

1.1 Purpose

This environmental impact report (EIR) (State Clearinghouse No. 2007121001) has been prepared to evaluate and disclose the significant environmental impacts associated with implementation of the proposed 2007 Monterey County General Plan (2007 General Plan). This is an update of the County of Monterey's (County's) existing general plan for the unincorporated, non-coastal portion of the County. Impacts are evaluated on the basis of the 2007 General Plan's 2030 planning horizon, as well as its full buildout in 2092. A copy of the 2007 General Plan is located on the accompanying CD at the end of this EIR.

This EIR has been prepared in accordance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), California Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.; the Guidelines for the California Environmental Quality Act (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 3); and the rules, regulations, and procedures for implementing CEQA as adopted by the County of Monterey. Accordingly, it discusses the existing physical and regulatory setting, describes the 2007 General Plan, and examines the project's potential to result in significant effects on resources. In addition to disclosing significant environmental impacts, the EIR also proposes mitigation measures, where feasible, to minimize or otherwise avoid significant environmental impacts and reviews five alternatives to the 2007 General Plan.

The purpose of this EIR is to inform County of Monterey decision-makers, representatives of other affected/responsible agencies, the public, and other interested parties of the potential environmental effects that may be associated with the 2007 General Plan. As authorized under CEQA Guidelines Section 15146, the project's impacts are analyzed on a general scale, in keeping with the broad level of detail found in the 2007 General Plan itself. Accordingly, the reader should not expect to find parcel-specific analyses here.

1.2 Project Summary

The proposed project consists of a comprehensive update of the existing 1982 County General Plan. Monterey County is located on the central California coast and is bounded by the Pacific Ocean (west), Santa Cruz County (north), San Benito, Fresno and Kings Counties (east), and San Luis Obispo County (south); refer to Exhibit 1-1. The proposed 2007 General Plan will serve as a "blueprint"

for growth; that is, it establishes the general pattern of land use and adopts goals and policies to guide the County in future land use decision-making. The goals and policies established by the General Plan address a range of related topics, including, but not limited to, establishing a development pattern centered on cities, Community Areas, and Rural Centers; providing infrastructure to serve new development concurrently with that development; conserving sensitive natural areas; conserving agriculture and the agricultural economy; addressing groundwater overdraft and water supply issues by establishing policies for new wells and restricting development in most areas until a sustainable water supply can be shown to be available; and protecting public health and safety. The Monterey County General Plan was last comprehensively updated in 1982, although it has been amended numerous times over the past 26 years.

The proposed 2007 General Plan is described in Section 3, “Project Description,” of this EIR. In brief, the 2007 General Plan would largely maintain existing land use patterns and concepts established by the existing 1982 General Plan, with an emphasis on directing future urbanization to the cities and designated unincorporated Community Areas and Rural Centers. No changes are proposed to the County’s adopted and certified Local Coastal Programs. Of course, because this is a County general plan it does not apply to any of the cities in Monterey County.

The following Table 1-1 provides a brief summary of the key components of the proposed 2007 General Plan.

Table 1-1. Key Components of the 2007 General Plan

Issue Area	2007 General Plan
Elements	Land Use, Circulation, Conservation and Open Space, Safety, Public Services, Agricultural, Area and Master Plans, and Economic Development
Area Plans	North County, Greater Salinas, Central Salinas Valley, Greater Monterey Peninsula, Toro, Cachagua, and South County
Master Plans	Carmel Valley and Fort Ord
Special Treatment Areas	Identifies 17 areas within the Area Plans for further planning study
Community Areas	Boronda, Castroville, Chualar, Fort Ord, and Pajaro
Rural Centers	Bradley, Lockwood, Pine Canyon, Pleyto, River Road, San Ardo, and San Lucas
Affordable Housing Overlay	Three areas where development of high-density, affordable housing is promoted: Mid-Carmel Valley; Highway 68/Monterey Peninsula Airport; and Reservation Road/Highway 68. Community Areas prior to adoption of a Community Plan and Rural Centers prior to the adoption of an Infrastructure and Financing Study are designated as affordable housing overlay districts (AHOs).
Services	Establishes goals and policies requiring the provision of services concurrently with new development in Community Areas, Rural Centers, and for subdivisions
Water Resources	Establishes goals and policies for water conservation, restrains development without a proven sustainable water supply, restricts water well development, and minimizes additional overdraft and seawater intrusion
Routine and Ongoing Agriculture	Exempts a number of “routine and ongoing” agricultural activities from selected policies of the 2007 General Plan Update, not including policies that minimize erosion
Agricultural Wine Corridor Plan	Establishes goals and policies supporting future development of up to 10 full-scale and 40 artisan wineries and related tourist-serving uses along Central/Arroyo Seco/River Road, Metz Road, and Jolon Road
2030 horizon (Unincorporated County only)	135,375 residents 48,670 dwelling units
2092 buildout (Unincorporated County only)	207,424 residents 74,573 dwelling units

1.2.1 2007 General Plan Objectives

The proposed 2007 General Plan has the following objectives:

- Provide direction for growth that supports continued viability of agricultural production and preserves as much of the County’s scenic and environmental resources as possible.

- Provide decision-makers, County staff, and the public with an updated General Plan that reflects the existing physical conditions and constraints in the County and provides a range of comprehensive policies to guide future development based upon those conditions and constraints.
- Modify existing land use designations to patterns that accommodate the most recent population growth, housing, and employment projections in an orderly manner that minimizes environmental impacts as feasible while meeting the County's obligations under California Planning Law to provide housing for all income levels.
- Direct new development to Community Areas and Rural Centers to facilitate the efficient provision of infrastructure and services while reducing the impacts of population growth, additional housing, and employment opportunities on agriculture, water supplies, and environmental resources.
- Establish policies that will conserve limited water supplies for current and projected future uses, including urban, rural, and agricultural uses.
- Establish new comprehensive policies and modify existing policies in the 1982 General Plan that reflect the latest legal, statutory, scientific, and technical changes and advances.
- Consider advice, concerns, and suggestions regarding future growth and development from all segments of the County population and, to the extent feasible, address these issues through new or modified goals, policies, or land use concepts.
- Support the continued viability of the agricultural industry by allowing routine and ongoing agricultural uses to proceed subject to standard regulations.
- Establish the Agricultural Winery Corridor Plan (AWCP) to facilitate the development of wineries along a corridor in the central and southern Salinas Valley to achieve a balance between the wine-grape production and wine processing capacity within the County.

1.3 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The implementation of the 2007 General Plan would result in a number of significant impacts on the environment. At the same time, the 2007 General Plan contains many policies that are intended to minimize or mitigate the potential impacts of its implementation. The analysis in this EIR considered the policies contained in the 2007 General Plan when determining whether the project would result in a significant environmental impact. Where the policies were insufficient to avoid an impact, additional mitigation was identified in the EIR. Table 1-2 briefly summarizes the impacts and mitigation measures that have been identified in the EIR.

Table 1-2. Executive Summary Table

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.1 LAND USE		
LU-1: Implementation of the 2007 General Plan would potentially result in the physical division of established communities.	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	2030—Less than significant Buildout—Less than significant
LU-2: Implementation of the 2007 General Plan would potentially result in conflicts with an adopted land use plan, general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	2030—Less than significant Buildout—Less than significant
LU-3: General Plan implementation would potentially conflict with an existing adopted habitat conservation or natural community conservation plan.	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	2030—Less than significant Buildout—Less than significant
4.2 AGRICULTURE RESOURCES		
AG-1: Implementation of the 2007 General Plan would result in the conversion of Important Farmland to non-agricultural use.	No feasible mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan goals and policies is available.	2030—Significant and unavoidable Buildout—Significant and unavoidable
AG-2: Implementation of the 2007 General Plan could result in conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural use or Williamson Act contracts.	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan goals and policies is necessary.	2030—Less than significant Buildout—Less than significant
AG-3: Implementation of the 2007 General Plan would involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, would result in conversion	No feasible mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan goals and policies is available.	2030—Significant and unavoidable Buildout—Significant and

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
of farmland to non-agricultural use.		unavoidable
CUM-1: Agricultural Resources	No mitigation is feasible.	Cumulatively considerable.
4.3 WATER RESOURCES		
WR-1: Residential, commercial, industrial, and public uses consistent with the 2007 General Plan would introduce additional nonpoint source pollutants to downstream surface waters, substantially degrading water quality.	No mitigation beyond the General Plan and Area Plan goals and policies is necessary.	2030—Less than significant Buildout—Less than significant
WR-2: Land uses and development consistent with the 2007 General Plan would result in increased soil erosion and sedimentation during construction activities, substantially degrading water quality in downstream waterways.	No mitigation beyond the General Plan and Area Plan goals and policies is necessary.	2030—Less than significant Buildout—Less than significant
WR-3: Agricultural and resource development (i.e., limited timber harvesting and mineral resources extraction) land uses consistent with the 2007 General Plan would increase sediment and nutrients in downstream waterways and violate water quality standards.	BIO-2.1: Stream Setback Ordinance. (see Section 4.9 Biological Resources, below). No additional mitigation beyond the General Plan and Area Plan goals and policies is necessary.	2030—Less than significant Buildout—Less than significant
WR-4: Land uses and development consistent with the 2007 General Plan would exceed the capacity of existing water supplies and necessitate the acquisition of new supplies to meet expected demands	2030 WR-1: Support a Regional Solution for the Monterey Peninsula In Addition to the Coastal Water Project The County will revise the draft 2007 General Plan to include the following new policy: PS-3.16 The County will participate in the Water for Monterey County Coalition, or similar regional group, for the purpose of identifying and supporting a variety of new water supply projects, water management programs, and multiple agency agreements that will provide additional domestic water supplies for the Monterey Peninsula and Seaside basin, while continuing to protect the Salinas and Pajaro River groundwater	2030—Significant and unavoidable (in some portions of the County) Buildout—Significant and unavoidable (in some portions of the County)

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
	<p>basins from saltwater intrusion. The County’s general objective, while recognizing that timeframes will be dependent upon the dynamics of the regional group, will be to complete the cooperative planning of these water supply alternatives within five years of adoption of the General Plan and to implement the selected alternatives within five years after that time. No additional mitigation measure is available.</p> <p>2092</p> <p>WR-1: Support a Regional Solution for the Monterey Peninsula In Addition to the Coastal Water Project. This measure is described above.</p> <p>WR-2: Initiate Planning for Additional Supplies to the Salinas Valley</p> <p>The County will revise the draft 2007 General Plan to include the following new policies:</p> <p>PS-3.17 The County will pursue expansion of the SVWP by initiating investigations of the capacity for the Salinas River water storage and distribution system to be further expanded. This shall also include investigations of expanded conjunctive use, use of recycled water for groundwater recharge and seawater intrusion barrier, and changes in operations of the reservoirs. The County’s overall objective is to have an expansion planned and in service by 2030.</p> <p>PS-3.18 The County will convene and coordinate a working group made up of the Salinas Valley cities, the MCWRA, and other affected entities for the purpose of identifying new water supply projects, water management programs, and multiple agency agreements that will provide additional domestic water supplies for the Salinas Valley. These may include, but are not limited to, expanded conjunctive use programs, further improvements to the upriver reservoirs, additional pipelines to provide more efficient distribution, and expanded use of recycled water to reinforce the hydraulic barrier against seawater intrusion. The County’s objective will be to complete the cooperative planning of these water supply alternatives by 2020 and have projects on line by 2030.</p> <p>BIO-2.3: Add Considerations Regarding Riparian Habitat and Stream Flows to Criteria for Long-Term Water Supply and Well Assessment. (see Section 4.9 Biological Resources, below).</p> <p>No additional mitigation measure is available.</p>	
<p>WR-5: Land uses and development consistent with the 2007 General Plan would increase the</p>	<p>The General Plan and Area Plan goals and policies will apply. Future projects will be subject to CEQA and have specific mitigation measures. As the experience with</p>	<p>2030—Significant and unavoidable</p>

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
demand for water storage, treatment, and conveyance facilities that could have significant secondary impacts on the environment.	existing large-scale water supply projects shows, impacts cannot always be mitigated to a less than significant level.	Buildout— Significant and unavoidable
WR-6: Land uses and development consistent with the 2007 General Plan would increase demand on groundwater supplies in some areas; the associated increased well pumping would result in the continued decline of groundwater levels and accelerated overdraft in portions of the county.	<p>2030 WR-1: Support a Regional Solution In Addition to the Coastal Water Project. This measure is described above.</p> <p>2092 WR-1: Support a Regional Solution In Addition to the Coastal Water Project. This measure is described above.</p> <p>WR-2: Initiate Planning for Additional Supplies to the Salinas Valley. This measure is described above.</p>	<p>2030—Significant and unavoidable (in some portions of the County)</p> <p>Buildout— Significant and unavoidable (in some portions of the County).</p>
WR-7: Land uses and development consistent with the 2007 General Plan would increase demand on groundwater supplies in areas currently experiencing or susceptible to saltwater intrusion. Increased groundwater pumping in certain coastal areas would result in increased saltwater intrusion in some areas of the county.	<p>2030 WR-1: Support a Regional Solution In Addition to the Coastal Water Project This measure is described above.</p> <p>2092 WR-1: Support a Regional Solution In Addition to the Coastal Water Project. This measure is described above.</p> <p>WR-2: Initiate Planning for Additional Supplies to the Salinas Valley. This measure is described above.</p>	<p>2030—Significant and unavoidable (in some portions of the County)</p> <p>Buildout— Significant and unavoidable (in some portions of the County)</p>
WR-8: Land uses and development consistent with the 2007 General Plan would result in sewer- and septic-related water quality impacts, including those associated with reuse of treated water and migration of septic tank leachfield wastewater effluent to groundwater that would violate water quality standards.	No additional mitigation beyond the General Plan and Area Plan goals and policies is required.	<p>2030—Less than significant</p> <p>Buildout—Less than significant</p>
WR-9: Land uses and development consistent with the 2007 General Plan would result in an increase in the number of private wells in unincorporated areas of the county. Approval	No mitigation beyond the General Plan and Area Plan goals and policies is necessary.	<p>2030—Less than significant</p> <p>Buildout—Less than significant</p>

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
of wells in these areas would result in well interference impacts.		
WR-10: Land use and development consistent with the 2007 General Plan would result in alterations to existing drainage patterns. Such changes would increase erosion, both in overland flow paths and in drainage swales and creeks.	2030 BIO-2.1: Stream Setback Ordinance. (see Section 4.9 Biological Resources, below). No additional mitigation beyond the General Plan and Area Plan goals and policies is necessary.	2030—Less than significant Buildout—Less than significant
WR-11: Land uses and development consistent with the 2007 General Plan would result in increases in storm water runoff and peak discharge. Existing storm drain systems, including urban creeks and rivers, may be incapable of accommodating increased flows, potentially resulting in increased onsite or offsite flooding.	No mitigation beyond the General Plan and Area Plan goals and policies is necessary.	2030—Less than significant Buildout—Less than significant
WR-12: Land uses and development consistent with the 2007 General Plan would allow continued development in 100-year flood hazard areas.	2030 No mitigation beyond the General Plan and Area Plan goals and policies is necessary. 2092 Extent and locations of future impact are unknown; no mitigation is feasible.	2030—Less than significant Buildout— Significant and unavoidable
WR-13: The placement of land uses and structures within Special Flood Hazard Areas would impede or redirect flood flows, resulting in secondary downstream flood damage, including bank failure.	2030 No mitigation beyond the General Plan and Area Plan goals and policies is necessary. 2092 Extent and locations of future impact are unknown; no mitigation is feasible.	2030—Less than significant Buildout— Significant and unavoidable
WR-14: Potential failure of levees or dams would expose people and structures to inundation and result in the loss of property, increased risk, injury, or death.	2030 No mitigation beyond the General Plan and Area Plan goals and policies is necessary. 2092 Extent and locations of future impact are unknown; no mitigation is feasible.	2030—Less than significant Buildout— Significant and unavoidable
CUM-2: Water Resources – Surface water	No mitigation beyond 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	Less than

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
quality:		cumulatively considerable.
CUM-3: Water Resources – Groundwater Quality:	Mitigation measures WR-1 and WR-2.	Cumulatively considerable.
CUM-4: Water Resources – Indirect impacts of water supply projects.	No mitigation is feasible.	Cumulatively considerable.
4.4 GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND SEISMICITY		
GEO-1: Implementation of the 2007 General Plan could expose persons and property to fault rupture hazards.	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan Area Plan goals and policies is necessary.	2030—Less than significant Buildout—Less than significant
GEO-2: Land uses and development consistent with the 2007 General Plan could expose people or structures to substantial adverse seismic effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking.	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan Area Plan goals and policies is necessary.	2030—Less than significant Buildout—Less than significant
GEO-3: Land uses and development consistent with the 2007 General Plan could expose property and structures to the damaging effects of ground subsidence hazards. This kind of geologic hazard can be seismically triggered (e.g., liquefaction), caused by seasonal saturation of the soils and rock materials, or related to grading activities.	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	2030—Less than significant Buildout—Less than significant
GEO-4: Land uses and development consistent with the 2007 General Plan could expose people and structures to substantial damaging effects of landslides, including the risk of loss, injury, or death from downslope earth movement that may be slow or rapidly occurring. This kind of geologic hazard is	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	2030—Less than significant Buildout—Less than significant

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
commonly caused by earthquakes, seasonal saturation of soils and rock, erosion, or grading activities.	BIO-2.1: Stream Setback Ordinance. (see Section 4.9 Biological Resources, below). No additional mitigation beyond the General Plan and Area Plan goals and policies is necessary.	2030—Less than significant Buildout—Less than significant
GEO-6: Land uses and development consistent with the 2007 General Plan could expose property improvements to potential adverse effects from expansive soils. Expansive soils can damage improvements, especially structures such as residential buildings, small commercial buildings, and pavements.	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	2030—Less than significant Buildout—Less than significant
GEO-7: Construction of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems on soils incapable of adequately supporting such systems could damage improvements and adversely affect groundwater resources.	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	2030—Less than significant Buildout—Less than significant
GEO-8: Land use activities and development consistent with the 2007 General Plan could expose persons and property to tsunami, seiche, or mudflow hazards.	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	2030—Less than significant Buildout—Less than significant
4.5 MINERAL RESOURCES		
MIN-1: Implementation of the 2007 General Plan would potentially result in the loss of availability of known mineral resources of value to the region and the residents of the state.	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	2030—Less than significant Buildout—Less than significant
MIN-2: Implementation of the 2007 General	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	2030—Less than

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Plan would potentially result in the loss of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan.		significant Buildout—Less than significant
4.6 TRANSPORTATION		
TRAN-1A: Development allowed under the 2007 General Plan would cause direct impacts on County roadways which would cause roadways to fall below the acceptable LOS standard D.	Impacts are less than significant, therefore no mitigation is necessary.	2030—Less than significant
TRAN-1B: Development of the land uses allowed under the 2007 General Plan would create traffic increases on County and Regional roadways which would cause the LOS to exceed the LOS standard, or contribute traffic to County and Regional roads that exceed the LOS standard without development.	No mitigation is feasible.	2030—Significant and unavoidable
TRAN 1-C: Growth in land uses allowed under the 2007 General Plan would increase demand for air travel at the County's four airports or increase development within the approach and departure pattern of airports.	Impacts are less than significant, therefore no mitigation is necessary.	2030—Less than significant
TRAN 1-D: Growth in land uses allowed under the 2007 General Plan could result in non-standard or hazardous designs or land uses that are incompatible with public facilities and adjoining land uses.	No additional mitigation measures beyond the 2007 General Plan are necessary.	2030—Less than significant
TRAN 1-E: Growth in land uses allowed under the 2007 General Plan would result in inadequate emergency access.	TRAN-1E: Revise Safety Element S-4.27 on increasing roadway connectivity to enhance emergency access. S-4.27 The County shall continue to review the procedure for proposed development, including minor and major subdivisions, and provide for an optional pre-submittal meeting between the project applicant, planning staff, and fire officials. In addition, the	2030—Significant and unavoidable

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
	County shall review Community Area and Rural Center Plans, and new development proposals for roadway connectivity that provides multiple routes for emergency response vehicles. At the time of their update, Community Area and Rural Center Plans shall identify primary and secondary response routes. Secondary response routes shall be required to accommodate through traffic and may be existing roads, or may be new roads required as part of development proposals. The emergency route and connectivity plans shall be coordinated with the appropriate Fire District.	
TRAN 1-F: Development allowed under the 2007 General Plan could potentially conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation or generate pedestrian, bicycle, or transit travel demand that would not be accommodated by current pedestrian facilities, bicycle development plans, or long-range transit plans.	No additional mitigation beyond 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	2030—Less than significant
TRAN-2A: Development allowed under the 2007 General Plan cumulatively with other development to the year 2030 would cause direct impacts on County roadways which would cause roadways to fall below the acceptable LOS standard D.	No additional mitigation beyond 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	2030—Less than cumulatively considerable
TRAN-2B: Development of the land uses allowed under the 2007 General Plan cumulatively with development in incorporated cities and in adjacent counties would create traffic increases on County and Regional roadways which would cause the LOS to exceed the LOS D standard, or contribute traffic to County and Regional roads that exceed the LOS standard without development.	<p>No mitigation is feasible for County and Regional roadways outside of the CVMP.</p> <p>TRAN-2B: Revise policies in the Carmel Valley Master Plan as follows:</p> <p>Policy CV-2.10. The following are policies regarding improvements to specific portions of Carmel Valley Road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Via Petra to Robinson Canyon Road. Every effort should be made to preserve its rural character by maintaining it as a 2-lane road with paved shoulders, passing lanes and left turn channelizations at intersections where warranted. b) Robinson Canyon Road to Laureles Grade. Every effort should be made to preserve its rural character by maintaining it as a 2-lane road with paved shoulders, passing lanes and left turn channelizations at intersections where warranted. c) Carmel Valley Road/Laureles Grade. A grade separation should be constructed at this location instead of a traffic signal. The grade separation needs to be constructed in a 	2030—Cumulatively considerable (most of county)

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
	<p>manner that minimizes impacts to the rural character of the road. An interim improvement of an all-way stop or stop signal is allowable during the period necessary to secure funding for the grade separation.</p> <p>d) Laureles Grade to Ford Road. Shoulder improvements and widening should be undertaken here and extended to Pilot Road, and include left turn channelization at intersections as warranted.</p> <p>e) East of Esquiline Road. Shoulder improvements should be undertaken at the sharper curves. Curves should be examined for spot realignment needs.</p> <p>f) Laureles Grade improvements. Improvements to Laureles Grade should consist of the construction of shoulder widening, spot realignments, passing lanes and/or paved turn-outs. Heavy vehicles should be discouraged from using this route.</p> <p>Policy CV-2.12: To accommodate existing and future traffic, the following road improvements are recommended:</p> <p>a) Add a northbound climbing lane between Rio Road and Carmel Valley Road;</p> <p>b) Laureles Grade—undertake shoulder improvements, widening and spot realignment;</p> <p>c) Carmel Valley Road, Robinson Canyon Road to Ford Road—add left turn channelization at all intersections. Shoulder improvements should be undertaken.</p> <p>Policy CV-2.18: To implement traffic standards to provide adequate streets and highways in Carmel Valley, the County shall conduct and implement the following:</p> <p>a) Twice yearly monitoring by Public Works (in June and October) of peak hour traffic at the following 12 locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Carmel Valley Road ▪ East of Holman Road ▪ Holman Road to Esquiline Road ▪ Esquiline Road to Ford Road ▪ Ford Road to Laureles Grade ▪ Laureles Grade to Robinson Canyon Road ▪ Robinson Canyon Road to Schulte Road ▪ Schulte Road to Rancho San Carlos Road ▪ Rancho San Carlos Road to Rio Road ▪ Rio Road to Carmel Rancho Boulevard 	

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Carmel Rancho Boulevard to SR1 <p>Other Locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Carmel Rancho Boulevard between Carmel Valley Road and Rio Road ▪ Rio Road between its eastern terminus and SR1 <p>b) A yearly evaluation report (December) shall be prepared jointly by the Public Works and Planning Departments and shall evaluate the peak-hour level of service (LOS) for these 12 locations to indicate segments approaching a traffic volume which would lower levels of service below the LOS standards established below under CV 2-18(d).</p> <p>c) Public hearings shall be held in January immediately following a December report in (b) above in which only 100 or less peak hour trips remain before an unacceptable level of service (as defined by CV 2-18(d)) would be reached for any of the 12 segments described above.</p> <p>d) The traffic LOS standards (measured for peak hour conditions) for the CVMP Area shall be as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Signalized Intersections—LOS of “C” is the acceptable condition. ▪ Unsignalized Intersections—LOS of “F” or meeting of any traffic signal warrant are defined as unacceptable conditions ▪ Carmel Valley Road Segment Operations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ LOS of “C” for Segments 1, 2, 8, 9, and 10 is an acceptable condition; □ LOS of “D” for Segments 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 is an acceptable condition. <p>During review of development applications which require a discretionary permit, if traffic analysis of the proposed project indicates that the project would result in traffic conditions that would exceed the standards described above in CV 2-18(d) after the analysis takes into consideration the Carmel Valley Traffic Improvement Program to be funded by the Carmel Valley Road Traffic Mitigation Fee, then approval of the project shall be conditioned on the prior (e.g. prior to project-generated traffic) construction of additional roadway improvements OR an Environmental Impact Report shall be prepared for the project. Such additional roadway improvements must be sufficient, when combined with the projects programmed in the Carmel Valley Traffic Improvement Program, to allow County to find that the affected roadway segments or intersections would meet the acceptable standard upon completion of the programmed plus additional improvements. This policy does not apply to the first single-family</p>	

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
	<p>residence on a legal lot of record.</p> <p>Policy CV-2.19 : Carmel Valley Traffic Improvement Program (CVTIP)</p> <p>a) The CVTIP shall include the following projects (unless a subsequent traffic analysis identifies that different projects are necessary to maintain the LOS standards in Policy CV-2.18(d):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Left-turn channelization on Carmel Valley Road west of Ford Road; ▪ Shoulder widening on Carmel Valley Road between Laureles Grade and Ford Road; ▪ Paved turnouts, new signage, shoulder improvements, and spot realignments on Laureles Grade; ▪ Grade separation at Laureles Grade and Carmel Valley Road (an interim improvement of an all-way stop or stop signal is allowable during the period necessary to secure funding for the grade separation); ▪ Sight Distance Improvement at Dorris Road; ▪ Passing lanes in front of the proposed September Ranch development; ▪ Passing lanes opposite Garland Park; ▪ Climbing Lane on Laureles Grade; ▪ Upgrade all new road improvements within Carmel Valley Road Corridor to Class 2 bike lanes; ▪ Passing lane (1/4 mile) between Schulte Road and Robinson Canyon Road; and ▪ Passing lane (1/4 mile) between Rancho San Carlos Rd and Schulte Road. <p>b) The County shall adopt an updated fee program to fund the CVTIP.</p> <p>c) All projects within the CVMP area and within the “Expanded Area” that contribute to traffic within the CVMP area shall contribute fair-share traffic impact fees to fund necessary improvements identified in the CVTIP, as updated at the time of building permit issuance.</p> <p>d) Where conditions are projected to approach unacceptable conditions (as defined by the monitoring and standards described above under CV 2-18(d)), the CVTIP shall be updated to plan for and fund adequate improvements to maintain acceptable conditions.</p>	

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
TRAN-2C: Growth in land uses allowed under the 2007 General Plan, cumulatively with development in incorporated cities and adjacent counties, would increase demand for air travel at the County's four airports or increase development within the approach and departure pattern of airports.	No additional mitigation beyond 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	2030—Less than cumulatively considerable
TRAN-2D: Growth in land uses allowed under the 2007 General Plan, cumulatively with development in incorporated cities and adjacent counties, could result in non-standard or hazardous designs or land uses that are incompatible with public facilities and adjoining land uses.	No additional mitigation beyond 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	2030—Less than cumulatively considerable
TRAN-2E: Growth in land uses allowed under the 2007 General Plan, cumulatively with development in incorporated cities and adjacent counties, would result in inadequate emergency access.	No additional mitigation beyond 2007 General Plan policies and Mitigation Measure TRAN-1E (described above) is available.	2030—Cumulatively considerable
TRAN-2F: Development allowed under the 2007 General Plan, cumulatively with development in incorporated cities and adjacent counties, could potentially conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation or generate pedestrian, bicycle, or transit travel demand that would not be accommodated by current pedestrian facilities, bicycle development plans, or long-range transit plans.	No additional mitigation beyond 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	2030—Less than cumulatively considerable
TRAN-3A: Buildout of the 2007 General Plan would cause project-specific impacts on County roadways which would cause roadways to fall below the acceptable LOS standard D.	No mitigation is necessary.	Buildout—Less than significant

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
TRAN-3B: Buildout of the 2007 General Plan would increase traffic on County and Regional roadways which would cause the LOS to exceed the LOS D standard, or contribute traffic to County and Regional roads that exceed the LOS standard without development.	No additional mitigation beyond 2007 General Plan policies and Mitigation Measure TRAN-2B (described above) is feasible.	Buildout— Significant and unavoidable
TRAN-3C: Buildout of the 2007 General Plan would increase demand for air travel at the County’s four airports or increase development within the approach and departure pattern of airports.	No mitigation is necessary.	Buildout—Less than significant
TRAN-3D: Buildout of the 2007 General Plan would result in non-standard or hazardous designs or land uses that are incompatible with public facilities and adjoining land uses.	No additional mitigation measures beyond the 2007 General Plan are necessary.	Buildout—Less than significant
TRAN-3E: Buildout of the 2007 General Plan would result in inadequate emergency access.	No additional mitigation beyond 2007 General Plan policies and Mitigation Measure TRAN-1E (described above) is available.	Buildout— Significant and unavoidable
TRAN-3F: Buildout of the 2007 General Plan would conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation or generate pedestrian, bicycle, or transit travel demand that would not be accommodated by current pedestrian facilities, bicycle development plans, or long-range transit plans	No mitigation is necessary.	Buildout—Less than significant
TRAN-4A: Buildout of the 2007 General Plan cumulatively with development in incorporated cities and adjacent counties would cause project-specific impacts on County roadways which would cause roadways to fall below the acceptable LOS standard D.	No mitigation is necessary.	Buildout—Less than significant
TRAN-4B: Buildout of the 2007 General Plan	No additional mitigation beyond 2007 General Plan policies and Mitigation Measure	Buildout—

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
cumulatively with development in incorporated cities and in adjacent counties would create traffic increases on County and Regional roadways which would cause the LOS to exceed the LOS D standard, or contribute traffic to County and Regional roads that exceed the LOS standard without development.	TRAN-2B (described above) is feasible.	Significant and unavoidable
TRAN-4C: Buildout of the 2007 General Plan, cumulatively with development in incorporated cities and adjacent counties, would increase demand for air travel at the County's four airports or increase development within the approach and departure pattern of airports.	No mitigation is necessary.	Buildout—Less than significant
TRAN-4D: Growth in land uses allowed under the 2007 General Plan, cumulatively with development in incorporated cities and adjacent counties, would result in non-standard or hazardous designs or land uses that are incompatible with public facilities and adjoining land uses.	No additional mitigation measures beyond the 2007 General Plan are necessary.	Buildout—Less than significant
TRAN-4E: Buildout of the 2007 General Plan, cumulatively with development in incorporated cities and adjacent counties, would result in inadequate emergency access.	No additional mitigation beyond 2007 General Plan policies and Mitigation Measure TRAN-1E (described above) is available.	Buildout—Significant and unavoidable
TRAN-4F: Buildout of the 2007 General Plan, cumulatively with development in incorporated cities and adjacent counties, would conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation or generate pedestrian, bicycle, or transit travel demand that would not be accommodated by current pedestrian facilities, bicycle development plans, or long-range transit plans.	No mitigation is necessary.	Buildout—Less than significant

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>TRAN-5A: Growth in land uses allowed under the 2007 General Plan to the year 2030 would create adverse impacts to County roads within the Agricultural and Winery Corridor.</p>	<p>TRAN-5A: The roadway segments exceeding LOS standards are two-lane rural roads that provide left turn lanes at some intersections. These segments include County Road G14 between US 101 and San Lucas Road, and Spreckels Boulevard between SR-68 and Harkins Road. Improvement of these segments would be funded through a combination of project-specific mitigation for individual developments, and through a Capital Improvement and Financing Plan fair-share funding mechanism established for the Corridor by the Public Works Department. These improvements would be implemented when:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) A proposed development’s project-specific assessment identifies a direct impact to the facility in terms of either LOS or safety. 2) A proposed development gains access from an intersection within the segment. 3) A corridor-wide nexus study prepared for the required Capital Improvement and Financing Plan identifies the level of development that can occur before triggering the improvements. <p>To maintain the rural character of the area, there are no plans to widen these roadways to four lane facilities. Therefore, the capacity of these segments will be increased by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Providing left turn lanes at intersections without left turn lanes and where the frequency of turning vehicles affects through vehicle movement; and/or 2. Increasing the width of the roadway shoulder at intersections to allow vehicles to pass turning vehicles; and/or 3. Constructing passing lanes as determined in the Capital Improvement and Financing Plan. 	<p>2030—Less than significant</p>
<p>TRAN-5B: Buildout of the 2007 General Plan would create adverse impacts to County roads within the Agricultural Winery Corridor.</p>	<p>No additional mitigation beyond 2007 General Plan policies and Mitigation Measure TRAN-5A (described above) is necessary.</p>	<p>Buildout—Less than significant</p>
<p>CUM-6: Transportation</p>	<p>Related mitigation measures are included in Section 4.6.</p>	<p>Cumulatively considerable</p>
<p>4.7 AIR QUALITY</p>		
<p>AQ-1: Buildout of the 2007 General Plan would conflict with applicable Air Quality Management Plans and Standards.</p>	<p>No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.</p>	<p>2030—Less than significant Buildout—Less than</p>

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
AQ-2: Generation of significant quantities of construction-related emissions would result in greater levels of air pollution.	<p>2030 and 2092</p> <p>AQ-1: The County of Monterey will update General Plan policy OS-10.5 as follows: OS-10.5. The County of Monterey will require that future construction in accordance with the 2007 implement MBUAPCD PM₁₀ control measures.</p> <p>AQ-2: Implement MBUAPCD Mitigation Measures for Off-Road Mobile Source and Heavy Duty Equipment Emissions.</p> <p>General Plan Policy OS-10.6 will be revised as follows: The County shall implement MBUAPCD measures to address off-road mobile source and heavy duty equipment emissions as conditions of approval for future development.</p>	<p>significant</p> <p>2030—Less than significant</p> <p>Buildout—Less than significant</p>
AQ-3: Net Change in Ozone Precursor (ROG and NOx) and Particulate Matter.	<p>2030 and 2092</p> <p>CC-2 and CC-3: See the description of these measures under Climate Change, below.</p> <p>AQ-3: Implement MBUAPCD Mitigation Measures for Commercial, Industrial, and Institutional Land Uses (MBUAPCD 2008).</p> <p>The following measures will be added to General Plan Policy OS-10.10:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide preferential carpool/vanpool parking spaces ▪ Implement a parking surcharge for single occupant vehicles ▪ Provide for shuttle/mini bus service ▪ Provide bicycle storage/parking facilities and shower/locker facilities ▪ Provide onsite child care centers ▪ Provide transit design features within the development ▪ Develop park-and-ride lots ▪ Employ a transportation/rideshare coordinator ▪ Implement a rideshare program ▪ Provide incentives to employees to rideshare or take public transportation ▪ Implement compressed work schedules ▪ Implement telecommuting program <p>AQ-4: Implement MBUAPCD Mitigation Measures for Residential Land Uses (MBUAPCD 2008).</p>	<p>2030—Significant and unavoidable</p> <p>Buildout—Significant and unavoidable</p>

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
	<p>General Plan Policy OS-10.10 will be revised to include the following measures to address residential land use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide bicycle paths within major subdivisions that link to an external network ▪ Provide pedestrian facilities within major subdivisions <p>AQ-5: Implement MBUAPCD Mitigation Measures for Alternative Fuels (MBUAPCD 2008).</p> <p>The following measures will be added to General Plan Policy OS-10.2 to address alternative fuels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Utilize electric fleet vehicles ▪ Utilize Ultra Low-Emission fleet vehicles ▪ Utilize methanol fleet vehicles ▪ Utilize liquid propane gas fleet vehicles ▪ Utilize compressed natural gas fleet vehicles 	
<p>AQ-4: Buildout of the 2007 General Plan would expose sensitive receptors to increased diesel exhaust.</p>	<p>2030 and 2092</p> <p>AQ-6:</p> <p>The County of Monterey shall require that construction contracts be given to those contractors who show evidence of the use of soot traps, ultra-low sulfur fuels, and other diesel engine emissions upgrades that reduce PM₁₀ emissions to less than 50% of the statewide PM₁₀ emissions average for comparable equipment.</p> <p>AQ-7:</p> <p>The following language should be included in General Plan policy OS-10.10:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Development of new sensitive land uses (schools, hospitals, facilities for the elderly) should not be located any closer than 500 feet of a freeway carrying more than 100,000 vehicles per day. 	<p>2030—Less than significant</p> <p>Buildout—Less than significant</p>
<p>AQ-5: Future traffic growth would cause increases in CO levels along County roadways.</p>	<p>No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.</p>	<p>2030—Less than significant</p> <p>Buildout—Less than significant</p>
<p>AQ-6: Buildout of the 2007 General Plan would result in the emission of objectionable</p>	<p>2030 and 2092</p> <p>AQ-8:</p>	<p>2030—Less than significant</p>

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
odors.	<p>The following measures should be added as General Plan Policy OS-10.12:</p> <p>OS-10.12. Provide for the proper storage and disposal of pomace resulting from winery operations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To minimize odors resulting from the storage of pomace, all residue shall be removed from the site or spread in the vineyards as a soil amendment by the winery. ▪ To prevent complaints resulting from burning of pomace, burning of pomace as a disposal method shall be prohibited. ▪ All wineries shall incorporate best management practices and technologies to prevent fugitive emissions and odors from escaping the winery during production. 	Buildout—Less than significant
CUM 7: Air Quality	No mitigation is feasible.	Cumulatively considerable.
4.8 NOISE		
Impact N-1: Future development activities associated with the 2007 General Plan would result in exposure of noise sensitive land uses (i.e. persons) to traffic noise in excess of County noise standards, or substantial increases in traffic noise.	No mitigation beyond 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	2030—Less than significant 2092—Less than significant
Impact N-2: Development activities associated with implementation of the 2007 General Plan would result in exposure of persons to excessive ground-borne vibration.	No mitigation beyond 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	2030—Less than significant 2092—Less than significant
Impact N-3: Implementation of the 2007 General Plan would create temporary, short-term noise impacts during associated construction activities.	No mitigation beyond 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	2030—Less than significant 2092—Less than significant
Impact N-4: Implementation of the 2007 General Plan would potentially expose people residing or working near an airport to excessive noise levels.	No mitigation beyond 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	2030—Less than significant 2092—Less than significant

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Impact N-5: Implementation of the 2007 General Plan would expose people residing or working near industrial/agricultural land uses and recreational venues to excessive noise levels.	No mitigation beyond 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	2030—Less than significant 2092—Less than significant
CUM-8: Noise	No mitigation beyond 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	Less than cumulatively considerable.

4.9 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

BIO-1: Potential Adverse Impact on Special-Status Species	<p>2030 <i>All Special Status Species—Program Level</i></p> <p>BIO-1.1: Baseline Inventory of Landcover, Special Status Species Habitat, Sensitive Natural Communities, Riparian Habitat, and Wetlands in Monterey County</p> <p>The County shall expand the inventory of listed species suitable and critical habitat required by Policy OS 5.1 and OS-5.2 to include an updated vegetation land cover map, identification of suitable habitat for special status species (as defined in this document), sensitive natural communities, and riparian habitat in Monterey County. The inventory shall include wetlands inventory as feasible based on existing data sources and aerial interpretation. This inventory should be updated at a minimum of ten-year intervals. The inventory can exclude areas that are not under the control of Monterey County (e.g. cities, state and federal lands).</p> <p>BIO-1.2: Salinas Valley Conservation Plan to preserve habitat for the San Joaquin kit fox in the Salinas Valley</p> <p>The County shall, in concert with the USFWS, CDFG, cities in the Salinas Valley, and stakeholders develop a conservation plan for the Salinas Valley to provide for the preservation of adequate habitat to sustain the San Joaquin kit fox population. The general focus area of the plan shall be the Salinas Valley south of the community of Chualar. The Conservation Plan, at a minimum, shall be adopted by Monterey County and shall be applied to all discretionary approvals (and their associated CEQA documents) with potential to affect the San Joaquin kit fox within the conservation plan area. The County shall complete the conservation plan within 4 years of General Plan adoption. The conservation plan funding program shall be developed and shall include a mitigation fee program for which development projects will be assessed a fee based on a</p>	2030—Less than significant 2092—Significant and unavoidable
---	---	--

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
	<p>proportional basis of impact to the San Joaquin kit fox. The compensation plan shall be developed and implemented in coordination with the appropriate state or federal agency and may provide mechanisms to mitigate impacts of an individual project through one or more of the following means: identifying an agency-approved mitigation bank or other compensation site (on- or off-site); and/or preserving habitat; monitoring the compensation site; and funding the management of the compensation site.</p> <p><i>All Special Status Species—Project Level</i></p> <p>BIO-1.3: Project Level Biological Survey and Avoidance, Minimization, and Compensation for Impacts to Non-Listed Special-Status Species and Sensitive Natural Communities.</p> <p>The County shall require that any development project that could potentially impact a non-listed special status species or sensitive natural community shall be required to conduct a biological survey of the site. If non-listed special-status species or sensitive natural communities are found on the site, the project biologist shall recommend measures necessary to avoid, minimize, and/or compensate for identified impacts to non-listed special status species and sensitive natural communities. An ordinance establishing minimum standards for a biological report shall be enacted. This policy shall only apply to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Development in Focused Growth Areas (Community Areas, Rural Centers and Housing Overlays (b) Development requiring a discretionary permit (c) Large scale wineries in the AWCP. <p>2092</p> <p>BIO-1.1 through BIO-1.3 as described above.</p> <p>BIO-1.4: By 2030, prepare an Update to the General Plan to identify expansion of existing focused growth areas and/or to identify new focused growth areas to reduce loss of natural habitat in Monterey County.</p> <p>The County shall update the County General Plan by no later than January 1, 2030 and shall consider the potential to expand focused growth areas established by the 2007 General Plan and/or the designation of new focused growth areas. The purpose of such expanded/new focused growth areas would be to reduce the loss of special status species (both listed and non-listed) and their habitat due to continued urban growth after 2030. The new/expanded growth areas shall be designed to accommodate at least 80% of the</p>	

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>BIO-2: Potential Adverse Effects on Sensitive Riparian Habitat, Other Sensitive Natural Communities and on Federal and State Jurisdictional Waters and Wetlands</p>	<p>projected residential and commercial growth in the unincorporated County from 2030 to buildout. This update will also address expansion of agricultural operations and potential impacts to special status species.</p> <p>BIO-1.5: By 2030, prepare a Comprehensive County Natural Communities Conservation Plan</p> <p>The County shall complete the preparation of a NCCP for all incorporated areas in Monterey County by no later than January 1, 2030 to address all state and federal listed species and all special-status species with potential to be listed up to buildout of the County. The County shall invite the participation of the incorporated cities, the federal land agencies, Caltrans and other stakeholders. The NCCP shall also cover preservation of sensitive natural communities, riparian habitat, and wetlands, and wildlife movement corridors and include mechanisms including on and off-site mitigation ratios and fee programs for mitigating impacts.</p> <hr/> <p>2030 <i>Program Level Mitigation Measures</i></p> <p>BIO-1.1 (as described above under Impacts to Special Status Species)</p> <p>BIO-2.1: Stream Setback Ordinance</p> <p>The county shall develop and adopt a county-wide Stream Setback Ordinance to establish minimum standards for the avoidance and setbacks for new development relative to streams. The ordinance shall identify standardized inventory methodologies and mapping requirements. A stream classification system shall be identified to distinguish between different stream types (based on hydrology, vegetation, and slope, etc.) and thus allow application of standard setbacks to different stream types. The ordinance shall identify specific setbacks relative to the following rivers and creeks so they can be implemented in the Area Plans: Salinas, Carmel River, Arroyo Seco, Pajaro River, Nacimiento, San Antonio, Gabilan Creek, and Toro Creek. The ordinance may identify specific setbacks for other creeks or may apply generic setbacks based on the stream classification developed for the ordinance. The purpose of the ordinance will be to preserve riparian habitat and reduce sediment and other water quality impacts of new development.</p> <p>The Stream Setback Ordinance shall apply to all discretionary development within the County and to conversion of previously uncultivated agricultural land (as defined in the General Policy Glossary) on normal soil slopes over 15% or on highly erodible soils on</p>	<p>2030—Less than significant</p> <p>2092—Significant and unavoidable.</p>

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
	<p>slopes over 10%.</p> <p>BIO-2.2—Oak Woodlands Mitigation Program.</p> <p>The County shall prepare, adopt and implement a program that allows project to mitigate the loss of oak woodlands. The program would include ratios for replacement, payment of fees to mitigate the loss or direct replacement for the loss of oak woodlands and monitoring for compliance. The program would identify criteria for suitable donor sites. Mitigation for the loss of oak tree woodlands may be either on-site or off-site. The program would allow payment to either a local fund established by the County. Until such time as the County program is implemented, payment of a fee may be made to the State Oak Woodlands Conservation Program. Replacement of oak woodlands shall be on a minimum 1:1 ratio.</p> <p>BIO-2.3: Add Considerations Regarding Riparian Habitat and Stream Flows to Criteria for Long-Term Water Supply and Well Assessment.</p> <p>Public Services Policies PS-3.3 and PS-3.4 establish the criteria for proof of a long-term water supply and for evaluation and approval of new wells. The following criteria shall be added to these policies:</p> <p>Policy PS-3.3.i—Effects on instream flows necessary to support riparian vegetation, wetlands, fish, and other aquatic life including migration potential for steelhead.</p> <p>Policy PS-3.4.g—Effects on instream flows necessary to support riparian vegetation, wetlands, fish, and other aquatic life including migration potential for steelhead.</p> <p><i>Project Level Mitigation Measure</i></p> <p>BIO-1.3 as described above under Impacts to Special Status Species.</p> <p>2092</p> <p>BIO-1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5 as described above under Impacts to Special Status Species.</p> <p>BIO-2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 as described above.</p>	
<p>BIO-3.1: Potential Disturbance and Loss of Native Fish and Wildlife Species Movement Corridors</p>	<p>2030</p> <p>BIO-1.2 described under Impacts to Special Status Species.</p> <p>BIO-2.1 described under Impacts to Sensitive Natural Communities.</p> <p>BIO-3.1: Project-Level Wildlife Movement Considerations.</p> <p>The County shall require discretionary projects to retain movement corridors of adequate</p>	<p>2030—Less than significant</p> <p>2092—Less than significant</p>

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
	<p>size and habitat quality to allow for continued wildlife use based on the needs of the species occupying the habitat. The County shall consider the need for wildlife movement in designing and expanding major roadways and public infrastructure projects to provide movement opportunities for terrestrial wildlife and to ensure that existing stream channels and riparian corridors continue to provide for wildlife movement and access.</p> <p>2092 BIO-1.2 described under Impacts to Special Status Species. BIO-1.3 described under Impacts to Special Status Species. BIO-1.4 described under Impacts to Special Status Species. BIO-1.5 discussed under Impacts to Special Status Species. BIO-2.1 discussed under Impacts to Sensitive Natural Communities. BIO-3.1 discussed above.</p>	
<p>BIO-3.2: Potential Loss or Disturbance of Nesting Migratory Birds and Raptors</p>	<p>2030 BIO-3.2: Remove Vegetation During the Nonbreeding Season and Avoid Disturbance of Nesting Migratory Birds, Including Raptors, as Appropriate (generally September 16 to January 31).</p> <p>Vegetation removed in the course of development will be removed only during the nonbreeding season (generally September 16 to January 31). Occupied nests of migratory birds, including raptors, will be avoided during this period. The county shall consult, or require the developer to consult, with a qualified biologist prior to any site preparation or construction work in order to (1) determine whether work is proposed during nesting season for migratory birds, (2) determine whether site vegetation is suitable to nesting migratory birds, (3) identify any regulatory requirements for setbacks or other avoidance measures for migratory birds which could nest on the site, and (4) establish project-specific requirements for setbacks, lock-out periods, or other methods of avoidance of nesting birds. The county shall require the development to follow the recommendations of the biologist.</p> <p>2092 BIO-3.2 discussed above.</p>	<p>2030—Less than significant 2092—Less than significant</p>
<p>BIO-4: Potential Loss of Protected Trees</p>	<p>No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.</p>	<p>2030—Less than significant 2092—Less than</p>

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		significant
BIO-5.1: Potential Inconsistency with Adopted Conservation Plan	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	2030—Less than significant 2092—Less than significant
CUM-9: Biological Resources	Mitigation measures BIO-1.1 to 1.5, BIO-2.1 to 2.3, BIO-3.1 to 3.2.	Cumulatively considerable.
4.10 CULTURAL RESOURCES		
CUL-1: Development under the 2007 General Plan could potentially damage or destroy historic resources.	CUL-1: Policy CSV-1.1 of the Central Salinas Valley Area Plan will be revised to read: CSV-1.1 <u>Special Treatment Area: Paraiso Hot Springs</u> —The Paraiso Hot Springs properties shall be designated a Special Treatment Area. Recreation and visitor serving land uses for the Paraiso Hot Springs Special Treatment Area may be permitted in accordance with a general development plan and other discretionary approvals such as subdivision maps, use permits, and design approvals. The Special Treatment Area may include such uses as a lodge, individual cottages, a visitor center, recreational vehicle accommodations, restaurant, shops, stables, tennis courts, aquaculture, mineral water bottling, hiking trails, vineyards, and orchards. The plan shall address cultural resources protection, fire safety, access, sewage treatment, water quality, water quantity, drainage, and soil stability issues (APN: 418-361-004, 418-361-009, 418-361-021, 418-361-022).	2030—Less than significant 2092—Less than significant
CUL-2: Development under the 2007 General Plan could potentially damage or destroy archaeological resources.	CUL-1 discussed under impacts to historic resources.	2030—Less than significant 2092—Less than significant
CUL-3: Development under the 2007 General Plan could result in damage or destruction of paleontological resources.	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	2030—Less than significant 2092—Less than significant
CUL-4: Buildout of the 2007 General Plan could damage or destroy burial sites.	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	2030—Less than significant

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.11 PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES		
PSU-1: Development and land use activities contemplated in the 2007 General Plan may result in the need for new or expanded fire facilities.	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	2092—Less than significant 2030—Less than significant Buildout—Less than significant
PSU-2: Development and land use activities contemplated in the 2007 General Plan may result in the need for new or expanded Sheriff's facilities.	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	2030—Less than significant Buildout—Less than significant
PSU-3: Development and land use activities contemplated in the 2007 General Plan may result in the need for new or expanded school facilities. Future schools may affect adjoining land uses.	2030 No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary. 2092 Specific mitigation of school operational impacts is not feasible because specific future school characteristics are unknown.	2030—Less than significant Buildout—Significant and unavoidable
PSU-4: Development and land use activities contemplated in the 2007 General Plan may result in the need for new or expanded library facilities.	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	2030—Less than significant Buildout—Less than significant
PSU-5: Development and land use activities contemplated in the 2007 General Plan may result in the need for new or expanded public health facilities.	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	2030—Less than significant Buildout—Less than significant
PSU-6: Development and land use activities contemplated in the 2007 General Plan may create additional demands for wastewater collection and treatment, resulting in a need for new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities.	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies and existing regulatory standards is necessary.	2030—Less than significant Buildout—Less than significant

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
PSU-7: Development and land use activities contemplated in the 2007 General Plan may result in the need for new or expanded stormwater drainage facilities.	PS-1: The County will add the following policy to the 2007 General Plan: Policy S-3.9: require all future developments to implement the most feasible number of Low Impact Development (LID) techniques into their stormwater management plan. The LID techniques may include, but are not limited to, grassy swales, rain gardens, bioretention cells, tree box filters, and preserve as much native vegetation as feasible possible on the project site.	2030—Less than significant Buildout—Less than significant
PSU-8: Development and land use activities contemplated in the 2007 General Plan may result in a need for new solid waste facilities or non-compliance with waste diversion requirements. Future solid waste facilities would have a significant effect on the environment.	2030 No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary. 2092 PS-2: The County will add the following policy to the 2007 General Plan: Policy PS-5.5 The County will review its Solid Waste Management Plan on a 5-year basis and institute policies and programs as necessary to exceed the wastestream reduction requirements of the California Integrated Waste Management Act. The County will adopt requirements for wineries to undertake individual or joint composting programs to reduce the volume of their wastestream. Specific mitigation measures to reduce the impacts of future solid waste facilities are infeasible because the characteristics of those future facilities are unknown.	2030—Less than significant Buildout— Significant and unavoidable
CUM-10: Public Services and Utilities – Solid Waste	No mitigation is feasible.	Cumulatively considerable.
4.12 PARKS AND RECREATION		
PAR-1: Implementation of the 2007 General Plan would result in the need for new or expanded parks and recreational facilities, which were not contemplated in the general plan.	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	Less than significant
PAR-2: Population growth associated with implementation of the 2007 General Plan would potentially create additional demands on existing parks and recreational facilities, thereby resulting in the physical deterioration of such facilities.	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	Less than significant

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.13 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS		
HAZ-1: New development in accordance with the 2007 General Plan would expose persons to hazardous materials from routine use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials or the release of hazardous materials.	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	Less than significant
HAZ-2: The 2007 General Plan would establish new land uses that would potentially create aviation safety hazards.	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	Less than significant
HAZ-3: New development in accordance with the 2007 General Plan would increase exposure to wildland fires.	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	Less than significant
HAZ-4: Development under the 2007 General Plan would establish new land uses that would interfere with the implementation of an emergency response or evacuation plan.	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	Less than significant
CUM-11: Hazards – Wildfire	No mitigation is feasible.	Cumulatively considerable.
4.14 AESTHETICS, LIGHT, AND GLARE		
AES-1: Implementation of the 2007 General Plan would result in a substantial adverse effects on scenic vistas.	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is available.	2030—Significant and unavoidable Buildout—Significant and unavoidable
AES-2: Implementation of the 2007 General Plan could result in the degradation of scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is available.	2030—Significant and unavoidable Buildout—Significant and unavoidable
AES-3: Implementation of the 2007 General	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is available.	2030—Significant

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Plan would substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of Monterey County.		and unavoidable Buildout— Significant and unavoidable
AES-4: Implementation of the 2007 General Plan could create substantial new sources of light and glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is available.	Significant and unavoidable
CUM-12: Aesthetics, Light and Glare	No mitigation is feasible.	Cumulatively considerable.
4.15 POPULATION AND HOUSING		
POP-1: Implementation of the 2007 General Plan would induce population growth in unincorporated Monterey County.	No feasible mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan goals and policies is available.	2030—Significant and unavoidable Buildout— Significant and unavoidable
POP-2: Buildout of the 2007 General Plan would result in the displacement of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of new housing elsewhere.	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	2030—Less than significant Buildout—Less than significant
POP-3: Buildout of the 2007 General Plan would result in the displacement of persons, necessitating the construction of new housing elsewhere.	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	2030—Less than significant Buildout—Less than significant
CUM-13: Population and Housing	No mitigation is feasible.	Cumulatively considerable.
4.16 CLIMATE CHANGE		
CC-1: Development of the 2007 General Plan would contribute considerably to cumulative GHG emissions and global climate change as	2030 Horizon CC-1a: Modify Policy OS-10.11 regarding the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan	2030—Less than cumulatively considerable

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>the County in 2020 would have GHG emissions greater than 72% of business as usual conditions.</p>	<p>Revise Policy OS-10.11 as follows:</p> <p>OS-10.11 Within 24 months of the adoption of the General Plan, Monterey County will develop a Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan with a target to reduce emissions by 2020 by 28% relative to estimated “business as usual” 2020 emissions.</p> <p>At a minimum, the Plan shall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. establish an inventory of current (2006) GHG emissions in the County of Monterey including but not limited to residential, commercial, industrial and agricultural emissions; b. forecast GHG emissions for 2020 for County operations; c. forecast GHG emissions for areas within the jurisdictional control of the County for “business as usual” conditions; d. identify methods to reduce GHG emissions; e. quantify the reductions in GHG emissions from the identified methods; f. requirements for monitoring and reporting of GHG emissions; g. establish a schedule of actions for implementation; h. identify funding sources for implementation; and i. identify a reduction goal for the 2030 Planning Horizon. <p>During preparation of the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan, the County shall also evaluate potential options for changes in County policies regarding land use and circulation as necessary to further achieve the 2020 and 2030 reduction goals and measures to promote urban forestry and public awareness concerning climate change.</p> <p>CC-2: Add Policy OS-10.12: Adoption of a Green Building Ordinance</p> <p>OS-10.12 Within 24 months of the adoption of the General Plan, the County shall adopt a Green Building Ordinance to require green building practices and materials for new civic buildings and new private residential, commercial, and industrial buildings that will include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All new County government projects and major renovations shall meet, at a minimum, LEED-Silver standards or an equivalent rating system ▪ All new commercial buildings shall be certified under the LEED rating system for commercial buildings or an equivalent rating system. ▪ All new residential projects of 6 units or more shall meet the GreenPoint Rating 	<p>Buildout— Cumulatively considerable</p>

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
	<p>System for residential buildings, or an equivalent alternate rating system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The County shall require consideration of solar building orientation, solar roofs, cool pavements, and planting of shade trees in development review of new commercial and industrial projects and new residential projects of 6 units or more. ▪ Prioritized parking within new commercial and retail areas for electric vehicles, hybrid vehicles, and alternative fuel vehicles shall be provided for new commercial and institutional developments. ▪ New commercial and industrial projects greater than 25,000 square feet shall be required to provide on-site renewable energy generation as part of their development proposal. This requirement can be met through a solar roof or other means. <p>CC-3: New Policy OS-10.13—Promote Alternative Energy Development</p> <p>OS-10.13: The County shall use Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to map and assess local renewable resources, the electric and gas transmission and distribution system, community growth areas anticipated to require new energy services, and other data useful to deployment of renewable technologies.</p> <p>The County shall adopt an Alternative Energy Promotion ordinance that will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ identify possible sites for production of energy using local renewable resources such as solar, wind, small hydro, and, biogas; ▪ consider the potential need for exemption from other General Plan policies concerning visual resources, ridgeline protection, biological resources; ▪ evaluate potential land use, environmental, economic, and other constraints affecting renewable energy development; and ▪ adopt measures to protect both renewable energy resources, such as utility easement, right-of-way, and land set-asides as well as visual and biological resources. <p>The County shall also complete the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evaluate the feasibility of Community Choice Aggregation (CCA) for the County. CCA allows cities and counties, or groups of them, to aggregate the electric loads of customers within their jurisdictions for purposes of procuring electrical services. CCA allows the community to choose what resources will serve their loads and can significantly increase renewable energy. ▪ If CCA is ultimately not pursued, the County shall evaluate the feasibility of purchasing renewable energy certificates to reduce the County’s contribution to 	

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
	<p>GHG emissions related to County electricity use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The County shall develop a ministerial permit process for approval of small-scale wind and solar energy systems for on-site home, small commercial, and farm use. <p>CC-4: New Policy PS-5.5—Promote Recycling and Waste Reduction</p> <p>PS-5.5: The County shall promote waste diversion and recycling and waste energy recovery as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The County shall adopt a 75% waste diversion goal. ▪ The County shall support the extension of the types of recycling services offered (e.g., to include food and green waste recycling). ▪ The County shall support waste conversion and methane recovery in local landfills to generate electricity. ▪ The County shall support and require the installation of anaerobic digesters for winery facilities and wastewater treatment facilities under County jurisdiction. <p>CC-5: Adopt GHG Reduction Plan for County Operations</p> <p>Within 12 months of adoption of the General Plan, the County shall quantify the current and projected (2020) GHG emissions associated with County operations and adopt a GHG Reduction Plan for County Operations. The goal of the plan shall be to reduce GHG emissions associated with County Operations by at least 28% relative to BAU 2020 conditions.</p> <p>Potential elements of the County Operations GHG Reduction Plan shall include, but are not limited to, the following measures: an energy tracking and management system; energy-efficient lighting; lights-out-at-night policy; occupancy sensors; heating, cooling and ventilation system retrofits; ENERGY STAR appliances; green or reflective roofing; improved water pumping energy efficiency; central irrigation control system; energy-efficient vending machines; preference for recycled materials in purchasing; use of low or zero-emission vehicles and equipment and recycling of construction materials in new county construction; conversion of fleets (as feasible) to electric and hybrid vehicles; and solar roofs.</p> <p>2092</p> <p>CC-11 (Same as BIO-1.9): By 2030, prepare an Update to the General Plan to identify expansion of existing focused growth areas and/or to identify new focused growth areas to reduce loss of natural habitat in Monterey County and vehicle miles traveled</p>	

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>CC-2: Development Allowed by the 2007 General Plan May Subject Property and Persons to Otherwise Avoidable Physical Harm in Light of Inevitable Climate Change.</p>	<p>The County shall update the County General Plan by no later than January 1, 2030 and shall consider the potential to expand focused growth areas established by the 2007 General Plan and/or the designation of new focused growth areas. The purpose of such expanded/new focused growth areas would be to reduce the loss of natural habitat due to continued urban growth after 2030. The new/expanded growth areas shall be designed to accommodate at least 80% of the projected residential and commercial growth in the unincorporated County from 2030 to buildout.</p> <p>CC-12: Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan Requirements Beyond 2030</p> <p>In parallel with the development and adoption of the 2030 General Plan, Monterey County will develop and adopt a Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan with a target to reduce 2050 GHG emissions by 80% relative to 1990 emissions.</p> <p>At a minimum, the Plan shall establish an inventory of current (2030) GHG emissions in the County of Monterey; forecast GHG emissions for 2050 for County operations and areas within the jurisdictional control of the County; identify methods to reduce GHG emissions; quantify the reductions in GHG emissions from the identified methods; identify requirements for monitoring and reporting of GHG emissions; establish a schedule of actions for implementation; and identify funding sources for implementation.</p>	<p>2030 and Buildout— Less than cumulatively considerable</p>
	<p>CC-13: Develop and Integrate Climate Change Preparedness Planning for Monterey County</p> <p>Monterey County shall prepare and implement a Climate Change Preparedness Plan to prepare proactively for the impacts of climate change to the County’s economy and natural ecosystems and to promote a climate resilient community.</p> <p>A useful guide to climate resiliency planning is <i>Preparing for Climate Change: A Guidebook for Local, Regional, and State Governments</i>. (The Climate Impacts Group, King County, Washington, and ICLEI—Local Governments for Sustainability 2007), which outlines the following steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Scope the climate change impacts to major County sectors and building and maintain support among stakeholders to prepare for climate change. ▪ Establish a climate change preparedness team. ▪ Identify planning areas relevant to climate change impacts. ▪ Conduct a vulnerability assessment based on climate change projections for the region, the sensitivity of planning areas to climate change impacts, and the ability of 	

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
CUM-12: Climate Change	<p>communities to adapt to climate change impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conduct a risk assessment based on the consequences, magnitude, and probability of climate change impacts, as well as on an evaluation of risk tolerance and community values. ▪ Establish a vision and guiding principles for climate resilient communities and set preparedness goals in priority planning areas based on these guiding principles. ▪ Develop, select, and prioritize possible preparedness actions. ▪ Identify a list of important implementation tools ▪ Develop an understanding of how to manage risk and uncertainty in the planning effort. ▪ Develop measures of resilience, and use these to track the results of actions over time ▪ Review assumptions and other essential information to ensure that planning remains relevant to the most salient climate change impacts. ▪ Update plans regularly. <p>Potential areas of emphasis for preparedness planning may include risk of wildfires, agricultural impacts, flooding and sea level rise, salt water intrusion; and health effects of increased heat and ozone, through appropriate policies and programs.</p> <p>Potential implementation steps could include adopting land use designations that restrict or prohibit development in areas that may be more severely impacted by climate change, e.g., areas that are at high risk of wildfire, sea level rise, or flooding; adoption of programs for the purchase or transfer of development rights in high risk areas to receiving areas of equal or greater value; and support for agricultural research on locally changing climate conditions.</p> <p>To be effective, preparedness planning needs to be an ongoing commitment of the County. The first plan shall be completed no later than 5 years after the adoption of the General Plan and shall be updated at least every 5 years thereafter.</p>	Cumulatively considerable.

1.4 Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

The EIR has identified the following areas where, after the implementation of feasible mitigation measures, the proposed project may nonetheless result in impacts that cannot be fully mitigated to a level of insignificance.

1.4.1 Agriculture Resources

Development and land use activities contemplated by the 2007 General Plan Update would result in the conversion of productive farmland to non-agricultural use. More than 5,500 acres of Important Farmland (as designated by the California Department of Conservation) and more than 7,000 acres of Williamson Act farmland would be converted to non-agricultural use. Note that there is overlap between Important Farmland and Williamson Act Farmland.

1.4.2 Water Resources

Future growth anticipated by the 2007 General Plan would result in significant impacts to groundwater resources in the Pajaro basin and Monterey Peninsula up to the 2030 planning horizon. A number of initiatives now underway would reduce the groundwater impacts in these areas, but not sufficiently to avoid a significant effect. The Salinas Valley Water Project avoids this impact in the Salinas Valley. Increased demands for potable water associated with future urban development may result in the exacerbation of existing groundwater overdraft and seawater intrusion problems in all parts of the county by 2092. Future initiatives are not well enough known to determine that they would avoid this impact.

1.4.3 Transportation

Future growth anticipated by the 2007 General Plan will result in greater traffic volumes on local and regional roadways (i.e., highways). The cumulative traffic generated by both cities and the County will cause some County roadways to operate at LOS E or F. Mitigation is proposed that would require future development projects to pay a Traffic Impact Fee; however, it would not fully reduce this potentially significant impact to a level of less than significant.

1.4.4 Aesthetics, Light, and Glare

Development contemplated by the 2007 General Plan would result in new development on agricultural and undeveloped lands. This new development would irreversibly change the localized visual character of these areas and introduce new sources of light and glare, which may adversely impact the quality of daytime and night time views.

1.4.5 Global Climate Change

Development authorized under the 2007 General Plan would increase the emissions of the “greenhouse” gases that are a major cause of global climate change. California law requires the California Air Resources Board and other state agencies to enact regulations that will reduce the state’s emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. Improved local land use plans and regulations will need to play a part in this reduction. As part of its commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, the county will adopt a climate action plan within two years of passage of the 2007 General Plan. A number of mitigations are also recommended. This will not reduce the impact below a level of significance.

1.5 Summary of Alternatives

CEQA requires the lead agency to consider a reasonable range of feasible alternatives to the proposed project that: (1) meet most or all of the project’s objectives; (2) substantially reduce one or more of its significant effects; and (3) are potentially feasible. The County has examined 5 alternatives to the 2007 General Plan. Because a general plan is a large and complex set of policies that are intended to interact with one another to result in a desired future pattern of land use, development, and resource conservation, the county has chosen to consider several alternative general plans. With one exception, these are fully developed plans that at one time or another have been prepared for the purpose of becoming the general plan for the county. The exception is the Transit Oriented Development alternative. It is based largely on the 2007 General Plan, with specific emphasis on reducing vehicle miles travelled through improved transit and land use restrictions.

Below are very brief summaries of each of the alternatives to the 2007 General Plan that are examined in Section 5 of this EIR. See Section 5 for a more complete description of each of the alternatives and a qualitative comparison of their potential impacts. As authorized under Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the alternatives are examined at a lesser level of detail than the 2007 General Plan. As required under CEQA, the range of alternatives includes the no-project alternative. The alternatives are qualitatively compared to the 2007 General Plan and each other in Table 1-3.

1.5.1 No Project—Existing 1982 General Plan Alternative

Under the No Project—Existing 1982 General Plan Alternative, the current General Plan (1982 General Plan) would remain in effect and future development would occur in accordance with the land use map and policies of this plan.

1.5.2 21st Century Monterey County General Plan Alternative

The 21st Century Monterey County General Plan (GPU3) Alternative would adopt the previously proposed General Plan update considered, and ultimately rejected, by the Monterey County Board of Supervisors in 2004. This alternative provides for the most extensive growth of the alternatives being considered: eight Community Areas and 17 Rural Centers.

1.5.3 General Plan Initiative Alternative

The General Plan Initiative (GPI) Alternative would adopt the version of the General Plan that was drafted by a community group and that was considered and defeated by voters on the June 2007 ballot. This alternative would establish five Community Areas and no Rural Centers. It is designed to strongly encourage future development to locate in the cities, rather than the unincorporated areas. Under this alternative, expanding areas designated for residential development would require a countywide vote.

1.5.4 General Plan 4 Alternative

The General Plan 4 Alternative is the General Plan that was adopted by the County Board of Supervisors in January 2007. It is similar to the 2007 General Plan in many respects. However, it does not have as strict a requirement for development evaluations prior to project approval to ensure that sufficient services will be available, nor does it limit development to the first residence on existing lots of record in the northern part of the county as the 2007 General Plan does. The slope development policies are also less stringent than proposed in the 2007 General Plan. It proposes more extensive development than the 2007 General Plan, with six Community Areas and nine Rural Centers identified as the primary areas for growth.

1.5.5 Transit Oriented Development Alternative

The Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Alternative would focus new development along existing and future transportation corridors. These corridors would be served by high-capacity and high-frequency public transportation. Public transportation in this alternative includes fixed-route bus service, rail, express bus service and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT). Development in these corridors would be concentrated at “nodes” adjoining public transportation stations. Estimated new residential development under the TOD alternative is the same as for the 2007 General Plan. Areas subject to subdivision restrictions would be designated as “sending” sites under a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program, with cities, Community Areas, Rural Centers, and affordable housing overlay districts (AHOs) identified as “receiving” areas.

In rendering a decision on a project, the decision makers are not obligated to select the environmentally superior alternative. Decision-makers may approve a project with significant effects. At the same time, the decision-makers cannot approve a project that would have significant, unavoidable effects unless there are no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would avoid those effects. The decision-makers are obligated to make specific findings describing why there are no feasible mitigations or alternatives.

Table 1-3. Summary of 2007 General Plan Alternatives

Topical Area	2007 General Plan	No Project	GPU3	GPI	GPU4	TOD
Land Use	Significant	Greater	Greater	Less	Same	Greater
Agriculture Resources	Significant	Greater	Greater	Greater	Greater	Less
Water Resources	Significant	Greater	Same	Greater	Same	Less
Geology, Soils, and Seismicity	Less Than Significant	Greater	Greater	Less	Greater	Same
Mineral Resources	Less Than Significant	Same	Same	Same	Same	Same
Transportation	Significant	Greater	Greater	Less	Greater	Less
Air Quality	Significant	Greater	Greater	Less	Greater	Less
Noise	Significant	Greater	Greater	Same	Greater	Greater
Biological Resources	Significant	Greater	Same	Greater	Greater	Less
Cultural Resources	Less Than Significant	Greater	Same	Greater	Same	Less
Public Services and Utilities	Less Than Significant	Greater	Same	Same	Greater	Less
Parks and Recreation	Significant	Greater	Same	Less	Greater	Same
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Less Than Significant	Greater	Greater	Greater	Same	Less
Aesthetics, Light, and Glare	Significant	Greater	Greater	Less	Greater	Same
Population and Housing	Significant	Same	Greater	Same	Greater	Same

Notes:

GPU3 = 21st Century Monterey County General Plan, dated January 2004.

GPI = General Plan Initiative.

GPU4 = 2006 General Plan and adopted General Plan 2006.

TOD = Transit Oriented Development Alternative.

1.6 Areas of Controversy and Issues to be Resolved

Pursuant to Section 15123 of the CEQA Guidelines, a summary section must identify areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public. In addition, the summary section also identifies issues to be resolved. Each of these issues is discussed below.

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the 2007 General Plan was distributed to the State Clearinghouse, responsible agencies, and other interested parties for a 30-day public review period from December 2, 2007 through January 3, 2008. In

addition, a public scoping meeting was held in January 2008. The NOP identified the following topics as being potentially significant impacts:

- Aesthetics, Light, and Glare
- Agriculture Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology, Soils, and Seismicity
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Land Use
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Parks and Recreation
- Population and Housing
- Public Services and Utilities
- Transportation
- Water Resources

A number of agencies, organizations, and individuals provided comments on the NOP. These comments suggested areas of study and identified concerns over the direction of the County general plan and its potential environmental impacts.

1.6.1 Areas of Controversy

Below are summaries of controversial issues that are anticipated to be debated during the public review and hearing process of this project.

1.6.1.1 Population Growth

Development contemplated by the 2007 General Plan would increase the population of the unincorporated areas of the County from 106,279 (estimated 2006 population) to approximately 135,375 persons by the 2030 planning horizon (a 27% increase). Full buildout in 2092 would see an estimated population of 207,424 (a 95% increase over 2006). Population growth has historically been a concern in Monterey County and the potential for additional growth outside of the cities on existing lots of record in the northern portion of the county is expected to be scrutinized closely.

1.6.1.2 Water Supply

Monterey County has significant existing water constraints. The three major watersheds in the County (Salinas, Carmel, and Pajaro Rivers) are all in a state of overdraft. Although initiatives are either underway or in the planning stages, except in the Salinas Valley, the initiatives will not be sufficient to provide water to support projected growth and will not stop groundwater decline within the 2030 planning horizon. Longer term, there may not be sufficient water in any of the watersheds. Sea water intrusion into underground aquifers is occurring in the upper Salinas Valley and in North County, including the Pajaro Valley. Planned or active initiatives are halting this intrusion, but will that will be difficult to continue with increased demand from new growth. Given these constraints, future development and land use activities would further exacerbate these water-related problems without careful planning.

1.6.1.3 Traffic Congestion

Future growth anticipated by the 2007 General Plan, as well as city growth during the 2030 planning horizon and beyond, would result in additional vehicle trips on local and regional roadways. These additional vehicle trips may result in some roadways operating at levels that exceed the County's preferred standard of traffic flow, causing increased traffic congestion in the County.

1.6.1.4 Loss of Farmland

Development and land use activities contemplated by the 2007 General Plan could potentially result in the loss of more than 5,400 acres of Important Farmland and 6,700 acres of Williamson Act land (much of it overlapping). The 2007 General Plan encourages development to occur first in the cities, Community Areas, and Rural Centers. The latter would require the conversion of relatively little agricultural land. However, development would also be allowed on existing lots outside of these areas (restricted to a single residence on lots of record within the North County, Greater Salinas, and Toro Area Plans). There are 4,629 existing lots of record of varying sizes, in the unincorporated county,

1.6.1.5 Biological Resources

Development contemplated by the 2007 General Plan, as well as continued expansion of agricultural lands, would occur in areas that contain sensitive plant and animal species, riparian areas, and wetlands. The conversion of these areas to other uses could potentially result in the significant loss or degradation of biological resources.

1.6.1.6 Aesthetics, Light, and Glare

Future growth in lesser developed or undeveloped areas would result in permanent localized impacts associated with aesthetics, light, and glare. New development may result in the conversion of natural areas or agricultural fields to urban uses, irreversibly changing the visual character of these areas. In addition, new development may also result in the introduction of substantial sources of light and glare, thereby altering daytime and nighttime views.

1.6.1.7 Global Climate Change

Emission of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases from routine human activities is inducing global climate change by trapping heat within the atmosphere. California is leading the way among the states in addressing climate change by reducing our greenhouse gas emissions. Local governments, such as Monterey County, are being looked upon to establish land use patterns and regulations that will reduce emissions by conserving energy, reducing vehicle miles travelled, and other actions.

1.6.2 Disagreement among Experts

This EIR contains substantial evidence to support the conclusions presented herein. However, there is the possibility that there will be disagreement among various parties regarding these conclusions. Both the State CEQA Guidelines and case law provide the standards for treating disagreement among experts. Where evidence and opinions conflict on an issue concerning the environment, and the lead agency knows of these controversies in advance, the EIR must acknowledge the controversies, summarize the conflicting opinions of the experts, and include sufficient information to allow the public and decision-makers to make an informed judgment about the environmental consequences of the proposed project.

Evidence presented during the public and agency review of the Draft EIR will be incorporated into the Final EIR for this project. In their proceedings, the decision-makers will consider comments received concerning the adequacy to the Draft EIR and address any objections raised in these comments. Decision-makers reviewing the Final EIR will have the ability to consider this material during the public hearing process.

1.7 Public Review of the Draft EIR

The Draft EIR will be available for public review for the statutory 45 day public review period, beginning September 5, 2008. During that time, agency

representatives and members of public will have the ability to submit written comments on the Draft EIR to the address provided below.

Carl Holm, Assistant Director
County of Monterey Resource Management Agency
Planning Department
168 W. Alisal Street, 2nd Floor
Salinas, CA 93901
Phone: 831.755.5025 Fax: 831.757.9516
E-mail: HolmCP@co.monterey.ca.us

Submittal of electronic comments in MS Word format is encouraged. After the end of the public review period, the County will prepare written responses to all environmental issues raised as part of preparing the Final EIR. The Final EIR will consist of the Draft EIR, comments received, written responses to comments, and list of commenter's. It may also contain additional information necessary to respond to the comments. All public agencies that submitted comments will be sent a copy of the County's response at least 10 days prior to the public hearing at which the Final EIR will be considered for approval by Board of Supervisors.

The Board of Supervisors will certify the Final EIR prior to taking action on the proposed 2007 General Plan. At that time, they will adopt findings regarding the disposition of each significant effect identified in the Final EIR, as well as a statement of overriding considerations describing the specific benefits that outweigh the projects significant and unavoidable impacts.

1.8 Future Use of this EIR

After certification by the County Board of Supervisors, this EIR may be used by the County and other agencies as a "first tier" document for later projects, as authorized by Section 15183 (projects consistent with a community plan or zoning) of the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Section 15000, et seq.). As a first tier document, the EIR would be the basis for later CEQA reviews. Reviews of later proposals under this provision of CEQA would be required to consider any project-specific impacts that were not addressed in the 2007 General Plan EIR.

These later projects are not known at this time. However, they may include County actions such as:

- Rezoning undertaken to make zoning consistent with the 2007 General Plan
- Adoption of plans for Community Areas and Rural Centers, to the extent that such plans are consistent with the 2007 General Plan and recognizing that there will be site-specific impacts needing additional CEQA analysis.
- Adoption of the Capital Infrastructure Financing Plans and similar infrastructure-related plans set out under the 2007 General Plan, with the

understanding that site-specific impacts will require additional CEQA analysis.

- Actions to implement the Agricultural Wineries Corridor Plan component of the 2007 General Plan, again recognizing that site-specific impacts will require further CEQA review.

Other agencies may also utilize this EIR for their decisions. The extent to which the EIR is relied upon will depend upon whether the actions are consistent with the 2007 General Plan, there are new project-specific impacts requiring additional CEQA review, and whether the other agency chooses to use the EIR. There are no such proposed actions by other agencies currently known. However, other actions may include:

- Consideration of annexation requests by the Local Agency Formation Commission of Monterey County.