

**ATTACHMENT 1**  
**ISSUES FOR FINAL CONSIDERATION**

---

**Natural Systems and Agriculture Element**

---

**TOPIC 1 - Biological Resources - Baylands Corridor**

**Background:** The September 11, 2007 Staff Report recommended removing the San Rafael Airport from the Baylands Corridor in order to ensure that planning for that airport would be consistent with the planning policies of San Rafael in which most of the airport is located. Upon closer examination, it was discovered that removing the San Rafael Airport necessitates removing other nearby property. That was not considered by the Planning Commission. Consequently for this and other reasons discussed below, staff recommends that Maps 2-5a and b continue to include the San Rafael Airport in the Baylands Corridor. The uses at that airport will be governed in part by TR-1.7 and TR-1.p which are set forth below.

There has also been objection to the language proposed for BIO-5 in the September 11, 2007 Staff Report which makes enhancement or restoration of wetlands in the vicinity of San Rafael Airport subject to safety concerns and applicable FAA regulations. That language is set forth below. It has been pointed out that San Rafael Airport is a private facility which is not subject to the same stringent FAA regulations and guidelines as apply to public airports. This is true, but nevertheless, wetland activities in the area of the airport should be subject to safety review for impact on airport operations as a matter of sound planning. There has been testimony that the birds which use wetlands and marshes do not typically cause interference with airport operations. If this is the case, the policy proposed by staff will not be a hindrance to wetland enhancement or restoration.

The City of San Rafael has requested the proposed Baylands Corridor not be applied to public and private property within incorporated San Rafael. Since 1974, the Countywide Plan has designated the entire county into three environmental units called corridors (see Map 1-1). Each environmental corridor is based on specific geographical and environmental characteristics and natural boundaries formed by north- and south-running ridges. A fourth, the proposed Baylands Corridor, encompasses lands along the shoreline of San Francisco and San Pablo Bays and provides heightened recognition of the unique environmental characteristics of this area and the need to protect its resources. For over 30 years the corridor concept has served as a foundation for the Plan, and has historically included Marin's cities and towns in addition to unincorporated areas. While incorporated lands are included in the Baylands Corridor, Goal BIO-5 makes it clear the policies, programs, and implementation measures related to the Baylands Corridor apply only within unincorporated



Marin County. Therefore, in order to remain consistent with Map 1-1, incorporated lands should remain within the Baylands Corridor.

Please note that previously considered revisions for the Baylands Corridor are noted in Attachment 2.A (September 11, 2007). Those modifications have been incorporated into the text below. However, unresolved issues are called out below in ~~strike~~through and underline.

## Issues for Final Consideration:

### GOAL BIO-5

**Baylands Conservation.** Preserve and enhance the diversity of the baylands ecosystem, including tidal marshes and adjacent uplands, seasonal marshes and wetlands, rocky shorelines, lagoons, agricultural lands, and low-lying grasslands overlying historical marshlands.

The Baylands Corridor is described on Maps 2-5a and 2-5b. While the mapped areas include lands within incorporated cities, the policies, programs, and implementation measures related to the Baylands Corridor apply only within unincorporated Marin County.

The Baylands Corridor consists of areas previously included in the Bayfront Conservation Zones in the 1994 Countywide Plan as well as all areas included in Bayfront Conservation Zone overlays adopted since the 1994 Countywide Plan. The Baylands Corridor consists of land containing historic bay marshlands based on maps prepared by the San Francisco Estuary Institute. Based upon information contained in studies completed during the preparation of this Plan, the Baylands Corridor also includes associated habitat from San Francisco Bay to Highway 101 in the Las Gallinas Planning Area. Except in the Tam Junction area and at the Rowland Boulevard and Highway 101 interchange in Novato, the Baylands Corridor does not extend west of Highway 101.

Where applicable for large parcels (more than two acres in size) which are primarily undeveloped, and based upon site specific characteristics, an additional area of 300 feet or more of associated habitat is included. The inclusion of the 300 foot buffer is consistent with the minimum setback recommendations of the 1999 *Baylands Ecosystem Habitat Goals* report. This portion of the corridor serves to both recognize the biological importance of associated uplands adjacent to remaining tidelands and to provide the opportunity to improve habitat values as part of future restoration of historic tidelands.

Within the Baylands Corridor, potential residential density and commercial floor area ratios shall be calculated at the low end of the applicable ranges. This provision does not apply to small parcels (two acres or less

in size) which were legally created prior to January 1, 2007. Within PD-AERA designation, the density and floor area ratios shall be as specified for those areas. Section 22.14.060 of the Development Code should be updated to reflect these policies.

For parcels of all sizes, existing lawful uses are grandfathered. For properties two acres or less in size within the Bayfront Conservation Zone on January 1, 2007, no additional regulations are imposed than previously applied to such lands. Creation of the Baylands Corridor will not subject currently allowed activities to additional County regulation. Such activities include repair and maintenance of bank erosion protection (riprap, plantings, etc.) and docks, levees or dredging of existing dredged channels (such as Novato Creek) including existing dredge disposal sites.

Within the Baylands Corridor, **public** improvements on airport **and immediately adjacent properties** pursuant to an approved Airport Master Plan or Airport Land Use Plan will not be subject to additional Baylands protection regulations.

The provisions of TR-1.7, *Direct Aviation Uses to Appropriate Locations*, and TR-1.p, *Limit Aviation Uses*, apply to airport facilities which are within the Baylands Corridor. Efforts to restore or enhance wetlands in the vicinity of the San Rafael Airport or Gness Field shall avoid creating possible safety concerns related to aircraft operations and shall be consistent with applicable FAA guidelines.

Detailed resource mapping and analysis should be undertaken to determine whether it is appropriate to include additional associated habitats located on large primarily undeveloped lands within the Baylands Corridor.

Small parcels not currently subject to tidal influence should be subject to mapping and analysis to determine whether they should be added to or omitted from the Baylands Corridor. In particular, historic marshland in the Richardson Bay and Bothin Marsh area should be included in the resource mapping and analysis to determine if these parcels meet the criteria for inclusion in the Baylands Corridor

This mapping and analysis should do the following: (1) identify existing vegetative cover and sensitive features, such as streams, wetlands, and occurrences of special-status species; (2) use focal species and other similar ecological tools to determine the interrelationship between baylands and uplands; (3) identify methods to maintain connectivity between sensitive habitat features and baylands; (4) specify criteria and thresholds used in determining the extent of upland habitat essential to the baylands ecosystem; and (5) make recommendations on an appropriate biologically based boundary if the Baylands Corridor is to be expanded;

(6) Identify lands that could be restored to provide habitat, or that provide protection from sea level rise. Completion of the analysis does not require on-site evaluations.

All parcels added to the Baylands corridor as a result of this study are subject to Baylands regulations in effect at that time.

## Policy

**BIO-5.1 Protect the Baylands Corridor.** Ensure that baylands and large, adjacent essential uplands are protected, and encourage enhancement efforts for baylands, including those in the Baylands Corridor. The following criteria shall be used to evaluate proposed development projects that may impact the Baylands Corridor:

i. For large parcels (over 2 acres in size), adhere to development setback standards for areas qualifying for protection under the WCA and SCA, but increase setback distances as necessary to ensure that hydrologically isolated features such as seasonal wetlands and freshwater marshes are adequately linked to permanently protected habitat. These additional development setbacks shall serve to prevent fragmentation and preserve essential upland buffers in the Baylands Corridor.

~~ii. The Baylands Corridor and specified setbacks do not extend over nontidal portions of~~ For small parcels (2 acres or less in size), ~~that border or partially extend over tidelands encourage property owners~~ where suitable habitat exists to preserve up to 10 feet landward of mean high tide ~~should be preserved~~ as a species refuge area for high water events. Site constraints, opportunities for avoidance of sensitive biological resources, and options for alternative mitigation ~~will~~ may also be considered. ~~in lieu of fixed setbacks on these properties.~~

iii. Minor redevelopment involving less than 25% of a structure on a residential or industrial parcel that is already filled and at least 50% developed may be exempted from the requirements for a site assessment, provided that no additional filling or modification to wetlands occurs. (See BIO-5.2)

*In addition, the following underlined revisions to the **Transportation** section of the Built Environment Element could be considered to further address Baylands-airport issues:*

**TR-1.7** *Limit Aviation Uses.* Maintain the County Airport at Gness Field as the primary civilian airport facility in the county and limit its use to general aviation, emergency flights and similar public uses, in accordance with the an approved Airport Master Plan or Airport Land Use Plan for Gness Field (1989) and current technological conditions. Continue to allow the private San Rafael Airport facility consistent with the 1993 Declaration of Restrictions and the heliport and seaplane bases in Richardson Bay to provide water-oriented visitor and commercial uses. Any proposed helipad shall be subject to all applicable CEQA requirements prior to consideration.

**TR-1.p** *Limit Aviation Uses.* Maintain the County Airport at Gness Field as the primary civilian airport facility in the county and limit its use to general aviation, emergency flights and similar public uses, in accordance with the an approved Airport Master Plan or Airport Land Use Plan for Gness Field (1989) and current technological conditions. Continue to allow the private San Rafael Airport facility consistent with the 1993 Declaration of Restrictions and the heliport and seaplane bases in Richardson Bay to provide water-oriented visitor and commercial uses. Any proposed helipad shall be subject to all applicable CEQA requirements prior to consideration.

*Program BIO-5.i should be revised as follows to reflect the additional analysis recommended in Goal BIO-5 above:*

**BIO-5.i** *Conduct Mapping and Analysis.* Undertake detailed resource mapping and biological analysis to determine whether it is appropriate to include additional associated habitats located on large primarily undeveloped lands within the Baylands Corridor, particularly those areas north of Novato and east of Highway 101. Small parcels not currently subject to tidal influence should be subject to mapping and analysis to determine whether they should be added to or omitted from the Baylands Corridor. In particular, historic marshland in the Richardson Bay and Bothin Marsh area should be included in the resource mapping and analysis to determine if these parcels meet the criteria for inclusion in the Baylands Corridor.

This mapping analysis should do the following: (1) identify existing vegetative cover and sensitive features, such as streams, wetlands, and occurrences of special-status species; (2) use focal species and other similar ecological tools to determine the interrelationship between baylands and uplands; (3) identify methods to maintain connectivity between sensitive habitat features and baylands; (4) specify criteria and thresholds used in determining the extent of upland habitat essential to the baylands ecosystem; and (5) make

recommendations on an appropriate biologically based boundary if the Baylands Corridor is to be expanded. (6) Identify lands that could be restored to provide habitat, or that provide protection from sea level rise. Completion of the analysis does not require on-site evaluations.

All parcels added to the Baylands corridor as a result of this study are subject to Baylands regulations in effect at that time.

## **TOPIC 2: Trails**

**Background:** All language changes related to trails on agricultural properties have been included in Attachment 2.A (*September 11, 2007 BOS*).

### **Issues for Final Consideration:**

- GOAL TRL-1 Trail Network Preservation and Expansion.** Preserve existing trail routes designated for public use on the Marin Countywide Trails Plan maps, and expand the public trail network for all user groups, where appropriate. Facilitate trail connections that can be used for safe routes to school and work.
- TRL-1.2 Expand the Countywide Trail System.** Acquire additional trails to complete the proposed countywide trail system, providing access to or between public lands and enhancing public trail use opportunities for all user groups, especially multi-use trails, as appropriate
- TRL-1.b* *Designate Trail Use Consistent with Agency Missions.* Consider developing criteria to determine public use of trails consistent with each agency's mission and policies. Explore and share information on innovative methods for safety and conflict resolution, such as for shared-use trails.
- TRL-2.8 Provide Trail Information.** Strive to provide information to trail users that facilitates visitor orientation, nature interpretation, code compliance and trail etiquette. Develop a methodology for signing trails to assist user and emergency personnel.
- TRL-2.c* *Eliminate Trail Redundancy* Identify, abandon, and restore

redundant or otherwise unnecessary trails or trail segments unless they provide alternate routes that facilitate user safety.

*TRL-2.1* **Ensure Trail Maintenance Funding.** Strive to identify and secure consistent sources of funding for trail maintenance. Develop a policy for funding that explores trail sponsorship, trail naming, trail adoption, trail maintenance annuities, jurisdictional cooperation, and other sustainable methodology.

*TRL-2.o* **Distribute Trail Maps and Information.** Provide clear signs and maps. Provide code, natural resource, and directional information about the trail network in multiple formats and languages. In communication with users, promote trail systems for exercise, family activity, and, where applicable, everyday movement from place to place.

## Trails Map

Remove proposed trail on the George (Johntz) property between the Dickson Ridge Fire Road and Nicasio Valley Road as shown on Marin Countywide Trails Plan Map 2-19d.

## **TOPIC 3: Agriculture and Food**

**Background:** All text changes related to home size on agricultural properties (Program AG-1.a) have been included in Attachment 2.A (September 11, 2007).

### **Issues for Final Consideration:**

**AG-1.2** **Encourage Contractual Protection.** Facilitate agricultural conservation easements, land conservation and farmland security zone contracts, and transfer of development rights between willing owners when used to preserve agricultural lands and resources.

**AG-1.g** **Revise Agricultural Zoning Districts.** Modify existing agricultural zoning districts to create a more uniform approach to preservation of agricultural lands, development standards, allowance of ancillary and compatible non-agricultural uses, and to limit incompatible non-agricultural commercial uses. The principal use of agriculturally zoned land shall be agricultural production, with non-agricultural uses limited to necessary residential uses and compatible ancillary uses that enhance farm income.



Consolidate suitable agricultural lands in the Inland Rural Corridor into **an effective** agricultural zoning district similar to the Agricultural Production Zoning District and create compatible zoning districts to accommodate lands currently zoned for, but not suited for, agriculture as a principal use.

Agricultural Production Zoning (APZ) **or a similar zoning district** shall apply to lands in the Inland Rural Corridor suitable for land-intensive or land-extensive agricultural productivity as well as on soils classified as Prime Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance capable of supporting production agriculture. The purpose of this zoning district shall be to preserve lands within the zone for agricultural uses **and support continued agricultural activities**. The principal use of these lands shall be agricultural, and any development shall be accessory, incidental, and in support of agricultural production.

Agricultural Residential Planned District Zoning (ARP) shall apply to lands adjacent to residential areas, and at the edges of Agricultural Production Zones in the Inland Rural and Coastal Corridors that have potential for agricultural production. This district may also be applied to lands with historic or potential agricultural uses within the City-Centered Corridor and in locations that function as community separators or greenbelts. This district is intended to protect agriculture but also allows residential and compatible commercial uses in areas that are transitional between residential and agricultural production uses.

Residential Agricultural Zoning District (RAZ) shall apply in rural areas within the City-Centered, Inland Rural, Coastal , and Baylands Corridors to accommodate typical rural uses including small-scale row crop production, 4H projects and associated uses, along with residential uses and compatible commercial uses.

Woodland Conservation Zoning District (WCZ) shall apply to selected lands currently in agricultural zoning districts that have a very dense native tree cover. Aerial photography shall be utilized to determine the extent of canopy cover characterizing properties to be included in this zoning district.

### **SUB-TOPIC 3.a: Clarify current permit regulations pertaining to Agriculture**

**Background:** Additional text could be added to the Background discussion of the Agriculture and Food Section of the Plan to better clarify current agriculture development regulations, including reference to the Development Code.

#### **Issue for Final Consideration:**

##### **2.10 Agriculture**

###### ***Background***

...The county agricultural land base consists of about 137,000 acres of private land and 32,000 acres of federal land in the Point Reyes National Seashore and Golden Gate National Recreation Area (see Figure 2-24). Federal legislation provides authority to lease or permit lands for agricultural use in these areas. The Agriculture (A), Agricultural Residential Planned (ARP), and Agricultural Production Zone (APZ) districts generally require at least 60-acre parcels in specific locations in the Inland Rural and Coastal corridors, and coastal areas. The Limited Agricultural (A-2) and Residential Agricultural (R-A) districts allow residential uses and limited agriculture. Specified agricultural land uses are also allowed in the Residential Single Family Planned (RSP) and Residential Multiple Planned (RMP) districts. This Section of the Countywide Plan contains policies and programs that seek to protect agricultural land and operations and maintain agricultural use.

Most customary agricultural production uses and related facilities are currently permitted under the Marin County Development Code without the need for master plans, use permits or other local zoning entitlements. For example, these activities include livestock grazing, crop production and dairy operations. The Development Code also provides use permit exemptions for small-scale agricultural production and retail sale facilities and exemptions from the Design Review process for agricultural accessory structures and related activities, such as barns and facilities for milking and packaging of fruits and vegetables. The types of agricultural land uses that are subject to special zoning requirements are for the most part limited to livestock sales/feed lots and agricultural processing and retail sale facilities not otherwise exempt based upon their size and the source(s) of product.

In the Coastal Zone, coastal development regulations adopted by the County to implement the State Coastal Act and Local Coastal Program may trigger a coastal permit for dwellings and agricultural productions facilities and operations. Common agricultural land uses and facilities, such as livestock grazing, crop production, barns and storage buildings,

and agricultural fencing, are, however, either exempt or may be excluded from coastal permit requirements.

Agricultural parcels are eligible for land conservation contracts under the Williamson Act (enacted by the State in 1965), provided that certain acreage, zoning, and production criteria are met (see Map 2-20, Protected Agricultural Lands). Land conservation contracts restrict land to agriculture for 10 years in exchange for tax assessment based on agricultural use rather than market value. These contracts allow only one principal residence per ownership, but additional dwellings may be allowed for family members or agricultural workers, in compliance with zoning. In agricultural zoning districts, landowners can request that the County create a Farmland Security Zone, which allows owners to gain a 35% reduction in assessed valuation for a minimum period of 20 years...

---

## **BUILT ENVIRONMENT ELEMENT**

---

### **TOPIC 4: Community Development**

**Background:** Numerous changes to the Community Development Section were tentatively approved by your Board at the September 25, 2007 hearing. Those additions have been included in Attachment 2.B (September 25, 2007). The text below includes new modifications.

#### **Issues for Final Consideration:**

**CD-1.3      Reduce Potential Impacts.** Calculate potential residential densities and commercial Floor Area Ratio (FAR) at the low end of the applicable range on sites with sensitive habitat or within the Ridge and Upland Greenbelt, or properties lacking public water or sewer systems except for multi-family parcels identified in certified Housing Elements.

**CD-2.11      Promote Diverse Affordable Housing Strategies.**  
Promote a diverse set of affordable housing strategies to convert existing market rate units to permanently convert affordable units in addition to building affordable housing in appropriate locations.

**CD-2.p      Convert Existing Market Rate Units.** Identify specific strategies and funding mechanisms for the conversion of existing market rate units into permanently affordable housing.

CD-3.c      Encourage Employee Commute Alternatives. Encourage and implement model employee commute alternatives including telecommuting, in partnership with the business community in order to reduce traffic congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

**CD-8.6**      **Establish Residential Land Use Categories and Densities.** Residential development is designated at a full range of densities, with an emphasis on providing more affordable housing including incentives for low and very low income units, while also recognizing that physical hazards, fire risk, development constraints, protection of natural resources, and the availability of public services and facilities can limit housing development in some areas.

### **TOPIC 5: Community Design**

**Background:** Changes to the Community Design Section were tentatively approved by your Board at the September 25, 2007 hearing. Those additions have been included in Attachment 2.B (September 25, 2007). The language below includes new modifications.

#### **Issue for Final Consideration:**

**DES-4.f**      Consider Participation in the California Scenic Highway Program. Consider participation in the Scenic Highway Program in order to preserve and enhance Marin's scenic highway corridors. (See also Section 3.9 Transportation.)

### **TOPIC 6: Energy and Green Building**

#### **Issue for Final Consideration:**

**EN-3.h**      Adopt LEED Gold Standards for Public Buildings. Implement where feasible the LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) Silver Gold certification requirements or a higher standard for development and major remodels of new public buildings.

Program (new)

EN-3.f      Evaluate Carbon Neutral Building Incentives. Evaluate the feasibility of incentives and regulations to achieve carbon neutral buildings.

## **TOPIC 7: Transportation**

**Background:** Numerous changes to the Transportation Section were tentatively approved by your Board at the September 25, 2007 hearing. Those additions have been included in Attachment 2.B (September 25, 2007). The language below includes a new modification.

### **Issue for Final Consideration:**

**TR-4.d** *Encourage Zero, Partial Zero, and Low-Emission Vehicle Use.* Publicize the State and Federal approval of zero and partial zero emission vehicles (with a fuel economy of at least 45 miles per gallon) to use HOV lanes. Support plug-In hybrid electric vehicles and new carbon neutral technologies.

## **TOPIC 8: Mineral Resources**

**Background:** In response to ongoing concerns, **MIN-1.1** and *Min-1.a* could be revised to allow more flexibility in specifying land uses in areas designated by State regulation as being of regional significance for mineral extraction. It is not possible to make these changes in the CWP because prior notice is required to the State (Public Resources Code Section 2762(b)) and they were not considered by the Planning Commission. However, a new policy and program could be included which would call for an evaluation of whether to provide flexibility.

### **Issue for Final Consideration:**

Policy (new):

**MIN-1.7** **Study Mineral Resource Areas.** In order to respond to changing needs, a study will be conducted to evaluate whether to provide more flexibility in land uses in areas subject to State designations for mineral extraction. The study will include the steps necessary to change mineral policies in order to comply with the requirements of the State Surface Mining and Reclamation Act.

Program (new)

**MIN-1.m** **Consider State Mineral Requirements.** Consider changing mineral policies consistent with state law or requirements to allow more flexibility in allowing alternative land uses where considered desirable by the County.

## **TOPIC 9: Noise**

**Background:** In response to ongoing concern, policies and programs in the Noise Section related to sound walls could be revised to ensure best technologies are being used as alternatives to sound walls.

### **Issues for Final Consideration:**

- NO-1.4**      **Limit Sound Walls Along Highway 101.** Promote **best available noise reduction technologies and** alternatives to sound walls to mitigate noise along Highway 101.
- NO-1.m**      ***Avoid Limit Sound Walls.*** Encourage Caltrans to **consider utilizing** alternatives to sound walls along Highway 101, such as landscaped berms, sloped walls, and other best technology. Amend the Development Code to include standards for construction of non-sound wall noise mitigation structures. Consider the impacts of reflected noise resulting from soundwall installation.

## **TOPIC 10 - Planning Areas, St. Vincent and Silveira Properties**

**Background:** Representatives of St. Vincent's have advanced the concept of a senior village/continuum of senior care community on their property. Although initially they believed that the continuum of care community could require an additional 65 peak-hour traffic trips, planning staff has clarified that limitations on peak hour trips would be in addition to the existing baseline. Furthermore, it is understood that the property owners may utilize their respective share of the full peak hour traffic trips of the traffic equivalency of all 221 residential units. Therefore, staff recommends approval of the revised text as listed below.

### **Issue for Final Consideration:**

#### **Planning Area 2 – Las Gallinas**

##### **St. Vincent's and Silveira**

##### **SV - Natural Systems Goals and Policies**

There are a number of protected resource areas on the St. Vincent's/Silveira lands, which include: tidelands; diked baylands, of which a portion are owned by the Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District and used for wastewater ponds and irrigation; Miller Creek and its riparian corridor; lands within the 100-year floodplain; and hills leading up to Pacheco Ridge at the northern boundary of the site (see Map 3-34, St. Vincent's/Silveira Environmental Features, **which is included for illustrative purposes only**).

## SV - Built Environment Goals and Policies

### *What are the desired outcomes?*

#### GOAL SV-2

##### Comprehensive Site Planning.

**SV-2.4 Cluster Development.** New non-agricultural development (e.g., building footprints, roads, and parking) on either the St. Vincent's or the Silveira property shall be clustered on restricted to up to five percent of the land area of each property, or as determined through a site specific analysis of agricultural and environmental constraints and resources, observing habitat protection policies including, but not limited to, streamside conservation, ridge and upland greenbelt, wetlands, tidelands, and community separation. Existing development shall not be counted toward the 5 percent cluster requirements restriction for the land area for each property.

In addition, development (e.g., educational/social service) on the St. Vincent's property should be clustered around the "H" complex with the Chapel and the "H" complex buildings retained as the community center as determined by a Master Plan process.

**SV-2.5 Establish Land Use Categories.** The St. Vincent's/Silveira area is assigned the Planned Designation—Agricultural and Environmental Resource Area land use category. Potential uses include agriculture and related uses, residential development, education and tourism, places of worship, institutional, and small-scale hospitality uses, as described more fully in SV-2.3.

In addition to existing uses, a total of up to 221 dwelling units for the combined St. Vincent's and Silveira sites may be allowed consisting of up to 121 market-rate dwelling units plus up to 100 additional dwelling units for very low and/or low income households. Senior units may include a combination of apartment style and congregate care units at varying degrees of affordability. The senior units shall be within the total allowable (with density bonus) dwelling unit cap of 221 units. Dwelling units shall be allocated proportionally to the respective St. Vincent's and Silveira areas based on the total acreage of the St. Vincent's and Silveira sites as determined by the County at the time of the

first application for development of more than four units or their equivalent.

Within these standards, the Master Plan approval process will determine the specific development suitable for these properties taking into consideration environmental constraints and the community benefits associated with providing a higher ratio of housing affordable to low and very low income persons and smaller residential unit sizes. Pursuant to the PD-Agricultural and Environmental Resource Area land use category, non-residential uses, **assisted senior housing, or other senior care facilities** may be permitted in lieu of some dwelling units, provided that the impacts of the senior care and other non-residential development on peak hour traffic do not exceed those projected for **the all** residential development being replaced **plus existing baseline trips.**

## **GOAL SV-5**

**Affordable and Senior Housing.**

### **Policy**

**SV-5.1 Encourage Affordable Housing.** Within the maximum number of units permitted, encourage the provision of affordable units above and beyond minimum inclusionary requirements through a variety of mechanisms, including density bonuses, financing assistance, grants, and partnerships with affordable housing providers.

**SV-5.2 Encourage Senior Housing.** **Anticipate the aging of Marin by creating a vibrant senior community serving a range of housing and supportive care needs.**

---

## **SOCIOECONOMIC ELEMENT**

---

### **TOPIC 11: Climate Change**

**Issues for Final Consideration - Climate change and the economy:**

Policy (new)

**EC-1.5 Consider the Impacts of Climate Change.** **Identify strategies to protect the economy from the impacts of sea level rise, natural disasters, and disease outbreaks**



Programs (new)

EC-1.m *Incorporate Economic Impacts of Climate Change into Planning.* Consider integrating economic disaster planning into disaster preparedness and mitigation plans and analyze impacts to the economy from climate change.

EC-1.n *Implement Economic Programs.* Consider retaining an Economic Sustainability Specialist to implement economic programs.

Priority is medium, responsibility is CDA (Economic Specialist), OES, and Disaster Council

### Issues for Final Consideration - Climate change and public safety:

Policy (new)

PS-1.3: **Analyze Implications of Sea Level Rise for Neighborhood Safety.** Analyze potential safety implications from sea level rise and prepare contingency plans in consultation with the Marin Disaster Council.

Program (new)

PS-1.f *Prepare Contingency Plans.* Work with the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) and the Marin Disaster Council to analyze implications of sea level rise and increased violent storm events and flooding on neighborhood safety and prepare contingency plans.

Priority is High, and responsible agencies include Marin Disaster Council, EOC, BCDC, and CDA

### Issues for Final Consideration - Climate change and education

Policy (new)

EDU-2.4 **Promote Climate Change Education.** Assist in building understanding of sustainability and climate change issues in schools.

Program (new)

EDU-2.p *Encourage Climate Change Curricula.* Encourage non profits and school districts to develop curricula for increased understanding of sustainability and climate change issues by students.

Priority is Medium and responsibility is Marin Office of Education, CDA, and non-profits

### Issues for Final Consideration: Climate change and public health

Policy (new)

**PH-4.6**

**Plan for Climate Change.** Plan for the public health implications of climate change, including disease and temperature effects.

Program (new)

**PH-4.m**

**Identify Potential Responses to Climate Change.** Work with the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and other leading health organizations to identify critical public health issues and identify potential responses necessary related to climate change.

Priority is Medium and responsibility is H&HS, and timeframe is Medium

### Issues for Final consideration: Climate change and parks and recreation

Policy (new)

**PK-1.3**

**Protect Park Resources From Impacts of Climate Change.** Identify strategies to protect park resources from the effects of climate change, such as violent weather, plant loss or change due to moisture and temperature changes, and sea level rise.

Program (new)

**PK-1.t**

**Prepare Contingency Plans.** Analyze risks to park resources from violent weather, plant and aquatic changes, and sea level rise, and prepare appropriate contingency plans

Priority is Medium and responsibility is Department of Parks & Open Space

## **TOPIC 12: New Terms for Glossary:**

### **Issues for Final consideration:**

**Level of Service (LOS).** A qualitative measure of operating conditions within a traffic stream, and their perception by motorists and/or passengers. A LOS definition generally describes these conditions in terms of such factors as speed, travel time, freedom to maneuver, comfort and convenience, and safety.

**Income Limit (Housing):** Maximum amounts that low or moderate income families may earn to qualify for subsidized rental housing or a low-interest mortgage. Limits are calculated by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and are based on family size and geographic location.

**Duet (Residential):** A detached building sharing a common wall which is designed for occupation as the residence of two families living independently of each other. Similar to a duplex except the connected units are on separate lots.

ATTACHMENT 2A- Issues Tentatively Resolved  
Decisions from the Board of Supervisors Hearing on September 11, 2007

TOPIC	ACTION
<p><b>1. Introduction (on pg 1-15)</b></p>	<p><b>Accepted</b> Add the following goal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>A Community safe from climate change.</u></b> Marin will be a leader in averting and adapting to aspects of climate change.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2. Biological Resources</b>  <b><u>2.A. Richardson Bay Boat Dock Study (pg 3-</u></b></p>	<p><b>Accepted – <i>additional language for Key Trends &amp; Community Development Activities for Planning Area 6 – Richardson Bay</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ <u>“The Richardson Bay Dock and Boat Study was completed in 2000 which identified approximately 75 existing boat docks and the potential for 7 additional individual boat docks that could be constructed without significant environmental impacts. In addition, approximately 150 boat docks have been identified in Paradise Cay along with plans for an increase to approximately 200 docks. Dredging districts in both the Strawberry and Paradise Cay communities continue to fund and conduct periodic maintenance dredging.”</u></li> </ul>
<p><b><u>2B: Wetlands Definition</u></b></p>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p><b><u>BIO-3.h (new) Evaluate Wetlands Definitions. Conduct a study to evaluate whether to continue rely upon the Corps of Engineers definition of wetlands outside of the Coastal Zone or to expand the use of the Coastal Zone (or "Cowardin") definition to the entire County. The study should consider all of the following in developing a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors: 1) the effect of the expanded wetland definition when coupled with SCA and WCA requirements; 2) the extent of the geographic areas potentially affected by the expanded definition; 3) performance of wetland delineations for areas outside the Coastal Zone (in-house staff or consultants); 4) potential costs and workloads associated with delineations, administration and appeals; and 5) overall feasibility of implementation and enforcement responsibilities associated with an expanded definition.</u></b></p>

ATTACHMENT 2A- Issues Tentatively Resolved  
 Decisions from the Board of Supervisors Hearing on September 11, 2007

TOPIC	ACTION
<b><u>2C. Riparian and Wetlands Protection</u></b>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p><b><u>BIO-4.t (NEW) Collaborate with Groups to Address Implementation of Protections to SCAs and WCAs.</u></b> Collaborate with local, regional, state, and federal organizations (Marin Organic, MALT, SPAWN, Marin Audubon, RCD, Fish and Game, RWQCB, Sierra Club, Farm Bureau, and affected property owners) to address long term habitat protection and develop funding mechanisms to address the issue.</p>
<b><u>3. Tax delinquent properties in SCA</u></b>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p><b><u>BIO-4.u (new) Investigate Tax Delinquent Properties.</u></b> Investigate conversion of tax delinquent properties in SCAs into public Ownership</p>
<b><u>4. Climate Change</u></b>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p><b>Goal</b>  <b>AIR-4 Minimization of Contributions to Greenhouse Gases.</b> Prepare policies that promote efficient management and use of resources in order to minimize greenhouse gas emissions. <b><u>Incorporate sea-level rise and more extreme weather information into the planning process.</u></b></p> <p><b>Programs</b>  <b>AIR-4.c Reduce Methane Emissions Released from Waste Disposal.</b> Encourage recycling, decrease waste sent to landfills, require landfill methane recovery, and <b><u>determine the potential to use promote methane recovery for energy production from other sources.</u></b></p> <p>Maintain priority rating "<b><u>High</u></b>," timeframe "<b><u>Immediate</u></b>," and identify funding source for</p>

ATTACHMENT 2A- Issues Tentatively Resolved  
 Decisions from the Board of Supervisors Hearing on September 11, 2007

TOPIC	ACTION
	<p>existing program AIR 4.f:</p> <p><b>AIR-4.f</b> <i>Establish a Climate Change Planning Process.</i> Continue implementation of the approved Marin County Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan. Integrate this plan into long range and current planning functions of other related agencies. Establish and maintain a process to implement, measure, evaluate, and modify implementing programs, using the Cities for Climate Protection Campaign as a model.</p>
<b><u>5. Trails</u></b>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>Revise CWP Trail maps as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove more recently proposed trails that are not associated with statewide or regional trail systems as shown on Attachment 4, Marin Countywide Trails Plan Maps 2-19b and 2-19d.</li> <li>• <u>Add names of regional trails on trail maps</u></li> <li>• <u>Add proposed greenway to maps</u></li> </ul> <p><b><u>SUB-TOPIC TRAILS ON AG PROPERTIES</u></b></p> <p><b>Key Trends and Issues</b>  <b><i>Can the trail system continue to grow?</i></b></p> <p>...Expansion of the public trail system is constrained by the funding necessary to acquire and/or construct trails, and the willingness of private landowners to sell their land or a public trail easement. <u>Occasionally, agencies acquire trail easements when a landowner seeks approval to develop his or her land.</u> In other circumstances, an agency may acquire a lease or license to permit public trail use through private land if a landowner is unwilling to sell a permanent easement. Due to the many challenges associated with acquiring public trail rights, the creation of a public trail system requires many years of effort. Trails that are redundant or have major impacts on water quality within individual watersheds should be evaluated to determine if they should be decommissioned and</p>

ATTACHMENT 2A- Issues Tentatively Resolved  
 Decisions from the Board of Supervisors Hearing on September 11, 2007

TOPIC	ACTION
	those alignments restored to a natural condition.
	<p><b>TRL -1.3</b>     <b>Facilitate Public Dedication of Trails.</b> Seek the <u>voluntary</u> dedication <u>or sale</u> of trail easements and/or the improvement of <u>trails in conjunction with development proposed</u> on lands traversed by trails shown on the Marin Countywide Plan Trails maps.</p>
	<p><i>TRL-1.d</i>     <i>Establish Regional Trail Connections.</i> Strive to complete regional trail systems in Marin County, including the Bay Area Ridge Trail, the San Francisco Bay Trail, and the California Coastal Trail. <u>The proposed alignment of the Coastal Trail will be considered through the process to update the Marin County Local Coastal Program. In addition, collaborate with property owners and representatives from the agricultural community on the planning and appropriate alignment of the Coastal Trail and other new trail connections in the Coastal Zone.</u></p>
	<p><b>TRL-1.g</b>     <i>Evaluate Proposed Development for Trail Impacts.</i> Review development proposals for consistency with the Marin Countywide Trails Plan and/or local community plan(s). Encourage project sponsors to <u>consider granting or selling</u> trail easements and/or improve trails on lands traversed by proposed trail connections shown on the adopted Marin Countywide Trails Plan maps. <u>Evaluate development applications for the appropriateness of requiring dedication of trails as a condition of development approval.</u></p>
	<p><i>TRL-1.j</i>     <i>Encourage Public-Private Trail Partnerships.</i> Encourage partnerships and cooperation between public land management agencies, and trail interest groups, <u>and property owners</u> to increase and improve trail use opportunities and minimize conflicts.</p>

ATTACHMENT 2A- Issues Tentatively Resolved  
 Decisions from the Board of Supervisors Hearing on September 11, 2007

TOPIC	ACTION
	<p><b>TRL-2.d</b> <i>Protect Property Rights.</i> Design and locate trails to avoid trespassing and adverse impacts on adjacent private lands and sensitive land uses. <u>such as agricultural operations.</u> New (proposed) trails located in agricultural areas should generally be sited in the public right of way where feasible and should generally avoid running through active agricultural lands or operations. In special circumstances when no other alternatives exist but to route a trail through agricultural lands, such as for a crucial trail gap in a regionally significant route or a longstanding adopted plan, the County will pursue a collaborative effort with the landowner to site the trail in a mutually acceptable location as far as possible from sensitive agricultural operations, preferably along fence or property lines.</p> <p><b>TRL-2.b</b> <i>Design, Build, and Manage Trails in a Sustainable Manner.</i> Incorporate design measures that protect vegetation, protect habitats, and minimize erosion. Suggested measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limit grading and vegetation removal.</li> <li>• Discourage people and pets from entering sensitive habitats or disturbing wildlife through education, signage, enforcement and, as a last resort, fencing.</li> <li>• Provide vegetative buffers between trails and wetlands or other sensitive habitats.</li> <li>• Consider using existing roads or trails rather than building new ones when possible.</li> <li>• <u>Temporarily cClose trails seasonally</u> when necessary to minimize erosion or resource impacts, <u>or to prevent threats of disease to livestock.</u></li> </ul>



ATTACHMENT 2A- Issues Tentatively Resolved  
Decisions from the Board of Supervisors Hearing on September 11, 2007

TOPIC	ACTION
	<p><b>TRL-2.f</b> <i>Acknowledge Historic Trail Users.</i> <u>When acquiring a property for public use, c</u>Consider trail use that occurred prior to <u>the</u> public acquisition. <u>when determining trail use.</u></p>
<p><b><u>6. Agricultural House Size and organic reference</u></b></p>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>Program</p> <p><b>DES-4.c</b> Regulate Mass and Scale. Ensure that the mass and scale of new structures respect environmental site constraints and character of the surrounding neighborhood (see DES-3.b), are compatible with ridge protection policies (see DES-4.e), and avoid tree-cutting (especially on wooded hillsides) and grading wherever possible. <u>Community Plans should consider regulations concerning home size.</u></p> <p><b>AG-1.a Residential Building Sizes in Agricultural Areas.</b> <u>The size of residential structures has been or will be dealt with in Community Plans or Specific Plans. Since most agricultural areas are located outside of community plan boundaries and no specific plans are anticipated in agricultural areas, standards concerning residential building sizes are covered in this program. The primary purpose of this program is to ensure that lands designated for agricultural use do not become defacto converted to residential use, thereby losing the long-term productivity of such lands. It is also a purpose of this program to enable the inter-generational transfer of agricultural lands within farm families so that the long-term productivity of such lands is maintained.</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Residential development shall not be allowed to diminish current or future agricultural use of the property or convert it to primarily residential use</li> <li>ii. Agricultural worker housing, up to 540 square of garage space for each dwelling unit, agricultural accessory structures and up to 500 square feet of office space used as a home occupation in connection with the agricultural</li> </ol>

ATTACHMENT 2A- Issues Tentatively Resolved  
 Decisions from the Board of Supervisors Hearing on September 11, 2007

TOPIC	ACTION
	<p>operation on the property shall be excluded from this policy.</p> <p>iii. <u>Any proposed residential development above 4,000 square feet shall be subject to design review and must ensure that the mass and scale of new or expanded structures respect environmental site constraints and the character of the surrounding area. Such development must be compatible with ridge protection policies (see DES-4.e) and avoid tree-cutting and grading wherever possible.</u></p> <p><u>Such proposed residential development is also subject to discretionary review. The County shall exercise its discretion in light of the following criteria and for the purpose of ensuring that the parcel does not defacto convert to residential use:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) The applicant's history of production agriculture in Marin or the North Bay Region;</li> <li>(2) How the long term agricultural use of the property will be preserved, for example, whether there is an existing or proposed dedication or sale of a permanent agricultural easements or other similar protective agricultural restrictions such as Williamson Act contract or farmland security zone</li> <li>(3) Whether long term capital investment in agriculture and related infrastructure, such as fencing, processing facilities, market mechanisms, agricultural worker housing or agricultural leasing opportunities have been established or are proposed to be established;</li> <li>(4) Whether sound land stewardship practices, such as <u>Marin Organic Certification</u>, riparian habitat restoration, water recharge projects, fish friendly farming practices or erosion control measures have been or will be implemented;</li> <li>(5) <u>Whether the proposed residence will facilitate the ongoing viability of agriculture such as through the intergenerational transfer of existing agricultural operations.</u></li> </ol> <p>iv. <u>In no event shall a single family residence subject to these provisions exceed</u></p>

ATTACHMENT 2A- Issues Tentatively Resolved  
Decisions from the Board of Supervisors Hearing on September 11, 2007

TOPIC	ACTION
	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>8,500 square feet in size.</b></p> <p>The square footage limitations noted in the above criteria represent potential maximum dwelling unit sizes and do not establish a mandatory entitlement or guaranteed right to development.</p> <p><b>AG-1.n <i>Standardize Sustainable Agricultural Indicators.</i></b> Establish sustainable agriculture indicators, such as increases <b>in organic farming in organic and other ecologically sound farming and ranching</b>, to assist in determining farm activities that protect agricultural land, promote farm economic viability, and further social activities necessary to sustain agriculture.</p>
<b><u>7. Requiring the removal of all invasive exotic species from agricultural land</u></b>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p><b>BIO 1.7 <i>Remove Invasive Exotic Plants.</i></b> Require the removal of invasive exotic species, to the extent feasible, when considering applicable measures in discretionary permit <b>approvals for non-agricultural development projects</b>, and include monitoring to prevent re-establishment in managed areas.</p>
<b><u>8. Requiring the merger of contiguously owned agricultural lands</u></b>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p><b>AG-1.c <i>Consider Incentives for the Voluntary Merger of Parcels on Lands Protected by Agricultural Conservation Easements.</i></b> <b>Consider whether it is appropriate for</b> agricultural conservation easements <b>should to include, but not be limited to incentives for the voluntary merger of contiguously owned agricultural lands. where proper findings can be made.</b></p>
<b><u>9. Ag clustering</u></b>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p><b>OS-2.h <i>Require Clustered Development.</i></b> <b>In cases where a public agency is unable to purchase or otherwise permanently secure an area designated as open space, limit allowed development to low density residential, agricultural or low intensity recreational uses with a provision.</b> Require clustering to provide effective</p>

ATTACHMENT 2A- Issues Tentatively Resolved  
 Decisions from the Board of Supervisors Hearing on September 11, 2007

TOPIC	ACTION
	protection to open space and environmental resources.
<b>10. Accuracy of Maps</b>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p><b>EH-2.i Minimize Impacts of Site Alteration.</b> Amend the Development Code to strictly limit the extent of any proposed fill, excavation, or other grading activities that could create or exacerbate risks in areas susceptible to geologic hazards. <b>as displayed These are shown for illustrative purposes only</b> on Maps 2-9, 2-10, and 2-11.</p> <p>Background Section <b>Biological Resources</b> Chapter:</p> <p><b>Resource Protection</b></p> <p>Federal and State laws regulate wetlands, stream channels, and plant and animal species vulnerable to change or threatened with extinction. The jurisdiction, resource management practices, and code enforcement activities of the federal and State regulatory agencies vary depending on the specific sensitive resource. Wetlands and special-status plants and animals listed as “endangered” or “threatened” receive the highest protection (Map 2-2 Special-Status Species and Sensitive Natural Communities <b>shown for illustrative purposes only</b>). Other plant and animal species that are not listed are still considered vulnerable enough to be recognized as special-status species (see Figure 5-1, Special-Status Species Known from Marin County) located in Section 5 of this Plan. In addition, a number of unique natural communities (sensitive natural communities) are recognized by the California Department of Fish and Game because of their scarcity and continued loss as a result of development.</p> <p><b>Add note on map – link to DFG <a href="#">CNDDDB map</a></b></p>

ATTACHMENT 2A- Issues Tentatively Resolved  
 Decisions from the Board of Supervisors Hearing on September 11, 2007

TOPIC	ACTION
<b>11. Access in SCAs</b>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p><b>Modify BIO-5.f as to eliminate 10 feet and be more like BIO-4.13:</b></p> <p><b>BIO-5.f</b>     <i>Control Public Access.</i> Design public use areas to be clearly marked, to minimize possible conflicts between public and private uses, to provide continuous <b>ten-foot-wide</b> walkways from the nearest roads to the shoreline and along the shoreline, to be set back <b>at least ten feet</b> from any proposed structure, and to be buffered from wetlands. Restrict access to environmentally sensitive marshland and adjacent habitat, especially during spawning and nesting seasons.</p>
	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p><b>Elevate Evacuation Routes (EH-2.1) program to <b>high</b> priority</b></p>

ATTACHMENT 2.B – Issues Tentatively Resolved  
 Decisions from the Board of Supervisor Hearing on September 25, 2007

TOPIC	ACTION
<p><b><u>1. HOD</u></b></p>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>Policy</p> <p><b>CD-2.3</b> Establish <i>a Housing Overlay Designation</i>. The Housing Overlay Designation (HOD) is established, as shown on Maps 3-2a and 3-2b. The purpose of the HOD is to encourage construction of units to meet the need for workforce housing, especially for very low- and low-income households, and for special needs housing, in the City-Centered Corridor close to transit, employment, and/or public services. Sites for the HOD include reuse of existing shopping centers or other underutilized sites. <u>Development on sites designated as both mixed use and as suggested HOD sites shall be developed pursuant to the HOD Policy and Program and not per mixed use land designation criteria.</u> Each square foot of market-rate HOD housing shall be offset by an equal reduction in the square footage of the permissible commercial development. Up to 658 housing units may be approved within the HOD, subject to a discretionary approval process.</p> <p>The criteria used in establishing the Housing Overlay Designation include:</p> <p>Designated by the Countywide Plan as Multifamily (MF), General Commercial (GC), Neighborhood Commercial (NC), Office Commercial (OC), Recreation Commercial (RC), or Public Facility (PF). Located within:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The unincorporated portion of the City-Centered Corridor:</li> <li>▪ One-half mile of a transit node or route with daily, regularly scheduled service: and</li> <li>▪ One mile of a medical facility, library, post office, or commercial center.</li> <li>▪ The area to be developed:                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not exceed an average 20 percent slope and is not within the Ridge and Upland Greenbelt;</li> <li>• Is not within a Wetlands Conservation Area or Streamside</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

ATTACHMENT 2.B – Issues Tentatively Resolved  
 Decisions from the Board of Supervisor Hearing on September 25, 2007

TOPIC	ACTION														
	<p align="center">Conservation Area;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is not a park or public open space area; and</li> <li>• Is not primarily located within the 100-year flood plain.</li> </ul> <p>The County will engage in discussions with cities and towns within Marin County regarding the possibility of locating residential units otherwise allocated to the HOD within these cities and towns, subject to the criteria described above.</p> <p>Based on the above, the potential HOD suggested sites and unit allocations by traffic impact areas are listed in Exhibit 5.0-15 and shown in Exhibit 5.0-16.</p>														
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th style="background-color: #cccccc;">Traffic Impact Areas as Determined by Screenlines and HOD Site Criteria (See Exhibit 5.0-16)</th> <th style="background-color: #cccccc;">HOD Unit Potential for Traffic Impact Areas (including Density Bonus Units)</th> <th style="background-color: #cccccc;">Suggested Qualifying Sites Within Traffic Impact Areas</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Screenline 7:</td> <td align="center"><u>Up to 110</u></td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Marinwood Shopping Center (<u>50</u> - 100 units)</li> <li>○ Idylberry School (up to 10 units)</li> <li>○ Other qualifying sites</li> </ul> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Screenline 8:</td> <td align="center"><u>Up to 25</u></td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Gallinas Elementary School</li> <li>○ Other qualifying sites</li> </ul> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Screenline 23:</td> <td align="center"><del>163</del> <u>Up to 88</u></td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ College of Marin (up to <u>50</u> <u>25 units – limited to student or workforce employees of the College</u>)</li> <li>○ Marin General Hospital (up</li> </ul> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Traffic Impact Areas as Determined by Screenlines and HOD Site Criteria (See Exhibit 5.0-16)	HOD Unit Potential for Traffic Impact Areas (including Density Bonus Units)	Suggested Qualifying Sites Within Traffic Impact Areas	Screenline 7:	<u>Up to 110</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Marinwood Shopping Center (<u>50</u> - 100 units)</li> <li>○ Idylberry School (up to 10 units)</li> <li>○ Other qualifying sites</li> </ul>	Screenline 8:	<u>Up to 25</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Gallinas Elementary School</li> <li>○ Other qualifying sites</li> </ul>	Screenline 23:	<del>163</del> <u>Up to 88</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ College of Marin (up to <u>50</u> <u>25 units – limited to student or workforce employees of the College</u>)</li> <li>○ Marin General Hospital (up</li> </ul>
Traffic Impact Areas as Determined by Screenlines and HOD Site Criteria (See Exhibit 5.0-16)	HOD Unit Potential for Traffic Impact Areas (including Density Bonus Units)	Suggested Qualifying Sites Within Traffic Impact Areas													
Screenline 7:	<u>Up to 110</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Marinwood Shopping Center (<u>50</u> - 100 units)</li> <li>○ Idylberry School (up to 10 units)</li> <li>○ Other qualifying sites</li> </ul>													
Screenline 8:	<u>Up to 25</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Gallinas Elementary School</li> <li>○ Other qualifying sites</li> </ul>													
Screenline 23:	<del>163</del> <u>Up to 88</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ College of Marin (up to <u>50</u> <u>25 units – limited to student or workforce employees of the College</u>)</li> <li>○ Marin General Hospital (up</li> </ul>													

ATTACHMENT 2.B – Issues Tentatively Resolved  
 Decisions from the Board of Supervisor Hearing on September 25, 2007

TOPIC	ACTION		
			to <del>400</del> <u>50</u> <u>total</u> units if associated with reconstruction or reuse and limited to <u>senior, affordable, workforce employees, or special needs housing</u>
	Screenline 22:	<u>Up to 10</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Toussin (up to 13 units)</li> <li>○ Other qualifying sites</li> </ul>
	Screenline 13:	<u>Up to 50</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Oak Manor</li> <li>○ Other qualifying sites</li> </ul>
	Screenline 17:	<u>Up to 100</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ California Park (San Rafael)</li> <li>○ Other qualifying sites</li> </ul>
	Screenline 19:	<u>Up to 50</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Strawberry Shopping Center</li> <li>○ Other qualifying sites</li> </ul>
	Screenline 21:	<u>Up to 150</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Fireside Motel</li> <li>○ Marin City Shopping Center</li> <li>○ Other qualifying sites</li> </ul>
		<u>Up to 583</u>	Units on named HOD sites
		Total: <u>Up to 658</u>	Total Potential HOD Units including Density Bonus Units



ATTACHMENT 2.B – Issues Tentatively Resolved  
 Decisions from the Board of Supervisor Hearing on September 25, 2007

TOPIC	ACTION
	<p><b>Program:</b></p> <p><b>CD-2.d</b> <i>Implement the Housing Overlay Designation Program.</i> The reviewing authority may allocate HOD units to suggested qualifying sites or other qualifying sites within Traffic Impact Areas shown on Exhibit 5.0-16 up to a total of 658 units, including any state density bonus units. <del>The number of HOD units shall be a density bonus and shall be an alternative to any density bonus authorized by State law; project sponsors may elect to proceed pursuant to either the HOD density bonus or state law density bonus.</del> Housing Overlay units within identified Traffic Screenlines may be allocated to suggested HOD sites listed in Exhibit 5.0-15 if the HOD project meets the following standards:</p> <p><del>1) Developer is encouraged to undertake a community based planning process.</del></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Developer is encouraged to maintain ownership interest in the project.</li> <li>2) High-quality building and site design that fits with the surrounding neighborhood and incorporates attractive and usable common/open space areas must be utilized, consistent with design guidelines.  <del>Income levels to be consistent with the County's inclusionary requirements.</del></li> <li>3) Affordability levels as follows:                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For rental developments:                             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i.) At least 49% of the units should be deed restricted and occupied <u>to the maximum extent feasible</u> by households whose incomes are 60% or less of area median income, adjusted for family size.</li> </ol> </li> <li>For ownership developments:                             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii.) at least 60% of the units should be deed restricted and occupied <u>to the maximum extent feasible</u> by households whose incomes are 80% or less of area median income adjusted for family size,</li> </ol> </li> </ul> </li> </ol>

ATTACHMENT 2.B – Issues Tentatively Resolved  
 Decisions from the Board of Supervisor Hearing on September 25, 2007

TOPIC	ACTION
	<p>iii.) OR at least 49% of the units should be deed restricted and occupied <b>to the maximum extent feasible</b> by households whose incomes are 60% or less of area median income, adjusted for family size.</p> <p>4) Affordable ownership and rental units shall be deed restricted in perpetuity or for a period of not less than 55 years to ensure a stock of affordable ownership and rental units.</p> <p>5) Housing densities of at least <b>25 30</b> units per acre <b>(for sites designated Neighborhood Commercial/Mixed Use where at least 25 units per acre applies)</b> on the portion of the site developed for housing.</p> <p>6) Projects that qualify for the designation and meet the affordability requirements may be entitled to development standard adjustments, such as parking, floor area ratio, height and fee reductions and other considerations.</p> <p>7) Additional “units” of senior housing on an HOD site may be permitted if:                      (i) the additional “units” are affordable to low and very low below market households; and                      (ii) projected peak-hour traffic impacts of the entire project site, including the traffic impacts of the additional “units” of senior housing, fall within the maximum peak-hour traffic generated by the permissible development on the site based on a traffic study to verify reduced trips and reduced parking.</p> <p>8) Parking requirements may be adjusted on a case-by-case basis for senior and affordable housing using criteria established in the URBEMIS model to encourage transit oriented development. Trip reduction credits may be obtained through utilization of a variety of mitigation measures: locating development close to transit, or in a location where the jobs-housing balance will be optimized; commitments from the developer to implement demand management programs including parking pricing and leased parking for market-rate units; use of tandem parking, and off-site parking, among other measures to permanently reduce parking need. Reduction of</p>

ATTACHMENT 2.B – Issues Tentatively Resolved  
 Decisions from the Board of Supervisor Hearing on September 25, 2007

TOPIC	ACTION
	<p>parking requirements are subject to discretionary approval and may require a parking study to verify reduced parking demand.</p> <p>9) Potential impacts are mitigated to the maximum extent feasible.</p> <p>10) Occupancy or resident preferences for HOD projects should be analyzed for appropriateness in each project, taking into consideration applicable traffic impacts, jobs/housing balance opportunities, and fair housing laws.</p> <p>Application can be made by a property owner to the County for the designation of a new HOD site which meets all of the criteria identified in Policy CD-2.3. In such cases, the review authority may designate an additional HOD site and reallocate units “assigned to” HOD sites within the same Traffic Impact Area and within the 658 total HOD units. Funding shall be pursued to prepare Master Plans and related environmental review documents to facilitate development on HOD sites. <u>The Marinwood Plaza Conceptual Master Plan approved by the Board of Supervisors provides an example of a community-based planning process that meets the goals of the Housing Overlay Designation.</u></p> <p>The County’s inclusionary housing ordinance (Marin County Code Chapter 22.22) shall be amended to exempt from inclusionary housing requirements any project developed with affordable housing as outlined in the HOD Program.</p> <p>The inclusion of workforce housing, especially for very low- and low-income households and for special needs housing, will be strongly encouraged at the time of commercial or other expansion and major remodeling proposals.</p>

ATTACHMENT 2.B – Issues Tentatively Resolved  
 Decisions from the Board of Supervisor Hearing on September 25, 2007

TOPIC	ACTION
<b><u>2. Community based planning</u></b>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p><b><u>CD—2.p (new) Encourage Community Based Planning for All Larger Scale Residential Development.</u></b> Undertake community-based planning for all larger scale residential development with broad public participation. The community-based planning approach should promote cooperation and collaboration.</p>
<b><u>3. Affordable Housing in Community Plans</u></b>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p><b><u>CD-2.g (new). Identify Affordable Housing Sites in Community Plans.</u></b> Community Plans should include additional sites that are appropriate for and qualify as affordable housing sites.</p>
<b><u>4. Mixed Use</u></b>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p><b>CD-8.7      <b>Establish Commercial/Mixed Use Land Use Categories and Intensities.</b></b>                      Commercial/mixed use land use categories are established to provide for a mix of retail, office, and industrial uses as well as mixed-use residential development in a manner compatible with public facilities, natural resource protection, environmental quality, and high standards of urban design. Mixed-use developments are intended to incorporate residential units on commercial properties including on-site housing for employees thereby contributing to affordable housing and reduced commutes.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The following criteria shall apply to any mixed-use development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. For parcels larger than 2 acres in size - no more than 50% of the new floor area may be developed for commercial uses, and the remaining new floor area shall be developed for new housing.</li> </ol>

ATTACHMENT 2.B – Issues Tentatively Resolved  
 Decisions from the Board of Supervisor Hearing on September 25, 2007

TOPIC	ACTION
	<p>For parcels 2 acres and less in size - no more than 75% of the new floor area may be developed for commercial uses, and the remaining new floor area shall be developed for new housing.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Projected peak-hour traffic impacts of the proposed mixed-use development are no greater than that for the maximum commercial development permissible on the site under the specific land use category;</li> <li>3. Priority shall be given to the retention of existing neighborhood serving <u>retail-commercial</u> uses; and</li> <li>4. The site design fits with the surrounding neighborhood and incorporates design elements such as podium parking, usable common/open space areas, and vertical mix of uses, where appropriate. In most instances, residential uses should be considered above the ground floor or located in a manner to provide the continuity of store frontages while maintaining visual interest and a pedestrian orientation.</li> <li>5. <u>For projects consisting of low income and very low income affordable units, the FAR may be exceeded to accommodate additional units for those affordable categories. For projects consisting of moderate income housing, the FAR may only be exceeded in areas with acceptable traffic levels of service - but not to an amount sufficient to cause an LOS standard to be exceeded.</u></li> <li>6. <u>Residential units on mixed-use sites along Shoreline Highway west of Highway 101 in the Tamalpais Area Community Plan area shall be restricted to 100 additional units (including density bonus) and not subject to the FAR exceptions listed in #5 above due to the area's highly constrained (week and weekend) traffic conditions, flooding and other hazards.</u></li> </ol> <p><u>Minor</u> renovations not resulting in additional square footage may be exempt</p>

ATTACHMENT 2.B – Issues Tentatively Resolved  
 Decisions from the Board of Supervisor Hearing on September 25, 2007

TOPIC	ACTION
	<p>from the above requirements if consistent with the requirements of the Marin County Jobs-Housing Linkage Ordinance, Chapter 22.22 of the Development Code.</p>
<p><b><u>5. San Rafael Rock Quarry Allowable Development</u></b></p>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p><b>PA-3.2</b>     <b>Designate Land Use in Point San Pedro.</b> Lands at the Point San Pedro Quarry shall be designated for <i>mineral resource conservation</i> during the period the quarry continues to operate. An updated quarry reclamation plan <b>and updated quarry permit are is</b> required to determine the length of time quarrying operations will continue. The quarry site shall also be designated Planned Designation-Reclamation Area in recognition of its potential future conversion to residential, marina, recreational, commercial or similar uses consistent with the updated Quarry Reclamation Plan. <b>Because the site is located within the sphere of influence for the City of San Rafael, the City will be provided the opportunity to the annex the property and conduct future land use approvals. If the site remains subject to County jurisdiction,</b> in order to comprehensively plan for alternative uses and provide a forum for public participation, a Specific or Master Plan will be required to determine residential densities, commercial floor area, and habitat protection areas. No changes in density or land use intensities are proposed prior to approval of a Specific or Master Plan. In order not to exceed current traffic levels, which include truck and other vehicle trips generated by quarry activity, the total number of dwelling units, or their equivalent in commercial or other uses, shall not exceed 75 dwelling units <b>unless otherwise determined by a county approved traffic study.</b></p>

ATTACHMENT 2.B – Issues Tentatively Resolved  
 Decisions from the Board of Supervisor Hearing on September 25, 2007

TOPIC	ACTION
<p><b><u>6. Focus Community Plans to Address Unique Community Needs</u></b></p>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p><b>CD-4.a</b> <i>Update Community Plans with a Watershed-Protection Approach.</i> Revise existing community plans in accordance with an approved work program to maintain consistency with the land use plan and programs of the Countywide Plan. Emphasis should also be placed on the need to consider and protect the health of watersheds when making site-specific land use decisions (see Map Set 3–36, Land Use Policy Maps in the Planning Areas Section). These updated community plans should also evaluate and refine the locations of the Ridge and Upland Greenbelt, <u>Baylands Corridor</u>, and address topics <u>such as design issues, home size (see DES-4.c), affordable housing sites, hazards, evacuation routes, flooding, bicycle and pedestrian circulation and other issues as needed.</u> (See also <u>CD-4.g Consider Additional Community Plans for Unincorporated Areas.</u>)</p> <p>In addition, Program <b>CD-4.g</b> could be modified as underlined below:</p> <p><b>CD-4.g</b> <i>Consider Additional Community Plans for Unincorporated Areas.</i> Propose development of additional community plans for unincorporated neighborhoods such as Santa Venetia and Muir Woods Park to be considered by the Board of Supervisors when reviewing Community Development Agency work program priorities. <u>Community Plans should focus on needs and concerns specific to particular neighborhoods such as design issues, home size (see DES-4.c), affordable housing sites, hazards, and evacuation routes (See also CD-4.a Update Community Plans with a Watershed-Protection Approach).</u></p>

ATTACHMENT 2.B – Issues Tentatively Resolved  
 Decisions from the Board of Supervisor Hearing on September 25, 2007

TOPIC	ACTION
<p><b><u>7. Climate Change</u></b></p> <p><b><u>7.a. Transportation and Climate Change</u></b></p>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p><u>Transportation Section</u></p> <p>Background                      “The transportation system and land use pattern are inextricably linked: any major change to one triggers the need to modify the other (as evidenced by the common practice of using computer models to balance future transportation capacity with growth projections). <b>Although it appears likely that private cars will remain the dominant form of transportation for the foreseeable future Energy consumption is responsible for an estimated 33 percent of Marin County’s greenhouse gas emissions. But an even larger share –62 percent – comes from transportation.</b> Traditional solutions to maintaining acceptable traffic flows, such as road widening, tend to be prohibitively expensive and environmentally damaging, while not relieving traffic congestion for the long term. Instead, major changes in travel behavior will be needed to reduce traffic congestion, greenhouse gas emissions, and air pollution in Marin, as described in Moving Forward: A 25-year Vision for Transportation in Marin County (2003)...”</p> <p><b>Programs</b></p> <p><b>TR-1.s</b> <i>VMT Reduction Monitoring and <b>Implementation and Transportation Demand Management Program.</b></i> Develop and implement a <b>countywide</b> program for monitoring and reducing <b>VMT consistent with state and regional efforts and based on information from state and regional planning agencies.</b> and Identify and require in new developments specific <b>transportation demand management (TDM)</b> strategies for reducing the VMT <b>below levels that would otherwise occur.</b> Consider the following types of strategies for inclusion in the VMT Reduction Monitoring and Implementation <b>and Transportation Demand Management</b> Program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Increased Transit</b></li> </ul>



ATTACHMENT 2.B – Issues Tentatively Resolved  
 Decisions from the Board of Supervisor Hearing on September 25, 2007

TOPIC	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ All new residential projects consisting of 25 units or more should be located within 1/2 miles of a transit node, shuttle service, or bus stop route with regularly scheduled, daily service during both off peak and peak times.</li> <li>➤ New multi-family projects consisting of 25 units or more should include TDM measures such as reduced parking for affordable or senior projects, subsidized public transportation passes, or ride-matching programs based on site specific review. For market-rate projects, consider TDM programs such as charging parking fees separate from rent.</li> <li>➤ Safe, convenient connections should be provided to existing pedestrian and bicycle facilities and secure bicycle parking should be provided in new nonresidential developments.</li> <li>➤ TDM should be required for new or expanded projects with 50 employees or more, including programs such as parking cash out, subsidized transit passes, ridesharing incentives, and bicycle storage facilities.</li> </ul> <p><u>TR-1.t (new) Reduce Single Occupancy Trips. Adopt fees and other programs that encourage alternatives to the single occupant vehicle. Consider imposing tolls, congestion pricing, parking fees, gas taxes and residential parking permit limits. Encourage and assist local cities and towns to adopt similar programs</u></p> <p><u>TR-1.u (new) Create Car Share Program. Support the establishment of a “Car Share” program to promote socially responsible car sharing by providing convenient, reliable, and affordable access to cars to reduce individual car ownership.</u></p> <p><u>TR-4.e (new), Support Alternative Fuels Vehicles. Actively support infrastructure needed for alternative fuel vehicles, including fueling and charging stations. Review</u></p>

ATTACHMENT 2.B – Issues Tentatively Resolved  
Decisions from the Board of Supervisor Hearing on September 25, 2007

TOPIC	ACTION
	<p><u>and consider revising applicable codes applying to refueling and recharging infrastructure. Support state, federal, and local efforts to increase fuel efficiency and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</u></p> <p>Increase priority rating for <b>TR-1.s</b>, <i>VMT Reduction Monitoring and Implementation Program</i>, from “Low” to “<b>High</b>”, change timeframe from “Long term” to “<b>Medium term</b>” and identify a potential funding source</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>TR-3.i (new) Provide Shuttle Service to Transit.</b> Support the creation of shuttle service and/or jitneys to collect riders for public transit (see AIR-3.1, AIR-4.b) <u>Consider providing such service for inter city-county streets</u></li> </ul>
<p><b><u>7B: Transportation and Marin County Bicycle Coalition Recommendations</u></b></p>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>Policy</p> <p><b>TR-2.1 Improve the Bicycle and Pedestrian Network.</b> <u>Ensure that all areas of the county have Promote</u> adequate bicycle and pedestrian links, <u>to the extent feasible, both internally and to other parts of within</u> the county, <u>including and that</u> streetscape improvements and standards <u>that are safe and</u> pedestrian and bicycle friendly</p> <p>Programs</p> <p><b>TR-2.d Fund Projects.</b> Work with the Transportation Authority of Marin and the Bicycle Advisory Group to implement the <u>2007 Marin County Unincorporated Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan</u>; include pedestrian and bicycle projects in the County Capital Improvement Program; and apply, where feasible, a portion of traffic mitigation fees toward improvements that will increase bicycle transportation and mitigate congestion. On site improvements and those located near approved development are a priority.</p>

ATTACHMENT 2.B – Issues Tentatively Resolved  
 Decisions from the Board of Supervisor Hearing on September 25, 2007

TOPIC	ACTION
	<p><b><u>TR-2.i Complete Streets. Consider Non-motorized Access in Transportation Projects.</u></b>                      Include safe and convenient bicycle and pedestrian access, where feasible, in all transportation improvement projects. Request that Caltrans and the Federal Highway Administration provide separated, safe and secure bicycle and pedestrian access as part of any roadway or interchange improvement work and that access for pedestrians and bicyclists be available during construction. Continue to implement the Department of Public Works policy on routine accommodation. While the County does not have authority to plan <del>or maintain</del> bicycle facilities located in other jurisdictions, it may be appropriate for the Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM) or similar entity or collaboration to assume this responsibility <u>for planning.</u></p> <p><b>TR-2.n Implement Nonmotorized Pilot Transportation Program.</b> Carry out the Nonmotorized Transportation Pilot Program through construction of adopted Pilot projects and initiation of adopted Pilot education and outreach programs. Continue participation in national Pilot efforts, including outreach and mode shift measurement. Encourage continued funding of Pilot activities in future federal transportation bills <u>and other state and local funding sources, including regional funding streams.</u></p>
<b><u>8. RIDGE AND UPLAND GREENBELT</u></b>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Modify the RUG boundary on revised Map 6.2 to follow the approximate location of the 350 foot contour interval.</li> <li>2. Make modifications to add Warner Ridge and Alto Hill areas within the Marin County Open Space District to the RUG on Map 3-1b. These areas were previously included in the 1994 Countywide Plan Ridge and Upland Greenbelt Policy Areas, Figure EQ-10.</li> </ol>

ATTACHMENT 2.B – Issues Tentatively Resolved  
 Decisions from the Board of Supervisor Hearing on September 25, 2007

TOPIC	ACTION
<b><u>9. Dark Sky</u></b>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p><b>DES-1.h</b>     <i>Lighting Design Guidelines.</i> Amend the Development Code to include lighting design guidelines to be applied through design review and other discretionary permits. <b>Explore the feasibility of amending the Building Code to include lighting specifications.</b> Require new development and major remodel projects that would make significant parking lot improvements or add new lighting to submit a lighting plan consistent with these guidelines for design review by County staff. Lighting design guidelines <b>and/or specifications</b> should address:</p>
<b><u>10. Telecommunications</u></b>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p><b><u>CD-3.c (new) Collaborate with the Marin Telecommunications Agency.</u></b> Continue to collaborate with, support and participate as a member of the Marin Telecommunications Agency to promote and facilitate the policy objectives of that agency. Consider future amendment to the Marin Countywide Plan to include additional County supported policies and programs to utilize best telecommunication technologies.</p>
<b><u>11. Public Health and Healthcare (Socioeconomic Element)</u></b>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p><b>Goal PH-3 Adequate Access to Quality Healthcare.</b> Ensure that all community members have affordable and convenient access to <b>a full range of</b> primary, preventive, and specialty health <b>care, including mental health care, vision,</b> and dental care.</p> <p><b>PH-3.2 Increase Health Insurance Options.</b> Enhance funding for health insurance products for children and adults not eligible for publicly funded health programs, <b>including support for state and national single payer systems.</b></p>

ATTACHMENT 2.B – Issues Tentatively Resolved  
 Decisions from the Board of Supervisor Hearing on September 25, 2007

TOPIC	ACTION
	<p><b>PH-3.c Streamline the Application Process Improve Access to Health Care.</b> <u>Improve access to health care for underserved populations by expanding the children’s health initiative, transitioning that initiative as feasible to include other underserved populations,</u> developing a one-stop electronic application process that can be used to enroll clients in health insurance <u>and other public benefit programs and through supporting state and national proposals for a single payer system.</u></p> <p><b>PH-3.d Improve Service Delivery and Utilization.</b> Develop proactive outreach and enrollment programs for insurance benefits, <u>and</u> integrated case management services with primary medical care, and <u>support electronic medical record portability</u> to improve utilization and quality of services, promote preventive care, and ensure insurance retention.</p>
<p><b><u>12. Elder Abuse</u></b>  <b><u>(Socioeconomic Element)</u></b></p>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p><b>Community Participation</b></p> <p><b>Key Trends and Issues</b></p> <p><i><b>Who is underrepresented in community dialogue?</b></i></p> <p>Public forums for decision-making have not typically offered information in languages other than English, nor have they always been held in places most convenient for people interested in a particular issue. Ethnic minorities, including recent immigrants, have not been represented on local advisory committees or decision-making bodies in proportion to their percentage of the overall population. <u>Voices of frail older adults living alone or in institutions such as a skilled-nursing facility are often not heard at these forums, particularly seniors who are no longer able to drive.</u></p>

ATTACHMENT 2.B – Issues Tentatively Resolved  
 Decisions from the Board of Supervisor Hearing on September 25, 2007

TOPIC	ACTION
	<p><b>PUBLIC HEALTH</b>  <b>Key Trends and Issues</b></p> <p><i><b>Are eating habits in Marin leading to obesity and other health problems?</b></i></p> <p><b>Community Health Survey results indicated that Marin shares in the national obesity epidemic.</b> The county is a long way from achieving the U.S. Healthy People 2010 goal of no more than 5% of children and adolescents being overweight and 15% of adults being obese (see Figure 4-27). Chronic diseases associated with obesity are also increasing. Factors contributing to obesity include poor eating habits, lack of physical activity, and school and community environments that make it difficult to access healthy foods and physical activity. <u>For the senior population, concerns with obesity and unhealthy lifestyles are also alarming. The Marin Community Health Survey (2001) found that 50.7% of Marin adults over the age of 60 are overweight or obese, and only 34.7% of seniors eat 5 servings of fruit and vegetable daily. The survey also indicates that 17.2% of seniors 60+ years never get moderate physical activity.</u></p> <p><i><b>Do Marin residents have access to affordable, quality healthcare?</b></i></p> <p>Affordability and availability are major issues. Persons from lower-income families, especially children, are most likely to obtain care at emergency rooms and may not get needed preventive or ongoing health care, such as immunizations and vision and dental checks. Language and cultural barriers may also limit access to quality care. Even for families fortunate enough to have health insurance, lack of provider capacity can impede timely access to health services, particularly specialty and dental care. Twenty-three percent of Hispanic/Latino adults have no health care coverage compared with 6.2% of Non-Hispanic White adults. Hispanics were significantly less likely to have health care coverage than any other ethnicity.</p>

ATTACHMENT 2.B – Issues Tentatively Resolved  
 Decisions from the Board of Supervisor Hearing on September 25, 2007

TOPIC	ACTION
	<p>Approximately 3,300 Marin children currently lack health insurance and may have difficulty accessing health care, according to local data, including the Marin Community Health Survey, reports from School Nurses and School Linked Service caseworkers, data from the Child Health and Disability Program, as well as data compiled by Certified Applicant Assistors in the community. Of this number, approximately two-thirds are eligible for public insurance programs. This indicates a need for integrated and proactive outreach, enrollment, and retention efforts. The parents of these children often do not qualify for public health programs and cannot afford private health insurance. Also, according to the 2000 Marin Community Health Survey, 12.1% of Hispanic/Latino children have no health care coverage compared to 1.8% of Non-Hispanic White children, and 15.4% of children with household incomes under the Federal Poverty Level (FPL) had no health care coverage. Only 0.9% of children with household incomes 300% of the FPL had no health care coverage.</p> <p><b>The quality of health care depends largely on health insurance.</b> Coverage in Marin varies by age, income, and ethnicity (as reported in the 2001 Marin Community Health Survey). While more than 90% of Marin adults have health insurance, that number is less than 80% for persons 18 to 24. Only 64% of adults in low-income households have health coverage. Only 76% of adults of Hispanic origin have health insurance. <u>Although Medicare, and in some cases Medi-Cal, provide healthcare coverage for seniors, the Marin Community Health Survey found that 58% of Marin older adults 65+ have no coverage for dental services, 38.8% have no coverage for mental health services, and 28.2% have no coverage for eye exams.</u></p>

**Table 3: Segment Level of Service**

Segment #	Segment	Direction	Peak Hour Volume	No. of Lanes	Volume Per Lane	Type	Capacity	V/C	Peak Direction LOS	# of Vehicles above Standard
<b>Non-Grandfathered, Satisfactory</b>										
1	Shoreline Highway (State Route 1), from Sir Francis Drake Blvd to Pt. Reyes Station	NB	124	1	124	II	800	0.16	A	
3	Novato Blvd. from San Marin Dr./Sutro Ave to Wilson Ave.	NB	346	1	346	II	800	0.43	A	
4	South Novato Blvd. from U.S. 101 to Novato Blvd.	NB	475	1	475	II	800	0.59	A	
5	State Route 37, from Sonoma County Line to U.S. 101	EB	2302	2	1151	I	2000	0.58	C	
10	Red Hill Ave. from Sir Francis Drake Blvd. to Hilldale Dr.	WB	1804	2	902	II	1200	0.75	C	
15	Interstate 580, from west of Sir Francis Drake Blvd. to Contra Costa Co. Line	WB	2634	2	1317	I	2000	0.66	C	
		EB	3271	2	1636	I	2000	0.82	D	
18	Tiburon Blvd. (State Route 131) from U.S. 101 to Strawberry Drive	EB	1449	2	725	II	960	0.75	C	
20	Bridgeway Blvd., from U.S. 101 to U.S. 101	NB	1258	2	629	II	960	0.66	B	
21	U.S. 101 from San Francisco County Line to Shoreline Highway (SR1)	NB	5486	4	1372	I	2000	0.69	C	
		SB	3575	4	894	I	2000	0.45	B	
24	Novato Blvd., from Wilson Ave. to Diablo Ave.	NB	912	1	912	II	960	0.95	E <sup>1</sup>	
<b>Grandfathered, Satisfactory</b>										
2	U.S. 101, from Atherton Ave. to Sonoma County Line	NB	3664	2	1832	I	2000	0.92	D	
6	Bel Marin Keys, from U.S.101 to Commercial Blvd	WB	1253	2	627	II	800	0.78	C	
7	U.S. 101, from N. San Pedro Rd. to State Route 37	NB	7748	4	1937	I	2000	0.97	E	
12	Sir Francis Drake Blvd., from College Ave. to Wolfe Grade	WB	1547	2	774	II	1200	0.64	B	
16	E. Sir Francis Drake Blvd., from U.S. 101 to Larkspur Landing Cir	EB	1446	2	723	II	960	0.75	C	
<b>Grandfathered, Improvement Plan Recommended</b>										
8	U.S. 101, from Mission Ave. to N. San Pedro Rd.	NB	8602	4	2151	I	2000	1.08	F	-151
9	Sir Francis Drake Blvd., from San Anselmo Ave. to Red Hill Ave.	WB	1880	2	940	II	960	0.98	E	
11	U.S. 101, from Interstate 580 to Mission Ave.	NB	6530	3	2177	I	2000	1.09	F	-177
13	U.S. 101 from Tiburon Blvd. (SR 131) to Interstate 580	NB	6214	3	2071	I	2000	1.04	F	-71
14	Interstate 580, from Sir Francis Drake Blvd. to Bellam Blvd.	EB	1941	1	1941	I	1400	1.39	F	-541
17	U.S. 101, from Shoreline Highway (SR 1) to Tiburon Blvd. (SR 131)	NB	7078	3	2359	I	2000	1.18	F	-359
19	Shoreline Highway (State Route 1), from Northern Ave. to Almonte Blvd.	NB	842	1	842	II	800	1.05	F	-42
22	Sir Francis Drake Blvd. from Butterfield Rd. to State Route 1	WB	910	1	910	II	960	0.95	E	
23	Sir Francis Drake Blvd. from College Ave. to Toussin Ave.	WB	1120	1	1120	II	960	1.17	F	-160

<sup>1</sup> More detailed intersection level analysis indicates Level of Service D (acceptable)



**Table 3: Segment Level of Service**

Segment #	Segment	Direction	Peak Hour Volume	No. of Lanes	Volume Per Lane	Type	Capacity	V/C	Peak Direction LOS	# of Vehicles above Standard
<b>Non-Grandfathered, Satisfactory</b>										
1	Shoreline Highway (State Route 1), from Sir Francis Drake Blvd to Pt. Reyes Station	NB	124	1	124	II	800	0.16	A	
3	Novato Blvd. from San Marin Dr./Sutro Ave to Wilson Ave.	NB	346	1	346	II	800	0.43	A	
4	South Novato Blvd. from U.S. 101 to Novato Blvd.	NB	475	1	475	II	800	0.59	A	
5	State Route 37, from Sonoma County Line to U.S. 101	EB	2302	2	1151	I	2000	0.58	C	
10	Red Hill Ave. from Sir Francis Drake Blvd. to Hilldale Dr.	WB	1804	2	902	II	1200	0.75	C	
15	Interstate 580, from west of Sir Francis Drake Blvd. to Contra Costa Co. Line	WB	2634	2	1317	I	2000	0.66	C	
		EB	3271	2	1636	I	2000	0.82	D	
18	Tiburon Blvd. (State Route 131) from U.S. 101 to Strawberry Drive	EB	1449	2	725	II	960	0.75	C	
20	Bridgeway Blvd., from U.S. 101 to U.S. 101	NB	1258	2	629	II	960	0.66	B	
21	U.S. 101 from San Francisco County Line to Shoreline Highway (SR1)	NB	5486	4	1372	I	2000	0.69	C	
		SB	3575	4	894	I	2000	0.45	B	
24	Novato Blvd., from Wilson Ave. to Diablo Ave.	NB	912	1	912	II	960	0.95	E <sup>1</sup>	
<b>Grandfathered, Satisfactory</b>										
2	U.S. 101, from Atherton Ave. to Sonoma County Line	NB	3664	2	1832	I	2000	0.92	D	
6	Bel Marin Keys, from U.S.101 to Commercial Blvd	WB	1253	2	627	II	800	0.78	C	
7	U.S. 101, from N. San Pedro Rd. to State Route 37	NB	7748	4	1937	I	2000	0.97	E	
12	Sir Francis Drake Blvd., from College Ave. to Wolfe Grade	WB	1547	2	774	II	1200	0.64	B	
16	E. Sir Francis Drake Blvd., from U.S. 101 to Larkspur Landing Cir	EB	1446	2	723	II	960	0.75	C	
<b>Grandfathered, Improvement Plan Recommended</b>										
8	U.S. 101, from Mission Ave. to N. San Pedro Rd.	NB	8602	4	2151	I	2000	1.08	F	-151
9	Sir Francis Drake Blvd., from San Anselmo Ave. to Red Hill Ave.	WB	1880	2	940	II	960	0.98	E	
11	U.S. 101, from Interstate 580 to Mission Ave.	NB	6530	3	2177	I	2000	1.09	F	-177
13	U.S. 101 from Tiburon Blvd. (SR 131) to Interstate 580	NB	6214	3	2071	I	2000	1.04	F	-71
14	Interstate 580, from Sir Francis Drake Blvd. to Bellam Blvd.	EB	1941	1	1941	I	1400	1.39	F	-541
17	U.S. 101, from Shoreline Highway (SR 1) to Tiburon Blvd. (SR 131)	NB	7078	3	2359	I	2000	1.18	F	-359
19	Shoreline Highway (State Route 1), from Northern Ave. to Almonte Blvd.	NB	842	1	842	II	800	1.05	F	-42
22	Sir Francis Drake Blvd. from Butterfield Rd. to State Route 1	WB	910	1	910	II	960	0.95	E	
23	Sir Francis Drake Blvd. from College Ave. to Toussin Ave.	WB	1120	1	1120	II	960	1.17	F	-160

<sup>1</sup> More detailed intersection level analysis indicates Level of Service D (acceptable)