General Comment: The list of LCP policies included in ARARs worksheet is incomplete. Below is a list of potentially relevent policies. Given that the City's CEQA document will serve as the environmental review for DTSC when considering approval of OU-E RAP, it has been determined that the EIR alternatives should consider OU-E in it's entirety as the dual purposes of the EIR make these projects inseperable. After the FS Addendum is complete, the project description finalized, and EIR Alternatives identified, additional agency comments can be provided.

Standard, Requirement, Criteria, Limitation	Citation	Description	Agency Comments	Туре
Coastal General Plan, Introduction	Policy 1-1	The policies of the Coastal Act (Coastal Act Sections 30210 through 30264) shall guide the interpretation of the Land Use Plan.		
Coastal General Plan, Introduction	Policy 1-2	Where policies within the Coastal General Plan overlap or conflict, the policy which is the most protective of coastal resources shall take precedence.		
Coastal General Plan, Introduction	Policy 1-3	Prior to the issuance of any development permit required by this Plan, the City shall make the finding that the development meets the standards set forth in all applicable Coastal General Plan policies		
Coastal General Plan, Introduction	Policy 1-4:	(appealable to the Coastal Commission)		
	Policy LU-10.3	The location and amount of new development shall maintain and enhance public access to the coast by: (1) facilitating the extension of transit services where feasible; (2) providing non-automobile circulation within the development that includes circulation connections outside of the development; (3) assuring that the recreational needs of new residents will be supported by onsite recreational facilities and/or off-site local park recreational facilities to ensure that coastal recreation areas are not overloaded; and (4) utilizing smart growth and mixed-use development concepts where feasible to improve circulation and reduce auto use, where such auto use would impact coastal access roads.		
Coastal General Plan, Land Use	Policy LU-10.6	Protect Special Communities. New Development shall, where appropriate, protect special communities and neighborhoods which, because of their unique characteristics, are popular visitor destination points for recreational uses.		
Coastal General Plan, Public Facilities	Policy PF-2.1	Development Pays Its Share: Require that new development pay its share of capital improvements and the cost of public services to maintain adequate levels of service.		
Coastal General Plan, Open Space	Policy OS-1.1	Definition of ESHA. "Environmentally sensitive habitat area" means any area in which plant or animal life or their habitats are either rare or especially valuable because of their special nature or role in an ecosystem and which could be easily disturbed or degraded by human activities and developments. Development in Wetlands. Diking, Filling, and Dredging of open coastal		
Coastal General Plan, Open Space	Policy OS-1.3	waters, wetlands, estuaries, and lakes shall be permitted where there is no feasible less environmentally damaging alternative, and where feasible mitigation measures have been provided to minimize adverse environmental effects, and shall be limited to the following uses: a. New or expanded port, energy, and coastal-dependent industrial facilities, including commercial fishing facilities. b. Maintaining existing or restoring previously dredged depths in existing navigational channels. turning basins, vessel berthing and mooring		
Coastal General Plan, Open Space	Policy OS-1.4	The more specific permissible use provisions for wetlands and rivers and streams identified in Policies OS-1.3 and OS-1.5 shall control over the more general permissible use provisions for ESHA identified in Policy OS-1.6.		

General Comment: The list of LCP policies included in ARARs worksheet is incomplete. Below is a list of potentially relevent policies. Given that the City's CEQA document will serve as the environmental review for DTSC when considering approval of OU-E RAP, it has been determined that the EIR alternatives should consider OU-E in it's entirety as the dual purposes of the EIR make these projects inseperable. After the FS Addendum is complete, the project description finalized, and EIR Alternatives identified, additional agency comments can be provided.

Policy OS-1.5

Development in Rivers and Streams. Channelizations, dams, or other substantial alterations of rivers and streams shall incorporate the best mitigation measures feasible, and be limited to:

- a. Necessary water supply projects,
- b. Flood control projects where no other method for protecting existing structures in the floodplain is feasible and where such protection is necessary for public safety or to protect existing development, or
- Developments where the primary function is the improvement of fish and wildlife habitat.

Coastal General Plan, Open Space

Policy OS-1.6

Development within ESHA shall protect ESHA against any significant disruption of habitat values and shall be limited to the following uses: a. Resource Dependent Uses. Public nature trails within riparian ESHA are considered a resource dependent use provided that: (1) the length of the trail within the riparian corridor shall be minimized; (2) the trail crosses the stream at right angles to the maximum extent feasible; (3) the trail is kept as far up slope from the stream as possible; (4) trail development involves a minimum of slope disturbance and vegetation clearing; and (5) the trail is the minimum width necessary. Interpretive signage may be used along permissible nature trails accessible to the public to provide information about the value and need to protect sensitive resources.

- b. Restoration projects where the primary purpose is restoration of the
- c. Invasive plant eradication projects if they are designed to protect and enhance habitat values.
- d. Pipelines and utility lines installed underneath the ESHA using directional drilling techniques designed to avoid significant disruption of habitat values.

Policy OS-1.7

Development in areas adjacent to ESHAs shall be sited and designed to prevent impacts which would significantly degrade such areas, and shall be compatible with the continuance of such habitat areas.

_ .. __ . .

General Comment: The list of LCP policies included in ARARs worksheet is incomplete. Below is a list of potentially relevent policies. Given that the City's CEQA document will serve as the environmental review for DTSC when considering approval of OU-E RAP, it has been determined that the EIR alternatives should consider OU-E in it's entirety as the dual purposes of the EIR make these projects inseperable. After the FS Addendum is complete, the project description finalized, and EIR Alternatives identified, additional agency comments can be provided.

Permitted Uses within ESHA Buffers. Development within an Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area buffer shall be limited to the following uses:

- a. Wetland Buffer.
- i. Uses allowed within the adjacent Wetland ESHA pursuant to Policy OS-1.3.
- ii. Nature trails and interpretive signage designed to provide information about the value and protection of the resources
- iii. Invasive plant eradication projects if they are designed to protect and enhance habitat values.
- b. Riparian Buffer.
- i. Uses allowed within the adjacent River and Stream ESHA pursuant to Policy OS1.5.
- ii. Uses allowed within the adjacent ESHA pursuant to Policy OS-1.6.
- iii. Buried pipelines and utility lines.
- iv. Bridges.
- v. Drainage and flood control facilities.
- c. Other types of ESHA Buffer.
- i. Uses allowed within the adjacent ESHA pursuant to Policy OS-1.6.
- ii. Buried pipelines and utility lines.
- iii. Bridges.
- iv. Drainage and flood control facilities

Drainage and Erosion Control Plan. Permissible development on all properties containing environmentally sensitive habitat, including but not limited to those areas identified as ESHAs on Map OS-1, shall prepare an erosion, sedimentation, runoff and pollutant control plan for approval by the City. The plan shall include measures to minimize erosion, runoff and discharge of pollutants during project construction, and to minimize erosion, runoff and discharge of pollutants from the site after the project is completed. Any changes in runoff volume, velocity, timing, pollutant discharge, or duration that may affect sensitive plant and animal populations, habitats, or buffer areas for those populations or habitats, shall be reviewed by a qualified biologist to ensure that there will not be adverse hydrologic or, erosion, water quality or sedimentation impacts on sensitive species or habitats. Mitigation measures shall be identified and adopted to minimize potential adverse runoff impacts. All projects resulting in new runoff to any streams in the City or to the ocean shall be designed to minimize the transport of pollutants from roads, parking lots, and other impermeable surfaces of the project.

Coastal General Plan, Open Space

Policy OS-1.10

Policy OS-1.12

General Comment: The list of LCP policies included in ARARs worksheet is incomplete. Below is a list of potentially relevent policies. Given that the City's CEQA document will serve as the environmental review for DTSC when considering approval of OU-E RAP, it has been determined that the EIR alternatives should consider OU-E in it's entirety as the dual purposes of the EIR make these projects inseperable. After the FS Addendum is complete, the project description finalized, and EIR Alternatives identified, additional agency comments can be provided.

Policy OS-1.13

Coastal General Plan, Open Space

Policy OS-1.14

Policy OS-1.15

Landscaping Adjacent to ESHA. All development located within or adjacent to environmentally sensitive habitat areas shall be conditioned to: a) Require all proposed plantings be obtained from local genetic stocks within Mendocino County. If documentation is provided to the review authority that demonstrates that native vegetation from local genetic stock is not available, native vegetation obtained from genetic stock outside the local area, but from within the adjacent region of the floristic province, may be used; and if local genetic stocks within the floristic province are unavailable, the Director may authorize use of a commercial native mix, provided it is clear of invasive seed. Director may also authorize use of a seed mix that is selected for rapid senescence and replacement with native stock; and b) Require an invasive plant monitoring and removal program; and c) Prohibit the planting of any plant species on the property that is (a) listed as problematic and/or invasive by the California Native Plant Society, the California Invasive Plant Council, and/or by the State of California, or (b) listed as a 'noxious weed' by the State of California or the U.S. Federal Government.

Vegetation Removal in ESHA. Prohibit vegetation removal in Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas and buffer areas except for: a) Vegetation removal authorized through coastal development permit approval to accommodate permissible development, b) Removal of trees for disease control, c) Vegetation removal for public safety purposes to abate a nuisance consistent with Coastal Act Section 30005, or d) Removal of firewood for the personal use of the property owner at his or her residence to the extent that such removal does not constitute development pursuant to Coastal Act Section 30106. Such activities shall be subject to restrictions to protect sensitive habitat values.

Implement the following measures when a project involves dredging, filling or diking of open coastal waters, wetlands, estuaries, or lakes: a. Dredging and spoils disposal shall be planned and carried out to

- avoid significant disruption to marine and wildlife habitats and to water circulation to the maximum extent feasible. Avoiding significant disruption means, in part, that the functional capacity of the wetland is maintained to the maximum extent feasible.
- b. Limitations may be imposed on dredging and spoils disposal, including but not limited to, limitations on the timing of the operation, the type of operation, the quantity of dredged material removed, and the location of the spoils site.
- c. Dredge spoils suitable for beach replenishment shall, where feasible, be transported to appropriate beaches or into suitable longshore current systems.
- d. Mitigation measures for dredging, filling, or diking of open coastal waters, wetlands and estuaries may include opening areas to tidal action, removing dikes, improving tidal flushing, wetland creation or other restoration measures.

General Comment: The list of LCP policies included in ARARs worksheet is incomplete. Below is a list of potentially relevent policies. Given that the City's CEQA document will serve as the environmental review for DTSC when considering approval of OU-E RAP, it has been determined that the EIR alternatives should consider OU-E in it's entirety as the dual purposes of the EIR make these projects inseperable. After the FS Addendum is complete, the project description finalized, and EIR Alternatives identified, additional agency comments can be provided.

a. Permit applications for development within or adjacent to Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas including areas identified in Map OS-1 or other sites identified by City staff which have the possibility of containing environmentally sensitive habitat shall include a biological report prepared by a qualified biologist which identifies the resources and provides recommended measures to ensure that the requirements of the Coastal Act and the City of Fort Bragg's Local Coastal Program are fully met. For sites that may contain wetlands, a wetland delineation

Coastal General Plan, Open Space	Policy OS-1.16	are fully met. For sites that may contain wetlands, a wetland delineation is required as part of the biological report. The required content of the biological report is specified in the Coastal Land Use and Development Code. b. Submittal of Biological Reports. These biological reports shall be reviewed by the City and approving agencies. The biological reports described above shall be submitted prior to filing as complete a coastal development permit application and may also be submitted as a part of any environmental documentation required pursuant to CEQA. The selection of the professional preparing the report shall be made or approved by the City or the agency approving the permit and paid for by the applicant. c. Biological reports shall contain mitigating measures meeting the following minimum standards: i.) They are specific, implementable, and, wherever feasible, quantifiable. ii) They result in the maximum feasible protection, habitat restoration and enhancement of sensitive environmental resources. Habitat restoration and enhancement shall be required wherever feasible, in addition to the applicable baseline standard of either avoiding or minimizing significant habitat disruption. iii) They are incorporated into a Mitigation Monitoring Program; and iv) They include substantial information and analysis to support a finding that there is no feasible, less environmentally damaging alternative.
	Policy OS-2.1	Riparian Habitat: Prevent development from destroying riparian habitat to the maximum feasible extent. Preserve, enhance, and restore existing riparian habitat in new development unless the preservation will prevent the establishment of all permitted uses on the property.
	Policy OS-2.2	Protect Aquifers: Protect groundwater aquifers.
Coastal General Plan, Open Space	Policy OS-2.1	To the maximum extent feasible, preserve, enhance, and restore streams and creeks to their natural state.
	Policy OS-3.1	Soil Erosion. Minimize soil erosion to prevent loss of productive soils, prevent flooding, landslides, and maintain infiltration capacity and soil structure.
Coastal General Plan, Open Space	Policy OS-4.1	Preserve Archaeological Resources. New development shall be located and designed to avoid archaeological and paleontological resources where feasible, and where new development would adversely affect archaeological or paleontological resources, reasonable mitigation measures shall be required.

General Comment: The list of LCP policies included in ARARs worksheet is incomplete. Below is a list of potentially relevent policies. Given that the City's CEQA document will serve as the environmental review for DTSC when considering approval of OU-E RAP, it has been determined that the EIR alternatives should consider OU-E in it's entirety as the dual purposes of the EIR make these projects inseperable. After the FS Addendum is complete, the project description finalized, and EIR Alternatives identified, additional agency comments can be provided.

Archaeological Resources Report Required. Development located within areas of known or potential archaeological or paleontological resources shall be required to submit a report consistent with of section

Coastal General Plan, Open Space	Policy OS-4.2	B below prior to approval of a building, grading, or coastal development permit for the development. i. Former Georgia Pacific timber mill. The entire property which comprises the former Georgia-Pacific timber mill site; ii. Noyo Bay. The area located along the south side of Noyo Bay (e.g., Todd Point); iii. Noyo River. All of the areas located adjacent to the north side of the Noyo River; iv. North Fort Bragg Coast. All of the areas located west of Highway 1 and north of Pudding Creek; v. Special Review Areas. All Special Review Areas identified on Map OS-2 in the Coastal General Plan; and vi. Other areas identified by the Director. Other areas identified by the environmental review process (Chapter 18.72), or brought to the attention of the City through special studies performed after the enactment of this Section, as having the potential for containing archaeological or paleontological resources. Report required. A project specific report shall be prepared by a qualified archaeologist and shall be submitted prior to filing as complete a coastal development permit application. The permit review authority may waive the
Coastal General Plan, Open Space	Policy OS-4.3	requirement for a project specific report if the Director determines that Halt all work if archaeological resources are uncovered during construction. Require an evaluation by a qualified archaeologist before recommencing construction.
Coastal General Plan, Open Space	Policy OS-4.4	Locate and/or design new development to avoid archaeological resources where feasible.
Coastal General Plan, Open Space	Policy OS-4.5	Mitigation shall be designed in compliance with the guidelines of the State Office of Historic Preservation and the State Native American Heritage Commission.
Coastal General Plan, Open Space	Policy OS-5.1	Native Species: Preserve native plant and animal species and their habitat.
Coastal General Plan, Open Space	Policy OS-5.2	To the maximum extent feasible and balanced with permitted use, require that site planning, construction, and maintenance of development preserve existing healthy trees and native vegetation on the site.
Coastal General Plan, Open Space	Policy OS-5.3	Require site planning and construction to maintain adequate open space to permit effective wildlife corridors for animal movement between open spaces.
Coastal General Plan, Open Space	Policy OS-5.4	Condition development projects, requiring discretionary approval to prohibit the planting of any species of broom, pampas grass, gorse, or other species of invasive non-native plants deemed undesirable by the City.
Coastal General Plan, Open Space	Policy OS-9.1	Minimize Introduction of Pollutants. Development shall be designed and managed to minimize the introduction of pollutants into coastal waters (including the ocean, estuaries, wetlands, rivers, streams, and lakes) to the extent feasible.

General Comment: The list of LCP policies included in ARARs worksheet is incomplete. Below is a list of potentially relevent policies. Given that the City's CEQA document will serve as the environmental review for DTSC when considering approval of OU-E RAP, it has been determined that the EIR alternatives should consider OU-E in it's entirety as the dual purposes of the EIR make these projects inseperable. After the FS Addendum is complete, the project description finalized, and EIR Alternatives identified, additional agency comments can be provided

rnatives identified, additional agency comments car	n be provided.	
	Policy OS-9.2	Minimize Increases in Stormwater Runoff. Development shall be designed and managed to minimize post-project increases in stormwater runoff volume and peak runoff rate, to the extent feasible, to avoid adverse impacts to coastal waters.
Coastal General Plan, Open Space	Policy OS-9.3	Maintain Biological Productivity and Quality of Coastal Waters. Development shall be designed and managed to maintain, and restore where feasible, the biological productivity and quality of coastal waters, consistent with sections 30230, 30231, and other relevant sections of the California Coastal Act. The Coastal Act sections set forth below are incorporated herein as policies of the Land Use Plan:
Coastal General Plan, Open Space	Policy OS-9.4	Maintain, Enhance, and Restore Marine Resources. Marine resources shall be maintained, enhanced, and, where feasible, restored. Special protection shall be given to areas and species of special biological or economic significance. Uses of the marine environment shall be carried out in a manner that will sustain the biological productivity of coastal waters and that will maintain healthy populations of all species of marine organisms adequate for long-term commercial, recreational, scientific, and educational purposes.
Coastal General Plan, Open Space	Policy OS-9.5	Maintain and Restore Biological Productivity and Water Quality. The biological productivity and the quality of coastal waters, streams, wetlands, estuaries, and lakes appropriate to maintain optimum populations of marine organisms and for the protection of human health shall be maintained and, where feasible, restored through, among other means, minimizing adverse effects of waste water discharges and entrainment, controlling runoff, preventing depletion of ground water supplies and substantial interference with surface water flow, encouraging waste water reclamation, maintaining natural vegetation buffer areas that protect riparian habitats, and minimizing alteration of natural streams.
	Policy OS-10.1	Construction-phase Stormwater Runoff Plan. All development that requires a grading permit or proposes to create or replace a cumulative site total of 5,000 square feet of impervious surface shall submit a Stormwater Runoff and Pollutant Control Plan. This plan shall evaluate potential construction-phase impacts to water quality and coastal waters, and shall specify temporary Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will be implemented to minimize erosion and sedimentation during construction, control runoff and prevent contamination of runoff by construction chemicals and materials.
		Post-Construction Runoff and Pollutant Control. All development that has the potential to adversely affect water quality or hydrology shall include in the Stormwater Runoff and Pollutant Control Plan measures for mosting runoff post construction stormwater management.

Policy OS-10.2

lopment that rology shall Plan measures for meeting runoff post-construction stormwater management standards. This plan shall specify Site Design Measures, Source Controls, and, if necessary, Treatment Control BMPs to minimize stormwater pollution and adverse changes in the site's runoff flow regime after construction, and shall include the monitoring and maintenance plans for Treatment Control BMPs.

General Comment: The list of LCP policies included in ARARs worksheet is incomplete. Below is a list of potentially relevent policies. Given that the City's CEQA document will serve as the environmental review for DTSC when considering approval of OU-E RAP, it has been determined that the EIR alternatives should consider OU-E in it's entirety as the dual purposes of the EIR make these projects inseperable. After the FS Addendum is complete, the project description finalized, and EIR Alternatives identified, additional agency comments can be provided.

Coastal General Plan, Open Space

Policy OS-10.3

of development that has the potential to adversely impact water quality or hydrology in the following order of emphasis:

A) Site Design BMPs. Any project design feature that reduces the creation or severity of potential pollutant sources, or reduces the

A) Site Design BMPs. Any project design feature that reduces the creation or severity of potential pollutant sources, or reduces the alteration of the project site's natural flow regime. Examples include minimizing impervious surfaces, and minimizing grading.

Emphasize Site Design and Source Control BMPs. Long-term postconstruction Best Management Practices (BMPs) that protect water quality and control runoff flow shall be incorporated in the project design.

B) Source Control BMPs. Any schedules of activities, prohibitions of practices, maintenance procedures, managerial practices, or operational practices that aim to prevent stormwater pollution by controlling pollutant sources and keeping pollutants segregated from runoff. Examples include covering outdoor storage areas, use of efficient irrigation, and minimizing the use of landscaping chemicals. Site Design BMPs may reduce a development's need for Source and/or Treatment Control BMPs, and Source Control BMPs may reduce the need for Treatment Control BMPs. Therefore, all development that has the potential to adversely affect water quality shall incorporate effective post-construction Site Design and Source Control BMPs, where applicable and feasible, to minimize adverse impacts to water quality or hydrology and coastal waters resulting from the development. Site Design and Source Control BMPs may include, but are not limited to, those outlined in the Coastal Land Use and Development Code Chapter 17.64.

Incorporate Treatment Control BMPs if Necessary. If the combination of Site Design and Source Control BMPs is not sufficient to protect water quality and coastal waters consistent with Policy OS-9.3, as determined by the review authority, development shall also incorporate post-construction Treatment Control BMPs. Projects of Special Water Quality Concern (see Policy OS-11.1) are presumed to require Treatment Control BMPs to meet the requirements of OS-9.3. Treatment Control BMPs may include, but are not limited to, those outlined in the Coastal Land Use and Development Code Chapter 17.64, including biofilters (e.g., vegetated swales or grass filter strips), bioretention, infiltration trenches or basins, retention ponds or constructed wetlands, detention basins, filtration systems, storm drain

Policy OS-10.4

General Comment: The list of LCP policies included in ARARs worksheet is incomplete. Below is a list of potentially relevent policies. Given that the City's CEQA document will serve as the environmental review for DTSC when considering approval of OU-E RAP, it has been determined that the EIR alternatives should consider OU-E in it's entirety as the dual purposes of the EIR make these projects inseperable. After the FS Addendum is complete, the project description finalized, and EIR Alternatives identified, additional agency comments can be provided.

regulations to protect groundwater may be violated.

Coastal General Plan, Open Space	Policy OS-10.5	Guidance on BMP Selection and Design. Where BMPs are required, BMPs shall be selected that have been shown to be effective in reducing the pollutants typically generated by the proposed land use. The strategy for selection of appropriate BMPS to protect water quality and coastal waters shall be guided by Chapter 17.64.070, Tables 1-3 of the Land Use & Development Code, or equivalent tables which list pollutants of concern for each type of development or land use. The design of BMPs shall be guided by the California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA) Stormwater BMP Handbooks dated January 2015 (or the current edition), or an equivalent BMP manual that describes the type, location, size, implementation, and maintenance of BMPs suitable to address the pollutants generated by the development. Caltrans' 2017 "Storm Water Quality Handbook: Project Planning and Design Guide" (or the current edition) may also be used to guide design of construction-phase BMPs.
	Policy OS-10.6	Water Quality Checklist. A water quality checklist shall be developed and used in the permit review process to evaluate a proposed development's potential impacts to water quality and coastal waters, and proposed mitigation measures.
Coastal General Plan, Open Space	Policy OS-11.1	Use Integrated Management Practices in Site Design. The City shall require, where appropriate and feasible, the use of small-scale Low Impact Development site design measures to maintain natural hydrology by minimizing impervious surfaces and infiltrating stormwater close to its source (e.g., vegetated swales, permeable pavements, and infiltration of rooftop runoff).
	Policy OS-11.2	Preserve Functions of Natural Drainage Systems. Development shall be sited, designed and managed to preserve, and where feasible restore the infiltration, purification, detention, and retention functions of natural drainage systems and hydrologic features (such as stream corridors, drainage swales, topographical depression, groundwater recharge areas, floodplains, and wetlands) that exist on the site, where appropriate and feasible. Drainage shall be conveyed from the developed area of the site in a non-erosive manner.
Coastal General Plan, Open Space	Policy OS-11.4	Infiltrate Stormwater Runoff. Development shall maximize on-site infiltration of stormwater runoff, where appropriate and feasible, to preserve natural hydrologic conditions, recharge groundwater, attenuate runoff flow, and minimize transport of pollutants. Alternative management practices shall be substituted where the review authority has determined that infiltration BMPs may result in adverse impacts, including but not limited to where saturated soils may lead to geologic instability, where infiltration may contribute to flooding, or where

General Comment: The list of LCP policies included in ARARs worksheet is incomplete. Below is a list of potentially relevent policies. Given that the City's CEQA document will serve as the environmental review for DTSC when considering approval of OU-E RAP, it has been determined that the EIR alternatives should consider OU-E in it's entirety as the dual purposes of the EIR make these projects inseperable. After the FS Addendum is complete, the project description finalized, and EIR Alternatives identified, additional agency comments can be provided.

Coastal General Plan, Open Space

Policy OS-11.7

Policy OS-12.1

Coastal General Plan, Open Space

Policy OS-12.2

Avoid Steep Slopes with Highly Erodible Soil. Where feasible, development shall be sited and designed to avoid areas on steep slopes (i.e., 12% or greater) with highly erodible soil. Developments on these hillside areas are considered Developments of Special Water Quality Concern, and are subject to additional requirements (see Policies OS-11.1 and OS-11.2).

Developments of Special Water Quality Concern. The categories of development listed below have the potential for greater adverse coastal water quality impacts, due to the development size, type of land use, impervious site coverage, or proximity to coastal waters. A development in one or more of the following categories shall be considered a "Development of Special Water Quality Concern," and shall be subject to additional requirements set forth in Policy OS-11.2 below to protect coastal water quality. Developments of Special Water Quality Concern include the following:

Additional Requirements for Developments of Special Water Quality Concern. All Developments of Special Water Quality Concern (as identified in Policy OS- 11.1, above) shall be subject to the following four additional requirements to protect coastal water quality: 1) Water Quality Management Plan. The applicant for a Development of Special Water Quality Concern shall be required to submit for approval a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP), prepared by a qualified licensed professional, which supplements the Stormwater Runoff and Pollution Control Plan. The WQMP shall include hydrologic calculations that quantify changes in pollutant loads and runoff flows resulting from the proposed development, and document the effectiveness of the specified BMPs that will be implemented to minimize post-construction water quality impacts. 2) Selection of Structural Treatment Control BMPs. As set forth in Policy OS-9.4. if the review authority determines that the combination of Site Design and Source Control BMPs is not sufficient to protect water quality and coastal waters as required by Policy OS-9.3, structural Treatment Control BMPs shall also be required. The WQMP for a Development of Special Water Quality Concern shall describe the selection of Treatment Controls BMPs, and applicants shall first consider the BMP, or combination of BMPs, that is most effective at removing the pollutant(s) of concern, or provide a justification if that BMP is determined to be infeasible. 3) 85th Percentile Design Standard for Treatment Control BMPs. For post- construction treatment of runoff in Developments of Special Water Quality Concern, Treatment Control BMPs (or suites of BMPs) shall be sized and designed to treat, infiltrate. or retain, at a minimum, the amount of stormwater runoff produced by all storms up to and including the 85th percentile, 24-hour storm event for volume-based BMPs, or the flow of runoff from a rain event equal to at least 2 times the 85th percentile, hourly storm event) for flow-based RMPs Structural Treatment controls are required when RMPs proposed

Municipal Activities to Protect and Restore Water Quality. The City shall promote both the protection and restoration of water quality and coastal waters. Water quality degradation can result from a variety of factors, including but not limited to the introduction of pollutants, increases in runoff volume and rate, generation of non-stormwater runoff, and alteration of physical, chemical, or biological features of the landscape.

Policy OS-13.1

General Comment: The list of LCP policies included in ARARs worksheet is incomplete. Below is a list of potentially relevent policies. Given that the City's CEQA document will serve as the environmental review for DTSC when considering approval of OU-E RAP, it has been determined that the EIR alternatives should consider OU-E in it's entirety as the dual purposes of the EIR make these projects inseperable. After the FS Addendum is complete, the project description finalized, and EIR Alternatives identified, additional agency comments can be provided.

Coastal General Plan, Open Space	Policy OS-13.5	Grading During Rainy Season. Grading is prohibited during periods of long-duration rainfall except in response to emergencies, unless the review authority determines that soil conditions at the project site are suitable, and adequate erosion and sedimentation control measures will be in place during all grading operations. Ground disturbing activities are to be performed during dry weather only and BMP's must be implemented at least 48 hours in advance of predicted rain.
Coastal General Plan, Open Space	Policy OS-14.1	Minimize Polluted Runoff and Pollution from Construction. All development shall minimize erosion, sedimentation, and the discharge of other polluted runoff (e.g., chemicals, vehicle fluids, concrete truck wash-out, and litter) from construction activities, to the extent feasible.
Coastal General Plan, Open Space	Policy OS-14.2	Minimize Land Disturbance During Construction. Land disturbance activities during construction (e.g., clearing, grading, and cut-and-fill) shall be minimized, to the extent feasible, to avoid increased erosion and sedimentation. Soil compaction due to construction activities shall be minimized, to the extent feasible, to retain the natural stormwater infiltration capacity of the soil.
Coastal General Plan, Open Space	Policy OS-14.3	Minimize Disturbance of Natural Vegetation. Construction shall minimize the disturbance of natural vegetation (including significant trees, native vegetation, and root structures), which are important for preventing erosion and sedimentation.
Coastal General Plan, Open Space	Policy OS-14.4	Stabilize Soil Promptly. Development shall implement soil stabilization BMPs (including, but not limited to, re-vegetation) on graded or disturbed areas as soon as feasible.
Coastal General Plan, Open Space	Policy OS-14.5	Grading During Rainy Season. Grading is prohibited during the rainy season (from November 1 to March 30), except in response to emergencies, unless the review authority determines that soil conditions at the project site are suitable, and adequate erosion and sedimentation control measures will be in place during all grading operations.
Coastal General Plan, Open Space	Policy OS-15.2	Protect and Restore Open Space. During the development review process, protect and restore open space areas such as wildlife habitats, view corridors, coastal areas, and watercourses as open and natural.
Coastal General Plan, Open Space	Policy OS-16.1	Coastal Access. Maximum access and recreational opportunities shall be provided consistent with public safety needs and the need to protect public rights, rights of private property owners, and natural resource areas from overuse. Provide public open space and shoreline access in the Coastal Zone as described in Table OS-2 and Map OS-4. Acquisitions for coastal access shall not preclude the potential development of necessary infrastructure to support coastal-dependent uses.
Coastal General Plan, Open Space	Policy OS-16.2	Right of Public Access. Development in the Coastal Zone shall not interfere with the public's right of access to the sea where acquired through 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. Public prescriptive rights must be protected wherever they exist.

General Comment: The list of LCP policies included in ARARs worksheet is incomplete. Below is a list of potentially relevent policies. Given that the City's CEQA document will serve as the environmental review for DTSC when considering approval of OU-E RAP, it has been determined that the EIR alternatives should consider OU-E in it's entirety as the dual purposes of the EIR make these projects inseperable. After the FS Addendum is complete, the project description finalized, and EIR Alternatives identified, additional agency comments can be provided.

Unless a landowner chooses to adjudicate any existing prescriptive

Coastal General Plan, Open Space	Policy OS-16.3	rights issue, where there is substantial evidence that prescriptive rights of access to the beach exist on a parcel, development on that parcel must be designed, or conditions must be imposed, to avoid interference with the prescriptive rights that may exist or to provide alternative, equivalent access.
Coastal General Plan, Open Space	Policy OS-16.7	Mitigation measures required for impacts to public access and recreational opportunities shall be implemented prior to or concurrent with construction of the approved development. Mitigation shall not substitute for implementation of a feasible project alternative that would avoid impacts to public access.
	Policy OS-19.3	Require new development to provide direct pedestrian connections, such as sidewalks, trails, and other rights-of-way to the existing and planned network of parks and trails wherever feasible.
Coastal General Plan, Safety	Policy SF-1.1	Minimize Hazards: New development shall: (a) Minimize risks to life and property in areas of high geologic, flood, and fire hazard; and (b) Assure stability and structural integrity, and neither create nor contribute significantly to erosion, geologic instability, or destruction of the site or surrounding area or in any way require the construction of protective devices that would substantially alter natural landforms along bluffs and cliffs.
Coastal General Plan, Safety	Policy SF-1.2	All ocean-front and blufftop development shall be sized, sited and designed to minimize risk from wave run-up, flooding, and beach and bluff erosion hazards, and avoid the need for a shoreline protective structure at any time during the life of the development.
Coastal General Plan, Safety	Policy SF-1.3	Geotechnical report required. Applications for development located in or near an area subject to geologic hazards, including but not limited to areas of geologic hazard shown on Map SF-1, shall be required to submit a geologic/soils/geotechnical study that identifies all potential geologic hazards affecting the proposed project site, all necessary mitigation measures, and demonstrates that the project site is suitable for the proposed development and that the development will be safe from geologic hazard. Such study shall be conducted by a licensed Certified Engineering Geologist (CEG) or Geotechnical Engineer (GE) and shall be prepared consistent with the requirements of Section 18.54.040(C) of the Coastal Land Use and Development Code. Refer to Map
Coastal General Plan, Safety	Policy SF-1.4	Blufftop Setback. All development located on a blufftop shall be setback from the bluff edge a sufficient distance to ensure that it will be stable for a projected 100-year economic life. Stability shall be defined as maintaining a minimum factor of safety against sliding of 1.5 (static) or 1.1 (pseudostatic), as described in Section 18.54.040(F) of the Coastal Land Use and Development Code. This requirement shall apply to the principal structure and accessory or ancillary structures. Slope stability analyses and erosion rate estimates shall be performed by a licensed Certified Engineering Geologist or Geotechnical Engineer.

General Comment: The list of LCP policies included in ARARs worksheet is incomplete. Below is a list of potentially relevent policies. Given that the City's CEQA document will serve as the environmental review for DTSC when considering approval of OU-E RAP, it has been determined that the EIR alternatives should consider OU-E in it's entirety as the dual purposes of the EIR make these projects inseperable. After the FS Addendum is complete, the project description finalized, and EIR Alternatives identified, additional agency comments can be provided.

Coastal General Plan, Safety

Policy SF-1.5

Coastal General Plan, Safety

Policy SF-1.9

Coastal General Plan, Safety Policy SF-1.10

Siting and design of new blufftop development and shoreline protective devices shall take into account anticipated future changes in sea level. In particular, an acceleration of the historic rate of sea level rise shall be considered. Development shall be set back a sufficient distance landward and elevated to a sufficient foundation height to eliminate or minimize to the maximum extent feasible hazards associated with anticipated sea level rise over the expected 100-year economic life of the structure.

Bluff Face and Bluff Retreat Setback: Prohibit development on the bluff face and within the bluff retreat setback because of the fragility of this environment and the potential for resultant increase in bluff and beach erosion due to poorly-sited development except that the following uses may be allowed with a conditional use permit: (1) engineered accessways or staircases to beaches, boardwalks, viewing platforms, and trail alignments for public access purposes; (2) pipelines to serve coastal dependent industry; (3) habitat restoration; (4) hazardous materials remediation; and (5) landform alterations where such alterations re-establish natural landforms and drainage patterns that have been eliminated by previous development activities. Findings shall be made that no feasible, less environmentally damaging, alternative is available and that feasible mitigation measures have been provided to minimize all adverse environmental impacts. Require as a part of the conditional use permit, a full environmental, geological, and engineering study as specified in Policy LC-6.1. Such structures shall be constructed and designed so as to neither create nor contribute to erosion of the bluff face and to be visually compatible with the surrounding area to the maximum extent feasible.

Seawalls, Breakwaters and Other Shoreline Structures: Prohibit construction of seawalls, breakwaters, revetments, groins, harbor channels, retaining walls, and other structures altering the natural shoreline processes unless a finding is made that such structures are required: (1) to serve coastal-dependent uses: or (2) to protect public beaches in danger from erosion; or (3) to protect existing structures that were legally constructed prior to the effective date of the Coastal Act; or (4) that were legally permitted prior to the effective date of this Coastal General Plan provided that the CDP did not contain a waiver of the right to a future shoreline or bluff protection structure; or (5) for a development consistent with Section 30233(a) of the Coastal Act and only when it can be demonstrated that said existing structures are at risk from identified hazards if no feasible or less environmentally damaging alternative is available and the structure has been designed to eliminate or mitigate adverse environmental impacts, including impacts upon local shoreline sand supply. The design and construction of allowed protective structures shall respect natural landforms and provide for lateral beach access. "Existing structures" for purposes of Policy LC-6.5 shall consist only of a principle structure, e.g. residential dwelling, required garage, or second residential unit, and shall not include accessory or ancillary structures such as decks, patios, stairs. landscaping, etc.

General Comment: The list of LCP policies included in ARARs worksheet is incomplete. Below is a list of potentially relevent policies. Given that the City's CEQA document will serve as the environmental review for DTSC when considering approval of OU-E RAP, it has been determined that the EIR alternatives should consider OU-E in it's entirety as the dual purposes of the EIR make these projects inseperable. After the FS Addendum is complete, the project description finalized, and EIR Alternatives identified, additional agency comments can be provided.

Seismic Hazards: Reduce the risk of loss of life, personal injury, and damage to property resulting from seismic hazards. Require professional inspection of foundations and excavations, earthwork, and other geotechnical aspects of site development during carbwork, and other geotechnical aspects of site development during carbwork, and other geotechnical aspects of site development during carbwork, and other geotechnical aspects of site development during carbwork, and other geotechnical aspects of site development during carbwork, and other geotechnical solits, geologic, and geotechnical studies as being prone to moderate or high levels of seismic hazard. Coastal General Plan, Safety Policy SF-2.4 Tsunami: Minimize development in areas subject to tsunami. Require development to pay for the costs of drainage facilities needed to drain project-generated runoff. Develop a City-wide drainage policy to assist staff to identify drainage improvements or impact fees required for development. Coastal General Plan, Safety Policy SF-3.5 Require, where necessary, the construction of siltation/detention basins to be incorporated into the design of development projects. Protection from Hazardous Waste and Materials: Provide measures to protect the public health from the hazards associated with the transportation, storage, and disposal of hazardous wastes (TSD Facilities). Support Environmental Review of Hazardous Waste Transportation, Storage and Disposal Facilities: Support a thorough environmental review of ror Hazardous Waste Transportation, Storage and Disposal (TSD) Facilities, including waste to energy projects, proposed in the Fort Bragg area.			
Coastal General Plan, Safety Policy SF-2.2 earthwork, and other geotechnical aspects of site development during construction on those sites specified in soils, geologic, and geotechnical studies as being prone to moderate or high levels of seismic hazard. Coastal General Plan, Safety Policy SF-2.4 Tsunami: Minimize development in areas subject to tsunami. Require development to pay for the costs of drainage facilities needed to drain project-generated runoff. Develop a City-wide drainage policy to assist staff to identify drainage improvements or impact fees required for development. Coastal General Plan, Safety Policy SF-3.5 Require, where necessary, the construction of siltation/detention basins to be incorporated into the design of development projects. Protection from Hazardous Waste and Materials: Provide measures to protect the public health from the hazards associated with the transportation, storage, and disposal of hazardous wastes (TSD Facilities). Support Environmental Review of Hazardous Waste Transportation, Storage and Disposal (TSD) Facilities, including waste to energy projects, proposed in the Fort	Coastal General Plan, Safety	Policy SF-2.1	
Coastal General Plan, Safety Policy SF-3.4 Policy SF-3.4 Policy SF-3.5 Require development to pay for the costs of drainage facilities needed to drain project-generated runoff. Develop a City-wide drainage policy to assist staff to identify drainage improvements or impact fees required for development. Require, where necessary, the construction of siltation/detention basins to be incorporated into the design of development projects. Protection from Hazardous Waste and Materials: Provide measures to protect the public health from the hazards associated with the transportation, storage, and disposal of hazardous wastes (TSD Facilities). Support Environmental Review of Hazardous Waste Transportation, Storage and Disposal Facilities: Support a thorough environmental review for Hazardous Waste Transportation, Storage and Disposal (TSD) Facilities, including waste to energy projects, proposed in the Fort	Coastal General Plan, Safety	Policy SF-2.2	earthwork, and other geotechnical aspects of site development during construction on those sites specified in soils, geologic, and geotechnical
to drain project-generated runoff. Develop a City-wide drainage policy to assist staff to identify drainage improvements or impact fees required for development. Coastal General Plan, Safety Policy SF-3.5 Require, where necessary, the construction of siltation/detention basins to be incorporated into the design of development projects. Protection from Hazardous Waste and Materials: Provide measures to protect the public health from the hazards associated with the transportation, storage, and disposal of hazardous wastes (TSD Facilities). Support Environmental Review of Hazardous Waste Transportation, Storage and Disposal Facilities: Support a thorough environmental review for Hazardous Waste Transportation, Storage and Disposal (TSD) Facilities, including waste to energy projects, proposed in the Fort	Coastal General Plan, Safety	Policy SF-2.4	Tsunami: Minimize development in areas subject to tsunami.
to be incorporated into the design of development projects. Protection from Hazardous Waste and Materials: Provide measures to protect the public health from the hazards associated with the transportation, storage, and disposal of hazardous wastes (TSD Facilities). Support Environmental Review of Hazardous Waste Transportation, Storage and Disposal Facilities: Support a thorough environmental review for Hazardous Waste Transportation, Storage and Disposal (TSD) Facilities, including waste to energy projects, proposed in the Fort	Coastal General Plan, Safety	Policy SF-3.4	to drain project-generated runoff. Develop a City-wide drainage policy to assist staff to identify drainage improvements or impact fees required
Policy SF-8.1 protect the public health from the hazards associated with the transportation, storage, and disposal of hazardous wastes (TSD Facilities). Support Environmental Review of Hazardous Waste Transportation, Storage and Disposal Facilities: Support a thorough environmental review for Hazardous Waste Transportation, Storage and Disposal Facilities: Support a thorough environmental review for Hazardous Waste Transportation, Storage and Disposal (TSD) Facilities, including waste to energy projects, proposed in the Fort	Coastal General Plan, Safety	Policy SF-3.5	
Storage and Disposal Facilities: Support a thorough environmental review for Hazardous Waste Transportation, Storage and Disposal (TSD) Facilities, including waste to energy projects, proposed in the Fort	Coastal General Plan, Safety	Policy SF-8.1	protect the public health from the hazards associated with the transportation, storage, and disposal of hazardous wastes (TSD
	Coastal General Plan, Safety	Policy SF-8.2	Storage and Disposal Facilities: Support a thorough environmental review for Hazardous Waste Transportation, Storage and Disposal (TSD) Facilities, including waste to energy projects, proposed in the Fort