the development of the West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan and appreciates the City’s and project applicant’s communication and willingness to take our agency’s multi-modal plans for the area into consideration early in the development process. Our agency supports the City’s intent through the proposed Local Coastal Program for this subarea to be an
active mixed-use commercial corridor that promotes connectivity and provides supporting uses to the future multi-modal transit station.

Our agency recommends that the City continue to work with our staff to ensure issues of motorized and non-motorized access, parking, bicycle and pedestrian safety, and the proposed Highway 1 widening project are properly addressed in the design and construction of future developments within the Local Coastal Program area.

Regional Road and Highway Impacts

2. The nature of the project location as a destination for shopping and retail, office workers, and other tourist attractions will serve as a regional draw for traffic both internal and external to the county, which will access the project subareas via Highway 218 (Canyon Del Rey Road), State Route 1, State Route 68, State Route 156, and Highway 101. Cumulative transportation impact mitigation for regional facilities should be accomplished through a contribution to our agency’s regional development impact fee program. Developments within the Local Coastal Program area are responsible for mitigation of cumulative impacts and collection of the Transportation Agency’s regional impact fees is the preferred mitigation measure for cumulative transportation impacts. Site-specific impacts will still need to be addressed and our Agency supports the funding of circulation infrastructure improvements through fair-share payments.

Pedestrian & Bicycle Travel

3. The Transportation Agency supports accommodation of alternative forms of transportation (rail, bus transit, bicycle and pedestrian transportation), both through the design of transportation facilities, and through the design and orientation of land uses. The Transportation Agency supports that the goals of the Local Coastal Program to create an area of bike and pedestrian-friendly developments, with the specific goals of developing a bike and pedestrian-friendly streetscape, including wide sidewalks and bicycle boulevards, and integrating with the planned multi-modal transit center.

To accomplish these goals, the future development planning should place a premium on safe and accessible pedestrian access to the site from intersections and crosswalks, sidewalks, and bicycle facilities. Future developments in the area should also be designed with sidewalks that connect to external facilities, provide access to transit stops, and do not include the use of cul-de-sacs without a cut-through for pedestrian travel. As per Caltrans standards, bicycle lanes should be constructed to the left of any right-hand turn lanes included in developments or constructed off-site as mitigation. Also, new roadways should be designed to accommodate bicycles with adequate pavement for bike travel, particularly along major arterials.

4. Our agency recommends that planned bike paths and walkways be linked to existing facilities that surround the project area, particularly on Imjin Parkway, 2nd Avenue, General Jim Moore Boulevard, and bike trails in the former Fort Ord area. Also, project applicants should consult with the Transportation Agency and the City of Seaside’s Bike Plans to ensure that all proposed bicycle facilities are accounted for in
site plans, such as the Class 2 facility on First Avenue connecting to the scenic trail, Class 1 facility on General Jim Moore Boulevard connecting to the existing bike path, and additional Class 2 facilities on Monterey Road, Lightfighter Drive, Gigling Road, and Third Street.

5. Our agency recommends that proper striping be included for all pedestrian crosswalks and walkways to clearly identify areas of pedestrian travel and ensure safe transitions for vehicles and pedestrians. Consideration should be given to the inclusion of intelligent crosswalks, which provide flashing notification lights when a pedestrian enters the crosswalk to increase visibility and alert drivers of their presence, particularly at the planned mid-block crosswalk on West Broadway Avenue leading to the proposed library. In addition, our agency recommends the use of mid-crosswalk islands as a safe refuge for pedestrians that do not completely cross before the traffic signal changes.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this document. If you have any questions, please contact Michael Zeller of my staff at (831) 775-0903.

Sincerely,

Debra L. Hale
Executive Director

CC: Dave Murray, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) District 5
Paul Greenway, Monterey County Department of Public Works
Carl Sedoryk, Monterey-Salinas Transit
John Doughty, AMBAG
Ed Kendig, Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District
Rick - I am reviewing the ND for the LCP and am confused. Since the LCP proposes land uses, were these uses addressed in the EIR for the Seaside GP? Is the ND only for the Coastal Implementation Plan? Sorry for the questions, but the project description leaves me with these questions. Janet Brennan
September 28, 2010

Mr. Rick Medina, Senior Planner
City of Seaside
440 Harcourt Avenue
Seaside, CA 93955

Re: Response to Comments for the Seaside LCP Negative Declaration (SCH #: 2010081016)

Dear Rick:

PMC has prepared this letter for the City of Seaside as a response to comment letters received on the Initial Study/Negative Declaration (IS/ND) for the above-captioned project during the 30-day public review period, which started on August 5, 2010 and ended on September 7, 2010. It should be noted that written responses to comments received on a ND are not required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); however, we have provided the City responses in writing to provide a complete record to address concerns.

The City received a total of five comment letters, which are attached. Letters were received from the following persons and agencies: State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit, Montereybay.com, California State Parks-Monterey District, City of Monterey, LandWatch Monterey County and the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC). The responses to comments raised in these letters have been summarized below. Please note that not all letters warrant a response to address environmental concerns.

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE AND PLANNING UNIT – This letter states that no state agencies submitted comments during the review period and that the State Clearinghouse review requirements have been complied with pursuant to CEQA.

No response necessary.

CALIFORNIA STATE PARKS-MONTEREY PENINSULA DISTRICT – This letter recommends changes to the Project Description and Environmental Setting for the Beach Subarea.

The recommended changes do not change the findings of the IS/ND and only provide clarification of the existing conditions. Therefore, to provide a complete understanding of the existing setting we recommend the following revisions be made to the project description in the Initial Study prior to adoption.

The following revisions are located in the 2nd paragraph on page 4 of the Initial Study:

Beach Subarea

The Beach Subarea consists of approximately seven acres of sand dunes and beach area including 500 feet of beach frontage along Monterey Bay and Pacific Ocean. The subarea is bordered by the Pacific Ocean to the north and west and four paved areas to the south and east, the beach visitor parking lot, the Monterey Bay Trail System, Sand Dunes Drive, and Highway 1. All property within the subarea is public property. Most of the dunes and beach areas in the subarea are owned by the California Department of Parks and Recreation and are managed as the Seaside Beach area of Monterey State Beach. The remainder of the property is undeveloped and developed road and utility rights-of-way that are owned by the City of Seaside. Existing developments within the subarea include the Monterey State beach Coastal...
Access Parking Lot, the Monterey Bay Recreational Trail, Sand Dunes Drive, and the Robert's Lake storm drain system. The primary use of the subarea is as an open space and recreational resource for the public City of Seaside. The beach is well used by surfers, picnickers, joggers, beachcombers, and nature enthusiasts year-round. The area also offers a respite for travelers along using Highway 1 and the Recreation Trail. The areas in between the visitor parking lot, the Monterey Bay Coastal Recreation Trail, Sand Dunes Drive that runs parallel to Highway 1, and other dune scrub habitat adjacent to the subarea are dominated by African ice plant. Within the subarea, the degradation of the sand dune environment from recreational use has resulted in the loss of dune vegetation and movement of the dunes by the wind, which has caused increased sedimentation and water quality problems within Roberts Lake and Laguna Grande (City of Seaside 2002). However, there is an effort to balance recreational use of the beach with preservation of fragile habitat. On the northeastern portion of the dune area which connects to State Parks land, designated trails have been identified and re-vegetation efforts are under way. Undeveloped portions of the subarea have been restored to native coastal scrub habitat by California State Parks Department or are active beach areas incapable of supporting terrestrial vegetation. The State Beach property provides significant native plant and wildlife habitat in addition to its primary purpose as a public recreation area.

CITY OF MONTEREY – This letter has several comments as described below.

Comment #1. The commenter states that the plan identifies view impact areas that are within the City of Monterey and asks what controls Monterey’s actions in regards to these areas.

Critical viewsheds and scenic resources identified on Figure 2-3 of the Land Use Plan (LUP) represent a preliminary mapping of visually sensitive areas consistent with those identified in the adopted 1983 LUP. The purpose of the map is to assist the City of Seaside in identifying significant public views of resources within its coastal zone. For views originating in the City of Monterey, the City of Monterey would control Monterey’s actions in this regard to identification and consideration of visual resources.

Comment #2. The commenter states that there was no mention of the light rail, which passes through the Roberts Lake subarea.

The Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way is identified in Chapter 2 (Coastal Zone) and Chapter 6 (Del Monte Subarea) of the LUP. Chapter 6 identifies the right-of-way as the future location of a multimodal transit hub consistent with the now-adopted West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (WBUVSP) which includes the Del Monte Subarea.

The WBUVSP identifies light rail as a potential use for this area. Any further specifics on a light rail project were not included in the LCP as they were unknown as the LCP was being drafted. The LCP does ensure that the right-of-way is protected (not subject to any plans for development) and the area within the Del Monte Subarea anticipates future development of a multi-modal hub consistent with the WBUVSP.

Comment #3. The commenter states that it appears that some policies seek to expand parking next to the beach that is within Monterey.

Policy PAR-B 1.3 of the LUP directs the City of Seaside to coordinate with State Parks and the City of Monterey for consideration of expanded parking to accommodate beach visitors. Potential expansion areas identified in the LCP include Roberts Lake (Seaside) and the lot west of the hotel, and on-street parking along the western portion of Sand Dune Drive (City of Monterey).

Comment #4. The commenter states that sea level rise protection requirements for the Beach subarea were not seen, and that only requirements for the Robert's Lake subarea were included.

Policies for Sea Level Rise begin in Chapter 2 – Coastal Zone (Policy NCR-CZ 5.3 – Protection from Natural Hazards – Sea Level Rise) which pertains to all areas within Seaside’s Coastal Zone. Additional, specific policies
for subareas are identified for Laguna Grande (Policy NCR-LG 5.1) and Roberts Lake (Policy NCR-RL 5.1). The Beach and Del Monte subarea chapters refer the reader back to Chapter 2, which contains several policies that apply to all areas within the coastal zone.

**LANDWATCH MONTEREY COUNTY** - This letter has several comments as described below.

Comment #1. The commenter states that the project description is not consistent throughout the document, citing that on pp. 1 and 9 the project description is said to consist of the LUP and CIP (related to land uses per commenter understanding) and in the impact analyses on p. 29, it is said to be the re-integration of policies and implementation tools (related to policy implementation per commenter understanding).

As stated on page 1 of the Initial Study (Project Description):

"The LCP consists of two major parts: The Land Use Plan (LUP) and the Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP). The LUP designates the kinds, location, and intensity of land and water uses, and presents applicable resource protection and development policies to accomplish the policies of the Coastal Act. The CIP provides development regulations for specific coastal zone activities and development needed to carry out the LUP."

Page 9 of the Initial Study the project is described as the "proposed City of Seaside Local Coastal Program (LCP) for the City's coastal zone," which "would update the 1983 Land Use Plan (LUP) of the City of Seaside (certified by the California Coastal Commission on October 12, 1983), and provide tools (Coastal Implementation Plan – CIP) to implement the land use plan."

As described on pp. 1 and 9, the project is clearly defined as the LCP consisting of both the land use plan (including land use policy) and implementation measures to carry out the land use plan.

The opening sentence of the analysis on page 29 (i.e. "The proposed LCP re-integrates the policies and implementation tools currently scattered among the city’s General Plan, Zoning Ordinance and other city documents into an up-to-date, stream-lined, user-friendly document that would allow the City to efficiently address future planning on specific parcels, coastal resources and access.") is intended to re-iterate the intent of the LCP and the mechanics of achieving it (as stated on page 9 of the Initial Study) and is not intended as a re-definition of the project description. The "re-integration of policies and Implementation tools" is a simply a component of the LCP. However, for greater clarification, the City may choose to revise the Initial Study prior to adoption as described below.

The last paragraph on page 29 of the Initial Study may be revised as follows:

The proposed LCP does not anticipate any additional population growth beyond what is anticipated in the City’s General Plan. Implementation of the LCP policies will not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly. The proposed LCP does not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Specifically, the proposed LCP is consistent with the intent and environmental protection mandates of the adopted Local Coastal Plan, the City of Seaside Zoning Ordinance, the City of Seaside General Plan and the California Coastal Act as described in the Land Use/Planning section of this Initial Study. Future development allowed under the proposed LCP land use designations (such as visitor-serving commercial) will be required to undergo independent environmental analysis including an evaluation of potential greenhouse gas emissions consistent with CEQA and City policies at the time of proposal.

The 2nd paragraph on page 43 of the Initial Study may be revised as follows:

Less than Significant. Implementation of the proposed LCP will not accommodate for additional population growth beyond what has been anticipated by the General Plan. Therefore, implementation of
the policies within the proposed LCP will not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. Any future development allowed under the proposed LCP land use designations (such as visitor serving commercial) will be required to undergo independent environmental analysis consistent with CEQA and city policies at the time of proposal.

Comment #2. The commenter notes that consistency with General Plan buildout population is inappropriate for an air quality consistency determination, citing that consistency of a project is based on population forecasts included in the 2008 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), which is determined by AMBAG.

The AQMP population forecasts are based on General Plan forecasts within the region. Since the 2008 AQMP was prepared after the Seaside General Plan was adopted (2004), it incorporates the anticipated growth identified within the General Plan. Since the LCP provides for buildout of the same land uses as the General Plan, the population associated with the LCP would also be consistent with the AQMP.

Comment #3. The commenter notes that impact on GHG emissions on the General plan should be identified and that there is sufficient information in the project description to calculate GHG emissions at this time rather than defer analysis.

The LCP incorporates existing land uses and policies found in the General Plan to provide a more useful tool for the City of Seaside to protect coastal resources. Implementation of the proposed LCP will not accommodate for additional population growth, nor does it accommodate an overall intensification of land uses beyond what has been anticipated by the General Plan.

The proposed LCP would not physically impact air quality, as no new development is proposed. Policies provided within the proposed LCP would minimize potential impact that future development may have on air quality and global climate change. The proposed project, itself, would not expand or intensify existing uses or introduce any new uses or new sources of greenhouse gases, pollutants or odors. Therefore, implementation of the LCP would not directly or indirectly result in GHG emissions to be calculated. All future development proposed within Seaside's coastal zone would be subject to subsequent environmental review at the time of proposal.

Comment #4. The commenter notes that none of the policies referred to in the Initial Study address the current Cease and Desist Order and the Seaside Basin adjudication requirements. In addition, the Initial Study does not address whether there are sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed. The proposed project is an LCP update. It consists of policy and implementation measures. It does not propose or entitle any specific development.

As described throughout the Initial Study, any future development allowed under the proposed LCP land use designations will be required to undergo independent environmental analysis consistent with CEQA and city policies at the time of proposal. This would include evaluation of sufficient water supply.

As identified on pp 33-34, the proposed update to the LCP includes specific policies intended to protect and, where feasible, enhance water supply consistent with the California Coastal Act. For any future development within Seaside's coastal zone, Policy LUD-CZ 2.6 outlines the general permit considerations for water/wastewater consistent with regional and local requirements. Specifically, this policy requires that prior to the approval of any new development within the coastal zone, adequate water and sewage treatment facility capacity shall be demonstrated consistent with the provisions and requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Comment #5. The commenter states that the Initial Study fails to address existing levels of service (LOS) that already exceed acceptable levels and fails to identify project level or cumulative impacts.

The proposed LCP is a policy and implementation document. Implementation of the LCP would not enable/approve any specific development project. As such, project-level or specific thresholds of evaluation, such as Level of Service (LOS), are not appropriate for this level of CEQA analysis.
Transportation and Traffic are evaluated in Section 16 of the Initial Study. As stated "Implementation of the proposed LCP will not accommodate for additional population growth beyond what has been anticipated by the General Plan. Therefore, implementation of the policies within the proposed LCP will not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. Any future development allowed under the proposed LCP land use designations will be required to undergo independent environmental analysis consistent with CEQA and city policies at the time of proposal."

Comment #6. The commenter states that the Initial Study should explain what the second step of the processing of completing the LCP is.

The first step of the LCP process is the Land Use Plan (LUP), which the City of Seaside completed in the early 1980s was adopted and certified by the Coastal Commission in October of 1988. The second part of the LCP process is the Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP), which had not completed until recently. The proposed LCP is an update to the originally completed LUP and provides the never completed CIP for a complete LCP.

TRANSPORTATION AGENCY FOR MONTEREY COUNTY (TAMC) – This letter has several comments as described below.

Comment #1. The commenter states appreciation for the City's willingness to take the Agency's Multi-Modal Transit Station plans into consideration, that the Agency supports the City's intent of the LCP's promotion of active mixed-use commercial corridor that promotes connectivity and provides supporting uses to the station. The Agency also recommends continued City and Agency cooperation in the design and construction of future developments within the LCP area.

Comment noted.

Comment #2. The commenter states that the nature of the project location will draw regional traffic, requiring developments within the project area resulting in impacts to mitigate preferably through the Agency's regional development impact fee program.

Contribution of fees to this program will be required for development projects that are deemed to contribute to regional traffic impacts at the time of individual project-level environmental review and mitigation monitoring, as appropriate.

Comment #3. The commenter states that the Agency supports accommodation of alternative forms of transportation. As such, the Commenter expresses support of the goals of the LCP to create an area of bike and pedestrian-friendly streetscape. In addition, commenter provides further, project-level standards, as required by Caltrans, and encouraged by the Agency, to ensure these goals are accomplished.

The comment is in regards to a design issue, not an environmental issue. The recommendations by the Commenter regarding bicycle and pedestrian circulation would be subject to City design review.

Comment #4. The commenter states that the Agency recommends that planned bike paths and walkways be linked to existing facilities that surround the project area, and that project applicants should consult with the Agency and City's Bike Plans to ensure that all proposed facilities are accounted for in site plans.

The comment is in regards to a design issue, not an environmental issue. The recommendations by the Commenter regarding bicycle and pedestrian circulation would be subject to City design review.

Comment #5. The commenter states that the Agency recommends proper striping be included for all pedestrian crosswalks and walkways, that consideration be given to the inclusion of intelligent crosswalks (particularly on West Broadway Avenue leading to the proposed library, and that mid-crosswalk islands be used.
The comment is in regards to a design issue, not an environmental issue. The recommendations by the Commenter regarding bicycle and pedestrian circulation would be subject to City design review.

MONTEREYBAY.ORG – The commenter requests clarification as to how the proposed land uses in the LCP were addressed in the General Plan EIR and if the ND is only for the CIP.

The General Plan EIR does not directly address the proposed land uses within the LCP since the General Plan EIR was certified prior to consideration of the proposed land uses within the LCP. The ND is for the entire LCP. The LCP has two components: the Land Use Plan (LUP), which provides the specific goals, policies, and implementation actions that govern land and water use within Seaside's coastal zone; and the Coastal Implementation Program (CIP), which provides development regulations for specific coastal zone activities needed to carry out the LUP.

The LCP establishes land use designations, general development criteria, and policies that regulate development specifically within the coastal zone. As stated on page 36 of the Initial Study, the proposed minor modifications to the land uses would provide greater clarification as to the location and intent of the coastal districts and greater consistency with actual on-the-ground conditions. Implementation of the LCP would result in an overall de-intensification of land uses around the Roberts Lake and Beach subareas. The proposed LCP does not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The proposed LCP is consistent with the intent and environmental protection mandates of the adopted Local Coastal Plan, the City of Seaside Zoning Ordinance, the City of Seaside General Plan, and the California Coastal Act.

Any comments received after receipt of this letter will be addressed as applicable at the board meeting. Please contact me should you have any questions regarding our response to comments at (831) 644-9174.

Sincerely,

PMC

Barb Kinison Brown
Project Manager

Attachments: Comment Letters on the Seaside LCP Negative Declaration
October 12, 2010

Rick Medina
Senior Planner
City of Seaside
440 Harcourt Ave.
Seaside, CA 93955

SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO COMMENTS ON SEASIDE LCP NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Dear Mr. Medina:

LandWatch Monterey County has reviewed responses to our comments on the seaside LCP Negative Declaration. We have the following comments:

1. In response to comment #2 the document states, “The AQMP population forecasts are based on General Plan forecasts within the region. Since the 2008 AQMP was prepared after the Seaside General Plan was adopted (2004), it incorporates the anticipated growth identified within the General Plan”. The AQMP incorporates forecasts prepared by AMBAG. These forecasts are not based on General Plan forecasts. Please review the methodology used by AMBAG for population forecasts (available on the AMBAG website) and revise your response accordingly. AMBAG should be requested to prepare a consistency finding per MBUAPCD’s CEQA Air Quality Guidelines.

2. In response to comment #3 the document states, “The proposed LCP incorporates existing land uses and policies found in the General Plan...Implementation of the proposed LCP will no accommodate additional population growth...The proposed LCP would not physically impact air quality, as no new development is proposed...”. These statements are immediately contradicted with the following statement, “Policies provided within the proposed LCP would minimize potential impact that future development may have on air quality.” Apparently, what is intended is that the LCP does not accommodate any new land uses beyond those included in the existing LCP and General Plan, and apparently, the original environmental document is being relied upon to address the impacts, although this is not stated. Regardless, the LCP is being amended, and the Negative Declaration must include estimates of GHG emissions and their impact on climate change since this impact was not addressed in the environmental document prepared for the original LCP and General Plan.

3. In response to comment #4 the document states, “The proposed project is an LCP update...It does not propose or entitle any specific development...any future development
allowed under the proposed LCP land use designations will be required to undergo independent environmental analysis...This would include evaluation of sufficient water supply.” CEQA requires that environmental analysis occur at the earliest possible date (Bozung et al v Ventura County LAFCO). As stated in our letter, there is sufficient information available to address environmental impacts at a programmatic level. This comment also applies to the response to comment #5.

Thank you for the opportunity to review your response to our comments.

Sincerely,

/\s/\

Amy L. White
Executive Director
Response the October 12, 2010 Land Watch Comment Letter

1. Comment states:
In response to comment #2 the document states, "The AQMP population forecasts are based on General Plan forecasts within the region. Since the 2008 AQMP was prepared after the Seaside General Plan was adopted (2004), it incorporates the anticipated growth identified within the General Plan." The AQMP incorporates forecasts prepared by AMBAG. These forecasts are not based on General Plan forecasts. Please review the methodology used by AMBAG for population forecasts (available on the AMBAG website) and revise your response accordingly. AMBAG should be requested to prepare a consistency finding per MBUAPCD's CEQA Air Quality Guidelines.

Response:
As identified in the 2008 AQMD, and based on discussions with Stephanie Nelson, Planner with AMBAG on October 12th, 2010, AMBAG population figures for the current 2008 AQMP represent "constrained forecasts" where limitations to growth due to such factors as the availability of water, wastewater treatment and local growth policies (including General Plans and local knowledge) are taken into account. As stated in the Initial Study:

Implementation of the LCP would not conflict or obstruct implementation of the applicable Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD) 2008 Air Quality Plan, as it would not result in additional growth.

As stated by AMBAG staff, consistency determinations are appropriate for development proposals where additional population may be quantified based on housing units. Consistency determinations are also appropriate for transportation projects. Consistency determinations would be based on the population increase associated with development in comparison to forecast population rates. Since the LCP is not a development proposal or a transportation plan or project, AMBAG would not conduct a consistency analysis on this project. Thus, no conflicts are expected.

2. Comment states:
In response to comment #3 the document states, "The proposed LCP incorporates existing land uses and policies found in the General Plan...Implementation of the proposed LCP will not accommodate additional population growth...The proposed LCP would not physically impact air quality, as no new development is proposed..." These statements are immediately contradiction with the following statement, "Policies provided within the proposed LCP would minimize potential impact that future development may have on air quality." Apparently, what is intended is that the LCP does not accommodate any new land uses beyond those included in the existing LCP and General Plan, and apparently, the original environmental document is being relied upon to address the impacts, although this is not stated. Regardless, the LCP is being amended, and the Negative Declaration must include estimates of GHG emissions and their impact on climate change since this impact was not addressed in the environmental document prepared for the original LCP and General Plan.

Response:
For background, the original comment (#3) in the August 24th Landwatch to the City was: "There is sufficient information in the Project Description to calculate GHG analysis. This cannot be deferred to a later time." In response the City provided the following on September 28th:
"The LCP incorporates existing land uses and policies found in the General Plan to provide a more useful tool for the City of Seaside to protect coastal resources. Implementation of the proposed LCP will not accommodate for additional population growth, nor does it accommodate an overall intensification of land uses beyond what has been anticipated by the General Plan.

The proposed LCP would not physically impact air quality, as no new development is proposed. Policies provided within the proposed LCP would minimize potential impact that future development may have on air quality and global climate change. The proposed project, itself, would not expand or intensify existing uses or introduce any new uses or new sources of greenhouse gases, pollutants or odors. Therefore, implementation of the LCP would not directly or indirectly result in GHG emissions to be calculated. All future development proposed within Seaside's coastal zone would be subject to subsequent environmental review at the time of proposal.”

For clarification, the 3rd sentence of the City’s response above should read:

Implementation of the proposed LCP itself would not have a physically significant impact on air quality, as no specific new development is proposed, and the LCP does not entitle any development. In fact, the proposal represents an overall de-intensification of land use within Seaside's Coastal Zone.

The LCP and its two component parts, the Land Use Plan and the Coastal Implementation Plan, add to the City’s regulatory framework for development and add to the protection of coastal resources in Seaside. The Local Coastal Program does not amend the General Plan. Thus, the baseline of conditions to which the Local Coastal Program was evaluated includes the existing Seaside General Plan, the Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan and other regulatory documents. Each of those earlier documents were evaluated in separate EIRs or environmental documents with mitigation measures imposed to lessen the significant impacts those regulatory actions have on the environment and the impacts of development that are authorized or permitted by those documents.

With that existing regulatory framework already in place, the Initial Study evaluated the impacts specific to the changes imposed by the Local Coastal Plan rather than to the impacts of development that was authorized by the existing regulatory framework. The Initial Study found that the impacts of the changes created by the Local Coastal Plan did not have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment. This is because the additional policies, programs and requirements of the Local Coastal Plan further limit overall development in the Coastal Zone and that development and impacts on environmental resources will be no more intense and will often be less intense than the development and impacts created or allowed by the existing regulatory framework.

As specifically identified in the City’s Planning Commission Staff Report (May 26, 2010) the minor proposed modifications to the adopted LCP would provide greater clarification as to the location and intent of the Coastal Districts and greater consistency with actual on-the-ground conditions. The proposed land use plan would result in an overall de-intensification of land uses around Robert’s Lake and the Beach area and does not entitle any development. Specifically:

- The addition of “Coastal” to the district titles would distinguish coastal zoning districts from other districts in the City.
- The addition of “Visitor Serving” to the commercial districts within the coastal zone would clarify the intent of these districts to accommodate visitors, tourists and guests.
• Designation of the beach area and the area around Roberts Lake (currently designated in the 1983 LCP as Visitor-Serving Commercial) as Coastal Parks and Open Space would provide greater protection of the beach and dune areas, and reflect the City's desire to keep those areas free from commercial development.

• Designation of the small area southwest of Roberts Lake currently occupied by the "boat house" (currently designated in the 1983 LCP as Visitor-Serving Commercial) as Coastal Visitor Serving Recreation would limit the commercial uses of the parcel exclusively to small recreational support uses.

• Designation of a small area on the northeast side of Robert's Lake would provide a more appropriate (although much smaller) location for opportunities for Coastal Visitor Serving Commercial Use than those currently identifies on the beach and the dune area of Roberts Lake.

• Minor expansion southward of the commercial area along the east side of Laguna Grande reflects the current use as an expanded parking area.

• The addition of a CMX/WBUVSP district is consistent with the pending West Broadway Specific Plan.

As the proposed LCP does not involve an overall intensification of land uses, and is not growth-inducing or traffic-inducing, the LCP would not have a significant impact or contribute to increases in GHG emissions. As stated in the Initial Study:

"The proposed LCP does not anticipate any additional population growth beyond what is anticipated in the City's General Plan. Implementation of the policies will not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly. The proposed LCP does not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Specifically, the proposed LCP is consistent with the intent and environmental protection mandates of the adopted Local Coastal Plan, the City of Seaside Zoning Ordinance, the City of Seaside General Plan and the California Coastal Act as described in the Land Use/Planning section of this Initial Study."

Therefore, the Initial Study identified this as a Less than Significant Impact.

The intent of the LCP update process is to clean up and update 1983 LUP policies and language and to establish consistency among City documents and with current Coastal Commission direction. The LCP does not propose any changes to the overall development pattern anticipated in the certified LCP and represents an overall de-intensification of land use. The proposal does not allow for any further development than currently allowed and does not have any new impacts than expected under current City regulations. That is, the project only modifies existing regulation and makes it more environmentally protective. This project does not open up underlying land uses or entitle anything.

Future development will be subject to the mitigation measures imposed by prior environmental documents, as well as requiring project-specific CEQA review. A meaningful analysis of GHG emissions, water usage or other project specific analysis prior to the establishment of specific development characteristics would be speculative consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15145.(see below) For example, future land uses that would be allowable to the land designated as Coastal Visitor Serving commercial, for example range from Visitor Center, to restaurant to hotel. Each of these potential uses would have widely different contributions to water use, traffic and GHG emissions.
3. Comment States:
In response to comment #4 and #5 the document states, "The proposed project is an LCP update... It does not propose or entitle any specific development... any future development allowed under the proposed LCP land use designations will be required to undergo independent environmental analysis... This would include evaluation of sufficient water supply." CEQA requires that environmental analysis occur at the earliest possible date (Bozung et al v Ventura County LAFCO). As stated in our letter, there is sufficient information available to address environmental impacts at a programmatic level.

Response:

See also response #2 above. The baseline of conditions to which the Local Coastal Program was evaluated includes the existing Seaside General Plan, the Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan and other regulatory documents. Each of those earlier documents were evaluated in separate EIRs or environmental documents with mitigation measures imposed to lessen the significant impacts those regulatory actions have on the environment and the impacts of development that are authorized or permitted by those documents.

The LCP is a policy document that does not propose significant land use changes and does not entitle any development. Changes made to land use designations (from the previously adopted/certified LCP) were made to provide clarity, to reflect current on the ground conditions, and to add greater protection to the beach areas as a guide for future development. A meaningful analysis of GHG emissions, water usage or other project specific analysis prior to the establishment of specific development characteristics would be speculative as discussed above.
SEASIDE LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM 2013

FORA CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION

Exhibit F: Coastal Zone Area and Subarea Map as modified by the California Coastal Commission
SEASIDE LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM 2013

FORA CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION

Exhibit G: Coastal Zone Land Use designations as modified by the California Coastal Commission
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Exhibit H: California Coastal Commission Staff Report
December 13, 2012
To: Coastal Commissioners and Interested Persons

From: Dan Carl, Deputy Director
Mike Watson, Coastal Planner

Subject: City of Seaside Local Coastal Program Amendment Number 1-11 (LUP Update and IP Certification). For public hearing and Commission action at its December 13, 2012 meeting in San Francisco.

DESCRIPTION OF SUBMITTAL

The City of Seaside is proposing to completely update its Local Coastal Program (LCP) Land Use Plan (LUP), and is proposing an LCP Implementation Plan (IP) for the first time. Thus, the City’s LCP amendment proposal constitutes a complete LCP for the first time for the City of Seaside. This is the first amendment to the LUP since its certification in 1983, and represents a comprehensive update that essentially replaces the majority of the LUP’s land use regulatory policies and programs. Although the general goals of the 1983 LUP remain current, the updated LUP contains numerous new policies addressing a variety of coastal resource issues not previously covered in the currently certified LUP. The LUP update reflects current understandings regarding sea level rise, flood and hazard abatement, environmentally sensitive habitat area (ESHA) and wetland protection, water quality enhancement, transportation planning, water and utility requirements, and a host of other relevant coastal planning issues. The proposed LCP amendment was received on June 3, 2011 and subsequently filed as complete on March 19, 2012. Coastal staff has worked very closely with City staff on issues raised by the submittal, and have reached agreement on suggested modifications to address coastal resource issues. As suggested to be modified, City and Coastal staff are in agreement on the LCP. The standard of review for the LUP is Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act, and the standard of review for the IP is the LUP, as amended.

BACKGROUND AND HISTORY OF THE CERTIFIED LUP

Certification of the LUP in 1983 was the end result of a lengthy land use planning effort that effectively began in 1977 and included several submittals and iterations, including: approval by the City on September 3, 1981; Commission certification with suggested modifications for the Laguna Grande/Roberts Lake subareas and denial of the Beach subarea on March 5, 1982; Commission approval of the Beach subarea with suggested modifications on August 12, 1982;
re-submittal of the Beach subarea on January 21, 1983; Commission approval with modifications of the Beach subarea on May 26, 1983; and concluding with Commission certification of the entire LUP (Laguna Grande, Roberts Lake, and Beach subareas) on October 12, 1983. This proposed LCP amendment is the first since the LUP was certified in 1983.

**SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that the Commission hold a public hearing and approve the LCP subject to modifications. This will require the Commission to deny both the LUP and IP as submitted, and then approve the LUP amendment and the IP if modified to incorporate the suggested modifications. The motions to accomplish this are found on pages 5 – 7 below. The City would have six months (i.e., until June 13, 2013) to accept the modifications or only the denials would stand.

The City of Seaside has put forth a considerable effort over the past several years to prepare and submit the proposed LCP, including working directly with staff during that time. The City has used this opportunity to bring the LUP up to date with current planning and development standards, particularly with regard to the protection of the City’s coastal resources. Overall, the LCP amendment as proposed by the City constitutes a far more comprehensive, detailed, and improved plan than the City’s currently certified LUP. The recommendation for approval with modifications is based on addressing remaining issues related to the protection of ESHA and wetland areas, provision of public recreational access, protection of water quality and visual resources, avoidance of flooding hazards, ensuring adequate public services (including related to transportation, circulation, water, and wastewater capacities), as well as other related coastal resource issues. These modifications range from major revisions, such as needed to ensure that the objectives of the Coastal Act policy are clearly articulated, and the insertion of policies/procedures for addressing storm water quality, heretofore missing from the LCP, to minor changes, such as rephrasing advisory wording (“should” “may”) into mandatory terms (“shall” “must”), consistent with the compulsory nature of a given policy. As indicated above, City and Commission staff have worked closely together to draft appropriate modifications, the City is in agreement with the suggested modifications, and the City is asking for the Commission to approve the LCP as modified.

**SUMMARY OF ISSUES**

The main issues associated with the proposed LCP amendment can be summarized as follows:

**Hazards**

The proposed LCP generally addresses coastal hazard issues in conjunction with minimizing flood risks by limiting development along the beach and shoreline, identifying sea level rise and related impacts, and maintaining the storm water outfall at Monterey State Beach. This is appropriate because, for the most part, coastal hazard issues within Seaside are predominantly related to maintaining the water level of Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake and avoiding flooding of adjacent commercial and residential properties inland of Highway 1. Over the years, the City has mechanically manipulated a sand berm to allow water from the lakes to release to the bay.
Additional policies are proposed to address threats from tsunami, require analysis of wave uprush/shoreline erosion in new development, and to refine outfall maintenance provisions.

**Water Quality**

The proposed LCP contains only limited provisions designed to maintain and enhance the quality of coastal waters. Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake both suffer from sedimentation, nutrient and urban pollutant loading, low oxygen levels, and other forms of degradation, and this water is ultimately conveyed onto Monterey State Beach and the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary. Staff is recommending modifications including more robust storm water and water quality protection provisions to mitigate both construction and post-construction water quality impacts, and to target specific classes of pollutants. The storm water and water quality provisions were coordinated through Commission water quality staff, including to ensure that they would effectively address new Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) requirements associated with the pending update to the statewide Phase II Stormwater Permit.

**Land Use**

Several lakefront properties would be designated for visitor-serving commercial and recreational uses, the proposed density and intensity of which could lead to adverse impacts to adjacent wetland and riparian habitats. The suggested modifications refine density/intensity and setback standards in order to adequately buffer adjacent resources to ensure they are protected.

**Public Access and Recreation**

The proposed LCP provides a good description of the various public access and recreational and visitor-serving opportunities available in Seaside. Seaside is the gateway to the Monterey peninsula with approximately 500 feet of beach frontage, two freshwater lakes, access to the Monterey Bay Coastal Recreation Trail and California Coastal Trail alignment, easy access to Cannery Row and area attractions, and options for overnight accommodation. In general, the proposed LCP policies call for protecting these facilities, and access to them, as well as for new improvements. However, there are a few parts of the LCP in need of refinement to ensure public recreational access is protected, provided and enhanced as required by the Coastal Act. For example, restrictions on the use of public facilities and parking in the evening hours that deprives visitors of a way to conveniently access the coast, are removed. Also, the water quality improvements described above will protect public use areas from the impact of storm water facilities and storm water flows, including related to public access and recreational use of Monterey State Beach and elsewhere on adjacent beaches. Finally, modifications are necessary to appropriately address provision and retention of lower-cost visitor-serving facilities. Thus, modifications will increase hours of available parking, will consolidate and, where feasible, eliminate storm water outfalls on area beaches, and will protect lower-cost visitor opportunities.

**Transportation and Circulation**

Highway 1 slices through the City on its seaward edge, and is the major transportation corridor in the region, including for public recreational and visitor use. The level of service for Highway 1 and area intersections in Seaside are poor during morning and afternoon peak periods, and at extended times during the busy summer months. To address these issues, the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) is developing plans for restoring rail service between Marina and the City of Monterey, and area planners are seeking for ways to encourage various forms of alternative transportation including through construction of a network of trails and paths.
such as the Monterey Bay Recreation Trail -- a local component of the California Coastal Trail. Given the context, modifications are included to address transportation capacities, to protect the former railroad right-of-way for the specific purpose of re-establishing light rail service and multi-modal transportation options (trails, etc.), to encourage alternative forms of transportation (e.g., hiking and biking), to require adequate parking and circulation in all new development, and to provide for maintenance and repair of existing transportation facilities in Seaside.

**Public Services**
The proposed LCP describes the City’s public infrastructure and offers policies for its future improvements and maintenance. However, certain public service constraints require additional detail. For example, the City of Seaside is in an area with severely limited water supplies, and the policies need to be amended to reflect that context. Thus, modifications are included to protect coastal priority uses, to ensure that adequate long-term and sustainable water supplies are available for development, and to ensure that water services are publicly managed.

**Other Issues**
By and large, the proposed LCP mostly adequately addresses issues of archaeological resources, ESHA, and visual resource protection. There are proposed policies for identification and preservation of archaeological sites and environmentally sensitive habitats, including through buffers. The City also commits to a number of actions to actively manage and improve its habitat areas. Similarly, there are proposed policies to address visual resources in a manner to prevent degrading scenic views of the lakes and Monterey Bay. However, certain refinements are necessary to ensure protection consistent with the Coastal Act. For example, the ESHA protection policies need additional detail for addressing cumulative impacts and appropriate acreage replacement ratios for unavoidable direct impacts. Similarly, certain policy additions are needed to round out archaeological protections. And for public views, the visual resource discussion needs to be updated (e.g., explicitly protecting public views from Highway 1), and policies for protecting views refined, particularly related to primary view corridors associated with the Highway and the City’s lakes. In terms of other Coastal Act topics, they are not relevant and thus not discussed in this report (e.g., the City of Seaside lacks any agricultural land, timberlands, boating facilities, dams, coastal-dependent industries, or major energy plants).

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SUMMARY**
The noted issues and others of more local concern were debated in many public forums. The City has provided a summary of public participation available for review at the Commission’s Central Coast District Office in Santa Cruz. The City Council, Planning Commission, and other City committees held at least four public hearings on various aspects of the proposed LCP prior to its submittal to the Commission.

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**
For further information on the City’s proposed LCP or this report, please contact Mike Watson at (831) 427-4863. Correspondence should be sent to the Central Coast District Office in Santa
Cruz district office at 725 Front Street, Suite 300, Santa Cruz, CA 95060.
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I. MOTIONS AND RESOLUTIONS

Staff is recommending that the Commission approve the LCP if modified. The Commission needs to take four separate actions, two on the LUP and two on the IP to effect this recommendation.

1. Denial of LUP as Submitted

Staff recommends a NO vote on the following motion. Failure of this motion will result in denial of the LUP amendment as submitted and adoption of the following resolution and findings. The motion passes only by an affirmative vote of a majority of the appointed Commissioners.

Motion:

I move that the Commission certify Land Use Plan Amendment SEA 1-11 as submitted by the City of Seaside. I recommend a no vote.
Resolution:

The Commission hereby denies certification of Land Use Plan Amendment SEA 1-11 as submitted by the City of Seaside and adopts the findings set forth below on the grounds that the amendment does not conform with the policies of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act. Certification of the Land Use Plan amendment would not comply with the California Environmental Quality Act because there are feasible alternatives or mitigation measures which could substantially lessen any significant adverse impact which the Land Use Plan Amendment may have on the environment.

2. Approval of LUP with Suggested Modifications

Staff recommends a YES vote on the following motion. Passage of the motion will result in the certification of the LUP amendment with suggested modifications and adoption of the following resolution and findings. The motion to certify with suggested modifications passes only upon an affirmative vote of the majority of the appointed Commissioners.

Motion:

I move that the Commission certify Land Use Plan Amendment SEA 1-11 for the City of Seaside if it is modified as suggested in this staff report. I recommend a yes vote.

Resolution:

The Commission hereby certifies Land Use Plan Amendment SEA 1-11 for the City of Seaside if modified as suggested and adopts the findings set forth below on the grounds that the Land Use Plan amendment with suggested modifications will meet the requirements of and be in conformity with the policies of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act. Certification of the land use plan amendment if modified as suggested complies with the California Environmental Quality Act because either 1) feasible mitigation measures and/or alternatives have been incorporated to substantially lessen any significant adverse effects of the plan on the environment, or 2) there are no further feasible alternatives or mitigation measures that would substantially lessen any significant adverse impacts which the Land Use Plan Amendment may have on the environment.

3. Denial of IP as Submitted

Staff recommends a YES vote on the following motion. Passage of this motion will result in rejection of the IP and the adoption of the following resolution and findings. The motion passes only by an affirmative vote of a majority of the Commissioners present.

Motion:

I move that the Commission reject Implementation Plan SEA 1-11 as submitted by the City of Seaside. I recommend a yes vote.
Resolution:

The Commission hereby denies certification of the Implementation Plan submitted for the City of Seaside and adopts the findings set forth below on grounds that the Implementation Plan as submitted does not conform with, and is inadequate to carry out, the provisions of the certified land use plan as amended. Certification of the Implementation Plan would not meet the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act as there are feasible alternatives and mitigation measures that would substantially lessen the significant adverse impacts on the environment that will result from certification of the Implementation Plan as submitted.

4. Approval of IP with Suggested Modifications

Staff recommends a YES vote on the following motion. Passage of this motion will result in certification of the IP with suggested modifications and the adoption of the following resolution and findings. The motion passes only by an affirmative vote of a majority of the Commissioners present.

Motion:

I move that the Commission certify Implementation Plan SEA 1-11 for the City of Seaside if it is modified as suggested in this staff report. I recommend a yes vote.

Resolution:

The Commission hereby certifies the Implementation Plan for the City of Seaside if modified as suggested and adopts the findings set forth below on grounds that the Implementation Plan with the suggested modifications conforms with, and is adequate to carry out, the provisions of the certified Land Use Plan as amended. Certification of the Implementation Plan if modified as suggested complies with the California Environmental Quality Act, because either 1) feasible mitigation measures and/or alternatives have been incorporated to substantially lessen any significant adverse effects of the Implementation Plan on the environment, or 2) there are no further feasible alternatives and mitigation measures that would substantially lessen any significant adverse impacts on the environment.

II. SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS

The Commission suggests that the following changes to the submitted City of Seaside Land Use Plan and Implementation Plan are necessary to make the requisite findings. If the City accepts the suggested modifications within six months of Commission action (i.e., by June 13, 2013), by formal resolution of the City Council, the City’s Local Coastal Program will become effective upon Commission concurrence with the Executive Director finding that this has been properly accomplished.

Please see Appendix A for the suggested modifications to the City of Seaside LUP, and Appendix B for the suggested modifications to the City’s IP.
III. FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS

A. NATURAL HAZARDS
Section 30253 of the Coastal Act requires minimization of risks to new development from natural hazards and states, in part:

New development shall: (1) Minimize risks to life and property in areas of high geologic, flood, and fire hazard. (2) Assure stability and structural integrity, and neither create nor contribute significantly to erosion, geologic instability, or destruction of the site or surrounding area or in any way require the construction of protective devices that would substantially alter natural landforms along bluffs and cliffs.

Coastal Act Section 30235 addresses the use of shoreline protective devices:

Revetments, breakwaters, groins, harbor channels, seawalls, cliff retaining walls, and other such construction that alters natural shoreline processes shall be permitted 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 shoreline sand supply. Existing marine structures causing water stagnation contributing to pollution problems and fish kills should be phased out or upgraded where feasible.

Background: The Seaside coastal zone encompasses approximately 70 acres (excluding the State Highway Route One corridor). At least half of this area is comprised of either beach or inland lakes which drain the much larger 13.5 square-mile Canyon del Rey Creek watershed. Runoff from the upper slopes of the watershed flows first into lake Laguna Grande, then Robert’s Lake, and lastly flows via a storm drain outfall onto Seaside State Beach. Channelization of this watercourse and increased development within the upper watershed has resulted in increased runoff being diverted to Seaside’s lakes. As a result, the areas around the lakes are prone to flooding during periods of high rainfall. In addition, natural hazards including shoreline erosion, sea level rise, and tsunamis can affect the coastal shoreline areas. In addition to these hazards, the Seaside coastal zone is also subject to potential hazards associated with seismic shaking, liquefaction, and fire.

LUP Analysis: The LUP generally has policies that provide for protection of development in areas impacted by natural hazards. These policies include minimizing risk to life and property in all new development via completion of specific geotechnical studies for new development and to determine the extent and type of hazards on a site. All applications for new development within identified hazard areas must include an adaptive management plan that identifies the expected life of the project along with strategies for decommissioning the development once its lifetime has been reached due to hazards. Additionally, the LUP directs the City to prepare an update to the Hazard Mitigation Plan which includes a vulnerability assessment to identify the areas of the city most at risk from sea level rise, along with recommended responses to identified threats.

The submitted LUP omits more specific policy direction on addressing impacts from tsunami, including requirements to avoid the flood inundation zone, and where avoidance is not possible, to site and design development above the maximum flood elevation. The submitted LUP is also
somewhat lacking in standards to ensure that natural habitat area buffers and public access and recreation amenities take into account changing sea level conditions. Geotechnical report requirements also require additional detail for development within in an area subject to ocean waves, tsunami, or flooding hazard, including in relation to the potential future use of shoreline armoring. Thus, as submitted, the LUP is inconsistent with Coastal Act Sections 30235 and 30253 regarding the avoidance of natural hazards and appropriate hazard response.

The LUP can be brought into conformance with the addition of modifications that require, as part of the CDP application process, a geotechnical report prepared by a licensed engineer subject to refined expectations and criteria for report contents. The report must include an analysis of wave uprush and shoreline erosion processes in order to establish the appropriate long-term setbacks that will ensure the safety and protection of any permitted structures over the life of the development without reliance on seawalls, deep caisson foundation, or similar engineered structures. The modifications further identify the conditions that must be considered in the report, including a seasonally eroded beach, high tide, long-term sea level rise projections, and the 100-year storm. The modifications also explicitly require identification of economic lifetime and expectations for decommissioning development when hazardous conditions dictate.

Additionally, modifications are proposed that require tsunami threats be addressed via siting and design measures that minimize and mitigate flood hazards to the maximum extent possible, including by designing all habitable space above the maximum flood elevation. A separate modification requires the development of a Tsunami Preparedness Plan that includes identifying susceptible areas, preparation of response policies/practices, deployment of an early warning system, identification of evacuation routes, and public education for mitigating the hazards associated with a tsunami.

Finally, modifications are proposed that require that public access and recreation amenities are managed in a manner that will ensure those amenities can adapt to changes in sea level rise and shoreline configuration. Similarly, establishment of natural habitat buffers must take into consideration changes in sea level conditions. Both adaption strategies are necessary for preserving the unique flora and fauna of the City’s interior lakes as well as its labyrinth of public access trails and recreation areas in the face of changing global climatic conditions.

As modified, the LUP Natural Hazard policies are consistent with and adequate to carry out the intent of Coastal Act Sections 30235 and 30253.

**B. WATER QUALITY**
The following sections of the Coastal Act pertain to the management of available water supplies and maintenance of water quality:

**Section 30230.** Marine resources shall be maintained, enhanced, and where feasible, restored. Special protection shall be given to areas and species of special biological or economic significance. Uses of the marine environment shall be carried out in a manner that will sustain the biological productivity of coastal waters and that will maintain healthy populations of all species of marine organisms adequate for long-term commercial, recreational, scientific, and educational purposes.
Section 30231. The biological productivity and the quality of coastal waters, streams, wetlands, estuaries, and lakes appropriate to maintain optimum populations of marine organisms and for the protection of human health shall be maintained and, where feasible, restored through, among other means, minimizing adverse effects of wastewater discharges and entertainment, controlling runoff, preventing depletion of ground water supplies and substantial interference with surface waterflow, encouraging wastewater reclamation, maintaining natural vegetation buffer areas that protect riparian habitats, and minimizing alteration of natural streams.

Background: In the past, both Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake have been significantly polluted. Major problem sources included urban runoff, erosion in the watershed, windblown sand from destabilized sand dunes, and nutrient input from waterfowl. The City’s Wetlands Management Enhancement and Restoration Program (WMERP; CDP 3-86-129) contained management objectives to improve the water quality of both lakes to a degree sufficient to support a recreational fishery, provide enhanced aesthetic qualities, and permit recreational boating.

Analysis: Seaside lies within and at the bottom of the Canyon Del Rey Creek watershed. Runoff from the upper slopes of the watershed and including the communities of Monterey, Del Rey Oaks, and Seaside, flows into Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake and ultimately flows via a storm drain outfall onto Seaside Beach and the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary. As noted in the public access section, the interior lakes and Seaside State Beach are very popular public recreational access areas. Maintaining and restoring water quality throughout the greater Canyon Del Rey Creek watershed, and in this case, Seaside’s urban landscape, is necessary to protect lake and bay resources, as well as public recreational access.

The Commission shares responsibility for regulating non-point source water pollution in the coastal zone with the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and the coastal Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs). The Commission and the RWQCB have been co-leads in developing stormwater regulations for the Central Coast region. Final post-Construction Stormwater Management Requirements have recently been developed and adopted (September 6, 2012). Management measures and practices are directed at reducing the volume and the harmful effects of polluted runoff entering Central Coast waterways, lakes, and beaches. These measures are best implemented at the local planning level, since they can be most effective during the design stage of development. All participating local governments, including the City of Seaside, are required to implement these measures within one year of adoption (i.e., September 6, 2013).

The Commission and the Central Coast RWQCB are both working to protect water quality in the southern Monterey Bay area including Seaside, although each has different authorities and responsibilities in that effort. The Commission has primary responsibility for protecting many coastal resources, including water quality, from the impacts of development in the coastal zone. The SWRCB and RWQCBs have primary responsibility for regulating discharges that may impact waters of the state through issuance of discharge permits, investigating water quality impacts, monitoring discharges, setting water quality standards and taking enforcement actions where standards are violated.
Seaside LUP as Submitted: The City’s LUP submittal includes a variety of important policies to address water quality issues. These include policies to develop a City-wide Storm Water Utility Program that will also address the City’s need to implement a National Pollution Discharge and Elimination System (NPDES) permit; policies to regulate illegal discharges; watershed protection policies to retain natural drainages; policies to restore areas beneficial to water quality; and so forth.

The submitted LUP also includes general development policies that require the protection of natural drainage systems, site planning to address drainage and polluted runoff, and the use of Best Management Practices (BMPs). Specific standards include requirements to: design post-construction BMPs to infiltrate and/or treat storm runoff; minimize impervious surfaces; implement Low Impact Development (LID) design techniques; and incorporate BMPs into commercial developments.

Coastal Act Consistency: The Commission recognizes that new development in Seaside has the potential to adversely impact coastal water quality through the removal of native vegetation, increase of impervious surfaces, increase of runoff, erosion, and sedimentation, and the introduction of pollutants such as petroleum, cleaning products, pesticides, and other pollutant sources. Coastal Act Sections 30230 and 30231 listed above require that coastal water quality be protected through policies that manage these types of new development impacts.

In particular, new development often results in an increase in impervious surface, which in turn decreases the infiltrative function and capacity of existing permeable land on project sites. Development and re-development activity in Seaside has the potential to lead to increased impermeable surfaces. The reduction in permeable surface can lead to an increase in the volume and velocity of storm water runoff that can be expected to leave the development site. Maintaining permeable surfaces and managing runoff onsite helps to limit the impacts of pollutant runoff. Pollutants commonly found in runoff associated with new development include:

- petroleum hydrocarbons such as oil and grease from vehicles;
- heavy metals;
- synthetic organic chemicals including paint and household cleaners;
- soap and dirt from washing vehicles;
- dirt and vegetation from yard maintenance;
- litter and organic matter;
- fertilizers, herbicides, and pesticides from household gardening or more intensive agricultural land use;
- nutrients from wastewater discharge, animal waste and crop residue; and
- bacteria and pathogens from wastewater discharge and animal waste.
The discharge of these pollutants to coastal waters can cause cumulative impacts such as:

- eutrophication and anoxic conditions resulting in fish kills and diseases and the alteration of aquatic habitat, including adverse changes to species composition and size;
- excess nutrients causing algae blooms and sedimentation increasing turbidity, which both reduce the penetration of sunlight needed by aquatic vegetation that provide food and cover for aquatic species;
- disruptions to the reproductive cycle of aquatic species;
- acute and sub-lethal toxicity in marine organisms leading to adverse changes in reproduction and feeding behavior; and
- human diseases such as hepatitis and dysentery.

These impacts reduce the biological productivity and the quality of coastal waters, wetlands, and lakes, and can have adverse impacts on human health. They are particularly important to manage in the vicinity of significant marine resources such as Laguna Grande, Roberts Lake and Monterey Bay – a National Marine Sanctuary.

As summarized above, Seaside’s submitted LUP contains a comprehensive set of water quality policies designed to protect and enhance water quality and the beneficial uses of local coastal waters from adverse impacts related to land development. With only a few exceptions, these policies contained in the Seaside LUP provide for the protection and enhancement of water quality and the beneficial uses of local coastal waters, protecting against adverse impacts related to land development consistent with Coastal Act Sections 30230 and 30231. To bring the LUP into full compliance with the Chapter 3 policies, modifications are needed that direct the City to implement the recently adopted Post-Construction Stormwater Management Requirements (September 6, 2012), and similarly adopt and implement the recommendations of the City’s soon-to-be revised Wetlands Management, Enhancement, and Restoration Program. Both are essential to halt and reverse the adverse water quality impacts affecting the City’s lakes and bay shoreline. Modifications are also necessary to require development and re-development to reduce sources of and/or treat pollution before it enters the storm drain system and ultimately the City’s coastal waterways. Lastly, a modification that directs the City to seek opportunities to consolidate and/or eliminate beach discharge facilities and outfalls where possible will improve the biological productivity and quality of coastal waters of the Monterey Bay Marine Sanctuary consistent with Coastal Act Sections 30230 and 30231.

If modified as described above, the Seaside LUP would include a comprehensive and appropriate set of policies to meet the goal of protecting and enhancing water quality of local coastal waters from adverse impacts related to development, consistent with Coastal Act sections 30230 and 30231.
C. WETLANDS AND ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE HABITAT AREAS
The following sections of the Coastal Act pertain to preservation and enhancement of coastal waters, wetlands, and environmentally sensitive habitat areas (ESHAs):

**Section 30107.5.** "Environmentally sensitive area" means any area in which plant or animal life or their habitats are either rare or especially valuable because of their special nature or role in an ecosystem and which could be easily disturbed or degraded by human activities and developments.

**Section 30231.** The biological productivity and the quality of coastal waters, streams, wetlands, estuaries, and lakes appropriate to maintain optimum populations of marine organisms and for the protection of human health shall be maintained and, where feasible, restored through, among other means, minimizing adverse effects of wastewater discharges and entertainment, controlling runoff, preventing depletion of ground water supplies and substantial interference with surface waterflow, encouraging wastewater reclamation, maintaining natural vegetation buffer areas that protect riparian habitats, and minimizing alteration of natural streams.

**Section 30240.** (a) Environmentally sensitive habitat areas shall be protected against any significant disruption of habitat values, and only uses dependent on those resources shall be allowed within those areas. (b) Development in areas adjacent to environmentally sensitive habitat areas and parks and recreation areas shall be sited and designed to prevent impacts which would significantly degrade those areas, and shall be compatible with the continuance of those habitat and recreation areas.

Additional Section 30233 in part provides wetland protection as follows:

**Section 30233.** (a) The diking, filling, or dredging of open coastal waters, wetlands, estuaries, and lakes shall be permitted in accordance with other applicable provisions of this division, 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 the following:

1. In open coastal waters, other than wetlands, including streams, estuaries, and lakes, new or expanded boating facilities and the placement of structural pilings for public recreational piers that provide public access and recreation.

2. Incidental public service purposes, including but not limited to, burying cables and pipes or inspection of piers and maintenance of existing intake and outfall lines.

3. Mineral extraction, including sand for restoring beaches, except in environmentally sensitive areas.

4. Restoration purposes.

5. Nature study, aquaculture, or similar resource dependent activities.

(b) Dredging and spoils disposal shall be planned and carried out to avoid significant
disruption to marine and wildlife habitats and water circulation. Dredge spoils suitable for beach replenishment should be transported for such purposes to appropriate beaches or into suitable long shore current systems.

(c) In addition to the other provisions of this section, diking, filling, or dredging in existing estuaries and wetlands shall maintain or enhance the functional capacity of the wetland or estuary.

Background: Coastal Act requirements emphasize the importance of protecting, maintaining, enhancing, and restoring coastal waters, wetlands, and ESHA. These requirements stress that future development within or adjacent to such areas must be appropriate in terms of the type of use, siting, and design to ensure that these areas are not degraded or threatened. Factors that have the potential to affect the viability and stability of natural systems include alteration in drainage systems, sedimentation and erosion, obstacles to proper water circulation, grading/dredging, filling and construction from development. All of these concerns must be prevented or mitigated by LUP policies to be found consistent with the Coastal Act. The three affected planning areas of the LUP can be combined into four generalized habitat types, including: 1) wetlands/marsh and open water; 2) riparian; 3) coastal strand (beach and dunes); and 5) mixed forest.

Beach: The Beach subarea consists of approximately 500 linear feet of beach frontage along the Pacific Ocean. At the back of the beach are undulating Flandrian sand dunes that have been stabilized mainly with both native dune plant and exotic species to prevent wind-driven erosion and to enhance habitat values for native plant and animal species. Inland of the dunes is the Monterey Bay Recreation Trail (a segment of the California Coastal Trail), Sand Dunes Drive, and ultimately Highway 1. There are sand dunes within the median strips between the rec trail, Sand Dune Drive and Highway 1, though much of the dunes are covered with non-native, invasive plant species such as ice plant and exotic grasses.

Laguna Grande/Robert’s Lake: Laguna Grande and Robert’s Lake are located inland of Highway 1 within the City of Seaside and adjoin the City of Monterey. The lakes are visible from the highway and are known for the regional park that includes the lake system.

Originally a seasonal estuarine body of water, the Laguna Grande/Robert’s Lake complex is now a freshwater marsh and two lakes. It is a portion of the Canyon Del Rey Creek that drains the 13.5 square mile Canyon Del Rey Creek watershed to the southeast. The creek flows through Laguna Grande, then into Robert’s Lake, and finally into Monterey Bay.

Combined, the water surface of Laguna Grande and Robert’s Lake covers approximately 29 acres. Originally it was one lake. Two lakes were formed when the Southern Pacific Railroad bed was constructed on fill through the lake in the 1880’s. In the ensuing years, the land on the Monterey side of Laguna Grande was subdivided for primarily residential uses, but actual development occurred slowly. Landfill operations on the shoreline over subsequent years reduced the size of the lake and formed land around the lake that was developed for commercial uses on the City of Seaside side of the lake. Much of the historic extent of wetlands and surrounding riparian vegetation has either been filled/removed for urban development and/or parkland. Pockets of moderate quality habitat do exist, but in general, high-quality wetland
habitat is somewhat limited and fragmented. In any case, though partially degraded, the lakes still provide important wetland habitat.

Small remnant portions of sand dunes are located on the inland slopes of Highway 1 surrounding Robert’s Lake. The remaining coastal strand habitat lies at the northern end of Laguna Grande. The natural extent of the Flandrian dune (coastal strand) community has decreased significantly due to man-made alterations by the two State highways (1 and 218), as well as by human traffic across them. Despite the past disturbance to these wetland, coastal strand, and associated communities, these habitats continue to support a variety of vegetation and wildlife. Because of this unusual setting, these coastal zone habitats are biologically and physically significant as a whole in that they represent a unique example of coastal zone plant and wildlife communities. From the sandy beach and dunes of the coastal strand along the Bay, to the marsh and riparian habitats adjacent to Roberts Lake and Laguna Grande, and into the mixed woodlands of oaks and eucalyptus, the planning areas contain a transect of coastal zone resources.

**LUP Analysis:** The proposed LUP’s coastal Zone chapter as well as the Laguna Grande and Robert’s Lake subarea sections identify the habitat types in the Seaside coastal zone, and include a series of policies that address the preservation and enhancement of these coastal zone habitats. The LUP has a fairly good description of what constitutes ESHA, and includes a recent Biological Inventory Report of the area’s plant and wildlife resources. All in all, the proposed LUP policies generally do a good job of ensuring that ESHA is protected pursuant to the Coastal Act policies.

For example with regard to sensitive habitats, Coastal Act Section 30240 requires that ESHA be protected against any significant disruption of habitat values, prohibits all but resource dependent uses, and requires areas adjacent to ESHA be sited and designed to prevent impacts that would significantly degrade ESHA. Thus, the LUP must contain appropriate standards, such as avoidance of ESHA for all but resource dependent uses, maintaining adequate habitat buffers, and full mitigation for all unavoidable impacts. The LUP clearly only allows resource dependent uses in ESHA and the establishment of appropriate habitat buffers. However, it falls short on requiring full mitigation of project impacts. Accordingly, a modification is attached that requires full mitigation, including identification of appropriate replacement/restoration ratios for any unavoidable impacts.

In terms of setbacks, the submitted LUP includes some lack of clarity on this issue. Modifications are provided to ensure that a 50-foot setback is required adjacent to the lakes, however this setback can be reduced if biological evidence indicates a lesser setback is appropriate. In no case is the setback allowed to go below 25 feet. Provisions are included to allow for certain public access trail enhancements within the setback area. These modifications include policies that are consistent with existing development, and were developed with input from the Commission’s Senior Ecologist, Dr. John Dixon.

A good number of the LUP Natural Habitat policies are dedicated to the protection and enhancement of lake-fronting wetlands, including a requirement for the preparation of an updated Wetlands Management and Enhancement Program (Program). Most of the stated policies and/or goals center on improving the quality of the water that enters the fresh water lake
system as a means to improve the biological productivity and habitat values of the lakes themselves. These values are reflected in the stated goals of the Program and in general are consistent with Coastal Act resource protection policies. However, the Program has not yet been developed, and it will only be effective if it is included in the LCP governing development within the coastal zone. As such, modifications are suggested that explicitly require the LCP be amended to incorporate and implement the findings of the Program when complete. Additionally, another modification requires the City to continue to participate in the regional Water Quality Control Board Stormwater regulation program and to implement and comply with the final management requirements of that program. And finally, the City has identified several activities designed to improve water exchange and the habitat values between the lakes, including via the removal of excess tules and exotic vegetation in and around lake culverts and outfalls. These activities would not be possible under the strict resource protection policies of the LUP. Thus, a modification based on Coastal Act section 30233 regarding the diking, filling, and dredging of coastal waters and wetlands is recommended to allow for necessary maintenance of flood control and storm water outfall facilities.

The LUP also prohibits any structural development within the Beach subarea and the sand dunes habitat located mainly seaward of the highway right-of-way. LUP policies further require preparation of a dune management plan to be implemented to manage public access, improve drainage from Roberts Lake, develop recreational improvements, and maintenance of existing facilities. However, the identified goals of the plan do not directly address dune stabilization or dune habitat enhancement to improve habitat values for native dune plant and animal species. The dune management plan goals also omit a requirement to ensure that maintenance activities avoid impacts on dune vegetation and its inhabitants during maintenance periods. For these reasons, the protection of dune habitat is not assured and a recommended modification is needed to address this issue.

Finally, a significant portion of the dunes within the Beach subarea are identified as ruderal because they are located within the Highway 1 right-of-way and covered in ice plant or other invasive species. The danger in this is that these significant but degraded dune resources, if not properly identified, will be exempt from the protection and enhancement requirements of the LCP. Though not contiguous with the larger dune formations generally west of the highway, the median strips are large enough to support native dune plant and animal species and may prove to be important in the transfer of seed bank and species diversity between the coastal dune strand and inland areas including around Roberts Lake. A modification is needed to ensure the proper land use designation is applied to these dune resources within the Highway One right of way.

If modified as described above, the Seaside LUP would include a comprehensive and appropriate set of policies to meet the goal of protecting, maintaining, enhancing, and restoring coastal waters, wetlands, and ESHA consistent with the Coastal Act.

D. LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT
The following sections of the Coastal Act guide land use and development locations and intensities:
Section 30221. Oceanfront land suitable for recreational use shall be protected for recreational use and development unless present and foreseeable future demand for public or commercial recreational activities that could be accommodated on the property is already adequately provided for in the area.

Section 30222. 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.

Section 30223. Upland areas necessary to support coastal recreational uses shall be reserved for such uses, where feasible.

Section 30250(a). New residential, commercial, or industrial development, except as otherwise provided in this division, shall be located within, contiguous with, or in close proximity to, existing developed areas able to accommodate it or, where such areas are not able to accommodate it, in other areas with adequate public services and where it will not have significant adverse effects, either individually or cumulatively, on coastal resources. In addition, land divisions, other than leases for agricultural uses, 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.

Section 30252. The location and amount of new development should maintain and enhance public access to the coast by (1) facilitating the provision or extension of transit service, (2) providing commercial facilities within or adjoining residential development or in other areas that will minimize the use of coastal access roads, (3) providing non-automobile circulation within the development, (4) providing adequate parking facilities or providing substitute means of serving the development with public transportation, (5) assuring the potential for public transit for high intensity uses such as high-rise office buildings, and by (6) assuring that the recreational needs of new residents will not overload nearby coastal recreation areas by correlating the amount of development with local park acquisition and development plans with the provision of onsite recreational facilities to serve the new development.

Background: The City of Seaside coastal zone encompasses approximately 236 acres of land which extends from Monterey Bay to the terminus of Canyon Del Rey creek at the rear of lake Laguna Grande, and includes a narrow commercial corridor adjacent to Del Monte Boulevard, and the Highway 1 right of way north of Fremont Street. Generally speaking, a significant portion of the coastal zone is either covered by lakes, beach, or parkland, or is otherwise already developed. As defined in the LUP, the City’s coastal zone is segmented into one Coastal Zone planning area and four planning subareas: Laguna Grande, Robert’s Lake, Beach, and Del Monte. The majority of the City’s coastal zone is designated as parks and open space. The remaining lands are split between a variety of proposed land uses including visitor-serving commercial, visitor-serving recreational, regional commercial, heavy commercial, West Broadway Urban Village mixed use, and transportation corridor.
Most of the proposed designations reflect existing uses in the surrounding subarea. In general, Monterey State Beach, the inland lakes, and the lakefront property immediately adjacent to Laguna Grande and Robert’s Lake are designated for parks and open space. There are two existing hotel sites at the north end of Laguna Grande which are designated as visitor-serving commercial, and two additional undeveloped parcels along Laguna Grande which are also proposed as visitor-serving commercial. Robert’s Lake has little structural development along its shores, save for vehicle parking spaces and observation/fishing platforms. The entire lake and shorefront are designated as open space with the exception of two locations, one being along Canyon Del Rey Boulevard and the other near the southeast corner of the lake adjacent to Del Monte, both of which would be designated for visitor-serving recreational uses. In the Del Monte planning area, the proposed designations are more intensive, reflecting the urbanized nature of the existing commercial uses of the properties. Properties generally south of the railroad corridor would be designated for redevelopment under the West Broadway Urban Village/Mixed Use plan portion of the LUP. Across the railroad corridor to the north, the City proposes retaining the current designations, including a mix of heavy and regional commercial, which have been in existence for years.

Finally, the LUP also identifies a potential coastal transportation corridor designation for the former Southern Pacific Railroad right of way, though it is not formally listed as a land use designation or graphically represented on Figure 2-10: Land Use Designations.

**LUP Analysis:** The relevant LUP sections and policies focus on the land use constraints and opportunities in each coastal zone planning area, as well as the appropriate location and intensity of new development, and ways to assure that development will not have significant adverse effects, either individually or cumulatively, on coastal resources.

The LUP has a map and text that designate land use categories throughout the City, consistent with the Coastal Act mandate to indicate kinds, locations, and intensities of land use. Generally, there is the Del Monte subarea with its commercial development, a few parcels adjacent to Laguna Grande, the beach parking lot at Seaside State Beach, and Robert’s Lake. Seaside is within the urbanized boundaries of Monterey Peninsula. Thus, except for the current lack of water described below, the proposed intensity of and locations of development is generally consistent with Coastal Act policies to concentrate development in urban areas with available services.

There is one concern, however, regarding the floor area exception for hotels in the coastal visitor-serving commercial district. The text of the LUP authorizes a floor area ratio (FAR) of 1:1 for all commercial uses, with the exception of hotels which would be allowed a FAR of 3:1. Of the two unimproved parcels designated for visitor-serving commercial uses, the site across the channel from the Holiday Inn Express and the Embassy Suites is most likely to be pursued as a hotel development site, according to the City. The site is within the Highway 1 viewshed and there are additional site constraints that otherwise would limit the amount of development that could occur at the site, including the need for habitat buffers to protect wetland and riparian vegetation along the margins of the lake, provision of on-site parking, and public access improvements around the lake. Together the constraints would drive development in a vertical fashion on the unrestricted portions of the site. As a result, a 3:1 FAR could lead to a very tall and boxy structure that could significantly degrade public views, including from Highway 1,
Monterey State Beach, and the Monterey Bay Recreation Trail. The proposed FAR provides for a level of urban development that exceeds the carrying capacity of the site, and it creates a development expectation that exceeds the current development standards implemented in Seaside’s coastal zone. Commission staff worked closely with City staff to identify a floor area ratio and supporting text for this site (including in terms of siting and design to limit perceived massing and protect adjacent wetland resources) that would allow for reasonable development of the site while still accounting for protection of coastal resources. Based on site inspection and analysis of surrounding development, modifications are suggested to allow an FAR of 1.5:1 for hotels, and to limit heights via a story limitation that should ensure that heights are no taller than the existing Holiday Inn Express.

Additionally, consideration of the above issue has led to the following proposed modifications to the LUP’s Land Use and Development section including modifying the aforementioned FAR for hotels in the visitor-serving commercial district, as well as inserting new policy language which identifies the described development intensities as maximums. To avoid exceeding the carrying capacity of the site, permitted development intensities must adequately address other resource constraints including public access, natural coastal resources and their buffers, hazards, and scenic visual resources. New policy LUD-CZ 2.1E requires all new development to be located in areas where it will not have any adverse resource impacts individually or cumulatively on coastal resources, consistent with Coastal Act Section 30250.

The LUP also considers designating the former Southern Pacific Railroad corridor as a transportation corridor for use as a light rail passenger route, rapid transit bus route, or other forms of non-motorized transportation, but stops short of actually designating the corridor for such purposes. The Transportation Agency of Monterey County owns the rail corridor and is currently planning to restore light rail service between the cities of Marina and Monterey with stops in, among other places, the City of Seaside. Coastal Act Section 30252 encourages new development to maintain and enhance public access, including by facilitating the provision or extension of public transit service and non-motorized forms of circulation. As submitted, the LUP doesn't provide enough direction regarding the opportunity to plan for and site and design new development and re-development in a manner that benefits public access consistent with the Coastal Act in this area. Thus, modifications are proposed to the text of the LUP and the LUP map establishing a Coastal Transportation Corridor (CTC) and designating the railroad corridor for such purposes.

Finally, recent mapping updates have led to coastal zone boundary revisions within the defined city limits of Seaside including roughly a dozen properties in the Del Monte planning subarea south of the railroad right-of-way that were found to be excluded from the coastal zone via legislative action in early 1980 (per Coastal Act Section 30160). In addition, the transfer of federal property, including almost 146 acres of land within the Highway 1 right-of-way north of Fremont Street, has expanded the Seaside coastal zone from the previous configuration. This property was previously owned by the Federal Government but transferred to the City when the military base closed (i.e., the former Fort Ord). These actions have resulted in property without a land use designation or in the case of the dozen properties along Del Monte, inaccurately defined as coastal zone resources when in fact they are not. Accordingly, modifications are needed to the various LUP maps to reflect the changes in the coastal zone boundary alignment as intended by
the legislature, as well as to identify and designate the Highway One corridor through Seaside for Coastal Transportation Corridor purposes.

If modified as described above, the Seaside LUP would include appropriate policies related to land use and development, including related to the kinds, intensities, and densities of uses, consistent with the Coastal Act.

E. VISUAL RESOURCES
Section 30251 of the Coastal Act provides for the protection and enhancement of coastal visual resources and states:

*The scenic and visual qualities of coastal areas shall be considered and protected as a resource of public importance. Permitted development shall be sited and designed to protect views to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas, to minimize the alteration of natural land forms, to be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas, and, where feasible, to restore and enhance visual quality in visually degraded areas. New development in highly scenic areas such as those designated in the California Coastline Preservation and Recreation Plan prepared by the Department of Parks and Recreation and by local government shall be subordinate to the character of its setting.*

**Background:** The elevated Highway 1 freeway runs west of Robert’s Lake and provides public viewing access of nearly the entire planning area – including views of Laguna Grande and Robert’s Lake, as well as of the beach and storefront. Del Monte Boulevard bisects Laguna Grande and Robert’s Lake. Ground-level viewpoints of the beach, dunes, and lakes are also available from public parking areas and shoulders along Sand Dunes Drive, Del Monte Boulevard, Canyon Del Rey, and other public roads.

**LUP Analysis:** The LUP addresses the protection of views to Monterey Bay and of views to and across Robert’s Lake and Laguna Grande in a number of ways. Figure 2-4 identifies view corridors and most of the important views from Highway 1 and other focal points within Seaside. The LUP’s Visual Resource section designates public views as important coastal resources and stipulates that the views identified in Figure 2-4 represent a preliminary mapping of visually sensitive areas. The policies generally mirror Coastal Act Section 30251 by requiring development to be sited and designed to protect visual resources, be visually compatible with the character of its surroundings, and where feasible to enhance and restore visually degraded areas. However, even though Figure 2-4 illustrates a minimum of eight important Highway 1 views, the visual representation is not explicitly carried over into the LUP’s visual resource protection policies. As such the LUP falls short of achieving full consistency with Coastal Act Section 30251. In addition, the LUP needs further definition of the types of design elements that will help to minimize and/or avoid visual impacts in visually sensitive areas. Relying on the general language of the LUP as the sole means of protecting and enhancing the visual resources of a visually sensitive area is insufficient to ensure consistency with Coastal Act Section 30251.

Accordingly, modifications are necessary that: 1) explicitly state that Highway 1 views are important and must be protected, 2) require in-the-field observations at the time development is proposed, and 3) identify and incorporate design elements such as shape, lighting, color, and
texture into new development to ensure visual resources are adequately protected. Thus, suggested modifications ensure that the scenic views and resources of Seaside’s beach, parks, and open space are adequately protected in the LUP. Therefore, as modified, the LUP policies will be adequate to carry out the intent of Coastal Act section 30251.

F. PUBLIC ACCESS AND RECREATION
The following sections of the Coastal Act are among those that provide for the preservation and enhancement of public access and recreation in the coastal zone.

**Section 30210.** In carrying out the requirement of Section 24 of Article X of the California Constitution, maximum access, which shall be conspicuously posted, and recreational opportunities shall be provided for all the people, consistent with public safety needs and the need to protect public rights, rights of private property owners, and natural resource areas from overuse.

**Section 30211.** Development shall not interfere with the public's right of access to the sea where acquired through use or legislative authorization, including, but not limited to, the use of dry sand and rocky coastal beaches to the first line of terrestrial vegetation.

**Section 30212(a).** Public access from the nearest public roadway to the shoreline and along the coast shall be provided in new development projects except where: (1) it is inconsistent with public safety, military security needs, or the protection of fragile coastal resources; (2) adequate access exists nearby; or (3) agriculture would be adversely affected. Dedicated accessway shall not be required to be opened to public use until a public agency or private association agrees to accept responsibility for maintenance and liability of the accessway.

**Section 30214(a).** The public access policies of this article shall be implemented in a manner that takes into account the need to regulate the time, place, and manner of public access depending on the facts and circumstances in each case including, but not limited to, the following: (1) Topographic and geologic site characteristics; (2) The capacity of the site to sustain use and at what level of intensity; (3) The appropriateness of limiting public access to the right to pass and repass depending on such factors as the fragility of the natural resources in the area and the proximity of the access area to adjacent residential uses; (4) The need to provide for the management of access areas so as to protect the privacy of adjacent property owners and to protect the aesthetic values of the area by providing for the collection of litter. (b) It is the intent of the Legislature that the public access policies of this article be carried out in a reasonable manner that considers the equities and that balances the rights of the individual property owner with the public's constitutional right of access pursuant to Section 4 of Article X of the California Constitution. Nothing in this section or any amendment thereto shall be construed as a limitation on the rights guaranteed to the public under Section 4 of Article X of the California Constitution. (c) In carrying out the public access policies of this article, the commission and any other responsible public agency shall consider and encourage the utilization of innovative access management techniques, including, but not limited to, agreements with private organizations which would minimize management costs and
encourage the use of volunteer programs.

The following sections of the Coastal Act are among those that pertain to the protection, enhancement, and provision of recreational opportunities:

**Section 30220.** Coastal areas suited for water-oriented recreational activities that cannot readily be provided at inland water areas shall be protected for such uses.

**Section 30221.** Oceanfront land suitable for recreational uses shall be protected for recreational use and development unless present and foreseeable future demand for public or commercial recreational activities that could be accommodated on the property is already adequately provided for the area.

**Section 30222.** 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.

**Section 30213.** Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged and, where feasible, provided. Developments providing public recreational opportunities are preferred. The commission shall not: (1) require that overnight room rentals be fixed at an amount certain for any privately owned and operated hotel, motel, or other similar visitor-serving facility located on either public or private lands; or (2) establish or approve any method for the identification of low or moderate income persons for the purpose of determining eligibility for overnight room rentals in any such facilities.

**Section 30212.5** Wherever appropriate and feasible, public facilities including parking areas or facilities, shall be distributed throughout an area so as to mitigate against impacts - social and otherwise - of overcrowding or overuse by the public of any single area.

**Section 30224.** Increased recreational boating use of coastal waters shall be encouraged in accordance with this division by developing dry storage areas, increasing public launch facilities, providing additional berthing space in existing harbors, limiting non-water dependent land uses that congest access corridors and preclude boating support facilities, providing harbors of refuge, and by providing for new boating facilities in natural harbors, new protected water areas, and in areas dredged from dry land.

**Section 30234.** Facilities serving the commercial fishing and recreational boating industries shall be protected and, where feasible, upgraded. Existing commercial fishing and recreational boating harbor space shall not be reduced unless the demand for those facilities no longer exists or adequate substitute space has been provided. Proposed recreational boating facilities shall, where feasible, be designed and located in such a fashion as not to interfere with the needs of the commercial fishing industry.

**Background:** The LUP’s Laguna Grande, Robert’s Lake, and Beach subareas contain diverse public access and recreation opportunities for both local residents and visitors. Among those features include Seaside State Beach and access to the Monterey Bay Recreation Trail – an
important link in the California Coastal Trail. Seaside State Beach is located just north and east of the Best Western Beach Resort in Monterey. There is free public parking, portable restrooms, and access to miles of uninterrupted sandy beach. This is the most popular and accessible beach access point in the southern Monterey Bay area.

Inland of Highway 1, recreational opportunities consist of public park land with lakefront access trails for pedestrians and cyclists, playground equipment, bbq areas, restrooms, picnic tables, etc. The area is popular with walkers, bird watchers, and model boat enthusiasts. Children enjoy playing on the playground equipment. The support facilities around Laguna Grande are often used to host local festivals.

The LUP includes a number of objectives to develop and enhance public recreational access improvements that: 1) enhance public opportunities for observation and enjoyment of the aesthetic qualities of wetlands; 2) complement the natural character of wetlands and riparian areas consistent with protection of these areas, and; 3) are compatible with existing recreational facilities at Laguna Grande, Roberts Lake, and Seaside Beach. Proposed improvements include further enhancement and connectivity of pedestrian and bicycle pathways, opportunities for environmental education through directional and interpretive signing, development of a Peninsula Visitors Center, and expanded use of area lakes for fishing, paddle boating, and observation platforms and piers, etc.

**LUP Analysis:** The proposed LUP includes, among other things, the goals, objectives, and policies designed to protect, maintain, and improve a multitude of public access and recreational opportunities along the Seaside shoreline and lakefront parks. The LUP discussion of public access and recreational issues appears on pages 2.24 – 2.27 and includes policies that are to a great extent, consistent with Coastal Act policies 30210, 30211, 30212, 30212.5, 30213, 30214, 30220, 30221, 30222, 30223, and 30252.

The proposed LUP policies identify and maintain the current variety and number of public access points and recreational support facilities along the beach and 1.5 miles of lakefront shoreline. Development activity is limited to public information signing and facilities that support active and passive recreational activities, beach access, designation of public parking areas, and designation of the trail and park network as part of the Monterey Bay Recreation Trail (MBRT) and California Coastal Trail (CCT) system. The plan recognizes the Humboldt Street parking lot as the principal vertical access point to Seaside Beach (Monterey State Beach) with free public parking spaces and easy access to the shoreline trail system. The LUP also identifies and acknowledges the various public access and recreational amenities along Robert’s Lake and Laguna Grande including parking areas, access points, restrooms, pathway system, and picnic areas. LUP policies provide additional protection and maintenance of these access and recreation amenities requiring they be repaired or maintained if damaged.

A 10-foot wide pedestrian path follows the undulating lake front around both Robert’s Lake and Laguna Grande. The City has adopted LUP policies to maintain the City’s system of pathways as a public recreational resource and has recommended that the trail network be designated as a local segment in the California Coastal Trail. LUP policies were also developed to allow a balance of uses with the City’s inland parks and open space land. The LUP contains policies that provide for public access and passive enjoyment of City parks while maintaining and preserving
sensitive habitat and natural resource areas. In summary, the City’s LUP policies address the access and recreation policies of the Coastal Act by: maintaining Seaside State Beach in public ownership, retaining existing public restroom facilities at Laguna Grande, designating the shoreline and lakefront pedestrian path as a segment of the California Coastal Trail, and providing public parking.

The proposed LUP is silent, however, on preserving low-cost visitor-serving amenities. Coastal Act Section 30213 requires that lower cost visitor and recreational facilities be protected and encouraged and where feasible, provided. These facilities provide access and recreation opportunities to a segment of society that is oftentimes being incrementally shut-out of central coast recreational amenities due to increasing costs. The LUP could also use additional direction on maximizing public parking at area parks and beaches, including with regard to ensuring that the MBRT and CCT are able to adapt to changes in the shoreline configuration and sea level rise. Similarly, as discussed above, the LUP needs to acknowledge the former Southern Pacific Rail Road (SPRR) right-of-way as an alternative transportation corridor for use by light rail, bikes, and pedestrians. To address these issues, modifications are required. For example, a new policy is added that requires a management approach/strategy for the MBRT and trail alignment. A management strategy is necessary to ensure that the MBRT can adapt to changes in the shoreline configuration which might be expected to occur given the projected estimates of sea level rise and increased coastal erosion. A new policy is also added that would ensure lower cost visitor and recreational facilities are protected, encouraged, and provided, and yet another to ensure that the SPRR be designated as a transportation corridor with an emphasis placed on expanding alternative forms of transportation, including those that enhance public access such as light rail, bus rapid transit, pedestrian and bicycle transport. Please see Exhibit A for the language of the modifications.

As modified, the City’s LUP policies for the protection and provision public access and recreational amenities are consistent with Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act.

G. PUBLIC SERVICES \ WATER SUPPLY
The following sections of the Coastal Act are among those that pertain to the management of available water supplies:

Section 30250(a). New residential, commercial, or industrial development, except as otherwise provided in this division, shall be located within, contiguous with, or in close proximity to, existing developed areas able to accommodate it or, where such areas are not able to accommodate it, in other areas with adequate public services and where it will not have significant adverse effects, either individually or cumulatively, on coastal resources. In addition, land divisions, other than leases for agricultural uses, 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.

Section 30254. New or expanded public works facilities shall be designed and limited to accommodate needs generated by development or uses permitted, consistent with the provisions of this division; provided, however, that it is the intent of the Legislature that
State Highway 1 in rural areas of the coastal zone remain a scenic two-lane road. Special districts shall not be formed or expanded, except where assessment for, and provision of, the service would not induce new development inconsistent with this division. 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 vital to the economic health of the region, state, or nation, public reaction, commercial recreation and visitor-serving land uses shall not be precluded by other development.

Water Background: Following severe drought conditions in the late 1970’s, voters approved the formation of the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (MPWMD) to regulate water resources on the Monterey Peninsula. The MPWMD regulates the collection, storage, distribution and delivery of water within the 170-square mile area of the district. All of the water used within the MPWMD comes from the Carmel River, from wells in the Carmel Valley, and the Seaside Basin. The MPWMD allocates water from these sources to the various water companies and smaller local jurisdictions.

The largest water distribution system in the Monterey Peninsula is operated by the California-American Water Company (Cal-Am), which provides water to nearly 95 percent of the 112,000 residents in the MPWMD. Cal-Am provides the vast majority of its water to its users through groundwater extractions and diversions from the Carmel River, including via the Los Padres Dam. Current Cal-Am water withdrawals have documented adverse impacts on the Carmel River. The river, which lies within the approximate 250 square mile Carmel River watershed, flows 35 miles northwest from the Ventana wilderness in Big Sur to the Ocean. Surface diversions and withdrawals from the river’s alluvial aquifer have had significant impacts on riparian habitat and associated species, particularly in the lower reaches.\(^1\) This includes adverse impacts to two federally threatened species, California Red Legged Frog (*Rana draytonii*), listed in 1996, and steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*), listed in 1997. In particular, water diversions and withdrawals reduce the stream flows that support steelhead habitat and the production of juvenile fish, especially during dry seasons.

In 1995 the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) issued Order 95-10, in response to complaints alleging that Cal-Am did not have a legal right to divert water from the river and that the diversions were having an adverse effect on the public trust resources of the river. The Board found that Cal-Am has a legal right only to withdraw about 3,376 acre-feet per year (afy), and that the Cal-Am diversions were having an adverse effect on the lower riparian corridor of the river, the wildlife that depend on this habitat, and the steelhead and other fish inhabiting the river. SWRCB thus ordered Cal-Am to extract no more than 11,285 afy from the River, and to implement measures to minimize harm to public trust resources and to reduce withdrawals. Existing withdrawals continue to have adverse effects on the coastal resources of the river and it has not been determined what the “safe yield” of the Carmel River might be so as to assure protection of the River’s habitat resources.\(^2\)

---

\(^1\) See, for example, Instream Flow Needs for Steelhead in the Carmel River: Bypass flow recommendations for water supply projects using Carmel River Waters, National Marine Fisheries Service, June 3, 2002.

\(^2\) Neither Cal-Am’s legal right (3,376 afy) nor the Order 95-10 maximum (11,285 afy) is meant to imply safe yield.
In October 2009, SWRCB issued Order WR2009-0060, which prescribes a series of additional cutbacks to Cal-Am’s pumping from Carmel River from 2010 through December 2016. Specifically, it includes a schedule for Cal-Am to reduce diversions from the Carmel River, bans new water service connections, bans increased use of water at existing service connections resulting from a change in zoning or use, and establishes a requirement to build smaller near-term water supply projects. If a new water supply does not come on line by the end of 2016, the California Public Utilities Commission (which regulates Cal-Am as a water utility), may require water rationing and/or a moratorium on new water permits for construction and remodels. Various agencies and stakeholders are actively pursuing alternative water supply projects, including desalination project options, groundwater recharge, conservation, and other options for the Monterey Peninsula, so that withdrawals from the Carmel River could be reduced or perhaps even be eliminated. However, none of these projects has come to fruition, and there have been significant challenges in identifying an acceptable project for all stakeholders, including one that could be successfully permitted by state and local entities.

Cal-Am water withdrawals are also adversely impacting the Seaside Basin. A recent technical report completed for MPWMD shows consistently declining water levels and deficit water budgets over an 8-year period, indicating that the Basin is in a state of overdraft since groundwater extractions exceed the sustainable yield. Because it is being over-drafted, the Basin is at risk of seawater intrusion, as well as other negative outcomes such as basin subsidence, chronically declining groundwater levels, and water quality degradation. According to the MPWMD-sponsored report, in the event of a prolonged drought, storage in the Seaside Basin could not be relied upon to sustain current levels of production for very many years in a row.

Most recently, existing and potential withdrawals from the Basin have been adjudicated in the Superior Court of Monterey County. The adjudication resulted in a court-ordered physical solution to the Basin’s groundwater problem. The operating yield for three years beginning in 2007 for the Basin as a whole was defined as 5,600 afy, including both Cal-Am and other users. The Court concluded that the “natural safe yield” of the Seaside Basin is between 2,581 and 2,913 afy. The judgment requires a 10% decrease in operating yield for the coastal subareas every three years beginning in 2010, where the decreases are to continue until production reaches 3,000 afy, as established under the judgment. All things being equal, at this rate of reduction, the Basin would reach equilibrium in approximately 20 years. Cal-Am’s current (2011) allocation for the Seaside Basin aquifer is 3,448 afy, and its ultimate adjudicated allocation is 1,474 afy. The Court concludes that while there is some uncertainty, all parties were in agreement that continued production from the Basin beyond the safe yield will ultimately result in seawater intrusion and deleterious effects to the basin in the foreseeable future.

Given the state of both the Carmel River and the Seaside Basin and the current SWRCB Orders, there is little or no water to allocate for new development. Consequently, Seaside (as well as the County and the other cities within the Cal-Am service area) maintains a waiting list for new water hookups.

---

3 Yates, Eugene, Martin Feeney & Lewis Rosenberg, *Seaside Groundwater Basin: Update on Water Resources Conditions* April 2005 for MPWMD. The estimated sustainable yield of the Seaside groundwater basin has been estimated to be about 2,880 afy while average extractions are about 5,600 afy.


5 *California American Water v. City of Seaside*, Monterey County Superior Court Case M66343.
At this time, there is no definite new supply of water on the horizon. Cal-Am and the MPWMD, however, are currently searching for additional water supplies. Possible alternative strategies include implementation of groundwater injection (e.g., storage of excess water from the Carmel River in the Seaside Coastal Basin during winter months), desalinization of seawater, wastewater recycling (i.e., using reclaimed wastewater for irrigation purposes), and additional water conservation efforts that include retrofitting or replacing water-using appliances and fixtures and drought resistant landscaping.

Given that water is an important coastal resource, especially within the Monterey Peninsula area where water supplies are extremely limited, it is vitally important that the LUP contains policies that adequately regulate development to protect water resources. These policies must be consistent with Coastal Act policies requiring that new urban development be located in urban areas with adequate public services, and that give priority to certain types of development when public services are limited.

**Wastewater Background:** Wastewater treatment and disposal for Seaside is provided by the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency (MRWPCA). The MRWPCA wastewater treatment plant is located two miles north of the town of Marina. Each day 21 million gallons of wastewater is processed at the plant; total plant capacity is approximately 30 million gallons per day (mgd). Additionally, MRWPCA operates a water recycling facility at the regional treatment plant and manages the distribution system under contract from the Monterey County Water Resources Agency. Sixty percent of incoming wastewater is recycled. In recent years, as much as 13,400 acre feet of water was delivered to farmers in the Northern Salinas Valley.

**LUP Analysis:** The proposed new language in the LUP acknowledges the resource problems with the Cal-Am water supplies on the Monterey Peninsula, including the adverse impacts on resources from Carmel River and Seaside Basin withdrawals and subsequent SWRCB actions to curb such problems. The new key policy NCR-CZ 3.1A states:

*New development shall be sited in areas with adequate public utility services (i.e., water treatment and delivery) and where it will not have significant adverse effects, either individually or cumulatively, on coastal resources.*

*Where existing public utility services, including water, can accommodate only a limited amount of new development, priority uses including essential public services, public recreation, and visitor-serving commercial land uses shall have priority over other development/uses.*

This proposed new policy ensures that not only should scarce water go to priority uses, it should also avoid adverse effects on coastal resources. In addition, it is imperative that projects not rely on unsustainable sources of water that lead to other coastal resource impacts, instead they must demonstrate the availability of adequate long-term supplies for development. The LUP conforms to Coastal Act requirements in this regard. That said, additional refinements such as tying CDP approval to a demonstration of a sustainable water supply are necessary to bring the LUP into full conformance with Coastal Act requirements. Towards those ends, Commission staff has worked together with the City to develop policy modifications that link development approval with a demonstrated adequate and sustainable water supply. These policies will ensure that the
existing resource impacts associated with the Cal-Am water supply are addressed consistent with the intent of coastal act policy 30250 and 30254.

The LUP also includes new language regarding current wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment, and adds explicit policies for demonstrating/verifying adequate wastewater services, including alternatives for demonstrating additional waste water treatment capacity. The proposed LUP policies specific to wastewater treatment include:

Policy LUD-CA 3.4Ai: Prior to the approval of any new development within the coastal zone, adequate sewage treatment facility capacity shall be demonstrated consistent with the provisions and requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Policy LUD-CA 3.4Aii: Capacity for additional wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment shall be verified.

Policy LUD-CA 3.4Aiii: Alternatives for demonstrating additional wastewater treatment capacity for permitted development may be considered, including but not limited to, (a) construction of a package treatment plant at the Seaside treatment facility to handle all projected sewage for the City's LUP land use designations; or (b) the construction of a new sewer line to the Monterey treatment facility to handle the same sewage capacities.

Accordingly, the proposed modifications to the LUP’s wastewater policies are consistent with the Coastal Act’s public services requirements because they ensure that development must show that it will be served by adequate, long-term wastewater treatment capacities before it can be approved.

Transportation/Circulation: Finally, the proposed LUP includes the identification of a transportation corridor through the City of Seaside along the alignment of the former Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way. As written the policy establishes the corridor for use by motorized and non-motorized forms of transportation. The LUP otherwise does not address circulation or the larger question of adequate public services. Thus, in order to address Coastal Act requirements regarding the provision of adequate public services, it is necessary to modify the LUP to include new policies that recognize State Highway Route One as a separate and vitally important transportation corridor, that ensure there is adequate circulation and parking facilities, that prohibit development that would interfere with future reuse of the SPRR right-of-way for transportation purposes, and that provide for maintenance of said corridors with a coastal development permit. These proposed new policies will ensure that future development will not lead to additional circulation impacts or concerns. The proposed LUP modifications include appropriate policy requirements that will ensure all new development addresses traffic issues, that alternative forms of transportation are encouraged and transportation routes protected, that future maintenance activities first obtain CDP’s and that any expansion of the highway or highway capacity first obtain an amendment to the LCP.

In conclusion, the proposed LUP, if modified as proposed, would be consistent with the relevant Coastal Act policies related to the provision of public services, and ensures that new development and its attendant service requirements will be consistent with all relevant Coastal Act policies. The proposed LUP with modifications ensures that new development will not be
approved unless an applicant can demonstrate that there are adequate public services available to serve the development without causing an adverse impact to coastal resources as directed by the Coastal Act.

H. ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED IP SUBMITTAL

The Commission may only reject a proposed IP submittal if it does not conform with or is inadequate to carry out the Land Use Plan (Section 30513). When the Commission is considering both an LUP and an IP amendment at the same hearing, and the Commission approves the LUP amendment, the standard of review is whether the IP conforms with and is adequate to carry out the newly certified LUP.

In this case, the proposed IP elements are essentially identical to the proposed LUP, with the exception of several implementing standards that are not in the LUP. All of the same general policy updates that are proposed to the LUP are proposed to the IP. For the same reasons as articulated above, the IP needs to be modified in the way the LUP needs to be modified (see Exhibit C). These modifications will ensure that the portions of the IP that are similar to the proposed LUP policies are modified in the same way to be in conformance with them, and to be adequate to carry them out, consistent with the requirement in Section 30513.

The only remaining issue is the adequacy of the additional implementing details in the IP. These include requiring applicants to include specific reports when applying for a CDP (for ESHA, wetlands, hazards, public viewed identification, archaeological resources, public access management, etc.), storm water discharge requirements, parking, landscaping, and sign regulations, and the criteria for the City’s few remaining redevelopment sites. These new and updated implementing details originate from the new LUP policies and provide additional detail to support those policies. For example, LUP Policy NCR-CZ 1.2.B requires biological surveys and reports to be completed for any potential development in or near ESHA. The corresponding IP Section 2.7.B.1 lists the specific things that are required of such reports, including preparation by a qualified biologist, field surveys during times when documented or expected habitat evidence is most likely to be detected, and a map that depicts any sensitive species or habitats, the development footprint, setbacks, and landscape areas. Similarly, the natural hazards resources section of the LUP includes general policies related to the avoidance of hazards and the need to protect life and property in general. The corresponding IP section specifies that development must analyze the hazard constraints associated with any project and demonstrate via technical reports that all hazards will be fully mitigated. IP requirements further compel a finding that the site is suitable for the proposed development without reliance on seawalls, deep piers, or similar engineering measures over the life of the development. All technical reports must be prepared by qualified professionals and be submitted as part of any permit application. In each of these cases, the additional specificity included in the IP ensures proper implementation of the policies found in both the LUP and IP.

Because the proposed IP, as modified, is mostly the same or derived from the proposed amended LUP as modified, it does not raise issues of consistency with the new LUP as modified. The additional standards included in the IP are intended to add detail and specificity that will guide implementation of the policies in the LUP. In other words, the proposed IP, as modified, does not
introduce any standards or requirements that are different and/or that did not emanate from the new LUP as modified. As such, the IP, as modified, is in conformance with and adequate to carry out the new LUP as modified.

I. **California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)**

The Coastal Commission’s review and development process for LCPs and LCP amendments has been certified by the Secretary of Resources as being the functional equivalent of the environmental review required by CEQA. Local governments are not required to undertake environmental analysis of proposed LCP amendments, although the Commission can and does use any environmental information that the local government has developed. CEQA requires that alternatives to the proposed action be reviewed and considered for their potential impact on the environment and that the least damaging feasible alternative be chosen as the alternative to undertake.

The City, acting as lead CEQA agency, found the proposed LCP amendment to be exempt under CEQA. This staff report has discussed the relevant coastal resource issues with the proposal. All public comments received to date have been addressed in the findings above. All above findings are incorporated herein in their entirety by reference.

The Commission has included modifications to the LUP Amendment and IP that would ensure that they are each consistent with Coastal Act requirements. There are no additional feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen any significant adverse environmental effects which approval of the amendment would have on the environment within the meaning of CEQA. Thus, the proposed amendment will not result in any significant environmental effects for which feasible mitigation measures have not been employed consistent with CEQA Section 21080.5(d)(2)(A).
Robert’s Lake and Laguna Grande

Source: California Coastal Records Project, Slide 200402094
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This document constitutes the Land Use Plan (LUP) for the City of Seaside’s Local Coastal Program (LCP). This LUP provides the specific goals, policies, and implementation actions that govern land and water use within Seaside’s coastal zone. The LUP together with its implementing measures (Coastal Implementation Plan, or CIP) constitute the LCP. The LCP governs decisions that determine the short- and long-term conservation and use of coastal resources, consistent with the California Coastal Act.

How to Use this Guide
This Users Guide, consisting of the four sections listed below, outlines the LUP and provides instructions for how its policies should be accessed.

- **Organization of the LUP** – This section provides the user with an overview of the organization of the LUP.
- **The Policies** – This section familiarizes the user with how policies are presented in the document.
- **Guide to the Process** – This section helps the user identify which policies govern the subarea in which a project is located.
- **Guide to the Policies** – This section helps the user understand how the policies are presented within the document and find project-relevant policies.

Organization of the LUP
The LUP has been organized into two primary sections—**Section I – LUP Policies** and **Section II – Background Report**—both containing multiple chapters. Chapters are organized by area and include a chapter for the overall Seaside coastal zone. A chapter is dedicated to each of the four Seaside coastal zone subareas. Information within **Chapter 2 – Coastal Zone** applies to the entire Seaside coastal zone. Information within each of the subarea
chapters applies to the specified subarea only. Thus, the sections have been organized as follows:

Section I – LUP Policies
   Chapter 1. Introduction
   Chapter 2. Coastal Zone
   Chapter 3. Laguna Grande Subarea
   Chapter 4. Roberts Lake Subarea
   Chapter 5. Beach Subarea
   Chapter 6. Del Monte Subarea

Section II – Background Report
   Chapter 1. Chronology of Events Leading to Certification of the 1983 LUP
   Chapter 2. Coastal Resources
   Chapter 3. Laguna Grande Subarea
   Chapter 4. Roberts Lake Subarea
   Chapter 5. Beach Subarea
   Chapter 6. Del Monte Subarea

Policies within Chapters 2 through 6 of Section I are organized into three major topic areas:

- Natural Coastal Resources (including Natural Habitat Areas, Visual Resources, Water Resources, Water Quality and Natural Hazards, as relevant)
- Public Access and Recreation
- Land Use and Development (including Land Use Designations and Definitions, Land Use and Development Requirements, and General Permit Considerations)

POLICY SYMBOLS
Policy symbols have been incorporated in the chapters to visually communicate the intended purpose of each subarea policy. Symbols used in the document are presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Symbol</th>
<th>Associated Policy Heading</th>
<th>Subarea Policies with Symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Coastal Resources</td>
<td>Natural Habitat Areas, Visual Resources, Water Resources, Water Quality, Natural Hazards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Access and Recreation</td>
<td>Public Access, Public Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use and Development</td>
<td>Land Use, Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IN-TEXT REFERENCES
The LUP uses in-text references in parenthesis and bolded to reference policies contained in other chapters of the document.

The Policies
The LUP provides the policies that govern land and water use within Seaside’s coastal zone. The policies are, by design, intended to protect and enhance the resources of the coastal zone in accordance with the California Coastal Act of 1976.

POLICY SUMMARY TABLE
A Policy Summary Table has been prepared to easily identify Coastal Act policies relevant to Seaside and the corresponding LUP policies. The Policy Summary Table is divided into four columns: Subject (1), Coastal Act Provision Policies (2), Relevant Chapter(s)/Page (3), and Related Policy Number (4). This format will allow users to easily find LUP policies that are related to the Coastal Act. The complete Policy Summary Table is located at the end of this chapter on page UG.7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Coastal Act Provision Policies</th>
<th>Relevant Ch/Page</th>
<th>Related Policy No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Coastal Resources</td>
<td>Section 30220 Protection of certain water-oriented activities</td>
<td>5/5.2 &amp; 5.4</td>
<td>NCR-B 1.1, NCR-B 4.1, NCR-B 5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBAREA POLICY TABLE
A Subarea Policy Table was created to provide a quick reference to the chapter’s policies, shown in the example provided below. The complete Subarea Policy Table is located at the end of this chapter on page UG.10.

CHAPTER 2. COASTAL ZONE AREA
PUBLIC ACCESS AND RECREATION
- Policy PAR-CZ 1.1.A – Designation of Public Access and Recreational Opportunities
- Policy PAR-CZ 1.1.B – Protection of Public Access and Recreational Opportunities
- Policy PAR-CZ 1.1.C – Management of Public Access and Recreational Opportunities

Guide to the Process
The LUP presents policies that govern the coastal zone as a whole and then presents policies for each subarea separately. The policies in the document are intended to be read as policy layers that govern a project location (see figure below).
The figure below gives an example of how to identify visual policies related to a proposed project in the Laguna Grande Subarea.

**Coastal Zone Chapter**

*Natural Coastal Resources*
- Natural Habitat Areas
- Visual Resources
- Water Resources
- Water Quality
- Natural Hazards
Public Access and Recreation
Land Use and Development

**Laguna Grande Subarea Chapter**

Purpose
Introduction
Policies
- Natural Coastal Resources
  - Public Access and Recreation
  - Land Use and Development
Proposed Implementation Actions

**Natural Coastal Resources**

1. Natural Habitat Areas
2. Visual Resources
3. Water Resources
4. Water Quality
5. Natural Hazards

**Visual Resources**

*Policy NCR-CZ 2.1.A- Designation of Visual Resources*
*Policy NCR-CZ 2.1.B- Protection of Visual Resources*

**Policy NCR-CZ 2.1.B: Protection of Visual Resources**

i. Visual resources shall be protected as a resource of public importance.
ii. View corridors of visual resources shall be preserved.
*Figure 2-4* shall be used to assist the City in identifying significant public views of visual resources, viewsheild enhancement areas, and visually sensitive areas where height and bulk limits and view corridors shall be required to preserve visibility.
iii. Development determined to have a significant adverse effect on a visual resource or substantially limit visibility of visual resource shall not be allowed.

**Policy NCR-LG 2.1.A: Protection of Visual Resources**

Proposed development within the Laguna Grande Subarea shall limit building profile and maximize public views of the lake and park.

**Laguna Grande Subarea**

**Roberts Lake Subarea**

**Del Monte Subarea**
Guide to the Policies
Two summary tables, a Policy Summary Table and a Subarea Policy Summary Table, have been drafted to guide the user in finding policies in the LUP that are relevant to a particular project. The Policy Summary Table identifies specific Coastal Act policies and identifies the relevant LUP chapters and related policy numbers that carry out the identified policy. The Subarea Policy Summary Table summarizes all the policies of the LUP by chapter (Chapter 2-6) and subchapter (Natural Coastal Resources, Public Access and Recreation, and Land Use and Development). The summary tables are presented below and in the following pages.

### POLICY SUMMARY TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Coastal Act Provision Policies</th>
<th>Ch./Pg</th>
<th>Policy No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Natural Habitat Areas** | **Section 30230 Marine resources; maintenance**  
Marine resources shall be maintained, enhanced, and where feasible, restored. Special protection shall be given to areas and species of special biological or economic significance. Uses of the marine environment shall be carried out in a manner that will sustain the biological productivity of coastal waters and that will maintain healthy populations of all species of marine organisms adequate for long-term commercial, recreational, scientific, and educational purposes. | 2/2.2 2-8       | NCR-CZ 1.1.A-B, 1.2.A-B, 1.3.A-B, 1.4.A-C |
|         | **Section 30231 Biological productivity; water quality**  
The biological productivity and the quality of coastal waters, streams, wetlands, estuaries, and lakes appropriate to maintain optimum populations of marine organisms and for the protection of human health shall be maintained and, where feasible, restored through, among other means, minimizing adverse effects of waste water discharges and entrainment, controlling runoff, preventing depletion of ground water supplies and substantial interference with surface water flow, encouraging waste water reclamation, maintaining natural vegetation buffer areas that protect riparian habitats, and minimizing alteration of natural streams. | 2/2.4, 2.8-13, 172/2.41-45 3/3.2-3 4/4.2-3 5/5.3-4 6/6.2 | NCR-CZ 1.1C, 1.4.B-C, 1.5.B-D, 4.1.A LUD-CZ 3.1.A-D NCR-LG 1.1.A, 4.1.A NCR-RL 4.1.A-C NCR-B 4.1.A NCR-DM 4.1.A |
|         | **Section 30233 Diking, filling or dredging; continued movement of sediment and nutrients**  
(a) The diking, filling, or dredging of open coastal waters, wetlands, estuaries, and lakes shall be permitted in accordance with other applicable provisions of this division, 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 the following:  
(1) New or expanded port, energy, and coastal-dependent industrial facilities, including commercial fishing facilities.  
(2) Maintaining existing, or restoring previously dredged, depths in existing navigational channels, turning basins, vessel berthing and mooring areas, and boat launching ramps.  
(3) In open coastal waters, other than wetlands, including streams, estuaries, and lakes, new or expanded boating facilities and the placement of structural pilings for public recreational piers that provide public access and recreational opportunities.  
(4) Incidental public service purposes, including but not limited to, burying cables and pipes or inspection of piers and maintenance of existing intake and outfall lines.  
(5) Mineral extraction, including sand for restoring beaches, except in environmentally sensitive areas.  
(6) Restoration purposes.  
(7) Nature study, aquaculture, or similar resource dependent activities.  
(b) Dredging and spoils disposal shall be planned and carried out to avoid significant disruption to marine and wildlife habitats and water circulation. Dredge spoils suitable for beach replenishment should be transported for these purposes to appropriate beaches or into suitable | 2/2.8-2.11 2/2.44-45 | NCR-CZ 1.4.C, 1.5.B-D LUD-CZ 3.1.D |
Subject | Coastal Act Provision Policies | Ch./Pg | Policy No.
--- | --- | --- | ---
**Visual Resources**

**Section 30251 Scenic and visual qualities**
The scenic and visual qualities of coastal areas shall be considered and protected as a resource of public importance. Permitted development shall be sited and designed to protect views to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas, to minimize the alteration of natural land forms, to be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas, and, where feasible, to restore and enhance visual quality in visually degraded areas. New development in highly scenic areas such as those designated in the California Coastline Preservation and Recreation Plan prepared by the Department of Parks and Recreation and by local government shall be subordinate to the character of its setting.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/2.4,13-15</td>
<td>NCR-CZ 1.1.C, 2.1.A-B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3.7</td>
<td>NCR-RL 2.1.A-B</td>
<td>LUD-RL 3.1.A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Water Resources**

**Section 30254 Public works facilities**
New or expanded public works facilities shall be designed and limited to accommodate the needs generated by development or uses permitted consistent with the provisions of this division; provided, however, that it is the intent of the Legislature that State Highway Route 1 in rural areas of the coastal zone remain a scenic two-lane road. Special districts shall not be formed or expanded except where assessment for, and provision of, the service would not induce new development inconsistent with this division. 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 vital to the economic health of the region, state, or nation, public recreation, commercial recreation, and visitor-serving land uses shall not be precluded by other development.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/2.13,16</td>
<td>NCR-CZ 2.1.A, 3.1.A-C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3.3</td>
<td>NCR-LG 3.1.A</td>
<td>NCR-B 1.1.A, 4.1.A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5.2-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 30236 Water supply and flood control**
Channelizations, dams, or other substantial alterations of rivers and streams shall incorporate the best mitigation measures feasible, and be limited to (i) necessary water supply projects, (ii) flood control projects where no other method for protecting existing structures in the flood plain is feasible and where such protection is necessary for public safety or to protect existing development, or (3) developments where the primary function is the improvement of fish and wildlife habitat. (Section 30237 (Repealed by Ch. 286, Stats. 2004.))

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/2.50-52</td>
<td>LUD-CZ 3.5.A-B</td>
<td>NCR-LG 5.1.B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3.3</td>
<td>NCR-RL 5.1.B-C</td>
<td>NCR-B 4.1.A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/4.3-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5.3-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Subject: Water Quality

**Section 30231 Biological productivity; water quality**

The biological productivity and the quality of coastal waters, streams, wetlands, estuaries, and lakes appropriate to maintain optimum populations of marine organisms and for the protection of human health shall be maintained and, where feasible, restored through, among other means, minimizing adverse effects of waste water discharges and entrainment, controlling runoff, preventing depletion of ground water supplies and substantial interference with surface water flow, encouraging waste water reclamation, maintaining natural vegetation buffer areas that protect riparian habitats, and minimizing alteration of natural streams.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ch./Pg</th>
<th>Policy No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/2.4, 8-10, 17</td>
<td>NCR-CZ 1.1.B-C, 1.4.C, 1.5.B-C, 4.1.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/2.38,42-44, 50</td>
<td>LUD-CZ 2.1.E, 3.1.B-C, 3.4.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3.3, 4/4.2-3, 5/5.3-4</td>
<td>NCR-LG 4.1.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/6.2</td>
<td>NCR-RL 4.1.A-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5.1-A</td>
<td>NCR-B 4.1.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/6.2</td>
<td>NCR-DM 4.1.A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Subject: Natural Hazards

**Section 30253 Minimization of adverse impacts**

New development shall do all of the following:

(a) Minimize risks to life and property in areas of high geologic, flood, and fire hazard.

(b) Assure stability and structural integrity, and neither create nor contribute significantly to erosion, geologic instability, or destruction of the site or surrounding area or in any way require the construction of protective devices that would substantially alter natural landforms along bluffs and cliffs.

(c) Be consistent with requirements imposed by an air pollution control district or the State Air Resources Board as to each particular development.

(d) Minimize energy consumption and vehicle miles traveled.

(e) Where appropriate, protect special communities and neighborhoods that, because of their unique characteristics, are popular visitor destination points for recreational uses.

(Amended by Ch. 179, Stats. 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ch./Pg</th>
<th>Policy No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/2.38, 44, 50-52</td>
<td>LUD-CZ 2.1.E, 3.1.D, 3.5.A-B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3.3</td>
<td>NCR-LG 5.1.A, 5.2.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5.3-4</td>
<td>NCR-B 4.1.A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Subject: Public Access

**Section 30210 Access; recreational opportunities; posting**

In carrying out the requirement of Section 4 of Article X of the California Constitution, maximum access, which shall be conspicuously posted, and recreational opportunities shall be provided for all the people consistent with public safety needs and the need to protect public rights, rights of private property owners, and natural resource areas from overuse. (Amended by Ch. 1075, Stats. 1978.)

**Section 30211 Development not to interfere with access**

Development shall not interfere with the public’s right of access to the sea where acquired through use or legislative authorization, including, but not limited to, the use of dry sand and rocky coastal beaches to the first line of terrestrial vegetation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ch./Pg</th>
<th>Policy No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/2.28-29</td>
<td>PAR-CZ 1.1.A-D, 1.2.A, 1.3.A, 1.4.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/2.52-53</td>
<td>LUD-CZ 3.6.A, 3.8.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3.4-5, 7</td>
<td>PAR-LG 1.1.A-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/4.4-5, 7</td>
<td>LUD-LG 3.2.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5.4-5</td>
<td>PAR-RL 1.1.A-C, 1.2.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/6.3-4</td>
<td>LUD-RL 3.1.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5.1-A</td>
<td>PAR-DM 1.1.A-C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 30212 New development projects**

(a) Public access from the nearest public roadway to the shoreline and along the coast shall be provided in new development projects except where: (1) it is inconsistent with public safety, military or security needs, or the protection of fragile coastal resources, (2) adequate access exists nearby, or, (3) agriculture would be adversely affected. Dedicated access way shall not be required to be opened to public use until a public agency or private association agrees to accept responsibility for maintenance and liability of the access way.

(b) For purposes of this section, “new development” does not include:

(1) Replacement of any structure pursuant to the provisions of subdivision (g) of Section 30610.

(2) The demolition and reconstruction of a single-family residence; provided, that the reconstructed residence shall not exceed either the floor area, height or bulk of the former structure by more than 10 percent, and that the reconstructed residence shall be sited in the same location on the affected property as the former structure.

(3) Improvements to any structure which do not change the intensity of its use, which do not increase either the floor area, height, or bulk of the structure by more than 10 percent, which do not block or impede public access, and which do not result in a seaward encroachment by the structure.

(4) The reconstruction or repair of any seawall; provided, however, that the reconstructed or repaired seawall is not a seaward of the location of the former structure.

(5) Any repair or maintenance activity for which the commission has determined, pursuant to Section 30610, that a coastal development permit will be required unless the commission determines that the activity will have an adverse impact on lateral public access along the beach. As
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Coastal Act Provision Policies</th>
<th>Ch./Pg</th>
<th>Policy No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="#">Coastal Act Provision Policies</a></td>
<td>2/2.28-29</td>
<td>3/3.5</td>
<td>PAR-CZ 1.1.B-D, 1.2A, 1.3A, 1.4A, 1.5A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/3.7</td>
<td>4/4.5</td>
<td>PAR-LG 1.1.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/4.7</td>
<td>5/5.4-5</td>
<td>LUD-LG 3.2A, PAR-LG 1.1.C, LUD-LG 3.1B, PAR-LG 1.1.A-B, 1.2A, 1.3A, 1.4A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 30212.5 Public facilities; distribution</strong>&lt;br&gt;Wherever appropriate and feasible, public facilities, including parking areas or facilities, shall be distributed throughout an area so as to mitigate against the impacts, social and otherwise, of overcrowding or overuse by the public of any single area.</td>
<td>2/2.28-29</td>
<td>3/3.5</td>
<td>PAR-CZ 1.1.B-D, 1.2A, 1.3A, 1.4A, 1.5A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/3.7</td>
<td>4/4.5</td>
<td>PAR-LG 1.1.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/4.7</td>
<td>5/5.4-5</td>
<td>LUD-LG 3.2A, PAR-LG 1.1.C, LUD-LG 3.1B, PAR-LG 1.1.A-B, 1.2A, 1.3A, 1.4A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 30220 Protection of certain water-oriented activities</strong>&lt;br&gt;Coastal areas suited for water-oriented recreational activities that cannot readily be provided at inland water areas shall be protected for such uses.</td>
<td>5/5.2</td>
<td>NCR-B 1.1.A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 30221 Oceanfront land; protection for recreational use and development</strong>&lt;br&gt;Oceanfront land suitable for recreational use shall be protected for recreational use and development unless present and foreseeable future demand for public or commercial recreational activities that could be accommodated on the property is already adequately provided for in the area. (Amended by Ch. 380, Stats. 1978.)</td>
<td>5/5.2-3</td>
<td>NCR-B 1.1.A, 1.4.A, 1.5A, LUD-B 1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 30240 Environmentally sensitive habitat areas; adjacent developments</strong>&lt;br&gt;(a) Environmentally sensitive habitat areas shall be protected against any significant disruption of habitat values, and only uses dependent on those resources shall be allowed within those areas.&lt;br&gt;(b) Development in areas adjacent to environmentally sensitive habitat areas and parks and recreation areas shall be sited and designed to prevent impacts which would significantly degrade those areas, and shall be compatible with the continuance of those habitat and recreation areas. (Amended by Ch. 285, Stats. 1991.)</td>
<td>2/2.2-4</td>
<td>NCR-CZ 1.1.A-C, 1.2.A-B, LUD-CZ 3.1.A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 30222 Private lands; priority of development purposes</strong>&lt;br&gt;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.</td>
<td>2/2.28-29</td>
<td>4/4.5</td>
<td>PAR-CZ 1.1.C, 1.2A, LUD-CZ 3.1.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 30244 Archaeological or paleontological resources</strong>&lt;br&gt;Where development would adversely impact archaeological or paleontological resources as identified by the State Historic Preservation Officer, reasonable mitigation measures shall be required.</td>
<td>2/2.53</td>
<td>LUD-CZ 3.7.A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 30250 Location; existing developed area</strong>&lt;br&gt;(a) New residential, commercial, or industrial development, except as otherwise provided in this division, shall be located within, contiguous with, or in close proximity to, existing developed areas able to accommodate it or, where such areas are not able to accommodate it, in other areas with adequate public services and where it will not have significant adverse effects, either individually or cumulatively, on coastal resources. In addition, land divisions, other than leases for agricultural uses, 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.&lt;br&gt;(b) Where feasible, new hazardous industrial development shall be located away from existing developed areas.&lt;br&gt;(c) Visitor-serving facilities that cannot feasibly be located in existing developed areas shall be located in existing isolated developments or at selected points of attraction for visitors. (Amended by Ch. 1090, Stats. 1979.)</td>
<td>2/2.2, 4, 13, 15</td>
<td>3/36</td>
<td>LUD-CZ 1.1.A-B, 2.1.A-B, LUD-LG 1.1.A, 2.1.A, LUD-LG 1.1.A, 2.1.A, LUD-B 1.1.A, 2.1.A, LUD-DM 1.1.A, 2.1.A-B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 30252 Maintenance and enhancement of public access</strong>&lt;br&gt;The location and amount of new development should maintain and enhance public access to the coast by (1) facilitating the provision or extension of transit service, (2) providing commercial facilities within or adjoining residential development or in other areas that will minimize the</td>
<td>2/2.28, 29, 27</td>
<td></td>
<td>PAR-CZ 1.1.C, 1.2A, 1.3A, 1.4.A, 1.5A, LUD-CZ 3.5.A, 3.8.A, PAR-LG 1.1.A-C, LUD-LG 3.2.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/2.50-51</td>
<td>3/3.4-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy No.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coastal Act Provision Policies</strong>&lt;br&gt;Ch./Pg</td>
<td>Policy No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Recreation</strong></td>
<td>5/5.2</td>
<td>NCR-B 1.1.A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use</strong></td>
<td>2/2.2-4</td>
<td>NCR-CZ 1.1.A-C, 1.2.A-B, LUD-CZ 3.1.A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coastal Act Provision Policies</strong>&lt;br&gt;Ch./Pg</td>
<td>Policy No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coastal Act Provision Policies</strong> Ch./Pg</td>
<td>Policy No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coastal Act Provision Policies**

**Public Recreation**

**Land Use**

**Development**

**Coastal Act Provision Policies**

**Public Recreation**

**Land Use**

**Development**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Subject</strong></th>
<th><strong>Coastal Act Provision Policies</strong></th>
<th><strong>Ch./Pg</strong></th>
<th><strong>Policy No.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>use of coastal access roads, (3) providing non-automobile circulation within the development, (4) providing adequate parking facilities or providing substitute means of serving the development with public transportation, (5) assuring the potential for public transit for high intensity uses such as high-rise office buildings, and by (6) assuring that the recreational needs of new residents will not overload nearby coastal recreation areas by correlating the amount of development with local park acquisition and development plans with the provision of onsite recreational facilities to serve the new development.</td>
<td>4/4.45/4.7 5/5.4-5 6/6.3-4</td>
<td>PAR-RL 1.1.A-C, 1.2.A  LUD-RL 3.1.B  PAR-B 1.1.A-B, 1.2.A  PAR-DM 1.1.A-C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Relevant policies include but are not limited to the policies listed in this table.

**Subarea Policy Summary Table**

**CHAPTER 2. COASTAL ZONE**

**NATURAL COASTAL RESOURCES**

**NATURAL HABITAT AREAS**

- Policy NCR-CZ 1.1.A – Promote Sustainable Development
- Policy NCR-CZ 1.1.B – Promote Sustainability of Biological Productivity
- Policy NCR-CZ 1.1.C – Minimize Adverse Effects to Natural Coastal Resources
- Policy NCR-CZ 1.2.A – Designation of ESHA
- Policy NCR-CZ 1.2.B – Protection of ESHA
- Policy NCR-CZ 1.3.A – Designation of Wetlands
- Policy NCR-CZ 1.3.B – Protection of Wetlands
- Policy NCR-CZ 1.4.A – Designation of Marine Resources
- Policy NCR-CZ 1.4.B – Protection of Marine Resources
- Policy NCR-CZ 1.4.C – Diking, Filling, Dredging of Marine Resources
- Policy NCR-CZ 1.5.A – Designation of the Canyon Del Rey Creek Watershed
- Policy NCR-CZ 1.5.B – Evaluation of the Canyon Del Rey Creek Watershed
- Policy NCR-CZ 1.5.C – Protection of the Canyon Del Rey Creek Watershed
- Policy NCR-CZ 1.5.D – Management of the Canyon Del Rey Creek Watershed
- Policy NCR-CZ 1.6.A – Control of Canada Goose Population

**VISUAL RESOURCES**

- Policy NCR-CZ 2.1.A – Designation of Visual Resources
- Policy NCR-CZ 2.1.B – Protection of Visual Resources

**WATER RESOURCES**

- Policy NCR-CZ 3.1.A – Provision for Potable Water Supply
- Policy NCR-CZ 3.1.D – Adequate Water
- Policy NCR-CZ 3.2.A – Water Reserves

**WATER QUALITY**

- Policy NCR-CZ 4.1.A – Water Quality

**NATURAL HAZARDS**

- Policy NCR-CZ 5.1.A – Designation of Natural Hazard Areas
- Policy NCR-CZ 5.1.B – Protection from Natural Hazards
- Policy NCR-CZ 5.2.A – Designation of Sea Level Rise Hazards
- Policy NCR-CZ 5.2.B – Protection from Sea Level Rise Hazards
### Policy NCR-CZ 5.2.C – Management of Sea Level Rise Hazards

### Policy NCR-CZ 5.3.A – Protection from Tsunami Hazards

### Policy NCR-CZ 5.3.B – Management of Tsunami Hazards

#### Public Access and Recreation

- **Policy PAR-CZ 1.1.A** – Designation of Public Access and Recreational Opportunities
- **Policy PAR-CZ 1.1.B** – Protection of Public Access and Recreational Opportunities
- **Policy PAR-CZ 1.1.C** – Management of Public Access and Recreational Opportunities
- **Policy PAR-CZ 1.1.D** – Provision of Recreational Facilities
- **Policy PAR-CZ 1.2.A** – Designation of Parking for Public Access and Recreational Opportunities
- **Policy PAR-CZ 1.3.A** – Designation of Trails
- **Policy PAR-CZ 1.4.A** – Public Access Improvements

#### Land Use and Development

##### Land Use Designations and Definitions

- **Policy LUD-CZ 1.1.A** – Land Use Designations Within the Coastal Zone
- **Policy LUD-CZ 1.2.A** – Definitions Within the Coastal Zone

##### Development and Land Use Requirements

- **Policy LUD-CZ 2.1.A** – Designation of Land Uses Within the Coastal Zone
- **Policy LUD-CZ 2.1.B** – Compliance with Land Uses Policies
- **Policy LUD-CZ 2.1.C** – Land Use Densities Within the Coastal Zone
- **Policy LUD-CZ 2.1.D** – Coastal development Permit Required
- **Policy LUD-CZ 2.1.E** – Minimize Adverse Effects

##### General Permit Considerations

- **Policy LUD-CZ 3.1.A** – Considerations for Natural Habitat Areas - ESHA
- **Policy LUD-CZ 3.1.B** – Considerations for Natural Habitat Areas – Wetland Vegetation Management
- **Policy LUD-CZ 3.1.C** – Considerations for Natural Habitat Areas – Wetlands and Marine Resources
- **Policy LUD-CZ 3.1.D** – Considerations for Natural Habitat Areas – Watershed/Water Quality
- **Policy LUD-CZ 3.2.A** – Considerations for Visual Resources
- **Policy LUD-CZ 3.3.A** – Considerations for Water Resources/Utilities
- **Policy LUD-CZ 3.3.B** – Considerations for Water Resources-Water Supply/Conservation
- **Policy LUD-CZ 3.4.A** – Considerations for Water Quality/Wastewater
- **Policy LUD-CZ 3.5.A** – Considerations for Natural Hazards
- **Policy LUD-CZ 3.5.B** – Considerations for Sea Level Rise
- **Policy LUD-CZ 3.6.A** – Considerations for Public Access and Recreation
- **Policy LUD-CZ 3.7.A** – Considerations for Cultural Resources
- **Policy LUD-CZ 3.8.A** – Considerations for Transportation and Circulation

### Chapter 3. Laguna Grande Subarea

#### Natural Coastal Resources

##### Natural Habitat Areas

- **Policy NCR-LG 1.1.A** – Vegetation Management

##### Visual Resources

- **Policy NCR-LG 2.1.A** – Protection of Visual Resources
- **Policy NCR-LG 2.1.B** – Management of Visual Resources
WATER RESOURCES
   Policy NCR-LG 3.1.A – Protection of Potable Water Supply

WATER QUALITY
   Policy NCR-LG 4.1.A – Management of Water Quality

NATURAL HAZARDS
   Policy NCR-LG 5.1.A – Management of Sea Level Rise Hazards
   Policy NCR-LG 5.2.A – Management of Flooding Hazards

PUBLIC ACCESS AND RECREATION
   Policy PAR-LG 1.1.A – Protection of Public Access and Recreational Opportunities
   Policy PAR-LG 1.1.B – Management of Public Access and Recreational Opportunities

LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT

LAND USE DESIGNATIONS AND DEFINITIONS
   Policy LUD-LG 1.1.A – Land Use Designations Within the Laguna Grande Subarea

DEVELOPMENT AND LAND USE REQUIREMENTS
   Policy LUD-LG 2.1.A – Designation of Land Uses Within the Laguna Grande Subarea

GENERAL PERMIT CONSIDERATIONS
   Policy LUD-LG 3.1.A – Considerations for Visual Resources
   Policy LUD-LG 3.2.A – Considerations for Public Access

CHAPTER 4. ROBERTS LAKE SUBAREA

NATURAL COASTAL RESOURCES

NATURAL HABITAT AREAS
   No Specific Policies

VISUAL RESOURCES
   Policy NCR-RL 2.1.A – Protection of Visual Resources
   Policy NCR-RL 2.1.B – Management of Visual Resources

WATER RESOURCES
   No Specific Policies

WATER QUALITY
   Policy NCR-RL 4.1.A – Management of Water Quality
   Policy NCR-RL 4.1.C – Filter and Treat Stormwater

NATURAL HAZARDS
   Policy NCR-RL 5.1.A – Management of Sea Level Rise Hazards
   Policy NCR-RL 5.1.B – Management of Flooding Hazards
   Policy NCR-RL 5.1.C – Protection from Flooding Hazards

PUBLIC ACCESS AND RECREATION
   Policy PAR-RL 1.1.A – Protection of Public Access and Recreational Opportunities
   Policy PAR-RL 1.1.B – Management of Public Access and Recreational Opportunities
   Policy PAR-RL 1.2.A – Designation of Parking for Public Access and Recreational Opportunities
CITY OF SEASIDE LUP USERS GUIDE

LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT

LAND USE DESIGNATIONS AND DEFINITIONS

- Policy LUD-RL 1.1.A – Land Use Designations Within the Roberts Lake Subarea
- Policy LUD-RL 2.1.A – Designation of Land Uses Within the Roberts Lake Subarea

DEVELOPMENT AND LAND USE REQUIREMENTS

- Policy LUD-RL 3.1.A – Considerations for Visual Resources
- Policy LUD-RL 3.1.B – Considerations for Public Access

GENERAL PERMIT CONSIDERATIONS

- Policy LUD-RL 3.1.A – Considerations for Visual Resources
- Policy LUD-RL 3.1.B – Considerations for Public Access

CHAPTER 5. BEACH SUBAREA

NATURAL COASTAL RESOURCES

NATURAL HABITAT AREAS

- Policy NCR-B 1.1.A – Protection of Dune/Beach Areas
- Policy NCR-B 1.1.B – Management of Dune/Beach Areas

VISUAL RESOURCES

- Policy NCR-B 2.1.A – Protection of Visual Resources

WATER RESOURCES

- Policy NCR-B 3.1.A – Management of Water Resources

WATER QUALITY

- Policy NCR-B 4.1.A – Management of Flooding Hazards and Water Quality

NATURAL HAZARDS

- No Specific Policies

PUBLIC ACCESS AND RECREATION

- Policy PAR-B 1.1.A – Protection of Public Access and Recreational Opportunities
- Policy PAR-B 1.2.A – Designation of Parking for Public Access and Recreational Opportunities
- Policy PAR-B 1.3.A – Designation of Public Beach Parking
- Policy PAR-B 1.4.A – Identification and Designation of California Coastal Trail

LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT

LAND USE DESIGNATIONS AND DEFINITIONS

- Policy LUD-B 1.1.A – Land Use Designations Within the Beach Subarea

DEVELOPMENT AND LAND USE REQUIREMENTS

- Policy LUD-B 2.1.A – Designation of Land Uses Within the Beach Subarea

GENERAL PERMIT CONSIDERATIONS

- Policy LUD-B 3.1.A – Considerations for Dune Management Plan
- Policy LUD-B 3.1.B – Considerations for Visual Resources

CHAPTER 6. DEL MONTE SUBAREA

NATURAL COASTAL RESOURCES

NATURAL HABITAT AREAS

- No Specific Policies

VISUAL RESOURCES

- No Specific Policies

WATER RESOURCES

- No Specific Policies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WATER QUALITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy NCR-DM 4.1.A</td>
<td>Management of Water Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NATURAL HAZARDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Specific Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC ACCESS AND RECREATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PAR-DM 1.1.A</td>
<td>Protection of Public Access and Recreational Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PAR-DM 1.1.B</td>
<td>Management of Public Access and Recreational Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PAR-DM 1.1.C</td>
<td>Provision for Public Access and Recreational Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LUD-DM 1.1.A</td>
<td>Land Use Designations Within the Del Monte Subarea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LUD-DM 2.1.A</td>
<td>Designation of Land Uses Within the Del Monte Subarea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LUD-DM 2.2.A</td>
<td>Requirements for Coastal Regional Commercial and Coastal Heavy Commercial Development within the Del Monte Subarea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LUD-DM 2.2.B</td>
<td>Requirements for Coastal Mixed Use Development within the Del Monte Subarea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL PERMIT CONSIDERATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LUD-DM 3.1.A</td>
<td>Considerations for Pedestrian and Bicycle Amenities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Purpose
This document establishes the Land Use Plan (LUP) for the City of Seaside’s Local Coastal Program (LCP), prepared in accordance with the California Coastal Act of 1976. The LUP provides the specific goals, policies, and proposed implementation actions that govern land and water use within Seaside’s coastal zone. The goals set forth in this LUP are, by design, intended to protect and enhance the resources of the coastal zone consistent with the goals of the Coastal Act as well as the expressed goals of the citizenry.

This LUP document updates and replaces the 1983 LUP for the LCP of the City of Seaside (certified by the California Coastal Commission on October 12, 1983).

Legislative Mandate
The California Coastal Act of 1976 requires local jurisdictions along the California coast to prepare an LCP. The LUP is a key element of the LCP, but constitutes only half of the document as defined by the California Coastal Act.

After certification of an LUP by the Coastal Commission, an Implementation Plan consisting of the land use controls (zoning ordinances, zoning district maps, and other legal instruments) necessary to carry out the Land Use Plan must be prepared. The Coastal Commission-certified Implementation Plan, when combined with the certified LUP, represents the LCP.

Coastal cities and counties must incorporate the following policies into their individual LCPs, as applicable:

The California Coastal Act defines a Local Coastal Program as:

. . . a local government’s land use plans, zoning ordinances, zoning district maps, and, within sensitive coastal resources areas, other implementing actions, which, when taken together, meet the requirements of, and implement the provisions and policies of [the Coastal Act] at the local level.

(PRC Section 30108.6)
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- Protection and expansion of public access to the shoreline and recreational opportunities and resources, including commercial visitor-serving facilities;
- Protection, enhancement, and restoration of environmentally sensitive habitats, including intertidal and nearshore waters, wetlands, bays and estuaries, riparian habitat, certain wood and grasslands, streams, lakes, and habitat for rare or endangered plants or animals;
- Protection of productive agricultural lands, commercial fisheries, and archeological resources;
- Protection of scenic coastal landscapes and seascapes;
- The establishment, to the extent possible, of urban-rural boundaries and directing new housing and other development into areas with adequate services to avoid wasteful urban sprawl and leapfrog development;
- Provision for the expansion, in an environmentally sound manner, of existing industrial ports and electricity-generating power plants, as well as for the siting of coastal-dependent industrial uses;
- Protection against loss of life and property from coastal hazards.

With the certified LCP, the City of Seaside assumes the responsibility for issuing coastal development permits (CDPs). Consistent with the provisions of the Coastal Act, the Coastal Commission will retain original permit jurisdiction over certain specified lands, such as any submerged lands, tidelands, and public trust land. The Commission will also retain the authority to hear appeals of the City’s CDP decisions, review and approve any amendments to the certified LCP, and review the LCP at least every five years to ensure proper implementation and continued compliance with the Coastal Act.

In authorizing CDPs, the City must make a finding that the proposed development conforms to the certified LCP.
The California Coastal Act

In October 1972, the United States Congress passed Title 16 U.S.C. 1451–1464, which established a federal coastal zone management policy and created a federal coastal zone. By that legislation, the Congress declared a national interest in the effective management, beneficial use, protection, and development of the coastal zone in order to balance the nation’s natural, environmental, and aesthetic resource needs with commercial-economic growth.

The Congress found and declared that it was a national policy “to encourage and assist the states to exercise effectively their responsibilities in the coastal zone through the development and implementation of management programs to achieve wise use of the land and water resources of the coastal zone giving full consideration to ecological, cultural, historic, and aesthetic values as well as to the need for economic development” (16 U.S.C. 1452b). As a result of that federal enactment, coastal states were provided a policy and source of funding for the implementation of federal goals.

The California Coastal Act of 1976 is the permanent enacting law approved by the state legislature. The Coastal Act provides for the transfer of permitting authority, with certain limitations reserved for the State, to local governments through adoption and certification of LCPs by the Coastal Commission.

According to Section 30001.5 of the Coastal Act, the basic goals of the State for the coastal zones are to:

- Protect, maintain, and, where feasible, enhance and restore the overall quality of the coastal zone environment and its natural and artificial resources.
- Assure orderly, balanced utilization and conservation of coastal zone resources taking into account the social and economic needs of the people of the state.
- Maximize public access to and along the coast and maximize public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone consistent with sound resources conservation principles and constitutionally protected rights of private property owners.
- Assure priority for coastal-dependent and coastal-related development over other development on the coast.
Encourage state and local initiatives and cooperation in preparing procedures to implement coordinated planning and development for mutually beneficial uses, including educational uses, in the coastal zone.

City of Seaside LUP History (1983 LUP)

The 1983 LUP was the result of a land use planning effort that began in 1977. The key elements of the process included an inventory of existing conditions, an evaluation of policy alternatives, three draft LUP documents, and numerous public workshops and public hearings. At the beginning of the LCP planning process, there was an expressed desired direction for the LCP as summarized in the following general goals:

- To encourage public access to the lake and beach shorelines, while minimizing adverse impact on dune and marsh habitats, and ensuring public safety from water run-up hazards.
- To maximize, to the extent feasible, the recreational potential of Laguna Grande, Roberts Lake, and the beach while, at the same time, preventing damage to or minimizing the loss of major natural habitat areas.
- To preserve and encourage low- and moderate-income housing opportunities where feasible, safe, and healthy.
- To minimize safety hazards and impacts from natural and man-induced hazards.
- To preserve and enhance coastal vistas, views, and view corridors while recognizing the rights of private property owners and the demands for visitor-serving facilities.
- To minimize dredging and filling unrelated to water quality considerations, while recognizing the recreational needs for open space.
- To provide coastal access, visitor-serving facilities, and public improvements within the funding constraints of the public sector.
- To allow each property owner an economic return on land owned.
- To allow land uses which respond to the institutional and natural constraints of the land, and which minimize disturbance of the surrounding land area.
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- To preserve and enhance the natural resources, environmental quality, and community character of the coastal zone.
- To enhance the long-term fiscal returns to local governments yielded by properties within the coastal zone.
- To promote the development of run-off control measures capable of minimizing the further siltation of Laguna Grande.

The more specific 1983 LUP policies were developed in response to these general goals, while still remaining consistent with Coastal Act policies.

The 1983 version of the LUP included portions of the coastal zones of both the City of Seaside and the City of Monterey (collectively referred to as the Laguna Grande coastal zone) and identified four subareas: Laguna Grande, Roberts Lake, Beach and Roberts Avenue.

The 1983 LUP Boundary and the defined subareas are illustrated in Figure 1-1. The jurisdictional boundaries of the cities of Seaside and Monterey represent an artificial separation of the estuarine complex, composed of Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake, formerly a single lagoon with an outlet to the ocean. Since the cities’ coastal zones are contiguous at Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake, and recognizing the interrelationship of the lakes, the cities agreed to study and plan for this segment of the coastal zone jointly. This decision was formalized in a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) adopted by the City Councils of both cities in November 1977.

The joint study area comprises the Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake subareas shown in Figure 1-1. The Beach Subarea and the Del Monte Subarea, also shown in Figure 1-1, are entirely in the City of Seaside. Therefore, while the 1983 LUP addressed each of the four subareas identified above, the Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake subareas were addressed jointly by the City of Seaside and the City of Monterey. The other two subareas, the Beach and Del Monte subareas, were addressed separately by the City of Seaside.
SECTION I
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Figure 1-1
1983 Land Use Plan Boundary and Subareas

Source: 1983 City of Seaside Land Use Plan for the Local Coastal Program.
On October 12, 1983, the Coastal Commission certified the City of Seaside LUP for its entire coastal zone including the Laguna Grande, Roberts Lake, Beach, and Del Monte subareas; however, the LCP has not been certified. A chronology of events leading up to the certification of the 1983 LCP is provided as Chapter 1 of Section II – Background Report.

**LUP Update Preparation (2009–2012 LUP)**

Although the general goals identified in the 1983 LUP remain current, the document itself is outdated and no longer reflects expectations for coastal protection or the current regulatory framework. With the intention of updating the LUP, as well as other City policy documents and programs, the City of Seaside City Council has been using a strategic planning process to set goals and identify the actions needed to accomplish those goals.

In 2002, the City Council adopted a strategic plan in order to focus resources toward the accomplishment of the City’s key goals. The City Council continuously reviews and updates the Strategic Plan on a six months basis to reflect current circumstances. The current three-year goals (2011–2014) are the following:

- Create and maintain a diverse, stable and sustainable economic base.
- Improve Public Safety and the City’s appearance.
- Lead the implementation of the water solution.
- Achieve fiscal wellness.
- Enhance engagement with the public.

The Council also works with City staff to identify specific steps to be taken to move the City closer to its ultimate goals. The City’s goals reflect the Council’s commitment to fulfilling the City’s mission and vision in a way that is consistent with its values.

The materials describing existing conditions, general goals, land use designations and policies, and land use intensity criteria found in the text of the LUP are the result of a land use planning effort which began in Summer 2008. The key elements of this planning effort included: an inventory of existing conditions; field reconnaissance and mapping; creation of base maps using Geographic Information System (GIS); preparation of a Biological Inventory Report (Appendix A); meeting with Commission Planning Staff; an evaluation of policy alternatives; and consolidation, formatting and updating policies.
The intent of the LUP Update is to:

- Maintain the intent of relevant general goals as put forward in the 1983 LUP, while remaining consistent with Coastal Act policies.
- Individualize the City’s LUP (rather than having a joint document with the City of Monterey).
- Update policies to be consistent with the City’s 2004 General Plan.
- For the Del Monte Subarea of the Coastal Zone, to support the goals established by the West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (WBUFSP).
- Identify and discard policies that are outdated or do not make sense based on the current setting.
- Eliminate redundancy and maintain consistency.
- Add to or expand policies and programs in response to changing community needs and issues.
- Organize coastal zone policies by geographic subarea so they are easier to find and implement.
- Incorporate relevant and timely policies necessary to sustainably guide planning in the City’s Coastal Zone.

New coastal policies and strategies have been included to address gaps in the current LUP, emerging issues and challenges and new (or anticipated) State requirements including those addressing climate change and sea level rise. The Seaside LUP Update applies to the Seaside Coastal Zone Area and including the four subareas illustrated in Figures 1-2a and 1-2b as well as the Highway 1 corridor within the City limits.

**RELATIONSHIP OF THE LUP TO EXISTING PLANS**

The LUP establishes land use designations, general development criteria, and policies that regulate development in the coastal zone. The City’s General Plan and the General Plan’s Land Use Element in particular may contain more precise development limits for specific properties. Should a conflict exist between the General Plan and the LUP, the LUP’s provisions shall take precedence. If a conflict arises between the LUP provisions internally, the provisions that are the most consistent with the Coastal Act and the most protective of coastal resources shall take precedence. However, in no case shall the policies of the LUP be interpreted to allow a development to exceed a development limit established by
the General Plan or its implementing ordinances. Development Standards and Design Guidelines established by the West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (WBUVSP), which are included in Appendix C, apply to a small portion of the Del Monte Subarea of the coastal zone. Management measures established by the Wetlands Management/Enhancement and Restoration Program included in Appendix B (approved by the Coastal Commission as coastal permit number 3-86-129) apply to portions of Laguna Grande within Seaside’s City limits. The LUP does not preclude other more detailed plans, such as a park master plan, from being developed and adopted separately in the future, provided that if they affect any provision of this LUP, they do not go into effect until the LUP has been correspondingly amended.

**Organization of this LUP**

The LUP has two primary components: Section I – LUP Policy chapters and Section II – Background Report chapters. Chapters within Section I and Section II are organized by area including a chapter for the overall City of Seaside coastal zone and a chapter dedicated to each of the four Seaside coastal zone subareas (Figure 1-2). Information in the Coastal Zone chapter applies to the entire Seaside coastal zone. Information within each of the subarea chapters applies to the specified subarea only.

Each topic chapter in Section I follows the same outline: a statement of purpose, a brief introduction, policies, and a summary of proposed implementation actions. Policies within each chapter are organized into the following three major topic areas:

- **Natural Coastal Resources** (Natural Habitat Areas, Visual Resources, Water Resources, Water Quality, and Natural Hazards)
- **Public Access and Recreation**
- **Land Use and Development** (Land Use Designations and Definitions, Land Use and Development Requirements, General Permit Considerations)

Policies are not listed in order of priority unless so stated. The user is referred to the User Guide provided at the beginning of this document for specific guidance in using this LUP.
Coastal Zone

Purpose
The intent of this chapter is to provide policies applicable to all areas within the Seaside coastal zone. Please refer to the appropriate subarea chapter for additional policies applicable to each specific subarea.

Introduction
The Seaside coastal zone encompasses approximately 90 acres of land that extend from the Pacific Ocean to the terminus of the Canyon Del Rey Creek on the southeastern portion of Laguna Grande. The coastal zone is completely bound on the southwest by the City of Monterey. To the northwest is the Pacific Ocean. Sand City and Canyon Del Rey Boulevard border most of the south and east portion of the coastal zone.

The Seaside coastal zone contains approximately 500 feet of beach frontage along the Pacific Ocean. A former estuarine complex, composed of Roberts Lake at the center and Laguna Grande to the south, makes up the vast portion of the City’s coastal zone area. Highway 1 separates the beach from Roberts Lake, although they are connected by an outfall located at the foot of Humboldt Street and in the seawall adjacent to the Monterey Beach Hotel. Del Monte Boulevard and the abandoned Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way separate Roberts Lake from Laguna Grande. The Seaside portion of the Monterey Bay Coastal Recreational Trail runs along a portion of the railroad right-of-way, around Roberts Lake, and along the coastline through the Beach Subarea. This section is part of an 18-mile coastal rail-trail that extends from Pacific Grove to Castroville. Several commercial businesses are located along the northeastern portion of Del Monte Boulevard.
Sustainable development is . . . development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
1987 Brundtland Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development

Land uses within the coastal zone area include residential, commercial, and park/open space. Habitats within the coastal zone area include marine, coastal dune scrub, estuarine, emergent wetland, coastal oak woodland, park, and urban (Figure 2-1).

The intent of the following policies is to protect, maintain, and, where feasible, enhance and restore the valued qualities of Seaside’s entire coastal zone area including its natural resources, scenic qualities, recreational and educational opportunities, and public access to coastal areas.

Policies
Policies for the coastal zone are presented below in three main subsections: Natural Coastal Resources, Public Access and Recreation, and Land Use Development (which provides more specific policies regarding development in the coastal zone).

Natural Coastal Resources

1. Natural Habitat Areas

Policy NCR-CZ 1.1.A – Promote Sustainable Development

New development shall promote environmental sustainability which is essential to reducing impacts to natural resources, habitat loss, and air and water resources.

Policy NCR-CZ 1.1.B – Promote Sustainability of Biological Productivity

i. The City shall identify and pursue appropriate methods of native enhancement and restoration that will sustain the biological productivity of coastal waters and that will maintain healthy populations of all species of marine organisms adequate for long-term commercial, recreational, scientific, and educational purposes.
### Policy NCR-CZ 1.1.C – Minimize Adverse Effects to Natural Coastal Resources

New development shall be located in areas where it will not have a significant adverse effect either individually or cumulatively on natural coastal resources and public access and recreation.

### Policy NCR-CZ 1.2.A – Designation of ESHA

Areas of particular habitat value and fragility consistent with Policy LUD-CZ 1.3.B are considered Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA). Figure 2-2 represents a preliminary mapping of lands containing potential ESHA. Actual determination of ESHA boundaries shall be based on facts on the ground at the time development is considered.

### Policy NCR-CZ 1.2.B – Protection of ESHA

i. ESHAs shall be protected against significant disruption of habitat values, and only uses dependent on those resources shall be allowed within those areas.

ii. Development in areas adjacent to ESHAs shall be sited and designed to prevent impacts which would significantly degrade those areas and shall be compatible with the continuance of those habitat areas.

iii. Site-specific surveys to confirm the presence and extent of identifiable plant and animal life or habitats shall be required for all new development in, and adjacent to, ESHA.

iv. Site-specific surveys shall be prepared by a qualified biologist and shall include recommended mitigation measures to avoid, and where avoidance is not possible, minimize sensitive habitat impacts.
Figure 2-2
Potential Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA) within the Coastal Zone
Policy NCR-CZ 1.3.A – Designation of Wetlands

Areas periodically or permanently covered with water that meet the definition of wetland in Coastal Act Section 30121, are considered to be wetlands. The presence of either hydrology, soils, or vegetation must be evidenced for an area to qualify as a wetland. The wetlands identified on Figure 2-3 shall represent a preliminary mapping of lands containing potential wetlands. Actual determination of wetland boundaries shall be based on facts on the ground at the time development is considered.

Policy NCR-CZ 1.3.B – Protection of Wetlands

i. The biological health and productivity of wetland areas shall be maintained, and where feasible, restored.

ii. Development that may have an adverse effect on a wetland shall not be allowed.

iii. The biological productivity of coastal waters, streams, wetlands, estuaries, and lakes, shall be maintained and restored, where feasible, to maintain optimum populations of marine organisms and to protect human health where applicable. Maintenance and restoration efforts shall support biological productivity by minimizing adverse effects of wastewater discharges and entrainment; controlling runoff, preventing substantial interference with surface water flow, and minimizing alteration of natural streams; preventing depletion of groundwater supplies; encouraging wastewater reclamation; and maintaining natural vegetation buffer areas that protect riparian habitats.
Figure 2-3
Potential Wetlands within the Coastal Zone Area

PMO
Policy NCR-CZ 1.4.A – Designation of Marine Resources

All significant bodies of water including the Monterey Bay, Laguna Grande Lake, and Roberts Lake are recognized as marine resources.

Policy NCR-CZ 1.4.B – Protection of Marine Resources

i. Marine resources shall be maintained, enhanced, and, to the extent feasible, restored. Uses of the marine environment shall be carried out in a manner that will improve habitat quality and will sustain the biological productivity of coastal waters.

ii. In addition to Policies NCR-CZ 1.3.B and 1.5.C, methods for maintenance and enhancement of marine resources include, but are not limited to, trash removal, sediment removal, non-native vegetation removal and native re-vegetation, and any other feasible methods to improve water quality (refer to Policies NCR-CZ 1.3.B, 1.5.C, 1.5.D and 4.1.A).

iii. The City shall seek opportunities to consolidate and/or eliminate reliance on storm water outfalls that daylight onto the beach and convey storm water into Monterey Bay. Such storm water shall be filtered and treated prior to discharge.

iv. All development shall adequately collect, filter, and treat its associated runoff. Low impact development concepts (e.g., limiting impervious surfaces, use of vegetated areas for runoff treatment, etc.) shall be encouraged.

Policy NCR-CZ 1.4.C – Diking, Filling, Dredging of Marine Resources

Diking, filling, or dredging activities shall be permitted in accordance with the other applicable provisions of the LCP, 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 the following:

The term Marine Resource, as it is used in this LUP, is a broad, encompassing term that incorporates all marine life and marine habitats, including the flora and fauna of the Monterey Bay Marine Sanctuary and all water bodies within the coastal zone that, due to their aesthetics, function, or contribution to the social and environmental ecosystem, are considered to have exceptional value and public importance.
• Placement of structural pilings for public recreational piers that provide public access and recreation;
• Incidental public services (i.e., maintenance of existing outfalls);
• Mineral extraction, including for restoring beaches, except in environmentally sensitive habitat areas;
• Restoration purposes;
• Nature study, aquaculture, or similar resource dependent activities

Dredging and spoils disposal shall be planned and carried out to avoid significant disruption to marine and wildlife habitats and water circulation. Dredge spoils suitable for beach replenishment should be transported for such purposes to appropriate beaches or into suitable long shore current systems.

In addition to the other provisions of this section, diking, filling, or dredging in existing estuaries and wetlands shall maintain or enhance the functional capacity of the wetland or estuary.

Policy NCR-CZ 1.5.A – Designation of the Canyon Del Rey Creek Watershed

The Canyon Del Rey Watershed includes lands from multiple jurisdictions. Lands contained within these jurisdictions have been designated as follows:
• 2010 General Plan of Monterey County: Rural Density/Permanent Grazing
• 2004 General Plan of City of Seaside: Parks and Open Space
• 2004 General Plan of the City of Monterey: Industrial/Park and Open Space
• 1997 Zoning Ordinance of Del Rey Oaks: Residential/Commercial/Park and Open Space

Policy NCR-CZ 1.5.B – Evaluation of the Canyon Del Rey Creek Watershed

Support ongoing efforts to prepare the Canyon del Rey Watershed Master Drainage Plan Update as part of the update to the Monterey Peninsula, Carmel Bay, and South Monterey Bay Integrated Regional Water Management Plan. Once adopted, the City shall incorporate the Master Drainage Plan results, goals,
policies, and objectives into the codes and programs of the City’s Municipal Code, and general Plan, where applicable.

**Policy NCR-CZ 1.5.C – Protection of the Canyon Del Rey Creek Watershed**

i. The City shall continue to implement the following erosion control and sedimentation mitigation measures:

- Continue enforcement of the Urban Storm Water Quality Management and Discharge Control ordinance, as amended, (Chapter 18.46 of the Seaside Municipal Code) for all future construction in the watershed.
- Design of street drainage to maximize retention and minimize impervious surface area and street flooding.
- Regulate construction activities on unstable slopes that are susceptible to erosion.
- Prevent additional gullying of alluvial terraces by maintaining riparian vegetation.

ii. The City shall continue to implement, monitor, comply with and update (as needed) the Monterey Regional Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP) as a participating entity in order to be in compliance with Final Phase II National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit No. CAS000004 adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board on April 30, 2003.

**Policy NCR-CZ 1.5.D – Management of the Canyon Del Rey Creek Watershed – Update of the Seaside Wetland Management / Enhancement and Restoration Program**

i. The functioning of the Canyon Del Rey Creek Watershed has potential implications for the entire Seaside coastal zone (potential flooding, erosion, water quality etc.). As such, the City of Seaside shall update the *Wetlands Management / Enhancement and Restoration Program for the Laguna Grande/Roberts Lake LCP (1983)* (Appendix B) to incorporate the findings of the *Canyon Del Rey Creek Watershed Master Drainage Plan Update* upon
completion (identified in **Policy NCR-CZ 1.5.B**). The updated *Wetlands Management / Enhancement and Restoration Program for the Laguna Grande/Roberts Lake LCP* shall be incorporated into the LCP through an LCP amendment and certification by the Coastal Commission. In addition to incorporating the findings of the *Canyon Del Rey Creek Watershed Master Drainage Plan Update*, the *Wetlands Management / Enhancement and Restoration Program* update shall include the following elements (at minimum):

- A clear statement of the goals of the native restoration and enhancement of habitat types and water quality within the Canyon Del Rey Creek Watershed that will sustain biological productivity, including a description of the existing habitat types and quality to provide a benchmark for developing performance criteria.
- Guidelines, programs, and funding sources for water quality improvements that are consistent with maintenance, reestablishment, and enhancement of existing wetland habitats and water quality improvement objectives.
- Guidelines, in consultation with the appropriate state and federal resource agencies, for the preservation and/or reestablishment of equivalent (size and biological value) areas of riparian and marsh vegetation.
- Guidelines which identify the appropriate method(s) of resource restoration and enhancement that will sustain the biological productivity of coastal waters (which may include dredging and filling if identified to be for the exclusive purpose of resource restoration or habitat enhancement only).
- Guidelines for the maintenance and management of all resource areas in the watershed after restoration or enhancement.
- Guidelines for design of recreational improvements and maintenance of all shoreline improvements in both Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake.
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- A timeline of near-, mid-, and long-term restoration opportunities.
- An identification of technical, planning, and design assistance needed to foster plan development.
- A Vegetation Management Plan that includes the following:
  - Identification of vegetation and habitat types within the Seaside coastal zone.
  - Guidelines for improvement, maintenance, and management of all identified resource areas including a Weed Eradication Plan, Planting Plan, Maintenance Plan, and Monitoring Plan, as appropriate.
  - Guidelines for stabilization of the dune areas including the area adjacent to Roberts Lake utilizing best available methods such as planting and maintaining native vegetation.
  - Identification of vegetative shoreline improvements that will encourage use by native, non-invasive, and non-nuisance wildlife.
  - Identification of areas appropriate for use as a community garden.
  - Identification of appropriate responsible parties for improvement, maintenance, and management of all resources.
  - A summary of relative cost and funding responsibilities.

ii. Until the update to the Wetlands Management / Enhancement and Restoration Program for the Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan, including the Laguna Grande and Roberts subareas, is completed, the City shall continue to implement and promote management / enhancement and restoration measures that meet the following objectives:

- Stabilize the water surface area and depth of Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake by removing accumulated sediment and controlling the influx of new sediment.
• Improve water quality to a degree sufficient to support a recreational fishery, provide enhanced aesthetic qualities and permit recreational boating;
• Provide shoreline improvements that enhance public opportunities for observation and enjoyment of the natural habitat areas, that complement the natural character of the wetlands and riparian areas and are consistent with the protection of these areas, and that are compatible with existing recreational facilities and with the use of the adjoining private properties.

Policy NCR-CZ 1.6.A – Control of Canada Goose Population
The City, in coordination with the Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District, shall explore and implement humane methods of controlling goose populations.

2. Visual Resources

Policy NCR-CZ 2.1.A – Designation of Visual Resources
The scenic and visual qualities of lakes and coastal areas, including Roberts Lake, Laguna Grande, the coastal sand dunes, and Monterey Bay/Pacific Ocean, including from State Highway 1, shall be considered visual resources of public importance. Scenic resources identified on Figure 2-4 shall represent a preliminary mapping of visually sensitive areas. Other scenic resources may be identified to be present based on existing conditions at the time proposed development is considered.

The scenic and visual qualities of lakes and coastal areas shall be considered a visual resource and shall be protected as a resource of public importance (i.e. public views to Roberts Lake, Laguna Grande, coastal sand dunes, Monterey Bay, and the Pacific Ocean).

Viewshed enhancement areas are those areas that can be restored or enhanced to improve visual quality of degraded conditions.

Visually sensitive areas are those areas that require height and bulk development restrictions to preserve the public’s ability to view visual resources.
Policy NCR-CZ 2.1.B – Protection of Visual Resources

i. Coastal visual resources shall be protected as a resource of public importance.

ii. Visual resources and important view corridors shall be preserved. Figure 2-4 shall be used to assist the City in identifying significant public views of visual resources, view corridors, viewshed enhancement areas, and visually sensitive areas where height and bulk limits shall be required to preserve visibility.

iii. Development determined to have a significant adverse effect on a visual resource or substantially limit visibility of visual resource shall not be allowed.

iv. Public trails, recreation areas, and public viewing areas shall be developed adjacent and/or accessible to scenic view corridors, where feasible.

v. New development shall be sited and designed to protect visual resources, minimize the alteration of natural land forms, preserve view corridors, be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas, and, where feasible, restore and enhance visual quality in visually degraded areas.

vi. Views of the Seaside coastal zone from State Highway 1 shall be protected and enhanced through regulation of siting, design, and landscaping of all new development.

vii. New structures shall be sited and designed to harmonize with the natural setting and to not be visually intrusive. Structures, including fences, shall be subordinate to and blended into the environment, which may be accomplished through use of appropriate materials that will achieve that effect. Where necessary, modification shall be required for siting, structural design, shape, lighting, color, texture, building materials, access, and screening to protect public views. When structures cannot be sited outside of common pubic viewing areas, structures in scenic areas shall provide screening, which may be accomplished through the use of non-invasive native vegetation and topography to help provide visual compatibility.

An adverse effect on a visual resource shall be defined as development that impacts views to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas, alters natural land forms, conflicts with the character of surrounding areas, and/or, does little to restore and enhance the visual quality within visually degraded areas.

A common public viewing area is a public area such as a public street, road, designated vista point, or public park from which the general public ordinarily views the surrounding viewshed.
3. Water Resources

Policy NCR-CZ 3.1.A – Provision for Potable Water Supply

i. The City shall participate in local and regional efforts to secure a safe and adequate/sustainable supply of water.

ii. New development shall be sited in areas with adequate public utility services (i.e., water treatment and delivery) and where it will not have significant adverse effects, either individually or cumulatively, on coastal resources.

• Where existing public utility services, including water, can accommodate only a limited amount of new development, priority uses including essential public services, public recreation, and visitor-serving commercial land uses shall have priority over other development/uses.


The City shall require that all new development, changes of ownership, and changes or expansions of use within the Coastal Zone meet or exceed Monterey Peninsula Water District’s Water Efficiency Standards.


Monitor water use in the City to ensure the availability of water to fulfill the goals of the LUP.

Policy NCR-CZ 3.1.D – Adequate Water

Development may only be approved if it is demonstrated to have a safe, adequate, and sustainable water supply.

Policy NCR-CZ 3.2.A – Water Reserves

The City shall continue to support regional efforts to develop an alternative water supply for the City of Seaside.
4. Water Quality

Policy NCR-CZ 4.1.A – Water Quality

i. The City shall actively pursue methods of improving water quality of lakes, streams, and other waterways throughout the LCP area by improving the quality of dry-weather and stormwater runoff flows through the adoption of adequate stormwater pollution prevention and Low Impact Development strategies.

ii. The biological productivity and quality of coastal waters, streams, wetlands, and lakes shall be maintained and, where feasible, restored through, among other means, minimizing adverse effects of wastewater discharges and entrainment, controlling runoff, encouraging wastewater reclamation, maintaining natural vegetation buffer areas that protect riparian habitats, and minimizing alteration of natural streams.

5. Natural Hazards

Policy NCR-CZ 5.1.A – Designation of Natural Hazard Areas

The hazard areas identified on Figures 2-5, 2-6, and 2-7 shall represent a preliminary mapping of potential hazards within the LCP area. Actual determination of hazard areas shall be based on facts on the ground at the time development is considered.

Policy NCR-CZ 5.1.B - Protection from Natural Hazards

i. All new development in areas subject to natural hazards, including geologic, flood, tsunami, sea level rise, ocean storm and surge, and fire hazard, shall be sited, designed, and sized to minimize risk to life, property, and the environment from natural disaster as warranted based on assessed risk and conditions on the ground.
Figure 2-5
Flood Hazard Areas
ii. Applications for new development and redevelopment in natural hazard areas shall include an Adaptive Management Plan that identifies the expected lifetime of the proposed development and strategies to decommission the development once it has been determined that the development’s lifetime has been reached due to hazards. Strategies identified in the Adaptive Management Plan may include, but are not limited to, removing the development and restoring the site to pre-development conditions; managed retreat; and/or other hazard abatement strategies. New development shall only be approved if the approval includes an Adaptive Management Plan with enforceable provisions for both determining when a development’s lifetime has been reached due to hazards, and for implementing the required abatement strategy at that time.

iii. New development shall assure structural stability over the lifetime of the project as determined by the Adaptive Management Plan.

iv. Proposed development shall be consistent with the following applicable goals and actions of the City of Seaside Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP), as modified to protect coastal resources:

- **Goal 1:** Minimize loss of life and property from hazard events.
- **Goal 2:** Improve safety for residents, business owners, and property in the City of Seaside.
- **Goal 3:** Mitigate for disasters.
  - **Action 3.09:** Continue to actively implement existing state law that requires the City to maintain lists of addresses of unreinforced masonry buildings and inform property owners that they own this type of hazardous structure.
  - **Action 3.10:** Ensure that all new construction is completed using the latest earthquake-resistant design techniques that will limit damage caused by earthquakes.
Action 3.11: Identify mitigation measures for areas that flood annually.

Action 3.12: Ensure that all new construction that is now, or as modified by rising sea level will be, within the 100-year flood zone is sited to avoid flood hazards to the maximum extent possible and otherwise constructed using design techniques that will limit damage caused by floods consistent with policies NCR-CZ 5.2.A, and NCR-CZ 5.2.C and by using the latest edition of the California Building Code.

Action 3.15: Ensure that new development pays its fair share of improvements to the storm drainage system necessary to accommodate increased flows from the development.

Action 3.16: Ensure that new developments are designed to reduce or eliminate flood damage by requiring lots and rights-of-way are laid out for the provision of approved sewer and drainage facilities, providing on-site detention facilities whenever practical.

Action 3.17: Encourage homeowners in flood-prone areas to participate in home elevation programs and other methods to adapt to sea level rise.

Action 3.22: Ensure that all new construction in areas susceptible to fires is completed using fire-resistant design techniques that will limit damage caused by wildfires. For example, require Class A roofing materials for all homes in areas susceptible to fires.

Action 3.27: Adopt a City ordinance that requires the following measures to reduce fire ignition due to earthquakes: bracing of gas-fired appliances and equipment; flexible couplings on gas appliances and equipment; and the bolting of homes to their foundations and strengthening of cripple walls.

Action 3.33: Provide technical assistance to homeowners whose homes were damaged by
natural hazards in order to site and design the residences to better avoid future hazards. Allow a streamlined permitting process for the rebuilding after a disaster.

- **Action 3.34:** Encourage the retrofitting of unreinforced masonry structures that have not been retrofitted.
- **Action 3.37:** Pass a City ordinance that will limit building in high-risk areas.

- **Goal 4:** Increase public education and awareness of hazards so that City residents can better anticipate and prepare for them.
  - **Action 4.15:** Educate property owners on the affordable, individual mitigation and preparedness measures that can be taken before the next hazard event through appropriate City public education outlets.

- **Goal 6:** Assure that continuity of local government operations will not be significantly disrupted by disasters.
  - **Action 6.10:** Participate in the Office of Emergency Services Safety Assessment Program (SAP) which formalizes arrangements with engineers, building officials, and other qualified people to report to the City, assess damage, and determine if buildings can be reoccupied after a disaster.

- **Goal 7:** Ensure the continuous function of utilities and critical transportation facilities.
  - **Action 7.10:** Encourage replacing aboveground utility lines with underground facilities.
  - **Action 7.11:** Assure that utility lines are installed underground for new development.
  - **Action 7.22:** Ensure that utility systems in new developments are constructed in ways that reduce or eliminate flood damage.

- **Goal 8:** Assure that the economic vitality of the community will not be threatened by future hazards.
Action 8.01: Encourage business owners to participate in a program similar to San Francisco’s Building Occupancy Resumption Program (BORP). This program permits owners of buildings to hire qualified structural engineers (California licensed structural engineers with relevant experience) to create facility-specific post-disaster inspection plans and allows these engineers to become automatically deputized as City inspectors for these buildings in the event of a disaster. This program allows rapid reoccupancy of the buildings.

Action 8.02: Provide technical assistance to businesses damaged by natural hazards in order to site and design development to better avoid future hazards. Allow a streamlined permitting process for the rebuilding of businesses after a disaster.

Policy NCR-CZ 5.2.A – Designation of Sea Level Rise Hazards

The City shall collaborate with local jurisdictions and identify properties and stakeholders most likely affected by rising sea levels. Collaboration between these agencies would be beneficial to the citizens of the Monterey Bay area. Adaptation to the effects of sea level rise by the local jurisdictions and agencies is necessary to reduce the potential negative impacts sea level rise may have upon the economy and infrastructure of the Monterey Bay area.

Policy NCR-CZ 5.2.B – Protection from Sea Level Rise Hazards

i. Collaboration between jurisdictions and agencies could lead to the development and successful implementation of adaptation measures to the threat of sea level rise. Other jurisdictions that may be affected by sea level rise within the Monterey Bay area include:

- California State Parks,
- California Department of Transportation,
- Cities of Monterey, Marina, Del Rey Oaks, Sand City, Pacific Grove, and Carmel-by-the-Sea,
Monterey County,
Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control District,
Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments,
Transportation Agency for Monterey County,
Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District,
Monterey Peninsula Waste Management District, and
California Coastal Commission.

ii. Organize educational workshops for local citizens to inform them of the concerns and potential impacts of sea level rise in the Monterey Bay area.

Seek partnerships with educational and institutional organizations to assist with the facilitation of educational workshops.

Support ongoing efforts to develop and implement practical, science-based, long-term solutions and adaptation strategies for minimizing potential adverse impacts of sea level rise.

Policy NCR-CZ 5.2.C – Management of Sea Level Rise Hazards

i. The City shall prepare periodic updates to the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (2005) to address the potential impacts sea level rise will have on the City of Seaside. The plan update process shall include input of local citizens, businesses, educational institutions, and neighboring jurisdictions and the following components:

a. A Vulnerability Assessment that identifies and analyzes areas within the city that are most at risk to the impacts of sea level rise. The Vulnerability Assessment will establish how far and how high coastal storms and ocean levels would inundate the city, including consideration of erosion and sedimentation factors.

b. A Beachfront Area Plan that addresses the impacts sea level rise will have on the Beach Subarea. The Area Plan shall propose methods to eliminate or minimize, to the maximum extent feasible, hazards associated with anticipated sea level rise over a minimum of 100 years. The Area Plan shall also include a wave uprush and impact
report and contain an analysis prepared by a licensed engineer with expertise in coastal engineering that addresses and demonstrates the effects of sea level rise in relation to the following:

- Beach profile
- Impacts to beach public access and recreation opportunities
- Areas most affected by wave uprush
- Evaluation of shoreline protection alternatives
- Protection alternatives for freshwater table
- Future projections of regional sea level rise
- Location changes of potential mean high tide lines

c. An identification of resources (including, but not limited to, visual resources, lakes, wetlands, parks, wildlife, and habitat), infrastructure improvements, public beach access and public trails (i.e., California Coastal Trail and Monterey Bay Recreation Trail), and properties that are potentially at risk to inundation or damage, and guidance for their protection.

d. Evaluation of potential salinity changes and water level rise impacts to wetlands, Laguna Grande, and Roberts Lake.

e. An identification of City policies that must change and recommendations for necessary policy changes that will make future development and area conservation projects more responsive and adaptive to sea level rise, including LCP policies through a LCP amendment.

f. An assessment of impacts to the city’s local economy and recommendations for maintaining the economic viability of vulnerable areas.

g. Mitigation and adaptation measures that can be implemented, as well as an analysis of the potential impacts of the measures.

h. A framework for future revisions to the plan and a proposed method for disseminating information to the public.
Policy NCR-CZ 5.3.A – Protection from Tsunami Hazards

All development located within the tsunami inundation zone shown on Figure 2-7 (and as updated by the most recent state or local California Emergency Management Agency maps), shall be designed and sited to minimize and mitigate flood hazards to the maximum extent possible including by designing all habitable space above the maximum flood elevation as defined by a qualified coastal geologist with experience in tsunami.

Policy NCR-CZ 5.3.B – Management of Tsunami Hazards

The City of Seaside shall prepare a Tsunami Preparedness Plan for mitigating the hazards associated with tsunamis, which shall include the following elements:

- Review local and distant tsunami inundation maps for Seaside and the southern Monterey Bay as they are developed to identify susceptible areas and plan evacuation routes.
- Periodically review and update tsunami preparation and response policies/practices to reflect current inundation maps and design standards.
- Participate in any regional effort to develop and implement workable response plans that the City’s emergency services can adopt immediately for evacuation in the case of a tsunami warning.
- Prepare and deploy a system of tsunami detection and early warning systems as warranted based on assessed risk.
- Include tsunami evacuation route information as part of any overall evacuation route sign program implemented in the City. Evacuation routes that lead away from low-lying areas around Roberts Lake, Laguna Grande, and the beach should be clearly posted. An evacuation route traffic monitoring system that provides real-time information on the traffic flow at critical roadways should be considered.
- Develop and implement a tsunami educational program for residents, visitors, and people who work in the susceptible areas.
• Require overnight visitor-serving facilities in susceptible areas to provide tsunami information and evacuation plans.
• Encourage the Monterey County Office of Education to include in their earthquake-preparedness curriculum information specifically related to the natural hazards that Seaside and Monterey citizens could face and what to do about them.
• Support tsunami research in the Southern Monterey Bay areas.

Public Access and Recreation

1. Public Access and Recreation

Policy PAR-CZ 1.1.A – Designation of Public Access and Recreational Opportunities
The public access areas identified on Figure 2-8 shall represent a preliminary generalized mapping of access points and passages to significant coastal features and recreational opportunities. Actual determination of public access areas shall be based on facts on the ground at the time development is considered.

Policy PAR-CZ 1.1.B – Protection of Public Access and Recreational Opportunities
Maximize and protect public access including pedestrian and bicycle connectivity and recreational opportunities in the coastal zone consistent with resource conservation principles, public safety, public rights, and the rights of private property owners.

Policy PAR-CZ 1.1.C – Management of Public Access and Recreational Opportunities
i. As development occurs, the City shall develop and implement a coastal access/directional sign program for all public access points, including those shown on Figure 2-8. The sign program shall include informational signs identifying the location of the Monterey Bay and California Coastal Trail alignments within Seaside.

ii. The City shall maximize opportunities for environmental education opportunities within the coastal zone through methods such as interpretive signage, outreach programs, on-site programs, guided walks along access and park trails, nature
walks, publications, newsletters, brochures, exhibits/displays, and websites.

iii. The City shall explore development of a Peninsula Visitors Center at a location within, or at a compatible location adjacent to, the coastal zone, provided the site has ample access to the lakes, parks, and beach to serve visitors to Seaside and the Monterey Bay area.

iv. Ensure the ability of the California Coastal Trail and Monterey Bay Recreation trail to adapt to changes in sea level rise.

**Policy PAR-CZ 1.1.D – Provision of Recreational Facilities**
Lower cost visitor serving and public recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and where feasible, provided.

**Policy PAR-CZ 1.2.A – Designation of Parking for Public Access and Recreational Opportunities**

i. The City shall provide free and unrestricted parking at all public access and public parking areas within the coastal zone during daylight hours (i.e., from one hour before sunrise to one hour after sunset) including those identified in Figures 2-8 and 2-9.

ii. Explore expanding public access parking opportunities at the Embassy Suites Hotel parking lot.

**Policy PAR-CZ 1.3.A – Designation of Trails**
The City shall establish, designate, and maintain a system of trails and an inter-connected trail / park network as components of the California Coastal Trail and Monterey Bay recreational trail alignments to the extent feasible.

**Policy PAR-CZ 1.4.A – Public Access Improvements**
Improve water quality and the recreational experience of southern Monterey Bay area beaches, including by pursuing opportunities to consolidate and/or eliminate reliance on storm water outfalls that convey storm water directly to the beach (Policy NCR-CZ 1.4.B.iii). Such storm water shall be filtered and treated prior to discharge.
Policy LUD-CZ 1.1.A – Land Use Designations Within the Coastal Zone

The following land use designations establish the type, density, and intensity of land use within the coastal zone. The maximum densities allowed for each land use are defined in the Development Standards provided in the Coastal Implementation Plan portion of the LCP. The permitted development intensities shall be limited to those that adequately provide for public access and recreation needs and that address site constraints. Consistency with applicable policies of the LCP will ensure that site constraints are adequately addressed by requiring protection from natural hazards and the preservation and enhancement of natural coastal and scenic visual resources (including provisions for appropriate buffers). The types of land uses allowed within the Coastal Zone are described below:

- Coastal Parks and Open Space (CPOS): This designation is appropriate in areas where the City wants to protect and preserve natural resources and habitat, views, and other visual amenities and protect people and property from natural and man-made hazards. This designation also identifies existing or planned parkland. Public use areas include the sandy beach, access ways, parks, trails, walkways, and other recreational amenities that are publicly owned or over which easements or similar instruments are required as a condition of development. The maximum floor area ratio (FAR) within this designation is 0.01:1.
Coastal Visitor-Serving Commercial (CVSC): Principal permitted visitor-serving commercial uses include hotels/motels, food service, retail establishments, visitor/traveler support services (such as visitor information centers), and recreational-related commercial uses. The maximum FAR is 1.0:1, except that hotels are allowed a maximum FAR of 1.5:1.

Coastal Visitor-Serving Recreation (CVSR): Principal permitted visitor-serving recreation uses include recreational equipment rental centers (such as bicycle, boat, and other recreational equipment) and visitor-serving support services (such as visitor information centers). Commercial uses such as hotels/motels, restaurants, and retail establishments are not allowed. However, counter food service (such as a snack bar), which is ancillary to a primary permitted use, is permissible. The maximum FAR is 0.5:1.

Coastal Regional Commercial (CCRG): Regional commercial uses are defined as large scale commercial development with retail, entertainment, and/or service uses of a scale and function to serve a regional market. These uses are allowed where existing regional commercial uses are developed within the coastal zone. Permitted regional commercial uses include general, grocery, and outdoor retail; shopping center; health and fitness facilities; and restaurants with table service. The maximum FAR is 1.0:1.

Coastal Heavy Commercial (CCH): Heavy Commercial uses are intended for subregional commercial activities such as auto and truck repair, contractor yards, warehousing, and light manufacturing. These uses are permitted where existing heavy commercial uses are developed within the coastal zone (i.e. near railroad right-of-way adjacent to Sand City boundary). The maximum FAR is 0.5:1.
Coastal Mixed Use/West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (CMX/WBUVSP): Seaside has developed a Mixed Use designation as a way to promote pedestrian- and transit-oriented activity centers that have a mixture of residential, commercial, office, and civic uses. This designation is appropriate in the Del Monte Subarea to be consistent and compatible with the West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan. The applicable Development Standards and Design Guidelines have been included in Appendix C of the CIP.

Coastal Transportation Corridor (CTC): The City of Seaside shall maintain the State Highway One right-of-way and the former Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way as essential public transportation corridors. Principal permitted uses of the corridors are for motorized and non-motorized forms of transportation. The former Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way shall be reserved for possible light rail, bus rapid transit route, or other non-motorized forms of transportation including pedestrian and/or bicycle paths.

Policy LUD-CZ 1.2.A – Definitions within the Coastal Zone

The following definitions shall be specific to the LCP. These definitions are intended to provide clarification and guidance for use of terminology used throughout the LCP.

i. An “adverse effect on a visual resource” shall be defined as development that impacts common public viewing areas to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas, alters natural land forms, conflicts with the character of surrounding areas, and/or, does little to restore and enhance the visual quality within visually degraded areas.

ii. “Canyon Del Rey Watershed” is the area beginning near the intersection of Quail Ridge Lane and State Route 68, continuing along State Route 68 toward the City of Monterey until the intersection of Canyon Del Rey Boulevard and State Route 68, and extending along Canyon Del Rey Boulevard until the terminus of Canyon Del Rey Creek at the
southeastern end of Laguna Grande, has been determined to have exceptional value and public importance.

iii. “Common public viewing area” is a public area such as a public street, road, designated vista point, or public park from which the general public ordinarily views the surrounding viewshed.

iv. "Cumulatively" or “cumulative effect” means the incremental effects of an individual project shall be reviewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.

v. "Development" means, on land, in or under water, the placement or erection of any solid material or structure; discharge or disposal of any dredged material or of any gaseous, liquid, solid, or thermal waste; grading, removing, dredging, mining, or extraction of any materials; change in the density or intensity of use of land, including, but not limited to, subdivision pursuant to the Subdivision Map Act (commencing with Section 66410 of the Government Code), and any other division of land, including lot splits, except where the land division is brought about in connection with the purchase of such land by a public agency for public recreational use; change in the intensity of use of water, or of access thereto; construction, reconstruction, demolition, or alteration of the size of any structure, including any facility of any private, public, or municipal utility; and the removal or harvesting of major vegetation other than for agricultural purposes, kelp harvesting, and timber operations which are in accordance with a timber harvesting plan submitted pursuant to the provisions of the Z'berg-Nejedly Forest Practice Act of 1973 (commencing with Section 4511).

vi. "Environmentally Sensitive habitat area" (ESHA) means any area in which plant or animal life or their habitats are either rare, or especially valuable because of their special nature or role in an ecosystem and which could be easily disturbed or degraded by human activities and developments.
vii. “Floor area ratio” (FAR) expresses the intensity of use on a lot. The FAR represents the ratio between the total gross floor area of all buildings on a lot and the total land area of that lot.

viii. “Feasible” means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, and technological factors.

ix. The “Fremont Corridor” is an area encompassing 19 acres of land located on the east side of Fremont Boulevard between La Salle Avenue and Olympia Avenue within the Laguna Grande Subarea.

x. “Marine Resource” is a broad, encompassing term that incorporates all marine life and marine habitats, including the flora and fauna of the Monterey Bay Marine Sanctuary and all water bodies within the coastal zone that, due to their aesthetics, function, or contribution to the social and environmental ecosystem, are considered to have exceptional value and public importance.

xi. A “Mitigation/Restoration and Monitoring Program,” prepared pursuant to Section 15097 of the CEQA Guidelines, describes the processes for implementing identified mitigation measures and/or restoration measures and the persons responsible for implementing and/or overseeing those mitigations.

xii. “Natural Hazard” is defined as threat of an atmospheric, earth, or water-related occurrence that will have a negative effect on life, property, or the environment. Natural hazards within Seaside’s coastal zone include the following: Seismic; Fire; Flood; Sea level rise; High wave event storms; surges; and tsunamis.
xiii. “Public Access” is defined as the ability of residents and visitors to use and enjoy areas within the coastal zone for recreational uses such as hiking, bicycling, and picnicking. Public access includes the provision of open access way to coastal features and connectivity to other existing coastal features and inland trail networks such as walkways and bicycle paths.

xiv. “Sea level rise” is defined as the anticipated sea level changes due to the greenhouse effect and associated global warming and climate changes.

xv. “Sustainable development” is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

xvi. “Viewshed enhancement areas” are those areas that can be restored or enhanced to improve visual quality of degraded conditions.

xvii. “Visually sensitive areas” are those areas that require height and bulk development restrictions to preserve the public’s ability to view visual resources.

xviii. “Wetland” is any area which may be covered periodically or permanently with shallow water and include saltwater marshes, freshwater marshes, open or closed brackish water marshes, swamps, mudflats, and fens.
2. Development and Land Use Requirements

Policy LUD-CZ 2.1.A – Designation of Land Uses Within the Coastal Zone

Land use designations for the Local Coastal Plan area are shown on Figures 2-10a and 2-10b.

Policy LUD-CZ 2.1.B – Compliance with Land Use Plan Policies

New development shall be required to demonstrate compliance with the Land Use Plan policies applicable to the particular project under consideration.

Policy LUD-CZ 2.1.C – Land Use Densities Within the Coastal Zone

The densities described in LUD-CZ 1.1.A represent a maximum. As required by the applicable policies of the LUP, permitted development intensities shall be limited to those which adequately address constraints including, but not limited to, public access and recreation needs, coastal hazards, natural habitats (i.e. sand dunes, wetlands, riparian, ESHA, and marine resources, etc.) and their appropriate buffers, natural landforms and scenic views.

Policy LUD-CZ 2.1.D - Coastal Development Permit Required

A Coastal Development Permit shall be required for all development within the Coastal Zone.

Policy LUD-CZ 2.1.E – Minimize Adverse Effects

New development shall be located in areas where it will not have significant adverse effect either individually or cumulatively on natural coastal resources and public access and recreation (Policy NCR-CZ 1.1.C).
3. General Permit Considerations

Policy LUD-CZ 3.1.A – Considerations for Natural Habitat Areas - ESHA

i. Proposed development in areas adjacent to an ESHA (as identified earlier by Policies NCR-CZ 1.2.A and 1.3.A), shall be required to demonstrate that it is sited and designed to be compatible with the protection of these resources.

ii. Proposed development in areas adjacent to an ESHA (including wetlands) shall be required to provide a site-specific resource report prepared by a qualified biologist. The report shall include, at a minimum, the following:

a. A site-specific survey evaluating existing known resources at the time of proposed development.

b. A map identifying existing known resources within the project’s identified area of potential impact at the time of proposed development.

c. An evaluation of necessary buffers and/or setbacks required around any identified ESHA, wetland or riparian vegetation to ensure the long-term biological integrity of the resource. All identified necessary buffers and/or setbacks required to ensure the biological integrity of the resource shall be mapped.

- Buffers or setbacks are required around Natural Habitat Areas including ESHA, riparian vegetation, and wetlands of a sufficient size to ensure the biological integrity of the resource, including under changing sea level conditions.

- A minimum buffer of 50 feet as measured from the extent of identified habitat type shall be required, unless a biological assessment results in information indicating that expanded or reduced setback/buffer would ensure the biological integrity of the resource. Smaller setbacks or buffers may be allowed only if it can be demonstrated that: (1) the required minimum 50-foot buffer would render the site unusable for its designated use; and (2) the
buffer has been adjusted downward only to a point where the designated use can be accommodated. Under no circumstances shall the buffer be reduced to less than 25-feet. If the buffer/setback is adjusted downward, additional mitigation measures developed in consultation with the Department of Fish & Game shall be implemented.

- No permanent structures shall be permitted within the required buffer/setback area except for structures of a minor nature that do not lead to significant degradation of the resource such as fences or at grade improvements for public access and/or recreation purposes (i.e. paths, trails, platforms, parking).

d. Identification of all biological impacts of proposed development.

e. Alternatives and/or mitigation for avoiding and/or reducing any identified impacts to a less than a significant level.

f. Mitigation / Restoration and Monitoring Program for any mitigation required, including identification of appropriate acre replacement / restoration ratios for any unavoidable impacts.

Policy LUD-CZ 3.1.B – Considerations for Natural Habitat Areas – Wetland Vegetation Management

i. For proposed development within the coastal zone, a Vegetation Management Report prepared by a qualified biologist shall be required. The report shall consist, at a minimum, of the following:

a. A site-specific survey of the vegetation and habitat types at the time of proposed development.

b. A map identifying existing vegetation and habitat types relative to the identified project area, and identification of all potential impacts associated with the proposed development.

c. Identification of appropriate native plant species for use in restoration activities.
d. Identification of appropriate buffers, or setbacks, necessary to protect identified vegetation.

e. Alternatives and/or mitigation for avoiding and/or minimizing identified impacts. Mitigation shall include procedures and planting/maintenance plans that will encourage, enhance, or reestablish desirable plant communities.

ii. The Vegetation Management Report shall be consistent with the most current version of the Wetland Management / Enhancement and Restoration Program (refer to Policy NCR-CZ 1.5.D).

Policy LUD-CZ 3.1.C – Considerations for Natural Habitat Areas - Wetlands and Marine Resources

i. Applicants for new development within the coastal zone located within, adjacent to, or that has watershed connection to a marine resource shall be required to submit a site-specific Wetland Management / Enhancement and Restoration Program (refer to Policy NCR-CZ 1.5.D) including, at a minimum, the following elements:

- A wetland delineation prepared by a qualified biologist with expertise in identifying wetlands and wetland indicators (i.e. soils, hydrology or vegetation).
- Identification of the current conditions of the site including flooding potential, water quality, and natural systems.
- Identification of all habitat types and known water quality concerns within the project area.
- Guidelines for water quality management and/or improvement that is consistent with maintenance, reestablishment, and enhancement of existing wetland habitats and water quality.
- An identification of appropriate methods of native enhancement and restoration that will sustain the biological productivity of existing wetland habitats.
- An identification of structural and nonstructural best management practices that will:
  - Maintain, and as feasible enhance, habitat and support natural systems of Laguna Grande, Roberts Lake and Monterey Bay,
- Maintain, and as feasible improve, water quality,
- Control erosion and sedimentation deposit, and
- Provide flood protection.

- Guidelines, after consultation with the appropriate state and federal resource agencies, for the preservation and/or reestablishment of equivalent (size and biological value) areas of riparian and marsh vegetation (if appropriate) including implementation and maintenance.

- Identification of technical, planning, and design mechanisms for plan implementation and maintenance.

**Policy LUD-CZ 3.1.D – Considerations for Natural Habitat Areas - Watershed/Water Quality**

Design and manage proposed development (new development or redevelopment) to eliminate or minimize dry-weather flows to Roberts Lake, Laguna Grande, and Monterey Bay in order to protect and enhance the biological productivity and diversity of fresh, intertidal, and marine organisms.

i. All proposed development shall prepare Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that includes, construction, and maintenance of erosion control, and water quality BMPs to be implemented during construction to prevent any construction related runoff and/or sediment from discharging to coastal waters including Roberts Lake, Laguna Grande, and the Beach Subareas as applicable.

ii. All proposed development shall include a post-construction drainage plan that identifies the appropriate types of BMPs to be used at the site, implementation and maintenance scheduling, monitoring requirements, and responsibilities.

iii. All proposed development shall include, to the extent feasible and as applicable to the type of development proposed, Site Design and Planning, Pollution Prevention, Source Control, and Treatment Control strategies that:
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- Minimize impervious surface, reduce the volume of runoff, and maximize infiltration of runoff.
- Incorporate Pollution Prevention and Source Control BMPs / techniques that eliminate or minimize sources of pollution generated on the site.
- Incorporate Low Impact Development (LID) design techniques (also known as Integrated Management Practices (IMPs)) that minimize and disconnect impervious surfaces and are integrated into the landscape design and distributed throughout the site.
- Incorporate Source Control and Treatment Control BMPs that capture and treat polluted runoff prior to entering the municipal storm drainage system or receiving waters. Treatment Control BMPs shall be consistent with Seaside Municipal Code Chapter 18.46, Urban Storm Water Quality Management and Discharge Control, the Monterey Regional Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP), the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board post-construction requirements and the regional NPDES Permit requirements.
- All development shall include in construction documents operational and maintenance provisions to ensure ongoing effectiveness of BMPs.
- All development shall be conditioned to require ongoing maintenance that is necessary for effective operation of all required water quality structural and non-structural BMPs for the life of the project.
- Consolidate and/or eliminate storm drain outfall where feasible. Emphasis shall be placed on eliminating / redirecting dry weather and storm water flows away from the Bay Street and former Fort Ord storm water outfalls.
Policy LUD-CZ 3.2.A – Considerations for Visual Resources

i. Proposals for new development shall include a map and visual analysis prepared by a qualified professional identifying the development's visual impacts, including potential impacts on scenic views and viewsheds including, but not limited to, those identified on Figure 2-4.

ii. Development shall be sited and designed to protect, and where feasible enhance, public views to Roberts Lake, Laguna Grande, Monterey Bay, and the Pacific Ocean, including from Highway 1, which may be accomplished by minimizing the alteration of the natural land forms and by designing development to be visually compatible with the character of the surrounding areas.

- Where feasible, development shall restore and enhance visual quality in visually degraded areas.

iii. Landscaping shall be sited and installed to screen parking and utility areas from public view (including views from the water and other recreation areas), provided such landscaping itself also protects and does not degrade views.

iv. Outdoor lighting and signs shall be designed to protect sensitive habitats, public recreation areas, public views, and night sky from intrusion, including by prohibiting signs with moving parts or flashing lights, minimizing glare, and shielding and directing lighting within the development areas.

Policy LUD-CZ 3.3.A – Considerations for Water Resources/Utilities

i. Installation of new water utility infrastructure shall be provided in a manner which allows development at densities and locations consistent with the land use designations defined in Policy LUD-CZ 1.1.A and taking into account the natural resource protection policies of this plan.

ii. Prior to the approval of any development within the coastal zone, adequate water capacity shall be demonstrated consistent with the provisions and
requirements of the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District.

iii. Capacity for additional water service shall be reserved according to the following ranking of priorities: (a) essential public services; (b) new and existing recreational or open space uses within the coastal zone; and (c) visitor-serving commercial uses.

iv. Applications for development shall demonstrate an adequate, sustainable, public (i.e., publicly owned and/or managed) water supply to support the proposed development. Private water supplies are prohibited to serve existing and new development.

Policy LUD-CZ 3.3.B – Considerations for Water Resources-Water Supply/Conservation

i. All new development, changes of ownership, and changes or expansions of use within the Coastal Zone receiving a water permit on or after January 1, 2010 shall meet or exceed the following Water Efficiency Standards (Policy NCR-CZ 3.1.B):

- Ultra-Low Flush Toilets shall be installed;
- Urinals installed in residential uses shall be designed to flush with one (1) gallon of water. Urinals installed in non-residential uses shall be pint urinals or zero water consumption urinals and shall be clearly specified on the final construction drawings. Zero water consumption urinals shall be encouraged in settings where there is a regular maintenance staff;
- Showerheads, Rain Bars, or Body Spray Nozzles shall be installed that were designed to emit a maximum of 2.0 gallons per minute of water. All shower fixtures should be equipped with scald protection valves rated for 2.0 gallons per minute showerheads. Installation of multiple Showerheads in one stall shall require timers for each Showerhead, Rain Bar, or Body Spray Nozzle. No timer shall operate with greater than a three (3) minute operating increment;
- Residential lavatory sink faucets shall emit a maximum of 2.2 gallons of water per minute at 60
2.48 psi and residential kitchen sink faucets shall emit a maximum of 2.2 gallons of water per minute at 60 psi; 8. Public lavatory faucets shall emit a maximum of 0.5 gallon of water per minute at 60 psi and public lavatory sinks equipped with automatic shut off devices or sensor faucets shall operate with a maximum flow of 0.25 gallons per cycle;

- High efficiency clothes washers shall be installed when a clothes washer is installed in a new structure;
- High efficiency dishwashers or high efficiency commercial dishwashers shall be installed and maintained on the site when a dishwasher is installed in a new structure permitted by a Water Permit;
- Instant-access hot water system(s) shall be installed for hot water access points to ensure that hot water is available within ten (10) seconds
- All hot water pipes shall be insulated;
- Sodium chloride (salt) water softeners shall be discouraged in New Construction. Alternate technologies such as potassium chloride shall be recommended. When a sodium chloride water softener is to be installed, the unit shall use demand-initiated regeneration which senses when the resin must be recharged, either electronically or with a meter that measures and calculates usage. This requirement shall be specified on the Construction Drawings;
- Water Efficient Pre-Rinse Spray Valves shall be utilized when a pre-rinse spray valve is installed;
- There shall be no single-pass water use systems in ice machines, hydraulic equipment, refrigeration condensers, X-ray processing equipment, air compressors, vacuum pumps, etc. Air-cooled or better technology shall be installed;
- Water cooled refrigeration equipment shall be prohibited when there is alternative cooling technology available;
• Cooling Towers shall be equipped with conductivity controllers that are used to increase the number of cycles that can be achieved;
• Boilerless steamers or connectionless steamers shall be installed in place of boiler-based steamers when a steamer is installed in new construction;
• All landscape shall comply and identify on the landscape plan the following requirements:
  o Group planting by hydrozones (water requirements).
  o Irrigation systems shall include the installation, use and maintenance of Weather-Based Irrigation System Controllers (e.g. Smart Controllers). Weather-Based Irrigation System Controllers shall include functioning Soil Moisture Sensors and a Rain Sensor as components of the system.
  o Drip Irrigation shall be utilized for watering all non-turf irrigated plantings.
  o Rotating Sprinkler Nozzles shall be utilized for turf irrigation.
  o Overhead spray irrigation shall not be used to water non-turf landscaping, including trees and shrubs.
  o Irrigation systems shall operate with at least 70 percent efficiency.
  o Rainwater and graywater collection/irrigation systems are encouraged to supplement irrigation for new landscaping. New structures shall be encouraged to include one or more rainwater cisterns and a system to provide at least 75 percent of exterior irrigation during normal rainfall years. Systems must be compliant with local catchment system standards, including Monterey County Department of Environmental Health. All sites utilizing a graywater reuse system shall install and maintain a backflow prevention device as required by the water distribution system operator that supplies water to the site.
Policy LUD-CZ 3.4.A – Considerations for Water Quality/Wastewater

i. Prior to the approval of any new development within the coastal zone, adequate sewage treatment facility capacity shall be demonstrated consistent with the provisions and requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board.

ii. Capacity for additional wastewater collection, conveyance and treatment shall be verified.

iii. Alternatives for demonstrating additional wastewater treatment capacity for permitted development may be considered, including but not limited to, (a) construction of a package treatment plant at the Seaside treatment facility to handle all projected sewage for the City's LUP land use designations; or (b) the construction of a new sewer line to the Monterey treatment facility to handle the same sewage capacities.

Policy LUD-CZ 3.5.A – Considerations for Natural Hazards

i. Applications for new development shall include an analysis of all potential hazards, site constraints, alternatives, and appropriate mitigation. The analysis shall also include a determination that the site is suitable for the proposed development and that it will be safe from hazards over the lifetime of the development without reliance on seawalls, deep piers, or similar engineering measures.

ii. Proposed development shall be consistent with applicable goals and policies of the LCP.

iii. All required geologic engineering reports shall be prepared by a qualified geotechnical engineer. Reports shall address site stability under static and pseudo-static conditions.

iv. Geologic reports submitted to the City shall be in conformance with guidelines established for such reports by the California Division of Mines and Geology and the Uniform Building Code, including the following:
  - Geologic reports shall include information on the regional and local geologic setting, topography,
significant landforms, soil types and thickness of soil or depth to bedrock, geologic hazards, soil/rock types, geologic structures, groundwater conditions, and other relevant properties, such as erosion potential and mineral economic resources.

• The geologic report shall contain the following ten major sections:
  - Summary
  - Description of Project Alternatives
  - Impacts
  - Geology of the Project Area
  - Geologic and Seismic Impacts
  - Mitigation of Impacts
  - Coordination with Other Agencies, Groups, or Consultants
  - Conclusions and Recommendations
  - Report Preparer’s Qualifications
  - References

v. All development proposed within an area that is subject to ocean wave, tsunami, or flooding shall prepare an analysis of wave up-rush / shoreline erosion, and be adequately set back from the area of hazard to be safe for the life of the development or a 100-year period, whichever is greater, without reliance on seawalls, deep piers, or similar engineering measures.

vi. Require all coastal development permit applications for all development on a beach or sand dune property subject to wave action to assess the potential for flooding or damage from waves, storm surge, or seiches, through a wave uprush and impact report prepared by a licensed civil engineer with expertise in coastal processes. The conditions that shall be considered in a wave uprush study are: a seasonally eroded beach combined with long-term (75 years) erosion; high tide conditions, combined with long-term (75 years) projects for sea level rise; storm waves from a 100-year storm event or a storm that compares to the 1982/83 El Niño event.
Policy LUD-CZ 3.5.B – Considerations for Sea Level Rise

i. Geotechnical reports prepared for proposed development shall include a comprehensive evaluation of potential sea level rise impacts. This evaluation shall include the following:

- A Vulnerability Assessment that identifies and analyzes areas within the city that are most at risk to the impacts of sea level rise. The Vulnerability Assessment shall establish how far and how high coastal storms and ocean levels would inundate the city, including consideration of erosion, inland flooding, and sedimentation factors.
- Identification of any site-dependent infrastructure that is at risk from sea level rise.
- Identify and prioritize mitigation and adaptation measures that can be implemented as well as an analysis of the potential impacts of the adaptation measures. Mitigation and adaptation measures shall be scaled to the local and regional hydrologic events projected. These measures may included but are not limited to riparian habitat restoration, living shoreline projects, management of invasive species, regional sediment management, and innovative designs.
- If the City’s Local Hazard Mitigation Plan update (required by Policy NCR-CZ 5.2.C) has been prepared at the time the site-specific comprehensive evaluation of sea level rise impacts are being evaluated, then the evaluations shall be consistent with the intent of that plan update.

Policy LUD-CZ 3.6.A – Considerations for Public Access and Recreation

i. Development shall not interfere with the public’s right of access to the shore and significant coastal recreation features.

ii. New development shall plan for and provide public access to coastal features.
Policy LUD-CZ 3.7.A – Considerations for Cultural Resources

i. Identify and protect archaeological resources within Seaside.

ii. Require a Phase I Archaeological Study performed by a Registered Professional Archaeologist to determine whether significant archaeological resources may be present when excavation activities are proposed.

iii. Mitigations are to be required as a condition of development where it would adversely impact any archaeological or paleontological resources, including, but not limited to, those qualified individuals as identified by the State Historic Preservation Officer.

Policy LUD-CZ 3.8.A – Considerations for Transportation and Circulation

i. Development shall be approved only where adequate circulation and parking have been provided.

ii. Retain the former Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way as a transportation corridor. Prohibit development that would interfere with future uses of the corridor identified in Policy LUD-CZ 1.1.A.

iii. Encourage non-motorized and other alternative forms of transportation in all new development.

iv. Maintenance of the existing highway, landscaping, and drainage facilities within the Highway 1 corridor may be permitted with a coastal development permit. Activities that involve an expansion of capacity or widening or realigning of the highway pavement or route shall require an amendment to the LCP.

Proposed Implementation Actions

- Support efforts to prepare the Canyon del Rey Watershed Master Drainage Plan Update (Policy NCR-CZ 1.5.B)

- Implement erosion control and sedimentation mitigation measures (Policy NCR-CZ 1.5.C.i)

- Implement, monitor, comply and update (as needed) the Monterey Regional Storm Water Management Plan
COASTAL ZONE

(SWMP) as a participating entity (Policy NCR-CZ 1.5.C.ii).

- Implement, monitor, and comply with the Regional Water Quality Control Board’s Post-Construction stormwater requirements for new and redevelopment for the Central Coast Region; and update appropriate policies, programs and documents, including Municipal Code Chapter 18.46, as needed.


- Implement and promote management / enhancement and restoration measures that meet the objectives of the current of Wetland Management/Enhancement and Restoration Program (Policy NCR-CZ 1.5.D.ii).

- Explore and implement humane methods of controlling goose population (Policy NCR-CZ 1.6.A)

- Participate in local and regional efforts to secure a safe and adequate/sustainable supply of water (Policy NCR-CZ 3.1.A.i).

- Require new development, changes of ownership, and changes or expansions of use to meet or exceed Monterey Peninsula Water Management District’s water efficiency standards (Policy NCR-CZ 3.1.B.i).

- Monitor water use within the City (Policy NCR-CZ 3.1.C).

- Support regional efforts to develop an alternative water supply (Policy NCR-CZ 3.2.A).

- Actively pursue methods of improving water quality of lakes, streams, and other waterways throughout the coastal zone (Policy NCR-CZ 4.1.A.i)

- Collaborate with local jurisdictions and identify properties and stakeholders most likely affected by rising sea levels (Policy NCR-CZ 5.2.A).

- Organize educational workshops to inform public of the concerns and potential impacts of se level rise (Policy NCR-CZ 5.2.B.ii).

- Update Local Hazard Mitigation Plan to address potential impacts of sea level rise (Policy NCR-CZ 5.2.C).
• Develop and implement a coastal access/directional sign program (Policy PAR-CZ 1.1.C.i).
• Maximize opportunities for environmental education within the coastal zone (Policy PAR-CZ 1.1.C.ii).
• Explore development of a Visitors Center (Policy PAR-CZ 1.1.C.iii).
• Provide free unrestricted parking at all public access and public parking areas (Policy PAR-CZ 1.2.A.i).
• Explore expanding public access parking at the existing Embassy Suites Hotel parking lot (Policy PAR-CZ 1.2.A.ii).
• Establish and maintain a system of trails that provides future connectivity to various California Coastal Trail and recreational alignments (Policy PAR-CZ 1.3.A).
• Participate in the regional planning efforts to restore light rail service along the Monterey Peninsula and through Seaside.
Purpose
The City of Seaside recognizes that the Laguna Grande Subarea contains resources that are unique to the Seaside coastal zone and require special considerations for environmental issues such as public parks, sensitive habitats, and flood hazards. As such, the intent of this chapter is to provide policies specific to the Laguna Grande Subarea. Please refer to Chapter 2 – Coastal Zone for additional policies that apply to this subarea, as well as to all areas within the Seaside coastal zone.

Introduction
The Laguna Grande Subarea comprises approximately 42 acres of land which extends from Del Monte Boulevard to Fremont Avenue on the southeastern portion of Laguna Grande. Laguna Grande is located directly across from Seaside City Hall and is bordered on the northwest by the Embassy Suites and Holiday Inn Express, by a mixture of commercial businesses on the northeastern corner, on the southwest by Monterey’s city boundary, and on the southeast by Fremont Boulevard.

Laguna Grande consists largely as emergent wetland containing bulrush and common cattails as well as the invasive giant European reed along the shoreline. Throughout the subarea, there exists a system of trails for the public to use and enjoy. Laguna Grande is also the receiver of sediment that has been collected by Canyon Del Rey Creek, which travels through portions of Monterey County, City of Del Rey Oaks, City of Monterey, and various private properties. Canyon Del Rey Creek enters Laguna Grande on the southeast side of the subarea, which is mostly undeveloped parkland.

The Laguna Grande Subarea’s primary land uses are as a city park as well as a regional park for the Monterey Peninsula. Two hotels and a restaurant are located on relatively small portions of
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the subarea, southwest of Del Monte Boulevard and along Canyon Del Rey Boulevard. Saint Seraphim’s parish, of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia, is located at the intersection of Canyon Del Rey Boulevard and Francis Avenue. Further description of the Laguna Grande Subarea setting can be found in Chapter 3 of Section II – Background of this Land Use Plan (LUP).

The intent of the following policies is to protect, maintain, enhance, and, as applicable, restore the unique and valued qualities of the Laguna Grande Subarea, including Laguna Grande itself, to support its scenic qualities, and recreational and educational opportunities while allowing for the development of Visitor Serving Commercial land uses in designated areas.

**Policies**

**Natural Coastal Resources**

1. **Natural Habitat Areas**

   **Policy NCR-LG 1.1.A – Vegetation Management**
   The City of Seaside shall work cooperatively with the City of Monterey, State Parks, and Regional Parks to stabilize area adjacent to Laguna Grande utilizing methods identified in the Vegetation Management Plan for the Seaside Coastal Zone (identified in Policy NCR-CZ 1.5.D.i), or if the plan is not complete, utilizing best available methods such as exotic and invasive plant removal, and planting and maintaining native vegetation.

2. **Visual Resources**

   **Policy NCR-LG 2.1.A – Protection of Visual Resources**
   Development within the Laguna Grande Subarea shall limit building height and bulk in order to minimize adverse impact on public views of the lake and park. Maintain a 50 foot buffer around Laguna Grande Lake and the channel connecting Laguna Grande Lake and Roberts Lake as shown in Figure 2-4.
Policy NCR-LG 2.1.B – Management of Visual Resources

i. Coordinate with the Regional Park District to provide viewshed improvements to areas identified on Figure 2-4 as a component of Coastal Visitor-Serving Commercial land use development and park improvements proposed for Laguna Grande.

ii. The City shall develop Gateway Guidelines for the Fremont Corridor adjacent to Laguna Grande Park.

3. Water Resources

Policy NCR-LG 3.1.A – Protection of Potable Water Supply

The City shall protect potable water supply within the Laguna Grande Subarea by utilizing methods identified in Policy NCR-CZ 3.1.B, as well as by using non-potable water supplies (e.g., from Laguna Grande) for non-potable uses such as park landscaping or as recharge if such use would not have a significant adverse effect on the lake or associated habitat.

Optimistic

4. Water Quality

Policy NCR-LG 4.1.A – Management of Water Quality

Improve the water quality of Laguna Grande, thus improving the recreational opportunities and preserving and enhancing the habitat value of Laguna Grande by carrying out the recommendations of the updated Wetland Management / Enhancement and Restoration Program (identified as Policy NCR-CZ 1.5.D.i), enforcing the Urban Storm Water Quality Management and Discharge Ordinance (Policy NCR-CA 1.5.C.i; Chapter 18.46), continued implementation of the Monterey Regional Storm Water Management Plan (Policy NCR-CZ 1.5.C.ii), and following the recommendations from the Canyon Del Rey Creek Watershed Master Drainage Plan Update (Policy NCR-CZ 1.5.B).

Policy NCR-LG 4.2.A – Water Quality Enhancement

The Fremont Corridor consists of 19 acres of land located on the east side of Fremont Blvd. between La Salle and Olympia avenues. Currently, a mix of commercial development is located along Fremont, including University Plaza between Echo and Phoenix avenues. A variety of residential units are located behind (i.e., east of) these businesses.
Investigate opportunities for habitat enhancement, impervious site coverage reduction, and restoration of previously disturbed areas.

5. Natural Hazards

Policy NCR-LG 5.1.A – Management of Sea Level Rise Hazards

The City shall protect and maintain the functionality of Laguna Grande and the adjacent park lands from impacts associated with sea level rise.

Policy NCR-LG 5.2.A – Management of Flooding Hazards

i. In order to maintain stormwater flows and prevent flooding that could otherwise result in hazardous conditions and property damage, the City shall maintain the outfall at Laguna Grande under Fremont Street. A coastal development permit shall be required for maintenance activities including periodic cleaning and removal of sand and debris to facilitate stormwater flows.

ii. The City shall accommodate for flooding impacts by increasing buffer areas around Laguna Grande and investigating opportunities for increasing lake capacity via sediment and fill removal.

Public Access and Recreation

Policy PAR-LG 1.1.A – Protection of Public Access and Recreational Opportunities

The City shall maintain, and enhance, pedestrian and bicycle connectivity within the Laguna Grande Subarea, and to Roberts Lake, and the beach to maximize public access and recreation opportunities to these coastal resources.

Policy PAR-LG 1.1.B – Management of Public Access and Recreational Opportunities

i. The City shall develop interpretive signage along access trails around Laguna Grande as part of ongoing park improvements and maintenance efforts.
ii. The City shall maintain the portion of Laguna Grande Park and facilities that are within the city, including restrooms, for the recreation purposes of its citizens and visitors.

iii. The City shall maintain and seek to enhance the developed pedestrian walkway/bikeway, including potential additions to it. The walkway/bikeway shall be maintained at a minimum width of 10 feet and so as to have a minimum impact on the wetland.

**Policy PAR-LG 1.1.C – Provisions for Public Access and Recreational Opportunities**

i. Develop pedestrian access along lands adjoining Laguna Grande. Where passing through or near the wildlife habitat area in Laguna Grande, this access is to be designed so as to protect wetland areas (e.g., a required setback from the inland extent of emergent wetland vegetation, overpass, etc.).

ii. New development shall be required to provide public access easements and access improvements, consistent with habitat protection, from public rights-of-way to the access trail.

iii. Upon the significant improvement in water quality of Laguna Grande (consistent with objectives presented in Policy NCR-LG 4.1.A), the City shall coordinate with the Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District to explore additional recreational water uses within Laguna Grande such as a fishing/fly-casting pier or paddle boat concession.

iv. The City shall coordinate with the Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District to provide additional active and passive recreational opportunities in and around Laguna Grande (such as a fishing pier, par course, disk golf or similar).

v. The City shall coordinate with the Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District for provision of additional programs and/or facilities for use by senior citizens and community groups (such as community garden, outdoor class area, horseshoe pit, bocce ball area, wildlife viewing station).
Land Use and Development

1. Land Use Designations and Definitions

Policy LUD-LG 1.1.A – Land Use Designations Within the Laguna Grande Subarea

The land use designation establishes the type, density, and intensity of land uses allowed. The Development Standards and Design Guidelines provided in the Coastal Implementation Plan portion of the LCP provide further guidance regarding the density and intensity of development allowed within each land use designation. Land within the Laguna Grande Subarea is designated as Coastal Parks and Open Space (CPOS) and Coastal Visitor-Serving Commercial (CVSC), which are defined as follows:

- **Coastal Parks and Open Space (CPOS):** This designation is appropriate in areas where the City wants to protect and preserve natural resources and habitat, views, and other visual amenities and protect people and property from natural and man-made hazards. This designation also identifies existing or planned parkland. Public use areas include the sandy beach, access ways, parks, trails, walkways, and other recreational amenities that are publicly owned or over which easements are required as a condition of development (IV.A.3.e). The maximum floor area ratio (FAR) within this designation is 0.01:1.

- **Coastal Visitor-Serving Commercial (CVSC):** Principal permitted visitor-serving commercial uses include hotels/motels, food service, retail establishments, visitor/traveler support services (such as visitor information centers), and recreational-related commercial uses. The maximum floor area ratio (FAR) is 1.0:1, except that hotels are allowed a maximum FAR of 1.5:1.
2. Development and Land Use Requirements

Policy LUD-LG 2.1.A – Designation of Land Uses Within the Laguna Grande Subarea

Land use designations in the Laguna Grande Subarea are shown earlier in Figure 2-10a of this plan.

3. General Permit Considerations

Policy LUD-LG 3.1.A – Considerations for Visual Resources

i. Permitted development shall be sited and designed to protect public views to Laguna Grande and be compatible with the regional park. Consideration of public views of the lake and park must be carefully considered as a component of the visual analysis required by Policy LUD-CZ 3.2.A.

ii. To protect views of Laguna Grande, proposed development should avoid placing structures in close proximity to the channel. Preferred development within 50-feet of the channel would consist of low-profile, and non-structural development including parking lots and recreational amenities (such as formalized viewing areas, off-street parking, and improved bike paths and trailways).

Policy LUD-LG 3.2.A – Considerations for Public Access

i. All relevant access improvements outlined in the Public Access section of this chapter are to be carried out as a condition of development.

ii. Proposed development in the Laguna Grande Subarea shall be required to provide public access easements and access improvements, consistent with habitat protection, to the access trail from the public right-of-way to the access trail.

iii. Proposed development will maintain and seek to enhance the developed pedestrian walkway/bikeway, including potential additions to it, as applicable. The walkway/bikeway shall be maintained at a minimum width of 10 feet and so as to have a minimum impact on the wetland.
iv. Proposed development within the Laguna Grande Subarea will be required to provide additional/enhanced public access through means such as directional/interpretive signage, public parking, and additional access points to coastal resources from Del Monte Boulevard or Canyon Del Rey Boulevard.

**Proposed Implementation Actions**

- Stabilize the areas adjacent to Laguna Grande utilizing methods identified in the Vegetation Management Plan for the Seaside Coastal Zone or, if the plan is not complete, utilizing best available methods (Policy NCR-LG 1.1.A).
- Coordinate with the Regional Park District to provide viewshed improvements as a component of park improvements proposed for Laguna Grande (Policy NCR-LG 3.1.A).
- Develop Gateway Guidelines for the Fremont Corridor (Policy NCR-LG 2.1.B.ii).
- Improve water quality and the recreational experience of southern Monterey Bay area beaches, including by properly maintaining the outfall at Laguna Grande under Fremont Street and by pursuing opportunities to consolidate and/or eliminate reliance on storm water outfalls which convey storm water directly to the beach. Such storm water shall be filtered and treated prior to discharge (Policy NCR-LG 5.2.A).
- Maintain, and where necessary improve, pedestrian and bicycle connectivity within the Laguna Grande Subarea (Policy PAR-LG 1.1.A).
- Develop interpretive signage along access trails around Laguna Grande (Policy PAR-LG 1.1.B.i).
- Maintain the portion of Laguna Grande Park and facilities that are within the city (Policy PAR-LG 1.1.B.ii).
- Maintain the developed pedestrian walkway/bikeway (Policy PAR-LG 1.1.B.iii).
• Expand recreational water uses within Laguna Grande (Policy PAR-LG 1.1.C.iii).

• Coordinate with the Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District to provide additional active recreational opportunities around Laguna Grande (Policy PAR-LG 1.1.C.iv).

• The City shall coordinate with the Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District for provision of additional programs and/or facilities for the use by senior citizens and community groups (Policy PAR-LG 1.1.C.v).
Purpose

The City of Seaside recognizes that the Roberts Lake Subarea contains resources that are unique to the Seaside coastal zone and require special considerations for issues such as recreational uses of the lake, the Boathouse on Roberts Lake, trail connectivity (including Monterey Bay Coastal Recreational Trail), dune vegetation, water salinity, sensitive habitats, and flood hazards. As such, the intent of this chapter is to provide policies specific to the Roberts Lake Subarea. Please refer to the Chapter 2 – Coastal Zone for additional policies that apply to this subarea, as well as to all areas within the Seaside coastal zone.

Introduction

The Roberts Lake Subarea is an approximately 21-acre area located in the central portion of Seaside’s coastal zone. The subarea is bordered on the southeast by Del Monte Boulevard, on the northeast by Canyon Del Rey Boulevard, on the northwest by Highway 1, and on the southwest by the La Quinta Inn on Roberts Avenue.

Roberts Lake is located in the central portion of Seaside’s coastal zone area across from the Embassy Suite and Holiday Inn Express hotels. The lake’s primary uses are as an open space for bird watching as well as a connection to the Monterey Bay Coastal Recreational Trail (Monterey Bay Coastal Trail).

The area north of Roberts Lake along the south and east of Highway 1 consists of coastal dune scrub habitat. This area is predominantly vegetated by African ice plant, and bordering the visitor parking lot is the emergent wetland that is Roberts Lake. The majority of the park area of the Roberts Lake Subarea is paved visitor parking. A trail system that connects to the Monterey Bay Coastal Trail system makes up the perimeter of the Roberts Lake Subarea. Historic public use of Roberts Lake includes model
boat racing, bird watching, and recreational fishing. Further
description of the Roberts Lake Subarea setting can be found in
Chapter 4 of Section II – Background Report located at the end
of this Land Use Plan (LUP).

The intent of the following policies is to protect, maintain,
 enhance, and, as applicable, restore the unique and valued
 qualities of the Roberts Lake Subarea including Roberts Lake, the
 Roberts Lake park area, scenic qualities, and recreational as well
 as educational opportunities.

**Policies**

**Natural Coastal Resources**

1. **Natural Habitat Areas**

There are no natural habitat policies specific to the Roberts Lake
Subarea. Please refer to Chapter 2 – Coastal Zone for policies
that apply to all areas within the Seaside coastal zone.

2. **Visual Resources**

   **Policy NCR-RL 2.1.A – Protection of Visual Resources**

   Development within the Roberts Lake Subarea shall limit building
   height and bulk in order to minimize impact on public views
   of Roberts Lake.

   **Policy NCR-RL 2.1.B – Management of Visual Resources**

   The City shall coordinate with the Monterey Bay Regional
   Park District to provide viewshed improvements to areas
   identified on Figure 2-4 as development is proposed within
   Roberts Lake subarea.

3. **Water Resources**

   There are no water resources policies specific to this subarea.
   Please refer to Chapter 2 – Coastal Zone for applicable policies
   for all areas within the coastal zone.

4. **Water Quality**

   **Policy NCR-RL 4.1.A – Management of Water Quality**

   Improve the water quality of Roberts Lake, thus improving
   the recreational opportunities and preserving and
   enhancing the habitat value of the lake by implementing
recommendations of the Wetland Management/Enhancement and Restoration Program (identified as Policy NCR-CZ 1.5.D), enforcing the Urban Storm Water Quality Management and Discharge Ordinance (Policy NCR-CZ 1.5.C.i; Chapter 18.46), continuing implementation of the Monterey Regional Stormwater Management Plan (Policy NCR-CZ 1.5.C.ii), and following the recommendations from the Canyon Del Rey Creek Watershed Master Drainage Plan Update (Policy NCR-CZ 1.5.B).

Investigate opportunities for habitat enhancement, impervious site coverage reduction, and restoration of previously disturbed areas.

Policy NCR-RL 4.1.C Filter and Treat Storm Water
Improve water quality and the recreational experience of southern Monterey Bay area beaches, including by pursuing opportunities to consolidate and/or eliminate reliance on storm water outfalls that convey storm water directly to the beach (Policy NCR-CZ 1.4.B.iii). Such storm water shall be filtered and treated prior to discharge.

5. Natural Hazards

Policy NCR-RL 5.1.A – Management of Sea Level Rise Hazards
The City shall protect and maintain Roberts Lake and associated recreational functionality from impacts associated with sea level rise.

Policy NCR-RL 5.1.B – Management of Flooding Hazards
In order to maintain stormwater flows and to prevent flooding that could otherwise result in hazardous conditions and property damage, the City shall maintain the outfalls at Roberts Lake (the foot of Humboldt Street and in the seawall adjacent to the Monterey Beach Hotel). A Coastal Development Permit shall be required for maintenance activities including periodic cleaning and removal of sand and debris from the outfall and occasional
breaching of the sand berm to facilitate stormwater flows. The City shall investigate alternative to mechanical breaching of the sand berm including via expanding lake capacity, hand-trenching, and future restoration of natural tidal flow under Highway 1.

**Policy NCR-RL 5.1.C – Protection from Flooding Hazards**

The City shall plan for flooding impacts by increasing buffer areas around Roberts Lake and investigating opportunities for increasing lake capacity via sediment and fill removal.

**Public Access and Recreation**

**Policy PAR-RL 1.1.A – Protection of Public Access and Recreational Opportunities**

The City shall maintain, and enhance pedestrian and bicycle connectivity within the Roberts Lake Subarea and to Laguna Grande, and the beach to maximize public access and recreation opportunities to these coastal resources.

**Policy PAR-RL 1.1.B – Management of Public Access and Recreational Opportunities**

i. The City of Seaside shall provide and maintain restrooms and maintain the established picnic areas on the City-owned land.

ii. Existing float line at Roberts Lake shall be replaced by a permanent and more effective means of restricting the area of recreational use of the lake (such as model boat operation) in order to protect the use of the lake by wildlife.

iii. Public use of City facilities shall be limited to daylight hours (i.e., from one hour before sunrise to one hour after sunset).

iv. Overnight activity and camping is prohibited.

**Policy PAR-RL 1.1.C – Provision for Public Access**

i. Require improvements to and a public access easement (a minimum width of 10 feet) along private lands adjoining the shoreline as a condition of new development. Where passing through or near the
wildlife habitat area associated with Roberts Lake, this access is to be designed so as to protect the habitat area.

ii. For the City-owned parcels around Roberts Lake, develop pedestrian access (a minimum width of 10 feet) along lands adjoining the shoreline. Where passing through or near the wildlife habitat area associated with Roberts Lake, this lateral access is to be designed so as to protect the habitat area.

iii. The City shall develop interpretive signage along access trails around Roberts Lake.

**Policy PAR-RL 1.2.A – Designation of Parking for Public Access and Recreation**

The City shall coordinate with State Parks and the City of Monterey, as appropriate, for the consideration and implementation of expanded public parking to accommodate beach visitors. Potential expansion for beach access may include development of additional parking areas at Roberts Lake. This effort should be coordinated with additional efforts to expand parking for beach access in the Beach Subarea as identified by Policy PAR-B 1.2.A.
Land Use and Development

1. Land Use Designations and Definitions

Policy LUD-RL 1.1.A – Land Use Designations Within the Roberts Lake Subarea

The land use designation establishes the type, density, and intensity of land uses allowed. The Development Standards and Design Guidelines provided in the Coastal Implementation Plan portion of the LCP provide further guidance as to the density and intensity of development allowed within each land use designation. Lands within the Roberts Lake Subarea are designated as Coastal Parks and Open Space (CPOS), Coastal Visitor-Serving Recreation (CVSR), and Coastal Transportation Corridor (CTC), which are defined as follows:

- **Coastal Parks and Open Space (CPOS):** This designation is appropriate in areas where the City wants to protect and preserve natural resources and habitat, views, and other visual amenities and protect people and property from natural and man-made hazards. This designation also identifies existing or planned parkland. Public use areas include the sandy beach, access ways, parks, trails, walkways, and other recreational amenities that are publicly owned or over which easements are required as a condition of development. The maximum floor area ratio (FAR) within this designation is 0.01:1.

- **Coastal Visitor-Serving Recreation (CVSR):** Principal permitted visitor-serving recreation uses include recreational equipment rental centers (such as bicycle, boat, and other recreational equipment) and visitor-serving support services (such as visitor information centers). Commercial uses such as hotels/motels, restaurants, and retail establishments are not allowed. However, counter food service (such as a snack bar), which is ancillary to a primary permitted use, is permissible. The maximum floor area ratio (FAR) is 0.5:1.

- **Coastal Transportation Corridor (CTC):** The City of Seaside shall maintain the State Highway One right-of-way and the former Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-
way as essential public transportation corridors. Principal permitted uses of the corridors are for motorized and non-motorized forms of transportation. The former Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way shall be reserved for possible light rail, bus rapid transit route, or other non-motorized forms of transportation including pedestrian and/or bicycle paths.

2. Development and Land Use Requirements

Policy LUD-RL 2.1.A – Designation of Land Uses Within the Roberts Lake Subarea

Land use designations for the Roberts Lake Subarea are shown earlier in Figure 2-10a of this plan.

3. General Permit Considerations

Policy LUD-RL 3.1.A – Considerations for Visual Resources

Permitted development shall be sited and designed to protect public views to Roberts Lake, the Pacific Ocean, recreation areas, and dune areas. Consideration of public views of these resources specific to the Roberts Lake Subarea must be carefully considered as a component of the visual analysis required by Policy LUD-CZ 3.2.A.

Policy LUD-RL 3.1.B – Considerations for Public Access

i. All relevant access improvements outlined in the Public Access and Recreation section of this chapter are to be carried out as a condition of development.

ii. Permitted development within the Roberts Lake Subarea will be required to provide a public access easement (a minimum width of 10 feet) along private lands adjoining the shoreline as a condition of new development. Where passing through or near the wildlife habitat area to be established in Roberts Lake, this access is to be designed so as to protect the habitat area.
Proposed Implementation Actions

- Coordinate with the Regional Park District to provide viewshed improvements as a component of recreational improvements proposed for Roberts Lake (Policy NCR-RL 2.1.B).

- Improve water quality of Roberts Lake through implementation of the current water quality policies and programs, and the current Wetland Management / Enhancement and Restoration Program (Policy NCR-RL 4.1.A).

- Maintain the outfalls at Roberts Lake (Policy NCR-RL 5.1.B).

- The City shall maintain, and where necessary improve, pedestrian and bicycle connectivity within the Roberts Lake Subarea to Laguna Grande and the beach (Policy PAR-RL 1.1.A).

- Develop interpretive signage along access trails around Roberts Lake (Policy PAR-RL 1.1.C.iii).

- Coordinate with State Parks and the City of Monterey, as appropriate, to expand public parking to accommodate beach visitors. Potential expansion for beach access may include development of additional parking areas at Roberts Lake (Policy PAR-RL 1.2.A). This effort should be coordinated with additional efforts to expand parking for beach access in the Beach Subarea as identified by Policy PAR-B 1.1.C.

- Provide and maintain restrooms and maintain established picnic areas on the City-owned land (Policy PAR-RL 1.1.B.i).

- Replace float line at Roberts Lake (Policy PAR-RL 1.1.B.ii).
Purpose

Although the Beach Subarea is a relatively small portion of Seaside’s coastal zone area, visitors and residents alike recognize it as a primary public accessway to the Pacific Ocean and Monterey Bay’s miles of coastal beaches. The area is also valued for its habitat and scenic qualities and because it includes Highway 1 within it. The intent of this chapter is to provide policies specific to preserving and protecting the unique resources of the Beach Subarea. Please refer to Chapter 2 – Coastal Zone for additional policies that apply to this subarea, as well as to all areas within the Seaside coastal zone.

Introduction

The Beach Subarea consists of approximately 500 feet of beach frontage along the Pacific Ocean. The Beach Subarea is bordered by the Pacific Ocean to the north and west and four paved areas to the south and east: the beach visitor parking lot, the Monterey Bay Trail system, Sand Dunes Drive, and Highway 1.

African ice plant dominates the areas in between the visitor parking lot, the Monterey Bay Coastal Recreation Trail, and Sand Dunes Drive which run parallel to Highway 1 and other dune scrub habitat adjacent to the Beach Subarea. Within the Beach Subarea, the degradation of the sand dune environment from recreational use has resulted in the loss of dune vegetation and movement of the dunes by the wind, which has caused increased sedimentation and water quality problems in Roberts Lake and Laguna Grande. However, there is an effort to balance recreational uses of the beach with preservation of fragile habitat. On the northeastern portion of the dune area connecting to State Parks land, designated trails have been identified and revegetation efforts are under way.
The primary use of the Beach Subarea is as an open space and recreational resource for the City of Seaside and for the Highway 1 corridor. The area provides expansive views of Monterey Bay and is an ideal location to watch the sun set over the Pacific Ocean. The beach is well used by surfers, picnickers, joggers, beachcombers, and nature enthusiasts year-round. The area also offers a respite for travelers along the Recreation Trail. Further description of the Beach Subarea setting can be found in Chapter 5 of Section II – Background Report located at the end of this Land Use Plan (LUP).

The intent of the following policies is to protect, maintain, enhance, and restore, as possible, the unique and valued qualities of the Beach Subarea including sensitive dune habitat, the magnificent views of the Monterey Bay and the California Coast, including from the Highway 1 corridor, recreational uses of the beach and waters, and its proximity to the Monterey Bay Coastal Trail.

**Policies**

**Natural Coastal Resources**

1. **Natural Habitat Areas**

   **Policy NCR-B 1.1.A – Protection of Dune/Beach Areas**
   
   i. In order to preserve and protect the natural resources of the Beach Subarea, no structural development shall be permitted to occur on land within the Beach Subarea with the exception of resource-dependent structures and structures to maintain or improve access or enjoyment of the beach (such as educational signage and permanent restrooms) and transportation related development within the developed roadway prism of Highway 1.

   ii. The City shall protect, maintain, and, where feasible, restore dune habitat within the Beach Subarea.

   **Policy NCR-B 1.1.B – Management of Dune/Beach Areas**

   Within the Beach Subarea, the City shall work cooperatively with State Parks to develop a Dune Management Plan. The plan shall include at a minimum:
• Guidelines for managing public access in order to stabilize the dunes and protect native dune habitat and its inhabitants.
• Guidelines for improving the drainage outlet (from the culvert) from Roberts Lake.
• Guidelines for maintaining the outfall with minimal impact on the beach, public access and recreation, and surrounding dune area.
• Guidelines for habitat enhancement and dune stabilization via revegetation with native dune plant species.
• Guidelines for design of recreational improvements and maintenance of all shoreline improvements.
• Guidelines for maintenance and management of all resource areas, including identification of appropriate responsible parties.
• Guidelines for development of interpretive signage.

2. Visual Resources

Permitted development shall be sited, designed, and constructed in such a way that they do not interfere with visual resources within the Beach Subarea (for example, by using setbacks, screening techniques, and design that blends in with the coastal dune character of the Beach Subarea).

3. Water Resources

Policy NCR-B 3.1.A – Management of Water Resources
Permitted restrooms shall have waterless toilets and employ strict water conservation measures for sinks, rinse areas, etc.

4. Water Quality

Policy NCR-B 4.1.A – Management of Flooding Hazards and Water Quality
i. In order to maintain stormwater flows and to prevent flooding that could otherwise result in hazardous conditions and property damage, the City shall
maintain the outfall in the seawall adjacent to the Monterey Beach Hotel. A Coastal Development Permit shall be required for maintenance activities including periodic cleaning and removal of sand and debris from the outfall and occasional breaching of the sand berm to facilitate stormwater flows. The City shall investigate alternatives to mechanical breaching of the sand berm including via expanding lake capacity, hand-trenching, and future expansion/restoration of natural tidal flow under Highway 1.

ii. Improve water quality for all surface flows into the beach area by enforcing the Urban Storm Water Quality Management and Discharge Ordinance (Policy NCR-CZ 1.5.C.i; Chapter 18.46), and continued implementation of the Monterey Regional Stormwater Management Plan (Policy NCR-CZ 1.5.C.ii).

5. Natural Hazards

There are no natural hazard policies specific to the Beach Subarea. Please refer to Chapter 2 – Coastal Zone for applicable policies for all areas within the coastal zone.

Public Access and Recreation

Policy PAR-B 1.1.A – Protection of Public Access and Recreational Opportunities

The City shall maintain and enhance pedestrian and bicycle connectivity within the Beach Subarea and to Laguna Grande, and Roberts Lake to maximize public access and recreation opportunities to these coastal resources.


To maximize public access to, and enjoyment of, the beach area, coordinate with State Parks and the City of Monterey, as appropriate, for the consideration and implementation of the following beach improvements:

- Development/improvement of public walkway easements,
BEACH SUBAREA

- Development of public viewing areas (such as platforms or benches),
- Maintenance of public parking,
- Development of permanent public restrooms, and
- Development of handicap access.


The City shall coordinate with State Parks and the City of Monterey, as appropriate, for the consideration and implementation of expanded public parking to accommodate beach visitors. Potential expansion for beach access may include development of additional parking areas at Roberts Lake, designated parking in the lot west of the existing hotel (currently the Best Western Beach Hotel), and on-street parking along the western portion of Sand Dune Drive. Said parking shall be clearly signed "Visitor Beach Parking" and adequate signage shall be provided along walkways/trails guiding visitors to the beach.

Policy PAR-B 1.3.A Designation of Public Beach Parking

Maintain free and unrestricted public parking at Seaside Beach (Monterey State Beach) parking lot at Humboldt Street.

Policy PAR-B 1.4.A Identification and Designation of California Coastal Trail

The California Coastal Trail transects the Beach Subarea. As development occurs, the City shall develop and implement a coastal access/directional sign program (Policy PAR-CZ 1.1.C), which will include informational signs identifying the location of the Monterey Bay and California Coastal Trail alignments within the Beach Subarea. In addition, the City shall establish, designate, and maintain a system of trails and an inter-connected trail/park network as components of the California Coastal Trail and Monterey Bay recreational trail alignments (Policy PAR-CZ 1.3.A).
1. Land Use Designations and Definitions

Policy LUD-B 1.1.A – Land Uses Designations Within the Beach Subarea

The land use designation establishes the type, density, and intensity of land use allowed. The Development Standards and Design Guidelines provided in the Coastal Implementation Plan portion of the LCP provide further guidance as to the density and intensity of development allowed within each land use designation. Land within the Beach Subarea is designated as Coastal Parks and Open Space (CPOS) and Coastal Transportation Corridor (CTC), which are defined as follows:

- **Coastal Parks and Open Space (CPOS):** This designation is appropriate in areas where the City wants to protect and preserve natural resources and habitat, views, and other visual amenities and protect people and property from natural and man-made hazards. This designation also identifies existing or planned parkland. Public use areas include the sandy beach, access ways, parks, trails, walkways, and other recreational amenities that are publicly owned or over which easements are required as a condition of development. The maximum floor area ratio (FAR) within this designation is 0.01:1.

- **Coastal Transportation Corridor (CTC):** The State Highway One right-of-way and the former Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way are essential public transportation corridors. Principal permitted uses of the corridors are for motorized and non-motorized forms of transportation. The former Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way shall be reserved for possible light rail, bus rapid transit route, or other non-motorized forms of transportation including pedestrian and/or bicycle paths.

2. Development and Land Use Requirements

Policy LUD-B 2.1.A – Designation of Land Uses Within the Beach Subarea

Land use designations for the Beach Subarea are shown in Figure 2-10a of this plan.
3. General Permit Considerations

Policy LUD-B 3.1.A – Considerations for Dune Management Plan

Permitted development within the Beach Subarea must demonstrate compliance with an adopted Dune Management Plan (as directed by Policy NCR-B 1.2), or if prior to completion of the plan, the applicant shall submit a Dune Management Plan consistent with State and City guidelines.

Policy LUD-B 3.1.B – Considerations for Visual Resources

Permitted development in the Beach Subarea must comply with the State Highway 1 Design Corridor Design Guidelines, as applicable. Currently these guidelines include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Vegetative and architectural screening techniques should be incorporated into projects to sustain or enhance scenic vistas.

- A minimum 100-foot setback from the west edge of the Caltrans right-of-way and screening techniques should be included to enhance views.

- Permitted structures and signage will be designed to blend with the coastal dune character (for example, by using earth-tone colors: tan, brown, forest green, gray, or dark blue).

- Sign support structures for all freestanding signs located within the design corridor cannot be located within 100 feet of the Caltrans right-of-way.

- Views of the sky, ocean, dunes, and ridgelines shall be preserved. Signs and their support structures shall not block views of the sky, ocean, or dunes.
Proposed Implementation Actions

- Coordinate with State Parks to develop a Dune Management Plan (refer to Policy NCR-B 1.1.B).
- Improve water quality and the recreational experience of southern Monterey Bay area beaches, including by properly maintaining the outfall in the seawall adjacent to the Monterey Beach Hotel (refer to Policy NCR-B 4.1.A) and by pursuing opportunities to consolidate and/or eliminate reliance on storm water outfalls that convey storm water directly to the beach (Policy NCR-CZ 1.4.B.iii). Such storm water shall be filtered and treated prior to discharge.
- Maintain, and where necessary improve, pedestrian and bicycle connectivity (refer to Policy PAR-B 1.1.A).
- Coordinate with State Parks and the City of Monterey, as appropriate, of the following beach improvements:
  - Development/improvement of public walkway easements,
  - Development of public viewing areas (such as platforms or benches),
  - Maintenance of public parking,
  - Development of permanent public restrooms, and
  - Development of handicap access (refer to Policy PAR-B 1.1.B).
- Coordinate with State Parks and the City of Monterey, as appropriate, for expanded public parking to accommodate beach visitors (refer to Policy PAR-B 1.2.A).
Purpose
The unique and valued qualities of the Del Monte Subarea include its central location to the downtown area of the City of Seaside as well as its proximity to coastal resources. As such, the intent of this chapter is to provide policies specific to the Del Monte Subarea. Please refer to Chapter 2 – Coastal Zone for additional policies that apply to this subarea, as well as to all areas within the Seaside coastal zone.

Introduction
The Del Monte Subarea encompasses roughly 9 acres of urban area along Del Monte Boulevard from its intersection with Canyon Del Rey Boulevard (Highway 218) to its intersection with West Broadway Avenue to the northeast. The Roberts Lake and Laguna Grande subareas are to the southwest, and the Beach Subarea is to the northeast on the opposite side of Highway 1 and the Monterey Bay Coastal Recreational Trail.

The Del Monte Subarea includes the Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way, which is to become the future location of a multimodal transit hub. In 2010, the West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (WBUVSP) was adopted which is partially located within the Del Monte Subarea. The goal of the Specific Plan is to revitalize and enhance the Del Monte Boulevard and West Broadway Avenue urban area through creation of a pedestrian-friendly urban village. The Specific Plan envisions the area between the railroad right-of-way and Del Monte Boulevard to be an active mixed-use commercial corridor that promotes connectivity and provides supporting uses to the future multimodal transit station and the existing and planned hotels on Canyon Del Rey Boulevard.
Current land uses in the Del Monte Subarea include commercial and light industrial uses. Further description of the Del Monte Subarea setting can be found in Chapter 6 of Section II – Background Report at the end of this Land Use Plan (LUP). The intent of the following policies is to protect the valued qualities of the Del Monte Subarea and to support the goals established by the WBUVSP.

Policies

Natural Coastal Resources

1. Natural Habitat Areas

There are no natural habitat policies specific to the Del Monte Subarea. Please refer to Chapter 2 – Coastal Zone for applicable policies for all areas within the coastal zone.

2. Visual Resources

There are no visual resource policies specific to the Del Monte Subarea. Please refer to Chapter 2 – Coastal Zone for applicable policies for all areas within the coastal zone.

3. Water Resources

There are no water resource policies specific to the Del Monte Subarea. Please refer to Chapter 2 – Coastal Zone for applicable policies for all areas within the coastal zone.

4. Water Quality

Policy NCR-DM 4.1.A – Management of Water Quality

Improve the water quality of coastal waters by carrying out the recommendations of the updated Wetland Management / Enhancement and Restoration Project Program (identified as Policy NCR-CZ 1.5.D.i), enforcing the Urban Storm Water Quality Management and Discharge Ordinance (Policy NCR-CZ 1.5.C.i; Chapter 18.46), implementation of the Monterey Regional Storm Water Management Plan (Policy NCR-CZ 1.5.C.ii), and following the recommendations from the Canyon Del Rey Creek Watershed Master Drainage Plan Update (Policy NCR-CZ 1.5.B).
5. Natural Hazards

There are no natural hazard policies specific to the Del Monte Subarea. Please refer to Chapter 2 – Coastal Zone for applicable policies for all areas within the coastal zone.

Public Access and Recreation

Policy PAR-DM 1.1.A – Protection of Public Access and Recreational Opportunities

i. The City shall maintain and enhance pedestrian and bicycle connectivity within the Del Monte Subarea to Laguna Grande, Roberts Lake, and the beach to maximize and ensure public access and recreation opportunities to these coastal resources.

ii. Streets shall enhance the non-vehicular environment by introducing a scale that is conducive to pedestrian and bicycle use.

iii. Sidewalks shall be functional and maximize pedestrian access to development projects.

iv. The City shall retain the former South Pacific Railroad Corridor for light rail and other alternative forms of transportation (including recreational trails) in Seaside and along the Monterey Peninsula.


i. The City shall maintain and enhance the street rights-of-way for bicycle and pedestrian use.

ii. The City shall maintain (keep free of debris, trash, etc.) the portions of the Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way transportation corridor that are within the Del Monte Subarea.

Policy PAR-DM 1.1.C – Provision for Public Access and Recreational Opportunities

i. Coastal mixed-use development shall include pedestrian amenities.

ii. Coastal mixed-use development shall provide bicycle parking equal to 10 percent of vehicle requirements.
iii. Coastal mixed-use development shall provide highly visible and secure bicycle parking at each entrance, and include a shelter, as feasible.

iv. The City shall work with the Transportation Agency of Monterey County to provide directional signage at the multi-modal transit station to direct travelers to the Coastal access and the Monterey Bay Coastal Trail (see Policy PAR-CZ 1.1.c.i).

Land Use and Development

1. Land Use Designations and Definitions

Policy LUD-DM 1.1.A – Land Use Designations Within the Del Monte Subarea

The land use designation establishes the type, density, and intensity of land use allowed. The Development Standards and Design Guidelines provided in the Coastal Implementation Plan portion of the LCP provide further guidance as to the density and intensity of development allowed within each land use designation. Land within the Del Monte Subarea is designated as Coastal Regional Commercial (CCRG), Coastal Heavy Commercial (CCH), Coastal Mixed Use/West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (CMX/WBUVSP), and Coastal Transportation Corridor (CTC), which are described as follows:

- Coastal Regional Commercial (CCRG): Regional commercial uses are defined as large scale commercial development with retail, entertainment, and/or service uses of a scale and function to serve a regional market. These uses are allowed where existing regional commercial uses are developed within the coastal zone. Permitted regional commercial uses include general, grocery, and outdoor retail; shopping center; health and fitness facilities; and restaurants with table service. The maximum FAR is 1.0:1.

- Coastal Heavy Commercial (CCH): Heavy Commercial uses are intended for subregional commercial activities such as auto and truck repair, contractor yards, warehousing, and light manufacturing. These uses are permitted where existing heavy commercial
uses are developed within the coastal zone (i.e. near railroad right-of-way adjacent to Sand City boundary). The maximum FAR is 0.5:1.

- **Coastal Mixed Use/West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (CMX/WBUVSP):** Seaside has developed a Mixed Use category as a way to promote pedestrian- and transit-oriented activity centers that have a mixture of residential, commercial, office, and civic uses. This designation is appropriate in the Del Monte Subarea to be consistent and compatible with the West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (WBUVSP). Applicable Development Standards and Design Guidelines from the WBUVSP have been included in **Appendix C** of the LCP. The City may consider identification and development of transit parking or transit-supporting uses as a component of mixed use within the coastal zone. This category is intended to accommodate a well-integrated mix of high-intensity residential, commercial, office, and civic uses. Housing densities range from 30 to 60 dwelling units per gross acre. Under this designation, residential and commercial uses may be developed on the same parcel (e.g., residential above commercial).

- **Coastal Transportation Corridor (CTC):** The City of Seaside shall maintain the State Highway One right-of-way and the former Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way as essential public transportation corridors. Principal permitted uses of the corridors are for motorized and non-motorized forms of transportation. The former Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way shall be reserved for possible light rail, bus rapid transit route, or other non-motorized forms of transportation including pedestrian and/or bicycle paths.

The City may consider identification and development of transit parking or transit-supporting uses as a component of regional commercial and mixed use within the coastal zone.
2. Development and Land Use Requirements

Policy LUD-DM 2.1.A – Designation of Land Uses Within the Del Monte Subarea

The land use designations for the Del Monte Subarea are shown earlier in Figure 2-10a of this plan.

Policy LUD-DM 2.2.A – Requirements for Coastal Regional Commercial and Coastal Heavy Commercial Development within the Del Monte Subarea

Coastal Regional Commercial and Heavy Commercial development shall refer to the Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP) (Title 18.10 of the Municipal Code) for the specific development standards.

Policy LUD-DM 2.2.B – Requirements for Coastal Mixed Use Development within the Del Monte Subarea

Coastal Mixed Use development shall be subject to the applicable development standards and design guidelines provided in the West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan, which are included in Appendix C of the LCP.

3. General Permit Considerations

Policy LUD-DM 3.1.A – Considerations for Pedestrian and Bicycle Amenities

i. Development shall include pedestrian amenities.

ii. Development shall provide bicycle parking equal to 10 percent of vehicle requirements

iii. Development shall provide highly visible and secure bicycle parking at each entrance, and include a shelter, as feasible.
Proposed Implementation Actions

- Foster connectivity to the future nearby multi-modal transit station.

- Maintain, and where necessary improve, pedestrian and bicycle connectivity within the Del Monte Subarea to Laguna Grande, Roberts Lake, and the beach to ensure public access to these coastal resources. (Policy PAR-DM 1.1.A)

- Maintain and enhance the street right-of-way for bicycle and pedestrian use consistent with the WBUVSP (Policy PAR-DM 1.1.B.i)

- Maintain (keep free of debris, trash, etc.) the portions of the Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way transportation corridor that are within the Del Monte Subarea. (Policy PAR-DM 1.1.B.ii)
### Chronology of Events Leading to Certification of the 1983 Land Use Plan (LUP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Document of Record</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 3, 1982</td>
<td>The Commission certified, with suggested modifications, the LUP components for the</td>
<td>Commission Staff Report of 8/97, p.41; Commission Staff Report of 8/98, p.42.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake subareas and denied the component for the Beach Subarea.</td>
<td>Included in Appendix A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1982</td>
<td>The Seaside City Council approved several modifications to the LUP components for the Laguna</td>
<td>Referenced in City Council Resolution #82-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grande and Roberts Lake subareas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 20, 1982</td>
<td>The Seaside City Council approved several modifications to the LUP components for the Beach</td>
<td>Referenced in City Council Resolution #82-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subarea.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1, 1982</td>
<td>The Seaside City Council adopted certain revisions to the LUP component for the Beach Subarea</td>
<td>Referenced in City Council Resolution #82-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and directed their submittal to the Coastal Commission.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 12, 1982</td>
<td>The Coastal Commission certified, with suggested modifications, the LUP component for the</td>
<td>Commission Staff Report of 8/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beach Subarea.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 7, 1982</td>
<td>The Seaside City Council rejected the Coastal Commission's suggested modification and approved</td>
<td>Referenced in City Council Resolution #83-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>alternative development policies for the LUP component for the Beach Subarea.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 20, 1983</td>
<td>The Seaside City Council adopted several of the Coastal Commission’s suggested modifications</td>
<td>Referenced in City Council Resolution #83-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to the LUP component for the Beach Subarea.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chronology of Events Leading Up to Certification of the 1983 LUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 12, 1983</td>
<td>The Seaside City Council adopted some of the additional Coastal Commission's suggested modifications to the LUP component for the Beach Subarea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Referenced in City Council Resolution #83-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 9, 1983</td>
<td>The Coastal Commission received and approved, with modifications, the City's submittal of 5/12/1983.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Referenced in City Council Resolution #83-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1, 1983</td>
<td>The Seaside City Council adopted the Coastal Commission's suggested modifications of the LUP component for the Beach Subarea and directed their submittal to the Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Referenced in City Council Resolution #83-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 12, 1983</td>
<td>The Coastal Commission certified the City of Seaside LUP for its entire coastal zone including the Laguna Grande, Roberts Lake, Beach, and Roberts Avenue subareas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Referenced in Coastal Commission Staff Report of 8/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 13, 1983</td>
<td>Mr. Michael Fisher, Executive Director, California Coastal Commission, formally notified the Mayor of the City of Seaside on the Coastal Commission's actions certifying the LUP for the City's coastal zone. In this communication, Mr. Fisher outlined all the required changes to the original LUP document and recommended that the document be reconstituted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coastal Commission letter dated 10/13/1983</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Introduction**

The City of Seaside coastal zone encompasses approximately 90 acres of land including a small area of beachfront and two inland lakes. Historically the coastal zone has served as a recreational destination for visitors to the Monterey Peninsula and as an open space resource for residents of Seaside. The coastal zone area is divided into four subareas, each with its unique character, all oriented toward serving the citizens and visitors to the City of Seaside.

Also offered in this chapter is a supplemental resource section which provides references and Internet links to inform planners or laypersons who might be interested in learning more about the coastal zone in general, and Seaside’s Coastal Zone in particular.
Existing Conditions

Coastal Zone Area

Land uses within the coastal zone include residential, commercial, and park/open space. Habitats within the coastal zone are diverse and include marine, coastal dune scrub, estuarine, emergent wetland, coastal oak woodland, park, urban, and ruderal habitats. Del Monte Boulevard and the abandoned Southern Pacific Railroad tracks separate the Roberts Lake Subarea from the Laguna Grande Subarea. State Highway 1 separates the Beach Subarea from the Roberts Lake Subarea and Del Monte Subarea. Canyon Del Rey Boulevard separates the Del Monte Subarea from the rest of the subareas.

Roberts Lake and Laguna Grande subareas exist because they serve as slowing down points for water flowing through the Canyon Del Rey Creek watershed as it trends seaward.

Canyon Del Rey Watershed

The Canyon Del Rey watershed begins at what is known as the “divide” which separates the Canyon Del Rey watershed from the El Toro Creek watershed. The “divide” is located near Quail Ridge Lane off of State Route 68. Canyon Del Rey Creek zigzags the entire length of State Route 68 until it reaches the intersection of Canyon Del Rey Boulevard. The creek then runs along Canyon Del Rey Boulevard and eventually flows under the Safeway supermarket at the corner of Fremont Boulevard and Canyon Del Rey Boulevard. After traveling under the Safeway supermarket through a culvert, the creek exits and flows into the Laguna Grande Subarea; the flow of the creek slows greatly and sediments that have been picked up along the way are deposited on the lake bottoms of Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake. The water within Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake is connected through a man-made canal that runs underneath Del Monte Boulevard. During tidal periods, Roberts Lake connects to the ocean via a man-made outflow canal which empties onto the Beach Subarea.
Current Issues of Canyon Del Rey Creek and Coastal Zone

Along the entire route of the creek are several grade control devices that are intended to control erosion along the creek’s banks. Several culverts direct water flow under man-made structures and use grade control devices to slow the water’s flow entering the culvert. Several of the grade control devices found along the creek’s path have not been maintained properly and as a result erosion of the creek’s banks has occurred. Use of culverts to channel the water through road segments has increased erosion of the creek bank. Culverts essentially act as water hoses which cause the outflow side of the culvert to erode the creek bank at a faster rate than the intake side of the culvert. At points along the path of Canyon Del Rey Creek, wetland areas exist which allow the creek flow to slow enough to deposit some of the picked up sediments. However, as the water exits these wetland
areas, the erosion process begins again through the disrepair of grade control devices and utilization of culverts to direct water flow as it makes its way toward the ocean.

Sedimentation and urban pollutants are gathered as the creek travels toward the ocean and are ultimately collected at the bottom of Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake as water flow slows. This deposition of sediment creates an anaerobic environment within the lakes. These anaerobic conditions often lead to a foul smell and allow tules to prosper at the water’s edge.

**Protection Of The Coastal Zone**

Through the protection and revitalization of the Canyon Del Rey watershed, the Coastal Zone area, specifically the Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake subareas, can be restored and enhanced to provide a healthier park environment for the residents and visitors to the Monterey Bay.

There are several protection and revitalization measures for Canyon Del Rey Creek, the discussion of which is beyond the scope of this document. As established by the policies contained within Section I – LUP Policies of this document, it is recommended that a watershed assessment be conducted after the adoption of this document by the City of Seaside. A joint jurisdiction agreement should also be formed for the protection, restoration, and enhancement of Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake.

**Supplemental Coastal Zone Resources and References**

**Park Information**

- City of Seaside – Recreation Services

- Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District

- City of Monterey Recreation and Community Services Department
  - [http://www.monterey.org/rec/](http://www.monterey.org/rec/)
**Water Resources/Quality**

- Monterey Peninsula Water Management District
  - [http://www.mpwmd.dst.ca.us/](http://www.mpwmd.dst.ca.us/)

- Cal-AM

- Regional Water Quality Control Board – Central Coast Region
  - [http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb3/](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb3/)

- Central Coast Joint Effort for LID and Hydromodification Control

- Monterey Regional Storm Water Management Program

- Marina Coast Water District
  - [http://www.mcwd.org/](http://www.mcwd.org/)

**Highway Design**

Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA), *Highway 1 Design Corridor – Design Guidelines (rev March 2005)*


**Community Groups**

- Monterey Peninsula Audubon Society
  - [http://www.montereyaudubon.org/index.htm](http://www.montereyaudubon.org/index.htm)

- Save Our Shores
  - [http://www.saveourshores.org/](http://www.saveourshores.org/)

- California State University Monterey Bay (CSUMB) Watershed Institute
  - [http://watershed.csumb.edu/wi/](http://watershed.csumb.edu/wi/)
Planning Resources

- Coastal Commission
  Central Coast District Office
  725 Front Street, Suite 300
  Santa Cruz, CA 95060-4508
  Phone (831) 427-4863
  FAX (831) 427-4877

- Coastal Act of 1976
  o http://www.coastal.ca.gov/ccatc.html

- Center for Ocean Solutions
  o http://www.centerforoceansolutions.org/

- NOAA – Monterey Bay Sanctuary
  o http://montereybay.noaa.gov/

- Governor’s Office of Emergency Services
  o http://www.oes.ca.gov/

- Hopkins Marine Station Monterey Bay
  o http://www-marine.stanford.edu/

- Monterey Bay Aquarium Research Institute (MBARI)
  o http://www.mbari.org/

- California Department of Fish and Game – Marine Division
  o http://www.dfg.ca.gov/marine/

- U. S. Geologic Survey – Pacific Science Center
  o http://walrus.wr.usgs.gov/infobank/

City of Seaside

- Seaside General Plan 2004

- Seaside Title 17 Zoning Code 2006
COASTAL RESOURCES

• Seaside Local Coastal Program 1983
  o http://www.ci.seaside.ca.us/index.aspx?page=191#Local%20Coastal%20Program

• Seaside Online Municipal Code
  o http://municipalcodes.lexisnexis.com/codes/seaside

• West Broadway Urban Village SP 9 29 08 or
  o http://www.broadwayurbanvillage.org/index.php/site

Reference Documents


• City of Seaside. 2007. Bicycle Transportation Plan.

• Seaside Parks, Rec & Community Services Plan Draft 2002


• Seaside GPU EIR Parks Comments 1994

• Laguna Grande-Roberts Lake DEIR 1986

• Laguna Grande-Roberts Lake LCP WMERP 1983

• Laguna Grande-Roberts Lake MMRP 1988
Introduction
Laguna Grande is one of four subareas contained within the coastal zone area. This chapter provides a discussion of the existing conditions, current environmental issues, and a bulleted outline of what can be done to protect, revitalize, and enhance the Laguna Grande Subarea.
SECTION II
CHAPTER 3

LAGUNA GRANDE SUBAREA

Existing Conditions
Natural Habitat Resources

Laguna Grande is located directly across from Seaside’s City Hall. It is bordered on the west by visitor-serving commercial and to the north by public institutional land uses (e.g., the Embassy Suites to the west and City Hall to the north). The subarea is bordered on the south by a single-family residential area and on the east side by Fremont Boulevard, a main arterial which serves the City of Monterey, City of Seaside, and City of Del Rey Oaks.

Riparian vegetation exists along the shorelines of Laguna Grande and predominantly consists of deciduous trees with a thick understory of shrubs and herbaceous growth. The shorelines of Laguna Grande are dominated by cattails and tule growth. Freshwater marsh areas cover approximately 6.8 acres in Laguna Grande. Riparian habitat is considered a high value habitat for wildlife.

Mixed woodland habitat within the Laguna Grande Subarea occurs along sloped embankments between the coastal oak woodland and riparian habitats. Coast live oak is the only species that occurs within the coastal oak woodland area.

Maintained lawns, non-native trees and shrubs, picnic tables, and playground structures occupy the interior area of the Laguna Grande Subarea. Trees have been planted along pedestrian trails to provide shade during summer use and are regularly pruned and maintained. The interior area of the subarea reflects typical residential park environments that are found in most cities across America.

The southeast side of Laguna Grande is a mixed riparian and woodland area consisting of coast live oak and dried-up tule growth and cattails along the Canyon Del Rey Creek path entering the subarea. This mixed corridor roughly continues southward along Canyon Del Rey Boulevard until its intersection with Fremont Boulevard, at which point water flow is directed underground below the Safeway supermarket directly south of the study area. Riparian woodland occurs primarily in the southern portion of the subarea, with scattered occurrences surrounding Roberts Lake and Laguna Grande.
Pedestrian trails bisect the subarea’s habitat communities and are subjected to ongoing disturbances (e.g., trail maintenance, public usage, and groundskeeping). Park improvement areas (e.g., picnic tables, playgrounds, and restrooms) are also subject to ongoing disturbances. These trails and park improvements are considered ruderal habitat, a habitat that is constantly disturbed and supports a diverse weedy flora, primarily of nonnative herbs and grasses.

This subarea represents the first major stop on the seaward journey of Canyon Del Rey Creek. As the water from Canyon Del Rey Creek flows into Laguna Grande, it slows and allows sediments and pollutants to fall out of suspension. This process of depositing sediments into Laguna Grande has caused the lake bottom to become an anaerobic environment which hinders fish life and wildlife that depend on a healthy habitat.

**Visual Resources**

The City of Seaside is centrally located along the Monterey Bay. This unique location provides magnificent views of the Pacific Ocean’s open water, bay beaches and coastline, coastal dunes, and the city lights of Monterey. Other significant visual features within Seaside’s coastal zone include natural features such as Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake.

From Highway 1, one can view Roberts Lake and Laguna Grande to the east and the Beach Subarea and Monterey Bay to the west. Views from Highway 1 allow passersby to experience Roberts Lake, Laguna Grande, the Beach Subarea, and Monterey Bay as a unique ecological system.
Water Resources/Quality

The water of Laguna Grande is significantly polluted for several reasons:

- Laguna Grande is significantly polluted due to sedimentation and pollutants carried to it by Canyon Del Rey Creek.
- Laguna Grande's water quality suffers from siltation, high nutrient levels, low dissolved oxygen, algae blooms, and fish kills. Major sources of pollution have been found to be originating from urban runoff, erosion in the watershed, windblown sand from unstabilized sand dunes, and nutrient input from waterfowl.
- Extensive tule growth in Laguna Grande contributes nitrogen to the water, adding to pollution problems.

Natural Hazards

Natural hazards of the surrounding area include earthquakes, flooding, and impacts from sea level rise.

- Laguna Grande lies within a flood zone. A 100-year storm could raise the water level of Laguna Grande from 8 feet to 12 feet above sea level. At that water level, most of the park would be inundated.
- The Chupines Fault runs along Canyon Del Rey Creek and continues through Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake. The Seaside Fault is located about 500 feet north of the Coastal Zone. These two faults are the closest and are classified as potentially active. However, the potential for fault rupture within the coastal zone is less than significant.
• The expected peak horizontal acceleration generated by any of the seismic sources potentially affecting the coastal zone have been estimated by the Seaside Local Hazard Mitigation Plan to occur between 0.61 to 0.70 gravity. This level of ground shaking in the coastal zone is a potentially significant hazard.

• Coastal zone topography is very gently sloping; a slump, located at the northwest corner of the southern portion of Laguna Grande, was reported after the 1989 Loma Prieta Earthquake, which could have been caused by liquefaction. Risk of lateral spreading is considered to be potentially significant.

• According to the Seaside Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, the entire coastal zone is within the Tsunami Evacuation Zone. In the event a tsunami does occur, the Laguna Grande Subarea would be inundated.

• As the effects of global warming continue to impact global climate, the Pacific Ocean is expected to rise, which would create the potential for sea level rise impacts to occur within the Laguna Grande Subarea.

Public Access

• Laguna Grande has a dedicated visitor parking lot which parallels Canyon Del Rey Boulevard.

• Trail access from Del Monte Boulevard (via the Monterey Bay Coastal Recreational Trail) is available.

• The public may also access the subarea via Fremont Boulevard.

Recreation

Primary use of the Laguna Grande Subarea is as a park and recreation open space resource. Several park improvements have been made to further support this function.

• Laguna Grande recreational activities include walking, bird watching, and picnicking, along with a playground area for neighborhood children.

• Laguna Grande is often used as local festival grounds.

Land Use

• Revisions to the coastal zone boundary have resulted in the retention of areas located within 125 feet of the
shoreline of Laguna Grande and within 100 feet of the channel connecting Laguna Grande to Roberts Lake. Much of this land is presently vacant. City of Seaside redevelopment plans show this area to be used primarily for visitor-serving commercial uses.

**Development**

Development of the Laguna Grande Subarea is limited to development of parks and open space and visitor serving commercial development. The City’s primary sites for new development within the Laguna Grande Subarea consist of the following:

- A City owned, vacant, 0.32 acre parcel located on the south side of Canyon Del Rey Boulevard. The parcel is bordered by the parking lot for Laguna Grande Park and the existing Restaurant site (Chili’s) located at 1359 Canyon Del Rey Boulevard to the north-northwest; Canyon Del Rey Boulevard and residential land uses to the north-northeast, Laguna Grande Park to east-northeast, and Laguna Grande Lake and recreation trail to the south-southeast-southwest. The parcel is relatively flat and is covered by bare ground and some ruderal vegetation. The parcel is designated for Visitor-Serving commercial land uses, which would allow the development of a new restaurant, interpretive learning center, office use, or an active recreational site for the expansion of the Laguna Grande Regional Park.

- A City owned, vacant, 2.28 acre parcel located on the southeast side of Del Monte Boulevard at 1350 Del Monte Boulevard. The parcel is bordered by Laguna Grande Lake to the southeast, the channel connecting Roberts Lake with Laguna Grande Lake and an existing hotel (Holiday Inn) to the east-northeast, Del Monte Boulevard and Roberts Lake to the north-northwest, and the Seaside-Monterey city limit line, on the other side of which is a hardware store and residential neighborhoods lies to south-southwest. The proposed project site is relatively flat and is covered primarily with bare ground and ruderal vegetation that slopes gently toward Laguna Grande Lake along the east and south sides. The parcel is designated for Visitor-Serving commercial land uses and is the largest
vacant developable parcel within the Laguna Grande Subarea. The project site has been targeted by the City for the development of a hotel or restaurant type of land use.

**Current Issues of Laguna Grande**

Laguna Grande is a coastal resource which possesses both habitat and recreational value of both local and statewide significance. The current environmental issues affecting the subarea are:

- Water quality of the lake
- Sedimentation control
- Pollution from urban runoff
- Tule growth
- Sea level rise

**Protection, Revitalization, and Enhancement Measures for Laguna Grande**

**Recommendations**

Please see the policies and implementation strategies contained within Chapter 3 – Laguna Grande Subarea of Section I of this document for detailed actions on protecting, revitalizing, and enhancing Laguna Grande.
Introduction
This chapter provides a discussion of the existing conditions, current environmental issues, and a bulleted outline of what can be done to protect, revitalize, and enhance the Roberts Lake Subarea.
Existing Conditions

Natural Habitat Resources

The emergent wetlands within the Roberts Lake Subarea consist of bulrush and common cattails as well as the invasive giant European reed along the shoreline. Riparian vegetation also exists along the shoreline and consists of deciduous trees with a thick understory of shrubs, herbaceous growth, and fallen tree limbs. Freshwater marsh areas cover approximately 1.5 acres of Roberts Lake. Together with the freshwater marsh of Laguna Grande, a complex wetland habitat that is rich in wildlife is formed.

Shade trees, shrubs, maintained lawns, and picnic tables line the perimeter of Roberts Lake, which mimics typical residential park environments.

The pedestrian trail system that encircles Roberts Lake and the park improvements (e.g., picnic tables and landscaping) are subjected to ongoing disturbances (e.g., trail maintenance, public usage, and groundskeeping). These trails and park improvements are considered ruderal habitat, a habitat that supports a diverse weedy flora, primarily of nonnative herbs and grasses.

Roberts Lake Subarea is the second to last stop of the seaward journey of Canyon Del Rey Creek. By the time water flow has reached Roberts Lake, it has picked up and carried with it large amounts of sediment and pollutants and has deposited them on the lake bottom of Laguna Grande; however, fine sediments are carried into Roberts Lake. As the flow of water lessens, these fine sediments are deposited on the lake bottom and create an anaerobic environment which hinders fish life and wildlife that depend on a healthy habitat.
Visual Resources

From Highway 1, visitors to Seaside can view Roberts Lake to the east as they travel to the City of Monterey. These views from Highway 1 allow visitors to the Monterey Bay area to experience Roberts Lake as an integral part of the Monterey Bay ecological system.

Water Resources/Quality

The water of Roberts Lake is significantly polluted for several reasons:

- Roberts Lake is significantly polluted due to sedimentation and pollutants carried to it by Canyon Del Rey Creek.
- Roberts Lake’s water quality suffers from siltation, high nutrient level content, low dissolved oxygen, algae blooms, and fish kills. Major pollution sources have been found to be originating from urban runoff, erosion in the watershed, windblown sand from unstabilized sand dunes, and nutrient input from waterfowl.
- Extensive tule growth in Roberts Lake also contributes to nitrogen levels found in the water, further compounding pollution problems.
Robert's Lake Subarea

Natural Hazards
Natural hazards of the surrounding area include earthquakes, impacts from sea level rise, and flooding.

- The Chupines Fault runs along Canyon Del Rey Creek through Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake. The potential for fault rupture within the coastal zone is less than significant.
- The expected peak horizontal acceleration generated by any of the seismic sources potentially affecting the coastal zone have been estimated by the 2005 Seaside Local Hazard Mitigation Plan to occur between 0.61 to 0.70 gravity. This level of ground shaking in the coastal zone is a potentially significant hazard.
- Roberts Lake lies within a flood zone. A 100-year storm could raise the water level of Roberts Lake from 8 feet to 12 feet above sea level. At that water level, most of the park would be inundated.
- The Coastal Zone topography is very gently sloping. Risk of lateral spreading within the coastal zone is considered to be potentially significant.
- According to the Seaside Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, the entire coastal zone is within the Tsunami Evacuation Zone. In the event a tsunami does occur, Roberts Lake would be completely inundated.
- As the effects of global warming continue to impact global climate, the Pacific Ocean is expected to rise, which would create the potential for sea level rise impacts to occur within the Roberts Lake Subarea.

Public Access
- There are two public parking areas for 14 vehicles near the northwestern shore.
- Trail access to Roberts Lake and the Beach Subarea is available from Canyon Del Rey Boulevard as well as from the Monterey Bay Coastal Recreational Trail.

Recreation
- Bird watching is a popular activity at the lake.
- Picnic tables are available to visitors.
- The Roberts Lake trail system connects to the Monterey Bay Coastal Recreational Trail system.
ROBERTS LAKE SUBAREA

Land Use
- Roberts Lake lies in both the City of Monterey and the City of Seaside. The parcels between Roberts Avenue and Highway 1 are in the City of Monterey and consist of dune scrub habitat. A parcel located on the southeastern shore of Roberts Lake is privately owned and currently contains a storage shed that is surrounded by a fence. The City of Seaside owns in fee title all of the area between the Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way and Roberts Avenue.
- Revisions to the coastal zone boundary have resulted in the retention of areas located within 125 feet of the shoreline of Laguna Grande and within 100 feet of the channel connecting Laguna Grande to Roberts Lake.

Development
- At the time of this document, there were no plans for development to occur near or on Roberts Lake.

Current Issues of Roberts Lake
Roberts Lake is a coastal resource which possesses both habitat and recreational value of both local and statewide significance. Current environmental issues of Roberts Lake include:
  - Water quality of the lake
  - Sedimentation control
  - Pollution from runoff
  - Sea level rise

Protection, Revitalization, and Enhancement Measures for Roberts Lake

Recommendations
Please see the policies and implementation strategies contained within Chapter 4 – Roberts Lake Subarea in Section I of this document for detailed actions on protecting, revitalizing, and enhancing Roberts Lake.
Introduction

This chapter provides a discussion of the existing conditions, current environmental issues, and a bulleted outline of what can be done to protect, revitalize, and enhance the Beach Subarea.
Existing Conditions

Natural Habitat Resources

The predominant habitat of the Beach Subarea is coastal dune scrub which consists of the tidal zone and the sandy upland area. The Beach Subarea contains numerous high dunes covered with a combination of beach grass, low shrubs, and other low-lying vegetation. The coastal dune scrub habitat occurs along ridges and hillsides and includes patchy ocean-side cover of shrubs and grassland.

Within Monterey State Beach (California State Park land), there is an area of sand dune habitat that has been restored to allow typical native sand dune species to thrive. Much of the dunes to the east of the Beach Subarea have been designated as sensitive habitat because of the likelihood that sensitive or endangered species may use this habitat as their nesting grounds.

The visitor parking lot, the Monterey Bay Coastal Recreational Trail, and Sand Dunes Drive make up what is called ruderal habitat. Ruderal habitat consists of habitat that occurs in areas of disturbance such as along roadsides, trails, and parking lots. Ruderal habitat supports a diverse array of weedy flora, primarily of nonnative herbs and grasses.

Visual Resources

Magnificent views of the Pacific Ocean’s open water, the Central Coast of California, coastal dunes, and the city lights of Monterey can be enjoyed from the Beach Subarea. The City of Seaside enjoys many coastal views throughout its coastal zone.
From Highway 1, looking west, visitors can view the City of Monterey, the Monterey Bay, and the Pacific Ocean. Views from Highway 1 allow passersby to experience the diversity of habitat that exists on the Monterey Bay Peninsula. Roberts Lake, Laguna Grande, the Beach Subarea, and Monterey Bay can be viewed as a complete ecological system.

**Natural Hazards**

Natural hazards of the surrounding area include earthquakes, flooding, and impacts from sea level rise.

- The Chupines Fault runs along Canyon Del Rey Creek and continues through Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake. However, the potential for fault rupture within the coastal zone is less than significant.
- The expected peak horizontal acceleration generated by any of the seismic sources potentially affecting the coastal zone have been estimated by the 2005 Seaside Local Hazard Mitigation Plan to occur between 0.61 to 0.70 gravity. This level of ground shaking in the coastal zone is a potentially significant hazard.
- The Beach Subarea lies within a flood zone. A 100-year storm could inundate the subarea.
- Coastal zone topography is very gently sloping. Risk of lateral spreading and liquefaction is considered to be potentially significant.
- The Beach Subarea abuts the Pacific Ocean. According to the Seaside Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, the entire coastal zone is within the Tsunami Evacuation Zone. The Beach Subarea would be the hardest hit subarea and would be completely inundated in the event a tsunami occurs.
- As the effects of global warming continue to impact global climate, the Pacific Ocean is expected to rise, which creates the potential for sea level rise impacts to occur within the Beach Subarea.

**Public Access**

The Beach Subarea has a range of existing access points that provide unique opportunities for both local residents and visitors to enjoy.
Public access presently exists to and along the shoreline in the Beach Subarea. The City of Seaside owns an easement that is the extension of Canyon Del Rey Boulevard. Visitor parking exists as a dedicated parking lot abutting the entrance to the Beach Subarea at the end of Canyon Del Rey Boulevard.

The Monterey Bay Coastal Recreational Trail passes through the Beach Subarea, providing visitors access to the entire Central Coast.

The Beach Subarea connects to the Roberts Lake and Laguna Grande subareas via the Monterey Bay Coastal Recreational Trail, allowing visitors to experience the complete dynamic of a wetland habitat community.

**Recreation**

The Beach Subarea consists of a section of 500 linear feet of Del Monte Beach, which extends in its entirety approximately 3 miles from Wharf No. 2 in Monterey through Seaside and Sand City on to Fort Ord Dunes State Park.

- Recreational activities in the Beach Subarea include walking, jogging, surf fishing, and surfing.
- Local residents take advantage of the incoming sea breeze to fly their kites during the summer season.
- The Beach Subarea is an excellent spot to view the sunset along the Pacific Ocean.

**Land Use**

The Beach Subarea lies entirely in the City of Seaside and is somewhat isolated from the rest of Seaside by Highway 1. Land within the Beach Subarea is designated as Coastal Parks and Open Space (CPOS) and Coastal Transportation Corridor (CTC),

- Most of the Beach Subarea is owned and maintained by the State Parks.
- There are no developable private parcels located within the Beach Subarea.

**Development**

- There are no developable parcels located within the Beach Subarea.
Current Issues of the Beach Subarea

The Beach Subarea is a coastal resource that possesses habitat and recreational value of both local and statewide significance. Current environmental issues include:

- Erosion control
- Pollution from urban runoff
- Sea level rise

Protection, Revitalization, and Enhancement measures for the Beach Subarea

Recommendations

Please see the policies and implementation strategies contained within Chapter 5 – Beach Subarea of Section I of this document for detailed actions on protecting, revitalizing, and enhancing the Beach Subarea.
Introduction

This chapter provides a discussion of the existing conditions and a bulleted outline of what is being done to redevelop the Del Monte Subarea.
SECTION II
CHAPTER 6

DELMONTE SUBAREA

Existing Conditions

Natural Habitat Resources

The Del Monte Subarea is located in the southwestern portion of the city, immediately south of the Seaside Auto Mall. Developed areas such as residences and commercial buildings are predominant within the Del Monte Subarea. There are a few vacant parcels which provide small pockets of habitat for degraded coast live oak woodland and/or ruderal grassland communities.

Most of the Del Monte Subarea is of ruderal habitat which exists along roadsides, trails, parking lots, vacant lots, etc. Much of the ruderal habitat in the Del Monte Subarea supports weeds and grasses. Many of the homes and some of the businesses have been landscaped with shrubs and trees.

Visual Resources

- Views of the surrounding hills and of Monterey Bay can and will most likely be seen at the height limit established herein and by the West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan.
- Views of Roberts Lake and Laguna Grande and the dunes to the south can be seen from several locations along Del Monte Boulevard and Canyon Del Rey Boulevard.

Natural Hazards

Natural hazards of the surrounding area include earthquakes, impacts from sea level rise, and flooding.

- The Chupines Fault runs along Canyon Del Rey Creek and continues through Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake. The Seaside Fault is located about 500 feet north of the Coastal Zone. These two faults are the closest and are classified as potentially active. However, the potential for fault rupture within the coastal zone is less than significant.
- The expected peak horizontal acceleration generated by any of the seismic sources potentially affecting the coastal zone have been estimated by the Seaside Local Hazard Mitigation Plan to occur between 0.61 to 0.70 gravity. This level of ground shaking in the coastal zone is a potentially significant hazard.
Coastal zone topography is very gently sloping. Risk of lateral spreading or liquefaction is considered to be potentially significant.

The coastal zone’s Beach Subarea abuts the Pacific Ocean and the Del Monte Subarea is approximately 2,000 to 3,000 feet from the shoreline. According to the Seaside Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, the entire coastal zone is within the Tsunami Evacuation Zone. In the event a tsunami occurs, minimal to major damage to the commercial buildings located within the Del Monte Subarea may occur, depending on the size of the tsunami and the speed it travels.

Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake also lie within a flood zone. A 100-year storm could raise the water level of Laguna Grande from 8 feet to 12 feet above sea level. The Del Monte Subarea is not located within a flood zone area.

Public Access

Trail access to the Roberts Lake, Laguna Grande, and Beach subareas is available along the southern segment of Del Monte Boulevard and along the entire length of Canyon Del Rey Boulevard.

Highway 1 separates the Del Monte Subarea from Monterey Bay.

The Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way is to become the future location of a multimodal transit hub which will improve connectivity between the Monterey Bay and surrounding communities.

Recreation

Roberts Lakes and Laguna Grande are to the southwest of the Del Monte Subarea and offer picnic tables, walking, a playground for neighborhood children, and bird watching activities.

The Monterey Bay Coastal Recreational Trail is also located to the southwest of the Del Monte Subarea and allows for cyclists and walkers to access the rest of the Monterey Bay.

Land Use

Existing land uses within the Del Monte Subarea include mixed use buildings along Del Monte Boulevard, a regional shopping
center, the railroad right-of-way, and heavy commercial near the railroad right-of-way and Sand City boundary. The General Plan (including the West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan) allows for the following land uses:

- **Regional Commercial (CRG):** Regional Commercial uses are defined as large scale commercial development with retail, entertainment, and/or service uses of a scale and function to serve a regional market. These uses are allowed where existing regional commercial uses are developed within the coastal zone. Permitted regional commercial uses include general, grocery, and outdoor retail; shopping center; health and fitness facilities; and restaurants with table service. The maximum FAR is 1.0:1.

- **Heavy Commercial (CH):** Heavy Commercial uses are intended for subregional commercial activities such as auto and truck repair, contractor yards, warehousing, and light manufacturing. These uses are permitted where existing heavy commercial uses are developed within the coastal zone (i.e. near railroad right-of-way adjacent to Sand City boundary).

- **Coastal Mixed Use/West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (CMX/WBUVSP):** Seaside has developed a Mixed Use category as a way to promote pedestrian- and transit-oriented activity centers that have a mixture of residential, commercial, office, and civic uses. This designation is appropriate in the Del Monte Subarea to be consistent and compatible with the West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (WBUVSP). Applicable Development Standards and Design Guidelines from the WBUVSP have been included in Appendix C of the LCP. The City may consider identification and development of transit parking or transit-supporting uses as a component of mixed use within the coastal zone. This category is intended to accommodate a well-integrated mix of high-intensity residential, commercial, office, and civic uses. Housing densities range from 30 to 60 dwelling units per gross acre. Under this designation, residential and commercial uses may be developed on the same parcel (e.g., residential above commercial).

- **Coastal Transportation Corridor (CTC):** The City of Seaside shall maintain the State Highway One right-of-way
and the former Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way as essential public transporation corridors. Principal permitted uses of the corridors are for motorized and non-motorized forms of transportation. The former Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way shall be reserved for possible light rail, bus rapid transit route, or other non-motorized forms of transportation including pedestrian and/or bicycle paths.

**Development**

Development of the Del Monte Subarea is limited to redevelopment of existing regional commercial and heavy commercial uses, and the mixed use area that is subject to the West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan. The purpose of the Specific Plan is to redevelop, revitalize, and enhance the economic, social, cultural, and recreational fabric of Del Monte Boulevard and West Broadway Avenue.

**Current Issues of the Del Monte Subarea**

The Del Monte Subarea does not possess any coastal resources of significance. However, this subarea provides redevelopment opportunities that may include future development of a multi-modal transit station; therefore, linkages between existing recreation trails and potential transit site are an important issue. Current environmental issues include:

- Erosion control
- Pollution from urban runoff
- Flooding
- Sea level rise

**Protection, Revitalization, and Enhancement Measures for the Del Monte Subarea**

**Recommendations**

Please see the policies and implementation strategies contained within Chapter 6 – Del Monte Subarea of Section I of this document for detailed actions on protecting, revitalizing, and enhancing the Del Monte Subarea.
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1.1 **Purpose of the Coastal Implementation Plan**

This document establishes the City of Seaside Coastal Implementation Plan representing the Coastal Zoning Ordinance, for the City of Seaside’s Local Coastal Program (LCP), prepared in accordance with the California Coastal Act (CCA) of 1976. As provided by the CCA, an LCP consists of two major components: the Land Use Plan (LUP) and the Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP). Whereas the LUP designates the kinds, location, and intensity of land and water uses and presents applicable resource protection and development policies, the CIP provides development regulations for specific coastal zone activities needed to carry out the LUP. Accordingly, the City of Seaside CIP describes the various implementation measures needed to carry out the City of Seaside LUP.

The purpose of this Title is to implement the City’s LUP and to protect and promote the public health, safety, peace, comfort, convenience, and general welfare of the City. More specifically, this Title is intended:

- To encourage public access to the lake and beach shorelines, while minimizing adverse impacts on dune and marsh habitats and ensuring public safety from water run-up hazards.
- To maximize, to the extent feasible, the recreational potential of the Laguna Grande, Roberts Lake, Beach, and Del Monte subareas, while at the same time preventing damage to or minimizing the loss of major natural habitat areas.
- To minimize safety hazards and impacts from natural and man-induced hazards.
- To preserve and enhance coastal vistas, views, and view corridors while recognizing the rights of private property owners and the demands for visitor-serving facilities.
- To minimize dredging and filling unrelated to water quality considerations, while recognizing the recreational needs for open space.
- To provide coastal access, visitor-serving facilities, and public improvements within the funding constraints of the public sector.
- To allow land uses which respond to the institutional and natural constraints of the land and which minimize disturbance of the surrounding land area.
- To preserve and enhance the natural resources, environmental quality, and community character of the coastal zone.
- To promote the development of run-off control measures capable of minimizing water quality impacts, including from siltation and to Laguna Grande and the Monterey Bay.

1.2 **Applicability**

*This Title applies to all development within the coastal zone of the City of Seaside.*

1.3 **Adoption**

Adoption of this Title by the City of Seaside Planning Commission is pursuant to the authority contained in Public Resources Code Sections 30000 et seq. (Coastal Act) and Title 14, Division 5.5 of the California Code of Regulations.

Upon adoption the terms, conditions, maps, and regulations of this Title shall govern, supersede, and replace the provisions included in the City’s Zoning Map and Zoning Code Sections 17.24.070 – CRG Coastal Zone Standards; 17.24.080 – CA
Zone Standards; 17.26 – Special Purposes Zones; 17.28.030 – Coastal Zone (CZ) Overlay Zone; and Section 17.52.082 – Coastal Development Permit.

1.4 Reference

This Title of the City of Seaside Municipal Code (Title 18.10) shall be known and cited as the “City of Seaside Coastal Zoning Ordinance.”

1.5 Responsibility for Administration

This Title shall be administered by: the Seaside City Planning Commission, referred to as the "Commission"; the Zoning Administrator, the Deputy City Manager – Resource Management Services Department, referred to as the "Deputy City Manager"; and the Resource Management Services Department, hereafter referred to as the "Department."

1.6 Conflict with Other Provisions

If there is a conflict between a provision of this Title and a provision of the General Plan, or any other City-adopted plan, resolution, or ordinance not included in this Title, the regulations outlined in this Title shall prevail.

1.7 Severability

If any chapter, section, subsection, paragraph, sentence, clause, phrase, or other portion of this Title is for any reason held to be invalid or unenforceable by a court, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of the Title.
2.1 Purpose

The purpose of this Chapter is to establish the zoning districts and related components of the implementation plan, including all zoning uses, regulations and requirements consistent with the policies and provisions in the Land Use Plan (LUP), applicable to all areas within the City of Seaside coastal zone.

2.2 Compliance

All properties within the coastal zone shall be subject to compliance with applicable regulations herein. Specifically, the following rules shall apply to property within designated Coastal Zoning Districts:

A. No structure shall be erected and no existing structure shall be moved, altered, added to, or enlarged, nor shall any land, structure, or premises be used, designated, or intended to be used for any purpose, or in any manner other than is included among the uses hereinafter listed as permitted in the district in which such structure, land, or premises is located.

B. No structure shall be erected, reconstructed, or structurally altered to exceed in height the limit hereinafter designated for the district in which such structure is located.

C. No structure shall be erected, altered, enlarged, or rebuilt, except in conformity to the setback, building site area, structure location, and other applicable regulations hereinafter designated for the district in which such structure is located.

D. No use shall be established, expanded, altered, changed, or otherwise modified except as provided for in the terms of this Title.

2.3 Establishment and Designation of Coastal Zoning Districts

A. Establishment of Coastal Zoning Districts. The City of Seaside coastal zone is hereby divided into seven Coastal Zoning Districts as shown below in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COASTAL ZONING SYMBOL</th>
<th>COASTAL ZONE DISTRICT NAME</th>
<th>PURPOSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPOS</td>
<td>Coastal Parks and Open Space</td>
<td>To protect and preserve coastal resources, including sensitive habitats, public views, and other visual amenities, and public recreational access opportunities, within the coastal zone. This zone is also applied to existing or planned coastal parkland. Public use areas include sandy beaches, access ways, parks, trails, walkways, and other recreational amenities that are publicly owned or over which easements have been established, including where they are required as a condition of development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVSC</td>
<td>Coastal Visitor-Serving Commercial</td>
<td>To establish areas to service the needs of visitors to Seaside and the surrounding area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVSR</td>
<td>Coastal Visitor-Serving Recreation</td>
<td>To establish areas to service the recreational needs of visitors to Seaside and the surrounding area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMXWBUVSP</td>
<td>Coastal Mixed Use / West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan</td>
<td>To promote pedestrian- and transit-oriented activity centers that have a mix of residential, commercial, office, and civic uses. This designation is appropriate in a portion of the Del Monte Subarea consistent and compatible with the West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan. The City may consider identification and development of transit parking or...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## COASTAL ZONING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COASTAL ZONING SYMBOL</th>
<th>COASTAL ZONE DISTRICT NAME</th>
<th>PURPOSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>supporting uses as a component of this designation within the coastal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>zone. This designation is intended to accommodate an active mixed-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>use corridor along Del Monte Boulevard as identified in the West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCRG</td>
<td>Coastal Regional Commercial</td>
<td>To establish areas with existing regional commercial uses that provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>employment generating opportunities for the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCH</td>
<td>Coastal Heavy Commercial</td>
<td>To establish areas with existing heavy commercial uses (i.e.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>automotive repair shops, contractor yards, light manufacturing, utility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>substations, and warehousing).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC</td>
<td>Coastal Transportation Corridor</td>
<td>To accommodate motorized and non-motorized forms of transportation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Designation of Coastal Zoning Districts

The designations, locations, and boundaries of districts are set forth on the City of Seaside Coastal Zoning Map, originally dated April 28, 2010. The City of Seaside Coastal Zoning Map is on file with the City Clerk and is illustrated in Figures 2a and 2b. This map may be amended by ordinance of the Planning Commission subject to certification by the California Coastal Commission.

### 2.4 Development Requiring Coastal Development Permit

All development as it is defined in Chapter 4 requires a Coastal Permit (i.e., a Coastal Administrative Permit or a Coastal Development Permit). The following types of development require a Coastal Development Permit (and may not be approved via a Coastal Administrative Permit) in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 3 of this Title regardless of which Coastal Zoning District or category of allowed uses it falls into:

A. Development which is deemed to have the potential to cause a significant environmental impact pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

B. Development within a visual resource area as identified on Figure 2-4, Views and Viewsheds to Visual Resources, of the LUP.

C. Development within 100 feet of mapped or field-identified wetlands or Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA).

D. Development within 750 feet of a known archaeological resource as identified through an archaeological survey report.

E. Development within a natural hazard area as defined in Chapter 4 or on soils with a high or very high erosion hazard potential, according to the Soil Conservation Service Soil Survey Manual.
2.5. Allowed Land Uses and Permit Requirements for Coastal Zoning Districts

A. Except as otherwise provided in this Title, persons wishing to undertake any development in the coastal zone shall obtain either: a Coastal Administrative Permit (CAP) for development associated with Principal Allowable Uses that: (1) as proposed is consistent with the LCP; (2) requires no discretionary approval other than a Coastal Permit; and (3) has no adverse effect either individually or cumulatively on coastal resources, including public access; or a Coastal Development Permit (CDP) for development associated with Conditional Allowable Uses or any other use/development not meeting the criteria for a CAP, in accordance with the provisions of this Title.

B. Table 2, below, summarizes the uses allowed in the Coastal Zoning Districts and identifies where such uses are principally permitted (P), conditionally permitted (UP), or not allowed (--) in compliance with this Title.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE (1)</th>
<th>PERMIT REQUIREMENTS BY ZONING DISTRICT(2,3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE, RESOURCE &amp; OPEN SPACE</td>
<td>CPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological restoration activities</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat management</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature preserve</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public use recreation</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDUSTRY, MANUFACTURING &amp; PROCESSING, WHOLESALING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing/processing – Light</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Development</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory – analysis, research and development, testing</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECREATION, EDUCATION &amp; PUBLIC ASSEMBLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating and related facilities (structures such as boathouses and launches)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biking and related facilities (structures such as bike racks and lockers)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference/convention facility</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library, museum, art gallery</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports and entertainment assembly</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive center/environmental education activities</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnivals, festivals, races not lasting more than three (3) days and not involving permanent facilities</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting facility, public or private</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/Fitness facility</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic area</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park, playground</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike trail</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light rail</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian path</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETAIL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal recreational equipment rental</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture, furnishings, and appliance store</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Center</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Retail – 5,000 SF or larger</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Retail – Less than 5,000 SF</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor retail sales and activities</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant, café – coffee shop – table service</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant, café – counter service such as a snack bar ancillary to a primary use</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant, café – fast food</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LAND USE (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMIT REQUIREMENTS BY ZONING DISTRICT(2,3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restaurant, café – drive-through</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winery/wine tasting</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SERVICES

| Lodging – hotel, motel, or inn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kennel, Animal Boarding |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Visitor/traveler support services |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Catering service |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Service stations |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maintenance Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Repair |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |

### ACCESSORY STRUCTURES

| Accessory structures and accessory uses appurtenant to any principal allowed use provided there is no intensification of the permitted use |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Accessory structures and uses prior to establishment of allowed main use or structure |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum accessory facilities, such as restrooms, parking accessory to other principal permitted uses |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:

(1) Refer to Chapter 4 – Definitions for land use definitions.
(2) See Table 1 for district name and purpose.
(3) Additional permits (such as building permits) may be required.

Refer to the applicable Development Standards and Design Guidelines for the West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan for specific land uses and permit requirements (LCP Appendix C). P Principal (Permitted) use allowed, Coastal Administrative Permit or Coastal Development Permit required (refer to Chapter 3) unless exempt.
UP Conditional use allowed, Coastal Development Permit required (refer to Chapter 3) unless exempt.
-- Use not allowed.

### 2.6 Site Development Standards

The following development standards apply to all property within the Coastal Zoning Districts as outlined in Table 3 below. Please refer to Section 2.7 for additional special development standards that may apply.

#### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Standard (1,6)</th>
<th>ZONING DISTRICT(2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum Structure Height</strong> (except where lower heights are necessary to protect public views 4,7)</td>
<td>24 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Setbacks</strong></td>
<td>30 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum Building Site Coverage</strong></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Lot Area</strong></td>
<td>1 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Lot Width</strong></td>
<td>300 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Development Standard (1,6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Standard</th>
<th>ZONING DISTRICT(2)</th>
<th>CPO</th>
<th>CVSC</th>
<th>CVSR</th>
<th>CCRG</th>
<th>CCH</th>
<th>CMX/ WBUVSP(3)</th>
<th>CTC(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Depth</td>
<td></td>
<td>500 ft.</td>
<td>125 ft.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation (Caltrans), Transportation Agency of Monterey County (TAMC), and/or Southern Pacific Railroad Standards, as applicable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Parking Requirements
- See 2.6.A Parking Requirements below.

#### Landscaping Requirements
- See 2.6.B Landscaping Requirements below.

#### Lighting Requirements
- See 2.6.C Lighting Requirements below. See also Section 2.7, Special Development Standards for additional requirements

#### Sign Requirements
- See 2.6.D Sign Requirements below.

#### Floor Area Ratio (FAR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPO</th>
<th>CVSC</th>
<th>CVSR</th>
<th>CCRG</th>
<th>CCH</th>
<th>CMX/ WBUVSP</th>
<th>CTC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.01:1</td>
<td>1.0:1</td>
<td>0.5:1</td>
<td>1.0:1</td>
<td>0.5:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Special Regulations for Hotels/Motels

- Maximum Hotel/Motel Density: 1.5:1 FAR
- Hotels/Motels Parking: 1 space per guestroom; plus two for every 50 rooms; plus parking as required for accessory uses

### Notes:
1. Refer to Chapter 4 — Definitions for definitions.
2. See Table 1 for district name and purpose.
3. Refer to the applicable Development Standards and Design Guidelines for the West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan for specific land uses and permit requirements (LCP Appendix C).
4. LUP Figure 2-4, Views and Viewsheds to Visual Resources, of the LUP shall be used to assist the City in identifying significant public views of natural features within the coastal zone to identify viewshed enhancement areas and identify sensitive areas where height and bulk limits shall be required.
5. State Highway 1 right-of-way is owned by Caltrans. Railroad right-of-way is owned by Southern Pacific Railroad. Bike path improvements may be subject to TAMC requirements.
6. The identified site development standards represent maximum and minimum thresholds for compliance, and not entitlements to those exact dimensions. Depending on actual site constraints, standards that are less than the maximum or more than the minimum standards may be required to ensure adequate coastal resource protection (e.g., a structure may be required to be limited to a lesser height than the maximum allowed height to adequately protect public views).
7. Refer to Section 2.7 for Special Development Standards for each subarea.

### A. Parking Requirements

#### General Parking Requirements

- These requirements are intended to ensure that suitable off-street parking and loading facilities are provided for all uses and developments, and that the facilities are properly designed, attractive, and located to be unobtrusive while meeting the needs of the specific use. Each land use and structure, including a change or expansion of a land use or structure, shall provide suitable off-street parking and loading facilities. A land use shall not be commenced and a structure shall not be occupied until the parking and loading improvements required by this chapter are completed and approved.

#### a. Parking and Loading Spaces to be Permanent

- Each parking and loading space shall be permanently available, marked, and maintained for parking or loading purposes for the use it is intended to serve; provided that the approval of a limited term permit may allow the temporary use of a parking or loading space for other purposes.

- Subdivision of Property. No subdivision shall be approved that has the effect of reducing existing on-site parking below the minimum number of spaces required by this chapter.

- Lot Re-Striping. A parking lot shall not be re-striped to reduce the number of parking spaces below the minimum required by this chapter.
b. **Parking and Loading to be Unrestricted.** A lessee, owner, tenant, or other person having control of the operation of a premises for which parking or loading spaces are required by this chapter shall not prevent, prohibit, or restrict authorized persons from using the spaces without the prior approval of the zoning administrator.

c. **Vehicles for Sale.** No vehicle, trailer, or other personal property shall be parked on private property for the purpose of displaying the vehicle, trailer, or other personal property for hire, rental, or sale, unless the applicable zone allows the use, and the person or business at that location is licensed to sell vehicles, trailers, or other personal property.

d. **Recreational Vehicle (RV) Parking**
   
   (1) The storage (parking for any period longer than seventy-two hours) of a recreational vehicle (RV) and/or boat in a residential zone shall be allowed only when all portions of the vehicle or boat are located entirely within the property boundaries and do not extend into the public right-of-way.

   (2) Parking within setback areas shall also comply with Setback Requirements and Exceptions - Limitations on the use of setbacks.

e. **Cargo Containers.** No shipping container (e.g., metal "Seatrain" or other similar cargo container) shall be stored within a designated parking space or loading area.

2. **Number of parking spaces required.** Each land use shall be provided the number of off-street parking spaces required.

a. **Parking requirements by Land Use**

   (1) Each land use shall provide the number of off-street parking spaces required by Table 4, except where a greater number of spaces is authorized through minor use permit or use permit approval.

   (2) A land use not specifically listed in Table 4 shall provide parking as required by the zoning administrator. The zoning administrator shall use the requirements in Table 4 as a guide in determining the appropriate number of off-street parking spaces required for the use.

   (3) In any case where Table 4 expresses a parking requirement based on floor area in square feet (for example: one space for each one thousand sf), "sf" means square feet of gross interior leaseable floor area, unless stated otherwise (e.g., ground area).

   (4) A single use with accessory components shall provide parking for each component. For example, a hotel with a gift shop shall provide the parking spaces required by Table 4 for a hotel (e.g., the guest rooms), and for a gift shop.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
<th>Vehicle Spaces Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All manufacturing, industrial, and processing</td>
<td>1 space for each 200 sf of office area;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uses, except the following</td>
<td>1 space for each 500 sf of floor and/or ground area devoted to other than office use;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 space for each 5,000 sf of open storage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media production</td>
<td>1 space for each 300 sf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling facilities:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy or light processing facilities</td>
<td>Determined by use permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large collection facilities</td>
<td>Determined by use permit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Land Use Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
<th>Vehicle Spaces Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scrap/dismantling yards</td>
<td>1 space for each 300 sf, plus 1 space for each 10,000 sf of gross yard area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small collection facilities</td>
<td>Determined by minor use permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesaling and distribution</td>
<td>1 space for each 500 sf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recreation, Education, and Public Assembly</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs, community centers, lodges, and meeting halls</td>
<td>1 space for each 4 fixed seats or 1 space for each 100 sf where there are no fixed seats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial recreation facilities - Indoor, except for the following:</td>
<td>1 space for each 400 sf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcades</td>
<td>1 space for each 200 sf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling alleys</td>
<td>4 spaces for each alley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool and billiard rooms</td>
<td>2 spaces for each table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial recreation facilities - Outdoor</td>
<td>Determined by use permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference/convention and sports/entertainment facilities</td>
<td>1 space for each 200 sf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retail and Service Commercial</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group One: Uses with &quot;low parking demand.&quot; Examples include appliance, carpet, fabric, furniture, and tile stores; book, card, and stationary stores; camera, dry cleaning and laundry, flower, gift, glass, hardware, heating and electrical, jewelry, paint, pet, plumbing, wallpaper stores; home improvement stores; photography studios, print shops; supermarkets; and other retail and light industrial uses determined to be similar by the zoning administrator.</td>
<td>1 space for each 500 sf or less, with a minimum requirement of 4 spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Two: Uses with &quot;medium parking demand.&quot; Examples include bakeries, banks, barber shops, beauty shops, business and professional offices, convenience stores, department stores, donut and ice cream shops, liquor stores, secondhand stores, and other retail uses determined to be similar by the zoning administrator.</td>
<td>1 space for each 300 sf or less, with a minimum requirement of 5 spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Three: Uses with &quot;high parking demand.&quot; Examples include bars, coffee houses, dental and medical offices and clinics, health clubs, laundromats, restaurants and other intense uses determined to be similar by the zoning administrator.</td>
<td>1 space for each 200 sf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Four: Uses with &quot;unique parking demands.&quot; Examples include auto repair, auto sales, contractor's yards, funeral homes, gas stations, hotels and motels, large day care facilities (e.g., child care and seniors), large group homes, mini-warehouse, self-service car wash, theaters, and other uses determined to be similar by the zoning administrator.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto and vehicle repair/service</td>
<td>4 spaces for each service or wash bay, plus spaces for any office as required by this section for offices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto and vehicle sales and rental</td>
<td>1 space for each 400 sf of floor area for the showroom and offices, plus 1 space for each 2,000 sf of outdoor display area, plus spaces as required by this section for parts sales and vehicle repair/service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor's storage yards</td>
<td>1 space for each 3,000 sf of lot area, plus spaces for any office as required by this section for offices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas stations without repair services</td>
<td>0.25 space for each gas pump, plus 2 spaces for each gasoline pump island, plus spaces as required by this section for convenience goods sales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging - hotels and motels</td>
<td>1 space for each unit, plus 2 spaces for the manager or owner, plus required spaces for all accessory uses (e.g., conference center, restaurant, spa, or other recreational facilities).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal storage (mini-warehouses)</td>
<td>4 spaces for the manager's office.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Land Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
<th>Vehicle Spaces Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>1 space for each 3 seats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-service car washes</td>
<td>1 space for each wash bay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theaters (e.g., movie)</td>
<td>1 space for each 4 seats or 1 space for each 100 sf, whichever would yield more spaces.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. **Expansion of Structure, Change in Use.** When a structure is enlarged, or when a change in its use requires more off-street parking than the previous use, additional parking spaces shall be provided in compliance with this chapter.

c. **Multi-Tenant Sites**

   (1) A site with multiple tenants (e.g., two or more) shall provide the aggregate number of parking spaces required for each separate use (e.g., sum of the separate requirements for each use), except where the site is developed as an integrated shopping center with shared parking and no spaces reserved for a particular use. In this instance, the parking shall be provided as required by Table 4 for a shopping center.

   (2) When a multi-tenant center includes one or more uses that will need more parking than retail uses (e.g., a health/fitness facility, restaurant, or theater) additional parking shall be required for the non-retail use unless a parking reduction is approved in compliance Reduction of Parking Requirements, below.

d. **Alternate Use of Parking Areas Prohibited**. Off-street parking areas shall not be used for the repair, servicing, or storage of vehicles or materials, the sale of any goods or services, or any other work area.

e. **Recreational Vehicle (RV) Parking Spaces**. Off-street recreational vehicle (RV) parking spaces shall be provided as follows for retail uses, shopping centers, and visitor attractions that are required by this chapter to provide forty or more off-street parking spaces.

   (1) RV parking spaces shall be provided at a minimum ratio of one RV space for each forty off-street vehicle parking spaces, or fraction thereof, required by this chapter.

   (2) Each RV parking space shall be designed as a pull-through space with a minimum width of twelve feet and a minimum length of forty feet, with fourteen feet of vertical clearance.

f. **Rounding of Calculations**. If a fractional number is obtained in calculations performed in compliance with this chapter, one additional parking space shall be required for a fractional unit of one-half or above, and no additional space shall be required for a fractional unit of less than one-half.

g. **Estimating Spaces**. Where fixed seating is provided as benches, bleachers, pews, or similar seating, a seat shall be defined as twenty-four inches of bench space for the purpose of calculating the number of parking spaces required by Table 4. Whenever parking requirements are based on the number of employees, calculations shall be based on the largest number of employees on duty at any one time.

h. **Nonconforming Parking**. A use or structure with nonconforming off-street parking may be physically changed or undergo a change in use in compliance with the following provisions.

   (1) The number of existing parking spaces shall be maintained on the site and additional parking shall be provided in compliance with this chapter for any additional floor area.

   (2) If the use of the structure is changed to one that requires more parking than the previous use, only the difference between the number of parking spaces required for the previous use and those required for the new use shall be added.

   (3) The change shall not eliminate the only portion of the site that can be used for the required or existing parking or access.
i. **Reduction of Parking Requirements.** No off-street parking facility shall be reduced in capacity or in area without sufficient additional capacity or additional area being provided in order to comply with the parking regulations unless they meet the following requirements.

   (1) **Shared On-Site Parking.** Where two or more adjacent nonresidential uses have distinct and differing peak parking usage periods (e.g., a theater and a bank), a reduction in the required number of parking spaces may be allowed through use permit approval. Approval shall also require a recorded covenant running with the land, recorded by the owner of the parking lot, guaranteeing that the required parking will be maintained exclusively for the use served for the duration of the use.

   (2) **Reduction of Required Parking.** The number of parking spaces may be reduced through the granting of a minor use permit based on quantitative information provided by the applicant that documents the need for fewer spaces (e.g., sales receipts, documentation of customer frequency, information on parking standards required for the proposed land use by other cities, etc.).

j. **Waiver of Requirements.** The parking requirements of this chapter may be waived through use permit approval when a nonconforming structure is proposed for rehabilitation if the Planning Commission first finds that the existing structure location, parcel size, or topography renders the requirement unreasonable.

3. **Additional Parking Provisions**

   a. **Disabled Parking Requirements.** Each non-residential development shall provide the following number of parking spaces for the disabled: One parking space for the disabled shall be provided within a parking lot with less than twenty-five spaces; and larger parking lots (e.g., with twenty-five or more spaces) shall include additional spaces for the disabled as required by state or federal law. Parking spaces required for the disabled shall count toward compliance with the minimum number of off-street parking spaces required by this chapter.

      Each parking space for the disabled shall have a minimum width of fourteen feet. All spaces for the disabled shall be located so that: The spaces provide easy access from the closest parking area to the major entrances of the use for which they are provided; the disabled individual is not compelled to wheel or walk behind parked cars other than his or her own; and a pedestrian way accessible to physically disabled persons shall be provided from each parking space to related facilities including curb cuts and/or ramps.

   b. **Bicycle Parking Requirements.** Each multi-family project and nonresidential land use shall provide bicycle parking. A multi-family project shall provide bicycle parking spaces equal to a minimum of ten percent of the required vehicle spaces, unless separate secured garage space is provided for each unit. The bicycle spaces shall be distributed throughout the project. A nonresidential project (e.g., office, retail, etc.) shall provide bicycle parking spaces equal to a minimum of five percent of the required vehicle spaces, distributed to serve customers and employees of the project.

      Each bicycle parking space shall include a stationary parking device to adequately secure the bicycle, shall be a minimum of two feet in width and six feet in length, with a minimum of seven feet of overhead clearance, and shall be conveniently located and generally within proximity to the main entrance of a structure.

   c. **Motorcycle Parking Requirements.** A parking lot with fifty or more vehicle parking spaces shall provide motorcycle parking spaces conveniently located near the main entrance to the primary structure and accessed by the same access aisles that serve the vehicle parking spaces in the parking lot. A minimum of one motorcycle parking space shall be provided for each fifty vehicle spaces or fraction thereof. Motorcycle spaces shall have minimum dimensions of four feet by seven feet.

   d. **Public Access Parking.** Public access parking and related facilities shall be provided at and/or adjacent to all identified beach, park, and open space areas commensurate with demand for such
facilities and the need to provide post-construction water quality measures including Low Impact Design (LiD) strategies identified in the Water Quality section below (Section G.5.b).

4. **Parking Design and Development Standards.** Required parking areas shall be designed, constructed, and properly maintained in compliance with the following requirements.

a. **Parking Lots Access and Circulation.** Parking areas shall provide suitable maneuvering area so that vehicles enter from and exit to a public street in a forward direction only. Parking lots shall be designed to prevent access at any point other than at designated access drives. Multi-family dwellings units are exempt from this requirement, unless specifically required by conditions of a discretionary permit. This requirement does not apply to alleys, unless so specified in a specific zone. A nonresidential development that provides fifty or more parking spaces shall have access driveways that are not intersected by a parking aisle, parking space, or another access driveway for a minimum distance of twenty feet from the street right-of-way, to provide a queuing or stacking area for vehicles entering and exiting the parking area. A minimum unobstructed clearance height of fourteen feet shall be maintained above areas accessible to vehicles within nonresidential developments.

b. **Location of Parking.** Parking shall be located on the same parcel as the uses served or within three hundred feet of the parcel if shared parking or public parking facilities are used to meet parking requirements. A greater distance may be authorized by the commission through use permit approval. Parking may be located within a required side or rear setback; provided that it is separated from the side or rear property line by a minimum five-foot wide landscaped area.

c. **Parking Lot Access on Adjacent Sites.** Developments are encouraged to provide on-site vehicle access to parking areas on adjacent properties to provide for convenience, safety and efficient circulation. A joint access agreement running with the land shall be recorded by the owners of the abutting properties guaranteeing the continued availability of the shared access between the properties.

d. **Parking Stall and Lot Dimensions.** The standard parking shall be a minimum wide of 9-feet wide and 19-feet long. However, depending the stall orientation and angle the length and depth of the stall may vary as shown in Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stall Orientation</th>
<th>Stall Width</th>
<th>Stall Depth (Measures Perpendicular to aisle)</th>
<th>Stall Length</th>
<th>Aisle Width</th>
<th>One-Way</th>
<th>Two-Way</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Parking Stalls</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel</td>
<td>9'</td>
<td>9'</td>
<td>22'</td>
<td>12'</td>
<td>24'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30°</td>
<td>9'</td>
<td>18'</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>12'</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45°</td>
<td>9'</td>
<td>20' 6&quot;</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>14'</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60°</td>
<td>9'</td>
<td>22'</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>18'</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpendicular</td>
<td>9'</td>
<td>19'</td>
<td>19'</td>
<td>24'</td>
<td>24'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compact Parking Stalls</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel</td>
<td>8'</td>
<td>8'</td>
<td>18'</td>
<td>12'</td>
<td>24'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30°</td>
<td>8'</td>
<td>15' 6&quot;</td>
<td>16'</td>
<td>12'</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45°</td>
<td>8'</td>
<td>17'</td>
<td>16'</td>
<td>14'</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60°</td>
<td>8'</td>
<td>18'</td>
<td>16'</td>
<td>18'</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpendicular</td>
<td>8'</td>
<td>16'</td>
<td>16'</td>
<td>24'</td>
<td>24'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
e. **Use of Compact Vehicle Spaces.** The first ten spaces of any project shall be standard sized spaces. In multi-family residential projects, up to thirty percent of the required uncovered parking spaces may be compact spaces (8-feet wide by 16-feet wide). For nonresidential projects, up to thirty percent of the required parking spaces may be compact spaces. Compact spaces shall be clearly labeled for "compact cars" and grouped together in one or more locations or at regular intervals so that only compact vehicles can easily maneuver into the space.

f. **Proper Grading, Surfacing and Maintenance of Parking Lots Required.** All grading plans relating to the parking facilities shall be reviewed and approved by the city engineer before any work can commence. All off-street parking facilities shall be properly graded and drained so as to dispose of all surface water accumulated within the area of the parking lot. In no instance shall a storm drainage facility be designed to allow the flow of water into abutting property. All parking spaces and maneuvering areas shall be properly surfaced with two inches of asphaltic concrete over a five-inch aggregate base, or comparable material as determined by the city engineer.

g. **Vehicle Overhanging Landscaped Area or Walkway Prohibited.** The required length of a parking space shall not provide for a vehicle overhanging a landscaped area or walkway.

h. **Water Quality Requirement.** Post-Construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) and water quality mitigation measures such as site design and source control BMPs, including Low Impact Development (LID) techniques, shall be incorporated into all parking and loading facilities projects to minimize impacts from storm water runoff and dry weather flows (see Water Quality Section G.5.b).

5. **Driveways and Site Access.** Each driveway providing site access from a street, alley, or other public right-of-way shall be designed, constructed, and properly maintained in compliance with the following.

a. **Number of Driveways.** The number and placement of driveways shall be limited as follows, provided that second driveways or additional curb cuts may be approved by the Traffic Advisory Committee. A multi-family or nonresidential development project on a parcel of two acres or less shall be limited to a maximum of two driveways, unless the city engineer determines that more than two driveways are required to accommodate the traffic for the project. Whenever a property has access to more than one street, access shall be generally limited to the lowest volume street where the impact of a new access will be minimized.

b. **Distance from Street Corners and Spacing.** Each driveway shall be separated from the nearest street intersection as follows, except where the city engineer allows less separation: A minimum of one hundred fifty feet from the nearest intersection, as measured from the centerline of the driveway to the centerline of the nearest travel lane of the intersecting street. For parcels with frontages less than one hundred fifty feet, the minimum distance shall be one hundred feet. Where two or more driveways serve the same or adjacent multi-family or nonresidential development, the centerline of the driveways shall be separated by a minimum of fifty feet. The city engineer may approve exceptions to this standard.

c. **Driveway Dimensions.** A driveway for a multi-family or nonresidential development shall have a minimum paved width of thirteen feet for a one-way driveway and twenty-six feet for a two-way driveway. The maximum driveway width shall be thirty-five feet, exclusive of any area provided for a median divider. Where unpaved driveways are otherwise allowed by this title or the review authority, each driveway shall be paved with concrete or asphalt for a minimum length of twenty feet from the public right-of-way.

d. **Clearance.** The nearest edge of a driveway curb cut shall be at least three feet from the nearest property line, the centerline of a fire hydrant, light standard, traffic signal, utility pole or other similar facility. Street trees shall be a minimum of 10-feet from the driveway access, measured at the trunk. A driveway shall have an overhead clearance of 14-feet in height except within a parking structure, which may be reduced to seven feet, six inches.
6. **Loading Space Requirements.** Off-street loading spaces shall be provided, unless determined by the City that the operating, shipping, and delivery characteristics of the use do not require the number or type of loading spaces required. Nonresidential uses shall provide off-street loading spaces as follows:

| Floor Area Under 15,000 Square Feet | None required; except grocery store greater than 5,000 sf. requires 1 space. |
| Floor Area 15,000 to 50,000 Square Feet | 1 space |
| Floor Area Over 50,000 Square Feet | 2 spaces |

a. **Loading Space Types.** Loading docks instead of loading spaces shall be required at big box stores, home improvement centers, and large shopping centers. Loading spaces, rather than loading docks, shall be required for convenience stores, offices, restaurants, small shopping centers where truck deliveries occur on a regular basis, but where a loading dock is not necessary.

b. **Development Standards.** Loading spaces shall be a minimum of 12-feet in width, 40-feet in length, with 14-feet of vertical clearance. Loading areas shall have lighting capable of providing adequate illumination for security and safety.

c. **Location.** Loading spaces shall be as near as possible to the main structure and limited to the rear two-thirds of the parcel, if feasible; situated to ensure that the loading facility is screened from adjacent streets; situated to ensure that loading and unloading takes place on-site and in no case faces a public street, or is located within a required front or street side setback, adjacent public right-of-way, or other on-site traffic circulation areas; and situated to ensure that all vehicular maneuvers occur on-site. The loading areas shall allow vehicles to enter from and exit to a public street in a forward motion only. Loading areas shall avoid adverse impacts upon neighboring residential properties. The review authority may restrict times allowed for loading and deliveries for loading spaces that are located closer than one hundred feet to a residential zone.

d. **Screening.** Loading areas shall be screened from abutting parcels and streets with a combination of dense landscaping and solid masonry walls with a minimum height of 6-feet.

e. **Striping.** Loading spaces shall be striped, and identified for "loading only." The striping and "loading only" notations shall be continuously maintained in a clear and visible manner in compliance with the approved plans.

f. **Surfacing.** All loading areas shall be surfaced with asphalt, concrete pavement, or comparable material as determined by the city engineer.

B. **Landscaping Requirements**

1. **General Landscaping Requirements.** For purposes of this section, landscaping shall mean the placement of materials (e.g., berms, decorative fences and walls, flowers, grass, groundcover, hedges, shrubs and trees) within a designated area.

a. To conserve water, the installation of native and/or drought-tolerant landscape materials is strongly encouraged.

b. All parts of a site not devoted to decks, patios, structures, and similar improvements, driveway and/or parking improvements, lighting, sidewalks, signs, and solid waste/recyclable materials collection and storage shall be landscaped in compliance with this section and this title.

c. Within coastal strand vegetation areas, undeveloped dune areas, steep dunes, and steep slope areas (those in excess of twenty-five percent slope) shall be landscaped with native, non-invasive plant species to maximize opportunities for native habitat restoration.
d. A master restoration plan shall be prepared by a qualified professional for any undeveloped private
dune areas, as well as all public dune areas situated within the coastal zone.

e. Where feasible and practical, landscaping shall be designed to address post-construction water quality
site design and Low Impact Design (LID) requirements (e.g., as bio-filtration, vegetated swales, or
similar) and to minimize adverse impacts from storm water runoff and dry weather flows.

2. Landscaping of Parking Lots. Parking lots shall be landscaped as follows:

a. Amount of Landscaping. Multi-family, commercial, and industrial uses shall provide landscaping within
each outdoor parking area at a minimum ratio of ten percent of the gross area of the parking lot. The
Board of Architectural Review may grant an exception for small, infill parking lots where compliance with
this standard is not feasible without significantly reducing the number of parking spaces. Trees not less
than five feet in height and fifteen-gallon container in size shall be planted throughout the parcel and
along any street frontage. At a minimum, one shade tree shall be provided for every five parking spaces.

b. Landscape Materials. Landscaping shall be provided throughout the parking lot as a combination of
groundcover, shrubs, and trees.

c. Location of Landscaping. Landscaping shall be evenly dispersed throughout the parking area, as
follows:

(1) Orchard-style planting (the placement of trees in uniformly-spaced rows) is encouraged for larger
parking areas;

(2) Parking lots with more than fifty spaces shall provide a concentration of landscape elements at
primary entrances, including, at a minimum, specimen trees, flowering plants, enhanced paving,
and project identification;

(3) Landscaping shall be located so that pedestrians are not required to cross unpaved landscaped
areas to reach building entrances from parked cars. This shall be achieved through proper
orientation of the landscaped fingers and islands, and by providing pedestrian access through
landscaped areas that would otherwise block direct pedestrian routes.

d. Perimeter Landscaping. All surface parking areas shall be screened from streets and adjoining
properties, and the open areas between the property line and the public street right-of-way shall be
landscaped. A parking area for a nonresidential use adjoining a public street shall be designed to
provide a landscaped planting strip between the street right-of-way and parking area equal in depth to
the setback required by the applicable zone or ten feet, whichever is greater; except that the required
width of the landscape strip may be reduced by the Board of Architectural Review (BAR) upon
recommendation from the City’s park supervisor, where it has been determined that the overall site area
is insufficient to accommodate allowable structures and required parking along with a landscape strip of
the otherwise required width.

(1) The landscaping shall be designed and maintained to screen cars from view from the street to a
minimum height of thirty-six inches, but shall not exceed any applicable height limit for landscaping
within a setback. Screening materials may include a combination of plant materials, earth berms,
raised planters, solid decorative masonry walls, or other screening devices which meet the intent of
this requirement.

(2) Shade trees shall be provided at a minimum rate of one for every twenty-five linear feet of
landscaped area, or other spacing as determined by the review authority to be appropriate to the
site and surrounding development.

(3) Parking areas for nonresidential uses shall provide a perimeter landscape strip at least eight feet
wide (inside dimension) where the parking area adjoins a side or rear property line; except that the
required width of the landscape strip may be reduced by the review authority where it determines
that overall site area is insufficient to accommodate allowable structures and required parking
along with a landscape strip of the otherwise required width. The requirement for a landscape strip
may be satisfied by a setback or buffer area that is otherwise required. Trees shall be provided at the rate of one for each twenty-five linear feet of landscaped area, or other spacing as determined by the review authority to be appropriate to the site and surrounding development.

(4) **Adjacent to Structures.** When a parking area is located adjacent to a nonresidential structure, a minimum eight-foot wide (inside dimension) landscape strip shall be provided adjacent to the structure, exclusive of any building entries, or areas immediately adjacent to the wall of the structure that serve as pedestrian accessways. The required width of the landscape strip may be reduced by the review authority where it determines that overall site area is insufficient to accommodate allowable structures and required parking along with a landscape strip of the otherwise required width.

(5) **Adjacent to Residential Use.** A parking area for a nonresidential use adjoining a residential use shall provide a landscaped buffer setback with a minimum ten-foot width between the parking area and the common property line bordering the residential use.

   i. A solid decorative masonry wall or fence, except for approved pedestrian access, and landscape buffer shall be provided along the property line to address land use compatibility issues (e.g., light/glare and nuisance noise) as determined by the review authority.

   ii. Trees shall be provided at the rate of one for each twenty-five linear feet of landscaped area, or other spacing as determined by the review authority to be appropriate to the site and surrounding development.

3. **Landscaping Standards**

   a. **Minimum Dimensions.** Each area of landscaping shall have a minimum interior width of eight feet within the residential and commercial zones, and five feet in the industrial zones. These dimensions may be reduced where the review authority determines they are infeasible because of limited site area. Wherever this title requires a landscaped area of a specified width, the width shall be measured within any curb or wall bordering the landscaping area.

   b. **Protective Curbing.** Required landscaping shall be protected with a minimum six-inch high concrete curb, except adjacent to bicycle paths, or where otherwise deemed unnecessary by the zoning administrator.

   c. **Safety Requirements.** Landscape materials shall be located so that at maturity they do not:

      (1) Interfere with safe sight distances for bicycle, pedestrian or vehicular traffic;

      (2) Conflict with overhead lights, utility lines or walkway lights; or

      (3) Block bicycle or pedestrian ways.

   d. **Lawns.** Lawns shall be limited to fifty percent of the total landscaped area on the site and only where the applicant provides calculations approved by the zoning administrator that demonstrate that the irrigation requirements will not exceed standard low water usage. No lawns shall be allowed:

      (1) In any area of ten feet or less in width; or

      (2) On any slope exceeding ten percent (twenty-five percent, where other project water-saving techniques compensate for the increased runoff). A level buffer zone of eighteen inches shall be
provided between bermed lawn areas and any hardscape (e.g., any street, walkway or similar feature); or

(3) A non-recreational land use.

e. Water Features. Decorative water features (e.g., fountains, ponds, waterfalls) shall have recirculating water systems.

4. Visual Obstructions

a. When placed within or immediately adjacent to a dedicated public right-of-way, no landscape material shall be allowed to obstruct clear vision or to create a potential traffic hazard.

b. Landscaping that is primarily intended or designed for fencing purposes shall not be allowed to exceed four feet in height within a required front setback area.

c. On the street sides of a corner parcel, no landscaping shall be allowed to exceed four feet in height above the top of the existing or proposed street curb within the traffic safety visibility area.

5. Trees

a. In order to achieve a more immediate effect, all trees planted on the street sides of a newly developed parcel shall be transplanted from 5-gallon or larger size containers. A tree proposed to replace an existing mature specimen tree shall be transplanted from a minimum 24-gallon size container.

b. All trees shall be adequately supported when planted. The supports shall be maintained until the trees are capable of withstanding the force of wind on their own.

c. Where existing trees are required to be preserved, all new development shall be designed in a manner which respects the current drip lines.

6. Solar Access. When trees are incorporated into an approved landscaping plan, they shall be planted in a manner which maximizes the provision of sunlight to nearby windows and/or solar collectors situated on-site or on an adjoining property.

7. Irrigation System Requirements. All landscaped areas except those approved for maintenance with intentionally non-irrigated native plants shall include an automatic irrigation system.

a. Water-efficient systems (e.g., bubbler-type, drip, mini-spray, or similar system) shall be used unless infeasible. Low-flow sprinkler heads with matched precipitation rates shall be used when spray or rotor-type heads are specified for watering shrubs and groundcover areas. Lawn areas shall be sized and shaped so they can be efficiently irrigated. Spray or run-off onto paved areas shall be avoided.

b. Dual or multi-program controllers with separated valves and circuits shall be used when the project contains more than one type of landscape treatment (e.g., groundcover, lawn, shrub, tree areas), or a variety of solar aspects. Soil moisture-sensing devices and rain sensors shall be used on larger projects (fifty thousand plus square feet of landscaped area) to minimize or eliminate over-watering.

c. Watering shall be scheduled at times of minimal wind conflict and evaporation loss.

d. Sprinkler heads shall have matched precipitation rates within each valve zone.

e. Check valves are required where elevation differential may cause low head drainage.
8. Responsibility of the Board of Architectural Review.
   a. The Board of Architectural Review (BAR) shall be primarily responsible for the review and approval of landscape plans and improvements within the city.
   b. All new construction shall receive prior approval of all landscape plans from the board of architectural review (BAR).

9. Statement of Surety. When required by City, security in the form of cash, performance bond, letter of credit, or instrument of credit, in an amount equal to one hundred fifty percent of the total value of all plant materials, irrigation, installation, and maintenance shall be posted with the city for a two-year period. The City may require statements of surety for phased development projects, a legitimate delay in landscape installation due to seasonal requirements (including adverse weather conditions) and similar circumstances where it may not be advisable or desirable to install all approved landscaping before occupancy of the site.
   a. Installation and Inspection Before Occupancy. All landscaping shall be installed and inspected by a representative of the department before the City will allow occupancy of any structure or authorize the issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

10. Maintenance of Landscape Areas. All landscaping (e.g., groundcover, hedges, lawns, shrubs, and trees) shall be maintained in a healthful and thriving condition at all times. Irrigation systems and their components shall be maintained in a fully functional manner consistent with the originally approved design and the provisions of this section.
   a. Regular maintenance shall include checking, adjusting, and repairing irrigation equipment; resetting automatic controllers; aerating and dethatching lawn areas; adding/replenishing mulch, fertilizer, and soil amendments; and mowing, pruning, trimming, and watering all landscaped areas. In addition, the landscaping shall regularly be kept free of weeds and debris, and all dead or decaying material shall be replaced in a timely manner. All fences and walls which have been incorporated into an approved landscaping plan shall regularly be maintained in an attractive and safe manner.
   b. Maintenance Agreement Required. Before final inspection or occupancy, and before the recordation of a final subdivision map where applicable, the applicant shall enter into a landscape maintenance agreement with the city to guarantee proper maintenance in compliance with subsection (N)(1) of this section. The form and content of the agreement shall be approved by the city attorney and the zoning administrator.
   c. Water Waste Prohibited. Water waste in existing developments resulting from inefficient landscape irrigation leading to excessive runoff, low head drainage, overspray, and other similar conditions where water flows onto adjacent property, non-irrigated areas, walks, roadways or structures is prohibited.
   d. Enforcement. Failure to maintain landscape areas in compliance with this section shall be deemed a public nuisance, and shall be subject to abatement, and/or the applicable planning permit may be revoked.

C. Lighting Requirements

Outdoor lighting on the site of a multi-family or non-residential structure or use shall comply with the following general requirements.

1. Lighting General Requirements.
   a. Maximum Height. An outdoor light fixture shall be limited to a maximum height of fourteen feet or the height of the nearest structure, whichever is less.
b. **Energy-Efficiency.** Outdoor lighting shall utilize energy-efficient (high pressure sodium, low pressure sodium, hard-wired compact fluorescent, or other lighting technology that is of equal or greater energy efficiency) fixtures and lamps.

c. **Position of Light Fixtures.** All lighting fixtures shall be properly directed, recessed, and/or shielded (e.g., downward and away from adjoining properties) to prevent light bleed, spill, and glare onto adjacent properties, wetlands or natural habitat areas, beach, or public rights-of-way, by:

(1) Ensuring that the light source (e.g., bulb, etc.) is not visible from off the site; and

(2) Confining glare and reflections within the boundaries of the subject site to the maximum extent feasible.

d. **Maximum Illumination.** No lighting on private property shall produce an illumination level greater than one foot-candle on any property within a residential zone except on the site of the light source.

e. **No Blinking, Flashing or High Intensity.** No permanently installed lighting shall blink, flash, or be of unusually high intensity or brightness, as determined by the City.

f. **New Light Fixtures on Commercial Buildings.** Installation of new light fixtures on commercial buildings shall be subject to review and approval by the City.

**D. Sign Requirements**

1. **Sign Permit Requirements**

   a. **Sign Permit Required.** No sign shall be constructed, installed, or modified, unless a sign permit is first obtained from the City. Any sign visible from the general viewing points identified on Figure 2-4 of the LUP must obtain a coastal permit. No sign permit shall be approved for an existing or proposed sign unless the sign is in compliance with all applicable requirements. A building permit may also be required for sign construction/installation.

   b. **Master Sign Program Required.** A master sign program approved by the board of architectural review (BAR) shall be required for any site with two or more tenants. As part of master sign program approval, the BAR may grant exceptions to the standards of this chapter for the maximum size and number of signs, based on design features including architectural style, proportion to landscaping, site visibility and building mass.

   c. **Review Authority.** The board of architectural review shall review each sign permit application and approve only those that comply with the following findings of approval:

      (1) The proposed signs do not exceed the standards of Zoning District Sign Standards and Standards for Specific Sign Types below and are of the minimum size and height necessary to enable pedestrians and motorists to readily identify the facility or site from a sufficient distance to safely and conveniently access the facility or site;

      (2) The placement of the sign on the site is appropriate for the height and area of a freestanding or projecting sign;

      (3) A flush or projecting sign relates to the architectural design of the structure. Signs that cover windows, or that spill over natural boundaries, and/or cover architectural features shall be prohibited;

      (4) The proposed signs do not unreasonably block the sight lines of existing signs on adjacent properties;
(5) The placement and size of the sign will not impair pedestrian or vehicular safety;

(6) The design, height, location, and size of the signs are visually complementary and compatible with the scale, and architectural style of the primary structures on the site, any prominent natural features on the site, and structures and prominent natural features on adjacent properties on the same street;

(7) The proposed signs will not block, interrupt, or otherwise degrade the scenic and visual quality to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas as identified on Figure 2-4 of the LUP; and

(8) The proposed signs are in substantial conformance with the design criteria for signs.

d. Application Requirements. An application for a sign permit shall be filed and processed. The application shall be accompanied by detailed and fully dimensioned plans, architectural drawings and sketches, and data/materials identified in the department handout for sign permits, and any applicable fees.

e. Expiration and Extension of Sign Permit Approval. Approval of a sign permit shall expire twelve months from the date of approval unless the sign has been installed, or a different expiration date is stipulated at the time of approval. Before the expiration of a sign permit, the applicant may apply to the department for an extension of up to an additional twelve months from the original date of expiration. The expiration date of the sign permit shall be automatically extended to concur with the expiration date of the companion building permit or other applicable permits for the project.

f. Exemptions from sign permit requirements. The following signs are allowed without sign permit approval; provided, they comply with General Requirements for All Signs, and any required building permit is obtained.

(1) Nonstructural Modifications and Maintenance.
   I. Modifications to sign copy on conforming signs, or changes to the face or copy of conforming changeable copy signs; and
   II. The normal maintenance of conforming signs, except as identified in Section 17.38.060(I) (Maintenance of signs), below.

(2) Identification Signs. Street identification and house identification signs not exceeding two square feet.

(3) Temporary Signs. The following temporary signs are allowed without a sign permit.
   I. Real Estate Signs. Real estate signs are allowed without a sign permit in compliance with California Civil Code Section 713, and properties within commercial, industrial, and other nonresidential zones shall be allowed one real estate sign of no more than sixteen square feet, with a maximum height for freestanding signs of six feet, for each parcel frontage.
   II. Political Signs. Political signs are allowed in compliance with the following requirements:
      a. Before the placement of a political sign, the agent/candidate shall post with the city clerk a plan for the removal of all signs placed in commercial and industrial zones and removal of all signs placed by the candidate or the agent in residential zones. In the event that the signs are not removed in compliance with the plan for removal, the city shall provide notice and summary abatement. The removal plan shall also apply to signs located at campaign or party headquarters.
      b. No political sign shall be erected prior to sixty days before the election to which the sign pertains.
      c. In commercial and industrial zones, each political sign and the total political signs on a parcel shall not exceed thirty-two square feet in area.
      d. In residential zones, no political sign shall exceed six square feet in area.
e. No political sign shall be located within a public right-of-way.
f. All political signs shall be removed within ten days after the election to which the signs pertain.

(4) Governmental Signs. Signs installed by the city, county, or a federal or state governmental agency, because of their responsibilities for the protection of public health, safety, and general welfare, including the following signs:
   I. Emergency and warning signs necessary for public safety or civil defense;
   II. Traffic signs erected and maintained by an authorized public agency;
   III. Legal notices, licenses, permits, and other signs required to be displayed by law;
   IV. Signs showing the location of public facilities (e.g., public telephones, restrooms, and underground utilities); and
   V. Any sign, posting, notice, or similar sign placed by or required by a governmental agency in carrying out its responsibility to protect public health, safety and general welfare.

(5) Miscellaneous Signs.
   I. Address numbers not exceeding twelve inches in height.
   II. Official Flags on Public or Quasi-Public Buildings. Flags of national, state, or local governments, or nationally recognized religious, fraternal, or public service agencies; provided, the length of the flag shall not exceed one-fourth the height of the flag pole, and the flag is not used for commercial advertising.
   III. Illumination, patterns, pictures, and/or symbols approved as architectural ornamentation or decoration by the review authority.
   IV. Historical plaques erected and maintained by nonprofit organizations, memorials, building cornerstones, and date-constructed stones; provided, that none of these exceed four square feet in area.
   V. Service station price signs required by state law, not exceeding the number and area required by state law.
   VI. Signs or displays located entirely inside of a structure.
   VII. Signs created by landscaping.
   VIII. Small, temporary signs, otherwise in conformance with the duration, number, and size requirements of this chapter, that address noncommercial issues.

(g) Prohibited signs. All signs not expressly allowed by this chapter shall be prohibited. Examples of prohibited signs include the following:

(1) Abandoned signs;
(2) Animated signs, including electronic message display signs, and variable intensity, blinking, or flashing signs, or signs that emit a varying intensity of light or color, except time and temperature displays (which are not considered signs);
(3) Balloons and other inflatable devices;
(4) Billboards and any other off-premise signs;
(5) Flags, except as specifically allowed by Section Official flags, above;
(6) Illegal signs;
(7) Moving signs, and other similar signs that are stationary but contain moving parts;
(8) Obscene signs;
(9) Pennants and streamers, except in conjunction with an athletic event, carnival, circus, or fair, or as allowed in Section Temporary signs, below;

(10) Pole signs and other freestanding signs over six feet in height;

(11) Roof signs;

(12) Because of the city’s compelling interest in ensuring traffic safety, signs that simulate in color, size, or design, any traffic control sign or signal, or that make use of characters, symbols, or words in a manner that interferes with, misleads, or confuses pedestrian or vehicular traffic;

(13) Signs in the form or shape of a directional arrow, or otherwise displaying a directional arrow, except as may be approved by the review authority, or as may be required for safety and convenience and for control of pedestrian or vehicular traffic within the premises of the subject use;

(14) Signs attached to or suspended from a boat, float, vehicle, or other movable objects parked within a public right-of-way, or in a location on private property that is visible from a public right-of-way, except a sign painted directly upon, magnetically affixed to, or permanently affixed to the body or other integral part of the vehicle;

(15) Signs burned, cut, or otherwise marked on or otherwise affixed to a hillside or tree;

(16) Signs with reflective material;

(17) Signs within the public right-of-way, except for signs installed or maintained by a government agency for traffic safety and directional purposes;

(18) Signs in residential zones, except as specifically allowed in this chapter;

(19) Signs in storage or in the process of assembly or repair, located outside on premises other than that advertised in the signs, that are visible from a public right-of-way; and

(20) Temporary and portable signs, except as specifically allowed by Section Temporary Signs, below.

2. **Sign General Requirements for All Signs.** The following rules shall govern the computation of sign area:

   a. **Sign Area Measurement.** Sign area measurement to determine compliance with the sign area limitations of this chapter shall occur as follows.

   (1) **Surface Area.** The surface area of a sign shall be calculated by enclosing the extreme limits of all emblem, framing, logo, representation, writing, or other display within a single continuous perimeter composed of squares or rectangles with no more than eight perimeter lines.

   ![Example Sign Area Calculation]

   (2) **Sign Structure.** Supporting bracing or framework that is determined by the zoning administrator to be clearly incidental to the display itself shall not be included in the calculation of total sign area.

   (3) **Multi-Faced Signs.** The area of a double-faced sign shall be calculated for one face only, unless the two faces are not back-to-back, parallel, and/or are separated by more than twelve inches.
(4) **Three-Dimensional Objects.** The area of a sign consisting of one or more three-dimensional objects (e.g., balls, cubes, clusters of objects, sculpture, or statue-like trademarks), shall be measured as their maximum projection upon a vertical plane.

b. **Sign Height**

(1) **Measurement.** The height of a sign shall be computed as the vertical distance from the lowest point of the base of the sign at normal grade, to the top of the highest attached component of the sign. Normal grade shall be construed to be the lower of either the:

- Existing grade before construction; or
- Newly established grade after construction, exclusive of any berming, filling, mounding, or excavating solely for the purpose of locating the sign.

(2) **Maximum Height for Freestanding Signs.** A freestanding sign shall not exceed a height of six feet above normal grade in the residential zones. Freestanding signs shall be limited to fourteen feet above normal grade in all other zones.

(3) **Maximum Height for Signs on Structures.** The top of a sign mounted on a structure shall not extend higher than the lesser of:

- The window sills of the second floor;
- The top of the wall to which the sign is attached, in the case of a one-story structure; or
- Twenty feet above normal grade.

c. **Sign Location Requirements.** Each sign shall be located in compliance with the following requirements, and all other applicable provisions of this chapter.

(1) Each sign shall be located on the same site as the subject of the sign, except as otherwise allowed by this chapter.

(2) No sign shall project over public property, or the public right-of-way, except where the city has granted an encroachment permit in addition to a sign permit.

(3) No sign shall be placed so as to interfere with the operation of a door, fire escape or window.

d. **Signs Placed Within the Public Right-of-Way.**

(1) No sign shall be allowed within the public right-of-way except for the following:

- Public signs erected by or on behalf of a governmental agency to convey public information, identify public property, post legal notices, or direct or regulate pedestrian or vehicular traffic;
- Bus stop signs installed by a public transit company;
- Informational signs of a public utility regarding its lines, pipes, poles or other facilities; or
- Emergency warning signs erected by a governmental agency, a public utility company, or a contractor doing authorized work within the public right-of-way.

(2) Any sign installed or placed within the public right-of-way other than in compliance with this section shall be forfeited to the public and be subject to confiscation.

(3) In addition, the city shall have the right to recover from the owner, or person placing the sign, the full costs for sign removal and disposal.
(4) A sign permit shall not be required for city signs placed within the public right-of-way.

e. **Design Criteria.** The following design criteria shall be used in reviewing the design of individual signs. Substantial conformance with each of the following design criteria shall be required before a sign permit or building permit can be approved.

(1) **Color.** Colors on signs and structural members should be harmonious with one another and relate to the dominant colors of the other structures on the site. Contrasting colors may be utilized if the overall effect of the sign is still compatible with the structure colors and prevailing colors in the surrounding neighborhood (where a theme can be identified).

(2) **Design and Construction.** The intent of this subsection is to ensure public safety, achieve signs of careful construction, neat and readable copy, and durability, to reduce maintenance costs and to prevent dilapidation. Each sign shall be designed by a professional (e.g., architect, building designer, landscape architect, interior designer, or another whose principal business is the design, manufacture, or sale of signs), or others who are capable of producing professional results. Each permanent sign should be constructed by persons whose principal business is building construction or a related trade including sign manufacturing and installation businesses, or others capable of producing professional results.

(3) **Materials and Structure.** Sign materials (including framing and supports) shall be representative of the type and scale of materials used on the primary on-site structure and on other on-site signs. Materials for permanent signs shall be durable and capable of withstanding weathering over the life of the sign with reasonable maintenance. The size of the structural members (e.g., braces, columns, and crossbeams) shall be proportional to the sign panel they are supporting. In general, fewer larger supporting members are preferable to many smaller supports. The use of individual letters incorporated into the structure's design is encouraged, rather than signs with background and framing other than the structure's wall(s).

(4) **Street Address.** The review authority may require that a sign include the site street address, where it determines that public safety and emergency vehicle response would be more effectively served than if the street address were displayed solely on one or more structures on the site.

f. **Copy Design Guidelines.** The city does not regulate the message content (copy) of signs; however, the following are principles of copy design and layout that can enhance the readability and attractiveness of signs. Copy design and layout consistent with these principles is encouraged.

(1) Sign copy should relate only to the name and/or nature of the business or commercial center.

(2) Permanent signs that advertise continuous sales, special prices, or include phone numbers, etc. should be avoided.

(3) Information should be conveyed briefly or by logo, symbol, or other graphic manner. The intent should be to increase the readability of the sign and thereby enhance the identity of the business.

(4) The area of letters or symbols should not exceed forty percent of the background area in commercial and industrial zones or sixty percent in residential zones.

(5) Freestanding signs should contain the street address of the parcel or the range of addresses for a multi-tenant center.

g. **Sign Lighting.** Sign lighting shall be designed to minimize light and glare on surrounding rights-of-way and properties in compliance with Section Outdoor Lighting and the following:

(1) External light sources shall be directed and shielded so they do not produce glare on any object other than the sign, and/or off the site of the sign;

(2) The light illuminating a sign shall not be of a brightness or intensity that will interfere with the reasonable enjoyment of residential properties;

(3) Sign illumination shall not blink, flash, flutter, or change light brightness, color or intensity;
(4) Colored lights shall not be used at a location or in a manner so as to be confused or construed as traffic control devices;

(5) Neither the direct nor reflected light from primary light sources shall create hazards for pedestrians or operators of motor vehicles;

(6) Reflective-type bulbs and incandescent lamps that exceed fifteen watts shall not be used so as to expose the face of the bulb or lamp to a public right-of-way or adjacent property;

(7) Light sources shall utilize hard-wired fluorescent or compact fluorescent lamps, or other lighting technology that is of equal or greater energy efficiency;

(8) Permanently installed illuminated panels, visible tubing, and strings of lights outlining all or a portion of a structure, other than lighting that is primarily for indirectly illuminating architectural features, signs, or landscaping, shall be deemed "signs" subject to this chapter and shall be counted as part of the allowed sign area. Each line of tubing or lights shall be deemed to have a minimum width of at least six inches for the purpose of calculating area.

h. Maintenance of Signs.

(1) Each sign and supporting hardware, including temporary signs, shall be maintained in good repair and functioning properly at all times.

(2) Any repair to a sign shall be of equal or better in quality of materials and design as the original sign.

(3) A sign that is not properly maintained and is dilapidated shall be deemed a public nuisance, and may be abated.

(4) When an existing sign is removed or replaced, all brackets, poles, and other supports that are no longer required shall be removed.

(5) Unpainted areas shall be painted to match the adjacent portion of the structure or the sign support structure.

2. Sign Requirements for Commercial Land Uses. The sign requirements shall be applicable to the CMX/WBUVSP, CVSC, CCH and CCRG land uses within the Coastal Zone. Allowed signs and sign standards for these land uses are summarized in Table 6, in addition to the provisions of Requirements for All Signs above and Standards for Specific Sign Types below, as applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allowed Sign Types</th>
<th>Maximum Sign Height</th>
<th>Maximum Number of Signs Allowed per Parcel</th>
<th>Maximum Sign Area Allowed per Parcel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ground-mounted and Ground-floor Signs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awning, Projecting, Wall, Freestanding, Suspended</td>
<td>Below roof (1) 14 ft Below eave/ canopy; at least 8 ft above a walking surface</td>
<td>• Single tenant site or structure: 3 of any combination of allowed sign types per primary structure frontage. • 1 of any allowed sign type on a secondary frontage. • Site or structure with 4 or more tenants: 1 of any allowed sign type for the primary structure frontage, and 1 for a secondary frontage.</td>
<td>• Maximum sign area per parcel. The total sign area on a parcel shall comply with the following requirements. • 1.0 sf for each linear foot of primary building frontage. • 0.5 additional sf for each linear foot of secondary building frontage. • Each site is allowed a total sign area of at least 25 sf regardless of frontage length. • Maximum sign area per building frontage. The total area of all signs on a primary frontage shall not exceed 100 sf.; the maximum area of a sign on a secondary frontage shall not exceed 50 sf. • Site with 4 or more tenants: Allowed an additional freestanding identification sign of 0.25 sf for each linear foot of total primary structure frontage, up to a maximum of 100 sf.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Allowed Sign Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allowed Sign Types</th>
<th>Maximum Sign Height</th>
<th>Maximum Number of Signs Allowed per Parcel</th>
<th>Maximum Sign Area Allowed per Parcel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second Floor Signs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awning, Projecting, Wall</td>
<td>Below roof (1)</td>
<td>1 per tenant space</td>
<td>12 sf for each tenant. 1 directory sign not to exceed 12 sf is also allowed to identify upper floor occupants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indoor Signs, and Outdoor Signs Not Visible from a Street</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awning, Freestanding, Projecting, Suspended, Wall, Window</td>
<td>Below roof (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
(1) At least one foot below the top of a parapet, the sill of a second floor window, and/or the lowest point of any cornice or roof overhang.

### Examples of Sign Types

3. **Standards by Sign Type.** Proposed signs shall comply with the following standards applicable to the specific sign type.
   
a. **Awning Signs.** Awning signs are allowed within commercial land uses but must be at least one foot below the top of a parapet, the sill of a second floor window, and/or the lowest point of any cornice or roof overhang. Each tenant space may have one 12 square foot awning. Three of any combination of
allowed sign types is the maximum allowed per primary structure frontage. The following standards apply to awning signs.

(1) Signs on awnings are limited to ground level or second story occupancies only.

(2) Awnings shall not be internally illuminated. Direct exterior lighting may allowed.

(3) Translucent awning materials are prohibited.

b. Freestanding Signs. Freestanding signs are allowed within the commercial land uses to a maximum height of 14 feet. The following standards apply to freestanding signs.

(1) Multiple signs shall be separated by a minimum of seventy-five feet to ensure adequate visibility for all signs. The review authority may modify this requirement where the locations of existing signs on adjacent properties would make the seventy-five foot separation impractical.

(2) A sign shall not project over public property, vehicular easements, or rights-of-way, and shall not obstruct a traffic safety sight area, as determined by the review authority.

(3) To assist emergency response personnel in locating the site, freestanding signs shall contain an illuminated street address plate. Numbers shall be a minimum of six inches in height. Street address numbers not exceeding twelve inches in height shall not be included in calculations of allowed sign area.

c. Murals. A mural placed on the wall of a structure may be allowed in any commercial or industrial zone subject to the following:

(1) A mural without text visible from a public right-of-way shall be counted as part of the sign area allowed by Sign Standards allowed for that land use; a mural with text shall comply with the sign area limitations applicable to the site;

(2) Murals that illustrate the local setting and history as sources of inspiration are encouraged;

(3) The approval of a mural shall require that the review authority first find that the colors, placement, and size of the mural are visually compatible with the structure’s architecture, and that the mural will serve to enhance the aesthetics of the city.

d. Projecting Signs. Projecting Signs are allowed within commercial land uses. The following standards apply to projecting signs where allowed.

(1) The maximum projection of a sign from a structure wall shall not exceed eight feet or more than two-thirds of the width of the public sidewalk below. Any projection over a public right-of-way shall require an encroachment permit.

(2) The top of a projecting sign shall not exceed the lesser of fourteen feet, eave height, parapet height, or sill height of a second floor window. No portion of the sign shall project above the eave line of a sloped roof
or the top of the parapet on a flat roof.

(3) A projecting sign shall maintain a minimum clearance of eight feet from the bottom of the sign to the finished grade below.

(4) Icon signs using shapes or symbols uniquely suited to the business, creative shapes, and three-dimensional signs are encouraged.

(5) Each sign shall be graphically designed for pedestrians, with a maximum area of eight square feet on each sign face, regardless of the length of the building frontage.

(6) Sign supports shall be well-designed and compatible with the design of the sign.

e. **Temporary Signs.** Temporary signs other than A-boards are allowed subject to the following requirements. A-board signs are instead subject to the requirements of subsection A of this section.

(1) **Banners and Pennants.** Temporary banners and pennants on private property shall comply with the following requirements:

   • The use of a banner or pennants may be allowed only for a licensed business for a period not to exceed thirty days per year. A temporary sign permit may be issued for not less than two consecutive days, up to thirty days. A business is only allowed one temporary sign permit for banners or pennants per year. This is in addition to the thirty days allowed for a business grand opening banner;

   • The application for a temporary sign permit for banners or pennants shall include the dates proposed by the applicant for scheduled banner use;

   • A bond shall be posted for a banner permit as required by the zoning administrator. The bond may be revoked if the temporary banner or pennants are not removed within two days following their scheduled use.

(2) **Construction Signs.** Construction identification signs may be allowed in all zones in compliance with the following standards.

   • The number, placement, size, and type of signs shall comply with the sign requirements for that land use.

   • The signs shall be removed before final building inspection or the issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

(3) **Other Temporary Signs.** Temporary signs may be authorized by the City, upon submittal of a sign application, plan for removal, and the fees required by the city's fee schedule. In a commercial or industrial zone, the combined area of temporary signs shall not exceed that allowed for the non-corner lots in the zone in which the sign will be placed. No more than one temporary sign shall be erected on a premise at a time. Temporary signs shall be subject to the same placement and height restrictions as permanent signs for the applicable land use. Temporary signs shall not be allowed for more than thirty consecutive days. Temporary signs shall not be allowed for a combined total of more than sixty days in a twelve-month period. Signs advertising a particular event shall be removed within ten days after the event. Inflatable or tethered signs are allowed for special events and may be installed for a period not to exceed five consecutive days, no more than two times in a twelve-month period. These signs may exceed the maximum sign area and sign height standards for the applicable zone.

f. **Wall Signs.** Wall signs are allowed within commercial land uses. The following standards apply to wall signs in all zones where allowed.

(1) One wall sign may be located on a primary structure
frontage, and on one secondary structure frontage.

(2) The area of the largest wall sign shall not exceed ten percent of the area of the building facade on which the sign is mounted or painted, including the area of windows, doors and recesses.

(3) A wall sign shall not project more than twelve inches from the surface to which it is attached.

g. **Window Signs.** Windows signs are allowed within commercial land uses. The following standards apply to permanent window signs where allowed.

(1) **Maximum Sign Area.** Permanent window signs shall not occupy more than twenty-five percent of the total window area.

(2) **Sign Location.** Signs shall be allowed only on windows located on the ground level and second story of a structure frontage.

(3) **Sign Materials.** Signs shall consist of individual letters, logos, or symbols applied to, stenciled on, or etched into the glass surface; however, neon signs with transparent backgrounds may be hung inside the window class.

(4) **Unobstructed Observation.** The lowermost portion of the entire window(s) (a minimum of twenty-four inches) shall be clear of any signs in order to allow for unobstructed observation by security personnel (e.g., city police, private security, etc.)

h. **Nonconforming signs.** A nonconforming sign is any permanent or temporary sign that was legally established and maintained in compliance with the provisions of all applicable laws in effect at the time of original installation but that does not now comply with the provisions of this title. A nonconforming sign shall not be: changed to another nonconforming sign; structurally altered to extend its useful life; enlarged; re-established after a business is discontinued for thirty days; re-established after damage or destruction to fifty percent or more of the value of the sign, or its components, as determined by the city’s building director; or re-installed after facade improvements that required the removal of the sign during construction. Any interruption in the use of a nonconforming sign(s) that continues for sixty days or more shall be deemed to be an abandonment of the sign(s). Subsequent use shall comply with the regulations of this chapter. Non-occupation or non-operation of the building or business advertised on the sign shall be deemed an interruption of the use of the sign(s).

4. **Public nuisance, abatement and violation.**

a. **Signs on Vacated Buildings.** Signs on premises that have been vacated for sixty days or more, and signs on multi-tenant buildings advertising a business that has been vacated for sixty days or more shall be immediately removed by the owner after the expiration of that period. The City may issue a notice to remove the signs after the expiration of the sixty-day period. The notice to remove shall specify a fifteen-day period during which the signs shall be removed. If the owner does not remove the signs during the fifteen-day period, the City may have the sign removed at costs borne by the City. The City will bill the property owner for all costs related to removal and storage. Costs not paid to the City shall be recovered.

b. **Violation, Abatement and Penalties.** Any sign within the city that fails to comply with the requirements of this chapter, other applicable state statutes or city ordinances, or for which a sign permit has not been obtained in compliance with this chapter, shall be subject to abatement.

2.7 **Special Development Standards**

A. **Purpose.** Special development standards provide for the establishment of certain regulations and/or considerations in areas where, by reason of location, topography, existing development conditions, or other
circumstances, development impacts may be greater or circumstances may necessitate additional site-specific regulation to further the purposes of this ordinance.

B. Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA)

   a. Applications for development of any type, including subdivision, shall include field surveys and impact analysis, by a qualified biologist to precisely determine the locations of habitat areas, including ESHAs, and to recommend siting, design, and related mitigation measures to ensure protection of any sensitive species or habitat areas present. All required setbacks, development footprint, fuel management, and landscape areas shall be illustrated on a map that depicts habitat areas. All biological reports shall include, at a minimum, the following:

   (1) A site-specific survey evaluating existing habitat resources that would be affected by development at the time of proposed development.

   (2) A map identifying existing habitat resources within the project’s identified area of potential impact at the time of proposed development.

   (3) An identification and evaluation of buffers, or setbacks, required around any identified habitat resources, including wetland or riparian vegetation, to ensure the biological integrity of the resource and consistency with the LCP.

   (4) Identification of all biological impacts of the proposed development.

   (5) Alternatives and/or mitigation measures for reducing any identified impacts to a less than a significant level.

   (6) Mitigation/Restoration and Monitoring Program for any mitigation required.

   b. All reports shall be prepared by a qualified biologist, and all field surveys for such biological reports shall be undertaken during times when documented or expected habitat evidence is most likely to be detected (e.g., flowering season, breeding season, etc.).

   c. At a minimum, a report shall be prepared for all proposed development that meets one or more of the following criteria:

   (1) The development is or may potentially be located within an environmentally sensitive habitat area, based on current available resource information or through on-site investigation;

   (2) The development is or may potentially be located within 100 feet of an environmentally sensitive habitat area and/or has the potential to significantly degrade such area; or

   (3) There is disagreement between City staff and the applicant as to whether the proposed development meets one of the above criteria.

   d. The report shall be required, submitted and accepted by the Planning Department prior to the application being determined complete. The manner (electronic versus hard copy, number of copies, etc.) in which said report is to be submitted shall be determined by the Planning Department.

   e. Report preparation shall be solely at applicant expense.
2. Development Within or Adjacent to an ESHA

a. Development within ESHA. ESHAs shall be protected against any significant disruption of habitat values, and only uses dependent on those resources shall be allowed within those areas.

b. Development adjacent to ESHA. Development in areas adjacent to ESHAs shall be sited and designed to prevent impacts which would significantly degrade those areas, and shall be compatible with the protection of those habitat areas.

c. Buffers. Development shall be set back from all ESHA, a sufficient distance to ensure the biological integrity of the resource. A minimum buffer of 50 feet, as measured from the edge of the identified ESHA, shall be required, although larger buffers are encouraged. Smaller setbacks or buffers may be allowed if it can be demonstrated that (1) a 50-foot buffer is not possible due to site constraints or would render the site unusable for designated use, (2) public recreational facilities, such as trail and/or nature observation platforms or piers, are provided within the buffer zone, and (3) in the opinion of a professional biologist, and to the satisfaction of the City, a smaller buffer would provide sufficient protection of the resource. Under no circumstances shall the buffer be reduced to less than 25 feet. If the buffer/setback is adjusted downward, additional mitigation measures developed in consultation with the Department of Fish & Game shall be implemented.

C. Marine Resource Areas

1. Designation of Marine Resource Areas. For any proposed development within the coastal zone, the Applicant and/or City shall identify whether it is located within, adjacent to, or has watershed connection to Laguna Grande, Roberts Lake, and/or Monterey Bay, each of which is identified in the LUP as a marine resource area.

2. Biological Study. Proposed development within or adjacent to a marine resource area shall provide a site-specific biological resource report prepared by a qualified biologist. Said report shall include, at a minimum, the criteria set forth in Section 2.7.B.2.d of this Chapter.

3. Buffer. Development shall be set back from all marine resource areas a sufficient distance to ensure the biological integrity of the resource. A minimum buffer of 50 feet, as measured from the ordinary high water mark shall be required, although larger buffers are encouraged. Smaller setbacks or buffers may be allowed if it can be demonstrated that (1) a 50-foot buffer is not possible due to site constraints, (2) public recreational facilities, such as trail and/or nature observation platforms or piers, are provided within the buffer zone, and (3) in the opinion of a professional biologist, and to the satisfaction of the City, a smaller buffer would provide sufficient protection of the resource. Under no circumstances shall the buffer be reduced to less than 25 feet. If the buffer/setback is adjusted downward, additional mitigation measures developed in consultation with the Department of Fish & Game shall be implemented.

4. Wetland Management and Enhancement Study for Development Within or Adjacent to a Marine Resource. Proposed development within the coastal zone located within, adjacent to, or that has watershed connection to a marine resource area must demonstrate compliance with the City’s adopted guidelines for the maintenance, enhancement, and restoration of Roberts Lake, Laguna Grande, and associated wetlands as identified in the current version of the Wetland Management/Enhancement and Restoration Program (Appendix B) (identified in Policy NCR-CZ 1.5.D of the LUP). The Applicant shall submit a site-specific Vegetation Management Plan (see Section F below) and drainage plan (see Section G below) that identify, at a minimum, the following:

a. Identification of the current conditions of the site including flooding potential, water quality, and natural systems.

b. Identification of all habitat types and water quality within the project area.
c. Guidelines for water quality management and/or improvement that is consistent with maintenance, reestablishment, and enhancement of marine resources area habitats and water quality.

d. An identification of appropriate methods of native habitat enhancement and restoration that will sustain the biological productivity of existing marine resources area habitats.

e. An identification of structural and nonstructural best management practices that will:

   (1) Maintain, and as feasible enhance, habitat and support natural systems of Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake,

   (2) Maintain, and as feasible improve, water quality,

   (3) Control erosion and sedimentation deposit, and

   (4) Provide flood protection.

f. Identification of technical, planning, and design mechanisms for plan implementation and maintenance.

   Any modifications of or discharging into jurisdictional features may be subject to Sections 401 and 404 of the Clean Water Act, and thus may require additional consultation with state and/or federal agencies, and may also require special permits. Mitigation of wetland/riparian impacts is required as a condition of any 404 permits and may include on-site preservation, restoration, or enhancement and/or off-site restoration or enhancement. For LCP-allowable modifications or discharges, and upon consultation with the appropriate state and federal resource agencies, the applicant is required to submit a plan for the preservation and/or reestablishment of equivalent (size and biological value) areas of riparian and marsh vegetation (if appropriate) including implementation and maintenance.

4. Diking, Filling, Dredging of Marine Resource Areas. Diking, filling, or dredging activities may be allowed only if such activities are: (a) the least environmentally damaging feasible alternative; (b) are accompanied by adequate mitigation measures to minimize adverse environmental effects; and (c) limited to the following:

   • Placement of structural pilings for public recreational piers that provide public access and recreation;

   • Incidental public services purposes;

   • Mineral extraction, including for restoring beaches, except in environmentally sensitive habitat areas;

   • Restoration purposes;

   • Nature study, aquaculture, or similar resource dependent activities

   Dredging and spoils disposal shall be planned and carried out to avoid significant disruption to marine and wildlife habitats and water circulation. Dredge spoils suitable for beach replenishment shall be transported for such purposes to appropriate beaches or into suitable long shore current systems. In addition to the other provisions of this section, diking, filling, or dredging in existing estuaries and wetlands shall maintain or enhance the functional capacity of the wetland or estuary.

D. Visually Sensitive Areas

1. Identification of Visual Resources. For any project proposed within the coastal zone, the Applicant and/or City shall identify whether it is located within a visually sensitive area, including but not limited to by referring to Figure 2-4, Views and Viewsheds to Visual Resources, of the LUP. Other visually sensitive areas may be identified at the time of development consideration.

2. Consideration of Visual Resources. All proposed development projects within the coastal zone shall be required to consider and protect visual resources, as such:
a. Proposals for development identified by the City to be within a visually sensitive area shall include a map and an analysis prepared by a qualified professional identifying the development’s visual impacts including potential impacts on critical views and viewsheds identified on Figure 2-4 of the LUP.

b. Permitted development shall demonstrate that it is sited and designed to protect, and where feasible enhance, public views to Roberts Lake, Laguna Grande, Monterey Bay, and the Pacific Ocean, including from Highway 1, that it has minimized the alteration of the natural land forms, and that it is visually compatible with the character of the surrounding areas.

c. Landscaping shall be sited and installed to screen and/or reduce the impact associated with visually intrusive elements, such as parking and utility areas, in relation to public views (including views from the water and other recreation areas).

d. Permitted outdoor lighting and signs shall be designed to protect sensitive habitats, public recreation areas, public views, and night sky from intrusion, by prohibiting signs with moving parts or flashing lights, minimizing glare, shielding, and directing lighting downward within the development areas.

e. Determination of an adverse effect shall be made by the Zoning Administrator after review and comment by the Resource Management Services Department and Public Works Division. Development determined to have an adverse effect on a visual resource shall not be allowed.

E. Natural Hazard Areas

1. Designation of Natural Hazard Areas. The hazard areas identified on Figure 2-5, Flood Hazard Areas, Figure 2-6, Faults and Wildland Fire Threat Categories, and Figure 2-7, Tsunami Evacuation Areas, of the LUP shall represent a preliminary mapping of potential hazards within the LCP area.

2. Protection from Natural Hazards

   a. Proposed development shall include an analysis of hazards or hazardous constraints associated with the project, any necessary mitigation measures, and a determination that the site is suitable for the proposed development and that it will be safe from hazard over the lifetime of the development without reliance on seawalls, deep piers, or similar engineering measures (Policy NCR-CA 5.1.B.iii). All proposed development shall identify its expected lifetime (Policy NCR-CA 5.1.B.ii).

   b. Mitigation of hazards shall be demonstrated by detailed technical reports specific to the hazard type in question (e.g., soils, geologic, geotechnical, erosion control, fire hazard, etc.) that are prepared by persons who are appropriately qualified in the hazard field in question (e.g., civil engineers and engineering geologists familiar with coastal processes, geotechnical engineers, etc.) and that are submitted as part of any permit application. All technical reports and analyses shall accompany development applications and/or be part of any required environmental documentation.

   c. Proposed development shall be consistent with policies and mitigation outlined in the City of Seaside Hazard Mitigation Plan (adopted September 2005), as applicable (refer to Policy NCR-CA 5.1.B.iv).

   d. Geologic engineering reports prepared by qualified professionals, for any development to be located within seismic hazard areas or on fill, shall be required. Reports shall address stability of the structure as well as of the fill.

   e. Geologic reports submitted to the City shall be in conformance with guidelines established for such reports by the California Division of Mines and Geology including the following:

      (1) Geologic reports shall include information on the regional and local geologic setting, topography, significant landforms, soil types and thickness of soil or depth to bedrock, geologic hazards, soil/rock types, geologic structures, groundwater conditions, and other relevant properties, such as
erosion potential and mineral economic resources. The geologic report shall, at a minimum, contain the following ten major sections:

- Summary
- Description of Project Alternatives
- Impacts
- Geology of the Project Area
- Geologic and Seismic Impacts
- Mitigation of Impacts
- Coordination with Other Agencies, Groups, or Consultants
- Conclusions and Recommendations
- Report Preparer’s Qualifications
- References

(2) All development that would be affected by coastal hazards including but not limited to episodic and long-term shoreline retreat and coastal erosion, high seas, ocean waves, storms, tsunami, coastal flooding, landslides, bluff and geologic instability, and the interaction of same, shall also include:

- Regional and local geologic setting including topography, significant landforms, soil types and thickness of soil or depth to bedrock, geologic hazards, soil/rock types, geologic structures, groundwater conditions, and other relevant properties, such as erosion potential and mineral economic resources;
- Historic, current and foreseeable erosion, including investigation of recorded land surveys and tax assessment records in addition to the use of historic maps and photographs where available, and possible changes in shore configuration and transport, including in relation to generally accepted estimates of accelerated future sea level rise over 100 years or the development's lifetime, whichever is greater;
- Bluff geometry and site topography, extending the surveying work beyond the site as needed to depict unusual geomorphic conditions that might affect the site and the proposed development. The extent of the bluff top considered should at a minimum include the area between the face of the bluff and a line described on the bluff top by the intersection of a plane inclined at a 20 degree angle from the horizontal passing through the toe of the bluff or cliff, or 50 feet inland from the edge of the cliff or bluff, whichever is greater;
- Geologic conditions, including soil, sediment, and rock types and characteristics in addition to structural features such as bedding, joints and faults;
- Evidence of past or potential landslide conditions, the implications of such conditions for the proposed development, and the potential effects of the development on landslide activity both on-site and off-site;
- Wave and tidal action, including effects of erosion on bluffs, and identification of extreme scour platform elevation seaward of the site as well as expected maximum wave up rush elevation for the site, all in relation to generally accepted estimates of accelerated future sea level rise over 100 years or the development's lifetime, whichever is greater;
- Ground and surface water conditions and variations, including hydrologic changes caused by the development (e.g., introduction of sewage effluent and irrigation water to the groundwater system, and alterations in surface drainage);
- Potential effects of seismic forces resulting from a maximum credible earthquake;
- Effect of the proposed development including siting and design of structures, septic system, landscaping, drainage, and grading, and impacts of construction activity on the stability of the site and the adjacent area;
- A quantitative slope stability analysis, including identification of factors of safety for the site and structures and any other factors that may affect slope stability;
• Potential erodibility of site and mitigating measures to be used to ensure minimized erosion problems during and after construction without reliance on shoreline armoring and/or other such shoreline altering development (i.e., landscaping and drainage design), including analysis of the ability of the development to withstand storms comparable to the winter storms of 1982-83 on the California Coastline;

• Any other recommended mitigation measures; and,

• When development of shoreline protection structures is proposed, in addition to the above items, the following topics shall also be addressed:
  a. Design wave height;
  b. Maximum expected wave height;
  c. Frequency of overtopping;
  d. Normal and maximum tidal ranges;
  e. Erosion rate with/without protection device;
  f. Effect of structure on adjoining property;
  g. Potential/effect of scouring at base;
  h. Sand supply impacts (beach encroachment, passive erosion, and retention of beach material);
  i. Design life of structure/maintenance provisions;
  j. Alternatives to the chosen design method including “no project”; and,
  k. Maintenance provisions including methods and materials.

f. All development proposed within an area that is subject to episodic and long-term shoreline retreat and coastal erosion, high seas, ocean waves, storms, tsunami, coastal flooding, landslides, bluff and geologic instability, and the interaction of same shall be sited and designed to minimize risks to life and property over the development’s lifetime, including by ensuring it is sited and designed in such a manner as to avoid the need for hazard response, including shoreline armoring, that leads to coastal resource impacts over the development’s lifetime, and shall include enforceable provisions for addressing any future hazard dangers to the development without such resource impacting hazard response (e.g., moving the development, removing the development, etc.).

g. Development shall be adequately set back from the area of hazard, including those which have been identified by a supporting technical report, in such a way as to assure stability and structural integrity over 100 years or the development’s lifetime whichever is greater, without creating nor contributing significantly to erosion, geologic instability, or destruction of the site or surrounding area or in any way requiring the construction of protective devices that would substantially alter natural landforms along the shoreline.

h. Development shall be sited to avoid any area that would be affected by a 100-year flood, including both inland flooding and ocean flooding and an interaction of the two, as much as feasible. Development allowed in such areas shall be limited to projects that provide a significant public benefit and where appropriate measures have been included to address the flooding hazard, including flood elevation, criteria for modification/removal of endangered elements over time, etc. No habitable structure shall be allowed at an elevation lower than 12 feet above mean sea level. A structure may be allowed in the 100-year floodplain only where it meets the above criteria and the standards mandated by the City’s participation in the Federal Flood Insurance Program.

i. Sea Level Rise. Permitted development shall consider potential sea level rise impacts identified in the update to the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (required by Policy NCR-CZ 5.2.C of the LUP).

F. Vegetation Management Report. For proposed development within the coastal zone, a Vegetation Management Report prepared by a qualified biologist shall be required. The report shall be tiered off the Vegetation Management
Plan for the Seaside Coastal Zone (identified in Policy NCR-CZ 1.5.D), if complete. The report shall include, at a minimum, the following:

1. A site-specific survey evaluating existing known vegetation and habitat types at the time of proposed development.

2. A map identifying existing known vegetation and habitat types within the project’s identified area of potential impact at the time of proposed development.

3. A determination of which native and non-invasive plant communities best fit the area.

4. Identification of any impacts of proposed development.

5. Alternatives and/or mitigation for reducing any identified impacts to a less than a significant level. Mitigation shall include procedures and planting/maintenance plans that will encourage, enhance, or reestablish desirable plant communities.

G. Water Quality

1. **Purpose:** To protect and enhance the quality of coastal waters in accordance with the City’s Local Coastal Plan (LCP; Land Use Plan and Implementation Plan), Section 30230, 30231, 30232, and 30240 of the California Coastal Act, and the City’s Phase II NPDES permit requirements. This chapter implements the applicable provisions in the Land Use Plan to protect and enhance the quality of coastal waters, by providing standards for the review and authorization of new development and re-development consistent with the requirements of the California Coastal Act and Resolution No. R3-2012-0025 of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Coast Region.

2. **Applicability:** The provisions of this chapter apply to the review of all coastal permit applications (CAPs and CDPs). All proposed development shall be evaluated for potential adverse impacts to coastal water quality as well as for opportunities to enhance coastal water quality of the City’s lakes and watercourses and the Monterey Bay.

3. **Application Submittal Requirements:** Applicants shall be required to submit to the City a preliminary post-construction runoff plan and a construction pollution prevention plan simultaneously with the submittal of a coastal permit application within the coastal zone. The preliminary construction and post-construction plans shall address impacts of storm water and dry weather runoff, and specify Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will be developed to minimize the discharge of pollutants and minimize increases in stormwater runoff volume and flow rates from the development during and after construction. Applicants shall be required to submit a final post-construction runoff plan for approval by the City prior to issuance of a building permit.

4. **Construction Pollution Prevention Plan:** A Construction Pollution Prevention Plan (also referred to as an Erosion Control and Sediment Plan) (CPPP or ECSP) is required for all development that involves on-site construction, to address the control of construction-phase erosion, sedimentation, and polluted runoff. This plan shall specify the temporary BMPs that will be implemented to minimize erosion and sedimentation during construction, and minimize pollution of runoff by construction chemicals and materials. The Construction Pollution Prevention Plan/Erosion Control and Sediment Plan shall demonstrate that:

   a. During construction, development shall minimize site runoff and erosion through the use of temporary BMPs (including, but not limited to, soil stabilization measures), and shall minimize the discharge of sediment and other potential pollutants resulting from construction activities (e.g., chemicals, vehicle fluids, asphalt and cement compounds, debris, and trash).

   b. Clearing and grading shall be limited to the minimal footprint necessary and for the shortest time necessary to avoid increased erosion and sedimentation. Soil compaction due to construction activities shall be minimized in order to retain the infiltration capacity of the soil.

   c. Construction shall minimize the disturbance of plant cover (including trees, native vegetation, and root structures), which is important for preventing erosion and sedimentation.
d. Development shall implement soil stabilization BMPs, including but not limited to re-vegetation, on graded or disturbed areas as soon as feasible.

e. Grading operations shall not be conducted during the rainy season (from October 1 to April 30), except in response to an emergency. The City may grant a postponement of the rainy season grading prohibition for a project for a specified length of time, based on a determination that conditions at the project site are suitable for wet weather grading without the potential for significant water quality impacts, the likelihood of significant precipitation is low during the period of postponement, adequate erosion and sedimentation control measures will be maintained during all grading operations, and all grading activities will stop if rain commences.

f. Construction Pollution Prevention Plan content. The final CPPP/ECSP shall be submitted with the final construction drawings for all projects. The plan shall include, at a minimum, a narrative report and map that describe all temporary erosion, sedimentation, and polluted runoff control measures to be implemented during construction, including:

i. Proposed methods for minimizing clearing and grading, soil compaction, and disturbance of natural vegetation.

ii. Erosion and sedimentation controls to be implemented.

iii. BMPs to be implemented for staging, storage, and disposal of excavated materials.

iv. Re-vegetation, hydromulching, or other strategy plans for protecting graded or disturbed areas which require disturbance for extended periods of time.

v. Other soil stabilization BMPs to be implemented.

vi. A schedule for installation and removal of temporary erosion control BMPs, and identification of temporary BMPs that will be converted to permanent post-construction BMPs.

vii. Proposed methods to prevent the discharge of sediment and other pollutants resulting from construction activities (e.g., paints, solvents, vehicle fluids, asphalt and cement compounds, and debris) into runoff.

viii. Design specifications for any required structural construction-phase BMPs, such as sedimentation basins.

ix. Pollution Prevention BMPs to be implemented for staging, storage, and disposal of construction chemicals and materials.

x. A description of pollution prevention/good housekeeping practices to be used on the construction site, including but not limited to, maintaining an inventory of chemicals and other materials to be used on-site, having a cleanup plan and cleanup materials readily available for spills and leaks, and ensuring that employees are trained in pollution prevention and spill cleanup practices.

xi. Proposed methods to prevent run-on into the construction site.

g. As applicable, obtain a Construction General Permit with Waste Discharge Identification Number WDID, from the State Water Quality Control Board. Prepare and submit Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan to city for review.

5. Post-Construction Water Quality Protection: Post-Construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) and water quality mitigation measures such as Site Design and Source Control BMPs, including Low Impact Development (LID) techniques, shall be incorporated into new development and re-development projects to minimize impacts from storm water runoff and dry weather flows. Treatment Control BMPs should be reserved for developments with an anticipated pollutant load, such as a gas station, car wash, or auto repair station, and for development greater than 5,000 square feet.

Post-Construction BMP considerations include, but are not limited to, the following:

a. BMP Design Standards:
Where BMPs are required, BMPs shall be selected that have been shown to be effective in reducing the pollutants typically generated by the proposed land use. The design of BMPs shall be guided by the current editions of the California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA) Stormwater BMP Handbooks, or an equivalent BMP manual that describes the type, location, size, implementation, and maintenance of BMPs suitable to address the pollutants generated by the development, and specific to a climate similar to that of the Central Coast of California.

b. Low Impact Development strategies:
   i. Site and design developments to minimize the impact of development on the infiltration, purification, detention, and retention functions of natural drainage systems that exist on and adjacent to the site.
   ii. Minimize the creation of impervious surfaces (including pavement, sidewalks, driveways, patios, parking areas, streets, and roof-tops), especially directly-connected impervious areas.
   iii. Maintain, or enhance where appropriate and feasible, on-site infiltration of runoff, in order to preserve natural hydrologic conditions, recharge groundwater, attenuate runoff flow, retain dry-weather runoff on-site, and minimize transport of pollutants, for up to the 85th percentile 24-hour storm event.
   iv. Divert runoff from impervious surfaces so that it flows into permeable areas in order to maintain, or enhance where appropriate and feasible, on-site infiltration capacity. Sites that have high pollutant loading, such as commercial or industrial sites, may require pre-treatment BMPs prior to infiltration.
   v. Where pavement is required, use permeable pavement (e.g., interlocking paver blocks, porous asphalt, permeable concrete, decomposed granite, or reinforced grass or gravel), where feasible, to reduce runoff. Permeable pavements shall be designed so that runoff infiltrates into the underlying soil or engineered substrate, filtering pollutants, buffering runoff generation, and recharging groundwater, and development shall provide for the ongoing maintenance required to assure permeability.

c. Site Design BMPs:
   i. Minimize creation of impervious surfaces
   ii. Provide adequate setbacks and buffers from coastal waters, including Laguna Grande, Roberts Lake and Monterey Bay.
   iii. Divert runoff from impervious surfaces (e.g., roof-tops, driveways, sidewalks, and patios) to permeable areas
   iv. Maintain or enhance on-site infiltration (e.g., using bio-filtration or vegetated swales for up to two-times the 85th percentile hourly rainfall intensity)
   v. Install permeable pavement where pavement is required
   vi. Disconnect directly-connected impervious areas
   vii. Improve and maintain soil quality
   viii. Install rain barrels or cisterns to capture roof runoff
   ix. Plant and preserve trees and other plants
   x. Install green roofs

d. Source Control BMPs:
   i. Cover Outdoor Storage Areas
   ii. Use Efficient Irrigation
   iii. Minimize Use Of Landscaping Chemicals
e. Treatment Control BMPs:
   i. Vegetated Swales
   ii. Detention Basins
   iii. Storm Drain Inlet Filters

6. **Post-Construction Runoff Plan:** A Post-Construction Runoff Plan (PCRP) is required for all development projects to specify BMPs that will be implemented to minimize discharge of pollutants and minimize increases in stormwater runoff volume and flow rate from the development after construction is completed.

At the time of submittal of a permit application, an applicant shall be required to submit to the City a preliminary PCRP, and prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a final PCRP for approval by the City.

The preliminary and final Post-Construction Runoff Plans shall include:
   a. A map showing site drainage patterns (pre- and post-project) and a narrative describing proposed changes to drainage; and the locations of any BMPs to be implemented and maintained on-site after construction has been completed.
   b. A description of the development site, including explanations of the site conditions (e.g., soil type, aspect and orientation), details of any potential pollutants originating from the post-construction use of the development, and any major changes to the grade and drainage capacity on the site due to the development.
   c. A description of proposed Site Design and Source Control BMPs to minimize post-construction polluted runoff and impacts to water quality, including:
      i. Measures to convey runoff from impervious surfaces into permeable areas of the property in a non-erosive manner.
      ii. Measures to maximize the ability of native substrates to retain and infiltrate runoff (including directing rooftop runoff to permeable areas rather than to the storm drain system).
      iii. Measures to maximize the area of on-site permeable surfaces, and to limit directly-connected impervious areas, in order to increase infiltration of runoff.
      iv. Measures to discharge runoff in a manner that avoids potential adverse impacts.
      v. Measures to keep pollutants from coming into contact with stormwater runoff.
      vi. A schedule for the installation or implementation of all BMPs.
      vii. An Operations and Maintenance Plan for any required BMPs that need ongoing maintenance to protect water quality for the life of the project.
      viii. A description of the relationship of the proposed development to the nearest surrounding coastal waters and wetlands, such as distance, elevation, and hydrologic connectivity

7. **Commercial and Industrial Developments:** The following subset of development require additional Post-Construction BMPs to address the predictable pollutants from those uses:
   a. Loading dock areas that have the potential for material spills to be quickly transported to the stormwater conveyance system shall be covered, and shall be designed to minimize run-on and runoff of stormwater. Direct connections to storm drains from depressed loading docks (e.g., truck wells) are prohibited.
   b. Development associated with fueling, repairing, storing, or washing automobiles or service vehicles requires special Site Design and Source Control BMPs to prevent anticipated pollutants from vehicles mixing with stormwater or surface water runoff and entering the storm drain system or coming in contact with coastal waters.
   c. Any exposed maintenance or industrial activity areas and areas where such activities may not be exposed but that result in stormwater contact with associated pollutants shall include designated areas for maintenance and servicing of equipment, and all such activities shall be confined to these areas. All
runoff within such designated areas and within any food service washdown areas shall be contained. The perimeter of these areas shall be constructed so as to completely contain runoff (i.e., curbs, berms, shower drains, etc.), and the contained area shall be plumbed to the sanitary sewer. The sewer connection in these areas shall be equipped with shutoff valves and these areas shall be covered (e.g., roofs or awnings) in such a manner as to minimize discharge of high volume stormwater flows to the sanitary sewer.

d. Site Design and Source Control BMPs must also be included which prevent run-on of surface water or stormwater from entering these service areas, where the water may come in contact with vehicle pollutants and then leave the site as polluted runoff.

e. In addition to the above requirements, the following BMPs shall be incorporated into the design of the following types of development:

i. Vehicle Service Facilities (e.g., gasoline stations, car washes, and automotive repair facilities) shall cover fuel dispensing and vehicle service areas with an overhanging roof structure or canopy. This cover must not drain onto the fuel dispensing area or service area, and all downspouts must be routed to prevent drainage across the fueling area.

ii. Fuel dispensing areas shall:
   1. be paved with Portland cement concrete (or an equivalent smooth, impervious surface; the use of asphalt concrete shall be prohibited)
   2. have a 2% to 4% slope to prevent ponding
   3. be separated from the rest of the site by a grade break that prevents run-on/runoff of storm water
   4. have a drainage system that captures all leaks, and spills and connects to a sump for collection and proper disposal.

iii. Areas designated for washing/steam cleaning of vehicles and equipment must:
   1. be equipped with a clarifier or other pre-treatment facility
   2. be properly connected to a sanitary sewer to prevent metals, oil and grease, solvents, and phosphates from entering the storm drain system or coastal waters.

iv. Repair/maintenance bays shall:
   1. be indoors, covered, or designed in such a way that prevents oil and grease, solvents, car battery acid, coolant, and gasoline from contacting storm water run-on/runoff.
   2. have a drainage system that captures all wash-water, leaks, and spills and connects to a sump for collection and disposal.

v. Direct connection of Vehicle Service Facilities to the storm drain system is prohibited.

vi. An Industrial Waste Discharge Permit must be obtained when required.

f. Parking lots over 5,000 square feet in area shall be designed to minimize impervious surfaces, and runoff from the parking lot shall be treated and/or infiltrated before it reaches the storm drain system so that heavy metals, oil and grease, and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons deposited on parking lot surfaces will not be transported to surface waters.

The design of landscaped areas for parking lots shall consider, and may, where appropriate, be required to include provisions for the on-site infiltration, detention, and/or retention of stormwater runoff, which reduces and slows runoff, and provides pollutant cleansing and groundwater recharge. Where landscaped areas are designed for infiltration detention, and/or retention of stormwater runoff from the parking lots, recessed landscaped areas (below the surface of the pavement) shall be required. Curb cuts shall be placed in curbs bordering landscaped areas, or curbs shall not be installed, to allow stormwater runoff to flow from the parking lot into landscaped areas. All surface parking areas shall be provided a permeable buffer between the parking area and adjoining streets and properties.
Accumulation of particulates contaminated by oil, grease, or other water-insoluble hydrocarbons from vehicle leaks shall be removed from heavily used parking lots (e.g., fast food outlets, lots with 25 or more parking spaces, sports event parking lots, hotels, shopping malls, grocery stores, and discount warehouse stores) by dry vacuuming or equivalent techniques. Filter treatment systems, particularly for hydrocarbon removal BMPs, shall be adequately maintained for the life of the development.

g. Restaurants shall be designed to minimize runoff of oil and grease, solvents, phosphates, and suspended solids to the storm drain system. Equipment washing/steam cleaning areas must be equipped with a grease trap, and properly connected to a sanitary sewer. If the wash area is to be located outdoors, it must be covered, paved, have secondary containment, and be connected to the sanitary sewer. Dumpster areas must have secondary containment.

h. Outdoor storage areas for materials with the potential to pollute stormwater (e.g., toxic compounds, oil and grease, heavy metals, nutrients, suspended solids, and other pollutants) must: 1) be protected by secondary containment structures such as berms, dikes, or curbs, 2) be sufficiently impervious to contain leaks and spills, and 3) have a roof or awning to minimize collection of stormwater within the secondary containment area.

i. Commercial, industrial, and multi-unit residential trash storage areas must: 1) have drainage from adjoining roofs and pavement diverted around the area, 2) be covered and/or screened or walled to prevent off-site transport of trash, and 3) be inspected and cleaned regularly.

8. Development Greater than 5,000 Square Feet: All new development and re-development greater than 5,000 square feet in site coverage or involving impervious surfaces of 5,000 square feet or more (2,500 square feet or more if within 200 feet of a lake or ocean shoreline, or otherwise determined to be development with water quality impacts by the City), shall be subject to the following additional requirements to protect coastal waters:

a. Hydromodification shall be controlled by maintaining certain characteristics of the pre-development hydrograph, as described herein. Where changes in stormwater runoff hydrology (i.e., volume and flow rate) may result in increased potential for stream bank erosion, downstream flooding, or adverse habitat impacts, runoff control measures (e.g., stormwater infiltration or detention) shall be required in order to retain on-site the Stormwater Quality Design Volume (SWQDv), for the City of Seaside this defined as the runoff volume from the 95th percentile, 24-hour storm event.

b. If the combination of Site Design and Source Control BMPs proposed will not be sufficient to minimize the runoff pollutants of concern, then a Treatment Control BMP (or suite of BMPs) shall be required, that is designed and sized appropriately to remove the pollutants of concern for the City of Seaside:

i. Volume-based BMPs should be sized to treat the 85th percentile 24-hour storm event, and

ii. Flow-through BMPs should be sized to treat the 85th percentile one-hour storm event (with an appropriate safety factor of two or greater)

c. A Water Quality and Hydrology Plan (WQHP) shall be required. In the application and initial planning process the applicant shall be required to submit for approval a preliminary WQHP and prior to issuance of a building permit the applicant shall submit a final WQHP for approval by the Department of Public Works that has been certified by a California Registered Civil Engineer, Professional Geologist, Certified Engineering Geologist, or Certified Hydrogeologist qualified to complete this work.

The Water Quality and Hydrology Plan shall contain the following:

i. A certified Post-Construction Runoff Plan for the project (Section 5 Post-Construction Runoff Plan, above) shall be included, either as an appendix or integrated into the WQHP.

ii. An estimate of the changes to the anticipated pollutant loads and changes in runoff flows, resulting from the proposed development; with supporting calculations.

iii. A description of any runoff control measures and/or Treatment Control BMPs that will be implemented to minimize post-construction hydrologic and/or water quality impacts; including a description of how LID or other alternative methods could not address the impacts.
iv. Where runoff control measures are required, provide pre-development and post-development stormwater runoff hydrographs demonstrating that the Stormwater Quality Design Volume (SWQDv) will be retained on-site.

v. If a Treatment Control BMP is required in the City of Seaside to remove a pollutant of concern, then a description of how the Treatment Control BMP (or suite of BMPs) will be sized to treat the 85th percentile 24-hour storm event for volume-based BMPs, or the 85th percentile one-hour storm event (with an appropriate safety factor of two or greater) for flow-through BMPs shall be included in the WQHP.

vi. A long-term plan for the maintenance of all BMPs, as appropriate, to ensure that they operate as designed for the life of the development.


H. Public Access and Recreation

1. New development shall be sited and designed to maximize public recreational access opportunities. Proposed development shall enhance and shall not impair the public’s ability to access and enjoy points and passages to public access features, including those identified in Figure 2-8, Public Access Points and Passages, of the LUP.

2. New development shall plan for and provide public access to and along the shoreline and the City’s lake and wetland areas in a manner that maximizes public trail and access connectivity and utility.

3. Maximize public pedestrian access opportunities and public access improvements (e.g., trails, benches, etc.), within the coastal zone. Areas within the West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan are also subject to the applicable Development Standards and Design Guidelines included in Appendix C. All public paths shall be designed at a minimum width of 10 feet.

I. Additional Standards for Coastal Zone Subareas

1. The City of Seaside recognizes that there are unique subareas within the City's coastal zone that require special considerations for environmental issues such as visual resources, public access and recreation, and dune management. As such, the City's coastal zone is further divided into four coastal zone subareas: Laguna Grande Subarea, Roberts Lake Subarea, Beach Subarea, and Del Monte Subarea as illustrated in Figures 2a and 2b. In addition to the development standards that apply throughout the City’s coastal zone, the following development standards identified below shall also apply within the specified subareas.

2. Additional Standards for Laguna Grande Subarea

a. Development within 100 feet of Laguna Grande, including the channel area, shall be limited to one-story, not exceeding a maximum of 20 feet, except for design/architectural features (e.g., cupolas, domes, tower elements, etc.) that are otherwise consistent with LCP policies and that shall not exceed a maximum height of 30 feet.

b. To protect views and environmental function of the Laguna Grande channel area, proposed development should avoid placing structures in close proximity to the channel. However, such improvements as parking lots and recreational amenities (such as formalized viewing areas, landscaping, interpretive or directional signage, and improved trailways) shall not be prohibited if in compliance with other provisions of this Title.

c. Maximize public access and access improvements, consistent with habitat protection, from the public right-of-way to and along public access trails. All public paths shall be designed at a minimum width of 10 feet.
d. Development shall not interfere with the maintenance/continuance of the developed pedestrian walkway/bikeway. The walkway/bikeway shall be maintained at a minimum width of 10 feet.

e. Expand/enhance public access through means such as directional/interpretive signage, public parking, and additional access points to coastal resources from Del Monte Boulevard or Canyon Del Rey Boulevard.

f. Development between 100 feet and 500 feet of Laguna Grande, including the channel area, shall be limited to a maximum of 5 stories and 60 feet in height and shall be oriented parallel to the channel (perpendicular to Del Monte) in a manner designed to maximize through Highway 1 views. Upper floors shall be setback from lower floors in a manner designed to step away from Laguna Grande, including the channel, and building facades shall include articulation (including breaking up the design with some areas of indent, varied rooflines, offsets, and projections that provide shadow patterns) designed to avoid a boxy look and to integrate the design into its surroundings in a manner protective of public views and the natural surroundings.

3. **Additional Standards for the Roberts Lake Subarea**

   a. Development within 100 feet of Roberts Lake shall be limited to one story, and 15 feet in height.

   b. Maximize public access and associated trail improvements along lands adjoining the Roberts Lake Subarea shoreline. All public paths shall be designed at a minimum width of 10 feet. Where passing through or near the wildlife habitat area to be established in Roberts Lake, this access is to be designed so as to protect the habitat area.

3. **Additional Standards for the Beach Subarea**

   a. Development in the Beach Subarea shall comply with applicable design guidelines for the Highway 1 corridor. Applicable guidelines include the following:

      (1) Vegetative and architectural screening techniques shall be incorporated into projects to protect and enhance public views.

      (2) A minimum 100-foot building setback from the edge of the Caltrans right-of-way. Screening techniques shall be included to protect and enhance public views.

      (3) Freestanding signs shall be minimized as much as possible and shall have a minimum 100-foot setback from the Caltrans right-of-way. The signage base shall be designed to blend with the coastal dune character (for example, by using earth-tone colors, etc.).

      (4) Permitted structures shall be sited and designed to integrate and blend with the coastal dune character (for example, low profile, natural materials, curvilinear as opposed to straight line forms, use of earth-tone colors, etc.).

      (5) Views of the sky, ocean, dunes, lakes and ridgelines shall be preserved and enhanced and shall not be blocked. Signs shall be limited to those necessary to direct and inform drivers along Highway 1 and only if such signs are sited and designed to protect and enhance public views.

   b. **Dune Management Plan.** Development within the Beach Subarea must demonstrate compliance with an adopted Dune Management Plan (as directed by Policy NCR-B 1.1.B), or if prior to completion of the plan, the Applicant shall submit a Dune Management Plan consistent with State and City guidelines.

4. **Additional Standards for the Del Monte Subarea.** Within the areas designated CCRG and CCH the following shall also apply:

   a. Development shall be set back a minimum of 50 feet from marsh or riparian vegetation associated with Roberts Lake.
b. The former Southern Pacific Railroad corridor shall be reserved for future rail and transportation links and other pedestrian access.

For the areas designated CMX/WBUVSP please also refer to the applicable Development Standards and Design Guidelines for the West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan as provided in LCP Appendix C.
CHAPTER 3 – COASTAL PERMITS

3.1 Purpose

The purpose of this Chapter is to establish the Coastal Permit process for the review of all development within the City of Seaside’s coastal zone to ensure that development projects are consistent with the intent and requirements of the Coastal Act and the City’s Local Coastal Land Use Plan (LUP), and to ensure timely review and action on proposed projects.

3.2 Coastal Permit Requirements

A. Coastal Permit Required. Except as otherwise provided in Subsection 3.3 – Exemptions, persons wishing to undertake any development in the coastal zone shall obtain a coastal permit, either a Coastal Administrative Permit (CAP) or a Coastal Development Permit (CDP), in accordance with the provisions of this Title.

B. Coastal Administrative Permit (CAP). Applications for development associated with a use that is listed as a Principally Permitted use in the respective category within the applicable zoning district and that: (1) as proposed is consistent with the LCP; (2) requires no discretionary approval other than a Coastal Permit; and (3) has no adverse effect either individually or cumulatively on coastal resources, including public access, shall obtain a Coastal Administrative Permit (CAP).

C. Coastal Development Permit (CDP). Applications for development associated with a use that is listed as a Conditional Allowable use in the respective category within the applicable zoning district or any other development not meeting the criteria for a CAP shall obtain a Coastal Development Permit (CDP).

D. Additional Permits. The review of a CDP application may be combined with and/or processed concurrently with the review of any other discretionary permit application required by other City ordinances. When an application for a development is proposed, the City shall not grant any such discretionary approval for development that conflicts with any policy or standard of this Title. No such discretionary approval shall be effective until or unless a CDP is approved that authorizes the subject development.

E. Legal Development and Permitting Processes. Development that legally occurred prior to the effective date of the Coastal Act of 1976 or its predecessor, the Coastal Zone Conservation Act of 1972, if applicable, is considered lawfully established development. Improvements, repair, modification, or additions subject to such existing development may be subject to a CAP/CDP or other City permit in accordance with the provisions of this Chapter. The CAP/CDP shall only be approved if the proposed development is consistent with the policies and standards of the City’s LCP.

F. Illegal Development and Permitting Processes. Development that occurred after the effective date of the Coastal Act of 1976 or its predecessor, the Coastal Zone Conservation Act if 1972, if applicable, and that was not authorized in a CAP/CDP or otherwise authorized under the Coastal Act, is not lawfully established or lawfully authorized development. No improvements, repair, modification, or additions to such existing development may be approved, unless the City also approves a CAP/CDP that authorizes the existing development. The CAP/CDP shall only be approved if the existing and proposed development, with any applicable conditions of approval, is consistent with the policies and standards of the City’s LCP.

3.3 Exemptions

Certain minor projects, as defined in accordance with the California Coastal Act of 1976 and the California Code of Regulations, are exempted from the requirements to obtain a coastal permit. Upon Coastal Commission notification, the City shall update this Section to remain consistent with legislative amendments to the Coastal Act and the California Code of Regulations, Title 14, California Coastal Commission. Any conflicts between this section and the current Coastal Act and California Code of Regulations shall be resolved in favor of the current Coastal Act and California Code of Regulations. Development listed below is exempt from the requirement to obtain City approval of a CAP/CDP. Requirements for any other permits are unaffected by this Section.

A. Projects with Coastal Commission Approval. Projects authorized by a valid coastal permit or equivalent
authorization issued by the Coastal Commission or in areas where the Coastal Commission retains original permit jurisdiction. A person undertaking development included in a public works plan or long-range development plan approved by the Coastal Commission is not required to obtain a CAP/CDP from the City. Other City permits may be required.

B. Replacement After Natural Disaster. The replacement of any structure, other than a public works facility, destroyed by a natural disaster is exempt provided that the replacement structure conforms to applicable existing zoning requirements, will be for the same uses as the destroyed structure, does not exceed either the floor area, height, or bulk of the destroyed structure by more than 10 percent, and will be sited in the same location on the affected property as the destroyed structure. Public Resources Code Section 30610(g)(1).

C. Improvements to Existing Single-Family Residences, including fixtures and structures directly attached to the residence and structures normally associated with a single-family residence uses such as garage, and landscaping, but not including guest houses and self-contained residential units. This exemption for improvements does not include the following:

1. Improvements to single-family residences where the development permit issued for the original structure by the City or Coastal Commission indicated that any future additions would require a coastal permit.

2. Improvements to a single-family residences if the residence and/or improvement is located on a beach, wetland, seaward of the mean high-tide line, in ESHA, in an area designated highly scenic in the LUP, or within 50 feet of the edge of a coastal bluff.

3. Improvements that involve any significant alteration of land forms including removal or placement of vegetation on a beach, wetland, dune, within 50 feet of the edge of a coastal bluff.

4. On property not included in subsections 3.3(C)2 above that is located between the sea and the first public road paralleling the sea, within 300 feet of the inland extent of any beach or of the mean high tide of the sea where there is no beach, whichever is the greater distance, or in a significant public viewshed, improvement that would result in an increase of 10 percent or more of internal floor area of an existing structure or an additional improvement of 10 percent or less where an improvement to the structure has previously been undertaken pursuant to subsection 3.3(C), increase in height by more than 10 percent of an existing structure and/or any significant non-attached structure such as garages, fences, shoreline protective works or docks.

5. In areas having a critically short water supply as declared by resolution of the Coastal Commission, construction of major water-using development not essential to residential use such as swimming pools, or construction or extension of landscape irrigation systems.

6. Expansion or construction of water wells or septic systems.

7. Improvements which would change the type or intensity of use of the structure.

D. Temporary Events. Temporary Events as defined in this section and which meet all of the following criteria:

1. The event will not occur between the Saturday of Memorial Day weekend through Labor Day, or if proposed in this period will be of less than one day in duration including setup and take-down; and

2. The event will not occupy any portion of a publicly or privately owned sandy beach or park area, public pier, public beach parking area and there is no potential for adverse effect on sensitive coastal resources; and

3. A fee will not be charged for general public admission and/or seating where no fee is currently charged for use of the same area (not including booth or entry fees); or if a fee is charged, it is for preferred seating only and more than 75% of the provided seating capacity is available free of charge for general public use; and
4. The proposed event has been reviewed in advance by the City and it has been determined that it meets the following criteria:

   a. The event will result in no adverse impact on opportunities for public use of or access to the area due to the proposed location and or timing of the event either individually or together with other development or temporary events scheduled before or after the particular event;

   b. There will be no direct or indirect impacts from the event and its associated activities or access requirements on environmentally sensitive habitat areas, rare or endangered species, significant scenic resources, or other coastal resources;

   c. The event has not previously required a coastal permit to address and monitor associated impacts to coastal resources.

E. **Repair and Maintenance Activities.** Repair or maintenance activities that do not result in an addition to, or enlargement or expansion of, the object of those repair or maintenance activities including activities determined by the Public Works Division as necessary and routine maintenance of stormwater systems or infrastructure in order to prevent flooding, hazard, etc. This exemption for repair and maintenance activities does not include the following:

   1. Any method of repair or maintenance of a seawall revetment, bluff retaining wall, breakwater, groin, culvert, outfall, or similar shoreline work that involves:

      a. Repair or maintenance involving substantial alteration of the foundation of the protective work including pilings and other surface or subsurface structures.

      b. The placement, whether temporary or permanent, of riprap, artificial berms of sand or other beach materials, or any other forms of solid materials, on a beach or in coastal waters, streams, wetlands, estuaries, and lakes or on a shoreline protective work, except for agricultural dikes within enclosed bays or estuaries.

      c. The replacement of 20 percent or more of the materials of an existing structure with materials of a different kind.

      d. The presence, whether temporary or permanent, of mechanized construction equipment or construction materials on any sand area, bluff, or environmentally sensitive habitat area, or within 20 feet of coastal waters or streams.

      e. Any repair or maintenance to facilities or structures or work located in an environmentally sensitive habitat area, any dune area, within 50 feet of the edge of a coastal bluff or environmentally sensitive habitat area, or within 20 feet of coastal waters or streams.

   2. The provisions of this Section shall not be applicable to those activities specifically described as exempt from coastal permit requirements in the document entitled Repair, Maintenance and Utility Hookups, adopted by the Coastal Commission on September 5, 1978. These projects shall be exempt from obtaining a CAP/CDP unless a proposed activity will have a risk of substantial adverse impact on public access, environmentally sensitive habitat area, wetlands, or public views to the ocean.

   3. Unless destroyed by natural disaster, the replacement of 50 percent or more of a single family residence, seawall, revetment, bluff retaining wall, breakwater, groin, or any other structure is not repair and maintenance but instead constitutes a replacement structure requiring a coastal development permit.

F. **Land Division.** Land division brought about in connection with the purchase of such land by a public agency for public recreational uses.

G. **Utility Connections.** The installation, testing, and placement in service or the replacement of any necessary utility
connection between an existing service facility and any development which has been granted a valid coastal permit that accounted for such connection; provided, however, that the City may require conditions to mitigate any adverse impacts on coastal resources including scenic resources.

3.4 Approval Authority

The Planning Commission shall be the Approval Authority to hear and decide applications for Coastal Development Permits (CDPs). The Zoning Administrator is the Approval Authority to consider Coastal Administrative Permits (CAPs).

3.5 Coastal Permit Process

A. Application. A prospective Applicant or their respective agent must pay the appropriate fees and submit sufficient information for a planner to determine which process they must follow for their request as outlined in Section 3.11 of this Chapter. An application for a CAP/CDP shall be reviewed in conjunction with whatever other permits are required for the project in the underlying zone. Where a CAP/CDP is combined with another permit, the approving body for the CAP/CDP shall be the same as that for the permit required for the underlying zoning district.

B. Hearings

1. Coastal Development Permits. All Coastal Development Permits require a public hearing. Before a decision on a CDP, the City shall provide notice of a public hearing by the Planning Commission.

2. Coastal Administrative Permits

   a. Initial Notice. A notice of the proposed development shall be provided to all persons who would otherwise be required to be notified of a public hearing (see below) as well as any other persons known to be interested in receiving notice. The notice shall state that the Zoning Administrator will decide whether to approve or disapprove the CAP application on a date specified in the notice and that a public hearing will be held only if requested in writing by any interested person before the specified date for the decision. The notice shall include a statement that failure by a person to request a public hearing may result in the loss of that person's ability to appeal to the Coastal Commission any action taken by the City on the CAP application.

   b. Hearing. If no request for public hearing is received by the City before the specified date for the decision, then the Zoning Administrator may take action without a public hearing. When a public hearing is requested, notice of the hearing shall be provided in accordance for then provisions for notice (below) and the Zoning Administrator shall conduct the public hearing before a decision on the application.

3. Noticing. For all CAP applications for which a public hearing is requested and for all CDP applications, the following notice provisions shall apply. Not less than ten (10) calendar days prior to consideration of the CAP/CDP, the City shall give notice of such consideration by mailing, postage prepaid, a notice of such consideration to all owners and legal residents of property within 300 feet of the exterior boundaries of the property to be occupied by the use/development for which the permit was applied, all persons who have requested, in writing, notices relating to coastal permits or the application being considered, all parties known to be interested in the application (including parties who have testified or submitted comments on the proposed development), interested public agencies, and the Coastal Commission.

C. Findings Required. All decisions on CAP/CDPs shall be accompanied by written findings. An application for a CDP may be approved or conditionally approved only if the decision maker makes all of the findings listed below:

1. The establishment, maintenance, or operation of the use or structure applied for will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to health, safety, peace, morals, comfort, and general welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, or be detrimental or injurious to property and improvement in the neighborhood, or to the general welfare of the city.
2. The subject property is in compliance with all rules and regulations pertaining to zoning uses, subdivision, and any other applicable provisions of this Title, and any zoning violations have been resolved, including any abatement costs have been paid.

3. The proposed project conforms to the public access and public recreation policies of the Coastal Act.

4. The proposed development is in conformance with plans, policies, and requirements of the certified Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan and complies with all regulations of the Certified Implementation Program. Specific findings shall be made with respect to the following:
   a. The proposed development protects vegetation, natural habitats, and natural resources consistent with the LUP.
   b. The design, location, size, and operating characteristics of the proposed development is consistent with any applicable design plans and/or area plans incorporated into the LUP.
   c. The proposed development maintains public access to and along the coast as set forth in the LUP.
   d. The proposed development is consistent with the LUP goal of providing visitor-serving needs as appropriate.
   e. The proposed development is consistent with the LUP goal of encouraging coastal dependent and related uses as appropriate.
   f. The proposed development protects and where feasible enhances coastal resources.

D. Conditions. Approval of a CAP/CDP shall be subject to conditions as necessary to ensure conformance with, and implementation of, the certified LCP. Modification and resubmittal of project plans, drawings and specifications, preparation of additional plans, or recordation of documents may be required to ensure conformance with the LCP. When modifications and resubmittal of plans, additional plans, or recorded documents are required, issuance of the permit shall be deferred for a sufficient period of time to allow the City to determine whether the modified project, the additional plans, or the recorded documents comply with the conditions of approval of the permit.

E. Notice of Final Action. For Coastal Administrative Permits approved without benefit of a public hearing, all persons receiving notice pursuant to 3.5.b.2.a or requesting such notice shall be notified in writing of the issuance of a Coastal Administrative Permit. For all CAPs/CDPs, a final action notice shall be prepared that describes the approved development (including all supporting findings, conditions, and materials (approved project plans, applicable technical reports, etc.)) and the process by which it was approved, and information on appeal procedures, including local appeals as well as appeals to the Coastal Commission. Within seven (7) calendar days of the final local action on a CAP/CDP, the City shall provide such notice of its action by first class mail to the Coastal Commission and to any persons who specifically requested notice of such final action by submitting a self-addressed, stamped envelope to the Resource Management Services Department-Planning Division. The City's action on a CAP/CDP shall not be considered final until all rights of appeal have been exhausted.

3.6 Determination of Permit Requirement

A. The Zoning Administrator shall determine, at the written request of any member of the public, whether or not any development proposed in the coastal zone is exempt from a Coastal Development Permit pursuant to this Title.

B. Any person wishing such determination shall submit to the Resource Management Services Department all statements, plans, and elevations deemed necessary by the Resource Management Services Department to assess the development.

C. After review, the Zoning Administrator shall notify the Applicant and the California Coastal Commission in writing:
1. That the development is exempt and state the category of exemption, or

2. That a Coastal Development Permit is required and, if so, whether it is appealable or not.

The procedure described in this Section shall be considered an administrative determination and is appealable pursuant to Section 3.12 of this Title.

3.7 Revocation

Where one or more of the conditions of a Coastal Permit have not been, or are not being, complied with, or when a Coastal Permit was granted on the basis of false material information, the Zoning Administrator (for a CAP) or the Planning Commission (for a CDP) may revoke or modify the Coastal Permit following public hearing. Notice of such hearing shall be the same as would be required for a new CDP.

3.8 Expiration of Coastal Permits

Unless the permit states otherwise, a CAP/CDP shall expire two (2) years from its date of approval if the development has not commenced during that time. The approving authority may grant an extension of one (1) year for good cause. Extensions shall be requested in writing by the Applicant or authorized agent prior to expiration of the two-year period. Such extensions of CAPs/CDPs shall be considered amendments for purpose of notice and appeal to the Coastal Commission.

3.9 Coastal Permit Amendments

Upon application by the permittee, a CAP/CDP may be amended. Application for an amendment shall be accomplished in the same manner specified by this Title for the initial application of the CAP/CDP. All sections of this Title dealing with the specific type of CAP/CDP shall apply to permit amendments.

3.10 Denial of Coastal Permit Applications

An application or local appeal may be denied and no further application for the denied request shall be filed in the ensuing twelve (12) months, except as otherwise specified at the same time of denial.

3.11 Coastal Permit Application Requirement and Fees

A. Filing Procedures

1. Application. Application for, and amendments to, CAPs/CDPs shall be made to the Resource Management Services Department on an application form provided by the Department, together with all required plans, maps, elevations, reports, and any such supporting information deemed necessary by the Planning Division or any other ordinance contained in the certified LCP to adequately assess and evaluate the proposed project. Application for a CAP/CDP may be submitted concurrently with other City permits required by the City. The application may include a fee set by the Planning Commission. It is the responsibility of the Applicant to establish evidence in support of all required LCP findings.

2. Review. Following submittal of an application, the Planning Division shall review the application for completeness. Within thirty (30) calendar days from submittal, the Planning Division shall notify the Applicant in writing of which parts of the application are incomplete and describe the specific materials needed to complete the application. Not later than 30 days after receipt of all of the requested materials, the Planning Division shall determine whether the submittal of the requested materials is complete and transmit that determination to the Applicant. If no determination of completeness is provided to the Applicant within 30 days of submittal, the application will be deemed complete. Any application for a CAP/CDP shall not be determined to be complete and shall not be filed until and unless the applicable requirements of this Title have been met. Until such application is determined to be complete by the Planning Division and has been reviewed in accordance with the applicable CEQA Guidelines and the California Coastal Act, no action shall be taken on it by the Planning Division.
3. **Non-acceptable Applications.** The Department shall not accept for filing an application for development on a lot or parcel or portion thereof which is the subject of a pending proposal for an adjustment to the boundary of the coastal zone pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 30103(b) of the Coastal Act.

**B. Application Fees.** The Planning Commission may, by resolution, establish a schedule of fees for CAP/CDP applications, approvals, and other matters pertaining to this Chapter. The schedule of fees may be changed or modified only by resolution of the Planning Commission. Until all applicable fees have been paid in full, no application shall be deemed complete and no action shall be taken on any application, appeal, or other matter pertaining to this Chapter for which a fee is required.

### 3.12 Coastal Permit Appeals

Development pursuant to an approved CAP/CDP shall not commence until the CAP/CDP is effective. The CAP/CDP is not effective until all potential avenues for appeal, including those to the Coastal Commission, have been exhausted. In the event that the Coastal Commission denies the permit or issues the permit on appeal, the CAP/CDP approved by the City is void.

**A. Local Appeals**

1. A decision or any portion of the decision made by the Deputy City Manager, or Department staff under the provisions of this Title may be appealed to the Planning Commission by an aggrieved person. Any decision made by the Planning Commission may be appealed by an aggrieved person to the City Council.

2. An action or decision by the Planning Commission in compliance with this Title may be appealed to the Council by an individual Council member, but the Council member shall not vote when the appeal is considered by the Council.

3. **Timing and Form of Appeal.** An appeal shall be submitted in writing within seven (7) calendar days of the date of the decision. The appeal shall state the pertinent facts and the basis for the appeal. Appeals addressed to the Planning Commission shall be filed with the Department; appeals addressed to the Council shall be filed with the City Clerk. An appeal shall be accompanied by the required filing fee.

4. **Report and Scheduling of Hearing.** When an appeal has been filed, the Zoning Administrator shall prepare a report on the matter and schedule the matter for a public hearing by the appropriate authority. Notice of the hearing shall be provided in the same form as is required for consideration of CDP applications, and the hearing shall be conducted. Any interested party may appear and be heard regarding the appeal. At the hearing, the appeal body may consider any issue involving the matter that is the subject of the appeal ("de novo"), in addition to the specific grounds for the appeal. The review authority may:

   a. Affirm, affirm in part, or reverse the action, determination, or decision that is the subject of the appeal, based upon findings of fact about the particular case. The findings shall identify the reasons for the action on the appeal, and verify the compliance or noncompliance of the subject of the appeal with this Title;

   b. Adopt additional conditions of approval that may address issues or concerns other than the subject of the appeal; or

   c. Disapprove the CAP/CDP approved by the previous review authority, even if the appellant only requested modification or elimination of one or more conditions of approval.

In the event of a tie vote by the appeal body, the decision being appealed shall stand.

5. If new or different evidence is presented on appeal, the Planning Commission or City Council may refer the matter to the previous review authority (i.e., Zoning Administrator or Planning Commission, as applicable), for further consideration.

6. The appeal body shall render its decision on the appeal within sixty (60) days of the initial public hearing,
unless the matter is continued for good cause.

7. **Effective Date of Appeal Decision.** A decision by the Planning Commission is effective seven (7) days after the date of the decision when no appeal of the decision has been filed with the Council. A decision by the Council is final on the date of the decision.

B. **Appeals to the Coastal Commission.** Any approval decision by the City on a CAP/CDP, or any approval or denial decision by the City on a CAP/CDP for a major public works project (including a publicly financed recreational facility and/or a special district development) or an energy facility, may be appealed by an aggrieved person or any two members of the Coastal Commission to the Coastal Commission.

1. Appeals to the Coastal Commission are limited to actions on the following types of developments:
   a. Developments approved by the City between the sea and the first public road paralleling the sea or within 300 feet of the inland extent of any beach or of the mean high tide line of the sea where there is no beach, whichever is the greater distance.
   b. Developments approved by the City not included within paragraph (1) that are located on tidelands, submerged lands, public trust lands, within 100 feet of any wetland, estuary, or stream, or within 300 feet of the top of the seaward face of any coastal bluff.
   c. Developments approved by the City not included within paragraph (1) or (2) that are located in a sensitive coastal resource area.
   d. Any development which constitutes a major public works project or a major energy facility.

2. Within ten (10) working days of Coastal Commission receipt of a complete notice of final City CAP/CDP action, an appealable CAP/CDP may be appealed to the Coastal Commission by an aggrieved person who has exhausted local appeals or by any two members of the Coastal Commission.

3. For appealable CAP/CDPs, an appellant shall be deemed to have exhausted local appeals and shall be qualified as an aggrieved person where the appellant has pursued his or her appeal to the appellate bodies identified in this Title; except that exhaustion of all local appeals shall not be required if any of the following occur:
   e. The City requires an appellant to appeal to more local appellate bodies than have been certified as appellate bodies for coastal permits in the coastal zone, in this Title.
   f. An appellant was denied the right of the initial local appeal by a City ordinance which restricts the class of persons who may appeal a local decision.
   g. An appellant was denied the right of local appeal because City notice and hearing procedures for the development did not comply with the provisions of this Title.
   h. The City charges an appeal fee for the filing or processing of appeals.
CHAPTER 4 – DEFINITIONS

The following definitions are provided for the following terms in the Coastal Implementation Plan.

4.1 Definitions

#. Definitions, “#”

2-year, 24-hour Design Storm is a nationally accepted rate that represents the largest amount of rainfall expected over a 24-hour period during a 2-year interval.

The 85th percentile rainfall event is the storm event whose precipitation total is greater than or equal to 85 percent of all storm events over a given period of record. For example, to determine what the 85th percentile storm event is in a specific location, all 24-hour storms that have recorded values over a 30 year period would be tabulated and a 85th percentile storm would be determined from this record (i.e., 15% of the storms would be greater than the number determined to be the 85th percentile storm).

A. Definitions, "A"

Accessory Structures. Structures that are accessory to principal allowed uses and structures, such as parking facilities, restrooms, etc.

Adverse Effect (on an ESHA). Any significant disruption of the habitat values, any significant degradation of habitat areas, and anything incompatible with the continuance of ESHA.

Adverse Effect on Visual Resources. Development that impacts views to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas, alters natural landforms, and/or conflicts with the character of surrounding areas.

Adverse Effect (on a wetland). Development in a wetland that is not an allowed use in a wetland and/or development which would degrade the ability of a wetland or marine resource to sustain and maintain its biological productivity (healthy populations of all species of marine organisms) and ability to provide a long-term commercial, recreational, scientific, and educational purpose.

Aggrieved Person. Any person who, in person or through a representative, appeared at a public hearing of the City of Seaside in connection with a City decision or action on a Coastal Administrative Permit or Coastal Development Permit application, or who, by other appropriate means prior to a hearing or the City’s final action on a CAP/CDP, informed the City of Seaside of the nature of his/her concerns or who for good cause was unable to do either. An aggrieved person includes the applicant for the CAP/CDP.

Agriculture, Resource & Open Space. See “Land Use.”

B. Definitions, "B"

Best Management Practices (BMPs). BMPs are the methods, measures, and practices selected and designed to reduce or eliminate pollutants in runoff, and/or to minimize changes in runoff flow characteristics resulting from development.

Building Site Coverage. Building site coverage means any area covered by a structure, structures, or structure protrusions including above grade decks but not including building eaves of 30 inches or less and not including paved driveways, sidewalks, paths, and patios.

C. Definitions, “C”

Canyon Del Rey Watershed. The Canyon Del Rey Watershed is defined as the area beginning near the intersection of Quail Ridge Lane and State Route 68, continuing along State Route 68 toward the City of Monterey until the intersection of Canyon Del Rey Boulevard and State Route 68, and extending along Canyon Del Rey Boulevard until the terminus of Canyon Del Rey Creek at the southeastern end of Laguna Grande, and is further defined as an area of exceptional value and public importance.
California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). A California law (California Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) which sets forth a process for public agencies to make informed decisions on discretionary project approvals. The process aids decision makers to determine whether any environmental impacts are associated with a proposed project. It requires environmental impacts associated with a proposed project to be eliminated or reduced and that alternatives and mitigation measures that will substantially reduce or eliminate significant impacts to the environment have been implemented.


Coastal Appeal Zone. A geographical area between the sea and first public road paralleling the sea or within 300 feet of the inland extent of any beach or within 300 feet of the mean high tide line of the sea where there is no beach, whichever is the greater distance, in combination with tidelands, submerged lands, public trust lands, and lands within 100 feet of any wetland, estuary, stream, or within 300 feet of the top of seaward face of any coastal bluff.

Coastal Commission. The California Coastal Commission as established by the California Coastal Act of 1976.

Coastal Development Permit (CDP). A type of Coastal Permit that requires a public hearing that may be granted in compliance with the California Coastal Act and the LCP, and which authorizes development and a specific use of land on a specific site, subject to compliance with any conditions of approval imposed on the permit.

Coastal Administrative Permit. A type of Coastal Permit that: (1) as proposed is consistent with the LCP; (2) requires no discretionary approval other than a Coastal Permit; (3) has no adverse effect either individually or cumulatively on coastal resources, including public access, (4) requires a public hearing only where one is requested; (5) may be granted in compliance with the California Coastal Act and the LCP, and (6) that authorizes development and a specific use of land on a specific site, subject to compliance with any conditions of approval imposed on the permit.

Coastal-Dependent Use. Any development, or use, that requires a site on, or adjacent to, the ocean to function.

Coastal Hazard. Including, but not limited to, episodic and long-term shoreline retreat and coastal erosion, high seas, ocean waves, storms, tsunami, coastal flooding, landslides, bluff and geologic instability, and the interaction of same.

Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP). Includes the implementation measures needed to carry out the goals, policies, and programs of the Land Use Plan (LUP) document of the Local Coastal Program (LCP).

Coastal Scenic View Corridor. An area in which development must be sited and designed to protect public views to the dunes, along the shorelines, and in scenic coastal areas, including to minimize the alteration of landforms, so that such development will be visually compatible with the character of the surrounding areas.

Coastal waters are wetlands, streams, rivers, drainage courses, estuaries, marshes, lakes, the ocean, and groundwater within the coastal zone.

Coastal Zone. The portions of the California Coastal Zone established by the California Coastal Act of 1976, and as defined by Section 30103 of the Public Resources Code, within the City of Seaside.

Coastal Parks and Open Space (CPOS) Zone Designation. See “Zoning District.”

Coastal Visitor-Serving Commercial (CVSC) Zone Designation. See “Zoning District.”

Coastal Visitor-Serving Recreation (CVSR) Zone Designation. See “Zoning District.”

Coastal Mixed Use/West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (CMX/WBUVSP) Zone Designation. See “Zoning District.”

Cumulatively. “Cumulatively” or “cumulative effect” means the incremental effects of an individual project shall be reviewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.

D. Definitions, “D”
Development. "Development" means, on land, in or under water, the placement or erection of any solid material or structure; discharge or disposal of any dredged material or of any gaseous, liquid, solid, or thermal waste; grading, removing, dredging, mining, or extraction of any materials; change in the density or intensity of use of land, including, but not limited to, subdivision pursuant to the Subdivision Map Act (commencing with Section 66410 of the Government Code), and any other division of land, including lot splits, except where the land division is brought about in connection with the purchase of such land by a public agency for public recreational use; change in the intensity of use of water, or of access thereto; construction, reconstruction, demolition, or alteration of the size of any structure, including any facility of any private, public, or municipal utility; and the removal or harvesting of major vegetation other than for agricultural purposes, kelp harvesting, and timber operations which are in accordance with a timber harvesting plan submitted pursuant to the provisions of the Z'berg-Nejedly Forest Practice Act of 1973 (commencing with Section 4511).

Directly-connected impervious areas include areas covered by a building, impermeable pavement, and/or other impervious surfaces that drain directly into the storm drain system without first flowing across permeable areas (e.g., vegetative landscaping or permeable pavement).

Discharge directly is defined as runoff that flows from the development to coastal waters and is not first combined with flows from any other adjacent areas.

Drainage course is a watercourse with a defined bed, bank, and channel, and/or with locally-indigenous hydrophytic vegetation.

Dry-weather runoff is the runoff from a site not attributed to precipitation; it typically includes, for example, irrigation water, wastewater from rinsing or pressure-washing pavements, and residential car wash water.

E. Definitions, "E"

Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA). Any land in which plant or animal life or their habitats are either rare or especially valuable because of their nature or role in an ecosystem and which could be easily disturbed or degraded by human activities and developments is defined to be an Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area, or ESHA, consistent with Coastal Act Section 30107.5.

F. Definitions, "F"

Feasible. "Feasible" means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, and technological factors.

Floor Area Ratio. Floor area ratio (FAR) expresses the intensity of use on a lot. The FAR represents the ratio between the total gross floor area of all buildings on a lot and the total land area of that lot. For example, a 20,000 square foot building on a 40,000 square foot lot yields a FAR of 0.50:1 or 50%. A 50% FAR describes a single-story building that covers half of the lot or a two-story building covering approximately one-quarter of the lot.

H. Definitions, "H"

Hydromodification is the physical effect on receiving waters linked to the modification of the flow rate, duration, and volume of runoff from development that influences sediment transport, erosion and depositional processes, and stream ecology.

L. Definitions, "L"

Land Use. The purpose for which land or a structure is designed, arranged, intended, occupied, or maintained.

A. Agriculture, Resource & Open Space. Land use that often allows uses such as farming operations, land preservation, parklands, recreational uses, educational facilities, etc.

B. Recreation, Education & Public Assembly. Land use that often allows uses such as meeting facilities, schools, playgrounds, recreation facilities, golf courses, health/fitness facilities, libraries, museums, theaters, equestrian facilities, etc.

C. Retail. Land use that often allows uses such as retail sales, recreational equipment rental and related activities, etc.
D. Services. Land use that often allows uses such as lodging, visitor/traveler support services, restaurants, wineries, service stations, recreational trails, etc.

**Land Use Plan (LUP).** The portion of a local government’s LCP that identifies the kinds, location, and intensity of land uses, the applicable resource protection and development policies, and, where necessary, a listing of implementing actions. (PRC Section 30108.5)

**Local Coastal Program (LCP).** The City of Seaside’s Land Use Plan and Coastal Implementation Plan as certified by the Coastal Commission constitute the City of Seaside Local Coastal Program.

**Lot Area.** Gross lot area is the total area included within the lot lines of a lot. Net lot area is the gross area of the lot from which submerged areas and road easements have been subtracted.

**Lot Depth.** The average linear distance between the front and the rear lot lines or the intersection of the two side lot lines if there is no rear line. The Resource Management Services Department shall determine lot depth for parcels of irregular configuration.

**Lot Width.** The horizontal distance between the side lot lines, measured at right angles to the lot depth at a point midway between the front and rear lot lines. The Resource Management Services Department shall determine lot width for parcels of irregular shape.

“**Low Impact Development (LID)**” is a set of development site design strategies with the goal of maintaining or reproducing the site’s pre-development hydrologic functions of storage, infiltration, and groundwater recharge, as well as the volume and rate of stormwater discharges. LID strategies use small-scale integrated and distributed management practices, including minimizing impervious surfaces, infiltrating stormwater close to its source, and preserving permeable soils and native vegetation.

M. Definitions, "M"

**Major Public Works and Energy Facilities**

(a) "Major public works" and "major energy facilities" mean facilities that cost more than one hundred thousand dollars ($100,000) with an automatic annual increase in accordance with the Engineering News Record Construction Cost Index, except for those governed by the provisions of Public Resources Code Sections 30610, 30610.5, 30611, or 30624.

(b) Notwithstanding the criteria in (a), "major public works" also means publicly financed recreational facilities that serve, affect, or otherwise impact regional or statewide use of the coast by increasing or decreasing public recreational opportunities or facilities. (Cal. Admin. Code Title 14, Section 13012)

**Marine Resource.** “Marine Resource” is a broad, encompassing term that incorporates all marine life and marine habitats, including the flora and fauna of the Monterey Bay Marine Sanctuary and all water bodies within the coastal zone that, due to their aesthetics, function, or contribution to the social and environmental ecosystem, are considered to have exceptional value and public importance.

**Marsh.** A tract of low wetland, often treeless and periodically inundated, generally characterized by a growth of grasses, sedges, cattails, and rushes.

**Mitigation/Restoration and Monitoring Program.** A program prepared pursuant to Section 15097 of the CEQA Guidelines. It describes the processes for implementing identified mitigation measures and/or restoration measures and the persons responsible for implementing and/or overseeing those mitigations. The specific mitigation/restoration measures themselves are intended to be the mitigation measures identified in the environmental review of a project.

**Mudflat.** A mud-covered, gently sloping tract of land alternately covered and left bare by tidal waters.

N. Definitions, "N"

**Natural Hazard.** A natural hazard is defined as threat of an atmospheric, earth, or water related occurrence (or potential threat of same) that will have a negative effect on life, property, or the environment. Natural hazards within Seaside’s coastal zone...
include but are not limited to episodic and long-term shoreline retreat and coastal erosion, high seas, ocean waves, storms, tsunami, coastal flooding, earthquakes, landslides, bluff and geologic instability, and the interaction of same.

P. Definitions, "P"

Public Access. The ability of residents and visitors to use and enjoy areas within the coastal zone for access and recreational activities such as hiking, bicycling, and picnicking. Public access includes the provision of open accessway to coastal features and connectivity to other existing coastal features and inland trail networks such as walkways and bicycle paths.

R. Definitions, "R"

Recreation, Education & Public Assembly. See "Land Use."

Repair and Maintenance. An activity designed to return the object of the repair and/or maintenance event to its prior legally established configuration.

Retail. See "Land Use."

Riparian Habitat/Corridor. An area of vegetation that is an association of plant species that grow adjacent to freshwater watercourses, including perennial and intermittent streams, lakes, and other watercourses and bodies of fresh water. The extent of riparian habitat/corridor is defined by the edge of riparian vegetation or, in the absence of such vegetation, the top edge of the bank of the watercourse.

Runoff includes both stormwater runoff and dry-weather (urban) runoff.

S. Definitions, "S"

Sand Dune (Dune). Sand dunes form in certain conditions of sand supply and wind energy and direction. Dunes are a dynamic habitat subject to extremes of physical disturbance, drying, and salt spray and support a unique suite of plant and animal species adapted to such harsh conditions.

Sea Level Rise. Commonly defined as the anticipated sea level changes due to the greenhouse effect and associated global warming and climatic changes.

Seawater Intrusion. The movement of saline water into freshwater aquifers. Most often, it is caused by groundwater pumping from coastal wells, or from construction of navigation channels. The channels and canals provide conduits for salt water to be brought into freshwater marshes; however, saltwater intrusion can also occur as the result of a natural process like a storm surge from a hurricane. Saltwater intrusion occurs in virtually all coastal aquifers, where they are in hydraulic continuity with seawater.

Services. See "Land Use."

Setback. The distance by which a structure, parking area, or other development feature must be separated from a lot line, other structure or development feature, street centerline, or other areas specified in this LCP.

Significant Environmental Impact (Significant Adverse Impact on the Environment). A substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance. An economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. A social or economic change related to a physical change may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant. (CEQA Guidelines, 14 Cal. Code of Reg. Section 15382)

Site Design Best Management Practices (BMPs). Project design features that reduce the creation or severity of potential pollutant sources, or reduce the alteration of the project site’s natural stormwater flow regime. Examples include minimizing impervious surfaces, preserving native vegetation, and infiltrating roof-top runoff.

Source Control Best Management Practices (BMPs). Methods that reduce potential pollutants at their sources and/or avoid entrainment of pollutants in runoff, including schedules of activities, prohibitions of practices, maintenance procedures,
managerial practices, or operational practices. Examples include covering outdoor storage areas, using efficient irrigation, and minimizing the use of landscaping chemicals.

**Stormwater runoff** is water resulting from precipitation that flows over land surfaces.

**Structure Height.** The distance measured vertically from existing grade to the top of the structure.

**Swamp.** A tract of wet, spongy land, often having a growth of certain types of trees and other vegetation, but unfit for cultivation.

**T. Definitions, “T”**

**Treatment Control BMPs.** Systems designed to remove pollutants from stormwater by simple gravity settling of particulate pollutants, filtration, biological uptake, media adsorption, or any other physical, biological, or chemical process. Examples include vegetated swales, detention basins, and storm drain inlet filters.

**V. Definitions, “V”**

**Viewshed Enhancement Area.** Those areas within the public viewshed that can be restored or enhanced to improve visual quality of degraded conditions.

**Visually Sensitive Area.** Those areas within the public viewshed that provide significant views and that require height and bulk restrictions and other development standards/mitigation measures to preserve and enhance important scenic resources, including those areas shown on LUP Figure 2-4.

**Visual Resource.** Those areas within the public viewshed that provide scenic value. The scenic and visual qualities of the Monterey Bay, the beach, lakes and other coastal areas shall be considered a visual resource and shall be protected as a resource of public importance.

**Visitor/Traveler Support.** Services such as hotels, motels, food service, information centers, etc. that provide support to visitors, guests, or tourists.

**W. Definitions, “W”**

**Watershed.** The region or area drained by a river, stream, etc.; drainage area.

**Wetland.** Defined by Section 30121 of the Coastal Act as lands within the coastal zone which may be covered periodically or permanently with shallow water and include saltwater marshes, freshwater marshes, open or closed brackish water marshes, swamps, mudflats, and fens. The definition of wetland is further detailed by Section 13577 (b)(1) of the California Code of Regulations as land where the water table is at, near, or above the land surface long enough to promote the formation of hydric soils or to support the growth of hydrophytes, and shall also include those types of wetlands where vegetation is lacking and soil is poorly developed or absent as a result of frequent and drastic fluctuations of surface water levels, wave action, water flow, turbidity or high concentrations of salts or other substances in the substrate. Such wetlands can be recognized by the presence of surface water or saturated substrate at some time during each year and their location within, or adjacent to, vegetated wetlands or deep-water habitats.

**Z. Definitions, “Z”**

**Zoning District.** Any district established by the Zoning Map and Section 2.3 – Establishment and Designation of Coastal Zoning Districts, within which certain land uses are allowed or prohibited, and certain site planning and development standards are established (e.g., setbacks, height limits, site coverage requirements, etc.).

1. **Coastal Parks and Open Space (CPOS) Zone Designation.** This designation is established to protect and preserve coastal resources including sensitive habitats, public views and other visual amenities, and; public recreational access opportunities within the coastal zone. This designation also identifies existing or planned parkland. Public use areas include the sandy beach, access ways, parks, trails, walkways, and other recreational amenities that are publicly owned or over which easements have been established, including where they are required as a condition of development (IV.A.3.e).
2. **Coastal Visitor-Serving Commercial (CVSC) Zone Designation.** This designation is established to service the recreational needs of visitors to Seaside and the surrounding area. Principal permitted visitor-serving commercial uses include hotels/motels, food service, retail establishments, visitor/traveler support services (such as visitor information centers), and recreational-related commercial uses (IV. A. 3.a).

3. **Coastal Visitor-Serving Recreation (CVSR) Zone Designation.** Principal permitted visitor-serving recreation uses include recreational equipment rental centers (such as bicycle, boat, and other recreational equipment) and visitor-serving support services (such as visitor information centers). However, counter food service (such as a snack bar), which is ancillary to a primary permitted use, is permissible.

4. **Coastal Mixed Use/West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan (CMX/WBUVSP) Zone Designation.** Seaside has developed a Mixed Use zone designation as a way to promote pedestrian- and transit-oriented activity centers that have a mixture of residential, commercial, office, and civic uses. This designation is appropriate in a portion of the Del Monte Subarea consistent and compatible with the West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan. The City may consider identification and development of transit parking or transit-supporting uses as a component of mixed use within the coastal zone. This category is intended to accommodate a well-integrated mix of high-intensity residential, commercial, office, and civic uses. Under this designation, residential and commercial or office and commercial uses may be developed on the same parcel (e.g., residential above commercial).

5. **Coastal Regional Commercial (CCRG) – Zone Designation.** The CCRG zone designation is established for existing regional commercial uses that provide employment generating opportunities for the community. Regional commercial uses are defined as large scale commercial development with retail, entertainment, and/or service uses of a scale and function to serve a regional market. These uses are allowed where existing regional commercial uses are developed within the coastal zone. Permitted regional commercial uses include general, grocery, and outdoor retail; shopping center; health and fitness facilities; and restaurants with table service.

6. **Coastal Heavy Commercial (CCH) – Zone Designation.** The Heavy Commercial zone designation is intended for sub-regional commercial activities such as auto and truck repair, contractor yards, warehousing, and light manufacturing. These uses are permitted where existing heavy commercial uses are developed within the coastal zone (i.e. near railroad right-of-way adjacent to Sand City boundary).

7. **Coastal Transportation Corridor (CTC) – Zone Designation.** The Coastal Transportation Corridor zone designation is established to accommodate motorized and non-motorized forms of transportation. The State Highway One right-of-way and the former Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way are essential public transportation corridors. Principal permitted uses of the corridors are for motorized and non-motorized forms of transportation. The former Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way shall be reserved for possible light rail, bus rapid transit route, or other non-motorized forms of transportation including pedestrian and/or bicycle paths.
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INTRODUCTION

On behalf of the City of Seaside, PMC conducted a biological resources inventory of the study area located partially within the City of Seaside, Monterey County, California (Figure 1). This report identifies the regional setting, local setting, and regulatory framework, in relation to the sensitive biological resources that may be affected from potential site development. This memo has been written to present an overview of potential biological issues and constraints that might be encountered, and that would affect project schedules or cost, if a possible future project is constructed.

STUDY AREA

The approximately 129-acre study area is located partially within the City of Seaside, California in the western portion of Monterey County (Figure 1). This location corresponds to the Seaside, California U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle map (USGS 1983). Elevation in the study area ranges from approximately zero to 57 feet (zero to 17 meters) above mean sea level. Study area topography varies from the sand-covered shore of the Pacific Ocean up to the sand dunes and down to the relatively flat terrace associated with the Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake. Elevation rises sharply in the southern portion of the study area near the southern edge of Laguna Grande Regional Park.

Land uses within the study area include residential, commercial, and park/open space. The study area is on the Monterey Bay, situated between the cities of Marina and Monterey. Habitats within the study area include the marine, coastal dune scrub, estuarine, emergent wetland, coastal oak woodland, park, urban, and ruderal habitats associated with the residential, commercial and park uses. Highway One separates the coastal dune habitat from the rest of the study area. Del Monte Boulevard and the abandoned Southern Pacific Railroad tracks separate Roberts Lake from Laguna Grande.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION/BACKGROUND

The City of Seaside is mandated by the California Coastal Act of 1976 to prepare a Local Coastal Program (LCP) for the area of the City that lies within the coastal zone boundary. The LCP consists of two major parts: the Land Use Plan (LUP) and the Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP). The LUP designates the kinds, location, and intensity for land and water uses, and presents applicable resource protection and development policies to accomplish the policies of the Coastal Act. The LCP must be adopted by the City, then approved (certified) by the California Coastal Commission. The LCP may be amended in accordance with California Code of Regulations and Public Resources Code.
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Figure 1
Regional Location
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Figure 2

Project Location

Source: NAIP, 2005; CASIL, 2007; PMC, 2008
METHODODOLOGY

Biological resources within the study area were identified by PMC biologist, Angela Calderaro, through field reconnaissance, a review of pertinent literature, and database queries. The primary sources of data referenced for this report included the following:

- “Federal Endangered and Threatened Species that may be Affected by Projects in the Seaside, California 7.5-Minute Topographic Quadrangle and Surrounding Quadrangles” (Appendix A; USFWS, 2008a);
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Critical Habitat Online Mapper (USFWS, 2008b);
- California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), Rarefind 3 computer program (Appendix A; CDFG, 2008a);
- CNDDB Quickviewer online database (CDFG, 2008b);
- California Native Plant Society (CNPS) online species inventory (Appendix A; CNPS, 2008);
- Ecological Subregions of California (Miles and Goudey, 1997);
- Administrative Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Laguna Grande/Roberts Lake Restoration Project (Holton Assoc and Moffatt and Nichols, 1986); and
- West Broadway Specific Plan Biological Resources Assessment (PMC, 2007).

Field Evaluation

General biological surveys of the study area were completed on August 2 and 3, 2008. Surveys included general plant and wildlife surveys and a vegetative community and wildlife habitat delineation. The entire study area was accessible during the surveys. The weather was warm (approximately 60 to 70 degrees Fahrenheit) with sunny to foggy skies, but the weather did not hamper survey efforts. Resources were mapped using Trimble Geo XT Global Positioning System (GPS), aerial photos, and topographic maps at a scale of 1 inch = 100 feet. Habitat types were noted on an aerial photograph and digitized using ArcGIS software (Figure 3). General plant and wildlife surveys were completed by walking through all habitats and recording data in a field notebook. Field surveys focused on identifying and delineating habitat for special-status plant and wildlife species, although general habitat conditions were noted and incidental species observations were recorded. A list of plants and wildlife observed during these surveys is shown in Appendix C.

The USFWS’s National Wetland Inventory (NWI) was also checked for presence of known wetlands and waters. The NWI is an inventory of wetlands identified on aerial photography by vegetation, visible hydrology, and geography, and subsequently classified in general accordance with Cowardin et al. (1979) Classification of Wetlands and Deep Water Habitats of the United States. Collateral information used in the NWI mapping effort includes USGS topographic maps and Natural Resources Conservation Service soil surveys. Figure 4 shows the NWI wetlands and other waters mapped within the vicinity of the study area. A wetland delineation was not conducted within the study area as a part of this survey effort. Additional or fewer features may be uncovered once a wetland delineation is conducted.
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Figure 3

Vegetative Communities within the Study Area
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vegetative Community</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Percentage of Study Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estuarine</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergent Wetland</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Dune Scrub</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Oak Woodland</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riparian</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Park</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruderal</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>128.9</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NAIP, 2005; CASIL, 2007; PMC, 2008
Figure 4

National Wetlands Inventory
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Source: CNDDB, 2008; NAIP, 2005; PMC, 2008
Special-status Species Assessment

Prior to the field visit, a database search for special-status species was conducted for the Seaside, California USGS 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle and surrounding quadrangles (Marina, Salinas, Monterey, Spreckels, Soberanes Point, Mount Carmel, and Carmel Valley). Appendix A presents the results of the CNDDDB, CNPS, and USFWS queries for special-status species that are known to occur or have the potential to occur within the study area and vicinity.

The CDFG’s CNDDDB was queried on August 1, 2008 for a list of special-status wildlife, botanical, and fisheries resources previously documented as occurring within the vicinity of the study area (Appendix A; CDFG 2008a/b). The database search was performed for special-status species within the USGS 7.5-minute quadrangles listed above. Locations of special-status species occurrences within a one-mile radius of the study area as recorded in CNDDDB are shown on Figures 5 and 6.

The CNPS inventory was also searched for rare or endangered plants that may occur within the vicinity of the study area. This query was performed for CNPS List 1A, List 1B, List 2, and List 3 special-status plants occurring in the surrounding USGS 7.5-minute quadrangles listed above (Appendix A; CNPS 2008). Since CNPS List 4 species are not included in the CNPS online inventory query, the only List 4 species included in this discussion are those species recorded in the vicinity of the study area within CNDDDB. List 1A species are presumed extinct in California. List 1B species are considered rare or endangered in California, but are more common elsewhere. List 2 species are rare, threatened, or endangered species in California, but are more common elsewhere. List 3 species lack the necessary information to assign them to a listing status. List 4 species have a limited distribution or that are infrequent throughout a broader area in California.

In addition, the USFWS, Ventura Office was consulted for a list of federally listed or candidate plant and wildlife species that may occur within the region of the study area (USFWS 2008). Appendix A includes a copy of the USFWS list and letter.

A special-status species was determined to have the potential to occur in the study area if its documented geographic range from the literature and database searches includes the project vicinity, if there is a known occurrence near the site, and if suitable habitat for the species was identified within or near the study area. A complete list of special-status species from the database searches, their conservation status, general habitat requirements, and rationale for including them in the report is summarized in Appendix B. Range and habitat information of special-status plant and wildlife species was obtained from the California Wildlife Habitat Relationships (CWHR) program version 8 (CDFG 2002) as well as other sources. No species-specific or protocol-level surveys for special-status species were conducted for this report.

Critical Habitat

When the USFWS lists a species as threatened or endangered under FESA, areas of habitat considered essential to its conservation and survival may be designated as critical habitat. These areas may require special consideration and/or protection due to their ecological importance. In August 2008, potential critical habitat designations within the general vicinity of the study area were checked using the USFWS Critical Habitat Portal (USFWS, 2008b). Figure 7 shows the designated critical habitat within the vicinity of the study area.
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Figure 5
Previously Recorded Special-status Plant Species within a One-mile Radius of the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Federal Status</th>
<th>State Status</th>
<th>CNPS List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Arctostaphylos pumila</td>
<td>sandmat manzanita</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Arctostaphylos pumila var. jungens</td>
<td>Monterey manzanita</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Clarkia alstonii</td>
<td>Jolon clarkia</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chorisamnthe pungens var. pungens</td>
<td>Monterey spineflower</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cordylanthus ramosissimus ssp. libulatus</td>
<td>seaside bird's-beak</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Encrateria fasciculata</td>
<td>Eastwood's goldenbush</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Erythronium amphinum</td>
<td>sand-loving wallflower</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hesperis littoralis ssp. litoralis</td>
<td>sand pea</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Helenium cuscuta ssp. scenica</td>
<td>Kellogg's horkelia</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Picea radiata</td>
<td>Yadon's rein orchid</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend
- 1 Mile Project Buffer
- Study Area
- CNDDB Occurrence Type

Source: CNDDB, 2008; NAIP, 2005; PMC, 2008
Figure 6

Previously Recorded Special-status Wildlife Species and Terrestrial Habitat within a One-mile Radius of the Study Area
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Critical Habitat within and Surrounding the Study Area
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REGULATORY SETTING

This section lists specific environmental review and consultation requirements and identifies permits and approvals from local, state, and federal agencies that may be applicable to the proposed project once the project has been established.

FEDERAL

Federal Endangered Species Act

The United States Congress passed the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) in 1973 to protect those species that are endangered or threatened with extinction. FESA is intended to operate in conjunction with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to help protect the ecosystems upon which endangered and threatened species depend. FESA prohibits the “take” of endangered or threatened wildlife species. “The term ‘take’ means to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct” (FESA Section 3 [(3)(19)]). Harm is further defined to include significant habitat modification or degradation that results in death or injury to listed species by significantly impairing behavioral patterns (50 CFR §17.3).

Migratory Bird Treaty Act

Raptors (birds of prey), migratory birds and other avian species are protected by a number of state and federal laws. The federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) prohibits the killing, possessing, or trading of migratory birds except in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Interior. Section 3503.5 of the California Fish and Game Code states that it is “unlawful to take, possess, or destroy any birds in the order Falconiformes or Strigiformes or to take, possess, or destroy the nest or eggs of any such bird except as otherwise provided by this code or any regulation adopted pursuant thereto.”

Section 404 of the Clean Water Act

The objective of the Clean Water Act (CWA 1977, as amended) is to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Nation’s waters. Discharge of fill material into waters of the U.S., including wetlands, is regulated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) under Section 404 of the federal CWA (33 USC 1251-1376). “Discharges of fill material” is defined as the addition of fill material into waters of the U.S., including, but not limited to the following: placement of fill that is necessary for the construction of any structure, or impoundment requiring rock, sand, dirt, or other material for its construction; site-development fills for recreational, industrial, commercial, residential, and other uses; causeways or road fills; fill for intake and outfall pipes and subaqueous utility lines [33 C.F.R. §328.2(f)]. In addition to verifying wetlands for potential jurisdiction, the USACE is responsible for the issuance of permits for projects that propose filling of wetlands. Section 404 permits are required for construction activities in waters of the U.S. Waters of the U.S. include essentially all surface waters such as all navigable waters and their tributaries, all interstate waters and their tributaries, all wetlands adjacent to these waters, and all impoundments of these waters. Navigable waters of the U.S. are defined as waters that have been used in the past, are now used, or are susceptible to use as a means to transport interstate or foreign commerce up to the head of navigation. Boundaries between jurisdictional waters and uplands are determined in a variety of ways depending on which type of water is present.
Wetlands are defined as “those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support and under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions” [33 C.F.R. §328.3(b)]. Presently, to be a wetland, a site must exhibit positive indicators of three wetland criteria: hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils, and wetland hydrology existing under the “normal circumstances” for the site. The lateral regulatory extent of non-tidal waters is determined by delineating the ordinary high water mark (OHWM) [33 C.F.R. §328.4(c)(1)].

**Section 401 of the Clean Water Act**

Section 401 of the CWA (33 U.S.C. 1341) requires any applicant for a federal license or permit to conduct any activity that may result in a discharge of a pollutant into waters of the U.S. to obtain a certification that the discharge will comply with the applicable effluent limitations and water quality standards. The Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (CCRWQB) is responsible for enforcing water quality criteria and protecting water resources within its region. The CCRWQB is responsible for controlling discharges to surface waters of the state by issuing waste discharge requirements (WDR) or commonly by issuing conditional waivers to WDR’s. The CCRWQB requires that a project proponent obtain a CWA Section 401 water quality certification or waiver for Section 404 permits granted by the USACE. A request for water quality certification (including WDR’s) by the CCRWQB and a Notice of Intent (NOI) application for a General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activities are prepared and submitted following completion of the CEQA environmental document and submittal of the wetland delineation to the USACE.

**State**

**California Coastal Act of 1976**

The California Coastal Act (California Public Resources Code sections 30000 et seq.) was enacted by the State Legislature in 1976 to provide long-term protection of California’s 1,100-mile coastline. The Coastal Act created a unique partnership between the State (acting through the California Coastal Commission) and local government (15 coastal counties and 58 cities) to manage the conservation and development of coastal resources through a comprehensive planning and regulatory program. Coastal Act policies constitute the standards used by the Coastal Commission in its coastal development permit decisions and for the review of local coastal programs (LCPs) prepared by local governments and submitted to the Commission for approval. These policies are also used by the Commission to review federal activities that affect the coastal zone. Coastal cities and counties must incorporate these policies into their individual LCPs. The policies require numerous provisions including, but not limited to:

- Protection and expansion of public access to the shoreline and recreational opportunities and resources, including commercial visitor-serving facilities, and
- Protection, enhancement and restoration of environmentally sensitive habitats, including intertidal and nearshore waters, wetlands, bays and estuaries, riparian habitat, certain wood and grasslands, streams, lakes, and habitat for rare or endangered plants or animals.

The Coastal Commission has various responsibilities including, but not limited to:

- Review and decide permits and appeals on permit decisions for new development in areas where the Commission retains coastal permitting authority;
• Review all amendments to previously approved land use plans prepared by cities and counties, industrial ports, and certain public and private universities located in the coastal zone; and

• Review and act on all federal activities that affect coastal resources, including federally permitted, funded, or initiated projects.

California Endangered Species Act

The State of California enacted the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) in 1984. CESA is similar to FESA but pertains to state-listed endangered and threatened species. CESA requires state agencies to consult with the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) when preparing California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documents. The purpose is to ensure that the lead agency's actions do not jeopardize the continued existence of a listed species or result in the destruction, or adverse modification of habitat essential to the continued existence of those species, if there are reasonable and prudent alternatives available (Fish and Game Code §2080). CESA directs agencies to consult with CDFG on projects or actions that could affect listed species, directs CDFG to determine whether jeopardy would occur and allows CDFG to identify "reasonable and prudent alternatives" to the project consistent with conserving the species. CESA allows CDFG to authorize exceptions to the state’s prohibition against take of a listed species if the "take" of a listed species is incidental to carrying out an otherwise lawful project that has been approved under CEQA (Fish & Game Code § 2081).

CDFG Species of Concern

In addition to formal listing under FESA and CESA, species receive additional consideration by CDFG and lead agencies during the CEQA process. Species that may be considered for review are included on a list of “Species of Special Concern”, developed by CDFG. This list tracks species in California whose numbers, reproductive success, or habitat may be threatened.

NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION

California Native Plant Society

The California Native Plant Society (CNPS) maintains a list of plant species native to California that have low population numbers, limited distribution, or are otherwise threatened with extinction. This information is published in the Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants of California. Potential impacts to populations of CNPS-listed plants receive consideration under CEQA review. The following identifies the definitions of the CNPS listings:

• List 1A: Plants presumed Extinct in California

• List 1B: Plants Rare, Threatened, or Endangered in California and elsewhere

• List 2: Plants Rare, Threatened, or Endangered in California, but more numerous elsewhere

• List 3: Plants about which we need more information – A Review List

• List 4: Plants of limited distribution – A Watch List

Threat Ranks
0.1: Seriously threatened in California (high degree/immediacy of threat)
0.2: Fairly threatened in California (moderate degree/immediacy of threat)
0.3: Not very threatened in California (low degree/immediacy of threats or no current threats known)

LOCAL

City of Seaside Tree Ordinance

Chapter 8.54 of the City of Seaside Municipal Code provides regulations that control the removal, protection, and preservation of trees within the City. Under Section 8.54.020, trees that are protected by this ordinance include any "woody perennial plant which usually, but not necessarily, has a single trunk and a height of ten feet or more, or has a circumference of twenty inches measured at twenty-four inches above the ground." Under Section 8.54.070, all removed trees must be replaced with a minimum five-gallon approved specimen tree of a species and in an approved location. Section 8.54.080 requires protection of trees during construction activities.

City of Seaside General Plan

The City’s goal is to preserve and protect the sensitive habitats and species within the community. In order to do that, the City of Seaside Wetland Management, Enhancement and Restoration Project for Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake (1983) identifies the Laguna Grande, Roberts Lake, beachfront, and the west Del Monte Boulevard frontage, from Canyon Del Rey to Fremont, as critical native vegetation and habitat areas. Additionally, the project provides for the protection of endangered plant communities in these areas through the use of dedicated conservation easements and prohibits use of non-native and non-native compatible plant species in proposed landscapes (City of Seaside General Plan 2004 referencing the City of Seaside Wetland Management Enhancement and Restoration Project for Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake, December 1983 per Diana Hurlbert, pers. communication 1/13/09).

City of Monterey

Chapter 37 of the City of Monterey Municipal Code provides regulations that control the removal, protection and preservation of trees and shrubs of both City and private trees within the City limits. The City regulates the trimming and removal of City trees and requires a permit to remove private trees larger than six inches in trunk diameter. There are currently 15 trees that are designated "Local Landmark Tree", which means they are trees of such unusual size, prominence or health that they are of significant value to the community (Section 37-12).

BIOLOGICAL SETTING

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Regional Setting

The study area is located near Monterey Bay in between Sand City and City of Monterey in the northwestern portion of Monterey County, California (Figure 1). The Central California Coast region is characterized by mountains, hills, valleys, and plains in the southern Coast Ranges of California (Miles and Goudey 1997). Watsonville Plain - Salinas Valley subsection is on an alluvial
plain on the east side of Monterey Bay and the alluvial plain of the Salinas Valley. The alluvial plains are mostly gently sloping to nearly level floodplain, stream terraces, and alluvial fans. There are recent dunes along the west side of Monterey Bay and stabilized dunes on the southeast side of the bay near the study area. The climate is modified greatly by marine influence. The mean annual precipitation is about 12 inches in the Salinas Valley up to about 30 inches on the northeast side of Monterey Bay, primarily as rain, although fog is common. Mean annual temperature is about 56° to 58° F. The mean freeze-free period is about 250 to 300 days. All but the larger streams are dry through most of the summer. Natural lakes are absent, although there is temporary ponding behind sand dunes (Miles and Goudey 1997).

Regional natural plant communities in the study area include those that are common to the Watsonville Plain - Salinas Valley subsection of the Coast Ranges (Miles and Goudey 1997). The predominant natural plant communities are valley oak series and needlegrass grasslands in the Salinas Valley and coast live oak series and California oatgrass series on the Watsonville Plain. There are cottonwood woodlands in riparian areas along the Salinas River; the mouth of the Salinas River is north of the study area near the city of Marina. The dunes support a succession of plant communities, from bare dune through herbaceous communities and coyote brush series to California sagebrush - black sage series on stabilized dunes on the southeast side of Monterey Bay. There is some pickleweed series in estuaries.

Vegetative Communities and Wildlife Habitats

Vegetative communities are assemblages of plant species that occur together in the same area. They are defined by species composition and relative abundance. The vegetative community descriptions and nomenclature described in this section generally follow the classification system provided in Sawyer and Keeler-Wolf's A Manual of California Vegetation (1995) and Mayer and Laudenslayer's A Guide to Wildlife Habitats of California (1988). Estuarine habitat, coastal dune scrub, coastal oak woodland, riparian habitat, and emergent wetlands are the dominant habitat types in the study area (Figure 4).

The study area is surrounded by urban habitat. The majority of the study area consists of open space in the form of recreational parkland. Roberts Lake and Laguna Grande Lake are surrounded by natural wildlife habitat such as coastal oak woodland and riparian habitat as well as urban parkland with manicured lawns, picnic tables, and playgrounds. The dominant native vegetation types bordering Laguna Grande include riparian (willow) woodland, as well as emergent wetland. There is a large field of ruderal (weedy) vegetation at the northwest end of the lake, and smaller patches elsewhere. There are also two landscaped park areas with planted lawns, shrubs, and trees, including non-native species such as eucalyptus (Eucalyptus sp.), New Zealand flax (Phormium sp.), and lily of the Nile (Agapanthas sp.). A large stand of tall eucalyptus trees surround the Orthodox Church at the southeast corner of the Laguna Grande Lake. Roberts Lake is ringed by a narrow but nearly continuous band of emergent wetlands with some small patches of riparian (willow) woodland. Beyond this narrow wetland-riparian zone, the lake is bordered by coastal dune vegetation with yellow bush lupine (Lupinus arboreus), African ice plant (Carpobrotus edulis), and other low vegetation. At the southwest end of the lake is a small stand of tall Monterey cypress (Cupressus macrocarpa). The study area also includes marine and coastal dune scrub habitat associated with the Monterey State Beach and surrounding land. Table 1 lists the vegetative communities mapped within the study area as well as the acreages for each. Descriptions of these habitats are provided below.
TABLE 1 – VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES WITHIN THE STUDY AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vegetative Community</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Percentage of Study Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estuarine</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergent Wetland</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Dune Scrub</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Oak Woodland</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Woodland</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riparian</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Park</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruderal</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>128.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Results of Field Surveys Conducted in August, 2008.

Marine

Marine habitats extend from the upper limit of the unvegetated shore to the ocean. The shore consists of any barren land between the spray zone to where terrestrial vegetation exceeds 10 percent canopy closure and may vary in width from a few feet to several hundred meters. Vegetation in the open ocean is limited to phytoplankton, which are produced where light is able to still penetrate. Phytoplankton together with the animal component, zooplankton, are the primary food source for filter-feeding fish and many invertebrates which are eaten directly by marine birds and mammals or are forage for fish and invertebrates consumed by marine birds and mammals. Marine habitats receive extensive use by shore and wading birds, gulls, tems, sea ducks, and ospreys (Pandion haliaetus). Other species that use marine habitats in varying amounts are island foxes (Vulpes sp.), river otters (Lontra canadensis), raccoons (Procyon lotor), and common ravens (Corvus corax). The bald eagle (Haliaeetus leucocephalus) feeds on fish taken from the marine habitats.

Estuarine

The location of the saltwater-freshwater transition zone within Roberts and Laguna Grande Lakes may vary depending on water levels and tidal influences. Although the NWI shows Laguna Grande as being a freshwater lake (Figure 4), the lake is hydrologically connected to Roberts Lake and Pacific Ocean. The salinity of the lakes may vary depending on tidal flows and freshwater runoff. The drainage system in the Seaside area is part of the Laguna Grande Drainage Basin and consists of a hierarchy of creeks, intermittent streams and other drainage ways that begin south of the study area and end at its connection with the Pacific Ocean (City of Seaside 2002). Estuarine habitats occur on periodically and permanently flooded substrates and open water portions of semi-enclosed coastal waters where tidal seawater is diluted by flowing fresh water (CDFG 2002). This mix of fresh and ocean waters usually forms a horizontal salinity gradient that varies by area and location with seasonal variations in fresh water inflow and tidal action. Laguna Grande and Roberts Lakes are connected via a cement canal under Del Monte Boulevard. There is an outlet on the northeast side of Roberts Lake that leads to the...
Pacific Ocean at the end of Canyon Del Rey Boulevard. Although currently sand has built up at the mouth of this outlet preventing water from entering the ocean at the surface, during high tides or storm events saline water may enter Roberts Lake and Laguna Grande through these connections. Although the lakes are connected hydrologically to a creek upstream from the lakes the creek goes underground. Water is conveyed through an underground stormwater drain and enters into the lakes via a cement culvert. Currently the shores of Laguna Grande contain small patches of cattails (Typha sp.); cattails tolerate a moderate level of salinity (Barbour, et. al. 1993), whereas Roberts Lake has none. The Laguna Grande/Roberts Lake environment consists of riparian woodland and emergent wetland vegetation (City of Seaside 2002).

Salinity determines species distribution in estuarine habitats. Organisms are primarily marine, except for anadromous fish or wildlife species that can migrate easily to fresh water. Estuarine habitats provide for reproduction, feeding, resting, and cover for many species of mammals and birds. These habitats provide shelter for large numbers of water birds, especially during heavy winter storms when open coastal waters become rough. mosquitofish (Gambusia affinis), goldfish (Carassius auratus), red shiner (Notropis lutrensis), Sacramento blackfish (Orthodon microlepidotus), Sacramento perch (Archoplites interruptus), and tule perch (Hysterocarpus traski), among others, have been reported in Laguna Grande and Roberts Lakes. Sacramento perch and tule perch are the dominant species in the lakes (Holton Associates and Moffatt and Nichols 1986). Clark’s grebe (Aechmophorus clarkia), pied-billed grebe (Podilimus podiceps), mallard (Anas platyrhynchos), graylag (barnyard) goose (Anser anser), American coot (Fulica americana), barn swallow (Hirundo rustica), California gull (Larus californicus), Heermann’s gull (L. heermanni), western gull (L. occidentalis), double-crested comorant (Phalacrocorax auritus), Caspian tem (Sterna caspia), and ruddy duck (Oxyura jamaicensis) were observed wading or foraging in the estuarine habitat.

Emergent Wetland

The emergent wetlands within the study area are dominated by bulrushes (Scirpus sp.). Emergent wetlands are characterized by erect, rooted herbaceous hydrophytes. Dominant vegetation is generally perennial monocots to 2 meters (6.6 feet) tall. All emergent wetlands are flooded frequently, enough so that the roots of the vegetation prosper in an anaerobic environment. On the upper margins of emergent wetlands, saturated or periodically flooded soils support several moist soil plant species such as big leaf sedge (Carex amplifolia), baltic rush (Juncus balticus), and redroot nutseedge (Cyperus erythrorhizos). On wetter sites, common cattail (Typha sp.), tule bulrush (Scirpus acutus), river bulrush (S. fluviatilis), and arrowhead (Sagittaria spp.) are potential dominant species. The emergent wetlands within the study area generally consist of mostly bulrush with scattered occurrences of common cattails and the invasive giant European reed (Arundo donax) along the edges of Laguna Grande. A list of plant species observed within the study area is available in Appendix B; this is not a comprehensive list, but rather a list of species observed incidentally during the survey.

Emergent wetlands are among the most productive wildlife habitats in California. They provide food, cover, and water for more than 160 species of birds, and numerous mammals, reptiles, and amphibians. The bald eagle and peregrine falcon (Falco peregrinus) use emergent wetlands as feeding areas and roost sites. Tricolored blackbird (Agelaius tricolor), a California species of special concern, and yellow-headed blackbird (Xanthocephalus xanthocephalus) may also use fresh emergent wetlands. Red-winged blackbird (Agelaius phoeniceus), song sparrow (Melospiza melodia), house sparrow (Passer domesticus), and black phoebe (Sayornis nigricans) were observed within the emergent wetland habitat within the study area.
Coastal Dune Scrub

The coastal dune habitat consists of the tidal zone and the sandy upland area. This habitat contains numerous high dunes covered with a variety of beach grass, low shrubs, and other vegetation. Within the study area, the degradation of the sand dune environment from recreational use has resulted in the loss of dune vegetation and movement of the dunes by the wind, which has caused increased sedimentation and water quality problems within Roberts Lake and Laguna Grande Lake (City of Seaside 2002). Pickleweed (Salicornia sp.) and African ice plant are dominant species within most of the sand dune habitat within the study area. The area in between the paved roads along Highway One and other dune scrub habitat adjacent to the urban environment is dominated by African ice plant. The area north of Roberts Lake along the southside of Highway One consists of coastal scrub habitat. Coastal scrub habitat occurs along ridges and hillsides and includes patchy oceanside cover of nearly prostrate subshrubs surrounded by grassland. Either yellow bush lupine or coyote brush (Baccharis pilularis) usually dominates the overstory. Other common overstory species are blue blossom ceanothus (Ceanothus thyrsiflorus repens), salal (Gaultheria shallon), bush monkey flower (Diplacus aurantius), and wooly sunflower (Eriophyllum sp.). This habitat type is often colonized by non-native species such as french broom (Genista sp.) and pampas grass (Cortaderia selloana). Structure of the plants associations that comprise coastal scrub is typified by low to moderate-sized shrubs with mesophytic leaves, flexible branches, semi-woody stems growing from a woody base and a shallow-root system.

Within Monterey State Beach (California state park land), there is an area of sand dune habitat that has been restored to allow typical native sand dune species to thrive. Species such as yellow sand verbena (Abronia latifolia), pink sand verbena (Abronia umbellata), beach bur (Ambrosia chamissonis), and thift/sea pink (Armeria maritima var. californica), European sea rocket (Cakile maritima), bluff lettuce (Dudleya caespitosa), and coast buckwheat (Eriogonum latifolium) were evident in this area. Menzies’ wallflower (Erysimum menziesii) which is federally and state-listed as endangered and CNPS list 1B.1 was observed within the study area in this restoration area. In addition CNPS list 4.3 Monterey coast paintbrush (Castilleja latifolia) was also observed. The coastal dune habitat on the north side of Highway One is designated as critical habitat for Monterey spineflower (Chorizanthe pungens var. pungens) (Figure 7). It is also fenced off and designated as a fragile restoration area for plants.

Little is known about the importance of coastal scrub habitat to wildlife. Though vegetation productivity is lower in coastal scrub than in adjacent chaparral habitats associated with it. Coastal scrub appears to support numbers of vertebrate species roughly equivalent to those in surrounding habitats. The federal and state listed endangered peregrine falcon occurs in coastal scrub habitat. Black legless lizard (Anniella pulchra nigra) a California species of special concern, globose dune beetle (Coelus globosus) and the federally endangered Smith’s blue butterfly (Euphilotes enoptes smithi) may also be found in the habitat. The federally threatened western snowy plover (Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus) may nest within this habitat. Signs are posted within the State Park land warning people of the sensitive nature of the area.

Coastal Oak Woodland/ Coast Live Oak Series

Coastal oak woodlands are extremely variable. The overstory consists of deciduous and evergreen hardwoods. In many coastal regions including the coastal oak woodland within the study area, coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia) is the only overstory species. Other species that may occur within Coastal oak woodland include California bay (Umbellularia californica), madrone (Arbutus menziesii), tanbark oak (Lithocarpus densiflorus), and canyon live oak (Quercus chrysolepis). Typical plants in dense coast live oak woodlands are shade tolerant
shrubs such as California blackberry (Rubus ursinus), common snowberry (Symphoricarpos albus), toyon, and herbaceous plants such as bracken fern (Pteridium aquilinum), California polypody (Polypodium californicum), fiesta flower (Pholistoma auritum), and miner’s lettuce (Claytonia perfoliata).

Coastal oak woodlands provide habitat for a variety of wildlife species. California quail (Callipepla californica), squirrels, and deer may be so dependent on acorns in fall and early winter that poor acorn year can result in significant declines in their populations. Western scrub jay (Aphelocoma californica) was observed within the study area.

Mixed Woodland

The mixed woodland within the study area occurs along a sloped embankment in between coastal oak woodland and riparian habitats. The mixed woodland has a mixture of species common to both habitats, including coast live oak, California bay, toyon, western sycamore (Platanus racemosa), Himalayan blackberry (Rubus discolor), Monterey pine, and eucalyptus.

Wildlife species that occur in coastal oak woodland and riparian habitats would also occur in the mixed woodland habitat.

Riparian Woodland/Mixed Willow Series

Riparian woodland occurs primarily in the southern portion of the study area with scattered occurrences surrounding Roberts and Laguna Grande Lake. The riparian corridor roughly continues southward along Canyon Del Rey Blvd although water flow is directed underground below the shopping center directly south of the study area (City of Seaside 2004). Common tree species associated with this habitat include Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii), western sycamore, and valley oak (Quercus lobata), with a subcanopy component consisting of black willow (Salix gooddingii), box elder (Acer negundo), Oregon ash (Fraxinus latifolia), and Northern California black walnut (Juglans californica var. hindsii). Understory vegetation includes sandbar willow (Salix exigua), wild grape (Vitis californica), and Himalayan blackberry. The herbaceous layer is sparse and more dominant in openings. Typical plants include mugwort (Artemisia douglasiana), Santa Barbara sedge (Carex barbara), common bedstraw (Galium aparine), telegraph-weed (Heterotheca grandiflora), and various introduced annual grasses including green bristlegrass (Setaria viridis), Bermuda grass (Cynodon dactylon), wild oat (Avena fatua), ripgut brome (Bromus diandrus), and soft chess (Bromus hordeaceus).

Riparian habitat is generally of high value for wildlife. Birds and mammals that occur in these areas typically include white-tailed deer (Odocoileus virginianus), coyote (Canis latrans), wild turkey (Meleagris gallopavo), opossum (Didelphis virginiana), striped skunk (Mephitis mephitis), beaver (Castor canadensis), western gray squirrel (Sciurus carolinensis), screech owl (Megascops kennicottii), great horned owl (Bubo virginianus), and California quail. A sharp-shinned hawk (Accipiter striatus) was observed within the riparian habitat within the study area.

Urban/Developed Land

A distinguishing characteristic of urban habitats is the mixture of native and exotic plant species. Species richness in these areas depends greatly upon community design (i.e., open space considerations) and proximity to the natural environment. Vegetation in these areas consists primarily of introduced ornamental trees and shrubs and manicured lawns as well as invasive weeds in disturbed areas. Many of the homes and some of the businesses within the study area are surrounded with urban landscaping and trees. Prior to development, the City of Seaside vicinity would likely have consisted of grassland, maritime chaparral, coastal scrub, and oak
woodland communities. Plant species observed within the study area include saltgrass (*Distichlis spicata*), black mustard (*Brassica nigra*), California brome (*Bromus carinatus*), prickly lettuce (*Lactuca serriola*), cheeseweed (*Malva* sp.), and various ornamentals, such as oleander (*Nerium oleander*) and crimson bottlebrush (*Callistemon citrinus*).

Native and introduced animal species that are tolerant of human activities often thrive in urban habitats. Exotic plant species may provide valuable habitat elements such as cover for nesting and roosting, as well as food sources such as nuts or berries. Birds and mammals that occur in these areas typically include introduced species adapted to human habitation, including rock pigeon (*Columba livia*), common raven, American crow (*Corvus brachyrhynchos*), and European starling (*Sturnus vulgaris*).

**Residential Park/Open Space**

Shade trees and lawns are characteristic of the residential park environment within the study area. Picnic tables and playground structures are also present. Lawns are maintained at a uniform height with continuous ground cover through irrigation and fertilization. The shrub cover is landscaped and maintained with hedges and ornamental plants. The shade trees within the study area are regularly pruned and maintained. Yellow bush lupine, blue blossom ceanothus, and woollyleaf manzanita (*Arctostaphylos tomentosa*) were planted along the trails within the study area. Wildlife species that occur in urban habitats would also occur in the residential parks.

**Ruderal (Disturbed)**

Ruderal (roadside) communities occur in areas of disturbances such as along roadsides, trails, parking lots, etc. These communities are subjected to ongoing or past disturbances (e.g., vehicle activities, mowing). Human debris and trash was prevalent adjacent to the roadways and within empty lots. Ruderal habitat in these disturbed areas supports a diverse weedy flora, primarily of nonnative herbs and grasses.

**Sensitive Habitats**

Sensitive habitats include a) areas of special concern to resource agencies, b) areas protected under CEQA, c) areas designated as sensitive natural communities by CDFG, d) areas outlined in Section 1600 of the California Fish and Game Code, e) areas regulated under Section 404 of the federal CWA, f) areas protected under Section 402 of the CWA, and g) areas protected under local regulations and policies. Although eight communities recognized by CDFG as sensitive have been previously recorded within the general vicinity of the study area (CDFG, 2008a/b), only central dune scrub (coastal dune scrub) occurs within the study area. Although Monterey cypress and Monterey pine trees occur in the study area, they are not in such great abundance or in a natural setting to qualify as a forest and therefore a sensitive habitat.

Aquatic habitats are considered by state and federal regulatory agencies to represent a sensitive and declining resource. Riparian areas and wetlands can serve significant biological functions by providing nesting, breeding, foraging, and spawning habitat for a wide variety of resident and migratory wildlife species. Impacts to stream channels with a defined bed and bank are addressed specifically by the California Fish and Game Code (§1600 et seq.) and may be regulated under Section 404 of the CWA. The USACE regulates dredging and placement of fill into waters of the U.S., including wetlands, with oversight of permitting decisions by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). The USFWS and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries Service) has input on permitting decisions by the USACE when an activity could affect water-dependent federally listed species.
The riparian habitat found within the study area is considered a sensitive habitat under these regulations. The typically riparian plant species (willow, valley oak, alder, ash, etc.) adjacent to the drainages and other water sources within the study area would be regarded as riparian habitat, potentially falling under CDFG jurisdiction. Coastal oak woodland, riparian, marine, estuarine and emergent wetland occur within the study area and are considered sensitive habitats. Sensitive natural communities present within the study area include potential wetlands and waters of the U.S. / waters of the State, consisting of the unnamed surface creek through the riparian habitat and emergent wetlands. Figure 8 shows all the known sensitive habitats present within the study area. None of the remaining plant associations are regarded as being of sensitive.

USFWS defines critical habitat as a specific area that is essential for the conservation of a federally-listed species and which may require special management considerations or protection. The study area contains habitat that is considered USFWS “critical habitat” based on critical habitat maps for federally listed species (USFWS 2008a). Designated critical habitat for Monterey spineflower is within the study area in the coastal dune habitat (Figure 7; USFWS 2008a).

Wildlife Corridors

Wildlife corridors refer to established migration and movement routes commonly used by resident and migratory species for passage from one geographic location to another. Corridors are present in a variety of habitats and link otherwise fragmented acres of undisturbed area. Maintaining the continuity of established wildlife corridors is important to a) sustain species with specific foraging requirements, b) preserve a species’ distribution potential, and c) retain diversity among many wildlife populations. Therefore, resource agencies consider wildlife corridors to be a sensitive resource.

Habitat loss, fragmentation, and degradation resulting from a change in land use or habitat conversion can alter the use and viability of wildlife movement corridors. According to Beier and Loe (1992), wildlife habitat corridors should fulfill several functions. They should maintain connectivity for daily movement, travel, mate-seeking, and migration; plant propagation; genetic interchange; population movement in response to environmental change or natural disaster; and recolonization of habitats subject to local extirpation.

The suitability of a habitat as a wildlife movement corridor is related to, among other factors, the habitat corridor’s dimensions (length and width), topography, vegetation, exposure to human influence, and the species in question (Beier and Loe 1992). Species utilize movement corridors in several ways. “Passage species” are those species that use corridors as thru-ways between outlying habitats. The habitat requirements for passage species are generally less than those for corridor dwellers. Passage species use corridors for brief durations, such as for seasonal migrations or movement within a home range. As such, movement corridors do not necessarily have to meet all of the habitat requirements necessary for a passage species’ everyday survival. Large herbivores (e.g., deer and elk) and medium-to-large carnivores (e.g., coyotes and mountain lions) are typically passage species. “Corridor dwellers” are those species that have limited dispersal capabilities, a category that includes most plants, insects, reptiles, amphibians, small mammals, and birds, and that use corridors for a greater length of time. As such, wildlife movement corridors must fulfill key habitat components specific to a species’ life history requirements in order for them to survive (Beier and Noss 1998). In general, however, the suitability and/or utility of the landscape, specifically, of the landscape as corridor habitat, is best evaluated on a species-level (Beier and Noss 1998).
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The riparian corridor, marine habitat and sand dunes provide suitable habitat for resident wildlife. Based on the surrounding and current land uses and the quality of the habitat onsite, the habitats within the study area have the potential to function as a wildlife movement corridor or aid in the dispersal of fish and wildlife species; however currently manmade structures and natural topography prevents safe and consistent passage. Although not required under law, it would be beneficial for wildlife if there was a more natural connection between the lakes, between the lake and ocean, and between the lakes and the riparian corridor further upstream.

Laguna Grande and Roberts Lakes are connected via a cement canal under Del Monte Boulevard. These culverts may prevent some species from entering the lakes (i.e. bottom dwellers or large marine mammals). There is an outlet on the northeast side of Roberts Lake that leads to the Pacific Ocean at the end of Canyon Del Rey Boulevard. Currently sand has built up at the mouth of this outlet preventing water from entering the ocean at the surface, although during high tides or storm events saline water may enter Roberts Lake and Laguna Grande through this connection. Although the lakes are connected hydrologically to a creek upstream, the creek goes underground. Water is conveyed from the creek through an underground stormwater drain and enters into the lakes via a cement culvert. The riparian corridor roughly continues southward along Canyon Del Rey Blvd although water flow is directed underground below the shopping center directly south of the study area (City of Seaside 2004). Figure 4 shows the creek interrupted by the shopping center to the south of the study area.

SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES

A list of special-status plant and wildlife species that have the potential to occur within the vicinity of the study area was compiled based on a background information search for previously documented special-status species within the project vicinity (Appendix B). Conclusions regarding habitat suitability and species occurrence are based on a reconnaissance-level assessment conducted by a PMC biologist, as well as existing literature and databases described previously. The potential for each special-status species to occur within the study area was assessed based on known occurrences of the species within a one-mile and five-mile radii of the study area, suitability of habitat within the study area, and professional expertise.

Figures 5 and 6 identify locations of previously recorded CNDDB occurrences within the vicinity of the study area. PMC identified 43 special-status plant species and 25 special-status wildlife species that have the potential to occur within the study area and are described in greater detail below.

Special-status Plant Species

Based on a review of the database searches (USFWS, 2008a; CDFG, 2008a/b; CNPS, 2008), a total of 61 special-status plant species have been recorded in the vicinity of the study area. Eighteen (18) of the plant species were excluded from analysis based on the lack of suitable habitat, range restrictions, local extirpations, lack of connectivity between areas of suitable and occupied habitat, and/or incompatible land use and/or habitat degradation/alteration of on-site or adjacent lands. Five of the target special-status plant species are restricted to playas, valley and foothill grassland, vernal pools, closed-cone coniferous forest, and chenopod scrub, all of which do not occur within the study area. Fifteen (15) of the species were outside of the elevation range for the species was outside of the elevation range of the study area (zero to 57 feet [17 meters]) and no suitable habitat was present.
Suitable habitat is present either within or adjacent to the study area for the remaining 43 special-status plant species from the database search and therefore cannot be excluded on the basis of a single site reconnaissance. Four special-status species (Monterey pine, Monterey cypress, Monterey Coast paintbrush and Menzies’ wallflower) were observed during the reconnaissance-level site survey (August 2 and 3, 2008). Although only 43 special-status species will be discussed in greater detail, this is not meant to imply that all other special-status species do not occur within the study area. Completion of a focused floristic study is needed to make a determination of presence or absence of special-status plant species within the study area.

A summary of the status, habitat affinities, blooming period, and potential for occurrence within the study area for each of the target plant species is presented in Appendix B. Table 2 lists the special-status plants that are considered in the impact analysis according to the habitat type found within the study area. Only those special-status species that have the potential to occur within the study area based on availability of suitable habitat are discussed in greater detail below.

**Table 2 – Vegetative Communities Within the Study Area and Associated Special-status Plant Species**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vegetative Communities</th>
<th>Special-status Species</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estuarine</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergent Wetland</td>
<td>Hickman’s popcorn-flower (List 4) Hickman’s cinquefoil (FE, SE, 1B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Dune Scrub</td>
<td>Hickman’s onion (1B) Little Sur manzanita (1B) Toro manzanita (1B) Sandmat manzanita (1B) Ocean bluff milk-vetch (List 4) Coastal dunes milk-vetch (FE, SE, 1B) Monterey Coast paintbrush (List 4) Monterey ceanothus (List 4) Monterey spineflower (FT, 1B) Robust spineflower (FE, 1B) Jolon clarkia (1B) Lewis’ clarkia (List 4) San Francisco collinsia (1B) Seaside bird’s-beak (SE, 1B) Branching beach aster (List 3) Hutchinson’s larkspur (1B) Virgate eriastrum (List 4) Eastwood’s goldenbush (1B) Sand-loving wallflower (1B) Menzies’ wallflower (FE, SE, 1B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Oak Woodland</td>
<td>Monterey cypress (1B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Woodland</td>
<td>Toro manzanita (1B) Sandmat manzanita (1B) Monterey Coast paintbrush (List 4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Vegetative Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vegetative Communities</th>
<th>Special-status Species</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robust spineflower (FE, 1B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small-leaved lomatium (List 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jolon clarkia (1B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carmel Valley bush-mallow (1B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lewis’ clarkia (List 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monterey pine (1B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seaside bird’s-beak (SE, 1B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael’s rein orchid (List 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monterey cypress (1B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maple-leaved checkerbloom (List 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monterey pine (1B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small-leaved lomatium (List 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maple-leaved checkerbloom (List 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riparian</td>
<td>Jolon clarkia (1B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monterey pine (1B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Park</td>
<td>Monterey cypress (1B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monterey pine (1B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Monterey cypress (1B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monterey pine (1B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruderal</td>
<td>Monterey cypress (1B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seaside bird’s-beak (SE, 1B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monterey pine (1B)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Federal status

- **FE** = Listed as endangered under the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA)
- **FT** = Listed as threatened under FESA
- **SE** = Listed as endangered under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA)
- **ST** = Listed as threatened under CESA
- **CR** = Species identified as rare by CDFG.

### State status

- **CNPS Listing**

- **1A** = Plants species that presumed extinct in California.
- **1B** = Plant species that are rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere.
- **List 2** = Plant species that are rare, threatened, or endangered in California, but more common elsewhere.
- **List 3** = Plant species that lack the necessary information to assign them to a listing status.
- **List 4** = Plants that have a limited distribution or that are infrequent throughout a broader area in California.

---

**Hickman’s onion** (Allium hickmanii) is designated by CNPS as list 1B.2. Hickman’s onion is a perennial bulbiferous herb in the lily family (Liliaceae). It is found in closed-cone coniferous forest, chaparral (maritime), coastal prairie, coastal scrub, and valley and foothill grassland. This species blooms from March to May. This species’ known elevation range is between five and 200 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are 13 previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

**Little Sur manzanita** (Arctostaphylos edmundsii) is designated by CNPS as list 1B.2. Little Sur manzanita is a perennial evergreen shrub in the heath family (Ericaceae). It is found in coastal bluff scrub and chaparral in sandy soils. It is known from fewer than ten occurrences. This species blooms from November to April. This species’ known elevation range is between 30 and 105 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008). The study area is outside this species known elevation range.

**Hooker’s manzanita** (Arctostaphylos hookeri sp. hookeri) is designated by CNPS as list 1B.2. Hooker’s manzanita is a perennial evergreen shrub in the heath family (Ericaceae). It is found in closed-cone coniferous forest, chaparral, cismontane woodland, and coastal scrub in sandy soils. This species blooms from January to June. This species’ known elevation range is between 85 and 536 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are five previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008). The study area is outside this species known elevation range.
Toro manzanita (*Arctostaphylos montereyensis*) is designated by CNPS as list 1B.2. Toro manzanita is a perennial evergreen shrub in the heath family (*Ericaceae*). It is found in chaparral (maritime), cismontane woodland, and coastal scrub in sandy soils. It is known from fewer than ten occurrences. This species blooms from February to March. This species’ known elevation range is between 30 and 730 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are six previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008). The study area is outside this species known elevation range.

Sandmat manzanita (*Arctostaphylos pumila*) is designated by CNPS as list 1B.2. Sandmat manzanita is a perennial evergreen shrub in the heath family (*Ericaceae*). It is found in closed-cone coniferous forest, chaparral (maritime), cismontane woodland, coastal dunes, and coastal scrub in sandy, openings. It is known from fewer than twenty occurrences. This species blooms from February to May. This species’ known elevation range is between three and 205 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are 10 previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area, three of which are within a one-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

Ocean bluff milk-vetch (*Astragalus nuttallii var. nuttallii*) is designated by CNPS as list 4.2. Ocean bluff milk-vetch is a perennial herb in the legume family (*Fabaceae*). It is found in coastal bluff scrub and coastal dunes. This species blooms from January to November. This species’ known elevation range is between three and 120 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

Coastal dunes milk-vetch (*Astragalus tener var. tili*) is federally and state-listed as endangered and designated by CNPS as list 1B.1. Coastal dunes milk-vetch is an annual herb in the legume family (*Fabaceae*). It is found in coastal bluff scrub (sandy), coastal dunes, coastal prairie (mesic), often vernally mesic areas. It is known from only one occurrence on the Monterey Peninsula. San Diego County occurrences have not been documented since the 1970’s, despite rediscovery attempts. This species blooms from March to May. This species’ known elevation range is between one and 50 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

Monterey Coast paintbrush (*Castilleja latifolia*) is designated by CNPS as list 4.3. Monterey Coast paintbrush is a perennial hemi-parasitic herb in the figwort family (*Scrophulariaceae*). It is found in closed-cone coniferous forest, cismontane woodland (openings), coastal dunes, and coastal scrub in sandy soils. This species blooms from February to September. This species’ known elevation range is between zero and 185 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008). This species was observed within the study area.

Monterey ceanothus (*Ceanothus cuneatus var. rigidus*) is designated by CNPS as list 4.2. Monterey ceanothus is a perennial evergreen shrub in the buckthorn family (*Rhamnaceae*). It is found in closed-cone coniferous forest, cismontane woodland, coastal dunes, and coastal scrub in sandy soils. This species intergrades with *C. c. var. fascicularis* in San Luis Obispo County. This species blooms from February to April (June). This species’ known elevation range is between three and 550 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

Monterey spineflower (*Chorizanthe pungens var. pungens*) is federally listed as threatened and designated by CNPS as list 1B.2. Monterey spineflower is an annual herb in the knotweed family (*Polygonaceae*). It is found in chaparral (maritime), cismontane woodland, coastal dunes,
coastal scrub, valley and foothill grassland in sandy soils. This species blooms from April to June (July). This species' known elevation range is between three and 450 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are five previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area, three of which are within a one-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

Robust spineflower (Chorizanthe robusta var. robusta) is federally listed as endangered and designated by CNPS as list 1B.1. Robust spineflower is an annual herb in the knotweed family (Polygonaceae). It is found in chaparral (maritime), cismontane woodland (openings), coastal dunes, coastal scrub in sandy or gravelly soils. Most populations have been extirpated, and now this species is known from only six extended occurrences. This species blooms from April to September. This species' known elevation range is between three and 300 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are two previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

Jolon clarkia (Clarkia jolonensis) is designated by CNPS as list 1B.2. Jolon clarkia is an annual herb in the evening primrose family (Onagraceae). It is found in chaparral, cismontane woodland, coastal scrub, and riparian woodland. It can be confused with C. lewisii. This species blooms from April to June. This species' known elevation range is between 20 and 660 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are five previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area, one of which is within a one-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

Lewis' clarkia (Clarkia lewisii) is designated by CNPS as list 4.3. Lewis' clarkia is an annual herb in the evening primrose family (Onagraceae). It is found in broad-leaved upland forest, closed-cone coniferous forest, chaparral, cismontane woodland, and coastal scrub. This species blooms from May to July. This species' known elevation range is between 30 and 610 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008). The study area is outside this species known elevation range.

San Francisco collinsia (Collinsia multicolor) is designated by CNPS as list 1B.2. San Francisco collinsia is an annual herb in the figwort family (Scrophulariaceae). It is found in closed-cone coniferous forest, chaparral, cismontane woodland, and coastal scrub, sometimes in serpentinite. This species blooms from March to May. This species' known elevation range is between 30 and 250 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There is one previously recorded occurrence within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008). The study area is outside this species known elevation range.

Seaside bird's-beak (Cordylanthus rigidus ssp. littoralis) is state-listed as endangered and designated by CNPS as list 1B.1. Seaside bird's-beak is an annual hemi-parasitic herb in the figwort family (Scrophulariaceae). It is found in closed-cone coniferous forest, chaparral (maritime), cismontane woodland, coastal dunes, and coastal scrub, on sandy, often disturbed sites. It is known from fewer than twenty occurrences. This species blooms from April to October. This species' known elevation range is between zero and 425 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are eight previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area, three of which are within a one-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

Branching beach aster (Corethrogyne leucophylla) is designated by CNPS as list 3.2. Branching beach aster is a perennial herb in the sunflower family (Asteraceae). It is found in closed-cone coniferous forest and coastal dunes. This species is a synonym of Lessingia filaginifolia var. filaginifolia in The Jepson Manual (Hickman 1993). This species blooms from May to December.
This species' known elevation range is between three and 60 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

**Monterey cypress** (*Cupressus [Callitropsis] macrocarpa*) is designated by CNPS as list 1B.2. Monterey cypress is a perennial evergreen tree in the cypress family (*Cupressaceae*). It is found in closed-cone coniferous forest, chaparral (maritime). It is known from only three native occurrences in the Monterey area. This species' known elevation range is between 30 and 300 meters. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008). This species is present within the study area, although it may have been planted.

**Hutchinson’s larkspur** (*Delphinium hutchinsoniae*) is designated by CNPS as list 1B.2. Hutchinson’s larkspur is a perennial herb in the buttercup family (*Ranunculaceae*). It is found in broad-leaved upland forest, chaparral, coastal dune, and coastal scrub. It is known from approximately ten occurrences. This species blooms from March to June. This species’ known elevation range is between zero and 427 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There is one previously recorded occurrence within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

**Virgate eriastrum** (*Eriastrum virgatum*) is designated by CNPS as list 4.3. Virgate eriastrum is an annual herb in the phlox family (*Polemoniaceae*). It is found in coastal bluff scrub, chaparral, coastal dunes, and coastal scrub in sandy soils. This species blooms from May to July. This species’ known elevation range is between 45 and 700 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008). The study area is outside this species known elevation range.

**Eastwood’s goldenbush** (*Ericameria fasciculata*) is designated by CNPS as list 1B.1. Eastwood’s goldenbush is a perennial evergreen shrub in the sunflower family (*Asteraceae*). It is found in closed-cone coniferous forest, chaparral (maritime), coastal dunes, and coastal scrub in sandy, openings. It is known from fewer than twenty occurrences in the Monterey Bay area. This species blooms from July to October. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are nine previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area, three of which are within a one-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008). The study area is outside this species known elevation range.

**Sand-loving wallflower** (*Erysimum ammophilum*) is designated by CNPS as list 1B.2. Sand-loving wallflower is a perennial herb in the mustard family (*Brassicaceae*). It is found in chaparral (maritime), coastal dunes, and coastal scrub in sandy, openings. Previously included in this species is *E. capitatum ssp. capitatum*. This species blooms from February to June. This species’ known elevation range is between zero and 60 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are eight previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area, two of which are within a one-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

**Menzies’ wallflower** (*Erysimum menziesii ssp. menziesii*) is federally and state-listed as endangered and designated by CNPS as list 1B.1. Menzies’ wallflower is a perennial herb in the mustard family (*Brassicaceae*). It is found in coastal dunes. It is known from only ten occurrences. It has been nearly extirpated on the Monterey Peninsula. This species blooms from March to June. This species’ known elevation range is between zero and 35 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are four previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008). This species was observed within the study area.

**Yadon’s wallflower** (*Erysimum menziesii ssp. yadonii*) is federally and state-listed as endangered and designated by CNPS as list 1B.1. Yadon’s wallflower is a perennial herb in the mustard family...
(Brassicaceae). It is found in coastal dunes. It is known only from six occurrences near Marina on Monterey Bay. This species is included under the state-listed Endangered *E. menziesii*. This species blooms from May to September. This species’ known elevation range is between zero and 10 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

**Fragrant fritillary** (*Fritillaria liliacea*) is designated by CNPS as list 1B.2. Fragrant fritillary is a perennial bulbiferous herb in the lily family (*Liliaceae*). It is found in cismontane woodland, coastal prairie, coastal scrub, valley and foothill grassland, often serpentine. This species blooms from February to April. This species’ known elevation range is between three and 410 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There is one previously recorded occurrence within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

**Monterey [sand] gilia** (*Gilia tenuiflora* ssp. *arenaria*) is federally listed as endangered, state-listed as threatened and designated by CNPS as list 1B.2. Monterey gilia is an annual herb in the phlox family (*Polemoniaceae*). It is found in chaparral (maritime), cismontane woodland, coastal dunes, coastal scrub, sandy, openings. It is known from fewer than twenty occurrences. This species blooms from April to June. This species’ known elevation range is between 10 and 45 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are 15 previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area, two of which are within a one-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

**San Francisco gumplant** (*Grindelia hirsutula* var. *maritime*) is designated by CNPS as list 1B.2. San Francisco gumplant is a perennial herb in the sunflower family (*Asteraceae*). It is found in coastal bluff scrub, coastal scrub, valley and foothill grassland, sandy or serpentine. It can be difficult to identify. This species blooms from June to September. This species’ known elevation range is between 15 and 400 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

**Kellogg’s horkelia** (*Horkelia cuneata* ssp. *sericea*) is designated by CNPS as list 1B.1. Kellogg’s horkelia is a perennial herb in the rose family (*Rosaceae*). It is found in closed-cone coniferous forest, chaparral (maritime), coastal dunes, and coastal scrub, sandy or gravelly, openings. Historical occurrences need field surveys. A previous occurrence from the Crocker Hills is probably the last remaining location in San Francisco Bay. The remaining plants are less distinct from *H. c. ssp. cuneata* than those formerly occurring near San Francisco. This species blooms from April to September. This species’ known elevation range is between 10 and 200 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are 11 previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area, two of which are within a one-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

**Beach layia** (*Layia carnosa*) is federally and state-listed as endangered and designated by CNPS as list 1B.1. Beach layia is an annual herb in the sunflower family (*Asteraceae*). It is found in coastal dunes and coastal scrub (sandy). This species blooms from March to July. This species’ known elevation range is between zero and 60 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are two previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

**Coast yellow leptosiphon** (*Leptosiphon croceus*) is designated by CNPS as list 1B.1. Coast yellow leptosiphon is an annual herb in the phlox family (*Polemoniaceae*). It is found in coastal bluff scrub and coastal prairie. It is known only from one occurrence near Moss Beach. This species blooms from April to May. This species’ known elevation range is between 10 and 150 meters.
Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

Large-flowered leptosiphon (*Leptosiphon grandiflorus*) is designated by CNPS as list 4.2. Large-flowered leptosiphon is an annual herb in the phlox family (*Polemoniaceae*). It is found in coastal bluff scrub, closed-cone coniferous forest, cismontane woodland, coastal dunes, coastal prairie, coastal scrub, valley and foothill grassland, usually in sandy soils. Many historical occurrences extirpated by development; need status information. This species is a synonym of *Linanthus grandiflorus* in The Jepson Manual (Hickman 1993). This species blooms from April to August. This species’ known elevation range is between 5 and 1,220 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

Small-leaved lomatium (*Lomatium parvifolium*) is designated by CNPS as list 4.2. Small-leaved lomatium is a perennial herb in the carrot family (*Apiaceae*). It is found in closed-cone coniferous forest, chaparral, coastal scrub, and riparian woodland, in serpentinite. This species blooms from January to June. This species’ known elevation range is between 20 and 700 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

Tidestrom’s lupine (*Lupinus tidestromii*) is federally and state-listed as endangered and designated by CNPS as list 1B.1. Tidestrom’s lupine is a perennial rhizomatous herb in the legume family (*Fabaceae*). It is found in coastal dunes. It is known from fewer than 20 occurrences. The conservation status includes the subspecies *L. t. var. layneae*. This species blooms from April to June. This species’ known elevation range is between zero - 100 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are seven previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

Carmel Valley bush-mallow (*Malacothamnus palmeri var. involucratus*) is designated by CNPS as list 1B.2. Carmel Valley bush-mallow is a perennial deciduous shrub in the mallow family (*Malvaceae*). It is found in chaparral, cismontane woodland, and coastal scrub. This species is a synonym of *M. palmeri* in The Jepson Manual. This species blooms from May to August (October). This species’ known elevation range is between 30 and 1,100 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are six previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

Carmel Valley malacothrix (*Malacothrix saxatilis var. arachnoidea*) is designated by CNPS as list 1B.2. Carmel Valley malacothrix is a perennial rhizomatous herb in the sunflower family (*Asteraceae*). It is found in chaparral (rocky) and coastal scrub. It is known from approximately ten occurrences. This species blooms from (March) June to December. This species’ known elevation range is between 25 and 1,036 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There is one previously recorded occurrence within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

Marsh microseris (*Microseris paludosa*) is designated by CNPS as list 1B.2. Marsh microseris is a perennial herb in the sunflower family (*Asteraceae*). It is found in closed-cone coniferous forest, cismontane woodland, coastal scrub, valley and foothill grassland. This species is similar to *M. laciniata* spp. leptosepala. This species blooms from April to June (July). This species’ known elevation range is between five and 300 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are five previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).
Monterey pine (*Pinus radiata*) is designated by CNPS as list 1B.1. Monterey pine is a perennial evergreen tree in the pine family (*Pinaceae*). It is found in closed-cone coniferous forest and cismontane woodland. Only three native stands in CA, at Ano Nuevo, Cambria, and the Monterey Peninsula; introduced in many areas. Only one-half of the species' historical extent remains undeveloped on the Monterey Peninsula, and forest destruction has been unevenly distributed over different geomorphic surfaces. This species' known elevation range is between 25 and 185 meters. There is one previously recorded occurrence within a five-mile radius of the study area, one of which is within a one-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008). This species is present within the study area, although some may have been planted.

Michael's rein orchid (*Piperia michaelii*) is designated by CNPS as list 4.2. Michael's rein orchid is a perennial herb in the orchid family (*Orchidaceae*). It is found in coastal bluff scrub, closed-cone coniferous forest, chaparral, cismontane woodland, coastal scrub, and lower montane coniferous forest. Recent surveys in Ventura County have been unsuccessful. It is known from Santa Cruz Island from a single collection in 1968. This species blooms from April to August. This species' known elevation range is between 3 - 915 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

Yadon's rein orchid (*Piperia yadonii*) is federally listed as endangered and designated by CNPS as list 1B.1. Yadon's rein orchid is a perennial herb in the orchid family (*Orchidaceae*). It is found in coastal bluff scrub, closed-cone coniferous forest, chaparral (maritime) in sandy soils. This species blooms from (February) May to August. This species' known elevation range is between 10 and 510 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are 12 previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area, two of which are within a one-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

Hickman's popcorn-flower (*Plagiobothrys chorisianus* var. *hickmanii*) is designated by CNPS as list 4.2. Hickman's popcorn-flower is an annual herb in the borage family (*Boraginaceae*). It is found in coastal bluff scrub, closed-cone coniferous forest, chaparral, coastal scrub, marshes and swamps, and vernal pools. This species intergrades with *P.c.* var. *chorisianus*. This species blooms from April to June. This species' known elevation range is between 15 and 185 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

Hickman's cinquefoil (*Potentilla hickmanii*) is federally and state-listed as endangered and designated by CNPS as list 1B.1. Hickman's cinquefoil is a perennial herb in the rose family (*Rosaceae*). It is found in coastal bluff scrub, closed-cone coniferous forest, meadows and seeps (vernally mesic), marshes and swamps (freshwater). This species blooms from April to August. This species' known elevation range is between 10 and 135 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are two previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

Maple-leaved checkerbloom (*Sidalcea malachroides*) is designated by CNPS as list 4.2. Maple-leaved checkerbloom is a perennial herb in the mallow family (*Malvaceae*). It is found in broad-leaved upland forest, coastal prairie, coastal scrub, North Coast coniferous forest, and riparian woodland, often in disturbed areas. This species blooms from April to August. This species' known elevation range is between two and 730 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There is one previously recorded occurrence within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).
Santa Cruz microseris (Stebbinsoseris decipiens) is designated by CNPS as list 1B.2. Santa Cruz microseris is an annual herb in the sunflower family (Asteraceae). It is found in broad-leaved upland forest, closed-cone coniferous forest, chaparral, coastal prairie, coastal scrub, and valley and foothill grassland/open areas, sometimes in serpentine. It is known from fewer than twenty occurrences. This species blooms from April to May. This species' known elevation range is between 10 and 500 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There is one previously recorded occurrence within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

Pacific Grove clover (Trifolium polyodon) is rare in California and designated by CNPS as list 1B.1. Pacific Grove clover is an annual herb in the legume family (Fabaceae). It is found in closed-cone coniferous forest, coastal prairie, meadows and seeps, valley and foothill grassland in mesic soils. It is known from seven occurrences on the Monterey and Point Lobos Peninsulas. A synonym of T. variegatum in The Jepson Manual (Hickman 1993), but appears to be distinct. This species blooms from April to June. This species' known elevation range is between five and 120 meters. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are six previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

Special-status Wildlife Species

Based on a review of special-status fish and wildlife species in the Seaside 7.5-minute quadrangle and surrounding quadrangles (CDFG, 2008a/b; USFWS, 2008a), a total of 32 special-status fish and wildlife species have been recorded from the project region. A summary of the status, habitat affinities, reported distribution, and potential for occurrence within the study area for each of the target fish and wildlife species is presented in Appendix B.

Of the 32 special-status species from Appendix B, seven of the special-status species were excluded from the analysis based on the lack of suitable habitat, range restrictions, local extirpations, lack of connectivity between areas of suitable and occupied habitat, and/or incompatible land use and/or habitat degradation/alteration of on-site or adjacent lands. Additional protocol-level surveys may be necessary to verify the presence or absence of the remaining special-status species within the study area.

Based on the database searches for special-status wildlife and habitat suitability within the study area, the species listed in Table 3 have the potential to occur within the study area. A brief discussion of these species is provided below. Migratory birds are not discussed specifically unless appearing on federal or State lists; migratory birds are addressed as a group below.

**Table 3 – Habitats Within the Study Area and Associated Special-status Species**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vegetative Communities</th>
<th>Special-status Species</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Tidewater goby (FE) Steelhead south/central California coast (FT) Southern sea otter (FT) Caspian tern (−) California least tern (FE, SE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estuarine</td>
<td>California linderiella fairy shrimp (−) Tidewater goby (FE) Steelhead south/central California coast (FT) California red-legged frog (FT, CSC) Western pond turtle (CSC) Southwestern pond turtle (CSC) Caspian tern (−) California least tern (FE, SE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetative Communities</td>
<td>Special-status Species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Emergent Wetland       | California red-legged frog (FT, CSC)  
Western pond turtle (CSC)  
Southwestern pond turtle (CSC)  
Tri-colored blackbird (CSC)  
Raptors and other migratory birds - nesting  
Salinas harvest mouse (~) |
| Coastal Dune Scrub     | Globose dune beetle (~)  
Smith’s blue butterfly (FE)  
Black legless lizard (CSC)  
Western snowy plover* (FT, CSC)  
Raptors and other migratory birds – nesting  
Caspian tern (~)  
California least tern (FE, SE) |
| Coastal Oak Woodland   | Black legless lizard (CSC)  
California horned lizard (CSC)  
Two-striped garter snake (CSC)  
Sharp-shinned hawk* (CSC)  
Ferruginous hawk* (CSC)  
Prairie falcon* (CSC)  
Raptors and other migratory birds - nesting  
Hoary bat (CSC)  
American badger (CSC) |
| Mixed Woodland         | Monarch butterfly (~)  
Black legless lizard (CSC)  
California horned lizard (CSC)  
Two-striped garter snake (CSC)  
Sharp-shinned hawk* (CSC)  
Ferruginous hawk* (CSC)  
Prairie falcon* (CSC)  
Raptors and other migratory birds - nesting  
Hoary bat (CSC)  
Monterey dusky-footed woodrat (CSC)  
American badger (CSC) |
| Riparian               | California linderiella fairy shrimp (~)  
California red-legged frog (FT, CSC)  
Western pond turtle (CSC)  
Southwestern pond turtle (CSC)  
Black legless lizard (CSC)  
California horned lizard (CSC)  
Two-striped garter snake (CSC)  
Sharp-shinned hawk* (CSC)  
Ferruginous hawk* (CSC)  
Prairie falcon* (CSC)  
Tri-colored blackbird (CSC)  
Raptors and other migratory birds - nesting  
Hoary bat (CSC)  
Monterey dusky-footed woodrat (CSC)  
Salinas harvest mouse (~)  
American badger (CSC) |
| Residential Park       | Monarch butterfly (~)  
Smith’s blue butterfly (FE)  
Sharp-shinned hawk* (CSC)  
Ferruginous hawk* (CSC)  
Prairie falcon* (CSC)  
Raptors and other migratory birds - nesting  
Burrowing owl (CSC)  
Hoary bat (CSC) |
| Urban                  | Raptors and other migratory birds - nesting |
| Ruderal                | Monarch butterfly (~)  
Burrowing owl (CSC)  
Raptors and other migratory birds - nesting  
American badger (CSC) |

**Federal status**

- **FE** = Listed as endangered under the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA)
- **FT** = Listed as threatened under FESA
- **~** = No Status

**State status**

- **SE** = Listed as endangered under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA)
- **ST** = Listed as threatened under CESA
- **CSC** = California Species of Concern as identified by CDFG
- **CFP** = Listed as fully protected under CDFG code

*Migratory Birds protected under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act.*
Invertebrates

Globose dune beetle (*Coelus globosus*) are flightless and quite sessile nocturnal beetles that inhabit sand dune formations, including fore dunes, sand hummocks, sometimes back dunes along immediate coast. Larvae and pupae spend most of the time in the sand. The larvae can also be found under vegetation or accumulated debris. Adults spend the hotter summer months aggregating under vegetation or debris. Adults come to the surface at night and on cool, foggy days. Larvae and adults feed on dead vegetable matter that accumulates on the sand. The dune beetles leave a distinct track on the beach that resembles a labyrinth. Their footprints cannot be seen on the track because the beetle walks below the sand, leaving a collapsed tunnel behind. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There is one previously recorded occurrence within a one-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

Monarch butterfly (*Danaus plexippus*) Habitat is a complex issue for this species. In general breeding areas are virtually all patches of milkweed in North America and some other regions. The critical conservation feature for North American populations is the overwintering habitats, which are certain high altitude Mexican conifer forests or coastal California conifer or Eucalyptus groves as identified in literature. Coastal regions are important flyways and so nectar (wild or in gardens) is an important resource in such places. However, essential overwintering areas for North American populations are limited to about 100 places in coastal California and the mountains of Mexico. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are four previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area, one of which is within a one-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

Smith’s blue butterfly (*Euphilotes enoptes smithi*) is federally listed as endangered. Smith’s blue butterfly is found in scattered colonies in coastal areas of Central California. It uses two habitats, coastal sand dunes and cliff/chaparral, both of which are endangered. Smith’s blue butterfly is associated with two species of buckwheat, seacliff buckwheat (*Eriogonum parvifolium*) and seaside buckwheat (*E. latifolium*) in all life stages, and the presence of these plants is a key habitat requirement. These plants are obligate host plants for the larvae and the principle nectar sources for adults. They also provide mating sites. The butterflies generally spend their lifetime within 200 feet of the host plant on which they emerged. Smith’s blues are found in coastal sand dunes and cliff/chaparral areas along the central California coast in Monterey, Santa Cruz, and San Mateo Counties. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are three previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area, one of which is within a one-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

California linderiella fairy shrimp (*Linderiella occidentalis*) inhabits large, fairly clear vernal pools and lakes. The California fairy shrimp is the most common fairy shrimp in the Central Valley. It has been documented on most land forms, geologic formations and soil types supporting vernal pools in California, at altitudes as high as 3,800 feet above sea level. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are two previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

Fish

Tidewater goby (*Eucyclogobius newberryi*) is federally listed as endangered. Historically widespread in brackish coastal lagoons and coastal creeks in California from the mouth of the Smith River, Del Norte County, south to Agua Hedionda Lagoon, San Diego County. Naturally absent (due to lack of suitable habitat) between Humboldt Bay and Ten Mile River, between Point Arena and Salmon Creek, and between Monterey Bay and Arroyo del Oso. Suitable
habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

Steelhead south/central California coast ESU (*Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus*) is federally listed as threatened. Both anadromous and non-anadromous forms exist. Anadromous forms migrate between freshwater breeding and marine non-breeding habitats; California breeders migrate to non-breeding habitats as far away as Alaska. Marginal habitat is present within the study area. There is one previously recorded occurrence within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

Amphibians

California red-legged frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*) is federally listed as threatened and a California species of special concern. California red-legged frogs are found in humid forests, woodlands, grasslands, and streambanks with plant cover, but are most common in the lowlands or foothills. They are frequently found in woods adjacent to streams from sea level to 8,000 feet (2,440 meters). Breeding habitat is in permanent or late season sources of deep water; lakes, ponds, reservoirs, slow streams, marshes, bogs, and swamps. This species breeds late December to early April. They are endemic to California and northern Baja California. Ranges along the coast from Mendocino County in northern California south to northern Baja California, and inland through the northern Sacramento Valley into the foothills of the Sierra Nevada mountains, south to Tulare county, and possibly Kern county. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are four previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

Reptiles

Western pond turtle (*Actinemys marmorata*) is a California species of special concern. Western pond turtles inhabit permanent or nearly permanent water in various habitats (e.g. ponds, streams, perennial drainages). Requires basking sites particularly in areas vegetated with riparian habitats. The western pond turtle includes two subspecies, the northwestern pond turtle (*A. m. marmorata*) and the southwestern pond turtle (*A. m. pallida*). The two subspecies range is interconnected within and around the San Francisco Bay Area. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

Southwestern pond turtle (*Actinemys marmorata pallida*) is a California species of special concern. Found in ponds, lakes, rivers, streams, creeks, marshes, and irrigation ditches, with abundant vegetation, and either rocky or muddy bottoms, in woodland, forest, and grassland. In streams, prefers pools to shallower areas. Logs, rocks, cattail mats, and exposed banks are required for basking. They may enter brackish water and even saltwater. From the San Francisco Bay south, along the coast ranges into northern Baja California (where it has disappeared throughout most of its range) from sea level to over 5,900 feet (1,800 meters) in elevation. Isolated populations occur along the Mojave River at Camp Cody and Afton Canyon. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

Black legless lizard (*Anniella pulchra nigra*) is a California species of special concern. This species occurs in moist warm loose soil with plant cover. Moisture is essential. This species occurs in sparsely vegetated areas of beach dunes, chaparral, pine-oak woodlands, desert scrub, sandy washes, and stream terraces with sycamores, cottonwoods, or oaks. Leaf litter under trees and bushes in sunny areas and dunes stabilized with bush lupine and mock heather often
indicate suitable habitat. It can often be found under surface objects such as rocks, boards, driftwood, and logs. It can also be found by gently raking leaf litter under bushes and trees. Sometimes found in suburban gardens in Southern California. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

**California horned lizard** (*Phrynosoma coronatum frontale*) is a California species of special concern. Frequents a wide variety of habitats; most common in lowlands along sandy washes with scattered low bushes. Inhabits open areas of sandy soil and low vegetation in valleys, foothills and semiarid mountains from sea level to 8,000 feet (2,438 meters) in elevation. Found in grasslands, coniferous forests, woodlands, and chaparral, with open areas and patches of loose soil. Often found in lowlands along sandy washes with scattered shrubs and along dirt roads, and frequently found near ant hills. Historically, found along the Pacific coast from the Baja California border west of the deserts and the Sierra Nevada, north to the Bay Area, and inland as far north as Shasta Reservoir, and south into Baja California. The current range is more fragmented. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

**Two-striped garter snake** (*Thamnophis hammondii*) is a California species of special concern. Generally found around pools, creeks, cattle tanks, and other water sources, often in rocky areas, in oak woodland, chaparral, brushland, and coniferous forest. Ranges continuously from near Salinas in Monterey County south along the coast mostly west of the south Coast Ranges, to southern California where it ranges east through the Transverse Ranges (and into the desert in Victorville) and south through the Peninsular Ranges into northern Baja California at elevations from sea level to 6,988 feet (2,130 meters). It also occurs in southern Baja in isolated areas and on Catalina Island. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

**Birds**

**CHARADRIIFORMES (shorebirds, gulls)**

**Western snowy plover** (*Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus*) is a federally threatened species and a California species of special concern. Sandy beaches, salt pond levees; needs sandy, gravelly, or friable soils for nesting. Plovers can be found on flat, open coastal beaches in dunes, and near stream mouths. They are well camouflaged and extremely hard to see, often crouching in small depressions taking shelter from the wind. From early spring to mid-fall, plovers nest in loose colonies, often coming back to the same beaches every year. The nests are simple scrapes in the sand with one to three eggs that the male warms at night, while the female does day duty. Eggs hatch in about 27 days, and within hours the chicks are searching for their food of insects and other beach invertebrates. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. California State Parks has designated the Monterey State Beach has snowy plover nesting habitat. There are two previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area, one of which is within a one-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

**Caspian tern** (*Sterna caspia*) is protected under the MBTA. They nest on sandy or gravelly beaches and shell banks in small colonies inland and along the coast. They are found inland along lakes and fresh-water marshes and also in brackish and salt waters of estuaries and bays. This species was observed within Roberts Lake. Marginal nesting habitat is present within the PSA.

**California least tern** (*Sternula antillarum*) is a federally and state endangered species and protected as a migratory bird under the MBTA. The bulk of its distribution is along the southern
California coast. The least tern arrives at its breeding grounds in late April. The breeding colonies are not dense and may appear along either marine or estuarine shores, or on sand bar islands in large rivers, in areas free from humans or predators. Nests are situated on barren to sparsely vegetated places near water, normally on sandy or gravelly substrates. Marginal nesting habitat is present within the PSA. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

**FALCONIFORMES (hawks, falcons)**

**Sharp-shinned hawk** (*Accipiter striatus*) is a California species of special concern. A robin- to pigeon-sized woodland hawk. Forest and open woodland, coniferous, mixed, or deciduous, primarily in coniferous in more northerm and mountainous portion of range. Young, dense, mixed or coniferous woodlands are preferred for nesting. This species migrates through various habitats, mainly along ridges, lakeshores, and coastlines. Nests usually in tree crotch or on branch next to trunk, most often 3-18 m up, hidden by thick foliage, usually in conifer in north. May build new nest, reuse old one, or modify old bird or squirrel nest. Nests generally seem to be in a stand of dense conifers near a forest opening, though this may reflect observer bias. This species was observed within the study area. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

**Ferruginous hawk** (*Buteo regalis*) is a California species of special concern. Ferruginous hawks are birds of open country. They are found in open habitats, such as grasslands, sagebrush, deserts, shrublands, and outer edges of pinyon-pine and other forests. They select rocky outcrops, hillsides, rock pinnacles, or trees for nest sites. Suitable nesting habitat is not present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

**Prairie falcon** (*Falco mexicanus*) is a California species of special concern. Prairie falcons are sandy-colored falcons with distinctive white eyebrows and dark wing-pit patches. Prairie Falcons inhabit hills, canyons, and mountains of arid grasslands and shrub-steppes of southwestern Canada, western United States, Baja California, and northern Mexico. They nest primarily on cliffs overlooking large open areas, using a ledge, cavity, crevice, or an abandoned nest of eagles, hawks, or ravens. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

**PASSERIFORMES (perching birds)**

**Tri-colored blackbird** (*Agelaius tricolor*) is a California species of special concern and year-round resident. They breed in freshwater wetlands, with tall dense vegetation including tule, cattail, blackberry and rose from April to July. Tri-colored blackbirds forage in grasslands and croplands. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There is one previously recorded occurrence within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

**STRIGIFORMES (owls)**

**Burrowing owl** (*Athene cunicularia*) is a California species of special concern. Open grasslands and shrublands up to 5,300 feet with low perches and small mammal burrows. Burrowing owls are year-round residents that breed from March to August. Marginal habitat is present within the study area. There are two previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area, one of which is within a one-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).
Raptors and Other Migratory Birds

Many bird species are migratory and fall under the jurisdiction of the MBTA. Various migratory birds and raptor species, in addition to those described in detail above, have the potential to inhabit the project vicinity. American kestrels (*Falco sparverius*), northern harriers (*Circus cyaneus*), and white-tailed kites (*Elanus leucurus*) may occur within the vicinity of the study area. Some raptor species, such as red-tailed hawk (*Buteo jamaicensis*) and great-horned owl (*Bubo virginianus*), are not considered special-status species because they are not rare or protected under FESA or CESA; however, the nests of all raptor species are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and Section 3503.5 of the California Fish and Game Code. Migratory birds forage and nest in multiple habitats such as annual grasslands, oak woodlands, and riparian forests. The nests of all migratory birds are protected under the MBTA, which makes it illegal to destroy any active migratory bird nest. The trees and shrubs found within the study area and in the vicinity provide potential nesting habitat for raptors and migratory birds that occur in the region. Consequently, raptor and migratory bird species are likely to forage and nest in the study area.

Mammals

**Southern sea otter** (*Enhydra lutris nereis*) is a federally threatened species. Sea otters are marine mammals. They inhabit temperate coastal waters with rocky or soft sediment ocean bottoms less than one kilometer from shore. Kelp forest ecosystems are characteristic of otter habitats. This species is found off the coast of central California. Marginal habitat for southern sea otter is present within the marine habitat within the study area.

**Hoary bat** (*Lasiurus cinereus*) is a California species of special concern. Basically solitary, except for mother-young association; however, during migration, groups of up to hundreds of individuals may form. Dispersed population allows little chance to obtain density figures. Those migrating through the western U.S. in fall go south at least into Mexico. Typically not attracted to houses or other human structures, they roost 10 to 15 feet up in trees along forest borders. In the summer, hoary bats don't emerge to feed until after dark. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There is one previously recorded occurrence within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

**Monterey dusky-footed woodrat** (*Neotoma macrotis luciana*) is California species of special concern. The nocturnal dusk-footed woodrats are generally found in dense chaparral, coastal sage-scrub, pinyon-juniper, oak and riparian woodlands, and mixed conifer forest habitats that have a well-developed understory. They seem to favor brushy habitat or woodland with a live oak component. They are highly arboreal, and thick-leaved trees and shrubs are important habitat components. These species at Fort Ord were found in coast live oak woodland and savanna habitat. They require an abundant supply of downed wood, sticks, bark, and miscellaneous plant materials to build stick houses (nests) for protection, food storage, resting, rearing of young, and social communications. Houses are generally constructed in areas that are dark, moist, and cool, and that provide good cover. This species has been known to build stick houses below rocky bluffs, in trees, on the ground, on north-facing hillsides, and on canyon slopes. The species responds favorably to restoration of riparian habitats. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

**Salinas harvest mouse** (*Reithrodontomys megalotis distichlis*) Known from a small area near Monterey Bay. These mice prefer grassy or weedy areas where adequate food and a certain degree of protective cover are available, especially in the vicinity of water. Meadows, marshes, and weed-covered banks of irrigation ditches seem to offer optimum habitat conditions. The
species seldom is found in forested areas. They utilize the runways and underground burrows of other rodents and frequently take over vacated burrows of pocket gophers. The nest usually is placed on the ground or slightly above it under some protective cover such as a board, a clump of lodged grass, or a tangle of weeds. These mice are also known to use the nests of marsh wrens in cattail marshes. They appear to be strictly nocturnal and active throughout the year. They are almost entirely vegetarians and feed on the green parts and seeds of plants. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are two previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area, one of which is within a one-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

American badger (*Taxidea taxus*) is California species of special concern. Stout-bodied, primarily solitary species that hunts for ground squirrels and other small mammal prey in open grassland, cropland, deserts, savanna, and shrubland communities. Badgers have large home ranges and spend inactive periods in underground burrows. Badgers typically mate in mid- to late summer and give birth between March and April. Marginal habitat is present within the study area. There are three previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area, one of which is within a one-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

**SUMMARY**

Given the sensitive nature of the area within the study area, development within the study area has the potential to affect sensitive habitats, special-status species, and other protected biological resources. The sand dune habitat within Monterey State Beach is particularly sensitive since it contains numerous special-status plant species, is designated critical habitat for Monterey spineflower, and provides nesting habitat for the federally threatened western snowy plover. The vegetation within and surrounding Roberts and Laguna Grande Lakes including the emergent wetlands and riparian habitats are considered sensitive by the state and the City of Seaside. In addition, a total of 43 special-status plant species and 25 special-status wildlife species have the potential to occur within the study area. Since the study area contains numerous sensitive biological resources any further development of the area would require careful planning and compliance with state, federal and local laws and regulations pertaining to these resources.
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APPENDIX A – DATABASE SEARCHES FOR SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES WITHIN THE VICINITY OF THE STUDY AREA
United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Ventura Fish and Wildlife Office
2493 Portola Road, Suite B
Ventura, California  93003

IN REPLY REFER TO:
81440-2008-5530

RECEIVED BY August 20, 2008

Angela Calderaro
Biologist, PMC
2729 Prospect Park Drive, Suite 220
Rancho Cordova, California  95670

Subject: Species List for the Seaview Local Coastal Program in Monterey County, California

Dear Ms. Calderaro:

This letter is in response to your request, dated August 2, 2008, and received in our office on August 11, 2008, for a list of endangered, threatened, and other special status species that may occur within the Seaview Local Coastal Program (LCP) area in Monterey County, California. The species list will be used to assist in the update of the biological inventory report for the LCP that is intended to provide an environmental baseline for the Land Use Plan and Coastal Implementation Plan.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service’s (Service) responsibilities include administering the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (Act), including sections 7, 9, and 10. Section 9 of the Act prohibits the taking of any federally listed endangered or threatened species. Section 3(18) of the Act defines take to mean to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct. Service regulations (50 CFR 17.3) define harm to include significant habitat modification or degradation which actually kills or injures wildlife by significantly impairing essential behavioral patterns, including breeding, feeding, or sheltering. Harassment is defined by the Service as an intentional or negligent action that creates the likelihood of injury to wildlife by annoying it to such an extent as to significantly disrupt normal behavioral patterns which include, but are not limited to, breeding, feeding, or sheltering. The Act provides for civil and criminal penalties for the unlawful taking of listed species.

Exemptions to the prohibitions against take may be obtained through coordination with the Service in two ways. If the subject project is to be funded, authorized, or carried out by a Federal agency and may affect a listed species, the Federal agency must consult with the Service, pursuant to section 7(a)(2) of the Act. If a proposed project does not involve a Federal agency but may result in the take of a listed animal species, the project proponent should apply for an incidental take permit, pursuant to section 10(a)(1)(B) of the Act. Once you have determined if the proposed project will have a lead Federal agency, we can provide you with more detailed information regarding the section 7 or 10(a)(1)(B) permitting process.

Seaside LCP-Appendix A
We recommend that you review information in the California Department of Fish and Game's Natural Diversity Data Base. You can contact the California Department of Fish and Game at (916) 324-3812 for information on other sensitive species that may occur in this area.

If you have any questions, please call Chad Mitcham of my staff at (805) 644-1766, extension 335.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

David M. Pereksta
Assistant Field Supervisor

Enclosure
LISTED SPECIES THAT MAY OCCUR IN THE SEAVIEW LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM AREA IN MONTEREY COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mammals</th>
<th>Birds</th>
<th>Amphibians</th>
<th>Invertebrates</th>
<th>Plants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southern sea otter</td>
<td>Brown pelican</td>
<td>California red-legged frog</td>
<td>Smith’s blue butterfly</td>
<td>Monterey spineflower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pelecanus occidentalis</td>
<td>California tiger salamander</td>
<td>Euphilotes enoptes smithi</td>
<td>Chorizanthe pungens var. pungens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sterna antillarum browni</td>
<td>Rana aurora draytonii</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chorizanthe robusta var. robusta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Erysimum menziesii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gilia tenuiflora ssp. arenaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lasthenia conjugens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Layia carnosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lupinus tidiestrorumi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Astragalus tener var. titi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Piperia yadonii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
E - Endangered          T - Threatened      CH - Critical habitat
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Element Code</th>
<th>Federal Status</th>
<th>State Status</th>
<th>Global Rank</th>
<th>State Rank</th>
<th>CNPS</th>
<th>CDFG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actinemys marmorata pallida</td>
<td>southwestern pond turtle</td>
<td>ARAAD02032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G3G4T2T3Q</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agelaius tricolor</td>
<td>tricolored blackbird</td>
<td>ABPBX0020</td>
<td>G2G3</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allium hickmani</td>
<td>Hickman's onion</td>
<td>PMLIL02140</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2.2</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambystoma californiense</td>
<td>California tiger salamander</td>
<td>AAAA01180</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>G2G3</td>
<td>S2S3</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anniella pulchra nigra</td>
<td>black legless lizard</td>
<td>ARACC01011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G3G4T2T3Q</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arctostaphylos edmundsii</td>
<td>Little Sur manzanita</td>
<td>PDERI04260</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2.2</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arctostaphylos hookeri ssp. hookeri</td>
<td>Hooker's manzanita</td>
<td>PDERI040J1</td>
<td>G3T2?</td>
<td>S2?</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arctostaphylos montereysensis</td>
<td>Toro manzanita</td>
<td>PDERI040R0</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2.1</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arctostaphylos pajaroenis</td>
<td>Pajaro manzanita</td>
<td>PDERI04100</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2.1</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arctostaphylos pumila</td>
<td>sandmat manzanita</td>
<td>PDERI04180</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2.2</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astragalus tener var. tener</td>
<td>alkali milk-vetch</td>
<td>PDFAB0F8R1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G1T1</td>
<td>S1.1</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astragalus tener var. ttit</td>
<td>coastal dunes milk-vetch</td>
<td>PDFAB0F8R2</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>G1T1</td>
<td>S1.1</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athene cunicularia</td>
<td>burrowing owl</td>
<td>ABNSB10010</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buteo regalis</td>
<td>ferruginous hawk</td>
<td>ABNKC19120</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S3S4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Dune Scrub</td>
<td>Central Dune Scrub</td>
<td>CTT21320CA</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Maritime Chaparral</td>
<td>Central Maritime Chaparral</td>
<td>CTT3720CA</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centromadia parry ss. congdonii</td>
<td>Congdon's tarplant</td>
<td>PDAST4R0P1</td>
<td>G4T3</td>
<td>S3.2</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus</td>
<td>western snowy plover</td>
<td>ABNNB03031</td>
<td>G4T3</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorizanthe pungens var. pungens</td>
<td>Monterey spineflower</td>
<td>PDGN040M2</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>G2T2</td>
<td>S2.2</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorizanthe robusta var. robusta</td>
<td>robust spineflower</td>
<td>PDGN040O2</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>G2T1</td>
<td>S1.1</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkia jolonensis</td>
<td>Jolon clarkia</td>
<td>PDONA050L0</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2.2</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coelus globosus</td>
<td>globose dune beetle</td>
<td>IICOL4A010</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collinsia multicolor</td>
<td>San Francisco collinsia</td>
<td>PDSCR0H0B0</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2.2</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordylanthus rigidus ssp. littoralis</td>
<td>seaside bird's-beak</td>
<td>PDSCR0J0P2</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>G5T1</td>
<td>S1.1</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupressus goveniana ssp. goveniana</td>
<td>Gowen cypress</td>
<td>PGCUP04031</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>G2T1</td>
<td>S1.2</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupressus macrocarpa</td>
<td>Monterey cypress</td>
<td>PGCUP04060</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>S1.2</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypseloides niger</td>
<td>black swift</td>
<td>ABNUA01010</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danaus plexippus</td>
<td>monarch butterfly</td>
<td>IILEPP2010</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphinium hutchinsoniae</td>
<td>Hutchinson's larkspur</td>
<td>PDRAN0B0V0</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2.1</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eremophila alpestris actia</td>
<td>California horned lark</td>
<td>ABPAT02011</td>
<td>G5T3Q</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ericameria fasciculata</td>
<td>Eastwood's goldenbush</td>
<td>PDAST3L080</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2.1</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Element Code</td>
<td>Federal Status</td>
<td>State Status</td>
<td>Global Rank</td>
<td>State Rank</td>
<td>CNPS</td>
<td>CDFG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Eriogonum nortonii</td>
<td>Pinnacles buckwheat</td>
<td>PDPGN08470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2.3</td>
<td>1B.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Erysimum ammophilum</td>
<td>sand-loving wallflower</td>
<td>PDDB1090</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2.2</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Erysimum menziesii ssp. menziesii</td>
<td>Menzies' wallflower</td>
<td>PDBRA160E1</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>G3?T2</td>
<td>S2.1</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Erysimum menziesii ssp. yadonii</td>
<td>Yadon's wallflower</td>
<td>PDBRA160E4</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>G3?T1</td>
<td>S1.1</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Eucyclogobius newbryi</td>
<td>tidewater goby</td>
<td>ACDCN04010</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td></td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S2S3</td>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Euphilotes enoptes smithi</td>
<td>Smith's blue butterfly</td>
<td>IILEP2026</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td></td>
<td>G5T1T2</td>
<td>S1S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Falco mexicanus</td>
<td>prairie falcon</td>
<td>ABKDO6090</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Fritillaria liliacea</td>
<td>fragrant fritillary</td>
<td>PMLIL0V00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2.2</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Gilia tenuiflora ssp. arenaria</td>
<td>sand gilia</td>
<td>PDPLM041P2</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>G3G4T2</td>
<td>S2.2</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Horkelia cuneata ssp. sericea</td>
<td>Kellogg's horkelia</td>
<td>PDROS0W54</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td></td>
<td>G4T1</td>
<td>S1.1</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Lasius cinereus</td>
<td>hoary bat</td>
<td>AMACO5030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S4?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Lasthenia conjugens</td>
<td>Contra Costa goldfields</td>
<td>PDAST5L040</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td></td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>S1.1</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Layia carnosa</td>
<td>beach layia</td>
<td>PDAST5N010</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td></td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2.1</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Linderiella occidentalis</td>
<td>California linderiella</td>
<td>ICBRA06010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S2S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Lupinus tidsstromii</td>
<td>Tidestrom's lupine</td>
<td>PDFAB2B3Y0</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2.1</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Malacothamnus palmeri var. involucratus</td>
<td>Carmel Valley bush-mallow</td>
<td>PDMAL030B1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G3T2Q</td>
<td>S2.2</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Malacothamnus palmeri var. palmeri</td>
<td>Santa Lucia bush-mallow</td>
<td>PDMAL030B5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G3T2Q</td>
<td>S2.2</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Malacothrix saxatilis var. arachnoidea</td>
<td>Carmel Valley malacothrix</td>
<td>PDAST600C2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G5T2</td>
<td>S2.2</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Microseris paludosa</td>
<td>marsh microseris</td>
<td>PDAST600D0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2.2</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 Monterey Cypress Forest</td>
<td>Monterey Cypress Forest</td>
<td>CTTS3150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>S1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Monterey Pine Forest</td>
<td>Monterey Pine Forest</td>
<td>CTTS3130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>S1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 Monterey Pygmy Cypress Forest</td>
<td>Monterey Pygmy Cypress Forest</td>
<td>CTTS3162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>S1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 Northern Bishop Pine Forest</td>
<td>Northern Bishop Pine Forest</td>
<td>CTTS3121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 Northern Coastal Salt Marsh</td>
<td>Northern Coastal Salt Marsh</td>
<td>CTTS2110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 Oceanodroma homochroa</td>
<td>ashy storm-petrel</td>
<td>ABND04030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 Onchorhynchus mykiss irideus</td>
<td>steelhead - south/central California coast ESU</td>
<td>AFCHA0209H</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td></td>
<td>G5T2Q</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 Pelecanus occidentalis californicus</td>
<td>California brown pelican</td>
<td>ABNFC01021</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>G4T3</td>
<td>S1S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 Phrynosoma coronatum (frontale population)</td>
<td>coast (California) horned lizard</td>
<td>ARACF12022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G4G5</td>
<td>S3S4</td>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Pinus radiata</td>
<td>Monterey pine</td>
<td>PGPIN040V0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>S1.1</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 Piperia yadonii</td>
<td>Yadon's rein orchid</td>
<td>PMORC1X070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2.1</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 Plagiobothrys uncinatus</td>
<td>hooked popcorn-flower</td>
<td>PDBOR0V170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S2.2</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Element Code</td>
<td>Federal Status</td>
<td>State Status</td>
<td>Global Rank</td>
<td>State Rank</td>
<td>CNPS</td>
<td>CDFG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentilla hickmanii</td>
<td>Hickman's cinquefoil</td>
<td>PDROS1B0U0</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>S1.1</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rana aurora draytonii</td>
<td>California red-legged frog</td>
<td>AAABH01022</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td></td>
<td>G4T2T3</td>
<td>S2S3</td>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reithrodontomys megalotis distichlis</td>
<td>Salinas harvest mouse</td>
<td>AMAFF02032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G5T1</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa pinetorum</td>
<td>pine rose</td>
<td>PDROS1J0W0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G2Q</td>
<td>S2.2</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidalcea malachroides</td>
<td>maple-leaved checkerbloom</td>
<td>PDMAL110E0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G3G4</td>
<td>S3S4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reithrodontomys megalotis distichlis</td>
<td>Salinas harvest mouse</td>
<td>AMAFF02032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G5T1</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa pinetorum</td>
<td>pine rose</td>
<td>PDROS1J0W0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G2Q</td>
<td>S2.2</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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Seaside LCP-Appendix A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Collinsia multicolor</td>
<td>collinsia</td>
<td>Scrophulariaceae</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cordylanthus rigidus ssp. littoralis</td>
<td>seaside bird's-beak</td>
<td>Scrophulariaceae</td>
<td>List 1B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Corethogyne leucophylla</td>
<td>branching beach aster</td>
<td>Asteraceae</td>
<td>List 3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Delphinium hutchinsoniae</td>
<td>Hutchinson's larkspur</td>
<td>Ranunculaceae</td>
<td>List 1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Delphinium umbraculorum</td>
<td>umbrella larkspur</td>
<td>Ranunculaceae</td>
<td>List 1B.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ericameria fasciculata</td>
<td>Eastwood's goldenbush</td>
<td>Asteraceae</td>
<td>List 1B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eriogonum nortonii</td>
<td>Pinnacles buckwheat</td>
<td>Polygonaceae</td>
<td>List 1B.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Erysimum ammophilum</td>
<td>sand-loving wallflower</td>
<td>Brassicaceae</td>
<td>List 1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Erysimum menziesii ssp. menziesii</td>
<td>Menzies' wallflower</td>
<td>Brassicaceae</td>
<td>List 1B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Erysimum menziesii ssp. yadonii</td>
<td>Yadon's wallflower</td>
<td>Brassicaceae</td>
<td>List 1B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fritillaria liliacea</td>
<td>fragrant fritillary</td>
<td>Liliaceae</td>
<td>List 1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Galium clementis</td>
<td>Santa Lucia bedstraw</td>
<td>Rubiaceae</td>
<td>List 1B.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gilia tenuiflora ssp. arenaria</td>
<td>Monterey gilia</td>
<td>Polemoniaceae</td>
<td>List 1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Grindelia hirsutula var. maritima</td>
<td>San Francisco gumplant</td>
<td>Asteraceae</td>
<td>List 1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Horkelia cuneata ssp. sericea</td>
<td>Kellogg's horkelia</td>
<td>Rosaceae</td>
<td>List 1B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lasthenia conjugens</td>
<td>Contra Costa goldfields</td>
<td>Asteraceae</td>
<td>List 1B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Layia carnosa</td>
<td>beach layia</td>
<td>Asteraceae</td>
<td>List 1B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Leptosiphon croceus</td>
<td>coast yellow leptosiphon</td>
<td>Polemoniaceae</td>
<td>List 1B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lupinus tidalstromii</td>
<td>Tidestrom's lupine</td>
<td>Fabaceae</td>
<td>List 1B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Malacothamnus palmeri var. involucratus</td>
<td>Carmel Valley bush-mallow</td>
<td>Malvaceae</td>
<td>List 1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Malacothamnus palmeri var. palmeri</td>
<td>Santa Lucia bush-mallow</td>
<td>Malvaceae</td>
<td>List 1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Malacothrix saxatilis var. arachnoidea</td>
<td>Carmel Valley malacothrix</td>
<td>Asteraceae</td>
<td>List 1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Micropus amphibolus</td>
<td>Mt. Diablo cottonweed</td>
<td>Asteraceae</td>
<td>List 3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Microseris paludosa</td>
<td>marsh microseris</td>
<td>Asteraceae</td>
<td>List 1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Monardella antonina ssp. antonina</td>
<td>San Antonio Hills monardella</td>
<td>Lamiaceae</td>
<td>List 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pinus radiata</td>
<td>Monterey pine</td>
<td>Pinaceae</td>
<td>List</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To save selected records for later study, click the ADD button.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td><strong>Piperia yadonii</strong>  📫</td>
<td>Yadon's rein orchid</td>
<td>Orchidaceae</td>
<td>List 1B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td><strong>Plagiobothrys uncinatus</strong>  📫</td>
<td>hooked popcorn-flower</td>
<td>Boraginaceae</td>
<td>List 1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td><strong>Potentilla hickmanii</strong>  📫</td>
<td>Hickman's cinquefoil</td>
<td>Rosaceae</td>
<td>List 1B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td><strong>Rosa pinetorum</strong>  📫</td>
<td>pine rose</td>
<td>Rosaceae</td>
<td>List 1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Stebbinsoseris decipiens</strong>  📫</td>
<td>Santa Cruz microseris</td>
<td>Asteraceae</td>
<td>List 1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td><strong>Tortula californica</strong>  📫</td>
<td>California screw-moss</td>
<td>Pottiaceae</td>
<td>List 1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td><strong>Trifolium buckwestiorum</strong>  📫</td>
<td>Santa Cruz clover</td>
<td>Fabaceae</td>
<td>List 1B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td><strong>Trifolium polyodon</strong>  📫</td>
<td>Pacific Grove clover</td>
<td>Fabaceae</td>
<td>List 1B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td><strong>Trifolium trichocalyx</strong>  📫</td>
<td>Monterey clover</td>
<td>Fabaceae</td>
<td>List 1B.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selections will appear in a new window.

No more hits.
APPENDIX B – SPECIAL-STATUS PLANT AND WILDLIFE SPECIES
### Table B-1 Special-status Plant Species

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name Common Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Habitat Description</th>
<th>Considered in Impact Analysis</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allium hickmanii Hickman’s onion</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are 13 previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arctostaphylos edmundsii Little Sur manzanita</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008). The study area is outside this species known elevation range.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arctostaphylos hookeri ssp. hookeri Hooker’s manzanita</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are five previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008). The study area is outside this species known elevation range.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arctostaphylos montereysensis Toro manzanita</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are six previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008). The study area is outside this species known elevation range.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B – Special-status Plant and Wildlife Species

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name Common Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Habitat Description</th>
<th>Considered in Impact Analysis</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arctostaphylos pajaroensis</strong> Pajaro manzanita</td>
<td>~ ~ 1B.1</td>
<td>Perennial evergreen shrub in the heath family (<em>Ericaceae</em>). Chaparral (sandy). Blooms: December - March Elevation: 30 - 760 meters</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is not present within the study area. There are three previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008). The study area is outside this species known elevation range.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arctostaphylos pumila</strong> Sandmat manzanita</td>
<td>~ ~ 1B.2</td>
<td>Perennial evergreen shrub in the heath family (<em>Ericaceae</em>). Closed-cone coniferous forest, chaparral (maritime), cismontane woodland, coastal dunes, coastal scrub in sandy, openings. Known from fewer than twenty occurrences. Blooms: February - May Elevation: 3 - 205 meters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are 10 previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area, three of which are within a one-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Astragalus macrodon</strong> Salinas milk-vetch</td>
<td>~ ~ 4.3</td>
<td>Perennial herb in the legume family (<em>Fabaceae</em>). Chaparral (openings), cismontane woodland, valley and foothill grassland, in sandstone, shale, or serpentinite. Blooms: April - July Elevation: 250 – 950 meters</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is not present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008). The study area is outside this species known elevation range.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Astragalus nuttallii var. nuttallii</strong> Ocean bluff milk-vetch</td>
<td>~ ~ 4.2</td>
<td>Perennial herb in the legume family (<em>Fabaceae</em>). Coastal bluff scrub and coastal dunes. Blooms: January – November Elevation: 3 – 120 meters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Astragalus tener var. tener</strong> Alkali milk-vetch</td>
<td>~ ~ 1B</td>
<td>Annual herb in the legume family (<em>Fabaceae</em>). Playas, valley and foothill grassland (adobe clay), and vernal pools (alkaline). Blooms: March - June Elevation: 1 - 60 meters</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is not present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Name Common Name</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Habitat Description</td>
<td>Considered in Impact Analysis</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astragalus tener var. titi Coastal dunes milk-vetch</td>
<td>FE SE 1B.1</td>
<td>Annual herb in the legume family (Fabaceae), Coastal bluff scrub (sandy), coastal dunes, coastal prairie (mesic), often vernally mesic areas. Known from only one occurrence on the Monterey Peninsula. San Diego County occurrences have not been documented since the 1970's, despite rediscovery attempts. Blooms: March - May Elevation: 1 – 50 meters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilleja latifolia Monterey Coast paintbrush</td>
<td>~ ~ 4.3</td>
<td>Perennial hemi-parasitic herb in the figwort family (Scrophulariaceae). Closed-cone coniferous forest, cismontane woodland (openings), coastal dunes, and coastal scrub in sandy soils. Blooms: February – September Elevation: 0 – 185 meters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>This species was observed within the study area. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceanothus cuneatus var. rigidus Monterey ceanothus</td>
<td>~ ~ 4.2</td>
<td>Perennial evergreen shrub in the buckthorn family (Rhamnaceae). Closed-cone coniferous forest, chaparral, coastal scrub, in sandy soils. Intergrades with C.c. var. fascicularis in San Luis Obispo County. Blooms: February – April (June Elevation: 3 – 550 meters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centromadia parryi ssp. congdonii Congdon’s tarplant</td>
<td>~ ~ 1B.2</td>
<td>Annual herb in the sunflower family (Asteraceae). Valley and foothill grassland (alkaline). A synonym of Hemizonia parryi ssp. congdonii in The Jepson Manual. Blooms: May – October (November) Elevation: 1 – 230 meters</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is not present within the study area. There is one previously recorded occurrence within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX B – SPECIAL-STATUS PLANT AND WILDLIFE SPECIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name Common Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Habitat Description</th>
<th>Considered in Impact Analysis</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chorizanthe pungens var. pungens Monterey spineflower</td>
<td>FT ~ 1B.2</td>
<td>Annual herb in the knotweed family (Polygonaceae). Chaparral (maritime), cismontane woodland, coastal dunes, coastal scrub, valley and foothill grassland in sandy soils. Blooms: April – June (July) Elevation: 3 – 450 meters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are five previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area, three of which are within a one-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorizanthe robusta var. robusta Robust spineflower</td>
<td>FE ~ 1B.1</td>
<td>Annual herb in the knotweed family (Polygonaceae). Chaparral (maritime), cismontane woodland (openings), coastal dunes, coastal scrub in sandy or gravelly soils. Most populations extirpated, and now known from only six extended occurrences. Blooms: April – September Elevation: 3 – 300 meters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are two previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkia jolonensis Jolon clarkia</td>
<td>~ ~ 1B.2</td>
<td>Annual herb in the evening primrose family (Onagraceae). Chaparral, cismontane woodland, coastal scrub, and riparian woodland. Can be confused with C. lewisii. Blooms: April – June Elevation: 20 – 660 meters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are five previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area, one of which is within a one-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkia lewisii Lewis' clarkia</td>
<td>~ ~ 4.3</td>
<td>Annual herb in the evening primrose family (Onagraceae). Broad-leaved upland forest, closed-cone coniferous forest, chaparral, cismontane woodland, and coastal scrub. Can be confused with C. lewisii. Blooms: May – July Elevation: 30 – 610 meters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008). The study area is outside this species known elevation range.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B – Special-status Plant and Wildlife Species

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>CNPS</th>
<th>Habitat Description</th>
<th>Considered in Impact Analysis</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collinsia multicolor</td>
<td>San Francisco collinsia</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual herb in the figwort family (Scrophulariaceae). Closed-cone coniferous forest, and coastal scrub, sometimes serpentine. Blooms: March – May Elevation: 30 – 250 meters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There is one previously recorded occurrence within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008). The study area is outside this species known elevation range.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordylanthus rigidus ssp. littoralis</td>
<td>Seaside bird’s-beak</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual hemi-parasitic herb in the figwort family (Scrophulariaceae). Closed-cone coniferous forest, chaparral (maritime), cismontane woodland, coastal dunes, and coastal scrub, on sandy, often disturbed sites. Known from fewer than twenty occurrences. Blooms: April – October Elevation: 0 – 425 meters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are eight previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area, three of which are within a one-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corethrogyne leucophylla</td>
<td>Branching beach aster</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perennial herb in the sunflower family (Asteraceae). Closed-cone coniferous forest and coastal dunes. A synonym of Lessingia filaginifolia var. filaginifolia in The Jepson Manual. Blooms: May – December Elevation: 3 – 60 meters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupressus [Callitropsis] goveniana ssp. goveniana</td>
<td>Gowen cypress</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perennial evergreen tree in the cypress family (Cupressaceae). Closed-cone coniferous forest and chaparral (maritime). Known from only three native occurrences in the Monterey area. Elevation: 30 – 300 meters</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is not present within the study area. There are two previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008). The study area is outside this species known elevation range.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupressus [Callitropsis] macrocarpa</td>
<td>Monterey cypress</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perennial evergreen tree in the cypress family (Cupressaceae). Closed-cone coniferous forest and chaparral (maritime). Known from only three native occurrences in the Monterey area. Elevation: 30 – 300 meters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>This species is present within the study area, although it may have been planted. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Special-Status Plant and Wildlife Species

#### Scientific Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name Common Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Habitat Description</th>
<th>Considered in Impact Analysis</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delphinium hutchinsoniae (Hutchinson's larkspur)</td>
<td>~ ~ 1B.2</td>
<td>Perennial herb in the buttercup family (Ranunculaceae). Broad-leaved upland forest, chaparral, coastal prairie, and coastal scrub. Known from approximately ten occurrences. Blooms: Marsh - June. Elevation: 0 – 427 meters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There is one previously recorded occurrence within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphinium umbraculorum (Umbrella larkspur)</td>
<td>~ ~ 1B.3</td>
<td>Perennial herb in the buttercup family (Ranunculaceae). Cismontane woodland. Hybridizes with <em>D. parryi</em> ssp. <em>parryi</em>. Blooms: April – June. Elevation: 400 – 1,600 meters</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is not present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008). The study area is outside this species known elevation range.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eriastrum virgatum (Virgate eriastrum)</td>
<td>~ ~ 4.3</td>
<td>Annual herb in the phlox family (Polemoniaceae). Coastal bluff scrub, chaparral, coastal dunes, and coastal scrub in sandy soils. Blooms: May – July. Elevation: 45 – 700 meters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008). The study area is outside this species known elevation range.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ericameria fasciculata (Eastwood's goldenbush)</td>
<td>~ ~ 1B.1</td>
<td>Perennial evergreen shrub in the sunflower family (Asteraceae). Closed-cone coniferous forest, chaparral (maritime), coastal dunes, and coastal scrub in sandy, openings. Known from fewer than twenty occurrences in the Monterey Bay area. Blooms: July – October. Elevation: 30 – 275 meters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are nine previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area, three of which are within a one-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008). The study area is outside this species known elevation range.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eriogonum nortonii (Pinnacles buckwheat)</td>
<td>~ ~ 1B.3</td>
<td>Annual herb in the knotweed family (Polygonaceae). Chaparral, valley and foothill grassland in sandy soils, often on recent burns. Known from approximately twenty occurrences. Blooms: May – August (September). Elevation: 300 – 975 meters</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is not present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008). The study area is outside this species known elevation range.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Name Common Name</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Habitat Description</td>
<td>Considered in Impact Analysis</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| *Erysimum ammophilum*  
Sand-loving wallflower | ~      | ~ 1B.2              | Yes                          | Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are eight previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area, two of which are within a one-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008). |
| *Erysimum menziesii* ssp.  
*menziesii*  
Menzies' wallflower | FE SE  | 1B.1                | Yes                          | Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are four previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008). This species was observed within the study area. |
| *Erysimum menziesii* ssp.  
*yadonii*  
Yadon's wallflower | FE SE  | 1B.1                | Yes                          | Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008). |
| *Fritillaria liliacea*  
Fragrant fritillary | ~      | ~ 1B.2              | Yes                          | Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There is one previously recorded occurrence within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008). |
| *Galium clementis*  
Santa Lucia bedstraw | ~      | ~ 1B.3              | No                           | Suitable habitat is not present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008). The study area is outside this species known elevation range. |
### Special-Status Plant and Wildlife Species

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name Common Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Habitat Description</th>
<th>Considered in Impact Analysis</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Gilia tenuiflora</em> ssp. <em>arenaria</em> Monterey [sand] gilia</td>
<td>FE ST 1B.2</td>
<td>Annual herb in the phlox family (<em>Polemoniaceae</em>). Chaparral (maritime), cismontane woodland, coastal dunes, coastal scrub, sandy, openings. Known from fewer than twenty occurrences. Blooms: April – June Elevation: 10 – 45 meters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are 15 previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area, two of which are within a one-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Grindelia hirsutula</em> var. <em>maritime</em> San Francisco gumplant</td>
<td>~ ~ 1B.2</td>
<td>Perennial herb in the sunflower family (<em>Asteraceae</em>). Coastal bluff scrub, coastal scrub, valley and foothill grassland, sandy or serpentinite. Can be difficult to identify. Blooms: June - September Elevation: 15 - 400 meters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Horkelia cuneata</em> ssp. <em>sericea</em> Kellogg's horkelia</td>
<td>~ ~ 1B.1</td>
<td>Perennial herb in the rose family (<em>Rosaceae</em>). Closed-cone coniferous forest, chaparral (maritime), coastal dunes, and coastal scrub, sandy or gravelly, openings. Historical occurrences need field surveys. Occurrence from the Crocker Hills probably last remaining location in S.F. Bay. Remaining plants less distinct from ssp. <em>cuneata</em> than those formerly occurring near San Francisco. Blooms: April – September Elevation: 10 – 200 meters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are 11 previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area, two of which are within a one-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lasthenia conjugens</em> Contra Costa goldfields</td>
<td>FE ~ 1B.1</td>
<td>Annual herb in the sunflower family (<em>Asteraceae</em>). Cismontane woodland, playas (alkaline), valley and foothill grassland, vernal pools, in mesic soils. Many historical occurrences extirpated by development and agriculture. Blooms: March – June Elevation: 0 – 470 meters</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is not present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Habitat Description</td>
<td>Considered in Impact Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layia carnosa</td>
<td>Beach layia</td>
<td>FE  SE  1B.1</td>
<td>Annual herb in the sunflower family (Asteraceae). Coastal dunes and coastal scrub (sandy). Blooms: March – July Elevation: 0 – 60 meters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leptosiphon croceus</td>
<td>Coast yellow leptosiphon</td>
<td>~  ~  1B.1</td>
<td>Annual herb in the phlox family (Polemoniaceae). Coastal bluff scrub and coastal prairie. Known only from one occurrence near Moss Beach. See L. parviflorus in The Jepson Manual. Blooms: April – May Elevation: 10 – 150 meters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leptosiphon grandiflorus</td>
<td>Large-flowered leptosiphon</td>
<td>~  ~  4.2</td>
<td>Annual herb in the phlox family (Polemoniaceae). Coastal bluff scrub, closed-cone coniferous forest, cismontane woodland, coastal dunes, coastal prairie, coastal scrub, valley and foothill grassland, usually in sandy soils. Many historical occurrences extirpated by development; need status information. A synonym of Linanthus grandiflorus in The Jepson Manual. Blooms: April – August Elevation: 5 – 1,220 meters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lomatium parvifolium</td>
<td>Small-leaved lomatium</td>
<td>~  ~  4.2</td>
<td>Perennial herb in the carrot family (Apiaceae). Closed-cone coniferous forest, chaparral, coastal scrub, and riparian woodland, in serpentine. Rare in Santa Cruz County. Blooms: January – June Elevation: 20 – 700 meters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Name Common Name</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Habitat Description</td>
<td>Considered in Impact Analysis</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lupinus tidestromii</strong></td>
<td>FE SE 1B.1</td>
<td>Perennial rhizomatous herb in the legume family (<em>Fabaceae</em>). Coastal dunes. Known from fewer than 20 occurrences. Includes <em>L. tidestromii</em> var. <em>layneae</em>. Only Monterey County plants are state-listed Endangered as <em>L.t. var. tidestromii</em>. Blooms: April - June Elevation: 0 - 100 meters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are seven previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Malacothamnus palmeri var. involucratus</strong> Carmel Valley bush-mallow</td>
<td>~ ~ 1B.2</td>
<td>Perennial deciduous shrub in the mallow family (<em>Malvaceae</em>). Chaparral, cismontane woodland, and coastal scrub. A synonym of <em>M. palmeri</em> in <em>The Jepson Manual</em>. Blooms: May – August (October) Elevation: 30 – 1,100 meters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are six previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Malacothamnus palmeri var. palmeri</strong> Santa Lucia bush-mallow</td>
<td>~ ~ 1B.2</td>
<td>Perennial deciduous shrub in the mallow family (<em>Malvaceae</em>). Chaparral (rocky). A synonym of <em>M. palmeri</em> in <em>The Jepson Manual</em>. Blooms: May – July Elevation: 60 – 360 meters</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is not present within the study area. There is one previously recorded occurrence within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008). The study area is outside this species known elevation range.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Malacothrix saxatilis var. arachnoidea</strong> Carmel Valley malacothrix</td>
<td>~ ~ 1B.2</td>
<td>Perennial rhizomatous herb in the sunflower family (<em>Asteraceae</em>). Chaparral (rocky) and coastal scrub. Known from approximately ten occurrences. Blooms: (March)June - December Elevation: 25 – 1,036 meters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There is one previously recorded occurrence within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Name Common Name</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Habitat Description</td>
<td>Considered in Impact Analysis</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micropus amphibolus Mt. Diablo cottonweed</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~ 3.2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Although marginal habitat is present within the study area, there are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008) and the study area is outside this species known elevation range. It is unlikely that this species occurs within the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microseris paludosa Marsh microseris</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~ 1B.2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are five previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monardella antonina ssp. antonina San Antonio Hills monardella</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~ 3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is not present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008). The study area is outside this species known elevation range.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ophioglossum californicum California adder's-tongue</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~ 4.2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is not present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008). The study area is outside this species known elevation range.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Habitat Description</td>
<td>Considered in Impact Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pinus radiata</em></td>
<td>Monterey pine</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Piperia michaelii</em></td>
<td>Michael’s rein orchid</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Piperia yadonii</em></td>
<td>Yadon’s rein orchid</td>
<td>FE</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Plagiobothrys chorisianus</em> var. <em>hickmanii</em></td>
<td>Hickman’s popcorn-flower</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Name Common Name</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Habitat Description</td>
<td>Considered in Impact Analysis</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plagiobothrys uncinatus</strong> Hooked popcorn-flower</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>Annual herb in the borage family (Boraginaceae). Chaparral (sandy), cismontane woodland, valley and foothill grassland. Field surveys needed in Gabilan and Santa Lucia ranges to determine status. Blooms: April - May Elevation: 300 – 760 meters</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is not present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008). The study area is outside this species known elevation range.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potentilla hickmanii</strong> Hickman’s cinquefoil</td>
<td>FE SE</td>
<td>Perennial herb in the rose family (Rosaceae). Coastal bluff scrub, closed-cone coniferous forest, meadows and seeps (vernally mesic), marshes and swamps (freshwater). Blooms: April – August Elevation: 10 – 135 meters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are two previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rosa pinetorum</strong> Pine rose</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>Perennial shrub in the rose family (Rosaceae). Closed-cone coniferous forest. Possible hybrid of R. spithamea, R. gymnocarpa, or others; further study needed. Blooms: May – July Elevation: 2 – 300 meters</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is not present within the study area. There are three previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sidalcea malachroides</strong> Maple-leaved checkerbloom</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>Perennial herb in the mallow family (Malvaceae). Broad-leaved upland forest, coastal prairie, coastal scrub, North Coast coniferous forest, and riparian woodland, often in disturbed areas. Endangered in Oregon. Blooms: April – August Elevation: 2 – 730 meters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There is one previously recorded occurrence within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stebbinsoseris decipiens</strong> Santa Cruz microseris</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>Annual herb in the sunflower family (Asteraceae). Broad-leaved upland forest, closed-cone coniferous forest, chaparral, coastal prairie, coastal scrub, valley and foothill grassland, open areas, sometimes serpentinite. Known from fewer than twenty occurrences. Blooms: April – May Elevation: 10 – 500 meters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There is one previously recorded occurrence within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Name Common Name</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>CNPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tortula californica California screw-moss</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>Moss in the Pottiaceae family. Chenopod scrub, valley and foothill grassland in sandy, soil. Elevation: 10 – 1,460 meters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trifolium buckwestiorum Santa Cruz clover</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td>Annual herb in the legume family (Fabaceae). Broad-leaved upland forest, cismontane woodland, coastal prairie in gravelly, margins. Known from fewer than fifteen very small occurrences; only one fully protected. Blooms: April - October Elevation: 105 – 610 meters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trifolium polyodon Pacific Grove clover</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td>Annual herb in the legume family (Fabaceae). Closed-cone coniferous forest, coastal prairie, meadows and seeps, valley and foothill grassland in mesic soils. Known from seven occurrences on the Monterey and Point Lobos Peninsulas. A synonym of T. variegatum in The Jepson Manual, but appears to be distinct. Blooms: April – June Elevation: 5 – 120 meters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trifolium trichocalyx Monterey clover</td>
<td>FE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td>Annual herb in the legume family (Fabaceae). Closed-cone coniferous forest (sandy, openings, burned areas). Known from only one occurrence from the central portion of the Monterey Peninsula. Fewer than 1,000 plants seen in 1987, none in 1992, and only 22 in 1995. Appears to be a fire follower. Blooms: April – June Elevation: 30 – 240 meters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Code Designations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal status¹: January 2007 USFWS Listing</th>
<th>State status²: January 2007 USFWS and CDFG Listing</th>
<th>CNPS³: January 2007 CNPS Listing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FE</strong> – Listed as endangered under the Endangered Species Act</td>
<td><strong>SE</strong> – Listed as endangered under the California Endangered Species Act</td>
<td><strong>1A</strong> – Plants species that presumed extinct in California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FT</strong> – Listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act</td>
<td><strong>ST</strong> – Listed as threatened under the California Endangered Species Act</td>
<td><strong>1B</strong> – Plant species that are rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FC</strong> – Candidate for listing (threatened or endangered) under Endangered Species Act</td>
<td><strong>CSC</strong> – Species of Concern as identified by CDFG</td>
<td>List 2 – Plant species that are rare, threatened, or endangered in California, but more common elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FD</strong> – Delisted in accordance with the Endangered Species Act</td>
<td><strong>CFP</strong> – Listed as fully protected under CDFG code</td>
<td>List 3 – Plant species that lack the necessary information to assign them to a listing status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CR</strong> – Species identified as rare by CDFG</td>
<td>List 4 = Plants that have a limited distribution or that are infrequent throughout a broader area in California.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Threat Ranks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threat Rank</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Seriously threatened in California (high degree/immediacy of threat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Fairly threatened in California (moderate degree/immediacy of threat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Not very threatened in California (low degree/immediacy of threats or no current threats known)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Habitat description

Habitat description⁵: Habitat description adapted from CNDDDB (CDFG 2008) and CNPS online inventory (CNPS 2008)
### Table B-2 Special-status Fish and Wildlife Species

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name (Scientific Name)</th>
<th>Invertebrates</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coelus globosus</strong>&lt;br&gt;Globose dune beetle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Danaus plexippus</strong>&lt;br&gt;Monarch butterfly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Habitat Description</th>
<th>Considered in Impact Analysis</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Globose dune beetle are flightless and quite sessile nocturnal beetles that inhabit sand dune formations, including fore dunes, sand hummocks, sometimes back dunes along immediate coast. Larvae and pupae spend most of the time in the sand. The larvae can also be found under vegetation or accumulated debris. Adults spend the hotter summer months aggregating under vegetation or debris. Adults come to the surface at night and on cool, foggy days. Larvae and adults feed on dead vegetable matter that accumulates on the sand. The dune beetles leave a distinct track on the beach that resembles a labyrinth. Their footprints cannot be seen on the track because the beetle walks below the sand, leaving a collapsed tunnel behind.

Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There is one previously recorded occurrence within a one-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).

Habitat is a complex issue for this species. In general breeding areas are virtually all patches of milkweed in North America and some other regions. The critical conservation feature for North American populations is the overwintering habitats, which are certain high altitude Mexican conifer forests or coastal California conifer or Eucalyptus groves as identified in literature. Coastal regions are important flyways and so nectar (wild or in gardens) is an important resource in such places. However, essential overwintering areas for North American populations are limited to about 100 places in coastal California and the mountains of Mexico.

Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are four previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area, one of which is within a one-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name (Scientific Name)</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Habitat Description</th>
<th>Considered in Impact Analysis</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Euphilotes enoptes smithi</strong> Smith’s blue butterfly</td>
<td>FE, ~</td>
<td>Smith’s blue butterfly is found in scattered colonies in coastal areas of Central California. It uses two habitats, coastal sand dunes and cliff/chaparral, both of which are endangered. Smith’s blue butterfly is associated with two species of buckwheat, seadrift buckwheat (<em>Eriogonum parvifolium</em>) and seaside buckwheat (<em>Eriogonum latifolium</em>) in all life stages, and the presence of these plants is a key habitat requirement. These plants are obligate host plants for the larvae and the principle nectar sources for adults. They also provide mating sites. The butterflies generally spend their lifetime within 200 feet of the host plant on which they emerged. Smith’s Blues are found in coastal sand dunes and cliff/chaparral areas along the central California coast in Monterey, Santa Cruz, and San Mateo Counties.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are three previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area, one of which is within a one-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Linderiella occidentalis</strong> California linderiella fairy shrimp</td>
<td>~, ~</td>
<td>Inhabits large, fairly clear vernal pools and lakes. The California fairy shrimp is the most common fairy shrimp in the Central Valley. It has been documented on most land forms, geologic formations and soil types supporting vernal pools in California, at altitudes as high as 3,800 feet above sea level.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are two previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eucyclogobius newberryi</strong> Tidewater goby</td>
<td>FE, ~</td>
<td>Historically widespread in brackish coastal lagoons and coastal creeks in California from the mouth of the Smith River, Del Norte County, south to Agua Hedionda Lagoon, San Diego County. Naturally absent (due to lack of suitable habitat) between Humboldt Bay and Ten Mile River, between Point Arena and Salmon Creek, and between Monterey Bay and Arroyo del Oso.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus</strong> Steelhead south/central California coast ESU</td>
<td>FT, ~</td>
<td>Both anadromous and non-anadromous forms exist. Anadromous forms migrate between freshwater breeding and marine non-breeding habitats; California breeders migrate to non-breeding habitats as far away as Alaska.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Marginal habitat is present within the study area. There is one previously recorded occurrence within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Special-status Plant and Wildlife Species

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name (Scientific Name)</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Habitat Description</th>
<th>Considered in Impact Analysis</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amphibians</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ambystoma californiense</em></td>
<td>FT, CSC</td>
<td>Typically found in annual grasslands of lower hills and valleys; breeds in temporary and permanent ponds and in streams; uses rodent burrows and other subterranean retreats in surrounding uplands for shelter; appears to be absent in waters containing predatory game fish. The California tiger salamander spends most of its lifecycle estivating underground in adjacent valley oak woodland or grassland habitat, primarily in abandoned rodent burrows. Research has shown that dispersing juveniles can roam up to two miles from their breeding ponds and that a minimum of several hundred acres of uplands habitat is needed surrounding a breeding pond in order for the species to survive over the long term.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is not present within the study area. There are five previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rana aurora draytonii</em></td>
<td>FT, CSC</td>
<td>Found in humid forests, woodlands, grasslands, and streamsides with plant cover. Most common in lowlands or foothills. Frequently found in woods adjacent to streams. Breeding habitat is in permanent or late season sources of deep water, lakes, ponds, reservoirs, slow streams, marshes, bogs, and swamps. From sea level to 8,000 feet (2,440 meters). Breeds late December to early April. Endemic to California and northern Baja California. Ranges along the coast from Mendocino County in northern California south to northern Baja California, and inland through the northern Sacramento Valley into the foothills of the Sierra Nevada mountains, south to Tulare county, and possibly Kern county.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are four previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reptiles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Actinemys marmorata</em></td>
<td>~, CSC</td>
<td>Permanent or nearly permanent water in various habitats (e.g. ponds, streams, perennial drainages). Requires basking sites particularly in areas vegetated with riparian habitats. The western pond turtle includes two subspecies, the northwestern pond turtle (<em>A. m. marmorata</em>) and the southwestern pond turtle (<em>A. m. pallida</em>). The two subspecies range is interconnected within and around the San Francisco Bay Area.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B – Special-status Plant and Wildlife Species

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Habitat Description</th>
<th>Considered in Impact Analysis</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actinemys marmorata pallida</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>Found in ponds, lakes, rivers, streams, creeks, marshes, and irrigation ditches, with abundant vegetation, and either rocky or muddy bottoms, in woodland, forest, and grassland. In streams, prefers pools to shallower areas. Logs, rocks, cattail mats, and exposed banks are required for basking. May enter brackish water and even seawater. From the San Francisco Bay south, along the coast ranges into northern Baja California (where it has disappeared throughout most of its range.) Isolated populations occur along the Mojave River at Camp Cody and Afton Canyon. From sea level to over 5,900 feet (1,800 meters) in elevation.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anniella pulchra nigra</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>Occurs in moist warm loose soil with plant cover. Moisture is essential. Occurs in sparsely vegetated areas of beach dunes, chaparral, pine-oak woodlands, desert scrub, sandy washes, and stream terraces with sycamores, cottonwoods, or oaks. Leaf litter under trees and bushes in sunny areas and dunes stabilized with bush lupine and mock heather often indicate suitable habitat. Often can be found under surface objects such as rocks, boards, driftwood, and logs. Can also be found by gently raking leaf litter under bushes and trees. Sometimes found in suburban gardens in Southern California.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B – Special-Status Plant and Wildlife Species

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name (Scientific Name)</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Habitat Description(^1)</th>
<th>Considered in Impact Analysis</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phrynosoma coronatum frontale California horned lizard</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>Frequent in a wide variety of habitats; most common in lowlands along sandy washes with scattered low bushes. Inhabits open areas of sandy soil and low vegetation in valleys, foothills and semiarid mountains from sea level to 8,000 feet (2,438 meters) in elevation. Found in grasslands, coniferous forests, woodlands, and chaparral, with open areas and patches of loose soil. Often found in lowlands along sandy washes with scattered shrubs and along dirt roads, and frequently found near ant hills. Historically, found along the Pacific coast from the Baja California border west of the deserts and the Sierra Nevada, north to the Bay Area, and inland as far north as Shasta Reservoir, and south into Baja California. Ranges up onto the Kern Plateau east of the crest of the Sierra Nevada. Current range is more fragmented.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thamnophis hammondii Two-striped garter snake</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>Generally found around pools, creeks, cattle tanks, and other water sources, often in rocky areas, in oak woodland, chaparral, brushland, and coniferous forest. Ranges continuously from near Salinas in Monterey County south along the coast mostly west of the south Coast Ranges, to southern California where it ranges east through the Transverse Ranges (and into the desert in Victorville) and south through the Peninsular Ranges into northern Baja California. Occurs in southern Baja in isolated areas. Also occurs on Catalina Island. At elevations from sea level to 6,988 feet (2130 meters).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Birds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name (Scientific Name)</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Habitat Description(^1)</th>
<th>Considered in Impact Analysis</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cypseloides niger Black swift</td>
<td>MNMC</td>
<td>Breeding black swifts are restricted to a very limited supply of potential nesting locations: behind or beside permanent or semi-permanent waterfalls, on perpendicular cliffs near water and in sea caves.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is not present within the study area. Breeding range does not include the Monterey Bay (Shuford and Gardalli 2008).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name (Scientific Name)</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Habitat Description ³</th>
<th>Considered in Impact Analysis</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHARADRIIFORMES (shorebirds, gulls)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus</strong>&lt;br&gt;Western snowy plover</td>
<td>FT; MNBMC</td>
<td>Sandy beaches, salt pond levees; needs sandy, gravelly, or friable soils for nesting. Plovers can be found on flat, open coastal beaches in dunes, and near stream mouths. They are well camouflaged and extremely hard to see, often crouching in small depressions taking shelter from the wind. From early spring to mid-fall, plovers nest in loose colonies, often coming back to the same beaches every year. The nests are simple scrapes in the sand with 1-3 eggs that the male warms at night, while the female does day duty. Eggs hatch in about 27 days, and within hours the chicks are searching for their food of insects and other beach invertebrates.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. California State Parks has designated the Monterey State Beach has snowy plover nesting habitat. There are two previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area, one of which is within a one-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hydroprogne [Sterna] caspia</strong>&lt;br&gt;Caspian tern</td>
<td>MNBMC</td>
<td>Nests on sandy or gravelly beaches and shell banks in small colonies inland and along the coast. Found inland along lakes and fresh-water marshes and also in brackish and salt waters of estuaries and bays.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>This species was observed within Roberts Lake. Marginal nesting habitat is present within the PSA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sternula antillarum</strong>&lt;br&gt;California least tern</td>
<td>FE; MNBMC</td>
<td>The bulk of distribution in southern California coast. The least tern arrives at its breeding grounds in late April. The breeding colonies are not dense and may appear along either marine or estuarine shores, or on sand bar islands in large rivers, in areas free from humans or predators. Nests are situated on barren to sparsely vegetated places near water, normally on sandy or gravelly substrates.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Marginal nesting habitat is present within the PSA. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FALCONIFORMES (hawks, falcons)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name (Scientific Name)</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Habitat Description¹</th>
<th>Considered in Impact Analysis</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accipiter striatus</strong>&lt;br&gt;Sharp-shinned hawk</td>
<td>MNBMC</td>
<td>A robin- to pigeon-sized woodland hawk. Forest and open woodland, coniferous, mixed, or deciduous, primarily in coniferous in more northern and mountainous portion of range. Young, dense, mixed or coniferous woodlands are preferred for nesting. Migrates through various habitats, mainly along ridges, lakeshores, and coastlines. Nests usually in tree crotch or on branch next to trunk, most often 3-18 m up, hidden by thick foliage, usually in conifer in north. May build new nest, reuse old one, or modify old bird or squirrel nest. Nests generally seem to be in a stand of dense conifers near a forest opening, though this may reflect observer bias.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>This species was observed within the study area. Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buteo regalis</strong>&lt;br&gt;Ferruginous hawk</td>
<td>MNBMC</td>
<td>Ferruginous hawks are birds of open country. They are found in open habitats, such as grasslands, sagebrush, deserts, shrublands, and outer edges of pinyon-pine and other forests. They select rocky outcrops, hillsides, rock pinnacles, or trees for nest sites.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable nesting habitat is not present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Falco mexicanus</strong>&lt;br&gt;Prairie falcon</td>
<td>MNBMC</td>
<td>Prairie Falcons are sandy-colored falcons with distinctive white eyebrows and dark wing-pit patches. Prairie falcons inhabit hills, canyons, and mountains of arid grasslands and shrub-steppes of southwestern Canada, western United States, Baja California, and northern Mexico. They nest primarily on cliffs overlooking large open areas, using a ledge, cavity, crevice, or an abandoned nest of eagles, hawks, or ravens.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PASSERIFORMES (perching birds)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name (Scientific Name)</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Habitat Description¹</th>
<th>Considered in Impact Analysis</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agelaius tricolor</strong>&lt;br&gt;Tri-colored blackbird</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>Breeds in freshwater wetlands, with tall dense vegetation including tule, cattail, blackberry and rose. Forages in grasslands and croplands. Resident year-round. Breeds April to July.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There is one previously recorded occurrence within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX B – SPECIAL-STATUS PLANT AND WILDLIFE SPECIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name (Scientific Name)</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Habitat Description</th>
<th>Considered in Impact Analysis</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Eremophila alpestris actia</em></td>
<td>MNBMC</td>
<td>A widespread occupant of open habitats across North America. Horned larks prefer areas with sparse vegetation and exposed soil. In western North America, this species is associated with desert brushlands, grasslands, and similar open habitats, as well as alpine meadows. Throughout their range, horned larks avoid all habitats dominated by dense vegetation and become scarce and locally distributed in heavily forested areas. Common to abundant resident in a variety of open habitats, usually where large trees and shrubs are absent. Grasslands and deserts to dwarf shrub habitats above tree line.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Marginal habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lanius ludovicianus</em> (Loggerhead shrike)</td>
<td>MNBMC</td>
<td>A common resident and winter visitor in lowlands and foothills throughout California. Open habitats with scattered shrubs, trees, posts, fences, utility lines, or other perches. Open-canopied valley foothill hardwood, valley foothill hardwood-conifer, valley foothill riparian, pinyon-juniper, juniper, desert riparian, and Joshua tree habitats. Egg-laying occurs from March to May.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Marginal habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pelicanus occidentalis californicus</em> (California brown pelican)</td>
<td>FE; MNBMC</td>
<td>(Nesting colony) Colonial nester on coastal islands just outside the surf line; nests on coastal islands of small to moderate size which afford immunity from attack by ground-dwelling predators. The nest location varies from a simple scrape on the ground on an island to a bulky stick nest in a low tree. Some immature birds may stray to inland freshwater lakes. The brown pelican has a habit of diving for fish from the air. It eats mainly herring-like fish. Groups of brown pelicans often travel in single file, flying low over the water’s surface.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Although suitable foraging habitat is present within the study area, suitable nesting habitat is not present. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX B – SPECIAL-STATUS PLANT AND WILDLIFE SPECIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name (Scientific Name)</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Habitat Description</th>
<th>Considered in Impact Analysis</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROCELLARIIFORMES</strong> (albatrosses, petrels)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanodroma homochroa</td>
<td>MNBMC</td>
<td>Ashy storm-petrel breeds on a small number of island groups and offshore rocks within the California Current System, the northernmost being off Mendocino County and the southernmost at Los Coronados Islands off northern Baja California, Mexico. Breeding has been confirmed at only six major island groups (South Farallon, San Miguel, Santa Cruz, Santa Barbara, San Clemente, and Los Coronado Islands) and three groups of offshore rocks (Castle Rock/Hurricane Point, Double Point, and Bird Rocks). Breeds in rock crevices and burrows in colonies on offshore islands. Birds feed at sea on planktonic crustaceans and small fish and visit the colony at night.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Although suitable foraging habitat is present within the study area; however this species is unlikely to nest within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STRIGIFORMES</strong> (owls)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athene cunicularia</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>Open grasslands and shrublands up to 5,300 feet with low perches and small mammal burrows. Resident year-round. Breeds March-August.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Marginal habitat is present within the study area. There are two previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area, one of which is within a one-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strix occidentalis occidentalis</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>A bird of dense, dark, old-growth or mixed mature and old-growth coniferous forests. Forests are usually dominated by firs or douglas-fir, but they also use mature hardwood forests of cottonwoods, alders, oak, and sycamore, especially along steep-walled river valleys. They prefer an uneven and multilayered canopy. They prefer shaded mountain slopes and canyons over flat plateau areas. The breeding season is from March to September.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is not present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mammals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name (Scientific Name)</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Habitat Description</th>
<th>Considered in Impact Analysis</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *Enhydra lutris nereis*  
Southern sea otter | Federal: FT  
State: ~ | Sea otters are marine mammals. They inhabit temperate coastal waters with rocky or soft sediment ocean bottoms less than 1 km from shore. Kelp forest ecosystems are characteristic of otter habitats. This species is found off the coast of central California. | Yes | Marginal habitat for southern sea otter is present within the marine habitat within the study area. |
| *Lasiurus cinereus*  
Hoary bat | ~  
CSC | Basically solitary, except for mother-young association; however, during migration, groups of up to hundreds of individuals may form. Dispersed population allows little chance to obtain density figures. Those migrating through the western U.S. in fall go south at least into Mexico. Typically not attracted to houses or other human structures, they roost 10-15 feet up in trees along forest borders. In the summer, hoary bats don't emerge to feed until after dark. | Yes | Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There is one previously recorded occurrence within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008). |
| *Neotoma macrotis luciana*  
Monterey dusky-footed woodrat | ~  
CSC | The nocturnal dusky-footed woodrats are generally found in dense chaparral, coastal sage-scrub, pinyon-juniper, oak and riparian woodlands, and mixed conifer forest habitats that have a well-developed understory. They seem to favor brushy habitat or woodland with a live oak component. They are highly arboreal, and thick-leaved trees and shrubs are important habitat components. These species at Fort Ord were found in coast live oak woodland and savanna habitat. They require an abundant supply of downed wood, sticks, bark, and miscellaneous plant materials to build stick houses (nests) for protection, food storage, resting, rearing of young, and social communications. Houses are generally constructed in areas that are dark, moist, and cool, and that provide good cover. This species has been known to build stick houses below rocky bluffs, in trees, on the ground, on north-facing hillsides, and on canyon slopes. The species responds favorably to restoration of riparian habitats. | Yes | Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are no previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008). |
## Common Name (Scientific Name)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name (Scientific Name)</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Habitat Description</th>
<th>Considered in Impact Analysis</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reithrodontomys megalotis distichlis Salinas harvest mouse</td>
<td>~ ~</td>
<td>Known from a small area near Monterey Bay. These mice prefer grassy or weedy areas where adequate food and a certain degree of protective cover are available, especially in the vicinity of water. Meadows, marshes, and weed-covered banks of irrigation ditches seem to offer optimum habitat conditions. The species seldom is found in forested areas. They utilize the runways and underground burrows of other rodents and frequently take over vacated burrows of pocket gophers. The nest usually is placed on the ground or slightly above it under some protective cover such as a board, a clump of lodged grass, or a tangle of weeds. These mice are also known to use the nests of marsh wrens in cattail marshes. They appear to be strictly nocturnal and active throughout the year. They are almost entirely vegetarians and feed on the green parts and seeds of plants.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suitable habitat is present within the study area. There are two previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area, one of which is within a one-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxidea taxus American badger</td>
<td>~ CSC</td>
<td>Stout-bodied, primarily solitary species that hunts for ground squirrels and other small mammal prey in open grassland, cropland, deserts, savanna, and shrubland communities. Badgers have large home ranges and spend inactive periods in underground burrows. Badgers typically mate in mid- to late summer and give birth between March and April.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Marginal habitat is present within the study area. There are three previously recorded occurrences within a five-mile radius of the study area, one of which is within a one-mile radius of the study area (CDFG 2008).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Code Designations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal status: USFWS Listing</th>
<th>State status: USFWS and CDFG Listing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESU = Evolutionary Significant Unit is a distinctive population.</td>
<td>SE = Listed as endangered under the California Endangered Species Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE = Listed as endangered under the Endangered Species Act</td>
<td>ST = Listed as threatened under the California Endangered Species Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT = Listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act</td>
<td>CSC = Species of Concern as identified by the CDFG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC = Candidate for listing (threatened or endangered) under Endangered Species Act</td>
<td>CFP = Listed as fully protected under CDFG code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FD = Delisted in accordance with the Endangered Species Act</td>
<td>CR = Rare in California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNBMC = Migratory Nongame Bird of Management Concern, protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Habitat description: Habitat description information adapted from CNDDB and [www.natureserve.org](http://www.natureserve.org).
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## APPENDIX C – PLANT AND WILDLIFE SPECIES OBSERVED DURING THE SITE RECONNAISSANCE

**TABLE C-1 PLANT SPECIES OBSERVED**

List compiled from surveys completed by a PMC biologist on August 2 and 3, 2008.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Habitat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Abronia latifolia</em></td>
<td>Yellow sand verbena</td>
<td>Sand dune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Abronia umbellate</em></td>
<td>Pink sand verbena</td>
<td>Sand dune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Agapanthus</em> sp.</td>
<td><em>Agapanthus</em> (&quot;Lily of the Nile&quot;)</td>
<td>Planted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Alnus</em> sp.</td>
<td>Alder</td>
<td>Riparian, Emergent Wetland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ambrosia chamissonis</em></td>
<td>Beach bur</td>
<td>Sand dune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Arctostaphylos tomentosa</em></td>
<td>Woollyleaf manzanita</td>
<td>Planted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Amenia maritime var. californica</em></td>
<td>Thrift/Sea Pink</td>
<td>Sand dune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Arundo donax</em></td>
<td>Giant European reed</td>
<td>Invasive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Baccharis pilularis</em></td>
<td>Coyote-brush</td>
<td>Ruderal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Brassica rapa</em></td>
<td>Field mustard</td>
<td>Urban/ruderal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cakile maritima</em></td>
<td>European sea rocket</td>
<td>Sand dune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Carpobrotus edulis</em></td>
<td>African ice plant</td>
<td>Erosion control; ruderal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Castilleja latifolia</em></td>
<td>Monterey Coast paintbrush</td>
<td>Coastal Dunes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ceanothus thyrsiflorus repens</em></td>
<td>Blue blossom ceanothus</td>
<td>Planted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cirsium vulgare</em></td>
<td>Bull thistle</td>
<td>Invasive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Convolvulus arvensis</em></td>
<td>Field bindweed</td>
<td>Urban/ruderal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cupressus macrocarpa</em></td>
<td>Monterey cypress</td>
<td>Residential Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cyperus</em> sp.</td>
<td>Nutsedge</td>
<td>Emergent wetland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dudleya caespitosa</em></td>
<td>Bluff lettuce</td>
<td>Sand dune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Equisetum arvense</em></td>
<td>Common horsetail</td>
<td>Residential park, Riparian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Eriogonum latifolium</em></td>
<td>Coast buckwheat</td>
<td>Sand dune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Erysimum menziesii</em></td>
<td>Menzies’ wallflower</td>
<td>Sand dune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Eschscholzia californica</em></td>
<td>California poppy</td>
<td>Coastal dune scrub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Eucalyptus</em> sp.</td>
<td>Eucalyptus</td>
<td>Urban, Ruderal, Residential Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Foeniculum vulgare</em></td>
<td>Fennel</td>
<td>Invasive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

County of Monterey
January 2009

**Seaside Local Coastal Program**
**Biological Inventory Report**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Habitat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genista sp.</td>
<td>Broom</td>
<td>Invasive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geranium sp.</td>
<td>Geranium</td>
<td>Planted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedera sp.</td>
<td>English ivy</td>
<td>Invasive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemizonia sp.</td>
<td>Tarweed</td>
<td>Urban/ruderal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemna sp.</td>
<td>Pondweed</td>
<td>Lacustrine, Stream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupinus arboreus</td>
<td>Yellow bush lupine</td>
<td>Coastal dune scrub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malva neglecta</td>
<td>Mallow</td>
<td>Urban/Ruderal;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phormium sp.</td>
<td>New Zealand flax</td>
<td>Planted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinus radiata</td>
<td>Monterey Pine</td>
<td>Residential Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantago lanceolata</td>
<td>English plantain</td>
<td>Urban/ruderal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platanus racemosa</td>
<td>California sycamore</td>
<td>Planted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Coast Live oak</td>
<td>Coastal Oak Woodland, Mixed Woodland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raphanus raphanistrum</td>
<td>Wild radish</td>
<td>Urban/ruderal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubus discolor</td>
<td>Himalayan blackberry</td>
<td>Riparian, Emergent Wetland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubus ursinus</td>
<td>California blackberry</td>
<td>Riparian, Emergent Wetland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salicornia sp.</td>
<td>Pickleweed</td>
<td>Coastal Dunes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salix laevigata</td>
<td>Red willow</td>
<td>Riparian, Emergent Wetland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scirpus sp.</td>
<td>Bulrush</td>
<td>Emergent wetland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typha latifolia</td>
<td>Broad-leaved cattail</td>
<td>Emergent wetland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table C-2 Wildlife Species Observed**

List compiled from surveys completed by a PMC biologist on August 2 and 3, 2008.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Habitat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambusia affinis</td>
<td>Mosquito fish</td>
<td>Estuarine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Birds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Habitat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accipiter striatus</td>
<td>Sharp-shinned hawk</td>
<td>Riparian woodland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Aechmophorus clarkii</em></td>
<td>Clark’s grebe</td>
<td>Estuarine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Agelaius phoeniceus</em></td>
<td>Red-winged blackbird</td>
<td>Emergent wetland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Anas platyrhynchos</em></td>
<td>Mallard</td>
<td>Estuarine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Anser anser</em></td>
<td>Graylag (Barnyard) goose</td>
<td>Estuarine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Aphelocoma californica</em></td>
<td>Western scrub jay</td>
<td>Coastal oak woodland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Branta canadensis</em></td>
<td>Canada goose</td>
<td>Estuarine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Buteo jamaicensis</em></td>
<td>Red-tailed hawk</td>
<td>Coastal dune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Carpodacus mexicanus</em></td>
<td>House finch</td>
<td>Urban/Ruderal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Charadrius vociferus</em></td>
<td>Killdeer</td>
<td>Ruderal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Columba livia</em></td>
<td>Rock pigeon</td>
<td>Urban/Ruderal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Corvus brachyrhynchos</em></td>
<td>American crow</td>
<td>Urban/Ruderal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Euphagus cyanocephalus</em></td>
<td>Brewer’s blackbird</td>
<td>Urban/Ruderal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fulica americana</em></td>
<td>American coot</td>
<td>Estuarine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hirundo rustica</em></td>
<td>Barn swallow</td>
<td>Urban/Ruderal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Larus californicus</em></td>
<td>California gull</td>
<td>Estuarine/Coastal dune/Marine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Larus heermanni</em></td>
<td>Heermann’s gull</td>
<td>Estuarine/Coastal dune/Marine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Larus occidentalis</em></td>
<td>Western gull</td>
<td>Estuarine/Coastal dune/Marine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Melospiza melodia</em></td>
<td>Song sparrow</td>
<td>Emergent wetland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Oxyura jamaicensis</em></td>
<td>Ruddy duck</td>
<td>Estuarine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Passer domesticus</em></td>
<td>House sparrow</td>
<td>Urban/Ruderal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Phalacrocorax auritus</em></td>
<td>Double-crested cormorant</td>
<td>Estuarine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Podilymbus podiceps</em></td>
<td>Pied-billed grebe</td>
<td>Estuarine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sayornis nigricans</em></td>
<td>Black phoebe</td>
<td>Emergent wetland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sterna caspia</em></td>
<td>Caspian tern</td>
<td>Estuarine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sturnus vulgaris</em></td>
<td>European starling</td>
<td>Urban/Ruderal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Zenaida macroura</em></td>
<td>Mourning dove</td>
<td>Urban/Ruderal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1.0 BACKGROUND

1.1 WETLANDS RESOURCES AT LAGUNA GRANDE AND ROBERTS LAKE

Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake were once a single brackish lagoon open to the ocean and periodically flushed by seawater. Over the years, filling for development and transportation purposes divided the lake and considerably reduced the water surface area. Seawater flushing no longer takes place and both lakes are freshwater. Rapid filling by sediment resulting from development around the lakes and in the watershed upstream, and by sand blowing into Roberts Lake from devegetated beach dunes west of Highway One has greatly reduced water depth. With this reduction in water volume, water quality has declined. There has been a marked encroachment of tules and other wetland vegetation in recent years. The process of eutrophication has set in; the lakes are in danger of dying.

Water quality is no longer good enough to support a fishery and the shallow water depth makes recreational boating impractical. The Cities of Seaside and Monterey and the Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District are concerned that the recreation potential of Laguna Grande in particular is declining. Adopted plans for development of a regional park will be difficult to complete unless significant water quality improvements can be made.

Poor water circulation and the extensive tule beds have encouraged the production of mosquitoes and midges; mosquito abatement is an on-going problem at the lakes. Finally, poor water quality and extensive tule growth have diminished the aesthetic qualities of Laguna Grande.

The changes just described are not without some positive effects however. The increase in the amount of emergent vegetation, and more especially riparian area on the Monterey side of Laguna Grande, and above the pedestrian bridge, have greatly increased waterfowl and bird habitat. The depletion of both wetland and riparian habitat throughout California makes the expansion of these resources all the more significant. The existence of this
vegetative resource offers previously unforeseen opportunities for passive recreation and nature study and, if properly managed, can compliment other recreational activities of the developing parks.

1.2 PLANNING BACKGROUND

Considerable time, effort, and money has been directed towards planning water quality improvements and recreational development at Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake. A Joint Powers Agency (JPA) comprised of the Cities of Seaside and Monterey and the Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District was formed in 1976 to work towards acquisition and development of a regional park at Laguna Grande. This has been a fruitful effort. The Regional Park District has acquired all of the water area of the lake and considerable adjacent land areas. A master plan has been developed and adopted for the park by the Regional Park District. The two cities have completed development of portions of the park facilities envisioned by the plan. The City of Seaside formed a development agency to acquire private parcels around the lake and has removed a large auto wrecking yard from the shoreline of Laguna Grande. Roberts Lake is not part of the regional park, but has been partially developed for park purposes by the City of Seaside.

The Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (Ambag) completed the 208 Water Quality Plan. Part of this study was a technical report that looked at various alternatives for improving water quality at the two lakes. Principal recommendations of these studies were that sedimentation and water pollution resulting from both urban and rural development in the watershed is in urgent need of correction and that a major dredging program is needed for the two lakes. A recent update of the 208 study has pointed out the lack of progress in these major areas.

The most recent planning that affects the two lakes has been the Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan (LUP) for the Laguna Grande Roberts Lake segment of the City of Seaside and City of Monterey coastal zone. The portion of this LUP within the City of Seaside has been adopted by the City of Seaside and certified by the
California Coastal Commission and is now the guiding land use
document for development in the area. All local development in
the area must be in conformance with the LUP.

The LUP land use map indicates a combination of open space and
private commercial development at and around the lake. While the
recreational uses indicated in the Laguna Grande Regional Park
Master Plan are generally consistent with open space designations
in the LUP, the LUP has not specifically incorporated or adopted
the park master plan. Instead a series of general resource
management, land use and development, and public access and
recreation policies are found in the LUP that serve to guide all
future development at Laguna Grande. A similar situation exists
for Roberts Lake.

The certified LUP is notable in its lack of specific identification
of environmentally sensitive habitats or other critical vegetation
resources at the two lakes. There are a series of recommendations in the LUP that as part of the LCP Implementation
Program that a wetlands restoration, enhancement, and management
program should be prepared and adopted for Laguna Grande and
Roberts Lake.

1.3 PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF STUDY

This report constitutes the restoration, enhancement and
management program for the wetlands at Laguna Grande at Roberts
Lake specified in the LUP. As a part of the LCP Implementation
Program for the Laguna Grande/Roberts Lake Sub-area the report is
to be adopted by both the Cities of Seaside and Monterey, and by
the California Coastal Commission. It therefore is both a local
and state document and will be the guiding standard for all
development effecting the wetland resources within the sub-area
and one of the basis for issuance of any required coastal
development permits.

The principal objectives of the program are to:
1) delineate on maps existing wetlands vegetation, and those
   areas of existing wetlands and riparian habitat of critical
   importance;
2) set forth a specific management program for the wetlands vegetation including maps and text;
3) identify appropriate shoreline improvements and related design guidelines;
4) establish precise set-back lines for shoreline improvements and development;
5) recommend a program to bring about improvements to water quality in the two lakes; and
6) to recommend a program to obtain the funds needed to carry out the water quality improvements. The report is organized to reflect this scope of work.

There are other tasks critical to realizing solutions to water quality problems at Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake that are beyond the scope or intent of this report. The most significant of these is the completion of engineering feasibility, design, and cost studies necessary before sedimentation problems can be resolved and dredging of the lakes can be undertaken.

1.4 PROGRAM METHODOLOGY

Completion of this study has involved a series of steps. Initially, a scope of work and grant agreement reflecting the certified LUP was developed by the City of Seaside and the staff of the California Coastal Commission in consultation with other affected jurisdictions. A consultant team was then selected to perform the study. As a first step, a careful review of all available literature and plans for the two lakes was made. The consultants then made a number of visits to the lakes and the watershed area. A plant biologist prepared the existing vegetation map, and together with an ecologist, developed the Critical Habitat map. A fisheries biologist reviewed water quality data for the lakes and assisted in preparing recommendations for water quality improvements. A series of meetings were held with representatives of public agencies that formed a Technical Advisory Committee (see list in credits page) to gain information and advice. Numerous individual contacts were made with TAC members and many other persons to obtain data or review specific points. A team of planners was responsible for developing the overall report and its recommendations.
1.5 KEY ISSUES AND CONCERNS

Several issues and concerns have resulted from the physical changes taking place at Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake, from changes occurring in the Canyon Del Rey watershed, and due to differing governmental objectives for management of the wetland resources. These may be summarized as follows:

- How to retard or reverse eutrophication of the lakes due to siltation, declining in water quality; and encroachment by aquatic and riparian vegetation.

- How to best manage the existing wetland and riparian vegetation in light of state goals and policies and the objectives of local agencies that desire to develop the area for park purposes.

- How to develop shoreline improvements around the two lakes consistent with the protection of the wetland habitats but that also further the broad goal of public access and recreation.

- How to provide sources of funds adequate to pay for the needed improvements to water quality.

An additional issue emerged that is an institutional problem;

- The pressing need for a unified and coordinated response to the problems at Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake by all affected and responsible local agencies.
2.0 KEY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

Several key findings have been drawn from the experience of the study and the numerous conclusions presented in this report. These, together with recommendations on key short-range and long-range actions are presented here.

2.1 KEY FINDINGS

- Highly valuable wetland and riparian habitat is present at both Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake. These areas should be retained and managed to maximize habitat values. Park development should treat these areas as a desirable recreation resource and provide suitable facilities to increase public access and enjoyment. Park development in critical habitat areas should be limited to passive uses such as walking and nature observation.

- Opportunities exist to improve wetlands habitat through a habitat management program that gradually removes undesirable invasive species and restores native species.

- Water quality can be improved by improved control of sediment. All of the jurisdictions in the watershed share direct responsibility for the maintenance of water quality in Laguna Grande and Roberts Lakes and are legally obliged to protect water quality.

- There are a number of potential sediment ponding basin sites, principally outside the Coastal Zone, at which effective ponds can be constructed. Taken together these may be adequate to arrest or significantly reduce further sedimentation of the lakes. Engineering design studies need to be undertaken as soon as possible to determine the most suitable sites and develop a construction and cost-sharing program.
• It has not been adequately determined by this or past studies whether a cost-effective program of dredging is feasible. Detailed engineering studies should be undertaken to determine how and where dredge spoils can be disposed of, and what the best methods of dredging are. Careful cost projections will need to be made by qualified engineers.

• The level of funding at the scale needed for dredging and dredge spoils disposal will be very high, likely exceeding local jurisdiction's financial capabilities. Major grant funds must be obtained, probably from the state. Many programs are available, yet competition is keen. A concerted, coordinated and widely supported fund acquisition effort should be made once accurate cost figures have been developed.

2.2 KEY SHORT-RANGE ACTIONS

1. The JPA should be expanded to include all jurisdiction in the Canyon Del Rey Watershed.

2. The JPA should request the Monterey County Flood Control and Water Conservations District to undertake engineering and design studies of sediment basins to control sedimentation of the lakes and to recommend a 'fair-share' cost sharing formula for all jurisdictions in the watershed.

3. The JPA should petition the Monterey County Board of Supervisors to establish a Zone of Benefit encompassing the Canyon Del Rey Watershed in order to raise funds for water quality improvements.

4. The JPA should meet with local, state and federal elected officials to request their support and assistance in fund raising efforts.

5. The Monterey Penninsula Regional Park District should apply to the California Coastal Conservancy for funds to support detailed engineering studies necessary for lake dredging and spoils disposal.
2.3 KEY LONG-RANGE ACTIONS

1. The JPA should consider legal action against any member or non-member jurisdiction in the watershed that refuses to enact and enforce minimum water quality control standards for new development.

2. Engineering studies should be undertaken to determine the feasibility and costs of dredging of Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake and the most economical method of dredge spoils disposal. This study should be funded by Coastal Conservancy grand funds if they can be obtained, or by funds raised by establishment of a MCFCWCD Zone of Benefit. Local general fund monies should be used based on the 'fair-share' formula if other funds are not found.

3. The Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District should pursue an aggressive grant application program once engineering studies demonstrate the feasibility of dredging and spoils disposal. This effort should receive strong political support from all jurisdictions in the park district.

4. The Cities of Seaside and Monterey and the Regional Park District should initiate a program of habitat management as recommended in this report. Detailed design plans should be developed for construction of the recommended shoreline improvements.
3.0 MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES

The following specific objectives have been formulated to serve as a basis for the recommendations contained in this report. They reflect both the applicable policies of the California Costal Act (See Appendix) and the specific intent of the work program and grant agreement that provided the financial support for the study. The objectives take into account the concerns of the key local agencies, the cities of Seaside and Monterey, the Monterey Penninsula Regional Park District, and the Northern Salinas Valley Mosquito Abatement District. The objectives of the California Department of Fish and Game are reflected as well.

3.1 NATURAL HABITAT AREAS

1. Enhance habitat value for migrant and resident wildlife.
2. Rejuvenate disturbed and decadent areas of native vegetation.
3. Manage emergent vegetation to maintain open vistas from developed recreation sites.
4. Manage vegetation to control insect nuisance vectors.
5. Maintain optimum mix of native vegetation forms to enhance wildlife value.

3.2 SHORELINE IMPROVEMENTS

1. Develop shoreline improvements that enhance public opportunities for observation, enjoyment, and appreciation of wetlands and riparian wildlife and aesthetic qualities of wetlands.
2. Develop shoreline improvements that compliment the natural character of wetlands and riparian areas and that are consistent with the protection of these areas.
3. Provide shoreline improvements compatible with existing recreational facilities at Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake and with the use and development of adjoining private properties.
3.3 WATER QUALITY

1. Stabilize the water surface area and depth at Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake by reducing the rate of sedimentation and by removal of bottom sediments.

2. Improve water quality in Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake to a degree sufficient to support a recreational fishery, provide enhanced aesthetic qualities, and permit recreational boating.
4.0 NATURAL HABITAT AREAS

4.1 EXISTING CONDITIONS

4.1.1 Roberts Lake

Roberts Lake is bordered by dense tule (California bulrush) growth with the exception of the barren north shoreline along Canyon Del Rey Blvd. and the improved parking/viewing/model boating areas on the west shore. Few trees grow around Roberts Lake with the exception of a couple of clumps of willows between the Southern Pacific railroad tracks and the east shoreline and a large cypress at the intersection of Roberts Avenue and Del Monte Blvd.

4.1.2 Laguna Grande

Laguna Grande is virtually entirely bordered by bulrushes. There is also a bulrush island adjacent to the park at the southeast (upper) end of the lagoon. Contrary to Roberts Lake significant portions of the shoreline are bordered by willow trees especially along the southwestern and northwestern shorelines. There is a rather large area at the southwest end of the lagoon occupied by riparian forest and cat-tail marshes. This forest serves to buffer the lagoon from the adjacent neighborhood and light industry. A red-shouldered hawk was seen perched in these trees on several occasions during field visits in October and November of 1983. The area at the upper end of the lagoon just below the footbridge shows increased growth of tules since the water depth has become shallow due to siltation. Bulrush marsh extends inward farther from the shoreline north of the bridge and appears somewhat drier, but more diverse, than other areas. Young willows are beginning to encroach on this area.

The lakebed above the footbridge is choked with bulrushes. The streamcourse is maintained open by dredging periodically conducted by the North Salinas Valley Mosquito Abatement District. Subsequent to the last dredging a considerable growth of acacias developed on the sediment which was piled along the
south side of the channel. The canyon bottom above the bridge is presently an extensive cat-tail and bulrush marsh. The area was historically an open water extension of the lagoon.

The north side of the canyon is occupied by eucalyptus groves at the west end and a well developed live oak woodland along Canyon Del Rey at the upper end. The south side of the canyon is grown over with a well developed riparian forest, almost entirely willows. One small eucalyptus grove also occurs in this area.

4.1.3 Vegetation Map

The vegetation around Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake was mapped at a scale of 1"=350' in the Land Use Plan for the Laguna Grande/Roberts Lake Local Coastal Program. Since that mapping certain areas of wetland and riparian vegetation have been filled and developed. The lands bordering Roberts Lake and Laguna Grande were remapped at a scale of 1"=100' in the fall of 1983 so as to enable accurate delineation of critical habitat areas.

The vegetation map differentiates between the following vegetation types: riparian, bulrush marsh, cat-tail marsh, oak woodland, ruderal vegetation, coastal strand, blackberry thickets, eucalyptus groves, other non-native invasive plants (acacia, elm, giant reed, periwinkle, pampass grass, german ivy), and cypress trees. The first four mentioned vegetation types are the most natural and considered to have the highest wildlife habitat value.

The only difficulty encountered during the mapping was in matching the vegetation with the shoreline as shown on the base map (The base map used was originally generated for the Local Coastal Program). This discrepancy was not rectified since no recent aerial photograph was available.
4.2 CRITICAL HABITAT

4.2.1 Roberts Lake

The critical habitats at Roberts Lake are:

1) open water at the south end of Roberts Lake

2) bulrush marsh along the shoreline of Roberts Lake excepting where adjacent to intensive recreational use areas - primarily bordering the eastern and southern shorelines of Roberts Lake.

3) riparian trees bordering the bulrushes on the east shore of Roberts Lake.

4.2.2 Laguna Grande

The critical habitats at Laguna Grande are:

1) sheltered backwater areas behind the tule islands at the upper (east) end of Laguna Grande

2) open water at the west end of Laguna Grande

3) bulrush islands at the east end of Laguna Grande

4) bulrush marsh along the shoreline of Laguna Grande excepting where adjacent to intensive recreational use areas - primarily bordering the western half of Laguna Grande.

5) cat-tail marshes in the riparian forest at the southwest end of Laguna Grande

6) bulrush and cat-tail marsh areas on the south side of the canyon upstream from the footbridge at the upper end of Laguna Grande

7) bulrush marsh at the upper end of Laguna Grande on the northwest side of the bridge
8) riparian forest at the southwest end of Laguna Grande

9) riparian vegetation at the west end and along the northwest border of Laguna Grande

10) riparian trees on the south bank opposite the bulrush island at the upper end of Laguna Grande

11) riparian forest on the southside of the canyon above (east of) the footbridge at the upper end of Laguna Grande

12) oak woodland on the south facing slope at the northeast end of the canyon above Laguna Grande

These areas are shown on the critical habitats map. They are differentiated as to critical wetland habitat, riparian habitat and upland habitat. The more important open water and backwater areas are not indicated on the map. The critical habitats map was developed with the expert advise of California Department of Fish and Game biologists.

4.2.3 Criteria for determining critical habitat

A combination of criteria were used to determine critical habitat areas. Firstly, freshwater wetland and riparian forest habitat are considered by the Department of Fish and Game to be of state-wide significance in light of the fact that these habitats have suffered the greatest degree of destruction statewide in the past. The determination of critical habitat areas is also based on the definition of "environmentally sensitive areas" as defined in the coastal act. Applicable coastal act policies are cited in the appendix.

Several criteria were applied to differentiate critical wetland habitat from other areas possessing wetland vegetation. These included the relative extent and health of the wetland vegetation and the relative isolation of wetland areas from human activity. Shoreline bulrush marsh vegetation adjacent to the developed park facilities in general was evaluated as affording significantly
less wildlife habitat value than bulrushes buffered by adjacent riparian vegetation. Observations on wildlife usage together with evaluations of the value of each habitat area to wildlife (especially waterfowl, waterbirds and riparian associated birds) for roosting, nesting, resting, and forage also formed a basis for the determination of critical habitat.
5.0 HABITAT MANAGEMENT

5.1 AREAS TO BE RETAINED

By in large all areas of significant and native vegetation (areas of high wildlife habitat value) are to be retained in their "natural" state unless otherwise indicated. It must be said however that retention of native vegetation/habitat does not always mean maintenance of the status quo. Other sections of this program advise on appropriate measures for maintaining and enhancing native habitat as well as modifying native vegetation to achieve other already stated compatible goals and objectives.

5.1.1 Roberts Lake

5.1.1.1 Riparian Forest (willows)
   a) Retain willow trees growing along eastern shoreline.

5.1.1.2 Bulrush Marsh
   a) Retain bulrushes along southern and eastern shorelines.
   
   b) Retain patches of the bulrushes presently along the western shoreline.

5.1.2 Laguna Grande

5.1.2.1 Riparian Forest (willows)
   a) Retain riparian forest on southwestern side of lagoon between Virgin Avenue and lakeshore.

   b) Retain willow grove at northwestern end of lagoon.

   c) Retain willow trees along north shore of lagoon (western portion).
d) Retain willow trees along southern shoreline of lagoon which buffer bulrush island, and backwater, from adjacent developed parkland.

e) Retain extensive riparian forest in canyon bottom and on south side of canyon upstream from footbridge extending to Kolb Avenue.

5.1.2.2 Bulrush Marsh

a) Retain bulrushes along southwestern shoreline next to riparian forest.

b) Retain bulrushes at western end of lagoon on either side of outlet (but not at outlet).

c) Retain bulrushes along northwestern and northern shoreline between western end of lagoon and developed parklands to the east.

d) Retain patches of bulrushes along selected portions of northern shoreline adjacent to the developed parklands.

e) Retain marsh along eastern shoreline at the upper end of lagoon (area just north of the footbridge).

f) Retain tule "island" which has developed on sediment deposited just west of the footbridge.

g) Retain tule "island" adjacent to, and directly north of, park on southeastern side of lagoon.

h) Retain portions of bulrush marsh immediately upstream from footbridge (see next section for recommended habitat improvements).

i) Retain bulrush marsh along stream corridor in the canyon bottom upstream from the lagoon.
5.1.2.3 Cat-tail Marsh

a) Retain cat-tail marshes (2) in riparian forest at southwest end of lagoon.

b) Retain cat-tail marshes (2) in riparian forest on south side of canyon just up canyon from footbridge.

c) Retain cat-tail marsh amidst riparian forest near upper end of canyon.

5.1.2.4 Oak Woodland

a) Retain oak woodland on south facing slope (north side) at upper end of canyon (above eucalyptus grove—see next section for recommendations for enhancement.

5.2 AREAS TO BE MODIFIED OR ENHANCED

5.2.1 Suggested modification of the existing emergent vegetation (tules)/open water pattern.

1. The creation of channels within and behind clumps of bulrushes will increase cover and provide shelter for waterfowl and waterbirds.

2. Maintaining the bulrush border and bulrush islands at widths of less than 20 feet will prevent matting of tules. Matted tule areas serve as breeding areas for mosquitoes and midges.

3. Breaking up the existing tule "island" into several "islands" each less than 100 feet in length will allow for mosquito control with mosquito fish. Mosquito fish will not swim up a channel for more than 50 feet.
4. Where possible the creation of approximately 10 feet of water between existing bulrushes and the shoreline will create protected backwater habitat. Some bulrushes should also be left growing on the shoreline.

5. The creation of approx. 12 foot wide channels in the area of dense bulrush growth immediately above the bridge at Laguna Grande will increase the value of the marsh for wildlife.

6. The creation of openings in the bulrushes along the shoreline, (i.e a disjunct border) will increase habitat value and open up vistas.

5.2.2 Eradication and Control of Invasive Non-Native Plants

A number of invasive, non-native plants have become established in various parts of Laguna Grande and Robert's Lake. It is important that these plants be controlled inasmuch as they spread quickly and replace native vegetation which is generally of greater value to wildlife. The locations of these non-native invasive plants which are to be removed are shown on the habitat management plans.

Removal of these plants should proceed with a minimum of ground disturbance. In most cases, removal should be by hand rather than with heavy equipment so as to minimize erosion and damage to surrounding vegetation.

Plant materials removed should be properly disposed of. Particular care should be given to the disposal of herbaceous material (kikuyu grass, periwinkle, German ivy) to prevent the establishment of new colonies.

The following guidelines will be helpful in the eradication and control of invasive species at Laguna Grande and Robert's Lake.

5.2.2.1 Blue Gum (Eucalyptus globulus). Extremely invasive. Grows and spreads rapidly, chokes out nearly all native trees and understory. The trees create a hazard by dropping branches and large pieces of bark, sometimes unannounced, during the dry
summer months. Trees resprout readily from stumps, so eradication can be laborious. Removal should be in stages. Young trees on the edges of the main grove should be removed as soon as possible. Larger trees should be removed periodically so as to allow native oak woodland to eventually replace the eucalyptus grove. The small eucalyptus grove located in the upper portion of the Laguna Grande site should be completely removed as soon as possible. The following procedure may be helpful in the eradication of eucalyptus:

(1) After falling tree, recut stump as close to ground surface as possible.

(2) Scrape loose soil away from base of stump.

(3) Strip all bark off of the stump and any exposed roots to below the soil level. This should prevent sprouting from the root crown.

(4) Replace the soil around the base of the stump. This will help promote the rotting of the stump.

(5) If stump sprouts appear, repeatedly remove sprouts before they reach six inches in length. This process will ultimately exhaust stored food reserves and stop resprouting.

(6) If stump sprouting continues to persist, treat stumps and/or sprouts with concentrated 2,4-Dichlorophenoxy acetic acid (2,4-D)* by either of the following methods:

Method 1 - Apply a 50% solution of 2,4-D amine in water to the exposed cambium layer. This should achieve a 95% kill in one application.

Method 2 - Apply a hot (140°F) 20% solution of 2,4-D to young sprouts.
Following the removal of eucalyptus trees, oaks (*Quercus agrifolia*, *Quercus lobata*) should be planted in their place. Guidelines for the revegetation of oaks are included in Appendix A.

5.2.2.2 Silver Wattle (*Acacia decurrens* var. *dealbata*). Very weedy and invasive. Particularly a problem along Laguna Grande inlet. Trees should be removed then checked at 2 year intervals for stump sprouts and new seedlings. Stumps may have to be treated with 2,4-D* (see step 6 above) if sprouting persists. Following removal, cottonwood (*Populus fremontii*) and willow (*Salix lasiolepis*) should be planted along the Laguna Grande inlet. Guidelines for the revegetation of cottonwood and willow are included in Appendix A.

5.2.2.3 English Elm (*Ulmus procera*). Invasive, spreading by means of suckers. Small grove located along Virgin Avenue. Trees encroaching in the direction of the lagoon should be removed to prevent the spread of elms into the riparian forest. Stumps and suckers should be treated with herbicide (2,4-D)* to prevent re-establishment (see step 6 above). Control of suckers will require ongoing maintenance.

5.2.2.4 Giant Reed (*Arundo donax*). Huge bamboo-like grass. Very weedy and invasive, spreading from underground rhizomes. All above ground and underground portions should be removed. Excavation to a depth of 18 to 24 inches should be sufficient to remove most underground material. The use of a back hoe for excavation is recommended. New sprouts from remaining underground rhizomes should be removed as they appear. Tule (*Scirpus sp.*) should re-establish itself in these areas.

5.2.2.5 Pampas Grass (*Cortaderia selloana*). Occasional single clumps scattered about the site. Should be removed wherever encountered. Excavation to a depth of 18 to 24 inches should be sufficient to remove most underground material. The use of a back hoe for excavation is recommended.
5.2.2.6 Periwinkle (*Vinca major*). A serious pest, especially in riparian situations with shade or moisture during the summer since it crowds out most native ground cover. Difficult to eradicate due to extensive rhizomes. Most effective way to eliminate periwinkle would be with an herbicide such as Roundup*. Small to moderate sized colonies located along north shore of Laguna Grande. Area where plants are removed should be revegetated with willow. Guidelines for the revegetation of willow are included in appendix A.

5.2.2.7 German Ivy (*Senecio mikanioides*). A serious pest in riparian areas. Spreads much as does periwinkle. Treating with an herbicide such as Roundup* is generally more effective than removal by hand. Moderate sized colony located along north shore of Laguna Grande. Revegetation should proceed as with periwinkle.

5.2.2.8 Kikuyu Grass (*Pennisetum clandestinum*). Extremely invasive. Easily recognized by light green color during the late spring and summer when most other grasses have turned brown. Fast growing, coarse, forming a deep, dense turf and choking out nearly all other low vegetation. Spreads by stolons and underground rhizomes, making eradication difficult. Covering much of area surrounding inlet to Laguna Grande. The use of an herbicide* specific to monocotyledonous plants may be of use in the eradication and control of this plant.

5.2.3 Modifications of vegetation for enhancement of scenic resource.

Planned, restrained, careful control of plant growth along the shorelines of, and adjacent to, Roberts Lake and Laguna Grande for the on-going maintenance and enhancement of scenic values is important for preservation of recreational values and consistent

*Precautions should be taken to insure that herbicides are not allowed to enter the lagoon or inlet. Consult Department of Fish and Game biologists before considering application.
with sound habitat management. Moreover enhanced opportunities for park visitors to view and enjoy wetlands wildlife and habitat will serve to increase public awareness and appreciation of the importance of wetland habitat preservation.

5.2.3.1 Roberts Lake. The primary view points at Roberts Lake are at the parking and observation areas along the western shoreline. These are periodically maintained by removing emergent vegetation immediately adjacent to these viewing areas.

The north shoreline of Roberts Lake has little aesthetic appeal since it is essentially devoid of vegetation and the shoreline is straight. Breaking up the rectangular appearance of the northeast corner could be accomplished by planting willows at the northeast corner only (not along the north shoreline) and the construction of a waterfowl island just offshore. It is also suggested that some trees, possibly cypress be planted along Del Monte Blvd. adjacent to the north shoreline. If widely spaced and open beneath they would not obstruct, but rather enhance, the view of the lagoon from this major thoroughfare.

5.2.3.2 Laguna Grande. The primary view points at Laguna Grande are from the parklands which are being developed on both the north and south shores in the eastern half of the lagoon. Views of the opposite shoreline and the open water at the opposite (west) end of the lagoon are plentiful but presently somewhat obscured by tules, blackberry thickets, patches of giant reed, and occasional trees. Much, but not all, of the vegetation along the shorelines of the developed recreation areas should be cleared to enhance the views of the lagoon and the near shore water areas. Shoreline areas which should be maintained free of vegetation (especially emergent vegetation) are delineated on the habitat management map. Adjacent areas where vegetation should remain for maintenance of habitat value are also shown.

The footbridge at the east end of Laguna Grande connecting the developed recreation areas on the south and north shores affords a clear view to the west down the full length of the lagoon. It is unlikely to become obstructed however the setting of the bridge would enhanced by clearing the silt and emergent
vegetation from both sides and beneath the footbridge thereby creating open water. The view in the opposite direction (to the east) from the footbridge would be enhanced by the creation of open water channels where there is presently dense tule growth.

The view from the pathway on the north side of the footbridge is presently unobstructed over the top of the marsh vegetation. It appears that a maintenance program may be required to control the growth of volunteer willow seedlings arising between the marsh and the pathway.

Significant views of the lagoon from the west end looking east will be afforded by the development of a hotel and restaurant currently under construction. Control of tule growth at the outlet will probably enhance these views.

5.2.4 Revegetation

5.2.4.1 Buffering of significant wildlife habitat areas. Planting trees adjacent to the bulrush marsh along certain open sections of the shoreline will help to shelter high wildlife use areas from human intrusion. Willow trees are the fastest growing and most suitable tree for this purpose. Stands of willows presently serve this function along certain sections of the shoreline. The willows will also serve as perches and nesting and foraging areas for a variety of waterbirds and riparian species. Guidelines for revegetation with willows are presented in the appendix.

5.2.4.2 Restoration of oak woodland. Following the removal of the eucalyptus trees which are encroaching the oak woodland on the south facing slope of the canyon live oak and valley oak trees should be planted in their place. Specifications for revegetation with oaks are included in the appendix.

5.2.4.3 Replanting of streambank. Following the removal of acacias which are growing along the watercourse leading into Laguna Grande the upper most portion of the left bank (south side) should be planted with cottonwoods (Fremont Cottonwood and/or Black Cottonwood). White alders might also be planted.
immediately adjacent to the stream. These trees will add some variety to the riparian forest and therein help to create a more diverse habitat. Specifications for revegetation with cottonwood and alder are included in the appendix.

5.2.5 Construction of Waterfowl Islands

The creation of some islands for wildlife, especially waterfowl, will greatly enhance the wildlife habitat value of both Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake. Islands are recommended at the west end of Laguna Grande and the south end of Roberts Lake. Previously there has been discussion of creating "islands" entirely of bulrushes. Islands with upland habitat will greatly increase the wildlife habitat value especially for potential waterfowl nesting. These islands will also form protected quiet water habitat on their leeward side. Large bulrush islands are to be avoided since the centers tend to become decadent with matted vegetation which may be of habitat value to wildlife but also serve as breeding sites for nuisance insects.

Guidelines for the dimensions and placement of these islands are presented in section 5.3.1. Detailed plans will need to be prepared for the construction of the islands. A schematic diagram follows.

5.3 PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES

5.3.1 Design guidelines for waterfowl islands.

Properly designed and placed artificial islands will provide resting areas for many waterbirds and possible breeding sites for some of the resident species. These islands will also provide shelter from the wind creating secluded quiet backwater areas between the islands and the shoreline. The following design criteria are to be considered in constructing these inlands so as to maximize their value to wildlife while at the same time avoiding creating nuisances (ex. breeding areas for mosquitos) or maintenance problems.
5.3.1.1 Size. Smaller islands located farther from the shore with greater vegetative cover are the most productive for waterfowl nesting. (Giroux 1981).

5.3.1.2 Elevation. The island surface should be high enough above the water surface to support upland vegetation. The ground surface should be at least two (2) feet above the high water level.

5.3.1.3 Shape. Rectangular islands are most appropriate because they have greater perimeter/area than circular, elliptical, or square islands. The greater the ratio of water-land edge to land mass the more attractive the insular habitat (Hammond and Mann 1956).

5.3.1.4 Area. Each island should encompass about 0.1 ha (Giroux 1981).

5.3.1.5 Dimensions. Giroux (1981) recommends that artificial islands for wildlife nesting should be approximately 25 m (82') wide and 40 m (130') long. Keith (1961) observed that preferred islands for nesting were at least 15 m (50') in diameter. Waterfowl islands at Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake should be less than 100' long to allow for circulation by mosquito fish. Suggested dimensions are 50' X 100'.

5.3.1.6 Distance between islands and shoreline. Normally, there should be a distance of at least 170 m (560') between the islands and the mainland to deter predators. Since the occurance of large predators, skunks, coyotes, etc, is probably less than in wilder areas a lesser distance from the mainland would probably be adequate. A distance of 100 ft. is recommended.

5.3.1.7 Distance between islands. Close spacing of islands protects them from wind and wave action however clustering of islands can increase their vulnerability to predators (Sherwood 1968, Giroux 1981). Giroux (1981) recommended that islands should be placed no closer than 100 m (330'). Again since there are fewer mammalian predators than in southeast Alberta where Giroux conducted his studies on the use of artifical islands by
nesting waterfowl, the recommended distance between islands is approximately 100 feet.

5.3.1.8 Shoreline protection. Emergent vegetation around the island can serve as natural breakwaters, however islands surrounded by a dense belt of tall emergent vegetation offer no access to open water and are therefore avoided by waterfowl. (Mihelsons, et al. 1967). Dense emergent vegetation should be encouraged to grow only on the windward side of the islands.

5.3.1.9 Water depth. The depth of water surrounding artificial waterfowl islands should be greater than 70 cm.

5.3.1.10 Planting. Establishment of vegetation on the islands should be promoted by seeding with a mixture of grasses and legumes. Additionally nesting waterfowl prefer stands of broad-leaved annuals and perennials mixed with grasses. Plants suitable for revegetation of the islands are -

Brewer's Saltbush (Atriplex lentiformis var. breweri)

Bluegrass (Poa annua)

Cultivated Oat (Avena sativa)

Common Barley (Hordeum vulgare)

Curly Dock (Rumex crispus)

Available information on establishment methods and habitat values of these plants is included in the appendix.

Willows may possibly invade these islands. Some willow growth might be favorable but maintenance would be required to ensure that willow growth did not overtake the entire island (i.e. that open weedy/grassy areas remain). Poison hemlock, fennel, and thistles are likely also to invade these islands.
5.4 MANAGEMENT AND MAINTENANCE RESPONSIBILITIES

5.4.1 Management/Maintenance of Bulrush Border

The removal of patches of bulrush along selected portions of the shorelines, cutting of channels thru dense masses of bulrush and the thinning of bulrush as shown on the habitat management plans should be accomplished in conjunction with the dredging program. Thereafter periodic maintenance of bulrushes will be the joint responsibility of the Regional Park District, City of Seaside and North Salinas Valley Mosquito Abatement District.

5.4.2 Removal of Non-native Invasive Plants

The removal of patches of invasive plants as shown on the habitat management plans will be the responsibility of the City of Seaside with potential funding assistance from the Regional Park District. Cooperative involvement of either the CCC or YCC is a strong possibility since much of this work will require intensive hand labor.

5.4.3 Management and Maintenance of Scenic Resources

Initial revitalization and later ongoing maintenance of the vegetation surrounding Roberts Lake and Laguna Grande will be the responsibility of the City of Seaside and City of Monterey Parks and Recreation Departments with potential financing from the Regional Parks District. Initial improvement of open water areas, removal of sediment deposits, and thinning of dense tule growth should be accomplished in conjunction with the dredging of the lagoons. Periodic maintenance of park shorelines thereafter will be the responsibility of the respective cities.

The Regional Park District should seek funding for the construction of these islands in conjunction with funding for the dredging program. The parks district may wish to have the public works departments of the two cities oversee the ritual construction which will most likely be contracted out.
5.4.4 Revegetation With Native Plants.

Replanting with native trees and shrubs after the eradication of invasive plants will be the responsibility of the respective park and recreation departments. If the work is to be contracted detailed revegetation plans and planting specifications will be required.

5.4.5 Construction of Waterfowl Islands

The waterfowl islands should be constructed at the time of dredging. It should be noted that it will probably not be possible to use any of the lakebed deposits for construction of these islands. Detailed plans and specifications for the construction of these islands will be required in order to ensure their stability. Hydrologic (incl. flood control) considerations should be evaluated in conjunction with a decision on final placement of the islands.

**Typical Waterfowl Island**

100' TO ANY OTHER ISLAND

PLANT ISLAND WITH MIXTURE OF GRASSES, LEGUMES, BROAD LEAVED ANNUALS AND PERENNIALS

PREVAILING WIND

ISLAND > 2' h

~ 10'

100' 2

WATER DEPTH > 70 cm.
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6.0 SHORELINE IMPROVEMENTS

A number of improvements are recommended around the shoreline of Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake and within wetland and riparian areas. The purpose of these improvements are to provide the physical and visual access required in the certified LUP, to help protect wetlands resources, to ensure access for mosquito abatement equipment and to enhance the quality of recreational opportunities. The selection, siting, and general design of the proposed improvements are based on the key objective of restoring, enhancing and managing the wetlands and riparian habitat. While many kinds of improvements are conceivable, only those consistent with this objective have been recommended.

Figure 4 illustrates the general location and nature of the recommended shoreline improvements. The discussion that follows describes them in more detail, provides general design guidelines, and assigns specific maintenance and construction responsibilities.

6.1 PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

6.1.1 Pedestrian Pathways and Elevated Boardwalks

Figure 7 of the certified LUP for the Laguna Grande/Roberts Lake sub-area indicates public accessways around the entire periphery of Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake and extending on either side of the stream channel above the bridge at Laguna Grande. Considerable portions of this path system have already been constructed by the Cities of Seaside and Monterey as part of the development of Laguna Grande Regional Park and Roberts Lake. Some additional length of pathway has been designed and is presently being installed as part of the Day's Inn project near the outlet channel of Laguna Grande. The pedestrian pathways proposed here reflect therefore the certified LUP, the existing pathways, and the private construction work in progress.
The pathways and boardwalk shown in Figure 4 upstream of the existing bridge over Laguna Grande are located to carry out the intent of the LUP for access while at the same time minimizing the disturbance of critical wetlands and riparian habitat. A boardwalk is recommended in order to provide access through marsh areas without disturbing vegetation or water flow patterns. The location of the pathway system has been selected in order to provide access to both sides of the stream channel and to permit an interesting loop trip to be made.

6.1.2 Benches

Benches should be installed at intervals along the pathway system at Laguna Grande to enhance the enjoyment of the park. Figure 4 shows general locations where benches may be placed but other sites may work as well.

6.1.3 Fishing and Observation Platforms and Piers

At several locations around Laguna Grande fishing and observation platforms or piers are recommended. These tie into the access pathway system, afford additional access to the lake and will enhance recreational opportunities. The locations indicated are illustrative only.

6.1.4 Access for Mosquito Abatement Equipment

The Northern Salinas Valley Mosquito Abatement District (NSVMAD) is responsible for the control of mosquitoes and midges and other noxious insects at Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake. The District must be able to have access along the shorelines of the two lakes in order to apply insecticides and to maintain water circulation.

6.1.5 Floatlines and Log Boom Barriers

Model power boat racing is a popular activity at Roberts Lake. Because the lake is also heavily used by waterfowl, the City of Seaside has placed a floatline to restrict the area of model boat operation in order to protect water birds. However, the floatline has from time to time been moved by unauthorized
persons, apparently to enlarge the model boat racing area. This has reduced the protected area available to waterfowl. It is recommended that the floatline be more permanently secured to avoid this problem, or that a more substantial barrier, such as a log boom, also firmly secured to the shore, be installed.

The tules along the shoreline of Laguna Grande serve as critical waterfowl habitat and are recommended for retention elsewhere in this report. In order for these wetland areas to be of maximum benefit to waterfowl human intrusion should be minimized, particularly during nesting season from October to May. It is recommended therefore that if Laguna Grande is eventually opened to boating, that a log boom barrier be used to keep boats away from nesting areas during the late fall, winter and early spring. The approximate placement of the moveable boom is shown on Figure 4.

6.1.6 Setbacks

The certified LUP requires that all shoreline improvements including lateral access pathways, park facilities, and private development be set-back specified distances from the inland extent of wetland and riparian vegetation. These setbacks are intended to ensure viability of the wetland and riparian areas of wildlife habitat. Thus, while the setbacks themselves are not a form of development, they are an important constraint to shoreline improvements.

6.2 DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR SHORELINE IMPROVEMENTS

There should be considerable latitude in the design of the shoreline structures described in this section. The Cities of Seaside and Monterey and the Monterey Penninsula Regional Park District should use their experience in selecting final designs. Aesthetic attractiveness is of course of concern. Low or moderate initial cost, durability, and ease of long-term maintenance are also important criteria.
Existing park structures at Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake generally set the tone, or design theme for continued development of the area including the shoreline structures discussed here. In addition, examples of elevated walkways and nature observation platforms at other parks can be used as models for structures at Laguna Grande.

The following criteria are intended as general guides in designing shoreline structures at Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake. Final design work can be completed prior to construction.

6.2.1 Pedestrian Pathways and Boardwalks

Pathways that will be constructed on dry land should follow the design standards presently in use by the Cities of Seaside at Laguna Grande.

6.2.1.1 Area 'A'. Pathways in areas indicated 'A' on Figure 4 should be for use by pedestrians but not bicycles. Use levels are not expected to be high; walking for pleasure will be the chief activity. Pathways should be 7' in width and surfaced with decomposed granite.

6.2.1.2 Area 'B'. The pathway constructed in this area should be the same as in 'A' areas above. It should be for pedestrians only; enjoyment of nature will be a chief activity. It should be seven feet in width and surfaced with decomposed granite in all portions of the pathway constructed on dry land. It differs from the 'A' areas in that some portions of the pathway traverses wet areas. In these areas the pathway should be built up with fill several feet to permit use by pedestrians and small vehicles of the NSVMA/D. The pathway bed should be about ten feet in width and small drainage culverts should be installed at intervals to permit water exchange.

6.2.1.3 Area 'C'. Pathways constructed in these areas should be essentially the same as in 'A' areas. They should be for use by pedestrians only; enjoyment of nature will be a chief activity. They should be seven feet in width and surfaced with decomposed granite on all portions of the pathways constructed on dry land.
They differ from 'A' areas in that some portions of the pathways traversing wetland areas should be constructed as boardwalks mounted on rootings or piers. Use of this form of lateral access is encouraged as a means of affording access to areas too wet for conventional pathway design while at the same time protecting sensitive wetland vegetation. Boardwalks of this type are in increasingly wide useage in ecological reserves and areas where nature and wildlife observation are principal activities.

Specific locations where boardwalks will need to be used should be determined at the time overall pathway layout is selected. Pathway layout should be planned during winter months to account for higher water levels in Laguna Grande.

Boardwalk construction is normally wood throughout. Width can be as narrow as four feet. Railings should be installed on both sides. The structure should be strong and steady. Wood used for the footings will be submerged and therefore should be resistant to rotting. The structure should be left unpainted although clear sealant may be used. Actual construction design may vary. Several illustrations are shown below.
6.2.1.4 Area 'D'. Pathway construction in this area can be located entirely outside critical habitat except for a brief length that will pass through the oak woodland. The pathway should be designed for both pedestrian and bicycle use, should be ten feet in width and surfaced with asphalt. This pathway will serve as a principal link between the Fremont Blvd., Canyon Del Rey intersection and areas of the park developed for active recreation. Details of pathway design should follow similar pathways already in place at Laguna Grande.

6.2.2 Benches

The design and construction of benches for resting along the pathway system can be extremely simple. A heavy wood plank approximately 4"x18"x6' mounted on wood or metal posts is suitable; other similar designs will work as well. Benches should be oriented parallel to the pathway and placed on the landward side several feet back from the pathway at locations where a break in the shoreline vegetation affords views of the lake, or where other interesting views are available. Caution should be taken that the locations of benches, or other park facilities, do not interfere with use of the pathway by NSVMAD equipment.

6.2.3 Fishing Piers and Observation Platforms

Fishing platforms or piers should be constructed once it has been demonstrated that an adequate recreational fishery can be maintained in Laguna Grande. These structures should extend from the bank towards the center of the lake for a distance of 15' to 20' or as far as is required to project at least 6' beyond the outer edge of the tules in order to permit enough room to cast. Piers of solid construction, mounted on pilings are more stable than floating docks and should be preferred. Full railings should be included for safety. Construction should be compatible in design, materials and finish with the boardwalks described above. A 'T' configuration will permit several people to fish at the same time. General dimensions and design are illustrated below.
The design and construction of observation platforms should generally be the same as for fishing piers with a few exceptions. Since the purpose of these structures is to provide only a "window" to the lake and shoreline vegetation, they do not need to extend beyond the edge of the tules. In order to maximize opportunities for wildlife observation, the platforms should be screened or camouflaged. This can be easily accomplished by retaining a narrow band of tules adjacent to the railings or by fastening tule cuttings to the railings to form a screen. General dimensions and design are illustrated below.

6.2.4 Access for Mosquito Abatement Equipment

Access for NSVMAD equipment should be ten feet in width above the bridge over Laguna Grande in order to permit passage of standard pickup trucks, and 8' in all other locations at Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake.
The pedestrian and bicycle paths shown on Figure 4 as 'A', 'B', and 'D' will generally be adequate for use by NSVMAD equipment. And should be used for this dual purpose rather than constructing additional access ways which would adversely impact wetland and riparian vegetation. If any additional width in these areas is needed for vehicular access it should be provided by clearing vegetation on the lake or stream channel side of the pedestrian path. Special care should be taken to avoid cutting willows or other riparian trees if pathway widening is required.

Access is not presently available for NSVMAD on the south side of the stream channel above the Lagune Grande Bridge. It is not recommended that vehicular access be provided here as this would require considerable draining or filling of wetlands or modification of critical habitat. If spraying is needed in this area it should be done by hand using the elevated pedestrian walkway (Area 'C') as far as possible.

Roberts Road offers access at present for NSVMAD equipment on the west side of Roberts Lake and will continue to be used in the future.

6.2.5 Floatlines/Log Boom Barriers

In order to secure the floatlines and/or log booms recommended earlier, secure attachment points should be constructed at the shoreline at each end of the barrier. Either cement plugs or wood or steel posts with heavy eye bolts can be used. Galvanized chain or cable should be used to secure log booms to anchor points on either shore. The method of fastening should be able to be removed easily in order that the boom can be moved.

The floats presently in use at Roberts Lake are sufficient in design for their purpose. Floats may not be adequate however at Laguna Grande as a means of limiting boating use at the lake. Logs, approximatley one foot in diameter, will form an impassable barrier and may have to be used.
6.2.6 Setbacks

The certified LUP sets forth the following requirements for setbacks at Laguna Grande and/or Roberts Lake:

- Where feasible at Laguna Grande, lateral access is to be set back a minimum of 10 feet from the inland extent of emergent vegetation. Where passing through or near the wildlife habitat area to be established at Laguna Grande this lateral access is to be designed so as to protect the habitat area.

- Development shall be set back a minimum of 20 feet from marsh or riparian vegetation.

- All development except for recreation and nature observation platforms and piers shall be set back a minimum of 50 feet from the inland extent of wetland and its associated vegetation.

In graphic form these setbacks would look like this:
While it is undoubtedly desirable to require that recreation facilities designed for active use be maintained at least 20' from the wetland vegetation, it is not necessary to prohibit passive public access from being located directly adjacent to wetland and riparian habitat. In some areas it is necessary and desirable to develop access within and through such areas in order to provide wildlife observation opportunities. In addition, mosquito abatement equipment must be able to be operated immediately adjacent to the inland extent of the wetland and riparian vegetation and it is most efficient to have the public accessway serve both uses. Accordingly it is recommended that the ten foot setback for lateral access stated in the local Coastal Program Land Use Plan be modified in favor of a more flexible policy that permits pathways to be based upon terrain considerations, the desire to enhance wildlife observation opportunities, and the desireability of joint use of the accessway by pedestrians and mosquito abatement equipment. This in effect will mean that there will be no setback for access pathways.

It is further recommended that the 20 foot and 50 foot setback lines be based upon the Critical Vegetation map (Figure 2) and on the Habitat Management map (Figure 3) rather than on the map of Existing Vegetation, because it is really the critical habitat in combination with proposed areas of revegetation that the setbacks should be established to protect. Setbacks should therefore be measured landward from the landward edge of critical habitat as indicated on Figure 2 and/or landward from the landward edge of proposed new vegetation as shown by Figure 3. This means that in areas where complete removal of emergent vegetation is proposed by Figure 3, that setbacks should be measured from the edge of the shoreline.

6.3 RESPONSIBILITIES FOR CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE

Development of Laguna Grande Regional Park has been a cooperative effort by the Monterey Penninsula Regional Park District and the Cities of Seaside and Monterey. Construction of physical facilities within their respective jurisdictions has been carried
out by the two cities with financial assistance from the Parks District. This pattern is expected to continue. Development of facilities at Roberts Lake is the exclusive responsibility of the City of Seaside.

At Laguna Grande it is assumed that all of the shoreline improvements described above and shown on Figure 4 will be completed by the City of Seaside with the exception of a limited section of the pathway on Area 'C' (between Sequoia and Kolb Avenue) which is in the City of Monterey. On-going maintenance of the shoreline improvements will also be the responsibility of the respective cities.
7.0 WATER QUALITY

7.1 LITERATURE REVIEW

The following summary describes previous studies done for Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake, as well as relevant water quality studies for other lakes.

7.1.1. AMBAG 208 Laguna Grande—Roberts Lake (1977)
This major study focused on management alternatives for improving water quality of the two lakes. Included are analyses of development control and technical alternatives for the upper watershed, as well as various alternatives for in-lake corrective measures. Lake bottom dredging was evaluated and recommended as one option. The discussion included probable dredging impacts, cost analysis (containing some errors) for removing and 2 feet of bottom sediment from Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake respectively. A recommendation was made for bentonite sealing after dredging, a recommendation for use of a "Mud Cat" dredge, and three short case studies.

7.1.2 NSVMAD Laguna Grande Management Recommendations and Correspondence to Calif. Coastal Commission (1981)
The report and letter focused on management considerations for water quality improvement and mosquito/midge control. Recommendations included control of tule growth; creation of "tule islands", dredging Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake, planting Mosquito fish (C. affinis) and prevention of future siltation by installation of sediment catch-basins and control of blowing sand at Roberts Lake. Prior to major development in the watershed the lakes were 14 feet deep. Current depth of Laguna Grande is approximately 3 feet, Roberts Lake is approximately 2 1/2 feet deep. The District has monitored water quality in the lakes since 1975.

The wetland plan reiterated water quality recommendations in the AMBAG 208 study. Dredging to a depth of 8 feet in Laguna Grande, 5 feet in Roberts Lake and creation of tule islands were
recommended. Purchase or lease of a Mud Cat dredge was also recommended. One objective of the plan was establishment of a lake fishery—possibly catchable trout as recommended by the California Department of Fish and Game.

7.1.4 Lake El Estero Restoration and Management Plan

A water and sediment program was conducted to determine the condition of the lake, nutrient sources, sediment disposal options and suitability of lake water for irrigation of park lands. A major source of nutrients contributing to lake eutrophication was found to be resident bird populations. Lake restoration recommendations include installation of sediment traps, lake deepening, aeration, bird control and yearly maintenance activities. Removal of lake water and sediment excavation by bulldozer was recommended to deepen the lake to an overall 4 foot depth. Costs of various restoration measures were also given.

7.1.5 Lake Merritt (Oakland) Restoration Project (1977) and Lake Merritt Management Plan (1979)

These reports contained a comprehensive study of lake hydrology, biology, pollutant sources and management recommendations. Lake dredging, weed harvesting, sediment traps, urban runoff controls, herbicides and aeration were discussed. Dredging the lake bottom by hydraulic dredge to a 7 foot depth was recommended. The spoil material would then be barged to Alcatraz Island and dumped.

7.2 DREDGING OPTIONS

Options for removal of lake bottom sediments reviewed include hydraulic dredge, dragline, clamshell, and lake drawdown and excavation by bulldozer. The lake drawdown/bulldozer excavation alternative may not be a viable option due to possible higher elevation of Roberts Lake making lake water removal difficult, and because of the likely existence of groundwater springs in the Laguna Grande lakebed.

Each of the remaining options have various advantages and disadvantages in terms of overall cost, mobilization and
dismantling, and operating efficiencies. It is important to recognize that the dredging technique selected is very much dependent on the method selected for dredge spoils disposal. For example, unless there is a large area available for stockpiling dredge material in reasonable proximity to the lake, hydraulic dredging may not be feasible due to be high water content of the material and necessity to dewater the sediments before ultimate use or disposal. Other factors which must be determined are the size class(es) of lakebed sediments and a reasonably precise determination of bottom contours for each lake.

Therefore, before the JPA and Park District proceed further with a particular dredging or excavation technique, it is recommended that a detailed engineering feasibility study be done for sediment removal. The study should be performed by a professional engineer with experience in dredging and sediment removal techniques. It should include:

- Identification of a practical intermediate storage and ultimate disposal site. (Existing data on chemical constituents in the sediments can be used to assist in the selection process). Possible disposal sites include the undeveloped park lands adjacent to Laguna Grande, the marina sanitary landfill, agricultural fill in the Marina-Castroville area, State Parks' beaches in the Seaside area. Water quality, cost and institutional constraints exist for each of these options.

- Lake bottom soundings to determine precise bottom contours for each lake.

- Sediment coring and grain-size analysis by a licensed soils engineer.

- Overall strategy and costs for the selected option.

7.2.1 Dredging Parameters—Laguna Grande

Existing depth—approx. 2 1/2-4 feet.
Recommended depth—5 to 8 feet (see Fig.5 proposed lake contours)
Current siltation rates-approx. 1600 tons/yr.
Total sediment to be removed-50,000 c.y.

7.2.2 Dredging Parameters—Roberts Lake

Existing Depth—approx. 2 1/2 feet
Recommended Depth—5 feet
Current siltation rates—3400 tons/yr. (@ rate of 2'/yr.)
Total sediment to be removed—30,000 c.y.

7.2.3 Lake Bottom Configuration

After dredging depths of 8 feet and 5 feet respectively are recommended for Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake (Figure 5) as the minimum depths necessary to maintain water quality, restrict algae growth and establish a warm or cold water fishery. Optimum depths for fish establishment are 10 feet in the center of Laguna Grande and 5 feet (instead of 4 feet) in the shallow zones near the tule islands. However, due to fiscal constraints the shallower depths are recommended and will provide sufficient water quality for fish. The 208 plan recommendations to remove 4 feet of material from Laguna Grande and 2 feet from Roberts Lake would not provide sufficient depth for establishment of any type of fishery, and would not provide adequate depths necessary for insect and algae control. It should also be noted that dredging volume and cost estimates (below) do not include sediment removal above the pedestrian bridge. If an open water area is contemplated by the City of Seaside and Park District in this area, estimates of volumes and cost should be calculated during the engineering feasibility study.

7.2.4 Dredging Cost Estimates

Because the AMBAG 208 Study and the Regional Park District in recent grant applications recommended acquisition of a Mud Cat type hydraulic dredge, the manufacturer has been contracted as part of this study in order to update earlier cost information. This is not a recommendation for acquisition of this type of dredge equipment—the engineering analysis should determine the appropriate equipment. However, the information will give the
District an idea of current costs to remove sediment and transport it to the edge of each lake.

Mud Cat Purchase:
- MC 915 Dredge: 129,000.00
- Discharge pipe package (8" X 1500'): 27,500.00
- Cable & harness equipment: 5,000.00
- Work boat: 4,000.00
- Freight: 6,800.00
- State Tax: 10,750.00

TOTAL: $183,050.00

Mud Cat Lease (3 months)
- MC 915 Dredge: 38,700.00
- Miscell. Equip.: 11,000.00
- State Tax: 3650.00
- Two-way freight: 13,600.00

TOTAL: $66,950.00

If a 24 hour shift were used, dredging could occur within a two-month period. In this case costs (except freight) should be reduced by one third.

Labor and operating costs should be added to both estimates. Approximately 300 hours will be needed to complete the operation. At $35/hr. the total cost would be $28,000.

Although the lease alternative appears more economical, purchase of a Mud Cat may be more cost effective in the long run. It provides a piece of equipment that can be used for the periodic maintenance dredging needed in the future for both lakes. The dredge can be leased to other local agencies to recover part or
all of the additional purchase cost. In addition, resale values for this type of dredge equipment are favorable due to high demand and unavailability on the west coast.

In order to project costs for removal and ultimate disposal, several assumptions must be made. If it is assumed that the bottom sediments are predominately sand-sized material and that a suitable location can be found close to each lake for sediment dewatering, then additional costs for pumping capacity and piping the sediment slurry to a distant location will not need to be accounted for. If the sediments contain relatively higher percentages of organic, silt, or clay material a large dewatering site would be necessary due to the very slow dewatering time from these sediments. Once started the dredge should be run continuously except for normal operational shut-downs for shift changes and maintenance.

For purposes of preliminary cost estimates it has been assumed that the Marina landfill will be the ultimate disposal site. Although there are possible uses for the dredge spoils (agricultural amendment, landfill, park soil additive and fill) none are assured options at this time. The Marina landfill dumping policies are currently in a period of change. The current $3/ton rate for "in-district" disposers may be increased in the future. Rates also depend on water content of the material disposed—with higher water content material subject to higher rates. In-district dry fill material is now accepted free although this policy may also change in the future.

Estimates for hauling the dredge spoils have varied between $3.50 and $6.50 per ton. The lower figure is based on hauling costs estimated for Lake El Estero sediment removal, while the higher cost estimates were obtained from local contractors. Because more definitive hauling costs would need to be derived through a competitive bid procedure, only a range of costs can be presented at this time.

Therefore, using the costs developed for the Mud Cat hydraulic dredge option, the total estimated project costs for this option would be as follows:
Mud Cat lease  $  66,950
Operating costs  28,000
Excavation of dried material ($3/ coy.)  240,000
Hauling-25 mile round trip ($3.50-$6.50/ton)  322,000 - 598,000
Dumping fee  276,000

Total Cost Estimate-Initial Dredging  $932,950 - $1,208,950

7.3 FISHERY OPTIONS

Potential opportunities and problems associated with the establishment of a recreational fishery have been reviewed because they bear directly on water quality improvements and dredging. There are two approaches to providing recreational fishing. One program approach would rely heavily on periodic stocking of catchable-sized fish—rainbow trout or other fish species. In this program the water quality would need to be sufficient to provide oxygen sufficient for survival, but little effort would be devoted to maintaining an ecosystem that provides food for fish and spawning habitat. However, fish would need to be stocked annually at the time of greatest fishing pressure.

The other approach would entail establishment of an ecosystem which would provide resources for a sustained, reproducing warm-water fishery with perhaps an additional put-and-take, catchable trout stocking program to enhance the recreational benefits of Laguna Grande. This would involve changing the present summer conditions of a blue-green algae dominated system with associated low oxygen levels. The abundance of blue-green algae is correlated with high concentrations of dissolved organic matter in lakes. A self-sustaining warm water fishery is plausible only if a major portion of the present sediment input and dissolved organic nutrient input can be prevented. A summer put-and-take trout fishery may not be plausible, either, if algal blooms and associated low oxygen conditions cannot be prevented. Dissolved organic matter cannot be controlled with upstream sediment traps.
Both of the program approaches noted above will entail dredging. Presently available water quality information is inadequate to predict post-dredging water quality and assess the long term viability of the aquatic habitat for fishes. After dredging and before any stocking of fish, water quality should be monitored through at least one flushing season to ensure that conditions are viable for fishes. Dredging will stir up and reintroduce toxicants, nutrients and other pollutants to the lake. These must be flushed out and/or be settled out before fish can survive.

After dredging, measures should be taken to encourage more aerobic bacterial degradation of sedimentary organic compounds to solve the blue-green algal bloom problem. Decomposition is presently dominated by anaerobic bacteria that create organic compounds that favor blue-green algae and most probably will continue after dredging unless the lake bottom substrate is modified (Donald Grant, pers. comm.). Modifications would require addition of rocks and coarse gravels to provide interstices for aerobic bacteria (Donald Grant, pers. comm.). This substrate would also create habitat for macroinvertebrates which would provide a food source and spawning substrate habitat for a self-sustaining warm water fishery. However, if the siltation problem were not solved after dredging, such substrate improvements would soon be covered over. If the plan were to stock catchable-sized, non-reproducing fishes each year that would be caught before they starved, then lake bed substrate would be less critical for fish. However, blue-green algal problems would continue with the likelihood of periodic fish kills.

Water quality sampling by NSVMAD from June 1975 to June 1977 in Laguna Grande indicate that water temperatures will probably be sufficiently warm for spawning reproduction and growth of some warm water fish species. The lake would be cooler after dredging, but water temperatures may be high enough at lake margins for spawning where tule islands might reduce water mixing. Water temperature measurements should be monitored to confirm this for the margins and photic zone.
If the program approach after dredging is to establish a naturally sustaining warm water fishery, it is recommended that blue gill (*Lepomis macrochirus*), largemouth bass (*Micropterus salmoides*) and white crappie (*Pomoxis annularis*) be introduced. These species spawn in spring and summer at temperatures of 18-21°C, 14-24°C and 97-200°C, respectively. They also forage on midges and mosquitoes. Blue gill survive and reproduce under a wide variety of conditions and would be most likely to maintain themselves. White crappie would be preferrable to black crappie (*Pomoxis nigromaculatus*) because the former have slightly greater tolerances for high turbidities, higher temperatures and lack of vegetation and other cover.

The more complex three-species combination, particularly with two species to compete with and forage upon the more adaptive blue gill, would be more likely to provide a more stable fish association than a two-species combination. Additionally, objects of cover should be distributed throughout the lake to provide fish cover and help prolong fish survival.

NSVMAD's recommendation to introduce mosquito fish (*Gambusia affinis*) is appropriate for mosquito control. They would also provide forage for other fishes. The recommendation by the California Department of Fish and Game to establish a put and take trout fishery appears plausible at this point for a dredged Laguna Grande. Winter lake conditions would be acceptable but water temperature and dissolved oxygen levels should be monitored in summer after dredging to confirm the favorability for rainbow trout. A rainbow trout fishery would require annual stocking to balance fishing pressure because rainbow trout cannot spawn successfully in lakes.

### 7.4 OTHER IN-LAKE RECOMMENDATIONS

#### 7.4.1 Periodic Dredging

Recommendations for periodic dredging cannot be made presently because of unknown factors associated with initial dredging options, engineering and costs, as well as the effectiveness of
sediment catch basins. It is reasonable to assume that upstream sediment basins will not be 100 percent effective, and that periodic redredging will be necessary to maintain lake depths and water quality.

7.4.2 Bentonite Clay Sealing

The AMBAG 208 Plan recommended a bentonite clay coating on the bottom of Laguna Grande and Roberts Lakes to prevent the release of nutrients from the lake bottoms. With dredging to depths as recommended above, it is doubtful lake bottom nutrients will continue to be as much of a water quality problem as occurs now. Further, the cost-effectiveness of such measure is questionable inasmuch as the clay layer would be covered by new sediment within a few years. It not only adds to the amount of future dredging needs, but could also prevent formation of a lake bottom substrate favorable to fish and wildlife. Therefore this management technique is not recommended.

7.4.3 Aeration

Aeration of the lake by means of compressed air outlets near the lake bottom is not recommended. This procedure would increase the mixing of the upper layers of the lake and enlarge the water volume which could be used by algae. Algae which would normally drop out of the photic zone and die would be brought back up into the light by air bubbles rising to the surface. Also, bubbles near the lake bottom would stir up the bottom, increase turbidity and resuspend nutrients. This would increase the nutrient supply for algae to accelerate their growth. The oxygen produced by aeration at night would prevent algal death as well as fish death. In short, aeration by compressed air could worsen the algal problem by increasing algal blooms.

Another option for oxygenating the water to prevent fish kills would be to install fountains which would intake water at the surface and aerate it by spraying. Problems of fouling of fountain pumps and bubble aerators must be considered in either option. Additionally, artificial oxygenation of any kind may
only be a short-term solution to possible fish kills and not a solution to the problem of algal blooms.

7.4.4 Bird Control

The non-native bird populations, especially at Roberts Lake, contribute a significant percentage of nutrients to the lakes. Recommendations made for Lake El Estero (Anderson-Nichols, 1983) are appropriate for Roberts Lake and for Laguna Grande as more human use areas develop. Principal recommendations include the need for signing and public education to discourage bird feeding, abandonment of pets, and covering trash receptacles.

7.4.5 Stoplog Outlet

The 208 Plan recommendation for a stoplog outlet at Roberts Lake should be implemented as proposed in the Plan. It should be used during the day season only to provide maximum water depth and lake volume.

7.5 SEDIMENT RETENTION PONDS

In order to maintain adequate lake depths and reasonably good water quality sediment input to the lake has to be curtailed. Sediment retention basins are needed around the lakes and in the upper watershed. The major upper watershed basins should be in place before lake dredging occurs.

The major sediment sources for Laguna Grande are in the upper watershed outside the Coastal Zone, and therefore the scope of this study. However because this is so important to overall lake management, possible sites for sediment basins in the upper watershed were reviewed. Total sediment control requirements must relate to ultimate development of the watershed, which is not fully known at this time.
Possible sites include the following:

1). Ryan Ranch. An existing sediment basin adjacent to Highway 68 is functioning reasonably well (Nov.-Dec., 1983). However, long term maintenance of this basin (after construction completed at Ryan Ranch) needs to be insured.

2). Highway 218/68 intersection. This is a possible location requiring little or no removal of sensitive wildlife habitat. If Monterey II is developed this site is logical in combination with on-site sediment control.

3). Highway 218 East of North-South Rd.

4). Highway 218-Frog Pond area. The Frog Pond itself is designated a natural area with recreational trails and high riparian wildlife value. A sediment basin could be constructed east of the Frog Pond without affecting recreational areas, but some removal of riparian vegetation would be necessary.

5). West of Driving range near Fremont Blvd. A small sediment catch basin could be established here without affecting use of the driving range. Existing trees in the area would screen the basin from view except for a narrow view corridor down the driving range itself. Loose fill now being dumped just northwest of this site is entering Canyon Del Rey Creek and the lakes.

6). North end Laguna Grande Regional Park near Kolb St. extension (see Fig. 5). This should be the site of the major sediment basin within the park. This portion of the park is the least sensitive in terms of vegetation and wildlife habitat. Considerations should be given to removing the Kolb St. fill and extending the basin to Fremont Blvd. if engineering studies indicate extra length is needed for proper functioning of the sediment basin. This basin should incorporate an oil/grease trap for removal of urban contaminants.
Effective sediment control in the watershed must occur if Laguna Grande and Roberts Lakes are to survive. Furthermore, it will be pointless to spend large sums of public monies to dredge the lakes if the sediment loading can't be arrested. Sediment control is the responsibility of all jurisdictions around the lake and upstream. Maximum sediment retention effectiveness requires the installation of several (2-3) upstream sediment basins. A mechanism for effective maintenance and clean-out of basins must be established. Also, further engineering study is needed in order to define optimal location, design and costs of sediment basins.

Sediment and urban pollutants are also entering the lakes from roads, parking areas, and storm drains. As recommended in the 208 Plan, sediment catch basins and oil/grease traps are needed on storm drain outlets around Laguna Grande and Robert Lake. Approximately eight major drainage outlets exist on the Seaside and Monterey sides of the lakes. None presently have sediment or grease traps. New private development and new public works drainage projects (replacement of the Seaside storm drain near City Hall for example) should be fitted with sediment and grease traps. Existing storm drains should be retrofitted.

7.6 ROBERTS LAKE SAND DUNE EROSION

Revegetation of the sand dune slopes adjacent to Roberts Lake was also recommended in the 208 Plan. According to that plan, blowing sand is the major source of Roberts Lake sediment. Some natural revegetation has occurred in the last several years reducing wind erosion from these slopes. However natural revegetation should be augmented by artificial revegetation in order to stabilize the dunes and largely eliminate this sediment source. Development of dune areas west of Highway One should be required to fully stabilize dunes.

7.7 OTHER WATERSHED MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

The AMBAG 208 Plan and 1982 plan update contain a number of additional management recommendations relating to Laguna
Grande/Roberts Lake water quality. These should be implemented by the appropriate jurisdictions in a timely manner if long term water quality problems in these lakes are to be avoided. They include:

- Vacuum street sweeping

- Pave driveways (Seaside)

- Develop management plan for existing urban erosion

- Adopt grading/erosion and sediment control ordinances (Del Rey Oaks)

- Adopt cluster development/roadway standards

- Require on-site retention of all runoff and sediment

- Establish hillside development policies and standards
8.0 FUNDING

8.1 INTRODUCTION

The development of Laguna Grande Regional Park, particularly the acquisition of private parcels, has been supported in large measure by grant funds from state and federal sources. Some of the grant sources used to date by the Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District include:

- 1974 Park Bond Act
- 1976 Park Bond Act
- Land and Water Conservation Act
- State Urban Park Program (SB-174)
- HUD

Local funds have generally been used to pay for the development of the existing level of recreational facilities at Laguna Grande Regional Park. Development of Roberts Lake, which is not part of the regional park system, has been funded by the City of Seaside.

In order to complete the water quality improvements necessary to realize the full recreation and habitat potential of the two lakes, considerable additional funds will be needed. These funding requirements probably exceed the combined capabilities of the local jurisdictions and accordingly, outside sources of funds will be needed. Specific activities for which financing needs to be arranged include: detailed engineering design, cost, and operational studies for the construction of sediment basins in the Laguna Grande (Canyon Del Rey) watershed; initial and maintenance dredging of Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake and dredge spoils disposal; construction costs for sediment basins and related channel improvements; and installation of aeration equipment if desired.

The following discussion outlines various funding opportunities potentially available to support these activities. The section concludes by recommending some specific actions that should be taken to provide the necessary funding.
8.2 Federal Grant Programs

(No information has been developed on Federal Sources).

8.3 State Grant Programs

The State of California administers a variety of grants and financial assistance programs, several of which may be suitable for use for wetlands restoration, management and enhancement. The availability of any particular grant program varies from year to year depending on fund balances, legislative restrictions etc. Many grant programs are offered only until the initial funds are used by grantees. Invariably grants are awarded on a competitive basis and competition is extremely keen.

A state booklet entitled State Funding Sources Related to Parks and Recreation published in August 1983 lists several grants that may be suitable for use at Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake. A listing and description of these is attached as Appendix A. Not on the list is the proposed A.B. 2099, 1984 Park Bond Act by local Assemblyman Sam Farr. This bill provides $79,000 for the Monterey Regional Park District.

8.4 Local Funding-Multi Jurisdiction

Laguna Grande is a regional park that serves all of the incorporated cities on the Monterey Peninsula and large portions of the county as well. Consequently, improvements to water quality at the lake are of direct benefit to all of these jurisdictions. Increased sediment production and water pollutions, that has caused the needs for sediment basins dredging and related work has occurred as a result of land use practices throughout the water shed of Laguna Grande and Roberts Lakes. The cities of Seaside, Monterey, Del Rey Oaks, Monterey County, and Ford Ord all have territory located in the watershed and all share responsibility for maintenance of water quality within the watershed. Moreover, the solution to controlling sedimentation of the two lakes can probably only be solved by cooperative action and coordinated financial support from all of the entities in the watershed. Two funding mechanisms are apparent:
8.4.1 Zone of Benefit—Monterey County Flood Control and Water Conservation District

A Zone of Benefit of the Monterey County Flood Control and Water District (MCFCWCD) could be formed with an area drawn to encompass the boundaries of the Canyon Del Rey watershed. The purpose of the Zone of Benefit would be to provide a taxing basis to raise funds for flood control work in the watershed, to spread these costs equitably to all landowners within the watershed, and to provide a single agency (MCFCWCD) to carry out the necessary engineering and management responsibilities.

Procedures required to form a Zone of Benefit generally are as follows: A petition would be drafted by interested property owners (cities of Seaside, Monterey, Del Rey Oaks, etc.) describing the need for flood control improvements such as channel work, erosion control, sediment basins, and dredging of Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake; an assessment report would be prepared by MCFCWCD showing assessment roles; MCFCWCD Board (Monterey County Board of Supervisors) would hold a hearing; a vote would be required of qualified voters during a general or special election and 50% of those voting must approve formation of the zone. Subsequent to formation of the zone, taxes would be levied and funds accrued to support flood control work. This would be an on-going source of funds. The MCFCWCD could provide staff assistance to manage the activities of the Zone of Benefit.

8.4.2 Local Bond Issue

Under the provisions of the "1913 Municipal Improvement Act" a bond issue could be proposed and brought to public vote. It would be necessary to establish the amount of the bond issue by determining the costs of improvements (sediment basins) and maintenance (dredging). This would first require that preliminary engineering and design studies be completed. The amount of revenue to be generated by the bonds would be uncertain.
8.5 Local Funding—Single Jurisdiction

8.5.1 Use of Local Funds

The City of Seaside has established a "Laguna Grande Park/Roberts Lake Park Development Fund" (Ordinance 618), whereby twenty-five percent (25%) of the occupancy tax and sales tax revenue derived from Laguna Grande hotel/commercial development, not to exceed $100,000 per year, will be deposited in the fund until park development is complete. At that point any fund balance will be transferred to the general fund and the special fund will be terminated. At present no revenues have been generated by this fund since the hotel/commercial development is not yet operating.

The City of Seaside could consider extending this special fund to apply to all future commercial development adjacent to the two lakes on the premiss that improvements to the lakes are of benefit to the economic well-being of any business located adjacent to it. This reasoning could be further extended to include use of some portion of the occupancy and sales tax revenue generated by hotel/commercial development in the Beach Sub-area, or in other parts of the city for improvements of the two lakes. Seaside could also consider amending Ordinance 618 to provide for the permanent, on-going use of some portion of the occupancy and sales tax revenues for periodic maintenance of sediment basins and dredging that will be required at the lakes.

The Cities of Monterey and Del Rey Oaks could enact similar provisions and thereby assist in raising funds for lake improvements. Programs of this kind do not however, represent new money to the local jurisdictions but rather an allocation of general fund revenues to a specific project.

8.5.2 Development Fees

The public jurisdictions in the Canyon Del Rey watershed could establish one-time development fees applicable to most types of development. Such fees would be based on the need to make water quality improvements including sediment traps, sediment basins
and lake dredging. The amount of such fees would need to be established by each jurisdiction in a way that would equitably reflect either the jurisdiction's proportional contribution to sedimentation of the lakes, or the degree to which the developments would benefit from improved flood control or water quality within the watershed.

Monterey County has already established the "Drainage Improvements Fund for Canyon Del Rey" for the purpose of making channel and other flood control improvements resulting from development of the Laguna Seca Ranch #2 subdivision. The County charges all major and minor subdivisions in the area a one-time fee of $60 per gross acre. No expenditures have been made by the County and the current balance of the fund is about $30,000. These monies may be available for construction of sediment basins within the watershed or for use to pay for engineering design studies throughout the basin. The fund is a useful model that the other agencies might consider for their own areas of jurisdiction.

8.5.3 Sale/Lease of Public Properties

Several parcels adjacent to Laguna Grande are in public ownership. Some of these are owned by the City of Seaside and are within the Laguna Grande Redevelopment Area. Another parcel, fronting on Fremont Avenue is owned by the Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District and is intended for use as part of Laguna Grande Regional Park.

Consideration should be given by these two agencies, if conditions of title or other deed restrictions will permit, of the sale or lease of these parcels for private commercial development. Income generated from such uses would likely be significant and could substantially defray the costs of water quality improvements.

8.5.4. Appropriations from City General Funds

Seaside, Monterey, Del Rey Oaks and Monterey County could individually appropriate monies from their general funds to support water quality improvements at Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake.
Because appropriations from general funds would likely be very limited in amount, but also because they could be made quickly, such funds might be most suitably used to support studies of sediment basin localities and design and dredging plans.

8.5.5 Private Grants

Several private foundations operate in the Monterey Peninsula area and are interested in the environmental and recreational fields. While a specific listing of these sources is not included here, a general review of their past activity was made. Most of the private foundation activity has been devoted to purchase of land, maintenance of acquired areas, or educational programs. It does not appear promising that private funding will be available for the water quality improvements needed at Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake, nor that if it were available that it would be in the amounts needed. Non-the-less, because several major foundations are locally represented this an avenue that can be pursued.

8.6 Recommendations

Obtaining adequate funding for water quality improvements is a major challenge particularly in view of the significant costs for dredging and spoils disposal. An overall strategy is needed to give direction and momentum to the development of a funding program.

A number of different funding opportunities are potentially available. The selection of which sources are developed should reflect specific needs. The funding strategy should differentiate between funding for initial engineering studies, large one-time costs for construction of sediment ponds, dredging and dredge disposal, and on-going cleaning of sediment ponds and maintenance dredging. Local funding sources may be adequate to pay for initial studies, on-going maintenance, and perhaps even part of the cost of constructing the sediment ponds. Initial dredging of Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake, and disposal of dredge spoils will in all likelihood require major state or federal grants.
The funding strategy selected should also differentiate between immediate actions and long-term needs. Reducing the rate of further sedimentation of the lakes is the most immediate priority. Accordingly funds for this work needs to be developed as soon as possible.

The following recommendations are based upon the information presented earlier in this section, upon a review of past funding activities at Laguna Grande, and upon discussions with local public officials and state agency representatives. Specific recommendations concerning the most suitable grants to pursue have not been made. Major grant applications for initial dredging work should probably be postponed until engineering and design studies have been completed and accurate cost information is developed.

1. The Laguna Grande JPA, which presently consists of the Cities of Seaside and Monterey and the Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District should be expanded to include all of the jurisdictions in the Canyon Del Rey watershed in order to maximize support for the development of funds for water quality improvements. The present JPA should formally request that Monterey County, Del Rey Oaks, Ford Ord and the Monterey Peninsula Airport District join the JPA and actively support its fund raising efforts.

2. The JPA should develop a coordinated short and long-range funding strategy to cover the requirements of all aspects of water quality improvements to Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake. Specific responsibilities for tasks set forth in the funding strategy should be assigned to designated staff of the member agencies. A time schedule for completing these tasks should be adopted and maintained. In general, the manager of the Regional Park District should lead major fund raising efforts, but he should receive assistance from the staff of the other agencies.

3. The JPA should act in concert in efforts to obtain financing for water quality improvements. Major grant applications
should be supported by resolutions of the governing bodies of the members of the JPA.

4. In general, the JPA should aggressively pursue every potential grant source capable of providing major funding. This may require making multiple applications each year. JPA staff should work closely with local state and federal representatives including Assemblyman Sam Farr, State Senator Henry Mello, and Congressman Leon Panetta in order to keep informed of potential funding sources and to focus efforts on obtaining funds. If JPA staff needs assistance in preparing grant applications, member agencies should consider contributing sufficient funds to employ a consultant to help prepare applications.

5. The JPA should develop and endorse a 'fair share' plan by which each member agency contributes to locally funded costs of water quality improvements based upon that jurisdiction's proportionate contribution to the sedimentation of Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake. The 'fair share' formula should be developed by qualified public or private engineers based on a study of major sediment sources in the watershed.

6. The JPA should formally request the Monterey County Flood Control and Water Conservation District to allocate funds from the "Drainage Improvements Fund for Canyon Del Rey" to the study of sediment basin design in the watershed. The JPA may also wish to request that the MCFCWCD organize and manage this study. If assistance from MCFCWCD is not available the JPA should commission engineering and design studies for sediment basins and request that member agencies contribute the cost of such studies.

7. The JPA should request proposals from qualified engineering firms for detailed feasibility and design studies for initial dredging and spoils disposal at Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake. Subsequently the JPA should apply to the California Coastal Conservancy for grant funds to support the engineering studies.
8. The JPA should petition the MCFCWCD to establish a Zone of Benefit for flood control improvements in the Canyon Del Rey watershed.

9. Monterey County should expand requirements for developer contributions to water quality improvements to cover all developable lands within county portions of the watershed.

10. The Cities of Monterey and Del Rey Oaks should review City of Seaside Ordinance 618 and the County's "Drainage Improvements Fund for Canyon Del Rey" to determine whether similar ordinances should be adopted in their respective jurisdictions.

11. The City of Seaside should amend Ordinance 618 to apply to all future commercial development adjacent to Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake and should also extend the ordinance indefinately.

12. The Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District and the City of Seaside should evaluate the desirability of selling or leasing publicly owned vacant parcels contiguous to Laguna Grande for commercial development in order to raise funds for water quality improvements.

13. The City of Del Rey Oaks should consider the use of city owned land behind Monte Mart for sediment basin purposes.
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APPENDIX A

CALIFORNIA COASTAL ACT POLICIES
NATURAL SYSTEMS

SENSITIVE HABITATS, WATER AND MARINE RESOURCES

L PURPOSE

A. DEFINITION AND IMPORTANCE OF SENSITIVE HABITATS

The Coastal Act (Section 30107.5) defines "environmentally sensitive areas" as any areas in which plant or animal life or their habitats are either rare or especially valuable because of their special nature or role in an eco-system and which could be easily disturbed or degraded by human activities and developments. These areas include:

- areas of special biological significance as identified by the State Water Resources Control Board (for prohibition of sewage discharge to certain water bodies);
- rare and endangered species habitat identified by the State Department of Fish and Game;
- all coastal wetlands and lagoons;
- all marine, wildlife, and education/research reserves;
- nearshore reefs, tidepools, seacaves, islets, offshore rocks, kelp beds;
- indigenous dune plant habitats;
- wilderness and primitive areas.

In this report, the terms "environmentally sensitive areas" and "sensitive habitats" are synonymous.

B. COASTAL ACT POLICIES

The Coastal Act contains the following policies for the protection, maintenance, enhancement, and restoration of sensitive habitats, water availability, and biological productivity:

Section 30240. (a) Environmentally sensitive habitat areas shall be protected against any significant disruption of habitat values, and only uses dependent on such resources shall be allowed within such areas. ("Uses dependent on such resources" include nature education and research, hunting, fishing, and aquaculture. Source: Local Coastal Program Manual.)

(b) Development in areas adjacent to environmentally sensitive habitat areas and parks and recreation areas shall be sited and designed to prevent impacts which would significantly degrade such areas, and shall be compatible with the continuance of such habitat areas.
Section 30230. Marine resources shall be maintained, enhanced, and where feasible, restored. Special protection shall be given to areas and species of special biological or economic significance. Uses of the marine environment shall be carried out in a manner that will sustain the biological productivity of coastal waters and that will maintain healthy populations of all species of marine organisms adequate for long-term commercial, recreational, scientific, and educational purposes.

Section 30231. The biological productivity and the quality of coastal waters, streams, wetlands, estuaries, and lakes appropriate to maintain optimum populations of marine organisms and for the protection of human health shall be maintained and, where feasible, restored through, among other means, minimizing adverse effects of waste water discharges and entrainment, controlling runoff, preventing depletion of groundwater supplies and substantial interference with surface water flow, encouraging waste water reclamation, maintaining natural vegetation buffer areas that protect riparian habitats, and minimizing alteration of natural streams.

Pursuant to Sections 30007.5 and 30250 of the Coastal Act, protection of resources — including sensitive habitats, marine resources, and water quality — has priority over all other land uses. Other priorities, in order of precedence, are maintaining agricultural production and providing sites for coastal-dependent industry; maximizing public access and recreational opportunities; and lastly, general, residential and commercial uses.
30223. (a) The diking, filling, or dredging of open coastal waters, wetlands, estuaries, and lakes shall be permitted in accordance with other applicable provisions of this division, 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 the following:

(1) New or expanded port, energy, and coastal-dependent industrial facilities, including commercial fishing facilities.

(2) Maintaining existing, or restoring previously dredged, depths in existing navigational channels, turning basins, vessel berthing and mooring areas, and boat launching ramps.

(3) In wetland areas only; entrance channels for new or expanded boating facilities; and in a degraded wetland, identified by the Department of Fish and Game pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 30411, for boating facilities if, in conjunction with such boating facilities, a substantial portion of the degraded wetland is restored and maintained as a biologically productive wetland; provided, however, that in no event shall the size of the wetland area used for such boating facility, including berthing space, turning basins, necessary navigation channels, and any necessary support service facilities, be greater than 25 percent of the total wetland area to be restored.

(4) In open coastal waters, other than wetlands, including streams, estuaries, and lakes, new or expanded boating facilities.

(5) Incidental public service purposes, including, but not limited to, burying cables and pipes or inspection of piers and maintenance of existing intake and outfall lines.

(6) Mineral extraction, including sand for restoring beaches, except in environmentally sensitive areas.

(7) Restoration purposes.

(8) Nature study, aquaculture, or similar resource-dependent activities.

(b) Dredging and spoils disposal shall be planned and carried out to avoid significant disruption to marine and wildlife habitats and water circulation. Dredge spoils suitable for beach replenishment should be transported for such purposes to appropriate beaches or into suitable longshore current systems.
(c) In addition to the other provisions of this section, diking, filling, or dredging in existing estuaries and wetlands shall maintain or enhance the functional capacity of the wetland or estuary. Any alteration of coastal wetlands identified by the Department of Fish and Game, including, but not limited to, the 19 coastal wetlands identified in its report entitled, “Acquisition Priorities for the Coastal Wetlands of California”, shall be limited to very minor incidental public facilities, restorative measures, nature study, commercial fishing facilities in Bodega Bay, and development in already developed parts of south San Diego Bay, if otherwise in accordance with this division.

30235. Revetments, breakwaters, groins, harbor channels, seawalls, cliff retaining walls, and other such construction that alters natural shoreline processes shall be permitted 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 shoreline sand supply. Existing marine structures causing water stagnation contributing to pollution problems and fishkills should be phased out or upgraded where feasible.
APPENDIX B

GUIDELINES FOR THE
REVEGETATION OF
NATIVE CALIFORNIA PLANTS
AT
LAGUNA GRANDE AND ROBERT'S LAKE
COAST LIVE OAK

Quercus agrifolia

APPEARANCE

Form/Shape- A tree with a broad, rounded crown which often is broader than it is high.

Foliage- Evergreen. Leaves are recurved, holly-like, 1-3 inches (2.5-7.5 cm.), leathery, oval to broadly elliptical with even tooth pattern, and are dark green.

Height at Maturity- 30-75 feet (9-23 m).

Spread at Maturity- 60-100 feet (18-30 m).

Flowers- Catkins appear from February to April. Striped acorns ripen first fall.

GROWTH RATE/MAXIMUM AGE

The growth rate is slow, but more rapid when young. The maximum age is 100-300 years.

ECOLOGICAL RELATIONSHIPS

Native Range- Sonoma County to San Diego County in valleys and lower elevations of the Coast Ranges.

Climate Zones- 7-9, 14-24

Plant Communities- Mixed Evergreen Forest, Foothill woodland.

Plant Associations-
Quercus lobata,
Quercus douglasii,
Platanus racemosa,
Arbutus menziesii,
Quercus wislizenii,
Arctostaphylos spp.,
Pseudotsuga menziesii,
Sequoia sempervirens.

WILDLIFE HABITAT VALUE

The acorns are an excellent food source for mallards, pintails, woodducks, clapper rails, pheasants, pigeons, quail, blackbirds, crows, jays, meadowlarks, thrushes, woodpeckers, titmice, starlings, thrashers, rabbits, foxes, muskrats, raccoons, squirrels, mice and woodrats. Has some value as browse for deer.

EROSION CONTROL VALUE

The deep, greedy roots provide good erosion control.
DESIGN/LANDSCAPING VALUE

It is a handsome "character" tree of California and provides good shade in groves or as a specimen tree. Established oaks are a treasure, a precious asset. Never but NEVER plant a lawn beneath one.

ADVERSE CHARACTERISTICS

It can have a messy leaf drop in early spring and sporadically throughout the year. Leaves, buds, and unleached acorns are mildly toxic to humans when eaten.

DISEASE & PEST SUSCEPTIBILITY

It is susceptible to oak moth larvae, goat moths, aphids, mites, white flies, scale insects, powdery mildew (when watered, fertilized, or heavily pruned), oak root fungus, and crown rot. Oak root fungus remains in the soil and can infect other plants, even after the oak is removed. Of the oaks, this species is the most severely damaged by oak leaf caterpillars (oak moth larvae). Most susceptible of all Pacific Coast oaks to rot.

PLANTING LOCATION

Area suitability—Foothills, Flatlands.

Channel location—Upper slope, top of bank, outside maintenance road, outside levee slope.

PLANT REQUIREMENTS

Exposure—Prefers sun but tolerates some shade especially when young. It can withstand wind and seashore conditions, but will be stunted.

Soil Tolerance—Tolerates many soil types, even heavy soils, but prefers loam with a gravelly subsoil.

Moisture Requirements—Established trees do not tolerate summer watering unless planted as nursery stock, in which case they can be good lawn trees. Requires good drainage and is drought tolerant once established.

MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS

For established trees, do not raise or lower grade level between the trunk and the drip line. Do not allow the soil to become compacted around the tree. Never water within four feet of the trunk or allow standing water around the trunk. Deep watering at the drip line is best. Plant only drought tolerant plants underneath the tree. Do not plant lawns or other ground covers that require regular watering.

Avoid excessive pruning because it may stimulate succulent new growth which is subject to powdery mildew.

PROPAGATION

Acorns ripen in September and October and must be sown when fresh. Sprout acorns between layers of moss or in sand, perlite, or vermiculite in a plastic bag placed in a refrigerator. Plant sprouted acorns when the taproot is 1" to 2" long. If sprouts are to be planted out directly do not trim taproot. Trim 1/2" from taproot if sprouts are to be planted in containers.

PLANTING OPTIONS

Seeds, container stock.
PLANTING PROCEDURES

Seed- Select fresh, plump, fallen acorns, free of worm holes. Remove the caps and place acorns in water, discard those which float. Plant acorns on or just beneath the soil surface. A screen can protect acorns from jays and squirrels. Seed can also be sprouted between layers of damp peat moss for about two weeks. To plant the sprouted seeds, clip roots to promote branching and place in holes just deep enough for the acorns to be covered. (Do not clip taproot if sprouts are to be planted out directly). At the bottom of each hole, poke a vertical hole to take the sprouted taproot. The first leaves should appear in 6-8 weeks. Seeds can also be planted in one gallon containers, allowed to grow until 8" - 12" high, and then planted in place. Water plants weekly the first two months, then monthly. Slow, deep watering encourages deep rooting. Make sure the plant has good drainage. Remove any crossing limbs in the early years of growth.

Container stock- Be sure the taproot is not coiled around the inside of the container. A coiled taproot should be carefully removed, and the wound painted with a suitable root sealant. Plants 5-8 feet high are not hurt by having the vertical root cut in transplanting if the rootball is otherwise big and firm.

Cuttings- No reliable method for rooting oak cuttings has been developed.

NURSERY LEAD TIME FOR PLANTING STOCK

One gallon: 8 months.
Five gallon: 2 years.
Fifteen gallon: 3 years.
An easy nursery crop, if mildew is controlled.

REMARKS

This is the most frequent and characteristic tree of the California Coast Range Valleys.
VALLEY OAK

Quercus lobata

APPEARANCE

Form/shape—A large, rounded tree. The crown is often broader than high and has pendulous branches when older. When young, the tree is more erect.

Foliage—Deciduous. Leaves are deeply cut into 7-11 rounded lobes and are about 2 1/2-4 inches (6.5-10 cm) long. They are dark green above and more pale beneath.

Height at Maturity—50-80+ feet (15-25+ m).

Spread at Maturity—50-70+ feet (15-21+ m).

Flower—Catkins appear from March to April. Acorn ripens first fall following catkins.

GROWTH RATE/MAXIMUM AGE

The growth rate is rapid when young, moderate later. The maximum age is 300-400 years.

ECOLOGICAL RELATIONSHIPS

Native Range—Valleys of Western and Central California and the inner Coast Ranges except close to the sea.

Climate Zones—1-3, 6-16, 18-21.

Plant Communities—Foothill Woodlands.

Plant Associations—Quercus agrifolia, Quercus douglasii, Quercus wislizenii

WILDLIFE HABITAT VALUE

The acorns are an excellent food source for mallards, pintails, woodducks, clapper rails, pheasant, pigeons, quail, blackbirds, crows, jays, meadowlarks, foxes, thrushes, woodpeckers, rabbits, titmice, starlings, mice, thrashers, muskrats, raccoons, squirrels, and woodrats. Has some browse value for deer.

EROSION CONTROL VALUE

The roots are deep and provide good erosion control.

DESIGN/LANDSCAPING VALUE

It is a handsome, massive tree when mature and provides excellent shade. Established oaks are a treasure, a precious asset. Never, but NEVER plant a lawn beneath one.
ADVERSE CHARACTERISTICS

The tree may drop limbs without warning especially when dry. Leaves, buds, and unleached acorns are mildly toxic to humans when eaten.

DISEASE & PEST SUSCEPTIBILITY

It is susceptible to oak moth larvae, goat moths, aphids, mites, white flies, scale insects, powdery mildew, anthracnose, oak root fungus, and crown rot. Oak root fungus remains in the soil and can infect other plants, even after the oak is removed.

PLANTING LOCATION

Area suitability- Foothills, Flatlands.

Channel location- Upper slope, top of bank, outside maintenance road.

PLANT REQUIREMENTS

Exposure- Prefers full sun; young plants can withstand some shade.

Soil Tolerance- Prefers rich, loamy soils but tolerates many soil types including heavy clay and moderately alkaline soils.

Moisture Requirements- Requires good drainage and is drought tolerant once established.

MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS

For established trees, do not raise or lower grade level between the trunk and the drip line. Do not allow the soil to become compacted around the tree.

Never water within four feet of the trunk or allow standing water around the trunk. Deep watering at the drip line is best. Plant only drought tolerant plants underneath the tree. Do not plant lawns or other ground covers that require regular watering. Avoid excessive pruning because it may stimulate succulent new growth which is subject to powdery mildew. Between ages of 5-10 years pocket gophers may be a great hazard because they eat the roots.

PROPAGATION

Seed is ripe in September and October and must be sown when fresh. Sprout acorns between layers of moss or in sand, perlite, or vermiculite in a plastic bag placed in a refrigerator. Plant sprouted acorns when the taproot is 1" to 2" long. If sprouts are to be planted out directly do not trim taproot. Trim 1/2" from taproot if sprouts are to be planted in containers.

PLANTING OPTIONS

Seeds, container stock.
PLANTING PROCEDURES

Seed—Select fresh, plump, fallen acorns, free of worm holes. Remove the caps and place acorns in water, discard those which float. Plant acorns on or just beneath the soil surface. A screen can protect acorns from jays and squirrels. Planting can be done anytime of the year. Seed can also be sprouted between layers of damp peat moss for about two weeks. To plant the sprouted seeds, clip roots to promote branching and place in holes just deep enough for the acorns to be covered. (Do not clip taproot if sprouts are to be planted out directly). At the bottom of each hole, poke a vertical hole to take the sprouted tap root. The first leaves should appear in 6-8 weeks. Seeds can also be planted in 1 gallon containers, allowed to grow until 8"-12" high, and then planted in place. Water plants weekly the first two months, then monthly. Slow, deep watering encourages deep rooting. Make sure the plant has good drainage. Remove any crossing limbs in the early years of growth.

Container stock—Be sure the taproot is not coiled around the inside of the container. A coiled taproot should be carefully removed, and the wound painted with a suitable root sealant. Plants 5-8 feet high are not hurt by having the vertical root cut in transplanting if the rootball is otherwise big and firm.

Cuttings—No reliable method for rooting oak cuttings has been developed.

NURSERY LEAD TIME FOR PLANTING STOCK

One gallon: 10 months.
Five gallon: 2 years.
Fifteen gallon: 3 years.

REMARKS

Said to be North America’s largest oak. Called Roble (Ro-blé) by the Spanish-Californians. Valley oak acorns were highly valued by California Indians because the acorns are sweet. This species, where growing natively, is an indicator of deep, rich soil. This species is adaptable to a wide range of growing conditions; however, individual trees require consistent treatment.
FREMONT COTTONWOOD

Populus fremontii

APPEARANCE

Form/Shape- A tall, broad, open crowned tree.

Foliage- Deciduous. Leaves are heart-shaped, coarsely toothed, 4 inches (10 cm) long, and yellow-green in color, turning lemon yellow in the fall. The leaves are often retained through most of the winter.

Height at Maturity- 40-90 feet (12-28 m).

Spread at Maturity- 30-50 feet (9-15 m).

Flowers- Catkins appear in March and April before the leaves come out.

GROWTH RATE/MAXIMUM AGE

The growth rate is rapid. The maximum age is 50 to 100 years.

ECOLOGICAL RELATIONSHIPS

Native Range- Sacramento River Valley and Western bordering hills, Sierra Foot hills in Southern California, along rivers for the Mojave Desert.

Climate Zones- 7-24.

Plant Communities- Along streams in many plant communities.

Plant Associations- Salix spp., Alnus rhombifolia, Platanus racemosa.

WILDLIFE HABITAT VALUE

The seeds are a food source for squirrels, meadow mice, and foxes. Fair quality browse for deer.

EROSION CONTROL VALUE

The deep, invasive roots provide good erosion control.

DESIGN/LANDSCAPING VALUE

Fremont Cottonwood is a good shade tree and provides a good windbreak when planted in groves. In fall, the leaves are an attractive yellow.
ADVERSE CHARACTERISTICS

Plant only male trees because female trees produce masses of cottony seeds that can be very messy. Don't plant near sewer lines and septic tanks because the roots are invasive near water. The tree is not suitable for city streets, lawns, or small gardens. Suckers badly, breaks easily.

DISEASE & PEST SUSCEPTIBILITY

It is susceptible to canker, leaf spot, hosts mistletoe, and is susceptible to wetwood (a bacterial infection).

PLANTING LOCATION

Area Suitability- Flatland.

Channel Location- Lower slope, middle slope, upper slope,

PLANT REQUIREMENTS

Exposure- Prefers full sun. Not tolerant of shade.

Soil Tolerance- Tolerates many soil types but best in sandy, humus soil in river bottoms.

Moisture Requirements- Requires constant moisture; must be watered regularly if planted in desert areas. It is drought tolerant if roots tap a good underground water source.

MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS

A low maintenance tree, but requires a few deep waterings during the dry season where planted away from permanent water.

PROPAGATION

Seeds ripen on female trees in summer. Use fresh seeds; no treatment is necessary. Easily grown from hardwood cuttings taken in midwinter.

PLANTING OPTIONS

Seeds, to produce male and female trees, cuttings, and container stock of selected forms like 'Nevada' if male trees are desired.

PLANTING PROCEDURES

Surface sterilize all cuttings to prevent spread of canker diseases. Can be planted any-time of the year if irrigated for establishment.

NURSERY LEAD TIME FOR PLANTING STOCK

One gallon: 6-8 months.
Five gallon: 15 months.

REMARKS

These trees are water indicators. Excellent streamside species where their vigorous spread would not cause problems.
ARROYO WILLOW

Salix lasiolaris

APPEARANCE

Form/Shape- An erect shrub or small tree.

Foliage- Deciduous. Leaves are 2 1/2-4 inches (6-10 cm) long, narrow and dark green; pubescent to glaucous underneath.

Height at Maturity- 6-30 feet (1.8-9 m).

Spread at Maturity- 6-15 feet (1.8-4.5 m).

Flowers- Catkins appear from February to April.

GROWTH RATE/MAXIMUM AGE

The growth rate is rapid. The maximum age is probably under 50 years.

ECOLOGICAL RELATIONSHIPS

Native Range- Streambeds throughout California.

Climate Zones- All zones.

Plant Communities- Many plant communities.

Plant Associations- Alnus rhombifolia, Acer macrophyllum, Salix laevigata, Platanus racemosa.

WILDLIFE HABITAT VALUE

Arroyo willow is a good source for gray squirrels, woodrats, and meadow mice. Avidly browsed by deer, but only of fair food value.

EROSION CONTROL VALUE

The shallow, long, rigid, invasive roots provide good erosion control.

DESIGN/LANDSCAPING VALUE

It is good in areas that undergo inundation.

ADVERSE CHARACTERISTICS

The roots are invasive and can be troublesome near sewer pipes, water lines, and septic tank systems.

DISEASE & PEST SUSCEPTIBILITY

It is susceptible to aphids, and aphid galls, leaf spotting fungi, and powdery mildew.

PLANTING LOCATION

Area Suitability- Foothills, Flatlands.
Channel Location - Streambed, toe of channel, lower slope, middle slope.

PLANT REQUIREMENTS

Exposure - Prefers full sun but is shade tolerant.

Soil Tolerance - Tolerates many soil types, including clay hardpan, shallow soil and sandy soil, but not heavy soils.

Moisture Requirements - Tolerates inundation. Requires high soil moisture but does not have high water requirements once established.

MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS

Deep watering encourages deep rooting.

PROPAGATION

Seeds ripen in the summer; they are viable for only a few days; no treatment is necessary. Cuttings are best when taken when the tree is dormant late fall to mid-winter. Cuttings may also be taken as new leaves begin to emerge.

PLANTING OPTIONS

Cuttings, seeds.

PLANTING PROCEDURES

Cuttings - Make each cutting at least 2 1/2 feet (7.5 dm) long with a diameter not greater than 2 inches (5 cm) at the largest end and 1/4 inch (5 mm) at the tip. For reference purposes make a slanted cut at the butt end and square cut at the tip. Cuttings should be planted the same day they are taken and should be kept moist. They should be planted in sunlit locations with plenty of moisture all year. Plant the cuttings in prepared holes or push them into saturated soils, butt end down at least 1 foot with at least 2 nodes above the ground.

NURSERY LEAD TIME FOR PLANTING STOCK

Little or no commercial availability.

REMARKS

Easy to grow from fresh cuttings.
WHITE ALDER

*Alnus rhombifolia*

**Appearance**

Form/Shape- A tall, round topped tree; pyramidal when young (to 40' or 14 m).

Foliage- Deciduous. Leaves are 2-3 inches (5-7.5 cm) long, oblong to ovate, doubly toothed, and bright, glossy green.

Height at Maturity- 50-90 feet (15-29 m).

Spread at Maturity- 30-40 feet (9-12 m).

Flowers- Pendulous catkins that appear in winter.

**Growth Rate/Maximum Age**

The growth rate is very rapid. The maximum age is generally under 100 years.

**Ecological Relationships**

Native Range- Found along permanent water courses and in meadows of most of California, except along the coast.

Climate Zones- 1-9, 14-21.

Plant Communities- Chapparal, Foothill Woodland, Yellow Pine Forest.

Plant Associations- *Platanus racemosa*, *Acer macrophyllum*, *Populus sp.*, *Salix spp.*

**Wildlife Habitat Value**

White alder seeds are a food source for goldfinches and other perching birds. Thickets provide effective wildlife cover.

**Erosion Control Value**

The roots are shallow, invasive, and provide good erosion control where water is plentiful.

**Design/Landscaping Value**

White alder is very fast-growing and useful as a lawn tree, hedge, or large divider tree. It has a short winter interval without leaves and a beautiful gray trunk.
ADVERSE CHARACTERISTICS

Do not plant near sewer or water lines or septic tank systems because this tree's shallow root system may aggressively invade and damage them.

DISEASE & PEST SUSCEPTIBILITY

It is sometimes susceptible to aphids & caterpillars but usually pest-free.

PLANTING LOCATION

Area Suitability— Foothills, Flatlands.

Channel Location— Toe of channel, lower slope.

PLANT REQUIREMENTS

Exposure— Prefers full sun but tolerates shade. Best growth with moderate overhead light.

Soil Tolerance— Prefers rich, humus soils, but is suitable on clay hardpan or sandy soil.

Moisture Requirements— Requires ample, perennial moisture to look its best, but survives as a street tree with normal rainfall.

MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS

Pruning is usually not necessary.

PROPAGATION

Seed ripens from late fall to winter and germinates without treatment. Cuttings do not root easily, and should be rooted in greenhouse or nursery for best results. Also propagates on-site by underground rhizomes, suckers, and basal sprouts.

PLANTING OPTIONS

Seed, container stock.

PLANTING PROCEDURES

Plants are easily handled and transplanted when young. The best time to plant is October, or throughout the winter.

NURSERY LEAD TIME FOR PLANTING STOCK

One gallon: 6 months.
Five gallon: 18 months - 2 years.

REMARKS

In the wild, alders develop root nodules which allow them to fix nitrogen and can enrich the nitrogen content of the soil. The tree is a water indicator whose leaves have the pleasant odor of fall. Usually appear in stands or at least multi-stemmed specimens when near water. Relatively heat-tolerant.
BREWER'S SALTBUSSH

Atriplex lentiformis var. breueri

APPEARANCE

Form/Shape- A dome-shaped dense shrub.

Foliage- Nearly evergreen. Leaves are 1-2 inches (2.5-5 cm) long, oval, bluish-gray, with smooth margins.

Height at Maturity- 5-7 feet (1.5-3 m).

Spread at Maturity- 6-8 feet (1.8-2.4 m).

Flowers- Tiny, greenish in large branched clusters, appearing from August to October.

GROWTH RATE/MAXIMUM AGE

Growth rate is rapid. The maximum age is unknown.

ECOLOGICAL RELATIONSHIPS

Native Range- On the coast from San Francisco Bay to Orange County inland to Riverside County.

Climate Zones- 8, 19, 14-24.

Plant Communities- Coastal Sage Scrub.

Plant Associations- Salix spp., Populus spp., Diplacus aurantiacus, Artemisia californica.

WILDLIFE HABITAT VALUE

The seeds are a good food source for Canada geese, quail, jack-rabbit, gophers, pocket mice, and kangaroo rats and possible forage for deer. Excellent cover for upland game birds.

EROSION CONTROL VALUE

The roots provide some erosion control.

DESIGN/LANDSCAPING VALUE

Brewers saltbush can be hedge pruned and provides a solid cover. It is useful as a wind screen, is fire retardant, and does well in hot areas. Not a showy plant, but the gray-white foliage is striking.

ADVERSE CHARACTERISTICS

Dead flowers and seed pods on female plants can appear messy if not pruned off.
DISEASE & PEST SUSCEPTIBILITY

It is susceptible to aphids.

PLANTING LOCATION

Area Suitability- Foothills, Flatlands, Bayside.

Channel Location-. Top of bank, outside maintenance road, outside levee slope.

PLANT REQUIREMENTS

Exposure- Prefers full sun; tolerates salt spray and wind.

Soil Tolerance- Tolerates unusually harsh soil conditions including alkaline and saline and dry or infertile conditions. It can grow on reclaimed marine soil or pure sand.

Moisture Requirements- Drought tolerant, but also tolerates considerable moisture.

MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS

It can tolerate pruning but does not require it. If heavily sheared in spring, it will remain bushy and full.

PROPAGATION

Seeds are ripe in the winter. Cuttings root easily most of the year.

PLANTING OPTIONS

Seeds, cuttings, layering, container plants.

PLANTING PROCEDURES

The best time to plant is fall.

NURSERY LEAD TIME FOR PLANTING STOCK

One gallon: 6 months.

REMARKS

Excellent for bank and spoils reclamation. May lose a branch occasionally to unknown causes. Very brittle.
CULTIVATED OAT

* * * * *

Avena sativa

The cultivated oat is an introduced annual cereal grass that grows 1-2 1/2 feet (3-7 dm) high. It grows quickly and provides good cover and erosion control; however, it does not reseed well, and can become a fire hazard. The plant grows in many soil conditions and requires little maintenance. The seed can be hydromulched at a rate of 300 lbs/acre on 5-10% slopes. Cattle can be poisoned due to a build up of nitrates. Horses and cattle have been lost due to the presence of a specific fungus, ergot. Waterbirds and songbirds frequently feed on the grain including California quail, Brewer's and redwing blackbirds, house finch, lesser goldfinch, and various ground squirrels and mice.

COMMON BARLEY

* * * * *

Hordeum vulgare

Barley is an introduced annual cereal grass that grows 2-3 feet (6-9 dm) high. It grows rapidly and provides excellent erosion control quickly, but does not reseed itself well. It is a moderate fire hazard and provides medium forage value for livestock. Little maintenance is required and it is tolerant of saline and alkaline soils. Seed should be applied at the rate of 300 lbs/acre on 0-5% slopes. In cold climates germination and growth are better than any other grass. It is good for late season planting. "Briggs" is the fastest growing variety. The grain is utilized by many waterfowl, upland gamebirds, songbirds and ground squirrels. Poisonous only if infected with specific fungus.
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WILDLIFE USE OF BULRUSHES FROM AMERICAN WILDLIFE & PLANTS
A GUIDE TO WILDLIFE FOOD HABITS: the use of trees, shrubs, weeds, and herbs by birds and mammals of the United States

by
Alexander C. Martin
Herbert S. Zim
and
Arnold L. Nelson
AMERICAN WILDLIFE & PLANTS
A GUIDE TO WILDLIFE FOOD HABITS: the use of trees, shrubs, weeds, and herbs by birds and mammals of the United States

BULRUSHES
Scirpus

[206 users] The 40 or more species of bulrush present in the United States form one of the most conspicuous plant groups in American marshlands. These representatives of the sedge family range considerably in size. Some are less than one foot high and hardly deserve the group name bulrush (implying large rush). On the other hand, tall species may reach a height of seven feet. Bulrushes vary in form and appearance: some have cylindrical or whip-like stems (round-stemmed group), some are triangular-stemmed and bare of leaves (threesquares), while still others have angular stems and conspicuous leaves or bracts (leafy bulrushes). The most important species in the three groups are:

ROUND-STEMMED BULRUSHES: Hardstem (acutus), mainly northern and western; softstem (validus), widespread; slender (heterocheatus), northern; southern (californicus), southern.

THREESQUARES: Common (americanus), widespread; Olney (olneyi), coastal and southwestern; Torrey (torreyi), northeastern; swamp (sturtevistii), southeastern.

LEAFY BULRUSHES: Alkali (palaeades), western; saltmarsh (robustus), coastal in East; river (fluvialis), northern.

The hard-coated seeds (achenes) of bulrushes are one of the more important and most commonly used foods of ducks and of certain marshbirds and shorebirds. The stems and underground parts are eaten by muskrats and geese. Furthermore, bulrushes furnish important nesting cover for waterfowl as well as for marsh wrens and blackbirds and give concealing protection to muskrats, otters, raccoons, and other animals.

An outstandingly important species, the country over, is the common threesquare (S. americanus). Ordinarily, it does not grow in extensive stands like some of the others, but it frequently forms fringes along the edge of ponds, lakes, and streams. These locations tend to make the plant’s seeds readily available to ducks. Its close relative, Olney threesquare, has little value for ducks but is one of the favorite foods of coastal muskrats.

Hardstem bulrush is the most common and valuable marsh plant of inland areas of the West, particularly in the Northwest. It tolerates some alkalinity but not so much as the alkali bulrush, another western species of considerable value. Saltmarsh bulrush is a useful food for ducks, geese, and muskrats along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts. Softstem and slender bulrushes and other species have value in their respective regions.

Waterfowl (seeds mainly)
*** Coost, NE and W, + SE

Duck
  • Baldpate, E, * W
  • Black, NE, * SE
  • Buffehead, NE and W
  • Canvasback, SE, + NE
  • Gadwall, SE, * W
  + Goldeneye, American, W
  • Mallard, Common, W, ** SE, * WI, + NE
  • Mottled, Gulf Coast
  • Pin-tail, NE and W, ** SE
  • Redhead, W, ** NE, + SE
  • Ring-necked, U.S.
  • Ruddy, W, ** E
  • Scap, Greater, W, + SE
  • Scap, Lesser, W, ** NE, + SE
  • Sho全面, SE, ** W
  • Teal, Blue-winged, W, ** E
  • Teal, Cinnamon, Mt.-Des.
  • Teal, Green-winged, U.S.
  • Teal, Blue-Green (stems)
  • Canada, Pac., ** Gulf Coast and Utah, + Atl. Coast
  • Snow, W, ** Gulf Coast (stems)
  • Tule, Calif. (stems)
  • Swan
  • Trumpeter, Mont. and B.C.
  • Whistling, E (seeds and stems)
  • Marshbirds and Shorebirds (seeds, rootstocks)
  • Avocet, W
  • Crane, Florida, Fla.

AABBREVIATIONS

PLANT PARTS
fr. = fruits
fl. = leaves
sd. = seeds
veg. = vegetative parts

REGIONS (in progression from East to West)
NE = Northeast
SE = Southeast
Mt.-Des. = Mountain-Desert
Pac. = Pacific

SEASONS
W = Winter (Nov. to Mar., typically)
Sp = Spring (April to May, typically)
Su = Summer (June to Aug., typically)
F = Fall (Sept. to Oct., typically)

EXTENT OF USE
  • = Use to an undetermined extent
  + = 1/2 to 2% of diet
  ++ = 2 to 5% of diet
  *** = 5 to 10% of diet
  **** = 10 to 15% of diet
  ***** = 15 to 25% of diet
  ****** = 25 to 50% of diet
  ******* = 50% or more of diet
APPENDIX D

SUMMARY OF STATE GRANT FUNDING SOURCES
PROGRAM

ROBERTI-Z'BERG URBAN OPEN-SPACE AND RECREATIONAL PROGRAM (Also called SB 174 or the Urban Grants Program)

California Department of Parks and Recreation
Office of Recreation and Local Services
P.O. Box 2390
Sacramento, CA 95811
(916) 445-4441

Purpose:

Acquisition and development (and operation and maintenance some years) of indoor and outdoor recreation areas and facilities. There is a competitive portion of this program available for communities on a need basis.

Specific annual budget allocations for this program allow up to 31% of block grant funds received by urbanized jurisdictions to be used, with some limitations, on operations and maintenance. Applications for need basis (competitive) grants are accepted separately for operations and maintenance projects. Funds for the program, authorized in the California Parklands Act of 1980, are for acquisition and development only.

Limitations:

75% state - 25% local matching program. Moneys available to local units of government. Acquisition projects may waive 25% matching funds when state approves criteria.

PROGRAM

1980 BOND ACT (CALIFORNIA PARKLANDS ACT OF 1980)

California Department of Parks and Recreation
Office of Recreation and Local Services
P.O. Box 2390
Sacramento, CA 95811
(916) 445-4441
Purpose: Acquisition and development of indoor and outdoor recreational areas and facilities and historic resources.

Limitations: There must be an approved Priority Plan for expenditure (distribution of funds). 100% development grants; 75% state/25% local match for acquisition unless exempt.

PROGRAM

CALIFORNIA CONSERVATION CORPS

California Conservation Corps
1530 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 445-6330

Purpose: To further the development and maintenance of the state's natural resources and environment; to accomplish useful and needed public service conservation work projects; to develop the natural environment to provide opportunities for greater public use.

PROGRAM

ENVIRONMENTAL LICENSE PLATE FUND

California Resources Agency
ELP Fund
The Resources Agency
1416 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 323-1971

Purpose: Provides funding for projects which help protect and/or preserve the environment and have one or more of the following purposes: control and abatement of air pollution; acquisition, preservation and restoration of natural areas; purchase of property for park purposes or public accessways to coastal areas; environmental education; enhancement of resources; protection of wildlife habitat; and protection of non-game species and rare and endangered plants and animals.
Limitations: The Environmental License Plate Fund is a special fund of the state budget. Funds can be appropriated by the Legislature to state agencies, cities, counties, and districts, the University of California, and private research organizations. A 12-month lead time is required before approved funds are available.

Deadline: August 15

PROGRAM

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD

Wildlife Conservation Board
California Department of Fish and Game
1416 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 445-8448

Purpose: Acquisition of land or interest in land for preservation of wildlife habitat or public access, and development of public access facilities for fishing, hunting, or associated recreation.

Limitations: 50% local matching funds required for fishing pier projects; 25-year lease or other proprietary interest in land to the Department of Fish and Game; and cooperative agreement for operation and maintenance by local agency.

PROGRAM

BOAT LAUNCHING FACILITY DEVELOPMENT GRANT

California Department of Boating and Waterways
1629 S Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 445-9657

Purpose: Developing boat launching facilities.

Limitations: Local governmental agency must own or control land, must also be able to operate and maintain facility. 100% grant program.
HARBORS AND MARINAS LOAN PROGRAM

California Department of Boating and Waterways
1629 S Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 445-9657

Purpose:
Loans to local government agencies and businesses for development or improvement of marina facilities.

STATE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR LOCAL WATER PROJECTS (Also called the Davis-Grunsky Program)

California Department of Water Resources
Local Projects Financing Office
1416 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 445-7924

Purpose:
Provides loans for construction of local domestic water projects and agricultural water conservation projects. Grants are provided for recreation and the enhancement of fish and wildlife. The state may also participate with an applicant as a partner under certain circumstances. Also, loans and grants may be considered for projects which would rehabilitate a dam and reservoir.

Limitations:
As of September 1982, the $130 million loan and grant program was oversubscribed, and new applications are not being accepted by the department.

STATE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM

California Department of Housing and Community Development
Dave Williamson
921 Tenth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 324-0943
Purpose: Recent congressional action allows for the transition of the CDBG - Non-Entitlement Program, formerly administered by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development, to the states. The state is currently drafting the program design and evaluation criteria in anticipation of administering the $25 million program for federal fiscal year 1983. The program will provide grants to eligible small cities and counties for a variety of housing, public facility, and economic development activities.

Limitations: Grants primarily benefit lower income people.

The following programs are administered by the STATE COASTAL CONSERVANCY. This agency undertakes projects directly and/or provides grant funds to local governments and non-profit agencies for projects located within the coastal zone or around San Francisco Bay. Funding sources are 1976 and 1980 park bond acts. The application process is continuous; inquiries may be made by telephone or by letter directed to:

Executive Officer
State Coastal Conservancy
1330 Broadway, Suite 1100
Oakland, CA 94612

PROGRAM RESOURCE ENHANCEMENT

Purpose: Provides up to 100% funding for acquisition or development projects to enhance and preserve coastal habitats in wetlands, rivers and streams, dunes, and other areas.

Limitations: Limited to projects designed to acquire or enhance important resource lands and habitats. Evidence of a local agreement for long-term operation and maintenance of the project generally required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>LAND TRUSTS/NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose:</td>
<td>Provides grants and technical assistance to private non-profit organizations involved in acquisition, enhancement, restoration, management, or development of access on coastal resource lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations:</td>
<td>Limited to projects designed to enhance wetlands, estuaries, streams, and watersheds, to provide public shoreline access, to preserve coastal agricultural lands, to preserve sensitive sites, or to consolidate lots to permit an orderly pattern of development. Project applicants must have 501(c) (3) status from the Internal Revenue Service and Articles of Incorporation stating that one of the principle purposes of the organization is &quot;the protection of land for coastal public access, agricultural, scientific, historical, educational, recreational, scenic, or open space opportunities&quot;. A fund payback or the commitment of matching funds is preferred.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Development Standards and Design Guidelines in this chapter provide design guidance for development projects undertaken in the West Broadway Urban Village Plan Area. The ultimate goal for these standards and guidelines is to promote the orderly development of the Urban Village in conformance with the vision and goals included in this Specific Plan.

Graphics are included to illustrate guideline intent. They are not intended to depict the only design solution to a specific standard or guideline.

The Development Standards and Design Guidelines contain language that reflects the following principles:

- **“Shall” or “Must”** indicate a design standard and means that conformance is mandatory.
- **“Should” or “Strongly Encouraged”** mean that conformance will be strongly encouraged by the City through the review process and that the guideline is intended to be a recommendation about how to implement the goals for development, which are provided in Section B of this chapter.

The standards are intended to mandate necessary design components in building projects that will help to create or preserve good urban fabric. The guidelines encourage high-quality building and site design while allowing flexibility for designers. All changes to existing or new development, including façade improvements, are subject to review by the Board of Architectural Review.

The provisions written in these Development Standards and Design Guidelines, when in conflict, shall take precedence over the City of Seaside Zoning Ordinance and other relevant Municipal Code sections within the West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan Area. The Seaside Zoning Ordinance continues to be applicable to issues not addressed by these Development Standards and Design Guidelines.
A. Goals for Development

The goals that follow apply to all areas of development in the West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan Area.

1. Contribute to a Village Identity
   - New development projects should establish individual identity while complementing the character of traditional design established within the context of the Urban Village and the city.
   - Gateways to the West Broadway Urban Village should demarcate the transition to the area from Highway 1, Sand City, Monterey and other parts of Seaside.

2. Encourage High-Quality Building Design
   - New development should display quality and character through materials and architectural expression such as massing, articulation and roof forms.
   - Buildings should be designed so as to provide attractive and detailed façades on all sides that face streets and adjacent development.

3. Facilitate Multiple Modes of Circulation
   - Streets should enhance the non-vehicular environment by introducing a scale that is conducive to pedestrian and bicycle use.
   - Sidewalks should be functional and maximize pedestrian access to development projects.
   - Streetscapes should be attractive and functional for pedestrians as well as vehicular traffic.
   - The spaces between and around buildings should contribute to a larger network of non-vehicular connections between neighborhood and cross-town destinations.
4. Strengthen the Pedestrian Realm

♦ Landscape and building elements, such as enhanced paving materials, accent lighting, streetscape furniture and adequate sidewalk space, should contribute to pedestrian environments that are aesthetically attractive and physically safe.

♦ Mixed-use commercial areas should include pedestrian amenities that contribute to active and economically-vibrant environments.

5. Strategically Locate Parking

♦ New development should decrease the visual prominence of the automobile and related parking facilities.

♦ Surface parking lots should be sited in ways that allow buildings and landscaping to be the primary focal elements viewed from streets.

6. Incorporate Sustainable Design Principles

♦ New development should minimize energy consumption, conserve water use, and use recycled or sustainable building materials.

♦ Landscaping should be appropriate to the local climate and provide stormwater collection and retention.
B. Development Standards

The following development standards apply to the West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan Area. They are intended to support the development of an active and lively downtown with a pedestrian-oriented mix of residential and commercial buildings that will draw visitors, shoppers and residents to the area. All new development, remodeled exteriors and new signage are subject to design review by the Board of Architectural Review (BAR). Table 7-1 lists permitted uses on ground floors and Table 7-2 lists permitted uses on upper floors. Except for provisions as laid out in the Specific Plan, definitions in Title 17 apply and can be found in Section 17.70 of the Municipal Code.

B.1 Permitted Uses on Primary Streets – MX Zone

The primary streets where pedestrian activity will be focused are Broadway Avenue, Del Monte Boulevard, Olympia Avenue and a short segment of Canyon Del Rey Boulevard, as mapped in Figure 7-1.

All uses in the West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan Area shall contribute to the revitalization and vibrancy of the Plan Area. In order to facilitate and ensure a high level of pedestrian activity, mixed-use buildings are required for all parcels that front onto Broadway Avenue and Del Monte Boulevard. Mixed-use buildings are defined for this Specific Plan as the combining of ground floor level sales and service...
uses, including eating and drinking establishments, with residential and/or office uses on upper floor levels. Following are permitted uses for ground floors and upper floors of buildings fronting onto primary streets in the Specific Plan Area.

### B.1.1 Permitted Ground Floor Uses

For development on all parcels that front onto primary streets, newly constructed buildings are required to have a mix of uses. Ground floor level retail sales and service uses or eating and drinking establishments are required for all parcels that front onto Broadway Avenue, Del Monte Boulevard and Olympia Avenue. The following uses are permitted:

#### B.1.1.1 Retail Sales and Services that include the following:

* **Specialty Food Retail**, including but not limited to the following:
  - groceries/drug stores (under 15,000 square feet); coffee/tea; candy; gourmet foods; ice cream; pastry/desserts; yogurt/dairy; doughnuts/bakery; wine.

* **Specialty Goods Retail**, including but not limited to the following:
  - cooking supplies/culinary; general housewares; decorator/art and design centers (including tile, floor and wall coverings); architectural showrooms and supplies; specialty hardware; specialty gardening supplies; antiques selling previously used, high-quality goods; party supplies; lamps and lighting; household accessories; stationery; books and magazines; musical instruments.

* **Quality Goods and Services**, including but not limited to the following:
  - small crafts; art supplies; picture framing; specialty furniture; clothing/shoe stores; thrift/consignment stores; electronics and computers; cameras/photography service and supplies; sporting goods; outdoor/sports clothing and supplies; toys/games; cards/gifts; jewelry/watches; florists.

* **Personal Services**, including but not limited to the following:
  - dry cleaning; shoe repair; seamstress; tailor; minor appliance repair; barber and beauty shops; finance and insurance services; pharmacy and drug stores.

* **Business Services** that have the capacity to generate a high degree of pedestrian activity, such as photocopying service and video/movie rentals and sales.

#### B.1.1.2 Eating and Drinking Establishments that include the following:

* Restaurants serving alcoholic beverages and/or providing entertainment, provided those activities are ancillary to the restaurant use.
Chairs and tables for outdoor dining and carts for merchant display may be permitted on sidewalks, paseos and other public rights-of-way and shall be consistent with Design Guidelines for the West Broadway Urban Village, provided that:

a. The use maintains a minimum six-foot wide travel zone that is clear and unimpeded for pedestrian traffic, and

b. The use does not infringe on the full width of the building entrance or otherwise impede access to and from the building.

B.1.1.3 Casual Dining/Quick Service/Fast Food restaurant so long as it does not include a drive-thru.

B.1.1.4 Plazas, paseos, parks and civic open spaces that are conducive to pedestrian activity.

B.1.1.5 Small-scale light manufacturing as an accessory to a primary retail use to allow for a wholesale component of a retail business, including the following and similar uses: bakery; upholstery; tile-making; screen-printing; architectural showroom and supplies.

B.1.1.6 Other similar and compatible uses deemed by the Zoning Administrator to facilitate vitality and pedestrian activity in accordance with the goals of the Urban Village Specific Plan.

B.1.2 Ground Floor Uses Requiring A Minor Use Permit

Findings in support of Minor Use Permits on primary streets must cite the potential for the use to contribute to pedestrian activity and to provide visual access for pedestrians into the ground floor use.

B.1.2.1 Civic and cultural facilities, including libraries, public recreation facilities, museums, art galleries, movie theaters and auditoriums.

B.1.2.2 Child care facilities.

B.1.2.3 Hair and nail salons, day spas, therapeutic massage.

B.1.2.4 Health and exercise clubs.

B.1.2.5 Public health facility.

B.1.2.6 Lodging or similar establishments engaged in the provision of temporary or travel accommodation on a less than monthly basis, including bed and breakfasts, hostels, hotels and inns.

B.1.2.7 Outdoor entertainment.

B.1.2.8 Other similar and compatible uses deemed by the Zoning Administrator to meet the purpose and intent of the Urban Village Specific Plan.
B.1.3 Ground Floor Uses Requiring A Use Permit

Findings in support of Use Permits on primary streets must cite the potential for the use to contribute to pedestrian activity and to provide visual access for pedestrians into the ground floor use.

B.1.3.1 Bars and nightclubs, including establishments providing entertainment or permitting dancing, and establishments serving alcoholic beverages not clearly ancillary to food service.

B.1.3.2 Public halls; clubs; lodges; meeting facilities.

B.1.3.3 Pool halls/billiards and bowling alleys as part of an eating and drinking establishment or other recreation use.

B.1.3.4 Banks and financial institutions.

B.1.3.5 Business, professional and government offices.

B.1.3.6 Parking structures.

B.1.3.7 Other similar and compatible uses deemed by the Planning Commission to meet the purpose and intent of the Urban Village Specific Plan.

B.1.4 Permitted Upper Floor Uses

Permitted upper floor uses on primary streets are intended to provide residential and small office uses above the ground floor including:

B.1.4.1 Multi-family residential.

B.1.4.2 Business, professional and government offices.

B.1.4.3 Medical and dental offices.

B.1.4.4 Other similar and compatible uses deemed by the Zoning Administrator to meet the purpose and intent of the Urban Village Specific Plan.

B.1.5 Upper Floor Uses Requiring A Minor Use Permit

For development on parcels on primary streets, the following uses on the upper floors are permitted with a Minor Use Permit:

B.1.5.1 Lodging or similar establishments engaged in the provision of temporary or travel accommodation on a less-than-monthly basis, including bed and breakfasts, hostels, hotels and inns.

B.1.5.2 Child care facilities.

B.1.5.3 Hair and nails salons, day spas, therapeutic massage.

B.1.5.4 Health and exercise clubs.

B.1.5.5 Public health facility.

B.1.5.6 Other similar and compatible uses deemed by the Zoning Administrator to meet the purpose and intent of the Urban Village Specific Plan.
B.1.6 Upper Floor Uses Requiring A Use Permit

For development on parcels on primary streets, the following uses on the upper floors are permitted with a Use Permit:

B.1.6.1 Parking structures.

B.1.6.2 Other similar and compatible uses deemed by the Planning Commission to meet the purpose and intent of the Urban Village Specific Plan.

B.2 Permitted Uses on the North Side of Palm Avenue and its Intersecting Streets — RH/MX Zone

Palm Avenue is envisioned as a primarily residential street. Typically, uses on Palm Avenue will follow the regulations of Section B.3; however, small-scale professional office and residential serving retail uses at the ground floor of properties fronting onto the north side of Palm Avenue and the immediately adjacent sections of Contra Costa, Hillsdale, Alhambra, and Calaveras Streets as seen in Figure 7-2, may be conditionally approved.

B.3 Permitted Uses on All Other Streets — RM/POS Zone

All other streets in the Plan Area are envisioned as being primarily residential in character. These streets, including the half-block portion of the intersecting streets as shown in Figure 7-3, shall be developed at densities that will create a transitional area between the adjacent blocks of the new mixed-use area to the north and existing single-family residential to the south.
B.4.1.1 For all commercial and mixed-use development with a residential component: 
3.0 FAR. Where residential is part of a mixed-use development, the FAR shall include the residential dwelling units.
B.4.1.2 For mixed-use development with office above retail: 2.5 FAR.
B.4.1.3 For residential development: 2.5 FAR with 80 percent site coverage.

B.4.2 Residential Density
Residential density is calculated by dividing the total number of dwelling units by site acreage (du/acre). Density shall be calculated on a project-wide basis. The allowable residential density for parcels in the West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan Area is as follows:

B.4.2.1 Where residential is part of mixed-use development: 30 to 60 du/acre.
B.4.2.2 Where unique site or project constraints exist, residential density at mixed-use development may occur at a minimum density below 30 du/acre with approval of the Planning Commission.
B.4.2.3 For all other residential development: 20 to 30 du/acre.
B.4.2.4 For residential on the south side of Palm Avenue: 10 to 20 du/acre

B.5 Height Standards
Height requirements are intended to ensure that the heights of new buildings contribute to the new character of the West Broadway Urban Village while being sensitive to the existing built fabric of the Specific Plan Area. Heights are measured from sidewalk or finished grade to the highest point of the roof. In all areas, architectural ornamentation may exceed the given height limit by a maximum of 10 feet. See Figure 7-4 for a key to height standard locations. Existing buildings that are demolished such that 75 percent or more of the existing building is affected shall be viewed as new construction and subject to these height standards. Interior tenant improvements are exempt from these height standards.

B.5.1 District 1: Both sides of West Broadway Avenue and Del Monte Boulevard, south side of Olympia Avenue, and Canyon Del Rey Boulevard between Amador Avenue and Sonoma Avenue

B.5.1.1 3 stories minimum, 5 stories maximum.
B.5.1.2 The fourth and fifth stories shall step back from third-story street walls 10 feet minimum.
B.5.2 District 2: North side of Palm Avenue, Elm Avenue, Amador Avenue, Sonoma Avenue and Imperial Street

B.5.2.1 2 stories minimum, 3 stories maximum.

B.5.3 District 3: South side of Palm Avenue

B.5.3.1 1 story minimum, 3 stories maximum for single-family attached.
B.5.3.2 1 story minimum, 2 stories maximum for single-family detached.
B.5.3.3 The third story shall step back from the rear property line a minimum of 25 feet where abutting existing residential lots to the south.

B.5.4 District 4: Canyon Del Rey Boulevard Between Elm Avenue and Amador Avenue

B.5.4.1 3 stories minimum, 5 story maximum for all uses except hotel, 8 stories maximum for hotel use only.
B.5.4.2 The fourth story and above shall step back from third story street walls 10 feet minimum.
B.6 Setback Standards

To create a pedestrian-friendly environment in the West Broadway Urban Village, mixed-use buildings shall be built up to the right-of-way (ROW), generally indicated by the edge of the sidewalk. Residential buildings may be set back from the street property line. Figure 7-5 indicates setbacks on primary streets. Figure 7-6 indicates setbacks for all other streets.

B.6.1 Setbacks on West Broadway Avenue, Olympia Avenue, Del Monte Boulevard, Canyon Del Rey Boulevard and the First Block of Side Streets

B.6.1.1 Front Setbacks: 0 feet minimum, 10 feet maximum.

Development fronting onto primary streets, plus first half-block of side streets, shall have:

- Building walls built to the street frontage for a minimum of 70 percent of the site.
- A maximum of 30 percent of the street frontage used for entry forecourts, paseos, outdoor plazas or parking access.
- The building wall at the street frontage built with a minimum of 60 percent of the ground floor consisting of windows or storefronts with views into the building.
B.6.1.2  *Side Setbacks:* 0 feet minimum and 5 feet maximum except for driveway access and paseos.
  
  ♦ *Side Setbacks For Paseos:* 20 feet from building face to building face, subject to review by the Fire Marshall.

B.6.1.3  *Rear Setbacks:* no rear setback requirements.

**B.6.2  Setbacks on All Other Streets**

B.6.2.1  *Front Setbacks:* 10 feet minimum and 20 feet maximum
  
  ♦ 0 feet minimum and 10 feet maximum where commercial ground floor uses are developed along the north side of Palm Avenue (see Section B.1.4 above).

B.6.2.2  *Side Setbacks:* 8 feet minimum.

B.6.2.3  *Rear Setbacks:* no rear setback requirements except for the south side of Palm Avenue.
  
  ♦ 10 feet for properties fronting onto the south side of Palm Avenue to buffer impact of development on existing residences to the south.
B.6.3  **Special Setback Standards**

B.6.3.1  At corner parcels, setback requirements from the primary street also apply to the secondary street.

B.6.3.2  Public plazas are exempt from street frontage setback requirements.

B.7  **Open Space Standards**

New development in the West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan Area shall provide open space as stated in this section, according to use. Mixed-use developments are required to provide publicly-accessible open space in the form of plazas, paseos and other greenspace. Standards and guidelines specifically related to plazas and paseos are described in Sections D.2 and D.3. Residential developments are required to provide private open space (defined as exterior space attached to individual units, such as balconies or secure yard space) and/or common open space (defined as secure space available to all residents of a project, such as a roof deck or garden above the base of the building).

B.7.1  **Commercial and Office**

B.7.1.1  Development shall provide 100 square feet of usable public open space for every 2,000 square feet of developed building footprint. This open space may be provided off site in a plaza or paseo if it is located in the West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan Area, and if approved by Planning Commission.

B.7.1.2  Parcels of less than 10,000 square feet are exempt from open space requirements.

B.7.2  **Residential**

B.7.2.1  All development with residential dwelling units shall provide a minimum of 80 square feet per unit of private open space and 100 square feet per unit of common open space.

B.7.2.2  Multi-family residential development shall provide active recreation elements for residents of all ages in common areas (outdoor, indoor, or both).

B.7.2.3  On the south side of Palm Avenue, residential units may have rear yards.

B.7.3  **Connectivity**

B.7.3.1  All public open spaces shall be accessible to the public during daylight hours and in the evening when businesses are open, and shall be designed to connect with public rights-of-way and adjacent public open spaces in the vicinity.
B.8 Parking Standards
New development in the West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan Area shall provide parking as stated in this section, according to use. The requirements here intend to minimize the impact of parking on the West Broadway Urban Village and to re-enforce the intended transit and pedestrian-oriented character. Requirements for renovation, enlargements or use changes apply only to net new floor area and/or the incremental increase in parking demand that accompanies a new higher intensity use. Incremental parking requirements shall be rounded to the next whole number when the fraction is 0.5 or higher.

B.8.1 Non-Residential Parking Requirements
B.8.1.1 Commercial, retail, office and all other non-residential uses shall require one space per every 500 square feet of development. Parking provided in private off-street facilities may not exceed one space per 400 square feet of development. If private parking remains open for non-exclusive use by the general public one space per 750 square feet is required.

B.8.1.2 Places of public assembly having fixed seating (i.e. auditoriums, theaters, assembly halls, etc.), shall be required to provide one (1) space for every four (4) persons of occupancy.

B.8.1.3 On-street parking along street frontages of projects may be counted toward the parking requirement. When a space falls on the line of two properties, it may be fractionally counted toward the requirement for each.

B.8.1.4 Where an existing private lot is converted to a shared lot that is open for non-exclusive use, spaces that are provided in excess of the amount required may be leased to other establishments.

B.8.1.5 The Zoning Administrator may grant a reduction of up to 25 percent of off-street parking requirements upon provision of an approved Transportation Demand Management plan for the project and tenants. Additionally, Zoning Code Section 17.34.120 allows for payment of a fee where provision of off-street parking is neither feasible nor desirable, subject to approval by the Planning Commission.

B.8.2 Residential Parking Requirements
B.8.2.1 For all residential and mixed-use development in the West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan Area, parking for dwelling units with two or more bedrooms shall be required at 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit. Parking for one bedroom or studio units shall be required at 1.0 space per dwelling unit.
B.8.2.2 Guest parking shall be required for all multi-family complexes of ten dwelling units or more at a rate of one space per ten dwelling units (or portion thereof). Residential development within a mixed use building is exempt from this standard.

B.8.3 Mixed-use Parking Requirements
B.8.3.1 For mixed-use developments, when two or more uses are located on the same lot or parcel or within the same building, the number of off-street parking spaces required shall be the sum of the total of the requirements of the various individual uses computed separately.

B.8.3.2 In cases where operators of uses wish to cooperatively establish and operate parking facilities, and certain uses generate parking demands primarily during hours when the remaining uses are not in operation or have a low demand, a reduction of up to 25 percent in the total number of spaces may be granted by the Zoning Administrator upon provision of an approved Transportation Demand Management plan for the project and tenants.

B.8.4 Parking Lots and Structures
B.8.4.1 New parking lots shall not front Broadway Avenue or corner parcels. Parking lots and structured parking shall be located at the rear or side of buildings.

B.8.4.2 Multi-story parking structures shall be lined with commercial, retail or residential use where allowed at the ground floor at street frontages.

B.8.5 Bicycle Parking
B.8.5.1 Bicycle parking shall be provided at 10 percent of vehicle requirements for all uses except single-family residential development.

B.8.5.2 For mixed-use development, secure bicycle parking shall be provided at each entrance, and include a shelter, as feasible.

B.8.5.3 Bicycle parking shall be installed at highly visible locations that are close to the main entrance of a destination.
B.9 Sustainable Development Standards

The intensity of land use and the pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly character envisioned by the West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan will further the City’s sustainability goals by ensuring that new buildings in the Urban Village incorporate sustainable design principles of minimizing energy consumption, conserving water, and use recycled or sustainable building materials. In addition, landscape and streetscape design will incorporate sustainability principles. The general measures listed below shall be reviewed and considered by all designers and builders in the Specific Plan Area.

B.9.1 Building Construction: Building Materials

B.9.1.1 Where feasible, renovate and add to existing buildings rather than demolish or build new buildings.

B.9.1.2 Recycle demolition and construction debris to the maximum extent possible. Deconstructive reuse and recycling is highly encouraged. Debris should be sorted on the job site and taken to recycling centers to ensure materials are being recycled.

B.9.1.3 Use locally-produced, extracted, harvested, recovered and manufactured building products from northern California as much as possible.

B.9.1.4 Use high-quality green or sustainable construction materials, products and furnishings with the maximum amount of recycled content available, where feasible.

B.9.1.5 Use recycled materials for building interiors, such as recycled carpet and recycled glass countertops.

B.9.1.6 Use “rapidly renewable” materials wherever appropriate, such as bamboo, engineered lumber and paper-based “cellulose” insulation.

B.9.1.7 Use low-emitting materials for all interior adhesives, sealants, paintings, coatings, carpet systems, composite wood and agrifiber products, and cleaning products.

B.9.1.8 Insulate and seal the building envelope while providing energy-efficient ventilation and fresh air exchange.

B.9.1.9 Provide recycling, composting and trash receptacles in all common areas. Central building collection locations for all waste types should be provided for pickup by waste haulers.

B.9.2 Building Construction: Doors and Windows

B.9.2.1 Install size-appropriate windows to balance natural light while reducing heat gain during the warm season.
B.9.2.2 Use Low-E (low-emissivity) glazing, dual and triple pane glazing and other energy-efficient window glazing technologies.

B.9.2.3 Install exterior shading over doors and windows, such as trellises, trees, awnings and overhangs to reduce heat gain during the warm season. Passive solar design should be incorporated such that heat gain is maximized during the cool season.

B.9.2.4 Provide window treatments such as shades and blinds that will diffuse incoming light and control glare.

B.9.2.5 Install operable windows in all commonly-used building areas. Operable windows can take advantage of the breezes in Seaside for natural cooling.

B.9.3 Building Construction: Water and Graywater

B.9.3.1 Install low water use fixtures and appliances. Use “on-demand” water heaters and low water use appliances such as front-loading clothes washers, water-efficient dishwashers, low-flow toilets and water-saving showerheads.

B.9.3.2 Collect and reuse rainwater, such as with a rooftop catchment system, to supplement landscape water use.

B.9.3.3 Pre-plumb buildings as feasible to allow for the installation of “graywater” systems and/or solar hot water systems. Water recycled from clothes washers, dishwashers and other uses should be collected and reused in the landscape, if coordinated with health standards.

B.9.4 Building Construction: Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC)

B.9.4.1 Install the most energy-efficient equipment feasible, such as sensor-controlled and economized HVAC systems, automatic-adjustment or occupancy-sensing lighting systems, Energy Star-qualified products, and interior design that optimizes the use of natural light.

B.9.4.2 Provide automatic shut-off HVAC controls to allow building heating and cooling to be turned off when building is not in use or when target temperatures are reached.

B.9.4.3 Use an Energy Management System (EMS) to heat and cool only occupied rooms.

B.9.5 Building Construction: Alternative Energy Generation

B.9.5.1 Pre-wire buildings as feasible to allow use of solar and wind electricity generation. Ensure that the electrical wiring and system is sized to accommodate additional amperage due to photovoltaic and wind-generated energy on-site.
B.9.5.2 Install solar photovoltaic panels as feasible to provide on-site energy generation. Sell unused energy back to the power company as possible.

B.9.5.3 Install solar hot water collectors as feasible to replace or supplement conventional water heating loads.

B.9.5.4 Install wind turbines where possible to utilize energy from the wind. Use wind turbines that avoid or reduce avian impacts.

B.9.5.5 Consider site layout and design of buildings in relation solar orientation and sea breezes to supplement heating and cooling loads.

B.9.5.6 Design for passive solar heat gain, where appropriate, using dark colored, dense materials that absorb heat from the sun and radiate back into the building interior slowly, such as concrete, adobe, brick and plaster. Roof systems should be designed so as not to absorb excessive heat that burdens HVAC systems.

B.9.5.7 Consider the installation of radiant floor heating or other efficient space heating technologies that eliminates forced air systems in buildings.

B.9.6 Landscaping and Streetscape

B.9.6.1 Use only native and other drought-resistant or drought-tolerant landscaping, and group landscaped areas by water need. Irrigation shall be drip irrigation directed where needed. Large areas of mowed lawn landscaping are not allowed.

B.9.6.2 Provide opportunities to recycle green waste. Recycling of landscape material should be made easy by providing bins at convenient locations. Shrubs that require trimming are discouraged.

B.9.6.3 Provide adequate shading of plazas, sidewalks, parking areas, common areas and buildings, where appropriate. Trees and trellises help to control heat gain in and around buildings.

B.9.6.4 Include low-impact development stormwater collection and treatment measures to control peak run off flow and volume. Where possible, increase permeable surface area on-site by employing stormwater management features such as permeable pavement, vegetated filter strips, vegetated drainage swales, flow-through planter boxes, infiltration basins or trenches, media filtration devices and vegetated roofs.

B.9.6.5 Encourage the use of rooftop rainwater catchment systems to reduce irrigation from potable water sources and eliminate excess stormwater runoff from roof structures.

B.9.6.6 Use reclaimed water systems such as on-site wastewater recycling when possible for landscape irrigation systems.
B.9.6.7 Install recirculating systems for recycled water in all decorative water features.

B.9.7 Lighting

B.9.7.1 Provide energy efficient interior and exterior light fixtures. For new construction and large renovations in the West Broadway Urban Village, interior and exterior lighting shall meet or exceed 2008 California Energy Commission standards for lighting efficiency.

B.9.7.2 Install lighting fixtures that are certified with the International Dark-Sky Association’s (IDA) Fixture Seal of Approval. (www.darksky.org)

B.9.7.3 Use sensor-controlled interior lights. Sensors ensure that lights automatically turn on when rooms are occupied and off when vacant.

B.9.7.4 Install photosensors at building interiors. These devices automatically dim lighting levels when natural light in the building is abundant.

B.9.7.5 Light exterior only as necessary; use the minimum light setting required to provide adequate security and safety. Focus lighting fixtures downward, use pedestrian-scaled fixtures, and ensure all fixtures have cut-off shading to resist light leakage into the night sky.

B.9.7.6 Position lighting in a manner that will reduce or avoid glare.
C. Design Principles

This section discusses basic principles for future development in the West Broadway Urban Village. These principles, although straightforward and rudimentary, should be considered in the preliminary phases of the design of a project. The goal inherent in these principles, and the guidelines in this document, is to produce a built environment that facilitates a high degree of pedestrian activity.

1. Building Orientation
Entrances to buildings shall face onto a public street.

2. Building Massing
The massing, or three-dimensional volumetric form, of larger buildings shall be broken into smaller components that more readily relate to the human scale.

3. Pedestrian Orientation
Site planning, building design and landscaping of projects should implement design solutions that provide amenities, maximize access and optimize the use of new development by pedestrians.

4. Building Components
A building shall have a base, a middle and a top, which can be achieved for any architectural style or building type.

5. Façade Composition
The design of building façades shall incorporate elements that help to break up long, undifferentiated walls or sides of buildings and facilitate a relationship with the building’s users as well as its landscape setting.

6. Relationship to the Human Form
Building façades shall incorporate design features and architectural elements that relate to the scale of the pedestrian.

7. Sustainability
Development shall incorporate elements and features that minimize impact on the natural and built environment.
D. Commercial Mixed-Use Development

This section contains standards and guidelines for new and redeveloped construction in the West Broadway Avenue and Del Monte Boulevard mixed-use areas. Developers are encouraged to implement a vertically mixed-use typology, such as multi-family residential or office use above a retail use.

Sections

D.1 Site Planning
D.2 Design for Pedestrians
D.3 Open Space
D.4 Parking
D.5 Building Design
D.6 Landscape Design
D.7 Signs
D.8 Lighting

D.1 Site Planning

INTENT: To ensure that new development creates an attractive West Broadway Urban Village that is comfortable for residents and visitors.

D.1.1 Building Location and Orientation

Standards

D.1.1.1 Parking shall not be allowed between the building and street edge.

Guidelines

D.1.1.2 Main façades with entrance doors and windows should front upon the primary street.
D.1.1.3 The location of site uses should be coordinated with adjoining properties to avoid creating nuisances such as noise, light intrusion, invasion of privacy and traffic, particularly when development is adjacent to sensitive uses such as residential development.

D.1.1.4 Owners of adjoining properties are strongly encouraged to develop shared facilities such as driveways, parking areas, pedestrian plazas and walkways.

D.1.2 Corner Sites

Guidelines

D.1.2.1 At street corners, new development should either be sited on the corner property lines or set back from the corner to provide a public open space that provides direct access to the buildings or frames an open space between buildings.

D.1.2.2 Buildings located on corners should include special design and architectural features that help to anchor the intersection.

D.1.2.3 To address the corner location, articulation of the building mass should be provided at corner sites, including, but not limited to, creating a rounded or angled facet on the corner, location of the building entrance at the corner and/or an embedded corner tower.

D.1.3 Development Along Alleys

Standards

D.1.3.1 Alleys shall have paving materials that accommodate pedestrian and vehicular traffic.

D.1.3.2 All trash bins shall be secured and screened from view.
Guidelines

D.1.3.3 Alleys should be treated as pedestrian connections where restaurants, flower shops and other commercial establishments are encouraged.

D.1.4 Service and Refuse Areas

Standards

D.1.4.1 Trash enclosures shall be constructed of durable and washable materials and the color, texture, and architectural detailing shall be consistent with the overall site and building design. Materials should be graffiti-resistant.

D.1.4.2 Trash enclosures shall be designed for collection from a side street, alleyway or parking area to avoid collection trucks needing to maneuver in busy roadways.

D.1.4.3 Roofs of trash or service enclosures shall be designed to complement the project buildings’ roof style and colors.

D.1.4.4 Loading and service entrances shall not intrude upon the public view, nor interfere with pedestrian and vehicular flows within the project site.

Guidelines

D.1.4.5 Trash enclosures, service areas, utility meters, and mechanical and electrical equipment should be screened from public view and located for convenient access by service vehicles.

D.1.4.6 Screening of service areas should be integrated into the overall building and landscape design.
D.1.5 Small-Scale Manufacturing Projects

Standards

D.1.5.1 Large truck deliveries shall be limited to the hours between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. when adjacent to residential development.

Guidelines

D.1.5.2 The visual character of development that houses a small-scale manufacturing use should be compatible with surrounding development and relate in size and scale to adjacent buildings and uses.

D.1.6 Sustainable Site Development

Guidelines

D.1.6.1 Existing buildings should be reused and incorporated into new development, if possible. If reuse or incorporation of existing buildings is not possible, then buildings materials should be recycled.

D.1.6.2 Solar access should be considered when site planning. Buildings should maximize the use of winter and summer sun for efficient energy use and reduce shading on neighboring properties and public spaces.

D.1.6.3 Non-automobile modes of transportation should be encouraged by providing no more than the minimum number of vehicle parking spaces, creating attractive pedestrian environments and providing bicycle parking.
D.2  **Design for Pedestrians**

**INTENT:** To ensure that pedestrian movement and amenities are an important part of the development of the site.

D.2.1  Pedestrian Orientation

**Standards**

D.2.1.1  All commercial mixed-use areas shall emphasize pedestrian orientation by creating attractive pedestrian spaces which utilize such features as plazas, interior walkways and paseos, ornamental gates, trellises, lighting, plant materials, seating, fountains, etc.

D.2.1.2  Outdoor pedestrian space shall be landscaped and include appropriate street furniture to facilitate pedestrian activity.
D.2.1.3 Attractive well-marked pedestrian links between parking and buildings shall be provided. The connections shall be designed as safe, clearly marked and attractive pedestrian walkways across parking spaces and landscaped areas.

D.2.1.4 All commercial mixed-use buildings shall be publicly-accessible via a path or walkway from a public sidewalk.

Guidelines

D.2.1.5 Pedestrian connections within development projects should include spaces such as plazas to encourage and attract pedestrian activity.

D.2.1.6 Pedestrian paths and plazas should be lit with pedestrian-scale lighting conforming to the guidelines in Section B.9.7.

D.2.1.7 Pedestrian paths and plazas should use permeable paving materials whenever possible.
D.3 Open Space

**INTENT:** To give design guidance for the amount, layout and materials of public, private and common open spaces.

D.3.1 Public Open Space

Guidelines

D.3.1.1 Plazas, building forecourts and paseos should be developed to maximize circulation opportunities between adjacent buildings.

D.3.1.2 Seating areas should be provided and coordinated with shading, landscaping, lighting and views to focal points.

D.3.1.3 Permeable paving materials should be used whenever possible.

D.3.1.4 Outdoor gathering spaces should be provided for residents and tenants that provide opportunities for ‘eyes on the street’ and amenities such as benches, barbeques and bocce ball courts that will encourage people to socialize communally.

D.3.2 Private Open Space

Guidelines

D.3.2.1 Private residential open space areas should be configured and designed to ensure privacy for residential uses while also providing linkages to the public open space components of the project.

D.3.2.2 Permeable paving materials should be used whenever possible.

D.3.2.3 Outdoor gathering spaces should be provided for residents and tenants that provide opportunities for ‘eyes on the street’ and amenities such as benches, barbeques and bocce ball courts that will encourage people to socialize communally.
D.4  PARKING

INTENT: To minimize the impact of surface parking on the aesthetic character desired for quality commercial mixed-use development in the West Broadway Urban Village.

D.4.1 Parking Area Design Standards

D.4.1.1 Surface parking areas facing a public street are discouraged. If unavoidable, they shall be buffered by landscaping or low walls and fencing. For security purposes, openings shall be incorporated into the design of buffers to provide views into the site.

Guidelines

D.4.1.2 Parking areas should be located in the rear of projects, or beneath buildings, with pedestrian connections between the parking areas and the street.

D.4.1.3 Parking should be integrated within the project and visually de-emphasized.

D.4.1.4 Landowners should be encouraged to enter into shared parking agreements that allow uses with different peak hours of operation to utilize off-street parking facilities provided by another building or use.

D.4.1.5 All outdoor parking areas should be divided into smaller units to decrease visual impacts associated with large expanses of pavement and vehicles, and to facilitate safe and efficient pedestrian movement between parking and residential and commercial development.

D.4.1.6 Permeable paving materials should be used whenever possible.
D.4.2 Access Drives

Guidelines

D.4.2.1 Building siting and parking design should maximize opportunities for shared parking, access entries and driveways in order to minimize the number of curb cuts and thus limit possible conflict between pedestrians and automobiles.

D.4.2.2 Whenever possible, vehicle access should be provided from side streets and alleys to limit the number of driveways along the main thoroughfares.

D.4.2.3 Access on corner lot driveways should be located as far as possible from intersections, but no less than the minimum required by City standards.

D.4.2.4 All new projects should provide bicycle racks that are located close to the buildings and do not impede pedestrian or auto circulation. Whenever possible, bicycle areas should be covered and located in areas that are clearly visible to site users.
D.5 BUILDING DESIGN

INTENT: To guide in shaping the urban form of the West Broadway Urban Village in a manner that is consistent with the City’s vision for the area, displaying a human-scaled rhythm through materials and architectural elements such as façade articulation, accented entries, window patterns and roof forms.

D.5.1 Façade Articulation

Standards

D.5.1.1 Buildings shall be articulated to reflect a small-scale street frontage rhythm, with building storefront widths of approximately 30 to 50 feet.

D.5.1.2 Where multiple tenant spaces are incorporated into a building, individual tenant spaces shall be located within the building bays. This can be achieved by any of the following:

- Placing a column, pier or pilaster between façade elements.
- Applying a vertical slot or recess between façade elements.
- Providing variation in plane along the building wall.
- Varying the building wall by recessing the storefront entrance or creating a niche for landscaping or for a pedestrian area.

D.5.1.3 Buildings shall have a clearly defined base and roof edge so that the façade has a distinct base, middle and top at a scale that relates to an individual person.

D.5.1.4 Building façades shall have elements that relate to the scale of a person.
D.5.1.5 All façades shall emphasize three-dimensional detailing such as cornices, window moldings, textures and reveals to cast shadows and create visual interest on the façade.

Guidelines
D.5.1.6 Façades without openings or changes in wall planes should be avoided.
D.5.1.7 Articulation should add three dimensional interest to the façade and not rely on “false” detailing.
D.5.1.8 Projecting elements such as awnings, trellises and overhangs should be used as an effective means of integrating the architectural edge with the adjoining pedestrian areas, adding three-dimensional interest to the façades and enhancing the sense of entry into the building.
D.5.1.9 One or more of the following elements should be used to articulate a building façade:
- Design details for the top of a building, including cornice lines, parapets, eaves, brackets and other detailing.
- Design details for the body, or middle, of the building, including windows, awnings, trellises, canopies, pilasters, columns, decorative lighting and window boxes.
- Design details for the base of a building, including recessed entry areas, covered outdoor areas and alcoves.
- Vertical architectural features, such as columns, piers, pilasters and slots.
D.5.1.10 Ground-floor façades should be designed to give individual identity to each retail establishment. Each shop should have a distinct façade with a unique character.

D.5.2 Entries

Standards
D.5.2.1 Entries to ground-floor retail areas shall occur from main streets, and shall be accented with features such as moldings, lighting, overhangs or awnings.

Guidelines
D.5.2.2 Main building entries or entries to upper story uses should be recessed into entry bays to create transitional spaces between the street and buildings.
D.5.2.3 Entrances should incorporate one or more of the following treatments:

- Marked by a taller mass above, such as a tower or volume that protrudes from the rest of the building surface.
- Accented by special architectural elements, such as columns, overhanging roofs, awnings and ornamental light fixtures.
- Indicated by a recessed entry or recessed bay in the façade.
- Sheltered by a projecting awning or canopy, designed as a canvas or fabric awning or as a permanent architectural canopy utilizing materials from the primary building.

D.5.3 Doors and Windows

D.5.3.1 Where unique use or occupancy requirements preclude the addition of windows, such as theaters or parking structures, exterior walls shall be painted with murals, designed to provide architectural relief, or shall be screened by landscaping and pedestrian amenities, such as trellises, benches, sculpture or shade structures.

D.5.3.2 Upper story windows shall be detailed with architectural elements, such as sills, molded surrounds, lintels and sliding devices.

D.5.3.3 Operable windows shall be used.

D.5.3.4 Window size and design shall be proportional to the size of the facade and architectural treatments.
D.5.3.5 Multi-pane window for all uses shall be either true divided or simulated divided. “Simulated divided light grids,” snap-in muntins (i.e. post or bars used to separate glass in a sash into multiple panes) and those located within double-paned glass should not be used.

D.5.3.6 Clear glass shall be used in ground-floor windows and doors. Deeply tinted glass or applied films shall not be permitted on ground floors.

Guidelines
D.5.3.7 Window patterns should architecturally distinguish a building’s first floor retail character, with a higher percentage of windows than on upper floors.

D.5.3.8 A minimum of 60 percent of linear store frontage at the primary street façade should be used for windows.

D.5.3.9 Doors at main entries should use high quality materials such as crafted wood, stainless steel, bronze and other ornamental metals.

D.5.3.10 Commercial storefronts should include street-oriented display windows. These windows should provide visual access to the inside of the building, while also serving as an area for merchandise display. Enclosed display window areas should be provided where actual windows cannot be provided.
D.5.3.11 The function and design of windows should be consistent with the use within.

D.5.3.12 Windows should maintain consistency in shape and location across the façade and be coordinated with façades of adjacent buildings. Unifying patterns should include a common window header line and aligned vertical centerlines of windows and doors.

D.5.3.13 Non-reflective films, coatings, low emissivity glass, and external and internal shade devices should be used for heat and glare control.

D.5.4 Awnings and Canopies

Standards

D.5.4.1 Canopies over building entries shall be incorporated into the design of the building, including colors and material detailing.

D.5.4.2 Backlighting of transparent or translucent awnings shall not be allowed.

Guidelines

D.5.4.3 Awnings are encouraged, and if used, should be provided over each storefront of buildings with multiple storefronts. These awnings should be located within the individual structural bays and should not hide architectural detailing.

D.5.4.4 Awnings should be made of durable materials that can withstand high winds, weathering by salt laden air and be easily maintained and cleaned.
D.5.5 Building Materials
Guidelines
D.5.5.1 A wide variety of materials is strongly encouraged to articulate different building elements, including the ground-floor façade, vertical elements such as columns and pilasters, roof and parapet terminations and window sills.
D.5.5.2 Within a design theme, a variety of durable materials and textures is strongly encouraged. Such materials may include both traditional materials, such as wood and stucco, and materials such as concrete, structural steel, corten steel and other high-quality durable metals which have not been used traditionally.
D.5.5.3 Metals that are not treated or coated should be avoided.
D.5.5.4 Genuine materials should be utilized rather than simulated materials. Where simulated materials are used, they should be used in keeping with the character and properties of the material being simulated.
D.5.5.5 Materials should be harmonious with adjacent buildings.
D.5.5.6 Quality materials shall turn corners to indicate depth and to prevent “false front” appearances.
D.5.5.7 Artwork should be incorporated into building design.

D.5.6 Color
Guidelines
D.5.6.1 Exterior building colors should be compatible with surrounding buildings.
D.5.6.2 Primary colors and other bright colors can be used as accents to enliven the
architecture, but should be used sparingly. Accent colors should be used to enhance visual interest.

D.5.6.3 Color should be used to enhance architectural elements.

D.5.7 Roofs and Parapets

Standards

D.5.7.1 The form, color and texture of the roof shall be an integral component of the building design.

D.5.7.2 All buildings shall provide cornice or parapet detailing in order to delineate a strong roofline along the primary façades.

D.5.7.3 All roof-mounted mechanical, electrical and external communication equipment, such as satellite dishes and microwave towers, shall be screened from public view and architecturally integrated into the building design. The screen shall be architecturally consistent with the building and coordinate with existing building materials.

Guidelines

D.5.7.4 The roof shape should reflect the configuration of the building’s mass and volume, and should be consistent in its character from all vantage points.

D.5.7.5 Cornices and horizontal bands of genuine materials such as wood trim or precast concrete rather than foam trim are encouraged.

D.5.7.6 False fronts and thinly applied mansard forms should be avoided.

D.5.7.7 Roofs should be proportionate to building mass and incorporate cornices, eaves and overhangs.
D.6  LANDSCAPE DESIGN

INTENT: To give design guidance for the amount, layout and materials of landscaping components of public and private development.

D.6.1  Function

Standards

D.6.1.1 Where pedestrian paths or walkways cross parking areas or driveways, the paths shall incorporate landscaping and decorative paving to define the pedestrian space.

D.6.1.2 Pedestrian entries into sites shall be enhanced with landscaping and decorative paving, trellis structures, pedestrian-scaled lighting and seating.

Guidelines

D.6.1.3 Landscaping should be used to provide an attractive setting for development, soften hard building contours, shade walkways, parking areas and other large expanses of pavement and to screen unsightly uses.

D.6.1.4 Where walkways cross traffic lanes, special design features should be used to increase safety for the pedestrian. Potential design features include raised or textured pavement, curb extensions to narrow the travel lane, and low-level lighting such as a bollard light.
D.6.2 Street Frontage Standards
D.6.2.1 Street trees shall be included along all street frontages of commercial mixed-use development. Trees should be selected from a list of City-approved trees.

Guidelines
D.6.2.2 Selected trees should be broad branching with a minimum mature canopy spread of 20 feet and a high canopy to allow visibility of buildings.
D.6.2.3 The City should develop detailed street tree plans that establish specific species and planting details for the City’s major mixed-use and commercial corridors.
D.6.2.4 Landscape beds should be created at curbs, where possible, including pots, planters and sustainable stormwater retention features.

D.6.3 Plants and Materials Standards
D.6.3.1 All landscaped areas shall have automatic irrigation systems installed to ensure that plant materials survive. It is particularly important in commercial mixed-use development that irrigation systems are designed so as not to overspray public walks, paved areas, buildings and fences.
D.6.3.2 Landscaped areas, including trees and other planting, as well as paving, walls and fences shall be regularly maintained.
Guidelines

D.6.3.3 Plant and landscape materials should be selected and sited to reflect both ornamental and functional characteristics. Full-headed shade trees, greenery and brightly colored flowering materials all add to the overall impression of Seaside.

D.6.3.4 A well-coordinated palette of plant species should be selected for general landscaping purposes, such as parking lots and street frontages, as listed in Appendix B.

D.6.3.5 Plant species should be generally hardy and not require extensive maintenance. Species that are native or well-adapted to the climate in Seaside are preferable, as they will generally require less water and maintenance.

D.6.3.6 Both seasonal and year-round flowering shrubs and trees should be used where they can be most appreciated, such as adjacent to walks and recreational areas, and as a frame for building entrances and stairs.

D.6.3.7 Evergreen shrubs and trees should be used for screening along rear property lines (not directly adjacent to residences), around trash/recycling areas and mechanical equipment, and to obscure grillwork and fencing associated with parking structures.
D.6.4  Landscaping in Plazas and Open Space

Standards
D.6.4.1 Outdoor pedestrian spaces shall include appropriate outdoor furniture, such as seating, walls, trash receptacles, bike racks and other elements.
D.6.4.2 Publicly-accessible private plazas and open spaces shall be landscaped and incorporate high-quality paving materials, such as stone, concrete or tile.
D.6.4.3 All screening shall be designed as an integral part of the overall building design.

Guidelines
D.6.4.4 Projects should develop a comprehensive open space network that uses plazas and other open space elements to connect uses.
D.6.4.5 Pedestrian amenities, such as plazas, courtyards, paseos and other open spaces should be considered for spaces between buildings.
D.6.4.6 Ample landscaping with fountains and well-shaded seating areas are highly encouraged. Plant materials, where appropriate, should provide variety while being consistent with the architectural design of the building.
D.6.4.7 Paving in plazas and open spaces should be permeable whenever possible.
D.6.4.8 Public art should be incorporated into open space projects whenever possible.

D.6.5  Parking Area Landscaping

Standards
D.6.5.1 All surface parking areas shall provide interior landscaping for shade and aesthetic enhancement.
D.6.5.2 Parking lots shall be landscaped with broad branching shade trees at a minimum ratio of:

- 6 trees per 20 parking spaces for double-loaded stalls
- 4 trees per 10 parking spaces for single-loaded stalls
- One tree for every 3 parking spaces for parking bays with less than 10 spaces.

Guidelines
D.6.5.3 Permeable surfaces for paving should be considered and used when possible.
D.6.5.4 Recycled materials should be considered for use in paving whenever possible.
D.6.5.5 Planter areas should provide a 4-foot minimum width of clear planting space.
D.6.5.6 Wheel stops should be used adjacent to tree wells and planter areas to protect landscaping from car overhangs. In place of wheel stops, the planter curb may be used for car overhangs, provided a 4-foot minimum clear planting area is maintained.
D.6.5.7 Drainage into swale areas is encouraged and may be accommodated through design elements such as flush curbs, perforated curbs and tree offsets.
D.7 **Signs**

**INTENT:** To ensure that signs are designed and constructed to make a positive contribution to the overall character of the commercial mixed-use project.

D.7.1 **Function**

**Standards**

D.7.1.1 The primary purpose of signs shall be to identify a business or businesses and residences located at a specific site.

**Guidelines**

D.7.1.2 The design of a sign should be simple and easy to read.

D.7.1.3 The sign’s message should be limited to the business name or the logo of the business occupying the site.

D.7.2 **Architectural Context and Placement**

**Standards**

D.7.2.1 Signs shall not be permitted on top of any roof, and no sign attached to a wall or eave shall project above the eave line of the building.

D.7.2.2 Where residential use is limited to the second floor, signs shall be limited to the first floor.

**Guidelines**

D.7.2.3 Sign design should conform to and be in harmony with the architectural character of the building.

D.7.2.4 Signs attached to a building should be designed as integral components of the building and not obscure or conceal architectural elements.
D.7.2.5 Standardized or corporate signs, which do not relate to the building architecture, should not be permitted.

D.7.2.6 Building signs should be located within an area of the façade that enhances and complements the architectural design.

D.7.2.7 Signs should generally be symmetrically located within a defined architectural space.

D.7.3 General Design Standards

D.7.3.1 Where internally illuminated lighting is used, only individual letter signs shall be permitted.

D.7.3.2 No “can” (box type) signs with translucent plastic sign panel front with applied or painted lettering shall be permitted except for tenant logos.

D.7.3.3 Signs with opaque faces and cutout lettering shall only be permitted where the sign ties into the architecture of the building.

Guidelines

D.7.3.4 Sign design should be appropriate to the business establishment, building architecture and area in which it is located.

D.7.3.5 Exposed neon signs are strongly discouraged.

D.7.4 Wall or Window Signs Standards

D.7.4.1 Painted signs and letters shall present a neat and aligned appearance. The services of a professional sign painter are strongly recommended.
D.7.4.2 Externally illuminated or halo lit signs are encouraged and where used shall have an opaque face.

D.7.4.3 All exterior sign lights shall be downlit and shielded to direct light toward the sign and reduce glare and impacts to the night sky.

D.7.4.4 Window signs advertising temporary sales or events shall not be permitted.

D.7.4.5 Window signs shall not be placed in a manner which obscures primary views into and out from the storefront.

Guidelines

D.7.4.6 Where individual letters are used, letters should be three dimensional, created by raised letter forms mounted to the building façade or sign panel, or by incised openings cut-out from the sign panel.

D.7.4.7 For signs identifying hours of operation, menus, newspaper reviews and other customer information, it is recommended that these be framed, board-mounted or plastic laminated for a finished appearance.
D.8 LIGHTING

**INTENT:** To ensure that the design of fixtures and the light provided contributes to the character of development and does not impact adjacent development or the night sky.

D.8.1 Function and Location Standards

D.8.1.1 Site plans and architectural plans shall include the location of fixtures, their design and the nature and level of the illumination they will provide.

D.8.1.2 Exterior lighting shall be designed as an integral part of the building and landscape design.

D.8.1.3 Lighting locations shall be concentrated at areas with security concerns such as parking lots, pedestrian paths, outdoor gathering spaces, at building entries and any other pedestrian accessible areas, and limited in other areas.

D.8.1.4 Lighting of outdoor service, loading and storage areas shall not be visible from the street or adjacent properties.

D.8.1.5 The height of luminaries shall be in scale with the building and site design and in no case shall they exceed 18 feet in height from grade.

D.8.1.6 The light source for externally-illuminated signs must be positioned so that light does not shine directly on adjoining properties or cause glare or shine in the eyes of motorists of pedestrians.

D.8.1.7 No outdoor lights shall be permitted that blink, flash or change intensity.
D.7.5  Projecting Signs

Guidelines

D.7.5.1 Projecting signs should be located near the front entry of a store.

D.7.5.2 Structural supports for projecting signs should be designed so that their visual appearance is minimized, and/or coordinated with the overall architecture and color scheme of the storefront. These signs should not appear to be “tacked on” without regard for the alignments, proportions, colors and forms of their adjacent buildings and signs.

D.7.5.3 Sign fonts should be selected to provide both visual clarity and artistic expression.

D.7.6  Multiple-Tenant Complexes

Standards

D.7.6.1 Multiple-tenant buildings and complexes shall develop a Master Sign Program that minimizes the potential visual conflicts and competition among tenant signs yet ensures adequate identification for each tenant.

Guidelines

D.7.6.2 Free-standing signs may include the names of major tenants.

D.7.6.3 Free-standing signs used to identify such complexes should include the name and address of the complex.
D.8.1.8 All outdoor lighting shall be downlit and fully shielded.

D.8.1.9 Area lighting shall be designed to minimize the negative effects of lighting the night sky and employ control features so as to avoid light being directed off-site.

Guidelines

D.8.1.10 Along street frontages, lighting should be employed to cast illumination by lighting walls and architectural features on buildings rather than employing features casting light outwards.

D.8.1.11 Lighting sources should be kept as low to the ground as possible while ensuring safe and functional levels of illumination.

D.8.1.12 If security lighting is needed, it should be integrated into the site design. Shielded fixtures should be located as low to the ground as possible.

D.8.1.13 In general, the location of lighting should respond to the anticipated use and not exceed the amount of illumination required by users. Illumination over an entire area or use of overly bright lighting is strongly discouraged. Flood lighting is strongly discouraged.