

Exhibit E

This page intentionally left blank.

Exhibit E

From: [Rich Gellert](#)
To: [293-pchearingcomments](#)
Subject: REF210024- Big Sur Land Use Plan
Date: Wednesday, February 14, 2024 6:55:08 PM

[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.]

It is critical to recognize chaparral as important habitat in Big Sur in the revised LUP draft plan. Chaparral should not negatively be noted as “fuel”, “hazardous accumulations of fuel”, “overgrown”, and especially not as “fire suppressed”. Chaparral is a vital habitat for numerous plant and animal species, including many endemic species that are uniquely adapted to this biome. The dense vegetation provides shelter, nesting sites, and food sources for various wildlife, contributing to biodiversity conservation and it is threatened by CAL FIRE and their agenda to masticate the native habitat of plants and animals with the agenda to be fire safe. I stand against mastication, and prescribed fire in the Big Sur area.

Chaparral fire patterns differ from those of forest fires. Chaparral’s natural fire pattern results in large, high-intensity crown fires that occur 30–150 years or more apart, where all above-ground plant cover is consumed. The hotter the fire, the better it is for the chaparral ecosystem. Hotter fires cause greater germination of native seeds and more destruction of invasive plant species. However, when fires occur more often than every 10–20 years, fires pave the way for the invasion of non-native, highly flammable weeds and grasses, and the decline of native plants. This invasion on non natives ultimately increases an area’s flammability, further increasing fire frequencies.

On the other hand, mixed Conifer and Ponderosa/Jeffrey Pine forests on the western slopes of the Sierra Nevada generally have mixed severity fires that occur every 20–60 years. **Old-growth chaparral is a beautiful, healthy ecosystem. Chaparral does not need fire to renew itself or to clean out excess vegetation.** Old growth chaparral continues to be a productive ecosystem, growing new leaves and branches in its upper canopy every year. In fact, some chaparral plants require the leaf litter and shade provided by older chaparral stands for their seeds to germinate successfully. Far from being unproductive, as some claim, old-growth chaparral (in excess of 50 years) is actually just beginning a new cycle of life.

Fire suppression has protected the biodiversity of California’s native shrublands from excessive fire. With fire frequency increasing, selective fire suppression has been essential in delaying the loss of native shrublands throughout the state. **After recognizing the risk of increased fire frequency in chaparral, California State Senator Hanna-Beth Jackson added an important caveat to her successful 2018 bill restricting Cal Fire’s habitat burning projects, so they do not result in converting healthy native-plant ecosystems to unhealthy non-native weeds and grasses. Cal Fire is attempting to circumvent this restriction, but the California Chaparral Institute, Endangered Habitats League, and Sequoia Forestkeeper are challenging this attempt in court.** Adaptation to fire requires hundreds of thousands to millions of years. Basic evolutionary science contradicts the belief that plant species have developed adaptations to fire over the past 5,000–10,000 years due to human burning practices. Instead, most California plant species have adapted to specific fire

Exhibit E

patterns or regimes that have evolved over the past 10 million years. Changes in fire frequency, intensity, and seasonality (coupled with disturbance of soil that typically occurs prior to prescribed burning), can dramatically reduce biodiversity. This has occurred throughout many areas in California, due to both accidental and prescribed fires. Therefore, I am against CalFire's plan to masticate and do prescribed burns to any lands in Big Sur.

Thank you - Rich



DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Armando Quintero, Director

Monterey District
2211 Garden Road
Monterey, CA 93940

February 14, 2024

Taylor Price
Associate Planner
Monterey County
831.784.5730
Price1@co. Monterey.ca.gov

Subject: Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan Update (Ref 210024)

Dear Mr. Price,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan Update (LUP update). California State Parks (CSP) would like to express our appreciation for the opportunity to comment as well as commend the County for the ongoing commitment to public engagement on this important effort for Big Sur.

The draft update, public meetings, community voices, and internal dialogue on this topic highlight several motivating factors that rightly justify the LUP update as needed to address stressors on the community. These stressors of workforce housing, overcrowding, new visitor behaviors, wildfire and floods, and emergency preparedness are also felt on public lands and by public employees that reside in the community, in some cases for entire careers. In addition to community impacts, these stressors also make managing increasing visitation, providing for public safety and emergency response, and continuing to preserve and protect natural and cultural resources more challenging as well.

Included, please find a table with comments specific to sections and pages in the draft LUP update.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this important project. We look forward to continuing to work with Monterey County, community members of Big Sur, and the many other essential participants and partners as this project progresses. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions at (831) 643-6326 or at daniel.shaw@parks.ca.gov

Sincerely,

Dan Shaw
Monterey Deputy District Superintendent
California State Parks

California State Parks Comments - Big Sur LUP ~~Exhibit~~ E

Comment	Page #
This language should be adjusted from "lack" to "additional resources and collaboration are needed to increase capacity to address substantial additional pressures on public lands from increased visitation and other stressors along the Big Sur Coast". All of the challenges that motivate an update to the LUP are being experienced by public land managers as well- massive increase in visitation and tourism, new behaviors (social media photo interest by the public), climate change driven wildfire and flooding, lack of workforce housing for staff that are part of the Big Sur community, and elevated natural and cultural resources protection needs that are compounded by all of these changes to the Coast since the prior LUP.	5 - "The lack of management of public land and access..."
Big Sur Community - Native peoples and voices were present for thousands of years.... and this continues today. This language should reflect not only this continuation to today, but the essential role of native voices, knowledge, and presence as community members into the future. This should include those with ancestral connection to the Big Sur Coast who are still present, still working independently and in partnership with others such as California State Parks to preserve and protect this special place.	7 - Though inhabited for thousands of years by Native American peoples...
The highway is the central node with expansive trails and recreational opportunities on either, and often both, sides in the same location. These opportunities arise from the highway node with access points that are severely limited and often require traversing across the highway (including by design in the LUP with a focus on access points only on the east side of the highway, but points of interest often on the west). This presents safety and congestions concerns. Addressing vetted and prioritized options to provide for safe highway crossing should be a focus of the LUP update (overpass, underpass, speed reductions, congestions signs, lights, etc).	8 - The highway shall remain a two-lane road and provide walking and bike trails wherever feasible
This section should address critical elements of wildfire preparedness. Fuel mitigation work is one action that can be taken especially in regards to defensible space, but this narrative should highlight the importance of other elements of preparedness including home hardening (and resources to support the community in home retrofits for resilience to ember cast/exposure), evacuation planning and evacuation route fuel reduction and maintenance, landscape scale planning, early detection capabilities, suppression resources, community wildfire protection plans, etc. The narrative is important and calling out these key priorities that are addressed later in the document would be beneficial.	9 Wildfire preparedness
language adds trails. Does this mean the new coastal trail sections will not be allowed as they would necessarily be in the CV is some locations?	14 3.2.3 A 4.

California State Parks Comments - Big Sur LUP ~~Exhibit E~~

Comment	Page #
E. It is Garrapata State Park, not Garrapata State Beach. The pullouts along highway 1 are not State Beach pullouts and not managed by State Parks. It is likely impossible to locate a restroom near the Garrapata Creek beach access that would not be visible from the highway, and also comply with grades for ADA access and also for stormwater and erosion control, avoid berms or vegetative screening, comply with CEQA, be serviceable by pumper trucks, and provide for public safety. Suggestion - 2. Southern Garrapata State Park in proximity to the beach access trail that will minimize visibility from the highway to the extent possible.	18
The LUP should address approved options to provide for safe highway crossing to connect parking/restroom locations mandated on the east side of the highway to beach areas on the west side of the highway. Planning for points of access on one side of the highway, with the point of interest on the other side of the highway is not possible when the authority to provide for safe connections across the highway are in the purview of other agencies. The LUP should address options to provide the safe connections.	19 For public safety at Soberanes Point and Garrapata Beach and any new units on the east side...
3.5.2 General Policies - Suggest adding 13. Removal of invasive plants (broom, grasses, etc) that contribute to flashy fuel loads and elevate human ignition potential and wildfire spread from public use areas into Big Sur forest lands.	36
#s 8, 9, 12 - these blanket statements do align with the California State Park mission. Grazing has the potential to benefit certain plant community types, with focused oversight and management, and this should be one option for public land managers. Grazing can also be detrimental to waterways, archaeological sites, many native animal species, most plant communities, and it can promote many non-native species such as Harding grass, French broom, Italian thistle, bull thistle, etc at the detriment of native grass and other species. California State Parks has an essential role to play on the greater landscape in providing a variety of habitat types and communities, including native grasslands, to promote landscape scale biodiversity and complexity. The Big Sur Coast can accommodate both the important agricultural grazing practices on lands dedicated for those uses that are such an important traditional practice on the Big Sur Coast, as well as the critical role in preservation of the State's extraordinary biodiversity, protection of natural and cultural resources, and provision of recreation opportunities that are the priority on State Park lands.	40
Add Acacia, Tree of Heaven and Pittosporum (Victoria Box) to this list. All of these are more invasive than the species listed (except eucalyptus) and are, at this point, eradicable, but especially, in the case of Pittosporum, on the move.	47 - C.8
Historical settlement of the Big Sur coast began with Native Americans...who are still present and active members of the community.	61 3.10
This section needs more investment of time and communication with tribal partners to determine and outline needs and priorities to protect tribal cultural resources and values.	64 - 3.11
The spread of non-native invasive plants is a detriment to the coastal scrub, chaparral and other plant communities and animal habitats that are unique to coastal Central California, in addition to the scenic beauty.	69 - 2nd ¶

California State Parks Comments - Big Sur LUP ~~Exhibit E~~

Comment	Page #
The spread of non-native invasive plants along the Big Sur coast is a primary threat to the ecological values in this area, the scenic viewshed, and wildfire ignition potential. The majority of these plants occur in or are spread within the Hwy 1 corridor / ROW and this should be emphasized as a critical problem in this section that requires substantial investment.	69 - 3rd ¶
See comment on Line 8 above.	71 A.3
All re-vegetation should be done using seed, cuttings or divisions sourced within five miles or less (depending on species) of a restoration site, in order to preserve genetic integrity, and to not introduce inappropriate "native" species to the area.	72 - B.1
Throughout this document, the reason for controlling non-native plants should be expanded from preserving the natural beauty or scenic vistas to also include preserving and enhancing the unique native plant communities and animal habitats.	72 - B.2
There should be information about non-native plants such as Jubata grass, to not collect and spread it.	74 - 3.C
Just a comment that there is turnover for some public agency employees but many dedicate entire careers in service to land and supporting the visitor serving community.	78 2nd ¶
While there are ongoing challenges with managing high visitation, there are many examples of improvements in the lower Big Sur River and these should be acknowledged. A couple examples - about 80 acres of upland riparian vegetation was successfully restored in Creamery Meadow (the lower southern part of the Big Sur River, very close to the river mouth) at Andrew Molera State Park, as a collaborative project between the Ventana Wilderness Society and State Parks. The area was converted from very weedy, disturbed grass field to oak, willow, cottonwood, redwood and other native trees and bushes. Substantial riparian restoration and revegetation has occurred throughout Pfeiffer Big Sur campground through intensive management, trail realignment, education, site relocation, and other actions. Compaction of soils in redwood groves has been continuously improved through similar actions. This section should highlight success stories and encourage expansion of these efforts, rather than making a generalization that things are worse.	83 1st ¶
density should be changed to densely	94 13.c
UAS should be allowed for natural resources management, monitoring and scientific research. As an example, in almost all of the western slope of the Santa Lucia Range in Big Sur, where jubata grass and other invasive non-native plants exist, non-drone weed control is not possible, or very infeasible and unsafe. Without exceptions for non-native plant management using drones, the proliferation of jubata grass, fountain grass and many other invasive plants will continue to spread, which is counter to the directives in this document. UAS pilot work on these plants, as well as photo monitoring to meet management objectives of Rx burns is currently being done by State Parks. Drones are being used for research and monitoring in MPA areas. Without this capability in the future, land management of the Big Sur coast will take several steps back.	95 - 15
Does this mean Partington Cove within JP burns State Park? Partington Cove is the only place within JP burns SP where access down to the beach is allowed. As it is written, it seems like they are two different areas.	111 - 3rd ¶

California State Parks Comments - Big Sur LUP ~~Exhibit~~ E

Comment	Page #
Is the new text here referring to the 21 miles or the whole area from Malpas to the SLO Co line? Because the Soberanes Fire wasn't in the 21 miles, it makes it seem like this is referring to the whole Big Sur area - confusing. Rather than referring to the area as "largely unmanaged" this should be phrased as "substantial additional investment and staffing are required to meet the demands of increased visitation and associated stressors on public land".	112 - 1st ¶
Partington Cove is part of JP Burns SP, and is the only area within the park with beach access.	116 A - 1st ¶
See line 6 above. New segments associated with the Coastal Trail could necessitate siting in the CV	118 C.1
and potential negative impacts on plant and animal habitat.	120 - 9
Shouldn't studies be conducted in all areas where trails may be constructed (not only in "areas where habitat and resource protection is a major concern"), since, often times, it is not known which/if sensitive natural and cultural resources exist in an area until specialists survey the area?	121 - E.1
The LUP should address approved options to provide for safe highway crossing to connect parking locations mandated on the east side of the highway to recreation sites on the west side of the highway. Planning for points of access on one side of the highway can't occur unless there are options to provide safe crossing that would be under the purview of different agencies.	124 4.
Something about removing non-native plants and restoring areas on private land with appropriate, locally sourced/grown natives should be inserted in this section? Pride of Madeira, fountain grass, feather grass and other invasive non-natives along the coast have been, and continue to be, planted on some private lands, which has spread throughout the coast, to other private and public land.	134 - 1st ¶

Exhibit E

From: [Patte Kronlund](#)
To: [293-pchearingcomments](#)
Cc: [Kate.Daniels@sen.ca.gov](#); [Martha Diehl](#); [Price, Taylor](#)
Subject: Public Comment - REF210024 - Big Sur Land Use Plan Update
Date: Friday, February 16, 2024 7:52:40 AM
Attachments: [CABS Public Comment REF210024 Big Sur Land Use Plan Update.pdf](#)

[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 Commissioners and County Staff,

Attached is my Comment Letter speaking to Community Housing.

Thank you,

Patte

Logo



Patte Kronlund

Executive Director

[Community Association of Big Sur](#)

[Fire Adapted Big Sur](#)

831-595-0072

patte@cabigsur.org





Exhibit E

Community Association of Big Sur
PO Box 59, Big Sur, CA 93920

Caring for the coast for over 50 years

Community Association of Big Sur is a 501 (c) 3 (EIN 77-0091132). Our shared mission is to protect and defend the rural and residential character, and to preserve the natural and aesthetic beauty of the Big Sur coast; to provide for the health, safety, and welfare of the Big Sur Community; to encourage community service and otherwise act in the interests of the residents and property owners of the community. CABS is committed to a collaborative approach towards responsible land stewardship. CABS believes that an effective partnership between private and public property owners is essential for a sustainable and healthy community.

STAFF

Executive Director

Patte Kronlund

Program Managers

Rachel Goldberger

Rayner Marx

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Ryne Leuzinger, Bd Chair

Kendra Morgenrath, Vice
Bd Chair

Lisa Kleissner, Treasurer

Jolinda Matthews,
Secretary

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Tom Collins

Katie Day

Mike Gilson

Butch Kronlund

Martin Palafox

Pam Peck

Blain VandenBerg

COMMUNITY ADVISORS

Mike Caplin

Martha Diehl

John Handy

Richard "Dick" Ravich

February 15, 2024

Dear Planning Commissioners,

Thank you for the second Public Workshop on the Big Sur Land Use Plan Update. I appreciate this opportunity to be a part of this Important update process.

I want to speak to one topic today: **Community Housing** and its importance:

- There is a **critical need** for this housing for not only our hospitality businesses but also for teachers, firefighters, artists, medical staff, carpenters, electricians, etc.
- **All solutions for housing need to be considered:** ADUs, JADUs and Caretaker Units. Also, please look at existing non-permitted long-term housing and supporting the property owners to come forward and make these legal conforming structures for long-term housing without being penalized.
- As important as the above, is the need for **"streamlined or administrative permitting" with the County and the Coastal Commission** on ADUs, JADUs and Caretaker Units. Just this alone will be beneficial to the property owners and/or businesses to be able to erect a housing unit in a few months vs year(s).
- The free, pre-approved ADU plans to homeowners by the County of Monterey is fantastic and helping to move the needle in the right direction of affordability and expediting the building permit process. **I also would like to encourage the County to give ADUs not adhering to the "Free Pre-approved Plan" (e.g., "modular" structures) the same opportunity to be acceptable housing in Monterey County that can be a more affordable alternative to a built from the ground up home.**

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Patte Kronlund

Executive Director, Community Association of Big Sur

Exhibit E

From: [tara evans](#)
To: [293-pchearingcomments](#)
Subject: REF210024 - Big Sur Land Use Plan Update
Date: Friday, February 16, 2024 7:36:07 AM

[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.]

To whom it may concern:

1. I am against CalFire performing prescribed burns on native chaparral and coastal forested areas...

- Chaparral is an essential habitat for a wide variety of plants and animals.
- Prescribed burns reduce biodiversity and spread the reproduction of non-native species.

2. I don't support CALFIRES generalized mastication protocol and mechanical thinning for potentially new implemented fire breaks...

- Firebreaks fragment natural habitat, disrupting ecosystems and the proliferation of non-native invasive species.
- Removing vegetation can leave soil vulnerable to erosion.

3. I am against mandated fire mitigation around homes...

- The removal of vegetation destroys natural habitat and can lead to increased soil erosion.
- Focus prevention from the home outward with fire safe structures and direct clearing around homes of flammable material.

4. I am against the use of herbicides on native chaparral...

- Herbicides can lead to a loss of biodiversity by affecting native plants by altering soil chemistry and microbial activity.
- Herbicides will affect native wildlife by reducing food and habitat, including pollinators.
- Herbicides can leach into groundwater.

Thank you,

Tara Evans Big Sur Resident since 1955

--

Tara
831-595-0502
Think Peace

Exhibit E

From: [Vasquez, Elizabeth](#)
To: [Price, Taylor](#)
Subject: FW: BIG SUR COAST LAND USE PLAN UPDATE, comment letter
Date: Tuesday, March 5, 2024 2:14:04 PM
Attachments: [Syphard SoCalFuelBreaks ForestEcoloMgmt 2011 KF.pdf](#)
[image001.png](#)

Good afternoon Taylor,

We received the below public correspondence for BSCLUP Update to the Planning Commission inbox.

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

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.*

From: Kerri Marie Frangioso <kfrangioso@ucdavis.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, March 5, 2024 1:57 PM
To: 293-pchearingcomments <pchearingcomments@co.monterey.ca.us>
Subject: BIG SUR COAST LAND USE PLAN UPDATE, comment letter

[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.]

Hello,

In an effort to back-up some of the conversations that have community members have been having with scientific evidence, I have summarized a paper below and attached a highlighted version to this email.

In 2011 A.Syphard published a peer-reviewed paper looking at the effectiveness of fuel breaks in 3 different, southern California National Forests (including the southern part of Los Padres National Forest). Much of this paper focuses specifically on the chaparral vegetation type which the authors admit has a very different fire regime and fire management issues against forested regions. None the less, many of the findings in the paper scientifically validate what several community members have been saying.

Many times, throughout the paper the authors emphasize that “fuel breaks played an important role in controlling large fires only when they facilitated fire management, primarily by providing access for firefighting activities,” and that firefighters need to be present to control fires; unmanned fuel breaks don’t stop fires. However, better maintained fuel breaks provide easier access for firefighters and give them more time to prepare for suppression activities.

Figures 2 on page 5 of the attached paper show the number of fires that intersect with fuelbreaks by

Exhibit E

National Forest and it's not impressive.

Figure 3 shows the % of fires that stopped at fuel breaks & the % that crossed over (page 6).

"Firefighter access was the only variable to directly improve the outcome in all three forests, and it was the most influential variable for the Los Padres and Angeles National Forests."

Page 6 also has an interesting paragraph that separates out the Los Padres National Forest saying that it was the only Forest where "season was not important in explaining fuel break outcome." It was also "the only Forest in which firefighting resources were not influential in explaining outcome", meaning that fires are notoriously difficult to control on the district no matter how many resources are thrown at it.

Page 10: "In southern California, fuel treatments can lead to ecological degradation because they often involve complete removal of vegetation, facilitate the spread of exotic species, and may thus indirectly contribute to increased fire frequency in a region where recurrent fire already threatens the native shrublands". Some parts of the Monterey Ranger District have arguably seen too many fires in recent history.

Also on page 10: "this study strongly supports the notion of constructing fuel breaks along the wildland-urban interface where firefighters will have better access to the fuel breaks, and where the fuel breaks will provide an immediate line of defense adjacent to homes that are at risk."


"constructing fuel breaks in remote, backcountry locations will do little to save homes during a wildfire because most firefighters will be needed to protect the wildland-urban interface, and fires will not be stopped by those fuel breaks that are located farther away."



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Forest Ecology and Management

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/foreco



Comparing the role of fuel breaks across southern California national forests

Alexandra D. Syphard^{a,*}, Jon E. Keeley^{b,c}, Teresa J. Brennan^b

^a Conservation Biology Institute, 10423 Sierra Vista Avenue, La Mesa, CA 91941, USA

^b U.S. Geological Survey, Western Ecological Research Center, Three Rivers, CA, USA

^c Department of Ecology & Evolutionary Biology, University of California, Los Angeles, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 3 January 2011

Received in revised form 23 February 2011

Accepted 24 February 2011

Keywords:

Structural equation model

Fuel treatment

National forest

Wildland–urban interface

Firefighting

Fire management

ABSTRACT

Fuel treatment of wildland vegetation is the primary approach advocated for mitigating fire risk at the wildland–urban interface (WUI), but little systematic research has been conducted to understand what role fuel treatments play in controlling large fires, which factors influence this role, or how the role of fuel treatments may vary over space and time. We assembled a spatial database of fuel breaks and fires from the last 30 years in four southern California national forests to better understand which factors are consistently important for fuel breaks in the control of large fires. We also explored which landscape features influence where fires and fuel breaks are most likely to intersect. The relative importance of significant factors explaining fuel break outcome and number of fire and fuel break intersections varied among the forests, which reflects high levels of regional landscape diversity. Nevertheless, several factors were consistently important across all the forests. **In general, fuel breaks played an important role in controlling large fires only when they facilitated fire management, primarily by providing access for firefighting activities.** Fire weather and fuel break maintenance were also consistently important. Models and maps predicting where fuel breaks and fires are most likely to intersect performed well in the regions where the models were developed, but these models did not extend well to other regions, reflecting how the environmental controls of fire regimes vary even within a single ecoregion. Nevertheless, similar mapping methods could be adopted in different landscapes to help with strategic location of fuel breaks. Strategic location of fuel breaks should also account for access points near communities, where fire protection is most important.

© 2011 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Wildfire is a key natural process in many ecosystems, but fire frequency, extent, and/or severity have surged across the globe in recent decades (Bowman et al., 2009; Flannigan et al., 2009; Westerling et al., 2006). The social and economic consequences of these fires are immense, with dramatic increases in property destruction and firefighting expenditures (Butry et al., 2001; NIFC, 2009). Altered fire regimes also threaten ecosystem integrity and biodiversity (Pausas and Keeley, 2009; Pyne, 2004). In many parts of the world the fire problem has been exacerbated by the continued expansion of the wildland–urban interface, where homes and lives are most vulnerable to wildfires, and where human ignitions increase the likelihood of fire occurring (Radeloff et al., 2005; Syphard et al., 2007). Mitigating the risk of wildfire at the wildland–urban interface, therefore, is now described as a major objective in the National Fire Plan (2001), the Healthy Forests

Restoration Act (2003), and other federal fire management documents. The primary approach advocated for mitigating fire risk is to reduce hazardous fuel loads through fuel treatments of vegetation in wildland areas. In the last decade, expenditures on fuel treatments and area treated has increased markedly (Mell et al., 2010), with U.S. federal land management agencies receiving billions of dollars and treating millions of hectares of land (Schoennagel et al., 2009).

Despite this recent surge in treatment area and expenditure, fuel treatments have been a cornerstone of fire management in the U.S.A. for the better part of the 20th century. Yet, little systematic research has been conducted to understand what role fuel treatments have played in controlling fire, which factors influence this role, or how the role of fuel treatments may vary over space and time. A number of simulation studies have improved our understanding of potential fuel treatment effectiveness in modifying forest fire behavior (e.g., Finney et al., 2007; Miller and Urban, 2000; Schmidt et al., 2008). However, most empirical studies have focused on relatively localized effects when fires have intersected fuel treatments on forests (e.g., Finney et al., 2005; Martinson and Omi, 2003; Raymond and Peterson, 2005; Schoennagel et al., 2004). Due to this relatively small temporal and spatial scale (but see

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: asyphard@consbio.org (A.D. Syphard), jon_keeley@usgs.gov (J.E. Keeley), tjbrennan@usgs.gov (T.J. Brennan).

Syphard et al., in press-b), these studies have not contributed to an understanding of factors that influence sustainable fuel treatment performance over broad landscapes. This is important because many parts of the western U.S. that intersect with urban environments comprise heterogeneous landscapes that include forest and non-forested ecosystems and because strategic planning requires an understanding of how repeated fire events over time are affected by fuel treatments.

Due in part to the paucity of appropriate research, there is no comprehensive fire policy in the United States that provides forest managers with science-based guidance on where, how, and when fuel treatments should be conducted (Agee et al., 2000; Franklin and Agee, 2003). Instead, within-agency policies are established and implemented according to the agencies' missions and objectives, and many policies are not publicly reviewed or debated (Franklin and Agee, 2003). Developing scientifically based general principles and guidelines for using fuel treatments to control fires could benefit managers if these guidelines were to facilitate decision-making with regards to strategic placement and tactical response. Given limits in time and money, managers need to prioritize where to place new fuel treatments and to determine the level of maintenance needed for current fuel treatments (Dellasala et al., 2004). Thus, a scientifically based methodology and set of principles could make the decision-making process not only easier but more defensible as well. Furthermore, a better understanding of the factors that influence the role of fuel treatments could lead to the identification of additional management considerations and the development of improved management practices.

The primary problem with development of general guidelines for fuel treatments is that fire-prone regions are highly variable with regards to their natural fire regimes and the factors that control them. Fire regimes vary as a function of forest type, fuels, terrain, climate, and ignition sources (Pyne et al., 1996; Keeley et al., 2009), and fuel treatment effectiveness may also vary according to these factors (Schoennagel et al., 2004). In addition, human development and other infrastructure strongly influence fire regimes and vulnerability to fire. Humans start and stop fires both directly (e.g., via suppression or accidental ignitions) and indirectly (e.g., via land use planning, land cover change, exotic species introduction, climate change), and their influence varies by scale and by locale (Cardille et al., 2001; Prestemon et al., 2002; Syphard et al., 2009). These variations in fire regime and human influence complicate the notion of general principles because management programs need to account for these differences (Noss et al., 2006).

Another reason that a "one size fits all" approach to fire management is problematic is that fuel treatment objectives are likely to vary from region to region, particularly for wildland areas versus the wildland–urban interface (Keeley et al., 2009). In wildland areas, particularly in western U.S. forests, fuel treatments are intended to change fire behavior and to reduce the severity of fire effects, whereas fuel treatments in the wildland–urban interface are intended to prevent fire from spreading into communities (Radeloff et al., 2005; Reinhardt et al., 2008). Therefore, the effectiveness of fuel treatments, and the factors that contribute to their effectiveness, may change as a function of fuel treatment objectives.

One way to determine how well certain guidelines may transfer from region to region is to identify which factors affecting fuel treatment outcome are most likely to vary. Identifying these could help to determine what aspects of plans need to be developed separately for each management area. Common decision-making tools could be developed that account for regional differences in those variables. If there are factors that are universally influential across different regions or landscapes, these could help in the development of general management considerations.

In California, where a substantial portion of the landscape comprises non-forested ecosystems such as chaparral and sage scrub,

fuel breaks have been a major part of fire management activities since the 1930s (Davis, 1965). Unlike forests where mechanical fuel treatments remove only surface fuels (preserving larger, older trees), fuel break construction in chaparral typically involves complete removal of vegetation, chemical herbicides, and permanent conversion of native shrublands to weedy herbaceous associations (Wakimoto, 1977).

In southern California, differences in natural fire regimes and the way fire regimes have been altered by past land use complicate fire management in the region. In the shrubland-dominated foothills and coastal valleys, fire frequency has substantially increased along with population growth and urban expansion (Keeley et al., 1999; Syphard et al., 2007). This increased fire frequency not only threatens homes and lives, but many shrublands cannot tolerate repeated fires and under such conditions are often replaced with non-native grasslands (Keeley and Fotheringham, 2003; Syphard et al., 2006). In shrubland-dominated regions, fuel manipulation projects involve a trade-off. On one hand, fuel breaks are needed to protect homes and lives, which are at an elevated risk in these crown fire shrublands; on the other hand, construction of fuel breaks typically involves complete removal of vegetation and may result in a range of ecological impacts. Thus, fire management in the region is greatly complicated by the need to balance both fire and resource management.

In the less extensive montane coniferous forests in the region, fire frequency has been unnaturally low during the last century, and fire hazard has consequently increased due to accumulated fuels associated with fire suppression and logging (Keeley, 2006), problems similar to other forests in the western U.S. (Miller et al., 2009). Because thinning and fuel manipulation is intended to improve forest vigor and reduce risk of catastrophic loss to wild-fire (often by restoring forests to more historic conditions), fuel treatments and resource benefits are likely to be compatible in these forested regions (Schwilke et al., 2009). However, this model of fuel accumulation and ecological compatibility with fuel treatments has often been inappropriately applied to chaparral (Keeley and Fotheringham, 2004, 2006).

To better understand the factors that influence the role of fuel treatments in controlling large fires in southern California, and how the role of fuel treatments varies across different landscapes, we assembled a spatial database of fuel breaks and fires from the last 30 years in four national forests. For this analysis, we only considered fuel manipulation projects that were clearly intended to serve as fuel breaks, which are defined as wide blocks, or strips, on which vegetation was manipulated to create lower fuel volume and reduced flammability (Green, 1977). Thus, prescribed fires and burn piles were excluded, as were any dozer lines created to aid suppression activities during the time that a fire was burning. We analyzed relationships among fires and fuel breaks to answer:

- (1) What are the most important environmental and management variables affecting the role of fuel breaks in controlling large fires, and do these factors vary among national forests?
- (2) What are the primary factors affecting the spatial pattern of fires and fuel break intersections, and do they vary among national forests?

Because we restricted our analysis to U.S. Forest Service national forests, we assumed these landscapes would be broadly similar in the tactical approaches used in the construction and maintenance of fuel breaks. Thus, this study could help determine how well management approaches for one national forest may transfer to other national forests. Also, on these largely non-forested landscapes we assumed that the primary management objective for fuel breaks in the region is to control the spread of fire and protect communities.

Table 1

Characteristics of fires and fuel breaks in the four southern California national forests. Fire rotation was calculated from 1980 to 2007.

	Angeles	Cleveland	Los Padres	San Bernardino
Area (ha)	26,375	21,117	61,464	30,408
Number of fires since 1980	175	118	96	253
Fire rotation period (years)	32	14	35	30
Fuel break length (km)	1834	482	550	1199

2. Methods

2.1. The national forests of southern California

The area of study included the Los Padres, Angeles, San Bernardino, and Cleveland National Forests (Table 1), an area spanning the extent of the state's South Coast Ecoregion (Keeley, 2006), which encompasses approximately 3.4 million ha (8% of the state) and is home to more than 19 million people (US Census 2000) (Fig. 1). Although the region is the most threatened hotspot of biodiversity in the continental US (Hunter, 1999), the national forest lands together occupy more than 1.5 million ha and offer some measure of protection for the region's biodiversity.

The South Coast Ecoregion is characterized by a Mediterranean-type climate, with cool, wet winters and warm, dry summers. Chaparral shrublands are the most extensive vegetation type, but there is extraordinary ecosystem diversity in the region, owing largely to a relatively sharp elevational gradient from sea level to more than 3500 m. Therefore, chaparral forms a mosaic with other vegetation types, including coastal sage scrub shrublands, grasslands, oak woodlands, and montane coniferous forests, and natural fire regimes are correspondingly variable (Keeley, 2006; Wells et al., 2004).

Fire management on the national forests is the responsibility of the U.S. Forest Service. The two primary strategies for management are to (1) suppress all actively burning fires, and (2) reduce the extent of future fires through mechanical construction of fuel breaks and limited use of prescription burning. We focus exclusively on fuel breaks in this study.

2.2. Data for dependent variables: fuel break outcome and fire/fuel break intersections

We acquired information on historic fuel breaks and their location from U.S. forest service staff on each of the four forests. We developed a digital spatial database of fuel breaks for the four forests by combining existing GIS layers with files that we created ourselves by digitizing fuel breaks that had been drawn on paper maps. Due to the substantial number of fuel breaks that were hand drawn, we conducted follow-up interviews to validate the newly digitized data.

On all the forests, we overlaid the fuel break GIS layer with fire perimeter polygons compiled by the California Department of Forestry-Fire and Resource Assessment Program (CALFIRE). The fire perimeter data represent the largest fires, with a minimum mapping unit of 4.04 ha (10 acres).

To evaluate factors affecting fuel break outcome, we first used a GIS overlay to identify all events in which a fire intersected a fuel break (within a 100 m buffer distance to account for potential data uncertainty). These events were considered potential case studies to retain for subsequent analysis. To be included for consideration, the date of the fire had to be later than the date of fuel break construction. For the case studies, we conducted a preliminary assessment as to whether fires stopped or crossed over fuel breaks, and then confirmed the outcome during personal interviews with firefighters who had first-hand knowledge of the event.

Table 2

Variables considered and retained in the multiple regression models explaining number of fire and fuel break intersections in three national forests. All variables retained in the models are designated through a significance symbol.

	Angeles	Los Padres	San Bernardino
Elevation	*		*
Slope			
Solar radiation		*	
USFS fuel model	*		*
Distance road		**	
Distance development		**	
Distance trails		**	
Historic fire frequency	***	**	***
Ignition density	*	*	
Deviance explained	37.27	27.55	54.7

* $p = 0.05$.

** $p = 0.01$.

*** $p = 0.001$.

Although data for some of the explanatory variables were acquired during personal interviews, we also used a GIS to extract information for other explanatory variables to relate to the fuel break outcome. See below for description of explanatory variables. For this analysis, we extracted data only from the portion of the fuel break that intersected the fire and averaged values across that area. In some cases, fires stopped at a portion of the fuel break, but ultimately crossed over the fuel break. For those cases, we classified the fuel break as not having stopped fire (for statistical analysis purposes only), and we only extracted explanatory variables for the section of the fuel break where the fire crossed over.

To analyze factors influencing the number of times fires intersected fuel breaks, we spatially stratified and classified all fuel breaks according to the number times they intersected fires during the study period. We only considered fires that had occurred since 1980, and to ensure that all fuel breaks had an equal chance of experiencing a fire, we only looked at fuel breaks that had been constructed before 1980. From this spatially stratified layer, we randomly selected point samples (greater than 1 km apart, to avoid spatial autocorrelation) to extract environmental data used as explanatory variables. The dependent variable was number of intersections at each sample location.

2.3. Explanatory variables for role of fuel breaks

The factors we considered as potentially influencing the role of fuel breaks on the forests included human and biophysical variables that have previously explained landscape-scale fire patterns in the region (Syphard et al., 2008), and that we used in a previous study of fuel breaks on a single national forest (Table 2, Syphard et al., in press-a). In addition to static landscape features, we also considered variables related to the actual event when a fire intersected a fuel break, including characteristics of fires, fuel breaks, vegetation age, and firefighting activities.

For the human variables, we considered distance to roads, trails, and development (Table 2) because fire ignitions in the region tend to occur near human activities (Syphard et al., 2008). We also hypothesized that these human variables may influence firefighting access and resources. For these three variables, we developed continuous grid surfaces reflecting the Euclidean distance to the nearest feature (road, trail, or development) and extrapolated values from those grids for the areas where fuel breaks intersected fires.

Biophysical variables (including climate, terrain, and fuels) influence fire spread rate, fuel moisture, flammability, and fire intensity (Pyne et al., 1996; Whelan, 1995). Therefore, we evaluated the potential influence of elevation, slope, solar radiation, vegetation age, and fuel model on fuel break outcome (Table 2). After




Fig. 1. Study area showing the four national forests of southern California. ANF is Angeles National Forest, CNF is Cleveland National Forest, LPNF is Los Padres National Forest, and SBNF is San Bernardino National Forest.

preliminary regression analysis, we found that climate variables were significantly correlated with terrain variables, so we did not include them. Because most fires are stand-replacing in southern California shrublands, we determined vegetation age by calculating the time since last fire in the area immediately adjacent to the fuel break before the fire intersected it.

Severe weather conditions are likely to strongly influence fire spread rates and intensity (Moritz et al., 2004; Keeley and Zedler, 2009), and lead to conditions that are dangerous for firefighters (Halsey, 2005). However, previous analysis indicated that, because weather is highly variable over space and time, it is difficult to attribute exact weather conditions to the moment of intersection (Syphard et al., in press-a). Instead, we considered fire size and season as potential explanatory variables because they indirectly reflect the severity of weather conditions (Finney, 2003; Westerling et al., 2004), particularly because of the importance of autumn Santa Ana winds in this region (Moritz et al., 2010). We calculated fire size from the fire perimeter data through GIS calculations, and we derived fire season from the attributes of the fire perimeter data. We reclassified the months of the fires into winter and spring (January through May), summer (June through August), and autumn (September through November) to reduce the degrees of freedom in the data.

We obtained information on fuel break condition and firefighting activities through personal interviews with firefighters and managers who were most familiar with the fire events. Fuel break length was calculated from the GIS files, but data on fuel break width were largely unavailable for all four forests. Because written fuel break maintenance records were often unavailable, we determined how well the fuel break had been maintained by asking fire personnel to indicate the condition of the fuel break at the time the fire intersected it on a scale from one to three. The ranking reflected poor to excellent conditions, with poor reflecting fuel breaks where the vegetation had almost entirely regrown, and excellent reflecting fuel breaks that were either entirely grass, or no vegetation had

regrown. To evaluate the importance of management activities, we also asked personnel to indicate whether they were able to gain access to the fuel break for firefighting (yes or no) and whether they had sufficient resources available (including manpower and equipment) to fight the fire, again on a scale of one to three, from poor (no resources) to excellent (full resources).

2.4. Explanatory variables for mapping number of intersections

To explain and map areas where fires and fuel breaks are most likely to intersect, we evaluated the same human and biophysical variables as for the fuel break outcome (Table 2). However, we did not consider fire and management variables related to single events because we were interested in trends across the entire study period (1980–2007). In addition, we hypothesized that significantly more fire and fuel break intersections would occur in areas that were historically fire-prone. Therefore, we additionally explored historic fire frequency (derived through overlay of fire perimeters from 1878 to 2007) as well as spatially interpolated ignition density as explanatory variables.

2.5. Fuel treatment outcome: structural equation modeling

Structural equation modeling provides advantages over traditional multiple regression analysis because it uses existing information to examine potential causal pathways among intercorrelated variables and identify indirect relationships (Bollen, 1989; Grace and Pugesek, 1998). The model is statistically evaluated to determine the degree of consistency with empirical data and compare the outcomes of alternative models. Although structural equation modeling is a confirmatory approach that tests a priori hypotheses of about interrelationships among variables, it is often essential to use exploratory regression and correlation analysis to suggest which pathways to explore (Grace, 2006).

For the different national forests, we initially conducted correlation analyses and built simple and multiple logistic regression models to explore the relationships among the explanatory variables and fuel break outcome. We used logistic regression because the response variable for fuel treatment outcome was binary, indicating whether the fuel treatment stopped the fire or not. Based on the hypothesized interrelationships developed through correlation and regression analysis, we developed and tested structural equation models using Mplus version 5.1 software. Because we modeled categorical outcomes, we used the weighted least-squares with mean and variance adjustment (WLSMV) estimator. To ensure that we retained only the important pathways in the final models, we sequentially removed one path at a time to ensure that, if a path were removed, the chi-square did not increase more than 3.84 points (the single degree-of-freedom test) (James B. Grace, personal communication). We also examined the fit of alternative models through *p*-values, root mean square error of approximation, and weighted root mean square residual (Hooper et al., 2008).

2.6. Number of intersections: multiple regression and predictive mapping

To evaluate the relative influence of the explanatory variables on the number of times fires intersected fuel breaks on the forests, we developed simple and multiple Poisson regression models that were appropriate for count response variables (Agresti, 1996). Because the objective of this part of our study was to create predictive maps (rather than explore causal pathways), we only used multiple regression analysis, as opposed to structural equation modeling. We first conducted simple regression models with each variable (and quadratic terms for continuous variables) to establish rankings for entering the variables into a multiple regression.

For the multiple regression models, we entered variables according to the amount of deviance they explained [D^2 , equivalent to the R^2 in ordinary least square models (Guisan and Zimmermann, 2000)] and only considered those variables that were significant at $p \leq 0.15$. We evaluated correlation coefficients in the models for all of the forests and avoided including two variables with a bivariate correlation ≥ 0.3 . For each forest, we evaluated alternative plausible multiple regression models with different combinations of predictor variables and selected the best model as the one that explained the highest percentage deviance with the lowest Akaike information criterion (AIC) (Quinn and Keough, 2002). We also checked to ensure that overdispersion was not present in the models.

After selecting the best multiple regression models, we converted them into continuous map surfaces that reflected the predicted number of fires that would intersect fuel breaks across the entire forest. We created these maps by applying the Poisson regression formula and predicted coefficients onto the GIS layers of the significant explanatory variables (as in Syphard et al., 2008). We evaluated the correspondence of the predicted number of intersections to the actual intersections that occurred through Pearson correlation coefficients. We also quantified the magnitude of discrepancy among predicted and observed values by calculating the root mean square error (RMSE).

To test how well the models that explained the number of intersections on one national forest matched the models in the other forests, we applied the models developed on each forest to the entire South Coast Ecoregion and compared the maps. To quantify the spatial correspondence among the maps, we used a Pearson's correlation coefficient to calculate pairwise correlations (Termansen et al., 2006; Syphard and Franklin, 2009). High correlations among maps would indicate that the factors controlling the spatial pattern of fire and fuel break intersections were similar among the forests, and low correlations would suggest that those factors vary.




Fig. 2. Number of fires that occurred in four national forests divided into those that intersected a fuel break and those that did not intersect a fuel break (A); and proportion of fuel break area intersected by 0–5 fires from 1980 to 2007 (B). ANF is Angeles National Forest, CNF is Cleveland National Forest, LPNF is Los Padres National Forest, and SBNF is San Bernardino National Forest.

3. Results

3.1. Summary of fuel break and fire intersections and outcomes

During the 28 years of the analysis, 641 fires occurred within the boundaries of the four national forests. On average, 23% of those fires intersected a fuels treatment, but the proportion of intersections varied among the forests (Fig. 2A). In fact, the number of intersections among fires and fuel breaks on the Cleveland National Forest was only 13 (11% of the intersections), and this small number precluded us from including that forest in our statistical analyses.

For the fuel breaks that we considered in our spatial analysis of intersections (i.e., those constructed on or before 1980), approximately 25–50% of the fuel break area never intersected a fire. On the other hand, approximately 10–45% of the fuel break area intersected multiple (two or more) fires. The proportion of fuel break area that intersected fires varied among the four forests (Fig. 2B).

When fires intersected fuel breaks, the percentage that stopped at the fuel breaks ranged from 22 to 47%, and the percentage that crossed over the fuel breaks ranged from 29 to 65%, depending on the forest (Fig. 3). We distinguished another group of fuel break intersections where fires crossed over fuel breaks, but the fuel breaks did change fire behavior enough to facilitate firefighter access and eventually help with the suppression of the fire. When this group is considered along with the other cases in which the fuel break held a portion of the fire, the percentage ranged from 10 to 23% (Fig. 3).

3.2. Fuel treatment outcome: structural equation modeling

Among the three national forests that we analyzed, there were seven variables that significantly affected fuel break/fire outcomes. However, the structural equation models revealed differences in the number and combination of important variables as well as




Fig. 3. Proportion of fire and fuel break intersections in four forests divided into those that effectively stopped a fire (Effective); those in which only a portion stopped a fire or that changed fire behavior (Both or Behavior); and those in which the fires crossed over the fuel break (Ineffective). ANF is Angeles National Forest, CNF is Cleveland National Forest, LPNF is Los Padres National Forest, and SBNF is San Bernardino National Forest.

differences in the interrelationships among them. We tested alternative models with different explanatory variables and different direct and indirect effects. The final model varied among the forests (Fig. 4). Despite these differences, most of the variables were common to at least two of the three forests; and three variables were common to all forests: firefighter access, fire size, and fuel break condition.

Firefighter access was the only variable to directly improve the outcome in all three forests, and it was the most influential variable for the Los Padres and Angeles National Forests. The proportion of events in which firefighters had access to fuel breaks was slightly lower in the Angeles than in the other two forests (Fig. 5C). On the Los Padres and San Bernardino forests, fire size was directly and negatively related to fuel break outcome; in the Angeles, fire size negatively affected firefighter access and thus indirectly influenced fuel break outcome. On average, the fires were smaller in the Angeles, but fire sizes were highly variable on all of the forests (Fig. 6). On the Los Padres and Angeles forests, fuel break condition facilitated firefighter access to fuel break and thus indirectly improved fuel break outcome; the relationship was direct in the San Bernardino, which reported the largest proportion of fuel breaks with low scores for fuel break condition (Fig. 5B).

The Los Padres was the only forest for which season was not important in explaining fuel break outcome, as later-season fires (i.e., September through November) had a direct negative influence on outcome for the Angeles; and for the San Bernardino, later-season fires contributed to increased fire size, so the effect was indirectly negative. Most of the fires on the Los Padres occurred in the summer months, whereas fires in the autumn were most common for the other two forests (Fig. 5E). The Los Padres was the only forest in which firefighting resources were not influential in explaining outcome. On both the Angeles and San Bernardino, resources indirectly improved fuel treatment outcome; but on the Angeles, the primary relationship was by improving access and on the San Bernardino, the primary relationship was through reduction in fire size. The overall distribution of firefighting resources, according to the interviews, was variable among the forests (Fig. 5A). Finally, the Los Padres was the only forest in which fuel break length had a significant direct and positive impact on fuel treatment outcome, and this forest had longer fuel breaks, on average, than the other two forests (Fig. 6).

The Angeles was the only forest in which vegetation age was not important. On the Los Padres, younger vegetation surrounding the fuel breaks improved firefighter access to the treatment, so the relationship was indirectly negative. On the San Bernardino, the relationship was direct and positive. Although the average vegetation age was lowest on the San




Fig. 4. Structural equation model of factors that directly and indirectly explain why fires stopped at fuel breaks in the Angeles, Los Padres, and San Bernardino National Forests. Solid arrows represent direction of effect, and coefficients shown along arrows are standardized values. Circles represent endogenous (or dependent) variables in the models. Due to insufficient number of fuel break/fire intersections the Cleveland National Forest was not included.

Bernardino, there was a lot of variability in age for all the forests (Fig. 6).

3.3. Number of intersections: multiple regression and predictive mapping

Of the variables we considered for explaining the number of fire and fuel break intersections in the forests, historic fire frequency was the only one that was retained in all three of the multiple regression models (Table 2). For all three forests, the number of intersections was strongly and positively related to the number of fires that had occurred since 1878 (date of the earliest fire in the database). Ignition density was also positively related to the number of intersections on the Angeles and Los Padres National




Fig. 5. Distribution of categorical variables for three national forests that were significant in any of the statistical models. The y-axis for all charts represents the proportion of observations within each forest. The charts represent (A) firefighting resources; (B) fuel break condition; (C) Access to fuel break; (D) historic fire frequency (with the average for each forest indicated in the legend); (E) season when intersection occurred; (F) fuel type. ANF is Angeles National Forest, LPNF is Los Padres National Forest, and SBNF is San Bernardino National Forest.

Forests, but was not retained in the model for the San Bernardino National Forest. The Los Padres had the lowest average number of fires and lowest ignition density, whereas the San Bernardino had the highest fire frequency and ignition density (Figs. 5D and 6).

For both the Angeles and San Bernardino National Forests, the number of intersections was negatively related to elevation, which was slightly higher on average on the San Bernardino than the other forests (Fig. 6). The fuel model parameter was also significant in explaining model variation for only the Angeles and San Bernardino. A larger number of intersections occurred in forest and timber fuel models on the San Bernardino National Forest ("TU" or "TL", Scott and Burgan (2005)), whereas the shrub models ("SH", Scott and Burgan (2005)) were more influential in the Angeles (Fig. 5F). Three variables were retained in the multiple-regression model for the Los Padres that were not important in the other

forests. On the Los Padres, fires were more likely to intersect fuel breaks when fuel breaks were in close proximity to trails, distance to roads was intermediate, and winter solar radiation was low. Both the average distance to trails and solar radiation were lower on the Los Padres than in the other two forests, but the average distance to roads was similar, with high variation in the three forests (Fig. 6).

The three map surfaces developed by applying the multiple-regression model formulas and coefficients to the GIS maps of the significant variables reflect a continuous probability distribution of where fires and fuel breaks are most likely to intersect (Fig. 6). The Pearson's correlation coefficients between the observed number of intersections and the number of intersections predicted by the model ranged between 0.59 and 0.74 (Table 3), and the root mean squared error ranged from 0.28 to 1.31 intersections. The correlations among the three maps generated by the differ-




Fig. 6. Distribution of continuous variables for three national forests that were significant in any of the statistical models.

ent multiple-regression models were lower, particularly for the Los Padres model (correlation of 0.21 with the Angeles and 0.16 with the San Bernardino). The Angeles and San Bernardino maps, however, had a much stronger correlation (0.54) (Fig. 7).

4. Discussion

The four southern California national forests studied here all share several features in common; they are in rugged terrain, are dominated by non-forested ecosystems, and contain a substantial amount of wildland–urban interface. These national forests, however, differ in the proportions of vegetation types, biophysical characteristics, and the relative proportions of wildland–urban interface and intermix landscapes. These differences are part of

Table 3
Pearson correlation coefficients among prediction maps for three national forests and among predicted and observed number of intersections within each forest. Root mean squared error (RMSE) is calculated between the observed and predicted number of intersections within each forest.

	Angeles	Los Padres	San Bernardino
Angeles map	1.00	0.21	0.54
Los Padres map	0.21	1.00	0.16
San Bernardino map	0.54	0.16	1.00
Observed <i>N</i> intersections	0.61	0.59	0.74
RMSE	1.31	0.76	0.28

the reason the significant factors explaining fuel break/fire outcomes and number of intersections were different among forests. Nevertheless, several factors were consistently important across all forests in explaining the number of intersections between fuel breaks and big fires and the role of fuel breaks in altering fire spread. These similarities support several general conclusions about the role of fuel breaks in controlling large fires in southern California.

One conclusion is that the primary role of fuel breaks in the region is to facilitate fire management activities. Two of the three fire management variables we considered (access and fuel break condition) were important in all three structural equation models (Fig. 4), and firefighter resources was important for two of the forests (Angeles and San Bernardino). Furthermore, while other important variables in the models (related to vegetation structure, fire size, and season) were not directly related to management, these variables often indirectly influence management, for example, by affecting access to treatment areas. Demonstrating the strength of these indirect effects is one of the benefits to structural equation modeling (Grace, 2006).

Firefighter access to fuel breaks was the most influential factor in fuel treatment outcome for the Los Padres and Angeles, and was also highly significant for the San Bernardino. The high level of significance for this variable supports the notion that, without firefighters present to control fires, fires will generally not stop at fuel breaks. Although three fires stopped on their own at the top of ridges on the San Bernardino, these fires constituted less than 1% of the cases. Only one fire stopped passively on the Los Padres, and none of the fires in our analysis stopped without firefighters on the Angeles. Despite this conclusion, it is important to point out that the fire perimeter database only includes fires greater than 10 ha; therefore, it is possible that some smaller fires do stop passively (i.e., without fire fighting actions) at fuel breaks. Many fire management personnel understand that fuel breaks are unlikely to passively stop most fires, particularly during extreme weather conditions, but the public, news media, and policy-makers may unrealistically expect otherwise. Our results show that such beliefs could lead to a false sense of security about the protective value of fuel breaks.

Most of the largest fire events in southern California occur during severe weather conditions in autumn, prior to winter rains, when dry, offshore Santa Ana winds can exceed 30 ms^{-1} (Miller and Shlegel, 2006; Moritz et al., 2010). Fighting fires during these weather conditions can be extremely dangerous, and during these wind events, multiple fires often break out simultaneously. These severe weather conditions likely explain why fire size was another variable that was highly significant in explaining fuel treatment outcome in all three forests. Discussions during the interviews confirmed that fires were more difficult to control, and likely to become large, under severe weather conditions. There are a number of reasons for this: the speed of such fires, which can cover 10,000 ha within a day or two, and thus the lack of time for accessing fuel breaks, the danger of aggressively attacking fires under such conditions, and firefighting resources spread too thin because of multiple fire fronts. Consistent with the effect of fire size, fire season was significant on the Angeles and San Bernardino because Santa Ana winds typically occur during the fall (and this was the season when fuel treatment/fire outcomes were poorest). The reason that season was not important for the Los Padres, but fire size was, is that Santa Ana winds are much less predictable there (Moritz et al., 2004, 2010). The Los Padres regularly experiences strong, hot wind down-canyon wind events known as “sundowners,” typically in summer (Ryan, 1996), but these are not annual events as are Santa Ana winds. It is possible for severe-weather fire events to occur in any season, not just the fall, across the entire southern California region. This explains why fire size was important on all three forests.

In addition to fire management and fire weather (i.e., size and season), there was evidence that vegetation structure played an




Fig. 7. Maps showing predicted distribution of areas most likely to intersect fuel breaks in the Angeles, Los Padres, and San Bernardino National Forests. The sample points along the fuel breaks also show the actual number of times fires intersected fuel breaks at those locations from 1980 to 2007.

important role in improving fuel break outcome in all three forests, and this was generally because **well-maintained fuel breaks were much easier for firefighters to access in time to prepare the fuel break for suppression activities**. Because young vegetation typically has a lower fuel load than old vegetation, one of the premises of conducting fuel manipulation is that young vegetation can directly slow or stop the spread of fire. However, in southern California shrublands, stand age and fuel loads play a limited role in stopping the spread of fire, particularly during extreme weather conditions, when fires often spread through or over very young age classes (Keeley and Zedler, 2009; Moritz, 1997; Moritz et al., 2004). Accordingly, while vegetation age was significant in the Los Padres, younger vegetation did not directly prevent fires from spreading, but helped facilitate firefighter access to fuel breaks. There are some parts of the Los Padres where, because of the lack of consistent Santa Ana influence, fuel age may play a role in controlling fire spread (Moritz, 1997). This particularly applies to the coastal area near the city of Santa Barbara. Regardless, the most significant relationship was between **vegetation age and firefighter access**.

Fuel break condition (i.e., how well it was maintained) played a similar role as vegetation age, and it was influential in all three forests. While the relationship was direct on the San Bernardino, **better-maintained fuel breaks improved access to fuel breaks** in the Los Padres and the Angeles, and thus, the relationship was indirect. Southern California chaparral forms a dense, continuous cover that is extremely difficult to maneuver in (Halsey, 2005), which likely explains why well-maintained fuel breaks improved the outcome.

As in the models for fuel break outcome, the models explaining the number of fire and fuel break intersections reflected regional landscape diversity and differences among the forests, while nevertheless suggesting several general conclusions. By far the most significant variable, and the only variable consistently significant for all forests, was historic fire frequency. This result is not surprising because areas that have burned most frequently in the past are likely to be most fire-prone in general. Ignition density patterns were also significant for two of the forests. Nevertheless, fire history was not the only factor explaining why fuel breaks intersect fires more in some places than in others. Fire and fuel break

intersections were a function of a combination of biophysical and human variables for all the forests, but the biophysical variables were generally more important than the human ones. This is consistent with other regional studies that have shown biophysical factors to be strongly related to patterns of fire occurrence and area burned, whereas human variables are most significant for explaining ignition patterns and fire frequency (Parisien and Moritz, 2009; Syphard et al., 2007, 2008).

The maps of predicted distribution of areas where fuel breaks are most likely to intersect with large fires did not correlate well among the forests, yet there was good correlation among observed and predicted number of intersections within the forests. In other words, the combination of factors that best predicted the number of intersections in one forest did not match well with the combination of factors that best predicted the intersections in the other forests. These differences reflect how the environmental controls of fire regimes vary from region to region, even within a single ecoregion. Therefore, a “one size fits all” management approach would be inappropriate if the objective were to map likely areas for fires and fuel treatments to intersect. While developing a model for one region and applying it to a different region may be inappropriate, the modeling methodology adopted here could easily be applied anywhere. These types of maps could be part of a manager's toolset in helping to identify areas where new fuel breaks could be constructed or where current fuel breaks should be maintained.

We cannot directly attribute differences in the influential variables of our models to differences among the forests because we only statistically analyzed three national forests. Nevertheless, the differences among the national forests do provide a perspective on the variability of the region, despite the fact that it all falls within the same ecoregion. This is striking considering that southern California has a distinctive fire regime, owing to the defining characteristics of the region's Mediterranean-type climate. Because of the cool, wet winters and hot, dry summers, and the specific properties of chaparral, this vegetation is particularly flammable for a substantial portion of the year and burns in large, stand-replacing, high-intensity fires (Pyne et al., 1996). The region's fire regime and fire management issues are typically most starkly contrasted against those in forested regions (Keeley et al., 2009). While it has been recognized that many fire management practices in forested regions are inappropriate for southern California shrublands (Halsey, 2005; Keeley and Fotheringham, 2006), this study shows how certain aspects of fire management may need to be individually tailored at even finer scales, dependent on terrain, proximity to urban environments, regional weather patterns, and fuel type composition.

In southern California, fuel treatments can lead to ecological degradation because they often involve complete removal of vegetation, facilitate the spread of exotic species, and may thus indirectly contribute to increased fire frequency in a region where recurrent fire already threatens the native shrublands (Merriam et al., 2006, 2007). These resource costs should be considered relative to the benefits of protecting communities, and these trade-offs should be considered when constructing new fuel breaks in the region. This is in contrast to forested regions, where the objective of protecting communities is often coupled with the objective of reshaping the age structure and composition of forests to resemble historic conditions (Reinhardt et al., 2008). In these forests, fuel breaks and resource benefits generally are mutually beneficial. Regardless of the region, mitigating fire risk to communities is a priority for federal land managers, yet most fuel treatments are not placed within the wildland–urban interface where they may have the greatest potential for protecting homes. Across the western United States, only 3% of the area treated from 2004 to 2008 was located in this interface (Schoennagel et al., 2009).

Many new fuel breaks are currently being constructed in southern California. In fact, the most likely reason there were not enough fire and fuel break intersections to complete a statistical analysis in the Cleveland National Forest is because a large proportion of the fuel treatments have been recently constructed. Despite the large amount of new fuel break construction, the results of this study show that many fires never actually intersect fuel breaks, and large areas of fuel breaks never intersect fire. Also, the forests that had the highest density and area of fuel breaks did not have the highest overall effectiveness of fuel breaks, suggesting that treating more area alone does not necessarily increase the safety of a region. It may be more effective to have fewer fuel breaks in strategically placed locations than to have greater area of fuel breaks overall, at least in terms of protecting communities. The results from all three forests show that fuel breaks played an important role in controlling large fires primarily where they provided access for firefighting activities. Strategically locating fewer fuel breaks could also reduce the potential for resource costs.

Discussion in the interviews revealed that many strategic decisions do go into placing fuel breaks. While these decisions are often based on years of fire management experience, quantitative and spatially explicit analyses could potentially be helpful in refining these strategic decisions. For example, maps like the ones generated here, showing where fuel treatments are mostly likely to intersect fires, could be combined with further spatial analyses of where access is best and where communities need the most protection. In particular, this study strongly supports the notion of constructing fuel breaks along the wildland–urban interface where firefighters will have better access to the fuel breaks, and where the fuel breaks will provide an immediate line of defense adjacent to homes that are at risk. The case studies from all four national forests demonstrate that fuel breaks will not stop fires without firefighter presence. Therefore, constructing fuel breaks in remote, backcountry locations will do little to save homes during a wildfire because most firefighters will be needed to protect the wildland–urban interface, and fires will not be stopped by those fuel breaks that are located farther away. Finally, because access to fuel breaks was consistently improved when vegetation structure was favorable, this study suggests that maintaining fuel breaks in strategic locations may be just as important as constructing new fuel breaks.

Acknowledgments

Support for this paper was provided by the USGS Multi-Hazards Demonstration Project. Any use of trade, product, or firm names in this publication is for descriptive purposes only and does not imply endorsement by the U.S. government.

References

- Agee, J.K., Bahro, B., Finney, M.A., Omi, P.N., Sapsis, D.B., Skinner, C.N., van Wagten-donk, J.W., Weatherspoon, C.P., 2000. The use of fuelbreaks in landscape fire management. *Forest Ecology and Management* 127, 55–66.
- Agresti, A., 1996. *An Introduction to Categorical Data Analysis*. John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Bollen, K.A., 1989. *Structural Equation Modeling with Latent Variables*. John Wiley and Sons, New York, NY.
- Bowman, D.M.J.S., Balch, J.K., Artaxo, P., Bond, W.J., Carlson, J.M., Cochrane, M.A., D'Antonio, C.M., DeFries, R.S., Doyle, J.C., Harrison, S.P., Johnston, F.H., Keeley, J.E., Krawchuk, M.A., Kull, C.A., Marston, J.B., Moritz, M.A., Prentice, I.C., Roos, C.I., Scott, A.C., Swetnam, T.W., van der Werf, G.R., Pyne, S.J., 2009. Fire in the Earth system. *Science* 324, 481–484.
- Butry, D.T., Mercer, D.E., Prestemon, J.R., Pye, J.M., Holmes, T.P., 2001. What is the price of catastrophic wildfire? *Journal of Forestry* 99, 9–17.
- Cardille, J.A., Ventura, S.J., Turner, M.G., 2001. Environmental and social factors influencing wildfires in the Upper Midwest, United States. *Ecological Applications* 11, 111–127.
- Davis, L.S., 1965. *The Economics of Wildfire Protection with Emphasis on Fuel Break Systems*. State of California, Resources Agency, Sacramento, CA.

- Dellasala, D.A., Williams, J.E., Williams, C.D., Franklin, J.F., 2004. Beyond smoke and mirrors: a synthesis of fire policy and science. *Conservation Biology* 18, 976–986.
- Finney, M.A., 2003. Calculating fire spread rates across random landscapes. *International Journal of Wildland Fire* 12, 167–174.
- Finney, M.A., McHugh, C.W., Grenfell, I.C., 2005. Stand and landscape effects of prescribed burning on two Arizona wildfires. *Canadian Journal of Forest Resources* 35, 1714–1722.
- Finney, M.A., Seli, R.C., McHugh, C.W., Ager, A.A., Bahro, B., Agee, J.K., 2007. Simulation of long-term landscape-level fuel treatment effects on large wildfires. *International Journal of Wildland Fire* 16, 712–727.
- Flannigan, M.D., Krawchuk, M.A., de Groot, W.J., Wotton, B.M., Gowman, L.M., 2009. Implications of changing climate for global wildland fire. *International Journal of Wildland Fire* 18, 483–507.
- Franklin, J.F., Agee, J.K., 2003. Forging a science-based national forest fire policy. *Issues in Science and Technology* 20, 59–66.
- Grace, J.B., 2006. *Structural Equation Modeling and Natural Systems*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY.
- Grace, J.B., Pugeseck, B.H., 1998. On the use of path analysis and related procedures for the investigation of ecological problems. *The American Naturalist* 152, 151–159.
- Green, L.R., 1977. Fuel breaks and other fuel modification for wildland fire control. In: *USDA Agric. Hdbk.*, 1977, p. 499.
- Guisan, A., Zimmermann, N.E., 2000. Predictive habitat distribution models in ecology. *Ecological Modelling* 135, 147–186.
- Halsey, R.W., 2005. *Fire, Chaparral and Survival in Southern California*. Sunbelt Publications, San Diego, CA.
- Hooper, D., Coughlan, J., Mullen, M.R., 2008. Structural equation modeling: guidelines for determining model fit. *The Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods* 6, 53–60.
- Hunter, R., 1999. *South Coast Regional Report: California Wildlands Project vision for wild California*. Davis, CA.
- Keeley, J.E., 2006. South coast bioregion. In: Sugihari, N.G., van Wagtenonk, J.W., Shaffer, K.E., Fites-Kaufman, J., Thode, A.E. (Eds.), *Fire in California's Ecosystems*. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA, pp. 350–390.
- Keeley, J.E., Fotheringham, C.J., 2003. Impact of past, present and future fire regimes on North American Mediterranean shrublands. In: Veblen, T.T., Baker, W.L., Montenegro, G., Swetnam, T.W. (Eds.), *Fire and Climate Change in Temperate Ecosystems of the Western Americas*. Springer, New York, pp. 218–262.
- Keeley, J.E., Fotheringham, C.J., Morais, M., 1999. Reexamining fire suppression impacts on brushland fire regimes. *Science* 284, 1829–1832.
- Keeley, J.E., Fotheringham, C.J., 2004. Lessons learned from the wildfires. In: Halsey, R.W. (Ed.), *Fire, Chaparral and Survival in Southern California*. Sunbelt Publications, El Cajon, CA, pp. 69–75.
- Keeley, J.E., Fotheringham, C.J., 2006. Wildfire management on a human dominated landscape: California chaparral wildfires. In: Wuertner, G. (Ed.), *Wildfire – A Century of Failed Forest Policy*. Island Press, Covelo, CA.
- Keeley, J.E., Zedler, P.A., 2009. Large, high intensity fire events in southern California shrublands: debunking the fine-grained age-patch model. *Ecological Applications* 19, 69–94.
- Keeley, J.E., Aplet, G.H., Christensen, N.L., Conard, S.G., Johnson, E.A., Omi, P.N., Peterson, D.L., Swetnam, T.W., 2009. Ecological foundations for fire management in North American forest and shrubland ecosystems. In: *USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station*, p. 92.
- Martinson, E.J., Omi, P.N., 2003. Performance of fuel treatments subjected to wildfires. In: Omi, P.N., Joyce, L.A. (Eds.), *Fire, Fuel Treatments, and Ecological Restoration*. USDA Forest Service Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fort Collins, CO, pp. 7–13.
- Mell, W.E., Manzano, S.L., Maranghides, A., Butry, D.T., Rehm, R.G., 2010. The wildland–urban interface fire problem – current approaches and research needs. *International Journal of Wildland Fire* 19, 238–251.
- Merriam, K.E., Keeley, J.E., Beyers, J.L., 2006. Fuel breaks affect nonnative species abundance in Californian plant communities. *Ecological Applications* 16, 515–527.
- Merriam, K.E., Keeley, J.E., Beyers, J.L., 2007. The role of fuel breaks in the invasion of nonnative plants. In: *USGS Scientific Investigations Report*, p. 69.
- Miller, C., Urban, D.L., 2000. Modeling the effects of fire management alterations on Sierra Nevada mixed-conifer forest. *Ecological Applications* 10, 85–94.
- Miller, N.L., Shlegel, N.J., 2006. Climate change projected fire weather sensitivity: California Santa Ana wind occurrence. *Geophysical Research Letters* 33, 1–5.
- Miller, J.D., Safford, H.D., Crammins, M., Thode, A.E., 2009. Quantitative evidence for increasing forest fire severity in the Sierra Nevada and southern Cascade Mountains, California and Nevada, USA. *Ecosystems* 12, 16–32.
- Moritz, M.A., 1997. Analyzing extreme disturbance events: fire in Los Padres National Forest. *Ecology* 7, 1252–1262.
- Moritz, M.A., Keeley, J.E., Johnson, E.A., Schaffner, A.A., 2004. Testing a basic assumption of shrubland fire management: how important is fuel age? *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 2, 67–72.
- Moritz, M.A., Moody, T.J., Krawchuk, M.A., Huges, M., Hall, A., 2010. Spatial variation in extreme winds predicts large wildfire locations in chaparral ecosystems. *Geophysical Research Letters* 37, L04801.
- NIFC, 2009. *Wildland fire statistics*. In: U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Boise, ID.
- Noss, R.F., Franklin, J.F., Baker, W.L., Schoennagel, T., Moyle, P.B., 2006. Managing fire-prone forests in the western United States. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 4, 481–487.
- Parisien, M.-A., Moritz, M.A., 2009. Environmental controls on the distribution of wildfire at multiple spatial scales. *Ecological Applications* 19, 127–154.
- Pausas, J.G., Keeley, J.E., 2009. A burning story: the role of fire in the history of life. *Bioscience* 59, 593–601.
- Prestemon, J.R., Pye, J.M., Butry, D.T., Holmes, T.P., Mercer, D.E., 2002. Understanding broadscale fire risks in a human-dominated landscape. *Forest Science* 48, 685–693.
- Pyne, S.J., Andrews, P.L., Laven, R.D., 1996. *Introduction to Wildland Fire*. Wiley, New York.
- Pyne, S.J., 2004. *Tending Fire Coping With America's Wildland Fires*. Island Press, Washington, D.C.
- Quinn, G.P., Keough, M.J., 2002. *Experimental Design and Data Analysis for Biologists*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Radeloff, V.C., Hammer, R.B., Stewart, S.I., Fried, J.S., Holcomb, S.S., McKeefry, J.F., 2005. The wildland–urban interface in the United States. *Ecological Applications* 15, 799–805.
- Raymond, C.L., Peterson, D.L., 2005. Fuel treatments alter the effects of wildfire in a mixed-evergreen forest, Oregon USA. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* 35, 2981–2995.
- Reinhardt, E.D., Keane, R.E., Calkin, D.E., Cohen, J.D., 2008. Objectives and considerations for wildland fuel treatment in forested ecosystems of the interior western United States. *Forest Ecology and Management* 256, 1997–2006.
- Ryan, G., 1996. Downslope winds of Santa Barbara, California. In: *US National Weather Service Technical Memorandum NWS-WR-240*.
- Schmidt, D.A., Taylor, A.H., Skinner, C.N., 2008. The influence of fuels treatment and landscape arrangement on simulated fire behavior, Southern Cascade range California. *Forest Ecology and Management* 225, 3170–3184.
- Schoennagel, T., Veblen, T.T., Romme, W.H., 2004. The interaction of fire, fuels, and climate across rocky mountain forests. *Bioscience* 54, 661–676.
- Schoennagel, T., Nelson, C.R., Theobald, D.M., Carnwath, G.C., Chapman, T.B., 2009. Implementation of National Fire Plan treatments near the wildland–urban interface in the western United States. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 106, 10706–10711.
- Scott, J.H., Burgan, R.E., 2005. Standard fire behavior fuel models: a comprehensive set for use with Rothermel's surface fire spread model. In: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fort Collins, CO, p. 72.
- Schwilk, D.W., Keeley, J.E., Knapp, E.E., McIver, J., Bailey, J.D., Fettig, C.J., Fiedler, C.E., Harrod, R.J., Moghaddas, J.J., Outcalt, K.W., Skinner, C.N., Stephens, S.L., Walldrop, T.A., Yaussy, D.A., Youngblood, A., 2009. The national fire and fire surrogate study: effects of fuel reduction methods on forest vegetation structure and fuels. *Ecological Applications* 19, 285–304.
- Syphard, A.D., Franklin, J., Keeley, J.E., 2006. Simulating the effects of frequent fire on southern California coastal shrublands. *Ecological Applications* 16, 1744–1756.
- Syphard, A.D., Radeloff, V.C., Keeley, J.E., Hawbaker, T.J., Clayton, M.K., Stewart, S.I., Hammer, R.B., 2007. Human influence on California fire regimes. *Ecological Applications* 17, 1388–1402.
- Syphard, A.D., Radeloff, V.C., Keuler, N.S., Taylor, R.S., Hawbaker, T.J., Stewart, S.I., Clayton, M.K., 2008. Predicting spatial patterns of fire on a southern California landscape. *International Journal of Wildland Fire* 17, 602–613.
- Syphard, A.D., Franklin, J., 2009. Differences in spatial predictions among species distribution models vary with species traits and environmental predictors. *Ecography* 32, 907–918.
- Syphard, A.D., Radeloff, V.C., Hawbaker, T.J., Stewart, S.I., 2009. Conservation threats due to human-caused increases in fire frequency in mediterranean-climate ecosystems. *Conservation Biology* 23, 758–769.
- Syphard, A.D., Keeley, J.E., Brennan, T.J., in press-a. Factors affecting fuel break effectiveness in the control of large fires on the Los Padres National Forest, California. *International Journal of Wildland Fire*.
- Syphard, A.D., Scheller, R.M., Ward, B.C., Spencer, W.D., Strittholt, J.R., in press-b. Simulating landscape-scale effects of fuels treatments in the Sierra Nevada, California. *International Journal of Wildland Fire*.
- Termansen, M., McClean, C.J., Preston, C.D., 2006. The use of genetic algorithms and Bayesian classification to model species distributions. *Ecological Modelling* 192, 410–424.
- Wakimoto, R.H., 1977. Chaparral growth and fuel assessment in southern California. In: Mooney, H.A., Conrad, C.E. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the symposium on environmental consequences of fire and fuel management in Mediterranean ecosystems*. USDA Forest Service, pp. 412–418.
- Wells, M.L., O'Leary, J.F., Franklin, J., Michaelsen, J., McKinsey, D.E., 2004. Variations in a regional fire regime related to vegetation type in San Diego County, California. *Landscape Ecology* 19, 139–152.
- Westerling, A.L., Cayan, D.R., Brown, T.J., Hall, B.L., Riddle, L.G., 2004. Climate, Santa Ana winds and autumn wildfires in Southern California. *Eos, Transactions, American Geophysical Union* 85, 289–300.
- Westerling, A.L., Hidalgo, H.G., Cayan, D.R., Swetnam, T.W., 2006. Warming and earlier spring increase western US forest wildfire activity. *Science* 313, 940–943.
- Whelan, R.J., 1995. *The Ecology of Fire*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, Great Britain.

Exhibit E

From: [Beretti, Melanie](#)
To: [Price, Taylor](#)
Cc: [Sanchez, Edgar](#)
Subject: FW: Big Sur Land Use Plan update
Date: Thursday, February 29, 2024 1:07:41 PM
Attachments: [Big Sur Land Use update ETMC letter 22824.pdf](#)

For records

Kindly,
Melanie

Melanie Beretti, AICP | Acting Chief of Planning
Phone | 831-755-5285 Email | BerettiM@co.monterey.ca.us

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

From: Susan Morley <cultural-resources@esselentribe.org>
Sent: Wednesday, February 28, 2024 2:23 PM
To: Beretti, Melanie <BerettiM@co.monterey.ca.us>; Spencer, Craig <SpencerC@co.monterey.ca.us>; Sanchez, Edgar <SanchezE8@co.monterey.ca.us>
Cc: Tom Nason <tribalchairman@esselentribe.org>; Cari Herthel <vicechair@esselentribe.org>; Jana Nason <tribaladmin@esselentribe.org>; NAHC@NAHC <NAHC@nahc.ca.gov>
Subject: Big Sur Land Use Plan update

[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.]

Please find attached a letter from the Chairman of the Esselen Tribe of Monterey County, Tom Little Bear Nason, regarding the Big Sur Land Use Plan Update.

Thank you,
Susan

Susan Morley
Cultural Resources Committee Chairperson Esselen Tribe of Monterey County cultural-resources@esselentribe.org
<<mailto:Cultural-resources@esselentribe.org>>
(831) 262-2300

PRIVILEGED & CONFIDENTIAL --

The information contained in this electronic transmission is legally privileged and confidential, and it is intended for the sole use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, please take notice that any form of dissemination, distribution or photocopying of this electronic transmission is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic transmission in error, please immediately contact Esselen Tribal Chair, and Cultural Committee Chairperson of the Esselen Tribe of Monterey County.



BIG SUR COAST LAND USE PLAN



**MONTEREY COUNTY, CALIFORNIA
BIG SUR COAST LAND USE PLAN
LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM**

**Prepared by the Monterey County
Planning Department**

**Adopted by the Monterey County
Planning Commission 2/11/81**

**Adopted by the Monterey County
Board of Supervisors 11/5/85**

**Dusan Petrovic, Chairman
Marc J. Del Piero
Sam Karas
Karin Strasser Kauffman
Barbara Shipnuck**

**Certification Acknowledged by
The California Coastal Commission
On April 10, 1986**

Participating Staff:

**Robert Slimmon, Jr.,
Director of Planning
Raymond W. Lamb,
Assistant Director of
Planning
David Young, Senior
Planner/Project
Coordinator**

Graphics:

**Steve Early
Jim DiMaggio**

Word Processors:

**Carmelia Moon
Rosalba M. Johnson**

Former Project Participants:

**Bill Farrel
Nancy Sackman
Michael Hitchcock
Edward Davidson
Scott McCreary
Susan Hilinski
Al Haynes
Ernest Franco
Nanci Brose
Dennis L. Wardell
Fred Ureta
Steve Sigala**

Consultants:

**Roy Trotter and Glen
Vita – Black & Veatch
Consulting Engineers
Anne McGowan, Attorney
Alexander T. Henson, Attorney
E. Clemson Shute, Attorney**

This document was prepared with financial assistance from the Office of Coastal Zone Management, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration under the provisions of the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 as amended, and from the California Coastal Commission, under the provisions of the California Coastal Act of 1976.

***LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM
MONTEREY COUNTY, CALIFORNIA
BIG SUR COAST LAND USE PLAN***

***MONTEREY COUNTY
LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM***

***Amendment Certified by the
California Coastal Commission on TBD***

Amendment Adopted by the Board of Supervisors on TBD

***Luis Alejo, Chairman
Glenn Church, Vice Chair
Chris Lopez***

***Wendy Root-Askew
Mary Adams***

***Effective Date of the LCP Amendment
TBD***

BIG SUR COAST LAND USE PLAN - AMENDMENTS

As Adopted by the ~~Monterey County Board of Supervisors~~ Board of Supervisors of the County of Monterey and Certified by the California Coastal Commission for the following date(s):

1. ***January 9, 1996** - AMEND AND ADD LANGUAGE TO BIG SUR COAST LAND USE PLAN POLICY 3.4.3.A.7 - Amend and add to Big Sur Land Use Plan Policy 3.4.3.A.7 regarding the timing of proof of water for subdivision applications.*
2. ***January 13, 2016** – AMEND AND ADD LANGUAGE TO BIG SUR COAST LAND USE PLAN POLICY 5.1.2 and 5.3.3, 5.4.3.I.2.c, 5.4.3.I.2.e, and TABLE 1 – Amend and add to Big Sur Land Use Plan Policy regarding Accessory Dwelling Units.*
3. ***TBD - AMEND AND ADD LANGUAGE TO BIG SUR LAND COAST USE PLAN POLICY 5.1.2 and 5.3.3, 5.4.3.I.2.c, 5.4.3.I.2.e, and TABLE 1 – Amend Big Sur Land Use Plan Policy regarding Accessory Dwelling Units and add caretaker units back into Plan.***
- 2.4. ***TBD – COMPREHENSIVE UPDATE TO THE BIG SUR COAST LAND USE PLAN***

Table of Contents

1.	<i>INTRODUCTION</i>	1
1.1	OVERVIEW	1
1.2	PHYSICAL AND CULTURAL SETTING	2
1.2	PAST AND PRESENT PLANNING	3
2.	<i>PHILOSOPHY & GOALS</i>	6
2.1	PHILOSOPHY AND GOALS	6
2.2	BASIC OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES	7
3.	<i>RESOURCE MANAGEMENT</i>	11
3.1	INTRODUCTION	11
3.2	SCENIC RESOURCES	12
3.2.1	<i>Key Policy</i>	13
3.2.2	<i>Definitions</i>	13
3.2.3	<i>Critical Viewshed</i>	13
3.2.4	<i>Land Not in the Critical Viewshed</i>	16
3.2.5	<i>Exceptions to the Key Policy</i>	17
3.2.6	<i>Recommended Actions</i>	20
3.3	ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE HABITATS	22
3.3.1	<i>Key Policy</i>	23
3.3.2	<i>General Policies</i>	23
3.3.3	<i>Specific Policies</i>	24
3.4	WATER RESOURCES	26
3.4.1	<i>Key Policy</i>	26
3.4.2	<i>General Policies</i>	27
3.4.3	<i>Specific Policies</i>	27
3.4.4	<i>Recommended Actions</i>	32

3.5	FOREST RESOURCES.....	32
3.5.1	<i>Key Policy</i>	35
3.5.2	<i>General Policies</i>	35
3.5.3	<i>Specific Policies</i>	36
3.5.4	<i>Recommended Actions</i>	38
3.6	AGRICULTURE	38
3.6.1	<i>Key Policy</i>	39
3.6.2	<i>General Policies</i>	39
3.6.3	<i>Recommendations</i>	41
3.7	HAZARDOUS AREAS	41
3.7.1	<i>Key Policy</i>	43
3.7.2	<i>General Policies</i>	43
3.7.3	<i>Specific Policies</i>	43
3.7.4	<i>Recommended Actions</i>	47
3.8	MINERAL RESOURCES.....	48
3.8.1	<i>Key Policy</i>	50
3.8.2	<i>General Policies</i>	50
3.8.3	<i>Specific Policies</i>	52
3.8.4	<i>The Little Sur River Watershed and Pico Blanco Limestone Deposits</i>	59
3.9	DREDGING, FILLING, AND SHORELINE STRUCTURES	60
3.9.1	<i>Key Policy</i>	61
3.10	HISTORICAL RESOURCES.....	61
3.10.1	<i>Key Policy</i>	63
3.10.2	<i>General Policies</i>	63
3.11	ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES	64
3.11.1	<i>Key Policy</i>	64
3.11.2	<i>General Policies</i>	65
4.	HIGHWAY 1 AND COUNTY ROADS	66
4.1	INTRODUCTION	66
4.1.1	<i>Key Policy</i>	69
4.1.2	<i>General Policies</i>	70
4.1.2	<i>Specific Policies</i>	71
4.2	RECOMMENDED ACTIONS.....	73

5.	<i>LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT</i>	76
5.1	INTRODUCTION	76
5.1.1	<i>Residential Land Use</i>	77
5.1.2	<i>Housing</i>	78
5.1.3	<i>Recreational Uses</i>	79
5.1.4	<i>Commercial Uses and Private Visitor-Serving Facilities</i>	80
5.1.5	<i>Other Activities</i>	81
5.2	LAND USE PLANNING ISSUES	82
5.3	PROPOSED LAND USES	83
5.3.1	<i>Land Use Categories</i>	84
5.3.2	<i>Land Use Map and Summary of Land Use Proposals</i>	87
5.3.3	<i>Summary of Development Potential</i>	89
5.4	DEVELOPMENT POLICIES	91
5.4.1	<i>Key Policy</i>	91
5.4.2	<i>General Policies</i>	91
5.4.3	<i>Specific Policies</i>	96
6.	<i>PUBLIC ACCESS</i>	110
6.1	INTRODUCTION	110
6.1.1	<i>Shoreline Access</i>	111
6.1.2	<i>Trails</i>	112
6.1.3	<i>Key Policy</i>	114
6.1.4	<i>General Policies</i>	115
6.1.5	<i>Specific Policies</i>	116
6.1.6	<i>Standards and Guidelines for Improvements to Accessways</i>	122
7.	<i>ADMINISTRATION AND IMPLEMENTATION</i>	125
7.1	LUP ADMINISTRATION	125
7.1.1	<i>Development Permit Process</i>	125
7.1.2	<i>LUP Revisions</i>	126
7.1.3	<i>Appeals</i>	126
7.1.4	<i>Public and Agency Participation and Coordination</i>	127
7.2	IMPLEMENTATION	127

7.2.1	<i>Zoning Ordinance Changes</i>	127
7.2.2	<i>Government Coordination and Local Participation Framework</i>	129
7.2.3	<i>Big Sur Coast Data Base</i>	131
7.2.4	<i>Merger</i>	131
7.2.5	<i>Transfer of Development Credits (TDC)</i>	131
7.2.5.A	<i>Key Policies</i>	131
7.2.5.B	<i>General Policies</i>	132
7.2.6	<i>Conservation Easements</i>	132
7.2.7	<i>Restoration/Acquisition</i>	133
7.2.8	<i>Enforcement Program</i>	135

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

TABLE 1:	Land Use and Development Summary		83 <u>XX</u>
FIGURE 1:	Proposed Land Use Rural Community Centers Big Sur Valley North - Detail A Big Sur Valley South - Detail B Lucia - Detail C Pacific Valley - Detail D Gorda - Detail E Commercial Facilities Outside Rural Community Centers - Detail F	following	83 <u>XX</u>
TABLE 2:	Site Specific Recommendations for Shoreline Access	following	146 <u>XX</u>
FIGURE 2:	Shoreline Access Plan	following	146 <u>XX</u>
FIGURE 3:	Trails Plan	following	146 <u>XX</u>

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 OVERVIEW

The plan contained in these pages is the Land Use Plan (LUP) for the Big Sur Coast segment of Monterey County's Local Coastal Program. After adoption by the County of Monterey and certification by the California Coastal Commission (Coastal Commission) this LUP will supersede the Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan which was adopted in 1984 and certified in 1986 (1986 LUP). The 1986 LUP had in turn superseded the Monterey County Coast Master Plan, which was adopted in 1962 and in effect for twenty-two years. This plan supersedes the Monterey County Coast Master Plan adopted in 1962 and in effect for twenty-two years. As the primary component of a certified Local Coastal Program, it will provide development standards to guide the actions of all State and local agencies. Under the provisions of the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act, actions by all federal agencies must be submitted for review by the California Coastal Commission. The Coastal Commission will rely on the certified Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan LUP for guidance when reviewing federal projects for consistency with the policies of the California Coastal Management Program.

This plan-LUP has been prepared to carry out the requirements of the California Coastal Act of 1976. The Coastal Act places emphasis on environmental protection and public recreation and access. Therefore, these were three important considerations used to formulate this plan-LUP.

The 1986 LUP has done an exemplary job of protecting the scenic and natural character of the Big Sur coast, while providing for careful public and private development within a continuously changing environment. The LUP is recognized as the gold standard of land use planning in California and the nation and has required only minimal amendment over its lifetime.

In 2013, the Big Sur LUAC and the South Coast LUAC returned to the task of updating the 1986 LUP. The work preparing this LUP is based largely on the 1986 LUP, while acknowledging that such factors as changed conditions, lessons learned, and new concerns necessitate that the 1986 LUP be updated to meet current needs. The LUP recognizes the historic and current importance of the resident Big Sur community's support for the protection and vitality of Big Sur. In 2021, the Monterey County Planning Commission began its review of the updates, held hearings and recommended its updates to the Board of Supervisors of the County of Monterey (Board of Supervisors). In XXXX, the update went to the Board of Supervisors for consideration, who then transmitted the update to the California Coastal Commission for certification. This LUP, adopted in XXXX, hopes to achieve a balance between ensuring the survivability of the Big Sur community and its neighborhoods and the Coastal Act's emphasis on other public benefits.

In the updates, as in the 1986 LUP, the narrative is unusually important. In applying the policies in this LUP, the narrative should be the primary source for context and interpretation.

1.2 *PHYSICAL AND CULTURAL SETTING*

The Big Sur coast of Central California is over seventy miles in length and stretches from the Carmel area on the north, south to the San Luis Obispo County line near San Simeon. Perhaps the largest single coastal planning area in California, the Big Sur region is also among the most geographically distinctive.

The Big Sur coast is where Highway 1 traces a narrow ledge along the rugged Santa Lucia Mountains above the Pacific shoreline, leading travelers into a scenic drama that is known around the world. In recognition of the spectacular beauty and other unique qualities of the Big Sur coast, the US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration has designated Highway 1 an All-American Road. This honor is awarded by the National Scenic Byways Program to those few highways in the United States that are so distinctive as to be considered destinations unto themselves.

The western slopes of the Santa Lucia Mountains, reaching an elevation of 5,200 feet at Cone Peak, drop precipitously to the sea. Much of the coast is bounded by sheer cliffs. Great offshore rocks punctuate the dramatic meeting of land and sea. Beaches are few; strong currents, waves, and cold water make swimming hazardous. Nearly fifty separate streams flow down the mountains to join the sea. Several of these, such as the Big Sur and Little Sur Rivers, Big Creek, Garrapata Creek, and Salmon Creek, have substantial year-round flows and support anadromous and resident game fish. The Big Sur coast is rich in plant and wildlife diversity. Coast redwoods are found in the cool moist canyons. The Santa Lucia fir and many other rare plants are present. Mountain lion, an occasional black bear, deer, and many smaller terrestrial animals and birds make Big Sur their home. While the California sea otter refuge runs the length of the coast, the otter is only a small part of the diverse spectrum of marine wildlife.

The climate in Big Sur is mild. Although the winters bring some of the heaviest rainfall in California, the summers are long and dry. Coastal fog is typical in summer mornings near the shore; inland and at the higher elevations temperatures can get quite high. Fire danger is ever present in summer and can be extremely hazardous for residents. The incidence and intensity of wildfires are significantly increasing since the adoption of the 1986 LUP.

The rugged mountainous terrain of the Big Sur coast has had a profound effect on historical use of the area and will continue to serve as a limitation on the kinds of activities that can be carried on and the scale of development. Natural constraints to development include availability of water, difficult access, unstable soils on steep slopes, and dangers of fire and flood.

The scenic qualities and the natural grandeur of the coast which result from the imposing geography, the rich vegetative compositions, and the dramatic meeting of land and sea are the area's greatest single attraction to the public. Big Sur has attained a worldwide reputation for spectacular beauty; sightseeing and scenic driving are the major recreational activities.

Although it has remained a rural area where sturdy pioneering families still carry on ranching, Big Sur's

residents have also achieved acclaim for their cultural contributions. Many well known writers, artists, and artisans have been inspired by the coast's dramatic vistas and timeless solitude. A strong community identity continues to attract new residents and also contributes to tourism. Today, tourism and private residential development are the strongest trends affecting management of the area.

In 2022, the Big Sur Coastal Planning Area occupied approximately 145,300 acres (on 1,483 parcels). Of this total, 42,158 acres (on approximately 1,232 parcels) representing 29 percent of the total land area, are in private ownership. The remaining 71 percent or 103,142 acres is in public ownership.

1.3 PAST AND PRESENT PLANNING

Past planning has been conscious of the unique qualities of Big Sur. Soon after the construction of Highway 1 in the late 1930's, the County drew national attention when it successfully prevented construction of a service station advertising sign and won a landmark case, securing for local government the right to use its police power for aesthetic purposes.

Beginning in 1959 and continuing until 1962, the County worked with local residents and consultants to develop a master plan for the coast. This plan, known as the Monterey County Coast Master Plan, has been recognized as both innovative and far reaching and has enjoyed the support of the people in the area. Closely following adoption of the Coast Master Plan, the County took the unusual step of inviting the federal government to study Highway 1 for designation as a national scenic parkway. Although the Federal study was never undertaken, the County published a report entitled, Wonderful One, and expressed its concern for the protection of the national interest along the Big Sur coast.

The County recognizes that even the best planning in time grows outdated and needs to be revised. Today's standards for environmental protection were unknown ten or fifteen years ago. What were thought to have been adequate parcel sizes for private land holdings at the time of the 1962 Master Plan are now understood to be too small to ensure the protection of the coast because excessive development could occur. Use of Highway 1 has grown beyond expectation. Pressures for new residential and commercial development, as well as increased public acquisitions and access, are now being felt along with a steady increase in recreational development and use.

In an effort to respond to these emerging problems, the County has undertaken several new planning programs in recent years. These began in 1970 when the County joined with Santa Cruz County to the north and San Luis Obispo County to the south in the development of the Tri-County Coastline Study. This innovative plan preceded the passage of Proposition 20, the California Coastal Initiative of 1972, and reflected the three counties' deep concern to improve the stewardship of the central coastline. This plan was set aside when Proposition 20 established the California Coastal Commission and charged it with the preparation of a master plan for the State's coastline. Monterey County The County of Monterey once again took the initiative by becoming one of ten jurisdictions in the State to conduct a special pilot planning program in cooperation with the Coastal Commission. The pilot study report, prepared by a consultant to the County in cooperation with local citizens and a broad range of public agencies, made strong recommendations but also identified areas where additional planning seemed

needed. Thereafter, following passage of the California Coastal Act in the fall of 1976, the County developed a comprehensive work program to guide preparation of the Big Sur Coast Local Coastal Program.

The work program identified issues to be resolved and outlined research and planning tasks. A comprehensive series of background reports prepared by the County summarized available data, studied coastal issues in the context of the California Coastal Act, and recommended County policy changes needed to meet the requirements of the Coastal Act. The reports have been widely circulated and reviewed both within the community of Big Sur and outside by interested individuals, groups, and public agencies. Based on the reports' recommendations and on the responses to them, this ~~plan~~-LUP has been prepared.

A great deal of useful information supporting the ~~plan~~-LUP is provided in the background reports but could -not be included in this document. The background reports can be consulted concerning the justification for policies or for detailed information about Big Sur's natural and human environment, but should not be considered authoritative.

The County adopted Protected Waterways Management Plans for the Little Sur River and Big Sur River in 1983. These provide authoritative resource data and analysis, identification of potential land use conflicts and goals, objectives, policies and recommendations for each watershed. These Protected Waterways Management Plans are incorporated by reference in this ~~Plan~~LUP. In general, the goals, objectives, and policies of the Little Sur and Big Sur protected waterways management plans are more specific and detailed statements of land use policy for these two waterways than the ~~LUP~~-LUP. However, in the event of conflict between either waterway plan and the ~~L~~-U-P, the most environmentally protective goals, objectives, or policies shall prevail regardless of the source.

Public participation in development of the ~~plan~~-LUP has been extensive. A Citizen Advisory Committee appointed in 1976 by the Board of Supervisors held numerous meetings to provide direction for the ~~plan~~-LUP and related studies. These meetings were often well attended by residents of the area and the general public. A series of town hall meetings were held in Big Sur at important points in the process to elicit the views of the entire community. Public agency participation included frequent and close working relationships with virtually every agency with an important role on the coast. Numerous presentations by State and Federal Agency personnel were made to the community.

The ~~plan~~-LUP has specifically been prepared to conform to the purposes and spirit of the California Coastal Act. Its proposals are intended to resolve the difficult issues that face Big Sur's future.

The major features of the 1986 LUP were to:

- o Guide all future planning decisions for County and State agencies, and set direction for the U.S. Forest Service in its planning.
- o Show the kinds, locations, and intensities of land uses allowed, therefore, serving as a basis of

zoning and other implementing actions.

- o Present policies concerning land development and environmental protection and management.
- o Call for management of Highway 1 and all other governmental activities on the Coast.
- o Set forth detailed review procedures for all applications based on a permit review process.
- o Set forth a system for coordinating the actions of all involved government agencies.
- o Provide an environmental resource management data base to support the ~~plan~~-LUP and future planning decisions and provide for the periodic updating of this information.
- o Identify the urgent need for financial assistance to the County in preserving Big Sur's natural resources and cultural heritage. Funds are specifically needed to protect scenic views and to provide public access.

It is clear from the above list that the 1986 LUP focused primarily on preserving and protecting Big Sur's natural resources. It is intended that this focus continues. In addition, changed conditions, lessons learned, and new emphasis necessitates a shift in focus. These include:

- The need to preserve and enhance the Big Sur community and neighborhoods by increasing the stock of affordable housing.
- The need to address overcrowding of Highway 1 due to the pressure of increased tourism.
- The lack of management of public land and access.
- The need to facilitate the ability of public agencies and private landowners to prepare for wildfire.

This LUP update was prepared initially by the Big Sur LUAC and the South Coast LUAC, which held many public meetings over the course of five years with the widest opportunity for public participation consistent with the legislative intent set forth under Section 30006 of the Coastal Act. These meetings were often well attended by residents of the area, the County Planning staff, and the general public.

Exhibit E

2. PHILOSOPHY & GOALS

2.1 PHILOSOPHY AND GOALS

The Big Sur Coast Citizens Advisory Committee in providing guidance to the County established the basic philosophy and goals upon which this ~~plan~~-LUP is based. In its report to the County entitled, Philosophy and Goals for Planning, the Committee stated:

The scenic beauty of the Big Sur Coast, and the opportunity to escape urban patterns, are prime attractions for residents and visitors alike. Man-made improvements detract from the near-wilderness attributes of the area if not individually, then collectively.

Quality should have precedence over quantity of any permitted uses, whether residential, recreational, or commercial. Any new development should remain within the small-scale, traditional and rural values of the area, rather than to introduce new or conflicting uses.

Land use planning and management policies should be directed towards maintenance and restoration of Big Sur's remaining rural and wilderness character. Without compromising its character or depleting its resources, the area should be accessible to as many as can be accommodated.

The special cultural characteristics of the Big Sur Coast should also be recognized as a primary resource. Man's presence along this coast continues to reflect a pioneering attitude of independence and resourcefulness; the environment has been a special nurturing ground for individual and creative fulfillment. The community itself and its traditional way of life are resources that can help to protect the environment and enhance the visitor experience.

From these philosophic concerns the following basic goal was defined by the Citizens Advisory Committee:

"To preserve for posterity the incomparable beauty of the Big Sur country, its special cultural and natural resources, its landforms and seascapes and inspirational vistas. To this end, all development must harmonize with and be subordinate to the wild and natural character of the land."

The County recognizes that the comprehensive preservation ethic expressed by these statements will require special vigilance and determination by all persons, public and private, whose actions affect the

Exhibit E

future of the Coast. New and innovative planning tools are needed. Coordination among the numerous governmental agencies with a role on the coast has taken on a new urgency. The ~~plan~~-LUP makes a number of recommendations requiring actions by both the County and other agencies. These recommendations must be vigorously pursued to make the ~~plan~~-LUP a success.

2.2 BASIC OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

To accomplish the major goal of the ~~plan~~LUP, ~~seven~~five basic objectives and policies are defined to guide all future public and private use of the coast. Natural Resources, Coastal Scenic Resources, Highway 1, Land Use and Development, and Shoreline Access were identified in the 1986 LUP. Big Sur Community and Wildfire Preparedness are added in this LUP.

1. Natural Resources

The overall direction for the future of the Big Sur coast is based around the theme of preserving the outstanding natural environment. The County's objective is to develop and effectively carry out a constantly improving system for managing ~~man's~~human's use of the natural resources of the Big Sur coast for the long-term benefit of both visitors and residents.

The County's basic policy is to take a strong and active role in the stewardship and safeguarding of Big Sur's irreplaceable natural resources. Where there are conflicts, protection of these national resources is the primary objective with definite precedence over land use development.

2. Coastal Scenic Resources

Recognizing the Big Sur coast's outstanding scenic beauty and its great benefit to the people of the State and the Nation, it is the County's objective to preserve these scenic resources in perpetuity and to promote, wherever possible, the restoration of the natural beauty of visually degraded areas.

The County's basic policy is to prohibit all future public or private development visible from Highway 1 and major public viewing areas.

3. Big Sur Community

Though inhabited for thousands of years by various Native American peoples, Big Sur was largely inaccessible to settlement before Highway 1 was completed in 1937. The Spanish were the first to attempt to colonize the area in the latter third of the 18th century, but it was more than a hundred years later before homesteaders arrived to settle permanently, and their names now mark the natural features of the land: Post Summit, Pfeiffer Beach, Dani Ridge, Castro Canyon, Partington Ridge, Notley's Landing, Bixby Canyon, Gamboa Point, and so on.

The heritage of these early settlers who braved hardship to raise their families lives in the spirit of a

Exhibit E

community that has endured rock and mud slides, road closures, forest fires and attempts to turn Big Sur into a national park, taking control from the hands of local, county and state authorities. This community has a rich culture which has given and continues to give much to the world. Because of its relative isolation and the striking beauty of its surroundings, Big Sur continues to inspire artists, sculptors, writers and poets, singers and songwriters, photographers, woodworkers, and spiritual seekers. The world famous Esalen Institute, which birthed the human potential movement, continues to inspire positive change in human relations. The New Camaldoli Hermitage offers peace and solitude to retreat guests from near and far. And the Henry Miller Library, named after long-time artist, author, and Big Sur resident, offers a variety of programs that are open to the local and traveling public.

Those who think of Big Sur as simply a majestic meeting of land and sea, who drive through on vacation or come to run the Big Sur Marathon, may not see or appreciate the resident community which embodies a fierce love of this land and a commitment to its protection as one of the natural and cultural wonders of the world. The Big Sur community is committed to preserving, protecting, and enhancing these natural and cultural resources in perpetuity. The community needs to continue to be here to do that. In this update, the County also recognizes that the Big Sur community is an integral part of the area, including an important part of the experience for visitors to the area. To ensure the community's long-term viability, the community needs must be considered along with the area's other resources.

4. *Highway 1*

Highway 1 traversing the Big Sur coast is a special road of great local, state, and national significance. It was built by the public primarily for scenic travel and recreational enjoyment and over the years has been managed with this purpose always in mind. In light of the public's great need for recreational opportunities, this original objective has become even more important.

~~Monterey County's~~The County of Monterey's basic policy is to take a strong and active role in guiding future use and improvement of Highway 1 and all categories of land use related to and dependent on the highway. The County's purpose will be to maintain and enhance the highway's aesthetic beauty and to protect its primary function as a recreational route. The highway shall remain a two-lane road and provide walking and bike trails wherever feasible. In order to maintain the highway's benefit to the public as a scenic recreational travel experience, the County will pursue legislation to restrict and regulate slow moving vehicles during peak travel hours.

5. *Land Use and Development*

The County's primary land use planning objective is to minimize development of the Big Sur coast in order to preserve the coast as a scenic rural area where residents' individual lifestyles can flourish, traditional ranching uses can continue, and the public can come to enjoy nature and find refuge from the pace of urban life.

Exhibit E

Changes in zoning density resulting from the 1986 LUP, which increased the minimum allowable parcel sizes for subdivisions from one acre to five acres for much of the area before the 1986 LUP's certification, to 40 to 320 acres after its certification, dramatically reduced the potential for development in the Big Sur Coastal Planning Area at buildout.

This LUP retains the subdivision densities of the 1986 LUP. However, it also attempts to address such problems as lack of affordable housing in the Big Sur Coastal Planning Area by use of such measures as allowing for construction of accessory residential housing units. Additionally, higher density for employee housing may be appropriate in certain areas of Big Sur.

The County's basic policy is that future land use development on the Big Sur coast shall be extremely limited, in keeping with the larger goal of preserving the Coast as a natural scenic area, while at the same time working to ensure the long-term viability of the Big Sur community. In all cases, new land uses must remain subordinate to the character and grandeur of the Big Sur coast. All proposed uses, whether public or private, must meet the same exacting environmental standards and must not degrade the Big Sur landscape.

6. *Shoreline Access*

The County acknowledges the increasing public demand for access to the Big Sur coast and wishes, in the spirit of the California Coastal Act, to accommodate this legitimate desire. However, in doing so, the County recognizes an ever greater commitment to preservation of the fragile natural environment. A range of additional concerns appear as well, including the need to ensure public safety and to protect the rights of property owners. Therefore, it is the County's objective to develop an optimal plan for public access that accounts, in a balanced way, for all these considerations.

Because preservation of the land in its natural state is the highest priority, the County's basic policy is that all future access must be subordinate to this objective. Care must be taken that while providing public access, that the beauty of the coast, its tranquility, and the health of its environment, are not marred by public overuse or carelessness. Visual access should be emphasized throughout Big Sur as an appropriate response to the needs of visitors. Visual access to the shoreline should be maintained by directing future development out of the viewshed.

It is the intention of ~~Monterey County~~ the County of Monterey to review both the ~~plan-LUP~~ policies and local development at 5-year intervals to determine what, if any, changes in the ~~plan-LUP~~ or its implementation may be desirable or necessary.

7. *Wildfire Preparedness*

Since the 1986 LUP was written, wildfires have become an even greater threat to the Big Sur Coastal Planning Area. Accumulation of vegetation and a changing climate put habitats and species, including critical habitat, and threatened and endangered species, at risk of unnatural high-

Exhibit E

heat-intensity wildfire, and threatens lives and property as well. Changes in policies as set forth in this LUP are intended to allow property owners the ability to more easily and readily perform wildfire fuel mitigation work.

DRAFT

3. *RESOURCE MANAGEMENT*

3.1 *INTRODUCTION*

The Big Sur coast has a rare heritage of scenic, natural, and cultural resources. The seventy-mile long coastal strip supports a diversity of plant, animal, and marine life found in few areas. The relative inaccessibility of the backcountry and the limited extent of man's activities have helped to protect these resources and to maintain a local culture.

The Big Sur coast is in its infancy in terms of geologic time. This newness--characterized by extreme ruggedness of terrain and underlying instability--makes the area susceptible to geologic disturbance. The relatively small seasonal water resources that support the present population of animals, plants and humans dictate that management of the quality and flow of ~~these~~^{se} water resources be a primary issue.

Development of the Big Sur coast has been limited by natural constraints and hazards such as the availability of water, difficulty of access, fire and flood potential, unstable soils, and seismic disturbance. However, as in other areas of high scenic and recreational value, neither natural nor man-made constraints have been sufficient to contain public and private development or recreational demands. The scarcity of choice land has resulted in use of inappropriate or hazardous areas. ~~At peak summer periods,~~ Highway 1 ~~has~~^{is} ~~approaching~~^{ing} maximum carrying capacity and ~~many local roads~~^{some recreational facilities} are overused. Some species of plants and animals are already extinct or near extinction, and unique and fragile habitats are increasingly threatened. Accelerated land use and development will inevitably create new pressures and aggravate perennial problems: fires, floods, landslides, water and air pollution, depletion of water resources, and further destruction of plant, animal and marine habitats. Geologic hazards created by development activities are not only private matters, but affect the public in general.

There is a need for limits in all areas of private and public development, in order to prevent overuse of resources. Maintenance of the quality of the natural experience along the Big Sur coast has precedence over the development of any permitted uses, whether residential, recreational, or commercial. New development should complement the area and its cultural traditions, rather than introduce conflicting uses.

The policies that follow are intended to guide the use and enjoyment of the coast and to afford an essential degree of protection for the area's natural environment.

All development proposals should be considered by means of site-specific evaluation followed by thoughtful deliberation. Such deliberation may from time to time require that competing goals and policies be balanced against each other to produce a reasonable outcome.

Exhibit E

The policies are based upon numerous background reports, analysis of a great deal of data, and the advice of many agencies and knowledgeable individuals. Much of this material is contained in the background reports. In addition to the text presented here, a series of maps have been prepared that reflect available information on the location of various resources and hazards. Copies of these maps at 2000' scale are available for public study at the Planning Department and in Big Sur at the County Branch Library. Reduced scale versions of these maps are available in booklet form from the Planning Department. Maps included cover:

- 1 -- Viewshed
- 2 -- Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas
- 3 -- Agricultural and Forest Resources
- 4 -- Hazards
- 5 -- Recreation and Visitor-Serving Facilities
- 6 -- Current Land Use
- 7 -- Parcel Sizes and Land Ownership
- 8 -- Existing Access Conditions

The County recognizes that inaccuracies may exist in these maps and no claims are made for their complete accuracy. It will be the County's intention to use these maps as constantly improving tools to be shared with the public. As new or improved information becomes available, the maps will be revised.

3.2 SCENIC RESOURCES

There is longstanding concern for the protection of the scenic beauty of the Big Sur area. During the early 1940's, the County's refusal to approve service station roadside advertising resulted in national attention. A landmark court decision in favor of the County, upheld the right of local government to regulate aesthetics through the police power. In the 1960's, Highway ~~One~~1 was designated as the first scenic highway in California's new State Scenic Highway System. Many other measures have been taken by the County to preserve the outstanding visual qualities of the Big Sur area. These have included, among other things, ~~use of the Scenic Conservation zones~~scenic conservation zoning, careful site, design and landscaping control, and abatement of visual nuisance.

In spite of these controls, increased development has gradually encroached into areas of outstanding

Exhibit E

beauty. In some cases this has been caused by poorly sited homes, or structures which have not been designed to blend well enough with their surroundings. In other cases, highly visible roads and trails have been built on scenically sensitive mountainsides to provide access to new homesites or residential parcels. In still other cases, public agencies have undertaken construction with little sensitivity to the land or to Big Sur's aesthetic values.

The aesthetic and scenic qualities and semi-wilderness character of the coast have received national and even international acclaim. Accordingly, the issue of visual resource protection is probably the most significant and far reaching question concerning the future of the Big Sur coast. A major premise of this plan-LUP is that unusual action must now be taken to preserve the coast's scenic beauty and natural appearance. The strong policies set forth in this plan-LUP are intended to safeguard this critically important resource. If carried out, they will assure the protection of the scenic magnificence of the area and reflect the desire of the people of Monterey County and the Big Sur community to preserve their heritage for present and future generations.

3.2.1 Key Policy

Recognizing the Big Sur coast's outstanding beauty and its great benefit to the people of the State and Nation, it is the County's objective to preserve these scenic resources in perpetuity and to promote the restoration of the natural beauty of visually degraded areas wherever possible. To this end, it is the County's policy to prohibit all future public or private development visible from Highway 1 and major public viewing areas (the Critical Viewshed), other than the development exceptions provided in this section, and to condition all new development in areas not visible from Highway 1 or major public viewing areas on the siting and design criteria set forth in Sections 3.2.3, 3.2.4, and 3.2.5 of this plan-LUP. This applies to all structures, the construction of public and private roads, trails, utilities, lighting, grading and removal or extraction of natural materials.

3.2.2 Definitions

1. Critical Viewshed: everything within sight of Highway 1 and major public viewing areas including turnouts, beaches and the following specific locations Soberanes Point, Garrapata Beach, Abalone Cove Vista Point, Bixby Creek Turnout, Hurricane Point Overlook, upper Sycamore Canyon Road (Highway 1 to Pais Road), Pfeiffer Beach/Cooper Beach, and specific views from Old Coast Road as defined by policy-Policy 3.8.4.4.

3.2.3 Critical Viewshed

A. Policies

1. In order to avoid creating further commitment to development within the Critical Viewshed all new parcels must contain building sites outside the Critical Viewshed.

Exhibit E

2. The best available planning techniques shall be used to permit development of parcels partially in the Critical Viewshed. These may include clustering of structures, sensitive site design, design control, transfer of development credits, and other techniques designed to allow development on such parcels outside the Critical Viewshed.
3. Where it is determined that an alternative building site on a parcel would result in conformance to the Key Policy, then the applicant will be required to modify thehis proposal accordingly. Similarly, changes in the design, height, or bulk of proposed structures will be required where this will result in an approvable project.
4. New roads, public parking, trails, grading or excavations will not be allowed to damage or intrude upon the Critical Viewshed. Such road construction or other work shall not commence until the entire project has completed the permit and appeal process. Grading or excavation shall include all alterations of natural landforms by earthmoving equipment. These restrictions shall not be interpreted as prohibiting restoration ~~of severely eroded water course channels or gullying~~, provided a plan is submitted and approved prior to commencing work.
5. Where it is determined that a proposed development cannot be re_sited, redesigned, or in any other way made to conform to the basic Critical Viewshed policy, then the site shall be considered environmentally inappropriate for development.
6. The County will participate with other public agencies and private groups to secure adequate funds to purchase Critical Viewshed parcels proposed for development or to secure for use by restricted landowners, other developable land areas to which new development can be transferred. The value of parcels, for purposes of establishing purchase price, shall not be diminished by virtue of their location in the viewshed or by the policies of this section.
7. The general policy concerning replacement of structures shall be to encourage re_siting or redesign in order to conform to the Key Policy. Replacement or enlargement of existing structures, or structures lost in fire or natural disaster within the Critical Viewshed shall be permitted on the original location on the site, provided no other less visible portion of the site is acceptable to the property owner, and provided the replacement or enlargement does not increase the visibility of the structure. Replacement or enlargement of structures outside the Critical Viewshed shall be permitted as long as such replacement or enlargement does not cause the structure to intrude into Critical Viewshed.
8. Landowners will be encouraged to grant scenic easements to the County over portions of their land in the Critical Viewshed.
9. The County encourages creative public and private efforts to restore the scenic beauty of

Exhibit E

visually/impacted areas of the coast and will assist such efforts where possible.

10. Soil berms, stockpiling and associated vegetation along Highway 1 shall not obstruct views of the ocean.
11. Where no other feasible mitigation measures for eliminating the adverse visual impacts of new development in the Critical Viewshed are available, the County has instituted a Transfer of Development Credits (TDC) system (pursuant to Section 20.64.190 of the Monterey County Code) that will permit development credits for a parcel within the Big Sur Coastal Planning Area determined to be developable except for the Critical Viewshed restrictions. Such credits may be transferred at the owner's option to a receiving parcel not in the Critical Viewshed and otherwise found to be suitable for an increased density of development. The use of transferred credits will be allowed as a conditional use under this LUP. However, the increase in residential density on the receiving parcel shall not exceed twice that which is specified by Section 5.4 of this LUP, except where: a) an environmental impact analysis reveals site suitability for more units; b) traffic impacts will be mitigated through reduction in the number of driveway encroachments onto Highway 1; and c) consistent with all other standards listed in this LUP.

Critical Viewshed parcels protected under a TDC system shall be secured through enforceable restrictions (e.g., scenic easement dedication, deed restriction, etc.), subject to County Counsel review and approval of the applicable documents.

B. *Procedures For identifying whether A Proposed Project Would Intrude On The Critical Viewshed.*

1. All development applications shall require individual onsite investigations to determine whether they would intrude on the Critical Viewshed. The proposed buildings shall be accurately indicated as to dimensions, height, and rooflines by poles and access roads, by stakes with flags which shall remain in place for the duration of the project review and approval process. Such indications of the extent of development shall be recorded photographically with superimposed representation of the proposed project. The standard for review is the objective determination of whether any portion of the proposed development is visible from Highway 1 or the major public viewing areas identified in the definition of the Critical Viewshed.
2. Visibility will be considered in terms of normal, unaided vision in any direction for any amount of time at any season. Ocean views from Highway 1 shall not be obscured by artificial berming/mounding or landscaping. Distant development, although in the technical line of sight, will not be considered visible if sited and designed so as not to be seen from Highway 1 and other major public viewing areas. LExterior light sources shall be prohibited if such light source would be directly visible from the locations designated in Policy 3.2.2.1 above. The Critical

Exhibit E

Viewshed does not include areas visible only from the hiking trails shown on the Trails Plan (Figure 3) including but not limited to the California Coastal Trail.

All new development not in conformance with the approved representations shall be removed.

3.2.4 Land Not in the Critical Viewshed

A. Policies

1. So that the visual continuity may remain undisturbed, the design and siting of structures, whether residential, commercial, agricultural, or public, and access thereto, shall not detract from the natural beauty of the undeveloped skylines, ridgelines, and the shoreline.
2. New applicants, when selecting a building site, must consider the visual effects upon public views as well as the views and privacy of neighbors. The portion of a parcel least visible from public viewpoints will be considered the appropriate site for the location of new structures. New structures shall be located where existing topography or trees provide natural screening and shall not be sited on open hillsides or silhouetted ridges. Sites shall not leave excavation scars or slope disturbance. Structures and access roads shall be designed to minimize alterations of the natural landform and to avoid, insofar as feasible, removal of healthy tree cover.
3. New development should be subordinate and blend with its environment, using materials or colors that will achieve that effect. Where necessary, appropriate modifications will be required for siting, structural design, size, shape, color, textures, building materials, access, and screening.
4. Landscape screening may be used wherever a moderate extension of native forested and chaparral areas is possible. Other screening must be of similar plant or tree species.
5. Sites for new structures shall be selected to avoid the construction of visible access roads and minimize the extent of environmental and engineering problems resulting from road construction.
6. New roads providing residential, recreational, ~~or agricultural~~, or emergency access will be considered only where it has been demonstrated that the use of existing roads is not feasible, or that permission for the use of an existing road is shown in writing to be unobtainable from neighboring property owners.
7. New roads shall avoid steep slopes and shall be located along the margins of forested areas, along natural land contours, or within existing vegetation. Road shall be aligned to minimize removal of native trees, and constructed to minimum standards consistent with the requirements of fire safety and emergency use. Drainage and erosion control measures must avoid invasive

Exhibit E

species and be adequate to prevent erosion. During road construction, side-casting of earth materials shall not be permitted; all materials not used for on-site fill shall be removed from the area.

8. ~~A~~Television antennas and communication and utility infrastructure shall be unobtrusive.

B. Procedures For Applying the General Scenic Resources Policies That Apply Outside the Critical Viewshed.

All development applications shall require individual on-site investigations. The proposed dimensions of buildings shall be accurately indicated as to dimensions, height, and rooflines by poles and access roads marked by stakes with flags which shall remain in place for the duration of the project review and approval process. The County shall determine whether the proposed development conforms to the policies set forth in Subsection A of this section.

3.2.5 Exceptions to the Key Policy

A. ~~Rural~~ Commercial Service Centers

Development within the following Rural Community Centers at —Big Sur Valley, Lucia, Gorda, and Pacific Valley, as well Commercial Facilities Outside of Rural Community Centers designated areas ~~as at~~ Westmere, Rocky Point Restaurant, Big Sur Inn, the Henry Miller Library and Coast Gallery, — provide essential services to the community and visiting public, and shall be permitted under careful design and siting controls as provided for in the County Zoning Ordinance (Title 20 of the County Code) and by Policy 5.4.3 of this ~~Plan~~LUP. Employee housing may be permitted in these land use designations.

B. Essential Ranching Structures

Essential agricultural structures required by commercial ranching and agriculture operations that cannot be feasibly located outside the viewshed shall be permitted under careful design and siting controls. Examples include barns, fences, windmills, water pumps, water tanks, stockponds and corrals. Replacement of existing structures is allowed. However, all aquaculture facilities will be subject to the same resource protection criteria and environmental standards as other development. Such uses shall conform to all non-~~C~~ritical ~~V~~iewshed standards.

C. Highway 1 Facilities

1. Public Highway Facilities.

Road capacity, safety and aesthetic improvements shall be allowed, as set forth below, provided they are consistent with Section 4.1.1, 4.1.2, and 4.1.3 of this ~~plan~~LUP. Signs,

Exhibit E

guardrails, and restrooms shall be of a design complementary to the rural setting and character of Big Sur, with preference for natural materials. Protective barriers constructed by Caltrans should utilize boulders or walls of rock construction. Public agency permanent highway signs should be framed with unpainted redwood. All highway signs should be reviewed once every three years by Caltrans to determine the need for their continued use. All unnecessary signs should be removed.

2. Private Highway Improvements.

Private driveway entrances, gates, roadside fences, mailboxes, and signs shall be of a design complementary to the rural setting and character of Big Sur, with preference for natural materials.

D. Utilities

It is the County's intent that utilities be installed underground. Overhead power or telephone lines will be considered only where overriding natural or physical constraints exist. Poles will be placed in the least conspicuous locations out of public, and where possible, private view. Exterior lighting will require shielding to reduce its long-range visibility, and to cause the light source to not be visible. Further, exterior lighting shall be downlite and minimal to reduce as much as possible light pollution. Communication and utility infrastructure ~~Transmitter towers and power facilities~~ must not appear in the Critical Viewshed. Water lines or underground conduits should be buried or otherwise obscured by vegetation.

E. Public Restrooms and State Park Parking

Public restrooms are encouraged at the following locations:

1. Soberanes Point near the barn on the east side of the Highway 1.
2. Garrapata State Beach, which may be visible from the State Beach pullout, but shall not be visible to motor vehicle traffic passing on Highway 1.
3. The viewpoint near Krenkle Corners/Grey Rock (Mile Marker 37), which may be visible to vehicles passing on Highway 1 only to the degree necessary.
4. The Vista Point near the Big Creek area (between Mile Markers 27 & 28).

In order to provide for parking and other low intensity support facilities for the State -of California system of parks on the Big Sur coast, flexibility in the basic viewshed policy may be permitted to allow use of excavating, berming, and indigenous plant screening at Soberanes Point, Garrapata Beach, ~~Little Sur River Mouth~~, and Point Sur Lighthouse if no environmentally suitable site is available that meets the Critical Viewshed criteria. Other new parking facilities shall be provided

Exhibit E

at off-highway locations rather than on the Highway ~~One-1~~ shoulder. The creation of new parking lots between Highway ~~One-1~~ and the ocean shall be avoided wherever possible to avoid detracting from scenic coastal views. This policy shall also apply to new units within the system that may be opened to the public. Parking and support facilities existing at current facilities shall be removed from Highway ~~One-1~~ whenever the necessary off-highway parking is provided. New off-highway facilities shall be designed, to conform to Critical Viewshed ~~P~~policy 3.2.4.3 if located in the Critical Viewshed (except for necessary entrance ways, which cannot be hidden from Highway ~~One-1~~), and to ~~P~~policy 3.2.4 if located outside the Critical Viewshed. Existing facilities shall be brought into conformance to the greatest extent possible. Land acquired for viewshed protection shall not be developed for parking or visitor serving facilities. Parking facilities for Soberanes Point and Garrapata Beach ~~, and Little Sur River Mouth~~ shall be located on the east side of Highway ~~One-1~~ and be completely out of the view of the Highway through the use of excavation, indigenous forestation and berming techniques which shall obscure all vehicles and facilities. Restroom facilities shall be located with the parking facilities. For public safety at Soberanes Point and Garrapata Beach ~~, Little Sur River Mouth~~, and any new units on the east side of Highway ~~One-1~~ connecting the parking and beach areas are highly desirable. Parking shall be provided for a maximum of 75 vehicles at these facilities.

F. Rocky Point Area Vacant Parcels

Existing vacant residential parcels in the Critical Viewshed between Highway 1 and the sea, from (and including) the southernmost existing residential parcel on Rocky Point, to the northernmost developed residential parcel on Kasler Point and from the southernmost developed parcel north of Abalone Cove to the northernmost developed parcel south of Garrapata Creek shall be permitted to be used for residential purposes subject to policies of Section 3.2.4 of this ~~plan~~LUP and the following standards.

Additional standards shall include keeping driveways as narrow as possible, avoiding paving where practical and consolidation of driveways; the use of roof and surface treatments, colors and materials which will visibly blend with the surrounding environment; the use of berming and other measures designed to minimize views of structures without blocking ocean vistas seen from Highway 1; prohibiting the dumping of excavated materials over the coastal bluff, and additions, antennae, night flood lighting, or other improvements in view of Highway 1 without separate permit consideration; and dedication of scenic easement over undeveloped portion of lot. Guest houses shall be attached to the main dwelling except where they can be sited to better implement these policies.

G. Otter Cove

Existing vacant residential parcels in the Critical Viewshed in the Otter Cove Subdivision seaward of Highway 1, south of Malpaso Creek, shall be permitted to be used for residential purposes subject to policies of Section 3.2.4 of this ~~plan~~LUP.

Additional standards shall include keeping driveways as narrow as possible, avoiding paving where

Exhibit E

practical and consolidation of driveways; the use of roof and surface treatments, colors and materials which will visibly blend with the surrounding environment; the use of berming and other measures designed to minimize views of structures without blocking ocean vistas seen from Highway 1; prohibiting the dumping of excavated materials over the coastal bluff, and additions, antennae, night floodlighting, or other improvements in view of Highway 1 without separate permit consideration; and dedication of scenic easement over undeveloped portion of lot. All guest houses shall be attached to the main dwelling.

H. Coastal-dependent Uses Exception

Coastal-dependent uses, natural resource management needs, and certain necessary public facilities as specified below are permitted provided that in each case there be a finding that no reasonable alternative exists, that no significant adverse visual impacts will result, and that all such uses are in conformance with Scenic Resources Policy 3.2.4 and all other policies. The exceptions are limited to:

- a. Removal of non-native trees;
- b. County road improvements in keeping with Policy 3.2.5.C-1;
- c. Minimal public access improvements on the beach along shoreline lateral accessways, such as litter collection facilities and rustic stairways;
- d. On-shore navigational aids (lights, radio beacons, weather stations) needed by the commercial fishing industry; and
- e. Improvements to Pacific Valley School.
- f. The joint U.S. Forest Service-~~California Department of Parks and Recreation~~State Parks-Caltrans administrative site in ~~Pfeiffer-Pfeiffer~~ Big Sur State Park.

3.2.6 Recommended Actions

1. The County shall explore all sources of funds - County, State and Federal - to compensate property owners denied development permits due to ~~Critical V~~Critical Viewshed restrictions. The County will discourage any increase in Federal land ownership, management or control if such increased Federal role would expose more of the Big Sur Coastal ~~Planning Area-area~~Planning Area to deleterious activities. Examples of deleterious activities are clear-cut commercial logging, open pit mining, oil and gas development, overuse of environmentally sensitive habitat areas, or the taking of private property for public use. The County will also support improved stewardship and management of existing public lands, and where appropriate, consultation with the Federal agencies to insure compatibility of land uses on both Federal and non-Federal lands. The Federal government will be asked to adhere to the same resource conservation policies of the

Exhibit E

certified Land Use Plan (LUP) as are applicable to other landowners.

The California Coastal Conservancy is requested to investigate and propose specific sources of funds to compensate property owners denied development permits due to Critical Viewshed restrictions. The Conservancy should devise and recommend to the County practical mechanisms and procedures to make such funds available to affected property owners in a timely manner.

Monterey County's representatives in the California Legislature and the United States Congress are requested to investigate and propose specific sources of funds for the County to use to compensate property owners denied development permits due to Critical Viewshed restrictions. These representatives are further requested to devise and recommend to the County practical mechanisms and procedures to make such funds available to affected property owners in a timely manner.

2. The California Coastal Conservancy should undertake a study to identify areas of the Big Sur coast suitable for visual restoration and should propose specific measures to encourage restoration. This study may be a cooperative effort between interested residents, groups, and other agencies, the Conservancy, and the County. At a minimum, the study should:
 - identify specific parcels unsuitable for development due to Critical Viewshed restrictions and recommend means of avoiding development on the properties.
 - prepare a map and list of specific developments, including roads that impact visual quality and propose means of gradually reducing such impacts. This should include an incentive program, including cost-sharing, for private landowners and residents to voluntarily undertake such work.
3. Where no other feasible mitigation measures for eliminating the adverse visual impacts of new development in the Critical Viewshed are available, the County has instituted a Transfer of Development Credits (TDC) system (pursuant to Section 20.64.190 of the Monterey County Code)~~may institute and utilize a Transfer of Development Credits (TDC) system~~ that will permit development credits for a parcel determined to be developable except for the Critical Viewshed restrictions. Such credits may be transferred at the owner's option to a receiving parcel not in the Critical Viewshed and otherwise found to be suitable for an increased density of development. The use of transferred credits will be allowed as a conditional use under this PlanLUP. However, the increase in residential density on the receiving parcel shall not exceed twice that which is specified by Section 5.4 of this PlanLUP, except where: a) an environmental impact analysis reveals site suitability for more units; b) traffic impacts will be mitigated through reduction in the number of driveway encroachments onto Highway 1; and c) consistent with all other standards listed in this PlanLUP.

Exhibit E

Critical ~~V~~iewshed parcels protected under a TDC system shall be secured through enforceable restrictions (e.g. scenic easement dedication), subject to County Counsel review and approval- of the applicable documents.

4. An effective and continuing program for litter control and abatement, including public education, should be undertaken by Caltrans, the California State-Department of Parks and Recreation, and the U.S. Forest Service. This program should include a regular schedule of litter removal along Highway 1 and on or near public beaches and selected viewing points.

3.3 ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE HABITATS

Environmentally sensitive habitats are areas in which plant or animal life or their habitats are either rare or ~~especially~~particularly valuable because of their special nature or role in an ecosystem. Environmentally sensitive habitats are also areas susceptible to disturbance or degradation by human activities and developments. Examples are riparian corridors and Areas of Special Biological Significance identified by the State Water Resources Control Board; rare and endangered species habitat; all coastal wetlands and lagoons; all marine wildlife haul-out, breeding and nesting area; education, research and wildlife reserves, including all tideland portions of the California Sea Otter State ~~Fish and~~ Game Refuge; nearshore reefs; tidepools; sea caves; islets and offshore rocks; kelp beds; indigenous dune plant habitats; Monarch butterfly mass overwintering sites; and wilderness and primitive areas. The California Coastal Act limits uses to those which are dependent on such resources; examples include nature education and research, hunting, fishing, and aquaculture.

The Big Sur coast supports a wealth and diversity of environmentally sensitive habitats perhaps unsurpassed in California. Many of these, especially in the marine environment, are in an essentially undisturbed condition yet are endangered by changes in land use or offshore activities. Some sensitive habitats already enjoy protection under laws guiding local, state, and federal agencies. Some sensitive marine resources are protected by sections of the California Fish and Game Code, the Federal Migratory Bird Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, and the Federal Endangered Species Act of 1973. Wildlife habitats are protected where they occur in legally designated areas such as the California Sea Otter Game Refuge, and rare and endangered plants are singled out for preservation under State and Federal legislation. Many of Big Sur's terrestrial habitats, however, including sensitive plants, dunes, serpentine rock associations, riparian corridors, coastal prairies, and grasslands are without adequate protection.

Essential roads are permitted in environmentally sensitive habitats provided that in each case there be a finding that no reasonable alternative exists, that no significant adverse impacts will result, and that such uses are in conformance with all other ~~Plan-LUP~~ policies. Essential roads are those which are unavoidably necessary to provide a minimum level of access to an existing parcel, where no access road presently exists and no reasonable economic use of the property is possible without such road. Reasonable alternatives are those which would have less impact on sensitive habitats and the Critical

Exhibit E

Viewshed; or would provide a more usable route for agricultural or visitor serving uses.

3.3.1 Key Policy

All practical efforts shall be made to maintain, restore, and if possible, enhance Big Sur's environmentally sensitive habitats. The development of all categories of land use, both public and private, should be subordinate to the protection of these critical areas.

3.3.2 General Policies

1. Development, including vegetation removal, excavation, grading, filing, and the construction of roads and structures, shall not be permitted in the environmentally sensitive habitat areas if it results in any potential disruption of habitat value. To approve development within any of these habitats the County must find that disruption of a habitat caused by the development is not significant.
2. Where private or public development is proposed, in documented or expected locations of environmentally sensitive habitats, field surveys by qualified individuals or agencies shall be made in order to determine precise locations of the habitat and to recommend mitigating measures to ensure its protection.
3. The County shall require deed restrictions or dedications of permanent conservation easements in environmentally sensitive habitats when new development is proposed on parcels containing such habitats. Where development has already occurred in areas supporting sensitive habitat, property owners should be encouraged to voluntarily establish conservation easements or deed restrictions.
4. For developments approved within environmentally sensitive habitats, the removal of indigenous vegetation and land disturbance (grading, excavation, paving, etc.) associated with the development shall be limited to that needed for the structural improvements themselves. The guiding philosophy shall be to limit the area of disturbance, to maximize the maintenance of the natural topography of the site, and to favor structural designs which achieve these goals.
5. Public access in areas of environmentally sensitive habitats shall be limited to low-intensity recreational, scientific, or educational uses. Access shall generally be controlled and confined to the designated trails and paths. No access shall be approved which results in significant disruption of the habitat.
6. To protect environmentally sensitive habitats and the high wildlife values associated with large areas of undisturbed habitat, the County shall retain significant and, where possible, continuous areas of undisturbed land in open space use. To this end, parcels of land in sensitive habitat areas shall be kept as large as possible, and if structures are permitted, they shall be clustered

Exhibit E

in the least environmentally sensitive areas.

7. Land uses adjacent to environmentally sensitive habitats shall be compatible with the long-term maintenance of the resource. New land uses shall be considered compatible only where they incorporate all site planning and design features needed to prevent significant habitat impacts, and where they do not establish a precedent for continued land development which, on a cumulative basis, could degrade the adjoining habitat.
8. New development adjacent to environmentally sensitive habitat areas shall be allowed only at densities compatible with the protection and maintenance of the adjoining resources. New subdivisions shall be approved only where potential impacts to environmentally sensitive habitats from development of proposed parcels can be avoided.
9. The County shall require the use of appropriate native or non-native species in proposed landscaping consistent with the County's standards for landscaping located at Chapter 16.63 of the Monterey County Code.

3.3.3 Specific Policies

A. Terrestrial Plant, Riparian, and Wildlife Habitats

1. Uses of sand dune habitats shall be restricted except for scientific and educational activities. Particular attention shall be given to sites of rare and endangered plants. Recreational access and associated facilities shall be directed away from dune habitats and focused on the beach area. All management agencies shall prohibit off-road vehicle use in dune areas.
2. In serpentine rock associated habitats, land use activities shall be low intensity and designed to ensure protection of habitat values.
3. Development or land use activities shall be sited to protect riparian habitat values. Development adjacent to stream courses shall be restricted to low intensities and constructed to minimize erosion, runoff, and water pollution. In order to protect riparian habitats, land use development activities will not be permitted that will have the effect of diminishing surface flows in coastal streams to levels that will result in loss of plant or wildlife habitat.
4. Except for water-related facilities (such as waterlines, spring boxes, etc.) that necessitate a lesser setback, for scientific purposes (such as flow meters and other instruments), and for restoration, Setbacks of 150' on each side of the streambank shall be required for all streams to protect riparian plant communities unless a narrower corridor can be demonstrated to be sufficient to protect existing vegetation and provide for restoration of previously disturbed vegetation.

Exhibit E

5. Access routes including recreational trails and roads shall be sited to avoid significant impacts to riparian corridors.
6. Recreational access to environmentally sensitive ~~scientifically important terrestrial~~ habitat areas may be restricted when necessary to protect the habitat.
7. Land uses in areas where natural grassland is found shall be compatible with the maintenance of the habitat. Development shall be sited and designed to avoid disturbance or destruction of grasslands. Compatible uses include managed grazing and low-intensity recreational and residential uses.
8. Residential development shall be sited and designed to have minimum impacts on redwood trees from soil compaction and other disturbances to tree roots. With similar considerations, recreation should be encouraged as an appropriate use for redwood forests.
9. Commercial harvesting of old growth redwoods or rare or sensitive tree species is generally inappropriate because of their scarcity, uniqueness, and scientific and educational value.
10. ~~Monterey County~~ The County of Monterey encourages residents and public agencies to undertake restoration of Big Sur's natural environment by removal of exotic plants such as Scotch and French Broom, Eucalyptus, Kikuyu grass, Vinca, Pampas grass, Gorse, and other non-native invasive species provided ed such removal does not increase potential erosion problems.

B. Marine Habitats

1. Development on parcels adjacent to intertidal habitat areas should be sited and designed to prevent percolation of septic runoff and deposition of sediment.
2. Alteration of the shoreline including diking, dredging, and filling, shall not be permitted except for work essential for the maintenance of Highway 1.
3. Concentration of recreational development or recreational activities near accessible tidepool communities shall not be permitted unless adequate management measures are provided to prevent degradation of the sensitive environment.
4. Site design techniques intended to screen structures from view of Highway 1 shall not involve major land modification that may impact adjacent marine habitats.
5. The coastal lagoons and estuaries of the Big Sur ~~c~~Coast shall remain undeveloped. Development in the adjacent buffer area shall be limited to the minimum required to support

Exhibit E

low-intensity recreational, scientific or educational uses, as consistent with ~~P~~policy 3.3.2.7 ~~above~~. The coastal lagoon and estuary buffer area shall, at a minimum, include all areas within 150 feet of the landward extent of hydrophytic vegetation or the average high water mark if no such vegetation exists.

3.4 WATER RESOURCES

Water is the lifeblood of both the natural ecosystem and all of the domestic uses on the Big Sur coast. Numerous streams flow down the west slope of the Santa Lucia Mountains to the Pacific Ocean. Several of these streams are quite large, but the majority are relatively small. They all directly support the wildlife and vegetative communities that make up the riparian environments enjoyed by the visitors and residents alike. The groundwater storage basins, located in the upper portions of watersheds, provide water of excellent quality for the spring and stream flows essential to the well-being of water users on the coast.

Because many of the streams are small, development of residences, business, agriculture, and public and private recreation and visitor-serving facilities can place excessive demands on the water available in some watersheds. Overuse of the water supply can result in degradation of the natural environment with losses of plant, wildlife, and fish habitats. Eventually, people dependent on the adequate supply of quality water will suffer as private and community water systems fail. The drought of 1976-77 emphasized the critical need for a careful and conservative approach to planning that recognizes that drought year flows are the controlling factor for all human and natural uses.

Most residents on the coast obtain water from natural springs, or divert water directly from a stream. The most favored sites for development are those with dependable year-round water, either on the parcel or close by. Yet, in some locations, the number of existing vacant parcels appears to exceed the capability of available water supplies. Informal water systems have been developed to bring water to "dry" parcels. Increasingly, property owners without a source of surface water on the property are installing wells to pump for groundwater. In some cases, these wells are being constructed in groundwater basins feeding springs that serve existing users lower down the mountain slopes. Such wells can jeopardize spring supplies of existing users and should be discouraged.

Proper management of water resources encompasses more than just insuring adequate water supplies. The protection of stream flows to maintain the natural environment is vital. The protection of water quality through planning that considers stream setbacks, erosion potential, siltation, vegetative maintenance, wildlife, scenic values, and other factors should be a part of all decisions concerning the development of the Big Sur coast.

3.4.1 Key Policy

The protection and maintenance of Big Sur's water resources is a basic prerequisite ~~for~~ the protection

Exhibit E

of all other natural systems. Therefore, water resources will be considered carefully in all planning decisions and approvals. In particular, the County shall insure that adequate water is retained in the stream system to provide for the maintenance of the natural community of fish, wildlife, and vegetation during the driest expected year.

3.4.2 General Policies

1. The County will take an active role in the conservation of Big Sur's water resources and will support and encourage the wise use and management of water resources by residents and public agencies.
2. The County will require adherence to the best watershed planning principles including: stream setbacks, stream flow maintenance, performance controls for development site features, maintenance of safe and good water quality, protection of natural vegetation along streams, and careful control of grading to avoid erosion and sedimentation.
3. Where watersheds are affected or are threatened by overuse of the water supply, the County will use its land use regulatory authority to limit development in order to protect the public health and welfare and to protect the natural values of the stream and its watershed.
4. The County will request technical assistance from appropriate public agencies as often as may be required in order to make sound decisions concerning management and protection of Big Sur's water resources and shall encourage and support development of a simplified permit coordination program that includes participation by all local, state, and federal agencies that regulate riparian areas.
5. The County shall in concert with the California State Water Resources Control Board, California Department of Water Resources, and the California Department of Fish and WildlifeGame, be responsible for cooperating with residents to manage surface and groundwater supplies, and to implement the goals and policies of this section. In approving new development, the County will require the monitoring of water use and the observance of water conservation measures.

3.4.3 Specific Policies**A. Water Supply and Use**

1. Applicants for development of residential, commercial, and visitor-serving facilities must demonstrate by appropriate seasonal testing that there will be an adequate water supply for all beneficial uses and be of good quality and quantity (e.g. at least 1/2 gallon per minute per single family dwelling year round) from a surface or groundwater source, or from a community water

Exhibit E

system under permit from the County.

2. Development of water supplies, or intensification of use of existing supplies from springs, streams, wells, or community water systems shall be regulated by permit in accordance with Coastal Act requirements. These permits shall be in addition to any required permits from the County Health Department.
- 2.3. Water storage tanks shall not be considered an intensification of water use and shall be encouraged and facilitated.
- 3.4. Applicants intending to utilize a water supply from a source not occurring on the parcel to be served, shall obtain any necessary rights or permits to appropriate the water from the State Water Resources Control Board Division of Water Rights prior to receiving project approval from the County. The State is requested to notify the County of all applications for appropriate water rights. The County's policy shall be to protest such applications that conflict with the protection of beneficial uses of water including instream flow requirements. The County shall require riparian or groundwater users applying for development rights to perfect and record their rights to the water to minimize future conflicts. The County also encourages existing riparian users to perfect and record their water rights.
- 4.5. Interbasin transfer of water: No new water system and no expansion of existing water systems which transport water out of the watershed of any perennial stream shall be allowed. Undeveloped parcels outside of the watershed of origin shall not be allowed to utilize transported water. Permit applications shall demonstrate a suitable source of water not requiring establishment or expansion of, or intensification of use, of an interbasin water transfer system. Where no on-site surface water source exists, exceptions may be made on a case-by-case basis for the development of a primary residence on a vacant parcel served by a County-approved connection to an existing water system. Where the total number of existing/potential vacant buildable residential parcels on such water system is more than four, such exceptions will be subject to a demonstration that:

 - a. no significant degradation of any of the Big Sur Coast's trout streams or other environmentally sensitive habitats will result, as demonstrated by an appropriate environmentally assessment prepared in accordance with California Department of Fish and Game Wildlife standards;
 - b. no increase water system pumping, transmission or storage capacity (other than fire reservoir capacity) will be required for the proposed development; and
 - c. such exception will not result in export of water beyond the Big Sur Coast or the authorized service area of the Carmel Riviera Mutual Water Company.

Exhibit E

Water system development or expansions constructed or installed after December 31, 1976, without benefit of coastal development permit will not be considered as "existing".

~~6. Small public water systems and private water systems supplying more than one user shall conform to the California Health and Safety Code, California Administrative Code, and County Ordinance 2250 as administered by the County Health Department, consistent with other policies of this section. All domestic water systems, including local small water systems, state small water systems, or small public water systems, shall conform to state law, and Chapter 15.04 of the Monterey County Code, as administered by the County Health Department, consistent with other policies of this section.~~

~~5.7.~~ All applicants for permits to develop water shall base their proposed systems on the current health laws and on the guidelines contained in "Guidelines for Applications, Appropriations, Permits, Control and Protection of Water Supply, Storage Distribution, and Use", on file in the County Planning Department.

B. Rivers and Streams

1. The effects of all new development proposals or intensification of land use activities or water uses on the natural character and values of the Big Sur coast's rivers and streams will be specifically considered in all land use decisions. Subjects to be addressed in such evaluations include protection of scenic quality, water quantity and quality, wildlife and fish habitat, and recreational values. Land use proposals determined to pose significant impacts to the natural integrity of the stream must be modified accordingly. The County will ~~request assistance from~~ consult with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife ~~Game~~ as a technical expert on wild life and fish habitat and mitigation measures.
2. In general, the high rate stream discharges during the winter should not be interrupted because of their beneficial effects on the stream and its living community and on beach replenishment. Therefore, any water diversions beyond the ordinary year-round entitlements must be consistent with policy 3.4.3.B.7 and carefully regulated to avoid impairment of beach sand supply and anadromous fish runs, and shall be limited to agricultural irrigation, and developments where the primary function is the improvement of fish and wildlife habitat.
3. Water quality, adequate year-round flows, and stream bed gravel conditions shall be protected in streams supporting rainbow and steelhead trout. These streams include: Garrapata Creek, Rocky Creek, Bixby Creek, Little Sur River, Big Sur River, Partington Creek, Anderson Creek, Hot Springs Creek, Vicente Creek, Big Creek, and Limekiln Creek.
4. The Big Sur and Little Sur Rivers are part of the California Protected Waterways system and the State Legislature has requested the County to prepare individual management plans that set

Exhibit E

forth criteria and guidelines for their protection. The County has worked cooperatively with property owners adjacent to the Big Sur and Little Sur Rivers in formulating the management plans. The goals, objectives and policies of these plans shall be followed in considering all land use applications within the areas they cover consistent with the other policies presented here.

5. Channelizations, dams, and other substantial alterations of natural streams will be considered generally inappropriate in the Big Sur Coastal ~~Planning Area~~-area. Minor alterations such as replacing existing wet water crossings with bridges and constructing/maintaining/replacing culverts and fords may be considered, but only if: a) consistent with the protection of environmentally sensitive habitats; b) no substantial interference with surface water flows, beach sand supply and anadromous fish runs will result; c) the type of use is consistent with Policy 3.7.3.B.-2 regarding floodplains; and, d) the project incorporates the best mitigation measures feasible.
6. Priority for Wells Over Surface Water Diversions: Where groundwater is available on the site, developments for the purpose of diverting surface water sources -- perennial streams and springs that feed perennial streams -- shall be avoided. Wells and infiltration fields located within or near a stream channel so as to tap stream sub-flow rather than groundwater will be considered as stream diversion structures for the purposes of this policy. Exceptions will be allowed only: a) for the development of a primary residence on a vacant parcel served by a County-approved connection to an existing water system where no interbasin transfer of water will result; b) for parcels which qualify as exceptions under ~~LUP~~-Policy 3.4.3.A.-4 regarding inter basin transfer of water; c) where groundwater well(s) would significantly deplete recharge areas needed to maintain natural springs; or, d) where the use of groundwater, either on the site or via a community system, is demonstrated to be infeasible and the adverse impacts of such diversion are mitigated to the extent feasible.

Non-availability of groundwater shall be demonstrated by test boring to a reasonable depth, unless it is demonstrated through surface geologic evidence or well-drilling data from adjacent properties, that the presence of adequate ground water is unlikely. This policy should not be read to prohibit instream uses which do not alter water quality or quantity. Water Resource Verification: No substantial water use intensification (e.g., residential subdivision with potential to increase number of households; residential or inn development of more than one unit; restaurant, bar or other food service development or expansion; recreational vehicle campground; development for commercial irrigated agriculture) shall proceed without specific verification that adequate water supplies are available, and that the proposed development will not adversely affect, cumulatively or individually, existing water supplies needed for the maintenance of riparian vegetation and anadromous fisheries, or the supply needed by existing users during the driest expected year. Such verification shall be supported by a report, prepared by a qualified professional hydrologist on the basis of well logs, stratigraphic profiles, and technical data as needed. The County shall consult with California Department of Fish and WildlifeGame as to the adequacy of the report before allowing water use intensification; and,

Exhibit E

if necessary, may at applicant's expense engage the services of an appropriate independent expert to review the report as well. In the case of water withdrawals from streams and springs, water use shall be measured and maximum use levels shall be consistent with instream flow requirements.

C. *Water Resource Study Area*

1. The County encourages the restoration of streams and their immediate natural environment both on public and private lands. Restoration projects may include: improvements to water supply and quality, enhancement of water flows or water retained for in-stream uses, improvement of fish habitat, installation of fish ladders, stream restocking, re-establishment or irrigation of riparian vegetation, etc.

Alteration of natural streams shall be minimized by minimizing adverse effects of waste water discharges and entrainment, controlling runoff, preventing significant depletion of groundwater supplies and substantial interference with surface water flows, encouraging waste water reclamation, and maintaining natural vegetation buffer areas that protect riparian habitats.

2. Establish a Community Water Resource Monitoring Program: The purposes of this program are to determine the factual extent of water supply problems and riparian habitat impacts in the water resource study areas; to provide for coordination with the California Department of Fish and WildlifeGame, State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Geologic Survey, County Flood Control DistrictMonterey County Water Resources Agency, and other involved water resource agencies; to identify potential solutions (if needed); and to detect water resource deficiencies which may arise in other watersheds. Maximum community support and participation will be important to the success of the program.

Water resource study areas shall be designated by the County, subject to public hearings. Initial designations shall include the following watersheds: Sycamore Canyon, Palo Colorado Canyon, Castro Canyon, Mud Creek, Graves Canyon, Little Sur River and Big Sur River (including Post Creek). The program will be supported with water data to be recorded by individual water system owners/operators, as well as test wells and/or stream flow measurements conducted by appropriate water management agencies.

Where significant water supply deficiencies are verified by the program, the County shall take appropriate steps to curtail further intensification of development and to implement conservation or restoration measures as needed to maintained instream flow requirements. In order to assure that future development is coupled with a viable water resource monitoring program, a financial contribution to the County proportional to expected new water use will be required from each developer at the time of project approval.¹~~1/~~

¹ The required financial contributions will not be collected until the monitoring program is initiated through implementation of this

Exhibit E

3. Individual Water System Monitoring. In the water resource study areas, permits for public and private water system expansion, new wells, and new stream and spring diversion developments shall require measuring of water resource extraction. A table of monthly readings shall be maintained by the water system operator. In the case of new wells, a well-driller's log shall also be completed and retained as a permanent record. Such information shall be made available to appropriate water management or planning authority upon request for purposes of completing a water resource study. All such information, if so requested by the water system operator, shall be protected as proprietary ~~proprietar~~ information.
4. Encourage Watershed Self-Sufficiency: Priority shall be given to the consolidation of existing mutual water systems or development of a new community water system in the Sycamore Canyon watershed, for the purpose of developing a water source other than Sycamore Canyon stream or the Big Sur River. Likewise, the development of a water source other than the Post Creek headwaters shall be encouraged for the westerly portion of the Coastlands tract.

3.4.4 Recommended Actions

1. The California~~State~~ Department of Fish and Wildlife~~Game~~, or other appropriate agencies should undertake studies to determine instream flow requirements to maintain the natural environment on all of Big Sur's streams that support resident or anadromous fish populations. Such studies should enlist the cooperation, participation, and guidance of local residents. The California Department of Fish and ~~Game~~ Wildlife should file for necessary water rights to protect the fisheries resource.^{2/}

~~1/ — The required financial contributions will not be collected until the monitoring program is initiated through implementation of this plan provision.~~

~~2/ — The long-term objective of this policy statement is not intended to interfere with existing water access rights in the Coastlands Subdivision.~~

3.5 FOREST RESOURCES

Big Sur is rich in forest resources. The California Coast Redwood reaches the southern limit of its range in the forested canyons of the south coast. Many other conifers are present also including large trees such as Ponderosa and Sugar Pine and Douglas Fir. Many species of hardwood trees are found as well. Oaks and madrones often dominate the drier slopes above the moist canyons. Many water-loving hardwoods grow along the streams forming rich riparian zones.

Overall, Big Sur's forests are unusual in their diversity and botanical interest. The dramatic contrast of

LUP provision.

² The long-term objective of this policy statement is not intended to interfere with existing water access rights in the Coastlands Subdivision.

Exhibit E

the coasts great redwood canyons with the brush-covered mountain slopes accounts for much of Big Sur's scenic grandeur. The recreational opportunities these forests provide have long been appreciated and their use continues to increase. Pfeiffer Big Sur State Park offers camping and hiking in the scenic redwood forests along the Big Sur River and has long been a favorite among State Parks. As wildlife habitats, they provide sanctuary for much of the abundant wildlife population of the coast. People also have seemed to prefer the forested areas as residential sites. The Big Sur Valley and Palo Colorado Canyons were developed years ago with rustic homes tucked away among the towering trees.

At the same time, the commercial value of the larger conifers found both on public and private lands is significant. While in the past, the limited extent of Big Sur's forests and the difficult terrain discouraged extensive harvesting, the dramatic depletion of more northern forests is escalating the demand for timber, especially old growth redwoods.

In recognition of these forest values, the Los Padres National Forest was established to insure protection and careful management of the resource. Public lands under Forest Service Management in Big Sur total about 759,000-700 acres, slightly more than half of the around 54 percent of the planning area Big Sur Coastal Planning Area. Much of this area is in the wilderness or reserve classification and tree harvesting is not permitted. The Forest Services overall policy for Big Sur is to manage the forest for its scientific, recreational, and aesthetic values and to permit only salvage cutting or harvesting necessary to maintain a healthy stand or to reduce fire hazard.

Regulation of the use of forest resources on private lands is the responsibility of the California State Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). In the past, the County has not encouraged logging, but has regulated it through a use permit process. To evaluate logging proposals the County has required Environmental Impact Reports to be prepared, and has relied on the Department of Forestry CAL FIRE for technical advice. This State agency administers harvests according to the requirements of the Forest Practices Act of 1973 including its special provision for southern forests. The California Coastal Commission, as required by the Coastal Act, has designated some of the potential commercial forest area in Big Sur as Special Treatment Areas. These designations provide for specific objectives and guidelines to be carried out by the Department of Forestry CAL FIRE, and consequently Monterey County, in administering any timber harvests. The rules are aimed generally at protecting public recreation areas, scenic values, soils, streams and wetlands.

In summary, the demand for harvesting of merchantable trees whether by timber operators from outside the area or by local landowners can be expected to increase. At the same time, there is growing pressure to preserve Big Sur's environment in its natural or present state for aesthetic, recreational and scientific purposes, -and- as wildlife habitat, and for its rural community. The concern that commercial harvesting could be highly destructive to the environment has raised questions as to whether logging should be permitted at all, and if so, under what regulations. These trends pose difficult issues for the County. They require that clear policy be established concerning commercial harvesting, and that careful management be assured.

A related issue is that to preserve woodlands and forests requires acknowledging: (1) the role that

Exhibit E

the policy of suppressing wildfires has played in accumulations of wildfire fuels; and (2) the role that importing non-native tree species has played. The kindling effect of these fuels can have the effect of increasing heat intensity of wildfires to levels that threaten survival of Big Sur's woodlands and forests in the event of a catastrophic wildfire. This LUP attempts to address this problem by allowing and encouraging reduction of hazardous accumulations of fuel to levels that will help ensure survival of the area's woodlands and forests after fires, and by allowing non-native trees to be removed unless a structure or structures will be exposed and visible in the Critical Viewshed.

In the years since the 1986 LUP was certified, the Big Sur Coastal Planning Area has been severely affected by Sudden Oak Death (SOD) and pitch canker. SOD has killed a high percentage of the tan oak population (*Notholithocarpus densiflorus*) and also threatens coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*), Shreve oak (*Quercus parvula*) and California black oak (*Quercus kelloggii*). A mysterious ailment at first, it has now been identified as the non-native pathogen *Phytophthora ramorum*.

The consequences of this infestation go far beyond the aesthetic. The very nature of our native forests is undergoing a transformation. In recent fires, firefighters have found it more difficult to control fires not only because of the increased fuel load but because of the difficulty of maneuvering around so many downed trees and branches. Fewer redwoods survived fire in areas where the infestations occur possibly because the dead wood burns hotter and longer.

Landowners and neighborhoods that have numerous trees killed by SOD should be encouraged to remove dead standing trees from around their respective structure and along road corridors. In addition, the loss of so many acorn bearing trees has an impact on the wildlife that depends on acorns as a food source.

The Monterey Pine forest is currently under threat from the fungal pathogen, pitch canker (*Fusarium circinatum*). Pitch canker is an incurable fungal disease (*Fusarium circinatum*). It is widespread and most damaging to the many planted Monterey Pine (*Pinus radiata*). It can also affect the following native: Knobcone pine (*Pinus attenuate*), sugar pine (*Pinus lambertiana*), Coulter pine (*Pinus coulteri*), ponderosa pine (*Pinus ponderosa*), as well as Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*).

CAL FIRE characterizes the threat of pitch canker to all native Monterey Pine stands as "severe." Initially, it was thought that Monterey Pine mortality would be extremely high; yet over time, it has been discovered that at least some trees had resistance to the pathogen. No treatment for infected trees is currently available. Research is ongoing to establish best management practices and potential treatments. The prevalence of this disease is an additional reason to discourage the planting of, and encourage removal of, the non-native Monterey Pine, Eucalyptus, and Monterey Cypress trees within the Big Sur Coastal Planning Area, that do not have sufficient habitat value to justify protection.

Exhibit E**3.5.1 Key Policy**

The primary use of forested land in Big Sur shall be for recreational and aesthetic enjoyment and for educational, scientific, watershed, and habitat protection activities. Commercial logging of healthy old growth redwood shall be considered an inappropriate use of a nationally significant resource. Limited salvage and selective logging activities will be allowed to maintain the health of the forest provided that all natural resource protection provisions of this ~~plan~~LUP are met.

3.5.2 General Policies

1. The regulations adopted by the ~~Department Board~~ of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) for Special Treatment areas generally provide a high level of resource protection and shall be applied to all commercial harvests.
2. All cutting or removal of trees shall be in keeping with the broad resource protection objectives of this ~~plan~~LUP. Specific policies, criteria, and standards of other sections of this LUP ~~plan~~ shall govern both commercial and non-commercial tree removal.
3. Restoration of native forest resources is encouraged for public agencies and residents as a means of maintaining and enhancing Big Sur's natural character. Removal of non-native tree species is encouraged and will not require County permits between October 15 and April 15.
4. Landmark trees of all species shall be protected in perpetuity as significant features of Big Sur's natural heritage. ~~The California Department of Forestry~~CAL FIRE, scientists from research institutions, and landowners should cooperate in the protection and enhancement of these resources and their supporting habitat. Landmark trees shall be defined as visually significant, historically significant, exemplary of its species, or more than 1000 years old. Only native trees shall be considered landmark trees.
5. Commercial harvesting of commercial timber species as well as oak and madrone will be regulated by permit and must be in conformance with the policies of this ~~plan~~LUP carried out in compliance with all applicable State and Federal laws, most notably the Forest Practices Act of 1973 with amendments, the California Environmental Quality Act, and the Special Treatment Area Criteria for the Monterey County area adopted by the California Coastal Commission, ~~and the State Board of Forestry~~. Only state licensed timber operators may conduct commercial logging operations.
6. The County will require that applicants for timber harvest permits first file and receive approval from the ~~California Department of Forestry~~CAL FIRE for a Timber Harvest Plan (THP). -The THP will -then be reviewed by the County for environmental impacts and consistency with the policies of this ~~plan~~LUP. If environmental documents are required, they shall be and certified prior to Planning Commission consideration of the coastal use permit. The Timber Harvest Plan

Exhibit E

will be required to provide substantive consideration of alternative harvesting systems which have less environmental impact, before tractor yarding is allowed.

7. The County will request advice and guidance from the California State Department of Fish and Wildlife Game, Regional Water Quality Control Board and California State Mining and Geology Board ~~Division of Mines and Geology~~, as appropriate, in reviewing proposed Timber Harvest Plans. The County shall engage the services of a registered professional Forester to review THP's as needed. This will be at the applicant's expense.
8. In addition to compliance with forestry and soils resources policies, all developments, forest management activities, and tree removal shall specifically conform to this LUP plan's policies regarding water and marine resources, environmentally sensitive habitat areas, and coastal visual resources.
- 8.9. Division of coastal commercial timberlands into units ~~of~~ less than commercial size or their conversion to uses which would preclude the primary uses listed in the Key Policy 3.5.1 shall not be allowed. Contiguous coastal commercial timberlands of 20 acres or more on any one legal- parcel shall not be divided into units of less than 20 acres, unless a binding agreement for the joint management of the timberland resource as a single unit is affected prior to or conditionally upon such land division. This policy does not apply to small-scale milling operations established pursuant to Policy 3.5.3.8, or to lands which are permanently precluded from commercial timber harvest for any reason--including the terms of a scenic easement in favor of a public agency or private non- profit conservation organization.
- 9.10. So long as required by state law, applicants for timber harvest permits must first file and receive approval from the ~~California Department of Forestry~~ CAL FIRE for a Timber Harvest Plan (THP). The THP will then be reviewed by the County for environmental impacts and consistency with the policies of this plan LUP. The Timber Harvest Plan will be required to provide substantive consideration of alternative harvesting systems which have less environmental impact, before tractor yarding is allowed.
11. All commercial timber removal under ~~Monterey County~~ the County of Monterey jurisdiction within the Big Sur ~~Local~~ Coastal Planning Area shall be processed as a County coastal development use permit item and ~~shall not be exempted from normal CEQA negative declaration or EIR process, whichever applies.~~
- 10.12. Removal of fallen or dead trees to maintain a healthy stand or to reduce fire hazard is allowed within defensible space including access to roadways.

3.5.3 *Specific Policies*

Exhibit E

1. Harvests proposed in watersheds which provide domestic water downstream of the proposal shall be limited to removal of no more than 15 percent of the total merchantable timber in any 10-year period.
2. Soil or stream disturbance resulting from commercial timber harvest shall not be allowed between October 15 and April 15. Erosion control programs shall be accomplished and certified by the ~~Department of Forestry~~CAL FIRE by September 30 of each year.
3. All salvage or selective logging activities shall take place outside the riparian corridor except the felling of trees. Felling and bucking shall not occur where trees, logs or debris could be deposited in the stream. Where a tree might fall into or across a stream it shall be cabled so that it falls at a right angle to the stream. Road construction to accommodate salvage or selective logging shall be kept to an absolute minimum. Applicants shall be required to evaluate the expected sediment yield or runoff associated with each project and the secondary impacts on aquatic and marine resources. Logging roads shall not impact the scenic view. Sidecasting of earth material shall not be permitted during the construction of roads. All excess material shall be removed from the site. Logging roads shall be constructed only in with the criteria set forth in Section 5.4.3.K~~2~~.
4. Water quality sampling of suspended sediment and turbidity shall be required for any commercial harvest prior to beginning of the operation and during at least one subsequent winter with average or above rainfall when the proposed harvest area contains a stream or well-defined stream channel. Costs of monitoring are to be borne by the applicant.
5. Applicants for timber harvest plans or use permits shall be required to certify through a qualified biologist that the proposed commercial timber harvesting activity will contribute to the stability and diversity of the forest and will be carried out in a manner that has no significant effect on environmentally sensitive habitat areas or water resources. Applicants shall further demonstrate through site investigation that proposed commercial timber harvesting does not impacting on the Ceritical V~~y~~iewshed and that the timber harvest shall be permitted only in those areas which can show that the timber can be removed from the area without creating a safety or traffic problem on a public road.
6. A cash deposit, bond or equivalent surety, payable to the County in an amount to be set by the Board of Supervisors, is required to insure compliance with the State Forest Practices Act and regulations and policies of this LUP~~plan~~. Should the timber operator fail to correct any violation or water quality problem due to the harvest within 15 days following receipt of notification to do- so, the County may correct the problem and charge all reasonable costs against the timber operator's surety.
7. Small-scale milling operations shall be permitted as part of logging operations subject to compatibility with resource protection policies and the peace of adjacent land uses.

Exhibit E

8. An insurance policy or other sufficient surety to indemnify the county for damages to county roads and appurtenant structures should be required of every timber operator during the life of ~~the~~ the Timber Harvest Plan.
9. Areas where timber is harvested shall be zoned into a district which allows only low intensity recreational uses and emphasizes the highest and best use of the land as being the continued management of water, soil and trees for timber production.
10. ~~(deleted) In the upper Bixby-Turner Creek watershed, every effort should be made to explore potential public acquisition of this scenic area for recreation and aesthetic enjoyment prior to the issue of permits for timber harvesting.~~

3.5.4 Recommended Actions

1. ~~The County should consider developing a vegetation treatment program addressing dead, diseased, and nonnative trees. The Timber Harvest Plan must be consistent with the vegetation treatment program. preparing detailed guidelines or a timber harvest ordinance to regulate proposed timber harvest activities in furtherance of the local coastal program land use plan.~~
- 1.2. ~~(deleted) Public agencies should fully explore the possible public acquisition of the upper Bixby-Turner Creek watershed for recreational aesthetic purposes.~~

3.6 AGRICULTURE

In the past, farming was practiced on a limited scale on the Big Sur coast. ~~TH~~~~However,~~ the lack of soils suitable for cultivation, limited water supply and other factors do not support large-scale commercial farming. Cultivation of crops can be expected to remain small scale for private use.

Since the 1800's cattle ranching has been the primary agricultural activity on the coast. Today commercial ranching takes place on a number of the larger properties and descendants of pioneer families still carry on this traditional use of the land. The U.S. Forest Service administers substantial range allotments in the Los Padres National Forest.

In addition to providing cattle for market, ranching has helped maintain the open grasslands characteristic of the scenic landscape. Many of the large meadows found on the coast were created by native grazing animals and have been kept brush free by cattle. The presence of livestock enhances the rural western feeling of Big Sur and adds to visitor's enjoyment of the area.

Increasing costs, high taxes, government restrictions, encroaching residential and public recreational development and other factors make profitable ranching difficult today. Owners of traditional ranching lands are compelled to consider other options for the use of their lands. Yet it is also acknowledged

Exhibit E

that ranching remains an activity that can produce some return from land that otherwise may have few economic alternatives. There is the feeling that it is desirable to perpetuate the ranching lifestyles both as part of Big Sur's heritage and for the public benefit.

The County and other agencies need to work cooperatively to support landowners in conserving grazing lands to preserve Big Sur's rural character. Careful land planning for large properties can result in the retention of ranching use while still permitting other uses of the property. Agricultural conservation contracts, initiated by the property owners, can in some instances, help reduce taxes and make profitable ranching more feasible. These and any other means of assisting owners of large ranching properties in protecting their land for agricultural use should be encouraged by the County.

Cannabis cultivation was introduced to the Big Sur community in the early 1950s. Over the past 50 years cannabis has provided a source of income for Big Sur farmers. Many of Big Sur's multiple generations of cannabis farmers are accredited for their contributions to higher standards, best practices, and unique cultivars. The cannabis plant is a cultural and economic treasure on the Big Sur coast and should be recognized and protected as such.

3.6.1 Key Policy

Agriculture, especially grazing, is a preferred use of coastal lands. In locations where grazing has been a traditional use, it should be retained and encouraged both under private and public ownership. Williamson Act contracts, scenic easements, tax incentives, large lot zoning, and other techniques will be encouraged by the County to promote and assist agriculture.

3.6.2 General Policies

1. All contiguous grasslands of 320 acres or more and those traditionally used for grazing use should be preserved for such use.
2. Uses compatible with the retention of grazing, including hunting and some forms of low intensity recreation, shall be encouraged as a means to assist maintaining land in agricultural use by providing additional income to land owners.
3. Residential, recreational and other land use development shall not be sited on land suitable for grazing unless an equivalent area of new grazing land is provided.
4. Residences and utility buildings and barns associated with agricultural uses shall be located to conserve grazing land.
5. Subdivision of large ranching properties is generally discouraged. The configuration of new parcels created through land divisions shall be designed in such a way to protect existing or

Exhibit E

potential agricultural activities and grazing resources. In cases where large ranching properties must be divided to accomplish other policies of this ~~Plan~~LUP, a binding agreement for the continued management of the entire property shall be required. (See policy 5.4.3.M for related policies).

6. Public accessways shall be designed to avoid conflicts with agricultural use. Where public trails must cross actively grazed areas a range of measures including signs, fences, berms, vegetation screens, and prescribed burning to eliminate hazardous accumulation of brush, shall be applied, as appropriate, to reduce conflicts to acceptable levels.
7. The County ~~Farm Advisor~~Agricultural Commissioner should continue to assist landowners in developing grazing management plans. Such plans should include rotation schedules, fencing programs, and other techniques to enhance grazing activity.
8. The U.S. Forest Service, ~~and the California State~~ Department of Parks and Recreation, ~~and the Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District~~ should lease grazing land to private individuals in order that such areas may continue in traditional agricultural use and to reduce fuel loads.
9. Where the California Department of Parks and Recreation acquires title to land formerly in grazing use, and where a lag of several years is anticipated before park development plans are implemented, the ~~California Department of Parks and Recreation~~Department should make every effort to lease the land for the purpose of continuing grazing on the property.
10. ~~The State Department of Forestry~~CAL FIRE and the U.S. Forest Service should actively participate and assist in developing prescribed burning programs for private and for public lands in order to improve and maintain the grazing resource.
11. Landowners shall be encouraged to establish or expand agricultural operations, ~~such as animal husbandry, livestock breeding, aviaries, vineyards, tree farms, native plant farms, and seed farms.~~
12. All public and private land managers, including the U.S. Forest Service and the California Department of Parks and Recreation, are encouraged to increase allotments for grazing to eliminate hazardous accumulation of brush and maintain native grassland.
13. The County shall coordinate with the U.S. Forest Service, the California Department of Parks and Recreation, the California Department of Transportation and other agencies to develop a plan to address invasive species and as may be required pursuant to Monterey County Code Chapter 10.46.

Exhibit E**3.6.3 Recommendations**

1. The County should seek long-term tax reforms that will permit agriculture lands to be assessed and taxed on the value of their earnings, rather than their development potential.
2. In order to encourage protection of grazing lands and continued cattle operations, the County shall explore all sources of funds - County, State and Federal - to compensate owners of grazing land for scenic easements over their lands except those federal funds which would increase federal land ownership, management or control.

3.7 HAZARDOUS AREAS

The Big Sur Coast Planning Area presents an unusually high degree of hazards for both existing residents and new developments. The rugged terrain of the Big Sur coast is in part the result of seismic activity associated with movement of continental plates. The plates intersect at the San Andreas Fault which parallels the coast some 40 miles inland. The series of faults paralleling the San Andreas account for the orientation of the ridges, valleys, and the shoreline. The two principal faults in the Big Sur segment are the San Gregorio-Palo Colorado Fault and the Sur-Nacimiento Fault which are both seismically active. Seismic hazards include ground rupture, shaking, and failure. Seismic sea waves (tsunami) originating elsewhere in the Pacific Ocean are not considered significant hazards on the Big Sur coast.

The western slopes of the Santa Lucia Mountains, reaching an elevation of approximately 5,200 feet at Cone Peak, drop precipitously to the sea. Much of the coast is bounded by sheer cliffs. Great offshore rocks punctuate the dramatic meeting of land and sea. Nearly fifty separate streams flow down the mountains to join the sea.

The primary factors that increase landslide risk are slope and certain soil characteristics. In general, the potential for landslide occurrence intensifies as slope increases on all soil types and across a wide range of geologic formations. Exposed unconsolidated sedimentary layer increases landslide potential wherever these deposits are present on steep slopes. Weathering and wildfires can lead to additional landslides.

Geologic hazards are also induced or aggravated by human activities. Construction of roads and building pads, in particular, can have disastrous consequences in terms of erosion or land failure. Extra care is needed both by property owners and the County to insure that new excavation, road building and construction areis undertaken only where natural conditions permit, and that such activities when in progress are carried out to the highest engineering standards.

Flood danger is very real in certain areas of Big Sur. The Big Sur and Little Sur Rivers have sizeable flood plains and many other streams on the coast can be hazardous during high water. Structures within known floodplains pose a life hazard to occupants during severe storms. Flood associated hazards include devastating mud flows such as the 1972 disaster that wiped out the Post Office and ambulance

Exhibit E

center, road wash-outs, and loss of septic tanks and leach fields. Flood damage to small water systems or contamination of wells can result from high water, septic system failure, or stream-carried debris. Road washouts isolate some properties and prevent the entry of emergency vehicles. During the El Nino floods of 1995, Highway 1 was completely washed away in a number of locations in the Big Sur Coastal Planning Area. During the severe winter storms of 2022-2023, Highway 1 was completely washed away at Paul's Slide (PM 21.7) and continues to be closed to through traffic as of the time of this writing.

The entire Big Sur area is subject to fire hazard to life, property, vegetation, and wildlife. The hazard varies locally and seasonally due to differences in fuel levels, weather, and topography, yet the risk to life and property remains high due to remoteness from fire stations, difficult access, and water supply problems. Public fire protection on the Big Sur coast is geared to forest fires rather than structural fires. Response time from the CAL FIRE Department of Forestry Station at Carmel Hill is lengthy due to distance and slow-moving traffic on Highway 1 where the shortage of turnouts and shoulders makes passing difficult. The all-volunteer Mid Coast Fire Brigade and Big Sur Fire companies at Garrapata and Big Sur, because of the shorter response time, provide some structural fire protection.

While fires can start from natural causes, people pose the greatest danger. Carelessness by residents or visitors during the long dry summers endangers the entire community. The 2016 Soberanes Fire is a good example of human-caused wildfire. An illegal campfire resulted in one death, numerous structures lost and over one hundred thousand acres burned at a cost of about \$260 million to suppress making it at the time the most expensive wildfire to fight in U.S. history. Illegal fires ~~This danger will inevitably increase as recreational use of the area increases and as more and more homes are built.~~ Recreational use of public areas, in particular, needs to be curtailed or closely supervised during periods of very high fire danger. More emphasis shall be placed on enforcement and ~~t~~The value of public education cannot be over-estimated for wildfire prevention. The siting and construction of new structures likewise needs extreme care to avoid endangering the occupants and the broader community as well.

Since the 1986 LUP was written, there have been four major fires in the LUP area, the Kirk Fire in 1999, the Basin Complex Fire in 2008, the Soberanes Fire in 2016, and the Dolan Fire in 2020. The LUP contains clear language intended to allow the removal of accumulated vegetation without the need for a coastal permit (see Section 3.7.3.C.8 and 5.4.2.13) to reduce unsafe fuel accumulations while preserving other key LUP policy values such as Critical Viewshed protection. In November 2010, the Monterey County Fire Safe Council prepared an advisory document entitled Monterey County Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) in collaboration with CAL FIRE, the U.S. Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, local fire agencies, property owners, and other stakeholders pursuant to the Healthy Forests Restoration Act. Implementation of the CWPP could be instrumental in reestablishing fire safety and resource protection in Big Sur. The addition of a programmatic vegetation management plan could reduce wildfire hazards. Since that time, new State legislation has been adopted requiring local jurisdictions to address wildfire risks in their General Plan, providing both guidance and requirements.

Since the drafting of the 1986 LUP, it has become evident that both plant pathogens and climate change increase wildfire frequency and intensity on the Big Sur coast. Global climate change brings increased

Exhibit E

extreme weather events which contributes to significantly new challenges to already difficult fire suppression.

3.7.1 Key Policy

Land use and development shall be carefully regulated through the best available planning practices in order to minimize risk to life and property and damage the natural environment.

3.7.2 General Policies

1. The Big Sur coast shall be considered as an area where projects may impact or be affected by environmental resources of hazardous or critical concern. Most projects will therefore not be eligible for the categorical exemption allowed under the California Environmental Quality Act.
2. As part of the development review process, all proposed development shall be evaluated for conformance and be required to comply with adopted hazard policies applicable to the site in question.
3. All development shall be sited and designed to minimize risk from geologic, flood, or fire hazards to a level generally acceptable to the community. Areas of a parcel which are subject to high hazard(s), shall generally be considered unsuitable for development. For any development proposed in high hazard areas, and environmental or geotechnical report shall be required prior to County review of the project.
4. In locations determined to have significant hazards, development permits should include a special condition requiring the owner to record a deed restriction describing the nature of the hazard(s), geotechnical and/or fire suppression mitigations and long-term maintenance requirements.

3.7.3 Specific Policies**A. Geologic Hazards**

1. All development shall be sited and designed to conform to site topography and to minimize grading and other site preparation activities. Applications for grading and building permits and applications for subdivisions shall be reviewed for potential impacts to on-site and off-site development arising from geologic and seismic hazards and erosion. Mitigation measures shall be required as necessary.
2. The lands within 1/8 mile of active or potentially active faults shall be treated as a fault zone characterized by high seismic hazards until geotechnical investigations accepted by the County indicate otherwise for either an entire fault zone or for any specific location with any zone.

Exhibit E

3. All structures shall be sited a minimum of 50 feet from an identified active fault or potentially active fault. Greater setbacks may be required where it is warranted by local geologic conditions.
4. Critical facilities, such as major transportation links, communications and utility lines, and emergency shelter facilities, shall be located, designed, and operated in a manner which maximizes their ability to remain functional after a major earthquake.
5. In those instances where critical facilities are located in or where they cross high hazard areas, all reasonable measures shall be taken to insure continuity or quick restoration of service in the event of earthquake.
6. New roads, bridges, and utility lines (either public or private) that cross active or potentially active fault zones should be designed and constructed in a manner which recognizes the hazard of fault movement. Water and electric lines should be equipped with shut-off devices or the equivalent which utilize the best available technology for quick shut-off consistent with providing reliable service.
7. All structures should be designed and constructed to: a) resist minor earthquakes with epicenters on the closest potentially active fault without damage; b) resist moderate earthquakes without structural damage, but with some non-structural damage allowable; c) resist major earthquake of the intensity or severity of the strongest experienced in California without collapse, but with some structural as well as non-structural damage allowable.
8. Structures and roads in areas subject to landsliding are prohibited unless a certified engineering geology report indicates mitigations exist to minimize risk to life and property. Mitigation measures shall not include massive grading or excavation or the construction of protective devices that would substantially alter natural landforms.
9. Any proposed development within 50 feet of the face of a cliff or bluff or within the area of a 20 degree angle from the toe of a cliff, whichever is greater, shall require the preparation of a geologic report prior to consideration of the proposed project. The report shall demonstrate that (a) the area is stable for development; and (b) the development will not create a geologic hazard or diminish the stability of the area.
10. New roads shall be constructed in accordance with the criteria set forth in Section 5.4.3.K.-2.
- 10.11. Coastal armoring, including but not limited to, seawalls, breakwaters, and riprap, shall not be allowed, except to protect structures existing at the time of this LUP and Highway 1.
- 11.12. Soils and geologic reports shall be required for all new land divisions and for the construction

Exhibit E

of roads and structures, excluding minor structures not occupied by people, in areas of known or suspected geologic hazards. Both potential onsite and offsite impacts shall be evaluated in the report.

Hazard areas requiring submission of such reports include the 100-year floodplain; landslide areas and other locations showing evidence of recent ground movement; earthquake fault zones; sites falling within the area of demonstration as provided in the Statewide Interpretive Guidelines for Blufftop Development (as amended February 4, 1981); and any other geologic high hazard area for which a geotechnical report is required by policy 3.7.2.3 above. Such reports shall be prepared by a soils engineer or registered and certified engineering geologist, as appropriate, acting within their areas of expertise, based upon an on-site evaluation; the reports shall be consistent with "Guidelines for Geologic/Seismic Reports" (CDMG Notes #37).

The California ~~Division of Mines and Geology~~State Mining and Geology Board will be requested to assist the County in reviewing the reports and resolving any disputes. The reports shall consider, at a minimum, the following, as applicable to the site:

- (1) Historic, current and foreseeable cliff 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.
- (2) Cliff 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.
- (3) Geologic conditions, including soil, sediment and rock types and characteristics in addition to structural features such as bedding, joints, and faults.
- (4) 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.
- (5) Wave and tidal action, including effects of marine erosion on seacliffs.
- (6) 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; alterations in surface drainage).
- (7) Potential effects of seismic forces resulting from a maximum credible earthquake.
- (8) Effects of the proposed development including siting and design of structures, septic

Exhibit E

system, landscaping, drainage, and grading, and impacts of construction activity on the stability of the site and adjacent area.

- (9) Any other factors that may affect slope stability.
- (10) Potential erodibility of site and mitigating measures to be used to ensure minimized erosion problems during and after construction (i.e., landscaping and drainage design).

B. Flood Hazards

1. The County's primary means of minimizing risk from flood hazards shall be through land use planning and the avoidance of development in floodprone areas. The development of flood control projects to protect new development in the natural floodplain is not considered desirable.
2. All new development, including filling, grading, and construction shall be prohibited within 100-year flood plains except as needed for outdoor recreation, wildlife habitat, agriculture, and similar low intensity open space uses, as well as bridges, road crossings using a culvert or ford, and water resource developments, water facilities and systems, for scientific purposes (such as flow meters and other instruments) and restoration and enhancement related projects requiring a streamside location, restoration activities pursuant to the Protected Waterways Plans, and flood control projects where no other method for protecting existing structures in the floodplain is feasible and such protection is necessary for public safety or to protect existing development.

C. Fire Hazard

1. The fire hazard policies contained in the Safety Element of the ~~Monterey County~~ County of Monterey General Plan shall be regularly reviewed and consistently applied in conjunction with the policies of this LUP. The CAL FIRE critical fire hazard map should be updated continually as new and more specific information becomes available ~~from the required written assessments~~.
2. New developments shall be avoided in extreme wildfire hazard areas as determined by site - specific assessment.
3. New development proposals or development inducing projects which would not be served by adequate fire protection services, public or private roads, or water for fire suppression should be limited to a low-intensity commensurate with such increased risk.
4. Roads serving new residential development shall be adequate to allow access by emergency vehicles while permitting evacuation of the area by residents.
5. The County of Monterey ~~County~~ should support and assist the efforts of the various fire

Exhibit E

protection agencies and districts to identify and minimize fire safety hazards to the public.

6. Each development proposal shall be accompanied by a written assessment of adequacy of access. The written assessment shall be prepared by the applicant and shall evaluate the project in relation to Title 19 of the Monterey County Code ~~Monterey County Subdivision Ordinance~~ as applicable, state requirements, types of existing and proposed roads, minimum road widths, and specific evacuation routes applicable to the parcel. The assessment shall be submitted to fire officials for their review and recommendations.
7. The County of Monterey shall require the creation and maintenance of defensible space around structures, roads for access, and critical infrastructure in Big Sur.
8. A Coastal Development Permit must be obtained for the removal or harvesting of trees and other major vegetation. However, in the Big Sur Coastal Planning Area the following shall not require a CDP:
 - (1) Removal of non-native or planted trees, except where this would result in the exposure of structures in the Critical Viewshed. The removal of non-native trees, regardless of size, including but not limited to Monterey Pine, Monterey Cypress and Eucalyptus provided this policy shall not be construed as permission to remove a tree that is habitat for threatened or endangered species listed under the Endangered Species Act or the California Endangered Species Act.
 - (2) Removal of hazardous trees that pose a present danger to life or property, or threaten contagion of nearby forested areas, subject to verification by the County or CAL Fire.
 - (3) Thinning of undergrowth or removal of small (less than 14" diameter), dead or dying trees, especially as needed to reduce unsafe fuel accumulations adjacent to existing structures, infrastructure, or roads.
 - (4) Prescribed burning, rushing, lopping or other methods of brush clearing which do not materially disturb underlying soils provided all permits required by other agencies are obtained.
 - (5) Fuel reduction work that is consistent with federal, state, and County law, including, but not limited to the Board of Forestry's Fire Safe Regulations and General Guidelines for Creating Defensible Space.

3.7.4 *Recommended Actions*

1. All existing utility lines that cross active or potentially active fault traces should be examined to

Exhibit E

determine their ability to survive fault movement in the amount likely to take place in the particular location. Utility companies should institute orderly programs of installing cut-off devices on these lines, starting with the lines that appear to be most vulnerable and those which serve the most people. Adequate emergency water supplies should be established and maintained in areas dependent upon water lines which cross active fault zones.

2. The County shall review and periodically revise the Monterey County Emergency Operations Plan~~the County-wide Disaster Contingency Plan~~. All appropriate County and public agencies shall be included in all phases of disaster contingency planning.

~~The guidelines contained in the cooperative federal/state FIRE SAFE GUIDE FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT IN CALIFORNIA, especially those pertaining to water supply, fire hydrants, and other fire prevention and control features, should be considered by the County for adoption as the basis for building standards in areas of moderate to high wildland fire hazard potential.~~

3. The County shall make the reduction of structural ignitability a high priority.
4. The County, in collaboration with the fire authority having jurisdiction, shall support fuel breaks.
5. The County shall implement the recommendations and priorities contained in the California Coastal Commission approved Public Works Plan for Fire Fuel Management.
6. The County shall encourage the retrofit of existing structures to meet the current Fire Code. At minimum, the County shall make available educational materials regarding the benefits and requirements for meeting the structural Fire Code to property owners.
- 3.7. The County shall encourage California Department of Parks and Recreation and the U.S. Forest Service to create and implement an effective wildfire fuel management where their property abuts private land.

3.8 MINERAL RESOURCES

The Big Sur area has a number of sites of historic and potential mineral resources which may be proposed for extraction in the future. Gold mining in the Los Burros District has occurred in the past and may be continued.

Significant conflicts arise in the watershed of the Little Sur River where substantial limestone deposits on Pico Blanco lie partly inside and partly outside the Los Padres National Forest. In 1981 the U.S. Forest Service approved a five-year Plan of Operations, 1981-1986, that allows the owner Graniterock~~Granite Rock~~ to commence exploratory operations and the mining company has opened a quarry on the South face of Pico Blanco within the National Forest boundary.

Exhibit E

In 1982, in response to a petition by ~~Graniterock~~Granite Rock, Co., the California State Mining and Geology Board classified these limestone deposits as a significant mineral resource (MRZ-2 area). The Classification Report estimates they contain 640 million tons of limestone whiting, a non-strategic, industrial chemical mineral. The State Mining and Geology Board has not designated the Pico Blanco deposits as a mineral resource of regional or statewide significance.

~~Graniterock~~Granite Rock also owns two easements across the El Sur Ranch connecting its limestone deposits to the Old Coast Road, one of which -- referred to in this ~~Plan~~LUP as the Dani Ridge access road -- has been developed for a haul road, while the other -- which cuts across slopes on the north side of the South Fork of the Little Sur River -- has not been developed.

In 1973, the California State Legislature recognized the statewide significance of the Little Sur River watershed's "extraordinary scenic, fishery, wildlife, (and) outdoor recreational values" by including it in the California Protected Waterways System and requested the County of Monterey ~~County~~ to prepare a Protected Waterways Management Plan to protect these values and the watershed's "free-flowing and wild status." (Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 32 - Relative to the Little Sur and Big Sur Rivers, 1973, and 1968 Cal. Stats. Chap. 1278 1.) Pursuant to this legislative request the ~~Board of Supervisors~~ Board adopted a Protected Waterways Management Plan for the Little Sur River in December 1983 and incorporated it by reference in this the 1986 PlanLUP. The Protected Waterways Management Plan for the Little Sur River is also incorporated by reference in this LUP.

Through adoption of the Protected Waterways Management Plan for the Little Sur River, the State has recognized the statewide significance of the fish and wildlife habitat of this watershed. These resources are also of national significance, and the County encourages the State to designate this area as a "coastal resource of national significance", as the term is used in Section 1455(i) of the federal Coastal Zone Management Act, and to adopt as part of the state coastal Zone Management Act, and to adopt as part of the state coastal management program" specific and enforceable standards to protect (these) resources", in accordance with Section 1455(i)."

Because of the extraordinary value of the natural resources of the Little Sur River watershed, the conflicts arising from mining operations on Pico Blanco and the jurisdictional complexities arising from the location of Pico Blanco limestone deposits partly inside and partly outside a national forest in a California Protected Waterway within the California coastal zone, the specific policies of Subsection 3.8.4 are needed to guide the application of state and federal law and other policies of this ~~plan~~LUP.

Limited mining of sand and gravel for local use has taken place in the past from the stream beds of the Big Sur and Little Sur Rivers. The California Department of Fish and ~~Game~~Wildlife has reviewed and provided guidance to some of these operations. Also, of considerable concern, is the potential development of the offshore oil and gas deposits. In addition to these mineral resources there are also limited oil and gas reserves located offshore on the Outer Continental Shelf. Proposals are being made

Exhibit E

by the Federal Government to lease these reserves for exploration and development. Experience with offshore oil development has repeatedly shown the inevitability of serious oil spills or other disasters that result in degradation and destruction of the marine environment including extensive loss of fish and wildlife and damage to local dependent industries. The Big Sur coast is the location of the California Sea Otter Game Refuge and possesses extensive and undisturbed marine and intertidal habitats for fish, marine mammals, and birds. Additionally, the coast is a scenic recreation area of great reknown. The County is deeply concerned that these wildlife and recreation resources of national significance will be critically jeopardized by exploration and development of off-shore oil and gas reserves and, accordingly, is in strong opposition to the development of these reserves.

The following policies are applicable in any review by the County of development activities on non-federal land. To the extent permissible under federal Supremacy principles and federal mining laws, the same policies will also apply to federal lands. These policies are adopted pursuant to the California Coastal Act of 1976, and the County's general plan power and police power. All lands within the "National Forest" land use designation (see Figure 1) which are subject to coastal development permit jurisdiction are subject to the land use policies for the Watershed and Scenic Conservation land use designation.

3.8.1 Key Policy

Development of mineral resources in the Big Sur coast area must be carefully planned and managed to ensure protection of the area's important scenic, recreational, and habitat values. The County shall evaluate any proposal for an increased level of extraction based upon a thorough balancing of the social, technological, environmental and recreational values long recognized to exist on the Big Sur coast and the economic values of any mineral deposit. In determining the value of a mineral deposit, the costs of reclamation and mitigation of adverse impacts will be considered. The County opposes development of any offshore or onshore oil and gas reserves that could adversely affect the scenic or habitat values of the Big Sur coast.

3.8.2 General Policies

1. All mineral resource development shall be in keeping with the broad resource protection objectives of this planLUP. The specific policies, criteria and standards of other sections of this planLUP shall govern both onshore and offshore mineral resource development. Mining will not be allowed in environmentally sensitive habitat areas such as riparian corridors, rare and endangered plant and animal habitat locations, or wetlands. Mining activities and related facilities such as roads, loading or conveyance facilities, shall not be permitted to be constructed in the Critical Viewshed and shall be sited and designed to protect views to and along the ocean and designated scenic coastal zone area.
2. The California Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA) establishes procedures

Exhibit E

whereby mineral deposits can be classified as significant mineral deposits and designated as having statewide or regional significance. In the event of classification the State Mining and Geology Board publishes a Classification Report containing useful mineral information. The County will recognize in this ~~Plan~~-LUP such information pertaining to mineral deposits on the Big Sur ~~C~~oast and will emphasize the conservation and development of classified deposits. However, pursuant to SMARA the County retains responsibility and broad discretion as lead agency to regulate, approve or disapprove all proposed surface mining operations, including those affecting deposits that have been classified as a significant mineral resource or designated as having statewide or regional significance.

- 3 Alternative methods of mineral extraction which result in minimal environmental impact shall be given substantive consideration before surface mining is allowed. Surface mining will not be considered an acceptable practice where less environmentally damaging techniques are feasible or in streams supporting anadromous fish runs unless it can be demonstrated that no adverse impacts will result.
- 4 For purposes of this ~~LUP~~Plan the term "surface mining" is now used to mean "surface mining operations" as that term is defined by the California Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975, ~~Public Resources~~ Code ~~§~~-2735. The following operations are excluded from this definition: (1) the operations conducted by the California Department of Transportation to extract road building materials for local use and (2) prospecting for, or the extraction of, minerals for commercial purposes and the removal of overburden in total amounts of less than 500 cubic yards in any one permit area or from any single mineral deposit or contiguous mineral deposits that have been classified as a significant mineral resource by the California Division of Mines pursuant to ~~Public Resources~~ Code ~~§~~-2761(b).

"Mining", as that term is used in this ~~LUP~~Plan, includes both surface mining and subsurface mining. "Mineral development" is the broad term that encompasses both mining and onshore and offshore exploitation of oil and gas resources.

- 5 Surface mining operations shall not be allowed in the following areas:
 - a Surface mining operations shall not be allowed in areas susceptible to landslide, erosion and other hazards such as proximity to earthquake faults, as designated on the Big Sur LCP Hazards Map or in the "Seismic and Slope Stability Hazards" maps in the Protected Waterways Management Plans for the Little Sur River and Big Sur River.
 - b In order to maintain the long term productivity of soils and timberlands, mining within Forestry Special Treatment Areas or other potential commercial timber lands shall not be permitted except for subsurface workings which would not result in a conversion of timberlands to other uses.

Exhibit E**3.8.3 Specific Policies**

1. Large-scale mineral development is not an appropriate use in Big Sur. The total amount of proposed surface from any mineral extraction operation or aggregate of operations (including quarry sites, tailings, overburden disposal sites, drilling pads, processing sites, roads) within any watershed shall be the minimum necessary to support the operation. (For the purposes of this policy, a watershed must be considered in its entirety, from the point where it drains into the Pacific Ocean, inland to the limit of the coastal zone).
2. All permit applications proposing to conduct mineral exploration or extraction operations shall be required to prepare an Environmental Impact Report, a quarry management plan and reclamation plan, and must meet the requirements of the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 as implemented by ~~Chapter 16.04 of the Monterey County Code, the County Mining Ordinance~~ herein incorporated by reference. The County will request advice and guidance from the ~~California State~~ Department of Fish and ~~Wildlife Game~~, -Regional Water Quality Control Board, and ~~California State Mining and Geology Board~~~~California Division of Mines and Geology~~, as appropriate in reviewing proposed quarry management and reclamation plans. The County may engage the services of geologic and biologic experts to review such plans as needed. - This will -be at the applicant's expense.
3. In addition to the requirements set forth in Monterey County Code Chapter 16.04, the required quarry management plan or reclamation plan, must address at a minimum, all the following elements as a condition of permit approval.
 - a. Cross section maps or plans of the land to be affected including the actual area to be mined, prepared by or under the direction of and certified by a registered professional engineer, or professional geologist with assistance from experts in related fields such as land surveying and landscape architecture, showing pertinent elevation and location of test borings or core samplings and depicting all of the following information:
 - (1) The nature and depth of the various strata of overburden.
 - (2) The location of subsurface water, if encountered, and its quality.
 - (3) The nature of the stratum immediately beneath the mineral deposit to be mined.
 - (4) Existing or previous surface mining limits.
 - (5) The location and extent of known workings of any underground mines, including mine openings to the surface.

Exhibit E

- (6) The location of aquifers.
 - (7) The estimated elevation of the water table.
 - (8) The location of spoil, waste, or refuse areas, suitable plant growth material stockpiling areas and, if necessary, stockpiling areas for other suitable strata.
 - (9) The location of all impoundments for waste or erosion control.
 - (10) Any settling or water treatment facility.
 - (11) Constructed or natural drainways and the location of any discharges to any surface body of water on the area of land to be affected or adjacent thereto.
 - (12) Profiles at appropriate cross sections of the anticipated final surface configuration that will be achieved pursuant to the applicant's proposed reclamation plan.
- b. Procedures to retain soil or eroded material on the site, to prevent the discharge of any water or runoff which would increase the natural level of turbidity in receiving waters, and to control the circulation of particulate matter in the atmosphere. Water quality sampling of suspended sediment and turbidity shall be required for any mining operations prior to the beginning of the operation and during subsequent winters. Costs of monitoring are to be borne by the applicant.
- c. Measures to stabilize slopes and mine tailings such as hydromulching, seeding and other appropriate measures; measures to prevent any increase in normal runoff, especially during peak periods, from the site such as requiring dispersal or storage so that scouring and erosion do not occur.
- d. A soil survey of all the plant growth material within the permit area.
- e. Measures to provide for the restoration of native plant species normally occurring in the mined areas.
- f. Measures to stockpile soil and spoils and provide for recontouring quarry sites to a natural appearance.
- g. Measures to regulate disposal of undesirable pollutants found in conjunction with mined materials (such as heavy metals, mercury, in gold mines).
- h. A phasing plan or other measures adequate to minimize the area of disruption during active

Exhibit E

mining in order to alleviate such impacts as soil erosion, dust propagation, and viewshed intrusion in areas not covered by General Policy #1. This phasing plan shall include a detailed estimated timetable for the accomplishment of each major step in the reclamation plan.

- i. A transportation element which discusses alternative methods of transporting quarried material. Haul routes and destinations must be specified.
 - j. Measures to maintain existing or historic recreational access over the property.
 - k. Measures to prevent impacts which would significantly degrade adjacent environmentally sensitive habitats and parks and recreation areas.
 - l. A determination by the permit applicant of the probable hydrologic consequences of the mining and reclamation operations, both on and off the mine site, with respect to the hydrologic regime, quantity and quality of water in surface and ground water systems including the dissolved and suspended solids under seasonal flow conditions and the collection of sufficient data for the mine site and surrounding areas so that an assessment can be made by the Board of Supervisors of the probable cumulative impacts of all anticipated mining in the area upon the hydrology of the area and particularly upon water availability and quality.
 - m. The use which is proposed to be made of the land following reclamation, including a discussion of the utility and capacity of the reclaimed land to support a variety of alternative uses and the relationship of such use to existing land use policies and plans, the surface owner's preferred use, and the comments of state and local governments or agencies thereof, which would have to initiate, implement, approve, or authorize the proposed use of the land following reclamation.
 - n. A detailed description of how the proposed postmining land use is to be achieved and the necessary support activities which may be needed to achieve the proposed land use.
4. Annual report of activities by permittee. The operator shall annually file on the anniversary date of the permit a notice of intent to continue mining operations and a map or statement that shall indicate:
- a. The land affected during the preceding year;
 - b. The land to be affected during the coming year; and
 - c. Any land reclaimed during the preceding year.

Exhibit E

5. Environmental protection performance standards. General performance standards shall be applicable to all surface mining and reclamation operations. In addition to the requirements set forth in Monterey County Code Chapter 16.04, each permittee shall be required at a minimum to comply with the following standards as a condition for permit approval:
 - a. Mining trucks shall not be permitted on Highway 1 during peak recreational use periods (7:00 a.m. until 10:00 p.m.).
 - b. Fill activities or improvements related to mining operations shall not be permitted in active flood plains or stream channels.
 - c. Existing or historical recreational access to the shoreline, the Ventana ~~W~~wilderness ~~a~~Area or state parks shall not be prevented by mining operations.
 - d. Unless the County finds that no significant adverse affects on the following specified habitat and recreational features will result, no mining which involves surface blasting, operation of loud equipment, or similar disruptions of natural peacefulness and solitude shall be allowed within close proximity of the following:
 - (1) Any State Highway 1 pullout;
 - (2) The Ventana Wilderness;
 - (3) Public recreation sites such as state parks, trails, campsites, and designated scenic viewpoints;
 - (4) Known Bald Eagle, Golden Eagle and Peregrine Falcon nesting sites; ~~and~~;
 - (5) Any California Condor roosting site.
 - e. Water quality sampling of suspended sediment and turbidity shall be required for any mining operations prior to the beginning of the operation and during subsequent winters. Costs of monitoring are to be borne by the applicant.
 - f. Construction or improvements of private roads required by mining operations shall meet standards described in Section 3.5, 5.4.3.K, and other sections of this ~~plan~~LUP.
 - g. All surface areas, including spoil piles affected by the surface mining and reclamation operation, shall be stabilized and protected to prevent or effectively control erosion and attendant air and water pollution. The operator shall ensure that the construction, maintenance, and postmining conditions of haul roads and access roads into and across the

Exhibit E

site of operations will effectively control or prevent erosion and siltation, pollution of water, damage to fish or wildlife or their habitat.

- h. The mining operator shall ensure that explosives are used only in accordance with existing state law and shall:
 - (1) Provide adequate advance written notice to local governments, adjacent landowners and residents who might be affected by the use of such explosives by the publication of the planned blasting schedule in a newspaper of general circulation in the area by mailing a copy of the proposed blasting schedule to every resident living within one-half mile of the proposed blasting site, and by providing daily notice to residents in such areas prior to any blasting.
 - (2) Maintain for a period of at least three years and make available for public inspection upon request a log detailing the location of the blasts, the pattern and depth of the drill holes, the amount of explosives used per hole, and the order and length of delay in the blasts.
 - (3) Limit the type of explosives and detonating equipment, the size, the timing, and the frequency of blasts based upon the physical conditions of the site so as to prevent:
 - a. Injury to persons.
 - b. Damage to and the impairment of the use and enjoyment of public and private property outside the permit area including, but not limited to, California State Parks, the Ventana Wilderness Area and public access thereto.
 - c. Change in the course, channel, or availability of ground or surface water outside the permit area.
- i. To minimize visual, scarring, disturbed surface areas shall be restored through use of indigenous vegetation so that no boundary is discernible between mined and unmined areas.
- j. Disturbed land shall be restored to a condition capable of supporting the uses which it was capable of supporting prior to any mining, or higher or better uses approved by the Board of Supervisors which may include agricultural, residential, recreational facilities or fish and wildlife habitat.
- k. Lands affected by surface mining operations which have been designated for postmining agricultural purposes or wildlife habitat shall be restored to the level of productivity equal to or greater, under equivalent management practices, than nonmined agricultural lands or

Exhibit E

wildlife habitat of similar soil types in the surrounding area. For those lands which are to be rehabilitated to indigenous grasslands, a diverse, effective and permanent vegetative cover shall be established of the same seasonal variety indigenous to the area to be affected and capable of self-regeneration, plant succession, and at least equal in extent of cover and productivity to the indigenous vegetation of the area. The level of productivity and cover attained on disturbed lands within the permit area shall be demonstrated by the permittee using comparisons with similar lands in the surrounding area having equivalent historical management practices and that are undisturbed by mining, or comparable disruptive activities.

1. Reclamation activities, particularly those relating to control of erosion and prevention of visual scarring, to the extent feasible, shall be conducted simultaneously with mining and in any case shall be initiated promptly after completion or abandonment of mining on those portions of the mine complex that will not be subject to further disturbance by the mining operation. In the absence of an order by the Board of Supervisors providing a longer period, the plan shall provide that reclamation activities shall be completed not more than 2 years after completion or abandonment of mining on that portion of mine complex.
6. A cash deposit, bond or equivalent surety, payable to the County in an amount to be set by the Board of Supervisors, is required to ensure compliance with the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act and regulations and policies of this ~~plan~~**LUP**. Should the mine operator fail to correct any violation or water quality problem due to the mining operation within 15 days following receipt of notification to do so, the County may correct the problem and charge all reasonable costs against the mine operator's surety.
7. Mining shall not be permitted in live stream channels or in locations where water quality or wildlife could be adversely affected or in sand dunes. In other areas limited extraction of sand and gravel for local construction purposes may be permitted under careful controls designed to:
 - a. Regulate instream and near-stream extraction so that maximum mitigation of adverse environmental effects occurs.
 - b. Limit future instream extraction to "safe yield" or annual replenishment levels.
 - c. Preserve soil resources and agricultural lands adjacent to the instream channels.
 - d. Maintain and enhance streambank stability while encouraging deposition, rather than erosion of fluvial materials.
 - e. Preserve and enhance the growth of riparian vegetation.
 - f. Maintain groundwater supplies and quality.

Exhibit E

g. Maintain surface water quality.

The California Department of Fish and WildlifeGame shall be requested to review all applications for sand and gravel extraction and to provide recommendations to the County concerning protection of wildlife habitat before the County approves the permit application.

8. Because of extraordinary risk to the Big Sur coast's special wildlife and recreational values and based on extensive evaluation of the Big Sur ~~c~~Coast, no sites have been identified which would be either practical or appropriate for the exploration, extraction, or handling of petroleum or related products either on-shore or off-shore. Therefore, such uses are not provided for in this ~~plan~~LUP, either on-shore or off-shore in the area under the jurisdiction of the State of California and the County of Monterey~~County~~. This prohibition is especially designated to protect the California Sea Otter State ~~Fish and~~ Game Refuge, the most sensitive watersheds listed in Section 3.2.~~34.B Rivers and Streams policy No. 3,~~ or any watershed which empties into the Ventana Wilderness, a designated Area of Special Biological Significance, a State Protected Waterway, California Department of~~State~~ Fish and WildlifeGame Refuge, or onto a public beach or other public shoreline recreation area.
9. In the event an oil spill occurs on the Big Sur coast the responsible entities shall secure a permit from the Board of Supervisors to determine appropriate measures to restore the damaged area to its condition prior to the spill. Any such permit shall be applied for within 3 calendar days of the spill's impact on the Monterey County Coast. Any actions taken immediately following the spill to limit or clean up the spill shall be evaluated as to their appropriateness and may be modified as conditions of the subsequent permit.
10. The County asserts its jurisdiction over mining operations on Federal lands within or adjacent to the Big Sur Coastal Zone to the full extent allowed by law. This includes the County's permit jurisdiction pursuant to its Surface Mining and Reclamation Ordinance and the California Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 and its coastal development permit jurisdiction pursuant to the California Coastal Act of 1976 and the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972.

The County shall establish mechanisms for consultation and comment upon mining operations on federal lands. These mechanisms may include formal and informal review, cooperative planning with federal agencies, development of memoranda of understanding, joint preparation of environmental impact statements or assessments, coordination through state agencies such as the Office of Planning and Research, and the like. These measures will be in addition to any coastal development permit requirements which may apply in any individual case.

11. To assure protection of habitat and recreational values on adjacent lands, the County shall consult with the affected public land management agency prior to approval of any mining activity

Exhibit E

on any parcel adjacent to National Forest, State Park, or University of California Land and Water Reserve lands, access roads or trails.

3.8.4 *The Little Sur River Watershed and Pico Blanco Limestone Deposits*

1. The upper watershed of the Little Sur River is classified as a natural waterway in accordance with the analysis stated in the Protected Waterways Management Plan for the Little Sur River (PWMP), pp. 64-65.
2. No new road may be developed nor may the capacity of any existing road be expanded in the upper watershed of the Little Sur River unless its dominant purpose is to serve priority uses for the Little Sur River watershed as determined by this ~~Plan~~LUP (Policy 5.4.2.3 and PWMP Objectives 1 and 10, pp. 66-67) and unless it conforms to all resource protection policies of this ~~Plan~~LUP. This restriction is based in part on: (1) the prohibition on large scale surface mining any place on the Big Sur Coastal Planning Area (Policy 3.8.3.1); (2) the policy "to retain significant and, where possible, continuous areas of undisturbed land in open space use" in order to protect environmentally sensitive habitats and wildlife values (Policy 3.3.2.6); (3) the determination by the Forest Service that the existing Dani Ridge road provides sufficient access across the U.S. Forest Service lands for ~~Graniterock~~ ~~Granite Rock~~ present mining operations (U.S. Forest Service, Environmental Assessment Report on approval of Granite Rock's Operating Plan, 1981, p. 1), (4) the determination that the upper watershed of the Little Sur River is a natural waterway (Policy 3.8.4.1) and (5) the conclusion in the PWMP that it is extremely unlikely that a new road could be built in the upper watershed without causing severe damage to aesthetic, ecological and recreational resources (PWMP, pp. 32, 46 and 51).
3. Because the North and South Forks of the Little Sur River are steelhead spawning habitat and because they support old growth redwoods and other riparian vegetation that would be harmed by siltation (PWMP, pp. 38, 27, 30 and 45), no new roads or expansion of existing roads shall be allowed that would cause siltation to enter either riparian corridor or the waters of either stream fork.
4. Because of the extraordinary scenic views of Pico Blanco from the Old Coast Road (PWMP, pp. 51, 53, 83 and Objective 10, p. 67) views of Pico Blanco from the Old Coast Road are included in the "Critical Viewshed" as that term is used in Policies 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 of this ~~Plan~~LUP. For the purpose of this ~~Plan~~LUP, Pico Blanco is defined as that land form bounded on the South by the South Fork of the Little Sur River, on the North by the North Fork of the Little Sur River and on the East by the Ventana Wilderness Area. All other views from the Old Coast Road shall be excluded from the Critical Viewshed except those views visible from Highway ~~One~~1.
5. With respect to any proposed development within the upper watershed of the Little Sur River,

Exhibit E

the applicant must demonstrate as a condition for permit approval that the proposed development, including the use of explosives, is consistent with Objectives 1 and 10 of the PWMP (pp. 66-67) and that it will not affect adversely the following resources and their resource value as identified in the PWMP:

- o critical habitat for raptors (golden eagles and prairie falcons) including both nesting and foraging habitat (PWMP, pp. 36. 38 and Figure 9, p. 37.)
- o mountain lion habitat (PWMP, p. 37)
- o riparian vegetation (PWMP, p. 37)
- o water quality and Steelhead trout habitat (PWMP, pp. 1, 30-33)
- o peregrine falcon

These specific environmental standards apply to the upper watershed of the Little Sur River in addition to the standards set out in Policy 3.8.3.5 that apply throughout the ~~Planning District~~Big Sur Coastal Planning Area.

6. Existing mining operations on Pico Blanco on federal mining claims within the Los Padres National Forest are deemed to constitute a first phase of operations that must be reclaimed in accordance with the standards set out in Policy 3.8.3.5 before any expansion of mining operations related to the Pico Blanco limestone deposits may be approved.

For purpose of this policy, "Pico Blanco limestone deposits" refers to those deposits that were classified as MRZ-2 or MRZ-3 areas by the California State Mining and Geology Board in 1982. - "Additional surface disturbances" as used in this policy includes disturbances affecting the Pico Blanco limestone deposits resulting from both expanded operations that are contiguous to areas that have already been disturbed (e.g., the existing quarry site, access and exploratory roads or disposal site) and those that are not contiguous to such presently disturbed areas.

3.9 DREDGING, FILLING, AND SHORELINE STRUCTURES

The natural shorelines processes on the Big Sur coast have been rarely affected by human's interference. The dredging, filling, and diking of coastal waters and wetlands have not occurred in the Big Sur area to any appreciable extent. Activities within this general category will be limited in the future to occasional instances where a temporary dike would be required in conjunction with construction or maintenance activities on Highway 1 or its numerous bridges. Cliff retaining walls also may be needed in limited places where cliff retreat may endanger the roadway. Ports and transport facilities are not to be located on the Big Sur coast and are considered inappropriate to the area. However, this prohibition shall not

Exhibit E

pertain to fishing.

3.9.1 Key Policy

1. Shoreline armoring shall be prohibited. Blufftop setbacks shall be adequate to avoid the need for seawalls during the development's economic lifespan.
2. Boating facilities requiring onshore structures are not appropriate on the Big Sur coast. If a harbor of refuge is required, it should be designed so as not to require onshore structures.
3. Where dredging or temporary dikes are required for essential work or maintenance of Highway 1, they should avoid disruption of marine and wildlife habitats and should restore the site to its original condition as early as practical. Dredge spoils suitable for beach replenishment should be transported for such purposes to appropriate beaches.
4. Shoreline, wetland, or blufftop projects, regardless of size, should have thorough environmental review with an assumed preference of the "no project alternative".
5. Permits issued by the State Lands Commission for projects on State tidelands shall conform to the policies of the Big Sur Coast Local Coastal Program.

3.10 HISTORICAL RESOURCES

Monterey County's historical heritage is rich and diverse. Prime examples of historic sites survive from each of the major periods of California's history. Historical settlement of the Big Sur coast began with Native Americans. Following exploration by the Spanish government, was initiated by the Mexican Government in the late 18th century through the bestow~~ed~~al of two land grants -- the 8,949 acres Rancho El Sur, between the Little Sur River and what is now called Cooper Point, and Rancho San Jose y Sur Chiquito, an 8,876-acre grant, bounded on the north by the Carmel River and on the south by the Palo Colorado Canyon.

The 1862 Homestead Act made With United State's occupation, unappropriated public lands in California became available to settlers in parcels of 160 acres. Big Sur was initially settled by a number of homesteaders whose names are now borne by well known topographic and natural features in Big Sur (e.g., the Pfeiffer's, Charlie Bixby, Jim Anderson).

The development of the tan bark industry in the mid-1870's led to the construction of several landings along the Big Sur coast. These landings were used not only for loading the bark, used in the manufacture of tannic acid, but also for shipping prime redwood lumber. Among them was Godfrey Notley's Landing, near the mouth of the Palo Colorado Canyon, around which a thriving village sprang up. Jim Anderson also had a landing, and there was another at the mouth of the Big Sur River. Perhaps the most spectacular was Partington Landing. The Rockland Cement Company chose Limekiln Canyon as its

Exhibit E

headquarters in the 1880's in order to exploit a rich deposit of calcareous rock discovered in the vicinity of the canyon. Schooners began to regularly frequent Rockland Landing to load limestone bricks and deliver supplies. With the demise of the liming operation, the days of industrial enterprise along the Big Sur coast came to an abrupt halt.

The discovery of gold near the head of Alder Creek led to the Big Sur Gold Rush of the 1880's. The Los Burros Mining District sprang into being with three stamp mills, and a boomtown named Manchester mushroomed on Alder Creek. In its heyday, Manchester boasted four stores, a restaurant, five saloons, a dance hall, and a hotel. By 1895 the boom had begun to fade.

As the 19th century drew to a close, more settlers came to live on the south coast. The two sons of one of the original homesteaders, Bill Post, each homesteaded 160 acres, while various relatives acquired tracts totaling another 640 acres. Their land stretched as far south as the site of the present-day Nepenthe Restaurant. The ranchhouse still stands on Highway 1 at the top of what is now called "Post Grade". Big Sur's original post office and its second schoolhouse were built on the Post Ranch.

The 20th century saw the emergence of recreation-oriented commercial development along the Big Sur coast. For decades, the Big Sur country had been attracting hunters and fishermen. The start of the resort business began with the Pfeiffer Ranch resort which catered to these sportsmen. The Hotel Idlewild, located on the banks of the Little Sur River, soon rivaled the Pfeiffer Ranch for its business.

The one deterrent to the development of the south coast as a mecca for tourists as well as sportsmen, was the hazardous road that had to be closed part of the year. The concept of a year-round scenic highway originated with Dr. John Roberts, the founder of the City of Seaside.

Many of the original settlers were enraged by the devastation resulting from the highway construction. Machinery blasted through the great cliffs, scarring granite promontories and defiling canyons and waterfalls with debris. On June 27, 1937, the highway was completed at a cost of approximately \$8,000,000. A way of life had ended, and a new era began for the beautiful country.

The process of ensuring the long-term protection of Big Sur's unique coastline was initiated by John Pfeiffer in 1934 when he sold 706 acres to the State for the nucleus of the 822-acre Pfeiffer Big Sur State Park. The Lathrop Browns, who purchased Saddle Rock Ranch, later donated the 1,700 acres which now constitutes Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Park. The 21-acre John Little State Park originally part of the State property sold to Milton Little, was donated by Elizabeth Livermore. Francis Molera, granddaughter of Juan Baustista Roger Cooper, placed 2,000 acres in trust for Andrew Molera State Park. The generosity of these pioneering families has been a lasting contribution to the preservation of Big Sur and the people of Monterey County and the State.

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, cannabis became a popular plant with local homestead farmers. Cannabis in Big Sur is historically recognized by the cultivar named "The Big Sur Holy." This special strain of cannabis was developed from Mexican seeds in the early 1970s by logger and

Exhibit E

artist Patrick Cassidy. He grew on the south coast region and has been credited by many locals as the founding father of cannabis cultivation in Big Sur.

On November 5, 1996 California voters approved Proposition 215, the Compassionate Use Act of 1996 (Health & Safety Code § 11362.5), “CUA”, an initiative that exempted certain patients and their primary caregivers from criminal liability under state law for the possession and cultivation of cannabis for medical purposes. Senate Bill 420, further clarified the scope of the CUA. The State of California enacted the Medical Marijuana Regulation and Safety Act (MMRSA), which created a state licensing program for commercial medical cannabis activities. The Board of Supervisors on July 12, 2016 adopted a resolution of intent (Resolution No. 16-210) to adopt coastal zoning regulations to establish criteria for local land use permits pursuant to MMRSA. By statewide initiative, the voters enacted the Adult Use of Marijuana Act (AUMA), which created a state licensing program for commercial adult-use cannabis activities. The State enacted the Medicinal and Adult-Use of Cannabis Regulatory and Safety Act (Business & Professional Code § 26000, *et seq.* (MAUCRSA)), which combined MMRSA and AUMA into a single state licensing scheme for both medicinal and adult-use cannabis. MAUCRSA allows counties and cities to maintain local regulatory authority over commercial cannabis activities. The Board of Supervisors on March 20, 2018 adopted the coastal zoning regulations, as certified by the Coastal Commission, which added Chapter 20.67 to the Monterey County Code. The Board of Supervisors on May 18, 2021 adopted the coastal zoning regulations, as certified by the Coastal Commission, which added and amended Chapter 20.69 of the Monterey County Code. This established a use that continues to the present day, one permit has been issued as of the time of this writing.

3.10.1 Key Policy

It is the policy of the County to protect, maintain, and where feasible, enhance and restore the cultural heritage of the County and its builtman-made resources and traditions.

3.10.2 General Policies

1. New development shall, where appropriate, protect significant historical buildings, landmarks, and districts because of their unique characteristics and contribution to the cultural heritage of the County.
2. The County shall provide for the mitigation of site and artifact disturbance in County-approved projects through the careful surveying of project sites and the consideration of project alternatives to preserve significant cultural resources.
3. The County shall maintain an identification survey and inventory program of historical sites and shall maintain a registry program to protect and preserve historical land-mark sites and districts.
4. Designated historical sites shall be protected through zoning and other suitable regulatory means

Exhibit E

to ensure that new development shall be compatible with existing historical resources to maintain the special values and unique character of the historic properties.

3.11 ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The Big Sur ~~coastal area~~ Coastal Planning Area of Monterey County is considered to be one of the most significant archaeological regions in California. At the time of Spanish contact, this area was occupied by three distinct aboriginal tribal groups -- the Es~~se~~alens, Costanoans, and Salinans. Investigations of the immediate coastline of Monterey County have revealed a very high density of shell middens. Areas adjacent to the immediate coast are not as well known although they are thought to contain a high density of tribal cultural sites. A number of these inland sites likely have significant archaeological value such as those identified in the vicinity of the Post Ranch (near Big Sur River), Big Sur Valley, and Pacific Valley.

Several Es~~se~~alens, Coastanoan, and Salinan sites in the Big Sur Coastal Planning Area have tribal cultural/religious value to local Native Americans. These include Junipero Serra Peak and Slates Hot Springs. Numerous pictograph sites discovered on the coast may also have tribal cultural/religious significance. Sacred sites of tribal cultural value are important whether or not they have archeological significance.

Currently known sites are mapped and on file with the Northwest Information Center at Sonoma State University ~~California Archaeological Site Survey District at Cabrillo College in Aptos, California.~~ To protect the sites, these maps are confidential. However, the Monterey County of Monterey Planning Department maintains contact with the Survey on all development projects affecting archaeologically sensitive areas. Tribal cultural resources are identified through consultation with the appropriate tribes.

At the present time, development/urbanization and unrestricted public access are the principal sources of destruction or damage to archaeological sites. In 1973, the California State Archaeological Task Force estimated that 50 percent of all recorded sites and 79 percent of all known sites in Monterey County had been destroyed. Direct threats to remaining sites from urbanization include: grading; construction of residential, commercial, and industrial structures; construction of paved surfaces; water projects; cattle grazing; plowing; and off-road vehicle use. Threats posed by public access are related to vandalism, the development of recreational sites (e.g., campgrounds, trailer parks) near archaeological sites, and the development of public roads and trails which inadvertently provide access to areas of archaeological significance. Sacred sites of tribal cultural value are at risk for destruction from minimal understanding of and respect for tribal cultural values.

3.11.1 Key Policy

Big Sur's archaeological and tribal cultural resources, including those areas considered to be archaeologically and culturally sensitive but not yet surveyed and mapped, shall be maintained and

Exhibit E

protected for their scientific and cultural heritage values. New land uses and development, both public and private, should be considered compatible with this objective only where they incorporate all site planning and design features necessary to avoid or mitigate impacts to archaeological and tribal cultural resources.

3.11.2 General Policies

1. All available measures, including purchase of archaeological easements, dedication to the County, tax relief, purchase of development rights, etc., shall be explored to avoid development on significant historic, paleontological, archaeological, and other classes of cultural sites.
2. When developments are proposed for parcels where paleontological resources or archaeological or other cultural sites are located, project design shall be required which avoids or substantially minimizes impacts to such cultural sites. To this end, emphasis should be placed on preserving the entire site rather than on excavation of the resource, particularly where the site has potential tribal cultural religious significance.
3. Because of the Coastal Zone's known abundance of paleontological resources, ~~and~~ archaeological and other tribal cultural sites, careful evaluation of these resources will be undertaken. ~~no sites or development shall be categorically exempt from environmental review in the Big Sur Local Coastal Plan.~~
4. ~~Whenever development will involve ground disturbance is to occur in areas having a probability of containing archaeological and/or tribal cultural resources sites, the County shall require the preparation of Site Survey Office or a professional archaeologist shall be contacted to determine whether the property has received an archaeological survey and consultation with the appropriate Native American tribes. If not, such a survey shall be conducted to determine if an archaeological site exists.~~
- 5.4. ~~Development shall make all attempts to avoid impacts to paleontological, archaeological, and tribal cultural resources. When sufficient planning flexibility does not permit allow avoiding impacts to these resources, impacts shall be minimized to the greatest extent feasible and a resources recovery plan, acceptable to the Chief of Planning, shall be provided. construction on paleontological, archaeological or other types of cultural sites, adequate preservation measures shall be required. Mitigation shall be designed to accord with guidelines of the State Office of Historic Preservation and the State of California Native American Heritage Commission.~~
- 6.5. ~~Off-road vehicle use, unauthorized collecting of artifacts, and other activities other than development which could destroy or damage paleontological, archaeological or cultural sites shall be prohibited.~~

4. **HIGHWAY ~~ONE~~ 1 AND COUNTY ROADS**

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Designated in 1965 as the first State Scenic Highway in California, Highway 1 along the Big Sur coast is the basic access route to the area. It traverses the length of Big Sur connecting two other major recreational areas, the Monterey Peninsula and the Hearst Castle at San Simeon in San Luis Obispo County. The Nacimiento-Fergusson Road, a ~~lightly-used~~ County road crossing the Hunter-Liggett Military Reservation and the coastal range, provides the only other access route to the seventy-mile long Big Sur coast from inland areas.

The major population centers of California, the San Francisco Bay Area, the Los Angeles Area, and the large cities of the Central Valley, are less than a day's drive from Big Sur. The Monterey Peninsula, Salinas, Santa Cruz, and San Luis Obispo are one to two hours away. The accessibility of Big Sur to these centers has a major impact on the demand to visit Big Sur and the resulting traffic congestion on Highway 1. Visitors from other states and foreign countries who are attracted to Big Sur's scenic beauty also contribute significant amounts of traffic along Highway 1. ~~In 1986~~ At present, an estimated 2.9 million people visited the Big Sur coast annually. In 2020, an estimated 4.5 – 7 million people annually visit the Big Sur coast.³

The traffic on Highway 1 is predominantly recreation oriented. ~~In 1986~~ Recreational traffic ~~was~~ is estimated to comprise 95% of all trips during the peak summer months. The remaining 5% consisted of residential traffic and a small volume of commercial and agricultural traffic. The number of residential-related trips is unchanged. Driving for pleasure constitutes the major proportion of recreational traffic along the Big Sur coast that originates from outside the area. ~~It accounts for in 1986~~ about 70% of the recreational traffic volume occurred during the peak summer months. Internal local trips within Big Sur consisted of about 65% recreational trips and 35% residential trips during a summer month. During this same peak period, passenger cars ~~we~~ are estimated to account for about 91% of the traffic on the highway north of Big Sur Valley; trucks account for 2%; buses, campers, motor homes, and vehicles with trailers make up about 5% of the traffic; and motorcycles account for 2% of total traffic. Current detailed data is not available, however, from observation, traffic conditions have substantially worsened along the highway all times of the year, particularly in high demand visitor locations.

~~It is expected that~~ Highway 1 cannot accommodate ~~anticipated~~ demands by traffic during peak use periods due to continued increases in if recreational use continues to increase along current patterns. ~~In 1986~~ At present, Highway 1 north of the Big Sur Valley ~~was~~ is able to handle average annual daily traffic volumes of 4,500 vehicles at Caltrans Level of Service D. Level of Service E ~~was~~ is attained during summer peak use periods when traffic reaches 8,300 vehicles per day. South of ~~(the~~ Big Sur Valley,

³ Thomas, G. (2020, December 30). Big sur is fed up with 'selfie tourism,' here's its new plan to transform travel in the region. San Francisco Chronicle . Retrieved October 20, 2023, from <https://www.sfchronicle.com/travel/article/New-Big-Sur-plan-aims-to-control-tourists-at-15836501.php>.

Exhibit E

conditions ~~we~~are similar. Average annual daily traffic reaches 2,600 vehicles per day corresponding to Service Level D. Peak use volumes reached 4,700 vehicles per day producing Service Level E conditions.

Activities or development that could generate significant volumes of truck traffic such as potential logging, mining, or other commercial operations could have detrimental effects on traffic conditions and could reduce the vehicle capacity of the highway. Daily and peak hour traffic can be much higher during the tourist season and major holidays at several sites along Highway 1.

Public transit to and through Big Sur is available only on a very limited basis by buses operating along Highway 1. Public bus service from downtown Monterey to Nepenthe south of the Big Sur Valley is provided by Monterey ~~Salinas Peninsula~~ Transit during the summer. Bus service between Monterey and San Luis Obispo with two round trips daily was recently put in operation by Coastlines, a privately owned transit company. Private tour buses operate along Highway 1 on a charter basis, transporting groups of visitors to various places in Big Sur and to Hearst Castle in San Luis Obispo County. Scheduling of bus service in the past has not fully met resident needs nor offered visitors adequate flexibility in travel times. Bus service needs to be expanded in order to become a viable transportation alternative. Increases in ridership and increased subsidies are necessary to expand service and meet the differing transit needs of both residents and visitors.

Bicycling along Highway 1, with its narrow lanes, blind curves, and heavy traffic, can be hazardous for inexperienced or careless cyclists. These conditions and the long steep grades, and strong winds discourage bicycling along the coast. However, experienced bicyclists on cross-country trips or day tours do use the highway in low numbers. ~~Improvements to the Bicentennial Bicycle Path would provide increased safety for bicyclists and motorists on Highway 1.~~

The very characteristics that make Highway 1 such an interesting driving experience also create traffic safety problems, particularly during congested periods. Slow-moving vehicles, drivers distracted while looking at the views, numerous access points to the highway from private roads or recreational areas, roadside parking, and unpaved turnouts cause traffic to slow down, effectively reducing the traffic capacity of the highway and limiting access to Big Sur. Improvements consistent with the character of the two-lane scenic highway are desirable to increase its safety and traffic capacity.

Local roads in Big Sur are private except for a few County roads and access roads to public trailheads and recreation areas. Palo Colorado Road carries both residential and recreational traffic and has the highest use of any road intersecting Highway 1. It has inadequate capacity to meet significantly increased recreational and residential traffic demands. Considerable volumes of traffic turning onto or off of Highway 1 in the Big Sur Valley occur at entrances to campgrounds, shop parking areas, and Pfeiffer Big Sur State Park. Sycamore Canyon Road, a private one-lane road over which the U.S. Forest Service holds easements for public access to Pfeiffer Beach, is carrying traffic during peak use periods that exceeds its safe capacity. This is leading to conflicts between recreational and residential traffic. ~~The Old Coast Road and Nacimiento-Fergusson Road experience low volumes of traffic which are~~

Exhibit E

~~accommodated without congestion problems and no future capacity problems are envisioned.~~

A primary transportation objective of the Coastal Act is to maintain Highway 1 in rural areas as a scenic two-lane road and to reserve most remaining capacity for the priority uses of the Act. The limited capacity of Highway 1 to accommodate local and recreation traffic at a level that reserves reasonable service and emergency use and also allows motorists to enjoy the beauty of Big Sur's scenic coast is a major concern. Because traffic volumes along sections of Highway 1 are at capacity during peak recreational use periods and because future demand for recreational access is expected to exceed the capacity of the highway, the capacity of the highway is a major constraint on the long range development of the coast. How the road capacity can be increased without damage to the intrinsic values of Big Sur and how capacity is allocated between visitor and local use is a major challenge.

With respect to the balance between local and visitor traffic, the 1986 LUP significantly reduced the number of new parcels that can be created by subdivision in the Big Sur Coastal Planning Area. What has not yet been addressed is the increased number of visitors adversely impacting Highway 1 capacity and visitors' experiences.

A closely related issue is what can be done to effectively manage use levels of the highway between Carmel and Cambria, particularly as needed to protect the priority uses of the Coastal Act. This appears necessary to insure that acceptable service levels are preserved so that the highway can meet its essential functions as the sole transportation and emergency route up and down the coast, and as a safe, pleasurable scenic and recreational travel facility.

Studies supporting this ~~plan~~-LUP have reached several important conclusions concerning future planning and management of Highway 1. One conclusion was that because the vast majority of traffic on the highway during congested peak use periods is recreational driving originating outside of Big Sur, efforts to reduce highway congestion by limiting land use development within Big Sur itself can have only marginal effects. Unless there was substantial change in current recreational use patterns and volumes, significant decreases in peak period traffic congestion wouldn't only be achieved through physical regulation of the highway including limitations to visitor access at its north and south ends.

A second important conclusion was that management of Highway 1 should attempt to optimize rather than maximize visitor use levels on the highway in relation to other user needs and planning objectives for the coast. As an objective, the maintenance of an acceptable minimum level of service and corresponding maximum traffic volume standard for Highway 1 traffic must satisfy several criteria. A reasonable level of traffic volume must be accommodated that reflects current recreational and residential use patterns, future demand for access to Big Sur, property rights of landowners, and resource protection goals aimed at preserving the natural character and beauty of Big Sur.

The encouragement of land uses that help redistribute traffic volumes to non-peak periods was a desirable approach to reducing traffic congestion on the highway. Development and management policies that encourage a more even distribution of traffic flow would result in an overall increase in

Exhibit E

access to Big Sur and place fewer constraints on the amount of recreational and residential development that could be approved.

Finally, studies for the 1986 LUPy has-showedn that the aesthetic qualities of Highway 1 are eroding. This wais the result of both private and public development in the scenic viewshed, and visitor overuse within the highway right-of-way itself. Gradually, many informal, unsurfaced and unsightly pullouts hadve developed along the highway, inviting illegal trespass and vandalism of private properties. The level of careless public use is resulting in a serious problem. Non-native and invasive plants are spreading along the highway to the detriment of the scenic beauty. The issues identified and analyzed above have not changed fundamentally.

The 1986 LUP addressed some of these problems, and where successful, those solutions are being carried forward in this LUP. In particular, the Critical Viewshed policy limiting new development along Highway 1 is carried forward. Nevertheless, some problems remain, which this LUP attempts to address. In keeping with the stature of Highway 1 as the preeminent scenic drive on the California coast, considerably greater attention and funds need to be allocated to its maintenance in order to preserve, restore, and enhance its aesthetic qualities.

Since the adoption of the 1986 LUP, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), with funding from the Federal Highway Administration and guidance from a 19-member stakeholder Steering Committee, completed the Big Sur Coast Highway Management Plan (CHMP) in 2004. As stated in the introduction to the CHMP:

“This document characterizes the intrinsic qualities important for long term preservation, summarizes the major issues identified by stakeholders, presents strategies and actions to address the issues, and proposes a structure for implementation...Situating on the steep western slopes of the Santa Lucia Mountains, Highway 1 provides access to a most unforgettable place. For this simple fact in combination with the protections in place with Monterey County’s Local Coastal Program, 72-miles of highway within Monterey County was designated an All-American Road in 1996. The All-American Road designation is generally reserved for routes considered destinations in themselves”.

The entire length of Highway 1 in the Big Sur Coastal Planning Area maintains the All-American Road Designation.

4.1.1 Key Policy

The County of Monterey ~~County~~ will take a strong and active role in guiding the use and improvement of Highway ~~One-1~~ and land use development dependent on the highway. The County's objective is to maintain –and –enhance the highway's aesthetic beauty and to protect its primary function as a recreational route. The highway shall remain a two-lane road and shall include walking and bicycle trails wherever feasible. In order to protect and enhance public recreational enjoyment of Big Sur's unique

Exhibit E

natural and scenic resources, recreational traffic should be regulated during congested peak use periods. The CHMP, as may be periodically amended, is the management framework for the continued safe and efficient operation of Highway 1 to preserve, protect and restore the scenic, natural and cultural character and qualities of the highway corridor.

4.1.2 General Policies

1. Improvements to Highway 1 shall be undertaken in order to increase its service capacity and safety, consistent with its retention as a scenic two-lane road because visual access is emphasized throughout Big Sur as an appropriate response to the needs of visitors.

The highway capacity improvements detailed in the following policies are essential for the maintenance of existing service levels for the benefit of Coastal Act priority uses and residents alike. In light of the ~~anticipated~~ traffic increases on the Coast Highway, the County shall periodically review the traffic levels after five years and determine what capacity improvements have been implemented or planned and what additional solutions may be necessary and feasible.

2. A principal objective of management, maintenance, and construction activities within the Highway 1 right-of-way shall be to maintain the highest possible standard of visual beauty and interest.
3. Existing levels of service on Highway 1 during peak use periods are frequently unacceptable, particularly from June to August between 10:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Therefore, in order to restore reasonable traveling speeds for residents and visitors, to protect emergency use of the highway, and enhance the quality and enjoyment of the scenic driving experience, reductions in ~~peak-use-period~~ traffic should be sought. A combination of actions, including public education and regulation of Highway 1 use ~~during peak periods~~, shall be undertaken to achieve an improved service level.
4. To conform to the Coastal Act, most remaining capacity on Highway 1 shall be reserved for coastal priority uses: recreation and visitor-serving facilities, the military, agriculture and other coastal dependent uses.
5. In order to enhance public access to the Big Sur coast and to reduce traffic congestion, an improved level of public bus service is encouraged. Monterey ~~Salinas Peninsula~~ Transit, other public carriers, and private and public recreational facilities are ~~requested-encouraged~~ to participate in reaching this objective.
6. The CHMP, although not a regulatory document, provides the framework for development and activities that may affect Highway 1. Proposed development and activities shall include an analysis of the proposal with respect to the objectives of the CHMP.

Exhibit E**4.1.2 Specific Policies****A. Road Capacity and Safety Improvements**

1. The County requests that, in order to maximize vehicular access to the Big Sur coast the width of Highway 1 be upgraded to a standard of 12-foot lanes and 2 - 4-foot shoulders where physically practical and consistent with the preservation of other coastal resources values. A program of constructing left-turn lanes, and other improvements shall be undertaken to improve traffic capacity and safety.
2. The County requests that appropriate areas along Highway 1 be designated by Caltrans for construction of paved turnouts for slow-moving vehicles. The turnouts should be signed to notify approaching vehicles in time to pull over. The California Slow-Moving Vehicle Law, California Vehicle Code Section 21665.24615, should be enforced during peak traffic periods.
3. Pedestrian and traffic hazards which result from on-shoulder parking at unsafe locations shall be corrected wherever possible, with priority being given to congested recreational attractions such as the Garrapata Beach-Soberanes Point area, the vicinity of the Bixby Bridge, the Andrew Molera State Park frontage, and River Inn, Julia Pfeiffer Burns and other locations where there is a documented safety problem. New facilities, both publicly-owned and commercial, must have adequate and safe off-shoulder parking before they are opened to public use. Existing facilities shall not be expanded unless the standard of adequate and safe parking is met. On-shoulder parking should not be allowed where safe shoulder width or sight distances cannot be achieved, or where important seaward vistas will be impaired. Caltrans is encouraged requested to initiate a program to carry out this policy; emphasis should be placed on the construction of parking areas with designated entrances and exits, at suitable locations as identified in cooperation with the County, U.S. Forest Service, California Department of Parks and Recreation, and local citizen advisors.
4. The number of private roads and recreational access road entrances off Highway 1 shall be limited whenever possible for traffic safety and management purposes. The County shall require new developments to demonstrate that the use of existing public or private roads is either not feasible or that easements for use cannot be obtained before it approves construction of a separate entrance to Highway 1.
5. Sycamore Canyon Road and Palo Colorado Road should be maintained at a level that resident and visitor traffic can safely be accommodated. The U.S Forest Service should consider providing a shuttle from Highway 1 to Pfeiffer Beach. Improvements to the width or alignment of these roads shall only be approved when negative visual and environmental impacts will not be substantial result and where the improvements will not adversely impact adjacent residents. Pedestrian access shall be provided where feasible. Priority uses shall not be precluded on these

Exhibit E

roads by non-priority developments.

6. The traffic bottleneck at Hurricane Point should be corrected as the highest priority for Caltrans' efforts on Highway 1 within the ~~Big Sur L.C.P. area~~ Big Sur Coastal Planning Area.

B. Aesthetic Improvements

1. Undesirable parking locations identified pursuant to ~~p~~Policy 4.1.3.A.3, as well as those which must be phased out under habitat or visual resource restoration programs, shall be retired from service when alternative safe facilities are in place. The placement of boulders or other methods should be used to prevent inappropriate public access or parking in such areas as soon as possible. Native vegetation that does not obscure the public view should be re-established on bare areas.
2. Specific attention shall ~~ould~~ be given by all Federal, the State, and local authorities to eradicate invasive non-native plant species that are contributing to a decline in the natural beauty of Big Sur. Pampas Grass, Kikuyu Grass, Broom, Eucalyptus and other invasive non-native species should be removed and replaced with native plants.
3. Where consistent with Critical Viewshed ~~scenic protection~~ and other resource management policies, public restrooms should be provided at major destination points including the Rural Community Centers, major public viewing areas adjacent to Highway 1, and State and National Forest developed recreation sites. Trash receptacles should be considered and a program of litter abatement shall be undertaken.
4. The County requests that ~~thean overall~~ design theme for the construction and appearance of improvements within the Highway 1 right-of-way as set out in the CHMP be ~~used~~ developed by Caltrans in cooperation with the California Department of Parks and Recreation, the U.-S. Forest Service and local citizens for the development of. ~~Design criteria shall apply to~~ roadway signs, fences and railings, access area improvements, bridges, restrooms, trash receptacles, etc. The objective of such criteria shall be to ensure that all improvements are inconspicuous and are in harmony with the rustic natural setting of the Big Sur Coast. ~~The special report by local citizens entitled, Design Standards for the Big Sur Highway, on file at the County Planning Department, should serve as a guide and point of departure for Caltrans and other public agencies in developing a design theme for Highway 1 and in making improvements within the State right-of-way.~~

C. Traffic Regulation and Coastal Priority Uses

1. To comply to Coastal Act policies concerning the allocation of limited highway capacity to coastal priority uses, 85 percent of the capacity of Highway 1 under improved road conditions and managed traffic shall be reserved to serve recreational travel, service trips to public and

Exhibit E

private recreation and visitor-serving facilities, use by military vehicles, and coastal-dependent agriculture. To implement this policy, the land use regulations of this ~~plan-LUP~~ limit future residential development to a level that will utilize not more than 15 percent of highway capacity at buildout.

2. Proposed new or expanded public or private recreation and visitor-serving uses shall be required to submit with their application, a traffic ~~component-study~~ which evaluates the anticipated impact to Highway 1 service capacity and makes recommendations on how conflicts can be overcome or mitigated.
3. Proposals for commercial mining or logging, that may produce heavy truck traffic, shall submit with their application, a traffic component evaluating potential conflicts with recreational and residential use of Highway 1 and County roads, and describing how such conflicts can be avoided. In general, the County will not approve applications requiring use of heavy trucks on Highway 1 during peak ~~recreational~~ use periods.

D. Public Transit

1. A program should be initiated by Monterey ~~Peninsula-Salinas~~ Transit or other public carriers, in conjunction with the ~~California~~ Department of Parks and Recreation, the U.S. Forest Service, and the County to expand bus service and provide bus stops at appropriate access points to recreation areas, trails, ~~and~~ roads on Highway 1, and visitor-serving facilities.
2. Development of new recreation areas and visitor-serving facilities or expansion of existing facilities shall be planned to maximize opportunities for access by bus. Applicants shall cooperate with Caltrans and transit authorities to provide bus stops in convenient proximity to the proposed recreational facility. Other improvements or services such as shelters, pick-up service from the transit stop, access trails that may be necessary, etc. shall be provided as part of the recreational facility proposal.
3. Monterey ~~Peninsula-Salinas~~ Transit or other public carriers, in conjunction with resident representatives should plan bus schedules to improve service for residents ~~and the workforce~~.
4. An expanded education and promotion program should be implemented in cooperation with other recreation agencies operating in the County, to provide information on Big Sur bus service and recreational areas that are accessible by bus.

4.2 RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

1. Caltrans should conduct Origin and Destination Studies of traffic on Highway 1 along the Big Sur coast on a regular basis in order to provide up to date information on trends in recreational and residential use of the highway.

Exhibit E

2. ~~(delete) Monterey County, San Luis Obispo County, and Caltrans should cooperate to evaluate the impacts of proposed developments on Highway 1 traffic conditions. The program should coordinate the planning and phasing of development generating significant traffic impacts in the two counties in order to insure that an equitable share of remaining Highway 1 capacity is allocated to each area according to appropriate priority uses.~~

3.2. ~~(delete) Consideration should be given to regulating vehicular access to Pfeiffer Beach on Sycamore Canyon Road during peak use periods. A temporary gate at Highway 1 operated by the Parks and Recreation Department is a possible approach. A shuttle service between Pfeiffer-Big Sur State Park and Pfeiffer Beach should also be considered.~~

4.3. The County requests that Caltrans, in cooperation with Monterey and San Luis Obispo Counties and the U.S. Forest Service, implement the Coast Highway Management Plan (CHMP). This plan~~The CHMP immediately begin a program of management of recreational use of Highway 1. The objectives of this program shall be to enhance public access and enjoyment of the Big Sur coast and the safety of Highway 1 by ensuring that service capacity at no time falls below Level of Service E or a minimum driving speed of 35 miles per hour and that Levels of Service D and C be obtained wherever the basic design of the highway permits.~~

The following management actions in addition to the improvements listed in Section 4.1.3.-A. above, shall be completed as part of this program. Caltrans is encouraged to complete additional studies as needed to determine specific features of this program.

a. A system of unobtrusive traffic signs advising travelers of traffic congestion on Highway 1 and suggesting alternate routes should be installed by Caltrans as a step in reducing undesirable peak period traffic congestion.

ab. An electronic system using current state of the art technology, to be updated as technology improves, advising travelers of traffic conditions on Highway 1 and suggesting alternate routes.

bc. Roadside visitor information centers should be established near the north end of the Big Sur coast and at San Simeon at the south end. These centers should provide information on road and traffic conditions, recreation opportunities, visitor accommodations and facilities, coastal access locations, and the environmental responsibilities of the public.

ed. Progressively stronger traffic regulation measures should be implemented if traffic congestion seriously affects access and travel conditions. The program should start with the placement of automated traffic conditions and route option signs. If traffic continues to increase causing unacceptable Highway 1 service loads, then the flow of traffic into Big Sur should be regulated by devices such as signal lights.

Exhibit E

de. Use of Highway 1 by slow-moving vehicles should be regulated during peak hours of peak traffic days in order to increase highway capacity to accommodate future growth in Big Sur coast travel demand. This can be accomplished by requiring slow-moving vehicles that are holding up traffic to pull over consistent with State law and may, in addition, require special State legislation to be adopted that will permit access controls to be established at certain critical times.

DRAFT

5. **LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT**

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The history of development in Big Sur reflects the changing demands for use of the land. Subsistence ranching, logging of redwoods, harvesting of tan bark, and mining of limestone and gold provided a livelihood for early residents. While life was extremely rugged in these early years, there was a population of nearly 1000 people by the 1880's largely supported by these basic industries. The mountainous terrain, numerous deep canyons, and lack of roads made travel difficult and slow. Most local products were shipped out by sea on the small coastal trading vessels that brought supplies to the isolated coast's residents. Palo Colorado Canyon, Notley's Landing, Bixby Creek, the Big Sur Valley, and Partington Canyon were early centers of activity. Around the turn of the century, limited recreational use of the coast began to take place. The Big Sur Valley could be reached by stage from Monterey and camping in the redwood groves grew in popularity. Hunting and trout fishing were also popular and some local residents supplemented their income by guiding sportsmen from the cities.

~~By 1986, Today~~ the tan bark and limestone industries had ~~ce~~ ceased. Gold is still mined on a limited basis in the Los Burros region and a few trees are harvested along the coast. Ranching continues as the major use of the large private holdings and contributes much to the character of Big Sur. By 2023, extraordinarily increased visitation, unanticipated at the time of the 1986 LUP, is by far the greatest land use challenge facing Big Sur ~~Public recreation and private residential development are by far the strongest land use trends today.~~

Single family residences comprise a major developed land use on private land. This occurs either in rural residential clusters in areas where development has historically been concentrated, or scattered along Highway 1. Many of the larger parcels are used for cattle grazing. Commercial uses, including restaurants, grocery stores, and service stations are generally concentrated in the Big Sur Valley. Small visitor-serving commercial areas include Lucia, Pacific Valley and Gorda, and a few isolated businesses along Highway 1. Recreational uses include public and private campgrounds, visitor accommodations, restaurants, State Park units, and the Los Padres National Forest. The U.S. Forest Service has offices and other facilities in the Big Sur Valley and at Pacific Valley. The California Department of State Parks and Recreation manages its units in Big Sur from offices in the Big Sur Valley. Caltrans has maintenance facilities in the Big Sur Valley and at Gorda. ~~The~~ There is a U.S. Naval Station at Point Sur, and the ~~Coast Guard operates the~~ lighthouse atop Point Sur, formerly owned by the Federal Government, was conveyed to the State of California in 2000 and is managed by the California Department of Parks and Recreation. A variety of public and quasi-public uses serving the local community are located in the Big Sur Valley. These include the Big Sur Grange Hall, Captain Cooper Elementary School, churches, the County library, and Post Office. Another elementary school is located at Pacific Valley.

At the time of the 1986 LUP, tThere ~~were~~ are approximately 1,100 parcels in private ownership on the

Exhibit E

Big Sur coast, ranging in size from less than an acre to several thousands of acres. Approximately 700 parcels ~~were are~~ vacant, and 370 parcels ~~wereare~~ occupied. Many had~~ve~~ more than one unit on them, either residential or commercial. Small parcels of 2.5 acres or less were generally located near the highway or in one of several areas subdivided in the past for residential purposes. Palo Colorado Canyon, Garrapatos Redwoods, Rocky Point, the Big Sur Valley, Coastlands, and Partington Ridge ~~wereare~~ among the areas having the greatest number of developed parcels.

As of 2022, there were approximately 1,232 parcels in private ownership on the Big Sur coast. Approximately 632 parcels were vacant, and 600 parcels were occupied; overall these numbers have not changed much since the 1986 LUP.

In 1986, a~~Approximately half of the Big Sur Coastal Planning Area~~~~coastal zone~~ ~~wais~~ in public ownership. ~~The LUP anticipated that by the U. S. Forest Service, the State Department of Parks and Recreation, the U. S. Navy, the U. S. Coast Guard, and the University of California. If public acquisition of private land s now contemplated or in progress are completed, would reach approximately 60% of the Big Sur Coastal Planning Area the coast will be publicly owned. As of 2022, approximately 71% of the Big Sur Coastal Planning Area is in public ownership, which is significantly more than anticipated in 1986. Public landowners within the Big Sur Coastal Planning Area now include the U.S. Forest Service, California Department of Parks and Recreation, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, the County of Monterey, the University of California, and other public entities. A significant percentage of~~~~Some of the~~ private land ~~remainings~~ have scenic easements or deed restrictions which limit the level of development.

Currently, the viability of the Big Sur community is threatened. There has been significantly more public acquisition of private land than was anticipated in 1986. Increased public lands and greater public visitation require increased management. The changing social, industrial, and economic landscape has made it increasingly difficult to live and work in Big Sur.

5.1.1 Residential Land Use

The 1976 mid-decade census recorded approximately 800 housing units, of which about 600 were permanent single family dwellings. A large proportion of these home are located in the several residential ~~neighborhoods~~~~areas~~ listed. These areas have generally been developed to a level where the natural environment is perceived to have been significantly altered, and where residential use is very apparent on the land. The size and density of these residential areas varies, but in all cases, they are more densely developed than surrounding lands. They contain a significant number of subdivided and residentially zoned lots in close proximity, yet do not contain resources or land use activities which generate significant employment services for the public. While there are historic expectations that buildout of these areas would proceed, a number of areas are not suitable for full development of all existing parcels because of conflicts with the broad objective of this ~~plan~~-LUP-particularly the protection of water and scenic resources or limited capacity of local roads.

Exhibit E

Restoration projects, discussed under the implementation section of the ~~plan~~LUP, will be needed in several -of the areas to reduce developmental potential or to provide improved water supplies.

The Residential Land Use designation in Big Sur is limited in size but critical to the viability of the Big Sur community and economy. Many of the full-time residents who live in these residential neighborhoods support the visitor serving community. The residential community provides the stable force that supports the character, value, and heritage in this LUP. Many of the public agency employees are here for limited duration and institutional memory is often lost in the process. The collective memory of the values set forth in the LUP resides with the residents and their community.

The term “neighborhoods” generally has a different meaning in Big Sur than it may have in urban areas due to Big Sur’s large parcel sizes and relatively low population densities. People who live miles apart often consider themselves to live in the same neighborhood. Neighborhoods are often centered around road and water associations.

The significance of the residential ~~neighborhoods~~areas for planning purposes is that they have the capacity, to some extent, to accommodate additional residential demand. Unlike the larger properties or commercial centers, they are not well suited for commercial agriculture, commercial, or visitor uses; use of these areas, to the extent consistent with resource protection, should continue to be for residential purposes. Because of the unique and limited nature and critical function of residential neighborhoods in Big Sur, commercial and transient uses within the Residential Land Use designation are inconsistent with this PlanLUP.

Residential ~~neighborhoods~~areas include: Otter Cove, Garrapata Ridge/Rocky Point, Garrapata and Palo Colorado, Green Ridge, Rocky Creek, Long Ridge Canyon, Bixby Canyon, Clear Ridge, Pfeiffer Ridge, Sycamore Canyon, Coastlands, Partington Ridge, ~~and~~ Buck Creek to Lime Creek and Pacific Valley. The Big Sur Valley, Lucia and Gorda also have significant residential use, although the primary function of these areas are community service and visitor-serving commercial facilities.

5.1.2 **Housing**

The 1976 mid-decade census provided considerable information concerning the need for low and moderate income housing on the coast. Of the housing units in the area, 17% were vacant due to being second homes. Only 1.3% were vacant and available, at that time, for sale or for rent. The census revealed that less than half of the occupied units were owner-occupied and that of all the units, 91% were single families. The census also estimated a median household income of \$9,785. A transportation study inventory revealed 423 persons employed in the area, one third in eating, drinking, and lodging places, and one third in government (military, Forest Service, etc.). Building Inspections Department records show the average cost-of construction for a single family unit on the Big Sur coast, the unincorporated Peninsula area, and the Carmel Valley, was \$36,000 in 1970 and rose to \$107,000 in 1979. This factor alone precludes low and moderate income persons and median income households

Exhibit E

from homeownership. The 1970 housing inventory identified 215 "Substandard" units and 109 units as "Conservation Feasible" in the Big Sur area. These figures indicate that some households may need assistance to meet the national and state goal of "a safe, decent, and sanitary house."

At the time of the 1986 LUP, a serious housing shortage existed for employees in Big Sur, particularly in the visitor industry. Because there is little housing available, employees have at times ~~were been~~ forced to camp-out, live in cars, or move in with friends. The shortage of affordable housing ~~has~~ also made recruitment of skilled employees difficult. Several factors affected solutions to the housing problems: the costs of land and housing precluded the use of traditional housing assistance programs; and year-round employment ~~was~~ not at a high enough level to support traditional single and multiple family housing projects. Employee housing provided by an employer ~~was~~ was identified as at-be-a primary source of affordable housing in the area. Accessory Dwelling Unit Housing, which ~~had~~ traditionally provided shelter for many long-time residents and employees, ~~was~~ is also to continue to be an important element of the affordable housing supply.

By 2023, the housing shortage has worsened and resulted in additional impacts. Currently, there are more jobs than housing available for the workforce. Traffic on Highway 1, a corridor already at capacity, is exacerbated by commuting employees, contractors and service providers who no longer live and work in Big Sur. The increased shortage of affordable housing has additionally posed a threat to vital community services such as volunteer fire brigades, rescue services, and the health center, reducing the quality of the visitor experience and residential life. The increasing number of vacation homes decreases the available housing stock. Employee housing provided by an employer continues to be a primary source of affordable housing. Caretaker housing, accessory dwelling units and junior accessory dwelling units must continue to provide housing opportunities in the Big Sur Coastal Planning Area.

The 2020 U.S. Census further reinforced the need for low and moderate income housing on the coast. Of the one U.S. Census Bureau, Tract 115.02, that encompasses the northern and central portion of Big Sur Coastal Planning Area, approximately 18% of housing units were vacant and classified as second homes and only approximately 10%, were vacant and available, at that time, for rent or sale. The 2020 U.S. Census revealed that approximately 41% of the occupied housing units were owner occupied, with the remainder 59% being renter occupied. The vast majority, approximately 80% of the housing units, were single family homes. The Census stated that median household income in 2020 was around \$53,000, yet the median value of owner-occupied housing units was \$1,601,600, which puts almost all rentals and for sale housing units out of reach of a resident earning the median housing income.

5.1.3 Recreational Uses

As a recreation area of regional, national, and international importance, in 1986 Big Sur ~~attracted~~ about 2.9 million visitors annually. By 2023, traffic counts suggest this number has grown to well over

Exhibit E

five million vehicle trips on Highway 1 in Big Sur per year. The accessibility of Big Sur to several nearby population centers is a ~~major~~ factor contributing to its high visitation. In addition, Big Sur draws a significant number of visitors to the region and to the state. The basic recreational resource of Big Sur is the visual beauty of its striking landforms and ~~unspoiled~~ landscape. The mountains, forests, creeks, rivers, and ocean shoreline combine to offer diverse recreational opportunities. The artistic and rustic lifestyle for which Big Sur is known creates an attractive cultural setting that complements the natural character of the area.

Recreational activity is concentrated along the coastal strip: on beaches, rocky shoreline, public parks and forest lands, campgrounds off Highway 1, and various visitor-serving facilities. The major recreational pursuit is pleasure driving and sightseeing along Highway 1. Other Big Sur recreational activities include picnicking, sunbathing, beach and tidepool exploration, surfing, scuba diving, fishing, hunting, nature study, hiking, backpacking, camping, horseback riding, and hang-gliding.

The Big Sur Valley has numerous camping, lodging, dining, and other visitor-serving facilities and is a focal point for recreational activity and services in Big Sur. The Big Sur River, the beach at the river mouth, the redwoods in the valley, and Pfeiffer Beach are major natural recreation resources in the area.

The coastal area north of the Big Sur Valley is intensely traveled by visitors passing through or sightseeing. People stop at numerous turnoffs to view panoramas of the coastline. In 1986, t~~The~~ major beaches at Garrapata, Little Sur River, and Point Sur ~~are currently were~~ in private ownership and ~~were~~are not formally open to the public, although there ~~wais~~ significant public use of Garrapata and Little Sur River Beach. Since the adoption of the 1986 LUP, t~~The~~ California Department of Parks and Recreation ~~acquired is currently negotiating to acquire~~ Garrapata State Park which includes Garrapata Beach. The Little Sur River Beach and Point Sur Beach remain in private ownership~~and the Point Sur Beach have been proposed for acquisition.~~ The backcountry of the National Forest is accessible in the northern area of Big Sur at Bottchers Gap at the end of Palo Colorado Road.

The Los Padres National Forest occupies much of the area south of the Big Sur Valley. The National Forest is a major hiking, backpacking, and camping area. Several trailheads offering access to the backcountry and the Ventana Wilderness are located off Highway 1. Several beaches including Sand Dollar Beach, Mill Creek Beach, and other smaller pocket beaches are scattered along the southern Big Sur coast within the boundaries of the National Forest. Hiking trails are scattered throughout the Ventana Wilderness and the National Forest backcountry. Day use facilities are provided at Mill Creek, Sand Dollar Beach, Willow Creek, and Pfeiffer Beach.

5.1.4 Commercial Uses and Private Visitor-Serving Facilities

At the time of the adoption of the 1986 LUP, t~~There~~ wais little current demand by residents for development of commercial facilities in Big Sur. Residents normally shop in the Monterey area or

Exhibit E

Cambria. Visitors do create demand for convenience goods and recreation-oriented supplies and services. Local artisans work in Big Sur, usually at small shops in their homes. Currently some local residents would like to see additional local serving commercial facilities (e.g., laundromat, hardware store, etc.) in Big Sur.

Privately-operated, visitor-serving facilities constitute the major commercial activity on the Big Sur coast. The Big Sur Valley is an historical and geographic area of residential and commercial development with a distinct community identity. A chief recreational destination point, it provides a variety of commercial and public services on a year round basis for area-wide residents and the visiting public, as well as functioning as a social center for activities and entertainment. Lucia, Gorda, and Pacific Valley offer more limited services along the southern coast.

At the time of the 1986 LUP~~present~~, there ~~were~~are eight motels, lodges, or inns on the coast providing a total of 168 rooms. Prices ~~range~~d from about \$25.00 to \$175.00 a night. Rustic cabins ~~were~~are available at two of the campgrounds. The New Camaldoli Hermitage, run by a Benedictine Order, ~~had~~s 11 rooms which ~~were~~are available with the Hermitage's permission for use as a retreat. Esalen, a nationally known institution, ~~offer~~eds accommodations for 90 people enrolled in education programs. Private campgrounds with about 350 units ~~constituted~~d over half of the vehicle access campsites in Big Sur. All of the private campgrounds except Limekiln Beach Redwood Campground ~~were~~are located in the Big Sur Valley.

Also at the time of the 1986 LUP, t~~f~~welve restaurants ~~seated~~d about 1,100 people. There ~~were~~are also nine grocery stores, seven gas stations, and few gift shops scattered along the length of Highway 1. Private facilities ~~were~~are typically of a small to moderate scale in harmony with the natural beauty of Big Sur.

In 2023, there are fifteen motels, lodges, or inns on the coast providing a total of 428 rooms. Prices ranged from approximately \$100.00 to \$3,836.00 a night. Rustic cabins are available at three of the campgrounds. Private campgrounds with 158 units constituted less than half of the vehicle access campsites in Big Sur. Public campgrounds with 318 units constituted more than half of the vehicle access campsites in Big Sur.

Also at the time of this LUP update, sixteen restaurants serve the Big Sur coast, two of which are currently closed. Four grocery stores, four gas stations, and several art galleries and shops featuring local products are distributed along the length of Highway 1. Private facilities continue to be of a small and moderate scale in harmony with the natural beauty of Big Sur.

5.1.5 Other Activities

In addition to ranching, several industries based around the use of natural resources have historically been located in Big Sur. Logging and mining were among the first important economic activities in

Exhibit E

the area, although over the years, the level of activity has declined. ~~During the last several years~~At the time of the 1986 LUP, renewed interest in the coast's redwood forests ~~had~~s been expressed by several commercial loggers. As the scarcity and price of redwood increaseds, it ~~wasean-be~~would be expected that pressure to log in Big Sur ~~would~~ill increase. As of 2023, that has not occurred.

Aquaculture, the cultivation of fish and shellfish for food, is an industry that is growing rapidly in many parts of the world. Several aquaculture operations at the time of the 1986 LUP ~~had~~ve in the past been active on the coast. The Garrapata Trout Farm at the confluence of Garrapata and Joshua Creeks and a commercial abalone farm offshore from the mouth of the Big Sur River ~~were~~are among these. The California Department of Fish and ~~Wildlife~~Game ~~presently~~s operated a crab and abalone breeding and research facility at Granite Creek at that time. No new facilities have been developed since the adoption of the 1986 LUP.

Gold mining in the Los Burros District ~~was~~is the focal point of ~~present~~in 1986 mining activity. Development of a large deposit of commercial grade limestone near the summit of Pico Blanco Mountain in the Little Sur River drainage has been proposed in the past by the owners of the property and may be proposed ~~-again~~ in the future.

Big Sur does not possess the characteristics essential to most industries engaged in manufacturing. Neither the transportation system work force, nor market are adequate to support most manufacturing and there is a lack of developable land for such uses.

5.2 LAND USE PLANNING ISSUES

Several key issues directly affect planning for the Big Sur coast. These issues concern the effects of intensified land use and development on the environment and character of the coast and the effect on public access to the area. ~~D~~Continued residential development and subdivision ~~for residential purposes~~ is a trend at odds with the preservation of the coast's natural, scenic, and rural character. The remaining capacity on Highway 1 at peak use periods to serve further land development is extremely limited. The California Coastal Act states that remaining road capacity shall be used to serve coastal development uses such as agriculture and coastal recreation and shall not be precluded by residential development. Thus, availability of capacity on Highway 1 to accommodate further residential development or subdivision is a major limitation to these uses. The basic emphasis of the Coastal Act is clear: to protect the environmental quality and resources of the California coast while making these available for the enjoyment of all of the citizens of the State. A major challenge of this ~~plan-LUP~~plan-LUP is to find a way to substantially curtail further commitment to ~~residential~~ development resulting from subdivision or other land use intensification beyond what is described in the 2023 LUP while also assisting landowners in achieving the most sensitive possible development of existing parcels.

A second challenge of the ~~plan-LUP~~plan-LUP is to encourage and to protect ranching as an important and traditional use of the larger land holdings with significant grazing resources. How recreational uses and visitor accommodations on such properties can be developed to help support agriculture is also an

Exhibit E

important consideration.

Finally, the ~~plan~~LUP must meet the Coastal Act's goal of encouraging public recreational use and enjoyment of the coast while ensuring that the very resources that make the coast so valuable for human enjoyment are not spoiled. At the time of the 1986 LUP, undesirable impacts of recreation had~~been~~been in evidence for some years and ~~have worsened today. They~~ must be corrected if Big Sur's long term promise is to be fulfilled. Overuse of existing private and public campgrounds, loss of riparian vegetation ~~through trampling~~, erosion of paths, compaction of soil in redwood forests, disruption of wildlife habitats, and increased fire hazards are a few of the problems associated with current levels of recreational use. ~~Pfeiffer-Big Sur State Park is an example of a State facility whose~~ The popularity of all of Big Sur's recreational facilities are~~and use is~~ at or beyond ~~their~~its environmental holding capacities. Some private campgrounds are similarly affected.

Visual impacts associated with recreation in Big Sur include littering, excessive numbers of parked vehicles along Highway 1, and development of visitor facilities that are visually obtrusive from the scenic highway. Residents of the coast are at times undesirably affected by recreational activities. There is a clear need to protect the quality of local water supplies, for residents and visitors alike, and to minimize the danger of fire ~~hazard during high public summer use periods~~. The privacy of the residents of the area should be protected as public access both to the shore and upland areas increases. Visitor safety is also an issue because of hazardous cliffs and dangerous ocean conditions.

The location, intensity, and character of ~~new~~ recreational facilities needs to be cognizant of all of these problems. Careful planning is needed to lessen, not increase, impacts associated with recreational enjoyment of the coast.

The 1986 LUP focused primarily on preserving and protecting Big Sur's natural resources. In addition to these goals, it is also necessary to preserve and enhance the Big Sur community and its neighborhoods. Big Sur employers report it is becoming increasingly difficult for employees to obtain affordable housing in Big Sur to provide visitor-serving services. Moreover, the Big Sur community is an integral part of the uniqueness of Big Sur, and the community certainly enhances the experience for visitors to the area. To ensure the community's long-term viability, it must also be nurtured along with the area's other resources. New and innovative planning tools are needed to do that.

5.3 PROPOSED LAND USES

This section describes the kinds, locations and intensities of land uses recommended for the Big Sur coast. The capabilities of Big Sur's natural environment and the capacity of the public service system to support development are reflected in these proposals. However, all new development is also subject to the policies of other sections of this ~~LUP~~plan concerning resource management, Highway 1 and other roads, shoreline access and trails, and is subject to the plans and provisions for administration and implementation. Thus, final determinations of the acceptability of development proposals and their

Exhibit E

locations and densities on a parcel can only be made during the project review process, in consideration of all elements of the LUPplan.

5.3.1 Land Use Categories

~~Eight~~Nine broad categories of land use are proposed for the Big Sur coast that reflect existing and traditional land uses and the priorities of the California Coastal Act. In all categories agricultural land use is a principal permitted use as provided for in Section 3.6 of this ~~Plan~~LUP.

1. National Forest

The U.-S. Forest Service manages the Los Padres National Forest under a multiple use concept in which conservation of plant and wildlife communities, protection of watersheds, maintenance of scenic beauty, ~~and~~ low intensity recreation, fire fuel mitigation, and employee housing to advance these purposes are principal land use activities. Forestry, mineral extraction and grazing can also be practiced under careful controls. Land uses permitted in the Ventana Wilderness portion of the National Forest are limited to backcountry recreation.

Non-federal development within this designation will be subject to the same development standards and criteria as Watershed and Scenic Conservation category. Existing administrative and community uses may continue to operate on National Forestland (e.g. Caltrans maintenance stations, local fire suppression facilities, Pacific Valley School).

2. Watershed and Scenic Conservation

Protection of watersheds, streams, plant communities, and scenic values is the primary objective. Principal uses in this category include agriculture/grazing and supporting ranch houses and related ranch buildings. Secondary, conditional uses that will be considered on their individual merits include the following: ~~r~~Recreational facilities permitted in the Outdoor Recreation category including rustic inn or lodging units, hostels; forestry, mineral extraction, aquaculture and related facilities; and single family residences ~~rural residential~~ and employee housing associated with any of these uses ~~are secondary, conditional uses that will be considered on their individual merits~~. Where on-site dining facilities are allowed for the inn units, they must be limited to that which is needed to serve on-premises overnight guests.

The following criteria shall apply to rustic inns, lodging units, hostels and employee housing: suitability for recreational uses of the parcel (5.4.3.C.-1); ability to avoid adverse impacts on adjacent habitats and agricultural activities (5.4.2.1 and 3); adequacy of access (5.4.3.D.-9) and water supply (3.4.1 and 5.4.3.N.-1); and ability of a proposed visitor-serving facility to support or assure the long term provision of open space and agricultural uses (5.4.3.C.-6).

3. Resource Conservation

Exhibit E

The purpose of the Resource Conservation land use designation is to protect, preserve, enhance, and restore sensitive resource areas in the County of Monterey. Of specific concern are the highly sensitive resources inherent in such areas such as viewshed, watershed, plant and wildlife habitat, streams, beaches, dunes, tidal areas, estuaries, sloughs, forests, public open space areas and riparian corridors. Protection of sensitive resources, plant communities, and animal habitats and important archaeologic sites is emphasized. Only very low intensity uses and supporting facilities compatible with protection of the resource are allowed. Appropriate uses can include carefully controlled low intensity day use recreation, education, and research. Two types of Resource Conservation areas are shown on the plan Big Sur Coastal Planning Area map. State Park Environmental Camping facilities and other low intensity facilities are allowed, as well as limited employee housing to support site management but only where it can be demonstrated that no significant adverse impact on the resources will result.

Coastal Strand and Wetlands - Applies to shoreline and intertidal areas, coastal wetlands, the lower reaches of major riparian corridors, and floodprone areas.

Forest and Upland Habitats - Applies to environmentally sensitive forest habitat, and grass, scrub, or chaparral ground cover, rare and endangered plant or wildlife habitats and upland riparian areas. It also applies to public or private reserves or open space areas set aside for resource preservation or research.

4. *Outdoor Recreation*

Low intensity recreational and educational uses that are compatible with the natural resources- of the area and require a minimum level of development to serve basic user needs and necessitating minimal alteration of the natural environment are appropriate. Such uses are defined as trails, picnic areas, walk-in camping, tent camping where the campsites are separated from one another, and supporting facilities. RV Campgrounds are limited to a maximum of 60 spaces. These are considered to be principal allowed uses.

Minimal necessary housing and maintenance facilities and moderate intensity recreational uses defined as tent platforms-Inns and RV campgrounds (up to 60 units per site), parks, stables, bicycle paths, improved restrooms, and interpretive centers are allowed as secondary and conditional uses. On-site dining facilities may be allowed, but only to the extent needed to serve on-premises overnight guests. Hostels-Inns and RV campgrounds over 60 spaces may be appropriate as well.

Such secondary and conditional moderate intensity uses are allowed provided that they be allowed in undeveloped park units only where it is infeasible to locate them in the existing developed park areas and only where strict conformance to the Critical Vviewshed protection policies can be achieved.

5. *Recreational, Visitor and Community - Serving Commercial, Public and Quasi - Public Uses*

Exhibit E

To respond to the needs of the traveling public and local residents, recreational and commercial visitor-serving facilities which may include restaurants, grocery or general stores and other community support facilities, local arts and crafts galleries, inns, hostels, service stations, RV campgrounds, rustic campgrounds, and hike-in and environmental campsites, employee housing and moderate intensity recreation are the principal permitted use types. Secondary, conditional uses include administrative, management and maintenance facilities for public agencies, fire stations, clinic and ambulance services, community halls, churches, post office, library and schools.

In order to facilitate the ability for people in Big Sur to live close to where they work, employee housing may be allowed on any parcel within this land use category subject to permit requirements.

Land use intensities for this designation are set forth in (Table 1.)

6. *Rural Residential*

Rural residences are considered a principal use on vacant parcels where applicable resource protection policies can be met. Secondary uses appurtenant to rural residences include garages, work or storage sheds, and art or craft studios.

7. *Military and Coast Guard*

The 1986 LUP included this ~~This~~ category as it applieds to the U.S. Naval Station and Coast Guard Station at Point Sur and the Navy property at Granite Creek leased to the California Department of Fish and ~~Game~~Wildlife. Coastal dependent development was the principal allowed use, with public agency facilities and moderate intensity recreation uses (as specified in Section 5.3.1.4) as secondary uses.

As provided by the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (CZMA), lands subject to exclusive federal jurisdiction, such as the Naval Facility at Pt. Sur, ~~were~~are not subject to Coastal Commission or County jurisdiction. However, when federally owned lands are opened to non-federal development, such developments are subject to coastal permit requirements. Accordingly, the land use designations shown for federal lands are for the purpose of regulating future non-federal development, if any. Federal projects on excluded lands will be addressed by the federal consistency process as provided by the CZMA.

As of 2023, there is only one parcel that is still owned by federal government for military purposes in the Big Sur Coastal Planning Area which is designated APN 159-011-016-000.

8. *Rural Community Center*

The Rural Community Center land use category provides a spectrum of functions for both the visiting

Exhibit E

public and for residents of the adjoining rural areas. Most land use activities appropriate in the Outdoor Recreation; and Recreational, Visitor and Community-Serving Commercial, Public and Quasi-Public classifications may occur in the Rural Community Center category. This land use category is intended to provide increased opportunities for people who work in Big Sur to live in Big Sur as well as a full spectrum of community and visitor support functions. Additional employee housing may be allowed where it would reduce impacts to Highway 1.

9. Commercial Facilities Outside a Rural Community Center

Four locations with existing commercial uses in 1986 did not have underlying land use categories. These commercial uses are to be governed by the specific provisions of this LUP and their zoning, as outlined below and elsewhere in this LUP.

In 1986, several commercial uses including the Rocky Point Restaurant, Big Sur Inn (also known as Deetjen's Big Sur Inn), and Coast Gallery, were found outside the Rural Community Centers designated on the land use map and these are considered conforming uses under the LUP. These continued uses, or uses of similar character and intensity to these uses, may be allowed at these locations. However, gasoline service stations, general stores, or similar highway-oriented commercial structures shall not be allowed outside of the Rural Community Centers.

Westmere, a well-known historic lodge with 24 units, also falls outside the Rural Community Center and may re-establish the historic use as a lodge of similar character and intensity that reflects the historic character of the site in design and scale, and that is located at the original site, which is hidden from public view. At Westmere, a food service facility serving on-premises overnight guests may be allowed if it can demonstrate that it will reduce impacts to Highway 1.

Additional employee housing may be allowed where it would reduce impacts to Highway 1.

5.3.2 *Land Use Map and Summary of Land Use Proposals*

The land uses described in the preceding section are to be located on the Big Sur coast as shown on the proposed land use map. ~~Eight~~Nine separate land use patterns are shown on the map's legend ~~and an additional designation is used for the four rural community centers.~~

Overall, the map reflects current land use patterns, with traditional centers of commercial, recreational, and residential activity remaining as the recommended areas for such uses in the future. Most of the land on the coast is rural and undeveloped as part of the Los Padres National Forest or large privately-held ownerships. The emphasis on these lands has been on minimal use and careful stewardship. These basic uses are proposed to remain over most of the area as indicated by the broad use of the Watershed and Scenic Conservation designation and the National Forest designation. The Watershed and Scenic Conservation category permits a number of land uses including ranches, rural residences, low intensity recreation, rustic visitor accommodations, and under careful controls, forestry, mining, and aquaculture.

Exhibit E

The development and resource policies of the ~~plan-LUP~~ will guide landowners in assuring that development is compatible with protection of the area. At the same time, the flexibility that this category permits provides an opportunity for landowners to obtain a reasonable return from the land.

Two Resource Conservation categories are shown on the map. The lagoons at the mouths of the Big Sur and Little Sur Rivers, and the riparian areas along the lower reaches of the two streams are classified as Wetlands and Coastal Strand. Numerous other areas along the coast, particularly shoreline and intertidal areas need the strict protection required by the Resource Conservation classification but, because of imprecise data on the locations and extent of these areas, they are not shown on the map. They will be managed instead through the application of the ~~plan's LUP's~~ various resource policies. The ~~plan-LUP~~ shows the Landels-Hill Big Creek Reserve as Forest and Upland Habitat in recognition of the research and preservation purposes to which this State-owned property is devoted.

The Outdoor Recreation category is applied to Andrew Molera State Park and the ~~recent~~ Garrapata acquisition, in order to provide recreational opportunities while ensuring the areas remain in a natural state. The major beaches on the coast, Garrapata, Little Sur, Point Sur, Pfeiffer, and Sand Dollar, are also included in this category to protect their primitive and natural character. In addition, uses permitted in this category are encouraged on appropriate sites within areas shown on the map as Watershed and Scenic Conservation. Large private properties in particular, can be developed to provide enjoyable low intensity, outdoor recreation opportunities for the public in a scenic and natural setting. Proposals for such uses will be considered on any suitable property.

Activities and facilities described in the Outdoor Recreation category are currently available at several public and private locations including Pfeiffer Big Sur State Park, Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Park, Limekiln Creek, Kirk Creek, Mill Creek and Plaskett Creek, which are reflected on the land use map. A number of privately-operated improved campgrounds are located in the Big Sur Valley.

Otter Cove, Palo Colorado Canyon, Bixby Canyon, Sycamore Canyon, Pfeiffer Ridge, Coastlands, and Partington Ridge areas are designated principally for Rural Residential use because they contain numerous comparatively small parcels, generally unsuitable for other kinds of development. While the land use map reflects the rural residential character of these areas, further subdivision is not generally appropriate and full buildout of all existing parcels may be unwise in view of the limitations of the natural environment. Recommendations in Section 5.4 of the ~~planLUP~~, point to the need for careful study of each of these areas to avoid undesirable cumulative impacts resulting from continued residential development. In all cases, residential development proposals for individual parcels will be considered on their merits in accordance with applicable ~~plan-LUP~~ policies.

The Military Land use designation is used at three locations, Granite Creek, the Point Sur Coast Guard Light Station, and the U.S. Navy Station just south of Point Sur. As of 2022, Military Land use designation is used at the U.S. Navy Station just south of Point Sur (APN 159-011-016-000).

Exhibit E

~~A special land use classification, called~~The Rural Community Center land use category is depicted by a dotted line circumscribing portions of the Big Sur Valley, Pacific Valley, Lucia, and Gorda. All areasportions of parcels that are within the Rural Community Center land use category as mapped will be rezoned to a Rural Community Center zoning, which will reflect these expanded opportunities. These ~~are~~ is is intended to illustrate the approximate the areas within which a variety of land use activities are now carried on and are intended to be a focus for similar types of future development. The ~~plan LUP~~ proposes that these areas continue toRural Community Center land use category provides a spectrum of functions for both the visiting public and for residents of the adjoining rural areas. ~~Major categories of~~Most land use activities appropriate ~~are those found~~ in the Outdoor Recreation; and Recreational, Visitor and Community-Serving Commercial, Public and Quasi-Public land use classifications categories may occur in the Rural Community Center category. The land useRural Community Center category is intended to provide increased opportunities for people who work in Big Sur to live in Big Sur as well as a full spectrum of community and visitor support functions. Residential development can take place in this category in the Big Sur Valley at 1 dwelling unit per existing vacant parcel or as employee housing ~~although because the limited~~ available developable land is limited ~~urges that other more essential uses should have preference.~~ In the portions of the Lucia, Gorda, and Pacific Valley areas delineated as Rural Community Centers, residential development should be avoided altogether, again, because of limited available land. Employee housing is an essential use that should have preference in the Rural Community Center. Employee housing units, in the Rural Community Center category may be built in lieu of Visitor Serving Accommodations.

The locations of any of these uses within the Rural Community Centers is not a major concern and can best be determined upon review of individual, specific proposals. In general any use allowed in any zone is appropriate for Rural Community Centers and may be considered.

5.3.3 *Summary of Development Potential*

The ~~plan LUP~~ permits development on existing vacant or partially developed parcels based on conformance to the standards of the ~~plan LUP~~. ~~In 1986, it was~~ is estimated that there ~~were~~ are 800 such parcels and that approximately 100 new parcels could be created through subdivision. The ~~plan LUP~~ also permitted ~~teds~~ up to 50 Accessory Dwelling Units. Expansion of lodging facilities in the Big Sur Valley, Lucia, Pacific Valley and Gorda ~~was~~ is possible to some extent. Up to 50 hostel units ~~could~~ an be constructed. Employee housing ~~could~~ may also be constructed to serve commercial visitor-serving facilities and State and Forest Service facilities. The inn unit density standards ~~were~~ are expected to hold inn development to less than 300 new units after LUP certification in 1986.

In 1986, ~~t~~The policies ~~that follow~~ established a slope density formula as the determinant of potential residential development. A conversion factor ~~is~~ was available in the Watershed and Scenic Conservation land use designation that permits potential residential units to be developed as inn unit

Exhibit E

s at the rate of two inn units per residence (up to a maximum of 8 per parcel), thereby establishing potential buildout for this major land use category.

Consequently, long range development of the coast ~~will~~depended upon the choices made by landowners over time. A strong response to demand for visitor facilities ~~would have~~resulted in a reduction in residential construction potential. For example, if 100 additional residential units ~~were~~are ultimately approved for development in the Watershed and Scenic Conservation area, this could result in 100 residences. It could also result in 50 residences and 100 inn units, or no residences and 200 inn units, etc. While this is only illustrative, it showeds the relationship of visitor-serving facilities and residential development based on the conversion factor. An important condition of the ~~plan-1986 LUP~~wais that property ~~could~~an be devoted to either residential or visitor-serving overnight accommodations, or a combination of both, but that density credit ~~could~~annot be applied for both uses from the same acreage.

The ~~plan-1986 LUP~~wais flexible concerning the siting of new development, allowing a range of land use proposals to be made at any particular location. Yet the ~~plan's-LUP's~~resource protection standards, and slope and road requirements, are stringent, ~~intending for~~ultimately causing new development to be sited on the most physically suitable locations and limiting buildout to a level that can be accommodated on those sites that can meet all of the ~~plan's-LUP's~~requirements.

While the intention remains the same, current conditions as of this LUP are different. Existing single-family dwellings that are not primary residences, caretaker units that are no longer occupied by caretakers, single family residences used as vacation rentals – all contribute to an acute lack of permanent housing in Big Sur. This in turn creates an inability for the community to continue to provide all the services the 1986 LUP anticipated. Additionally, the workforce to support increased visitor demand must commute extraordinarily long distances contributing to capacity issues and vehicle miles traveled on Highway 1.

Because of increased visitation due to many unanticipated factors including international travel demand, special events, and new or expanded physical access points to the coast, Highway 1 use has far exceeded projections, and the ability of Big Sur to provide access for visitors has been impaired. Table 1 summarizes the major categories of development according to the locations at which the use could take place and provides standards to guide the density at which campgrounds can be clustered on the site. -No limitation is established in the ~~plan-LUP~~re for the number of campsites that could be developed.

Since the adoption of the LUP in 1986, there have been 83⁴ new Visitor Accommodation units permitted and built and 30 Visitor Accommodation units remain allocated for potential

⁴ These 83 units consist of 73 inn units built or permitted, plus 3 r.v. campground [campsite] units and 7 hostel beds [units].

Exhibit E

development at Chappellet (6 units)⁵ and Westmere (24 units)⁶ as envisioned in the 1986 LUP. Visitor Accommodations consist of inn units, RV Campground sites, and hostels. There are currently a total of 600 Visitor Accommodation units⁷ and a total of 476 Campground units, per data obtained and verified by the County of Monterey and in collaboration with the Big Sur Chamber of Commerce. Given there has been an increase in the popularity of camping options that provide significantly more amenities compared to traditional rustic camping units approved as Rustic Campground sites at such locations as Treebones, would now be classified as Visitor Accommodations. Notwithstanding other categories of accommodations that may apply, these types of units generally have similar use, impacts, and affordability as inn units and are therefore counted as Visitor Accommodation units in the LUP.

5.4 DEVELOPMENT POLICIES

5.4.1 Key Policy

Future land use development on the Big Sur coast should be extremely limited, in keeping with the larger goal of preserving the coast as a scenic natural area and protecting the capacity of Highway 1 to accommodate recreational and community use. In all cases, new land uses must remain subordinate to the character and grandeur of the Big Sur country. All proposed uses, whether public or private, must meet the same exacting environmental standards and must contribute to the preservation of Big Sur's scenery.

5.4.2 General Policies

1. All development and use of the land whether public or private shall conform to all applicable policies of this LUPplan and shall meet the same resource protection standards.

The Big Sur River and Little Sur River Protected Waterway Management Plans are incorporated by reference into this planLUP. The goals, objectives and policies of the plans shall apply in those areas, as will all provisions of this LUPplan.

2. Development of any area of Big SurBig Sur Coastal Planning Area will be limited to uses for that area illustrated on the Land Use Pplan maps and to the use intensities described in the text and tables. Uses not shown on the plan-maps or described in the text will not be permitted.
3. Agriculture, passive recreation, and rural residential uses traditionally established in Big Sur are

⁵ Chappellet - Per Big Sur Valley South - Detail B (map).

⁶ Westmere - Per Big Sur LUP Section 5.4.3.E.2.

⁷ Inclusive of the 6 units allocated to Chappellet and the 24 units allocated to Westmere. There are 570 Visitor Accommodations units excluding Chappellet and Westmere.

Exhibit E

the most appropriate activities on private lands.

4. Land divisions in general are discouraged and are especially inappropriate on large ranches.
5. Existing parcels of record are considered buildable parcels and are suitable for development of uses consistent with the Land Use Plan maps provided all resource protection policies can be fully satisfied, there is adequate building areas of less than 30% cross slope, and they are not merged by provisions elsewhere in this planLUP.
6. Many types of land use found in other locations in the County are inappropriate to the Big Sur coast and are in conflict with the rural environment, the protection of natural resources, and the general peace of the area and are not therefore provided for in the planLUP. Among these uses are intensive recreational activities such as tennis, golf, cinemas, mechanized recreation, boating facilities, industrial development, manufacturing other than cottage industry or art production, on-shore or off-shore energy facilities, large scale mineral extraction or mining, oil extraction, commercial timber harvesting, and any non-coastally dependent industries. In general, any land use or development of a character, scale, or activity level inconsistent with the goals of preserving the coast's natural, undeveloped beauty and tranquility as well as protecting Highway 1 capacity will not be permitted.
7. Where areas are designated for watershed restoration in accordance with the procedures specified in Policy 3.4.3.C-2 of this planLUP, the County shall consider the objectives of the proposed restoration activities and limit development in such areas accordingly, regardless of the land uses proposed for the area in this planLUP.
8. It is the policy of the Monterey County of Monterey that lands in excess of thirty percent cross slope, located east of Highway 1, shall not be developed. Those portions of a parcel in this area that have a cross slope of thirty percent or more shall receive a density of one dwelling unit (d.u.) for 320 acres.

The calculation of residential development potential on property east of Highway 1 will be based on the following slope density formula:

<i>CROSS SLOPE</i>	<i>DWELLING UNIT/ACRE</i>
Under - 15%	1 - 40
18 - 30%	1 - 80
Over - 30%	1 - 320

Property west of Highway 1 may be developed at a density rate of 1 d.u. per 40 acres.

This policy does not apply to employee housing developed in Rural Community Centers.

Exhibit E

- 4.—9. The following density standards for inn unit development ~~were~~^{are} designed to allow up to 300 new visitor-serving lodge or inn units on the Big Sur Coast ~~beyond what existed in 1986,~~ based on protection of the capacity of Highway ~~One-1~~ to accommodate recreational use, the avoidance of overuse of areas of the coast, and the need for development to respect the rural character of the Big Sur Coast and its many natural resources. Out of the 300 new Visitor Accommodation units identified in the 1986 LUP, 113 new units have been approved or allocated. This includes 83 new approved units⁸ and 24 units allocated to Westmere and six units allocated to Chappellet. As such, 187 new Visitor Accommodation units remain. However, in 2023, Highway 1 is significantly over capacity and impacting all uses. Therefore, any application for an additional visitor-serving lodge or inn unit development must demonstrate it will not significantly increase demands on the limited capacity of Highway 1 to serve the visiting public.

The number of visitor-serving lodging units on any one site is limited to 30, reflecting the small scale character of the special Big Sur community. Two or more ~~clusters of visitor-serving lodging units~~^{facilities} on the same property shall not be contiguous (minimum separation 400 feet). ~~As specified in Table 1,~~ ^{The maximum inn unit density in the Rural Community Centers shall be one unit per acre, with a minimum parcel size of ten acres. In Rural Community Centers employee housing is a top priority, employee housing units may be developed in place of visitor-serving lodge or inn units at a maximum density of 1 unit per acre.}

In ~~other locations~~ ^{land use categories other than Rural Community Centers} where inn unit development is allowed ~~in the land use designations,~~ the number of allowable new inn units shall be two lodging units for each potential subdivision lot that is permanently retired by action of the applicant. An applicant must determine from Policy 5.4.2.8, above, the allowable residential density on land that can be further subdivided and then multiply that density times two to determine the allowable number of visitor-serving units. However, the maximum inn unit density allowance for any one ownership in the Watershed and Scenic Conservation land use designation shall not in any event exceed a net of 8 per existing parcel, which may be aggregated into clusters up to the maximum per site specified above. In land use categories other than Rural Community Centers where employee housing is allowed, employee housing is a top priority. In these land use categories employee housing units may be developed in place of visitor-serving lodge or inn units at the same maximum density allowed for visitor-serving lodge or inn units, per this policy.

10. Open space approved as a part of a development proposal shall be secured by a scenic easement, assuring its retention in perpetual open space or agricultural use. Fire fuel management activities authorized by the fire authority having jurisdiction shall be allowed within the easement as long as these activities remain consistent with the Critical Viewshed policy and the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection CAL FIRE General

⁸ These 83 units consist of 73 inn units built or permitted, plus 3 r.v. campground [campsite] units and 7 hostel beds [units].

Exhibit E

Guidelines, as may be periodically amended.

~~10.11.~~ ~~[deleted] Before any development (other than agricultural improvements and a hostel at the Pt. Sur lighthouse) is approved for the area adjacent to Naval Facility Pt. Sur, the Commanding Officer shall be consulted to insure that the proposed development will not constitute a hazard to military security. The area is defined as that area bounded by Highway One on the east, the first ridge south of the facility, and the Pt. Sur Lighthouse access road on the north, including the Pt. Sur Lighthouse Reservation and extending perpendicularly to the seaward limit of the coastal zone.~~

~~11.12.~~ Off-site advertising signs shall not be allowed.

On-site ~~a~~Advertising signs are only allowed in connection with commercial or visitor-serving uses, to a maximum 35 square feet. The size, design, materials, and location of all signs should be in keeping with the local character, appropriate for the intended use, and be subject to the ~~d~~Development pPermit pProcess. Materials shall be limited to those which are natural, including unpainted wood (except for lettering) and stone, whenever feasible. No exterior or interior neon plastic, moving, or flashing signs will be allowed.

Caltrans should not allow any private signs or advertising structures within the state right-of-way.

~~12.13.~~ A coastal development permit must be obtained for the removal of trees and other major vegetation. However, in the Big Sur Coastal Land Use Plan~~Coast~~ area the following will not be considered as removal of major vegetation:

- a. Removal of non-native or planted trees (including, but not limited to Monterey Pine, Monterey Cypress and Eucalyptus), except where this would result the exposure of structures in the Critical Viewshed;
- b. Removal of hazardous trees which pose an imminent danger to life or property, or threaten contagion of nearby forested areas, subject to verification by the County or California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection~~CAL FIRE~~;
- c. Thinning of small (less than 12" diameter) or dead trees from density forested areas, especially as needed to reduce unsafe fuel accumulations adjacent to existing occupied buildings; and,
- d. Prescribed burning, crushing, lopping or other methods of brush clearing which do not materially disturb underlying soils.

Exhibit E

e-e. Removal of dead vegetation and management of live vegetation to maintain defensible space around structures and infrastructure consistent with fire safety standards in state law and the Critical Viewshed policy.

Selective removal of trees may be permitted where consistent with the Forest Resources policies of this LUPPlan, provided that no impairment of the Ceritical Vviewshed or degradation of environmentally sensitive habitat areas will result. Where the removal of trees is part of a stand improvement project or similar long-term management effort, the submission of a Forest Management Plan for the site will be encouraged by the County; approval of such- plans pursuant to a coastal development permit will obviate the need for multiple permit requests on the same site.

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.
15. The takeoff and landing of Unmanned Aircraft Systems is prohibited in the Big Sur Coastal Planning Area, except under emergency circumstances (as further described below), due to its 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. Unmanned Aircraft Systems may be used for emergency medical, fire, or search and rescue purposes.
- 13;16. Special events of appropriate scale in this rural area may be considered event activities which involve assemblages of people which are to be held within the Big Sur Coastal Planning Area. Special events occurring in Rural Community Center and Commercial Facilities Outside a Rural Community Center shall require a Coastal Development Permit in each case and shall limit the noise that goes outside of the property line to ensure the preservation of the wild and scenic character of the Big Sur Coastal Planning Area. Further, all special events in Rural Community Center and Commercial Facilities Outside a Rural Community Center land use categories will be analyzed for potential impacts they may have to Highway 1. Special events in areas outside of Rural Community Centers and Commercial Facilities Outside of a Rural Community Center may be considered on a case by case basis if they adhere and comply with all other elements of this LUP in addition to the requirements of special events occurring in Rural Community Center and Commercial Facilities Outside of a Rural Community Center.

Exhibit E**5.4.3 Specific Policies****A. National Forest Lands**

1. The County ~~strongly~~ supports continued management of the Ventana Wilderness in ~~strict~~ adherence to the provisions of the Wilderness Act.
2. The County requests that the U.S. Forest Service give special attention in its planning and management of the Los Padres National Forest to the protection of the natural environment from recreational overuse and to the protection of adjacent residents from fire hazard and water pollution resulting from recreational use.
3. The County will consult with the U.S. Forest Service prior to the issuance of a coastal development permit for any parcel adjacent to the National Forest lands, roads, or access trails.
4. The "National Forest" land use designation may include some lands not currently managed by the U.S. Forest Service. Non-federal development within the "National Forest" land use designation will be subject to the policies for "Watershed and Scenic Conservation". Lands added to Los Padres National Forest outside the certified "National Forest" designation will not be redesignated without LUPPlan amendments.
- 4.5. Federal land management plans should address the impacts of visitors on the environment, acceptable levels of use, traffic flow and safety on Highway 1 and subsidiary roads, fire hazards, and the quality of visitor experience.

B. Agriculture

1. Agricultural resource protection policies presented in Chapter 3 provide the basic framework to guide agricultural activities and shall be considered in all development applications where existing or potential grazing land is concerned. Management of agricultural operations should be particularly sensitive to the protection of water quality and vegetation in riparian areas.
2. Aquaculture activities are considered agriculture uses and are generally compatible- with the goals of this LUPplan. Processing facilities will be carefully considered to assure compatibility with the area.

C. Development of New or Expanded Recreation and Visitor Serving Facilities

1. Development of recreation and visitor-serving facilities, including housing for employees, at locations suitable for such use is preferred over other types of development in Big Sur because of Big Sur's national significance as a recreation area.

Exhibit E

- ~~4.2.~~ Maintenance of the rustic, outdoor recreational character of Big Sur is emphasized. The expansion and development of recreation and visitor-serving facilities in Big Sur shall be of a scale and nature that is compatible with the natural and cultural character of the area while offering opportunities for visitors to experience and enjoy the beauty and inspiration that the Big Sur environment presents. Intensive recreational uses or facilities are not appropriate and shall not be permitted.

Compatible scale and character shall include limiting the number of visitor accommodation units as specified in 5.4.2.9 and shall limit such structures to two stories in height, subject to site constraints. Intensive visitor-serving projects (those over 5 units) will be required to enhance and/or provide public coastal recreational opportunities consistent with Coastal Act Sections 30212.5 and 30222 and all ~~Plan~~ policies in this LUP including but not limited to 4.1 and 3.2.1.

The provisions of this policy shall apply to policy 3, below, as well as all other relevant ~~LUP~~Plan policies.

- ~~2.3.~~ ~~The Soberanes Point, Garrapata State Park, the Brazil Ranch, and Andrew Molera State Park Beach, and the Little Sur River~~ areas ~~should be planned~~are only suited for low-intensity, ~~day-use~~ recreational development with minimal provision of facilities and consistent with the Critical Viewshed Policy in this LUP. The scenic and natural resources of these areas should be preserved in a natural state.

- ~~3.4.~~ Historical resource areas can offer interesting and attractive recreational opportunities~~—~~ for visitors to Big Sur. These areas shall be preserved for public recreational and educational use.

- ~~4.5.~~ The County encourages expansion and development of public and private recreation and visitor-serving facilities, including housing for employees, within existing areas of development. Accordingly, new development, or expansion of existing recreation and visitor-serving facilities in the Big Sur Valley, and at Lucia, Gorda, and Pacific Valley is generally acceptable provided resource protection policies can be met.

- ~~5.6.~~ Undeveloped areas in Big Sur shall generally be preserved for low intensity recreational use such as hiking and camping and nature study provided resource protection policies can be met. Only minimal alterations of Big Sur's existing natural environment and recreational character shall be allowed. Development of low intensity recreation uses and visitor-serving facilities are encouraged on the larger properties where this will assist in providing economic uses of the land and in meeting Coastal Act objectives for public recreation.

- ~~6.7.~~ Recreational and visitor-serving facility expansion and development proposals shall be evaluated on an individual basis. All proposals must demonstrate consistency with the ~~land-use plan~~LUP and environmental, visual, design and traffic constraints. Visitor-serving facilities may be approved on any size parcel meeting the standards listed in Table 1 and large enough to allow

Exhibit E

for the construction of needed employee housing, provide adequate sewage disposal and parking, and otherwise, satisfy the policies of this ~~plan~~LUP. Additional criteria for inn unit development include:

- a. Must have direct unshared access to Highway 1~~public road (not including Sycamore Canyon or Palo Colorado Roads)~~, or shared common access~~driveway~~ to Highway One~~1~~ with permission of all the other owners;
- b. Deed restrictions must be recorded to preclude rental or subdivision of the inn units as separate residential dwelling units; and
- ~~b.c.~~ Employee housing must be adequate for all proposed uses. Employee housing units shall not be used as visitor accommodations.

No portion of acreage necessary for one facility type shall be credited to a different facility type. For example, pursuant to Table 1, a 25-acre parcel in a Rural Community Center could have 25 inn units, or 50 rustic~~RV~~ campsites or 10 inn units and 30 rustic~~RV~~ campsites.

Inns shall provide at least one parking space per room. Free-standing restaurants (not part of an inn) shall provide at least one space per four seats or per 100 sq. ft. of both open and enclosed dining area, whichever is greater. In addition, adequate and separate employee parking shall be provided.

New free-standing restaurant development shall be limited to the Rural Community Centers and the sites specified in ~~Plan-LUP~~ policy 5.4.3.E-1. The maximum size for such new restaurant structures shall be that amount of space needed for a 120-seat enclosed dining room facility. Elsewhere, restaurants shall not be larger than required to serve the maximum size inn allowed on the parcel (generally, at the ratio of two seats per inn unit). Expansion of existing restaurant buildings shall be limited in scale to that which is in character with Big Sur, not to exceed a 10% expansion in area or an area sufficient for 120 dining room seats, whichever is greater.

7.8. Projects for new or extensively expanded recreation and visitor-serving facilities shall provide low-cost recreational facilities as part of the development. The establishment of low-cost hostels in Big Sur is encouraged as part of a comprehensive hostel system for the California coast.

8.9. Applicants for commercial developments changing the number of employees shall submit a profile of the number of expected employees. The profile shall indicate, in general ranges, the total number of employees, the number of employees housed on site, and the number of employees that need housing, the income of the prospective employees and other information that would allow for an assessment of the employee housing needs to be created by the development. An employee housing plan shall be submitted that indicates how the employer

Exhibit E

shall, as part of the development or otherwise, satisfy all, or a substantial portion of, the housing needs of the employees. The employee housing plan shall be implemented prior to or concurrently with the commercial development.

10. The County requests that State and Federal agencies prepare long range recreational development plans for areas under their jurisdiction. The County requests that these plans contain traffic components describing the portion of Highway 1 capacity required to serve the proposed recreational development, including public transportation potential. The County will seek to assure that approval of these plans will be made jointly and on a cooperative basis, by all agencies involved in the management of Highway 1. Environmental assessments will be required for all such proposals. Development of public and private recreational facilities will be phased as part of a recreational growth management program based on available highway capacity. Development standards for approval of recreational facilities and visitor-serving facilities on government lands shall be identical to those applied to private developments in Big Sur.
11. Short term transient use for thirty or fewer days whereby residents host visitors in their homes or on their properties for compensation shall only be allowed in permitted bed and breakfast facilities. Rental of units located within County-approved hotels, motels, hostels and bed and breakfasts shall not be considered short term transient use.
12. To address highway capacity, noise, safety and other potential environmental impacts, this LUP requires a Coastal Development Permit for assemblages of people for compensation.
- 9.13. Time share Projects are prohibited in the Big Sur Coastal Planning Area.

D. Recreation Management

1. Management of recreation uses in Big Sur shall emphasize the enjoyment of the natural scenic environment and shall preserve the rural, wilderness, and inspirational qualities for which the Big Sur coast is famous. A high standard of resource protection is required to maintain the valuable resources of the Big Sur coast in perpetuity.
2. Additional funding should be allocated by the State and Federal governments to manage and maintain existing public recreation areas before more public land is opened to recreational use by these same agencies.
3. Management policies for ~~o~~Outdoor ~~r~~Recreation areas shall be to limit levels of use in environmentally sensitive habitat areas and redirect recreational activities to other areas able to support anticipated use with minimal environmental impacts including Highway 1 capacity.

Exhibit E

4. Pleasure driving along scenic Highway 1 is the primary ~~a major~~ recreational activity. Public transit service to the coast should be expanded. Local transit service within Big Sur should be initiated to serve the visitors of State Parks, Los Padres National Forest facilities, and private recreation and visitor-serving facilities.
5. The California Department of Parks and Recreation and the U.S. Forest Service should reserve a portion of campground capacity for visitors arriving during non-peak traffic hours in order to distribute Highway 1 traffic destined for these areas more evenly throughout the day.
6. The County will cooperate with Caltrans, the California Department of Parks and Recreation, the Forest Service and San Luis Obispo County in establishing roadside visitor information centers near each end of the Big Sur coast. These centers will be for the convenience of travelers, will assist in reducing unnecessary traffic on Highway 1, and will help coordinate operation of private and public recreational facilities. The determination of appropriate information center sites will be coordinated with Caltrans as part of the Plan-LUP implementation.
7. Caltrans shall provide additional roadside restroom facilities located south of Big Sur Valley to serve visitors and the traveling public, consistent with Critical Viewshed and resource protection criteria. The determination of appropriate restroom locations will be coordinated with Caltrans as part of the Plan-LUP implementation.
8. Improvements to ~~the Bicentennial Highway 1 Bicycle Path~~ shall be completed where feasible ~~and the route shall be properly signed and marked to alert drivers and to~~ provide bicyclists extra protection.
9. Adequate public access shall be provided to recreational areas but all appropriate management measures should be used to discourage trespass. Site design and facility management should discourage trespass onto adjacent property.
10. Surfing and scuba diving are not encouraged due to hazardous conditions. Development of special facilities for these uses would be inappropriate.
11. The U.S. Forest Service may designate appropriate areas in the vicinity of Pacific Valley for hang-gliding and paragliding shall provide supervision to discourage ~~hang-gliding these activities~~ in areas that could endanger the safety of ~~recreationists hang-gliders~~ and the public. Hang-gliding and paragliding from or to private property shall be allowed only upon prior approval of the owner.
12. Off-road vehicle recreation ~~its~~ not an appropriate use in the Land Use Plan LUP area.

E. Commercial

Exhibit E

1. Development of new commercial uses serving community and visitor needs be directed to the existing Rural Community Centers of the Big Sur Valley, Lucia, Gorda, and Pacific Valley. Several commercial uses including the Rocky Point Restaurant, Big Sur Inn, and Coast Gallery, are currently found outside the Rural Community Centers designated on the land use map and these are considered conforming uses under ~~this~~ LUPlan. However, ~~-gasoline -service -stations,~~ general stores, or similar highway-oriented commercial structures shall not be allowed outside of the ~~R~~rural ~~C~~community ~~C~~centers.
2. Westmere, well known as the site of a lodge serving visitors to the northern portion of the Big Sur ~~c~~Coast, may re-establish the historic use as a lodge of 24 units that reflects the historic character of the site in design and scale. A specific development proposal for Westmere may request additional units subject to the limitations set forth in this LUPlan. In order to meet policies for the protection of the Critical Viewshed, the new lodge should use the original site which is hidden from public view. Overall visual restoration of the surrounding area under the same ownership, should be carried out as a condition of the development of the lodge, and public access to the beach at Rocky Creek should also be provided.
3. Commercial development shall carry out the rustic character of Big Sur both in size, scale, activities, and design.
4. Large scale commercial facilities that are unlike the existing character and size of facilities in Big Sur shall not be permitted.
5. Cottage ~~shop~~ industry and home occupations, defined as small-scale manufacturing of artistic or craft items, are encouraged as a traditional activity in the area. ~~They~~It shall be treated as an appropriate home occupation in any areas where residences are permitted and shall not be restricted to areas designated for commercial uses.
6. Commercial facilities shall be aimed at serving both local residents and the visiting public. ~~Businesses intended to serve solely local residents are discouraged.~~ No minimum site standards are established for commercial uses but adequate physical area must be available to meet parking requirements and natural resource concerns ~~must be available~~ before existing businesses can be expanded or new facilities can be approved.
7. Existing commercial facilities are encouraged to expand and improve existing buildings as a desirable means of meeting growth in demand. Scattered commercial uses not in Rural Community Centers may expand existing secondary uses provided such expansion is small in scale and clearly subordinate and incidental to the primary use.
8. Renewal of use permits for existing commercial uses or the establishment of new uses will require careful consideration of the impact of the use on surrounding land from a good neighbor point of

Exhibit E

view. Particularly where commercial activities are in proximity to residences, care must be taken to ensure that noise or visual modification do not affect the peace and tranquility of existing neighbors.

9. New commercial uses or expansion of existing uses will be evaluated for their impact on traffic safety and highway capacity in the area. Parking shall be screened from public views from Highway ~~One~~1 and should in no event create hazards for motorists or pedestrians.
10. Commercial development which would enhance recreational use of public lands existing nearby by providing specific physical improvements (e.g. trail links, interpretive facilities) or management (e.g. ranger, fire control, contribution of funds to a public management agency), or development which includes specific improvements to public access to the shoreline and the surrounding lands shall be preferred.
11. Existing and permitted visitor-serving uses will be protected from encroachment by incompatible uses ~~(such as residences)~~ which might hamper their future ability to expand or improve consistent with Policy 5.4.3.E-7.

Conversion of existing low cost overnight accommodations to other uses, unless replaced with comparable facilities, will not be permitted.

F. *Public/Quasi-Public*

1. A range of public and quasi-public services are present in Big Sur and serve both the local community and visitors. These include, or have included in the past, churches, two elementary schools, volunteer fire protection, County library, post office, Big Sur Grange Hall, ambulance service, State Park and Forest Service management facilities, and public agency radio repeaters, flood monitors and navigational aids. These should continue to be concentrated in the Big Sur Valley, Pacific Valley, Lucia, and Gorda but should be upgraded based on present need and future growth.
2. In general, improvements should be made in the level of public services available in Big Sur. Permanent buildings should be constructed for the U.S. Post Office and the County Branch Library. Other facilities needed include a fire station to protect against structural fires and to augment the volunteer companies, a public meeting hall to reduce pressure on the Big Sur Grange Hall, and an emergency clinic with ambulance service. Where practical, such uses should be clustered or co-located to minimize impacts.
3. The existing elementary schools in the Big Sur Valley and at Pacific Valley are expected to be adequate for some time. Increased classroom needs should be accommodated at these locations rather than new sites.

Exhibit E

4. Like other uses, public and quasi-public uses must meet strict resource protection and environmental criteria. Such facilities shall not be constructed in primary floodplains.

G. Rural Residential

1. Subdivision of large undeveloped or agricultural properties for residential purposes is strongly discouraged. Clustering of residential units on large undivided properties at this rate is preferred to subdivision creating separate parcels.
2. Development in designated rural residential areas shall continue to be limited to residential uses in order to protect residents from unwanted intrusion by other incompatible activities and because neither available vacant land, water, nor roads are adequate to support more intensive uses.
3. Reconstitution of parcels or mergers may be required for any area of the coast where past land divisions have resulted in parcels being unusable under current standards or where cumulative impacts on coastal resources require limitations on further development. Parcel mergers shall be based on the following criteria:
 - (a) The minimum buildable parcel shall be one acre;
 - (b) Each parcel must contain a suitable septic and drainfield location on slopes less than 30%, and must be able to meet Regional Water Quality and County stream setback and septic system requirements; and
 - (c) Each parcel must conform to all Plan-LUP policies for residential development on existing parcels.
4. Merger provisions shall apply to Garrapatos Redwoods Subdivision.

H. Residential Subdivision

1. Subdivision of land for residential use is preferred in areas which are in proximity to existing developed areas able to accommodate further development. "Developed areas" shall mean those areas indicated as such on the land-use planLUP map as Rural Residential or Rural Community Center. Subdivisions of land not in proximity to existing developed areas should generally be discouraged until a development pattern for the surrounding area has been established and the proposed subdivision is shown to be compatible with that development pattern. The County shall adopt guidelines in the implementation of this plan-LUP for determining the relevant surrounding area of a proposed subdivision and the establishment of a development pattern for the surrounding area.

Exhibit E

2. Subdivision layouts shall be encouraged that vary from conventional subdivision standards if the proposed innovations in design better meet the policies and intent of the Coastal Act and this ~~plan~~LUP.
3. Density rates, as specified in ~~policy~~Policy 5.4.2.8 and Table 1 shall not be meant to define the minimum lot size where clustering is proposed. However, restrictions shall be applied to ensure that the density rate is not exceeded by additional divisions of the original parcel, and in no event shall any new parcel be less than one acre in size.
4. Resubdivisions and lot line adjustments are encouraged when no new developable lots are created and when ~~plan~~LUP policies are better met by this action.
5. Non-contiguous parcels shall be included within the scope of the resubdivision policy. Lots served by Highway 1 north of Hurricane Pt. may be retired in favor of increased density south of the Point.

I. Low and Moderate Income Housing

The County is required by State laws mandating the Housing Element of the General Plan, to provide programs to increase the availability of low and moderate income housing. ~~The following policies which are based on the goals of the adopted County Housing Element reflect those actions that will be most effective for the Big Sur coast.~~

1. The County shall protect existing affordable housing in the Big Sur coastal ~~area~~ from loss due to deterioration, conversion or any other reason. Additionally, the County shall promote the development of long term rental housing. The County shall:
 - a) Require replacement, on a one-for-one basis, of all demolished units which were affordable to low and moderate income households. However, prior to demolition of any residence, an historical evaluation shall be made to determine if the structure has historical significance. Historically significant structures shall not be demolished.
 - b) Promote rehabilitation and weatherization of housing units owned or rented by low and moderate income households.
 - c) Study relaxation of building code requirements and if appropriate adopt minimum building code regulations for the rehabilitation of older housing units.
 - d) Replacement affordable housing units shall be retained as low and moderate income units through deed restrictions or other enforceable mechanisms.

Exhibit E

- e) Allow non-traditional housing types such as single-room occupancy units, modular housing, and yurts for long term housing.
- f) Provide an expedited and cost effective process for rehabilitation to meet minimum health and safety standards of substandard and/or illegal units to use for long term housing.
- g) Encourage geographic dispersion of long term rental housing by allowing accessory dwelling units.
- ~~d)h)~~ Encourage residential long-term rental housing on private properties through contracts with businesses.

2. The County shall encourage the expansion of housing opportunities for low and moderate income households. The County shall:

- a) Work cooperatively with Big Sur residents desiring to construct hand-made houses of original design, utilizing native materials. The County encourages this as a contribution to the coast's culture and will assist residents in insuring these designs meet minimum necessary health and safety standards.
- b) Require that as a condition of all permits related to additions to existing public or private visitor facilities or the construction of new facilities that employee housing be constructed on-site, or in the ~~immediate~~-vicinity, and be made available to low and moderate income employees in accordance with Policy C-9 of this section. Such housing must be provided prior to or concurrent with the proposed development, and must be permanently linked to the visitor-serving use through appropriate binding guarantees. Maximum size per newly-constructed employee housing unit (other than dormitories) shall be 850 square feet. The maximum number of such new housing units shall not exceed one per inn unit or one per six restaurant seats.
- c) Encourage the use of accessory dwelling unit as an appropriate means of providing affordable housing for caretakers, ranch hands, convalescent help, and domestic employees. Detached accessory dwelling units shall not exceed 1,200 square feet in size. Subdivisions shall not be permitted to divide a principal residence from a accessory dwelling units. Only one accessory dwelling unit shall be allowed on the parcel. All such units shall be considered as part of the residential buildout allowed by this ~~plan~~LUP.

A total of 50 such units may be allowed in the area of the ~~Big Sur Land Use Plan~~LUP.

Exhibit E

- d) Additional agricultural employee housing is permitted at the rate of one dormitory/bunkhouse per ranch, consistent with all other ~~Plan~~ LUP policies.
- e) If a project qualifies for a density bonus under Government Code Section 65915, the density bonuses shall be granted unless the additional density sought by the applicant cannot feasibly be accommodated on the site in a manner that, for reasons other than density, is in conformity with this ~~plan~~ LUP.

J. Second Structures

- 1. Detached or attached guest-rooms are not to be equipped for permanent living and are not considered residences. They shall be permitted at the maximum rate of one (either attached or detached) per parcel or one (either attached or detached) for each principal residence providing the constraints of the parcel and other ~~plan~~ LUP policies permit. Furthermore, detached guest rooms shall be located in close proximity to the principal residence, share the same utilities except where prohibited by public health, contain no kitchen or cooking facilities, and be to 425 square feet. Conditions shall be implemented by covenants, conditions, and restrictions ~~CC & Rs~~ or other legal restrictions, including revocation provisions for non-conformance. Subdivisions shall not be permitted to divide a principal residence from a guest room.
- 2. Studios and other small non-residential and non-commercial accessory structures such as tool sheds, workshops, or barns may be permitted on any size parcel provided the constraints of the parcel and other ~~plan~~ LUP policies permit. None of these units shall ever be used for habitation purposes. For structures whose design does not preclude habitation, legal restrictions shall be applied in the same manner as described in Policy 5.4.3.J-1 above.

K. Private Roads Outside the Critical -Viewshed

- 1. New private roads may be permitted only where:
 - a) The proposed new road is appropriate for the establishment, continuation or expansion of Coastal Act priority use; or
 - b) The proposed new road is essential for basic residential access, and no reasonable alternative exists; or
 - c) The proposed new road provides a superior alternative to an existing road in carrying out the policies of this ~~Plan~~ LUP.
- 2. New private roads shall meet all the following criteria, in addition to meeting all other resource protection policies of this ~~Plan~~ LUP:

Exhibit E

- a) Such roads shall be able to accommodate emergency vehicles, particularly fire equipment, while permitting residents to evacuate the area.
 - b) Appropriate planting of exposed slopes and submittal of detailed drainage and erosion control plans shall be conditions for issuance of a permit for such roads.
 - c) A qualified biologist shall certify that any environmentally sensitive habitats present will not be harmed.
 - d) A qualified engineer shall certify that potential erosion impacts from road construction shall be adequately mitigated (i.e., the proposed road construction will not induce landsliding or significant soil creep, nor increase existing erosion rates). Mitigation measures shall not include massive grading or excavation or the construction of protective devices that would substantially alter natural landforms.
 - e) New roads across slopes of 30 percent or greater shall not be allowed unless:
 - 1. No feasible alternative exists; and
 - 2. The proposed design of the road on balance better achieves the- overall resource protection objectives of this PlanLUP.
3. The County shall require 12-foot width for roads serving new residential development, including both minor subdivisions and isolated single-family dwellings. Narrower residential roads should be allowed only where adequate turnouts are provided at frequent intervals to the satisfaction of the Department of ForestryCAL FIRE and the U.S. Forest Service, where applicable. Greater roadway widths may be necessary to accommodate clustering of residential units, or where non- residential use is permitted, provided that all criteria of Policy 2 above are met. The standards for private rural roads set forth in the County's Subdivision OrdinanceTitle 19 and Chapter 16.80 of the Monterey County Code should serve as guidelines for road requirements.

L. *Big Sur Valley*

- 1. Special attention shall be given to the Big Sur Valley as the community center as well as a center of recreational activity on the Big Sur coast. Policies of this plan-LUP concerning recreation and commercial development, public and quasi-public uses, hazards, and traffic shall be carefully considered in all development proposals in the Valley. Of special concern for sites having highway frontage is whether the highway access is unsafe for the principal use, and for parcels without frontage, whether the access is unsafe for the principal use and the site is of adequate size to accommodate a viable principal use.

Exhibit E

2. Outdoor Recreation, Recreation and Visitor-Serving Commercial uses, and Public and Quasi-Public uses, shall be the principal uses in the Valley since the available space for these necessary activities is very limited. Residential development will be considered appropriate on sites not suitable for these uses.
3. Offices and related service buildings of the Department of Parks and Recreation and the U.S. Forest Service shall be grouped together on an integrated site with permanent, aesthetically-pleasing buildings. Parking areas for these facilities, and the existing trailhead parking lot for the Ventana Wilderness, shall be screened from public view to the maximum possible extent through careful siting and the use of vegetative screening.
4. Visual emphasis for development in the Big Sur Valley should be on tasteful, rustic design using natural materials and careful siting of structures to meet scenic protection objectives rather than the criteria of non-visibility. This policy variation is needed because of the importance of the area as a recreation destination point and because development is already visible.
5. Traffic congestion, recreational overuse with associated environmental impacts, increased levels of activity and noise, and limitations on available water to serve new or expanded uses, all point to the need for special care in planning for the growth of the Big Sur Valley. County policy will be to avoid construction of sewer systems and treatment plants to serve development in the Big Sur Valley, unless pollution of the Big Sur River requires this step.
6. The 100-year floodplain of the Big Sur River poses considerable limitations on development in the Valley. No additional permanent structures shall be permitted to be built in the floodplain. Campgrounds or similar outdoor recreational uses are most appropriate in this hazardous area.
7. The County encourages both public and private interests to undertake work to restore riparian vegetation, improve stream channel conditions, and reduce impacts of concentrated use along the lower Big Sur River. These needs are discussed more fully in the management plan for the Big Sur River which will serve as an additional guide to development and use of the lower river area. The management plan for the Big Sur River is on file at the County Planning Department in Salinas.
8. The Big Sur Valley policies apply only in the Rural Community Center and Outdoor Recreation land use designations.

K. Development of Large Properties and Ranches

1. The development of properties of 320 acres or greater, for uses other than agricultural structures or a single residence, shall require submittal of an overall development and management plan for the property. The plan shall indicate all long range uses contemplated on the property. Areas proposed for development of residences, visitor-serving facilities or low intensity recreational

Exhibit E

uses shall be clearly delineated and areas to be retained for grazing, and open space and habitat protection, and public access shall be indicated. All proposed roads shall be shown. The plan shall contain a description of how development will be phased over time.

2. Because ~~A~~gricultural and ~~R~~ecreational uses most closely conform to the priorities of the Coastal Act, the County encourages plans that emphasize these uses. The County will assist private landowners of large properties in the preparation of development plans that increase the viability of ~~agricultural~~ Agricultural and ~~recreational~~ Recreational uses and that will help sustain the property in an undivided state over the long term.
3. Residential subdivision is discouraged in favor of clustering residential uses at locations on the property that create minimal disruption of existing or potential ~~agricultural~~ Agricultural uses, and that retain the balance of the property in an undivided interest between the new owners.
4. Owners of large properties are encouraged to take advantage of tax benefits that can result through working with non-profit conservation agencies or trusts, such as the Big Sur Land Trust, the Nature Conservancy, the Trust for Public Lands, and the California Coastal Conservancy. The County will assist large property owners in voluntarily securing agricultural, conservation, and scenic easements on their property to reflect the low intensity development appropriate in rural areas.

N. Water Resource Study Areas

1. Applications requiring development or intensification of water use shall be permitted in watershed study areas designated in Section 3.4.3 only as provided by the policies of that section.

O. Recommendations

1. The County recognizes that full development of vacant parcels in the rural residential areas may be undesirable or unfeasible because of various resource limitations. Detailed planning review of areas with known or anticipated problems should be completed within the next few years in order to assist residents and property owners in finding acceptable solutions. Master environmental impact statements are one tool that could be used. In the Sycamore Canyon and Pfeiffer Ridge areas, for example, studies should be directed to resolving fire protection, water supply, and traffic congestion issues. Palo Colorado Canyon appears to contain more vacant parcels than the available water supply can serve.

Exhibit E

6. *PUBLIC ACCESS*

6.1 *INTRODUCTION*

Shoreline accessways and upland trails are essential components of the public access system on the Big Sur coast. Both are important to the public enjoyment and appreciation of Big Sur's scenic qualities and wilderness character.

In recognition of its spectacular beauty and other unique qualities, this part of Highway 1 has been designated an All-American Road and has received national and even international acclaim. This honor is afforded by the National Scenic Byways Program to those few highways in America that are so distinctive as to be considered experiences unto themselves. The use of Highway 1 by the public is primarily for scenic travel. Accordingly, visual access should be emphasized and protected for the Big Sur coast as an appropriate response to the needs of visitors.

Many of the most suitable locations for physical access are already in public ownership or have been traditionally used by the public. These areas need to be protected and managed for continued public use and enjoyment. The lack of adequate management of existing access areas has led to a decline in the quality of natural resources as well as the visual experience and has created hazards to public safety and danger of fires. Additionally, increasing incidents of vandalism and damage to resources from public use have contributed to private landowners' reluctance to permit public use of trails through their property. While new locations may be suitable for access and the opportunities for increasing access must not be lost, provision of adequate management must be a requirement to any additional access.

This ~~plan~~ LUP sets forth policies and actions to protect, provide, and manage public access in order to enhance the visitor experience while assuring preservation of the coast's environmental quality. The intent of these recommendations is to use the existing system as much as possible, and to improve existing but deteriorated trails, where needed, to provide more evenly distributed access. This approach minimizes both the visual and environmental impacts associated with construction and use of new trails and the conflicts involved in providing a new trail access through a multitude of private ownerships. Cooperation between the County, public management agencies, local landowners, and the community are essential to the implementation of the Access Element.

Strong policies are set forth in this LUP to safeguard the County's high priority – visual access by the millions of visitors who drive Highway 1. If carried out, they should preserve the scenic magnificence of the area for present and future generations.

The following discussion provides more detailed information on shoreline access and upland trails.

Exhibit E**6.1.1 Shoreline Access**

The public's right to shoreline access is ensured by the State Constitution and provisions of the California Coastal Act. In the past, the County and other public agencies have sought to provide access, where suitable, along the Big Sur coast. The visual experience has been the most traditional and most dominant form of access along the coast. Therefore, preservation of visual resources is an overriding goal in planning for Big Sur.

The spectacular scenic quality of the Big Sur coast is, in large part, due to the rugged topography and undeveloped nature of the area. Steep cliffs and bluffs lead to rocky shorelines punctuated by seasonal pocket beaches. A few wide sandy beaches are concentrated in less steep terrain along the coast. In general, access to most of the shoreline is difficult and hazardous. Access destinations of suitable size, safety, and distance from sensitive habitats are found irregularly along the coast. Much of the coast is suitable only for visual rather than physical access.

At ~~least~~approximately half of the shoreline is in public ownership. Presently the following locations in public ownership provide shoreline access: Garrapata State Park, Andrew ~~J.~~ Molera State Park, Pfeiffer Beach, Limekiln Creek, Partington Cove, J.P. Burns State Park, Kirk Creek, Mill Creek, Sand Dollar Beach, Jade Cove, Pacific Valley Shoreline, Willow Creek, Cape San Martin, and Alder Creek.

At the time of the 1986 LUP, ~~t~~The following sites ~~were~~are in private ownership with existing public use, although the legality of such use ~~was~~is not always clear: Malpas Creek, Garrapata Beach, Rocky Point to Rocky Creek, Bixby Creek, Hurricane Point, Little Sur River, Little Sur to Point Sur, Swiss Canyon, Fuller's Beach, Big Creek, Gamboa Point, and Vicente Creek. A private campground ~~was~~is operated at Limekiln Creek, with beach access available for a fee. The shoreline from Soberanes Point to Garrapata Beach and the Little Sur River ~~was~~is slated for acquisition by the State Department of Parks and Recreation.

As of the 2023 LUP, Garrapata State Park and Limekiln were acquired by the State Department of Parks and Recreation.

At the time of the 1986 LUP, ~~i~~n northern Big Sur, in the area between Malpas Creek and ~~Molera Park experiences heavy visitor use: the highest incidence of public access over private lands occurs here. In central Big Sur, from Molera Park to J. P. Burns Park (16 miles), there were~~are four public coastal access points. Currently, additional public acquisitions at Garrapata State Park have provided additional public coastal access points. This area experiences the greatest concentration of hiking, camping and overnight use. At the time of the 1986 LUP, ~~t~~The coast between Anderson Canyon and Limekiln Creek (14 miles) is for the most part privately-owned, and is characterized by extremely steep topography that limits access. Currently, Limekiln State Park provides additional public access. The major portion of the south coast, from Limekiln to the San Luis Obispo County line (21 miles), is in the National Forest with various improved access points. In general, unrestricted shoreline access exists on these lands. Unfortunately, access is largely unmanaged on these lands and has led to erosion,

Exhibit E

accidents and injuries, rampant illegal camping, wildfires such as the devastating Soberanes Fire, pervasive trash, human waste, destruction of native flora and fauna and proliferation of invasive plants. Due to steep, unstable slopes, visual access is the only reasonable response to the need for public access for much of this area. This area is a high priority for maintenance, preservation and restoration to address these problems.

Access trails outside of the National Forest tend to be informal and hazardous. Parking lots are provided at the State Park units and developed Forest Service beaches. Parking is available at two scenic overlooks, Abalone Cove and Vista Point, both of which are paved turnouts maintained by Caltrans. At the other shoreline destinations, parking is available only at unpaved pullouts. Many of these locations are hazardous and should be reviewed for safety for pedestrians and vehicles.

Many access sites along the coast have experienced degradation from unmanaged use or overuse. Unplanned and unmaintained trails have led to trampling of vegetation, soil compaction, and visual scarring of the bluffs. Problems of litter and sanitation as well as the issues outlined above occur all along Highway 1 and at beaches in private ownership with frequent public use. The impact of all of this is the lessening of the quality of the recreational experience for the visitors, as well as degradation of fr the natural resources of the coastline.

Though the County recognizes the increasing public demand for access to the Big Sur coast, it also recognizes the importance of preserving the fragile natural environment and the quality of visitor experience. A range of additional concerns, including the need to ensure public safety and to protect the rights of residents and landowners must be resolved. County's objective then, is to plan for public shoreline access and ensure balance between these considerations. The proposals in this chapter are aimed at meeting these many requirements. Combined with an active implementation program, they should do much to effect an optimum degree of public shoreline access. Beyond the policies presented here, the Shoreline Access background report makes recommendations for specific improvements needed at various access locations. These should be used as a guide by the County and other agencies when actual improvements are initiated.

6.1.2 Trails

Trails provide both recreational opportunities for the hiker, equestrian, and bicyclist, as well an alternative form of transportation to recreational areas. Public access to scenic and remote areas not served by roads can be obtained sometimes by trail. Most of the trails in Big Sur are located within Los Padres National Forest and California State Parks. The general policy of the U.S. Forest Service is to permit public access throughout the forest, and there is a network of ~~maintained~~ trails and backpacking camps. Some of the trails and ~~dirt~~ roads leading into the forest, cross private lands, and do not currently have full public right-of-way through these sections.

Today there are fewer miles of maintained trails than in former years. Over time, many traditional trails have been abandoned or closed to public use. Additional trails have been added as land has been acquired by public agencies. Most of the trails are not maintained~~Some of the trails in the National~~

Exhibit E

~~Forest are not maintained because they cross private lands with no legal rights-of-way.~~ Prior to the construction of Highway 1, a trail existed along the length of the Big Sur coast, along the present alignment of the highway. The Old Coast Road is part of this early coastal trail.

~~O~~According to the Big Sur Unit Forest Management Plan, over 100 miles of trails exist within the Big Sur portion of the Los Padres National Forest. Hiking is the major activity, but hunting, fishing, and horseback riding are also popular. Portions of the Ventana Wilderness are also located within or adjacent to the Coastal Zone. The U.S. Forest Service is concerned that overuse has damaged wilderness qualities in portions of the Ventana Wilderness, for example, through overuse of existing access along the Big Sur River. The U.S. Forest Service is encouraging the provision of additional access points or trails into the wilderness to help alleviate this problem. While this approach will disperse use, it will exacerbate safe and effective management challenges.

Andrew Molera, Pfeiffer Big Sur and Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Parks contain trails within the park units. In addition to providing pedestrian circulation within the parks themselves, some of these trails could assist in providing improved access to public forest lands east of the ~~highway~~Highway 1.

In the section of the coast from Malpas Creek to the Big Sur Valley, the Los Padres National Forest boundary is several miles east of Highway 1. At present, trail access to the National Forest from the highway is through private lands. Some trails have informal rights-of-way used by the U.S. Forest Service and there are a few trails which have historically been used by the public. Access through private lands is often arranged between the landowners and organized groups, particularly hiking or nature study clubs.

~~When the 1986 LUP was adopted, t~~The idea of a Pacific Coast trail system along the length of the California coast is not new~~was being considered.~~ The State of California Trails Plan recommended such a trail network, and the Monterey County Trails Plan proposed this for the Big Sur area. Specific alignments ~~were have never been developed.~~ In 2001, SB 908 was enacted to establish the California Coastal Trail from the Oregon border to Mexico. The specific alignment through the Big Sur Coastal Planning Area is being developed using a community-based planning process as shown on the Big Sur Coast Local Coastal Program Trails Plan. A continuous trail system in a north-south direction would offer a unique recreational experience for both the coastal visitor and resident.

~~E~~The only existing trails paralleling the coast are in Garrapata State Park, the Old Coast Road, Andrew Molera State Park, along the beach or adjacent bluffs, and the Coast Ridge Road. The Coast Ridge Road is a jeep road which begins near Ventana Inn south of the Big Sur Valley, and extends to the southern boundary of the County with a few interruptions. Several trails connect Highway 1 to the Coast Ridge Road along its length.

There is an overall need to improve the coastal trail system, including increased trail access to the National Forest particularly to relieve areas of existing overuse. Where improvements are made, they should be coupled with a management program to protect affected public and private resources.

Exhibit E

The Trails Map illustrates the trails that are recommended to provide major links to public lands. Only major trails are shown. Other trails exist on private lands but may not provide links to public recreation areas. In some cases, provision of new trails may pose problems with respect to acquiring rights-of-way or conflict with private land use. These are not shown on the map.

The corridor concept reflected on the proposed Trail Plan is often used in planning trails in preference to precise trail alignments. In cases where no trail presently exists, planning for trail corridors preserves flexibility to determine the most suitable alignments for trail improvements at the time such opportunities become available. In all cases, including where specific trails already exist, the corridor concept reflects the need to consider the interrelationship of the trail and its use by the public and adjacent existing or proposed land uses. By planning for the trail as a corridor the range of possible impacts can be anticipated and properly considered.

Some public trails exist in Big Sur within the State Parks and National Forest that are not shown in the Trail Plan^{here}. These are trails which are not major corridors or do not have trailheads in the coastal zone. They can be easily found in Park and Forest Service maps, and trails guide for the area.

Trails through future park lands should be provided only after the land is acquired and opened for public use. For public trails presently crossing private lands, State Parks and Recreation or the Forest Service should obtain full legal rights-of-way, including management and maintenance arrangements.

Some trails are open to organized groups on a reservation basis only, such as the loop interpretive trail now owned by the State as part of Landels-Hill Big Creek Reserve. The plan proposes that this practice continue and be expanded as a means of ensuring protection of sensitive natural resources or avoiding undesirable conflicts with private uses while still accommodating public access. Private trails can be opened to the public on a fee basis in conjunction with low intensity recreation facilities allowed on private lands. Trails easements may be required as part of the subdivision or zoning process where appropriate. In some instances, private trails may be opened to the public through trail easements. These should be pursued where the trail would be of public benefit.

6.1.3 Key Policy

The rights of access to the shoreline, public lands, and along the coast, and opportunities for recreational hiking access, shall be protected, encouraged and enhanced as well as appropriately funded and managed for adequate maintenance and public safety. No new public access shall be allowed, other than visual access and the California Coastal Trail, until existing public trails are properly restored, maintained, secured, and managed, and sanitation facilities and security are provided. This should assure an orderly, balanced utilization and conservation of Coastal Zone resources.

Yet because preservation of the natural environment is the highest priority, all future access must be consistent with this objective. Care must be taken that while providing public access, the beauty of the coast, its tranquility and the health of its environment are not marred by public overuse or carelessness. The protection of visual access should be emphasized throughout Big Sur as an appropriate response

Exhibit E

to the needs of recreationists. Visual access shall be maintained by directing all future development including trails out of the viewshed. The protection of private property rights must always be of concern.

6.1.4 General Policies

1. Overall, the best locations -for public access to the shoreline, public lands and along the coast are already in use or have been used in the past. Major public access areas, ~~whether in public or private ownership~~, shall be permanently protected for long term public use. These should be improved and managed properly by designated public or private agencies; furthermore, the County will require the preparation and implementation of access management plans for all accessways on the property or within the Park unit before new locations are opened on any particular ownership. Such access management plans shall address intensity of use, parking, protection of fragile coastal resources, maintenance, etc.
2. Other areas suitable for public access should also be protected for such use. At such time as new access is provided, or existing access is formalized or increased, an appropriate public agency must assume management responsibility for public use, or agreements concerning such responsibility must be reached with landowners. Any new public access shall utilize only existing public lands or existing public easements over private land or land voluntarily offered for trail use.
3. Access should be discouraged as inappropriate where it would be inconsistent with public safety, military security or the protection of fragile coastal resources. The County and other public agencies should cooperate with landowners to develop effective methods to direct access to appropriate locations.
4. Visual access should be protected for long term public use. The development of scenic viewpoints in conjunction with accessways or where physical access is not appropriate is encouraged.
5. Bluff top and lateral access is appropriate in many areas along the coast. These opportunities shall be protected for long term public use, subject to adequate management programs, the development of which is an implementation activity.
6. Trails should be located in areas able to sustain public use without damage to scenic and natural resources or other conflicts. Therefore, new and existing trails should be sited or rerouted to avoid safety hazards, sensitive habitats, and incompatible land uses.
7. The provision of new access or formalization of existing access is to be guided by detailed management plans, including implementation responsibilities. These should include community ideas and desires to guarantee quality land preservation, be consistent with Coastal Act policies, and must attempt to positively resolve access conflicts with residential land uses. It is the

Exhibit E

County's policy to work closely with local citizen advisors and public agencies in planning for access and management.

8. Access for scientific study of the shoreline or upland areas should also be made available, and the County encourages private landowners to permit such access if requested. Scientific use of public or private lands, particularly where specimen collecting is intended, should be in conformance with policies in Section 3.3 of this planLUP. Where appropriate, scientific access easements will be required for new developments in areas needing study as defined by the Environmentally Sensitive Habitat section of the PlanLUP.
9. In providing for access, the County seeks to ensure that the rights of residents and property owners, including their peace, privacy, safety, health, and property are not jeopardized by unmanaged, inappropriate (as defined in policy 6.1.4.3), or irresponsible public access.
- 9.10. The California Coastal Trail through the Big Sur Coastal Planning Area shall be aligned consistent with the community-based planning process as shown in the Big Sur Coast Local Coastal Program Trails Plan. The alignment of the California Coastal Trail through Big Sur shall be planned, constructed, managed and maintained consistent with the community-based planning process.

6.1.5 *Specific Policies*

A. *Shoreline Access Priorities*

1. ~~The first~~ priority shoreline access locations are those major access areas presently in active use. These areas should be retained for long term public use. They should be improved and managed properly consistent with an approved management plan before they new locations are opened to increased formal public access by their owners. Priority ~~1~~ areas are: Rocky Point (B), Garrapata State Park, Doud Acquisition, Little Sur Beach, Hurricane Point (B), Andrew Molera State Park, Pfeiffer Beach, Partington Cove, anyon and MeWay Canyon in Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Park (B), Limekiln Creek State Park, Kirk Creek, Mill Creek, Pacific Valley (B), Sand Dollar, Jade Cove, Willow Creek, ove, Alder Creek and Villa Creek. (B: Bluff top access only).
2. ~~The second priority for improvement of public accessways should be placed on areas that have ample beaches, minimal public safety hazards, and either absence of sensitive habitats or habitats that can be protected from adverse impacts. Priority 2 areas are: Kasler Point, Rocky Point (B)*, Palo Colorado (B), Bixby Creek, Point Sur, False Sur, Swiss Canyon, and Gamboa Beach.~~
3. ~~The third priority for improvement of public accessways should be placed on areas that have attractive destinations where safety hazards or resource conflicts can be mitigated, and with~~

Exhibit E

~~potential for improved parking. Priority 3 access areas are: Otter Cove, south Palo Colorado area shoreline (B), Rocky Creek, Hurricane Point (B), Castro Grimes, Anderson Landing area (including John Little State Reserve), Dolan Creek area, Big Creek beach, Lopez Point (B), Lucia and Wild Cattle Creek.~~

~~* (B): Bluff top access only.~~

- ~~1.~~ Some areas of the Big Sur coast are not appropriate (as defined in policy 6.1.4.3) for formalized public access. ~~Until further studies justify the need and suitability for access to the shoreline at Wreck Beach, Coastlands, Grimes Partington, Dolan Creek canyon, Vista Point, Vicente Creek, and Salmon Creek, such access should be discouraged.~~ As development proposals are submitted within these areas, the suitability for access shall be reviewed and determined on a case by case basis.
- ~~12.~~ The County shall actively support efforts to mitigate hazardous traffic and parking along Highway 1, and to deter illegal access.

B. *Providing and Managing Shoreline Access*

1. The County will work with appropriate agencies to properly maintain and manage ward acquisition or other methods to secure legal access to those areas identified as priorities ~~1, 2 or 3 which do not have formal access arrangements.~~ The priority locations listed above are all presently in active use and will, when properly maintained and managed, provide adequate shoreline access to the visiting public.
2. The County will require provision of shoreline access, where appropriate, as ~~part of~~ development applications. Permit conditions will include either dedication of ~~accessways~~ through the donation of land, easements, or the payment of in-lieu fees.

Dedications of access easements or offers thereof to an appropriate public agency or private foundation will be required in all locations fronting the shoreline as a condition of new development (except those developments listed in Section 30212(b) of the Coastal Act) unless vertical or lateral access is found to be inappropriate due to conflicts with Critical Viewshed, fragile coastal resources, military security, public safety or agriculture--and such conflicts can not be reduced through siting or design alternatives or through mitigation measures including special methods of managing public access. Also, vertical access will not be required if adequate access to the same shoreline destination already exists nearby. Trail easements and offers shall be as specified by Policy 6.1.6.3 or where a specific location is known, no less than 10 feet in width. On dry sand and rocky beaches, lateral access easements or offers to dedicate such easements shall be required over the entire beach area to the toe of the coastal bluff, or absent such bluff, to the first line of terrestrial vegetation. Easements or dedications shall be free of prior liens or encumbrances, except for tax liens. All such dedications or offers shall be subject to review by County Counsel prior to recording. Only those forms of shoreline access (vertical, lateral, blufftop, visual) which are suitable for the site need be required. Suitable forms of access for the most prominent locations along the Big Sur shoreline are listed in Table 2 of this PlanLUP. Offers must be for a period

Exhibit E

of 25 years, but access will be developed and opened to public use only in accordance with Plan-LUP policies. 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.

For residential, commercial, or visitor serving developments (developments of more than one residential unit per parcel, major commercial structures, and inn development of more than 8 units) the County shall require the property owner to provide, improve and maintain shoreline access facilities consistent with the policies of this component as a condition of permit approval.

3. Where access is inappropriate as defined by the Plan-LUP policies, the County will use all available means to discourage use of these areas and direct public access to other areas.
4. Siting and design of development proposals which protect shoreline access will be required in the permit process. Modification to a project may be required if access cannot be otherwise protected. Accessways themselves may have to be rerouted or improved when formally dedicated in order to avoid hazards or to protect resource areas.
5. Where the County is advised that an accessway is being closed by property owners, a determination will be made whether the accessway is identified in the access plan. If the access is found appropriate, the County will work with the parties concerned in an effort to maintain the access in public use.

Under State law, development cannot interfere with the public's right of access to the sea where acquired through historical 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. Where such public rights will be preserved through dedication of an alternative access route, the substituted location must be at least equivalent in usefulness and area served as the original routing.

6. The County will work with local, state, and federal management agencies landowners to ensure that accessways obtained through acquisition, dedications, and permit conditions are adequately managed and maintained. An ongoing management program will be required before accessways are opened to the public. The County will encourage such programs to be sponsored through private as well as public means.

C. *Providing and Managing Trails*

1. Trail corridors shown in the Trails Plan Map are recommended as public access routes to public lands or other destinations. Where trails already exist, alignments should remain the same, except where rerouting would be feasible to reduce adverse environmental or visual impacts. The siting of new trails shall require an approved access management plan consistent with this LUP, field inspection and environmental review.

Exhibit E

2. The Trails Plan Map recommends a ~~comprehensive~~ continuous trail system along the Big Sur coast. In developing this trail system, lands already in public ownership or proposed for public acquisition should be used wherever possible in preference to private property. The shoulders of public roads ~~may~~should be used where essential to bridge gaps where a trail elsewhere is not feasible because of hazardous conditions, terrain, or existing concentrations of development. ~~This occurs along sections of Highway 1, the Old Coast Road, and Sycamore Canyon Road.~~ In general, sections of the trail system along the Highway should be kept to a minimum to ensure the safety of pedestrians and motorists. ~~Southward from Pfeiffer Big Sur State Park, the through coastal trail corridor along the existing Coast Ridge Road, as shown on Figure 3, shall be considered as an interim location. A more favorable route, seaward of Coast Ridge Road on U.S. Forest Service and State Park lands, and entirely within the Coastal Zone boundary should be identified. Such revised location should parallel the shoreline as nearly as feasible on existing public lands, considering the natural contour of the land and the objective of connecting existing public trail segments; and shall be subject to the individual approval of each landowner/management agency on the revised route.~~
- 3.2. The County ~~may~~shall require trail easements to be granted through private land in accordance with the Trails Map as a condition to issuance of development permits, approval of land divisions, or other approvals required from the County. The County encourages voluntary dedication of trail easements on private lands. In general, the County will seek to arrange that such dedications are made from the property owner to the California Department of State Department of Parks and Recreation or to the U.S. Forest Service because these agencies are envisioned to have primary responsibility for improving and managing the trail systems. Trail easements secured through Coastal Commission ~~permits and other locations~~ may~~should~~ be used where appropriate as part of the system.
- 4.3. Where specific trail alignments have not been identified but where the property of concern is within a trail corridor, a general offer of dedication may~~will~~ be required consistent with the standards for trail corridors in the area. Precise trail alignments may~~will~~ be agreed upon at a future ~~time~~ ~~through~~ cooperation between the landowner and the public agencies with responsibility for ~~constructing and maintaining the trail.~~
- 5.4. The County encourages the California~~State~~ Department of Parks and Recreation and the U. S. Forest Service to acquire full legal rights-of-way across private lands in accordance with the Trail Map where such rights do not presently exist.
- 6.5. The California~~State~~ Department of Parks and Recreation and the U.S. Forest Service are the primary agencies responsible for trail planning, construction, restoration, maintenance, management and liability. These agencies have a special responsibility to coordinate and assure continuity to and through State and Federal lands. The County's role will generally be confined to assisting in the provision of access easements, and in the review and guidance of plans related to trails construction and use management.
- 7.6. Except as necessary for shoreline access or for the trail corridor system (see Figures 2 and 3),

Exhibit E

trails through future park lands should be constructed after the land is acquired and opened for public use and not while still in private ownership. For public trails presently crossing private lands, the County requests the California Department of Parks and Recreation or the U.S. Forest Service to obtain full legal rights-of-way including management and maintenance arrangements.

- ~~8.7.~~ Caltrans should directly participate in any detailed trails planning that will require construction of trailhead parking and sanitation facilities ~~areas~~ within the State highway rights-of-way.
- ~~9.8.~~ Plans for new trail locations and plans to intensify use of existing trails shall be submitted for review by the California ~~State~~ Department of Fish and ~~Game~~ Wildlife in order to assess the potential impact of such use on sensitive habitats. The California Department ~~of Fish and Wildlife~~ Game is requested to participate with other agencies in determining the most appropriate alignments for new trails and all provide management guide lines where needed to minimize impacts to habitats.
- ~~10.9.~~ Other agencies should review the plans for new trails or increased use of existing trails to provide guidance concerning fire hazard, water supply protection and other considerations.
- ~~11.10.~~ The practice of opening private trails to organized groups on a reservation basis is encouraged in order to reduce conflicts between private and public use. Private trails can be opened to the public on a fee basis in conjunction with low intensity recreation facilities allowed on private lands. In some instances, private trails may be opened to the public through easements, provided maintenance by a public agency were assured. Management and easement arrangements should be pursued where the trail would be of public benefit.
- ~~12.11.~~ The California Coastal Conservancy is encouraged to participate in trails planning and to provide financing and general assistance to the agencies involved.

D. Public Safety Criteria

- 1. Public safety should be ensured wherever shoreline access is provided. In some locations the presence of unavoidable hazards will preclude access from being provided. In other locations, hand rails, stairways, bridges, warning signs, and other improvements should be used to reduce risks. Such public safety improvements should be consistent with the Critical Viewshed. Where this is not possible, access may be inappropriate. Closure of access areas during periods of extreme fire hazard or high seas may also be appropriate.
- 2. In extremely hazardous areas where safe access to the shoreline is not feasible, existing trails should be closed. In these areas, establishment and maintenance of visual access should be emphasized as an appropriate response to the needs of the public.

Exhibit E***E. Habitat and Resource Protection- Criteria***

1. In areas where habitat and resource protection is a major concern, studies ~~shall~~^{ould} be conducted to determine maximum acceptable levels of public use and methods by which resource values can best be protected. The conclusions ~~of these studies shall~~^{ould} be a basis for management ~~plans~~ for each access location.
2. In locations of sensitive plant or wildlife habitats, access may be entirely inappropriate.
3. Private water supplies shall be protected by locating public access at an appropriate distance from surface, spring, and well water sources based on consultation with County health officials.

F. Visual Resources Criteria

1. Future land use planning shall be compatible with the goal of providing visual access. To this end, all new structures and ancillary facilities should be located outside of the ~~Critical~~^{public} ~~V~~^{view}shed as defined in Chapter 3.
2. Trails and access improvements including stairs, ramps, railings, restrooms and parking facilities should be sited and designed in a manner compatible with the goal of strict ~~Critical~~ ~~V~~^{view}shed protection. In some circumstances, this may limit the establishment of access improvements.

G. Land Use Compatibility Criteria

1. New development shall not encroach on well-established accessways nor preclude future provision of access.
2. Shoreline access shall be provided through or adjacent to existing or new residential areas upon completion of a management plan that adequately resolves problems of noise, visual buffering, trespass, ~~general~~ maintenance, ~~minimization of~~ fire hazards, protection of private water supplies, parking and liability.

Development applications which contain required access shall have management plans developed and approved as part of the permit process. Management plans may allow measures such as the following to reduce access/residential conflicts:

- a. minimum distance of 10 feet between an accessway and an existing or proposed residential structure;
- b. allow the use of fences or berms between accessways and residences or agricultural uses;
- c. limiting access to daylight hours; and

Exhibit E

- d. limiting activity to pedestrian or passive recreational uses.
3. Where accessways are proposed through or adjacent to land in agricultural uses, these uses should be fully protected from disturbance. A full range of mitigation measures should be used including buffer strips, berms, fences, controlled burning, and periodic closures.
- ~~4. Access to the shoreline shall be provided, improved, and managed at military and government facilities where there are suitable destination areas except in those cases where maximum military security is required. When high security requirements cease, access shall then be provided. Before any area adjacent to the Point Sur Naval facility is opened to unescorted public access, the Commanding Officer shall be consulted to insure that provisions to protect military security are satisfactory.~~

6.1.6 Standards and Guidelines for Improvements to Accessways

The following standards for the location and design of accessways are meant to carry out access policies through more detailed specifications. These apply to both public and private developments and are based on the goals of providing access, consistent with protection of Big Sur's unique visual and natural resources. Criteria for the location, distribution and size of accessways shall require that they be consistent with the need to preserve fragile coastal resources, military security and public safety, and be appropriate for the site and intended use.

1. Management - Public or private agencies responsible for managing coastal accessways ~~shall~~ develop management programs before accessways are opened. Such programs should be coordinated with the management of recreational destination points. Management of access trails ~~shall~~ address, but not be limited to, the following:
 - a) the need for seasonal restrictions, if any;
 - b) the improvements needed for trails, including stairs or ramps;
 - c) the proposed location, capacity, and construction of parking facilities if needed;
 - d) sanitation (bathrooms, water, trash, etc.);
 - e) ongoing maintenance and management; and
 - f) compatibility with adjacent land uses.

Existing and future access dedications shall be mapped and related management recommendations listed as part of the implementation of the PlanLUP.

Exhibit E

2. Visual Appearance - Structural improvements to accessways should be kept to a minimum to reduce impacts to viewshed, shall be consistent with Critical Viewshed policies, and should be allowed only for safety purposes, or where essential for protection of agriculture, fragile natural habitats, archaeological sites, military security or private development.

Stairways, ramps, and signs should be constructed of natural materials, or metal where vandalism is a threat. Paint should be avoided to reduce maintenance problems.

Wherever possible, trails (except for trailhead signs) should be screened from the road to minimize visual intrusion. Where natural topography requires that trail heads be located within view of the road, methods such as berms planted with native vegetation should be used.

Grading or cuts required for safety or resource protection should conform to the natural topography. Parking and other facilities such as restrooms should be sited or screened to reduce visual impacts.

3. Trails - The width of trail corridors should be variable based on localized conditions of topography, vegetation, wildlife habitats, scenic concerns, proximity to water supplies or developed land uses. Corridors should generally be in the range of 50 to 100 feet in width but should not be narrower than is reasonable to protect both public and private resource and uses adjacent to the trail as well as protect local residents' privacy and the public's interest in a quiet and scenic hiking experience.

All plans to improve existing trails or create new ones should ensure that environmentally sensitive habitats are protected from overuse. Measures to prevent or reduce impacts should be used, including:

- a) non-improvement or elimination of access to remote fragile coastal resources areas;
- b) routing or re-routing of trails to avoid environmentally sensitive habitats;
- c) design features to screen or separate trails and destination points from environmentally sensitive habitats;
- d) invasive plant removal and revegetation projects, sediment basins, and other site features; and
- e) restriction or redistribution of the number of access points into an environmentally sensitive habitat area.

T~~New~~ trails should not be sited through or directly adjacent to wetlands. If any access is provided, wood boardwalks or similar structures that minimize impacts to wetland vegetation should be used.

Exhibit E

Trails along stream corridors should be sited and designed to avoid impacts to riparian vegetation, wildlife, and water quality. Measures include, but are not limited to, controlling runoff and erosion, contouring and siting trails to conform to the natural topography, and separating and screening from important riparian habitat areas.

Access trails to intertidal areas should be sited to spread the zone of public use rather than concentrate it in a small area.

4. Parking and Facilities - Emphasis ~~shall~~ould be given to improving access on the east side of Highway 1 suitable for parking near accessways or trailheads and, where feasible, pedestrian access to the west side of the ~~H~~highway 1 shall be provided. Such areas ~~shall~~ould be effectively screened from the road through the location of site features, construction of berms, or planting of vegetation screens.

The number of parking spaces provided ~~shall~~ould not exceed the capacity of the shoreline destination as determined by its size, sensitivity of the resources, and the type and intensity of use appropriate for the area.

Parking areas and turnouts ~~shall~~ould be designed and constructed in a manner which would not contribute to slope failure or excessive erosion, and would prevent runoff and degradation of water quality. Where feasible, porous surfacing materials which allow drainage should be used.

In areas where the public must cross traffic on a curve to reach a parking area, appropriate warning signs should be posted. Grade separations should be considered, where needed for safety and construction is feasible. If road width permits, consideration should be given to installation of left turn lanes into parking areas.

7. ADMINISTRATION AND IMPLEMENTATION

7.1 ~~PLAN~~LUP ADMINISTRATION

This ~~LUP~~plan is designed to implement the California Coastal Act. It is a local plan which shall direct ~~the County of~~ Monterey ~~County~~ in making land use decisions in the Big Sur ~~Coastal Planning Area~~. The advice of local residents shall be routinely sought in the administration of this ~~plan~~LUP. The County shall work with other levels of government to secure their compliance with this ~~plan~~LUP; conformance by all public agencies, including Federal ~~and State~~ agencies, is needed for this ~~LUP~~Plan to work as intended. Other levels of government shall be consulted by the County regarding help, guidance, and resources to implement this ~~plan~~LUP. However, the County shall have the primary responsibility for implementing the ~~Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan~~LUP and the efforts of other State and local agencies shall be consistent with this ~~plan~~LUP and coordinated with the efforts of the County. This ~~LUP~~plan will also provide guidance to the California Coastal Commission in its review of Federal projects pursuant to the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act.

In the event of a conflict or inconsistency between the LUP and other County Adopted Plans the Coastal Act will be prevail over all else. Then the LUP will prevail over any inconsistencies that may arise from Parts 2 through 6 of the Coastal Implementation Plan, Title 20, and any other regulations in the County.

As required by 1986 Big Sur Coast Land Use PlanLUP, ~~The the~~ County ~~shall~~ developed the structure necessary to establish a permanent and authoritative voice for the residents of the community of the Big Sur coast. The Big Sur Multi-Agency Advisory Council (BSMAAC), ~~which shall ensure~~s community participation in the coordination and implementation activities necessary to carry out the mandates of the LCP.

7.1.1 Development Permit Process

Coastal Development Permits or Coastal Administrative Permits (referred to as coastal permits in this LUP) will be required from the County for development proposed on private or public lands (except excluded Federal lands or exempt lands pursuant to this LUP or its implementation documents). To be approved, permit applicants will be required to demonstrate conformance to the ~~plan~~LUP.

1. The proposal must be in conformance with the kinds of uses and use intensities permitted for the specific geophysical area concerned. If a proposal does not meet this basic requirement, it will not be processed further.
2. The second area of review, concerns conformance to the policies of the ~~LUP~~plan contained in the Resource Management and Land Use and Development sections, and, if applicable, the Public Access and Highway ~~One~~1/County Roads sections. In particular, the proposed project must fully meet the objectives, policies, and standards for each applicable section of the

Exhibit E

LUPPlan. If the proposal is not consistent with these policies, it shall not be approved even though it may be consistent with land use designations for the area. For example, applications for residential development in an area designated for this use will not be approved if the parcel is entirely within a 100 year floodplain or if inadequate water supply is shown to exist.

3. All proposals must fully meet any specific zoning provisions adopted to implement the LUPplan.

3.4. All proposals must ~~follow fully comply with~~ the California Environmental Quality Act process and meet the environmental standards of this LUPplan.

Applicants are responsible for providing all necessary information to support proposals as described in the policies concerning development and resources. Where information is questioned or contested by the County, the burden of proof rests with the applicant. Where additional information is requested by the County, applicants are required to provide such information before further consideration by the County will be given to the proposal.

The County will make a good faith effort to work cooperatively with landowners in the evaluation and processing of development applications as expeditiously as possible. County staff will provide advice and guidance to the public concerning interpretation of provisions of the planLUP. County staff will prepare written reports supporting all permit recommendations. These reports will summarize the development proposal, pertinent issues and information, and will describe how the proposal meets or does not meet relevant provisions of the planLUP. The report will contain recommendations on whether the proposal should be approved, approved with conditions, or denied. Permit reports shall be made a permanent part of the record and copies shall be available for public review prior to formal consideration of the application.

7.1.2 Plan-LUP Revisions

The Local Coastal Program will be updated over time as need dictates. Formal amendment procedures will be used to accomplish changes to the plan-LUP or its implementation ordinances. Because the LUPplan is a Local Coastal Program prepared under the California Coastal Act, any changes made must be consistent with the Act. The California Coastal Commission must approve future changes or amendments to the LUPplan. This LUPplan shall be automatically reviewed after three years of utilization to determine the effectiveness of the implementation procedures.

7.1.3 Appeals

Appeals to the Coastal Commission may be made, consistent with provisions of the Coastal Act, when individual or group believes the County is not acting in conformance with the planLUP. The appeals procedure is described in the California Coastal Act.

Exhibit E**7.1.4 Public and Agency Participation and -Coordination**

The County will cooperate with all other government agencies on matters of mutual interest concerning the Big Sur coast. The format for coordination is the Big Sur Multi-Agency Advisory Council and shall be the primary public forum for this collaboration. described in the implementation section. The County will provide technical or policy advice to other agencies as requested and will seek advice on technical or policy matters from appropriate agencies as the need arises.

The County ~~will~~ provides a mechanism for advice and comment from appointed community representatives on permit matters and on all long-range decisions affecting planning and management of the coast at the Big Sur and South Coast Land Use Advisory Committees. The general public is encouraged to attend and participate in County public meetings and hearings concerning administration of the LUPplan or processing of development applications.

7.2 IMPLEMENTATION

Implementation of the LUPPlan will require the County, and in some cases, other jurisdictions, to develop and adopt ordinances, procedures, or agreements in addition to the Land Use Plan in order to carry out the Land Use Plan map, tables and policies. The major implementation measures that the County should adopt are described here.

7.2.1 Zoning Ordinance Changes**A. Rezoning**

As of 1986, Rrezoning of the Big Sur coast ~~will be necessary~~ was necessary to reflect the ~~land use plan~~ LUP. In accordance with State laws, the uses, densities and locations of zoning revisions must be consistent with the Land Use Plan Map and policies. As of 1986, zZoning should be adequately flexible to permit the range of uses and densities provided for in the LUPplan.

~~The Monterey County Zoning Ordinance (Ordinance No. 911) should be amended to delete use of the combining Coastal Zone (CZ) district, and to add general coastal zone regulations and separate coastal zone districts as set out above. The general regulations will incorporate and refer to Coastal Act (Public Resources Code Section 30000 et seq.) policies. They will also incorporate provisions of the Monterey County Zoning Ordinance for Design Control districts (Section 25) and Scenic Conservation Districts (Section 23.3c), for appeal (Section 32), and enforcement (Section 35), and provisions of the Subdivision Ordinance (Ordinance No. 1713) for appeal and for enforcement (Section 10). The Coastal Implementation Plan and Monterey County Code will be updated to be consistent with this LUP.~~

~~Some~~ As of 1986, some suggested zoning districts included:

Exhibit E

CZ-WSC Coastal Zone Watershed and Scenic Conservation District: Includes residential development, low intensity recreation, agriculture, and forest and watershed management.

CZ-OR Coastal Zone-Outdoor Recreation District: Includes moderate use intensity recreation.

CZ-RCC Coastal Zone-Rural Community Center District: Includes residential development, visitor-serving and recreation support areas, and quasi-public uses.

Since that time, the zoning for the area has been implemented and these are the current districts:

CZ-WSC Coastal Zone Watershed and Scenic Conservation District: Includes residential development, low intensity recreation, agriculture, and forest and watershed management.

CZ-CGC Coastal Zone Coastal General Commercial: Includes a broad range of commercial uses suitable for the convenience visitors and nearby residential uses.

CZ-LDR Coastal Zone Low Density Residential: Includes low density residential uses.

CZ-PQP Coastal Zone Public/Quasi Public: Includes public and quasi-public uses.

CZ-OR Coastal Zone Open Space Recreation: Includes moderate intensity recreation and outdoor recreation.

CZ-RC Coastal Zone Resource Conservation: Includes sensitive resource areas in the County of Monterey. Development should only be carried out by allowing only such development that can be achieved without adverse effect and which will subordinate the resources of the particular area.

CZ-VSC Coastal Zone Visitor Serving Commercial: Includes uses that service the needs of visitors and the traveling public in the County of Monterey.

CZ-RDR Coastal Zone Rural Density Residential: Includes rural density residential uses.

B. Development Permits

All development in the coastal zone will be required to obtain a development permit from the County that will be approved based on demonstrated compliance with the LUP plan and all its provisions. Some forms of development, similar to that exempted in the Coastal Act, may also be exempted from obtaining a coastal permit from the County. Final action on coastal permits will be taken by the Board

Exhibit E

of Supervisors for standard subdivisions; all other development will be considered by the Planning Commission subject to Board of Supervisors Board-appeals.

C. *Site Plan Review*

Projects applying for a coastal permit will undergo a comprehensive site plan review to determine the consistency of the proposed project with the LUPplan. The applicant will be permitted flexibility to develop -in any manner which is consistent with any of the variety of uses and densities included in the particular zoning district, and which meets the performance standards set forth in the land-use-planLUP.

D. *Performance Standards*

Environmental performance standards are incorporated in the Big Sur Land Use PlanLUP in the form of specific policies designed to protect riparian and forest areas, wildlife habitats, and other sensitive environmental concerns. As the carrying capacity of the coastal areas are determined through improvements in the data base and available information, the policies and implementation ordinances will be refined to include quantified performance standards.

E. *Minimum Size of Parcels*

The minimum size of parcels permitted in land subdivision will be based upon the necessity to prevent harm to the existing natural uses of the land.

The Watershed and Scenic Conservation District-land use designation will permit subdivision at a density rate of 40 acres or more per parcel as a means of deterring further development from harming the rural character of the land. Larger minimum parcel sizes will apply on steeper lands. In addition to one residential unit permitted on such parcels, certain other coastal-priority-uses maywill be permitted in accordance with the land-use-planLUP.

Existing legal lots of record which are smaller than the stated optimum size in the new-zoning district will be permitted to develop in a use consistent with those included in the new-zoning district as long as the proposed project meets the performance standards of the Land Use PlanLUP.

Parcels will be permitted to be subdivided on the basis of density standards of the planLUP. A review of the land according to local coastal program performance standards may demonstrate that a lesser intensity of development is appropriate. If such review demonstrates that the particular parcel will support a higher intensity of use, the applicant may develop at the higher density upon purchase of development credits from other parcels in the Critical Viewshed.

7.2.2 *Government Coordination and Local Participation Framework*

Exhibit E

A framework or structure for improved coordination between the numerous government agencies involved on the Big Sur coast, as mandated in the 1986 Land Use Plan LUP, has been—should be developed to resolve issues of mutual concern. The County created the Big Sur Multi-Agency Advisory Council (BSMAAC) on July 8, 1986. BSMAAC is composed of elected officials; appointed representatives from federal, state, and local agencies; and community representatives. BSMAAC has been instrumental in identifying local issues and developing frameworks for addressing them. BSMAAC is vital to the success of this LUP.

C~~For example,~~ careful planning and use~~age~~ of the Big Sur coast due to the limitation of highway capacity is a responsibility shared by Monterey County and San Luis Obispo County. Assurances are needed that development contemplated for the San Simeon coastal area does not adversely affect access to the Big Sur region as a whole. A means of providing continuing and enhanced participation in decisions about the regioneoast's future is also needed and should be made available to the residents of the area. The County should take a lead role in developing these structures.

~~One alternative is a joint powers agreement entered into by the U. S. Forest Service, the Coastal Commission, the State Departments of Fish and Game and Parks and Recreation, Caltrans, Monterey and San Luis Obispo Counties, and other entities as deemed necessary, in order to form a Big Sur Council with the power to plan and coordinate implementation activities, and to acquire land and funds. This may be a workable approach to government coordination, although it has two drawbacks: there are no assurances that the various entities would agree to the purposes to such an agreement; and there may be lack of funds available to support acquisition and management. In view of acquisition needs along the coast, this is a serious deficiency.~~

~~The Memorandum of Understanding is another possible agreement which can bring the various entities together to coordinate planning and implementation efforts. If no joint acquisition effort is planned, the memorandum of understanding may be more desirable than the joint powers agreement because it does not mandate the financial responsibility legislatively required in the joint powers agreement.~~

Because the U.S. Forest Service owns 7579,000703 acres in the Big Sur Coastal Planning UnitArea--roughly one half54% the total area--and because the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 excludes all lands subject to exclusive federal jurisdiction from the California coastal zone, special means should be developed to assure that the development, use, planning and management of these federal lands is coordinated effectively with the implementation of the Big Sur Coast Local Coastal Program. . referred to above, are addressed through the BSMAAC which is not likely to be a sufficient means to accomplish this coordination because the U.–S. Forest Service's discretion is tightly circumscribed by federal statute. The County, therefore, requests its representatives in the United States Congress to explore the need for federal legislative authorizations and mandates to the U.S. Forest Service to assure that its development, use, management and administration of Los Padres National Forest lands is effectively consistent with this LUP coordinatwith the implementation of the Local Coastal Program on private lands and lands owned by the State and County.

Exhibit E**7.2.3 Big Sur Coast Data Base**

Following adoption of the ~~plan~~LUP, the County will use all available information about the natural and cultural resources of the Big Sur coast developed in the planning process in its review of development applications and in other actions relating to the management of the coast. This body of information will be supplemented or updated from time to time as new information is available to the County.

The background reports and written responses to them used in the creation of the 1986 LUP are the foundation of the data base. This can be supplemented by information provided by property owners during the course of development applications or by other agencies in their individual activities. The information will be maintained in the County Planning Department and as far as possible in the County Branch library in Big Sur. Maintained as a collection of information in a central location, the data will be readily available to the public, other agencies, and County officials. During review of any projects or activities on the Big Sur coast, the County Staff is required to review available and pertinent information and include it in recommendations about projects or activities in the area.

All existing information will be integrated with the Planning Department's present data base and included in the department's information. At least once a year the County staff shall prepare a summary and bibliography of new information received during the preceding year.

7.2.4 Merger

[deleted]

~~Merger of contiguous substandard size lots held by the same owner is an appropriate mechanism in areas designated as restoration areas in which development of individual legal lots of record would harm the existing natural uses. The County should create a combining zone which, when applied to the selected areas, will cause such undersized lots, when contiguous and held by the same owner, to merge to the minimum size permitted by the existent zoning.~~

7.2.5 Transfer of Development Credits (TDC)

TDC's comprise a system that will assist the owners of lots restricted in their residential development potential by Critical Viewshed policies contained within the ~~plan~~LUP. They provide an economic/planning incentive under which density credits can be reallocated within the Big Sur Coastal Planning Area and outside the Critical Viewshed. ~~certain boundaries.~~ Additionally, the use of this technique is intended to encourage the transfer of residential development potential from large ranch parcels in order to maintain the viability and stability of agricultural operations. The County has instituted a Transfer of Development Credits (TDC) system (pursuant to Section 20.64.190 of the Monterey County Code).

7.2.5.A Key Policies

Exhibit E

1. To provide owners of "~~C~~ritical ~~V~~iewshed lots" fair and real opportunities to build in Big Sur.
2. To provide incentives for preservation of large ranches in agricultural operations, and permanently protect their ~~C~~ritical ~~V~~iewshed.
3. To provide economic compensation in the form of density credits for lots rendered unbuildable due exclusively to LUP ~~C~~ritical Viewshed policies.

7.2.5.B General Policies

1. Any non-~~C~~ritical ~~V~~iewshed parcel in the Big Sur Coastal Planning Area is a potential "receiver" site provided development proposed for it meets the LUP's development and siting standards and the TDC program rules for obtaining additional density.
2. "Critical ~~V~~iewshed lot" owners would have the right to transfer residential development potential from such restricted parcels and to build two units elsewhere in the Big Sur Coastal Planning Area or transfer two development credits for each lot retired subject to the criteria of LUP policy 3.2.6.3.
3. Large ranches would have the option to cluster their credits to non-~~C~~ritical ~~V~~iewshed sites east of Highway ~~One~~1, to apply for development within the rules specified in the LUP, transfer density credits to their property, or any combination of these alternatives.

7.2.6 Conservation Easements

Conservation and Scenic Easements and Williamson Act Contracts provide tax benefits when such enforceable restrictions on the use of land limit the amount of development on a parcel.

While Conservation and Scenic Easements are in use now in the County to mitigate adverse environmental impacts, since the adoption of the 1986 LUP the County ~~should~~ adopted a clear policy implementing regulations directing the requirement of these easements for the varied resource protection uses encouraged in the ~~plan~~LUP. County land use regulations such as zoning and subdivision ordinances should contain these requirements as well as others authorized by State legislation, such as restrictions on future use, and length of the term (at least 10 years) with automatic renewal. Each deed dedicating open space should include the particular findings upon which the open space easement is based.

The County ~~may~~should also consider having the Coastal Conservancy, because of its legislated resource protection role on the coast, named as grantee of the ~~any such open space~~ easements. Alternatives could include continuing the County as grantee but contracting out enforcement to a nonprofit agency such as the Coastal Conservancy, or giving the grantor a choice of grantees from a list of appropriate nonprofit

Exhibit E

organizations.

State legislation permits Williamson Act ~~Contracts~~contracts to be executed for reasons very similar to the ones for which Conservation and Scenic Easements are permitted. While it is generally thought that property tax advantages of Williamson Act contracts have been lost in the passage of Proposition 13, the contracts remain a viable enforceable restriction along with ~~open-space~~Conservation and Scenic Easements. Consideration should be given to decreasing both the present minimum acreage requirement from 40 acres to 20 acres and the length of such contracts from the present 20-year term to 10 years.

Conservation and Scenic Easements are the appropriate vehicle which could be made available for coastal resource protection. They are different from Williamson Act ~~Contracts~~contracts in that they must be in perpetuity. Conservation easements ~~shall~~should be included as a requirement in coastal permit applications -in areas containing wildlife habitats, wetlands, and other resource areas and particularly in scenic areas.

7.2.7 Restoration/Acquisition

Restoration projects refer to those activities that the County, in cooperation with coastal residents and other agencies, can undertake in an effort to mitigate undesirable impacts of existing development or commitment to development on the quality of the coastal environment and its resources. Examples of areas that require restoration in order to meet the environmental standards of this ~~plan~~LUP have been described in various sections of the ~~plan~~LUP. For instance, some areas of the coast committed to development - by virtue of the existence of many small undeveloped parcels created for residential purposes - appear to lack adequate water to serve continued development without entailing extremely adverse impacts on the natural environment. There are also isolated examples where natural ecosystems have been impacted, frequently from recreational overuse. Portions of the lower Big Sur River riparian area have been seriously degraded and need restoration work. In other areas, past development has resulted in structures or buildings that are highly visible and obtrusive to the quality of the natural environment. In some cases, road construction has left highly visible scars. Installation of utility poles has also resulted in the erosion of the visual quality of Big Sur. Perhaps most serious, are the undesirable impacts on the beauty of the coast resulting from continued residential buildout in certain areas having numerous small, vacant parcels. Finally, even natural events, such as landslides, mudslides, or lightning caused fires, result in changes or damage to the landscape and its resources. Such events may necessitate remedial action if environmental quality or scenic beauty is to be restored.

A variety of restoration techniques are available, and the County should support and encourage these.

A. Private Voluntary Action

Individual landowners are encouraged to voluntarily undertake those activities on their property which can help mitigate the types of environmental or visual problems discussed in this ~~plan~~LUP. In many

Exhibit E

cases, simple landscape screening or repainting of a structure would do much to restore scenic beauty in highly visible areas. Screening of private roads as needed would also be beneficial. Private work, in some cases, is needed in riparian areas to alleviate impacts to streams. In other areas, improved control of erosion or soil loss from sites during rain storms would help protect water quality in coastal streams.

B. Action by Other Government Agencies

All other government agencies are requested to undertake needed coastal restoration work in their areas of jurisdiction in order to realize the objectives of this ~~plan~~LUP. ~~California Department of State~~ Parks and Recreation, Caltrans, and the U.S. ~~Forest Service~~Navy, in particular, are requested to work toward the restoration of environmental and scenic qualities of lands they manage.

C. Site Planning

The County can achieve necessary restoration on private and State lands by requiring such work as a condition of permit approval. This technique should be used within reason whenever possible.

D. Transfer of Development Credits (TDC)

TDC's should be encouraged to avoid new development on ~~Ceritical~~ ~~V~~iewshed lots and on large ranches. The County has instituted a Transfer of Development Credits (TDC) system (pursuant to Section 20.64.190 of the Monterey County Code).

E. Acquisition

Acquisition by a public agency of privately held land in the Critical Viewshed may be beneficial as a restoration project where it reduces the commitment to development ~~created by the presence of many small undeveloped parcels~~. In certain instances, acquisition may be the only reasonably effective tool for avoiding problems relating to ~~Critical V~~iewshed development. This ~~LUP~~plan proposes that acquisition be used as a means of avoiding development on highly scenic ~~Critical V~~iewshed parcels for which no other planning remedy can be found. Acquisition can be carried out by the County of Monterey~~County~~, by various State agencies, such as the California Department of Parks and Recreation or the California Coastal Conservancy. The County should take a favorable posture toward acquisition of undeveloped ~~viewshed~~ parcels that are totally within the ~~Critical V~~iewshed. The County should invite purchase of these parcels by State agencies and, in particular, should support the assistance of the Federal ~~g~~Government through the U.-S. Forest Service in acquiring such parcels within their boundaries either in fee or simply through the purchase of development rights or easements.

In 1987, through Proposition 70, the County obtained \$25 million to compensate owners of parcels rendered unusable by the Critical Viewshed policy. These funds have been spent. Because the County lacks sufficient funds to compensate landowners for not developing remaining undeveloped parcels in

Exhibit E

the ~~C~~ritical ~~V~~iewshed and because the County lacks funds to acquire scenic easements over large parcels, it hereby requests its representatives in the California State Legislature and the United States Congress to seek state and federal funds to assist the County and be administered by the County in the implementation of the Local Coastal Program and, where necessary, to compensate landowners for protecting the agricultural and scenic resources of the Big Sur ~~c~~Coast.

~~The County shall seek necessary acquisition funds through the Land and Water Conservation fund or its successor agency, by making every effort to ensure that the implementation of the Big Sur L.U.P. is placed high on the list of priorities of the State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP).~~

F. Coastal Conservancy Projects

The Coastal Conservancy has been established with a broad range of powers and capabilities, all aimed at the conservation of important coastal resources. The Conservancy can perform planning studies, purchase land for various purposes, consolidate small parcels into larger more desirable parcels, and can resell them on the private market to "rollover" and regain its capital outlay. The result of this process is to overcome the environmental concerns resulting from poor lot configuration or excessive numbers of parcels in important restoration areas. The Conservancy should work cooperatively with the County on restoration programs by nomination of potential Conservancy projects and participating in the development of the project. The Conservancy is encouraged to develop affordable housing on any land it acquires, where appropriate.

G. Nonprofit Private and Public Conservancy Foundations

Private organizations should assist in the conservation of important natural and cultural values. These organizations can purchase land in fee or simply acquire easements to avoid development in sensitive areas or provide community housing in appropriate areas. The County of Monterey ~~County~~ should support and encourage the activities of these organizations in Big Sur.

7.2.8 Enforcement Program

Monterey County's Local Coastal Program will be only as effective as its enforcement. Several recommendations for a more effective enforcement program will follow.

All County departments engaged in activities in the coastal area should be informed about the Local Coastal Program and should refer any possible violations to the Planning-Housing and Community Development Department or its successor for investigation.

Planning staff should be increased in order to provide more onsite review of proposed development and more explanation to applicants about permit restrictions. Extra ~~planning~~ staff is also needed to perform regular inspection of continuing coastal permit conditions.

Exhibit E

Because of the County Counsel's role as advisor in planning matters, violations of the ~~subdivision or planning ordinances~~ Monterey County Code will be referred to the County Counsel's Office rather than to that of the District Attorney when such follow-up is deemed necessary by the Planning-Housing and Community Development Department. In addition, land use violations in the coastal areas should be punished by imposition of civil penalties wherever possible. provided for in the Coastal Act, rather than by current misdemeanor prosecution.

The County also has a duty to pursue legal remedies against persons who illegally use open space or similar easements granted to the County. The County must not only enjoin such misuse, but must also seek recovery of damages for such misuse.

Jurisdiction problems which may arise when the County attempts to enforce the Local Coastal Program on State lands can be precluded by requiring State consent to County inspection as a condition of approval for coastal permits granted to State agencies. Federal agencies will be requested to submit an enforcement program as part of a Memorandum of Understanding among agencies involved in the Big Sur ~~Local~~ Coastal Planning Area.

Exhibit E**GLOSSARY**

DEVELOPMENT: Except where specifically specified otherwise in this **PlanLUP**, shall be as defined by Section 30106 of the California Coastal Act.

EXISTING DEVELOPMENT: Means all projects legally developed as of December 31, 1976, or later if approved under a coastal development permit where such permit is required under the law.

EXISTING PARCEL: Means a separate legal parcel recorded as of December 31, 1976, or later if approved under a coastal development permit. Does not include parcels recorded without benefit of coastal development permit where such permit was required by law prior to 1977. Parcels crossed by public road or highway rights-of-way will not be considered to have been “subdivided” by such a road or highway. Except where a legal determination by the County (or by the Commission on appeal of a permit application) concludes otherwise for a particular ownership, contiguous U.S. Lots which have been patented or aggregated under a single ownership will be considered as a single parcel for Subdivision Map Act purposes.

FRAGILE COASTAL RESOURCES: Means in the Big Sur **Coast** area, exposed cliff faces, all environmentally sensitive habitats, and significant archaeological and paleontological resources which would likely be exposed to vandalism.

NATURAL ENVIRONMENT: As used in the Public Access Key Policy (Section 6.1.3) is synonymous with “fragile coastal resources.”

UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS (UAS): Pursuant to Public Law 112-95, Section 331(8), an unmanned aircraft system is an unmanned aircraft and the equipment necessary for the safe and efficient operation of that aircraft. An unmanned aircraft is a component of a UAS. It is defined by statute as an aircraft that is operated without the possibility of direct human intervention from within or on the aircraft.

Exhibit E

SEVERABILITY

If any provision of the ~~Plan~~ LUP is held by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, void, or unenforceable, the remaining provisions shall remain in full force and effect.

DRAFT

This page intentionally left blank