



TO: Planning Commission Chair and Members

SUBMITTED BY: Peter T. Imhof, Planning and Environmental Review Director

PREPARED BY: Anne Wells, Advance Planning Manager
Andy Newkirk, Supervising Planner
Cam Audras, Assistant Planner
Molly Cunningham, Assistant Planner

SUBJECT: Local Coastal Program Workshop 4

RECOMMENDATION:

Receive a presentation, allow public comments, and provide feedback on the City's Local Coastal Program.

BACKGROUND:

This February 9, 2026 workshop is the fourth workshop to discuss the City's Local Coastal Program (LCP). The first workshop occurred on December 8, 2025. The staff report for Workshop 1 provided detailed background on the California Coastal Act, LCPs, permit authority in the Coastal Zone, the City's General Plan / Coastal Land Use Plan as a foundation for a future LCP, the significance of LCP certification, and California Coastal Commission staff review of the General Plan / Coastal Land Use Plan. Additionally, three topic areas were included where Coastal Commission staff proposed revisions to the City's General Plan / Coastal Land Use Plan: Archaeology and Paleontology, Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA), and Oil and Gas.

A second public workshop was held on January 12, 2026. The staff report for Workshop 2 included a discussion of Coastal Commission staff-proposed revisions to the City's General Plan / Coastal Land Use Plan on the following topics: Public Access, Safety (Coastal Hazards); and Visual Resources. At Workshop 2, Public Access was discussed but Safety (Coastal Hazards) and Visual Resources were not.

A third public workshop, on January 26, 2026, covered Coastal Commission staff proposed revisions related to Safety (Coastal Hazards) and Visual Resources that were originally introduced in the staff report for Workshop 2.

Workshop 4 continues the review of Coastal Commission staff-proposed revisions to City General Plan / Coastal Land Use Plan policies that are intended to serve as the Coastal Land Use Plan (CLUP) portion of the City's LCP.

DISCUSSION:

This LCP workshop addresses Coastal Commission staff-proposed revisions to the following four policy topics: Public Facilities, Water Conservation, Transportation, and Water Quality. Water Conservation is included with Public Facilities in the discussion as the guiding Coastal Act requirements for these two topics are the same.

These topic areas will be the focus of discussion and feedback from the Planning Commission and the public. This staff report highlights the more significant proposed policy revisions. However, any of the proposed revisions included in the policy tables in staff report Attachments 1 through 4 may be discussed at the workshop. The questions listed at the end of each topic area are intended to guide the discussion and are designed to solicit feedback from each Planning Commissioner, while also providing the public with guidance and opportunities to share input on the same topics.

Public Facilities (and Water Conservation)

Within Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act, public facilities and impacts on development are discussed in Sections 30250 and 30254. Section 30250(a) states, in part, that:

New residential, commercial, or industrial development, except as otherwise provided in this division, shall be located within, contiguous with, or in close proximity to, existing developed areas able to accommodate it or, where such areas are not able to accommodate it, in other areas with adequate public services and where it will not have significant adverse effects, either individually or cumulatively, on coastal resources.

Section 30254 states: “[n]ew or expanded public works facilities shall be designed and limited to accommodate needs generated by development or uses permitted consistent with the provisions of [the Coastal Act].”

Section 30254 further states that:

Where existing or planned public works facilities can accommodate only a limited amount of new development, services to coastal-dependent land use, essential public services and basic industries vital to the economic health of the region, state, or nation, public recreation, commercial recreation, and visitor-serving land uses shall not be precluded by other development.

The City currently maintains public facilities policies in the aptly titled Public Facilities Element. Coastal Commission staff suggested extensive edits to the City's approach to public facility policies throughout the Public Facilities Element. These suggested edits can

be found in Attachment 1. Coastal Commission staff also provided specific proposed revisions related to water conservation. These revisions focus on Conservation Element Policy CE 15 (Water Conservation, Waste Reduction, and Materials Recycling) and a new subpolicy on groundwater and water supply within Conservation Element Policy CE 10 (Watershed Management and Water Quality). These can be found in Attachment 2. No specific issues are identified in the staff report related to Public Facilities.

Question 1: Is there any feedback for City staff to consider moving forward regarding public facilities?

Transportation

Transportation is not a topic specifically called out within Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act. However, Section 30252 notes that new development should support public access by:

(1) facilitating the provision or extension of transit service, (2) providing commercial facilities within or adjoining residential development or in other areas that will minimize the use of coastal access roads, (3) providing nonautomobile circulation within the development, (4) providing adequate parking facilities or providing substitute means of serving the development with public transportation, (5) assuring the potential for public transit for high intensity uses such as high-rise office buildings...

Coastal Act Section 30253(d) also notes that new development should minimize vehicle miles traveled.

Coastal Commission staff suggested edits to the City's transportation policies throughout the Transportation Element. These can be found in Attachment 3. Below is a summary of some of the significant changes related to City transportation policies.

Complete Streets versus Vision Zero

Coastal Commission staff proposed a new subpolicy TE 1.1 (Complete Streets) to guide the design of new and reconstructed, retrofitted, repaved, rehabilitated, or changed streets.¹ This proposed policy could have impacts on Public Works' implementation of the annual paving project within the City with potential significant financial costs to the City. Additionally, City Council adopted Resolution No. 24-07 on February 20, 2024, supporting Vision Zero Efforts to eliminate fatal and severe transportation related collisions. The resolution endorses comprehensive holistic Vision Zero principles as a means to achieve this goal and directs staff to incorporate Vision Zero goals as a guiding principle for transportation planning, design of streets and sidewalks, and maintenance of public rights of way. Public Works would support an alternative subpolicy TE 1.1 to reflect the City's commitment to Vision Zero. Such an alternative subpolicy could read:

¹ Note that the General Plan already has multi-modal policies, such as subpolicy TE 1.3 (Improved Connectivity in Street, Pedestrian, and Bikeway Systems) and TE 1.4 (Multi-Use Street System) and the City has an adopted Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.

TE 1.1 Vision Zero. [GP/CP] Streets shall be planned and designed to prioritize the elimination of traffic-related fatalities and serious injuries consistent with the City's adopted Vision Zero approach. Roadway safety improvements shall be implemented based on data-driven analysis, risk, project scope, and feasibility, and shall be incorporated primarily through new construction, reconstruction, or projects that modify roadway geometry, operations, or circulation. Routine maintenance, repaving, and rehabilitation projects within the existing right-of-way shall focus on preserving infrastructure and may incorporate safety enhancements where feasible and consistent with City Council-adopted policy.

Removal of Capital Projects

The General Plan currently includes Policy TE 5 (Planned Street and Road Improvements). Policy TE 5 was included in the General Plan to serve as mitigation to impacts on intersection levels of service due to the growth allowed for in the General Plan. Over time, several of the projects in Policy TE 5 have been completed, such as subpolicy TE 5.2 (Replacement of the Cathedral Oaks/Hollister Interchange); some are underway, such as subpolicy TE 5.4 (Hollister Avenue (Old Town) Redesign Improvements); while others are potential future capital projects, such as subpolicy TE 5.5 (New US-101 Freeway Crossings).

Coastal Commission staff recommended removal of all capital projects identified in Policy TE 5 from the CLUP and where a project is in the Coastal Zone, to delete the subpolicy altogether. The three subpolicies proposed for deletion are: TE 5.2 (Replacement of the Cathedral Oaks/Hollister Interchange), which is already complete; TE 5.3 (Ekwill-Fowler-South Kellogg Improvements), portions of which are currently under construction; and TE 5.7 (Connection of Phelps Road). Coastal Commission staff suggested elimination of all TE 5 policies that identify major future transportation projects to avoid, from their perspective, pre-authorization of projects that have not been evaluated for their potential to impact coastal resources.

Removal of these policies could impact the analysis in the Environmental Impact Report for the City's General Plan. Additionally, the City would need to identify new General Plan policies to justify the outstanding portions of TE 5.3 and the Phelps Road connection when doing the annual General Plan conformity findings required under Government Code Section 65401 for the annual adoption of the City's Capital Improvement Program list of projects.

Public Coastal Access Parking

As summarized in Workshop 2, the City's coastal access policies can be found in the General Plan Open Space Element. Citations related to protections for public access under the Coastal Act (Sections 30210-30214) are also included in the Workshop 2 staff report. Coastal Commission staff proposed many edits related to coastal access within the Open Space Element. However, Coastal Commission staff also proposed edits

related to public access within the Transportation Element in addition to the Open Space Element revisions.

Coastal Commission staff proposed a new subpolicy, TE 9.8 (Public Coastal Access Parking Mitigation), that would only allow restrictions on or elimination of existing on-street public parking for coastal access if mitigation is provided or it is demonstrated that such restrictions or elimination will not adversely impact public coastal access. This could limit or complicate the City's efforts to regulate parking along Phelps Road, Marymount Way, and Whittier Drive during large Isla Vista events like Deltopia and Halloween. Additionally, in some locations, vehicles currently park on unimproved dirt shoulders without curb and gutter, within drainage paths, or adjacent to environmentally sensitive habitat areas. These conditions contribute to erosion, runoff, and resource impacts. Requiring mitigation for removal of such parking to address runoff, erosion, habitat protection, or safety concerns could create an unreasonable and costly burden for the City's Public Works Department.

At this point, it is unclear whether parking restrictions on these roads would adversely impact public coastal access and, if so, what mitigation would need to be provided by the City.

Coastal Commission staff also proposed revisions to subpolicy TE 9.3 (Parking in Residential Neighborhoods) to state that new development and/or expansion of an existing use in residential areas shall avoid displacement of public parking spaces that are accommodating parking for public access and recreation. Currently, subpolicy TE 9.3 states that on-site parking shall be provided to "minimize" parking in public rights-of way. A cross-reference to the requirements in subpolicy TE 9.8 is also proposed in subpolicy TE 9.3. At this time, it is unclear what on-street parking in the Ellwood neighborhood would be considered as accommodating parking for public access and recreation. Consequently, it is unclear what this proposed subpolicy revision would mean for the permitting of accessory dwelling units (where no parking is required) and for certain housing projects availing themselves of parking reductions under State law. Note that a similar edit is proposed to OS 3.3 (Coastal Access Parking) to prohibit the displacement of street parking in residential areas unless free replacement parking is provided. Adding similar, but not identical, requirements in two places could also lead to confusion and differing interpretations of policies appearing to serve the same intent (for instance subpolicy OS 3.3(b) would protect "coastal recreation users" parking while subpolicy TE 9.8 would protect "coastal access" parking).

Mandates Outside City Authority

The City includes transportation policies to advocate for certain outcomes outside the City's direct control and to coordinate with outside agencies on issues within those agencies' control. Examples of these types of policies are in subpolicy TE 3.2 (Freeways) and in Policies TE 7 (Public Transit (Bus Transportation)) and TE 15 (Regional Transportation).

Coastal Commission staff proposed new language related to transportation planning and projects that the City does not have direct approval authority over. Within subpolicy TE 3.2, Coastal Commission staff recommended two new subpolicy requirements as subpolicies TE 3.2(h) and TE 3.2(i). These new subpolicies include mandates for new projects on US-101 and State Route (SR)-217. However, as noted in the introduction to subpolicy TE 3.2, “The rights-of-way for these routes are controlled and managed by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans).” As a result, the City does not have the authority to mandate certain requirements for projects located on US-101 and SR-217. Without additional context, the proposed policy additions may inadvertently suggest a level of City control over these projects that does not exist. It should be noted that subpolicy TE 3.2 already has other City-mandate language related to US-101 and SR-217 (such as in subpolicy TE 3.2(b), (c), and (g)) but Coastal Commission staff’s proposed revisions add additional misleading policy language to the Transportation Element. Because these proposed subpolicies regulate infrastructure and development beyond the City’s jurisdiction, lack an enforceable implementation mechanism, and rely on decisions made by other agencies, their inclusion in the LCP could create further confusion and unrealistic compliance expectations without improving coastal access, pedestrian connectivity, or noise mitigation outcomes.

Coastal Commission staff proposed a new subpolicy TE 3.1x (Advance Planning for Transportation Infrastructure) that similarly presumes a level of control or authority of projects that the City does not have. Within this proposed subpolicy, the City would mandate itself to work with Caltrans and other transportation asset owners and managers to conduct advance planning for segments of transportation infrastructure that are vulnerable or that are expected to become vulnerable to coastal hazards. Such a subpolicy puts the City in a difficult position as the City cannot control such planning processes yet mandates that such processes occur. The proposed subpolicy also assumes Caltrans would allow the collaboration proposed for in the subpolicy.

Similar issues are illustrated in Coastal Commission staff proposed new subpolicies TE 15.X (Environmental Justice Planning) and TE 15.X (Environmental Justice Impacts) that commit the City to certain processes related to environmental justice for projects the City does not control.

Question 2: Do you support removal of capital projects from the CLUP when considering the issues this may create, including General Plan conformity determinations ?

Question 3: Do you support the Complete Streets subpolicy proposed by Coastal Commission staff or would you prefer to incorporate the City’s existing adopted Vision Zero approach?

Question 4: Do you support more stringent requirements regarding restrictions on, or elimination of, existing on-street public parking for coastal access/recreation?

Question 5: Are you comfortable including mandates for City involvement in projects which the City does not have direct authority over?

Question 6: Is there other feedback for City staff to consider moving forward regarding transportation?

Water Quality

Within Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act, water quality is ostensibly regulated under Coastal Act Sections 30230-30236. These sections of the Coastal Act focus on the marine environment. For terrestrial land use, the most relevant provision is Section 30231, which focuses on water quality impacts to the marine environment. Section 30231 states:

The biological productivity and the quality of coastal waters, streams, wetlands, estuaries, and lakes appropriate to maintain optimum populations of marine organisms and for the protection of human health shall be maintained and, where feasible, restored through, among other means, minimizing adverse effects of waste water discharges and entrainment, controlling runoff, preventing depletion of ground water supplies and substantial interference with surface waterflow, encouraging waste water reclamation, maintaining natural vegetation buffer areas that protect riparian habitats, and minimizing alteration of natural streams.

Section 30412(b) of the Coastal Act clarifies roles and responsibilities for overseeing water quality management in California:

The State Water Resources Control Board and the California regional water quality control boards are the state agencies with primary responsibility for the coordination and control of water quality...The commission shall assure that proposed development and local coastal programs shall not frustrate this section. The commission shall not, except as provided in subdivision (c), modify, adopt conditions, or take any action in conflict with any determination by the State Water Resources Control Board or any California regional water quality control board in matters relating to water quality...

The City currently maintains water quality policy provisions in Conservation Element Policy CE 10 (Watershed Management and Water Quality). Coastal Commission staff suggested extensive edits to Policy CE 10. These can be found in Attachment 4. Below is a discussion of two of the most significant changes.

Limitations on Construction Activities

Coastal Commission staff proposed a new subpolicy CE X.x (Avoid Land Disturbance Activities During the Rainy Season), which takes some language from subpolicies CE 1.9(i) and (j), but with substantial changes. The proposed revisions would create new limitations on the timing of certain construction activities (grading, earth-moving, and vegetation clearance) to address water quality concerns. Currently, the City allows these activities year-round, with certain specific limitations and additional requirements for work adjacent to ESHA. The State Water Resources Control Board also allows construction year around subject to certain requirements. Under Coastal Commission staff-proposed

revisions, the City would prohibit any grading, earthmoving, and vegetation clearance during the rainy season, which is suggested to span from November 1 to April 30. Limited exceptions to the prohibition would include: (1) if the City granted an extension for a specific length of time, based on an inspection of the project site, and a determination that conditions at the site are suitable for continued work with implementation of appropriate erosion and sediment control measures that will be maintained during the activity; or (2) if the City allows for necessary land disturbance activities under emergency conditions to remediate hazardous flooding or geologic conditions that endanger public health and safety.

In short, based on this proposed requirement and limited exceptions, new construction projects could not begin from November 1 to April 30, except under emergency conditions. This restriction would limit the commencement of grading, earth-moving, and vegetation clearance to six months of the year, between May 1 and October 31. Note that a separate Coastal Commission staff-proposed new subpolicy CE 1.9(e) in the Conservation Element (provided to Planning Commission at Workshop 1) states that “[t]he timing of grading and construction activities shall avoid potential disruption of wildlife during critical time periods such as nesting or breeding seasons.” Nesting and breeding often occur from February to August.

Stormwater Requirements

Several subpolicies within Policy CE 10 include requirements and expectations for how new development will address and minimize impacts associated with stormwater runoff from the site of the development. Currently, the City complies with requirements set out for the City by the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Coastal Commission staff proposed additions within Policy CE 10 create a separate, overlapping yet more onerous set of requirements within the City’s Coastal Zone that is not needed for the City to meet its stormwater regulatory obligations.

Currently, if a development creates or replaces 2,500 square feet or more of impervious surface, then Central Coast Post-Construction Requirements (PCR) and Phase II Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Program Requirements apply consistent with State law. The PCR requirements include four tiers based on the amount of new or replaced impervious surface. The second highest tier, Tier 3, applies to projects that create or replace 15,000 square feet or more impervious surface area. The highest tier, Tier 4, applies to projects that create or replace 22,500 square feet or more impervious surface area. Within City Hall, Public Works staff implement these requirements. Note that the MS4 requirements are currently being updated by the RWQCB, which oversees requirements for stormwater management in the City. The RWQCB will also be revising and updating the PCR during the 2026 calendar year. The details about the PCR tiers and requirements are not currently in Policy CE 10.

Coastal Commission staff proposed a new subpolicy CE 10.X (Additional Requirements for Developments of Water Quality Concern) and a list of what are considered “Developments of Water Quality Concern.” Proposed subpolicy CE 10.X would require these developments to:

- Conduct a polluted runoff and hydrologic site characterization by a qualified licensed professional, early in the development planning and design stage, and document the expected effectiveness of the proposed best management practices (BMPs). (subpolicy CE 10.x(a)) Note that the purpose of the polluted runoff and hydrologic site characterization is unclear, as the bulk of the proposed subpolicy includes objective standards that need to be met.
- Size low impact development (LID), Runoff Control, and Treatment Control BMPs to infiltrate, retain, or treat, at a minimum, the runoff volume generated by the 95th percentile 24-hour rainfall event for volume-based BMPs, or two times the 95th percentile 1-hour rainfall intensity for flow-based BMPs. The 95th percentile rainfall event shall be determined using local rainfall data. (subpolicy CE 10.x(b))
- Use an LID approach that gives priority to preventive site design strategies to minimize post-development changes in the site's stormwater flow regime, supplemented by structural BMPs to retain on-site (by means of infiltration, evapotranspiration, or harvesting for later irrigation use), at a minimum, the runoff volume generated by the 95th percentile 24-hour rainfall event, to the extent appropriate and feasible. (subpolicy CE 10.x(c))
- Conduct an alternatives analysis to demonstrate that there are no appropriate and feasible alternative project designs that would substantially improve runoff retention, if a proposed development will not retain on-site the runoff volume generated by the 95th percentile 24-hour rainfall event using an LID approach. (subpolicy CE 10.x(d))
- Use a Treatment Control BMP (or suite of BMPs) to remove pollutants of concern from any portion of the runoff volumes generated by the 95th percentile 24-hour rainfall event that will not be retained on-site, or if additional pollutant removal is necessary to protect coastal waters. (subpolicy CE 10.x(e))
- Use structural Runoff Control BMPs to minimize adverse post-development changes in the runoff flow regime for projects that will add more than 15,000 square feet of impervious surface area and for any portion of the runoff volume that will not be retained onsite by the 95th percentile 24-hour rainfall event. (subpolicy CE 10.x(f))

In total, the standards provided above differ from and potentially conflict with the City's existing PCRs. The requirements of subpolicy CE 10.x(f) are similar to existing requirements for Tier 3 projects. However, when combined with subpolicies CE 10.x(c), (d), and (e), this proposed policy would create competing standards between the LCP requirements and the existing City PCRs. These additional requirements would create a more subjective and complicated process for stormwater management analysis and requirements, both for applicants and for the City. Finally, the alternatives analysis requirements in proposed subpolicy CE 10.x(d) are not clearly defined and could be a mechanism to significantly reduce the size of proposed development in a subjective manner. Layering additional, subjective requirements on top of established regulatory programs could create inconsistency, confusion, and inefficiency without a corresponding water quality benefit.

Coastal Commission staff also proposed a threshold for the requirements of subpolicy CE 10.X as development that creates and/or replaces a cumulative site total of 10,000 square feet or more of impervious surface area. Note that this trigger is significantly lower than the current trigger to Tier 4 requirements under the City's existing PCRs. Beyond a square footage impervious surface threshold, Coastal Commission staff also proposed that the following categories be considered "Development of Water Quality Concern" and thus trigger the application of the requirements of subpolicy CE 10.X:

1. Residential development that creates and/or replaces five or more dwelling units.
2. Hillside development on a slope greater than 15 percent on a site with erodible soils.
3. 75 percent or more of the site's surface area will be impervious surfaces.
4. A parking lot, street, road, or highway facility that creates and/or replaces a cumulative site total of 5,000 square feet or more of impervious surface area.
5. A vehicle service facility, including a retail gasoline outlet, commercial car wash, or vehicle repair facility.
6. Commercial or industrial development with a potential for generating a high pollutant load that may potentially enter coastal waters or the storm drain system.
7. Any project developed on land where the soil has been contaminated by a previous land use, and where the contaminated soil has the potential to be eroded or to release the contaminants into runoff.
8. Developments that create and/or replace a cumulative site total of 2,500 square feet or more of impervious surface area, if the development is located within 100 feet of coastal waters (including the ocean, estuaries, wetlands, lagoons, and streams) or discharges directly to coastal waters (i.e., does not discharge to a public storm drain system).
9. Any other development determined by the City to be a Development of Water Quality Concern.

Note that the above includes certain housing projects, in addition to a variety of other projects, that currently do not require heightened stormwater management requirements under the City's existing PCRs. Several of these categories create issues for the City.

Under Category 1, the five-unit residential trigger may incentivize fewer but larger residential units in order to avoid more stringent stormwater control requirements. The justification for the five-unit threshold is unclear. Note that without this trigger, residential development would still be considered under the 10,000-square foot standard discussed above.

Categories 3 and 4 create significant burdens on Public Works road maintenance efforts. The proposed triggers, particularly the inclusion of streets, roads, and highways creating or replacing as little as 5,000 square feet of impervious surface, would capture most City paving projects. Public Works maintenance and rehabilitation projects occur entirely within existing, fully built-out rights-of-way that are already impervious and constrained by utilities, drainage infrastructure, access requirements, private property, and safety standards. There is no physical footprint or feasible mechanism within these corridors to install infiltration-based LID features, retention facilities, or treatment BMPs without

acquiring additional property or fundamentally reconstructing the roadway, which is neither practical nor intended for maintenance work.

Application of subpolicy CE 10.X to maintenance projects would require the City to retain additional consultants to prepare polluted runoff and hydrologic site characterizations, alternatives analyses, and stormwater modeling solely to repave or rehabilitate existing streets. This would introduce unnecessary bureaucracy, increase costs, extend project schedules, and significantly reduce the effectiveness of the City's pavement preservation and infrastructure maintenance programs. This subpolicy would materially hinder the City's ability to perform routine maintenance, defer needed repairs, increase long-term lifecycle costs, and negatively affect roadway conditions and public safety.

Under Category 9, Coastal Commission staff also proposed as a "Development of Water Quality Concern" anything determined to be such "by the City." This additional catch-all category creates a subjective and unclear trigger for additional stormwater management requirements. Because stormwater management requirements can impact project design, this determination would need to be made by City staff at or prior to a development application. The same issue can occur with Category 6. It is unclear how and when the determination of Category 6 applicability would take place and what would guide that consideration.

Question 7: Should the City effectively prohibit new construction activities (grading, earth-moving, and vegetation removal) during the winter half of each year?

Question 8: Are you comfortable removing a duplicative separate, more stringent stormwater management requirement scheme, that differs from the requirements overseen by the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board?

Question 9: Is there other feedback for City staff to consider moving forward regarding the marine environment/water quality?

Additional Feedback

At the conclusion of the workshop, City staff will also provide the public and Planning Commission with an opportunity to discuss any additional questions and/or comments regarding any of the material from the three workshops.

Question 10: Do you have any additional questions or comments for City staff regarding Coastal Commission staff proposed edits to City policy?

NEXT STEPS:

After receiving feedback from the Planning Commission and public on all suggested policy revisions, staff will address next steps in consultation with Coastal Commission staff.

At a later date, the City will provide a public draft of the LCP for review and consideration by the Planning Commission and recommendation to the City Council for adoption and submittal to the Coastal Commission for certification.

LEGAL REVIEW BY: Winnie Cai, Assistant City Attorney

APPROVED BY: Peter Imhof, Director of Planning and Environmental Review

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Public Facilities Policies with Coastal Commission Staff Proposed Revisions in Underline and Strikethrough
2. Water Conservation Policies with Coastal Commission Staff Proposed Revisions in Underline and Strikethrough
3. Transportation Policies with Coastal Commission Staff Proposed Revisions in Underline and Strikethrough
4. Water Quality Policies with Coastal Commission Staff Proposed Revisions in Underline and Strikethrough
5. Staff Presentation