

**ATTACHMENT NO. 1
LUP SUMMARY TABLE**

PLN100138 – Pebble Beach Company

Board of Supervisors
January 24, 2012

LUP SUMMARY TABLE

Summary of Key Changes to the DMF Land Use Plan

Existing LUP Section	Proposed LUP Section/Policy	LUP Changes	Discussion
Chapter 1. Introduction			
Introductory material	Introductory material	Reworded discussion of California Coastal Act, Monterey County LCP and Del Monte Forest LUP updated to clarify the relationships of the Coastal Act, the LCP, and the LUP. Reworded organization summary and deletion of Chapter 7, OSAC Plan. Updated definitions.	No change in level of development or environmental protection. Regarding Chapter 7, OSAC Plan, see discussion below.
Policy Guidance Statements	Key Policies	Minor rewordings to Key Policies for Freshwater and Marine Resources, Forest Resources, scenic and Visual Resources, and Circulation, and Public Access. Key Policy for Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas modified to allow for exceptions to ESHA policies where specifically and explicitly authorized by the LUP. Key Policy for Cultural Resources acknowledges that in certain cases impacts may be unavoidable. Key Policy for Land Use and Development changed to remove requirement to designate all ESHA as open space. Key Policy for Waste and Wastewater changed to add requirement for long-term sustainable public water supplies and wastewater treatment capacities. Key Policy for Housing changed to acknowledge protection of affordable housing both with the Forest and in outlying areas.	No change in level of development or environmental protection. ESHA exemptions only apply to the PBC Concept Plan. Cleanup of prior practice which always recognized that unavoidable impacts may be possible. Intent of entirety of existing LCP was not to require designation of open space for all ESHA. Removal of requirement does not result in more impact to ESHA separate from PBC Concept Plan Areas. Additional requirements strengthen resources protection by requiring long-term sustainable water and wastewater treatment capacity. No change of intent to apply the County's Housing Element within all of Monterey County.

Existing LUP Section	Proposed LUP Section/Policy	LUP Changes	Discussion
Chapter 2. Resource Management Element			
Introduction	Introduction	Reworded introduction. Added description of the PBC Concept Plan as integral part of the overall LUP that balances certain impacts to ESHA, wetlands, dunes, streams and riparian corridors in concentrated development areas near existing developed areas for the benefit of preserving larger contiguous areas off forest, dunes, and open space.	Changes facilitate PBC Concept Plan.
Freshwater and Marine Resources	Freshwater and Marine Resources	Minor rewordings of Key Policy and policies without substantial change in intent.	Changes do not increase development potential or environmental protection requirements.
Policy Guidance Statement and Policies	Key Policy and Policies 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7		
Freshwater and Marine Resources Policy 3	Freshwater and Marine Resources Policy 3	Policy amended to delete prohibition of grading greater than 1 acre/100 cubic yards in winter.	Technical edit to make the LUP a policy document versus a technical document. Technical detail moved to the CIP, and also regulatory language in the County's grading code. The CIP contains the same prohibition so no change in substance.
ESHA Introduction	ESHA Introduction	Added Yadon's piperia, California, red-legged frog, portions of the native Monterey pine forest and central maritime chaparral as examples of ESHA in the DMF. Require ESHA to be defined based on evaluation of current resources on the ground and their current sensitivity. Deletion of Appendix A.	Changes will increase level of environmental protection by requiring assessment of sensitivity and delineation of ESHA to be based on current conditions as opposed to a static definition of ESHA. Specifically increases protection of Yadon's piperia, California red-legged frog, portion of the native Monterey pine forest and central maritime chaparral which are not called out as ESHA in existing LCP.
	Key Policy	Reference to OSAC Plan deleted from Policy Guidance Statement. Allowance of defined exceptions to LCP (for PBC Concept Plan).	See discussion below on OSAC Plan.
ESHA Policies 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 29.	ESHA Policies 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27.	Minor changes were made to these ESHA policies without change in resource protection intent. Reference to OSAC Plan deleted from policies.	No change in level of development potential or resource protection in light of overall LCP requirements and requirements of other applicable resource protection regulations. See discussion below on OSAC Plan.

Existing LUP Section	Proposed LUP Section/Policy	LUP Changes	Discussion
ESHA Policy 17	ESHA Policy 16	Deleted reference to Appendix A, performance standards and ESHA. New policy only concerns survey.	As noted above, ESHA delineations to be based on current conditions and sensitivity which is more protective than existing plan overall.
ESHA Policy 16	ESHA Policy 17	Deletion of reference to development of lots of record in remnant dune habitat.	More protective of dune habitat than existing LCP by deleting reference to lot of record development in dune areas.
ESHA Policy 20	Deleted	Spanish Bay Planning Area.	Prior Policy 20 contained prior requirements for the Spanish Bay planning area that have already been completed.
ESHA Policy 21b	Deleted	Deleted policy regarding acquisition of the Shumway parcel.	Parcel already acquired.
ESHA Policy 26	Deleted	Deleted policy regarding placement of easements over Huckleberry Hill Natural Habitat Area and of allowing public works use of former quarry sites and the haul road.	Easements over HHNHA have been recorded. Deletion of reference to quarry sites consistent with change to prohibit development of Sawmill quarry site. Haul road to be used as trail in PBC Concept Plan.
ESHA Policy 28	Deleted	Deleted policy that previously subdivided land is subject to the same ESHA requirements as new residential development or subdivisions. Deleted policy that development is not allowed on any parcel that is entirely ESHA, except as provided in Policy 74 (Policy 74 allowed access improvements in ESHA is consistent with site-specific requirements).	Within Concept Plan development areas, the deletion of this policy would allow the development included in the project. All other non-Concept Plan new development would still be subject to ESHA policies which limit development in ESHA as required by the California Coastal Act. Other policies in the Land Use Plan, including those found in the proposed amendments to the LUP, are equally protective of ESHA, making the old policy redundant in protecting these biological resources. Prior Policy 28 would have resulted in constitutional takings if applied in a manner to preclude any development whatsoever on a parcel and thus could not have been legally enforced.
ESHA Policy 30	ESHA Policy 28	Changed protected pupping season from April through July to April 1 to June 1.	Changed to make policy consistent with PBC-USFWS agreement negotiated subsequent to existing LCP.
ESHA Policy 30a	ESHA Policy 29	Deleted specific permit requirements relative to water quality.	Water quality permits already require all of the substantive requirements reflected in existing language.

Existing LUP Section	Proposed LUP Section/Policy	LUP Changes	Discussion
Forest Resources Introduction Policy Guidance Statement	Forest Resources Introduction Key Policy	Rewording on text, with substantial additions characterizing the Monterey pine forests and other forests in the DMF. Includes concept of ESHA forests as more intact forested areas vs. non-ESHA forests including less intact aggregations of trees.	Existing LCP does not define Monterey pine as ESHA except in limited circumstances and thus definitions within this introduction actually expand the applicability of ESHA within forests in the DMF.
Forest Resources Policies 31, 33, 34, 36, 38	Forest Resources Policies 30, 32, 33, 35, 37	Minor changes were made to these ESHA policies without change in resource protection intent.	No change in level of development potential or resource protection in light of overall LCP requirements.
Forest Resources Policy 32	Forest Resources Policy 31	Deleted specific tree by tree requirements.	Technical edit to make the LUP more of a policy document and leave detail to CIP. CIP edits, new language prohibits tree removal within ESHA unless part of restoration and enhancement, removal of Monterey cypress in its native range, and Coast Live oaks over 24 inches. Monterey pine and other tree removal (where not ESHA) still subject to recommendations of an approved Forest Management Plan. Overall intent of language similarly protective as existing plan.
Forest Resources Policy 35	Forest Resources Policy 34	Policy amended to delete prohibition of grading greater than 1 acre/100 cubic yards in winter.	See discussion above for Policy 3.
Forest Resources Policy 37	Forest Resources Policy 36	Deletion of reference to commercial harvesting allowance. Deletion of Landmark Tree status.	Elimination of allowance is more protective of forest resource than existing LCP. Technical edit to make the LUP a policy document versus a technical document. Technical detail moved to the CIP. Re-written policies offer expanded protection to healthy trees, regardless of size.
Forest Resources Policy 39	Deleted	Deleted policy concerning Forestry Special Treatment Areas and subdivision.	Original language was concerned with preserving commercial timberland. Commercial timbering is no longer an existing or proposed use in the revised LUP and thus this policy is no longer needed.

Existing LUP Section	Proposed LUP Section/Policy	LUP Changes	Discussion
Hazards Intro Policy Guidance Statement Policies 40-45, 48, 49	Hazards Intro Key Policy Policies 38-42, 45, 46	Minor changes were made to these policies without change in intent to hazard regulation. Specific content of site stability evaluation deleted.	No change in level of development potential or resource protection in light of overall LCP requirements. County code (Section 20.147.060.A9) contains requirements for site stability evaluation report.
Hazards Policy 42	Deleted	Deleted policy stating that new development must comply with the Seismic Safety element of the County General Plan.	Development is subject to the General Plan so this policy was superfluous.
Hazards New Policies 46 and 47	Hazards New Policies 43 and 44	New constraints and requirements regarding shoreline protection added to LCP.	New requirements promote avoidance of the need for shoreline armoring or alternations to the minimum feasible. This is more protective than the existing LCP of shoreline resources.
Scenic and Visual Resources Introduction Policy Guidance Statement Policies 51-59	Scenic and Visual Resources Introduction Key Policy Policies 48-56	Minor changes were made to these policies without change in resource protection intent.	No change in level of development potential or resource protection in light of overall LCP requirements.
Scenic and Visual Resources Policy 50	Scenic and Visual Resources Policy 47	Deletion of requirement to designate land along SR 68 and 17-Mile Drive as outdoor recreation, low-density residential or open space only.	New policy is more restrictive. Existing policy is limited to those areas identified on the Visual Resources Map. New policy requires site-by-site determination, with no limitation to area of applicability.
Archaeological Resources Introduction Policy Guidance Statement Policies 60-62, 65-67	Cultural Resources Introduction Key Policy Policies 57 to 59, 61-63	Minor rewording of background information. Key Policy changed to acknowledge possible mitigation as opposed to prior plan that called only for avoidance.	Existing policy unrealistic and unreflective of actual practice. Policies, as proposed, maintain same level of protection but more clearly acknowledge actual process of cultural resource protection.

Existing LUP Section	Proposed LUP Section/Policy	LUP Changes	Discussion
Archaeological Resources Policy 63	Cultural Resources Policy 60	Change to acknowledge possible mitigation as opposed to prior plan that called only for avoidance.	See above discussion.
Archaeological Resources Policy 64	Deleted	Deleted policy prohibiting categorical exemptions for projects with potential to damage an archaeologically sensitive area.	CEQA requirements already preclude this possibility so policy is superfluous.
Chapter 3. Land Use and Development			
Introduction Policy Guidance Statement Policies 68, 68a 68b, 69, 70, 72, 74-78, 79-83, 85, 89, 90, 93	Introduction Key Policy Policies 64-68, 70, 72- 75, 78-84, 85, 89, 90, 93	Minor rewording and deletion of OSAC Plan. Rewording of certain policies without increase of development potential or decrease of resource protection. Deletion of reference to OSAC Plan and Site-Specific Public Access Design Criteria.	No change in level of development potential or resource protection in light of overall LCP requirements. See below for discussion of OSAC Plan and Site-Specific Public Access Design Criteria.
Policy 71	Policy 69	Allowance of provision of parking requirements off-site.	Clarifying language. Reflection of past and current practice.
Policy 73	Deleted	Deletion of reference to Site-Specific Access Recommendations (Appendix B) and replacement with Del Monte Forest Public Access Management Plan to be developed later.	Appendix B Site Specific Recommendations deleted because items completed. Technical edit to make the LUP a policy document versus a technical document. The intent of the new Public Access Management Plan is to consolidate and update all of the existing technical agreements that were mostly written in the 1980s. No functional change to public access requirements.
Policy 78a	Policy 76	Deleted 850 SF limit on accessory dwelling unit and deleted limitation of only one caretaker unit per parcel.	Title 20 amended to replace caretaker units and senior units with a single accessory unit. Where a parcel could currently have the potential for one caretaker unit and one senior unit, they would only be able to have one accessory unit, which is more restrictive than current LCP.

Existing LUP Section	Proposed LUP Section/Policy	LUP Changes	Discussion
Not in existing plan	Policy 77	Allowance of employee housing for recreational equestrian uses.	Clarifying language added to reflect the existing interpretation that Coastal Act established recreation as a priority use. Current LUP language is not exclusive of recreational uses.
Policy 84	Policy 84	New policy to require Pescadero watershed development site coverage limit to 9,000 square feet. Reduction of Area B setback from 200 feet to 100 feet.	No current site coverage limit in LUP. Intended to help control water quality in runoff to Carmel Bay.
Policy 86	Policy 86	Deletion of allowing golf courses in residential designations.	The setback requirement of 200 feet was meant to screen structural development from public view. Development in Area B will only include a surface parking lot that will be screened by vegetation along 17-Mile Drive and Congress Road. Reference to Area B deleted because it is part of the Concept Plan. No impacts beyond that in the Concept Plan.
Policy 87	Policy 87	Deletion of reference to hospital and neighborhood commercial at quarry site and addition of residential use.	This change eliminates the potential of allowing golf courses in residentially-designated areas which is more protective than the existing LCP.
Policy 88	Policy 88	Added reference to PBC water entitlement as an exception to water priority.	This change is relevant to the PBC Concept Plan. This is a change in the type of development allowed at the quarry site but does not increase overall development potential.
Policy 91	Policy 91	Allowance of low-intensity visitor-serving facilities (such as restaurant, golf-related shops) at all Del Monte Forest golf courses (not just Poppy Hills).	Because PBC entitlement is recognized as related to prior reductions in use of potable water from the Carmel River, the addition of the entitlement to the policy does not result in a net increase in water use related to development.
Policy 92	Policy 92	Addition of residential development as allowance in formerly mined areas and deletion of neighborhood commercial.	This has been practice to date. Prior language did not prohibit such facilities at other locations. Cleaned up language.
			This change is relevant to the Concept Plan. This is a change in the type of development allowed at the quarry site but does not increase overall development potential.

Existing LUP Section	Proposed LUP Section/Policy	LUP Changes	Discussion
Policy 94	Policy 94	New policy allowing a hotel at Spyglass Quarry site or low-density single-family residences.	Part of PBC Concept Plan. Existing LCP allows use of previously mined areas for development.
Not in existing LUP	Policy 95	Prohibition of development of Sawmill Gulch quarry site.	More protective than existing LCP which had more potential for development at some portions of the former quarry.
Policy 95	Policy 96	Allowance of residential and deletion of neighborhood commercial at Corporation Yard.	This change is relevant to the PBC Concept Plan. This is a change in the type of development allowed at the quarry site but does not increase overall development potential.
Land Use Designations	Land Use Designations	Deletion of residential use being allowed in VSC.	Reflects practice to date of prioritizing visitor-serving uses only in VSC areas. Does not increase development potential.
		Addition to OSR of driving ranges, clubhouses, trails and neighborhood parks.	Addition of recognized recreational uses reflects character of recreational use in DMF and is consistent with existing LUP language.
		Deletion of reference to OSAC Plan.	Maintenance is still under the OSAC plan but plan will now function as guidance outside the LUP. The Open Space Management Plan will be updated with a Forest Management Plan that will be prepared with the participation of interested groups (e.g., County, CCC, PBC, OSAC, DMFF, PBCSD, CNPS, etc.).
		Deletion of reference to restoration of shoreline areas in the County Club Planning Area.	Restoration previously required has been completed.
		Use of fee for low-cost visitor-serving accommodations in the Coastal Zone (instead of in the DMF).	Part of the DMF Agreement between the CCC and PBC. No broader application beyond PBC Concept Plan.

Existing LUP Section	Proposed LUP Section/Policy	LUP Changes	Discussion
Land Use by Planning Area	Land Use by Planning Area	Table A showing units per area deleted. Planning area descriptions revised to recognize completed development and Concept Plan, Deletes reference to OSAC Plan.	Table A now outdated in light of completed development and proposed Concept Plan. Development on non-Concept Plan areas governed by County zoning code. See discussion of OSAC Plan below. Change would not alter allowable development on non-Concept Plan lands.
Not in existing LUP	Concept Plan Introduction	Introduces Concept Plan.	Reflects project to be analyzed in the DEIR.
Not in existing LUP	Concept Plan Requirements Applicable to ESHA, Wetlands, Dunes, Streams, and Riparian Corridors	New text describes that notwithstanding the presence of ESHA, wetlands, dunes, streams and riparian corridors, development located in Concept Plan development areas shall be allowed subject to certain setbacks and buffers.	Reflects project to be analyzed in the DEIR.
Not in existing LUP	Concept Plan Requirements Applicable to Certain Setbacks/Buffers	New text describes specific setbacks and buffers for Concept Plan development areas.	Reflects project to be analyzed in the DEIR.
Not in existing LUP	Concept Plan Requirements Applicable to Further Subdivision	New text describes that no further subdivision is allowed in the residential areas included in the Concept Plan.	Reflects project to be analyzed in the DEIR.
Not in existing LUP	Concept Plan Requirements Applicable to Preservation Areas	New text describes that easements shall be dedicated for Concept Plan preservation areas accompanied by comprehensive forest and resource management plan, adequate funding, and protection and management in perpetuity.	Reflects project to be analyzed in the DEIR.
Not in existing LUP	Concept Plan requirements Applicable to Forest Management on Residential Lots	New text described requirements for forest management on Concept Plan residential lots.	Reflects project to be analyzed in the DEIR. Dedication of Preservation Areas noted in the Concept Plan provides the required forest habitat and tree replacement for Concept Plan development.

Existing LUP Section	Proposed LUP Section/Policy	LUP Changes	Discussion
Not in existing LUP	Concept Plan requirements Applicable to Traffic and Circulation	New text describes that Concept Plan development must be conditional on improvement to the SR 1/SR 68/17-Mile Drive intersections, and improvements to the Lodge area parking and circulation and any traffic and circulation requirements identified during project review.	Reflects project to be analyzed in the DEIR.
Not in existing LUP	Concept Plan requirements Applicable to Water and Wastewater	New text describes that concept plan development can use water from the Pebble Beach Water Entitlement and that adequate water is available to meet expected demand. New text described that adequate wastewater treatment capacity is available for concept plan development, and that new development is conditional on compliance with all requirements for wastewater impact.	Reflects project to be analyzed in the DEIR.
Not in existing LUP	Concept Plan Requirements Applicable to Public Access and Recreation	New text requires preparation of a Del Monte Forest Public Access Management Plan subject to review and approval by the County and the Executive Director of the Coastal Commission. Plan is intended as comprehensive plan for all public access in the Del Monte Forest. New text clarifies public access requirements and responsibilities.	Replaces prior Policy 145 and Appendix B and related requirements. Any new public access improvements not included in the project shall require separate permit and environmental review.
Not in existing LUP	Concept Plan Requirements Applicable to Low-Cost Visitor-Serving Facilities	Requires provision for lower-cost overnight visitor-serving accommodations as a condition of approval of the first development in the concept plan that provides overnight visitor-serving accommodations. Allow condition to be satisfied by payment of a fee to an organization to provide lower-cost visitor accommodations in the coastal zone.	New visitor-serving accommodations shall require separate permit and environmental review by the County, in coordination with the California Coastal Commission.
Not in existing LUP	Concept Plan Requirements Applicable to Affordable Housing	New text notes that the concept plan is subject to the County's Inclusionary Housing Ordinance.	Reflects current County policy.

Existing LUP Section	Proposed LUP Section/Policy	LUP Changes	Discussion
Not in existing LUP	Concept Plan Implementation	New text describes that all other requirements of the LCP apply to the concept plan, except as specifically noted in policies in this or other sections. Notes that the LCP is to be read that the concept plan residential development is ultimately allowable consistent development of similar residential lots in the DMF.	Reflects project to be analyzed in the DEIR.
Chapter 4. Land Use Support Element			
Introduction	Introduction	Introductory language updated to reflect current circulation conditions. Minor rewording of circulation policies. Reference to site-specific access recommendations deleted in favor of new access plan noted above and due to completion of prior access improvements. Clarified gate access fees.	No change in level of development potential or resource protection in light of overall LCP requirements. See below for discussion of site-specific access recommendations.
Planned Circulation Improvements	Planned Circulation Improvements		
Policy Guidance Statement	Key Policy		
Circulation Policies 96-108	Circulation Policies 97-110		
Waste and Wastewater Services	Waste and Wastewater Services	Introductory language updated to current conditions and status. Minor updates to policy language. Added requirement for proof of adequate long-term sustainable public water supply and public wastewater treatment capacity.	No change in level of development potential. Resource protection enhanced by requirements for long-term sustainable public water supply and wastewater treatment capacity.
Considerations	Considerations		
Policy Guidance statement	Key Policy		
Policies 110, 111, 113-114	Policies 112, 113, 115, 116		
Policy 109	Policy 111	Deletion of language that stated that residential development was not a priority for water and wastewater capacity.	Existing policy stated that residential development was not a priority. Deletion of policy will facilitate Concept Plan use of PBC water entitlement and use of PBC water entitlement by other residential development. Other residential development subject to individual project processing. Use of the PBC water entitlement in part for residential use will not result in water supply impacts due to reduction in water use that resulted from granting of entitlement.

Existing LUP Section	Proposed LUP Section/Policy	LUP Changes	Discussion
Policy 112	Policy 114	Deletion of reserving water from allocations for present lot owners	Allocations are obsolete.
Policy 115	Deleted	Deleted policy supporting reclamation projects.	Reclamation project completed.
N/A	Policy 117	New policy supporting wastewater disposal to minimize or eliminate Carmel Bay pollution.	More protective than existing LCP.
N/A	Policy 118	New policy requiring new development to demonstrate additional wastewater discharge will not significantly affect coastal resource, in particular Carmel Bay.	More protective than existing LCP.
Housing Intro Policy Guidance Statement Policies 116-119	Housing Intro Key Policy Policies 120-121	Introductory language updated and minor rewording of circulation policies. Deleted prior language allowing timeshares for new development.	No change in level of development potential or resource protection in light of overall LCP requirements.
Policy 117	Deleted	Deleted prior policy regarding protection of loss of affordable housing due to deterioration, demolition, and conversion.	Affordable housing is protected by the County's adopted housing element
Policy 118	Deleted	Deleted prior policy regarding compliance with County's Inclusionary Ordinance and Housing Element.	New development must still comply with the Inclusionary ordinance and Housing Element, so policy was superfluous.
Chapter 5. Public Access Element			
Introduction Policy Guidance Statement Policies 120, 124-144	Introduction Key Policy Policies 123, 125 - 146	Updated to reflect completion of access improvements since original adoption of the LCP. Updated language/minor rewording of policies. Deleted reference to site-specific access requirements due to completion of prior access improvements and in favor of new access plan.	Specific access requirements removed because items completed. Technical edit to make the LUP a policy document versus a technical document. The intent of the new Public Access Management Plan will be to consolidate and update all of the existing technical agreements that were mostly written in the 1980s. No functional change to public access requirements.

Existing LUP Section	Proposed LUP Section/Policy	LUP Changes	Discussion
Policy 120	Policy 122	Deletion of reference LUP access maps	LUP figures updated. Public and shoreline access information consolidated with recreational information on new LUP Figure 8 (Public Access and Recreational Facilities).
Policy 122	Policy 124	Deletion of reference to visual resources maps	LUP figures updated. Visual Resources are identified on new LUP Figure 3.
Policy 123	Deleted	Deletion of Existing Policy 123 allowing bluff top and lateral access as appropriate shoreline use.	Deletion of policy is more restrictive than current LCP.
Policy 145	Deleted	Deletion of the Site-Specific Access Recommendations (Appendix B and Old Policy 145) and replacement with Del Monte Forest Public Access Management Plan to be developed later.	Specific list removed because items completed. Technical edit to make the LUP a policy document versus a technical document. The intent of the new Public Access Management Plan is to consolidate and update all of the existing technical agreements that were mostly written in the 1980s. No functional change to public access requirements.
Chapter 6. Implementation			
Implementation	Implementation	Deleted reference to OSAC Plan and site-specific shoreline public access design criteria. Rewording of language.	See discussion below about OSAC Plan. See discussion above regarding deletion of prior site-specific access requirements due to completion of prior improvements and in favor of new access plan.
Water and Sewer Allocations by Development Area Table B	Timing of Development	Deletion of water and sewer allocations by development area.	The allocations are obsolete. LUP updated with current information about water supply and wastewater capacity. Concept Plan development served by available water supply and wastewater capacity. Other new development must demonstrate capacity.

Existing LUP Section	Proposed LUP Section/Policy	LUP Changes	Discussion
Chapter 7. Del Monte Forest Open Space Management Plan (OSAC) (Deleted)			
Open Space Management Plan	Open Space Management Plan	OSAC Plan (Section 7) deleted from LUP.	The OSAC Plan has been replaced with policy requirements that achieve the same result. The purpose of technical edit to make the LUP a policy document versus a technical document.
Appendix A. List of Environmental Sensitive Habitats (Deleted)			
Appendix A	Deleted	Deleted	The OSAC Plan will be updated with a Forest Management Plan that will be prepared with the participation of interested groups (e.g.; County, CCC, PBC, OSAC, DMFF, CNPS, etc.).
Appendix B. Site-Specific Access Recommendations (Deleted)			
Appendix B	Deleted	Access Recommendations deleted.	As noted above, the prior access recommendations have been implemented and will be replaced by the new access plan required to be developed as a condition for the Concept Plan.