

**From:** Julie Williams [<mailto:jkwb42@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 30, 2015 8:17 PM  
**To:** Wall, Robert  
**Subject:** INTRA- Chapter consistency review from Julie on behalf of HumCPR  
**Importance:** High

Hi Rob,

Here is the intra or between chapter consistency review done for HumCPR by me. They want you to have it asap so you can get started on your review. Feel free to forward on to BOS and Counsel, CAO.

Also feel free to call me with questions you may have.

I want you to know that you, your department, and the BOS are CHAMPIONS with respect to all of the hard work you have done and are continuing to do. These items seemed to still rub the wrong way in how or IF they comport to the rest of the plan. The Housing Element items we discussed, as well as the Consistency with the Guiding Principle items in the beginning chapters. (YUCK!)

Let me know if there is anything you need or whatever. Hope this helps you, perhaps you can use the form for your starting point.

Cheers!

Julie Williams  
445-5799

Comment Number	Chapter or - Page #	Section # , Item #, or Paragraph ( ¶ ) #	Consistency Finding
1	1.4 Guiding Principles	1.4, ¶ 3	<p><b>Inclusion of the guiding principles as one of findings for future General Plan amendments.</b> “. . . The principles have been used to guide the drafting of the goals and policies in each plan element, to create a vision for the future <i>and to serve as the basis for evaluating future amendments.</i>”</p> <p>Inconsistent with the overall Plan</p> <p>The requirement of a finding of consistency with the guiding principles as a BASIS for evaluating future general plan amendments is inconsistent. Because of their very broad nature, guiding principles are not quantifiable; THEY ARE GOALS and are not implementable. No amendment can be found to be compatible with them.</p> <p>Further, should any of the proposed principles <u>not</u> be adopted, the language of this item infers that the finding requirement will still survive as plan amendment criteria nonetheless. That may be improper process outside of the mandates of state law – the County can't do that!</p>
2	3-10 Governance Policy	GP-P8, including item “E.”	<p><b>GP-P8. Required Findings and Criteria for Amendments.</b> A petition for amendment of this Plan <u>may be accepted for processing</u> upon the Board of Supervisors making one or more of the following findings:</p> <p><i>E. The proposed amendment has the potential for public benefit and is consistent with the Guiding Principles and applicable goals of the Plan.</i></p> <p>...</p> <p>For approval of Plan Amendments, the Board must make the findings the proposed revision is in the public interest, <i>and is consistent with the Guiding Principles in Section 1.4 and applicable goals of the Plan.</i></p> <p>Inconsistent with the overall Plan</p> <p>Within this one item the requirement of a finding or consistency with the goals enumerated in the guiding principles are redundant. Further, Because of their very broad nature, guiding principles are not quantifiable; THEY ARE GOALS and are not implementable.</p> <p><b>No amendment can be found to be compatible with them.</b> Should any of the proposed principles <u>not</u> be adopted in this plan as proposed, the language of this item infers that the finding requirement will still survive as plan amendment criteria nonetheless. That may be improper process outside of the mandates of state law – the County can't do that!</p>

Comment Number	Chapter or - Page #	Section # , Item #, or Paragraph ( ¶ ) #	Consistency Finding
3	4.2 Growth Planning	<p><b>General Comment.</b> Explicit non-support of on site septic or water supply or mandatory connection requirements.</p> <p>Inconsistent with Chapter 8.0 the Housing Element and with the overall plan</p>	<p>The Growth Planning chapter does not include any discussion of support for on-site water or septic systems – both of which are permitted by the Environmental Health Division (DEH) of the County and are allowed under state law, making several items within the chapter inconsistent with the Plan goal of development AND with state law.</p> <p>Any policy of prohibition of on-site water and septic systems would be inconsistent with state law and could easily be interpreted as prejudicial in terms of environmental justice.</p> <p>The County is not a service provider. Community Services Districts are the service providers that decide within their own MSR and planning documents when and where connections are available and practical on the ground. Many items are redundant and outside County jurisdiction.</p> <p><b>(GP-IM4) (GP-S4,5) (GP-P3,6,7)</b></p>
4	4.2	<p><b>General Comment.</b> Non-existing or incomplete mapping</p> <p>Inconsistent with Chapter 8.0 the Housing Element and with the overall plan</p>	<p>There are many items in this chapter that call for mapping that is currently non- existing or incomplete.</p> <p><b>(GP-IM4) (GP-S4,5)</b></p>
5	4.2	<p><b>GP-P10</b></p> <p>Inconsistent with Forest Resources Chapter (4.6)</p>	<p>As written, P10 may not be consistent with Forest Practices Act and Forest Practices Rules. For clarification, the timber site quality reference should be modified per the definitions recommended by the Forestry review Committee for the Plan and for the Glossary.</p>
6	4.3 Urban Lands	<p>Zoning “overlays” and “opportunity zones” .</p> <p>Inconsistent with Chapter 8.0 the Housing Element, and the overall plan</p>	<p>There are many items that call either for ‘zoning overlay’ or additional ‘opportunity zones’ or ‘designated’ areas within this portion of the land use element.</p> <p>These measures in and of themselves underestimate the power of the zoning ordinance and create unnecessary compounded regulations. The existence of any designated opportunity zone infers potential misinterpretation of restriction, discouragement or prohibition of residential housing outside of HOZ’s, introducing prejudice.</p> <p><b>(UL-P2) (UL-S3) (UL-IM2, IM3)</b></p>

Comment Number	Chapter or - Page #	Section # , Item #, or Paragraph ( ¶ ) #	Consistency Finding
7		<p data-bbox="596 261 684 321"><b>UL-P13</b> <b>UL-P7</b></p> <p data-bbox="533 358 743 516">Inconsistent with chapter 9.0, the Economic Development Element.</p>	<p data-bbox="785 261 1940 391"><b>UL-P13. Big Box Design-</b> Large format retail provides JOBS. This is arbitrary prejudicial nonsense. People that shop in these types of stores save money; to pay for food, medical bills, rent and the like. Our economy is struggling. The County should support more jobs whether they are housed in big boxes or pyramids.</p> <p data-bbox="785 407 1877 467">Due to the sizes required for the uses for port, rail and airports any restrictions on large format uses are in conflict with the Economic Development Element.</p> <p data-bbox="785 505 1940 597"><b>UL-P7 - Neighborhood and Town Centers-</b> should not be a policy, our neighborhoods and town centers are well established over 100 years. Any prohibition of commercial is inconsistent with Economic Development Element.</p>
8		<p data-bbox="596 634 684 659"><b>UL-S6</b></p> <p data-bbox="520 667 751 824">Inconsistent with Zoning Ordinance and/or Subdivision Ordinance</p>	<p data-bbox="785 634 1940 727"><b>UL-S6- Landscaping Standards</b> – This item language is and should remain in the Subdivision Ordinance to be applied by the Public Works Land Use Division on a case by case basis. Not needed in the General Plan. Redundant.</p>
9	4.4 Rural Lands	<p data-bbox="596 846 684 870"><b>RL –S4</b></p> <p data-bbox="520 878 751 1036">Inconsistent with Zoning Ordinance and/or Subdivision Ordinance</p>	<p data-bbox="785 846 1940 938"><b>RL –S4 Subdivision Standards</b> - This item language is and should remain in the Subdivision Ordinance to be applied by the Public Works Land Use Division on a case by case basis. Not needed in the General Plan. Redundant.</p>
10	4.5 Agricultural Resources	<p data-bbox="596 1089 684 1114"><b>AG-P1</b></p> <p data-bbox="520 1122 751 1312">Inconsistent within itself. Inconsistent with Chapter 8 the Housing Element as written.</p> <p data-bbox="520 1349 751 1503">Outside the Williamson Act program, there is no existing County funded</p>	<p data-bbox="785 1089 1255 1114"><b>AG-P1. Planned Rural Development.</b></p> <p data-bbox="785 1122 1940 1247">1. Is this 'PRD' related to or the same as Public Works Land Use's "PRD; Permanent Road District"? To clarify, so there would not be <u>2 PRD programs</u>, would it be possible to use the existing term for clustering residential development to alleviate on-site constraints instead e.g. 'RPUD': Rural Planned Unit Development?</p> <p data-bbox="785 1284 1940 1503">2. <b>AG-P1 may not be consistent with itself.</b> Voluntary and Mandatory are diametrically opposed adjectives. <i>Is the point of P1 is to keep lands ag lands conserved and protected from conversion to other uses? If so, we agree with the Forestry review Committee's former input to allow flexibility for owners while keeping lands in production with differing time term options and the remainder restricted with conservation easement (may or may not be 95% of lands on the ground.) for owners and heirs similar to those suggested for timber resource lands.</i> Example below:</p>

Comment  
Number

Chapter or -  
Page #

Section # , Item # ,  
or Paragraph  
( ¶ ) #

Consistency Finding

Conservation Program, or entity. If referring to outside conservation entity, that entity will have its own requirements. If area under conservation easement has any **limitations on uses allowed**, maybe inconsistent with Economic Development Chapter 9.0

**Tier One Clustering:** Density credit: 2 times existing entitlements to be granted. Protection instrument: Deed Restriction recorded against parcel with a 20 year term. Rezone of home site parcels: Planning Staff to recommends approval of rezone application of home site parcels to Planning Commission and to the Board of Supervisors.

**Tier Two Clustering Program:** Density credit: 4 times existing entitlements to be granted. Protection instrument: Conservation easement with a 40 year term.

**Tier Three clustering program:** Density credit: 6 times existing entitlements to be granted. Protection instrument: Conservation easement with a 60 year term.

**Tier Four clustering program:** Density credit: 8 times existing entitlements to be granted. Protection instrument: Conservation easement with an 80 year term.

11

4.5

**AG-S4**  
Inconsistent within itself.  
Inconsistent with Chapter 8 the Housing Element as written.

**AG-S4. Planned Rural Development Program Clustering Incentive Options:** Tier 1 clustering program:

Density credit: 1.5 times existing entitlements when 95% of subject lands are protected  
Protection instrument: Conservation easement or equivalent protection on remainder  
Rezone homesite parcels: County to conduct re-zones. **[BOS tentative action 7-23-2012: Straw Vote 5-0]**

Is 95% an arbitrary number? How did staff arrive at this number? Most Conservation easements need flexibility to be successful for both willing property owners as well as conservation entity. If area under conservation easement has any limitations on uses allowed, maybe inconsistent with Economic Development Chapter 9.0. Other than the Williamson Act program, there is no existing County funded Conservation Program, or entity. If referring to outside conservation entity, that entity will have its own requirements.

12

4.5

**AG-P5**  
Inconsistent with Zoning Ordinance and/or Subdivision

**AG-P5. Conservation of Agricultural Lands.** The Williamson Act Program, Guidelines and zoning are already in place to encourage agricultural use. The County cannot nor should it force or mandate conservation, nor can they or should they prohibit or dis-allow development if conditionally permitted or principally permitted as supported other areas of the plan.

Comment Number	Chapter or - Page #	Section # , Item #, or Paragraph ( ¶ ) #	Consistency Finding
13	4.5	<p>Ordinance, Housing Element Ch. 8, and Economic Development Element Ch. 9</p> <p><b>AG-P6</b> Inconsistent with Zoning Ordinance and/or Subdivision Ordinance Housing Element Ch. 8, and Economic Development Element Ch. 9</p>	<p>P5 is not consistent with P1 regarding density and clustering in exchange for conservation, nor is it consistent with the BOS preference that residences be principally permitted on all parcels.</p> <p><b>AG-P6. Agricultural Land Conversion - No Net Loss.</b> The only conversions from ag to other uses recently have been by the County to State and Federal Agencies. The Williamson Act Program, Guidelines and zoning are already in place to encourage agricultural use. The County cannot nor should it force or mandate conservation, nor can they or should they prohibit or dis-allow development if conditionally permitted or principally permitted as supported other areas of the plan. A single family residence and appurtenant uses (barn, etc.) and 2<sup>nd</sup> unit if desired and conditionally permitted do <b>not constitute</b> a CONVERSION from ag lands.</p> <p><b>P6 is inconsistent with P1</b> neither regarding density and clustering in exchange for conservation, nor is it consistent with the BOS decision that residences be principally permitted on all parcels. Unless flexibility for land owners and their heirs for conservation and or estate planning are kept in place via zoning, plan amendments and probate laws, this item may be inconsistent with Economic Development Element.</p>
14	4.5 Forest Resources	<p><b>FR-P9</b> As written Inconsistent with State law and with BOS action to allow for residences on all Resource lands.</p>	<p><b>FR-P9 Residential Construction on TPZ Zoned Parcels.</b> Recognize the right to construct a residence and accessory buildings under a ministerial permitting process-County standard consistent with other Elements of the General Plan. <del>when the use does not detract from the growing and harvesting of timber and associated compatible uses.</del></p> <p>Development of residences on TPZ lands are permitted via CalFire. The BOS has determined they shall be a principally permitted use.</p>
15	4.5	<p><b>FR-P11</b> As written, Inconsistent with the Subdivision Map Act. As courtesy, we have provided state law.</p>	<p><b>FR-P11. Lot Line Adjustments.</b> We respectfully request that our general plan stick to the state law on lot line adjustments and with Conversion permit process of CalFire. It is that simple.</p> <p>Per Subdivision Map Act Section 66412(d), Humboldt County Planning Commission shall limit its review and approval of lot line adjustments to a determination of whether or not the parcels resulting from the lot line adjustment will conform to the local general plan, any applicable coastal plan and zoning and building ordinance. The Planning Commission shall not impose conditions or exactions on its approval of a lot line adjustment except to</p>

Comment  
Number

Chapter or -  
Page #

Section # , Item # ,  
or Paragraph  
( ¶ ) #

Consistency Finding

conform to the local general plan, any applicable coastal plan, and zoning and building ordinances, to require the prepayment of real property taxes prior to the approval of the lot line adjustment, or to facilitate the relocation of existing utilities, infrastructure or easements.

No tentative map, parcel map, or final map shall be required as a condition of approval of a lot line adjustment. The lot line adjustment shall be reflected in a deed, which shall be recorded. No record of survey shall be required for a lot line adjustment unless required by Section 8762 of the Business and Professions Code.

16

4.5

**FR-P13**  
Inconsistent within  
itself.

Inconsistent with  
Chapter 8 the  
Housing Element  
as written.

Other than the  
Williamson Act  
program, there is  
no existing  
County funded  
Conservation  
Program, or  
entity. TPZ  
program is a  
ZONE that offers a  
tax benefit via the  
State.

IF referring to  
outside  
conservation  
entity, that entity  
will have its own  
requirements.

**FR-P13. Planned Rural Unit Development.** The County shall consider and if appropriate, develop a Planned Rural Unit Development (PRD) program that allows voluntary clustering of home sites when lands most suitable for timber production are retained for permanent continued production. Consider incentives such as density bonuses. [BOS tentative action 6-17-2013: Straw Vote 5-0]

1. Is this 'PRD' related to or the same as Public Works Land Use's "PRD; Permanent Road District"? To clarify so there would not be 2 PRD programs, would it be possible to use the existing term for clustering residential development to alleviate on-site constraints instead e.g. 'PUD': Planned Unit Development or RPUD (rural planned unit development)? **P13 is not be consistent with itself.** Voluntary and Mandatory are diametrically opposed adjectives.

Is the point of P13 is to keep lands timber lands in production protected from conversion to other uses? If so, we agree with the format of FR-S1, but with differing time term options and the remainder restricted with conservation easement (may or may not be 95% of lands on the ground.) for owners and heirs. Example below:

Tier 1 clustering program:  
Density credit: 2 times existing entitlements to be granted. Protection instrument: Deed Restriction recorded against parcel with a 20 year term.  
Rezone of homesite parcels: Planning Staff to recommends approval of rezone application of homesite parcels to Planning Commission and to the Board of Supervisors.  
JTMP: When required under Section 51119.5 of the Government Code.

Tier 2 clustering program:  
Density credit: 4 times existing entitlements to be granted.  
Protection instrument: Conservation easement with a 40 year term.

Comment Number	Chapter or - Page #	Section # , Item #, or Paragraph ( ¶ ) #	Consistency Finding
		If area under conservation easement has any limitations on uses allowed, maybe inconsistent with Economic Development Chapter 9.0	<p>Rezone of homesite parcels: Planning Staff to recommend approval of rezone application of homesite parcels to Planning Commission and to the Board of Supervisors. JTMP: When required under Section 51119.5 of the Government Code.</p> <p>Tier 3 clustering program: Density credit: 6 times existing entitlements to be granted. Protection instrument: Conservation easement with a 60 year term. Rezone of homesite parcels: Planning Staff to recommend approval of rezone application of homesite parcels to Planning Commission and to the Board of Supervisors. JTMP: When required under Section 51119.5 of the Government Code.</p> <p>Tier 4 clustering program: Density credit: 8 times existing entitlements to be granted. Protection instrument: Conservation easement with a 80 year term. Rezone of homesite parcels: Planning Staff to recommend approval of rezone application of homesite parcels to Planning Commission and to the Board of Supervisors. JTMP: When required under Section 51119.5 of the Government Code.</p>
17	5 Infrastructure	<b>General Comment</b>	<p>The Infrastructure Chapter is one chapter that is likely to be obsolete when adopted and not implementable. This chapter was written using a technical background report that was so limited in scope that it did not even include the County Department of Public Works own Capital Improvement Program. It is our understanding that when former staff chose to include the details from ordinances in the plan, the language of those items would then be elevated as a plan mandate the courts would recognize as unchangeable. These items need to be flexible to change as needed when engineering standards or existing related ordinances or plans change (e.g. CSD's Municipal Service Plans etc.).</p> <p>Nor did it include that department's schedule of maintenance and upgrades and the deferred maintenance to the tune of millions of dollars. This chapter is riddled with items that do not mention the source of funding needed for all of the programs it contains. Additionally, this Chapter is likely to be effected by several changes in the legislature with regard to mandated programs and requirements regarding drainage, storm water run off, TMDL's for sediment and erosion, aquifer regulations etc. from the State.</p>
18	7 Circulation	<b>General Comment</b>	<p>The Circulation Element includes detail that is in our subdivision ordinance, or in the grading ordinance under the Public Works Land Use Division jurisdiction.</p> <p>It is our understanding that when former staff chose to include the details from ordinances in the plan, the language of those items would then be elevated as a plan mandate the</p>



Comment Number	Chapter or - Page #	Section # , Item #, or Paragraph ( ¶ ) #	Consistency Finding
19	7	C-IM1	<p>courts would recognize as unchangeable. These items need to be flexible to change as needed when engineering standards or existing related ordinances or plans change (e.g. CSD's Municipal Service Plans etc.).</p> <p>We are also of the understanding that this chapter calls for a Transportation Plan <b>in addition to the one that exists and is up and running under Public Works and HCAOG. Why are we duplicating that? Who will pay for it????</b></p> <p>This chapter also includes concepts that deeply trouble us because of the social engineering nature of the language in many items. This chapter needs to be re-written. (C-Px, C-P25, C-IM12,C-P28, C-P32C-S2, C-P34,C-S8, C-P?).</p> <p><b>C-IM1. County-Wide Transportation Plan.</b> Inconsistent with existing County transportation plans, Subdivision and grading ordinances.</p>
20	8 HOUSING ELEMENT	<p><b>General Comments</b> Zoning “overlays” and “opportunity zones”. Inconsistent with Chapter 8.0 the Housing Element, and the overall plan</p>	<p>Even though the Housing Element has been certified, we found many inconsistencies within it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Redevelopment:</b> inconsistent with current state law. IF used to discuss rehabilitation, should explicitly state such.</li> <li>• <b>Housing Opportunity Zones:</b> infers potential misinterpretation of restriction, discouragement or prohibition of residential development outside said ‘designated’ HOZ’s.),</li> <li>• <b>Mid-point density:</b> State law calls for density ranges as does the zoning ordinance; the county cannot arbitrarily call for only mid-point density and above),</li> <li>• <b>“Fast-tracking” permits:</b> Redundant and possibly inconsistent with the Permit streamlining Act and CEQA time clock. There is no need for new unfunded mandate.</li> <li>• <b>Lack of funding</b> availability thus not implementable</li> <li>• <b>Big Box regulations:</b> inconsistent with Economic Development Chapter and overall fiscal health of county residents.</li> </ul>
21	8	<p>General Comments <b>§8.12.20</b> Appendix policies inconsistent and not</p>	<p><b>Policies not in the General Plan Document, only in Appendix and therefore cannot be implemented. Presents EIR issues as well.</b> There are many “policies” within §8.12.20 of the Housing Element Appendix which in and of themselves sort of complicate things. <b><u>Inconsistent with state law. The policies within an appendix can not be incorporated by reference into a general plan. All policies need to be IN the plan itself, and all policies must be analyzed in the plan EIR.</u></b></p>

Comment Number	Chapter or - Page #	Section # , Item #, or Paragraph ( ¶ ) #	Consistency Finding
		implementable	What is meant by “as stand-alone projects with separate environmental review”?. The ‘policies’ need to be included as such with the necessary accompanying standards and implementation measures!
22	8	<b>Zoning “overlays” and “opportunity zones”</b>  Inconsistent with the overall plan	<b>H-P2. Housing Opportunity Zones.</b> Any special designations or combining zones such as HOZ's are inconsistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan in its entirety: to develop affordable housing within the whole of the County to be available to all income levels. Infers potential misinterpretation of restriction, discouragement or prohibition of residential housing outside of HOZ's. Also infers to preferential application processing if project within such zone which is inconsistent with state law. Only projects with enforceable affordable housing covenants may receive such benefits. Use the base zone as permissible uses and other uses as conditional uses and STOP THERE!  <b>(H-P2, P11, P13, ) (H-S2, S3, S5, S9, S12, S14,) (H-IM10, IM-37, IM40)</b>
23	8	<b>Mid-Point Density</b>  Inconsistent with Zoning Ordinance, Subdivision Ordinance and/or grading ordinance and County wide plan.	<b>H-S2. Achieving the Target Densities in Humboldt County Housing Opportunity Zones.</b> Like HOZ'S, any discussion or inclusion of the term or concept of 'mid-point density' is inconsistent with density range laws, and kills the opportunity to create affordable housing in the county. The 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence adds prejudicial language that can be misinterpreted as a prohibition of developing to or within the allowable density ranges within the base zone as allowed by state law.  <b>(H-P3, P5, ) (H-S2, S3, S6,)</b>
24	8	<b>H-S14</b> <b>Inconsistent with CEQA;</b> calls for 10 subject review and not 17 subject environmental review.	<b>H-S14. Standards for Environmental Review of Residential Subdivisions in Housing Opportunity Zones.</b> ALL projects must undergo the same 17 subject review to provide a level playing field!
25	8	<u><b>H-S12</b></u>	<b>H-S12. Standards for Extremely Low, Very Low and Low Income Sites in the Residential Land Inventory.</b> The RHNA Plan allocations for extremely low, very low and low income housing

Comment Number	Chapter or - Page #	Section # , Item # , or Paragraph ( ¶ ) #	Consistency Finding
		<u>Inconsistent with Zoning density ranges called for in Zoning Ordinance</u>	units shall be accommodated on sites suitable and zoned for multifamily residential development by right (no discretionary review is required). Multi-family sites shall be considered suitable if they contain one or more developable acres planned and zoned for at least <b>15 dwelling units per acre</b> and can be provided with public water and sewer services within the planning period. No more than 100 units can be counted on any single parcel.
			<b>Is this mid-point density for RM only for the multi-family rezone area of the McKinleyville area plan per lawsuit settlement? If so, for clarification, could "for the McKinleyville planning area only" be added, or are these benefits to be applied county wide???. Or is it referring to a maximum allowable density for ALL RM zones County wide? If for all RM, it would be inconsistent with the density range allowable in the Zoning Ordinance, and has not been analyzed in the EIR.</b>
26	8	<u>H-IM37</u>  <u>Inconsistent with the density ranges of the Zoning ordinance</u>	<b>H-IM37. Affordable Multifamily Housing Land Inventory.</b> The County shall increase the inventory of lots suitable for inclusion in the affordable multifamily housing inventory and allowed by right (no discretionary review is required), including any necessary rezonings to R-3: Residential Multiple Family or RM: Residential Multifamily to accommodate 77 additional units, which can accommodate the housing need for extremely low, very low and low income households pursuant to Government Code Section 65583 (c) (1) (A). This program will be on a voluntary basis and use the Q – Qualified zone to establish minimum density and other requirements. Responsible Agency: Planning and Building Department.
			<b>Is this item, here only as part of the McKinleyville lawsuit settlement? If so, for clarification, could "for the McKinleyville planning area only" be added, or are these benefits to be applied county wide???. Is this mid-point density for RM only for the multi-family rezone area of the McKinleyville area plan per lawsuit settlement? Or is it referring to a maximum allowable density for ALL RM zones County wide? If for all RM, it would be inconsistent with the density range allowable in the Zoning Ordinance, and presents EIR issues.</b>
27	8	<u>H-P15</u>	<b>H-P15. Fee Deferrals, Subsidies and Density Bonuses.</b> This is a back-door method for Inclusionary Zoning program that the BOS did not support.
28	8	<u>H-P17</u>	<b>H-P17. Deferral of Minor Subdivision Improvements.</b> This is a back-door method for Inclusionary Zoning program that the BOS did not support.
29	8	<u>H-IM19 and H-IM20</u>  <u>Inconsistent with</u>	<b>H-IM19. Continued Implementation of Effective Policies from the Previous Housing Element.</b> The County shall continue to implement the policies from the 2009/2010 Housing Element labeled as "→" and "+" in §8.12.20 of the Housing Element Appendix.

Comment Number	Chapter or - Page #	Section # , Item #, or Paragraph ( ¶ ) #	Consistency Finding
		<u>State Law.</u>	<p><b>H-IM20. Consideration of Policies from the “Idea Bank”.</b> The County shall consider implementing the policies and implementation measures labeled with a “→” in §8.12.20 of the Housing Element Appendix as stand-alone projects with <b>separate environmental review.</b> (What is “the Idea bank”?) <b>NONSENSE!</b></p> <p>There are many “policies” within §8.12.20 of the Housing Element Appendix which in and of themselves sort of complicate things. <b>Inconsistent with state law. The policies within an appendix can not be incorporated by reference into a general plan. All policies need to be IN the plan itself, and all policies must be analyzed in the plan EIR.</b> The ‘policies’ need to be included as such with the necessary accompanying standards and implementation measures!</p>
30	9 Economic Development	ED-P2x	<b>ED-P2X. Local Vendor Preference.</b> While we appreciate the thought of always being included in any and all local projects’ bidding process, we don’t suggest the Plan should use the word preference; it may suggest a discriminatory policy towards all qualified bidders and potentially get the County into trouble! The playing field should remain level.
31	9	ED-P3X Definition?	<b>ED-P3X: Value Added Manufacturing.</b> <u>Support opportunities to remove barriers to and facilitate expansion of value added manufacturing.</u> Lacks definitions for what is “value added” manufacturing and who would decide that. Impossible to implement.
32	9	IMX Definition?	<b>(IMX) Regulatory Incentives for Emerging Industries.</b> Lacks definition of specifically what is meant by “base and emerging industries”; what is meant by NOT being a “base or emerging industry”? Who would decide that based on what criteria? Impossible to implement. Potentially prejudicial.
33	9	ED-IM1X	<b>ED-IM1X: Support For Entrepreneurial Business Systems Efficiency</b> (licensed Point of Sale systems). <b>Inconsistent with Economic Development!</b>
34	9	ED-P6	<p><b>ED-IM7. Large Format Retail.</b> Large format retail provides JOBS. This is arbitrary prejudicial nonsense. People that shop in these types of stores save money; to pay for food, medical bills, rent and the like. Our economy is struggling. The County should support more jobs whether they are housed in big boxes or pyramids.</p> <p>Also, due to the sizes required for the uses for port, rail and airports any restrictions on large format uses are in conflict with this plan chapter amongst others. Due to the space required for port, rail and airports, any restrictions on large format uses are in conflict with this plan chapter amongst others.</p>

Comment Number	Chapter or - Page #	Section # , Item #, or Paragraph ( ¶ ) #	Consistency Finding
35	10.2 Conservation and open space	<b>CO-P4</b> <b>Inconsistent with the housing element, with existing development, and the plan in its entirety.</b>	<b>CO-P4. Community Separation.</b> The Plan encourages development along existing roadways and circulation routes, which also in our case, lead from one community to the next and pass by these areas. Inconsistent in relation to P4X and S6, S7. Also, may not be consistent with P4X and S6; both of which allow development in these areas with standards whereas this Item by virtue of "maintain separation of" language discourages any development in these areas.
36	10.2	<b>CO-S7</b> <b>Inconsistent with the housing element, existing development and the plan in its entirety.</b>	<p><b>CO-S7 Subdivisions in Community Separators.</b> Subdivisions in community separators shall:</p> <p>A. Ensure developments are subordinate to or consistent with the view scape, from the point of view of public roadways and public trails.* <b>OFFENSIVE</b></p> <p>B. Reduce visual impact where consistent with the Land Use Element by clustering.</p> <p>C. Preserve natural features and native vegetation by locating building sites and roadways.</p> <p>D. Where appropriate, encourage the dedication of permanent open space easement at the time of subdivision.</p> <p>Because the Plan historically and currently encourages development along existing roadways and circulation routes, which also in our case, lead from one community to the next and pass by these areas in most communities, making this item counter-intuitive. The roads, houses etc. are already there, and everything is already within view. <b>Item A is prejudicial social engineering – please remove from plan!</b></p>
37	10.2	<b>CO-IM6</b> <b>Zoning "overlays" inconsistent with the housing element and with overall plan</b>	<b>CO-IM6 Community Separators.</b> Any special designations or combining zones such as Community Separators are inconsistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan in its entirety: to develop affordable housing within the whole of the County to be available to all income levels. Infers potential misinterpretation of restriction, discouragement or prohibition of residential housing.
38	10.2	<b>CO-P5</b> <b>Inconsistent with subdivision and grading ordinance.</b>	<p><b>CO-P5. Planning for Recreational Needs within Communities.</b> For clarity, should this sentence be in Public Lands or Infrastructure element? There are acres and acres of parklands in Humboldt County and we have times when we cannot maintain them. How much is going to be enough?</p> <p><b>We would like to see this portion removed and program dropped from the Plan as funding reimbursement for the existing program has not worked for a number of years; monies paid</b></p>

Comment Number	Chapter or - Page #	Section # , Item # , or Paragraph ( ¶ ) #	Consistency Finding
39	10.3 Biologic Resources	BR-P7	<p>have not been returned to developers if no parks were built by sunset date as required.</p> <p><b>BR-P7. Wetland Identification.</b> <del>The presence of wetlands in the vicinity of a proposed project. Wetland delineation by a qualified professional shall be required when wetland characterization and limits cannot be easily inventoried and identified by site inspection shall be determined during the review process for discretionary projects and for ministerial building and grading permit applications, when the proposed building development activity. The presence of wetlands in the vicinity of a proposed project involves new construction or expansion of existing structures or grading activities. Wetland delineation by a qualified professional shall be required when wetland characterization and limits cannot be easily inventoried and identified by site inspection.</del> <b>Respectfully, please consider the simplifying edits to this item below- it reads better and says the same thing!</b></p> <p>If wetlands are located in the vicinity of a proposed project, wetland delineation by a qualified professional shall be required when wetland characterization and limits cannot be easily inventoried and identified by site inspection. Inspection shall be determined during the review process for discretionary projects, for ministerial building and grading permit applications, or when the proposed building development activity involves new construction or expansion of existing structures or grading activities in the vicinity of wetlands.</p>
40	10.3	<b>BR-P9 Inconsistent with grading ordinance and possible state law.</b>	<p><b>BR-S9. Erosion Control.</b> Erosion control measures for development within Streamside Management Areas shall include the following: (to save space) . . . . <b>Note: should this level of detail be left in the Grading Ordinance and be referred to in S7 or S8, above? It is likely that all project referrals from Public Works Land Use Division will address these concerns. ALSO important to note: Mandatory on site drainage requirements from Water Quality Control Board may dictate further changes on these items.</b></p>
41	10.4 Mineral Resources	<b>General Comment  Inconsistent with the economic interests of our community.  Redundant with</b>	<p>Mineral resources – An OPTIONAL ELEMENT per State Guidelines. We are concerned that the proposed policy language that dictates extraction and exporting quantities of sand, gravel and rock in and from Humboldt County will directly dictate the affordability of housing, commercial and other construction in Humboldt County. Sand, gravel and rock are base materials for road grading, fill and concrete used in construction. Any regulations put on this industry other than those that are already in effect through the North Coast Air Quality Management District, Northern California Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the California Department of Conservation would be duplicative and potentially crippling to this County's economic viability. For example:</p>

Comment Number	Chapter or - Page #	Section # , Item #, or Paragraph ( ¶ ) #	Consistency Finding
		regulations of other agencies with jurisdiction.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quarries and withdraw pits are sometimes on portions of lands with Open Space designation; this is inconsistent: The Open Space plan designation should be deleted from the plan because it limits uses for residential, ag, financing purposes etc. the word VACANT or the term DEDICATED CONSERVATION AREA would be more economically friendly to the overall general plan.</li> <li>Rock quarry owners, usually ranchers and timber land owners, regularly have to rely on using the proceeds from their rock quarries to supplement their incomes.</li> <li>The construction industry suffers higher prices due to lower product availability, thereby directly affecting housing affordability.</li> <li>The County Public Works Department relies on immediate access from quarry owners to aggregate when it needs sand, gravel and rock for road and highway repairs, slide repairs and slope stabilization. It too, would suffer higher costs due to lower availability.</li> <li>The County Economic Development Department is in support of renovating the local railroads to have future product transport potential for all goods leaving and entering the County. Adding regulatory costs would affect the availability of gravel, rock and sand, and would threaten the likelihood of railroad track beds, tunnels etc. ever being constructed or repaired in this County.</li> </ul>
			<p>Humboldt County should stay out of the mining business. Relevant mining issues are currently governed by agencies more equipped to deal with them such as the North Coast Air Quality Management District, Northern California Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the California Department of Conservation. Each project applicant currently deals with all traffic, cultural resources, reclamation, water quality, and environmental issues during the CEQA process on a project-by-project basis. Leave the current policies in place; do not add more burdens to the mining community.</p>
			<p>Aggregates are literally the building blocks of the construction industry. Adding costs and duplicating regulations ultimately raises the cost of every commercial, residential, and public project built. Some of the proposed policies may have severe, negative long-term economic impacts on the mining community and the construction industry at large. We do not support any additional regulations on the Mineral Resource industry in Humboldt County, and therefore supports the elimination of this element.</p>
42	10.7 Scenic resources	SR-P1  No mapping.	<p><b>SR-P1. Development in <i>Mapped Scenic Areas</i>.</b> There is no mapping of Scenic areas within the State CalTrans program located in Humboldt County. We are not sure if the inclusion of this language satisfies grant application criteria. If part of criteria for grant, please state so. If not, we would support deletion of this item. Other than the definition within the CalTrans</p>

Comment Number	Chapter or - Page #	Section # , Item #, or Paragraph ( ¶ ) #	Consistency Finding
		<p><b>Definitions?</b></p> <p><b>Inconsistent with the Housing Element and with the overall plan.</b></p>	<p>highway scenic route program, has yet to be defined. Who would determine and what are the criteria to be met? "Visible disturbance and interruption of natural features". <b>What is visual disturbance? How does one interrupt a natural feature?</b> Who would determine and what are the criteria to be met? Aren't human beings natural features too? <b>Overly restrictive and too subjective. Impossible to implement.</b> The primary jurisdiction for Scenic Highways lies in the hands of State CalTrans and not the county – should the county be thinking of applying for inclusion in the state's program --- this fact needs to be incorporated into this item.</p>
43	10.7	<p><b>SR-S1</b></p> <p><b>No mapping.</b></p> <p><b>Definitions?</b></p> <p><b>Inconsistent with the Housing Element and with the overall plan.</b></p> <p><b>Inconsistent with the Subdivision Ordinance and the Grading ordinance.</b></p>	<p><b>SR-S1. Development in Mapped Scenic Areas.</b> There is no mapping of Scenic areas within the State CalTrans program located in Humboldt County. "Visible disturbance and interruption of natural features". Lacks definitions. What is visual disturbance? How does one interrupt a natural feature? Who would determine and what are the criteria to be met? Aren't human beings natural features too? Overly restrictive and too subjective. Impossible to implement.</p> <p>Mandating Narrow roads? Counter intuitive on the ground, and counter to the Plan. *There already are safety standards for all Roads in the Subdivision Ordinance, in the Fire SRA standards, and for highways via CalTrans engineering and design standards for public health and safety (for cars, bikes and pedestrians), for maintenance, and for drainage concerns and for the movement of wildlife. *Public utility corridors need to meet the access, maintenance and safety requirements of their own entity's engineered design standards; and in sloping areas the utilities rely on gravity and soils stability for access etc. so it would stand to reason they "follow natural contours" when they can.</p> <p>Whether or not restoration is called for is up to the Land Use division of Public Works as conditions of approval via the referral portion of projects as CEQA requires. Additional conditions are submitted by the California Fish and Wildlife department on a case by case basis. This item is covered in P6, S6 and SR-SXX and IM4 of this chapter. Can this portion of the item be deleted due to redundancy?</p>
44	10.7	<p><b>SR-IM1</b></p> <p><b>No Mapping</b></p> <p><b>Definitions?</b></p>	<p><b>SR-IM1. Mapping of Scenic Areas, Heritage Landscapes and Scenic Highways.</b> There is no mapping of Scenic areas within the State program or otherwise. We are not sure if the inclusion of this language satisfies grant application criteria for HCD or others. If part of criteria for grant, please state so. <u>If not, we would support deletion of this item.</u> Please delete reference to design review in the item. Heritage Landscapes has yet to be defined; who would determine and what are the criteria to be met, and what is to be protected</p>



Comment Number	Chapter or - Page #	Section # , Item # , or Paragraph ( ¶ ) #	Consistency Finding
45	10.7	<p>SR-P2  <b>Inconsistent with the Housing Element and the overall plan.</b></p> <p>No Mapping</p> <p>Definitions</p>	<p>and by whom? <b><u>Overly restrictive and too subjective. Impossible to implement.</u></b>  The primary jurisdiction for Scenic Highways lies in the hands of State CalTrans and not the county – should the county be thinking of applying for inclusion in the state's program --- this fact needs to be incorporated into this item.</p> <p><b>SR-P2. Development in Mapped Heritage Landscapes.</b> There is no mapping of Scenic areas within the State program or otherwise. Please delete reference to design review in the item. Heritage Landscapes has yet to be defined; who would determine and what are the criteria to be met, and what is to be protected and by whom? <b><u>Overly restrictive and too subjective. Impossible to implement.</u></b></p>
46	10.7	<p>SR-P3  <b>Because of the severe restrictions on development of lands fronting Highways that are within the Cal Trans scenic roadway program, inconsistent with the Housing element and the overall plan.</b></p>	<p><b>SR-P3. Scenic Highway Protection.</b> Is this item referring to the CalTrans program? Are there thoughts of adding any of our highways to the CalTrans list that would meet CalTrans program criteria? Also for clarity, the primary jurisdiction for Scenic Highways lies in the hands of State CalTrans and not the county – should the county be thinking of applying for inclusion in the state's program --- this fact needs to be incorporated into this item.  <b>Because of the severe restrictions on development of lands fronting Highways that are within the Cal Trans scenic roadway program, inconsistent with the Housing element and the overall plan.</b></p>
47	10.7	<p>SR-S3  <b>No mapping. Inconsistent with the subdivision ordinance and the grading ordinance.</b></p>	<p><b>SR-S3. Scenic Highway Standards.</b> The following standards apply to mapped Scenic Highways: A. <u>Visual Buffer Width.</u> (truncated to save space. . . )  <b>If this item is <i>not</i> referring to the CalTrans program, this level of detail <u>may not comport</u> with the Subdivision Ordinance and the Grading Ordinance in place within the County Code --- which is, we feel, where specific standards belong.</b></p> <p>Are there thoughts of adding any of our highways to the CalTrans list that would meet CalTrans program criteria? The primary jurisdiction for Scenic Highways lies in the hands of State CalTrans and not the county. <b>Because of the severe restrictions on development of</b></p>

Comment Number	Chapter or - Page #	Section # , Item #, or Paragraph ( ¶ ) #	Consistency Finding
			lands fronting Highways that are within the Cal Trans scenic roadway program, inconsistent with the Housing element and the overall plan.
48	10.7	<p>SR-P6 Inconsistent with state law.</p> <p>Inconsistent with Economic Development Element</p>	<p><b>SR-P6. Term of Off-Premise Billboards and Prohibition.</b> The County cannot “Limit the term” nor “Prohibit the construction of new” billboards when it does not own the land wherein such bill boards may be. Nor is the County a party to any advertising leases. It is our understanding that most if not all off premise billboards are under permits from CalTrans (State) or on Tribal lands and not subject to the County regulations. If any existing billboards do not meet state standards, it is up to the state to deal with, not the county.</p>
49	10.7	<p>SR-S6, and SR-SXX Inconsistent with Economic Development Element</p>	<p><b>SR-S6. New Off-Premise Billboards.</b> <b>SR-SXX. Permits for Billboards.</b> Most if not all off premise billboards are under permits from CalTrans (State), Railroad or on Tribal lands and not subject to the County regulations.</p>
50	10.7	<p>SR-P7 No mapping Inconsistent with Economic Development Element</p>	<p><b>SR-P7. Billboards in Sensitive Habitat Areas.</b> There are no maps of sensitive habitat areas in the Plan.</p>
51	10.7	<p>SR-IM5 Inconsistent with economic development element.</p>	<p><b>SR-IM5. Removal of Illegal Billboards</b></p> <p>Why is the county making recommendation or supporting actions or positions of other agencies <b>within the general plan</b>? They most certainly can do so in correspondence or included as a part of their “legislative platform” statement, and we do <i>not support this item being included in the General Plan. HIGHLY Inappropriate.</i></p> <p><b>As to taking down billboards on County property, yes, the county may take down billboards on their own property ONLY if they pay fair market value as a going business concern to the owner of the bill board on their own lands; not at a depreciated value, and not at the value of the building materials used in the construction of the billboard. The only other legal measure to remove billboards is if the lease is not renewed. At that time, the owner, if desired, can either take the board down or find another lessee. Does the County DA have budget etc. for this?</b></p>

Comment Number	Chapter or - Page #	Section # , Item #, or Paragraph ( ¶ ) #	Consistency Finding
52	10.7	SR-P8 Inconsistent with Economic Development Element	<p><b>SR-P8. Removal or Relocation of Billboards on Public Lands and Right-of-Ways in the Northwestern Pacific Railroad Right-of-Way.</b> Why is the county making recommendation or supporting actions or positions of other agencies <b>within the general plan</b>? They most certainly can do so in correspondence or included as a part of their "legislative platform" statement, and we do <i>not support this item being included in the General Plan. HIGHLY Inappropriate.</i></p> <p>For clarity, As to taking down billboards on County property, The County can take down billboards on their own property ONLY if they pay fair market value as a going business concern to the owner of the bill board on their own lands; not a depreciated value, and not the value of the building materials used in the construction of the billboard. The only other legal measure to remove billboards is if the lease is not renewed. At that time, the owner, if desired, can either take the board down or find another lessee.</p>
53	11 Water Resources	General Comments	<p>There are so many inconsistencies in this element.</p> <p>We are mindful of recent legislation calling for Special Districts within Counties or counties themselves to take on oversight of PORTIONS of water resources monitoring.</p> <p>Our County has not vetted the legislation nor begun discussion the issue with any /all of the Community Services Districts within a public forum. Many items in this element call for the County to regulate issues that are <u>not within the scope of the legislated directive</u>, nor are its jurisdiction outside of the scope of the legislated directive.</p> <p>Additionally, we discovered an outside water agency may have drafted the element to their liking; which we think is inappropriate. If an outside agency wants to change its own regulations, let it do so via the Legislature.</p>
54	11	WR-P2 Basin Plan Water Resources Control Board jurisdiction.	<p><b>WR-P2. Protection for Surface and Groundwater Uses.</b> The reference to "Basin Plans" appears to be duplicative of State and Federal efforts with respect to the state's ground waters; those are the responsibilities of the Water resources Control Board and CA. Department of Fish and Game, not the jurisdiction of the county and should not be in the general plan. No Mapping.</p>
55	11	WR-P3 Watershed North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board	<p><b>WR-P3. Proactive Protections.</b> 3361.1: <b>Projects must provide evidence of water availability prior to recordation of map.</b></p> <p>This policy as written is not implementable because it contains too many undefined terms and duplications of state and federal efforts (Reference to Watershed areas and the state's surface waters). Those are the responsibilities of the North Coast Regional Water</p>

Comment Number	Chapter or - Page #	Section # , Item #, or Paragraph ( ¶ ) #	Consistency Finding
		<p><b>Jurisdiction.</b> <b>No Mapping.</b></p>	<p>Quality Control Board and CA. Department of Fish and Game and not the jurisdiction of the county and should not be in the general plan.</p> <p>To which specific “watersheds” does it refer? There is no mapping. What criteria will be used to make the findings of “limited water supply” and “threats to water quality” and by whom? How would potentially significant cumulative effects be determined and by whom?</p> <p>To simplify, perhaps the framework plan policy (3361.6) could be used here instead as shown above.</p>
56	11	<p><b>WR-P4 Service provider and CSD jurisdiction in addition to North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board Jurisdiction.</b> <b>No Mapping.</b></p>	<p><b>WR-P4.Critical Municipal Water Supply Areas.</b> This item is limited to specific municipalities or CSD's. This plan should not be duplicative of State and Federal efforts (reference to Watershed areas and the state's surface waters); those are the responsibilities of the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board and CA. Department of Fish and Game and not the jurisdiction of the county and should not be in the general plan. Additionally, there is no mapping.</p>
57	11	<p><b>WR-P5, WR-S3 Watershed North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board Jurisdiction.</b> <b>No Mapping</b></p> <p><b>Incorrect species added to “listed” language.</b></p> <p><b>Authorized vs. unauthorized take discussion not included.</b></p>	<p><b>WR-P5.Critical Watershed Water Supply Areas.</b> The Board of Supervisors shall <b>recognize all or portions of watersheds as “Critical Water Supply Areas” Watersheds</b> if cumulative impacts from <b>existing or planned land and water resource</b> uses within the area <b>have been found via CEQA review to have the potential to possibly</b> create significant environmental impacts to threatened or endangered species including <b>Chinook salmon, Coho salmon or steelhead. Land and Water resources</b> within Critical Water Supply Areas <b>Watersheds</b> shall be protected by the application of specific standards for such areas to avoid <b>the unauthorized take</b> of threatened or endangered species.</p> <p>Please delete or modify as shown. Chinook only are listed at this time. The North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board regulates discharges of waste to ensure the suitability of habitat for listed species dependent upon waters of the State.</p> <p>The “take” of listed species is regulated by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW), the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. This general plan effort should not duplicate those State and Federal efforts. State and Federal agencies have regulatory authority to authorize incidental take of listed species under certain terms and conditions. Proposed WR-P5 fails to</p>

Comment Number	Chapter or - Page #	Section # , Item #, or Paragraph ( ¶ ) #	Consistency Finding
58	11	<b>WR-S1</b> <b>Watershed</b> <b>North Coast</b> <b>Regional Water</b> <b>Quality Control</b> <b>Board</b> <b>Jurisdiction.</b> <b>No Mapping</b> <b>Inconsistent with</b> <b>state laws.</b>	<p>account for or recognize authorized take, and furthers a seeming ban on all “take” within the County. We do not support this item. Further, there is no mapping.</p> <p><b>WR-S1. Designation of Critical Water Supply and <del>Watershed Areas</del>.</b> The designation <del>recognition</del> by the Board of Supervisors of Critical Water Supply area <b>designation by the state or federal water agencies and <del>Watershed Areas</del></b> shall be at a public hearing where it can be announced for the public knowledge.</p> <p><b>The county has not the power to designate.</b> For clarity, see our comments for P4, and P5. The designation of Critical Water Supply needs to be mapped, and limited to specific municipalities and CSD’s.</p>
59	11	<b>WR-S2</b> <b>Watershed</b> <b>North Coast</b> <b>Regional Water</b> <b>Quality Control</b> <b>Board</b> <b>Jurisdiction.</b> <b>No Mapping.</b> <b>Inconsistent with</b> <b>subdivision</b> <b>ordinance and</b> <b>grading</b> <b>ordinance.</b>	<p><b>WR-S2. Development within Critical Water Supply Areas.</b> Ministerial <b>and Discretionary</b> land use development proposed within Critical Water Supply areas shall comply with <u>performance standards and supplemental permit conditions per the Grading and Subdivision Ordinance and other state or federal agencies as required for a given project per those agency’s referral standards and permit requirements.</u></p> <p>We modified using above language for clarity and comportment with the plan and state law.</p>
60	11	<b>WR-P6</b>  <b>Inconsistent with</b> <b>housing element</b>	<p><b>WR-P6. Subdivisions.</b> Not all subdivisions are associated with residential development and increased water demand (e.g. lot line adjustment is often used for resource lands management or ag lands management where no residential development occurs). Also, see the following for adequate language: <b>WR-P3. Proactive Protections. 3361.1: <u>Projects must provide evidence of water availability prior to recordation of map.</u></b></p>
61	11	<b>WR-S6</b> <b>Inconsistent with</b> <b>the housing</b>	<p><b>WR-S6. Subdivisions <u>for Residential Development</u> Demonstration of Sufficient Water Supply.</b> The two sources cited in this item (SB610 and SB221) indicate that this only applies to a <u>500 Unit residential development</u> OR a <u>project that would increase the number of the public</u></p>

Comment Number	Chapter or - Page #	Section # , Item #, or Paragraph ( ¶ ) #	Consistency Finding
		element and with the overall general plan.	<p><u>water system's existing connections by 10%</u>. Not all subdivisions associated with residential development are that large nor require a 10% increase in water service connections; in fact, there never has been that large of a project in Humboldt County.</p> <p>Additionally, not all subdivisions are associated with residential development and increased water demand (e.g. lot line adjustment is often used for resource lands management or ag lands management where no residential development occurs). Also, see the following for adequate language: <b>WR-P3. Proactive Protections. 3361.1: Projects must provide evidence of water availability prior to recordation of map.</b></p>
62	11	<p><b>WR-IM1 Watershed North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board Jurisdiction. No Mapping. Inconsistent with subdivision ordinance and grading ordinance.</b></p>	<p><b>WR-IM1. Critical Water Supply and Watershed Area Ordinance.</b> For clarity, please delete IM1. The state's surface waters and any appurtenant policies are the responsibilities of North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board and Ca Dept. of Fish and Game and are not County jurisdiction and not necessary in general plan. Any such ordinance would be duplicative.</p>
63	11	<p><b>WR-IM2 Zoning "overlays" inconsistent with the housing element and with overall plan. Watershed North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board Jurisdiction. No Mapping.</b></p>	<p><b>WR-IM2. Critical Water Supply and Watershed Area Overlay Designation.</b> For clarity, please delete IM2. The state's surface waters and appurtenant state policies or designation determinations are the responsibilities of North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board and Ca Dept. of Fish and Game and are not County jurisdiction and not necessary in general plan. Any such zoning overlay would be duplicative.</p> <p>Any special designations or combining zones such as this are inconsistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan in its entirety: to develop affordable housing within the whole of the County to be available to all income levels. Infers potential misinterpretation of restriction, discouragement or prohibition of residential housing.</p>

Comment Number	Chapter or - Page #	Section # , Item #, or Paragraph ( ¶ ) #	Consistency Finding
64	11	WR-Px2	<b>WR-Px2. Mitigate Controllable Sediment Discharge Sites.</b> This item is not needed as TMDL's are already addressed by and are under the authority of Federal and State Water Quality. <b>Delete. Duplicative.</b>
65	11	<b>WR-P8 Inconsistent with subdivision ordinance and grading ordinance.</b>	<b>WR-P8. Erosion and Sediment Discharge.</b> This is already done by the County Public Works Land Use Division. TMDL's are already addressed by and are under the authority of Federal and State Water Quality.
66	11	<b>WR-P11 – and General comment</b>	<b>WR-P11. Small and Micro Hydroelectric.</b> It is our understanding that if an on-site small (where less than 5 kilowatts of power is generated) hydroelectric development occurs on land that is occupied by owner, no C.U.P. can be required by the County and no permit is required by either the P.U.C., nor is a streambed alteration permit required by Fish and Wildlife nor is permission required by North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board. The permitting of larger hydroelectric development is not the purview of the County – and all such developments are under the authority of P.U.C., Federal and State Water Quality.
67	11	<b>WR-S11  As written, may be inconsistent with housing element.</b>	<b>WR-S11. Small <del>Micro</del> Hydroelectric.</b> Development of run-of-the-river <del>micro</del> hydroelectric projects on privately owned lands are considered accessory to principally permitted allowed uses if they are sized to meet the electrical demands of the subject property, <b>generate less than 5 kilowatts of power to be used on-site only and designed to avoid impacts to stream flow and fisheries.</b>  For clarity, Modify as shown. Use of the term “Micro” is not necessary; former staff thought using the term would “catch” and prohibit homesteading (see the housing element).
68	11	<b>IM7 Basin Plan Water Resources Control Board jurisdiction. Duplicative of Environmental Health’s scope.</b>	<b>WR-IM7. <del>Basin Plan</del> Septic Requirements.</b> Update and amend existing County septic regulations to reflect the latest <del>Basin Plan</del> standards for design and maintenance of on-site wastewater systems.  Revisions to the County's Ordinance and regulatory guidelines are currently on-going by the County Department of Environmental Health under the guidance of the Water Board. Locally, the regulations for septic are with Environmental Health and not planning. Does not need to be in the plan.

Comment Number	Chapter or - Page #	Section # , Item #, or Paragraph ( ¶ ) #	Consistency Finding
69	11	<b>WR-P17 Watershed North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board Jurisdiction. No Mapping.</b>	<p>The reference to Basin Plans appears to be duplicative of State and Federal efforts on behalf of the state's ground waters. Those are the responsibilities of the State Water resources Control Board and CA. Department of Fish and Game and not the jurisdiction of the county and should not be in the general plan.</p> <p><b>WR-P17. Watershed Planning. Please delete P17.</b> The state's surface waters and appurtenant state policies or designation determinations are the responsibilities of North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board and Ca Dept. of Fish and Game and are not County jurisdiction and not necessary in general plan.</p> <p>Further, it is our understanding that this policy was drafted in the past and intended to <b>add a second level of boundaries onto the planning process in Humboldt County above and beyond State land use laws, zoning, plan designations, districts, special districts and the like.</b> There is no need to do so, no funding available at this time to do so, nor is fundraising or staffing mentioned within P17. Future efforts cannot be used as mitigation in the Plan EIR. Please DELETE.</p>
70	11	<b>WR-P19 Definitions Watershed North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board Jurisdiction. No Mapping.</b>	<p><b>WR-P19. Regional Water Management Planning.</b> What or who is NCRP? What does "adaptive management" mean? The County IS NOT BOUND to incorporate or adopt the goals and objectives of the NCIRWMP, including any future amendments to the existing NCIRWMP. Because we see no mention of funding in P19, who will be assigned to work with the NCIRWMP and how will it be funded?</p>
71	11	WR-P23	<p><b>WR-P23. Conservation and Re-use Strategy. Once a private system is permitted by Dept. of Environmental Health, the County has no say in the system.</b></p>
72	11	<b>WR-P24 Basin Plan. Water Resources Control Board jurisdiction. Inconsistent.</b>	<p><b>WR-P24. Restoration of Flow Rates.</b> <u>The County shall advocate for reductions in water exports</u> support and encourage <u>and</u> improved flow release from existing reservoirs on the Trinity, Klamath and Eel rivers to <u>restore and enhance fisheries, natural sediment transport, water quality, recreational opportunities, industrial uses, and other beneficial uses.</u> <u>as identified in the Basin Plan.</u></p> <p>The county does have authority over the reclamation of waters, prevention and control of</p>



Comment Number	Chapter or - Page #	Section # , Item # , or Paragraph ( ¶ ) #	Consistency Finding
			<p>water pollution, regulation of the use of land within stream channels, prevention and control of erosion of soils, beaches and the protection of water supply areas.</p> <p>It does not have authority of water exports of the state waters; that is the purview of the State Water resources Control Board. <b>THERE ARE NO CURRENT WATER EXPORTS IN HUMBOLDT COUNTY NOW, ARE THERE? How can the County reduce something that DOES NOT EXIST?</b></p>
73	11	<b>WR-S12</b> <b>Water Resources Control Board jurisdiction.</b> <b>Inconsistent.</b>	<b>WR-S12. Water Export Projects on Humboldt County Rivers. DELETE.</b> The County does NOT have legal regulatory or legislative authority over or to approve water export projects, it is doubtful that this item would be useful!
74	11	<b>WR-S13</b> <b>Water Resources Control Board jurisdiction.</b> <b>Inconsistent.</b>	<b>WR-S13. Minimizing Effects of Water Exports. DELETE.</b> The County does NOT have legal regulatory or legislative authority over or to approve water export projects, it is doubtful that this item would be useful!
75	11	<b>WR-P30</b> <b>Inconsistent with Grading and Subdivision ordinance and new LID requirements.</b>	<b>WR-P30. Natural Stormwater Drainage Courses</b> The level of detail should remain in the Grading and Subdivision ordinances in addition to the new LID ordinance, to be applied to the extent needed on a case by case basis and NOT be included here to be applied in a blanket fashion. Please delete the strike out language. ALSO: This item may be inconsistent with the new General Stormwater Permit requirements.
76	11	<b>WR-S14</b> <b>Inconsistent with Grading and Subdivision ordinance and new LID requirements.</b>	<b>WR-S14. Storm Water Management.</b> <u>During construction, the recommendations of the Land Use Division of Public works will be adhered to on a case by case basis, relying upon the County Grading and Subdivision Ordinances.</u>  Modified to try to repair this one...  The level of detail should remain in the Grading and Subdivision ordinances to be applied to the extent needed on a case by case basis and NOT be included here to be applied in a blanket fashion.
77	11	<b>WR-P32</b> <b>Inconsistent with Grading and Subdivision ordinance and</b>	<b>WR-P32. New Drainage Facilities.</b> Please modify to : <u>For residential and commercial development the need for drainage facilities shall be as a result of a referral by the Land Use Division of Public Works and installed/constructed on a case by case basis to the satisfaction of the Land Use Division of Public Works per the County Grading, Subdivision</u>

Comment Number	Chapter or - Page #	Section # , Item #, or Paragraph ( ¶ ) #	Consistency Finding
78	11	<p>new LID requirements.</p> <p>WR-P34 Inconsistent with Grading and Subdivision ordinance and new LID requirements.</p>	<p><u>and LID ordinances. No such requirements are to be applied to forests or ranchlands.</u></p> <p><b>WR-P34. Commercial and Industrial Activities.</b> Please modify as shown: <u>For commercial and industrial development, the need for drainage facilities shall be as a result of a referral by the Land Use Division of Public Works and installed/constructed on a case by case basis to the satisfaction of the Land Use Division of Public Works per the County Grading, Subdivision and LID ordinances. No such requirements are to be applied to forests or ranchlands.</u></p>
79	11	<p>WR-P37 Inconsistent with Grading and Subdivision ordinance and new LID requirements.</p>	<p><b>WR-P37. Storm Drainage Design Standards.</b> Detailed standards <b>are</b> in grading ordinance.</p> <p><b>Please modify as shown:</b> <u>For residential and commercial development the need for drainage facilities shall be as a result of a referral by the Land Use Division of Public Works and installed/constructed on a case by case basis to the satisfaction of the Land Use Division of Public Works per the County Grading, Subdivision and LID ordinances. No such requirements are to be applied to forests or ranchlands.</u></p>
80	11	<p>WR-P38 Inconsistent with Grading and Subdivision ordinance and new LID requirements. Inconsistent with overall plan</p>	<p><b>WR-P38 Storm Drainage Impact Reduction.</b> There is no Redevelopment agency, ordinance, projects or dollars in Humboldt County. Refer to new ordinance in addition to Grading and Subdivision Ordinances on case by case basis as needed to be determined by Public Works. Land Use.</p>
81	12 Energy Element	<p>General Comments</p> <p>May not be consistent with economic development chapter.</p>	<p><b>Energy Element -</b> <u>This element is an optional element per State General Plan guidelines.</u> The content of this element is disconcerting from the perspective of the context in which it is being presented. We find most of the narrative tone to be overly subjective, over-reaching, broad, and it lacks clear definitions and the justification needed for anyone to make a balanced informed decision. It adds excessive cost burdens on to all projects.</p> <p>We Do NOT Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Blanket application of trendy energy 'efficient' policy or regulation language for the entire County when it is not needed on the ground. REALLY BAD.</li> <li>• The creation of a County managed non-profit advisory agency that will replicate responsibilities borne by energy service providers that the Public Utilities Commission</li> </ul>

Comment  
Number

Chapter or -  
Page #

Section # , Item # ,  
or Paragraph  
( ¶ ) #

Consistency Finding

oversees. The County is in no position to provide energy services, they are end-users.

- The creation of a County managed non-profit advisory agency that will replicate responsibilities borne by our County Building Department that implements the dictates of Title 24 as well as the Building Codes that are regularly reviewed, updated, and implemented state wide is not needed.
- We do NOT support any Municipal Utility Feasibility study being conducted to examine the viability of establishing a Municipal utility. If the Supervisors want to explore that potential, that language, that proposal, any action to do so does not belong in the General Plan. Nor would we support any relationship between a municipal utility and the Community Development Services Department.
- We do NOT support mandatory language wherein an advisory agency provides a **separate public review process** outside of and in addition to the Planning Commission review, and CEQA, and Title 24 for applications.
- The language found in the draft Energy Element takes on the burden of financial responsibility and liability within the proposed advisory agency when the County cannot afford to even maintain its existing roads, infrastructure or its own buildings without the need to apply for government subsidies to cover the expenditures.
- There is also language in the element that discusses the proposed advisory agency managing county wide energy services in times of emergency – earthquakes, storm events and the like. These discussions purport potential responsibilities that are already administered by the County's Office of Emergency Services in concert with the service providers that include emergency planning management with the following service disciplines: local Fire departments, Fire districts, Police and Sheriff's departments, Municipal Water Districts, Community Service Districts, Public Works departments, Hospitals, Schools.
- The O.E.S. is under mandate of Federal and State laws to do so. If the Office of Emergency Services is being dissolved, or if the Supervisors want to take emergency planning and response responsibilities away from the County Sheriff's department, that language, that proposal, any action to do so does not belong in the General Plan.

Comment Number	Chapter or - Page #	Section # , Item #, or Paragraph ( ¶ ) #	Consistency Finding
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We are concerned that it duplicates oversight and management authority of the implementation strategies of the Energy Element to an advisory agency when it already exists in the process according to state laws: Title 24 and the Building Codes as implemented by the County Building Department.</li> <li>The existence of RCEA is contingent upon the receipt of grant funding. There does not need to be any new County agency created adding to the already burdensome layers of bureaucracy that surround the permit process for development in our county.</li> </ul>
82	12	<b>E-IM5 May not be consistent with economic development chapter.</b>	<b>E-IM5. Wind Energy Development.</b> This Element proudly espouses how forward thinking Humboldt County is with regard to renewable resources. Now is the time to prove that here in this element. Could the strike out text be removed from the element? Also for clarity, why not include larger wind energy systems? If the recent Shell proposal was not a good one for the Wildcat ridge area specifically, what is to say there is not a better large project for a different area or a smaller scale project for the Wildcat ridge area? To only support projects of a certain size can be construed as prejudicial to project proponents wishing to construct larger projects that may benefit our communities as additional energy providers. Provide a level playing field.
83	12	<b>E-P8</b>	<b>E-P8. County Building Design Standards.</b> Design, construct and operate all new and renovated <del>County-owned facilities to U.S. Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) "Silver"</del> or better energy efficiency standards consistent with State Executive Order S-20-04, or to similar California Green Building Standards.  We are sure it is a good idea for any Proprietary programs should be named in the general plan.
84	12	<b>E-S3 May not be consistent with economic development chapter.</b>	<b>E-S3. Wind Generating Facilities.</b> Overly subjective; whose convenience, in what way? Why would the availability of additional energy sources be inconvenient for anyone – especially in this plan and this chapter? This Element proudly espouses how forward thinking Humboldt County is with regard to renewable resources. Now is the time to prove that here in this element.
85	12	<b>E-S4 May not be consistent with</b>	<b>E-S4. Oil and Gas Pipelines near sensitive habitat.</b> This level of detail should be only in Ordinance. Reliance upon CEQA needs to be mentioned.

Comment Number	Chapter or - Page #	Section # , Item # , or Paragraph ( ¶ ) #	Consistency Finding
86	12	<p>economic development chapter.</p> <p><b>E-P10</b></p> <p><b>May not be consistent with economic development chapter.</b></p> <p><b>Inconsistent with the Circulation element.</b></p>	<p><b>E-P10. Transportation Management Plans. DELETE THIS</b> Other than government, and perhaps Humboldt State University and the local hospitals, there are not any large enough employers in the County, nor are there likely to be any new ones if policies such as these are included in this general plan. <b><u>INCONSISTENT with the Economic Development Chapter of the plan, and the Circulation Plan, AND COMMON SENSE.</u></b></p>
87	12	<p><b>E-P15</b></p> <p><b>Zoning "overlays" inconsistent with the housing element and with overall plan</b></p>	<p><b>E-P15. Wind Energy Overlay Zones.</b></p> <p><b>No Overlay Zones! Add use to the base zone as either principally or conditionally permitted and call it good for heaven's sake!!</b></p>
88	12	<p><b>E-S7</b></p> <p><b>Inconsistent with the Housing Element, Economic Development element, Growth Planning OR urban lands element and the Subdivision ordinance.</b></p>	<p><b>S7. Solar Access Protection</b> - Belongs in the Subdivision Ordinance if anywhere as a voluntary recommendation per state law. NOT Consistent with the General Plan Housing Element, Economic Development Element, Growth Planning Element or Urban Lands Element because it is counter to housing construction, infill and do not make sense with our weather patterns on December 21<sup>st</sup>. If the County REALLY WANTS TO SUPPORT INFILL, FIX THIS! Also this does not comport with on-site or curb-side parking in the subdivision ordinance ----</p> <p>MANY infill projects are stopped by this ridiculous regulation.</p>
89	12	<p><b>E-IM13</b></p> <p><b>Inconsistent with overall plan, the economic</b></p>	<p><b>E-IM13. Renewable Energy Permitting Process.</b> The P.U.C. regulates energy permits. There are too many questions we have here: First, is this portion of the item talking about County facilities or private facilities? Shouldn't the identification of said systems better left to those that know what they are and have experience with design and function, install and maintenance? Again, as mentioned above – why eliminate the potential for larger</p>

Comment Number	Chapter or - Page #	Section # , Item #, or Paragraph ( ¶ ) #	Consistency Finding
		development element and maybe the housing element. Confusing	<p>systems?</p> <p>Any additional or special permit requirement would likely add costs onto housing making them less affordable, and would actually be a dis-incentive to the idea of energy efficiency provision. <b>Some of this very detailed language should only should apply to large scale projects, and be in an ordinance.</b></p> <p>We do not think energy efficiency should be limited to ANY zone. As this is written, it limits energy efficiency no matter where someone wants to do it! As it is written it is NOT CONSISTENT within this element. The exception to that, of course, would be large scale projects: wind, drilling, dams or wave energy – Should be allowed to go through the regular CEQA public hearing process as perhaps "Large Scale Energy Permit". ; AND any such projects would also be subject to other authority (P.U.C., Coastal Commission comes to mind) and their permits, so permit timing etc. would have to come at the right time and in the right order of who would be lead agency etc.</p>
90	12	<b>E-IM14 Inconsistent with housing element.</b>	<b>E-IM14 Energy Ordinance.</b> Any additional or special permit requirement would likely add costs onto building housing or other construction projects making them less affordable. This item would actually be a dis-incentive to the idea of energy efficiency provision.
91	13 Noise Element	<b>N-S8 Ordinance language</b>	<b>N-S8. Short-term Noise Performance Standards (Lmax).</b> We think the level of detail belongs in an ordinance and not in a standard. The language is excessive for most projects and would only come up for an airport area, or medium-high impact manufacturing or heavy industrial uses. It has been our experience that such levels of detail would only come into play for those types of projects within their project description and sound reports or as a result of CEQA finding the need for mitigation.
92	13	<b>N-P2 Inconsistent with the housing element.</b>	<b>N-P2. Guide to Land Use Planning.</b> For clarity, the first part of P2 is fine. The second part is nonsense and should be deleted. Because the Airport compatibility plan/matrix is already in use, and because there are already residential and commercial uses around our existing airports this second paragraph is not needed. Additionally, the communities already exist – people live where they can afford to and/or want to. Unless you are gonna permit a whole new community way out in the rural part of the county from square one, why is this here???. This ideal is social engineering of the worst sort. DELETE.
93	13	<b>N-IM1 Combining Zone</b>	<b>N-IM1. Noise Impact Combining Zone.</b> Utilize Noise Impact <b>Combining Zone</b> designations to identify areas where noise impact mitigations are required. <b>BOS tentative revision 3-11-</b>

Comment Number	Chapter or - Page #	Section # , Item #, or Paragraph ( ¶ ) #	Consistency Finding
		Duplicate.	<p><b>2013: Straw Vote 5-0]</b></p> <p>NO COMBINING ZONES. Any location that would either principally permit or conditionally permit such a loud use would already have a matching zone such as a zone designation for medium to heavy industrial or airports (etc.) right? Why the need to add another set of regulations on top of what is/should be already there?</p>
94	13	N-IM3	<p><b>N-IM3. Compliance Program.</b> This item calls for the County planners to become enforcers where we already have law enforcement and a District Attorney's Office to prosecute. The County Planning Department does not have the money, the time or the training. <b>Delete.</b></p>
95	13	N-P3 Cal Trans jurisdiction	<p><b>N-P3. Noise from U.S. Highway 101 (U.S. 101) and State Highway 299.</b> This item talks about CalTrans right of ways; none of which the County has jurisdiction over. Let Caltrans decide if there is a problem and let them come up with and pay for and construct or install or plan the solution....</p>
96	13	N-P4.  NONSENSE	<p><del><b>N-P4. Protection from Excessive Noise.</b> Protect persons from existing or future excessive levels of noise which interfere with sleep, communication, relaxation, health or legally permitted use of property.</del></p> <p>Are you kidding? What is this here for? This is RIDICULOUS. Is the noise growling cats? Is it a teen-ager's stereo? Is it an airplane? Is it a gunshot 3 miles away? What is this doing in the general plan???</p> <p>Not implementable. DELETE</p>
97	13	N-IM7x  NONSENSE and Social Engineering	<p><del><b>N-IM7x. Noise Control Ordinance.</b> Prepare and consider a noise control ordinance to regulate noise sources in order to protect persons from existing or future excessive levels of noise which interfere with sleep, communication, relaxation, health or legally permitted use of property. The ordinance shall define excessive levels of noise and may exempt or modify noise requirements for agricultural uses, construction activities, school functions, property maintenance, waste collection and other sources. The ordinance shall include responsibilities and procedures for enforcement, abatement and variances.</del></p> <p><b>Note:</b> This ideal is social engineering of the worst sort. DELETE. Impossible to implement.</p>
98	14 Safety Element	S-IM3 REDUNDANT	<p><del><b>S-IM3.Drainage Ordinance.</b> The County shall implement drainage course flood mitigation policies through the adoption of a drainage ordinance. This is redundant; we already have and implement the grading and subdivision ordinance! Please delete.</del></p>

Comment Number	Chapter or - Page #	Section # , Item #, or Paragraph ( ¶ ) #	Consistency Finding
99	14	S-PX5 As written, <b>INCONSISTENT WITHIN ITSELF</b>	<p><b>S-PX5 <del>Protection of Native Plants.</del> Maximize fire resistance using Firewise Plants around structures.</b> The County shall promote fire-safe practices that <u>encourage conservation and the use</u> of firewise plants around structures as listed on the CALFire Fuel Reduction standards in SRA areas. <del>native plants and native plant ecosystems, while protecting citizens, firefighters, and property.</del> Please modify as shown – it makes more sense, would be less redundant and conflicting within itself, reads better, <b>and makes sense on the ground.</b></p> <p>Native species are not known for their fire retardant characteristics . . . <b>inconsistent in itself.</b> To really be fire resistant you either need ice plant or ROCKS.</p>
100	15 Air Quality Element	<b>AQ-P1</b>  <b>SOCIAL ENGINEERING NONSENSE</b>	<p><b>AQ-P1. Reduce Length and Frequency of Vehicle Trips.</b> Reduce the length and frequency of vehicle trips through land use and transportation policies by encouraging mixed-use development, compact development patterns in areas served by public transit, and active modes of travel.</p> <p>We do not understand how this item would be implementable. Because of our county's geographic size, people drive. Because our towns and cities have separation between them, people drive to and from work, services and play. Because our county is pretty and offers many recreational uses, people drive.</p> <p>Not only can a general Plan NOT stop them from driving, a general plan should not contain policies to even TRY try to stop people from driving. Our county (over 2.2 million acres in size) has fewer than 150,000 people in it. There are more trees than people, and therefore any air quality 'issues' from cars, people, or cows are <u>naturally</u> off-set. <b>Please delete any items such as this that are obviously of the social engineering ideal removed from this plan.</b></p>
101	15	<b>AQ-IM1</b> <b>NCAQMD</b> <b>Jurisdiction</b>	<p><b>AQ-IM1. Review Attainment Plan Revisions.</b> IM1 does use the word 'transportation' in the item (could generally be related to vehicles) NCAQMD would be lead agency for any Air Quality violations of their own regulations; how and why would the County revise rules not under or of its own jurisdiction? Perhaps this item should be deleted.</p>
102	15	<b>AQ-IM3</b> <b>Inconsistent with Energy Element.</b> <b>Optional Legislation</b>	<p><b>AQ-IM3. County-wide Climate Action Plan.</b> This legislation was OPTIONAL.</p> <p>EP5. Regional Energy Authority. Note: The existence of RCEA is contingent upon the receipt of grant funding. There does not need to be any new County agency created adding to the already burdensome layers of bureaucracy that surround the permit process for</p>



Comment Number	Chapter or - Page #	Section # , Item #, or Paragraph ( ¶ ) #	Consistency Finding
		language.	development in our county. IM3 and IM5 also inconsistent with Energy P5, Energy IM2; both items recognize RCEA as lead agency.
103	15	<b>AQ-IMX Definition Inconsistent with Housing Element</b>	<b>AQ-IMx. Review of Greenhouse Gas Emissions Impacts of New Development.</b> Optional legislation. Lacks definitions for what is meant by "large scale", and who would decide that. CEQA mandates all discretionary permits discuss air quality. Development in Humboldt County has not topped over 400 units in one year since 1991. IMx. NOT consistent with P5. Counter to Housing Element.
104	15	<b>AQ-P7</b>	<b>AQ-P7. Interagency Coordination.</b> Instead of adding yet <i>another</i> written directive to coordinate with other agencies, could a promise / policy be added to read something to the effect that "staff will continue to follow the California Permit Streamlining Act on all project applications"? <b>Really, it would mean more.</b>
105	15	<b>AQ-P9 NCAQMD Jurisdiction</b>	<b>AQ-P9. County Climate Action Plan.</b> NCAQMD would be lead agency for any Air Quality violations of their own regulations; how and why would the County revise rules not under or of its own jurisdiction? Perhaps this item should be deleted.
106	15	<b>AQ-S4 Inconsistent with Economic Development Element</b>	<b>AQ-S4. Preservation and Replacement of On-site Trees.</b> If a project has to clear trees to make way for its building, parking, solar shading, fire-truck turn-arounds, and other county regulated requirements to go into business in the first place to provide JOBS, make the on-site re-plant <i>optional</i> . As written it may not be consistent with Economic Development Element. It certainly lacks common sense.