

**Nichols • Berman**  
**Environmental Planning**  
110 East D Street Suite E  
Benicia California  
9 4 5 1 0

---

***MARIN COUNTYWIDE  
PLAN UPDATE***

***Final Environmental Impact Report  
Response to Comments  
Amendment II***

---

*COUNTY OF MARIN  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY*

*State Clearinghouse No. 2004022076*

*NOVEMBER 2007*

**MARIN COUNTYWIDE PLAN UPDATE  
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT  
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS  
AMENDMENT II**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

|  | <i>Page</i> |
|--|-------------|
| Introduction   | 1           |
| Board of Supervisors Revisions to the Marin Countywide Plan Update | 2           |

## **INTRODUCTION**

Marin County prepared, and on January 16, 2007, circulated the Draft EIR on the proposed *Marin Countywide Plan Update* project. The Draft EIR was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. During the public review period from January 16, 2007 to March 16, 2007 and at the two public hearings February 12, 2007 and February 26, 2007, comments on the Draft EIR were solicited from governmental agencies and the public.

Marin County circulated a Final EIR on June 4, 2007. All written comments received during the 60-day public review period and comments received at all of the public hearings were address in the Final EIR.

The Marin County *Environmental Impact Review Guidelines* provide for a minimum ten-day period for review of the Final EIR prior to any action to its certification. During the public review period from June 4, 2007 to June 18, 2007 and at the public hearing June 11, 2007, comments on the adequacy of the responses to comments were solicited.

After the close of the review period for the Final EIR, Marin County prepared a Final EIR Amendment (July 2007). The Final EIR Amendment addressed comments and issues regarding the Final EIR.

This document is the Final EIR Amendment II. The following exhibit presents the revisions to the *Marin Countywide Plan Update* that have been recommend by the Marin County Board of Supervisors.

In July 2007, the Marin County Planning Commission recommended adoption of the *Marin Countywide Plan Update* to the Board of Supervisors.<sup>1</sup> The following exhibit summarizes all of the Board of Supervisors' revisions to the *Marin Countywide Plan Update* goals, policies, and programs. The lefthand column shows the Board of Supervisors' revisions to the Planning Commission's recommended goals, policies, and programs. The lefthand column lists the goal, policy, or program, with revisions shown in ~~strike through~~ and underline. The righthand column includes an evaluation of the recommended revisions on the EIR's analysis.

Based on this analysis, the Board of Supervisors' revisions do not raise new or more severe impacts or new mitigations or alternatives not considered in the Final EIR and do not require recirculation for further review and comment in accordance with *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15088.5.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Planning Commission Recommended Draft Marin Countywide Plan*, Marin County Planning Commission, July 23, 2007.

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>   | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>  |
| <p><b>Introduction (on pg 1- 15)</b></p> <p>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>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision serves as clarification and does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |
| <p><b>Biological Resources 2.A: Richardson Bay Boat Dock Study</b></p> <p>Additional language for Key Trends &amp; Community Development Activities for Planning Area 6 – Richardson Bay</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>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision serves as clarification and does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>   | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>   |
| <p><b>Biological Resources 2B: Wetlands Definition</b></p> <p><b>BIO-3.h</b> <u>(new) Evaluate Wetlands Definitions.</u> 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; 5) overall feasibility of implementation and enforcement responsibilities associated with an expanded definition; 6) benefits and challenges of a consistent definition throughout the county; 7) what percentage of wetlands would continue to be regulated by the Army Corps of Engineers; and 8) what percentage of cost could be paid for by the applicant.</p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this new program as a refinement of the Countywide Plan. This program would provide for an evaluation of whether to expand the definition of wetlands. As such, this program would further reduce impacts associated with wetlands degradation and does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>  |
| <p><b>Biological Resources 2C. Riparian and Wetlands Protection</b></p> <p><b>BIO-4.t</b> <u>(new) Collaborate with Groups to Address Implementation of Protections to SCAs and WCAs.</u> Collaborate with local, regional, state, and federal organizations (Marin Organic, MALT, SPAWN, Marin Audubon, RCD, Fish and Game, RWQCB, Sierra Club, Farm Bureau, Trout Unlimited, and affected property owners) to address long term habitat protection and develop funding mechanisms to address the issue.</p>   | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this new program as a refinement of the Countywide Plan. This program would encourage collaboration with local, regional, state and federal organizations to protect riparian and wetlands habitat. As such, this program would further reduce impacts associated with degradation of SCAs and WCAs and does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>  | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>  |
| <p><b>BIO-4.u (new) Investigate Tax Delinquent Properties.</b> <u>Investigate conversion of tax delinquent properties in SCAs into public ownership.</u></p>   | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this new program as a refinement of the Countywide Plan. This program would investigate the possibility of taking public ownership of tax delinquent properties in SCAs. As such, this program would further reduce impacts associated with degradation of SCAs and does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>  |
| <p><b>Goal 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. <u>Incorporate sea-level rise and more extreme weather information into the planning process.</u></p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This goal promotes efficiency in the name of minimizing greenhouse gas emissions. The revision strengthens this goal by taking into account the need to adapt to climate change by incorporating sea-level rise and extreme weather possibilities into the planning process. Therefore, this goal further reduces impacts associated with climate change. This revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>  | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>   |
| <p><b>AIR-4.c Reduce Methane Emissions Released from Waste Disposal.</b> Encourage recycling, decrease waste sent to landfills, require landfill methane recovery, and <del>determine the potential to use</del> <u>promote</u> methane recovery for energy production <u>from other sources</u>.</p>  | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision serves as clarification and does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>        |
| <p>Maintain priority rating “<u>High</u>,” timeframe “<u>Immediate</u>,” and identify funding source for existing program AIR 4.f: <b>Establish a Climate Change Planning Process</b></p>  | <p>The Board of Supervisors does not propose revisions to Program AIR 4.f but requires identifying funding for this program. This change does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</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>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision serves as clarification and does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>        |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>   | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>  |
| <p>Key Trends and Issues</p> <p>Can the trail system continue to grow?</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. <del>Occasionally, agencies acquire trail easements when a landowner seeks approval to develop his or her land.</del> 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 those alignments restored to a natural condition.</p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision serves as clarification of applicable legal standards and does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |
| <p><b>TRL -1.3 Facilitate Public Dedication of Trails.</b> Seek the <u>voluntary dedication or sale</u> of trail easements and/or the improvement of trails <del>in conjunction with development proposed on</del> lands traversed by trails shown on the Marin Countywide Plan Trails maps.</p>  | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision serves as clarification of applicable legal standards and does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |



| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>   | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>  |
| <p><b>TRL-1.d Establish Regional Trail Connections.</b> 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>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This program seeks to integrate local trails with regional trail systems. This revision strengthens this program by clarifying the process for planning one of the regional trails, the California Coastal Trail. This revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |
| <p><b>TRL-1.g Evaluate Proposed Development for Trail Impacts.</b> 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. <del>Evaluate development applications for the appropriateness of requiring dedication of trails as a condition of development approval.</del></p>                                   | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This program seeks to promote a cooperative relationship with landowners and expand the range of tools available for trail acquisition consistent with legal requirements. This revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>  |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>  | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>  |
| <p><b>TRL-1.j Encourage Public-Private Trail Partnerships.</b> Encourage partnerships and cooperation between public land management agencies, <del>and</del> trail interest groups, <u>and property owners</u> to increase and improve trail use opportunities and minimize conflicts.</p>  | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This program encourages partnerships among the various trail stakeholders. The revision strengthens this program by recognizing the need to partner with property owners to promote trail use opportunities. This revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>  |
| <p><b>TRL-2.d Protect Private Property.</b> Design and locate trails to avoid trespassing and adverse impacts on adjacent private lands and sensitive land uses. <del>such as agricultural operations.</del> New (proposed) trails located in agricultural areas should <del>generally</del> be sited in the public right of way where feasible and should <del>generally</del> avoid running through active agricultural lands or operations. <u>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.</u></p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This program reduces impacts of trail use on agricultural lands. The revision strengthens this program by clarifying the procedure for siting trails in agricultural areas. Therefore, this policy further reduces impacts associated with trail use on agricultural lands. This revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>  | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>   |
| <p><b>TRL-2.b Design, Build, and Manage Trails in a Sustainable Manner.</b> Incorporate design measures that protect vegetation, protect habitats, and minimize erosion. Suggested measures include:</p> <p>Limit grading and vegetation removal.</p> <p>Discourage people and pets from entering sensitive habitats or disturbing wildlife through education, signage, enforcement and, as a last resort, fencing.</p> <p>Provide vegetative buffers between trails and wetlands or other sensitive habitats.</p> <p>Consider using existing roads or trails rather than building new ones when possible.</p> <p><u>Temporarily c</u>Close trails <del>seasonally</del> when necessary to minimize erosion or resource impacts, <u>or to prevent threats of disease to livestock.</u></p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This program reduces impacts related to trail use. The revision strengthens this program by providing for the temporary closure of trails when necessary to prevent threats of disease to livestock. Therefore, this policy further reduces impacts associated with trail use. This revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |
| <p><b>TRL-2.f Acknowledge Historic Trail Users.</b> <u>When acquiring a property for public use,</u> <del>c</del>Consider trail use that occurred prior to <u>the</u> public acquisition. <del>when determining trail use.</del></p>   | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision serves as clarification and does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>  |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>  | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>  |
| <p><b>DES-4.c Regulate Mass and Scale.</b> 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>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This program reduces impacts to the County’s visual resources. The revision strengthens this program by bringing it into line with Goal CD-4, pursuant to which the County strives to coordinate implementation of the Countywide Plan with Community Plans and other jurisdictions. Therefore, this policy further reduces the impact new development will have on the County’s scenic beauty. This revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |
| <p><b>AG-1.n Standardize Sustainable Agricultural Indicators.</b> Establish sustainable agriculture indicators, such as increases <del>in organic farming</del> <u>in organic and other ecologically sound farming and ranching</u>, to assist in determining farm activities that protect agricultural land, promote farm economic viability, and further social activities necessary to sustain agriculture.</p>               | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision serves as clarification and does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>   |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>   | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>   |
| <p><b>BIO 1.7 Remove Invasive Exotic Plants.</b> Require the removal of invasive exotic species, to the extent feasible, when considering applicable measures in discretionary permit approvals for <del>non-agricultural</del> development projects <u>unrelated to agriculture</u>, and include monitoring to prevent re-establishment in managed areas.</p>  | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision serves as clarification and does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>  |
| <p><b>AG-1.c Consider <u>Incentives for the Voluntary Merger of Parcels on Lands Protected by Agricultural Conservation Easements</u>.</b> <del>Consider whether it is appropriate for agricultural conservation easements should to include, but not be limited to incentives for the voluntary merger of contiguously owned agricultural lands. where proper findings can be made.</del></p>              | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision serves as clarification and does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>  |
| <p><b>OS-2.h Require Clustered Development.</b> <del>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.</del> Require clustering to provide effective protection to open space and environmental resources.</p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision serves as clarification consistent with applicable legal standards and does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>  | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>  |
| <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. <del>as displayed</del> <u>These are shown for illustrative purposes only</u> on Maps 2-9, 2-10, and 2-11.</p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision clarifies that hazard areas will be identified on a case-by-case basis according to information available at the time and does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>  | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>   |
| <p><b><u>Background Section</u> (Biological Resources Chapter)</b></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 <u>shown for illustrative purposes only</u>). 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>Add note on map-- link to DFG CNDDDB map</p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision clarifies that sensitive resources will be identified on a case-by-case basis according to information available at the time and does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>   | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>  |
| <p><b>BIO-5.f Control Public Access.</b> Design public use areas to be clearly marked, to minimize possible conflicts between public and private uses, to provide continuous <del>ten-foot-wide</del> walkways from the nearest roads to the shoreline and along the shoreline, to be set back at <del>least ten feet</del> 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>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision provides flexibility in designing public use areas to protect sensitive resources and private properties while allowing public access and does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |
| <p><b>EH-2.1</b> Elevate Evacuation Routes program to <u>high</u> priority</p>  | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision strengthens the policy by elevating its priority so that implementation will happen more quickly. This revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>                           |
| <p><b>CD-2.3 Establish a Housing Overlay Designation.</b> 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. <del>including s</del> Sites for the HOD include reuse of existing shopping centers or other underutilized sites. <del>Development within the HOD that meets the standards in Program CD-2.d shall be eligible for a HOD density bonus as an alternative to any density bonus authorized by State law.</del> Development pursuant to this Policy and the HOD Programs on sites designated as both mixed use and as suggested HOD sites <del>are subject to the HOD criteria for development</del></p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts modifications to HOD Policy CD-2.3 and its related Program (Program CD-2.d) to refine further the Countywide Plan. These revisions ensure that, on sites within areas of extreme traffic due to a combination of commuters, recreation and other trips, total new housing development will be limited, but within those limits, affordable housing, housing</p>                                  |



| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>   | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>   |
| <p><del>and not as mixed use</del> shall be developed pursuant <u>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).<br/>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:<br/>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 Conservation Area;</li> <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> </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 <del>Exhibit 5.0-15</del> <u>Figure 3-3</u> and shown in <del>Exhibit 5.0-16</del> <u>Map 3-2c</u>.</p> <p>(continued on following page)</p> | <p>for the local workforce, and housing for seniors and special needs will be prioritized (see e.g. Screenline 23 area). In addition, the Board’s clarification that the total HOD units on “suggested sites” would be an “up to” amount further ensures that new housing developed will be within the total new development analyzed in the EIR. The Board added language to the Program stating that affordability goals would be met to the “maximum extent feasible” so that there was flexibility to accommodate a slightly modified affordability mix as necessary for a particular project to be economically feasible. Finally, allowing projects of up to 30 units per acre developed as housing ensures that HOD projects qualify as Housing Inventory sites under the Housing Element. These revisions to the HOD Policy and Program strengthen the HOD Policy and Program by prioritizing affordable, senior and workforce units within an HOD development and ensuring HOD project feasibility. These revisions do not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor do they trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>  |  |   | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b> |
| <b>Traffic Impact Areas as Determined by Screenlines and HOD Site Criteria (See Exhibit 5.0-16 Map 3-2c)</b> | <b>HOD Unit Potential for Traffic Impact Areas (including Density Bonus Units)</b> | <b>Suggested Qualifying Sites Within Traffic Impact Areas</b>   |  |
| Screenline 7:  | <u>Up to 110</u>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Marinwood Shopping Center (<u>50 - 100</u> 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 <del>50</del> <u>25</u> units – <u>limited to student or workforce employees of the College</u>)</li> <li>○ Marin General Hospital (up to <del>400-50</del> <u>total</u> units if associated with reconstruction or reuse, <u>of which up to 25 units must be designated senior housing and up to 25 units designated for and limited to senior, affordable, workforce employees, or special needs housing</u>)</li> </ul> |  |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b> |                         |  |
|---|-------------------------|--|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>                               |                         | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>   |
|   |                         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Toussin (up to 13 units)</li> <li>○ Other qualifying sites</li> </ul>     |
| Screenline 22:  | <u>Up to</u> 10         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Oak Manor</li> <li>○ Other qualifying sites</li> </ul>                    |
| Screenline 13:  | <u>Up to</u> 50         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ California Park (San Rafael)</li> <li>○ Other qualifying sites</li> </ul> |
| Screenline 17:  | <u>Up to</u> 100        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Strawberry Shopping Center</li> <li>○ Other qualifying sites</li> </ul>   |
| Screenline 19:  | <u>Up to</u> 50         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Fireside Motel</li> </ul>   |
| Screenline 21:  | <u>Up to</u> 150        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Marin City Shopping Center</li> <li>○ Other qualifying sites</li> </ul>   |
|   | <u>Up to</u> 583        | Units on named HOD sites   |
|   | Total: <u>Up to</u> 658 | Total Potential HOD Units including Density Bonus Units  |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>   | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>  |
| <p><b>CD-2.d Implement the Housing Overlay Designation Program.</b> The reviewing authority may allocate HOD units to suggested qualifying sites or other qualifying sites within Traffic Impact Areas shown on <del>Exhibit 5-0-16</del> <u>Map 3-2c</u> up to a total of 658 units, including any applicable 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 <del>Exhibit 5-0-15</del> <u>Figure 3-3</u> if the HOD project meets the following standards:</p> <p><del>1) Developer is encouraged to undertake a community based planning process.</del></p> <p>1) Developer is encouraged to maintain ownership interest in the project.</p> <p>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.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><del>Income levels to be consistent with the County's inclusionary requirements.</del></p> <p>3) Affordability levels as follows:</p> <p>For rental developments:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">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.</p> <p>For ownership developments:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">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,</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">iii.) OR 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.</p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts these revisions to refine further the Countywide Plan. The effect of these revisions is discussed in the analysis for Policy CD-2.3 (Establish a Housing Overlay Designation) above. These revisions do not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor do they trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>   | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b> |
| <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 <del>25</del> <u>30</u> units per acre (<u>except for sites designated Neighborhood Commercial/Mixed Use where at least 25 units per acre applies</u>) 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:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) the additional “units” are affordable to low and very low below market households; and</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(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 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>(continued on following page)</p> |  |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>  | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>  |
| <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> |   |
| <p><b>CD-2.p (new) Encourage Community Based Planning for Issues of Community-Wide Interest.</b> <u>Encourage and support a community-based planning approach for projects with broad community-wide interest. The community-based planning process should promote cooperation and collaboration.</u></p>  | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this new program as a refinement of the Countywide Plan. This new program further reduces land use, population and housing impacts by supporting the development of affordable housing projects. The new program does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>   | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>   |
| <p><b>CD-2.g</b> <u>(new) Identify Affordable Housing Sites in Community Plans.</u> Community Plans should include additional sites that are appropriate for and qualify as affordable housing sites.</p>   | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this new program as a refinement of the Countywide Plan. This new program further reduces land use, population and housing impacts by supporting the development of affordable housing projects. The new program does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>  |
| <p><b>CD-8.7</b> <b>Establish Commercial/Mixed Use Land Use Categories and Intensities.</b><br/>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. <del>Mixed-use projects shall not exceed the maximum permissible Floor Area Ratio for each site, except for units affordable to low and very low income households located in areas with acceptable vehicle levels of service.</del> Up to 1,036 residential units may be approved countywide for mixed-use development, subject to a discretionary approval process.</p> <p>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> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">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> <p>(continued on following page)</p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts the modifications to the Mixed Use Policy to exceed the FAR in limited circumstances to ensure that within the total cap of potential mixed use units, priority would be given to units affordable to very low, low and moderate income persons and families. Additional unit caps for mixed use units were also established by the Board for the Tamalpais Community Area due to the area's highly constrained (week and weekend) traffic conditions, flooding and other hazards. Moreover, since the overall mixed use unit caps established by the Planning Commission remain in place, the modifications by the Board will not result in additional traffic impacts beyond those analyzed in the EIR. Overall, these Policy revisions further reduce land use, population and housing impacts by supporting the</p> |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>  | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>  |
| <p>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;</p> <p>3. Priority shall be given to the retention of existing neighborhood serving <del>retail</del> <u>commercial</u> uses; and</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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></p> <p>6. <u>Residential units on mixed-use sites <del>along Shoreline Highway west of Highway 101</del> in the Tamalpais Area Community Plan area shall be restricted to 100 additional units (including any applicable 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></p> <p><del>Minor</del> renovations not resulting in additional square footage may be exempt 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>The following categories shall be established for commercial land uses:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><b>General Commercial/Mixed Use.</b> The General Commercial mixed-use land use category is established to allow for a wide variety of commercial uses, including retail and service businesses, professional offices, and restaurants, in conjunction with mixed-use residential development. The Development Code includes permitted and conditional uses and development standards consistent with this</p> | <p>development of affordable housing projects. These Policy revisions do not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor do they trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |



| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>  | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b> |
| <p>designation. The Land Use Policy Maps provide Floor Area Ratio (FAR) standards for this designation. Residential development located in a mixed-use development within this designation shall be included in the permissible amount of development under these FARs. <del>Mixed-use projects shall not exceed the maximum permissible Floor Area Ratio for each site, except for units affordable to low and very low income households located in areas with acceptable vehicle levels of service.</del> <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 (Refer to CD-2.3 for projects located within the Housing Overlay Designation.)</u></p> <p><b>Office Commercial/Mixed Use.</b> The Office Commercial/Mixed Use land use category is established to encourage a mixture of professional, administrative, and medical office uses, in conjunction with mixed-use or residential development where appropriate. Employee and resident-serving retail and service businesses may also be permitted within this category. The Development Code includes permitted and conditional uses and development standards consistent with this designation. The Land Use Policy Maps provide for commercial floor area ratio (FAR) standards for this designation. Residential <del>ojects shall not exceed the maximum permissible Floor Area Ratio for</del> development located in a mixed-use development within this designation shall be included in the permissible amount of development under these FARs. <del>Mixed-use projects shall not exceed the maximum permissible Floor Area Ratio for each site, except for units affordable to low and very low income households located in areas with acceptable vehicle levels of service.</del> <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 (Refer to CD-2.3 for projects located within the Housing Overlay Designation.)</u></p> |  |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>   | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b> |
| <p><b>Neighborhood Commercial/Mixed Use</b> The Neighborhood Commercial/Mixed Use land use category is established to encourage smaller-scale retail and neighborhood-serving office and service uses in conjunction with residential development oriented toward pedestrians and located in close proximity to residential neighborhoods. The Development Code includes permitted and conditional uses and development standards consistent with this designation. The Land Use Policy Maps provide for commercial floor area ratio (FAR) standards for this designation. Residential development located in a mixed-use development within this designation shall be included in the permissible amount of development under these FARs. <del>Mixed use projects shall not exceed the maximum permissible Floor Area Ratio for each site, except for units affordable to low and very low income households located in areas with acceptable vehicle levels of service.</del> <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 (Refer to CD-2.3 for projects located within the Housing Overlay Designation.)</u></p> <p><b>Recreational Commercial.</b> The Recreational Commercial land use category is established to provide for resorts, lodging facilities, restaurants, and privately owned recreational facilities, such as golf courses and recreational boat marinas. See the Development Code for a complete list of permitted and conditional uses and development standards consistent with this designation. The Land Use Policy Maps provide for commercial floor area ratio (FAR) standards for this designation. Residential development located in a mixed-use development within this designation shall be included in the permissible amount of development under these FARs. <del>Mixed use projects shall not exceed the maximum permissible Floor Area Ratio for each site, except for units affordable to low and very low income households located in areas with acceptable vehicle levels of service.</del> <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</u></p> |  |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>   | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>   |
| <p style="text-align: center;"><u>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. (Refer to CD-2.3 for projects located within the Housing Overlay Designation.)</u></p> <p><b>Industrial.</b> The Industrial land use category is established to provide for industrial uses such as warehouses, storage, laboratories, retail and administrative offices. <del>Housing for employees or very low and low income housing may also be permitted, except that FAR is not applied to affordable or workforce housing.</del> See the Development Code for a complete list of permitted and conditional uses and development standards. Refer to the Land Use Policy Maps for commercial floor area ratio (FAR) standards. <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></p>  |  |
| <p><b>PA-3.2 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. <u>Applications for an updated quarry reclamation plan and updated quarry permit are currently pending. is required to determine the length of time quarrying operations will continue.</u> 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. <u>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, in order to</u> 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 <u>unless otherwise determined by a county approved traffic study.</u></p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision serves as clarification, and maintains the focus on limiting development so as not to exceed current traffic levels. This revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>   | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>   |
| <p><b>CD-4.a</b>    <b>Update Community Plans with a Watershed-Protection Approach.</b> 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>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This program promotes consistency with community plans, and reduces impacts related to watersheds. The revision strengthens this program by requiring further consistency between community plans and the Countywide Plan. This revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>                                     |
| <p><b>CD-4.g</b>    <b>Consider Additional Community Plans for Unincorporated Areas.</b> 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</u> (See also <u>CD-4.a Update Community Plans with a Watershed-Protection Approach</u>).</p>   | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This program promotes the use of community plans for unincorporated areas. The revision strengthens this program by explaining what these community plans should include and by requiring further consistency between community plans and the Countywide Plan. This revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>   | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>   |
| <p><b><u>Transportation Section</u></b></p> <p><b>Background</b></p> <p>“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). <del>Although it appears likely that private cars will remain the dominant form of transportation for the foreseeable future</del> <u>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.</u> 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>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. The revision strengthens this background section by shifting the emphasis from the inevitability of reliance on cars to the importance of reducing the contribution of transportation to the County’s greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, this revision further reduces impacts associated with climate change. This revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |
| <p><b>TR-1.s</b> <b><u>VMT Reduction Monitoring and Implementation and Transportation Demand Management Program.</u></b> Develop and implement a <u>countywide program for monitoring and reducing VMT consistent with state and regional efforts and based on information from state and regional planning agencies.</u> <del>and</del> Identify and require in new developments specific <u>transportation demand management (TDM) strategies for reducing the VMT below levels that would otherwise occur.</u> Consider the following types of strategies for inclusion in the VMT Reduction Monitoring and Implementation <u>and Transportation Demand Management Program:</u></p> <p><b><u>Increased Transit</u></b></p> <p>All new residential projects consisting of 25 units or more should be located within 1/2 miles of a transit node, <u>shuttle service</u>, or bus <del>stop</del> route with regularly scheduled, daily service <del>during both off peak and peak times.</del></p> <p>(continued on following page)</p>  | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. New Program TR-1.s was proposed by the DEIR as mitigation for Impact 4.2-1 Increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled. The changes strengthen the program by emphasizing the connection between this program and the concept of Transportation Demand Management. The proposed changes do not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor do they trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>   |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>   | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>   |
| <p>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.</p> <p>Safe, convenient connections should be provided to existing pedestrian and bicycle facilities and secure bicycle parking should be provided in new nonresidential developments.</p> <p>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.</p> |  |
| <p><b>TR-1.t</b> <u>(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>The Board of Supervisors adopts this new program as a refinement of the Countywide Plan. This program discusses the adoption of fees and other programs that encourage alternatives to the single occupant vehicle. As such, this program would further reduce Impact 4.2-1 Increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled. This revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>  | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>  |
| <p><b>TR-1.u</b> <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>The Board of Supervisors adopts this new program as a refinement of the Countywide Plan. This program promotes car sharing. As such, this program would further reduce Impact 4.2-1 Increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled. This revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>  |
| <p><b>TR-4.e</b> <u>(new) Support Alternative Fuels Vehicles. Actively support infrastructure needed for alternative fuel vehicles, including fueling and charging stations. Review 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>The Board of Supervisors adopts this new program as a refinement of the Countywide Plan. This new program supports other policies and programs related to clean fuels and low-emissions vehicles. As such, this program would further reduce impacts associated with vehicle use and climate change. This revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>   | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>   |
| <p><b>TR-1.s VMT Reduction Monitoring and Implementation Program.</b> Increase priority rating for TR-1.s from “Low” to “<u>High</u>,” change timeframe from “Long term” to “<u>Medium term</u>” and identify a potential funding source.</p>                               | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision strengthens the policy by elevating its priority and timeframe for implementation, so that implementation will happen more quickly, and by calling for identification of a funding source. This revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>                               |
| <p><b>TR-3.i (new) Provide Shuttle Service to Transit.</b> <u>Support the creation of shuttle service, corridor trolleys, and/or jitneys to collect riders for public transit (see AIR-3.1, AIR-4.b) Consider providing such service for inter city-county streets.</u></p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this new program as a refinement of the Countywide Plan. This new program provides shuttle connections to public transit. As such, this program would further reduce Impact 4.10-7 Energy Consumption and Land Use Patterns as well as impacts on air quality and greenhouse gas emissions. This revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |



| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>  | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>  |
| <p><b>TR-2.1</b> <b>Improve the Bicycle and Pedestrian Network.</b> <del>Ensure that all areas of the county have</del> Promote adequate bicycle and pedestrian links, to the extent feasible, both internally and <del>to other parts of</del> throughout the county, including <del>and that</del> streetscape improvements and standards <u>that are safe and</u> pedestrian and bicycle friendly.</p>  | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision serves as clarification and does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |
| <p><b>TR-2.d</b> <b>Fund Projects.</b> Work with the Transportation Authority of Marin and the Bicycle Advisory Group to implement the 2007 <i>Marin County Unincorporated Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan</i>; 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>  | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision serves as clarification and does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |
| <p><b>TR-2.1</b> <b>Complete Streets.</b> <del>Consider Non-motorized Access in Transportation Projects.</del> 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 or <del>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>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision serves as clarification and does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>   | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>  |
| <p><b>TR-2.n</b>    <b>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> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This program reduces impacts related to pedestrians and bicycle use. The revision strengthens this program by including further sources of potential funding. This revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |
| <p><b>RIDGE AND UPLAND GREENBELT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modify the RUG boundary on revised Map 6.2 to follow the approximate location of the 350 foot contour interval.</li> <li>• 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> </ul>  | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision serves as clarification and does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines</p>  |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>   | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>   |
| <p><b>DES-1.h</b> <b>Lighting Design Guidelines.</b> Amend the Development Code to include lighting design guidelines to be applied through design review and other discretionary permits. <u>Explore the feasibility of amending the Building Code to include lighting specifications.</u> 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 <u>and/or specifications</u> should address:</p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. New Program DES-1.h was proposed by the DEIR as mitigation for Impact 4.12-4 Light Pollution and Nighttime Sky. The change strengthens this program by considering the establishment of lighting specifications, which would be more effective than mere guidelines. This revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |
| <p><b>CD-3.c</b> <b><u>(new) Collaborate with the Marin Telecommunications Agency.</u></b> <u>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.</u></p>  | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this new program as a refinement of the Countywide Plan. This program would promote improved telecommunication technologies. As such, this program supports other policies and programs related to low vehicle use employment opportunities. This program does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>   |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>  | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>   |
| <p><b>Goal PH-3 Adequate Access to Quality Healthcare.</b> Ensure that all community members have affordable and convenient access to <u>a full range of</u> primary, preventive, and specialty health care, <u>including mental health care, vision,</u> and dental care.</p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. Pursuant to this goal, the County would ensure that all community members have access to healthcare. This revision strengthens this goal by explicitly applying the goal to mental health and vision care. This revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</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, <u>including support for state and national single payer systems.</u></p>                          | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This policy enhances health insurance options for those not eligible for publicly funded health programs. The revision strengthens this policy by supporting state and national single payer systems, which would expand health access for those not currently eligible for publicly funded health programs. This revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>  | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>  |
| <p><b>PH-3.c</b> <del>Streamline the Application Process</del> <b><u>Improve Access to Health Care.</u></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, developing a one-stop electronic application process that can be used to enroll clients in health insurance and other public benefit programs and through supporting state and national proposals for a single payer system.</u></p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This program improves access to health care by streamlining the application process. The revision strengthens this program by generalizing the program to include other means of improving access to health care. This revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>   | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>  |
| <p><b>PH-3.d Improve Service Delivery and Utilization.</b> Develop proactive outreach and enrollment programs for insurance benefits, <del>and</del> 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>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This program improves health care service delivery and utilization. The revision strengthens this program by supporting electronic medical record portability. This revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>                  |
| <p><b>SOCIOECONOMIC ELEMENT</b></p> <p><b>4.7 Elder Abuse-- Community Participation</b></p> <p><b>Key Trends and Issues</b></p> <p><b>Who is underrepresented in community dialogue?</b></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> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This section discusses those who are underrepresented in community dialogue. The revision strengthens this section by recognizing the underrepresentation of some older adults. This revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>  | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>  |
| <p><b>SOCIOECONOMIC ELEMENT</b></p> <p><b>4.11 Public Health</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><b>Key Trends and Issues</b></p> <p><i>Are eating habits in Marin leading to obesity and other health problems?</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>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This section discusses obesity in Marin. The revision strengthens this section by recognizing that older adults have particular problems with obesity and unhealthy lifestyles. This revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |
| <p><b>SOCIOECONOMIC ELEMENT</b></p> <p><b>4.11 Public Health</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><b>Key Trends and Issues</b></p> <p><i>Do Marin residents have access to affordable, quality healthcare?</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> <p>(continued on following page)</p>  | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This section discusses health care coverage in Marin. The revision adds a discussion of mental health, dental, and vision coverage for older adults. This revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>                            |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>   | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>   |
| <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> |  |
| <p><b>Baylands Corridor</b></p> <p><b>San Rafael Airport- entire property out of the Baylands Corridor and into City-Centered Corridor (change map)</b></p> <p><b>Goal BIO-5 Baylands Conservation.</b> 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.</p> <p>(continued on following page)</p>  | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to clarify the limits of its jurisdiction, to reduce potential conflicts between airport operations at Gness Field and San Rafael Airport and the habitat protection and enhancement associated with the Baylands Corridor, and to remove reference to additional detailed resource analysis to determine whether additional large primarily undeveloped lands are included in the Baylands Corridor. The EIR acknowledges that</p> |



| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>  | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>  |
| <p>The Baylands Corridor is described on Maps 2-5a and 2-5b. <u>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.</u></p> <p>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.</p> <p>Where applicable for large parcels (more than <del>two</del> <u>2</u> acres in size) <del>which that</del> 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.</p> <p>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 (<del>two</del> <u>2</u> acres or less in size) <del>which that</del> 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.</p> <p>(continued on following page)</p> | <p>any efforts to restore or enhance wetlands located near Gness field would have to be balanced with the possible safety concerns that increased activity by birds and other wildlife may have on airport operations, which is true near the San Rafael Airport as well. These revisions do not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor do they trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>   | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b> |
| <p>For parcels of all sizes, existing lawful uses are grandfathered. For properties <del>two</del> <u>2</u> 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.</p> <p>Within the Baylands Corridor, <u>public improvements on airport at Gness Field and immediately adjacent properties</u> pursuant to an approved Airport Master Plan or Airport Land Use Plan will not be subject to additional Baylands protection regulations. <del>Within the Baylands Corridor, improvements at the San Rafael airport, pursuant to an approved Airport Master Plan and the City of San Rafael General Plan and other applicable City regulations and which are consistent with the 1983 Declaration of Restrictions, will not be subject to additional County Baylands protection regulations.</del></p> <p><del>The provisions of TR 1.7, <i>Direct Aviation Uses to Appropriate Locations</i>, and TR 1.p, <i>Limit Aviation Uses</i>, apply to airport facilities which are within the Baylands Corridor. Efforts to restore or enhance wetlands in the vicinity of the San Rafael Airport <u>Gness Field shall be consistent with an approved Airport Master Plan or Airport Land Use Plan and applicable FAA regulations. Efforts to restore or enhance wetlands in the vicinity of the San Rafael Airport or Gness Field shall be consistent with the City of San Rafael's General Plan and other applicable City regulations and shall also be consistent with avoid creating possible safety concerns considerations related to aircraft operations and shall be consistent with applicable FAA guidelines.</u></del></p> |  |
| <p>(continued on following page)</p>  |  |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>   | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b> |
| <p><u>The provisions of TR-1.7, Direct Aviation Uses to Appropriate Locations, and TR-1.p, Limit Aviation Uses, apply to Gness Field. Efforts to restore or enhance wetlands in the vicinity of Gness Field shall be consistent with an approved Airport Master Plan or Airport Land Use Plan and applicable FAA regulations. While the San Rafael Airport is not in the Baylands Corridor, efforts to restore or enhance wetlands in the vicinity of the San Rafael Airport shall be consistent with the City of San Rafael’s General Plan and other applicable City regulations and shall also be consistent with safety considerations related to aircraft operations.</u></p> <p><del>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.</del></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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; <u>(6) Identify lands that provide habitat, could be restored to provide habitat, or that provide protection from sea level rise.</u> Completion of the analysis does not require on-site evaluations.</p> <p>All parcels added to the Baylands Corridor as a result of this study are subject to Baylands regulations in effect at that time.</p> |  |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>   | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>  |
| <p>Map 2-5    Revise map 2-5 to move the San Rafael Airport from the Baylands Corridor to the City Centered Corridor.</p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to Map 2-5 to ensure that potential conflicts between airport operations at San Rafael Airport and the wetland enhancement associated with the Baylands Corridor do not occur. The EIR acknowledges that any efforts to restore or enhance wetlands located near Gness field would have to be balanced with the possible safety concerns that increased activity by birds and other wildlife may have on airport operations, which is true near the San Rafael Airport as well. This revision includes undeveloped marshlands along the Las Gallinas Creek corridor in both the City of San Rafael and unincorporated lands south of the creek under ownership by the airport. While the unincorporated lands that contain marshlands along the creek would ideally be included in the Baylands Corridor, the Wetland Conservation Area and Stream Conservation Area policies would continue to provide protection for these lands, which are also known to support special-status species such as the endangered California clapper rail.</p> <p>Given the relatively small segment of land along the Las Gallinas Creek corridor, and the protections provided under other relevant Countywide goals and policies, the revision related to the</p> |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>   | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>   |
|   | Baylands Corridor in the vicinity of the San Rafael Airport does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.  |
| <p>BIO-5.i <i>Conduct Mapping and Analysis.</i> <del>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.</del> 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.</p> <p>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. <u>(6) Identify lands that provide habitat, could be restored to provide habitat or that provide protection from sea level rise.</u> Completion of the analysis does not require on-site evaluations.</p> <p><u>All parcels added to the Baylands corridor as a result of this study are subject to Baylands regulations in effect at that time.</u></p> | The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision serves as clarification and does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>  | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>  |
| <b>Aviation Uses</b>   |   |
| <p><b>TR-1.7</b>    <b>Direct Aviation Uses to Appropriate Locations.</b> Maintain Gness Field as the County’s civilian airport facility and limit its use and expansion in accordance with the adopted Airport Master Plan. Continue to allow the private San Rafael Airport <u>consistent with the 1983-1993 Declaration of Restrictions</u> and the Richardson Bay seaplane base and helipad. Require additional aviation facility proposals to conduct site-specific environmental analysis prior to consideration.</p>  | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision serves as clarification and does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |
| <p><b>TR-1.p</b>    <b>Limit Aviation Uses.</b> 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 <u>and similar public uses</u>, in accordance with <del>the</del> <u>an approved Airport Master Plan or Airport Land Use Plan for Gness Field (1989)</u> and current technological conditions. Continue to allow the private San Rafael Airport facility <u>consistent with the 1983-1993 Declaration of Restrictions, the San Rafael General Plan and other applicable City land use regulations</u>, 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. <del>Allow discretion by the Board of Supervisors for changes to aviation policy.</del></p>                                     | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision serves as clarification and does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |
| <b>AGRICULTURE</b>   |   |
| <p><b>2.10</b>        <b>Background</b></p> <p>...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</p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision serves as clarification and does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>   | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b> |
| <p>and programs that seek to protect agricultural land and operations and maintain agricultural use.</p> <p><u>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.</u></p> <p><u>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.</u></p> <p>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...</p> |  |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>   | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>  |
| <p>AG-1.2 <b>Encourage Contractual Protection.</b> Facilitate agricultural conservation easements, land conservation and farmland security zone contracts, and transfer of development rights <u>between willing owners</u> when used to preserve agricultural lands and resources.</p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision serves as clarification of existing legal standards and does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |



| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>  | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>  |
| <p><b>AG-1.g</b> <i>Revise Agricultural Zoning Districts.</i> 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.</p> <p>Consolidate suitable agricultural lands in the Inland Rural Corridor into <u>an effective agricultural zoning district</u> 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.</p> <p><i>Agricultural Production Zoning (APZ) or a similar zoning district</i> 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 <u>and support continued agricultural activities</u>. The principal use of these lands shall be agricultural, and any development shall be accessory, incidental, and in support of agricultural production.</p> <p><i>Agricultural Residential Planned District Zoning (ARP)</i> 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.</p> <p><i>Residential Agricultural Zoning District (RAZ)</i> 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.</p> <p>(continued on following page)</p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This change serves as a point of clarification for consistency with Policy AG-1.6 and does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>  | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>  |
| <p><i>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.</i></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> <p><del>Limit non-agricultural development on agriculturally zoned property so that it is consistent with dwelling sizes typically accessory to agricultural production uses, while considering the need for landowner family housing. Limitations for residential development on a parcel shall be based upon the following criteria:</del></p> <p><del>i. The total floor area of all dwelling units and non-agricultural accessory structures on a parcel shall not exceed an aggregate of 6,000 square feet, except that an aggregate of 8,500 square feet may be allowed in order to protect the long-term productivity of the agricultural land and enable the inter-generational transfer of agricultural lands within existing farm families. Specifically, up to 8,500 aggregate square feet may be considered for agricultural family members where agricultural residences totaling at least 4,000 square feet existed on the site on January 1, 2007. In such cases, the additional 2,500 additional square feet allowance cannot be applied to an existing residence where the addition would result in a structure over 4,000 square feet in size or result in a new structure exceeding 2,500 square feet.</del></p> <p><del>ii. The total floor area for any single dwelling unit on a parcel shall not exceed 3,000 square feet except as provided herein.</del></p> <p>(continued on following page)</p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision provides clarification and strengthens the program by specifying the purpose of the program, by specifying criteria for when design review is triggered, and by reducing the allowable size for residences subject to these provisions. The Development Code generally requires Design Review for conventionally-zoned properties with residential development exceeding a total building area of 4,000 square feet, inclusive of existing and proposed residential floor area. This revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>  | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b> |
| <p>iii. <del>Agricultural worker housing, up to 540 square feet of garage space for each dwelling unit, agricultural accessory structures and up to a total of 500 square feet of office space used as a home occupation in connection with the agricultural operation on the property shall be excluded from the above residential floor area limits.</del></p> <p>iv. <del>Residential development shall not be allowed to diminish current or future agricultural use of the property or convert it to primarily residential use.</del></p> <p>v. <del>Single dwelling units in excess of 3,000 square feet of floor area, but not more than 6,000 square feet of floor area, may be allowed if there is evidence of a bona fide commercial agricultural production operation on the property. In making this determination, the County shall consider the following components within an Agricultural Production and Stewardship Plan: (1) the applicant's history of production agriculture in Marin or the North Bay region; (2) how the long term agricultural use of the property will be preserved; (3) whether agricultural infrastructure, such as fencing, processing facilities, marketing mechanisms, agricultural worker housing or agricultural land leasing opportunities has been established or will enhance the proposed agricultural uses; (4) whether sound land stewardship practices, such as Marin Organic Certification, riparian habitat restoration, water recharge projects, fish friendly farming practices, or erosion control measures have been or will be implemented; and (5) dedication or sale of perpetual agricultural conservation easements be offered voluntarily to ensure continued agricultural production.</del></p> <p>i. <u>Residential development shall not be allowed to diminish current or future agricultural use of the property or convert it to primarily residential use</u></p> <p>ii. <u>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 operation on the property shall be excluded from this policy.</u></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</u></p> |  |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>  | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b> |
| <p><u>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 some or all 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) <u>The applicant’s history of production agriculture.</u></li> <li>(2) <u>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</u></li> <li>(3) <u>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;</u></li> <li>(4) <u>Whether sound land stewardship practices, such riparian habitat restoration, water recharge projects, fish friendly farming practices or erosion control measures have been or will be implemented;</u></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 7,000 <del>8,500</del> square feet in size.</u></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> |  |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>   | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>  |
| <p><b>TRAILS</b></p> <p><b>2.9 Background</b></p> <p>Trails enhance the quality of life in Marin and the health of the public by offering opportunities to enjoy the wealth of parks and open space in Marin County. Trails originated in Marin as links between Native American communities. The transportation needs of missions, logging enterprises, and ranches resulted in an expansion of this original trail system in the 19th and early-20th centuries. Some of these old trails and roads have become part of Marin’s road system, while others have disappeared through disuse. Still others survive to this day on public parks and open space lands, ranches, and elsewhere. The current public trail network was created over decades, segment by segment, mile by mile, as public agencies acquired land and made it accessible to the public. Some of these agencies have acquired public trail easements through private lands, expanding the public trail network beyond the boundaries of public lands and creating trail connections between public lands and Marin’s communities (see Figure 2-20). Expanding the public trail network still further, some of Marin’s public trails are — or could be — part of regional or statewide trail systems such as the State Coastal Trail, the Bay Area Ridge Trail, and the San Francisco Bay Trail (see Map 2-18, Coastal, Ridge and Bay Trails, and Maps 2-19a through j, Marin Countywide Trails Plan).</p> <p>The Countywide Plan first included a Trails Element in 1984, following a study of existing and proposed trails in the county. All 11 Marin cities and towns contributed funds to the study, and most adopted their respective portions of the final plan.</p> <p>This section of the Countywide Plan contains policies and programs intended to ensure that trails are acquired, built, and managed effectively, and that they provide appropriate access for all segments of the population <u>in coordination with the Marin County Department of Parks and Open Space</u>. In this section of the plan, “trails” are defined as unpaved public access routes, ranging from narrow paths to fire protection roads. These trails are not intended for public motorized vehicle use. The Transportation Section of the Built Environment Element discusses paved bike paths. A Trails Technical Background Report (see Introduction, “Marin Countywide Plan Supporting Documents”) discusses trail acquisition, development, maintenance, and liability issues, and describes types of</p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision serves as clarification and does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>  | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>  |
| <p>trails and categories of trail users in detail.</p> <p>The maps contained in this section are for use in planning and preserving Marin’s network of public trails — not as trail guides. Trails of local significance that do not appear in the following maps may appear in community plans...</p>                                     |   |
| <p><b>GOAL TRL-1</b></p> <p><b>Trail Network Preservation.</b> 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. <u>Facilitate trail connections that can be used for safe routes to school and work.</u></p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This goal seeks, in part, to expand the public trail network for all users. This revision strengthens this goal by calling for facilitation of connecting trails for use by students and commuters. This revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |
| <p><b>TRL-1.2 Expand the Countywide Trail System.</b> 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, <u>including multi-use trails</u>, as appropriate.</p>                                     | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision serves as clarification and does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>   |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>   | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>  |
| <p><b>TRL-1.b</b> <b>Designate Trail Use Consistent with Agency Missions.</b> <del>Consider developing criteria to</del><br/> <u>Determine</u> public use of trails consistent with each agency’s mission and policies.<br/> <u>Explore and share information on innovative methods for safety and conflict resolution,</u><br/> <del>such as on shared-use trails.</del></p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision strengthens the effectiveness of this program by including stronger language related to implementation if this program. This revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |
| <p><b>TRL-1.h</b> <b>Encourage Voluntary Sale or Dedication.</b> Encourage project sponsors to voluntarily <u>sell or grant</u> trail easements and/or the improvement of trails in conjunction with development proposed on lands traversed by trail connections shown on the adopted Marin Countywide Trails Plan maps.</p>   | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision serves as clarification and does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>   |
| <p><b>TRL-2.8</b> <b>Provide Trail Information.</b> Strive to provide information to trail users that facilitates visitor orientation, nature interpretation, code compliance and trail etiquette. <u>Develop a methodology for signing trails to assist user and emergency personnel.</u></p>  | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. The revision strengthens this policy by calling for implementation of trail signs to assist users and emergency personnel. This revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>            |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>  | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>  |
| <p><b>TRL-2. Ensure Trail Maintenance Funding.</b> Strive to identify and secure consistent sources of funding for trail maintenance. <u>Develop a program for funding that explores <del>trail sponsorship, trail naming,</del> trail adoption, trail maintenance annuities, jurisdictional cooperation, and other sustainable methodology.</u></p>                     | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. The revision strengthens the program by calling for development of a program for sustainable funding. This change does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>                                 |
| <p><b>TRL-2.o Distribute Trail Maps and Information.</b> Provide clear signs and maps. Provide code, natural resource, and directional information about the trail network in multiple formats and languages. <u>In communication with users, promote trail systems for exercise, family activity, and, where applicable, everyday movement from place to place.</u></p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. The revision strengthens the program by promoting the variety of potential trail uses. This change does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>  |
| <p><b>CD-2.11 Promote Diverse Affordable Housing Strategies.</b> Promote a diverse set of affordable housing strategies to convert existing market rate units to permanently <del>convert</del> affordable units in addition to building affordable housing in appropriate locations.</p>  | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this new policy to refine further the Countywide Plan. This new policy supports other policies and programs related to reducing vehicle miles traveled and achieving jobs/housing balance. This change does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |



| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>  | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>   |
| <p><b>CD-2.r</b> <u>Convert Existing Market Rate Units. Identify specific strategies and funding mechanisms for the conversion of existing market rate units into permanently affordable housing.</u></p>  | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this new program to refine further the Countywide Plan. This new program supports other policies and programs related to reducing vehicle miles traveled and achieving jobs/housing balance. This change does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>    |
| <p><b>CD-1.3</b> <u>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.</u></p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision serves as clarification and does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>  |
| <p><b>CD-3.d (new)</b> <u>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.</u></p>   | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this new program to refine further the Countywide Plan. This new program supports other policies and programs related to reducing vehicle miles traveled and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. This change does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>  | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>  |
| <p><b>CD-8.6</b>    <b>Establish Residential Land Use Categories and Densities.</b> Residential development is designated at a full range of densities, with an emphasis on providing more affordable housing <u>including incentives for low and very low income units</u>, 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.</p>  | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision serves as clarification and does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |
| <p><b>DES-4.e</b>    <b>Protect Views of Ridge and Upland Greenbelt Areas.</b> Employ a variety of strategies to protect views of Ridge and Upland Greenbelt areas, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifying any unmapped ridgelines of countywide significance, both developed and undeveloped, and <u>adjusting the adding them to the adopted County Ridge and Upland Greenbelt Areas map as appropriate</u>;</li> <li>Amending the Development Code and County zoning maps to designate a suburban edge on all parcels contiguous to the City-Centered Corridor that abut the Ridge and Upland Greenbelt, and requiring that those parcels develop at rural densities with visually sensitive site design;</li> <li>Rezoning Ridge and Upland Greenbelt lands to the Planned District category and adjacent buffer areas to a transitional district, thereby subjecting them to County Design Review Requirements that include hillside protection;</li> <li>Requiring buildings in Ridge and Upland Greenbelt areas to be screened from view by wooded areas, rock outcrops, or topographical features (see DES-3.b); and</li> <li>Calculating density for Ridge and Upland Greenbelt subdivisions at the lowest end of the General Plan designation range.</li> </ul> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision serves as clarification and does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>  | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>   |
| <p><b>Scenic Highway Program</b></p> <p><b>DES-4.f</b>    <b><u>Consider Participation</u> in the California Scenic Highway Program.</b> <u>Consider participation</u> in the Scenic Highway Program in order to preserve and enhance Marin’s scenic highway corridors. (See also Section 3.9 Transportation.)</p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to as clarification and to refine further the Countywide Plan. This program, in conjunction with other programs in the Countywide Plan, seeks to protect scenic resources in the County. For example, goal DES-4 Protection of Scenic Resources, policy DES-4.1 Preserve Visual Quality, and programs DES-4.a Protect Key Public Views, DES-4.b Minimize Visual Impacts of Public Facilities, DES-4.d Protect Views of Ridgelines, DES-4.e, Protect Views of Ridge and Upland Greenbelt Areas are all protective of scenic resources. In addition, the Development Code calls for clustering structures to minimize visual prominence from roadways and other sensitive view sites, placing buildings so that they are screened by existing vegetation, rock outcroppings or topography and do not impair views. The revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>   | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>   |
| <p><b>EN-3.h</b>    <b>Adopt LEED <u>Gold</u> Standards for Public Buildings.</b> Implement where feasible the LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) <del>Silver</del> <u>Gold</u> certification requirements or a higher standard for development and major remodels of new public buildings.</p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This program seeks to promote energy efficiency and environmental design. This revision strengthens this program by adopting a higher standard of certification. This revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>   |
| <p><b>EN-3.f</b>    <b><u>Evaluate Carbon Neutral Building Incentives.</u></b> Evaluate the feasibility of incentives and regulations to achieve carbon neutral buildings.</p>  | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This new program calls for an evaluation of the feasibility for implementing incentives to achieve carbon neutral buildings. Therefore, this program further reduces impacts to Impact 4.3-6 Increase in Greenhouse Gas Emissions. This revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>   | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>   |
| <p><b>TR-4.d</b>    <b>Encourage Zero, Partial Zero, and Low-Emission Vehicle Use.</b> 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. <u>Support plug-In hybrid electric vehicles and new carbon neutral technologies.</u></p>   | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision specifies the County’s support for new technologies that reduce polluting emissions. Therefore, this program further reduces impacts to Impact 4.3-6 Increase in Greenhouse Gas Emissions. This revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |
| <p><b>MIN-1.7</b>    <b>Study Mineral Resource Areas.</b> <u>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.</u></p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this new policy as a refinement of the Countywide Plan. This policy calls for compliance with new state laws associated with the mineral extraction. The policy does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>   |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>  | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>  |
| <p><b>MIN-1.m</b> <b>Consider State Mineral Requirements.</b> Consider <u>changing mineral policies consistent with state law or requirements to allow more flexibility in allowing alternative land uses where considered desirable by the County.</u></p>  | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this new program as a refinement of the Countywide Plan. This program calls for compliance with new state laws associated with mineral extraction. The program does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |
| <p><b>NO-1.4</b> <b>Limit Sound Walls Along Highway 101.</b> Promote <u>best available noise reduction technologies and alternatives to sound walls to mitigate noise along Highway 101.</u></p>   | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision serves as clarification and does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>   |
| <p><b>NO-1.m</b> <b><del>Avoid</del> Limit Sound Walls.</b> Encourage Caltrans to <u>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.</u></p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision serves as clarification and does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>   |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>   | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>  |
| <p><b>Planning Areas – St. Vincent’s</b><br/>Remove <b>Map 3-34</b></p>   | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. Environmental features of the St. Vincent’s / Silveria properties are mapped on several EIR Exhibits (i.e., 4.5-3, 4.6-6) that employed more up to date information than Map 3-34. Therefore, the removal of Map 3-34 does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |
| <p><b>SV- Built Environment Goals and Policies</b><br/><i>What are the desired outcomes?</i><br/><b>Goal SV-2</b><br/><b>Comprehensive Site Planning.</b><br/><b>SV-2.4 Cluster Development.</b> New non-agricultural development (<u>e.g., building footprints, roads, and parking</u>) on either the St. Vincent’s or the Silveira property shall be <del>clustered</del> <del>or restricted</del> 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 <del>cluster requirements</del> restriction for the land area for each property.</p> <p>In addition, development (<u>e.g., educational/social service</u>) 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.</p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision clarifies the restrictions associated with clustering of development. The revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>  |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>   | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>  |
| <p><b>SV-2.5</b>     <b>Establish Land Use Categories.</b> The St. Vincent's/ and Silveira area <del>properties are</del> 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.</p> <p>In addition to existing uses, a total of <u>up to</u> 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. <del>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.</del> 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.</p> <p>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, <u>assisted senior housing, or other senior care facilities</u> 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 <del>the</del> <u>all</u> residential development being replaced <u>plus existing baseline trips</u>.</p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. The CWP EIR analyzed three levels of development on the St. Vincent's /Silveira properties: 221, 350, and 501 housing units. Therefore, this revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |



| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>  | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>  |
| <p><b>GOAL SV-5</b><br/><b>Affordable and Senior Housing.</b></p>  | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this revision to refine further the Countywide Plan. This revision serves as clarification and does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>   |
| <p><b>SV-5.2</b>     <b>Encourage Senior Housing.</b> <u>Anticipate the aging of Marin by creating a vibrant senior community serving a range of housing and income from very low to market rate supportive care needs.</u></p>  | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this new policy to refine further the Countywide Plan. This new policy supports Countywide Plan goals related to affordable housing. The revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>  |
| <p><b>EH-3.b</b>     <b>Update Maps.</b> <u>Annually review those areas covered by the Countywide Plan that are subject to flooding, identified by floodplain mapping prepared by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) or Department of Water Resources, and update Map 2-12 and other General Plan maps accordingly. Periodically review and overlay County zoning maps to show flood, tsunami, and inundation hazard areas along the San Francisco Bay, San Pablo Bay, Tomales Bay, and the Pacific Ocean, the Bayfront Conservation Zone, and the Coastal Zone.</u></p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts the revision to this program as a refinement of the Countywide Plan. This program calls for updating County maps to show flood hazard areas. This revision calls for additional mapping and analysis of flood prone area of the County. As such, the revision would not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>   | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>   |
| <p><b>Climate Change and <u>Economy</u></b></p> <p><b><u>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</u></b></p>   | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this new policy as a refinement of the Countywide Plan. This new policy supports Countywide Plan goals related to establishing and maintaining a vibrant economy and calls for consideration of climate change in future planning efforts. The revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>   |
| <p><b>Climate Change and <u>Economy</u></b></p> <p><b><u>EC-1.0 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.</u></b></p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this new program as a refinement of the Countywide Plan. This new program supports Countywide Plan goals related to establishing and maintaining a vibrant economy and calls for consideration of climate change in future planning efforts. The revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>  | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>   |
| <p><b>Climate Change and <u>Economy</u></b></p> <p><b>EC-1.p <u>Implement Economic Programs.</u></b> Consider retaining an <u>Economic Sustainability Specialist to implement economic programs.</u></p> <p>Priority is <u>medium</u>, responsibility is <u>CDA (Economic Specialist), OES, and Disaster Council</u></p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this new program as a refinement of the Countywide Plan. This new program supports Countywide Plan goals related to establishing and maintaining a vibrant economy. The revision does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>  |
| <p><b>Climate Change and <u>Public Safety</u></b></p> <p><b>PS-1.3 <u>Analyze Implications of Sea Level Rise for Neighborhood Safety.</u></b> <u>Analyze potential safety implications from sea level rise and prepare contingency plans in consultation with the Marin Disaster Council.</u></p>                        | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this new policy as a refinement of the Countywide Plan. This policy calls for consideration of sea level rise in future planning efforts and would thus further reduce potential impacts related to flooding. The program does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>  | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>  |
| <p><b>Climate Change and <u>Public Safety</u></b></p> <p><b>PS-1.f <u>Prepare Contingency Plans.</u></b> <u>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.</u></p> <p>Priority is <u>High</u>, and responsible agencies include <u>Marin Disaster Council, EOC, BCDC, and CDA</u></p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this new program as a refinement of the Countywide Plan. This program calls for consideration of sea level rise and climate change in future planning efforts and would thus further reduce potential impacts related to flooding. The program does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |
| <p><b>Climate Change and <u>Education</u></b></p> <p><b>EDU-2.4 <u>Promote Climate Change Education.</u></b> <u>Assist in building understanding of sustainability and climate change issues in schools.</u></p>   | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this new policy to refine further the Countywide Plan. This new policy supports other policies and programs related to minimizing the impacts of climate change. This change does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>   |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>   | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>  |
| <p><b>Climate Change and <u>Education</u></b></p> <p><b>EDU-2.p</b> <u>Encourage Climate Change Curricula.</u> Encourage non profits and school districts to develop curricula for increased understanding of sustainability and climate change issues by students.</p> <p>Priority is <u>Medium</u> and responsibility is <u>Marin Office of Education, CDA, and non-profits</u></p>   | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this new program to refine further the Countywide Plan. This new program supports other policies and programs related to minimizing the impacts of climate change. This change does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |
| <p><b>Climate Change and <u>Public Health</u></b></p> <p><b>PH-4.6</b> <u>Plan for Climate Change.</u> Plan for the public health implications of climate change, including disease and temperature effects.</p>  | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this new policy to refine further the Countywide Plan. This new policy supports other policies and programs related to minimizing the impacts of climate change. This change does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>   |
| <p><b>Climate Change and <u>Public Health</u></b></p> <p><b>PH-4.m</b> <u>Identify Potential Responses to Climate Change.</u> 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 <u>Medium</u> and responsibility is <u>H&amp;HS</u>, and timeframe is <u>Medium</u></p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this new program to refine further the Countywide Plan. This new program supports other policies and programs related to minimizing the impacts of climate change. This change does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>  | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>  |
| <p><b>Climate Change and Parks and Recreation</b></p> <p><b>PK-1.3</b> <u>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.</u></p>                          | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this new policy to refine further the Countywide Plan. This new policy supports other policies and programs related to minimizing the impacts of climate change. This change does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>   |
| <p><b>Climate Change and Parks and Recreation</b></p> <p><b>PK-1.v</b> <u>Prepare Contingency Plans. Analyze risks to park resources from violent weather, plant and aquatic changes, and sea level rise, and prepare appropriate contingency plans</u></p> <p>Priority is <u>Medium</u> and responsibility is <u>Department of Parks &amp; Open Space</u></p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts this new program to refine further the Countywide Plan. This new program supports other policies and programs related to minimizing the impacts of climate change. This change does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>   | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>   |
| <p><b><u>New Terms for Glossary</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Level of Service (LOS).</u></b> <u>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.</u></p> <p><b><u>Income Limit (Housing):</u></b> <u>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.</u></p> <p><b><u>Duet (Residential):</u></b> <u>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.</u></p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts these revisions to refine further the Countywide Plan. These revisions serve as clarification and do not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor do they trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |

| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>  | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>  |
| <p><b>The Mitigated Alternative</b></p> <p>The Mitigated Alternative was revised to eliminate the following policy:</p> <p><del><b>Policy CD-2.2 Establish a Housing Bank.</b> A “Housing Bank” is established, representing adjustments to the development potential of certain environmentally constrained sites within the county. The Housing Bank includes 1,763 units, which may be allocated to sites within the Housing Overlay Designation, as described in Policies CD-2.3 and 2.4. The Housing Bank will be drawn down as qualifying units are constructed and will be eliminated when all 1,763 units have been constructed.</del></p> | <p>Pursuant to the Planning Commission’s recommendation, the Board of Supervisors deletes this policy, which would have established a housing bank to accommodate housing units removed from the development potential of certain environmentally constrained areas to the City-Centered Corridor, where adequate services and public transportation are available. The Housing Bank would have facilitated allocation of the housing units to specific areas of the Housing Overlay Designation (HOD). However, through implementation of <b><u>Policy CD-2.3 Establish a Housing Overlay Designation</u></b>, sites within the HOD are assigned caps for housing unit allocations. Therefore, elimination of this policy does not affect the reallocation of these housing units because the reallocation will still be accomplished through implementation of Policy CD-2.3. The elimination of this policy does not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the <i>CEQA Guidelines</i>.</p> |



| <b>Summary of Board of Supervisors Revisions for the CWP Update</b>  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Board of Supervisors Revisions</b>  | <b>Effect of Change on Analysis in EIR</b>   |
| <p><b>Other Minor Changes</b><br/>                     Other technical changes occur throughout the document that do not alter the document substantively.</p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors adopts these revisions to refine further the Countywide Plan. These revisions serve as clarification and do not affect any analysis or alter any conclusions in the EIR, nor does it trigger the thresholds for recirculation as identified in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> |