

# Exhibit D

This page intentionally left blank.

**Exhibit D**

SHUTE MIHALY  
& WEINBERGER LLP

396 HAYES STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102  
T: (415) 552-7272 F: (415) 552-5816  
www.smwlaw.com

SARA A. CLARK  
Attorney  
Clark@smwlaw.com

June 17, 2024

**Via Electronic Mail Only**

Monterey County Planning Commission  
County of Monterey Government Center  
168 W. Alisal Street  
Salinas, CA 93901  
Email: [pricet1@co.monterey.ca.us](mailto:pricet1@co.monterey.ca.us)  
[pchearingcomments@co.monterey.ca.us](mailto:pchearingcomments@co.monterey.ca.us)

Re: Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan Update: Rural Community Center

Dear Chair Diehl and Members of the Planning Commission:

This firm represents Keep Big Sur Wild (“KBSW”) on matters related to the proposed update to the Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan (“LUP Update”), and we submit these comments on their behalf. Keep Big Sur Wild is a group of residents concerned with protecting the scenic landscape, sensitive natural resources, and wild, rural character of the Big Sur coastal region. As you know, KBSW has been engaged on the LUP Update throughout its development, and submitted initial comments in December 2023 and subsequent comments in February and March 2024. We write today to oppose the expansion of the Rural Community Center land use designation beyond the original 1986 parameters and oppose other changes in the zoning that encourage or facilitate the ongoing commercialization of Big Sur, including allowing the conversion of rustic campgrounds to campgrounds with more amenities (“glamping”), which require additional employee upkeep. Curtailing uses that increase the need for more employees is an important solution to our current housing shortage.

First, KBSW opposes any expansion of the Rural Community Center (“RCC”) land use designation boundaries. While the Ad Hoc Committee has not formally proposed expanding the boundaries, the March 27, 2024 Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan Update includes maps of possible RCC land use category expansion areas. The Planning Committee requested input on the possible RCC expansion without providing any clear policy reason for altering the parameters established under the 1986 Big Sur Coast Land

## Exhibit D

Monterey County Planning Commission  
June 17, 2024  
Page 2

Use Plan. Expanding the application of this land use category, which the Planning Committee notes is “intended to provide increased opportunities for people . . . to live in Big Sur as well as a full spectrum of community and visitor support functions,” would likely lead to increased commercial development. This expansion would be contrary to the underlying rationale of the Big Sur Land Use Plan—which was to severely restrict both commercial and residential development to protect both highway capacity and sensitive coastal resources. It would also contribute to the continued overtourism, by facilitating the expansion of new destinations that drive increased travel.

Second, the development of additional commercial uses even within the existing RCC areas undermines the core purpose of the Big Sur Land Use Plan. The primary principal of the Land Use Plan is to protect the spectacular wild and scenic natural landscape millions experience every year as they drive scenic Highway 1. Visual exploration of the coast by daytime visitors, the lowest cost avenue for the public to access Big Sur’s iconic scenery, will suffer even greater impacts by additional traffic related to commercial uses. The March 27 Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan Update proposes increased development opportunities with the only limitation that such development “may be allowed if it can demonstrate that it will reduce impacts to Highway 1.” It is nearly impossible to assess traffic impacts on a project-by-project basis. Traffic is cumulative in nature. Any development other than very limited employee housing to accommodate existing workers. will increase congestion on already overused roads. Highway 1 is approaching “maximum carrying capacity,” and any additional increase in traffic will cause a “significant impact” because this protected resource is already at its limit.

Third, the Planning Commission should address factors contributing to the need for additional employee housing. While KBSW acknowledges the necessity of affordable housing to accommodate existing employees, curbing the trend toward “glamping” or other expanded-amenity visitor accommodations and experiences which require greater employee upkeep will lessen the need for expanded employee accommodations. As we mentioned in our March 26 letter, there is an emerging trend toward less rustic campgrounds with expanded amenities. These amenities - tent platforms, yurts, improved restrooms, RV campgrounds – require more employee maintenance than the traditional “rustic” campgrounds prevalent in Big Sur when the Land Use Plan was initially drafted. Beyond the pressures glamping places on local affordable housing due to the increase in staff, it requires expanded utility development and erodes the availability of low-cost accommodations in Big Sur. Thus, it is necessary that the County enforce the VSU Cap against glamping sites functioning as lodge or inn units.

**Exhibit D**

Monterey County Planning Commission  
June 17, 2024  
Page 3

In conclusion, we urge the Planning Commission not to expand the boundaries of the Rustic Community Center land use category from the parameters established under the original 1986 Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan, preserve access to the iconic scenery of Big Sur by preventing the development of any additional commercial facilities, and address recent trends in visitor accommodations that worsen the need for employee housing.

Thank you for your time and attention to these important issues.

Very truly yours,

SHUTE, MIHALY & WEINBERGER LLP



Sara A. Clark

1793865.2

## Exhibit D

**From:** [Vasquez, Elizabeth](#)  
**To:** [Price, Taylor](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Ban Short Term Rentals  
**Date:** Friday, April 5, 2024 4:36:46 PM

---

Good afternoon Taylor,

Please see the below correspondence below for BSCLUP Update.

Kindly,

Elizabeth Vasquez  
Senior Secretary (WOC)  
Housing and Community Development  
1441 Schilling Place, South Bldg. 2nd Floor,  
Salinas, CA 93901  
Office: (831)755-5025 Desk: (831) 784-5737  
Fax: (831) 757-9516  
[VasquezE4@co.monterey.ca.us](mailto:VasquezE4@co.monterey.ca.us)

-----Original Message-----

From: Marcus Foster <[marcusfoster69@gmail.com](mailto:marcusfoster69@gmail.com)>  
Sent: Friday, April 5, 2024 10:49 AM  
To: 293-pchearingcomments <[pchearingcomments@co.monterey.ca.us](mailto:pchearingcomments@co.monterey.ca.us)>  
Subject: Ban Short Term Rentals

[CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. ]

Dear Members of Planning Commission:

I support the language that does not allow "short term transient use for thirty or fewer days whereby residents host visitors in their homes or on their properties for compensation."

Short term rentals deplete guest and caretaker houses for the potential use of long term rentals for employees and residents that contribute to this small and unique community. These people are the workers of the "legal" hotels, volunteers on our fire department, artists, etc., I have watched these properties that used to house friends that lived and worked here get evicted so new owners can turn them into commercial Visitor Serving Units, which have a cap in the Land Use Plan that we have already exceeded, so they can make a profit. This is a dangerous precedent as outside interests and even corporations are buying up houses outside the Visitor Serving Commercially zoned areas to convert them not only into hotels but also into special event wedding sites.

Some of the letters I have read in favor of STR's have admitted to doing so for years and have other houses around the state in which they use for the same purpose. It is a business for them at the expense of our community. They are upset that there will be a policy in the new LUP that prohibits STR's. They need to be reminded that this activity is already illegal in the unincorporated coastal zone of Monterey County and the current LUP states "residential areas are not well suited for commercial or visitor use." This is where the lack of enforcement by the County has led to this false sense of anger towards the draft update.

Enforcement of the LUP and County ordinances is mandatory in preserving Big Sur and its community! Monterey County is so fortunate to have this state, national and worldwide treasure that brings in millions of dollars to the County and California businesses. I believe it needs a designated Monterey County code enforcement officer just

## **Exhibit D**

for the Big Sur planning area that focuses solely on making sure the policies in the Big Sur Land Use Plan are upheld and followed.

The County and State can't keep talking about the emergency need for housing for its residents and workforce and then allow the conversion of existing houses into hotel rooms for visitors. It's time to take care of people that want to live here over the visiting public and the absentee second home owners that just look at their Big Sur properties as a way to make money.

--

Marcus Foster  
Full Time Resident  
Big Sur, CA

## Exhibit D

**From:** [Vasquez, Elizabeth](#)  
**To:** [Price, Taylor](#)  
**Subject:** FW: No More Planting of Invasive Non-Natives  
**Date:** Monday, April 1, 2024 9:19:20 AM  
**Attachments:** [image002.png](#)

---

Good morning Taylor,

Please see the below comment for BSCLUP Update.

Kindly,



**Elizabeth Vasquez**  
Senior Secretary (WOC)  
Housing and Community Development  
1441 Schilling Place, South Bldg. 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor,  
Salinas, CA 93901  
Office: (831)755-5025 Desk: (831) 784-5737  
Fax: (831) 757-9516  
[VasquezE4@co.monterey.ca.us](mailto:VasquezE4@co.monterey.ca.us)

*Confidentiality Notice: This communication and any attachments may contain confidential and privileged information for the use of the designated recipient (s). Distribution, reproduction or any other use of this transmission by any party other than the intended recipient is prohibited.*

**Please be advised that as of April 15th, 2024, my email address will be changing to [VasquezE4@countyofmonterey.gov](mailto:VasquezE4@countyofmonterey.gov), and our County web address will be [www.countyofmonterey.gov](http://www.countyofmonterey.gov). Kindly update your records accordingly to ensure seamless communication. NOTE: emails sent to my [co.monterey.ca.us](mailto:co.monterey.ca.us) address will forward to my new email address for a limited time. Thank you for your attention to this matter.**

---

**From:** Marcus Foster <marcusfoster69@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 30, 2024 8:34 PM  
**To:** 293-pchearingcomments <pchearingcomments@co.monterey.ca.us>  
**Subject:** No More Planting of Invasive Non-Natives

[CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. ]

Dear Members of Planning Commission:

Big Sur has a Monterey Cypress Tree problem. As many of you know, invasive plant species are taking over the natural landscape of Big Sur. We often talk about Jubata Grass (Pampas), Scotch and French Broom, Cape Ivy, etc., but the non native invasive Cypress Trees often get overlooked. Brought to the area from their two native stands, Cypress Point in Pebble Beach and Point Lobos, by homesteaders for fast growing wind blocks and shade. They were then used later in time after the



## Exhibit D

highway was built and before the LUP was adopted to screen homes along the famous scenic highway and are currently still being used for this purpose. However, over time these "invasive" trees grow to 70 to 90 feet tall and the houses and structures become visible due to lower branches getting trimmed up due to wind damage or owners preference for a "canopy" style look. This has caused the scenic ocean views to become blocked and homes to become more visible in the Critical Viewshed along with the fact that they outcompete the native vegetation. This trend is most evident from the "Crab Lab" (MM 64.5) south to Bixby Bridge. Houses that were never visible before now are and previous views of the ocean have all but disappeared.

I support the language in the draft update that states "removal of non-native or planted trees, except where this would result in the exposure of structures in the Critical Viewshed." It also states that it "discourages the planting of, and encourage removal of, non-native Monterey Pine, Eucalyptus, and Monterey Cypress trees within the Big Sur Land Use Plan Area."

I do however believe it should be taken to another level with a strict policy that any plant or tree that is in the category of "INVASIVE" non-native should be prohibited from ever being planted in the Big Sur LUP area. Invasives need more attention here as they are completely destroying the natural landscape, ecosystems and scenic viewsheds of the area. This would be a great start to reverse the environmental damage invasives have done to Big Sur over the past century.

Thank you,

--

Marcus Foster  
Resident  
Big Sur, CA

## Exhibit D

**From:** [Vasquez, Elizabeth](#)  
**To:** [Price, Taylor](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Prioritize Fuel Reduction  
**Date:** Monday, April 1, 2024 9:18:05 AM  
**Attachments:** [image002.png](#)

---

Good morning Taylor,

Please see the below comment for BSCLUP Update.

Kindly,



**Elizabeth Vasquez**

Senior Secretary (WOC)  
Housing and Community Development  
1441 Schilling Place, South Bldg. 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor,  
Salinas, CA 93901  
Office: (831)755-5025 Desk: (831) 784-5737  
Fax: (831) 757-9516  
[VasquezE4@co.monterey.ca.us](mailto:VasquezE4@co.monterey.ca.us)

*Confidentiality Notice: This communication and any attachments may contain confidential and privileged information for the use of the designated recipient (s). Distribution, reproduction or any other use of this transmission by any party other than the intended recipient is prohibited.*

**Please be advised that as of April 15th, 2024, my email address will be changing to [VasquezE4@countyofmonterey.gov](mailto:VasquezE4@countyofmonterey.gov), and our County web address will be [www.countyofmonterey.gov](http://www.countyofmonterey.gov). Kindly update your records accordingly to ensure seamless communication. NOTE: emails sent to my [co.monterey.ca.us](mailto:co.monterey.ca.us) address will forward to my new email address for a limited time. Thank you for your attention to this matter.**

---

**From:** David Hurwitz <davidhurwitz@me.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 28, 2024 3:00 PM  
**To:** 293-pchearingcomments <pchearingcomments@co.monterey.ca.us>;  
BSLUP@firesafemonterey.org  
**Cc:** Richard Bates <firewise.fscmc@gmail.com>; Pam Peck <pam@firesafemonterey.org>  
**Subject:** Prioritize Fuel Reduction

[CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. ]

Planning Commission of Monterey County:

I represent the Boronda-Garzas Firewise Community in Carmel Valley, and urge you to edit the update to the Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan to avoid regulatory hindrances to wildfire fuel reduction work.

## **Exhibit D**

Our forests are dangerously overgrown, including on public lands like Garland Ranch, adjacent to my own Boronda-Garzas Firesafe Community. Meanwhile, residents face daunting regulatory hurdles for fuel reduction on their private property. This must change, else lives will be lost, both human and animal, when the next wildfire hits and is fueled by excessive fuel loads.

Hence, the Boronda-Garzas Firewise Community strongly endorses the [January 25 letter to you from the Fire Safe Council for Monterey County](#) on this matter, and the detailed recommendations included in that letter, dated December 12, 2023.

Respectfully,

David Hurwitz  
1 Boronda Road  
Carmel Valley 93924

650-743-9788

**Exhibit D**

**From:** [Price, Taylor](#)  
**To:** [Vasquez, Elizabeth](#)  
**Cc:** [Navarro, Janet](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Item 14 in the Draft Big Sur Land Use Plan  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 4, 2024 2:19:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)  
[image005.png](#)  
[image006.png](#)  
[image007.png](#)  
[image008.png](#)

---

Hi Elizabeth,

Sorry, I forgot to respond to this email. Yes, I plan on including this in the public comment for my report for 6/26.

Thanks,



**Taylor Price** *(he/him or they/them)*  
Associate Planner  
County of Monterey – Housing & Community  
Development  
1441 Schilling Place, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor South, Salinas, CA 93901  
O: (831) 784-5730  
[pricet1@countyofmonterey.gov](mailto:pricet1@countyofmonterey.gov)



---

**From:** Vasquez, Elizabeth <VasquezE4@countyofmonterey.gov>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 31, 2024 6:48 AM  
**To:** Price, Taylor <PriceT1@countyofmonterey.gov>  
**Cc:** Navarro, Janet <NavarroJ1@countyofmonterey.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: Item 14 in the Draft Big Sur Land Use Plan

Okay, thank you! Will you be adding it as a public comment exhibit to your report for 6/26 or do you want me to save it in our folder and distribute it after that agenda gets distributed?

Kindly,



**Elizabeth Vasquez**  
Senior Secretary  
Housing and Community Development  
1441 Schilling Place, South Bldg. 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor,  
Salinas, CA 93901  
Office: (831)755-5025 Desk: (831) 784-5737  
Fax: (831) 757-9516  
[vasqueze4@countyofmonterey.gov](mailto:vasqueze4@countyofmonterey.gov)

**Confidentiality Notice: This communication and any attachments may contain confidential and privileged**

**Exhibit D**

*information for the use of the designated recipient (s). Distribution, reproduction or any other use of this transmission by any party other than the intended recipient is prohibited.*

---

**From:** Price, Taylor <[PriceT1@countyofmonterey.gov](mailto:PriceT1@countyofmonterey.gov)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 30, 2024 5:04 PM  
**To:** Vasquez, Elizabeth <[VasquezE4@countyofmonterey.gov](mailto:VasquezE4@countyofmonterey.gov)>  
**Cc:** Navarro, Janet <[NavarroJ1@countyofmonterey.gov](mailto:NavarroJ1@countyofmonterey.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: Item 14 in the Draft Big Sur Land Use Plan

Hi Elizabeth,

Yes, this should be for the BSCLUP.

Thanks,



**Taylor Price** (*he/him or they/them*)  
Associate Planner  
County of Monterey – Housing & Community  
Development  
1441 Schilling Place, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor South, Salinas, CA 93901  
O: (831) 784-5730  
[pricet1@countyofmonterey.gov](mailto:pricet1@countyofmonterey.gov)



---

**From:** Vasquez, Elizabeth <[VasquezE4@countyofmonterey.gov](mailto:VasquezE4@countyofmonterey.gov)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 30, 2024 4:39 PM  
**To:** Price, Taylor <[PriceT1@countyofmonterey.gov](mailto:PriceT1@countyofmonterey.gov)>  
**Cc:** Navarro, Janet <[NavarroJ1@countyofmonterey.gov](mailto:NavarroJ1@countyofmonterey.gov)>  
**Subject:** FW: Item 14 in the Draft Big Sur Land Use Plan

Hi Taylor,

We received the below comment and attachment to the PC inbox. I'm thinking it's for the BSCLUP, could you confirm? I can add it as a comment for 'non-agenda' items for the PC 6/5/24 meeting.

Kindly,



**Elizabeth Vasquez**  
Senior Secretary  
Housing and Community Development  
1441 Schilling Place, South Bldg. 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor,  
Salinas, CA 93901  
Office: (831)755-5025 Desk: (831) 784-5737  
Fax: (831) 757-9516  
[vasqueze4@countyofmonterey.gov](mailto:vasqueze4@countyofmonterey.gov)

**Confidentiality Notice: This communication and any attachments may contain confidential and privileged**

## Exhibit D

*information for the use of the designated recipient (s). Distribution, reproduction or any other use of this transmission by any party other than the intended recipient is prohibited.*

---

**From:** Jan Freiwald <[jfreiwald@reefcheck.org](mailto:jfreiwald@reefcheck.org)>

**Sent:** Thursday, May 30, 2024 1:01 PM

**To:** 293-pchearingcomments <[pchearingcomments@countyofmonterey.gov](mailto:pchearingcomments@countyofmonterey.gov)>;  
[daniels.kate@gmail.com](mailto:daniels.kate@gmail.com)

**Subject:** Item 14 in the Draft Big Sur Land Use Plan

[CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. ]

Dear Planning Commission,

I am Jan Freiwald, the Executive Director of Reef Check. Founded in 1996, the Reef Check Foundation is an international non-profit organization dedicated to the conservation of tropical coral reefs and temperate kelp forests. With headquarters in California and volunteer teams in more than 40 countries and territories, Reef Check's mission is to lead citizen scientists who promote stewardship of sustainable reef communities around the globe.

Most recently, Reef Check began working on restoring kelp forests, with the hope of reversing some of the devastating collapse of these ecosystems along the North American West Coast. The focus of this program is on community-based restoration by engaging volunteers and providing economic benefit to the local communities that depend on the ocean environment and are the most hard hit by the effective loss of kelp in many regions. Helicopters have been a vital resource for our restoration efforts in Big Sur, as you will see in the attached document the use of a local pilot, Peter Fenton, has allowed us to continue an ongoing aerial survey of the major effected areas. We have used this valuable imagery to validate progress, identify new targets for restoration, and to maintain a high situational awareness of the kelp forest health. Early discovery of newly lost areas of kelp is a critical component of our most recent approach to early intervention. Real time, high resolution aerial imagery facilitates early discovery of kelp decline before more widespread loss is occurring. This allows for early intervention and hopefully recovery and stop of further loss of this iconic habitat along the Big Sur coast.

Item 14 in the Draft Big Sur Land Use Plan (ref below) would severely impact our ongoing efforts to maintain and expand the natural wildlife habitat recovery in Big Sur. We believe the existing NOAA and FAA guidelines adequately protect this natural habitat and additional language in the proposed land use plan would have a negative effect on our efforts.

Sincerely,  
Jan Freiwald, PhD  
Executive Director, Reef Check Foundation

--

Jan Freiwald, PhD  
Executive Director  
Reef Check Foundation  
phone: (831) 345-8167  
[jfreiwald@reefcheck.org](mailto:jfreiwald@reefcheck.org)  
[www.reefcheck.org](http://www.reefcheck.org)

## **Exhibit D**

REF, Item 14. A permanent helicopter pad or heliport is prohibited in the Big Sur Coastal Planning Area due to helicopter use's direct conflict with Big Sur's rural and wild character; its effect on the peace and tranquility of Big Sur's small-scale, traditional and rural setting; and its potential to harass wildlife. A permanent helicopter pad or heliport may be allowed for emergency medical, fire, or search and rescue purposes, may be considered on a case by case basis if they adhere and comply with all other elements of this LUP. Temporary helicopter landing areas may be allowed for emergency medical, fire, or search and rescue purposes or as temporarily needed during construction. Upon the end of any such emergency or construction, the temporary landing area must be removed. Development of properties where the primary means of access is via helicopter shall be discouraged from developing, as development of these properties is a direct conflict with Big Sur's rural and wild character.



# Ventana Wildlife Society

Conserving Native Wildlife and their Habitats

June 6, 2024

Taylor Price,  
Associate Planner  
Sent via email

Re: Comments for Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan Update

Dear Planning Commission,

Founded in 1977, Ventana Wildlife Society led the way to the successful reintroduction of the iconic Bald Eagle and the California Condor to their native central coast habitats. Through adherence to rigorous science, collaboration to amplify our efforts, and educational outreach to underserved and historically marginalized communities, our organization strives to address pressing ecosystem challenges while inspiring the next generation of environmental and wildlife stewards. We conducted our first release of captive-raised condors to Big Sur in 1997 and the wild flock now numbers 100 individuals in central California.

### *Condors and the Big Sur Coast LUP*

We appreciate that protections for wildlife such as peregrine falcons, golden eagles and others remain in the marked up LUP. We appreciate that the California condor is specifically mentioned in the LUP (Section 3.8.3, paragraph 5d(5)) and that mining and other disturbance is restricted nearby “roosting” sites but we suggest you could also include “nesting” in this sentence. We also recommend you take this opportunity to provide further protections for the condor and offer additional comments below.

In the early phase of condor releases in Big Sur, which began in 1997, collisions with power lines was a significant threat, but due to Pacific Gas and Electric’s work to install bird flight diverters and installing “tree wire” as well as undergrounding one key segment of line, this mortality factor has been greatly reduced. Bird flight diverters and insulated power lines provide birds, such as condors, flying in low visibility a better chance of avoidance and are recommended in Big Sur.

We collaborated with PG&E and conducted a GIS analysis of condor movements relative to existing power structures within PG&E’s service territory and found only a small percentage of poles and lines represent the greatest risk. This risk assessment tool was used to identify top priority areas to retrofit and many were completed, though at least one high-risk area in Big Sur remains a threat today.

### BOARD MEMBERS

Bill Eckert  
*Chair*

Abel Valdez  
*Vice Chair*

Cynthia Garfield  
*Treasurer*

Amanda Freedman,  
DVM  
*Secretary*

Rebeca Andrade  
Alec Arago

Amedee Brickey

J. Alan Fagan

Mason Mallory

Mark Osterkamp

Cesar Velazquez

**Ventana Wildlife Society**

9699 Blue Larkspur Ln  
Ste 105  
Monterey CA 93940  
831-455-9514

501(c)(3) Tax ID Number  
94-2795935.

www.ventanaws.org  
facebook | You Tube  
Instagram | Twitter





# Ventana Wildlife Society

Conserving Native Wildlife and their Habitats

**BOARD MEMBERS**

Bill Eckert  
*Chair*

Abel Valdez  
*Vice Chair*

Cynthia Garfield  
*Treasurer*

Amanda Freedman,  
DVM  
*Secretary*

Rebeca Andrade  
Alec Arago

Amedee Brickey

J. Alan Fagan

Mason Mallory

Mark Osterkamp

Cesar Velazquez

We request that in the LUP, you encourage bird protection measures such as installing bird flight diverters, insulated “tree wire” and other similar efforts for the protection of the California condor and other large flying birds such as golden eagles. Tree wire is highly recommended because it prevents electrocution and its visible profile is only slightly greater than an exposed wire, thereby in keeping with aesthetic values. Moreover, the installation of tree wire is an excellent tool for fire protection, which is an added benefit for the community.

*Helicopters and Condors*

Human or helicopter disturbance at condor nest sites has yet to be determined the cause of failure of any condor nest in Big Sur since 2006, when they began breeding in the area again and therefore is not a major concern for condor recovery efforts.

We believe the FAA is best suited to regulate airspace as opposed to local land use plans and recommend this section to be deleted. Alternatively, we request modification to include an exemption for condor protection measures.

Although no collision between a condor and helicopter has been documented to date, the risk to pilot and condor is just too great. We have long recommended that when low-flying helicopters are in condor areas, there should be at least one condor monitor located nearby with the ability to communicate with the pilot before and during flight operations. Most condors in the wild carry radio transmitters and our team of biologists and volunteers track the movements of the birds on a daily basis as well the whereabouts and outcomes of nests. Collision is a concern but easily managed, especially with professional condor monitors included in project work.

Similar to the comment above, helicopters are commonly used to retrofit power lines with bird protection and therefore we recommend that in the LUP in section 5.4.2 “General Policies”, paragraph 14 that it explicitly includes “retrofitting power lines with bird protection” in the context of construction.

*Unmanned Aircraft Systems*

One unintended consequence of the suggested language is the preclusion of legitimate biological survey tools and other environmental monitoring using such systems. We feel this would be a disservice to the protection of Big Sur resources to outright ban the use of unmanned aircraft systems. We trust the aim is to discourage tourists from using drones to capture their experience, which we agree is a nuisance to wildlife and people alike due to the numbers of flights and intensity in certain areas, but we suggest we should not limit our



# Ventana Wildlife Society

Conserving Native Wildlife and their Habitats

**BOARD MEMBERS**

Bill Eckert  
*Chair*

Abel Valdez  
*Vice Chair*

Cynthia Garfield  
*Treasurer*

Amanda Freedman,  
DVM  
*Secretary*

Rebeca Andrade  
Alec Arago

Amedee Brickey

J. Alan Fagan

Mason Mallory

Mark Osterkamp

Cesar Velazquez

ability to conduct legitimate science. Nor should we prevent future film makers from capturing video from the air, but it must be well managed and enforced.

We recommend modifying the last sentence of section 5.4.2 "General Policies", paragraph 15 to read "Unmanned Aircraft Systems may be used for emergency medical, fire, search and rescue, or permitted environmental surveys and video recordings."

*Events*

In section 5.4.2 "General Policies", paragraph 16 we recommend you remove the ambiguity in the opening sentence "Special events of appropriate scale..." and define it better or better yet delete this entire section. Obtaining a Coastal Development Permit is not something easy to secure and the timeline of acceptance is often unclear as well. Is the County ready to handle these type of permit authorizations? We are concerned that this provision in effect would ban all special events. Is a Coastal Development Permit even an appropriate mechanism for an event if no construction is involved? Monterey County Zoning, Title 20.70.025 "COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMITS" states, "...those uses not considered development shall not require a Coastal Development Permit." In fact, under "Exemptions" 20.70.120 you could build a deck or storage building under 1,000 square feet without needing a CDP, for example, so it seems incongruous to require a permit for just an event.

*Bixby Bridge*

We wish to recognize the addition of text "Bixby Bridge vicinity" in section 4.1.2 "Specific Policies", paragraph A.3 is of the utmost importance. This ongoing safety problem and traffic nightmare should be addressed immediately and well before the adoption of this LUP amendment but appreciate greatly that the language was added nonetheless.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Kelly Sorenson  
Executive Director

**Ventana Wildlife Society**

9699 Blue Larkspur Ln  
Ste 105  
Monterey CA 93940  
831-455-9514

501(c)(3) Tax ID Number  
94-2795935.

www.ventanaws.org  
facebook | You Tube  
Instagram | Twitter