

**EXHIBIT A
PC FLAGGED ITEMS**

ELEMENT/POLICY	COMMENT/ISSUE	RESOLUTION
ELEMENTS		
INTRODUCTION	Status of narrative vs policy	Add clarifying paragraph to Section 1.2
INTRODUCTION	Clarity of Coastal zone separation (Look at EIR language, include coastal zone figure?)	Clarify paragraph in Section 1.5
INTRODUCTION	Update status of Housing Element (will be reviewed as consistent with GP, not GP with HE)	Add sentence to end of Section 1.5
INTRODUCTION	Policies in GP collective and inter-related, not to be pulled out separately without evaluation of overall impact.	Clarify paragraph in Section 1.5
INTRODUCTION	Dates of GP?	Clarifying edits Delete reference to specific GP version
Goal LU-1	What did EIR assume for exempting routine and ongoing from viewshed policies?	No recommended change to language developed through GPU process.
LU-1.13	Not just public light. Dark sky policy	Delete “public”
LU-1.16(f)	Requirement for LLA (“f” does not fit because LLA is acquisition by definition) Avoid of acquisition of private property phrase	Amend to clarify “not require” acquisition.
LU-1.19	What happens until Ordinance is adopted? Clear direction	See <i>Interim Ordinance</i> below
LU-2.10	What is meant by adequate water supply? Where is this intended to apply?	Amended to be consistent with State second unit law and only eliminate areas where policies regulate use due to resource constraints (e.g. water, waste water). Not intended to eliminate South County. Clarified intent of “adequate water” Also see <i>Long Term Water Supply</i> definition below.
LU-2.11	How does this apply to other policies such as affordable housing?	Recommend deleting this policy because it is not needed with State law.

**EXHIBIT A
PC FLAGGED ITEMS**

ELEMENT/POLICY	COMMENT/ISSUE	RESOLUTION
LU-2.12(b)(2)	Clarify difference between Workforce housing and Market Rate Housing.	Recommended change to fit reformatting and separate policy from criteria, but not intended to change context of language developed through GPU process.
LU-2.12(b)(3)	Is CEQA reference needed?	Deleted
LU-2.12(h)	Redevelopment reference?	Clarify relation to areas that are also Community Areas.
LU-2.13	Conform with RDA law?	Clarified language “consistent” vs “comply”
LU-2.16	Modification proposed by staff not clear.	Change from “and/or” to “and”
LU-2.29	What was intended? Clean Up “or” vs “and”	No recommended change to language developed through GPU process.
LU-2.34(b) LU-4.1 LU-5.1	Clarify Building “intensity” Coverage and density...increase density but not coverage?	Change to reflect “extent of use of land” consistent with Section 65302 GC. Intent is to limit building footprint.
Goal C-1 C-1.1	LOS D by 2027?	Changed to 2030 to reflect 20 years from draft 2010 GP
C-1.2	Language to base priorities on CIFP	Amended to clarify multiple sources for accomplishing goals (not just TIF/CIFP)
C-1.3 C-1.4 C-1.8 C-1.11	How do these read together - Cross Reference? Pay fee if build a barn? Pay fee if below LOS D, but build if crossing the threshold? Allow further degradation. Clarify	C-1.3 establishes concurrency for addressing traffic impacts. Clarifies how Traffic Tier 1 is different than Tiers 2 and 3. C-1.4 establishes thresholds for when construction is required versus when fees are applied (clarified) C-1.5 establishes that all jurisdictions need to address their fair share of impacts to other jurisdictions (sentence moved from C-1.3). C-1.8 establishes the fee for roadways in the unincorporated County areas that are not included in the TAMC fee (Tier 2). C-1.11 establishes the fee for roadways of regional significance (Tier 3).

**EXHIBIT A
PC FLAGGED ITEMS**

ELEMENT/POLICY	COMMENT/ISSUE	RESOLUTION
C-1.12	Long term/larger plan language (what roads are being added?) Unclear...needs introductory sentence Simplify and clarify	Introductory that this policy applies to AWCP area. More general for GP policy.
C-3.5 C-4.3 C-4.7 Goal C-10	stronger and clearer bike path connections (bike safety)	Amend C-10 to reflect stronger bike policy.
C-5.1	Recognize existing scenic corridors	Added reference to Figures 13-16
Goal C-9	Is it needed since related to Coastal? Is it required per 65302?	Coastal related policies deleted Defer to LCP, which will continue to rely on 1982 GP until LCP updated.
OS- 1.3 and OS-1.5	How different from old GP Policy 26.1.9?	Provided 1982 GP language for comparison.
OS-1.10	Separate Monterey Bay Sanctuary/Scenic Trail (coastal only)?	Reformat policy versus criteria. Most of the trail is in the coastal area, but a small portion is not.
OS-3.5(2)	PC had directed using Title 21 as basis. Use 2010 GPU5 as base language, but simplify “a”, “d” and “e” don’t make sense as exemptions as written...clarify intent (i.e. “e” so there is no off site runoff) Detail vs Policy Equity of large vs small? Connection of 10% limit? 10% exception v. fairness Ag more stringent than Development? Use erosion science (k-value), not slope, as criterion (different issues) Do maps exist to tie to erosion instead of slope? What is effect of changing 20 years on previous	Reformat policy SEE EXHIBIT C OF 7/14 PC STAFF REPORT

**EXHIBIT A
PC FLAGGED ITEMS**

ELEMENT/POLICY	COMMENT/ISSUE	RESOLUTION
	cultivation? What changes upset the EIR (e.g. 10% exception, 20 v 40 years)? Add use to previously uncultivated...irrigation also important. Add more of 3.5 to definitions;	
OS-4.3 to 4.7	Coastal reference? Delete/Modify?	Delete coastal reference
OS-5.5	ROAA reference? Why not “encourage” action (not required)?	No recommended change to language developed through GPU process.
OS-5.12	clarify whether it is only protecting listed species Delete listed species reference at end of sentence?	Delete “for State and federally listed species”
OS-5.19 (deleted version) OS-5.16, OS-5.21	Why delete? Relation to 5.21 and 5.16? Explain “functional equivalent” from baseline of prior language. Old language creates baseline so individual project does not take whole responsibility. Does change have unplanned impact? Would be better to not have each project do a biological study if no baseline inventory...holistic approach preferred. Also, something about clustering policies	No recommended change to language. Response to questions re the substitution of biological resource policies: Per the FEIR, pages 2-126 through 2-128, BIO-1.1 was not required to address impacts, but to inform project-level evaluations. Evaluation of impacts can be completed using existing data combined with project-specific evaluations. In addition, OS-5.1 through OS-5.4 collectively provide for the mapping of critical habitat and habitat for listed species.
OS-5.22	Change makes it sound less committed.	Change “would” to “shall”
OS-5.23	Clarifying language	Change “would” to “shall”
OS-5.25	Complete ban versus avoid disturbance? Overly broad? Formatting	Revise formatting

**EXHIBIT A
PC FLAGGED ITEMS**

ELEMENT/POLICY	COMMENT/ISSUE	RESOLUTION
OS-8.1	Clarifying language Check accuracy of wording and terminology (Archaeological Phase I, II, III report)	See <i>Glossary</i> for definition of Phase I, II & III
OS-8.3	ROAA reference? Why needed? Also 6.3, 7.3	Policy clarifies exemption is limited to extent “as allowed by state or federal law.” No change proposed.
OS-8.4	Clarify	
OS-8.6	LCP reference	Deleted reference
OS-8.7	SB18	Defined by title
OS-10.9	What is PM ₁₀ ? Amend so meet requirement (AB32) but flexible enough with changing laws	Glossary to add definition of PM ₁₀ and NO _x (see below) Clarified language to meet “daily threshold”
OS-10.10	Clarifying language Last bullet board compared to other more specific bullets “should” versus “may” or “shall” See <i>OTHER</i>	Revised last bullet to be more direct.
OS-10.11	Clarifying language 2006 vs 2005 Need safety valve if state changes. Any benefit from growing crops in calculating GHG reductions? How do fires effect emissions and limits?	If State changes, policy may need to be amended. Specifics to be addressed with inventory.
OS-10.12	Bike parking - priority? Large project to complete with 24 months	Added Bicycles to Bullet #5 See <i>OTHER</i> re timing
OS-10.14	Clarifying language	Clarified “15% less than 2005 <u>emission levels</u> ”
S - Intro	Older bldgs = fire hazard Railroads = noise	Added sentence to structural fire hazard. Revised paragraph on noise
S-2.11	edited	PC edits
S-3.1	Edit consistent with today’s standards	Clarifying edit

**EXHIBIT A
PC FLAGGED ITEMS**

ELEMENT/POLICY	COMMENT/ISSUE	RESOLUTION
S-3.9	Needs outcome statement	Added “In order to minimize urban runoff...”
S-4.27/5.17	Duplicate language 5+ lots, 2 access	Duplicate language deleted from S-4.27
S-5.1	Prep for & response to consistency with other resource protections	Clarifying edits.
S-6.5	Urban not limited to CA, suburban not limited to RC	Clarify definition of areas. Also see <i>Table PS-1</i> amendment.
S-7.7 to 7.19	Rewrite, clear/precise, activities, non-equipment, contracts	7.8, 7.10; edit to clarify and remove language relative to private contracts.
PS-1.1 PS-1.2	Benefit area (clarify or OK?) “a” CIFP v “the” CIFP Lots of Record or not?	Clarify multiple CIFPs Separated and clarify APFS versus CIFP
Table PS-1	Septic v Alt Wastewater Footnote 1-Record notice Footnote 4- RHNA...if becomes necessary	Require notice recorded with Map Delete footnote reference “4” to Rural Standard classifications Create new “suburban” classification for Rural Centers where footnote 4 applies.
PS-2.6	Clarify “impacted”	Change “impacted” to “contaminated”
PS-2.9	“d” not recharge potential...part of “c”?	Edited to clarify
PS-3	“sustainable”	FEIR, Glossary BOS
PS-3.2 PS-3.7	Exemption versus bending definition	Combine PS-3.2 and PS-3.7 with PS-3.3 to consolidate criteria and exceptions. PS-3.11 (revised) moved to follow PS-3.2 as PS-3.3.
PS-3.4 PS-3.5	h + i – separate policy v part of well assessment criteria. h – not use name? Incl lots of record + ag wells?	Moved “h” to CVMP and “i” to NC AP Ag wells address in PS-3.5 (clarified). Recommended change to fit reformatting, but not intended to change context of language developed through GPU process.

**EXHIBIT A
PC FLAGGED ITEMS**

ELEMENT/POLICY	COMMENT/ISSUE	RESOLUTION
PS-3.6	Include lots of record? Conflict with Regional Water project (desal well)?	Clarified to include lots of record and not conflict with possible use for desalinization.
PS-3.9	Programs within CIFP	No recommended change to language developed through GPU process.
PS-3.11	“assured”	Simplified to remove Code reference and move to follow criteria for Long Term Sustainable Water Supply.
PS-3.12 to 3.14	Format of intro statements	Amended to provide definitive introduction statement
PS-3.16	Collaborate with stakeholders more general (coalition) - names come and go Shall participate “as appropriate”	Amended to clarify and make general to regional participation.
PS-3.18	Clarify	Amended to clarify timing
PS-4.7	g – separate, not part of list generally or when feasible	Amended to clarify as directed
PS-4.8	Rewrite; “Specific criteria that ___”, “shall include”	Amended to clarify as directed
PS-4.10	Clarify preferable v feasible, flexibility of Agency, allow case-by-case option.	Amended to clarify as directed
PS-5.5	Within unincorporated County, “public” facilities v private (e.g. alt wastewater for residential)	Delete “under County jurisdiction”
PS-9.3 to 9.6	Format intro (declarative)	Amended to clarify as directed
AG-Intro	We no longer are defining R-O Ag	Amended Intro: “Establish Ag Exemptions” Reflect Ag Land Trust name change and add current statistics.
AG-1.1	Shall vs should Clarify neighboring property is focus	No recommended change to language developed through GPU process.

**EXHIBIT A
PC FLAGGED ITEMS**

ELEMENT/POLICY	COMMENT/ISSUE	RESOLUTION
AG-1.2	Edit to clean up format Criteria vs policy Clarify neighbor use does not limit allowed use (b)	Reformatted to separate criteria, policy, and exemptions Recommended change to fit formatting, but not intended to change context of language developed through GPU process. “enforced by” changed to “enforceable”
AG-1.3	Exceptions are too narrow Existing <u>and</u> allowed Ag operations (reasonably foreseeable allowed uses)	No recommended change to language developed through GPU process.
AG-1.12	Performance standard Specify level of mitigation from EIR	Standard is to mitigate the loss of acreage based on type of soil. GPU process was to defer specifics to ordinance. Reformatted to separate policy, exceptions, and interim process. Recommended change to fit formatting, but not intended to change context of language developed through GPU process.
AG-3.3	How did consultant analyze R-O Ag?...if we do not know what it is (e.g. OS-1.9) How affects OS-3.5?	No recommended change pending resolution of Policy OS-3.5
AG-4.3, 4.4		Definitive introduction Clarification
ED-Intro	Education?	Include 14% of employment in education from AMBAG.
ED-1.1 thru 1.4	Needs definitive introduction	“The County shall...”
ED	Review for intent: Key Industries Clustered Industries Key Industry Clusters	Terms added to Glossary for clarification
ED-3.2, 3.3	“should”	Replaced should with shall/may
ED-3.1, 4.4		Added definitive intro: “The County shall...”

**EXHIBIT A
PC FLAGGED ITEMS**

ELEMENT/POLICY	COMMENT/ISSUE	RESOLUTION
ED-4.6, 4.7	Coastal	Recommend no change and retain coastal business opportunities that may locate within inland areas.
ED-XX	Integrate Enterprise Zone and “Green Business” policy language	No change proposed at this time
AREA PLANS		
CACH-1.6	Build with LU-1.13	Cross reference LU-1.13
CACH-3.4	Fuel management Clarify (no permit for less than 4 trees?)	Amended tree policies in CACH, CV, GMP and North County to accommodate flexibility with current direction to address fuel management and Board direction on Monterey pines to be addressed in an ordinance. Identifies trees of concern and establishes criteria for an ordinance. Current practice is: Administrative Permit for 1-3 trees, Use Permit for 4+, and ministerial review for hazardous trees/fuel management.
CACH-4.3	“should encourage”	“should” changed to “shall”
CVMP	Entire Plan Flagged Commissioner Diehl to review and report	Citizen group established by Sup Potter Meetings run by Commissioner Diehl.
CSV-1.7	Public request to amend STA language (see Exhibit B)	Amended to reflect 2010 as current conditions rather than 2007.
GS-1.2/CSV-1.3	Avoid duplicate text in multiple APs to avoid inconsistency.	Consolidated into CSV policy
GS-1.7/CSV-1.4	Avoid duplicate text in multiple APs to avoid inconsistency.	Consolidated into CSV policy
GS-1.12/GMP-1.9	Avoid duplicate text in multiple APs to avoid inconsistency.	Consolidated into GMP policy
GS-1.9	shall vs may	Changed shall to may per PC direction.
GS-6.2	Format Why not in other areas of the GP (unique or better to be broad based)?	Corrected typo. Reformatted second part into bullets. PC to consider applying to other areas.

**EXHIBIT A
PC FLAGGED ITEMS**

ELEMENT/POLICY	COMMENT/ISSUE	RESOLUTION
GMP-2.10	Coastal?	Deleted because relates to coastal uses.
FO (Parker Flats) – pg FO-15	Refer to p FO-4 (Land Swap Agreement) York Road (County or City?)	
FO LU-1.3 (pg FO-19)	Consistency with HE and LU Element?	
FO Bio A-1 (pg FO-47)	Relation to HCP? If/When HCP adopted, would it govern FOMP?	
NC	NC-1.5	See <i>Lots of Record</i> below
SC-3.1	Why cogeneration South County only? Wider importance?	PC to consider applying to other areas
T-1.7	Clarify description of impacted area to match Land Use Map.	Amended to clarify the area consists of the Toro Groundwater Basin as illustrated in the LU Map.
Toro Land Use Map	Tarp Property, Pine Canyon/Salinas (Clarify if error or not) Amarl Property (Parker Road) Ferrini Property (River Road/Hwy 68)	TARP: Current GP and Zoning designate as F/40. Property not included as an approved POR (GPU3). Possibly part of GPU3 Rural Center. Not included in GPU4 POR discussions. AMARAL: Land Use Map corrected to only include portion with existing homes. Larger lot returned to F/40. FERRINI The 1982 GP established LDR (5-1 du/ac) land use designation for this property. The Area Plan was adopted/amended to reflect an adopted Specific Plan. In the late 80's, the County took action to repeal the SP and remove the zoning, but staff has found no action to remove the 1982 General Plan designation. Staff has interpreted Board direction for using the 1982 Plan to mean that the 1982 GP land use would apply, so the 2010 map reflects the 1982 land use designation but with a specific density of LDR/2.5.
AWCP-Intro 1.1 to 1.4	Clarify Introduction	Commissioner Getzelman drafted edits
AWCP-2.1	Different than 1.3?	Edited relative to Introduction edits.

**EXHIBIT A
PC FLAGGED ITEMS**

ELEMENT/POLICY	COMMENT/ISSUE	RESOLUTION
AWCP-3.3	Clarify new biological study language Address biological rather than discretion? Limited AP process?	Ministerial process impacts EIR because specific footprint of impact unknown at the programmatic level.
AWCP-3.2.B	Define Industry-wide events	See <i>Glossary</i>
AWCP-4.5	Edit to C-1.12 Include produce stands? Study cost?	Deleted AWCP 4.5 with reference to PS-1.1 (CIFP) and C-1.12 (AWCP Traffic) for consistency.
GLOSSARY		
Critical Viewshed	Definition is limited to Toro area	Critical viewshed determination is currently limited to the Toro Planning Area (Figure16). NOTE: Glossary could be amended to simply refer to Visual Sensitivity Maps to allow amendments in other areas)
Highly Erodible	was that versus erodible soils definition? K-factor	Added “highly and moved to “H” section of Glossary
Long Term Water Supply	“sustainable” (indefinite OR more water in vs out)	Term amended in Glossary as “Long Term Sustainable Water Supply”
Tier vs Phase	Tiers referenced in C-1.3 Phases referenced in OS-6, OS-7 and OS-8	Terms for Archaeological Phase I, II, III Studies added to Glossary
PM ₁₀ and NO _x	Add defining language	Definition of PM ₁₀ added to Glossary
Encourage Promote Support	Low Moderate High	Amended encourage. No change to promote or support.
Previously Uncultivated	Impact of changing 20 year threshold?	PC may consider change to 30 years
Slope	Clarify (degree vs percent) relative to measuring slope	Changed “degree” to “measurement” to avoid confusion of terms.
Winery Events	Define “industry-wide”	Added definition of Industry-wide (Winery) Events

**EXHIBIT A
PC FLAGGED ITEMS**

ELEMENT/POLICY	COMMENT/ISSUE	RESOLUTION
BOS ISSUES		
Floodplain Development	Development in fringe allowed to fill and create potential impact to others? Clarity of rules to require discretionary review to avoid impact to other property while not taking all use away	Defer to BOS
OTHER		
Language	Consistent and clear (shall, should, would, will, may, can be, etc.)	Review for should/could/would and replace with consistent application of shall or may as appropriate.
Septic versus Onsite Wastewater	Review for consistent terminology	Amended LU-1.15, LU-2.10, PS (Intro), Table PS-1/Note 5, PS-2.6, PS-4.10, Glossary (Septic Systems, Alt Wastewater, On-site Wastewater, Package Treatment, Wastewater Treatment Facility), CV-5.5, CSV-1.1, CSV-1.2, CSV-5.2, Fort Ord Hydrology Policy C-5.
Property Owner Requests	Lots of Record Impact	<p>The following approved PORs were impacted by incorporating the “Lots of Record” policies (GS, NC, and Toro:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • POR#43 (Banks); Change from LC to HDR/6 (APN: 133-021-002-000, 133-023-025-0000, 1.7 acres). Potential Increase = 10 units. • POR#48 (Culp); Change from RC/B-8 to LDR/1.5 (APN: 125-522-020-000, 3.9 acres). Potential Increase = 1 additional lot/unit. • POR#50 (DeOcampo); Change from F/40 to LDR/1 (APN: 267-111-003-000, 4.9 acres). LDR would allow four lots/units. F/40 allows three units (not lots) without discretionary review. Potential Increase = 1 additional unit (3 lots). Option = Change to LDR/2 to allow only one additional

**EXHIBIT A
PC FLAGGED ITEMS**

ELEMENT/POLICY	COMMENT/ISSUE	RESOLUTION
		<p>lot/unit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • POR#70 (Perez); Change from RC/B-8 to LDR/2.5 (APN:127-061-043-000, 11.0 acres). Allows 4 lots/units. Potential Increase = 3 additional lot/unit. Option = Change to LDR/5 to allow only one additional lot/unit. • POR#119 (Jordan); Change from LDR/1 to HDR/6 (APN: 127-021-011-000, 0.4 acres). Acreage would allow 2 units if changed. • Non POR (Rodriguez); Change from RC/10 to RDR/5.1 (APN: 141-051-028/029-000, 10.3 acres), RC was LCP designation and zoning was supposed to be changed with coastal boundary change. Potential Increase = 1 additional lot/unit. Option = Change to RDR/5.1 but no exception to allow second unit (financing only). <p>NOTE: Culp is only one that has come forward requesting exemption from the Lots of Record policy. Unless an exception is created now for one or more of these cases, a GPA is required to remove/amend NC-1.5 before any residential project can move forward.</p>
Interim Ordinance	how handle that? Implementation Plan?	Staff's recommended priority list will be provided to the Commission

**EXHIBIT A
PC FLAGGED ITEMS**

ELEMENT/POLICY	COMMENT/ISSUE	RESOLUTION
Timelines	What happens if timeline to complete task is not met? LU-1.19 (Dev Eval, 12 mo) LU-2.12 (25% Exempt, review every 2 yr) LU-9.1 (Impl Plan, 3 mo), C-1.2/PS-1.1/PS-3.9/AWCP-4.5 (CIFP, 18 mo from TIF, review 5 yrs, adjust 1 yr), C-1.8 (County TIF 18 mo), OS-3.9 (Hydrology Program, 5 yr), OS-5.19 (Kit Fox Strategy, 4 yr), OS-5.22 (Stream Setback, 3 yr), OS-5.23 (Oak Conservation, 5 yr), OS-10.11 (GHG Plan, 24 mo), OS-10.12 (Green Bldg Ord, 24 mo), OS-10.14 (GHG-County, 12 mo), PS-3.16/PS-3.18 (Water Supply Alt, 5 yr)	Counsel to consider and report