

Appendix D: Preliminary Recommendations to Other Entities

REVISED SEPTEMBER 2004

Chapter 2 - Land Use and Public Works:

Issue LU-8: Protection of North County Water Supply and Agriculture

LU-8.8 Continue agricultural water conservation initiatives: Natural Resource Conservation Service, Elkhorn Slough Foundation, and other entities with an interest in agriculture should continue to pursue agricultural management plans with individual growers to accomplish groundwater use reductions in combination with non-point source pollution reduction.

LU-8.9 Increase water conservation: The various entities that have a stake in North County water supply issues should continue and increase public education programs aimed at water conservation.

LU-8.10 Establish a program to facilitate water offsets: The various water providers in North County should establish a program or programs that can determine where water use can be reduced and how those who want to increase water use can undertake or pay for the commensurate water use reductions pursuant to Recommendation LU-8.1.

LU-8.11 Accelerate efforts to implement a water project: Pajaro Valley Water Management Agency (PVWMA) and other parties (along with Monterey County) should continue efforts to actually implement a water supply augmentation or groundwater reduction program that is consistent with LCP and Coastal Act policy as soon as possible. Any entity preparing an EIR or a project report on water should include policy analysis screening including consideration of Coastal Act provisions. Also, any entity proposing a desalination facility should review the results of California's Desalination Task Force or successor efforts to plan its project accordingly. The Coastal Commission should follow water planning in North County and advocate early coordination to the sponsors to allow screening of alternatives for LCP compliance.

LU-8.12 Coordinate water planning: The various entities that have a stake in North County water supply issues, such as California Department of Water Resources (DWR), United States Bureau of Reclamation, PVWMA, California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), North County Citizen's Oversight Coalition, and Resource Conservation Districts (RCDs) (along with Monterey County) should establish a coordination mechanism, such as periodic water forum meetings.

LU-8.13 Engage in regional water supply planning: The various entities that have a stake in North County and Monterey Peninsula water supply issues shall coordinate and integrate their respective planning processes, especially with regard to desalination facilities. They should work towards achieving consensus on such issues as to what is the region's water supply need, whether desalination should be relied upon to address the region's water needs vis-à-vis other alternatives, whether there

should be one or more desalination plants serving the region, the best location(s) for a desalination plant (or plants), and whether co-location with the power plant is appropriate and the least environmentally damaging option, as well as address institutional issues of mutual concern (e.g., service area boundaries, funding, interagency agreements). Such considerations shall be made consistent with Coastal Act policies (as well as other state and federal regulations), through use of, for example, the Coastal Commission's report, *Seawater Desalination and the California Coastal Act* (March 2004) and *California Water Desalination Task Force Final Report*. It would be helpful for an entity that has or could attain regional authority (e.g., California Public Utilities Commission, Monterey County Water Resources Agency) to take the lead in establishing and sponsoring this coordination effort.

Issue LU-9: Water Supply in the California-American Water Company Service Area

LU-9.6 Pursue water projects that protect Carmel River and other resources: Monterey Peninsula Water Management District or any successor agency should pursue water supply management strategies or projects that maximize protection of coastal resources, including maintenance of adequate flows in the Carmel River to protect riparian fish habitat, consistent with the LCP and Coastal Act (see Recommendations LU-8.4 and LU-9.4). The agency shall first allocate any new water that is developed to completely offset Cal-Am's unlawful diversions from the Carmel River, an estimated 10,730 acre-feet (AF) per year, before any water produced by Cal-Am can be used for new construction or expansions in use. Although the physical development of some alternatives under consideration would occur outside of the coastal zone, there may be impacts on coastal zone resources that should be carefully addressed.

LU-9.7 Allocate water consistent with Coastal Act priorities: Monterey Peninsula Water Management District or any successor agency should allocate water to jurisdictions in a manner consistent with Coastal Act priorities.

LU-9.8 Review reclamation offset: Monterey Peninsula Water Management District and Pebble Beach Company should review the implementation of their agreement assigning the Company 365 af/yr of additional Cal-Am water in light of the experience with the reclamation project, future proposed developments and their water demand, and the pertinent State Water Resources Control Board orders.

Issue LU-10: Big Sur Valley Water Supply

LU-10.4 Obtain stream flow information for the El Sur Ranch diversion: The State Water Resources Control Board should include in its forthcoming EIR on the proposed El Sur Ranch diversion information on low flows, current water use, projected demand, and instream flow requirements sufficient to enable a determination of consistency with *Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan* policies.

LU-10.5 Form watershed councils: Citizens should form watershed coordinating councils (CRMPs) for the Big Sur and Sycamore Canyon watersheds.

Issue LU-11: Moss Landing Community Plan

LU-11.5 Pursue multi-agency planning for Moss Landing: Agencies with regulatory responsibility in the Moss Landing area should work toward improving coordination to address multiple plan objectives, including responses to shoreline erosion (see Recommendation LU-11.6) and integrated dredge materials management (Recommendation LU-11.7). The primary objective of this approach would be for the various agencies to be guided by a common plan that is consistent with their mandates and that facilitates regulatory streamlining where appropriate, such as making use of an integrated public works plan or possibly a federal consistency action. These agencies should also coordinate with those addressing ways to reduce non-point source pollution and sediment inputs from upper watershed activities (see Recommendations for Issues WQ-6: Watershed Planning, WQ-8: North County Water Quality and Watershed Restoration, CH-11: Salinas River Mouth Breaching, and CH-12: Tembladero Slough).

LU-11.6 Coordinate responses to shoreline erosion in Moss Landing: The Coastal Commission, Moss Landing Harbor District, State Parks, US Army Corps of Engineers, and other affected parties should agree on an erosion study or studies for the Corps to undertake, and pursue recommended solutions in order to mitigate for impacts associated with the Harbor entrance jetties.

LU-11.7 Establish an integrated dredge materials management team: The US Army Corps of Engineers, SF Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Coastal Commission, California State Lands Commission, U.S. EPA, and Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, (along with Monterey County) should coordinate to establish the creation of a Central Coast Dredging Team (CCDT). CCDT members should coordinate to develop and implement a comprehensive and integrated approach to handling dredged material management issues in order to efficiently process dredging permit applications. The CCDT should assure that 1) the laws and policies of the member agencies will be fully implemented, 2) full public review and input to the decision making process will be maintained and 3) projects will be managed in an environmentally and economically sound manner. The CCDT, would review all maintenance dredging and disposal permit applications, and, among other things, coordinate in preparing staff recommendations regarding the approval, modification, or denial of 1) quality assurance project plans, sampling and analysis plans and dredge operations plans, 2) results of testing pursuant to the approved plans; 3) completeness of permit applications; and 4) material suitability of disposal at existing in-water disposal sites, ocean disposal sites, beach renourishment sites, or upland disposal sites.

Issue LU-12: Carmel Area Uplands

LU-12.6 Pursue acquisitions to protect sensitive lands: The Big Sur Land Trust, State Parks and Recreation, Monterey Regional Park District and other agencies should continue to seek and support funding for acquisitions of the remaining vacant parcels in the area and should continue their acquisitions to fill in gaps, consistent with any plan prepared for the Carmel Area Uplands (See Recommendation LU-12.3).

LU-12.7 Consider LCP requirements in structuring land agreements: Organizations that acquire interests or easements in land should consult with Monterey County to help ensure that potential land

transactions are consistent with LCP objectives, and with any policies that specifically address the parcel or grouping of parcels in question. Resulting agreements on land ownership, open space conservation areas, and remaining building sites should be structured to be consistent with LCP objectives, especially to avoid the creation of privately owned remainder parcels, the development of which would conflict with LCP objectives.

Issue LU-13: Big Sur Coast Highway Management Plan

LU-13.11 Complete Big Sur Coast Highway Management Plan: The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) should complete the Big Sur Coast Highway Management Plan (CHMP), in the context of the ongoing CHMP public participation process, in a manner reflective of Coastal Act objectives. Caltrans may subsequently prepare one or more public works plans for highway improvements, consistent with the approved CHMP management strategies and best practices, as provided by the California Coastal Act, in order to achieve permit streamlining and other efficiencies.

LU-13.12 Address pullouts as a follow-up CHMP study: The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), as part of completing or implementing the Big Sur Coast Highway Management Plan (CHMP) should inventory all pullouts, along with their functional attributes (trailhead, scenic vantage point, slow-moving traffic relief, materials staging, etc.) and prepare a brief “prescription” (recommended management approach) for each. The prescription should also address the various quantities of stored landslide material awaiting disposal, to the extent that these materials comprise roadside berms and occupy space in pullouts. Caltrans should coordinate with the County and U. S. Forest Service on this task because the limits of the State Highway right of way are not always clearly known for each pullout and may extend beyond Caltrans’ ownership.

LU-13.13 Coordinate with federal agencies: The U.S. Forest Service and Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, in updating their respective plans (*Los Padres National Forest Management Plan*, *Sanctuary’s Proposed Action Plan*), should strive for consistency with the County LCP (including their periodic review recommendations) and CMHP and continue to coordinate with the County and Coastal Commission regarding any differences through the Big Sur Multi-agency Council. Future activities and the permissions they grant should be consistent with the LCP and CHMP.

LU-13.14 Audit signs for viewshed restoration: California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) shall review all highway signs and upright markers at least once every three years to determine the need for their continued use. Signs and markers that are found by Caltrans to be no longer necessary shall be removed. Retained signs and markers that are larger than needed, or unnecessarily detract from scenic public views, shall be replaced with smaller or less intrusive examples. Sign removal or replacement pursuant to this policy shall not be considered development.

LU-13.15 Coordinate sign minimization programs: Entities with or proposing signs along Highway One shall coordinate with Caltrans in auditing and removing (or requiring removal when appropriate) excessive signage along the Highway One corridor. Agencies and private parties shall coordinate in implementing alternative measures for improving visitor orientation could serve to minimize sign clutter such as highway advisory radio (HAR).

Issue LU-14: Highway One and the Moss Landing Corridor

LU-14.8 Undertake transportation planning collaboratively and comprehensively: Caltrans should continue to work in partnership with the Coastal Commission, the Transportation Agency of Monterey County (TAMC), Monterey-Salinas Transit (MST), and Monterey County to comprehensively plan for transportation, including rail, transit bus, and bikeway alternatives, throughout the entire North Monterey County corridor. Emphasis should be placed on identifying and then implementing feasible alternatives to adding through travel lanes to Highway 1 between Castroville and Salinas Road (see Recommendation LU-14.1). The planning exercise should also address whether cross-over traffic to and from Highway 1 to Highway 101, can be better accommodated along existing transportation corridors easterly of Elkhorn and Moro Cojo Sloughs, without impacting wetlands. Planning should be guided by more thorough investigation of traffic origin and destination than has been completed to date as well as more detailed location of environmental constraints. Such planning should proceed prior to finalizing specific plans for the Highway 156 corridor.

LU-14.9 Make planning documents consistent: Caltrans should include in the revised *Highway One Transportation Concept Report* maintaining Highway One between Salinas Road and Route 183 as a two-lane road, consistent with Recommendation LU-14.1 above and Coastal Act Section 30254. TAMC should revise the *Regional Transportation Plan* and AMBAG should revise the *Metropolitan Transportation Plan* accordingly.

LU-14.10 Give priority to rail: TAMC, SCCRTC, AMBAG, Caltrans, California Transportation Commission, and others should give priority in their planning functions and funding allocations to enhancing passenger and freight service along existing rail lines (i.e., Union Pacific mainline segment between Pajaro Junction and Castroville and the Moss Landing and Castroville-Monterey Peninsula branch lines) and restoring service on the Castroville-Monterey Peninsula branch line. Such service restoration would potentially entail, but not be limited to, new passenger facilities including automobile parking, bicycle lockers, MST transit bus stop, a station platform or building at the former Fort Ord and one in Castroville proper, not on agricultural land. Also support should be given to an on-going program of safety improvements to reduce the risk of catastrophic spills into the Elkhorn Slough wetland system.

LU-14.11 Expand transit service: MST, SCMTD, SCCRTC, TAMC, AMBAG, AMTRAK, Greyhound, CSUMB, and other major traffic generators should work toward increased, convenient, and coordinated bus service, especially from Santa Cruz and Watsonville to Fort Ord and the Monterey Peninsula.

LU-14.12 Reduce use of Highway One corridor: AMBAG, TAMC, major traffic generators, and other entities should continue and expand demand reduction programs, such as Commute Solutions, to reduce motor vehicular use of Highway One corridor through Moss Landing.

LU-14.13 Use signing to help relieve congestion: Caltrans should install signs and use other methods of directing travelers throughout the region to be consistent with the goal of minimizing freight and commuter congestion on the Highway One corridor through Moss Landing while still providing for recreational and other appropriate coastal access. Travelers should be informed that they are moving

through a special rural area of the coastal zone and that speeds that allow for the safe enjoyment of the scenery should be followed.

Issue LU-15: Fort Ord

LU-15.3 Plan for inland railroad station: TAMC should plan for any support of rail platforms (e.g., station building, parking lot) to be inland of Highway One in order to protect environmentally sensitive dune habitat and scenic resources.

LU-15.4 Prepare State Parks plan: State Parks and Recreation should coordinate with Monterey County and the Coastal Commission in its General Plan preparation for Fort Ord to determine both the most appropriate future development review (i.e., for projects that would require coastal permits versus public works plans) and to develop appropriate policies and proposals that comply with the Coastal Act and the LCP if and when it becomes certified to cover Fort Ord (see Recommendation LU-15.1)

Chapter 3 - Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas

Issue SH-28: Protecting Central Maritime Chaparral Habitat

SH-28.7 Preserve large tracts of remaining maritime chaparral: Governmental and non-profit agencies that have an interest in habitat protection (along with Monterey County) should work towards preserving as many extant tracts of maritime chaparral as possible, along with other individual parcels covered with chaparral or that would contribute to contiguous habitat areas. The efforts by the Elkhorn Slough Foundation to acquire properties in the Elkhorn Slough watershed should continue and be supported.

SH-28.8 Establish maritime chaparral clearinghouse: Governmental and non-profit agencies that have an interest in habitat protection (along with Monterey County) should establish an overall management entity and/or clearinghouse for perpetuating the survival and restoration of maritime chaparral habitat. One task of such an entity would be to carry out *North County Land Use Plan* policy 2.3.2.6 regarding voluntary easements by developing programs that would make it attractive for landowners to protect and manage chaparral appropriately on their property. Even where easements have been required, they do not explicitly contemplate third party management. Thus, a mechanism would have to be developed to allow some co-operative oversight of private properties to carry out habitat management by an entity other than Monterey County. Another task of such an entity would be to encourage, coordinate, assist, and monitor chaparral habitat management efforts on individual properties, in line with Recommendations SH-28.9, SH-28.10, and SH-28.11.

SH-28.9 Continue maritime chaparral research: Governmental and non-profit agencies that have an interest in habitat protection (along with Monterey County) should encourage and support continued research into how best to manage, protect and enhance maritime chaparral. A focus should be on management measures that account for the already fragmented nature of the remaining habitat and how to respond to emerging threats such as sudden oak death syndrome.

SH-28.10 Employ prescribed burning: Land owners and land managers responsible for maritime chaparral habitat should employ prescribed burning at established intervals to promote regeneration of central maritime chaparral plant species, to prevent conversion to oak woodland, and to reduce the fuel load to prevent catastrophic fires. The interval of the prescribed burns should be determined on a case by case basis, depending on various factors such as the requirements of species present, air quality concerns, proximity to developments, safety concerns. Intervals should not be less than 15 years apart. Mowing and/or cutting is not recommended as a way to promote maritime chaparral regeneration, but may be employed in cases where burning is not possible, based on the advice of a biologist with expertise in this matter and in accordance with the latest scientific findings.

SH-28.11 Eradicate invasive plants: Land owners and land managers responsible for maritime chaparral habitat should employ measures to eradicate existing invasive exotic plant species and should implement frequent monitoring to prevent establishment of new invasive species. Mechanical methods should be employed over chemical methods that can impact non-target species as well as the environment.

Issue SH-29: Protection of Monterey Pine Forest Habitat

SH-29.9 Continue Monterey Pine forest research: Governmental and non-profit agencies, universities, and others that have an interest in habitat protection (along with Monterey County) should continue to support research into ways to preserve and enhance the pine forest including addressing pine pitch canker and genetic diversity.

SH-29.10 Consider listing pine as threatened: The USF&WS and/or the State Department of Fish and Game should consider listing Monterey Pine as threatened or endangered.

SH-29.11 Coordinate management of protected pine forest: Del Monte Forest Foundation, along with Monterey County and other entities, should cooperate in establishing a management structure to oversee all the Monterey pine forest, including that on portions of developed parcels. Since there are few easements that allow for third party management over many of these parcels, a mechanism would have to be developed to allow some co-operative oversight of private properties to develop and carry out forest management plans. This approach would require funding and cooperation among many public and private entities. It would also require continued scientific study to determine how to best replicate natural forest regeneration conditions.

Issue SH-31: Protection of Sand Dune Habitat

SH-31.4 Manage dunes that have been protected: The Del Monte Forest Foundation should continue their monitoring program for the Asilomar dunes in Del Monte Forest to ensure that the ecosystem remains healthy and should coordinate with the County and Coastal Commission in doing so.

Chapter 4 - Water Quality and Marine Resources

Issue WQ-8: North County Water Quality and Watershed Restoration

WQ-8.5 Use PG&E settlement funds for most critical erosion problems: Organizations receiving funds from the PG&E settlement should coordinate with agencies and others studying the impacts of erosion and non-point source pollution on coastal resource of the Elkhorn Slough complex including Moss Landing Harbor (e.g., Coastal Commission, State Coastal Conservancy, Elkhorn Slough Foundation and Moss Landing Marine Laboratories). Consultation should occur to identify the priority problem areas (i.e., high erosion or contaminant inputs) and the projects that shall have the greatest effect on protecting these coastal resources.

WQ-8.6 Prepare agricultural management plans: Agricultural operators should prepare agricultural management plans consistent with the framework established under the comprehensive resources plan (see Recommendation WQ-8.2).

WQ-8.7 Expand the Environmental Quality Incentives Program: The Natural Resources Conservation Service should continue to fund and staff the EQIP program to the level needed to address non-point source pollution in the North County planning area.

WQ-8.8 Evaluate success of permit coordination program: In applying for an extension of the Elkhorn Slough Watershed Permit Coordination Project, the Natural Resources Conservation Service and the Resource Conservation District of Monterey County should provide an evaluation of how practices are chosen from the perspective of erosion and runoff prevention and minimization of work in sensitive habitat areas for the authorizing agencies (e.g., the Coastal Commission, Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection Department) to review and to adjust the application for extension accordingly.

Issue WQ-9: Carmel Bay Area of Special Biological Significance and Ecological Reserve

WQ-9.6 Determine relationship of pollution sources to Carmel Bay water quality: As part of comprehensive watershed plans for the three watersheds that empty into Carmel Bay (pursuant to Recommendations for Issue WQ-6: Watershed Planning in Appendix A), the entities preparing the plans should employ modeling techniques to better understand the types and amounts of non-point source pollution being generated and the impacts that these might have on the Bay and its special attributes. Additional monitoring of the Bay's water quality should occur as necessary to generate data to support this objective.

WQ-9.7 Establish watershed councils: Citizens should form watershed coordinating councils (CRMPs) for Pescadero Canyon and San Jose Creek watersheds.

Chapter 5 - Public Access

Issue PA-10: Coastal Access Points

PA-10.5 Implement access recommendations: Agencies with land ownership and access responsibilities, such as State Parks, U.S. Forest Service (USFS), Big Sur Land Trust (BSLT), The

Nature Conservancy (TNC), and the Monterey Peninsula Recreation and Park District (MPRPD), (along with Monterey County) should obtain funding for and then complete implementation of the access point recommendations in the LCP for which they have authority.

PA-10.6 Prepare access management plans: Agencies with land ownership and access responsibilities, such as State Parks, USFS, BSLT, TNC, and MPRPD, should:

- prepare access management plans for all of their holdings. Such plans should be integrated into any general management plans for the holdings, such as State Park General Plans, and should be consistent with LCP policies,
- monitor visitor use and conduct public access capacity analysis to determine areas being under- or over-utilized and provide recommendations for adaptive management, if necessary, to protect sensitive wildlife and habitat areas,
- maintain supervision by regular presence of management staff to minimize vandalism, improve safety and provide for resource protection,
- develop measures to implement signage consistency and ensure that all public access facilities and signs are installed as required.

PA-10.7 Coordinate access points with the California Coastal Trail: Agencies with land ownership and access responsibilities should coordinate with Monterey County, the State Coastal Conservancy, and Coastal Commission to link access points with the California Coastal Trail and Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail and to incorporate regulatory, directional and interpretive signage relating to the Trails, wherever possible.

PA-10.8 Increase public awareness of Pebble Beach access: Pebble Beach Company should increase public awareness of access opportunities, including those at Stillwater Cove and Carmel Beach, by, for example, including all access points on literature and maps handed out to the public; installing public access signs at each access point; and training security and gatehouse personnel to provide map handouts to all visitors and to let bicyclists in for free pursuant to *Del Monte Forest LUP* Policy 108.

PA-10.9 Preserve some level of public access at Big Creek Reserve: Big Creek Natural Reserve should prepare and submit to the Coastal Commission a long range development plan with an access component that balances the University's research needs with the Coastal Act mandates for public access.

Issue PA-11: Coastal Trail System

PA-11.9 Plan actual trail segments: Agencies with trail planning and funding responsibilities, such as the State Coastal Conservancy, AMBAG, Transportation Authority of Monterey County (TAMC) and the actual land stewards listed in Recommendation PA-11.10, should prepare more detailed trail plans. These plans should translate the current general trail locations described and depicted in the LCP into a

level of detail suitable for actually determining funding requirements, acquiring any needed easements, and guiding trail installation.

PA-11.10 Implement trail recommendations: Agencies with land ownership and trail responsibilities, such as State Parks, U.S. Forest Service (USFS), Big Sur Land Trust (BSLT), The Nature Conservancy (TNC), and Monterey Peninsula Recreation and Park District (MPRPD), should cooperate and coordinate to obtain funding for and then complete implementation of the trail recommendations in the LCP for which they have authority. Implementation should include preparing and following access management plans (see Recommendation PA-10.6). Agencies should coordinate funding and acquisition priorities, public use regulations, and resource management efforts (e.g., for control and removal of exotic or invasive species). Such coordination is especially important in cases where one entity's trail links to another's.

Issue PA-13: Recreational Units in Big Sur

PA-13.8 Evaluate potential hostel sites in State Parks: State Department of Parks and Recreation, in consultation with Hostelling International, Monterey County, and others, should perform the necessary evaluation to determine whether a structure in Pfeiffer Big Sur State Park can be used as a hostel; and, if so, prepare the necessary permit application and funding requests. If no structures are determined suitable or if additional beds are also desired, State Parks should evaluate alternative sites for a hostel within their holdings, e.g., in Andrew Molera State Park as part of preparing a General Plan for the Park.

Chapter 6 - Coastal Hazards

Issue CH-8: Del Monte Forest Shoreline Erosion

CH-8.5 Coordinate shoreline management: The Pebble Beach Company, Cypress Point Club, and Monterey Peninsula Country Club should coordinate in preparing shoreline management plans for their respective shoreline segments.

Issue CH-9: Rural Fire Standards

CH-9.6 Coordinate fire prevention efforts: The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, local fire protection districts, and others involved in fire safety should coordinate with resource agency staff and revise their public information documents to be more specific about recommended alternative vegetation management measures can be used to help minimize fire hazards consistent with resource protection.

CH-9.7 Minimize habitat impacts from fire prevention measures: Managers of land with environmentally sensitive habitats (such as State Park personnel) should be guided by maintenance plans to protect and enhance the habitats, based on the latest applicable scientific literature (see Recommendations SH-28.5 and SH-29.4). Any necessary fire prevention measures should be consistent with these plans to maximize protection of environmentally sensitive habitats. Where such plans are not in place or are not applicable, required fire protection measures should be implemented in a manner that

minimizes adverse impacts on environmentally sensitive habitats and where possible promote the health of the sensitive habitat in question.

Issue CH-10: Carmel River Mouth Breaching

CH-10.5 Coordinate agency responses to breaching: Agencies with permit authority (i.e., Coastal Commission, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, Regional Water Quality Control Board, and California Department of Fish and Game along with Monterey County) should develop a coordinated response to river mouth management. For example, agencies should provide the County with a comprehensive list of application requirements, coordinate a time limit for reviewing the material and processing the permits, and pursue joint enforcement actions against any failures to obtain permits or violations of permit conditions. Approved permits should be for a defined time period (e.g., five years) and mandate that the least environmentally damaging alternative be pursued to a timely conclusion (see Recommendation CH-10.2).

CH-10.6 Include lagoon management in a Carmel River watershed plan: As part of a comprehensive Carmel River watershed plan (pursuant to Recommendations under Issue WQ-6: Watershed Planning in Appendix A), the entity preparing the plan should include a discussion of lagoon protection and management in the context of overall river management, consistent with Recommendations CH-10.1 through CH-10.3. For example, lagoon habitat management needs to account for silt or pollutants that are derived from river flows and low to no flows due to upstream water withdrawals.

Issue CH-11: Salinas River Mouth Breaching

CH-11.5 Include lagoon management in a Salinas River watershed plan: As part of a comprehensive Salinas River watershed plan (pursuant to Recommendations under Issue WQ-6: Watershed Planning in Appendix A), the entity preparing the plan should discuss lagoon protection and management in the context of overall river management, consistent with Recommendations CH-11.1 through CH-11.3. For example, lagoon habitat management needs to account for silt or pollutants that are derived from river flows and low to no flows due to upstream water withdrawals.

Issue CH-13: Pajaro River

CH-13.4 Include lagoon management in a Pajaro River watershed plan: As part of a comprehensive Pajaro River watershed plan (pursuant to Recommendations under Issue WQ-6: Watershed Planning in Appendix A), the entity preparing the plan should discuss lagoon protection and management in the context of overall river management, consistent with Recommendations CH-13.2. For example, lagoon habitat management needs to account for silt or pollutants that are derived from river flows and times of low to no flows due to upstream water withdrawals.

CH-13.5 Implement flood control in a manner protective of resources: Agencies engaged in flood protection, such as Santa Cruz County, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and Department of Water Resources (along with Monterey County), should work cooperatively to prepare and implement flood

controls strategies consistent with Recommendation CH-13.2 in the context of an overall Pajaro River watershed management plan (see Recommendation CH-13.4).

Chapter 7 - Scenic and Visual Resources

Issue SR-10: Big Sur Critical Viewshed

SR-10.13 Identify potential TDC receiver sites: Public agencies, land trusts, and private landowners with holdings in Big Sur (along with Monterey County) should work together to identify potential TDC receiver sites.

SR-10.14 Identify funding sources to protect critical viewshed: Big Sur Land Trust, citizens groups, and/or others (along with Monterey County) should identify and pursue sources of funding to purchase remaining critical viewshed parcels (or scenic easements over them) whose development potential are not retired through the TDC programs or by other means.

SR-10.15 Develop successor program to Proposition 70: Big Sur Land Trust, Coastal Conservancy and/or other similar public and non-profit agencies (along with Monterey County) should continue to develop and implement a strategy to retire any visible development potential in the Big Sur critical viewshed. The program should catalog and evaluate those parcels within the viewshed that have no buildable site outside of the critical viewshed. The program should establish a list of priority parcels and cost estimates developed in advance of new viewshed acquisitions based on an evaluation of the experiences with using Proposition 70 funds. It should be available to fund opportunity sales. The program may also include efforts to retire development potential in other more cost-effective ways and should also include measures to manage these lands. Publicly acquired lands or easements should include public access where appropriate and should not preclude access in the future.

SR-10.16 Implement viewshed restoration policies: Big Sur Land Trust, Coastal Conservancy, and/or other similar public and non-profit agencies (along with Monterey County) should develop and implement the phased, voluntary restoration strategy identified in *Big Sur Coast LUP* Sections 3.2.6 and 7.2.7. The goal of the restoration strategy is to improve the quality of the critical viewshed by removing or modifying non-essential structures, overhead utility lines, and other visual detractors that degrade the scenic character of the viewshed. This approach would require identification of areas of the coast where the viewshed can be feasibly restored to a more unspoiled condition. Detracting elements that need attention include, but are not limited to road scars, utility poles, non-essential signs, intrusive lighting, and invasive non-native vegetation. Such program should be designed to support the owners of existing residential, commercial, and open space properties that desire to cooperatively assist in viewshed restoration. The program should provide appropriate incentives, including assistance in grant requests, for utility undergrounding, erosion control, landscape screening, repainting, facilitation of permits for remediation work, setback variances, and other measures that will encourage the removal, relocation, modification, or concealment of existing visible development. For those structures that still serve a current use, relocation outside of the critical viewshed would generally be the preferred restoration measure. However, such relocation must still be consistent with other resource protection policies, and

redesign may be necessary to reduce bulk or height in order to place the structure outside of the critical viewshed. These measures should not be applied to bona fide historical structures that contribute to the rustic and rural ambience of the Big Sur Coast.

SR-10.17 Institute community viewshed protection programs: Community groups, real estate agents, and others should develop programs to discourage incompatible development in Big Sur (especially in the critical viewshed); e.g., develop and implement measures that publicize the requirements for additions and remodels to potential buyers and neighborhood CC&Rs and develop and implement programs to voluntarily reduce lighting that is visible to the public.

SR-10.19 Protect and restore the Point Sur viewshed: In preparing the General Plan for Point Sur State Historical Park, State Parks and Recreation should follow LCP policies that prohibit new development in the viewshed, allow structural enlargements or replacements that do not increase visibility, and allow screened parking to serve the Point Sur Lighthouse (see Recommendation SR-10.1). Similarly, State Parks should design specific projects using the same criteria. State Parks shall follow-through on a commitment to restore the public viewshed at this location. Rehabilitation of any structure in the viewshed should only be proposed if State Parks finds that it is not economically feasible to restore the public viewshed in the structure's location. State Parks should review its other land holdings to determine whether there are alternative sites out of the viewshed to house staff.

CHAPTER 8 - Archaeological, Cultural & Paleontological Resources

AR.9 Periodically review archaeological procedures: Native Americans, archaeological experts, and others should periodically meet to review and discuss County procedures to determine if they are working well in protecting archaeological sites and make any necessary corrective recommendations to Monterey County.

AR.10 Ensure reports meet professional standards: Archaeological researchers should periodically analyze a sample of archaeological reports prepared for coastal permits to determine if they comply with current professional standards and make any necessary corrective recommendations to Monterey County regarding such reports.