

GAVPAC
OUTLINE OF DISCUSSION
ON
RESOURCES
(updated 01/20/11)

In order to focus and structure our discussion on Resources, I request that you re-read the Gaviota Study Group Report section on Stewarding the Land and Resources (attached) and consider the following as ideas and subject areas for us to direct staff in developing policies on this subject:

1. **Watershed Planning:** Develop a watershed planning policy utilizing the principles enunciated in the Study Group Report. Key elements include:

- Watershed planning is voluntary.
- Incentives should be provided which reward landowners for doing a watershed plan, ie it should act as a master plan or development agreement which allows ministerial approval of improvements within designated areas on the plan.
- Landowners involved in watershed planning should be provided government technical assistance at no cost, and there should be no fees charged by the government for processing them.

GavPAC recommendation to Staff made during Meeting No. 25:

- a) *create a voluntary watershed management plan policy approach to management of watersheds with lands not seeking enhanced entitlements*
- b) *consider policies for using a mandatory approach to watershed management for development such as subdivisions, and use tools such as development agreements, in-lieu fees, master plans, etc to implement that policy*
- c) *create plan area wide best management practices for water quality protection*
- d) *promote interagency coordination and engagement of public agencies, particularly those with landholdings within the plan area (U.S. Forest Service, State Parks, etc)*
- e) *policy should reflect the GavPAC's desire to use watersheds as a central organizing concept for policy development.*

2. **Control of Invasive Plants:** The County, the Cachuma RCD and the USDA NRCS should provide assistance to landowners to remove and control invasive species. In the case of an emergency, such as the citing of a new and highly contagious species, the County should have the right to enter private property, after notice, and remove the species.

GavPAC recommendation to Staff made during Meeting No. 24:

- a) *The County shall apply for grants to assist landowners in removing invasive or noxious species.*
- b) *Landscape plans and palettes in the Plan area shall not include invasive or noxious plants.*

3. Restoration: Implement the permit streamlining system in place in other coastal Counties for NRCS single stop permitting of defined restoration projects. Develop and implement strong policies protecting landowners from adverse effects of restoration. Consider a list of priority restoration projects to recommend for a pilot project to demonstrate how the new policies could work to protect property owners.

GavPAC recommendation to Staff made during Meeting No. 24:

a) Develop a mechanism to implement a County-wide programmatic permit for habitat restoration projects, including the development of a safe harbor mechanism at the State, Federal, and County level to protect landowners (landowners doing restoration and neighboring landowners) from the effect of restoring endangered species habitat and ESHA.

4. Wildlife corridors: Consider adoption of a policy which protects riparian corridors and other major and mapped wildlife corridors consistent with the right of property owners to develop their property.

5. Interagency Council: Develop a policy to establish an interagency council on the model of the Monterey County council which will consist of all public agencies with jurisdiction or property in Gaviota and which will review and comment on any significant agency project planned for the Gaviota area in light of County policies which protect the natural resources.

GavPAC recommendation to Staff made during Meeting No. 25:

a) The GavPAC directed Staff to develop policy to support the creation of an interagency council which would function as a clearinghouse for issues in the plan area.

6. ESHA: How is ESHA determined? Does the current County mapping continue and how is it updated? Can we exclude from official ESHA areas restored by landowners? How can we deal with the CCC definition which seems to embrace practically all the land in Gaviota? Why must grasslands with at least 10% native grass be considered ESHA? What is the setback from ESHA? How do we deal with ESHA in trying to facilitate agriculture?

GavPAC recommendation to Staff made during Meeting No. 25:

a) Extend ESHA mapping to inland areas

b) Examine ESHA regulations in the zoning ordinance to ensure that it is consistent with the Coastal Act

c) Create flexible buffer policies and consider the purpose and context of the buffer as well as the use of the land next to the buffer

d) allow for maintenance and of existing non-conforming development located within sensitive habitat buffers

e) use a hierarchy construct to consider additional habitat types or individual species that could be protected to a similar degree as ESHA

7. Cultural Resources: Develop development standards that support existing policy protecting archaeological and historical resources. Also encourage potential development of a community cultural center on the coast.