### Exhibit A



## EXHIBIT A DISCUSSION

#### BACKGROUND

The North County Land Use Plan (NCLUP) was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on April 28, 1982 and the plan was later certified by the California Coastal Commission on June 4, 1982. The Monterey County Coastal Implementation Plan, Part 2, Regulations for Development in the North County Land Use Plan Area (CIP) was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on January 5, 1988 and certified by the California Coastal Commission on December 10, 1987. The Moss Landing Community Plan (MLCP) is found in Chapter 5 of the NCLUP and implementing regulations are found in Section 20.144.160 of the CIP.

In 2008, the County was notified of several new development proposals in Moss Landing. This presented an opportunity to look at the 1982 MLCP and develop an update to its policies in areas where the goal/direction may be out of date, to reflect the current land uses, and provide direction for future development in the community. Formation of the Moss Landing Community Plan Update Committee (Committee) was the first step of this work. The Committee provided recommendations, with input from the public, for the MLCP Update (Exhibit G) through the consideration of development opportunities, infrastructure constraints, and several prospective projects with the overall goal of preserving Moss Landing's unique community character. The Committee's recommendation and public response was to pursue a moderate growth scenario.

The 2009 Committee's transportation recommendations focused on traffic safety. Staff commenced work on drafting an update to the plan with the 2009 Committee's recommendations incorporated and a public draft was circulated for review in October 2012 and work on the environmental document began. Refinement of the plan continued, and revised plans were drafted and circulated in 2014, 2015, and 2017.

#### **CURRENT WORK**

Numerous comments on the circulated 2015 draft were received that most of the 2009 Committee's recommendations were no longer in the plan. Planning staff was tasked to go through the policies and make necessary modifications to incorporate those recommendations. In addition, staff brought the community in on policy discussions to ensure their concerns are addressed and the community's needs are met. To this date, seven community meetings have been held to discuss policies relative to:

- Sea level rise and climate change,
- Visual resources and community character,
- Historical resources,
- Tribal cultural and archaeological resources,
- Biological resources,
- Noise,
- Transportation,
- Pedestrian and bicycle facilities,
- Public transit/rail services,
- Public access and Recreation,

- Land use (partial), and
- Wastewater (partial).

Members of the public that reside, manage businesses, work, and recreate in the community; organizations and associations interested in the community; and local and state agencies have been participating in these meetings. Attendance suggests that participation is based on interest of the agendized topic of discussion. This may be attributed to the time commitment necessary to meet twice a month.

Community meeting attendance during traffic policy discussions included community residents, business owners (Elkhorn Slough Safari and Whispering Charters), Moss Landing Harbor District (staff, board members, and representative), research facilities and their representatives (MBARI), Monterey County Supervisorial District 2 staff, Friends, Artists and Neighbors of Elkhorn Slough (FANS) and their representative, Elkhorn Slough Foundation, Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) staff, Transportation Agency for Monterey (TAMC) staff, and RMA-Public Works and Facilities staff.

#### PLANNING COMMISSION WORKSHOP DISCUSSION

The discussion below presents the Commission with transportation policies. Applicable policy information from the North County Land Use Plan (NCLUP) and direction of the 2009 Committee is included for each policy topic to provide the Commission with context. The intent of each policy is first summarized followed by a table containing the 2017 MCLP draft policy language, staff's recommended language, and a blank column for the Commission to notate any recommended language and/or changes. Following the table is a narrative explaining earlier discussions, modification to language, and the resulting draft policy for the Commission's consideration. The matrix finalized after the community meetings, but prior to this workshop, contain strikeout and underline text, are attached to allow the Commission a clear comparison (**Exhibit B**).

#### **TOPIC: TRANSPORTATION**

Discussion of transportation policies occurred over the course of three community meetings (October 17 & 30 and November 13, 2018 and an average of 18.33 members of the public were in attendance (23 on the 17<sup>th</sup>, 19 on the 30<sup>th</sup>, and 13 on the 13<sup>th</sup>). Staff provided the community with the current 1982 NCLUP overarching transportation policies and the 2017 draft MLCP policies. At the request of the community, staff also provided information on an existing permitted project currently under construction on southeastern end of Moss Landing Road (Moss Landing History & Heritage Center, File No. ZA6151).

NCLUP – The goal of NCLUP Chapter 3.1, Transportation, is to preserve highway capacity for coastal access and coastal-dependent uses and improve safety and efficiency of the roadways. The plan acknowledges existing traffic congestion issues and the need for highway and road upgrades to address increasing traffic volumes; and how the lack of funding, environmental concerns, and impacts to prime agricultural land play a significant part in delaying upgrades to occur.

This is demonstrated by Key Policy 3.1.1 – "State highways within the North County coastal area should be upgraded to provide for a safe and uncongested flow of traffic. Major County roads should be expanded or managed to accommodate traffic volumes at Level of Service C. Public transit should be expanded to provide a viable transportation alternative."

General and specific policies supporting this key policy and applicable to the Moss Landing Community Plan area are summarized below (see **Exhibit C** for complete policy language):

- 3.1.2.1 widen Highway 1 to four lanes.
- 3.1.2.3 limit access roads to Highway 1, consolidate existing where feasible.
- 3.1.2.4 improve Highway 1 consistent with State Scenic Highway design standards.
- 3.1.2.5 upgrade major arterial roads. Upgrade local and rural roads only as necessary.
- 3.1.3.1 coastal-dependent industrial, agricultural, commercial, and recreational uses are prioritized over non-coastal-dependent development until Highway 1 is expanded.
- 3.1.3.3 new access roads or commercial entrances on Highway 1 shall not be allowed unless infeasible.

Based on the above, NCLUP Recommended Action No. 3.1.4.1 stipulates that the State Department of Transportation shall initiate a study for the widening Highway 1 and evaluation of expansion shall minimizing encroachment on agricultural uses, environmentally sensitive habitats and commercial uses.

<u>2009 BOS Committee</u> – An Infrastructure Subcommittee was created to focus on existing and future sewer, water, and traffic needs of the community and address their related issues (**Exhibit I**). The committee stated that traffic issues are centered around Highway 1. Specifically, the difficulty of making turning movements on and off Highway 1 from both ends of Moss Landing and Dolan Roads. The community expressed a desire for installing traffic signals at the Dolan Road–Highway 1 and/or Moss Landing Road–Highway 1 intersections. However, this is not

supported by Caltrans. In addition, it is the desire of the California Coastal Commission<sup>1</sup> that Highway 1 remain as a rural scenic two land highway. As a result, the committee found that the best solution would be to develop criteria instead of focusing on a specific transportation improvement project and concluded with the following recommendations:

- No. 26 All transportation planning along Highway 1 needs to be done in the context of a Corridor System Management Plan (CSMP). All improvements shall be made consistent with this plan.
- No. 27 The traffic study prepared for the update of the Moss Landing Community Plan needs to be consistent with the Caltrans CSMP and include success criteria by which future projects are evaluated. The criteria should be, but are not limited to such factors as: resource impacts (wetlands, farmlands, etc.), safety needs, congestion reduction, community acceptance (local and regional), fundability, total overall delay at node, and possible alternative routes.
- No. 28 The Moss Landing Community should develop multiple viable modes to transportation which is not reliant upon single occupancy vehicles. The Plan update needs to tie together mass transit opportunities with significant pedestrian and bicycle linkages.
- No. 29 There is a need to provide some connectivity between Moss Landing Business Park and the development on the west side of Highway 1.
- No. 30 The committee did look at several small, low-cost, short-term, traffic solutions that would improve traffic circulation and safety. These include:
  - a. Realigning the Moss Landing Road, Potrero Road, and Highway 1 intersection.
  - b. Consolidating and realigning driveways.
  - c. Installing acceleration and deceleration lanes
  - d. Restrict the use of any improvements, structures or plant material that impacts traffic safety.
  - e. Lower the speed limit along Moss Landing Road. Examine the use of a school zone in front of Moss Landing Marine Labs.

<u>1982 Moss Landing Community Plan</u> – The current circulation policies found in the Moss Landing Community Plan, Chapter 5, Section 5.2.2 are found in **Exhibit D** for reference.

https://www.coastal.ca.gov/recap3/MCO%20PeriodicReviewstaffreport-Sept%202004.pdf

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See California Coastal Commission staff report dated November 26, 2003. Recommendation LU-14.1 calls for improvement of Highway 1 while maintaining its two-lane configuration.

The intent of this policy is to ensure development of new or expanded visitor-serving commercial facilities provide adequate parking and access. New access points to State Route 1 (SR1) shall be avoided and existing shall be consolidated. This policy is consistent with NCLUP Policies 3.1.2.3 and 3.1.3.3 summarized above and found in **Exhibit C**.

| 2017 Version                           | Staff Recommendation            | Planning<br>Commission Input |
|--|---------------------------------|------------------------------|
| New or expanded visitor-serving        | New or expanded visitor-        |                              |
| commercial facilities in Moss Landing  | serving commercial facilities   |                              |
| shall provide adequate parking, either | in Moss Landing shall           |                              |
| on or off site, and safe access,       | provide adequate parking,       |                              |
| including necessary turning lanes,     | either on or off site, and safe |                              |
| acceleration lanes, and signing.       | access, including necessary     |                              |
| Wherever possible, access to State     | turning lanes, acceleration     |                              |
| Route 1 from commercial facilities     | lanes, and signing. Wherever    |                              |
| should be consolidated. The creation   | possible, access to State       |                              |
| of new direct driveway access onto     | Route 1 from commercial         |                              |
| State Route 1 from new or existing     | facilities should be            |                              |
| commercial uses should be avoided.     | consolidated.                   |                              |

<u>California Coastal Commission (CCC) Staff Narrative</u> – Staff discussed this policy with CCC staff prior to the community meeting. It was suggested the language be strengthened.

<u>Community Recommendation Narrative</u> – One member in attendance inquired if "safe access" was referred to vehicles access only does it include pedestrian access too. Some members in attendance suggested that the last sentence of the policy be moved and covered by subsequent Policy 3.4 below.

<u>Staff's Recommendation Narrative</u> – This policy focuses on vehicular access because pedestrian access is already covered under a separate set of policies. Based on the recommendation of CCC staff, the community was presented with modified language that was directive. However, this language is not included in the above recommendation because it is found in the last sentence of the policy and staff is in agreement with the community's suggestion to move it to Policy 3.4. Any precise regulatory language will be included in the accompanying Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP).

The intent of this policy is to identify the County's intent to plan and fund a balanced multimodal transportation network for the Community. Prior to the community meeting, staff discussed this policy with Coastal Commission staff, who suggested the language be strengthened. Therefore, the community was presented with modified language that is more directive.

| 2017 Version                  | Staff Recommendation                      | Planning<br>Commission<br>Input |
|-------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| The County of Monterey shall  | The County of Monterey shall identify     |                                 |
| plan for a balanced,          | funding to construct and maintain plan    |                                 |
| multimodal transportation     | for a balanced, multimodal                |                                 |
| network that meets the needs  | transportation network, consistent with   |                                 |
| of all users of the streets,  | TAMC and Caltrans Plans, that meets       |                                 |
| roads, and highways for safe  | the needs of the community and all        |                                 |
| and convenient travel, in a   | users of the streets, roads, and highways |                                 |
| manner that avoids impacts to | for safe and convenient travel, in a      |                                 |
| important natural resources,  | manner that avoids impacts to important   |                                 |
| including the Elkhorn Slough  | natural resources, including the Elkhorn  |                                 |
| and wildlife.                 | Slough and wildlife.                      |                                 |

<u>California Coastal Commission (CCC) Staff Narrative</u> – Staff discussed this policy with CCC staff prior to the community meeting. It was suggested that the language was too general and the policy should be deleted.

<u>Community Recommendation Narrative</u> – Some members wanted the policy to only address multimodal transportation and allow for protection of natural resource under other policies (end sentence at "travel."). Others felt that policy should include a statement about balancing the desire to provide a multimodal network against the protection of natural resources. FANS suggested deletion based on the recommendation by CCC staff and recommends a separate policy be drafted mandating communication with the community be open. Residents had concerns with allowing large trucks on the community streets and suggested addressing the needs of the community by not making it general for all users.

Staff's Recommendation Narrative – In order to qualify for regional and state funds, staff recommends the language state: "identify funding to construct and maintain a balanced multimodal transportation network consistent with TAMC and Caltrans Plan". Consistent with the Commission's general statement that policies should focus on specific topics and should avoid language that spill over into other areas, staff recommends language relative to impacts to natural resources be stricken. Open communication with the community is provided for in the development review process. In addition, community character resource policies provide for the creation of a Moss Landing LUAC that would review and make recommendations on development applications.

The intent of this policy is to ensure that all feasible traffic generation reduction measures required by industrial development are implemented and that needed highway/County road improvements are constructed prior to occupancy. The CIP will include regulations for traffic study and fee program implementation, specifically Castroville and Dolan and for Highway1/Dolan Road intersection.

| 2017 Version                 | Staff Recommendation                    | Planning Commission<br>Input |
|------------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| The County of Monterey       | The County of Monterey shall            |                              |
| shall require all feasible   | require all feasible traffic generation |                              |
| traffic generation           | reduction measures of any new           |                              |
| reduction measures of any    | and/or expanded industrial uses(s)      |                              |
| new or expanded industrial   | and/or facility that would generate     |                              |
| facility that would          | significant freight and employee        |                              |
| generate significant freight | traffic on the segment of State Route   |                              |
| and employee traffic on      | 1 between Castroville and Salinas       |                              |
| the segment of State Route   | Road. Development in the industrial     |                              |
| 1 between Castroville and    | areas shall not be allowed until        |                              |
| Salinas Road.                | needed improvements are made to         |                              |
|                              | the Dolan Road and State Route 1        |                              |
|                              | <u>intersection.</u>                    |                              |

<u>California Coastal Commission (CCC) Staff Narrative</u> – Staff discussed this policy with CCC staff prior to the community meeting. There were no recommendations.

<u>Community Recommendation Narrative</u> – Members suggested additional qualifying language to clarify what types of development would be applicable to the policy.

<u>Staff's Recommendation Narrative</u> – Staff recommends additional language addressing industrial development and necessary improvements to the Dolan Road and State Route 1 intersection.

The intent of this policy is to ensure direct access to SR 1 from the Moss Landing Business Park property is avoided. However, some exceptions are provided. This policy is consistent with NCLUP Policies 3.1.2.3 and 3.1.3.3 summarized above and found in **Exhibit C**.

| 2017 Version                   | Staff Recommendation             | Planning Commission<br>Input |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| The creation of new direct     | The creation of new direct       |                              |
| driveway access onto State     | driveway access onto State Route |                              |
| Route 1 from either Moss       | 1 from properties east of State  |                              |
| Landing Business Park should   | Route 1 either Moss Landing      |                              |
| be avoided. Limited exceptions | Business Park should shall be    |                              |
| include:                       | prohibited avoided. Limited      |                              |
| a. Egress from Moss            | exceptions include:              |                              |
| Landing Power Plant            | a. Egress from Moss              |                              |
| onto State Route 1 for         | Landing Power Plant onto         |                              |
| northbound only traffic,       | State Route 1 for                |                              |
| and                            | northbound only traffic,         |                              |
| b. Emergency egress from       | <del>and</del>                   |                              |
| either site. Major             | b. Emergency egress from         |                              |
| access for each facility       | either site. Major access        |                              |
| should be maintained           | for each facility should be      |                              |
| on Dolan Road.                 | maintained on Dolan              |                              |
| c. Access identified           | Road.                            |                              |
| through a                      | c. Access identified through     |                              |
| comprehensive corridor         | a comprehensive corridor         |                              |
| study as a necessary           | study as a necessary             |                              |
| improvement.                   | <del>improvement.</del>          |                              |

<u>California Coastal Commission (CCC) Staff Narrative</u> – Staff discussed this policy with CCC staff prior to the community meeting. Deletion of exception "c" was recommended.

<u>Community Recommendation Narrative</u> – Members found staff's modification acceptable.

<u>Staff's Recommendation Narrative</u> – Staff meet with RMA-Public Works and Facilities, TAMC, and Caltrans and discussed this policy. It was determined that elimination of new access to SR1 would be safest for the community. Staff recommends deletion of exceptions, consistent with the last sentence of previous Policy 3.1. Language modified to allow the policy applicable to properties, not uses.

The intent of this policy is to identify the County's commitment to move forward with the 2009 Board Committee recommendation..

| 2017 Version                  | Staff Recommendation              | Planning Commission<br>Input |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| The County of Monterey        | The County of Monterey shall      |                              |
| shall work with TAMC to       | work with TAMC to include the set |                              |
| include the set of            | of select the preferred           |                              |
| improvements identified as    | improvement(s) identified as a    |                              |
| a result of the 2017 Corridor | result of the 2017 Corridor Study |                              |
| Study prepared for the Moss   | prepared for in the Moss Landing  |                              |
| Landing Community Plan in     | Community Plan and include in the |                              |
| the Regional Transportation   | Regional Transportation Plan      |                              |
| Improvement Program and       | Improvement Program and the       |                              |
| the Regional Traffic Impact   | Regional Traffic Impact Fee       |                              |
| Fee Program.                  | <del>Program</del> .              |                              |

<u>California Coastal Commission (CCC) Staff Narrative</u> – Staff discussed this policy with CCC staff prior to the community meeting. There were no recommendations.

<u>Community Recommendation Narrative</u> – Members found staff's modification acceptable.

<u>Staff's Recommendation Narrative</u> – Traffic improvement options will be identified and analyzed in the MLCP EIR. Therefore, the recommended language allows for flexibility.

The intent of this policy is address improvements to State Route 1 and 183 intersection. This intersection is outside of the Moss Landing Community Plan boundary.

| 2017 Version                | Staff Recommendation     | Planning Commission<br>Input |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| The County of Monterey      | Delete or move to NCLUP. |                              |
| shall work with TAMC to     |                          |                              |
| include improvements to     |                          |                              |
| the State Route 183/State   |                          |                              |
| Route 1 intersection in its |                          |                              |
| Regional Transportation     |                          |                              |
| Improvement Program and     |                          |                              |
| the Regional Traffic        |                          |                              |
| Impact Fee Program.         |                          |                              |

<u>California Coastal Commission (CCC) Staff Narrative</u> – Staff discussed this policy with CCC staff prior to the community meeting. It was recommended to move this policy to NCLUP.

<u>Community Recommendation Narrative</u> – Members found staff's proposal acceptable.

<u>Staff's Recommendation Narrative</u> – Staff suggests deletion as the policy does not apply to Moss Landing. The policy could be added to the transportation policies contained in the NCLUP now, or when the LUP is updated at a later date.

The intent of this policy is to allow future SR1 access opportunities north of the Elkhorn Slough bridge.

| 2017 Version  | Staff<br>Recommendation | Planning Commission<br>Input |
|---|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| The County of Monterey shall work with Cal-Trans to identify shared access opportunities for the State Route 1 corridor north of the Elkhorn Slough bridge. | Delete.                 |                              |

<u>California Coastal Commission (CCC) Staff Narrative</u> – Staff discussed this policy with CCC staff prior to the community meeting. There were no recommendations.

<u>Community Recommendation Narrative</u> – Members found staff's proposal acceptable.

<u>Staff's Recommendation Narrative</u> – Staff recommends deletion of this policy. Language in the preceding Moss Landing Policies 3.1 and 3.5 above address the intent.

#### **CONCLUSION**

Based on the suggested policy language presented, and discussions that will occur during the workshop, staff requests the Commission provide direction to finalize these policies for preparation of a Draft Community Plan. In accordance with the management process for preparation and adoption of Long Range planning documents endorsed by the Board of Supervisors (Board Order 13-0055 No. 22), the Commission's direction will contribute to completion of Phase 3: Draft Document/Public Review and advance to Phase 4: Public Hearing/Adoption.

|                   | General Ordinance/Document Preparation Process                            |
|-------------------|---|
| Phase 1: Scoping  | At a preliminary level and in collaboration with relevant County          |
|                   | departments and outside agencies, identify the need and purpose, policy   |
|                   | and regulatory framework, relationship to other ordinances/documents      |
|                   | being prepared and technical requirements. Develop alternative            |
|                   | approaches and present to the RMA Deputy Director, County Counsel,        |
|                   | and other senior management for discussion and confirmation.              |
|                   | Completion of this phase is considered 20% of the work effort.            |
| Phase 2: Concept/ | Prepare an administrative draft of the recommended concept and/or         |
| Alternatives      | alternative approaches to address specific issues for internal discussion |
| Development       | with relevant County departments. Based on this draft effort, staff will  |
|                   | refine concepts/alternatives. Staff will transmit the concept/alternative |
|                   | description to established committees and groups such as (but not limited |
|                   | to) the Land Use Advisory Committees, Agricultural Advisory               |
|                   | Committee, Alternative Energy and Environment Committing, and             |
|                   | Permit Streamlining Task Force. These committees/groups will be given     |
|                   | the opportunity to submit comments to staff to be included in the input   |
|                   | transmitted to the Planning Commission. Staff will then conduct a         |
|                   | noticed Planning Commission Workshop to present the purpose, policy       |
|                   | and regulatory framework, technical background, proposed                  |
|                   | concept/alternatives, and proposed process (including appropriate         |
|                   | stakeholders). The Planning Commission will receive the staff             |
|                   | presentation, public comment and provide direction in developing a draft  |
|                   | ordinance and/or performing additional research and analysis. If          |
|                   | necessary staff will develop additional options and return for another    |
|                   | workshop on the concept/approach; completion of this phase is             |
|                   | considered 50% of the work effort.  |
| Phase 3: Draft    | Prepare a draft document for public review by Board Subcommittees,        |
| Document/Public   | outside agencies, and interest groups as identified by the Planning       |
| Review            | Commission. Refine the draft document based on this input and prepare     |
|                   | a draft environmental review document. Distribute draft documents for     |
|                   | public review. If new issues arise or there are differing opinions for a  |
|                   | solution, conduct an additional Planning Commission Workshop to           |
|                   | present options and receive direction. Following the public review,       |
|                   | evaluate comments received and prepare draft responses in collaboration   |
|                   | with relevant County departments, consultants and outside agencies.       |
|                   | Completion of this phase is considered 80% of the work effort.            |

| Phase 4: Public   | Finalize the document and hold Planning Commission hearing to               |
|-------------------|---|
| Hearings/Adoption | consider a formal recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. Address       |
|                   | Planning Commission recommendations and forward onto the Board for          |
|                   | a noticed public hearing as required. Perform project close out activities. |
|                   | Completion of this phase is considered 100% of the work effort.             |

# This page intentionally left blank