

Local Coastal Program Update

Land Use Plan Policy Framework Questionnaire Report

City of Marina

August 2025



Table of Contents

1.0 LAND USE PLAN POLICY FRAMEWORK QUESTIONNAIRE	1-1
1.1 Introduction	1-1
1.2 Survey Design.....	1-1
1.3 Survey Results	1-2
1.4 Summary	1-36

Figures

Figure 1	Open-ended Response Word Cloud.....	1-34
----------	-------------------------------------	------

Tables

Table 1	Public Access and Recreation Responses.....	1-3
Table 2	Biological Resources and Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA) Responses	1-10
Table 3	Marine Resources and Water Quality	1-16
Table 4	Opportunistic Beach Nourishment Program Responses	1-18
Table 5	Land Use and Development Responses.....	1-21
Table 6	Scenic and Visual Resources Responses.....	1-27
Table 7	Tribal, Cultural and Historic Resources	1-30
Table 8	Environmental Justice.....	1-32
Table 9	Open-ended Responses	1-35

Land Use Plan Policy Framework Questionnaire

1.1 Introduction

The Land Use Plan Policy Framework Questionnaire was conducted from July 1, 2025, to August 8, 2025, to provide community members and visitors an opportunity to share their input on policy ideas being considered for the comprehensive Local Coastal program (LCP) update. The questionnaire was broken into eight sections, with each section corresponding with the major policy chapters of the Land Use Plan. To cater to Marina's diverse community, the questionnaire was conducted in English, Spanish, Korean, and Vietnamese. It was available online at the City of Marina LCP Update website (marinalcpupdate.com) and in hardcopy at the City of Marina Planning Department.

The LCP Update Team (EMC Planning Group and City staff) staff distributed the survey through an email to the City's interested person contact list and to the LCP Update interested person list. The LCP Update Team also shared information about how to take the questionnaire during the July 30, 2025 LCP Workshop #2. A total of 42 questionnaire responses were received, reflecting a range of perspectives from Marina's residents and visitors.

The questionnaire responses discussed below represent an uncontrolled sample size of self-selected community members who are considered to be motivated and interested in the LCP Update. This can make it difficult to draw definitive conclusions based on the responses received. However, the insights gathered provide valuable information on the community's level of support for various policy ideas being considered for the Land Use Plan update.

1.2 Survey Design

The survey was conducted using SurveyMonkey. Each survey question reflected a policy idea being considered. Respondents were asked to provide their level of agreement (from strongly disagree to strongly agree) for each policy idea being considered. Respondents were able to skip questions. Not every respondent responded to every question.

1.3 Survey Results

Public Access and Recreation

The first group of questions included policy ideas being considered for the Public Access and Recreation chapter of the Land Use Plan. Each question asked respondents to rate their level of agreement with each policy (strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree). [Table 1, Public Access and Recreation Responses](#), below, shows the responses received for each proposed policy idea, along with the weighted average for each question. The higher the weighted average, the more respondents agreed with the proposed policy idea.

Survey results showed the strongest support for ensuring that everyone can access the coast, preventing future development from restricting that access, reducing pollution and litter along the shoreline, and improving public facilities and access at Lake Court. Conversely, respondents expressed the least support for adding multilingual wayfinding signs in English, Spanish, and Korean; easing restrictions on beach parking curfews and fees; allowing the loss of public coastal access if replaced elsewhere; repurposing the Lake Court corporation yard for housing, offices, or a campground; constructing a parking lot near the Marina Dunes Preserve trailhead; and allowing minimal employee housing at the North Dunes site.

Table 1 Public Access and Recreation Responses

Proposed Policy Idea	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Responses	Weighted Average
PAR-1: Provide maximum coastal access and recreational opportunities for all people.	4.88% 2	4.88% 2	14.63% 6	21.95% 9	53.66% 22	41	4.15
PAR-2: Reduce barriers to public coastal access.	7.32% 3	7.32% 3	12.20% 5	29.27% 12	43.90% 18	41	3.88
PAR-3: Design public access facilities vulnerable to coastal dune erosion or sea level rise to anticipate eventual loss, retreat, and replacement.	9.52% 4	0.00% 0	4.76% 2	38.10% 16	47.62% 20	42	4.14
PAR-4: Require new development proposed between the first public roadway and the shoreline to provide public access.	7.89% 3	0.00% 0	18.42% 7	23.68% 9	50.00% 19	38	4.08
PAR-5: Require a Coastal Development Permit with public access mitigation for any proposed project that reduces or limits access to the beach or coast.	9.76% 4	7.32% 3	4.88% 2	14.63% 6	63.41% 26	41	4.15
PAR-6: Enhance the quality of the City’s beaches and wetlands by reducing sources of pollution and litter, as feasible.	9.52% 4	2.38% 1	2.38% 1	23.81% 10	61.90% 26	42	4.26

Proposed Policy Idea	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Responses	Weighted Average
PAR-7: Retreat non-coastal dependent facilities, such as offices, inland of State Route 1.	9.76% 4	4.88% 2	7.32% 3	29.27% 12	48.78% 20	41	4.02
PAR-8: Improve wayfinding coastal access signs throughout the City and provide all signs in English, Spanish and Korean.	9.09% 3	33.33% 11	36.36% 12	9.09% 3	12.12% 4	33	2.82
PAR-9: Improve safety, accessibility, environmental sustainability, and aesthetics of coastal access points.	6.06% 2	3.03% 1	9.09% 3	48.48% 16	33.33% 11	33	4.00
PAR-10: Improve and expand parking near existing coastal access points.	12.12% 4	9.09% 3	18.18% 6	36.36% 12	24.24% 8	33	3.52
PAR-11: Minimize beach parking lot curfews and fees.	18.18% 6	15.15% 5	18.18% 6	18.18% 6	30.30% 10	33	3.27
PAR-12: Design coastal trails to reduce biological impacts and to adapt to coastal hazards.	3.03% 1	3.03% 1	15.15% 5	36.36% 12	42.42% 14	33	4.12
PAR-13: Allow abandonment of public rights-of-way that provide access to the coast only if adequate public access is preserved or provided elsewhere.	15.15% 5	21.21% 7	18.18% 6	12.12% 4	33.33% 11	33	3.27

Proposed Policy Idea	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Responses	Weighted Average
PAR-14: New coastal access that is required as a condition of new development must be maintained by an identified public or private entity.	6.06% 2	0.00% 0	18.18% 6	30.30% 10	45.45% 15	33	4.09
PAR-15: Retrofit or relocate existing trails and amenities to prepare for and prevent potential impacts from sea level rise.	9.09% 3	3.03% 1	18.18% 6	39.39% 13	30.30% 10	33	3.79
PAR-16: Consider coastal trails and beach accessways as coastal-dependent uses, unless there is a habitat-specific limitation that precludes development or aggravates hazards.	3.13% 1	0.00% 0	28.13% 9	46.88% 15	21.88% 7	32	3.84
PAR-17: Require ADA accessible coastal access, where feasible.	3.13% 1	9.38% 3	21.88% 7	40.63% 13	25.00% 8	32	3.75
PAR-18: Provide bicycle lanes connecting Marina's City-center to coastal access points, where feasible.	3.13% 1	0.00% 0	31.25% 10	28.13% 9	37.50% 12	32	3.97
PAR-19: Retain existing and provide new low-cost overnight accommodations.	6.25% 2	9.38% 3	28.13% 9	37.50% 12	18.75% 6	32	3.53

Proposed Policy Idea	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Responses	Weighted Average
PAR-20: Prioritize recreation-related development over private residential or general commercial development on land designated for Visitor Serving Commercial.	12.50% 4	6.25% 2	21.88% 7	18.75% 6	40.63% 13	32	3.69
PAR-21: Increase awareness of the coastal access at Fort Ord Dunes State Park with wayfinding on State Route 1, Second Avenue, 9th Street, and 8th Street.	3.33% 1	13.33% 4	26.67% 8	26.67% 8	30.00% 9	30	3.67
PAR-22: Encourage the repurposing of the existing city-owned corporation yard at Lake Court for State Parks (or similar public agency) employee housing, offices, a corporation yard, or lower-cost public overnight accommodations such as a small campground.	3.85% 1	15.38% 4	38.46% 10	26.92% 7	15.38% 4	26	3.35
PAR-23: Assess parking and street improvements, a day-use area, playground, restroom, and limited overnight uses at the end of Lake Court.	17.86% 5	10.71% 3	28.57% 8	17.86% 5	25.00% 7	28	3.21
PAR-24: The City will collaborate with State Parks to address trail improvements, parking, and coastal access from Lake Court.	3.57% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	46.43% 13	50.00% 14	28	4.39

Proposed Policy Idea	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Responses	Weighted Average
PAR-25: Encourage the inland retreat and relocation of the Marina State Beach parking lot further from the shore to avoid the erosion impacts of sea level rise and storm surge.	3.57% 1	14.29% 4	21.43% 6	28.57% 8	32.14% 9	28	3.71
PAR-26: At Sanctuary Beach Resort, ensure public beach access is clearly marked and visually distinct from the resort and that public parking spaces are clearly marked in accordance to its Coastal Development Permit.	0.00% 0	11.11% 3	11.11% 3	40.74% 11	37.04% 10	27	4.04
PAR-27: Allow dogs on leash only due to the presence of federally threatened snowy plovers at the beach fronting the Sanctuary Beach Resort.	3.70% 1	7.41% 2	18.52% 5	18.52% 5	51.85% 14	27	4.07
PAR-28: Encourage the Monterey Peninsula Regional Parks District (MPRPD) to construct a boardwalk to provide easier beach access to the Marina Dunes Preserve, as feasible.	7.41% 2	3.70% 1	22.22% 6	37.04% 10	29.63% 8	27	3.78
PAR-29: Evaluate constructing a parking lot along Dunes Drive near the trailhead to the Marina Dunes Preserve.	18.52% 5	14.81% 4	18.52% 5	22.22% 6	25.93% 7	27	3.22

Proposed Policy Idea	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Responses	Weighted Average
PAR-30: Develop the North Dunes (former CEMEX site) to enhance public access and recreation opportunities, including a visitor center, restrooms, parking facilities, ADA-accessible trails, viewing areas, and tent camping areas.	3.70% 1	18.52% 5	11.11% 3	7.41% 2	59.26% 16	27	4
PAR-31: Provide additional parking at the north end of Dunes Drive to support future trails on the North Dunes (former CEMEX property).	7.41% 2	18.52% 5	3.70% 1	14.81% 4	55.56% 15	27	3.93
PAR-32: Permit and encourage minimal public agency employee housing on the North Dunes site (former CEMEX site) to support park operations and management in the regional area.	7.41% 2	18.52% 5	14.81% 4	37.04% 10	22.22% 6	27	3.48
PAR-33: Plan and implement recreation improvements in concert with habitat enhancement and restoration activities at Locke-Paddon Park.	7.41% 2	7.41% 2	11.11% 3	29.63% 8	44.44% 12	27	3.96
PAR-34: Provide educational opportunities about wetlands and birds at Locke-Paddon Park.	3.70% 1	0.00% 0	25.93% 7	22.22% 6	48.15% 13	27	4.11

Biological Resources and Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA)

The second group of questions included policy ideas being considered for the Biological Resources and Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas chapter of the Land Use Plan. Each question asked respondents to rate their level of agreement with each policy (strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree). [Table 2, Biological Resources and Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas \(ESHA\) Responses](#), below, shows the responses received for each proposed policy idea, along with the weighted average for each question. The higher the weighted average, the more respondents agreed with the proposed policy idea.

Survey respondents showed the strongest support for policies that strictly protect environmentally sensitive habitat areas (ESHA) and wetlands. This included requiring restoration and monitoring plans for any development affecting ESHA, using only drought-tolerant native plants for revegetation, keeping Marina's coastal dunes and beaches in their natural state, preventing habitat damage from coastal access, protecting sensitive species such as Western snowy plovers, preserving wetlands for wildlife, prohibiting development in wetlands except for nature observation, and allowing routine maintenance at the Locke-Paddon Park wetland. In contrast, respondents expressed the least support for allowing ESHA impacts in exchange for other Coastal Act priorities, using a sliding-scale mitigation ratio based on project impacts, or permitting recreation improvements at Locke-Paddon Park even with mitigation.

Table 2 Biological Resources and Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA) Responses

Proposed Policy Idea	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Responses	Weighted Average
BIO-1: A qualified biologist shall conduct a site visit to evaluate whether environmentally sensitive habitat area (ESHA) is present at the time of the proposed development.	11.54% 3	0.00% 0	15.38% 4	15.38% 4	57.69% 15	26	4.08
BIO-2: Limit development in ESHA to uses dependent on the resource (e.g., habitat restoration, scientific research, low-intensity public access and recreation, including trails and boardwalks, parking for coastal access, low-impact camping, educational signage, activities relating to managed retreat in response to sea-level rise, etc.).	7.69% 2	7.69% 2	23.08% 6	11.54% 3	50.00% 13	26	3.88
BIO-3: Site and design development to avoid and reduce impacts to ESHA including, but not limited to, vernal ponds, wetlands, and watercourses to the greatest extent feasible.	7.69% 2	3.85% 1	19.23% 5	26.92% 7	42.31% 11	26	3.92
BIO-4: Allow impacts to ESHA for projects that fulfill other Coastal Act priorities, provided coastal resources are protected on balance.	7.69% 2	15.38% 4	19.23% 5	34.62% 9	23.08% 6	26	3.5

Proposed Policy Idea	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Responses	Weighted Average
BIO-5: Require a biological assessment, botanical survey, and/or a wetland delineation prepared by a qualified biologist for development within and near ESHA, as needed.	7.69% 2	3.85% 1	19.23% 5	26.92% 7	42.31% 11	26	3.92
BIO-6: Require a Restoration and Monitoring Plan as part of the Coastal Development Permit filing requirement for development impacting ESHA.	0.00% 0	7.69% 2	15.38% 4	26.92% 7	50.00% 13	26	4.19
BIO-7: Require revegetation of project sites within ESHA to use drought tolerant plant species naturally found around the project site. Prohibit species listed on the California Invasive Plant Council's (Cal-IPC) Invasive Plant List (Cal-IPC 2024).	3.85% 1	3.85% 1	11.54% 3	30.77% 8	50.00% 13	26	4.19
BIO-8: Require a Coastal Development Permit for conservation projects that reduce public coastal access. Incorporate mitigation that minimizes access impacts while achieving the conservation goal.	11.54% 3	3.85% 1	23.08% 6	38.46% 10	23.08% 6	26	3.58

Proposed Policy Idea	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Responses	Weighted Average
BIO-9: Plan and accommodate managed retreat in a manner that maintains contiguous ESHA habitat and wildlife corridors between the beach, foredune, and back dune to the greatest extent feasible.	8.00% 2	4.00% 1	16.00% 4	36.00% 9	36.00% 9	25	3.88
BIO-10: Allow trimming of up to 25 percent of a trees canopy, including trees classified as major vegetation, without a Coastal Development Permit.	7.69% 2	11.54% 3	23.08% 6	30.77% 8	26.92% 7	26	3.58
BIO-11: Mitigate impacts to ESHA on sliding scale ratio depending on the development's impacts.	12.50% 3	4.17% 1	37.50% 9	25.00% 6	20.83% 5	24	3.38
BIO-12: Replace trees that are considered major vegetation at a ratio of 5:1.	3.85% 1	11.54% 3	15.38% 4	26.92% 7	42.31% 11	26	3.92
BIO-13: Maintain the natural and undeveloped state of Marina's coastal dunes and beaches.	4.00% 1	12.00% 3	8.00% 2	12.00% 3	64.00% [^] 16	25	4.20
BIO-14: Support and encourage conservation, land acquisition, and habitat restoration efforts of Marina's coastal sand dunes.	4.00% 1	8.00% 2	20.00% 5	8.00% 2	60.00% 15	25	4.12

Proposed Policy Idea	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Responses	Weighted Average
BIO-15: Concentrate dune conservation and restoration efforts in areas which provide high-quality, contiguous habitat.	4.00% 1	4.00% 1	20.00% 5	24.00% 6	48.00% 12	25	4.08
BIO-16: Prohibit activities which alter the profile of a dune, result in the disturbance or removal of dune vegetation, or involve any direct removal or excavation of sand from dunes.	8.00% 2	16.00% 4	12.00% 3	12.00% 3	52.00% 13	25	3.84
BIO-17: Ensure that access to or across coastal dune habitats does not cause significant damage or degradation to the habitat.	4.00% 1	4.00% 1	12.00% 3	32.00% 8	48.00% 12	25	4.16
BIO-18: Protect sensitive species habitat, including but not limited to Western snowy plovers nesting and roosting areas.	4.00% 1	0.00% 0	16.00% 4	28.00% 7	52.00% 13	25	4.24
BIO-19: Preserve and maintain Marina's vernal ponds and wetlands as productive wildlife habitats.	4.00% 1	0.00% 0	16.00% 4	28.00% 7	52.00% 13	25	4.24
BIO-20: Prohibit development in wetlands; the only exception shall be for development that supports nature observation.	4.00% 1	4.00% 1	16.00% 4	20.00% 5	56.00% 14	25	4.20

Proposed Policy Idea	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Responses	Weighted Average
BIO-21: Allow routine maintenance activities in and around the Locke-Paddon Park vernal pond.	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	4.00% 1	28.00% 7	68.00% 17	25	4.64
BIO-22: Permit active and passive recreation improvements at Locke-Paddon Park, provided that all applicable mitigation requirements of the BIO Chapter are met.	12.50% 3	12.50% 3	16.67% 4	29.17% 7	29.17% 7	24	3.5

Marine Resources and Water Quality

The third group of questions included policy ideas being considered for the Marine Resources and Water Quality chapter of the Land Use Plan. Each question asked respondents to rate their level of agreement with each policy (strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree). [Table 3, Marine Resources and Water Quality Responses](#), below, shows the responses received for each proposed policy idea, along with the weighted average for each question. The higher the weighted average, the more respondents agreed with the proposed policy idea.

Based on the survey results, most respondents supported all of the policy ideas being considered.

Table 3 Marine Resources and Water Quality Responses

Proposed Policy Idea	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Responses	Weighted Average
MWQ-1: Allow restoration, public access, viewing areas, temporary lifeguard facilities, and coastal-dependent recreation in the marine environment.	4.35% 1	8.70% 2	13.04% 3	26.09% 6	69.57% 16	23	4.65
MWQ-2: Require new development to incorporate stormwater pollution controls as required by local and State law.	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	4.35% 1	26.09% 6	69.57% 16	23	4.65
MWQ-3: Require development to minimize new impervious surfaces.	4.35% 1	4.35% 1	8.70% 2	26.09% 6	56.52% 13	23	4.26

Opportunistic Beach Nourishment Program

The fourth group of questions included policy ideas being considered for the Opportunistic Beach Nourishment Program chapter of the Land Use Plan. Each question asked respondents to rate their level of agreement with each policy (strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly agree). [Table 4, Opportunistic Beach Nourishment Program Responses](#), below, shows the responses received for each proposed policy idea, along with the weighted average for each question. The higher the weighted average, the more respondents agreed with the proposed policy idea.

Survey respondents supported prioritizing the Opportunistic Beach Nourishment Program as a preferred emergency response to dune erosion and applying standard biological resource protection measures to all such projects. There was no significant disagreement with any of the proposed policy ideas.

Table 4 Opportunistic Beach Nourishment Program Responses

Proposed Policy Idea	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Responses	Weighted Average
OBNP-1: Prioritize the Opportunistic Beach Nourishment Program as the preferred emergency response to dune erosion.	0.00% 0	4.35% 1	8.70% 2	26.09% 6	56.52% 13	23	4.26
OBNP-2: Identify potential receiver and stockpile sites for sand placement.	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	19.05% 4	61.90% 13	19.05% 4	21	4.00
OBNP-3: Identify potentially-suitable sources of sand in the region.	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	19.05% 4	57.14% 12	23.81% 5	21	4.05
OBNP-4: Establish cost-effective and streamlined environmental compliance and permitting processes for OBNP-related activities.	0.00% 0	4.76% 1	33.33% 7	38.10% 8	23.81% 5	21	3.81
OBNP-5: Prior to any sand transfer, the City shall define the design considerations for each planned placement activity, including maximum volume, placement techniques, placement rates and location(s), and transportation methods.	0.00% 0	4.55% 1	22.73% 5	40.91% 9	31.82% 7	22	4.00

Proposed Policy Idea	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Responses	Weighted Average
OBNP-6: Ensure the OBNP will maximize the benefits of beach nourishment while avoiding significant adverse impacts to water quality, sensitive species and/or habitats, cultural resources, and recreation.	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	31.82% 7	27.27% 6	40.91% 9	22	4.09
OBNP-7: Utilize OBNP in conjunction with other nature-based living shoreline approaches where applicable.	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	36.36% 8	22.73% 5	40.91% 9	22	4.05
OBNP-8: Apply standard biological resource protection mitigation measures to all OBNP projects.	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	27.27% 6	27.27% 6	45.45% 10	22	4.18

Land Use and Development

The fifth group of questions included policy ideas being considered for the Land Use and Development chapter of the Land Use Plan. Each question asked respondents to rate their level of agreement with each policy (strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly agree). [Table 5, Land Use and Development Responses](#), below, shows the responses received for each proposed policy idea, along with the weighted average for each question. The higher the weighted average, the more respondents agreed with the proposed policy idea.

Survey respondents most supported designing public infrastructure—such as water, sewer, stormwater, communications, renewable energy, and transportation systems—to meet the needs of anticipated development. They were least supportive of expanding affordable public transit to coastal areas, broadening the range of uses in the Public Facility district, setting hotel and restaurant uses as the primary permitted visitor-serving uses, promoting affordable visitor-oriented commercial businesses, prioritizing low-cost visitor accommodations, applying the city’s Housing Element programs in coastal residential areas, and treating general commercial uses as a low priority in the coastal zone.

Table 5 Land Use and Development Responses

Proposed Policy Idea	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Responses	Weighted Average
LUD-1: All new development shall comply with the policies of the Land Use Plan.	4.76% 1	0.00% 0	4.76% 1	47.62% 10	42.86% 9	21	4.24
LUD-2: Exempt the following uses from Coastal Development Permits: trail improvements, minor improvements to single-family dwellings including, but not limited to JADUs and ADUs, small habitat restoration projects (defined by CEQA Section 15333), and temporary uses.	4.55% 1	13.64% 3	13.64% 3	31.82% 7	36.36% 8	22	3.82
LUD-3: Design public infrastructure, including water, sewer, stormwater management, communications, renewable energy, and transportation systems to meet the needs of anticipated development.	0.00% 0	4.55% 1	4.55% 1	45.45% 10	45.45% 10	22	4.32
LUD-4: Concentrate new development within existing developed areas.	14.29% 3	9.52% 2	19.05% 4	23.81% 5	33.33% 7	21	3.52
LUD-5: Encourage affordable public transit accessibility to coastal access areas.	4.76% 1	19.05% 4	33.33% 7	14.29% 3	28.57% 6	21	3.43

Proposed Policy Idea	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Responses	Weighted Average
LUD-6: Encourage multi-modal streets that support active transportation.	0.00% 0	5.00% 1	35.00% 7	30.00% 6	30.00% 6	20	3.85
LUD-7: Identify parcels which can be redeveloped to accommodate managed retreat for critical coastal uses.	0.00% 0	9.52% 2	19.05% 4	42.86% 9	28.57% 6	21	3.90
LUD-8: Until December 31, 2040, no new development other than public parks and open space uses (including agricultural uses) shall be permitted at the former CEMEX site.	14.29% 3	9.52% 2	0.00% 0	14.29% 3	61.90% 13	21	4.00
LUD-10: Permitted uses in the Coastal - Open-Space (C – OS) Land Use Designation include preserved open space, dune preservation, coastal dependent research, beach access, public parks and recreation facilities and supporting uses, sensitive habitat areas and restoration projects supporting them, vernal ponds, open space for hazard protection or scenic preservation, and coastal-dependent recreation.	0.00% 0	5.00% 1	25.00% 5	25.00% 5	45.00% 9	20	4.10
LUD-11: Prioritize improvements to recreational facilities within the Coastal - Open-Space (C-OS) district.	5.00% 1	15.00% 3	15.00% 3	30.00% 6	35.00% 7	20	3.75

Proposed Policy Idea	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Responses	Weighted Average
LUD-12: Uses allowed in the C – Public Facility (C-PF) district include, but are not limited to civic center, library, police and fire stations, post office, and parks district employee housing, public works yard, school, and other civic offices.	5.00% 1	20.00% 4	25.00% 5	30.00% 6	20.00% 4	20	3.40
LUD-13: Principally permitted uses in the Visitor Serving Commercial land use category are hotels, restaurants, retail, and other visitor serving uses. Drive-thru uses are prohibited.	23.64% 3	9.09% 2	27.27% 6	22.73% 5	27.27% 6	22	3.41
LUD-14: Prioritize visitor-oriented commercial activities over other types of commercial on the east side of Dunes Drive.	0.00% 0	20.00% 4	20.00% 4	30.00% 6	30.00% 6	20	3.70
LUD-15: Visitor-serving commercial uses shall be located and designed so that they complement one another and meet a range of visitor needs, including affordability.	0.00% 0	20.00% 4	20.00% 4	30.00% 6	30.00% 6	20	3.70
LUD-16: Encourage visitor-oriented commercial uses that meet the affordability needs of visitors.	10.00% 2	30.00% 6	15.00% 3	20.00% 4	25.00% 5	20	3.20

Proposed Policy Idea	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Responses	Weighted Average
LUD-17: Prioritize low-cost visitor serving accommodations. Low-cost visitor serving accommodations are lodging facilities that are accessible and affordable to the general public and are typically offered at a rate that is less than the average rate for overnight accommodations in the area.	22.73% 5	18.18% 4	18.18% 4	27.27% 6	13.64% 3	22	2.91
LUD-18: Principally permitted uses in the Low-Density Residential land use category include single family homes and accessory dwelling units (ADUs and JADUs).	4.76% 1	14.29% 3	14.29% 3	38.10% 8	28.57% 6	21	3.71
LUD-19: Apply the City of Marina's Housing Element housing programs in the areas designated for residential use in the coastal zone.	5.26% 1	10.53% 2	42.11% 8	21.05% 4	21.05% 4	19	3.42
LUD-20: Encourage retention and further construction of ADUs and JADUs on parcels with single family dwellings.	0.00% 0	30.00% 6	20.00% 4	15.00% 3	35.00% 7	20	3.55
LUD-21: Adopt the city's ADU/JADU ordinance by reference, to ensure compliance with State law.	0.00% 0	5.00% 1	25.00% 5	40.00% 8	30.00% 6	20	3.95

Proposed Policy Idea	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Responses	Weighted Average
LUD-22: Design new housing units in the coastal zone so that habitat impacts are minimized.	4.76% 1	9.52% 2	23.81% 5	38.10% 8	23.81% 5	21	3.67
LUD-23: Permitted uses in the General Commercial Land Use Designation include retail stores, commercial shops conducted within a building and other uses with similar characteristics and which will not be detrimental or obnoxious to the neighborhood in which they are to be located, and supportive and transitional housing uses mandated by State law.	4.55% 1	4.55% 1	27.27% 6	45.45% 10	18.18% 4	22	3.68
LUD-24: General Commercial uses are a low priority use in the coastal zone and shall be sited to have no impact on sensitive coastal resources.	13.64% 3	9.09% 2	31.82% 7	18.18% 4	27.27% 6	22	3.36

Scenic and Visual Resources

The sixth group of questions included policy ideas being considered for the Scenic and Visual Resources chapter of the Land Use Plan. Each question asked respondents to rate their level of agreement with each policy (strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree). [Table 6, Scenic and Visual Resources Responses](#), below, shows the responses received for each proposed policy idea, along with the weighted average for each question. The higher the weighted average, the more respondents agreed with the proposed policy idea.

Generally, respondents supported all of the proposed policy ideas in this section.

Table 6 Scenic and Visual Resources Responses

Proposed Policy Idea	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Responses	Weighted Average
VIS-1: Site and design new development west of Highway 1 to protect views to and along the ocean.	4.75% 1	9.52% 2	0.00% 0	28.57% 6	57.14% 12	21	4.24
VIS-2: Prevent fences, walls, and landscaping from obstructing public scenic views.	0.00% 0	5.26% 1	5.26% 1	31.58% 6	57.89% 11	19	4.42
VIS-3: Protect views of the dunes from Highway 1 and the beach by prohibiting ridgeline development.	0.00% 0	9.52% 2	14.29% 3	14.29% 3	61.90% 13	21	4.29
VIS-4: Revegetate disturbed areas of sand dunes, particularly those which are highly visible.	4.76% 1	0.00% 0	14.29% 3	28.57% 6	52.38% 11	21	4.24
VIS-5: Cluster development to preserve coastal view corridors from Highway 1.	0.00% 0	4.76% 1	14.29% 3	33.33% 7	47.62% 10	21	4.24
VIS-6: Protect dark night skies as part of Marina’s scenic and visual character.	0.00% 0	4.76% 1	4.76% 1	23.81% 5	66.67% 14	21	4.52
VIS-7: Ensure that signs are designed and located to minimize visual impacts.	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	9.52% 2	23.81% 5	66.67% 14	21	4.57

Proposed Policy Idea	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Responses	Weighted Average
VIS-8: Prohibit the construction of new non-wayfinding, off-site commercial signs, including billboards.	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	14.29% 3	19.05% 4	66.67% 14	21	4.52
VIS-9: Require new development applications to include preliminary utility plans that address and minimize visual impacts.	0.00% 0	4.76% 1	9.52% 2	23.81% 5	61.90% 13	21	4.43
VIS-10: Require all telecommunications facilities to include concealment features and shall place support facilities underground where feasible.	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	4.76% 1	33.33% 7	61.90% 13	21	4.57
VIS-11: Require drought tolerant species for landscaping and use native species to the greatest extent feasible. Require drip or micro-spray irrigation when irrigation is required.	4.76% 1	9.52% 2	9.52% 2	14.29% 3	61.90% 13	21	4.19

Tribal, Cultural and Historic Resources (CUL)

The seventh group of questions included policy ideas being considered for the Tribal, Cultural and Historic Resources chapter of the Land Use Plan. Each question asked respondents to rate their level of agreement with each policy (strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly agree). [Table 7, Tribal, Cultural and Historic Resources Responses](#), below, shows the responses received for each proposed policy idea, along with the weighted average for each question. The higher the weighted average, the more respondents agreed with the proposed policy idea.

Most respondents were neutral or supportive of the policy ideas in this section, with the greatest opposition directed toward requiring a Phase 1 archaeological survey by a Registered Professional Archaeologist for any new soil-disturbing development in the coastal zone.

Table 7 Tribal, Cultural and Historic Resources

Proposed Policy Idea	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Responses	Weighted Average
CUL-1: Protect and preserve historical, archaeological and paleontological resources.	4.76% 1	4.76% 1	38.10% 8	9.52% 2	42.86% 9	21	3.81
CUL-2: Adhere to the Coastal Commission’s 2018 Tribal Consultation Policies when reviewing LCP amendments and Coastal Development Permits.	4.76% 1	14.29% 3	19.05% 4	19.05% 4	42.86% 9	21	3.81
CUL-3: Require a Phase 1 archaeological survey report, prepared by a Registered Professional Archaeologist, for any development within the coastal zone that involves new disturbance of soils.	13.64% 3	13.64% 3	18.18% 4	18.18% 4	36.36% 8	22	3.50
CUL-4: Site and design new development to avoid impacts to known cultural resources or when cultural resources are discovered through the archaeological survey report process.	9.52% 2	14.29% 3	19.05% 4	19.05% 4	38.10% 8	21	3.62
CUL-5: Cease work immediately if archaeological resources are discovered during construction in accordance to State law.	9.52% 2	4.76% 1	19.05% 4	28.57% 6	38.10% 8	21	3.81

Environmental Justice

The eighth group of questions included policy ideas being considered for the Environmental Justice chapter of the Land Use Plan. Each question asked respondents to rate their level of agreement with each policy (strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree). [Table 8, Environmental Justice Responses](#), below, shows the responses received for each proposed policy idea, along with the weighted average for each question. The higher the weighted average, the more respondents agreed with the proposed policy idea.

Environmental Justice policy ideas received mixed responses, with lower support for providing civic materials in multiple languages, expanding public transit to the coast with flat rates and more frequent service, and encouraging lower-cost housing within the coastal zone.

Table 8 Environmental Justice Responses

Proposed Policy Idea	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Responses	Weighted Average
EJ-1: The City shall promote and protect equitable access to beaches, recreational facilities, and open spaces for all.	9.52% 2	4.76% 1	9.52% 2	33.33% 7	42.86% 9	21	3.95
EJ-2: Create an open and transparent community engagement process.	0.00% 0	4.76% 1	9.52% 2	19.05% 4	66.67% 14	21	4.48
EJ-3: Provide civic materials in English, Spanish, Korean, and other languages if needed.	4.55% 1	22.73% 5	22.73% 5	18.18% 4	31.82% 7	22	3.50
EJ-4: Ensure that disadvantaged communities are not disproportionately affected by pollution.	13.64% 3	4.55% 1	13.64% 3	22.73% 5	59.09% 13	22	4.32
EJ-5: Avoid siting hazardous facilities in flood-prone areas and areas prone to erosion.	4.55% 1	0.00% 0	13.64% 3	22.73% 5	59.09% 13	22	4.32
EJ-6: Require adverse environmental and Environmental Justice impacts to be mitigated for within the City of Marina.	9.09% 2	9.09% 2	18.18% 4	13.64% 3	50.00% 11	22	3.86
EJ-7: Support and facilitate local farmers markets.	0.00% 0	4.55% 1	13.64% 3	27.27% 6	54.55% 12	22	4.32

Proposed Policy Idea	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Responses	Weighted Average
EJ-8: Prioritize improvements to walking and biking infrastructure that provide safe, accessible, and convenient routes to the coast.	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	18.18% 4	31.82% 7	50.00% 11	22	4.32
EJ-9: Expand public transit service in the form of flat rates and increased headway frequency to the City's coast.	9.09% 2	4.55% 1	40.91% 9	18.18% 4	27.27% 6	22	3.50
EJ-10: Invest in improvements to ADA accessible overlooks, as feasible, along the coast to improve access to the coast for all.	0.00% 0	15.00% 3	20.00% 4	30.00% 6	35.00% 7	20	3.85
EJ-11: Encourage lower-cost housing within the coastal zone.	28.57% 6	14.29% 3	14.29% 3	19.05% 4	23.81% 5	21	2.95

Open-ended Responses

Ten open-ended responses were received. Figure 1, Open-ended Response Word Cloud highlighting the most frequently used terms in the responses. Key themes emerging from these responses included:

- **Environmental Protection & Tree Planting** – Support for planting native trees, restoring habitats, and preserving open space over development.
- **Parks & Public Access** – Desire for more parks, safe public access to the coast, and keeping land west of Highway 1 undeveloped.
- **Transportation & Safety** – Improve pedestrian/bike safety and connectivity; limit car access near the coast.
- **Opposition to Development** – Concerns about traffic, loss of views, and incompatible land uses.

Figure 1 Open-ended Response Word Cloud



Table 9 Open-ended Responses

Do you have any additional comments, questions, or suggestions?
PLANT COASTAL REDWOODS, Monterey Cypress and Monterey Pine trees!!! Will greatly enhance our community especially when viewable from PCH1. Offer these trees for free to homeowners and businesses. Encourage community to plant more trees!
Many of these questions are confusing and/or redundant. Some are phrased to appeal to a specific political point of view. In my opinion, the survey is flawed. I look forward to seeing the results and hearing the ensuing discussions.
Please create more parks and plant more native trees in Marina, especially Cypress, and prioritize the restoration and preservation of the environment and wildlife habitats over any commercial development projects.
Accessibility for residents and safety for bikes and pedestrians travelling to and from the coast from neighborhoods. Limit car access west of 1. Keep cars east of 1 and provide public transportation and safe roads/streets/sidewalks for access rather than more parking lots on the coast. Ped/bike crossings at on/off hwy1 ramps feel very unsafe at all times vehicles are present. There is safe side walking access beyond the 7/11 near Walmart. Sidewalk access at end of beach road is severely lacking. Pedestrian crossings at streets like Michael and reservation feel very unsafe as well. Children/younger people without adults should be able to safely navigate on foot or bike from their house or school to the coast and nearby parks/library. If it is safe and accessible for them it will be for residents and visitors.
Traffic surveys need to be done to ensure traffic is not going to impact the tranquility of the area!!
We should not open our Coastal Zone to significant commercial or residential development. We should expend our energy to make our coastline accessible and informative to those who visit us. Don't let what is happening in the new Shea section (big homes, tall buildings obscuring sight of the ocean). We don't want to let developers do what they've done in SoCal .. views for the rich and habitat destroyed for development.
There is no clear definition of "recreational opportunities" or "recreation facilities" relative to Locke Paddon Park and CEMEX property. How can you answer a question about recreation activities when you don't know what the activities would be. For Marina State Beach it is not asked if you want a return of the boardwalk on the dunes. For Lake Dr Corp Yard the five options should have been separate questions. No to campgrounds in that area but yes to State

Parks employee housing. For irrigation, no micro spray should be allowed, only subsurface irrigation.

There is an egregious lack of public involvement and transparency regarding city plans to build a garden and a food forest at Locke Paddon park. A few council members are pushing their own pet projects without working with the whole city and MRPMD constituents to have any meaningful public engagement process.

Stop spending working persons tax dollars (e.g. their labor) to support 'low-income' and 'disadvantaged communities'. Those groups can get a job, work, live within their means just like other people do.

Don't ever put anything else West of Highway 1 except managed retreat for existing buildings and a park/historical environment for the CEMEX property.

1.4 Summary

The analysis of Marina's Policy Framework Questionnaire highlights a community deeply invested in protecting the natural beauty, biological resources, and tranquility of their coastline. Respondents overwhelmingly support policy ideas which aim to retain and provide more coastal access, limit future development west of State Route 1, retain the largely natural and undeveloped qualities of Marina's coastal zone, and protect biological resources and visual resources. Respondents were less aligned on policy ideas which specified which types of uses should occur within each Land Use Designation.