

From: Laura Morgan <thesquig@yahoo.com>

Sent: Tuesday, June 21, 2022 4:51 PM

To: Caitlin Cornwall <Caitlin.Cornwall@sonoma-county.org>; Jacquelynne Ocana <Jacquelynne.Ocana@sonoma-county.org>; Larry Reed <Larry.Reed@sonoma-county.org>; Eric Koenigshofer <Eric.Koenigshofer@sonoma-county.org>; Kevin Deas <Kevin.Deas@sonoma-county.org>

Cc: Gary Helfrich <Gary.Helfrich@sonoma-county.org>; Tennis Wick <Tennis.Wick@sonoma-county.org>; Lynda Hopkins <Lynda.Hopkins@sonoma-county.org>; Peter@Coastal Benham <peter.benham@coastal.ca.gov>; SonCo_LCP.Update2020 <sonco_lcpupdate2020@googlegroups.com>; Ernie Carpenter <ernie_man@comcast.net>; Richard Retecki <Retecki43@gmail.com>; Planner <planner@sonoma-county.org>

Subject: LCP Final Draft Comments from Save the Sonoma Coast

EXTERNAL

Esteemed Planning Commissioners and Staff,

Thanks to all of you for your hours of toil over this document. It is a monumental and durable achievement for which we are deeply grateful.

In advance of the upcoming and last Planning Commission hearing on June 29th, here are a few more group comments/concerns re: the LCP Final Draft.

Glossary: Please define “planned community” and “resources and rural development”

Land Use:

-Planned Communities are zoned as recreational and open space without adequate justification (Land Use, p LU-18);

-Diverse Ag allows a change in zoning to accommodate hobby Ag (eg, vineyards) and permitted in areas “surrounded by farming” (p LU- 19-20), which could lead to creeping vineyards and their attendant use of pesticides.

-Commercial Tourist Zoning in Bodega Bay to occupy Rural Residential area of Bodega Harbor?

-Still no policy to protect our coastline as a whole from onshore support of offshore energy production?? Why not take a protective stance by adding it to existing Policy C-LU-3a: “A Local Coastal Plan Amendment shall be required for any proposed onshore facility to support offshore oil and gas exploration or development. Any such amendment shall not be effective until a majority of the voters in Sonoma County, in a general or special election, approve the proposed amendment, unless such amendment is approved by the California Coastal Commission pursuant to Section 30515 of the California Coastal Act....”,

especially when we have below it Policy C-LU-3b: “Prohibit facilities that support offshore oil, gas, or energy production facilities within the Commercial Fishing land use category. (PC REVISED - EXISTING LCP REVISED?? pp LU-29-30

-Policies C-LU-5f through 5t specifically call for development of all tiny communities along the coast, from Annapolis to Valley Ford. Why is this necessary? It will increase traffic on already congested Hwy 1, make emergency services more difficult to provide and impair the charm of those very places. pp LU-37-39

-Policy C-LU-5q: Allow expansion of public access the Bridgehaven Resort, by adding boat rentals and launching and day use facilities subject to design review. Require public access as a condition of for approval of any Coastal Permit for expansion of uses at the resort. (CCC REVISED - EXISTING LCP REVISED)

This is ESHA. Anadromous fish enter Willow Creek just up-River from Bridgehaven. Should be thrown out.

-Program C-LU-5-1P: Establish performance standards for the use of existing residences for vacation rentals and hosted rentals. In developing standards consider: requirements for designated property managers, safety, parking, noise, and number of guests allowed for day time and nighttime occupancy. In addition to performance standards, identify areas where high concentration of vacation rental would impact environmentally sensitive habitat areas, water quality, or coastal access and develop land use policy to avoid these impacts. (NEW)

No specifics, no policy, no enforcement. p LU-39

Public Access

-“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.....” p PA-23

It is antithetical to the policies in OSRC to substantially modify the natural environment.

-“GOAL C-PA-4: Establish a no or low cost parking system with adequate parking facilities for coastal parks, beaches, access-ways, and trails throughout the Sonoma County coast, with minimal impacts on views, public safety, and natural resources.” p PA-30

Rejects the idea of shuttles and lowering vehicle miles traveled.

OSRC Element

Still mis-spellings (eg, *Stellar* sea lions), omissions compared to what we requested and mistakes we pointed out before (eg, eelgrass prevalence). On the other hand, there are some terrific improvements in riparian, wetland and marine mammal protections, significant pesticide control language.

Another omission? GOAL C-OSRC-13: Promote energy conservation and increase energy supply by increased reliance on renewable energy sources that will ____? greenhouse gas emissions.

We still strongly disagree with the construction of scenic vista points along already congested and crumbling Hwy 1.

-Mineral Resources basically provides rationale and policy for re-opening Cheney Gulch Quarry to aggregate mining (pp OSRC-51-52), which was prohibited for biotic resource protection in the past. Considering that California has been internationally designated as a biodiversity hot-spot at extreme risk for extinctions, why is this being allowed??

Thanks once again for including many of our recommendations in the Draft,

Laura Morgan for Save the Sonoma Coast

THIS EMAIL ORIGINATED OUTSIDE OF THE SONOMA COUNTY EMAIL SYSTEM.

Warning: If you don't know this email sender or the email is unexpected, **do not** click any web links, attachments, and **never** give out your user ID or password.