

PLANNING COMMISSION SUGGESTED CHANGES TO THE DRAFT 2030 GENERAL PLAN

July 1, 2011

The following table summarizes the suggested changes to the draft 2030 General Plan made by the Planning Commission during their June 22, 2011 meeting. The table is based on an earlier table, and also summarizes staff recommendations and direction received during the May 3, 2011, joint Planning Commission/Board of Supervisors study session. Planning Commission suggested changes are noted in **green text** in a row under the respective topic. Note: if there was no Planning Commission discussion or suggested change, the Planning Commission agreed with the staff recommendation.

#	Goal, Policy, or Implementation Program	Page	Suggested Modification	Source	Staff Recommendation	Study Session Direction
1	Policy Document Introduction	I-5	Add a discussion of the San Joaquin Valley Smart Growth Principles to the Introduction (Part I, page 5).	Agriculture Focus Group	Not Recommended. RESPONSE: Added paragraphs to Page LU-1 and Page 22 of Overview indicating recognition of the San Joaquin Blueprint Planning principles and policy to achieve 7.1 DU/AC residential densities.	DISAGREE: PC/BOS would like to see a general statement about the GP's relationship with Blueprint. Possibly add tags to policies that directly relate to Blueprint
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ELEMENT						
5	Policy ED-7.1: Tourism Promotion (IGC) Continue to work with the Merced Visitor Services, Greater Merced Chamber and Visitors Bureau, UC Merced, the Farm Bureau, and interested public and private stakeholders to market Merced County as a premier tourist destination.	ED-11	Add reference to the Castle Air Museum and Challenger Learning Center.	Economic Development Focus Group	Recommended. RESPONSE: Replace "Greater Merced Chamber and Visitors Bureau" with "chambers of commerce"	AGREE, but revise to just say "chambers" instead of listing the specific name.
7			Add a new policy to facilitate partnerships to promote and facilitate agriculture-related economic development. The partnerships could include the County, cities, Farm Bureau, chambers of commerce, Merced Ahead, and NGOs.	Economic Development Focus Group Farm Bureau	Recommended. RESPONSE: New Policy ED-7.5 (Page ED-11) that stresses partnerships among agricultural groups, and city and County economic development departments.	AGREE, but revise so it applies to more than just the agencies/organizations listed

#	Goal, Policy, or Implementation Program	Page	Suggested Modification	Source	Staff Recommendation	Study Session Direction
LAND USE ELEMENT						
21	Alternative Policy Language Suggestion: Policy LU-3.X: New Rural Residential Centers (RDR) Consider designating new Rural Residential Centers for locations currently zoned agriculture where there are clusters of existing small residential parcels.	LU-12	Include allowed water availability as an overriding consideration before expanding small residential parcels.	Sierra Club	Recommended. RESPONSE: Delete Alternate Policy LU-3.X and replace with new Policy LU-3.4 "No new RRCs may be established."	DISAGREE: Consensus that water availability issue only applies to expansion of existing Rural Residential Centers (RRCs). Need policy clarification stating no new RRC's .
25	Policy LU-1.4: New Urban Communities (RDR) Allow a limited number of new urban communities in areas off productive agricultural land in order to accommodate projected growth while minimizing the conversion of productive agricultural lands. Policy LU-5.A.1: Urban Community Establishment (RDR) Allow consideration of new Urban Communities that include a balance of land uses for jobs, tax revenues, and housing.	LU-8, LU-15	Define "limited" and delete policies.	Agricultural Focus Group Sierra Club MARG	Not Recommended. RESPONSE: If Policy LU-1.4 is to be retained, modify to read: "Consider the establishment of new Urban Communities in areas off of productive agricultural land (as defined in the General Plan Glossary) which satisfy the policy requirements under Goal LU-5.F, in order to accommodate projected future growth."	MIXED DISCUSSION: PC and BOS will consider policies for New Communities (Towns) at upcoming policy meetings. More definition of some terms like "productive agricultural lands" and "limited" requested.
06/22 PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION: <i>The Planning Commission did not suggest any direct changes to this policy. There was discussion about not allowing New Communities in the 2030 General Plan. However, there was general consensus to keep this policy/concept in the draft plan and review future New Communities on a case-by-case basis.</i>						
27	Goal LU-5.F, Policy LU-5.F.1 through LU-5.F.3	LU-20 - LU-23	Delete all discussion related to New Towns in the Land Use Element. <i>NOTE: MARG stated there is no justification for these types of developments, but if Goal LU-5.F is included, they recommend adoption of the alternate policy language in Policy LU-5.F.1 (on page LU-23 of the draft policies).</i>	Agricultural Focus Group Sierra Club MARG	Not Recommended. RESPONSE: Extensive evaluation and processing requirements are presented in the policies listed; more specific direction on adding or deleting criteria will be sought during upcoming PC and Board policy review meetings.	AGREE. There was also discussion about expanding NT criteria to include a mathematical model for when they could/should be developed or when a certain percentage of development occurs in existing new communities.

#	Goal, Policy, or Implementation Program	Page	Suggested Modification	Source	Staff Recommendation	Study Session Direction
29	Alternative Policy Language Suggestions: Policy LU-6.10: New Commercial Designation (RDR) Amend the Zoning Code to allow a limited form of Highway Interchange Center on a State Highway on parcels of 10 acres or less, are limited to agricultural support and visitor commercial uses, and similar features.	LU-25		MARG	Neutral. <u>RESPONSE: Was not MARG comment, but Policy AG-1.5 and Program AG-J will include these types of considerations.</u>	<u>AGREE: Include in consideration of agricultural tourism policy development.</u>
AGRICULTURAL ELEMENT						
30	Agricultural Economy Agriculture plays a key role in shaping the economy and unique character of Merced County. A top priority for the County is to protect the existing agricultural economy, and to also find ways to expand the agricultural economy in the future. The policies in this section address the protection, expansion, and diversification of the local agricultural economy and its support industries.	AG-1	Revise section to begin with " <i>Agriculture is the leading industry that shapes the economy...</i> "	Valley Land Alliance	Neutral.	<u>KEEP AS IS, NO CHANGE</u>
31	Policy AG-1.5: On-Site Product Sales (SO/JP) Identify locations where on-site farm product sales have good economic potential, such as on major roadways and support creation of agricultural tours and trails which promote agricultural tourism.	AG-2	Include farm-stays, farm tours and trails in order to promote tourism.	Valley Land Alliance	Recommended. <u>RESPONSE: Add details in Program AG-J (Item #47), and in future Zone Code revision. Included as new bullet "f" and "g".</u>	<u>AGREE, but would like to see "more meat" on the policy. There was also a discussion of how this policy related to major roadways.</u>

#	Goal, Policy, or Implementation Program	Page	Suggested Modification	Source	Staff Recommendation	Study Session Direction
33	<p>Policy AG-1.8: Legislative Advocacy (IGC) Actively monitor, review, comment, and advocate on pending major State and Federal legislation and executive orders which could have an impact on agriculture in Merced County. Coordinate position statements with the Farm Bureau and other agricultural interest groups in the County.</p>	AG-2	<p>Include an Agricultural Advisory Committee (see recommendation regarding Implementation Program AG-F) to advise the Board on legislative advocacy. The Modified policy would read:</p> <p><i>“Policy AG-1.8: Legislative Advocacy. Direct the Agricultural Advisory Committee to actively monitor pending major Federal and State legislation and Executive Orders which have an impact on agriculture in Merced County and advise the Board of Supervisors regarding appropriate comments and actions. Coordinate position statements with the Farm Bureau and other agricultural interest groups in the County.”</i></p>	Agricultural Focus Group	Neutral.	DISAGREE: Keep the appointment of an Ag Committee out of the General Plan, the Board can establish it later if necessary/desired.
34	<p>Policy AG-2.2: Agricultural Land Mitigation (RDR) Protect agricultural areas from conversion to non- agricultural uses by establishing and implementing an agricultural mitigation program in cooperation with the six cities in Merced County, with consistent standards for county and city governments, that matches acres converted with farmland acres preserved at a 1:1 ratio.</p>	AG-3	<p>Revise the mitigation ratio to 4:1. In the alternative, adopt a sliding scale based on the LESA model ranging from 4:1 to 1:1. NOTE: Agricultural focus group recommended a higher ratio whether or not cities had similar programs in place.</p>	<p>Agricultural Focus Group</p> <p>Farm Bureau</p> <p>Valley Land Alliance</p>	<p>Not Recommended.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Policy to be modified by adding the following sentence at the end: “In addition, the LESA model may be used to determine whether the conservation land is of equal or greater value than the land being converted.”</p>	AGREE: General support for 1:1 mitigation ratio, but some discussion over not including mitigation for commercial and industrial projects. There was also support to use LESA land evaluation model as an option for evaluating property.
<p>06/22 PLANNING COMMISSION SUGGESTION: <i>The Planning Commission recommended the County adopt a 1:1 mitigation ratio. However, they also suggested that commercial and industrial lands be exempt from this mitigation requirement. The Planning Commission agreed to support use of the LESA model, used to compare the value of agricultural land being converted to the land being conserved, as an option rather than a requirement. The Commission would also like to see the Cities agree to the same mitigation ratio and felt that they would be more inclined to adopt a mitigation program if commercial and industrial designated lands were excluded.</i></p>						

#	Goal, Policy, or Implementation Program	Page	Suggested Modification	Source	Staff Recommendation	Study Session Direction
37	Policy AG-2.9: Infrastructure Extension (RDR/MPSP) Oppose the extension of urban services, such as sewer lines, water lines, or other urban infrastructure, into areas designated for agricultural use, unless necessary to protect public health, safety, and welfare.	AG-4	Add the phrase “related to existing development” at the end of the policy so the policy reads: <i>“Policy AG-2.9: Infrastructure Extension. Oppose the extension of urban services, such as sewer lines, water lines, or other urban infrastructure, into areas designated for agricultural use, unless necessary to protect public health, safety, and welfare related to existing residential development.”</i>	Agricultural Focus Group	Not Recommended.	AGREE: With some discussion that keeping the policy as worded allows option to provide water to farm labor camps and similar necessary projects.
45	Program AG-F: Agricultural Land Conservation Advisory Committee (SO, PI) Re-establish the Technical Advisory Committee for Agricultural Land Conservation. Once re-established, the TAC ALC shall undertake a study to define options and incentives for increasing minimum parcel sizes in agricultural zones.	AG-12	Revise implementation program to establish a broad-based agricultural advisory committee to provide advice and input to the Board of Supervisors on all agricultural issues, not just land conservation. Change the name of the implementation measure to “Agricultural Advisory Committee.” Have the main task of the committee be forming policies.	Agricultural Focus Group Valley Land Alliance	Neutral. RESPONSE: Program to be deleted.	DISAGREE: Keep appointment of a Committee out of the General Plan.
48	Program AG-F through J	AG-11 - AG-14	Add UC Cooperative Extension as a supporting department to all implementation programs.	Agricultural Focus Group	Not Recommended.	AGREE: Add Cooperative Extension.
06/22 PLANNING COMMISSION SUGGESTION: <i>Planning Staff suggested, and the Planning Commission agreed, to re-insert Alternative Policy AG-2.7: “Merced County Agricultural Preserve Consolidation” which provides an alternative to reducing the Williamson Act Agricultural Preserve boundary. This alternative would modify the Agricultural Preserve Rules and Procedures to allow parcels less than 10 acres for a limited number of circumstances authorized as exceptions in the County Zoning Code and Consistent with State law.</i>						
TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION ELEMENT						
54	Policy CIR-1.X: Truck-Related Development (RDR) Discourage development that causes significant increases in truck traffic on facilities that are not capable of accommodating truck traffic due to	CIR-10	Move Policy CIR-1.X Truck-Related Development to the Air Quality Element list of recommended policies. <i>NOTE: MARG recommended all text</i>	Circulation Focus Group MARG	Not Recommended. RESPONSE: Included as policy AQ-1.11	AGREE: however replace “facilities” with “roads.”

#	Goal, Policy, or Implementation Program	Page	Suggested Modification	Source	Staff Recommendation	Study Session Direction
	pavement section deficiency or other capacity limitations, unless adequate mitigation through fees or improvements in required as part of the permit approval.		<i>be deleted after words "truck traffic" so the policy is about air quality not road impacts.</i>			
PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES ELEMENT						
66	Policy PFS-8.9: University and College Expansions (SO) Work cooperatively with the University of California and Merced Community College to support the expansion of curriculum, enrollment, and facilities at the University of California, Merced.	PFS-13	Revise policy to clarify that the expansion of a UC should not include housing development, but should only include UC Merced educational facilities.	Valley Land Alliance Farm Bureau	Not Recommended.	AGREE, but include "Merced Community College Westside Campus" in the list.
68	Policy PFS-9.3: First 5 Program (FB) Continue to provide financial and/or technical support through the Merced County First 5 Program.	PFS-13	Remove the specific reference to the First 5 Program and instead refer to early care and education programs. Revise text would read: <i>Continue to research potential financial and/or technical support for early care and education programs.</i>	Public Infrastructure Focus Group	Recommended with modification. RESPONSE: Policy to be deleted.	DISAGREE – Consensus to remove the entire policy from the GP.
69	Policy PFS-9.4: Childcare Facilities at Major Job Centers Encourage the inclusion of childcare centers at major job centers to serve the employees of those centers, as well as those to whom the location provides convenient access.	PFS-14	Add the words "and facilities" after job centers in both the title and policy text.	Public Infrastructure Focus Group	Recommended.	AGREE: Recognize industries are only "encouraged" to provide childcare to neighborhood kids not associated with the business, not required.
70	Program PFS-E: Reuse and Recycling Materials (PI) Prepare educational materials to inform residents about reuse, recycling, and composting of solid waste materials.	PFS-16	Include the Agricultural Commissioner as the Responsible Department.	Public Infrastructure Focus Group	Recommended. RESPONSE: Program to be deleted	DISAGREE: Remove policy, this is an MCAG issue, not County

#	Goal, Policy, or Implementation Program	Page	Suggested Modification	Source	Staff Recommendation	Study Session Direction
NATURAL RESOURCES ELEMENT						
71	<p>Policy NR-1.1: Habitat Protection (RDR/PSR) Identify and protect areas that have significant long-term habitat and wetland values from urban and incompatible agricultural encroachment, including riparian corridors, wetlands, grasslands, rivers and waterways, oak woodlands, and vernal pools.</p>	NR-1	Add the phrase "but not limited to" after "including."	Open Space/ Habitat Focus Group	Recommended. RESPONSE: Revise to read: <u>Identify areas that have significant long-term habitat and wetland values including riparian corridors, wetlands, grasslands, rivers and waterways, oak woodlands and vernal pools, and provide information on this habitat to landowners.</u>	AGREE: However staff needs to revise/expand to address issue of habitat protection by trustee State and Federal agencies, and Counties role to inform and provide mapping information to landowners.
72	<p>Policy NR-1.6: Terrestrial Wildlife Mobility (SO) Encourage property owners within or adjacent to designated habitat connectivity corridors that have been mapped or otherwise identified by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service <u>to manage their lands in accordance with such mapping programs. to install wildlife friendly fencing, provide roadway undercrossing, or install oversized culverts and bridges to allow movement of terrestrial wildlife.</u></p>	NR-2	Revise policy to apply as a requirement on new development, new facilities, and agricultural activities subject to a grading permit.	Open Space/ Habitat Focus Group	Not Recommended. RESPONSE: Revise to read <u>as shown.</u>	AGREE: But remove the last part of the policy.

#	Goal, Policy, or Implementation Program	Page	Suggested Modification	Source	Staff Recommendation	Study Session Direction
74	<p>Policy NR-1.8: Grading Permits (RDR) Amend the Zoning Code to add the requirement for landowners to obtain a grading permit prior to the removal of natural vegetation, wetlands, or the alteration of any drainage feature.</p>	NR-2	<p>Modify policy and add a new implementation program requiring a grading permit for previously undisturbed land. Proposed policy language:</p> <p><i>“Require a permit for all grading activities that affect land contours, alter natural drainage patterns, change land use from natural pasture to crops or urban uses, remove natural vegetation or impact sensitive habitats”.</i></p>	Open Space/ Habitat Focus Group	Neutral. RESPONSE: Policy to be deleted.	REMOVE POLICY. BOS and PC do not support a grading ordinance. Note, this comes up in other policies in the plan (references to grading ordinance). Need to remove all references. Instead, County could create an information brochure about grading.
78	<p>Policy NR-1.19: San Joaquin River Restoration Program Support (MPSP/SO) Support the San Joaquin River Restoration Program efforts to restore and maintain fish populations in the San Joaquin River and avoid/reduce adverse water supply impacts to Friant Division long-term contractors.</p>	NR-3	<p>Remove the word “maintain.”</p> <p>NOTE: The focus group was divided on the language of this policy. Some members wanted to qualify the policy to assure downstream users would not be negatively affected. Other group members want the policy unchanged.</p> <p>The Farm Bureau suggests either properly address all of the issues and concerns brought forth by this federal law which also involves third-party impacts or delete this policy.</p> <p>CCID Suggests revision to monitor this program to insure protection of landowners, local water agencies, and other third parties.</p>	Open Space/ Habitat Focus Group Farm Bureau CCID	Recommended. RESPONSE: Modify to read: Monitor the San Joaquin River Restoration Program efforts to ensure protection of landowners, local water agencies, and other third parties.	AGREE: With CCID modification.

#	Goal, Policy, or Implementation Program	Page	Suggested Modification	Source	Staff Recommendation	Study Session Direction
80	Policy NR-2.4: Solar Power (RDR) Encourage on-site solar power use in residential, commercial, and industrial buildings, and solar power farms in rural locations that do not harm long-term agricultural productivity and habitat values.	NR-5	Change the phrase “solar power farms” to “solar power facilities.” Encourage solar power in rural locations only if they are not located on prime agland, they are mitigated, the land must be restored upon disuse of the solar facility, and the facility must be for direct use by landowners. Require facilities that do not contribute to the general operations to place facilities on non-prime, non-Williamson Act land.	Open Space/ Habitat Focus Group Valley Land Alliance Farm Bureau	Recommended with modification. <u>RESPONSE: Change word “farms” to “facilities.”</u>	AGREE
06/22 PLANNING COMMISSION SUGGESTION: County Counsel suggested, and the Planning Commission agreed, the policy should be revised add “utility-scale solar” since that is the correct term when referring to large-scale solar operations.						
RECREATION AND CULTURAL RESOURCES ELEMENT						
94	Goal RCR-2	RCR-5	Create a new Policy RCR-2.8: Historical Preservation Areas (page RCR-5) that reads: <i>“Allow sites of historical and archaeological significance to be designated as historical preservation areas.”</i>	Public Infrastructure Focus Group	Neutral. <u>RESPONSE: Add Policy RCR-2.8 to read: “Allow sites of historical and archaeological significance to be designated as historical preservation areas or sites during the Community Planning process or on individual sites in rural areas.”</u>	SUPPORT ADDING: But also add in language explaining that preservation areas are typically identified during the community plan update process
AIR QUALITY ELEMENT						
95	Introduction; Fugitive Dust and PM 10	AQ-1; AQ-7 - AQ-8	Revise so that air quality goals/policies also specifically address PM2.5 and ozone (not just PM 10).	Circulation Focus Group Sierra Club	Recommended. <u>RESPONSE: Specific references can be removed from the document. Element has been revised to state that the County will be consistent with State and Federal regulations</u>	AGREE: However BOS/PC raised the question of whether we can remove specific references to PM2.5 and PM10 and instead say “in compliance with air district requirements.”

#	Goal, Policy, or Implementation Program	Page	Suggested Modification	Source	Staff Recommendation	Study Session Direction
96	Introduction; Fugitive Dust and PM 10	AQ-1; AQ-7 - AQ-8	Add a symbol within the text or a specific index page pointing to policies to highlight policies or significant references to GHG and air quality as they occur throughout the GPU to comply with AB 32 and state scrutinization.	Sierra Club	Recommended with modification. <u>RESPONSE: An earth symbol has been added to identify goals, policies, and programs that related/implement to AB 32.</u>	<u>AGREE, however BOS/PC raised the question of whether we can remove specific references to PM2.5 and PM10 and instead say "in compliance with air district requirements."</u>
101			Add policies regarding PM 2.5 and ozone.	Valley Land Alliance	Recommended.	<u>AGREE, but questioned whether we can remove specific references to PM2.5 and PM10 and instead say "in compliance with air district requirements."</u>
103	Program AQ-A: Climate Action Plan (MPSP) Prepare, maintain, and implement a Climate Action Plan (CAP) for the County that identifies strategies the County can take to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through land use and transportation planning. The plan shall also address economic and social adaptation to the effects of global and local climate change. The plan shall include: a. a baseline analysis to determine 1990 and 2010 (or most appropriate base year) greenhouse gas emission levels in the County; b. actions necessary to reduce Countywide greenhouse gas emissions relative to the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control Districts adopted reduction target of 5 percent by 2020 and 10 percent by 2035. c. implementation strategies to help	AQ-9	Revise implementation program by removing the percent targets and reference to SJVAPC. Add "Health Department" as a supporting department.	Circulation Focus Group Open Space/Habitat Focus Group	Recommended. <u>RESPONSE: The specific targets do not need to be included in the program. The program was revised to reference compliance with State and Federal requirements.</u>	<u>AGREE: But check if Air District Requirement</u>

#	Goal, Policy, or Implementation Program	Page	Suggested Modification	Source	Staff Recommendation	Study Session Direction
	<p>the County adapt to the effects of global and local climate change; and</p> <p>d. a program to regularly monitor emissions and verify results a minimum of every five years starting in 2010.</p> <p>e. A provision to amend the General Plan to include the policies and programs of the Climate Action Plan.</p> <p>f. A requirement that County operations and actions, as well as land use approvals, are consistent with the Climate Action Plan.</p>					
WATER ELEMENT						
111	<p>Policy W-1.9: Additional Surface Water Supply (SO/IGC) Encourage programs by Federal, State, or regional bodies to supply additional surface water to deficient areas of the County. Encourage efforts by local districts to obtain grants or other funding for irrigation projects.</p>	W-2	<p>Revise policy to read:</p> <p><i>Encourage programs by Federal, State, or regional bodies to supply any uncommitted surface water for irrigation to underserved areas of the County.</i></p>	<p>Water Resources Focus Group</p>	<p>Recommended.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Policy to be deleted.</p>	<p>DISAGREE: This is a legislative issue and should not be part of the General Plan</p>
112	<p>Policy W-1.11: Groundwater Overdraft Protection Support increased use of surface water and groundwater conjunctive use programs to reduce the potential for groundwater overdraft.</p>	W-3	<p>Modify policy to call out the use of secondary water and other sources of reclaimed water to lessen use of groundwater.</p> <p>Where "practical" (source nearby), require large water consumers (non-ag) to use secondary water. School athletic fields, sports complexes, and large landscape areas could use surface water, like canals, instead of pumping from the groundwater table.</p>	<p>Water Resources Focus Group</p> <p>Sierra Club</p>	<p>Recommend with modification.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Policy to read: "Where a water supply source is nearby and accessible, encourage large water consumers to use available surface irrigation water (secondary water) for school athletic fields, sports complexes and large landscape areas."</p>	<p>AGREE</p>

#	Goal, Policy, or Implementation Program	Page	Suggested Modification	Source	Staff Recommendation	Study Session Direction
121	<p>Policy W-2.4: Agricultural and Urban Practices to Minimize Water Contamination (JP) Encourage agricultural and urban practices farmers and ranchers to comply with the requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board for irrigated lands and confined animal facilities, which mandate agricultural practices that minimize erosion and the generation of contaminated runoff to ground or surface waters by providing assistance and incentives.</p>	W-4	Revise Policy Title to read "Agriculture and Urban Practices to Minimize Water Contamination". Delete "farmers and ranchers" and replace with "agriculture and urban practices".	Farm Bureau	Not Recommended. RESPONSE: Modifications will be added as shown.	DISAGREE WITH STAFF. BOS and PC would like to see the suggested edits included to make it broader than just ag industry.
126	<p>Policy W-3.2: Landscape Water Efficiency (SO/PI) Promote the conservation of water in urban areas through the implementation of the State Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance as implemented in Section 18.38 (Landscaping Standards) of the County Zoning Ordinance.</p>	W-6	Change "promote" to "mandate."	Valley Land Alliance Farm Bureau	Recommended with modification. RESPONSE: Replace "Promote" with "Ensure."	AGREE
128	<p>Policy W-3.6: New Construction (RDR/SO) Promote efficient water conveyance systems in new construction, including systems for the recycling of greywater.</p>	W-6	Change "Promote" to "Require" at the beginning of each policy and "including systems" to "requiring systems for the recycling of grey water." (See Policy W-3X: Efficiency standards).	Water Resources Focus Group Valley Land Alliance Farm Bureau	Not Recommended. RESPONSE: According to Environmental Health Division, it is not effective or efficient to attempt to reuse individual septic system wastewater.	AGREE: However, staff asked to come back with information regarding on-site grey water use.
129	<p>Policy W-3.8: Water Reuse Programs (RDR/SO) Encourage water reuse programs to conserve raw or potable water supplies (such as the capture of rainwater) consistent with State Department of Public Health guidelines.</p>	W-6	Replace "encourage" with "require."	Valley Land Alliance	Not Recommended. RESPONSE: According to Environmental Health Division, it is not effective or efficient to attempt to reuse individual septic system wastewater.	AGREE. However, staff needs to come back with information regarding on-site grey water use.

#	Goal, Policy, or Implementation Program	Page	Suggested Modification	Source	Staff Recommendation	Study Session Direction
130	Policy W-3.12: Water Conservation Information (IGC/PI) Provide information on water conservation measures to farmers, and coordinate with conservation efforts of the University of California, Cooperative Extension, local Resource Conservation Districts, the Natural Resource Conservation Service, and irrigation districts.	W-6	Replace "farmers" with "the general public."	Farm Bureau	Recommend with modification. <u>RESPONSE: Staff has confirmed that they do provide this information.</u>	<u>AGREE. Staff to confirm all agencies listed actually have water conservation info available.</u>
139	Policy W-5.1: Countywide Water Supply Study (RDR/MPSP/PSR) Prepare and regularly update a comprehensive water supply study that includes all three hydrologic zones and takes into consideration activities in neighboring counties and the region. The plan shall consider reductions in Federal and State water deliveries in the western part of the County and anticipated reductions in water supplies due to climate change.	W-9	Change "three hydrologic zones" to "four groundwater basins."	Water Resources Focus Group	Neutral. <u>RESPONSE: For coordination with the IRWMP process there is a benefit to include the Chowchilla groundwater basin as the fourth groundwater basin, therefore the policy will be modified as requested.</u>	<u>AGREE: However, there was a lot of discussion regarding the Chowchilla basin. Staff agreed to come back with more info and provide guidance to decision makers.</u>
140	Goal W-5	W-8, W-9	Add new policy under Goal W-5 that requires flood control infrastructure to be coordinated with opportunities for groundwater recharge countywide. (Merced Irrigation District to provide written comments regarding this topic.)	Water Resources Focus Group	Neutral. <u>RESPONSE: MID did not provide comments regarding a new policy for flood control.</u>	<u>AGREE</u>

#	Goal, Policy, or Implementation Program	Page	Suggested Modification	Source	Staff Recommendation	Study Session Direction
142	<p>Program W-C: County-wide Water Supply Study (RDR, MPSP, PSR) Prepare, adopt, and regularly update a comprehensive water supply study that includes all three hydrologic zones and takes into consideration activities in neighboring counties and the region. The plan shall consider reductions in Federal and State water deliveries in the western part of the County and anticipated reductions in water supplies due to climate change.</p>	W-10	Revise Program W-C (page W-10) to have an implementation date of 2011-2013.	Water Resources Focus Group	Neutral.	AGREE: Tied to Policy 5.1 (Item #139).