

Natural Resources Policy Comparison Table

Biological Resources Policies

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
<i>General Policies</i>	
<u>6-1. Protection and Enhancement of ESHA.</u> Protect and, where possible, enhance or restore environmentally sensitive habitat areas (ESHAs).	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<u>6-2. Impact Avoidance.</u> Avoid impacts to ESHA through development siting and design, buffer provisions, best management practices, and other protective avoidance measures. Only resource-dependent uses shall be allowed within an ESHA.	New 2018 Planning Commission Public Draft Policy
<u>6-3. Development Review.</u> Any development proposed to occur within or adjacent to ESHAs, Potential ESHAs, or unmapped areas that may contain ESHA shall assess the site for the presence and potential presence of sensitive habitats and special-status species as part of the development review process, in order to make an ESHA determination.	New 2018 Planning Commission Public Draft Policy
<u>6-4. Illegal Disturbance.</u> Any area mapped as ESHA or otherwise determined to have previously been ESHA shall not be deprived of protection, as required by the policies and provisions of the LCP, on the basis that habitat has been illegally removed, filled, degraded, or that species of concern have been illegally eliminated.	New 2018 Planning Commission Public Draft Policy
<u>6-5. Community Education.</u> Provide educational opportunities and interpretation in conservation areas as feasible to broaden community appreciation and awareness, considering potential impacts to sensitive habitats and special-status species.	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<u>6-6. Land Conservation.</u> Foster partnerships with agencies, trusts, and conservation organizations to strategically acquire and assemble open space lands for conservation.	2016 First Public Draft Policy

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
<p><u>6-7. Continued Viability.</u> Provide for the continued viability of coastal habitats by planning for inland migration and replacement as habitats are lost to sea level rise.</p>	<p>2016 First Public Draft Policy, Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment</p>
<i>ESHA Identification and Designation</i>	
<p><u>6-8. ESHA Definition.</u> An Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA) is 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, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Any habitat area that is rare or especially valuable from a local, regional, or statewide basis. b. Areas that contribute to the viability of plant or animal species designated as rare, threatened, or endangered under State or Federal law. c. Areas that contribute to the viability of species designated as Fully Protected or Species of Special Concern under State law or regulations. d. Areas that contribute to the viability of plant species for which there is compelling evidence of rarity, for example, those designated 1b (Rare or endangered in California and elsewhere) or 2 (rare, threatened or endangered in California but more common elsewhere) by the California Native Plant Society. <p>ESHAs in the Half Moon Bay Planning Area include marine habitat, sea cliffs, dunes, wetlands, riparian corridors, and coastal prairie; as well as areas that may support rare, threatened, endangered, or unique species due to the presence of the species or habitat suitable to support the species. Regardless of whether riparian corridors and wetlands are designated as ESHA, the LCP policies and standards applicable to riparian corridors and wetlands shall apply.</p>	<p><u>Original LUP 3-1. Definition of Sensitive Habitats</u> Define sensitive habitats as any area in which plant or animal life or their habitats are either rare or especially valuable and as those areas which meet one of the following criteria: (1) habitats containing or supporting "rare and endangered" species as defined by the State Fish and Game Commission, (2) all perennial and intermittent streams and their tributaries, (3) coastal tidelands and marshes, (4) coastal and offshore areas containing breeding and/or nesting sites and coastal areas used by migratory and resident water-associated birds for resting and feeding, (5) areas used for scientific study and research concerning fish and wildlife, (6) lakes and ponds and adjacent shore habitat, (7) existing game and wildlife refuges and reserves, and (8) sand dunes. Such areas include riparian areas, wetlands, sand dunes, marine habitats, sea cliffs, and habitats supporting rare, endangered, and unique species.</p>
<p><u>6-9. Potential ESHA.</u> Define Potential ESHA as areas that are likely to support sensitive habitat or special status species but require further definition or study before a final ESHA designation can be made. Potential ESHA includes areas previously studied by qualified biological professionals and found to contain significant natural resources requiring further definition or study, as mapped in Figures 6-2, 6-3, and 6-4. Vacant or undeveloped parcels throughout the Planning Area that have not been subject to previous biological study by qualified professionals may also be ESHA or Potential ESHA, pending further study. Potential ESHA designation serves as a "flag" or alert</p>	<p>2016 First Public Draft Policy</p>

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
<p>for biological inventories to be undertaken when development is proposed. Areas will be designated ESHA if detailed study confirms the presence and boundaries of the sensitive biological resource meeting the criteria in Policy 6-8, and can be designated Potential ESHA if a biological study does not definitely demonstrate the criteria in Policy 6-8 but demonstrates suitable habitat or likely presence of special status species on a site.</p>	
<p><u>6-10. Unique Species.</u> Define unique species as an organism that has scientific or historic value, few indigenous habitats, some characteristic(s) that draw attention or are locally uncommon, or that are common only locally or are of limited range. Locally designate unique species and create guidelines for the protection and management of unique species. Unique species identified in the LCP include winter raptor populations on the Half Moon Bay bluffs. Guidelines for the protection and management of unique species may include specifications for buffers, mitigation ratios, and others.</p>	<p>From original LUP pages 58-60 and 2016 First Public Draft Policy</p>
<p><u>6-11. ESHA Mapping.</u> Update the ESHA maps as new information becomes available and as biological resources evaluations are completed. Review the ESHA maps every three years to ensure that they are up to date and reflect current information and completed studies. Areas meeting the criteria in Policy 6-8 shall be designated as ESHA on the LUP ESHA habitat map (Figure 6-2), the LUP ESHA special status species map (Figure 6-3), and a summary map (Figure 6-4). The ESHA maps are not intended to be a static resource, and policies require them to be updated and revised based on new information. LUP policies provide criteria for the addition and removal of ESHA designations, which should be reflected on the ESHA maps. Revisions to the ESHA maps shall be treated as LCP amendments and shall require certification by the Coastal Commission. Areas qualifying for ESHA designation shall be afforded ESHA protections upon determination, rather than upon map amendment certification.</p>	<p><u>Original LUP 3-2. Designation of Sensitive Habitats.</u> Designate sensitive habitats as those, including but not limited to, shown on the Habitat Areas and Water Resources Overlay.</p>
<p><u>6-12. Protection of Degraded ESHA.</u> Ensure that any area mapped as ESHA shall not be deprived of protection as ESHA, as required by the policies and provisions of the LCP, on the basis that habitat has been illegally removed, degraded, or species that are rare or especially valuable because of their nature or role in an ecosystem have been eliminated.</p>	<p>2016 First Public Draft Policy</p>

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
<p><u>6-13. Unmapped ESHA.</u> Recognize that the ESHA maps are not an exhaustive compilation of all habitat areas within the Planning Area that meet the definition of ESHA. Any area not designated on the LUP ESHA Maps that meets the ESHA criteria stated in Policy 6-8 is ESHA and shall be accorded all the protection provided for ESHA in the LCP.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-14. Removal of ESHA Designation.</u> Remove the ESHA designation from any areas previously mapped as ESHA if a site-specific biological study, prepared pursuant to Policy 6-17 contains conclusive evidence that an area previously mapped as ESHA is not an area that meets the definition of ESHA set forth in Policy 6-8. If the area is determined to be adjacent to ESHA, ESHA buffer policies shall apply. If an area is not ESHA or ESHA buffer, LCP policies and standards for protection of ESHA and ESHA buffer shall not apply and development may be allowed (consistent with other LCP requirements) once the ESHA map has been amended and certified by the Coastal Commission.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-15. Reporting Biological Sightings.</u> Encourage the reporting and verification of special-status species sightings in the Planning Area with the California Natural Diversity Database and with a qualified biologist. Inform and educate the public on how to identify, report, and protect special-status species.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-16. Biological Inventory.</u> Require that proposals for new development in areas mapped as Potential ESHA, or in unmapped areas with potential to support sensitive plant or animal species, include an inventory conducted by a qualified biologist of habitat types and plant and animal species present and likely to be present on the project site. If the initial inventory indicates the presence or potential for sensitive species or habitat on the project site, a detailed biological study shall be required.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-17. Biological Study.</u> Require all applicants for development in and adjacent to ESHA and projects for which a biological inventory indicated the presence or potential for sensitive species or habitat to prepare a biological study by a City-approved qualified professional to be submitted prior to development review and prior to any ground disturbance. The report shall consider both any identified ESHA and areas adjacent to the ESHA and will determine if significant impacts to the ESHA, to the special-status species supported by the ESHA, or to on- or off-site biological productivity may occur and recommend the most feasible avoidance and/or mitigation</p>	<p><u>Original LUP Policy 3-5 Permit Conditions.</u> a) Require all applicants to prepare a biologic report by a qualified professional selected jointly by the applicant and the City to be submitted prior to development review. The report will determine if significant impacts on the sensitive habitats may occur, and recommend the most</p>

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
<p>measures if impacts may occur. At minimum, the study should also provide and discuss the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. For animals: Requirements for food, water, nesting or denning sites and requirements for reproduction, predation, dispersal, refugia, and migration; b. For plants: Life histories, and requirements for soils, climate, and geography; c. A map depicting the locations of plants or animals and/or their habitats; and d. Recommended avoidance and/or mitigation measures if the proposed development has potential to impact any on-site or adjacent sensitive habitat areas or special-status species. e. Where a reduced buffer zone is proposed, a recommendation of whether the reduced buffer zone would be amply protective of the biological integrity of the site’s sensitive habitats and special-status species given the site-specific characteristics of the resource(s) and of the type and intensity of proposed development. <p>Studies shall be made public and subject to review and comments by jurisdictional agencies and the public.</p>	<p>feasible mitigation measures if impacts may occur.</p> <p>The report shall consider both any identified sensitive habitats and areas adjacent. Recommended uses and intensities within the habitat area shall be dependent on such resources, and shall be sited and designed to prevent impacts which would significantly degrade areas adjacent to the habitats. The City and the applicant shall jointly develop an appropriate program to evaluate the adequacy of any mitigation measures imposed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b) When applicable, require as a condition of permit approval the restoration of damaged habitat(s) when, in the judgment of the Planning Director, restoration is partially or wholly feasible. <p><u>Original LUP Policy 3-23 Permit Conditions.</u> Require, prior to permit issuance, that a qualified biologist prepare a report which defines the requirements of rare and endangered organisms. At minimum, require the report to discuss: (1) animal food, water, nesting or denning sites and reproduction, predation and migration requirements, (2) plants' life histories and soils, climate, and geographic requirements, (3) a map depicting the locations of plants or animals and/or their habitats, (4) any development must not impact the functional capacity of the habitat, and (5) recommend mitigation if development is permitted within or adjacent to identified habitats.</p>

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
<p><u>6-18. Site-Specific Evaluation and Sea Level Rise.</u> Require site-specific biological evaluations and field observations of coastal habitat to include an evaluation of vulnerability to sea level rise for projects located within 300 feet of the bluff edge or where otherwise appropriate based on best available science for inundation projections. Such an evaluation should consider both topographic features as well as habitat and species sensitivities (for example, sensitivity to inundation and saltwater intrusion).</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy, Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment
<p><u>6-19. Citywide Inventory.</u> Establish a comprehensive archive of biological studies, biological mapping, and other relevant biological information for sites throughout the city to support biological resource protection and to inform future ESHA map amendments.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<i>ESHA Protection</i>	
<p><u>6-20. Permitted Uses in ESHA and ESHA Buffers.</u> Limit development in ESHAs and ESHA buffer zones to resource-dependent uses; including but not limited to public accessways and trails, educational activities, research, and habitat restoration; that would not significantly or cumulatively degrade such areas or cause significant or cumulative disruption of habitat values, and that are compatible with long-term habitat protection and viability.</p>	<p><u>Original LUP Policy 3-3. Protection of Sensitive Habitats.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Prohibit any land use and/or development which would have significant adverse impacts on sensitive habitat areas. b) Development in areas adjacent to sensitive habitats shall be sited and designed to prevent impacts that could significantly degrade the environmentally sensitive habitats. All uses shall be compatible with the maintenance of biologic productivity of such areas.
<p><u>6-21. Performance Standards in ESHA.</u> Site and design new development permitted in or adjacent to ESHA to avoid and minimize impacts to ESHA. If there is no feasible alternative that can eliminate all impacts, then the alternative that would result in the fewest or least significant impacts shall be selected. Impacts to ESHA that cannot be avoided through the implementation of siting and design alternatives shall be fully mitigated. Methods for avoiding or minimizing impacts include, but are not limited to utilizing raised boardwalks, installing informative signage and exclusion fencing, and implementing construction best management practices.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
<p><u>6-22. ESHA Buffer Zones.</u> Require buffer areas of sufficient size to ensure the biological integrity and preservation of the habitat they are designed to protect. Terrestrial ESHA shall have a minimum buffer width of 100 feet, with larger buffers required on a case-by-case basis based on site-specific project reviews. Smaller ESHA buffers may be allowed only where the following can be demonstrated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A 100-foot wide buffer is not possible due to site-specific constraints, and b. The proposed narrower buffer would be amply protective of the biological integrity of the ESHA given the site-specific characteristics of the resource and of the type and intensity of disturbance, as confirmed by a qualified biologist. <p>Maintain buffers with native vegetation to serve as transitional habitat and provide distance and physical barriers to human intrusion.</p>	<p>2016 First Public Draft Policy</p>
<p><u>6-23. Performance Standards in ESHA Buffers.</u> Ensure that development in areas adjacent to ESHA is sited and designed to prevent impacts that could significantly degrade the ESHA. All allowable and approved uses shall be compatible with the maintenance of biological productivity of such areas.</p>	<p><u>Original LUP Policy 3-3. Protection of Sensitive Habitats.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Prohibit any land use and/or development which would have significant adverse impacts on sensitive habitat areas. b) Development in areas adjacent to sensitive habitats shall be sited and designed to prevent impacts that could significantly degrade the environmentally sensitive habitats. All uses shall be compatible with the maintenance of biologic productivity of such areas.
<p><u>6-24. Pre-Existing Development and ESHA.</u> Where an area within or adjacent to any pre-existing permitted development or land use is confirmed to meet the definition of ESHA, the pre-existing use may continue provided that the use has not lapsed for a period of one year or more and that any changes to the site that constitute new development are sited and designed to avoid new impacts to ESHA. Implementation of best management practices and avoidance measures is encouraged for qualifying continuing uses.</p>	<p>New 2018 Planning Commission Public Draft Policy</p>

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
<p><u>6-25. Established Neighborhoods Adjacent to ESHA.</u> In established neighborhoods, additions or improvements to developed sites adjacent to ESHA may be allowed with a minimum 20-foot buffer from the adjacent habitat area, provided no new adverse impacts occur.</p>	New 2018 Planning Commission Public Draft Policy
<p><i>Wetlands</i></p>	
<p><u>6-26. Wetlands Definition.</u> Wetlands shall be defined as consistent with the single-parameter definition of the Coastal Act and the Coastal Commission’s Regulations, and shall include land where the water table is at, near, or above the land surface long enough to promote the formation of hydric soils or to support the growth of hydrophytes, and shall also include those types of wetlands where vegetation is lacking and soil is poorly developed or absent as a result of frequent and drastic fluctuations of surface water levels, wave action, water flow, turbidity or high concentrations of salts or other substances in the substrate. Such wetlands can be recognized by the presence of surface water or saturated substrate at some time during each year and their location within, or adjacent to, vegetated wetlands or deep-water habitats.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-27. Wetland Delineation.</u> Require a survey and analysis with the delineation of all wetland areas when the initial site survey indicates the presence or potential for wetland species or indicators. Wetland delineations will be conducted in accordance with Policy 6-26, the definitions of wetland boundaries contained in section 13577(b) of the California Code of Regulations, and applicable guidance from the California Coastal Commission.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-28. Wetland Condition.</u> The condition of a wetland does not affect its regulatory status as a defined wetland. The Coastal Act does not distinguish between wetlands according to their quality. Thus, under the Coastal Act, poorly functioning or degraded areas that meet the definition of wetlands are subject to wetland protection policies.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-29. Permitted Uses in Wetlands.</u> Permit the diking, filling, or dredging of wetlands only where there is no feasible less environmentally damaging alternative and where feasible mitigation measures have been provided to minimize adverse environmental effects, limited to the following uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Education and research activities; b. Public trails; 	2016 First Public Draft Policy

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. Habitat restoration and fish and wildlife management activities; and d. Incidental public service purposes, including but not limited to, burying cables and pipes or inspection of piers, maintenance of existing intake and outfall lines, and emergency repairs. <p>Other uses specified in Section 30233 of the Coastal Act may only be allowed pursuant to an LCP amendment. Permitted uses may be subject to review and approval by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and other resource management agencies, as applicable.</p>	
<p><u>6-30. Performance Standards in Wetlands and Wetland Buffers.</u> Require that development permitted in wetlands and wetland buffers minimizes adverse impacts during and after construction. Specifically, require that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. All paths be elevated (catwalks) so as not to impede movement of water; b. All construction takes place during daylight hours; c. All outdoor lighting be kept at a distance away from the wetland sufficient to not affect the wildlife; d. Motorized machinery be kept to less than 45-dBA at the wetland boundary, except for farm machinery; e. All construction which alters wetland vegetation be required to replace the vegetation to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director including “no action” in order to allow for natural reestablishment; f. No herbicides be used in wetlands unless specifically approved by the County Agricultural Commissioner and all jurisdictional regulatory agencies, g. Any permit for development includes necessary mitigation, monitoring, and maintenance programs; and h. All projects be reviewed by the jurisdictional regulatory agencies to determine appropriate mitigation measures. 	<p>New 2018 Planning Commission Public Draft Policy</p>

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
<p><u>6-31. Wetland Buffers.</u> Wetland buffer zones shall extend a minimum of 100 feet landward from the edge of the delineated wetland. A larger buffer shall be required as necessary to maintain the functional capacity of the wetland ecosystem. This setback may be reduced to no less than 50 feet only where the following can be demonstrated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. No alternative development site or design is possible; and b. Adequacy of the alternative setback to protect wetland resources is conclusively demonstrated by a professional biologist to the satisfaction of the City and all jurisdictional regulatory agencies. <p>In established neighborhoods, additions or improvements to developed sites adjacent to wetlands may be allowed with a minimum 20-foot buffer from the adjacent wetland area, provided no new adverse impacts occur.</p>	New 2018 Planning Commission Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-32. Permitted Uses within Wetland Buffer Zones.</u> Within wetland buffer zones, permit only the following uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Uses allowed within wetlands; b. Public scenic overlooks; and c. Agricultural uses that produce no impact on the adjacent wetlands. 	New 2018 Planning Commission Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-33. Wetland Protection.</u> Protect and, where feasible, restore the biological productivity and the quality of wetlands for both on- and off-site benefits.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<p><i>Riparian Corridors</i></p>	
<p><u>6-34. Riparian Corridors Definition.</u> Riparian corridors are defined on the ground by an association of primarily native plant and animal species within or adjacent to a watercourse. Boundaries of riparian corridors are determined by the limit of riparian vegetation or top of bank, or other confining topography, whichever is greater. The limit of riparian vegetation is determined by the drip line of riparian canopy trees or the limit of riparian shrubs or herbaceous vegetation.</p>	<p><u>Original LUP Policy 3-7. Definition of Riparian Corridors.</u> Define riparian corridors by the "limit of riparian vegetation" (i.e. a line determined by the association of plant and animal species normally found near streams, lakes, and other bodies of fresh water: red alder, jaumea, pickleweed, big leaf maple, narrowleaf cattail, arroyo willow, broadleaf cattail, horsetail, creek dogwood, black cottonwood, and box elder). Such a</p>

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
	corridor must contain at least a 50% cover of some combination of the plants listed.
<p><u>6-35. Designation of Riparian Corridors.</u> Designate all watercourses meeting the definition of riparian corridor contained in Policy 6-34 as riparian corridors on the LCP ESHA maps.</p>	<p><u>Original LUP Policy 3-8. Designation of Riparian Corridors.</u> Establish riparian corridors for all perennial and intermittent streams and lakes and other bodies of fresh water in the Coastal Zone. Designate those corridors shown on the Habitat Areas and Water Resources Overlay and any other riparian area as sensitive habitats requiring protection, except for manmade irrigation ponds over 2,500 square feet surface area.</p>
<p><u>6-36. Permitted Uses in Riparian Corridors.</u> Permit only the following resource-dependent uses within riparian corridors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Education and research activities; b. Consumptive uses as provided for in the Fish and Game Code and Title 14 of the California Administrative Code; c. Habitat restoration and fish and wildlife management activities; and d. Necessary water supply projects. <p>Where no feasible alternative exists permit the following uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Stream-dependent aquaculture, provided that any non-stream-dependent facilities are located outside of the corridor; b. Flood, sedimentation, or erosion control projects where no other method for protecting existing structures in the flood plain is feasible and where such protection is necessary for public safety or to protect existing development; c. Bridges providing an important public transportation or resource-dependent function where supports do not significantly impact the riparian corridor or its resources, such as free-span designs; d. Pipelines and stormwater runoff facilities; 	<p><u>Original LUP Policy 3-9. Permitted Uses in Riparian Corridors.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Within corridors, permit only the following uses: (1) education and research, (2) consumptive uses as provided for in the Fish and Game Code and Title 14 of the California Administrative Code, (3) fish and wildlife management activities, (4) trails and scenic overlooks on public land (s), and (5) necessary water supply projects. b) When no feasible or practicable alternative exists, permit the following uses: (1) stream-dependent aquaculture provided that non-stream-dependent facilities locate outside of corridor, (2) flood control projects where no other method for protecting existing structures in the flood plain is feasible and where such protection is necessary for public safety or to protect existing development, (3) bridges when supports are not in significant conflict with corridor resources, (4) pipelines and

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> e. Repair, maintenance, or incidental improvement of roadways or road crossings that do not increase the capacity of the roadway; and f. Agricultural uses provided no existing riparian vegetation is removed and no soil, nutrients, waste, or other material is allowed to enter stream channels. 	<p>storm water runoff facilities, (5) improvement, repair or maintenance of roadways or road crossings, (6) agricultural uses, provided no existing riparian vegetation is removed, and no soil is allowed to enter stream channels.</p>
<p><u>6-37. Performance Standards in Riparian Corridors.</u> Require development permitted in riparian corridors to adhere to the following performance standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Minimize removal of native vegetation; b. Minimize land exposure during construction and use temporary vegetation or mulching to protect critical areas; c. Minimize erosion, sedimentation, and runoff by appropriately grading and replanting modified areas with native species; d. Use only native plant species when replanting, and monitor replanted species and replace as necessary to ensure establishment; e. Provide sufficient passage upstream and downstream for native and anadromous fish as specified by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and the National Marine Fisheries Service; f. Minimize adverse effects of waste water discharges and entrainment; g. Prevent depletion of groundwater supplies and substantial interference with surface and subsurface water flows; h. Encourage wastewater reclamation; i. Maintain natural vegetation buffer areas that protect riparian habitats; j. Minimize alteration of natural streams; k. Maintain hydrologic function and sediment transport function of drainages; and l. Provide mitigation and long-term monitoring and reporting for any adverse impacts incurred upstream or downstream as a result of permitted development. 	<p><u>Original LUP Policy 3-10. Performance Standards in Riparian Corridors.</u> Require development permitted in corridors to: (1) minimize removal of vegetation, (2) minimize land exposure during construction and use temporary vegetation or mulching to protect critical areas, (3) minimize erosion, sedimentation, and runoff by appropriately grading and replanting modified areas, (4) use only adapted native or non-invasive exotic plant species when replanting, (5) provide sufficient passage for native and anadromous fish as specified by the State Department of Fish and Game, (6) minimize adverse effects of waste water discharges and entrainment, (7) prevent depletion of groundwater supplies and substantial interference with surface and subsurface waterflows, (8) encourage waste water reclamation, (9) maintain natural vegetation buffer areas that protect riparian habitats, and (10) minimize alteration of natural streams.</p>

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
<p><u>6-38. Riparian Corridor Buffers.</u> Establish buffer zones along both sides of riparian corridors to provide habitat protection and space for meander belts and vegetation growth. For Pilarcitos Creek, Frenchmans Creek, Apanolio Creek, Arroyo Leon, Kehoe Watercourse, Arroyo Cañada Verde west of Highway 1, and the Wavecrest Arroyo, establish the buffer zone extending a minimum of 50 feet from the outer limit of the riparian vegetation and at least 100 feet from the top of bank, whichever is greater. Where these riparian corridors are adjacent to lands designated as Urban Reserve, Open Space Reserve, Open Space for Conservation, and undeveloped Planned Developments, the buffer zone requirements shall increase to at least 100 feet from the outer limit of the riparian vegetation and at least 100 feet from the top of bank, whichever is greater. For all other intermittent and ephemeral streams with riparian vegetation (e.g. Naples Creek, the riparian corridor in the northwestern area of Ocean Colony, and Arroyo Cañada Verde east of Highway 1), establish buffer zones measuring 35 feet from the limits of riparian vegetation or the top of bank, whichever is greater. Where any riparian corridor is adjacent to established neighborhoods, allow a minimum 20-foot buffer for additions or improvements to developed sites provided that no new adverse impacts occur.</p>	<p><u>Original LUP Policy 3-11. Establishment of Buffer Zones.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) On both sides of riparian corridors, from the “limit of riparian vegetation,” extend buffer zones 50 feet outward for perennial streams and 30 feet outward for intermittent streams. b) Where no riparian vegetation exists along both sides of riparian corridors, extend buffer zones 50 feet from the bank edge for perennial streams and 30 feet from the midpoint of intermittent streams. c) Along lakes, ponds, and other wet areas, extend buffer zones 100 feet from the high water point, except for man-made ponds and reservoirs used for agricultural purposes for which no buffer zone is designated.
<p><u>6-39. Permitted Uses within Riparian Corridor Buffers.</u> Permit only the following uses in riparian corridor buffer zones:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Uses permitted in riparian corridors; b. Public scenic overlooks; c. Structures on existing legal building sites, set back a minimum of 20 feet from the limit of riparian vegetation or top of bank (whichever is greater), if no feasible alternative exists and if no other building site on the parcel exists; d. Crop growing and grazing, providing no existing riparian vegetation is removed and no soil is allowed to enter stream channels; and e. Infrastructure improvements that protect public safety and property that also restore the hydrological function of the watercourse. 	<p><u>Original LUP Policy 3-12. Permitted Uses in Buffer Zones.</u> Within buffer zones, permit only the following uses: (1) uses permitted in riparian corridors, (2) structures on existing legal building sites, set back 20 feet from the limit of riparian vegetation, only if no feasible alternative exists, and only if no other building site on the parcel exists, (3) crop growing and grazing consistent with Policy 3-9, (4) timbering in "streamside corridors" as defined and controlled by State and County regulations for timber harvesting, and (5) no new parcels shall be created whose only building site is in the buffer area except for parcels created in compliance with Policies 3-3, 3-4, and 3-5 if consistent with existing development in the area and if building sites are set back 20 feet from the limit of riparian vegetation or if no vegetation 20 feet from the</p>

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
<p><u>6-40. Pre-Existing Building Sites within a Riparian Corridor Buffer.</u> Ensure that parcels whose only building site is in a riparian corridor buffer are consistent with existing development in the area and that the building sites are set back a sufficient distance to prevent negative impacts to biological resources in the riparian corridor. The minimum buffer size for such parcels shall be 20 feet from the limit of riparian vegetation or the top of bank, whichever is greater.</p>	<p>bank edge of a perennial and 20 feet from the midpoint of an intermittent stream. <u>Original LUP Policy 3-12. Permitted Uses in Buffer Zones.</u> ...(5) no new parcels shall be created whose only building site is in the buffer area except for parcels created in compliance with Policies 3-3, 3-4, and 3-5 if consistent with existing development in the area and if building sites are set back 20 feet from the limit of riparian vegetation or if no vegetation 20 feet from the bank edge of a perennial and 20 feet from the midpoint of an intermittent stream.</p>
<p><u>6-41. Performance Standards in Riparian Corridor Buffer Zones.</u> Require development permitted in riparian corridor buffer zones to adhere to the following performance standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Minimize the removal of vegetation; b. Conform to natural topography to minimize erosion potential; c. Prevent runoff and sedimentation from exceeding pre-development levels; d. Replant where appropriate with native and non-invasive exotics; e. Prevent discharge of toxic substances, such as fertilizers and pesticides, into the riparian corridor; f. Maintain or restore the hydrologic function of the watercourse; and g. Anticipate space for potential meander belts and minimize development in these areas. 	<p><u>Original LUP Policy 3-13. Performance Standards in Buffer Zones.</u> Require uses permitted in buffer zones to: (1) minimize removal of vegetation, (2) conform to natural topography to minimize erosion potential, (3) make provisions to (i.e. catch basins) to keep runoff and sedimentation from exceeding pre-development levels, (4) replant where appropriate with native and non-invasive exotics, (5) prevent discharge of toxic substances, such as fertilizers and pesticides, into the riparian corridor, (6) remove vegetation in or adjacent to man-made agricultural ponds if the life of the pond is endangered, (7) allow dredging in or adjacent to man-made ponds if the San Mateo County Resource Conservation District certifies that siltation imperils continued use of the pond for agricultural water storage and supply.</p>

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
<p><u>6-42. Non-Riparian Watercourse Buffers.</u> Where a watercourse lacks riparian vegetation, the boundary of the watercourse is defined by the top of bank or similar confining topography. Establish buffer zones along both sides of non-riparian watercourses (e.g. Pullman Watercourse) to provide space for potential meander belts and natural erosion and flooding hazards, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. For non-riparian watercourses, the buffer zone shall extend a minimum of 35 feet from the top of bank. b. Where any non-riparian watercourse is adjacent to an established neighborhood, allow a minimum 20-foot buffer for additions or improvements to developed sites provided that no new adverse impacts occur. c. Where any non-riparian watercourse is adjacent to an existing building site, building sites must be set back a minimum of 20 feet from the top of bank for both perennial and intermittent streams. <p>Buffer zones shall not apply to man-made drainage ditches lacking riparian vegetation.</p>	<p>New 2018 Planning Commission Public Draft Policy</p>
<p><u>6-43. Permitted Uses in Non-Riparian Watercourses and Buffers.</u> Permit only the uses allowed within riparian corridors in non-riparian watercourses. Permit only the uses allowed within riparian corridor buffer zones in non-riparian watercourse buffer zones. Permitted development in non-riparian watercourses and non-riparian watercourse buffer zones shall adhere to the performance standards required for permitted uses in riparian corridors and riparian corridor buffer zones, respectively.</p>	<p>New 2018 Planning Commission Public Draft Policy</p>
<p><i>Sand Dunes</i></p>	
<p><u>6-44. Designation of Sand Dune Habitats.</u> Designate all coastal sand dunes as ESHA and include these areas on the ESHA maps. Coastal sand dunes in the Planning Area are associated with the central dune scrub habitat type.</p>	<p><u>Original LUP Policy 3-14. Designation of Sand Dune Habitats.</u> Designate all dune areas as protected sensitive habitats.</p>
<p><u>6-45. Prohibited Activities in Dune Habitats.</u></p>	<p><u>Original LUP Policy 3-16. Development Standards.</u> a) Prohibit any activity which alters the profile of an active dune or which results in the</p>

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
<p>Prohibit any activity which alters the profile of an active dune or which results in the disturbance or removal of dune vegetation on active dunes. Prohibit any direct removal or excavation of sand from active dunes.</p>	<p>disturbance or removal of dune vegetation on active dunes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b) Control pedestrian traffic in dune areas. c) Prohibit all non-authorized motor vehicles from dune areas. d) Post signs informing recreational users not to disturb dunes or their natural vegetation. e) Where development is permitted, require re-vegetation with appropriate stabilizing species (preferably native) as a condition of permit approval. f) Prohibit any direct removal or excavation of sand from active dunes. g) Require development to locate only landward of the most seaward stabilized dune. h) When no feasible or practical alternative exists, permit underground utilities.
<p><u>6-46. Permitted Uses in Dune Habitats.</u> Permit only the following resource-dependent uses in dune areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Education and research activities; b. Habitat restoration and fish and wildlife management activities; c. Public trails including beach access; and d. Temporary disruption for underground utilities where no feasible alternative exists and where ESHA is fully restored and impacts are mitigated. 	<p><u>Original LUP Policy 3-15. Permitted Uses.</u> In dune areas, permit only the following uses: (1) education and research, and (2) trails.</p>
<p><u>6-47. Access in Dune Habitats.</u> Ensure that access to coastal dune habitats does not result in damage or degradation to the habitat by directing pedestrian traffic to well-defined formal pathways and controlling pedestrian access to sensitive areas, posting signs informing recreational users not to disturb the dunes or their natural vegetation, and prohibiting all non-authorized motor vehicles.</p>	<p><u>Original LUP Policy 3-16. Development Standards.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Prohibit any activity which alters the profile of an active dune or which results in the disturbance or removal of dune vegetation on active dunes. b) Control pedestrian traffic in dune areas.

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c) Prohibit all non-authorized motor vehicles from dune areas. d) Post signs informing recreational users not to disturb dunes or their natural vegetation. e) Where development is permitted, require re-vegetation with appropriate stabilizing species (preferably native) as a condition of permit approval. f) Prohibit any direct removal or excavation of sand from active dunes. g) Require development to locate only landward of the most seaward stabilized dune. h) When no feasible or practical alternative exists, permit underground utilities.
<p><u>6-48. Nesting and Roosting Sites.</u> Protect nesting and roosting areas in sand dune habitats for sensitive birds such as Western Snowy Plovers by means which may include, but are not limited to, fencing, signage, or seasonal access restrictions.</p>	<p>2016 First Public Draft Policy</p>
<p><u>6-49. Performance Standards in Dune Habitats.</u> Require development permitted in coastal dune habitats to adhere to the following performance standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Revegetate disturbed areas with appropriate stabilizing native species as a condition of permit approval, and b. Locate development landward of the most seaward stabilized dune. 	<p><u>Original LUP Policy 3-16. Development Standards.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Prohibit any activity which alters the profile of an active dune or which results in the disturbance or removal of dune vegetation on active dunes. b) Control pedestrian traffic in dune areas. c) Prohibit all non-authorized motor vehicles from dune areas. d) Post signs informing recreational users not to disturb dunes or their natural vegetation. e) Where development is permitted, require re-vegetation with appropriate stabilizing species (preferably native) as a condition of permit approval.

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f) Prohibit any direct removal or excavation of sand from active dunes. g) Require development to locate only landward of the most seaward stabilized dune. h) When no feasible or practical alternative exists, permit underground utilities.
<p><u>6-50. Dune Management.</u> Develop or encourage management plans to enhance and restore sand dune habitats, including consideration of ways that the system will change with rising sea level.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy, Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment
<p><u>6-51. Dune Restoration.</u> Encourage projects by agencies and community groups to assist in the stabilization and restoration of dune habitats.</p>	<p><u>Original LUP Policy 3-17. Restoration of Dunes.</u> Encourage projects by agencies and community groups to assist in the stabilization and restoration of dunes.</p>
<p><u>6-52. Public Acquisition of Dune Habitat.</u> Encourage and pursue public acquisition of dune habitat.</p>	<p><u>Original LUP Policy 3-18. Public Acquisition.</u> Encourage public acquisition of the dune habitat. (Known dunes are currently owned by the State. See page 45).</p>
<i>Coastal Terrace Prairie</i>	
<p><u>6-53. Permitted Uses in Coastal Terrace Prairie.</u> Permit only the following uses in coastal terrace prairie habitat areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Education and research activities; b. Habitat restoration and fish and wildlife management activities; and c. Public trails. 	New 2018 Planning Commission Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-54. Performance Standards in Coastal Terrace Prairie.</u> Require development permitted in coastal terrace prairie habitats to adhere to the following performance standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Site and design development to minimize impacts to and allow landward expansion of the coastal prairie habitat; b. Protect nesting and roosting areas by means which may include but are not limited to fencing, signage, or seasonal access restrictions; and 	New 2018 Planning Commission Public Draft Policy

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
<p>c. Restore and revegetate on-site or adjacent coastal terrace prairie habitat to mitigate for any development impacts.</p>	
<p><u>6-55. Coastal Terrace Prairie Buffers.</u> Establish buffer zones from coastal terrace prairie habitat areas to provide habitat protection and space for vegetation growth and inland retreat. The minimum buffer size shall be 100 feet from the limit of coastal terrace prairie vegetation, with larger buffers required on a case-by-case basis based on site-specific project reviews. Smaller buffers may be allowed only where the following can be demonstrated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A 100-foot wide buffer is not possible due to site-specific constraints, and b. The proposed narrower buffer would be amply protective of the biological integrity of the coastal terrace prairie given the site-specific characteristics of the resource and of the type and intensity of disturbance, as confirmed by a qualified biologist. 	New 2018 Planning Commission Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-56. Coastal Terrace Prairie Management and Restoration.</u> Encourage and implement management plans and restoration projects to improve the coastal prairie habitat system, including consideration of ways that the system will change with rising sea level.</p>	New 2018 Planning Commission Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-57. Public Acquisition of Coastal Terrace Prairie Habitat.</u> Encourage and pursue public acquisition of coastal terrace prairie habitat.</p>	New 2018 Planning Commission Public Draft Policy
<p><i>Sea Cliffs/Bluffs</i></p>	
<p><u>6-58. Permitted Uses in Sea Cliff/Bluff Areas.</u> Where nesting or roosting exists, permit only education and research activities in sea cliff/bluff habitat areas. Where nesting and roosting do not exist, permit only the following uses in sea cliff/bluff habitat areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Education and research activities; b. Public beach accessways; c. Public trails and limited scenic outlooks; d. Restoration projects; e. Shoreline protective devices as permitted by the policies contained in Chapter 7, Coastal Hazards; 	<p><u>Original LUP Policy 3-19. Permitted Uses.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Where nesting or roosting exists, permit only education and research activities. b) Where nesting or roosting do not exist, permit only the following uses: (1) education and research, (2) limited foot paths, (3) limited recreational rock climbing, (4) road and underground utility construction where no feasible alternative exists, and (5) intake or outfall lines provided that the habitat is not threatened.

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f. Temporary disruption for underground utilities where no feasible alternative exists and where ESHA is fully restored and impacts are mitigated; and g. Intake or outfall lines provided that they would not disturb or degrade adjacent habitat areas and are designed or redeveloped to not need any shoreline protection. 	
<p><u>6-59. Performance Standards in Sea Cliff/Bluff Areas.</u> Require development in bluff and cliff areas to adhere to the following performance standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Restrict pedestrian traffic in bluff and cliff areas and on faces to a limited number of well-defined trails to discourage human caused erosion and avoid seabird nesting and roosting sites; b. Direct sheet flow from trails away from bluff edges to distribute and percolate inland; and c. Post signs informing recreational users not to disturb natural vegetation or nesting and roosting sites. 	<p><u>Original LUP Policy 3-20. Development Standards.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Restrict pedestrian traffic in bluff and cliff areas and on faces to a limited number of well-defined trails which avoid seabird nesting and roosting sites. b) Post signs informing recreational users not to disturb natural vegetation or nesting and roosting sites.
<i>Marine Habitats</i>	
<p><u>6-60. Permitted Uses in Marine Habitat Areas.</u> Permit only the following uses in marine habitat areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Education and research activities; b. Restoration projects; c. Public beach accessways; d. Temporary lifeguard towers/stations; e. Coastal dependent recreation activities; and f. Shoreline protective devices as permitted by the policies contained in Chapter 7, Coastal Hazards. 	New 2018 Planning Commission Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-61. Performance Standards in Marine Habitat Areas.</u> Any development or structure permitted within marine habitat area shall be the alternative with the least impact on coastal resources and recreation, the minimum size necessary, and shall provide any necessary mitigation.</p>	New 2018 Planning Commission Public Draft Policy
<u>6-62. Adjacent Development.</u>	2016 First Public Draft Policy

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
<p>Require that development on beach or ocean bluff areas adjacent to marine and beach habitats shall be sited and designed to prevent impacts that could significantly degrade the ESHA and the special-status species supported by the ESHA. All uses shall be compatible with the maintenance of the biological productivity of such areas.</p>	
<p><u>6-63. Non-Point Source Pollution.</u> Require that new development prevent or reduce non-point source pollution in the near shore environment through implementation of the non-point source pollution and private sewage disposal system policies contained in the Hydrology and Water Quality section of this chapter.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-64. Nearshore Habitats.</u> Preserve and, where appropriate and feasible, enhance nearshore shallow fish habitats and shore fishing areas.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<p><i>Ponds & Impoundments</i></p>	
<p><u>6-65. Active Man-Made Agricultural Ponds and Impoundments.</u> Man-made agricultural ponds and impoundments actively being used for agricultural purposes are not considered ESHA, even if biological resources are present. Buffer zones for active man-made agricultural ponds and impoundments shall not apply to agricultural operations and agriculture dependent development. Implementation of best management practices and avoidance measures is encouraged for continued use, repair, and maintenance of the pond or impoundment.</p>	<p><u>Original LUP Policy 3-11. Establishment of [Riparian] Buffer Zones.</u> ... c) Along lakes, ponds, and other wet areas, extend buffer zones 100 feet from the high water point, except for man-made ponds and reservoirs used for agricultural purposes for which no buffer zone is designated.</p>
<p><u>6-66. Abandoned Man-Made Agricultural Ponds and Impoundments.</u> Man-made agricultural ponds and impoundments that have been abandoned and not used for agricultural purposes for a period of five years or more may be designated as ESHA if a Biological Resource Evaluation required in association with a new development proposal finds presence of significant biological resources. If the abandoned pond or impoundment is determined to be ESHA, ESHA protection policies and buffer requirements shall apply.</p>	<p><u>Original LUP Policy 3-11. Establishment of [Riparian] Buffer Zones.</u> ... c) Along lakes, ponds, and other wet areas, extend buffer zones 100 feet from the high water point, except for man-made ponds and reservoirs used for agricultural purposes for which no buffer zone is designated.</p>
<p><u>6-67. Active Man-Made Non-Agricultural Ponds within Previously-Developed Land Uses.</u> The use, repair, and maintenance of active man-made non-agricultural ponds within previously permitted developed land uses may continue even if resources such as wetlands or habitat for special status species are present. Buffer zone requirements for active man-made non-agricultural ponds shall not apply. Implementation of best management practices and avoidance measures is encouraged for continued use, repair, and maintenance of the permitted land use and the pond's intended function.</p>	New 2018 Planning Commission Public Draft Policy

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
<p><u>6-68. Abandoned Man-Made Non-Agricultural Ponds.</u> Man-made non-agricultural ponds that have been abandoned for a period of one year or more may be designated as ESHA if a Biological Resource Evaluation required in association with a new development proposal finds presence of significant biological resources. If the abandoned pond is determined to be ESHA, ESHA protection policies and buffer requirements shall apply.</p>	New 2018 Planning Commission Public Draft Policy
<i>Development Standards</i>	
<p><u>6-69. Public and Recreational Access.</u> Ensure that public accessways and trails located within or adjacent to ESHA are sited and designed to minimize impacts to ESHA. Measures including, but not limited to, signage, placement of boardwalks, and limited fencing shall be implemented and maintained as necessary to protect ESHA.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-70. Land Divisions.</u> Design land divisions, including lot line adjustments, to preclude new development within and minimize impacts to ESHAs and their buffer areas. Land divisions shall only be permitted if each new parcel being created could be developed (including construction of any necessary access road), without building in ESHA or ESHA buffers, or removing ESHA for fuel modification. Require any land divisions containing areas of ESHA or ESHA buffer zones to record a deed restriction that protects such areas from non-resource dependent development.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-71. Development Adjacent to Open Space.</u> Require new development adjacent to parklands or public open space, where the purpose of the park or open space is to protect the natural environment and ESHA, to be sited and designed to minimize impacts to habitat and recreational opportunities, to the maximum extent feasible.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-72. Equestrian Operations.</u> Establish a program to require equestrian operations located adjacent to ESHA to implement BMPs to ensure protection of sensitive habitat areas, biological productivity, and coastal water quality.</p>	New 2018 Planning Commission Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-73. Wildlife Corridors.</u> Preserve, protect, and enhance wildlife corridors, including watercourses, connecting ESHA and open space areas to allow for seasonal migration as well as daily movements for foraging.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-74. Exterior Lighting and ESHA.</u></p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
<p>Ensure that exterior night lighting is minimized, restricted to low intensity fixtures, shielded, and directed away from ESHA in order to minimize impacts on wildlife. Limit high intensity perimeter lighting and lighting for sports courts or other private recreational facilities in ESHA, ESHA buffers, or where night lighting would increase illumination in ESHA. Prohibit the use of lighting directed over marine waters.</p>	
<p><u>6-75. Construction and ESHA.</u> Ensure that construction of new development does not impact on-site or nearby ESHA that supports sensitive bird or other animal species by requiring construction projects to implement best management practices, noise and vibration reduction measures, and monitoring by a qualified biologist during construction.</p>	New 2018 Planning Commission Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-76. Active Nest Monitoring.</u> Ensure construction during nesting seasons complies with Migratory Bird Treaty Act, California Fish and Game Code, and other applicable regulations by surveying the project vicinity for active nests, avoiding disturbance if active nests are found by employing exclusion buffers or other methods recommended by a qualified biologist, and monitoring active nests until all young have fledged.</p>	New 2018 Planning Commission Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-77. Bird-Safe Building Design.</u> Ensure that new buildings require bird safe building design by requiring new or renovated buildings to provide bird-safe building façade treatments, limited use of reflective building surfaces, appropriate locations for landscaping and water treatments, restricted use of guy wires, means to reduce light pollution, and other treatments to reduce bird strikes as accepted by the City.</p>	New 2018 Planning Commission Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-78. Invasive Species.</u> Prohibit the use of invasive plant species in ESHA and ESHA buffers. Develop and maintain an updated list of invasive species.</p>	<p><u>Original LUP Policy 3-39. Sale Prevention.</u> Encourage the voluntary cooperation of the retail nursery trade to prevent the sale of undesirable pampas grass and French, Scotch, and other invasive brooms in the County.</p>
<p><u>6-79. Invasive Species Removal.</u> Encourage private landowners and public agencies to remove invasive species from their lands. Allow such work to occur with an expedited review process where there is de minimis risk to ESHA and public safety.</p>	<p><u>Original LUP Policy 3-37. Voluntary Cooperation.</u> Encourage the voluntary cooperation of private landowners to remove from their lands the undesirable pampas grass, French, Scotch and over-</p>

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
	<p>invasive brooms. Similarly, encourage landowners to remove blue gum seedlings to prevent their spread.</p> <p><u>Original LUP Policy 3-38. Public Agency Requirements.</u> Require public agencies, to the point feasible, to remove the undesirable pampas grass and French, Scotch, and other invasive brooms from their lands.</p>
<p><u>6-80. Chemical Substances.</u> Prohibit the use of insecticides, herbicides, or any toxic chemical substance within ESHA and ESHA buffer areas where application of such substances would impact the ESHA, except where necessary to protect or enhance the habitat itself, such as eradication of invasive plant species, or habitat restoration. When restoring habitat, limit the introduction of organic material altering natural bank and water chemistry.</p>	<p>2016 First Public Draft Policy</p>
<p><u>6-81. Interpretive Signage.</u> Permit interpretive signage in ESHA accessible to the public to provide information about the habitat value and need to protect sensitive resources.</p>	<p>2016 First Public Draft Policy</p>
<p><u>6-82. Allocation of Public Funds.</u> Use the following criteria in setting priorities for allocating limited local, state, or federal public funds for ESHA preservation or restoration.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Biological and scientific significance of the habitat; b. Degree of endangerment from development or other activities; c. Accessibility for educational and scientific uses and vulnerability to overuse; and d. Significance of habitat for recreational, aesthetic, and economic value. 	<p><u>Original LUP Policy 3-6. Allocation of Public Funds.</u> In setting priorities for allocating limited local, State, or Federal public funds for preservation or restoration, use the following criteria: (1) biological and scientific significance of the habitat, (2) degree of endangerment from development or other activities, and (3) accessibility for educational and scientific uses and vulnerability to overuse.</p>
<p><i>Fuel Modification and Vegetation Removal</i></p>	

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
<p><u>6-83. Fuel Modification and Habitat Preservation.</u> Require all new development to be sited and designed to minimize required fuel modification and brush clearance in natural vegetation areas in order to reduce habitat disturbance or destruction, removal or modification of natural vegetation, and irrigation of natural areas, while providing for fire safety. Development shall utilize fire resistant materials and incorporate alternative fuel modification measures, such as firewalls (except where this would have impacts on visual resources and/or habitat), and landscaping techniques, where feasible, to minimize the total area modified. All development shall be subject to applicable federal, state and county fire protection requirements.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-84. Fuel Modification Plan.</u> Require that applications for new habitable structures within 100 feet of ESHA include a fuel modification plan for the project site, prepared by a landscape architect or resource specialist that incorporates measures to minimize removal of native vegetation and to minimize impacts to ESHA, while providing for fire safety, consistent with the requirements of the applicable fire safety regulations. Such plans shall be reviewed and approved by the Coastside Fire District. Additionally, applications shall include a site plan depicting the brush clearance, if any, that would be required on adjacent properties to provide fire safety for the proposed structures with an access easement or agreement from the adjacent property owner(s) to perform and maintain the required brush clearance.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-85. Vegetation Removal.</u> Require that applications for new development include a quantification of the acreage of natural vegetation that would be removed or made subject to thinning, irrigation, or other modification by the proposed project, including building pad and road/driveway areas, as well as required fuel modification on the project site and brush clearance on adjacent properties and buffers.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-86. Mitigation for Fuel Modification.</u> Require that all new development include mitigation for unavoidable impacts to ESHA from the removal, conversion, or modification of natural habitat for new development, including required fuel modification and brush clearance.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<i>Grading</i>	
<u>6-87. Grading and Site Plan.</u>	2016 First Public Draft Policy

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
<p>Require all new development to be sited and designed so as to minimize grading, alteration of physical features, and vegetation clearance in order to prevent soil erosion, stream siltation, reduced water percolation, increased runoff, and adverse impacts on plant and animal life and prevent net increases in baseline flows for any receiving waterbody.</p>	
<p><u>6-88. Grading Permit.</u> Require grading or earthmoving exceeding 50 cubic yards (total including cut and fill) to apply for a grading permit, with the exception of tilling related to existing agricultural operations. The City Engineer shall have discretion to require a grading permit based on site-specific conditions and unusual circumstances for grading or earthmoving of less than 50 cubic yards. Grading plans shall meet the requirements of the local implementation plan with respect to maximum quantities, maximum cuts and fills, remedial grading, grading for safety purposes, and maximum heights of cut or fill. Grading proposed in or adjacent to an ESHA shall be minimized to the maximum extent feasible.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-89. Seasonal Grading.</u> Prohibit earthmoving during the rainy season (extending generally from October 15 to April 15) for development that is 1) located within or adjacent to ESHA, or 2) that includes grading on slopes greater than 25 percent. In such cases, approved grading shall not be undertaken unless there is sufficient time to complete grading operations before the rainy season. If grading operations are not completed before the rainy season begins, grading shall be halted and temporary erosion control measures shall be put into place to minimize erosion until grading resumes after April 15, unless the City determines that completion of grading would be more protective of resources. Grading during the rainy season may be permitted to remediate hazardous geologic conditions that endanger public health and safety.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-90. Erosion Control Measures.</u> Ensure that where grading is permitted during the rainy season (extending generally from October 15 to April 15), erosion control measures such as sediment basins, silt fencing, sandbagging, and installation of geofabrics, shall be implemented prior to and concurrent with grading operations. Such measures shall be maintained through final grading and until landscaping and permanent drainage is installed and established.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
<p><u>6-91. Landscaping and Revegetation.</u> Require cut and fill slopes and other areas disturbed by construction activities (including areas disturbed by fuel modification or brush clearance) to be landscaped or revegetated at the completion of grading. Landscape plans shall provide that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Plantings shall be native, drought-tolerant plant species, and blend with the existing natural vegetation and natural habitats on the site, except as noted below. b. Invasive plant species that tend to supplant native species and natural habitats shall be prohibited. c. Non-invasive ornamental plants and lawn may be permitted in combination with native, drought-tolerant species within the irrigated zone(s) required for fuel modification nearest approved residential structures. d. Landscaping or revegetation shall provide 90 percent coverage within five years, or that percentage of revegetation demonstrated locally appropriate for a healthy stand of the particular native vegetation type chosen for restoration. Landscaping or revegetation that is located within any required fuel modification thinning zone shall provide 60 percent coverage within five years. e. Any landscaping or revegetation shall be monitored and reported for a period of at least five years following the completion of planting. Performance criteria shall be designed to measure the success of the plantings. Mid-course corrections shall be implemented if necessary. If performance standards are not met by the end of the designated monitoring period, the monitoring period shall be extended until the standards are met. 	<p>2016 First Public Draft Policy</p>
<p><i>Mitigation and Restoration</i></p>	
<p><u>6-92. Mitigation.</u> Require mitigation in the form of habitat creation or substantial restoration for allowable impacts to ESHA and other sensitive resources that cannot be avoided through the implementation of siting and design alternatives. Priority shall be given to on-site mitigation. Off-site mitigation measures shall only be approved when it is not feasible to fully mitigate impacts on-site. Mitigation shall not substitute for implementation of the project alternative that would avoid impacts to ESHA.</p>	<p>2016 First Public Draft Policy</p>

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
<p><u>6-93. Mitigation Ratios.</u> Assess allowable resource impacts to determine required mitigation ratios on a case-by-case basis. At a minimum, apply the following mitigation ratios:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. 10:1 for native tree replacement (e.g. oaks, willow); b. 3:1 for riparian habitats; c. 3:1 for other habitats that support state or federal rare, threatened, or endangered species, species of special concern (designated by the CDFW), or CNPS 1b or 2 listed plants; and d. 2:1 for Central Dune Scrub not occupied by listed species. e. 1:1 for locally significant tree replacement (e.g. Monterey cypress, Monterey pine) <p>The ratios represent the acreage of the area to be restored/created to the acreage impacted.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-94. Mitigation Monitoring.</u> Require mitigation measures for impacts to ESHA that cannot be avoided through the implementation of siting and design alternatives. Such mitigation can include habitat restoration and/or enhancement that shall be monitored for a period of no less than five years following completion. Specific mitigation objectives and performance standards shall be designed to measure the success of the restoration and/or enhancement. Mid-course corrections shall be implemented if necessary. Monitoring reports shall be provided to the City annually and at the conclusion of the five-year monitoring period that document the success or failure of the mitigation. If performance standards are not met by the end of five years, the monitoring period shall be extended until the standards are met. However, if after ten years, performance standards have still not been met, the applicant shall submit an amendment proposing alternative mitigation measures to meet the same required mitigation ratio(s).</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-95. Habitat Restoration.</u> Require habitat restoration as a condition of approval for any permitted impacts to habitats when, in the judgment of the Community Development Director, restoration is partially or wholly feasible. A habitat restoration plan shall be provided for review and approval by the Community Development Director that includes, at a minimum, specific restoration objectives and performance standards with mitigation monitoring and reporting requirements.</p>	<p><u>Original LUP Policy 3-5. Permit Conditions.</u> ...b) When applicable, require as a condition of permit approval the restoration of damaged habitat(s) when, in the judgment of the Planning Director, restoration is partially or wholly feasible.</p>
<p><u>6-96. Minor Habitat Maintenance and Improvement Projects.</u></p>	New 2018 Planning Commission Public Draft Policy

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
Allow for an expedited permit review or waiver process when any minor habitat improvement projects that constitute development are proposed, such as the removal of debris, litter, or invasive exotic species and limited fuel modification with non-mechanized and/or non-motorized equipment, that will not cause any adverse impacts to ESHA or Potential ESHA.	
<p><u>6-97. Wetland Sediment Restoration.</u> Restore natural hydrodynamic systems to help ensure the ability of wetlands to persist with sea level rise by ensuring that sediment is available for wetland accretion.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy, Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment
<p><u>6-98. Wetland Mitigation.</u> Require, where any dike or fill development is permitted in wetlands, mitigation measures including, at minimum, creation or substantial restoration of wetlands of a similar type. On-site mitigation is preferred; off-site mitigation options will only be reviewed in the case that on-site mitigation is demonstrated to be infeasible. Adverse impacts shall be mitigated at a ratio of 3:1 for seasonal wetlands, freshwater marsh and riparian corridors, unless the applicant provides evidence establishing, and the City finds, that creation or restoration of a lesser area of wetlands will fully mitigate the adverse impacts of the dike or fill project. In no event will the mitigation ratio be less than 2:1 unless, prior to the development impacts, the mitigation is completed and is empirically demonstrated to meet performance criteria that establish that the created or restored wetlands are functionally equivalent or superior to the impacted wetlands.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-99. Priority Conservation Areas.</u> Coordinate with the Association of Bay Area Governments to support Priority Conservation Areas in Half Moon Bay and identify lands that could qualify as a Priority Conservation Area.</p>	New 2018 Planning Commission Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-100. Mitigation Banking.</u> Utilize mitigation banks as a means to compensate for natural resource impacts elsewhere, and to accomplish resource management and habitat restoration goals. Qualify the City as a recipient for mitigation banking projects and coordinate with the appropriate resource management agencies to establish mitigation banks and habitat restoration plans.</p>	New 2018 Planning Commission Public Draft Policy
<p><i>Open Space Acquisition for Conservation</i></p>	
<p><u>6-101. Partnerships for Open Space Conservation and Habitat Management.</u> Coordinate with San Mateo County, the State of California, the San Mateo County Resource Conservation District, Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District, and other related local, state, or federal conservation and environmental organizations to strategically acquire and manage lands to be conserved as open space for hazard avoidance and habitat protection.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy, Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
<p><u>6-102. Open Space Preservation and Conservation.</u> Preserve land for its ecological or recreational value through limiting or prohibiting development and any uses that conflict with ecological preservation goals. Potential strategies include open space management plans that evaluate and consider the impacts of sea level rise, establishing open space and conservation areas through land use designations and zoning, redevelopment restrictions, acquisition and easement programs, and setback and buffer requirements.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy, Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment
<p><u>6-103. Public Acquisition.</u> Establish a program to partner with state, federal, and non-profit organizations to acquire and protect natural resource areas for public use, including areas that could serve as refugia for species impacted by sea level rise, or areas that could be appropriate sites for coastal habitat creation or restoration.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy, Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment
<p><u>6-104. Open Space Requirements.</u> Require permit conditions for new development in certain areas that buffers around natural resource areas be protected through a conservation easement, deed restrictions, or other comparable mechanism.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy, Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment
<p><u>6-105. Development Restrictions.</u> Establish a formalized program to identify, acquire, and manage areas appropriate for some form of conservation protection. Use easements or other strategies to limit or restrict development on portions of a parcel or subdivision that are most vulnerable to sea level rise impacts. The program might develop standard agreements to be used for easements and identify the entities that could hold the easements.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy, Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment
<p><i>Sea Level Rise</i></p>	
<p><u>6-106. Sea Level Rise and ESHA.</u> Establish measures to ensure the continued viability of ESHA, such as protection of animal and habitat migration zones, habitat corridors, and other applicable adaptation strategies where at risk from sea level rise, through measures including the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Preserve open areas that are adjacent to wetlands to allow for migration of these habitats as sea levels rise; b. Protect refugia, or areas that may be relatively unaltered by global climate change and thus can serve as a refuge for coastal species displaced from their native habitat due to sea level rise or other climate change impacts; 	2016 First Public Draft Policy, Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. Enable identification of important animal movement corridors. Develop regulations to protect these corridors for present and future conditions, taking into account habitat shifts from climate change. Require that new structures such as highways, medians, bridges, culverts, and other development are designed to facilitate movement of animals; and d. Reserve space for a “habitat migration corridor” or areas into which wetlands and other habitats could migrate as sea level rise induced inundation of existing wetland areas occurs. These areas could be reserved through land acquisition, use designations, zoning buffers, setbacks, conservation easement requirements, and clustering development. Prioritize habitat migration corridors for land acquisition. 	
<p><u>6-107. Development and Habitat Migration.</u> Ensure that development provides opportunities for ESHA vulnerable to sea level rise impacts to migrate inland over time through measures such as the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Restrict the construction of new development in areas that are adjacent to wetlands and ESHA in order to preserve buffers and open areas to allow for habitat migration; b. Cluster development away from land where wetlands and other coastal habitats and dispersal areas could migrate with sea level rise; and c. For subdivisions, require lots to be configured in a way that allows inland migration of natural resource areas. Open space easements and lot line adjustments may be effective tools to facilitate locating physical development further away from hazards or sensitive resources. Prohibit the creation of new lots that would be vulnerable to sea level rise. 	2016 First Public Draft Policy, Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment
<p><u>6-108. Habitat Restoration, Creation, or Enhancement.</u> Ensure that habitat restoration, creation, or enhancement projects are designed to withstand impacts of sea level rise and adapt to future conditions. Encourage such projects for the purpose of continued viability of biological value, and as a method of sequestering greenhouse gases.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy, Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment
<p><u>6-109. Sediment Restoration.</u> Facilitate the delivery of clean, dredged sediment for areas where exiting wetlands are or may become sediment-limited due to sea level rise.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy, Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment
<p><u>6-110. Ecosystem Function.</u> Pursue strategies to protect ecosystem function under a range of future sea level rise or climate change scenarios. Recommend coastal habitat management strategies that strive to protect</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy, Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
ecosystem function in the future, including protecting a wide range of ecosystem types, protecting refugia, protecting wildlife and habitat corridors, and establishing methods to monitor ecosystem change over time.	
<p><u>6-111. Sea Level Rise Monitoring.</u> Establish a monitoring protocol and requirements for evaluating sea level rise impacts to coastal habitats over time, including bluff retreat, seawater intrusion, water table trends, and rainfall patterns. Such a protocol would also help identify triggers at which additional adaptation options are necessary.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy, Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment

Natural Shorelines Policies

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
<p><u>6-112. Shoreline Protection.</u> Protect, enhance, and preserve Half Moon Bay’s shoreline, including its beaches, dunes, and coastal bluffs through comprehensive management.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-113. Shoreline Management Planning.</u> Establish a shoreline management plan, cooperating with other agencies, districts, and communities such as San Mateo County and the Harbor District where possible, to address long-term shoreline change due to coastal processes such as erosion and sea level rise. Include the short and long-term goals for the Half Moon Bay coast, the management actions and policies necessary for reaching those goals, and any necessary monitoring to ensure effectiveness and success. Incorporate strategies necessary to manage and adapt to changes in wave, flooding, and erosion hazards due to sea level rise. A shoreline management plan should include the following components:</p> <p>a. Beach Nourishment Program. Identify locations where nourishment may be appropriate and establish a beach nourishment program and protocols for conducting beach nourishment; establish criteria for the design, construction, and management of the nourishment area; and establish measures to minimize adverse biological resource impacts from deposition of material, such as sand compatibility specifications, timing or seasonal restrictions, and identification of environmentally preferred locations for</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy, Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
<p>deposits. Consider how nourishment options may need to change over time as sea level rises.</p> <p>b. Sediment Management. Identify natural sediment supplies and opportunities to remove or modify existing structures or actions that impair natural sand supply. Support studies to better understand the City’s sediment budget. Support nature-based responses to sea level rise by maintaining and restoring natural sand supply. The program should be periodically updated to address on-going changes from sea level rise. Engage in regional cooperation with San Mateo County and other Midcoast communities to implement the program.</p> <p>c. Sea Level Rise Strategy. Develop a comprehensive beach management strategy to address loss of beach areas, including loss of lateral access, or changes in beach management due to sea level rise. A program to minimize loss of beach area may include a beach nourishment program; restoring sand and sediment supply to the littoral cell; removal, adjustments, or maintenance to shoreline protection structures; use of man-made structures such as terminal groins or artificial reefs to retain sediment; or other actions.</p> <p>d. Shoreline Protection. Include an inventory of existing shoreline protective devices as well as standard engineering plans and analyses defining the specific types of shoreline protection that would be acceptable or preferable for specific areas, and identification of the types of protective devices that would not be acceptable for certain areas in order to minimize risks and impacts to public access and scenic resources.</p> <p>e. Emergency Armoring. Identify procedures to address emergency armoring, such as: coordination with property owners and for field inspections before and after storm seasons; guidance for types of temporary protective structures preferred; mitigation requirements; and a provision for removal of temporary structures if no follow up permit is filed.</p> <p>f. New Armoring. Establish standards for alternatives analyses, conditions of approval, and monitoring requirements that would be required elements of all new hazard response and hard shoreline protection projects, as consistent with the shoreline and bluff protection policies in the Coastal Hazards chapter. Feasibility analyses should assure that hard protective devices are only used as a last resort, and conditions and monitoring requirements should include mechanisms to ensure public safety and shoreline protection effectiveness with provisions for eventual removal of the protective device.</p>	

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
<p><u>6-114. Dune Management.</u> Identify existing dune systems and develop or encourage management plans to enhance and restore these areas, including consideration of ways that the system will change with rising sea level.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy, Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment
<p><u>6-115. Regional Sediment Management.</u> Collaborate with regional efforts to develop a Regional Sediment Management (RSM) program that includes strategies designed to allow the use of natural processes to solve engineering problems. Local sediment management actions and policies can also be implemented through an RSM.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy, Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment

Hydrology and Water Quality Policies

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
<i>General Policies</i>	
<p><u>6-116. Protect and Conserve Water Resources.</u> Protect, conserve, and, where feasible, restore the quality of the City’s watersheds and water resources, including fresh water, marine habitats, and groundwater.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-117. Green Infrastructure.</u> Promote and prioritize the use of Low Impact Development (LID) strategies, Best Management Practices (BMPs), and on-site infiltration to create green infrastructure for treating and reducing stormwater runoff in coordination with the City’s Green Infrastructure Plan. In and adjacent to ESHA, use resource-dependent green infrastructure projects for natural restoration purposes and provision of buffer areas to allow for natural erosion, evolution of natural drainage flows, and sediment transport balance.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-118. Habitat Restoration.</u> Restore, enhance, and preserve of riparian, wetland, and open water habitats.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-119. Stormwater Management.</u> Reduce impacts from erosion and water quality degradation by managing project runoff stormwater discharge rates and implementing hydromodification management measures.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
<u>6-120. Sea Level Rise.</u> Ensure that sea level rise impacts do not exacerbate water pollution from sources such as runoff, contaminated sites, stormwater, and wastewater.	2016 First Public Draft Policy, Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment
<i>Watershed and Groundwater Management</i>	
<u>6-121. Watershed Planning.</u> Support and participate in watershed planning efforts. Coordinate with San Mateo County, the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and other agencies.	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<u>6-122. Groundwater Management.</u> Plan and coordinate monitoring, operation, and administration of a groundwater basin or portion of a groundwater basin with the goal of fostering long-term sustainability of the resource. Specify limits or establish other standards for the use of groundwater and sensitive aquifers. Coordinate with other regional water planning efforts.	2016 First Public Draft Policy, Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment
<u>6-123. Groundwater Analysis.</u> Encourage or support ongoing and new analysis to develop reliable data to better understand groundwater resources and the potential/limitation for increased public/municipal use.	2016 First Public Draft Policy, Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment
<u>6-124. Seawater Intrusion.</u> Promote research to increase the understanding of the vulnerability of coastal aquifers to seawater intrusion and establish a long-term strategy for addressing risks.	2016 First Public Draft Policy, Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment
<u>6-125. Groundwater Extraction.</u> Regulate development to limit or prevent extraction and avoid overdraft from aquifers that are potentially vulnerable to saltwater intrusion. Encourage measures to recharge shallow aquifers that are depleted.	2016 First Public Draft Policy, Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment
<u>6-126. Hazardous Materials Sites.</u> Monitor the status of hazardous materials sites in the Planning Area and work with property owners and state agencies to ensure proper and timely cleanup of all sites, prioritizing low-lying contaminated sites for remediation and restoration.	2016 First Public Draft Policy, Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment
<i>Development</i>	
<u>6-127. Siting and Design.</u> Site and design new development to avoid impacts to coastal waters by incorporating measures designed to achieve the following:	2016 First Public Draft Policy

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Protect, restore, and enhance areas that provide important water quality benefits, areas necessary to maintain riparian and aquatic biota and/or that are susceptible to erosion and sediment loss; b. Limit increases of impervious surfaces, especially impervious surfaces directly connected to the storm drain system; c. Minimize the transport of pollutants from development into runoff and coastal waters; d. Limit land disturbance activities such as clearing and grading, and cut-and-fill to reduce erosion and sediment loss; and e. Preserve, restore, and enhance natural drainage features and vegetation. 	
<p><u>6-128. Runoff Rates.</u> Ensure that post-development peak stormwater runoff discharge rates do not exceed the estimated pre-development rate produced by the 85th percentile 24-hour design storm. Dry weather runoff from new development must not exceed the pre-development baseline flow rate to receiving waterbodies.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-129. ESHA Protection.</u> In areas in or adjacent to an Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA), plan, site, and design development to protect the ESHA from any significant disruption of habitat values resulting from the discharge of stormwater or dry-weather runoff flows.</p>	New 2018 Planning Commission Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-130. Construction Best Management Practices (BMPs).</u> Ensure that new development includes construction phase erosion control and polluted runoff control plans. These plans shall specify BMPs that will be implemented to minimize erosion and sedimentation, provide adequate sanitary and waste disposal facilities and prevent contamination of runoff by construction chemicals and materials.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-131. Drainage Plans.</u> Require new development to provide post-development phase drainage and polluted runoff control plans. These plans shall specify site design, source control and treatment control BMPs that will be implemented to minimize post-construction polluted runoff, and shall include the monitoring and maintenance plans for these BMPs.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-132. Existing Drainage Patterns.</u> Require that, where feasible, drainage plans be designed to complement and utilize existing drainage patterns and systems, conveying drainage from the developed area of the site in a</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
non-erosive manner. Disturbed or degraded natural drainage systems shall be restored, where feasible, except where there are geologic or public safety concerns.	
<u>6-133. Construction Activities.</u> Require measures during construction to limit land disturbance activities such as clearing and grading and cut-and-fill; avoid steep slopes, unstable areas and erosive soils; and minimize disturbance of natural vegetation and other physical or biological features important to preventing erosion or sedimentation.	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<u>6-134. Graded and Disturbed Areas.</u> Require that new development that requires a grading permit includes landscaping and re-vegetation of graded or disturbed areas, with drought-tolerant native or non-invasive plants.	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<u>6-135. Post-Construction BMPs.</u> Ensure that post-construction structural BMPs (or suites of BMPs) are designed to treat, infiltrate, or filter 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 two times the 85th percentile 1-hour storm event for flow-based BMPs. Update storm event standards and precipitation models with best available science on climate change as necessary.	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<u>6-136. BMP Maintenance.</u> Require structural BMPs to be inspected, cleaned, and repaired as necessary to ensure proper functioning for the life of the development. As a condition of permit approval, require ongoing application, maintenance and monitoring as is necessary for effective operation of all BMPs (including site design, source control, and treatment control).	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<u>6-137. Land Division Design.</u> Prohibit land divisions that would result in building pads, access roads, or driveways located on slopes over 30 percent, or result in grading on slopes over 30 percent. All land divisions shall be designed such that the location of building pads and access roads minimizes erosion and sedimentation. Ensure that new subdivisions are sized, designed and provide adequate space for necessary runoff and drainage controls, as consistent with the LCP.	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<u>6-138. Erosion from Infrastructure.</u> Ensure that new roads, bridges, culverts, and outfalls shall not cause or contribute to streambank or hillside erosion or creek or wetland siltation and shall include BMPs to minimize impacts to water quality, including construction phase erosion control and polluted	2016 First Public Draft Policy

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
runoff control plans, and soil stabilization practices. Where space is available, dispersal of sheet flow from roads into vegetated areas or other on-site infiltration practices shall be incorporated into road and bridge design.	
<u>6-139. Water Quality Checklists.</u> Develop and maintain water quality checklists to be used in the coastal development permit review process to assess potential water quality impacts from small projects, special projects, and C.3 regulated projects.	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<u>6-140. Developments of Particular Water Quality Concern.</u> Identify categories of development that have a greater potential for adverse impacts to water quality and hydrology as those consistent with NPDES C.3 Regulated Projects. In association with any coastal development permit application, such categories of development shall: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Conduct a polluted runoff and hydrologic site characterization by a qualified licensed professional and document the expected effectiveness of the proposed BMPs; b. Size LID, Runoff Control, and Treatment Control BMPs for the 85th percentile design storm; c. Use a green infrastructure approach to retain the design storm runoff on-site; d. Use Treatment Control and Runoff Control BMPs to remove pollutants of concern and minimize adverse post-development changes in the runoff flow regime if any portion of the runoff produced by the design storm cannot be retained on-site. 	New 2018 Planning Commission Public Draft Policy
<i>Stormwater Management</i>	
<u>6-141. Green Infrastructure Plan.</u> Continue to develop and implement a Green Infrastructure Plan that prioritizes areas for green infrastructure improvements and establishes standards for drainage improvements and management.	New 2018 Planning Commission Public Draft Policy
<u>6-142. Stormwater Infrastructure.</u> Improve citywide stormwater infrastructure to ensure adequate dispersal and detainment of stormwater, reduce flood potential, and allow groundwater recharge during storms. Incorporate Low Impact Design (LID) strategies into the city’s stormwater system.	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<u>6-143. Stormwater Infrastructure and Sea Level Rise.</u> Encourage stormwater infrastructure that prioritizes or restores natural drainage patterns and reduces impacts from higher water levels through green infrastructure methods. Improve	2016 First Public Draft Policy, Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
<p>existing hard infrastructure based on site-specific conditions through measures such as widening drainage ditches, improving carrying and storage capacity of tidally-influenced streams, installing larger pipes and culverts, adding pumps, converting culverts to bridges, creating retention and detention basins, and developing contingency plans for extreme events. Avoid hard infrastructure improvements in natural areas, including bluffs and cliffs.</p>	
<p><u>6-144. Stormwater Retrofit for Sea Level Rise.</u> Identify and prioritize development in low-lying or other at-risk areas with inadequate stormwater infrastructure and take steps to retrofit these systems to better accommodate sea level rise driven changes, prioritizing methods that utilizes natural drainage patterns and systems. Remove hard drainage structures in natural areas where feasible, and replace with natural, green systems.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy, Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment
<p><u>6-145. Stormwater Pollutants.</u> Continue implementing National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) provisions for long-term reduction of stormwater pollutants, and the San Mateo Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program (SMCWPPP). Cooperate with the SMCWPPP requirements for water quality design, source control, stormwater treatment, low impact development, hydromodification management, and construction site controls.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-146. Sea Level Rise Impacts and Runoff Pollution.</u> Coordinate with the Regional Water Quality Control Board and San Mateo County Resource Conservation District to add policies to reduce water pollution from runoff should agricultural lands or other sources of non-point pollution become flooded or inundated due to sea level rise.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy, Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment
<p><u>6-147. Citywide Drainage Master Plan.</u> Complete an update of the Citywide Drainage Master Plan, incorporating an inventory of stormwater infrastructure and hydraulic and hydrologic analysis to identify inadequate infrastructure, especially in areas identified as having localized flooding, erosion, or sedimentation concerns. Include sea level rise and extreme storms in stormwater management plans and actions.</p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy, Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment
<p><u>6-148. Flood Mapping.</u> Support efforts to update the City’s FEMA flood mapping with historical information collection, grant funding, and studies.</p>	New 2018 Planning Commission Public Draft Policy
<p><u>6-149. Pervious Surface.</u></p>	2016 First Public Draft Policy

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
Maximize the amount of pervious surfaces in public spaces to allow urban runoff infiltration and groundwater recharge.	
<u>6-150. Litter, Debris, and Contaminants.</u> Ensure that public areas, including streets and recreational areas, are routinely cleaned of litter, debris, and contaminant residue. Coordinate with and support efforts by other organizations or volunteer groups to promote clean-ups of beaches and public open spaces. Require the City, property owners, or homeowners associations, as applicable, to sweep permitted parking lots and public and private streets frequently to remove debris and contaminated residue in coordination with garbage collection schedules.	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<u>6-151. Education and Outreach.</u> Continue and expand public education and outreach to reduce industrial and illicit discharges to stormwater infrastructure.	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<u>6-152. Analysis of Pollutant Sources.</u> Encourage or support ongoing and new analysis to understand surface water quality pollution sources, especially in Pilarcitos Creek.	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<i>Wastewater</i>	
<u>6-153. Wastewater Discharges.</u> Work with the Sewer Authority Mid-Coastside to ensure that any wastewater discharges minimize impacts to the biological productivity and quality of coastal streams, wetlands, estuaries, and the oceans.	2016 First Public Draft Policy
<u>6-154. New Outfalls and Treatment Facilities.</u> Prioritize the use of green infrastructure instead of new outfalls when feasible. Otherwise ensure that new ocean outfalls, wastewater treatment facilities, and other facilities that could negatively impact water quality if flooded or inundated, are sited and designed to minimize impacts from sea level rise. Avoid construction of new stormwater outfalls and direct stormwater to existing facilities with appropriate treatment and filtration where feasible. Where new outfalls cannot be avoided, plan, site, and design stormwater outfalls to minimize adverse impacts on coastal resources, including consolidation of existing and new outfalls where appropriate. Consolidate new and existing outfalls where appropriate.	2016 First Public Draft Policy, Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment
<u>6-155. Wastewater System Protection.</u> Coordinate with the Sewer Authority Mid-Coast and other applicable agencies to ensure that wastewater treatment and disposal systems are not adversely affected by the impacts of sea	2016 First Public Draft Policy, Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
<p>level rise over the full life of the structure and ensure that damage to these facilities would not result in impacts to water quality or other coastal resources. Avoid siting new facilities in hazardous locations. If complete avoidance is not possible, minimize elements of the system that are in hazardous areas and design any facilities in hazardous areas to withstand worst-case scenario sea level rise impacts.</p>	
<p><u>6-156. Wastewater Infrastructure Retrofit, Relocation, and Removal.</u> Establish a program to retrofit, relocate, or eliminate ocean outfalls and other wastewater infrastructure, including private septic systems, deemed at risk. Alternatives include modifications to outfall lines, the use of green infrastructure, and redesign of waste and stormwater systems. Identify areas where sea level rise could affect flow of wastewater from outfalls and lead to backup and inland flooding, and plan to retrofit, relocate, or eliminate these outfalls to prevent damage and impacts to water quality.</p>	<p>2016 First Public Draft Policy, Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment</p>
<p><u>6-157. Wastewater Treatment.</u> Coordinate with the Sewer Authority Mid-Coastside to develop a retrofit strategy to manage impacts from sea level rise-related coastal flooding to ensure continued function of the facility while minimizing risks to sensitive coastal habitats and water quality from damage or overflows.</p>	<p>2016 First Public Draft Policy, Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment</p>
<p><i>Hydromodification</i></p>	
<p><u>6-158. Natural Hydrology.</u> Preserve, or where feasible, restore natural hydrologic conditions such that downstream erosion, natural sedimentation rates, surface flow, and groundwater recharge function near natural equilibrium states.</p>	<p>2016 First Public Draft Policy</p>
<p><u>6-159. Alteration of Natural Drainage Courses.</u> Prohibit alterations or disturbance of streams or natural drainage courses, or human-made or altered drainage courses that have replaced natural streams or drainages and serve the same function, with the following exceptions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Necessary water supply projects; b. Flood, sedimentation, or erosion control projects to protect public safety and existing structures where there is no other feasible alternative; or c. The improvement of fish and wildlife habitat. <p>Any alterations permitted for one of these three purposes shall adhere to the performance standards listed for permitted uses within riparian corridors in Policy 6-36; shall minimize</p>	<p><u>Original LUP Policy 3-9. Permitted Uses in Riparian Corridors.</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Within corridors, permit only the following uses: (1) education and research, (2) consumptive uses as provided for in the Fish and Game Code and Title 14 of the California Administrative Code, (3) fish and wildlife management activities, (4) trails and scenic overlooks on public land(s), and (5) necessary water supply projects.

LUP Update – 2018 Public Draft	Origin
<p>impacts to coastal resources, including the depletion of groundwater; and shall include maximum feasible mitigation measures to mitigate unavoidable impacts. Green infrastructure shall be preferred for flood protection over “hard” solutions such as concrete or riprap channels. Any permitted stream alterations shall include BMPs for hydromodification activities.</p>	<p>b) When no feasible or practicable alternative exists, permit the following uses: (1) stream-dependent aquaculture provided that non-stream-dependent facilities locate outside of corridor, (2) flood control projects where no other method for protecting existing structures in the flood plain is feasible and where such protection is necessary for public safety or to protect existing development, (3) bridges when supports are not in significant conflict with corridor resources, (4) pipelines and storm water runoff facilities, (5) improvement, repair or maintenance of roadways or road crossings, (6) agricultural uses, provided no existing riparian vegetation is removed, and no soil is allowed to enter stream channels.</p> <p><u>Original LUP Policy 3-10. Performance Standards in Riparian Corridors.</u> Require development permitted in corridors to... (10) minimize alteration of natural streams.</p>
<p><u>6-160. Restoration.</u> Encourage and implement opportunities to restore wetlands, riparian corridors, and other habitats that provide flood retention and storage, carbon sequestration, remediation for degraded water quality, and groundwater recharge.</p>	<p>2016 First Public Draft Policy</p>
<p><u>6-161. Hydromodification Impacts.</u> Evaluate any channelization or dam proposals permitted pursuant to Policy 6-157 in the context of watershed planning, considering potential benefits and/or adverse impacts to the watershed as a whole. Potential adverse impacts of such projects include effects on wildlife migration, downstream erosion, dam maintenance (to remove silt and trash) and interruption of sand supplies to beaches.</p>	<p>2016 First Public Draft Policy</p>