



Issues of Concern on the LCP
Prepared for the July 21, 2022 Sonoma Coast MAC meeting
Issues raised by MAC representatives; Responding comments from Permit Sonoma.

Scott Farmer, Timber Cove Coast MAC Representative:

1. Program C-OSRC-11-P1: I wish to underscore the importance that this program indeed establish a coastal permit exemption defining and allowing best practices to reduce woodland fire risk. Make it easy to do the right thing. Time is of the essence.

Thank you for your comment. This is a high priority program.

2. The passage about High Schools incorrectly states that coast high schoolers from Fort Ross south attend El Molino. El Molino no longer serves high schoolers.

This will reference will be updated to reflect the consolidation of El Molino and Analy high schools.

3. Program C-PF-5-P2: I fully support this addition to the LCP.

Thank you for your comment.

Beth Bruzzone, Bodega/Valley Ford Coast MAC Representative:

1. South Sonoma Coast constituents have many concerns with the LCP. Most important on the list is that as a whole, Supervisor Hopkins constituents feel frustrated and unheard, that their voices do not matter, that NGO's, public-private organizations, parks department and outside influences carry more weight, are more favored than the voting public. I want to lead with this concern because it is something I hear from a wide variety of folks in District 5 on a wide variety of issues. Please note that I am not intending to be inflammatory, I am reporting back to D5 what I am hearing from constituents. This first paragraph directly relates to the last paragraph.

We appreciate your comment and ensure that the constituents of South Sonoma Coast's comments have been reviewed by staff and included in the public record that will be made available to the Board of Supervisors for their review.

2. Public Access is more important than personal property rights and impact on our residents and our environment. Trespassing is an issue on the ranches and many of our residential communities. I am hearing this from people that live in Valley Ford, Bodega, Bodega Harbour Homeowners Association, Bay Flat/Westside Area and Old Town mostly, but many in the greater Bodega Bay Area have voiced this concern. Public access is ruining our environment. Sensitive habitats are being trampled and eroded. For the first time in anyones memory graffiti and tagging is occurring. Wildlife is being stalked and disturbed by visitors and their off leash dogs without any concept of repercussions or safety. Not much hope for the new tri county campaign to take your trash with you, many see it as moneys that could have gone to something more realistic.....people either have manners and a conscious or they don't. Signage and marketing wont change the behavior of bad actors. In short, the LCP needs to effectively balance local needs with visitors needs, not give visitors the majority of the consideration. Many people have brought up to me that the Coastal Act specifically mentions that personal property rights and the environment shall not be infringed.

Thank you for your comment.

The Public Access Element protects and defends the public's constitutionally guaranteed rights of access to and along the Sonoma Coast while upholding the requirements of the Coastal Act. The Public Access Element establishes policies to protect existing access areas and identifies future public access areas. Your comment has been reviewed by staff, and we will ensure that public access areas will be protected, and that local needs shall be taking into serious consideration.

3. Lack of consideration of topography and natural limitations on roadways and coastal access regarding carrying capacity. Too many people on the roads at the same time is a really big complaint. In general, the option of a shuttle without a reservation system and visitor parking restrictions is not well received, that the needs and expectations of the visitors to the coast are not the same as visitors to the river. Many people have mentioned Muirwoods as a model of what could be done, within the LCP, to deal with the overwhelming number of people that come to Bodega Bay and surrounding areas, on popular weekends.

Thank you for your comment. Circulation and Transit Element Policy C-CT-2d, Program C-CT-2-P1 and Initiative C-CT-2-I1 and Public Access Program C-PA-4-P3 support development of public transit options.

4. The greater Bodega Bay Area is a cash cow for the county coffers via TOT dollars. This concern is in lock step with vacation rental concerns. Too many vacation rentals tax all of our limited resources and are ruining our sense of community. The LCP needs to address this issue and reign in rentals and create meaningful consequences for bad behavior (for all, including property owners and residents) Water use comes up in this part of the conversation as well, many have suggested water monitoring for visitors/renters. It's not

uncommon to witness visitors washing their boats and vehicles or letting their children play in sprinklers or with the hose, unconcerned about water shortages.

Thank you for your comment. The County is currently reviewing an update to the countywide Vacation Rental Ordinance and regulations are proposed for the Coastal Zone. More information about that project may be found by visiting the [Vacation Rental Update](#) page. The Local Coastal Plan Public Facilities Element acknowledges that water supply is limited and developing new sources is unlikely.

5. Fire and natural disaster. Lack of capacity to deal with tourists when a disaster occurs, whether we are prevented from leaving due to road encumbrances, or emergency services are prevented from getting to us. Constituents brought up two very real concerns: Earthquake on a heavy use weekend and 900 full time residents need to feed and house 5000 to 10,000 visitors....or....a fast moving wildfire erupts and 5000 to 10,000 visitors are competing with the 900 residents, pets, ranchers and livestock, trying to evacuate or seek safe shelter.

Thank you for your comment. The County will soon begin the process of evaluating evacuation routes and planning for evacuation routes as part of an update to the Public Safety Element of the General Plan 2020. Please look for more information about this project in the coming months by reviewing our [Proposed Long-Range Plans](#) page.

6. Another equally important, common comment from constituents in my area is the lack of being able to read and digest the Planning Commission's recommendations draft of the LCP for the Board of Supervisors before it was voted on by the Planning Commissioners. PRMD publicly stated that there would be a 30 day complete draft review period prior to the vote. That did not happen. People understood that this massive document was an overwhelming undertaking, and it being late was not the main concern, but that adjustments should have been made to delay future meetings, so that the public had/has adequate time to do their due diligence on the new, revised document, and any further revisions the Board of Supervisors may make to the final draft prior to the Coastal Commission review.

Thank you for your comment.

Staff worked diligently to ensure that ample review time was provided prior to the final Planning Commission meeting to review the draft. Although staff was not able to meet the 30 day deadline for the complete draft, individual elements, maps, and appendices were available for review with additional elements made available as they were finalized. The draft documents to be reviewed by the Board will be made available for review at least 7 days prior to the meeting on 8/30/22.

Jill Lippett, Jenner Coast MAC Representative

1. Save the Sonoma Coast had done in-depth analysis of the LCP and presented innumerable comments, the bulk of which were adopted by the Planning Commission. These are the outstanding issues still of major concern.

No stops on construction of onshore facilities you support offshore energy production (eg, wind turbines), Land Use Element, Policy 3LU 3b;

Thank you for your comment.

Policy C-LU-3b prohibits facilities that support offshore oil, gas, or energy production facilities within the Commercial Fishing land use category.

2. Provisions for piping in water from inland to support coastal construction, Water Element, Policy

Section 5.1 of the Water Resources Element Policy C-WR-5b requires full environmental assessment of any proposal to import water. Policy C-WR-5c requires tracking of trucked water.

3. Lack of mapped ESHA, no accounting for future ESHA due to climate change, OSRC Element;

Individual Coastal Development permits are reviewed on a cases-by-case basis and development proposed by these permits is reviewed for impacts, including potential impacts to ESHA. The Environment maps are a helpful guide for locating known ESHA areas, however, each project location is reviewed on the basis of the definition of ESHA as defined by the text of the LCP and biological surveys are required to make the findings for no impacts to ESHA. Policy C-OSRC-8a states that "Mapping shown in Figures C-OSRC-2a through 2k is not a comprehensive inventory of all ESHA due to changing habitats, future improvements in identifying ESHA, regulatory changes, and scientific discovery." This policy and Policy C-OSRC-8b establish criteria for identifying ESHA at the project level. Policy C-OSRC-8c requires site specific biological resource assessments to identify ESHA on the project site and evaluate adverse impacts that may result from development.

4. -No policy re: optimal forest management for sustainable timber harvest, fire fuel reduction, carbon sequestration, OSRC Element;

Thank you for your comment.

See pages OSRC-47 to OSRC-51 for timber harvest related policies. See Initiative C-PS-6-I1 in the Public Safety element for fire fuel reduction. The lack of carbon sequestration policies has been noted.

5. Separation of small communities from Bodega Bay sphere of influence (ask Rue or Maggie for specific language and citation);

Thank you for your comment.

6. Pushing construction of more "Planned Communities", counting their private common land as "Open Space" and "Natural Resource Conservation", ppLU 18-20;

Thank you for your comment.

7. Re-opening Cheney Gulch to gravel mining, Land Use, pp51-52;

The State Mining and Geology Board identifies remaining sandstone deposit at this site as regionally significant for construction grade aggregate and a priority site for aggregate production, and by law Sonoma County must manage the conservation and development of identified mineral deposits, such as construction grade aggregate. Policy C-OSRC-12b requires that in addition to environmental review, the project must demonstrate that an economic need exists for aggregate materials produced at the site and that full reclamation of the site is feasible and that reclamation will fully restore ecological function of the site to that which existed prior to any mining operation.

8. Allowing vineyards (and their attendant use of pesticides) in the Coastal Zone, Agriculture Element, p AR 10;

Thank you for your comment. Initiative C-AR-1-I5 proposes a reduction in pesticide use. Vineyard proposals do require submittal of a Coastal Development Permit prior to installation and future proposals will be reviewed for their impact on the environment and adjacent properties. Policy C-OSRC-7c prohibits any development that involves the use of pesticides that have potential to significantly degrade Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas or coastal water quality or harm wildlife.

“Initiative C-AR-1-I5: Work with local Resource Conservation Districts and agricultural associations to encourage and promote sustainable agricultural and land management practices that conserve energy and protect water and soil, reduce pesticide use, and supports locally grown and processed agricultural products, to help ensure the long-term use and conservation of coastal resources.”

9. Zoning for Commercial Tourism in Rural Residential areas of Bodega Harbor and "other planned developments", Land Use Element, pLU-24;

Thank you for your comment.

10. Pushing development of all small communities in the Coastal Zone, from Annapolis to Valley Ford, which will presumably require piped water, Land Use Element, Policies 5f thru 5t;

Thank you for your comment.

Policies including C-LU-5o, C-LU-5p, C-LU-5s, and C-LU-5t all specify that development expansions in Jenner, Duncan Mills, Chanslor Ranch, and Valley Ford are required to meet water supply requirements.

11. Plans to develop a recreational facility at Bridgehaven, where the convergence of Willow Creek and the Russian River comprises critical environmentally-sensitive salmonid migratory habitat, Land Use Element, Policy C-LU 5q;

Policy C-LU 5q allows for boat launching and rental, and requires that public access be provided as part of any expansion. Establishment of these limited uses will require environmental review and a consolidated Coastal Development Permit as any boat launch facilities will be in the Coastal Commission's retained jurisdiction.

12. No regulation of VRBOs-just a suggestion that standards be developed, Land Use, pLU-39, Program C-LU-5-1p;

Thank you for your comment. The County is currently reviewing an update to the countywide Vacation Rental Ordinance and regulations are proposed for the Coastal Zone. More information about that project may be found by visiting the [Vacation Rental Update](#) page.

13. Allowing "substantial modifications of the natural environment" for development of recreational facilities, Public Access, pPA-23;

Thank you for your comment. In planning for recreational activities, substantial modifications of the natural environment for a specific activity should be first avoided, then minimized when avoidance is not possible.

14. Increasing traffic on Hwy 1 through construction of "Scenic Vista Points"-OSRC, p5, and parking lots along the coast-Public Access, pPA-30, Goal C-PA-4;

Thank you for your comment.

15. Inadequate Glossary to define key terms used in Policy;

Thank you for your comment.

16. No Zoning document available to ascertain actual physical location of new zoning categories created in LCP draft.

No new zoning categories have been proposed by the updated LCP draft. You may review the draft [Land Use Map Series](#) located with the draft LCP Figures. Following adoption of the LCP update additional zoning code changes will be brought before the Board of Supervisors and notice of that project will be provided at that time.

Richard Charter, The Ocean Foundation, Bodega Bay

1. Local Control Over Onshore Industrial Facilities Needed in the Sonoma Coast LCP Update:

During the 1980's, Sonoma County's elected officials and their constituents were alarmed to learn that the small fishing harbor at Bodega Bay was the prime target for a large industrial facility to support offshore oil and gas drilling then planned near our Sonoma Coast beaches. For this reason, our LCP has since required a vote of the electorate should any such oil facility be proposed here. Now, fast-forward to 2022, and Bodega Bay is once again on the map of potential industrial facilities that are likely to be built in the next decade or so to bring a subsea electrical power cable onshore into a large shoreline substation to connect with an overland high-voltage transmission line to the San Francisco Bay Area. The potential right-of-way for such a transmission line remained active after the Bodega Bay nuclear power plant was stopped, crossing the Estero Americano and routed toward Marin. Now, our present LCP Update proceeding offers us a one-time opportunity to similarly keep our local control over subsea cable landfalls, onshore industrial substations, and transmission lines from floating offshore wind arrays resulting from this year's pending federal offshore wind leases off of Humboldt County, and likely, also within a year off of Mendocino County. This is not a step to oppose offshore wind energy development that will occur on the North Coast, we may well want to support the wind arrays, but this current LCP Update represents the only way to maintain strong local control as some of the same big petroleum companies that previously wanted to build major facilities here in Bodega Bay to service their offshore oil drilling rigs are instead now operating as floating offshore wind companies, such as Shell, BP, and Equinor (formerly Statoil). The LCP Update is our best feasible opportunity to keep the future of Bodega Bay, and the rest of the Sonoma Coast, under local stewardship here at the County level.

Permit Sonoma staff has not been able to find evidence that the proposed 220 kV Bodega Bay – Ignacio transmission line right-of-way is “active”. Sonoma County Code Chapter 31 “On-Shore Oil and Gas Facilities ordinance of Sonoma County” requires voter approval for on-shore gas and oil facilities, but this ordinance requires that any amendment be approved by the voters. This is reflected in Policy C-LU-3a. It should also be noted that local control is limited by Section 30515 of the Coastal Act, which allows the Coastal Commission to directly amend the Local Coastal Plan if the Commission determines that a public need of an area greater than that included within the certified local coastal program exists.

Thank you for your comment.

Brian Leubitz, Bodega Bay Coast MAC Representative

1. Traffic. Currently the LCP mentions parking and traffic between Jenner and Bodega Bay. Policy C-PA-4a calls for additional parking, but the calls elsewhere in the document for additional services from Bodega Bay to Jenner don't adequately consider the traffic, particularly during weekends. In Bodega Bay, there is no adequate plan to deal with the traffic from the left turn from Highway 1 onto Westside road. A turn lane would alleviate much of that traffic.

Thank you for your comment.

2. Water Services & Subdivisions: A revision in the public facilities (C-PF-2i) would encourage larger scale development by encouraging urban (aka Bodega Bay) water systems to grow to meet the demands of new developments. Given the limited water resources available to Bodega Bay, this seems impractical.

Thank you for your comment.

Policy C-PF-2i states that any subdivision of land or new development uses within a water or wastewater service area shall be required to include written certification from the service provider that existing water and wastewater services are available to serve the new parcels, development, and uses. It also states that the service provider will make improvements to the water or wastewater systems necessary to accommodate new development uses prior to final project approval.

3. Noise: Under previous drafts/LCPs, there was a specific noise element. Given the increased development in Bodega Bay and weekend crowds, does the current draft do enough to protect the environment and wild animals from human created noise?

Thank you for your comment. Policy C-LU-1e requires that noise be evaluated for impacts to biological resources even if the general noise standards found in Policy C-LU-1d are met. Policy

C-LU1g prohibits special events from generating temporary noise impacts that would affect biological resources. Impulsive sounds, such as fireworks are prohibited. These standards are more restrictive than the current Local Coastal Plan, which does not consider impacts to biological resources.

LCP Policies C-LU-1d, C-LU-1e, C-LU-1g, C-LU-5-1p discuss noise levels.

Ginny Nichols, Bodega Bay Coast MAC Representative

1. Figure C-LU-1 Land Use Map incorrectly shows Sereno del Mar(SDM) in Subarea 8 instead of in Subarea 9. Residents of SDM are in the Bodega Bay Fire Protection District (BBFPD) and vote in Bodega Bay.

Thank you for pointing this out. This can be addressed in technical corrections.

2. Figure C-PF-1 Facilities Fire Map Series shows Sereno del Mar in BBFPD. These two maps should be consistent and show SDM as a part of Bodega Bay. Therefore SDM should be in Subarea 9. The request is to update the map Figure C-LU-1 Land Use Map to make them consistent.

Thank you for pointing this out. This can be addressed in technical corrections.