

Community Infrastructure and Services Element Items – Board Modifications (per Straw Votes), Planning Commission, Proposed Changes based on Public Comment, and Staff Recommendations

Straw Vote	Board Modifications/Planning Commission Draft	Proposed Changes Based on Public Comment	Staff Recommendation & Notes
R	<p>IS-G1. Adequate Infrastructure and Services. Well maintained public infrastructure and services supporting existing development with an ability to expand to satisfy the needs of new development.</p>	<p>Option 1: Adequate Infrastructure and Services. Well maintained public infrastructure and services supporting existing and future development. with an ability to expand to satisfy the needs of new development. <i>Discussion:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Wanted to see differentiation between existing development and future development and allowance for increasing capacity.</i> • <i>Avoid “choke points” that limit future development, but don’t build whole systems “to nowhere”.</i> • <i>Simplification of language and consideration of existing and future development</i> </p>	<p>BOS/10-15-12: retain Support ad hoc group recommendations Proposed edit simplifies goal and maintains intent.</p>
R	<p>IS-G2. Sustainable Funding. Adequate and sustainable revenue sources for capital improvements and maintenance of infrastructure and services.</p>	<p>Option 1: Existing language. <i>Discussion: Work on Policy and Implementation language to mitigate impact fees</i> *Option 2: Sustainable Funding. The County shall seek adequate and sustainable revenue sources <u>excluding impact fees for</u> capital improvements and maintenance of infrastructure and services. The County may only consider impact fees for roads after determining if it is viable. <i>Discussion: Address concern about assessing impact fees – need better definition. Support for traffic fees proportional to impact. Concern about County adhering to proportional impact fee guidance and ‘big pot’ that fees go into w/o clarity about where it is spent... huge unmet maintenance need that can’t be met by new development. Addressed in other Elements. Need to charge any project adding to traffic issues, not just large developments</i></p>	<p>BOS/10-15-12: retain Support Board of Supervisors straw vote May not be appropriate to limit the range of appropriate future revenue options through goal setting. Various types of fee are in place now, including fire impact fees recently adopted by Board of Supervisors. If strict limitations are desired by the Board of Supervisors, policy setting may be the most appropriate direction.</p>
R	<p>IS-G3. Interagency Coordination. Coordinated planning, prioritization, funding, and implementation of infrastructure and public service projects across jurisdictional boundaries.</p>	<p>The Ad Hoc Working Group has reviewed this policy and suggested no changes</p>	<p>BOS/10-15-12: retain Support Board of Supervisors straw vote</p>
M/D	<p>IS-P1. G-P15. Water Service Provider Coordination. Coordinate with water service providers <u>and work cooperatively where appropriate to identify infrastructure and public service needs, help to secure funding to implement essential infrastructure and service projects on water supply and demand in their respective areas, and participate in the five-year updates of urban water management plans long-range planning efforts consistent with this Plan.</u></p>	<p>Option 1: IS-P1. Coordination with Service Providers. The County shall work cooperatively with cities and service providers to identify needs, secure funding, and implement infrastructure and public service projects consistent with this Plan <u>and capital improvement plans.</u> <i>Discussion: capital improvement plans need to be addressed-they are necessary.</i></p>	<p>Modify G-P15. Water Service Provider Coordination Support Board of Supervisors straw vote to edit policy and move to Governance; however, retaining within Community Infrastructure and Services may be appropriate and consistent with this Elements objectives. Capital improvement planning is supported in policy IS-P19, Water and Wastewater System Capital Improvement Programs, and IS-IM1, Coordination with Service Providers, as well as other policies and implementation measures. Capital improvement planning is important for the successful implementation of the General Plan and local agency capital planning and programming should occur pursuant to Government Code 65403 and be consistent with the General Plan.</p>
D	<p>IS-P2. Prioritization. The County shall give highest priority to infrastructure and services necessary to protect public health and safety. Infrastructure projects that support regional housing goals, provide for economic growth, and further conservation and open space goals shall also receive high priority. Transparent and open public processes shall be used to prioritize projects based on funding guidelines and objective ranking criteria.</p>	<p>Option 1: IS-P2. Prioritization. The County shall give highest priority to infrastructure and services necessary to protect public health and safety. Infrastructure projects that support regional housing goals, <u>meet market demands</u> and provide for economic growth, and further conservation and open space goals shall also receive high priority. Transparent and open public processes shall be used to prioritize projects based on funding guidelines and objective ranking criteria. Option 2: IS-P2. Prioritization. The County shall give highest priority to infrastructure and services necessary to protect public health and safety. Infrastructure projects that support regional housing goals, provide for economic growth, and further conservation and open space goals shall also receive high priority. Transparent and open public processes shall be used to prioritize projects based on funding guidelines and objective ranking criteria.</p>	<p>BOS/10-15-12: delete Support Board of Supervisors straw vote After further review, staff feels that is not clear where and how this policy will be applied.</p>
R	<p>IS-P3. Public infrastructure and Services Standards. Use objective public infrastructure and service standards to:</p>	<p>Option 1: Existing option <i>Discussion: Some areas need benchmarks, this language doesn't mean they are mandatory. Discussion about requiring and reporting a lack of service for rural and remote areas. Sometimes minimum level of service in unachievable: consider if CWTP could meet this need.</i></p>	<p>BOS/10-15-12: retain Support Board of Supervisors straw vote</p>

Community Infrastructure and Services Element Items – Board Modifications (per Straw Votes), Planning Commission, Proposed Changes based on Public Comment, and Staff Recommendations

Straw Vote	Board Modifications/Planning Commission Draft	Proposed Changes Based on Public Comment	Staff Recommendation & Notes
	<p>A. Assess service conditions;</p> <p>B. Establish minimum levels of service benchmarks;</p> <p>C. Specify infrastructure and service needs for new development;</p> <p>D. Identify deficiencies and rank priorities; and</p> <p>Set goals for levels of service for funding purposes.</p>	<p>Option 2: Public infrastructure and Services Standards. Use objective public infrastructure and service standards to:</p> <p>A. Assess service conditions;</p> <p>B. Establish minimum levels of service benchmarks;</p> <p>C. Specify infrastructure and service needs for new development;</p> <p>D. Identify deficiencies and rank priorities; and</p> <p>E. Set goals for levels of service for funding purposes.</p> <p><i>Discussion: Concern is about staff interpretation of meaning, e.g. minimum levels of service, concern that if it doesn't meet that, a house cannot be built. Lack of remedies in variance process... use of minimum standards has been applied as an absolute. Striking A-C: all three would negatively affect rural areas.</i></p> <p><i>ALSO: Consider potential new IM: development of a 'disclosure form' upon purchase of rural or remote properties w/limited or no service ensuring buyer agrees to that lack of services.</i></p>	<p>The adoption of clear and objective standards would limit the potential for staff interpretation. The standards of other local agencies would be utilized by the County.</p>
<p>M</p>	<p>IS-P4. Requirements for Discretionary Development. The adequacy of public infrastructure and services for discretionary development <u>greater than a single family residence and/or second unit</u> shall be assessed relative to service standards adopted by the Board of Supervisors, local service providers, and state and federal agencies. <u>Such</u> discretionary development may be approved if it can be found that:</p> <p>A. Existing services are adequate; or</p> <p>B. Adequacy will be attained concurrent with project implementation through project conditions; or</p> <p>C. Adequacy will be obtained over a finite time period through the implementation of a defined capital improvement or service development plan; or</p> <p>Evidence in the record supports a finding that the discretionary development cannot be feasibly provided with adequate infrastructure and services and project approval will not adversely impact health, welfare, and safety or plans to provide infrastructure or services to the community.</p>	<p>Option 1: Retain as written</p> <p>Option 2: The adequacy of public infrastructure and services for discretionary development <u>greater than a single family residence and/or secondary residential unit or minor subdivision</u>, shall be assessed relative to service standards adopted by the Board of Supervisors, local service providers, and state and federal agencies. <u>Such</u> discretionary development may be approved if it can be found that:</p> <p>A. Existing services are adequate; or</p> <p>B. Adequacy will be attained concurrent with project implementation through project conditions; or</p> <p>C. Adequacy will be obtained over a finite time period through the implementation of a defined capital improvement or service development plan; or</p> <p>D. Evidence in the record supports a finding that the discretionary development cannot be feasibly provided with adequate infrastructure and services and project approval will not adversely impact health, welfare, and safety or plans to provide infrastructure or services to the community.</p> <p><i>Discussion: 'Services' not clearly able to be identified or assessed.</i></p>	<p>BOS/10-15-12: modify</p> <p>Support Board of Supervisors straw vote</p> <p>Clear and objective standards for services would be adopted as an ordinance.</p>
<p>M</p>	<p>IS-P5. Fiscal Impact Assessment. The economic <u>fiscal</u> impacts of discretionary development (i.e. projects that require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report that may have significant impacts on existing and planned public infrastructure and services) shall be considered during the project review process. Significant adverse affects shall be mitigated to the extent feasible through changes in project design, timing, or financial exactions in proportion to project impacts.</p>	<p>Option 1: Retain as written</p> <p>Option 2: The economic <u>fiscal</u> impacts, <u>including the increase in tax base</u>, of discretionary development <u>requiring an EIR</u> on existing and planned public infrastructure and services shall be considered during the project review process. Significant adverse affects shall be mitigated to the extent feasible through changes in project design, timing, or financial exactions in proportion to project impacts.</p>	<p>BOS/10-15-12: modify</p> <p>Support Board of Supervisors straw vote</p> <p>The increase in the tax base would be included in any analysis of fiscal impacts. The California Planning Roundtable defines a fiscal impact report as a projection of the public costs and revenues that will result from a proposed program or development. In addition, removing the requirement that fiscal impacts be mitigated eliminates the usefulness of a fiscal impact analysis.</p>

Community Infrastructure and Services Element Items – Board Modifications (per Straw Votes), Planning Commission, Proposed Changes based on Public Comment, and Staff Recommendations

Straw Vote	Board Modifications/Planning Commission Draft	Proposed Changes Based on Public Comment	Staff Recommendation & Notes
R	<p>IS-P6. Fair Share Cost Allocation. New development shall pay the proportional cost of providing infrastructure and services needed to serve the development.</p>	<p>Option 1: New development shall pay the proportional cost of providing <u>transportation and drainage</u> infrastructure and services needed to serve the development. Option 2: Delete policy. <i>Discussion: Option 2 would implement impact fees for transportation and drainage where option 1 does not.</i></p>	<p>BOS/10-15-12: retain Support Board of Supervisors straw vote Although impacts to transportation and drainage infrastructure are important, these are not the only facilities and services that could be affected by new development. Impacts to other facilities and services should be evaluated and addressed as well.</p>
M	<p>IS-P7. Mitigation of Cross-jurisdictional Impacts. The County shall work with the cities to ensure fiscal impacts associated with new development are mutually mitigated for each affected jurisdiction, across jurisdictional boundaries.</p>	<p>Option 1: Retain as written Option 2: Delete policy.</p>	<p>BOS/10-15-12: modify Support Board of Supervisors straw vote The potential impacts of development can cross jurisdictional boundaries. It is important to coordinate with other jurisdictions to plan for and address such impacts</p>
R	<p>IS-P8. Infrastructure and Services Capacity. In coordination with service providers, the County shall periodically monitor the capacities of infrastructure and services in relation to existing and planned demand.</p>	<p>The Ad Hoc Working Group has reviewed this policy and suggested no changes</p>	<p>BOS/10-15-12: retain Support Board of Supervisors straw vote</p>
R	<p>IS-P9. Capacity of Facilities and Land Use Decisions. The County shall evaluate the capacity and sizing of road and drainage facilities and coordinate with water and wastewater service providers to determine adequacy for proposed land uses and discretionary development. The density, timing, and design of new development shall be consistent with service capacity.</p>	<p>Option 1: The County shall evaluate the capacity and sizing of road and drainage facilities and coordinate with water and wastewater service providers to determine adequacy for proposed land uses <u>changes</u> and discretionary development. The density, timing, and design of new development shall be consistent with service capacity. Option 2: IS-P9. Capacity of Facilities and Land Use Designation Decisions. The County shall evaluate the capacity and sizing of road and drainage facilities and coordinate with water and wastewater service providers to determine adequacy for proposed land use designation changes proposed under this plan. uses and discretionary development. The density, timing, and design of new development shall be consistent with service capacity. <u>A general plan amendment would trigger a county-led review of capacity.</u> <i>Discussion: With the exception of wastewater, water and drainage--the transportation portion is covered in the circulation element if the recommended transportation plan is implemented. We need criteria for assessing capacity of redevelopment.</i></p>	<p>BOS/10-15-12: retain Support Board of Supervisors straw vote The monitoring of infrastructure capacity would be ongoing and should include all facilities that are essential to the build out of planned land uses.</p>
R	<p>IS-P10. Infrastructure and Service Inadequacies. The County shall coordinate with service providers to proactively identify areas of the County where existing infrastructure and service inadequacies limit development rights otherwise permitted in this Plan.</p>	<p>Option 1: The County shall coordinate with service providers to proactively identify areas of the County where existing infrastructure and service inadequacies limit development rights otherwise permitted in this Plan. Option 2: Delete policy. <i>Discussion: Concern that it is redundant and moratorium areas will be picked due to this policy.</i></p>	<p>BOS/10-15-12: retain Support Board of Supervisors straw vote; however would support Option 1. Ongoing coordination with water and wastewater service providers to monitor infrastructure capacity would be ongoing and should include all facilities that are essential to the build out of planned land uses.</p>
D	<p>IS-P11. Consolidation and Cost Sharing. Support consolidations or cost sharing to reduce service delivery costs, including costs related to administration, staff training, insurance, purchasing, and vehicle maintenance.</p>	<p>Option 1: Delete policy. <i>Discussion: Deferred to the Board's prior to desire to delete this policy</i></p>	<p>BOS/10-15-12: Eliminate [There is no related policy in Growth Planning or Governance] Support Board of Supervisors straw vote</p>
R	<p>IS-P12. State and Federal Advocacy. Coordinate with local service provider's efforts to influence legislation</p>	<p>The Ad Hoc Working Group has reviewed this policy and suggested no changes</p>	<p>BOS/10-15-12: retain</p>

Community Infrastructure and Services Element Items – Board Modifications (per Straw Votes), Planning Commission, Proposed Changes based on Public Comment, and Staff Recommendations

Straw Vote	Board Modifications/Planning Commission Draft	Proposed Changes Based on Public Comment	Staff Recommendation & Notes
	or regulations to achieve outcomes consistent with the goals and policies of this Plan.		Support Board of Supervisors straw vote
R	IS-P13. District Boundaries, Spheres of Influence, and Community Plans. District boundaries, spheres of influence, municipal service reviews, and community plans shall be mutually compatible and support the orderly development and timing of infrastructure and services.	Option 1: Retain as written. Option 2: District boundaries, spheres of influence, municipal service reviews, and community plans shall be mutually compatible and support the orderly development and timing of infrastructure and services.	BOS/10-15-12: retain Support Board of Supervisors straw vote The meaning of the proposed edits to the proposed policy contained in Option 2 is unclear.
R	IS-P14. Changes in District Boundaries. Support the adjustment of service district or city boundaries to eliminate service area gaps, align district boundaries with already served areas, consolidate districts, or improve service delivery, or to address an existing or impending threat to the public health or safety of the residents of the affected territory, consistent with this Plan.	The Ad Hoc Working Group has reviewed this policy and suggested no changes	BOS/10-15-12: retain Support Board of Supervisors straw vote
R	IS-PX. Out of Area Service to Address Threats to Public Health. Encourage the Humboldt LAFCo to amend its policies and procedures to allow local agencies to provide new or extended services outside jurisdictional boundaries and outside spheres of influence to respond to existing or impending threats to the public health or safety, consistent with Government Code 56133, without the requirement to execute an annexation agreement.	The Ad Hoc Working Group has reviewed this policy and suggested no changes	BOS/10-15-12: retain Support Board of Supervisors straw vote
R	IS-P15. Road and Drainage System Funding Sources. The County shall develop funding mechanisms and sources to support the construction and maintenance of road and drainage facilities consistent with the policies and standards of the Circulation and Water Resources elements.	Option 1: Existing Policy Option 2: Delete policy <i>Discussion: Discussion: some felt this could be addressed in Circulation Element and the CWTP and others felt that the new storm water requirements will require the county to find funding sources for drainage.</i> New Policy to link goal to lms	BOS/10-15-12: retain Support Board of Supervisors straw vote The need for new funding mechanisms, especially for the maintenance of existing roads, has been clearly documented and additional funding would be beneficial. There is currently no funding source for drainage maintenance.
M	IS-P16. Drainage and Flood Control. The County shall Develop and maintain a countywide drainage and flood control plan to guide capital improvements and maintenance and serve as a basis for long-term sustainable funding mechanisms.	Option 1: Drainage and Flood Control. The County shall Develop and maintain a countywide drainage and flood control plan. to guide capital improvements and maintenance and serve as a basis for long-term sustainable funding mechanisms. <i>Discussion: Simplification of language. Details are addressed in the IM.</i>	BOS/10-15-12: modify Support Board of Supervisors straw vote It is appropriate to describe the need for a new plan in policy language.
M	IS-P17. Law Enforcement. The County shall continue to monitor law enforcement needs and coverage. New development shall pay its proportionate share of law enforcement costs.	Option 1: Law Enforcement. The County shall continue to monitor law enforcement infrastructure needs, and coverage. New development shall pay its proportionate share of law enforcement costs. <i>Discussion: Impact fees cannot be used for salaries.</i>	BOS/10-15-12: modify Support Board of Supervisors straw vote The policy addresses all law enforcement costs. Impact fees are not the only future funding option to support law enforcement in the unincorporated area. Implementation measures provide additional detail regarding funding options.

Community Infrastructure and Services Element Items – Board Modifications (per Straw Votes), Planning Commission, Proposed Changes based on Public Comment, and Staff Recommendations

Straw Vote	Board Modifications/Planning Commission Draft	Proposed Changes Based on Public Comment	Staff Recommendation & Notes
R	<p>IS-P18. Expanded Fire Protection Services. Encourage the expansion of existing special district boundaries, or the formation of a County Service Area with agreements to fund contract fire services, as a means to provide fire protection services to areas outside of fire district boundaries.</p>	<p>Option 1: Delete this policy. <i>Discussion: County is in assistance role, not lead role. Perhaps LAFCO should be assisting fire districts, not County. General Plan isn't the place to address service areas.</i></p>	<p>BOS/10-15-12: retain Support Board of Supervisors straw vote This policy is consistent with the County's Master Fire Protection Plan. The policy "encourages" the expansion of fire protection service boundaries. The County has recently assisted in the formation of two new fire protection districts that may not have been successful without such assistance.</p>
R	<p>IS-P19. Water and Wastewater System Capital Improvement Programs. Support the efforts of service providers to develop and maintain capital improvement programs for construction of water and wastewater systems.</p>	<p>The Ad Hoc Working Group has reviewed this policy and suggested no changes</p>	<p>BOS/10-15-12: retain Support Board of Supervisors straw vote</p>
R	<p>IS-P20. On-Site Sewage Disposal Requirements. Maintain regulations governing construction and maintenance of on-site sewage disposal systems to protect health and safety and to reflect changes in state law and advances in treatment technologies.</p>	<p>Option 1: On-Site Sewage Disposal Requirements. Maintain regulations governing construction and maintenance of on-site sewage disposal systems to protect health and safety, and to reflect changes in state law and advances in treatment technologies. <u>County shall recognize and allow the use of alternative onsite sewage disposal systems that meet state standards, including new advances in treatment technology.</u> <i>Discussion:</i> • Following state law is assumed; is calling out the need to update regulations a GPU issue or an administrative issue? • Provide more clarity about alternative treatment options. • Many low income projects rejected due to lack of infrastructure.</p> <p>Option 2: On-Site Sewage Disposal Requirements. Maintain regulations governing construction and maintenance of on-site sewage disposal systems to protect health and safety and to reflect changes in state law and advances in treatment technologies. <u>Recognize and allow the use of alternative onsite sewage disposal systems that meet state standards.</u> <i>Discussion: Don't want to see continued contamination of water supply. County policies are not updated to reflect State law (e.g. projects on septic permitted by County in Fairhaven that RWQCB would deny).</i> RESEARCH: Move this policy to a more appropriate Element (perhaps Water Resources)? Discussion: Focus is on public systems. On-site sewage disposal may not be a policy issue since it is not a public infrastructure issue. (However it is regulated by state and county.) NEW POLICY IN GOVERNANCE TO ADDRESS CONSISTENCY BETWEEN LOCAL AND STATE REGULATION? Also: staff interpretation of state law can be a contributor to inconsistency.</p>	<p>BOS/10-15-12: retain Support ad hoc group recommendation Option 2. Policy could be moved to Water Resources.</p>
R	<p>IS-P21. Parks and Recreation Service in Urban Development Areas. Encourage and support special districts to provide neighborhood parks and recreation services within Urban Development Areas.</p>	<p>The Ad Hoc Working Group has reviewed this policy and suggested no changes</p>	<p>BOS/10-15-12: retain Support Board of Supervisors straw vote</p>
D	<p>IS-P22. Park Dedications Held in Perpetuity. Parklands shall be dedicated and held in perpetuity and protected against diversion to both non-recreational purposes and conflicts with adjacent land uses.</p>	<p>Option 1: Delete policy. <i>Discussion: Perpetuity is too long to know what's best for a site in the future.</i> Option 2: Move policy to Open Space Element and consider the language there. Karen Brooks: This implementation measure needs to state, "management and maintenance plans need to be consistent with adjacent land uses."</p>	<p>BOS/10-15-12: eliminate Support Board of Supervisors straw vote</p>
M	<p>IS-P23. Private Recreation Facilities. The development of private sector recreation facilities shall be</p>	<p>Option 1: Delete policy. <i>Discussion: Don't see it as a necessary policy given what is already required.</i></p>	<p>BOS/11-5-12: Unanimous modification</p>

Community Infrastructure and Services Element Items – Board Modifications (per Straw Votes), Planning Commission, Proposed Changes based on Public Comment, and Staff Recommendations

Straw Vote	Board Modifications/Planning Commission Draft	Proposed Changes Based on Public Comment	Staff Recommendation & Notes
	encouraged but shall not be a substitute for public park requirements. Joint public-private development of recreation facilities shall be encouraged.		Support Board of Supervisors straw vote
D	IS-P24. Joint Use Facilities. Encourage the utilization of schools, especially in rural areas, as community centers for activities such as public meetings, continuing education, recreation, and cultural events. Joint public-private development of recreation facilities shall be encouraged.	Option 1: Delete policy. <i>Discussion: Encourage leaves open interpretation. Encourages without funding to support school costs associated with providing facilities. Does not belong in the GP. There are options available to address liability and maintenance costs via agreements. 'Encourage' could mean staff researching options to support more schools' ability to address liability and maintenance issues.</i>	BOS/11-5-12: Delete – unanimous Support Board of Supervisors straw vote
M	IS-P25. Street Lighting. Street lighting shall be required based on the need when necessary to improve public safety and facilitate nighttime travel. Lighting systems shall direct light to prescribed areas at prescribed illumination levels and minimize the trespass of light on neighboring properties and glare to the night sky.	Option 1: Street Lighting. Street lighting shall be required when necessary to improve public safety <u>in urban areas, and facilitate nighttime travel.</u> Lighting systems shall direct light to prescribed areas at prescribed illumination levels and minimize the trespass of light on neighboring properties and glare to the night sky. <i>Discussion: Question about 'when necessary to improve public safety'... need definition of suburban before agreeing to remove that language. Standard and IM provide specificity of stricken language.</i> Option 2: Existing language. Option 3: Street Lighting. Street lighting shall be required when necessary to improve public safety <u>in urban and suburban areas, and in some important rural intersections,</u> and facilitate nighttime travel. Lighting systems shall direct light to prescribed areas at prescribed illumination levels and minimize the trespass of light on neighboring properties and glare to the night sky. <i>Discussion: PC and public support for reducing glare. Many communities have safety concerns about rural intersections, particularly on state highways.</i> Appears the county may not have clear procedures for when/where is lighting required? REQUEST OF STAFF: Development of clear definitions for 'urban, suburban, rural and remote' classifications	BOS/11-5-12: Unanimous modification Support Board of Supervisors straw vote Street lights are not addressed in the Framework General Plan or Community Plans, except for the McKinleyville Community Plan. IS-IM30 provides detail on urban versus rural settings. Proposed policy IS-P25, standard IS-S10, and implementation measure IS-IM30 were intended make sure that street lighting is considered in project review and incorporated where warranted, based on standards that differentiate between urban and rural settings. In addition, where lighting is warranted there should be a funding source, such as a County street lighting district, to operate and maintain such lights.
D	IS-P26. County Facilities. Proposed County capital projects and facilities with land use implications valued in excess of \$100-500,000 shall be analyzed for consistency with this Plan and applicable city general plans.	Option 1: Proposed County capital projects and facilities with land use implications valued in excess of \$500,000 shall be analyzed for consistency with this Plan and applicable city general plans. <i>Discussion: This is consistent with the 1984 Framework Plan.</i>	BOS/11-5-12: 4 to delete, one supervisor is ambivalent Support Board of Supervisors straw vote
M	IS-P27. County Library Facilities and Services. Continue to assess needs of the County's residents and expand library facilities and services as necessary. New development shall pay its proportionate share of library facility costs.	Option 1: County Library Facilities and Services. Continue to assess needs of the County's residents and expand library facilities and services as necessary. New development shall pay its proportionate share of library facility costs. <i>Discussion: Consistent with BOS straw vote.</i>	BOS/11-5-12: 4 keep it in taking out second sentence, 1 against Support Board of Supervisors straw vote
M	IS-P28. Location of School Facilities. Coordinate with school districts when planning new school facilities in proximity to neighborhoods with adequate road, pedestrian, and bicycle circulation and access to public water and sewer services. Locate schools outside of land use hazard areas as defined in the Safety Element of this Plan.	Option 1: <u>The County shall assist school districts to site</u> new school facilities, <u>where feasible,</u> in proximity to neighborhoods with adequate road, pedestrian, and bicycle circulation and, access to public water and sewer services. <u>Schools should be located</u> outside of land use hazard areas as defined in the Safety Element of this Plan. Option 2: Delete policy. <i>Discussion: some support the state law gives power to independently elected school boards to determine siting.</i>	BOS/11-5-12: Unanimous modifications. Clean up grammar as necessary. Support Board of Supervisors straw vote County coordination does not affect the independent authority of school districts.
R	IS-P29. Conversion of School Facilities. Conversion of closed school sites and facilities to other uses shall be consistent compatible with existing or planned land uses of adjacent areas and involve affected residents	Option 1: Delete policy.	BOS/11-5-12: Retain – unanimous Support Board of Supervisors straw vote

Community Infrastructure and Services Element Items – Board Modifications (per Straw Votes), Planning Commission, Proposed Changes based on Public Comment, and Staff Recommendations

Straw Vote	Board Modifications/Planning Commission Draft	Proposed Changes Based on Public Comment	Staff Recommendation & Notes
	in the decision-making process.		The evaluation of land use compatibility and the involvement of the public to essential to land use planning.
R	<p>IS-PX1. Building Permit Referrals. Provide building permit referrals to the appropriate local fire chief for new buildings within the fire related district boundary and/or the identified response area.</p>	<p>Option 1: IS-PX1. Building Permit <u>Notification</u> Referrals. Provide building permit <u>notification</u> referrals to the appropriate local fire chief for new buildings within the fire related district boundary and/or the identified response area. <i>Discussion: some feel that notification seems appropriate but referral for a approval does not.</i></p>	<p>BOS/11-5-12: Retain - unanimous Support Board of Supervisors straw vote</p> <p>The form used by the Building Division is called a "Referral." Agencies that receive referrals are not provided any additional authority by virtue of receiving the referral.</p>
	<p>IS-PX2. Fire Service Impacts from New Development. During review of discretionary permits within fire related district boundaries or identified response areas, utilize recommendations from the appropriate local fire chief as feasible mitigation measures to reduce impacts to emergency response and fire suppression services from new development.</p>	<p>Option 1: Fire Service Impacts from New Development. During review of discretionary permits within fire related district boundaries or identified response areas, utilize recommendations from the appropriate local fire chief as feasible mitigation measures to reduce impacts to emergency response and fire suppression services from new development. Option 2: Fire Service Standards for Mitigation of New Development. The County shall work with Fire Districts when establishing standards and mitigation measures for new development consistent with urban, suburban, rural and remote land uses. <i>Discussion: Individual fire chiefs may not have training in development standards.</i></p>	<p>Support BOS Revision Draft #2 (see below). The Fire Chiefs would accept this version also.</p> <p>The BOS directed staff to prepare two versions of IS-PX2 for consideration. Staff provided these options to the Fire Chief's review prior to transmitting to the Board.</p> <p>Suggested Revision Draft #1 IS-PX2. Fire Service Impacts from New Development. During review of discretionary permits within fire related district boundaries or identified response areas, utilize consider recommendations from the appropriate local fire chief as feasible mitigation measures to reduce impacts to emergency response and fire suppression services from new development.</p> <p>Suggested Revision Draft #2 IS-PX2. Fire Service Impacts from New Development. During review of discretionary permits within fire related district boundaries or identified response areas, utilize recommendations from the appropriate local fire chief as where feasible as mitigation measures to reduce impacts to emergency response and fire suppression services from new development.</p> <p>The Fire Chiefs involved in developing the proposed policy responded to staffs inquiry in the following manner: "The change to "consider recommendations" or "where feasible" most likely means no action will be taken. I think this really waters down what we were trying to accomplish. If we have to take one then revision #2 is better. The Fire Chiefs also described some of the types of mitigations that would be recommended: "adding a hydrant, standpipes, wider road or turn around, additional or larger rural tanks etc."</p>

Community Infrastructure and Services Element Items – Board Modifications (per Straw Votes), Planning Commission, Proposed Changes based on Public Comment, and Staff Recommendations

Straw Vote	Board Modifications/Planning Commission Draft	Proposed Changes Based on Public Comment	Staff Recommendation & Notes
	<p>IS-S1. Adequate Public Infrastructure and Services Ordinance. Adequate public infrastructure and services standards shall be used to determine the level of infrastructure and services necessary for new development. Standards shall be specified by ordinance for County provided services, including roads, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, drainage, law enforcement, on-site wastewater disposal and recreation. Standards for non-County services, including public transportation, water, public wastewater, emergency services and fire, shall be referenced and based on applicable service provider criteria. County standards shall be consistent with Plan policies and, to the extent practical, generally accepted levels of service. Standards for non-County services shall should be consistent with levels of service adopted by local service providers and, to the extent practical, generally accepted levels of service.</p>	<p>Option 1: Retain as written w/removal of reference to ordinance. Option 2: Adequate Public Infrastructure and Services Ordinance. Adequate public infrastructure and services standards shall be used to determine the level of infrastructure and services necessary for new development. Standards shall be specified by ordinance for County provided services, including roads, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, drainage, law enforcement, on-site wastewater disposal and recreation. Standards for non-County services, including public transportation, water, public wastewater, emergency services and fire, shall be referenced and based on applicable service provider criteria. County standards shall be consistent with Plan policies and, to the extent practical, generally accepted levels of service. Standards for non-County services should be consistent with levels of service adopted by local service providers and, to the extent practical, generally accepted levels of service. <i>Discussion: Issue w/County dictating how to address non-County services .Not the appropriate place for this direction. County can't tell itself what to do by ordinance. GP is a policy, not an ordinance, that does not carry penalties. Some feel the Standard should be re-evaluated and considered as or integrated with one or more policies.</i></p>	<p>BOS/11-5-12: 2 yeses, 3 not sure. Support ad hoc group recommendation: Option 1. Non-County service standards would be established by the appropriate service provider.</p>
	<p>IS-S2. Service Inadequacies and Development Limitations. The County shall request that water and wastewater service providers submit formal notice approved by their governing body of any newly identified capacity limitations within Urban Development Areas that have the potential to result in a development moratorium or other limitation of development rights otherwise permitted by this Plan. The County shall take appropriate actions as necessary to reflect new capacity limitations in land use and permitting decisions and communications to the public.</p>	<p>The Ad Hoc Working Group has not reviewed this Policy, Standard, or Implementation Measure</p>	<p>Support Planning Commission Draft Policy</p>
	<p>IS-S3. Infrastructure Project CEQA and NEPA Land Use Consistency Determinations. Policies of this Plan which avoid or mitigate environmental effects shall be considered by CEQA lead agencies and federal agencies conducting NEPA evaluations in the evaluation of the environmental impacts of proposed infrastructure projects. Policy conflicts should be considered potentially significant land use impacts pursuant to California Public Resources Code 21083 and Code of Federal Regulations Title 40, Part 6.</p>	<p>The Ad Hoc Working Group has not reviewed this Policy, Standard, or Implementation Measure</p>	<p>Support Planning Commission Draft Policy</p>
	<p>IS-S4. Subdivisions Outside of Fire District Boundaries. Subdivisions outside of fire district boundaries shall be conditioned to: 1. Annex to or form a fire-related district or a county service area and provide funding to ensure that the district has adequate capacity to provide services, or 2. condition 1 is not feasible, establish an adequate</p>	<p>IS-S4. Subdivisions Outside of Fire District Boundaries. Subdivisions outside of fire district boundaries shall be conditioned to upon one of the following: A1. Annex to or form a fire-related district or a county service area and provide funding to ensure that the district has adequate capacity to provide services, or B2. If condition 1 is not feasible, establishment of an adequate ongoing funding source and execution of a fire protection agreement with an appropriate local fire service provider with LAFCO approval, as appropriate, or C3. Record acknowledgment of no available emergency response and fire suppression services and implement required mitigations.</p>	<p>Support Planning Commission Draft Policy If this standard is modified to remove the requirement to annex or establish an ongoing funding source, if feasible, it would no longer clearly sustain the ongoing delivery of fire protection services.</p>

Community Infrastructure and Services Element Items – Board Modifications (per Straw Votes), Planning Commission, Proposed Changes based on Public Comment, and Staff Recommendations

Straw Vote	Board Modifications/Planning Commission Draft	Proposed Changes Based on Public Comment	Staff Recommendation & Notes
	<p>ongoing funding source and execute a fire protection agreement with an appropriate local fire service provider with LAFCO approval, as appropriate, or</p> <p>3. record acknowledgment of no available emergency response and fire suppression services and implement required mitigations.</p>		
	<p>IS-S5. Other Development Outside of Fire District Boundaries. New industrial, commercial, and residential development, excluding subdivisions pursuant to the Subdivision Map Act, outside of fire district-boundaries shall be responsible prior to permit approval, to obtain from an appropriate local fire service provider written acknowledgement of the available emergency response and fire suppression services and recommended mitigations.</p> <p>If written acknowledgement indicates that no service is available or no acknowledgement is received the following shall apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For building permits a note shall be placed on the permit indicating that no emergency response and fire suppression services are available. • For discretionary permits findings shall be made that no service is available and the project shall be conditioned to record acknowledgment of no available emergency response and fire suppression services. 	<p>The Ad Hoc Working Group has reviewed this policy and suggested no changes</p>	<p>Support Planning Commission Draft Policy</p> <p>Please note: This standard was placed on the Board's key issue identification "short list" as a request by the Humboldt Association of Realtors in June 2012. Due to their participation in the Ad Hoc Working Group, staff is not including this as a "short list" item.</p>
	<p>IS-S6. Water and Wastewater Service Commitment for Proposed Development Projects. Discretionary development served by public water and/or wastewater service shall receive written service commitments from the appropriate district or agency prior to receiving final approval from the County.</p>	<p>The Ad Hoc Working Group has not reviewed this Policy, Standard, or Implementation Measure</p>	<p>Support Planning Commission Draft Policy</p>
	<p>IS-S7. Dedication or In-lieu Fee Requirements. Require all new residential development to offer to dedicate land or pay a parkland dedication in-lieu fee for public parks sufficient to achieve park standards contained in the General Plan.</p>	<p>Option 1: Require all new residential <u>subdivision</u> development to offer to dedicate land or pay a parkland and dedication in-lieu fee for public parks sufficient to achieve park standards contained in the General Plan. Option 2: Delete it. Discussion: some feel that mandating this throughout the county is not appropriate and that this is an urban policy that should be tailored to high growth areas.</p>	<p>Support ad hoc group recommendation: Option 1.</p> <p>This is very similar to existing policy in the MCCP and ECP.</p>
	<p>IS-S8. Parkland Dedication. As new development is approved, ensure that the combined amount of Humboldt County and local park land provided by a special district authorized to provide parks and recreation services meets minimum recreation standards.</p>	<p>Option 1: Existing language, (however if option 1 IS -S7 is chosen, delete is okay). Discussion: Some feel S7 is stronger language and better worded. Option 2: Delete it.</p>	<p>Support ad hoc group recommendation: Option 1.</p>
	<p>IS-S9. Services and Location of Parks. Park sites within Urban Development Areas, except for park sites</p>	<p>Option 1: Delete it Discussion: too specific for plan & doesn't benefit communities obtaining parks; says 'should' and it's guidance, not</p>	<p>Support ad hoc group recommendation: Option 1.</p>

Community Infrastructure and Services Element Items – Board Modifications (per Straw Votes), Planning Commission, Proposed Changes based on Public Comment, and Staff Recommendations

Straw Vote	Board Modifications/Planning Commission Draft	Proposed Changes Based on Public Comment	Staff Recommendation & Notes
	<p>established for that are not dedicated to the protection of open space and wildlife/habitat values, should be provided with adequate water, sewer, law enforcement, and fire protection services and located in predominantly residential areas accessible by foot, bicycle, and automobile. The terrain of park sites within Urban Development Areas should be suitable to accommodate both active and passive recreational activities.</p>	<p>directive; don't have a rec master plan, where these standards would be most appropriate</p>	
	<p>IS-S10. Street Lighting. Where development is required to install streetlights, they shall be designed to block upward transmission of light, avoid light trespass, and achieve design illumination in prescribed areas with limited scatter.</p>	<p>The Ad Hoc Working Group has not reviewed this Policy, Standard, or Implementation Measure</p>	<p>Support Planning Commission Draft Policy</p>
	<p>IS-IM1. Coordination with Service Providers. Coordinate with special districts, cities, LAFCO, and other local service providers by reviewing and commenting on capital improvement plans, proposed spheres of influence, municipal service reviews, annexations, and changes in organization. Enter into formal cooperative relationships when appropriate to plan, fund, and implement infrastructure and service delivery projects.</p>	<p>Option 1: IS-IM1. Coordination with Service Providers. Coordinate <u>as appropriate</u> with special districts, cities, LAFCO, and other local service providers by reviewing and commenting on capital improvement plans, proposed spheres of influence, municipal service reviews, annexations, and changes in organization. Enter into formal cooperative relationships when appropriate to plan, fund, and implement infrastructure and service delivery projects. (Goes with P1 but not S1) <i>Discussion: Not practical to require County staff to review special districts' documents. Small CSDs can need help; this says staff SHALL assist, however. Some are concerned that, even with recommended language, that the local service provider could be overridden by staff with less knowledge about that system.</i></p>	<p>Support ad hoc group recommendation: Option 1. Coordinating and providing comments is consistent with current practices. Comments are made in consideration of the General Plan and do not limit the authority of other local agencies.</p>
	<p>IS-IM2. Adequate Public Infrastructure and Services Standards. Develop and adopt an ordinance establishing adequate public infrastructure and services standards.</p>	<p>Option 1: Retain as written: <i>Discussion: Have a question about if Ordinance is the right language to use.</i> Option 2: Delete it. <i>Discussion: Some feel that if Option2 w/IS-P3 is chosen, it follows that it should be deleted.</i> Associated with P3</p>	<p>Support ad hoc group recommendation: Option 1. If adopted by ordinance, service and facility standards would likely become part of the County's development regulations, similar to the Zoning and Subdivision Regulations.</p>
	<p>IS-IM3. Comprehensive Fiscal Impact Study. Prepare and regularly update a comprehensive fiscal impact study that quantifies the relationship between new development and the need for additional public facilities and services.</p>	<p>The Ad Hoc Working Group has not reviewed this Policy, Standard, or Implementation Measure</p>	<p>Support Planning Commission Draft Policy</p>
	<p>IS- IM4. Impact Fees for New Development: Establish and periodically update a development impact fee program based on a comprehensive development fiscal impact study and other similar studies.</p>	<p>Option 1: Maintain existing language. Option 2: Impact Fees for New Development: <u>The County shall conduct a nexus study to determine if a development impact fee program for roads would raise sufficient funds to impliment capital improvement without discouraging affordable housing.</u> Option 3: Delete It <i>Discussion: Some people wanted to limit impact fees to the possibility of roads only and did not want to agree to any fee prior to review of a nexus study.</i></p>	<p>Support ad hoc group recommendation: Option 1. A development impact fee program based on a comprehensive development fiscal impact study and other similar studies would involve a nexus study. An impact fee cannot be adopted without a nexus study.</p>
	<p>IS-IM5. Fiscal Impact Assessment. Prepare guidelines for the preparation and evaluation of fiscal impact assessments for large scale discretionary projects. Establish threshold criteria to identify applicable large-scale projects.</p>	<p>The Ad Hoc Working Group has not reviewed this Policy, Standard, or Implementation Measure</p>	<p>Support Planning Commission Draft Policy</p>
	<p>IS-IM6. Mello Roos Community Facilities Districts/Special Assessment District Formation</p>	<p>The Ad Hoc Working Group has not reviewed this Policy, Standard, or Implementation Measure</p>	<p>Support Planning Commission Draft Policy</p>

Community Infrastructure and Services Element Items – Board Modifications (per Straw Votes), Planning Commission, Proposed Changes based on Public Comment, and Staff Recommendations

Straw Vote	Board Modifications/Planning Commission Draft	Proposed Changes Based on Public Comment	Staff Recommendation & Notes
	<p>Procedures. Prepare local goals and policies concerning the use of the Mello Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982 (pursuant to California Government Code Sections 55312.7 and 53345.8) and include special assessment district financing program policies, as appropriate.</p>		
	<p>IS-IM7. Community Facilities Districts/Assessment Districts. Facilitate the development of Mello Roos Community Facilities Districts or special assessments districts, as appropriate, in new development areas where current funding will not support adequate infrastructure or service standards.</p>	<p>The Ad Hoc Working Group has not reviewed this Policy, Standard, or Implementation Measure</p>	<p>Support Planning Commission Draft Policy</p>
	<p>IS-IM8. Infrastructure and Services Funding Sources. Establish funding sources for public facilities and services including impact fees, tax increment financing, special taxes, special assessments, user fees, and grant funding.</p>	<p>Option 1: Maintain existing language. Option 2: IS-IM8. Infrastructure and Services Funding Sources. Investigate funding sources for public facilities and services including special taxes, special assessments, user fees, and grant funding.</p>	<p>Support ad hoc group recommendation: Option 2, with the following modification: IS-IM8. Infrastructure and Services Funding Sources. Investigate and implement, as directed by the Board of Supervisors, funding sources for public facilities and services including special taxes, special assessments, user fees, and grant funding</p>
	<p>IS-IM9. Reimbursement. Develop the ability to enter into voluntary reimbursement agreements to reimburse developers over time as subsequent development is approved for expenditures in excess of the developer's fair share costs.</p>	<p>The Ad Hoc Working Group has reviewed this policy and suggested no changes</p>	<p>Support Planning Commission Draft Policy</p>
	<p>IS-IM10. State and Federal Legislation, Appropriations, and Grant and Loan Programs. The County shall actively advocate for state and federal legislation, appropriations, and grant and loan programs that increase funding for community infrastructure.</p>	<p>The Ad Hoc Working Group has reviewed this policy and suggested no changes</p>	<p>Support Planning Commission Draft Policy</p>
	<p>IS-IM11. State and Federal Advocacy. Maintain a list of legislative and regulatory priorities that include infrastructure and service issues and advocate actions that benefit the County and local service providers.</p>	<p>The Ad Hoc Working Group has reviewed this policy and suggested no changes</p>	<p>Support Planning Commission Draft Policy</p>
	<p>IS-IM12. Other Roadway Funding Mechanisms. The County shall pursue other funding mechanisms to augment development impact fees to meet roadway and drainage improvement needs, such as reimbursement agreements, debt financing, voter-approved taxes, assessment districts, and state and federal grants.</p>	<p>IS-IM12. Option 1: Existing language Option 2: Other Roadway Funding Mechanisms. The County shall pursue other funding mechanisms to augment development impact fees to meet roadway and drainage improvement needs, such as reimbursement agreements, debt financing, voter-approved taxes, assessment districts, and state and federal grants. <u>Actively support and seek state and federal funding, such as infrastructure banks, to improve and enhance storm drainage and flood control facilities.</u></p>	<p>Support ad hoc group recommendation: Option 2, with the following modification: IS-IM12. Other Roadway Funding Mechanisms. The County shall pursue other funding mechanisms to augment development impact fees to meet roadway and drainage improvement needs, such as reimbursement agreements, development impact fees, debt financing, voter-approved taxes, assessment districts, and state and federal grants. <u>Actively support and seek state and federal funding, such as infrastructure banks, to improve and enhance storm drainage and flood control facilities.</u></p>
	<p>IS-IM13. Drainage and Flood Control Plan. Prepare a countywide Drainage and Flood Control Plan that inventories existing facilities, prioritizes needs, and provides a basis for funding mechanisms for capital</p>	<p>The Ad Hoc Working Group has reviewed this policy and suggested no changes</p>	<p>Support Planning Commission Draft Policy</p>

Community Infrastructure and Services Element Items – Board Modifications (per Straw Votes), Planning Commission, Proposed Changes based on Public Comment, and Staff Recommendations

Straw Vote	Board Modifications/Planning Commission Draft	Proposed Changes Based on Public Comment	Staff Recommendation & Notes
	improvements and maintenance.		
	IS-IM14. Storm Drainage Impact Fees. Establish impact fees for off-site costs clearly and rationally connected to and resulting from new development. Fee shall include escalation clauses and should be based on the County Storm Drainage Master Plan and Capital Improvement Plan.	Option 1: IS-IM14. Storm Drainage Impact Fees. Establish impact fees for off-site costs clearly and rationally connected to and resulting from new development in <u>areas included in the 2013 MS4 Phase II NPDES Permit.</u> Fee shall include escalation clauses and should be based on the County Storm Drainage Master Plan and Capital Improvement Plan. <i>Discussion: Together with IM13? IM14 to be limited to areas covered in 2013 MS4 permit. To meet Clean Water Act counties have to do this.</i>	Support Planning Commission Draft Policy The County Storm Drainage Master Plan and Capital Improvement Plan may identify improvements that would appropriately be funded through impacts that are not located within areas subject to 2013 MS4 Phase II NPDES Permits. This language may be too specific for a General Plan.
	IS-IM15. Other Storm Drainage Funding Mechanisms. Establish other funding mechanisms, as appropriate, to augment developer and/or mitigation fees to construct and maintain storm drainage improvements, which may include reimbursement agreements, debt financing, voter-approved taxes, and assessment districts. Actively support and seek state and federal funding, such as infrastructure banks, to improve and enhance storm drainage and flood control facilities.	Option 1: The County shall pursue establishment of other funding mechanisms, as appropriate, to augment developer and/or mitigation fees to construct and maintain storm drainage improvements, which may include reimbursement agreements, debt financing, voter-approved taxes, and assessment districts. Actively support and seek state and federal funding, such as infrastructure banks, to improve and enhance storm drainage and flood control facilities. Option 2. Delete and add last (bolded above) sentence to IM 12 (see IM 12 option 2) <i>Discussion: redundant. Move the last sentence to IS-IM 12</i>	Support ad hoc group recommendation: Option 1 Option 1 provides sufficient detail regarding the range of available funding sources; however, IS-IM15. Other Storm Drainage Funding Mechanisms IS-IM14. Storm Drainage Impact Fees, could be combined.
	IS-IM16. Sheriff's Office Funding Sources. Periodically assess the adequacy of existing Sheriff's Office funding sources and seek to identify, develop, and maintain sustainable funding sources to maintain Sheriff's Office levels of service, including increased operational fees, development fees, new taxes, or special assessments.	Option 1: IS-IM16. Delete it. Option 2: Existing language	Support ad hoc group recommendation: Option 2
	IS-IM17. Fire Protection Special Assessments. Support the development of fire district special assessments and special taxes to fund fire protection services.	Option 1: Fire Protection Special Assessments. Provide technical support for the development of fire district special assessments and special taxes to fund fire protection services <u>consistent with Proposition 218.</u> <i>Discussion: Must be consistent with Prop 218</i>	Support Planning Commission Draft Policy All assessments and taxes must comply with Prop 218 and specific requirements of the Government Code. Fire protection districts would be responsible for preparing, adopting, and carrying out appropriate balloting.
	IS-IM18. Fire Impact Fees. Support and promote the development of capital improvement programs by fire protection service providers that can be used to establish development impact fees. Develop documents to facilitate the development of impact fees, such as a methodology for establishing fee amounts and standard agreements between fire-related districts and the County.	Option 1. Retain as written. <i>Discussion: Impact fees can be an appropriate source of funding.</i> Option 2: Fire <u>District Funding</u> Impact Fees . Support and promote the development of capital improvement plans by fire protection service providers that can be used to establish <u>funding</u> . development impact fees . Develop documents to facilitate the development of impact fees, such as a methodology for establishing funding sources <u>fee amounts and standard agreements between fire-related districts and the County consistent with Proposition 218.</u> <i>Discussion: Alter language to coincide with "funding sources" and not fees. Services can't be funded by impact fees. Fire departments need a lot of equipment. This goes to P18 which we want to delete. Again, must be consistent with Prop 218.</i>	Support ad hoc group recommendation: Option 1 Impact fees can only fund facilities and certain long-lived equipment, the need for which is triggered by new development. The County has adopted an enabling ordinance for fire impact fees. This ordinance specifies the procedures that fire related districts must follow in order for the County to adopt an impact fee on their behalf. All impact fees must comply with Government Code 66000 and following, the Mitigation Fee Act.
	IS-IM19. Pooled Costs/Shared Resources for Fire Districts. In consultation with the Humboldt County Fire Chief's Association, develop programs for special districts to reduce operating costs.	The Ad Hoc Working Group has reviewed this policy and suggested no changes	Support Planning Commission Draft Policy
	IS-IM20. Fire Protection Levels of Service. Support the	Option 1: Retain as written	Support ad hoc group recommendation: Option 1

Community Infrastructure and Services Element Items – Board Modifications (per Straw Votes), Planning Commission, Proposed Changes based on Public Comment, and Staff Recommendations

Straw Vote	Board Modifications/Planning Commission Draft	Proposed Changes Based on Public Comment	Staff Recommendation & Notes
	development of a level of service standards by the Humboldt County Fire Chief's Association.	Option 2: Support the development of a level of service assessments-standards by the Humboldt County Fire Chief's Association.	The Humboldt County Fire Chief's Association has been working to develop level of service standards or criteria based on National Fire Protection Association 1720, Standard for the Organization and Deployment of Fire Suppression, Emergency Medical Operations, and Special Operations to the Public by Volunteer Departments. What will ultimately be adopted by the Humboldt County Fire Chief's Association is unknown at this time. County staff has provided assistance the Association in its efforts.
	IS-IM21. Standards of Fire Protection Response. Encourage fire districts to prepare Standards of Coverage Studies and address substandard conditions. These studies may include: establishment of baseline conditions, risk assessment, level of service standards and objectives, critical task capability assessment, reliability assessment, and policy recommendations.	The Ad Hoc Working Group has not reviewed this Policy, Standard, or Implementation Measure	Support Planning Commission Draft Policy
	IS-IM22. County Service Area-Fire Protection. In close coordination with fire-related districts, non-agency fire departments, and CAL FIRE, establish County Service Areas and adequate ongoing fire protection funding sources in areas with developed and developable land that cannot be served by existing fire-related districts and where new districts cannot feasibly be established. Utilize fire protection service agreements with existing fire service providers, where appropriate. Utilize County Service Areas to augment the level of service and capacity of existing fire service providers, where appropriate.	The Ad Hoc Working Group has not reviewed this Policy, Standard, or Implementation Measure	Support Planning Commission Draft Policy
	IS-IM23. Fire Protection Municipal Service Review. Support the preparation of a comprehensive countywide fire protection municipal service review by the Humboldt LAFCO to determine the best approaches to improving levels of service countywide and expand service to areas outside existing fire-related district boundaries.	The Ad Hoc Working Group has not reviewed this Policy, Standard, or Implementation Measure	Support Planning Commission Draft Policy
	IS-IM24. Monitor Infrastructure and Services Capacity. Utilize wastewater treatment plant annual reports (prepared pursuant to federal NPDES permits), water system annual inspection reports (as prepared by California Department of Public Health, Drinking Water Program), and close coordination with water and wastewater providers to monitor the capacities of infrastructure and services to ensure that growth does not exceed acceptable levels of service.	Associated with P3 Option 1 : Retain existing language. Option 2 : Delete this IM. <i>Discussion: Some feel this is already covered in P8, P9, and P10.</i>	Support ad hoc group recommendation: Option 1 This implementation measure is intended to carry out the policies that are identified by the Ad Hoc Working Group in their comments.
	IS-IM25. Organization of Water and Wastewater Providers. Assist in the establishment of an organization of local water agencies, such as an	The Ad Hoc Working Group has reviewed this policy and suggested no changes	Support Planning Commission Draft Policy

Community Infrastructure and Services Element Items – Board Modifications (per Straw Votes), Planning Commission, Proposed Changes based on Public Comment, and Staff Recommendations

Straw Vote	Board Modifications/Planning Commission Draft	Proposed Changes Based on Public Comment	Staff Recommendation & Notes
	association or authority, to improve water quality, service capacity, and level of service of all water and wastewater services providers.		
	IS-IM26. Sizing of Water and Wastewater Systems. Provide this Plan and land inventory data to service providers for system planning, facility sizing, and CEQA evaluations of land use consistency.	Option 1: Provide this Plan and land inventory data to service providers for system planning, facility sizing, and CEQA evaluations of land use consistency. <u>Get feedback from the service providers to update county land inventory.</u> Discussion: ensure that it's a cooperative effort.	Support ad hoc group recommendation Option 1 with following revisions: IS-IM26. Sizing of Water and Wastewater Systems. Provide this Plan and land inventory data to service providers for system planning, facility sizing, and CEQA evaluations of land use consistency. Get feedback from Coordinate with the service providers to update county land inventory.
	IS-IM27. Coordination with Water and Wastewater Service Providers. Utilize the review of capital improvement plans, referrals, "will serve" letters, and project review meetings, as appropriate, to coordinate with water and wastewater service providers and ensure that necessary infrastructure planning and funding mechanisms are in place to support existing, planned, and proposed development.	Option 1. Existing language Option 2: Delete it. Discussion: Is this feasible and/or within the jurisdiction of the county? Needs to be some coordination. There are several other IMs that refer to coordination; however some are concerned with the tools listed here.	Support ad hoc group recommendation: Option 1 This implementation measure is intended to clearly identify the opportunities available to the County to coordinate with service providers.
	IS-IM28. Use of Parkland and Fees. The County shall develop a schedule for the use of land and fees collected under parkland dedication provisions, including mechanisms for tracking the expenditure of funds for a five-year period in coordination with special districts providing parks and recreation.	The Ad Hoc Working Group has reviewed this policy and suggested no changes	Support Planning Commission Draft Policy
	IS-IM29. Parks and Recreation. Prepare parks and recreation standards for new development that differentiate between urban and rural settings; specify acreage of park land per 1,000 residents; and specify land dedication, in-lieu fee, or other mechanisms to make park and recreation improvements and criteria for establishing Mello Roos Community Facilities Districts or special assessment to ensure adequate funding for operation and maintenance.	Option 1: Prepare parks and recreation standards for new development that <u>considers community preference and differentiate between urban, suburban, and rural settings; specify acreage of park land per 1,000 residents; and specify land dedication, in-lieu fee, or other mechanisms to make park and recreation improvements and criteria for establishing Mello Roos Community Facilities Districts or a special assessment district to ensure adequate funding for operation and maintenance.</u> Option 2: Prepare parks and recreation standards <u>for each community specifying measures to make improvement and secure adequate funding for operations and maintenance.</u> Discussion: Quimby collects in-lieu fees already where established. Some do not support a Mello Roos on top of that and the acreage standard. This is a standard that is more applicable to urban areas not remote areas. Mello Roos will only really benefit for large developments. Option 2 allows communities to set their own standards vs. county standards	Support ad hoc group recommendation: Option 1 Option 1 provides the sufficient detail to accomplish parks and recreation planning.
	IS-IM30. Street Lighting. Prepare street lighting standards for new development that differentiate between urban and rural settings and that specify when streetlights are required based on intersection type and functional classification. Establish lighting design criteria, considering AASHTO and International Dark-Sky Association guidelines.	<i>Option 1: Retain as written.</i> <i>Option 2: Street Lighting. Prepare street lighting standards for new development that differentiate between urban and rural settings that allow for community-specific priorities and standards and that specify when streetlights are required based on intersection type and functional classification. Establish lighting design criteria, considering AASHTO and International Dark-Sky Association guidelines.</i> NEW IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE? Re: lighting standards for intersections developed in CWTP?	Support ad hoc group recommendation: Option 2 Street lighting standards could be integrated with a program for comprehensive roadway design.
	IS-IM31. Expand Lighting Services. Require that development within an Urban Development Area be annexed to County street lighting districts if nearby, whether or not the project site is contiguous with current district boundaries.	This IM was missing from the ad hoc working groups chart.	Support Planning Commission Draft Policy

