

4.11 Public Services and Utilities

4.11.1 Abstract

A number of public service agencies and utility providers serve the unincorporated areas of Monterey County. These agencies and providers include nearly 20 fire protection agencies, the Monterey County Sheriff's Office, three dozen school districts, various County departments, and multiple water and wastewater districts.

All impacts related to public services and utilities would be less than significant and would not require mitigation beyond implementation of the proposed 2007 General Plan policies and programs. Impacts to water supply and infrastructure are discussed in Section 4.3.

4.11.2 Existing Setting

4.11.2.1 Fire Protection

Fire protection services in the county are currently provided by several different organizations, including fire protection districts, volunteer fire departments, fire brigades, the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDFFP), the U.S. Forest Service, the National Parks Service, and the U.S. military. Over 20 different fire protection entities serve the County (Exhibit 4.11.1).

Fire protection districts are the primary fire service providers. These independent special districts serve both incorporated and unincorporated areas. The cities of Carmel-by-the-Sea, Gonzales, King City, Marina, Monterey, Pacific Grove, Salinas, Seaside, and Soledad all have their own fire departments. Districts can establish and operate fire departments (though some do not have fire stations) and develop water storage facilities for fire protection. They can also operate ambulance services and provide rescue and first-aid services. Many of the districts have mutual aid agreements with one another, and several districts contract for services with the CDFFP. In most cases, the districts, volunteer fire departments, and brigades emphasize structural fire protection, while the CDFFP addresses wildland fires.

The CDFFP also provides protection to most of the southeast county, areas south of San Antonio Reservoir, the upper elevations and benchlands of the central Salinas Valley, and the upper elevations south of lower Carmel Valley. Fort Hunter Liggett and Camp Roberts are served by the military. The Big Sur Coast is protected by the Big Sur Volunteer Fire Brigade (a brigade does not have the same funding structure as the fire protection districts). The U.S. Forest Service provides wildland fire suppression in Los Padres National Forest.

4.11.2.2 Sheriff’s Protection

The Monterey County Sheriff’s Office provides police services to the unincorporated portions of the county. These services include patrol, crime prevention, and crime investigation provided out of stations in Monterey, Salinas, and King City. The Sheriff’s Patrol Division provides a full range of law enforcement and related emergency response services to a resident population of approximately 110,000 (unincorporated areas) over an area of 3,325 square miles. Table 4.11-1 summarizes each station’s service area. In addition, the Sheriff’s Office operates the County Detention Facility in Salinas.

Table 4.11-1. Sheriff’s Station Summary

Regional Station	Address	Service Area
Central	1414 Natividad Road in Salinas	Castroville, Aromas, Toro Park , Spreckels, Prunedale, Chualar, Fort Ord (portions)
Coastal	1200 Aguajito Road in Monterey	Monterey Peninsula, Carmel Valley, Big Sur Coast
South County	250 Franciscan Way in King City	Central Salinas Valley, San Lucas, San Ardo, Bradley, Bryson-Hesperia, Parkfield, Fort Hunter Ligget, Camp Roberts, Lake San Antonio

Source: Monterey County Sheriff’s Office 2008.

The Sheriff’s Office contains an Administrative Bureau, an Enforcement Operations Bureau, and a Custody Operations Bureau. The Enforcement Operations Bureau includes the Patrol Division, Narcotics Division, Investigations Division, Homeland Security Division, Crime Prevention Unit, Special Operations Division, and various other teams (such as Hostage/Crisis Negotiation, Search and Rescue, S.W.A.T., and K-9).

As of June 2006, the Sheriff’s Office had 462.5 full-time equivalent staff positions. This includes 338 sworn safety officer positions and 124.5 non-sworn positions. As of June 2006, the Sheriff’s Office 48 positions were vacant, 30 of them for sworn personnel and 18 for non-sworn personnel.

4.11.2.3 Schools

A total of 36 public school districts and charter school programs serve Monterey County. This total includes seven school districts whose boundaries overlap into other counties (Exhibit 4.11.2). The 29 school districts and charter school programs wholly contained in Monterey County are summarized in Table 4.11-2. In 2006, more than 53,000 students were enrolled in these districts.

School districts based in San Benito, Fresno, Santa Cruz, and San Luis Obispo Counties also serve portions of Monterey County. These seven districts are summarized in Table 4.11-3.

4.11.2.4 Library Services

The County provides library services to residents of the unincorporated county and eight cities through the Monterey County Free Libraries system. Branch libraries are located in the following communities: Aromas, Big Sur, Bradley, Buena Vista (Las Palmas area), Carmel Valley, Castroville, Gonzales, Greenfield, King City, Marina, Pajaro, Parkfield, Prunedale, San Ardo, San Lucas, Seaside, and Soledad. The Library also maintains deposit collections in some local schools. The Library’s service area does not include the city limits of the cities of Carmel-by-the-Sea, Monterey, Pacific Grove, and Salinas, which operate their own public libraries.

Monterey County Free Libraries offer library materials in a variety of formats (i.e., books, talking books [books on tape], magazines and newspapers, pamphlets, large print, electronic resources, and videos) and in a variety of languages, such as English, Spanish, Korean, and Vietnamese. The library also operates two bookmobiles: one based in Prunedale and the other based in King City. The two bookmobiles visit more than 30 communities on a regular basis.

Table 4.11-2. Summary of Monterey County School Districts

District	District Type	Number of Schools	Enrollment (2006–2007)
Alisal Union School District	K-8	13	7,416
Bradley Union School District	K-8	1	28
Carmel Unified School District	K-12	6	2,132
Chualar Union Elementary School District	K-8	1	310
Cypress Grove Charter High School Arts & Science	9-12	1	166
Gonzales Unified School District	K-12	4	2,272
Graves Elementary District	K-8	1	40
Greenfield Union Elementary School District	K-8	4	2,468
International School	K-7	1	336
King City Joint Union High School District	9-12	4	2,142
King City Union Elementary School District	K-8	4	2,434
Lagunita School District	K-8	1	60
Learning for Life Charter School District	7-12	1	107
Mission Union Elementary School District	K-8	1	97
Monterey County Office of Education District	K-12	5	1,628
Monterey Peninsula Unified School District	K-12	22	11,607
North Monterey County Unified School District	K-12	8	4,707

District	District Type	Number of Schools	Enrollment (2006–2007)
Oasis Charter District	K-6	1	118
Pacific Grove Unified School District	K-12	5	1,725
Pacific Unified School District	K-12	1	21
Salinas City Elementary School District	K-6	12	7,788
Salinas Union High School District	7-12	10	13,548
San Antonio Union School District	K-8	1	193
San Ardo Union School District	K-8	1	120
San Lucas Union School District	K-8	1	78
Santa Rita Union School District	K-8	5	2,924
Soledad Unified School District	K-12	8	4,255
Spreckels Union School District	K-8	2	870
Washington Union School District	K-8	3	969
Total		128	70,559

Source: Ed-Data, Education Data Partnership 2008.

Table 4.11-3. Summary of School Districts Based In Other Counties

District	Home County	District Type	Total Number of Schools	Schools in Monterey County	Total District Enrollment (2006–2007)
Aromas-San Juan Unified School District	San Benito	K-12	3	1	1,330
Coalinga-Huron Joint Unified School District	Fresno	K-12	11	—	4,348
Pajaro Valley Unified School District	Santa Cruz	K-12	33	3	19,162
Paso Robles Joint Union School District	San Luis Obispo	K-12	12	—	5,030
Pleasant Valley Joint Union Elementary School District	San Luis Obispo	K-8	1	—	137
San Miguel Joint Union Elementary School District	San Luis Obispo	K-8	2	—	454
Shandon Joint Unified District	San Luis Obispo	K-12	4	1	384
Total			61	5	30,845

Source: Ed-Data, Education Data Partnership 2008.

4.11.2.5 Public Health

The Monterey County Health Department provides public health services to Monterey County. The Health Department provides a variety of services, including adult behavioral services alcohol and drug treatment, communicable diseases treatment, HIV/AIDS prevention, immunization, lifestyle risk, maternity, pediatric, and reproductive health services.

The Health Department operates clinics in Marina, Salinas, and Seaside. Natividad Hospital in Salinas, which is currently operated by the County, is the main provider of care for indigent and underinsured residents of the County and provides both primary and in-patient care.

4.11.2.6 Wastewater

Wastewater disposal in the urban areas of the county is mostly provided through sewage treatment plants. The Central Coast RWQCB has not identified any significant issues with any of the present plant operations.

Wastewater Treatment Facilities

There are two regional treatment facilities in Monterey County. The Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency (MRWPCA) provides wastewater transmission, treatment, and disposal. The Agency's wastewater treatment plant is located north of the City of Marina, immediately south of the Salinas River. The membership and areas served by the MRWPCA include Del Rey Oaks, Seaside, Monterey, Pacific Grove, Salinas, Sand City, and MCWD. The Agency also serves the unincorporated areas of Moss Landing, Boronda, Castroville, and the former Fort Ord area. The wastewater treatment plant capacity is 29.6 MGD (about 89 acre-feet per day) and current demand is 21.0 MGD (about 64.5 acre-feet per day).

The Carmel Area Water District (CAWD) is the other regional district providing wastewater services in the county. The CAWD operates and maintains sewage collection, treatment, and disposal facilities. The District's facilities are located at the mouth of the Carmel River and serve the City of Carmel-by-the-Sea, Del Monte Forest/Pebble Beach, and portions of the Carmel Valley. The wastewater treatment plant capacity is 4.0 MGD (about 1.2 acre-feet per day) and current demand is 1.7 MGD (about 5.2 acre-feet per day).

In addition, the incorporated cities in the central Salinas Valley operate their own wastewater treatment facilities. A summary of the regional and city wastewater treatment facilities is provided in Table 4.11-4.

Table 4.11-4. Municipal Wastewater Disposal in Monterey County

Wastewater Treatment System	Service Area	Treatment Level	Capacity	Current Use	Remaining Capacity
Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency	Del Rey Oaks, Marina, Monterey, Pacific Grove, Salinas, Sand City, Seaside	Tertiary	29.6 MGD (27.0 MGD permitted)	21 MGD	8.6 MGD
Carmel Area Wastewater District	Carmel-by-the-Sea, Pebble Beach, portions of Carmel Valley	Tertiary	4.0 MGD (3.0 MGD permitted)	1.7 MGD	2.7 MGD
Gonzales	Gonzales	Primary	0.706 MGD	0.35 MGD	0.356 MGD
Greenfield	Greenfield	Primary	1.0 MGD	0.8 MGD	0.2 MGD
King City	King City	Secondary	1.2 MGD	0.731 MGD	0.469 MGD
Soledad	Soledad	Secondary	5.6 MGD (3.1 MGD permitted)	2.5 MGD	3.1 MGD

MGD = Million gallons per day.

Source: Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments 1999.

Monterey County also has several County Service Areas (CSAs) providing wastewater services. CSAs provide various services to the unincorporated areas of the county. Wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal as well as septic tank maintenance are among the permitted services.

Rural Treatment Systems

On-site wastewater systems provide treatment and disposal of domestic wastes on individual sites. There are three basic types of treatment systems: septic tanks, biological treatment units, and chemical treatment units. A treatment system is usually used in combination with a soil absorption field: drain fields, seepage pits, leaching chambers, absorption mounds, and evapotranspiration beds. The predominant type of wastewater system used in the rural communities of Monterey County is the septic tank and dual drain field.

Many of the homes in Monterey County are currently using septic systems. Most of these systems pre-date 1969 County regulations governing the approval of individual disposal systems and have undersized septic tanks; inadequate area for expansion; and undersized, crowded drain fields. In some cases, when conventional septic systems fail, an alternative system may be allowed by the County Environmental Health Department. Alternative systems may employ aerobic processes to breakdown organic material or may use an engineered mound where percolation is inhibited. These alternative systems require intensive monitoring and are expensive to maintain.

4.11.2.7 Solid Waste

Two agencies oversee solid waste disposal in Monterey County. The Monterey Regional Waste Management District (MRWMD) serves the western coastal areas of Monterey County. MRWMD’s service area includes the cities of Carmel-by-the-Sea, Del Rey Oaks, Marina, Monterey, Pacific Grove, Sand City, and Seaside; and the unincorporated areas of Big Sur, Carmel Highlands, Carmel Valley, Castroville, Corral De Tierra, Laguna Seca, Moss Landing, Pebble Beach, San Benancio, and Toro Park. The District covers a total of 853 square miles.

The Salinas Valley Solid Waste Authority (SVSWA) serves the eastern inland portions of Monterey County. SVSWA’s service area includes the cities of Gonzales, Greenfield, King City, Salinas, and Soledad; and the unincorporated communities of Bradley, Chualar, Jolon, Lockwood, Pine Canyon (King City), Pleyto, Prunedale, San Ardo, San Lucas, and Spreckels.

Collection Service

Waste Management, Inc. provides contract solid waste and recycling collection services to unincorporated areas of Monterey County. Waste Management hauls solid waste and recyclables to each respective agency’s facilities.

Landfills

Three active landfills currently operate in Monterey County. They are summarized in Table 4.11-5.

Table 4.11-5. Monterey County Landfill Summary

Landfill	Location	Operator	Permitted Capacity	Remaining Capacity	Closure Date
Crazy Horse Sanitary Landfill	Salinas	SVSWA	2.7 million cubic yards	1.0 million cubic yards	2009
Johnson Canyon Sanitary Landfill	Gonzales	SVSWA	13.8 million cubic yards	6.9 million cubic yards	2040
Marina Landfill	Marina	MRWMD	49.7 million cubic yards	48.6 million cubic yards	2107

Source: California Integrated Waste Management Board 2008a.

SVSWA currently has future plans to expand both of its landfills, as well as site a new landfill. This would increase capacity beyond that shown in Table 4.11-5. MRWMD has enough capacity at its existing landfill and has no immediate plans to expand or site a new landfill.

Waste Diversion Rates

Waste diversion is a measurement of how much solid waste is diverted from landfills by waste prevention or recycling activities. Table 4.11-6 summarizes the waste diversion rates for unincorporated Monterey County from 1996 through 2006. Although diversion rates improved substantially to over 50 percent in 2001, diversion rates have fluctuated and have begun to drop in recent years. Outreach efforts associated with recycling and waste diversion programs are being implemented to motivate the public to recycle.

Table 4.11-6. Waste Diversion Rates (1996–2006)

Year	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Diversion rate (%)	23	25	25	30	31	57	53	54	58	49	50

Source: California Integrated Waste Management Board 2008b.

The State requires that each jurisdiction achieve a diversion rate of at least 50 percent. Monterey County is currently in compliance with this requirement.

4.11.3 Regulatory Framework

4.11.3.1 Federal and State

Federal Regulations

The federal government sets minimum standards for the protection of water quality, including for drinking water and environmental protection, and has jurisdiction over flow in some waters where rivers or streams cross state boundaries. The federal government also has a voice in water management through its jurisdiction over energy regulation (for hydroelectric projects) and where endangered fish and aquatic species occur within a water body.

The federal CWA (including WDRs, the NPDES program, and Section 303(d) impaired water bodies and TMDLs) is described in detail in Section 4.3, Water Resources. The CWA is largely administered by the State Water Board and the Central Coast RWQCB.

State Regulations

Wastewater Disposal

CCRWQCB has adopted water quality standards to be met by treatment. These are imposed, for treatment facilities, through the waste discharge requirement (WDR) permitting process administered by the CCRWQCB. Wastewater

treatment plants, both public and private, are required to meet the standards under individual WDRs issued and enforced by the CCRWQCB. The CCRWQCB has adopted a WDR waiver for onsite domestic wastewater treatment for individual residences. A WDR “waiver” does not waive permitting, but rather establishes standard requirements for permitting qualifying projects.

Municipal Services Review

LAFCO is the agency empowered to incorporate, annex to, or dissolve cities and special districts. The objectives of LAFCO law (Government Code Section 56000 et seq.) require LAFCO to discourage urban sprawl, encourage the orderly formation and development of local government agencies, ensure the provision of adequate urban services, and preserve agricultural land resources on a countywide basis. Each county’s LAFCO is comprised of representatives of the county, cities, special districts, and the public.

To assist with these functions, California Government Code Section 56430 requires LAFCOs to conduct Municipal Services Reviews (MSRs) that describe the municipal services provided by the agencies that are subject to LAFCO authority. MSRs are comprehensive studies designed to collect and analyze information about the governance structures and efficiencies of service providers, to estimate their ability to meet current and future service needs, and to identify opportunities for greater coordination and cooperation between providers. LAFCO may include one or more services in the review, and the study area may be the whole county or any subarea as determined by LAFCO.

The goals of the MSR are to determine infrastructure needs or deficiencies, growth and population projections for the affected area, financing constraints and opportunities, opportunities for shared facilities, and government structure options. MSRs can therefore provide useful information in evaluating water supply issues.

Wastewater Management

Wastewater disposal is regulated by the County Health Department, the CCRWQCB, and the SWRCB. Please see the Regulatory Framework for Potable Water above and in Section 4.3, Water Resources.

Solid Waste—California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989

Decreasing landfill disposal capacity and the increasing difficulty to site or expand waste disposal facilities, whether as a result of public opposition or the enactment of more stringent environmental regulations, led to the passage of the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939) (Chapter 1095, Statutes of 1989, et seq.). AB 939 was adopted in an effort to improve planning for solid waste facilities and reduce the volume and toxicity of solid waste that is disposed. With its passage, solid waste management practices were redefined by (1) requiring each of the cities and unincorporated portions of counties throughout the State of California to divert 25 percent by 1995 and, as of the year 2000, 50 percent of the solid waste that is disposed; and (2) requiring local governments to prepare and implement plans that would improve waste resource management by integrating solid waste management principles that place

importance on first reducing solid waste through source reduction, reuse, recycling, and composting before disposing of it through environmentally safe landfill disposal or transformation (e.g., regulated incineration of solid waste materials).

Fire Protection—Uniform Fire Code and California Building Standards Code

The Uniform Fire Code published by the International Fire Code Institute and the Uniform Building Code (adopted in California as the California Building Standards Code) published by the International Conference of Building Officials both prescribe performance characteristics and materials to be used to achieve acceptable levels of fire protection.

Amendments to the California Building Standards effective in 2008 increased the requirements for defensible space and require more fire-resistant building materials and design than prior codes. These codes are in effect in areas identified as having severe fire hazards.

Public Education—Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998 (SB 50)

In 1998, the California State Legislature enacted SB 50, which made significant amendments to existing State law governing school fees. SB 50 prohibited state or local agencies from imposing school impact mitigation fees, dedications, or other requirements in excess of those provided in the statute. Government Code Section 65995(e) provides that where payment has been made to a school district in accordance with the school fee program that is considered full mitigation of any school impacts. The legislation also prohibits local agencies from denying or conditioning any project (including a general plan) based on the inadequacy of school facilities.

Water Quality

A number of federal, state, and local governments protect beneficial uses and water quality objectives for surface water and groundwater resources. Government Code Section 65302 (Land Use), requires city and county general plans to address water supply as a topical issue, using an Urban Water Management Plan as a primary source document. Programs and regulations related to drinking water quality, water supply, and wastewater treatment and disposal are described below.

4.11.4 Project Impacts

Impacts to public service utilities from the 2007 General Plan policies on the 2030 planning horizon and 2092 buildout are discussed. The significance of the impact is based on the thresholds of significance, which are described below. If the impact would be significant, a mitigation measure to minimize the impact and the resultant level of significance of the impact are stated. Then, the impacts of the 2007 General Plan policies on the projected 2092 buildout, along with proposed mitigation are discussed.

4.11.4.1 Methodology

The impacts on public service utilities were based on using thresholds of significance to determine impact significance, described below, and an analysis of the remaining service capacity and expected future growth within the Community Areas. In addition, compliance with federal, state and local ordinances and regulation regarding public service utilities were also considered.

4.11.4.2 Thresholds of Significance

Implementation of the 2007 General Plan would result in a significant impact on public services and utilities if it would:

- Require new or expanded fire protection facilities;
- Require new or expanded Sheriff's facilities;
- Require new or expanded school facilities;
- Require new or expanded library facilities;
- Require new or expanded public health facilities;
- Require new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities;
- Require new or expanded storm water drainage facilities; or
- Require new or expanded solid waste disposal facilities or result in non-compliance with federal, state, or local statutes related to solid waste.

4.11.4.3 Impact Analysis

Buildout of the 2007 General Plan would impact the sheriff, fire protection, wastewater treatment, landfill, libraries, public school, and storm water drainage facilities if, new or expansions of the existing facilities are required. The following section provides an analysis of the potential impacts the 2007 General Plan policies would have on the 2030 planning horizon. Furthermore, mitigation measures and the minimization of the mitigation measures are also discussed.

Fire Protection

Impact PSU-1: Development and land use activities contemplated in the 2007 General Plan may result in the need for new or expanded fire facilities. (Less than Significant Impact.)

2030 Planning Horizon

Impact of Development with Policies

Implementation of the 2007 General Plan would increase urban development in the unincorporated areas of the county, resulting in a greater need for fire protection in order to avoid adverse effects on the public health and safety. The policies of the 2007 General Plan would avoid significant effects. New or expanded fire protection facilities would be required, particularly near the proposed Pajaro, Boronda, Castroville, Chualar, and Fort Ord Community Areas, which would result in significant effects.

2007 General Plan Policies

The 2007 General Plan proposes a number of policies to ensure that new or expanded fire facilities would be provided concurrently with anticipated growth.

Public Service Element

Public Service Element Policies PS-1.1 through PS-1.6 establish general standards for the provision of public facilities concurrently with future growth. Furthermore, these policies direct growth where adequate facilities currently exist, seek to achieve acceptable level of service standards through improvements funded by fair share impact fees and planned capital improvements. These policies would decrease the impact of future growth by requiring that fire stations be developed concurrently with future developments and that fire stations provide an Adequate Public Facility and Services (APFS) that meets or exceeds the required amount by the development.

Safety Element

Safety Element Policies S-4.1 through S-4.33 address potential impacts from fire hazards. The policies include educational awareness and participation about fire hazards, establish a minimum roadway access for fire vehicles, and require new developments to provide fire suppression systems, such as fire breaks, fire-retardant building materials, and automatic fire sprinkler systems. Furthermore, these policies would create a design review process by county planning and fire officials to address project design, landscaping, and building standards. The policies described above would decrease accidental fires through educational awareness of the

public. The above described policies would also prevent small fires from enlarging by establishing roadway access for fire vehicles and requiring new developments to provide fire suppressant systems. In addition, the design review process would further decrease fires from occurring by ensuring the project design, landscaping and building standards and other fire-protection related issues are addressed.

Safety Element Policies S-6.1 through S-6.8 set forth emergency preparedness policies to ensure that fire protection agencies would have adequate resources to meet the demands of the buildout population. These resources includes, adequate emergency centers and brochures that specify the levels of emergency levels available throughout the county be developed. Policy S-6.6 prohibits development in areas that cannot be reached by emergency vehicles within the county standards.

Area Plan Policies

Most of the fire policies are contained in the 2007 General Plan for the entire county. Two Area Plans provide area specific fire protection policies.

Greater Salinas Area Plan

Policy GS-1.1 requires that future development within the Butterfly Village portion of the Rancho San Juan Special Treatment Area provide adequate public services, including fire protection.

Cachagua Area Plan

Policy CACH-4.3 encourages the formation of a fire district in this area to assist and ensure that a minimum level of fire protection is available to residents within the area plan boundaries.

Development Impact Fees

New development projects also would be assessed impact fees to finance capital improvements for fire protection facilities. Because payment of these fees would be limited to the project's fair share, additional funding sources would be required to ensure that adequate facilities are provided concurrently with growth. Capital Improvement and Financing Plans that identify what is required to meet APFS needs are required under Public Services Element Policy PS-1.1.

Significance Determination

The 2007 General Plan and Area Plan goals and policies are designed to accommodate growth in Community Areas while ensuring that new development provides adequate fire protection facilities and services to

future residents. These comprehensive policies will ensure that facilities are built and operated to provide an acceptable level of fire protection.

Physical construction, resource demands, and employee requirements associated with future fire protection facilities and services would be addressed in future separate environmental reviews. However, typical impacts of fire protection facilities include noise and intermittent traffic disruption, depending on the location and design of the facility. Noise impacts are generally unavoidable due to the use of loud sirens when equipment is leaving the station on emergency calls; however, it is highly unlikely that noise impacts would occur frequently. Thus, noise impacts from sirens would be less than significant due to their low frequent occurrence and because it not expected to impact the overall noise level of a given area. Future facilities would include mitigation as necessary to reduce the magnitude of potential site-specific effects. Traffic disruption is typically short in nature; only long enough for equipment to leave the station and therefore has no impact on traffic congestion.

There are no plans at the current time that describe the size, location, or operational characteristics of these future facilities. Therefore, their environmental impacts cannot be determined with any certainty and are examined at only a general level of detail. New facilities and services would serve the Community Areas and Rural Centers (where demand is expected to be greatest) and likely would be located in those areas. When specific facilities are proposed, they would be subject to CEQA review; mitigation of any significant impacts that may be identified would be required where feasible.

Mitigation Measures

Because new or expanded fire protection facilities associated with implementation of the 2007 General Plan policies would require project-specific environmental review and potentially significant adverse effects would be mitigated as feasible, no mitigation is necessary.

Significance Conclusion

Adequate facilities will be provided in a timely manner such that impacts on the public health, safety and welfare are less than significant. Future fire station operations will have a less than significant noise impact on nearby residences and other sensitive uses because noise impacts are not likely to occur on a frequent basis.

Buildout

Impact of Development with Policies

Buildout in 2092 will result in increased development which, in turn, will require the construction or expansion of facilities beyond 2030 levels. Future policies and service standards are unknown; however, we may assume that

they will maintain or increase current standards. Historically, society has increased standards of safety; thus, it can be assumed that by buildout county standards of public safety and services will have been increased. The 2007 General Plan and Area Plan goals and policies will be implemented, including adoption of a County noise ordinance that will establish enforceable noise limits.

2007 General Plan Policies

The 2007 General Plan and Area Plan policies summarized above identify the public service, safety, and noise policies that will be in place to provide adequate fire protection services to future county residents.

Significance Determination

Future fire stations are assumed to require sirens to be sounded as vehicles leave on emergency calls. This would presumably result in temporary noise levels that exceed acceptable standards at nearby sensitive uses. As today, future facilities will be subject to environmental analysis and the mitigation of noise impacts, to the extent feasible. Nonetheless, occasional noise impacts may not be avoidable; however, noise impacts are not expected to occur frequently. The construction and operation of future fire stations would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Because new or expanded fire protection facilities associated with implementation of the 2007 General Plan policies would require project-specific environmental review and potentially significant adverse effects would be mitigated as feasible, no additional mitigation is necessary beyond 2007 General Plan policies and adoption of the County noise ordinance.

Significance Conclusion

The impacts of operating future facilities will be less than significant.

Sheriff's Protection

Impact 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. (Less-Than-Significant Impact.)

2030 Planning Horizon

Impact of Development with Policies

Implementation of the 2007 General Plan would increase the population of the unincorporated areas of Monterey County, resulting in a greater demand for Sheriff's protection. New or expanded Sheriff's facilities would be required, particularly near the proposed Pajaro, Boronda, Castroville, Chualar, and Fort Ord Community Areas.

2007 General Plan Policies

The 2007 General Plan proposes a number of policies to ensure that new or expanded Sheriff's facilities would be provided concurrently with future growth.

Public Services Element

As discussed under Impact PSU-1, Public Services Element Policies PS-1.1 through PS-1.6 would establish general standards for the provision of adequate public facilities. These policies would decrease the impact on sheriff facilities by that requiring future developments be developed concurrently with future sheriff stations. According to the policies, future sheriff stations must provide an Adequate Public Facility and Services (APFS) that meets or exceeds the required amount by the development. The development of new sheriff facilities concurrently with development would decrease the impact by providing an APFS.

Safety Element

As stated in Impact 1, Safety Element Policies S-6.1 through S-6.8 set forth emergency preparedness policies to ensure that the Sheriff's Office would have adequate resources to meet the demands of the 2030 population. Policies S-6.1 through S-6.8 would decrease impact on sheriff stations by ensuring that stations have the adequate resources in an emergency situation, which include emergency centers, information on the levels of emergency provided and prohibiting development in areas that cannot be reached by emergency vehicles.

Area Plan Policies

One supplemental Area Plan policy concerns Sheriff's services:

Greater Salinas Area Plan

Policy GS-1.1 requires that future development within the Butterfly Village portion of the Rancho San Juan Special Treatment Area provide adequate public services, including Sheriff's protection.

Development Impact Fees

PS-1.4 would require payment of a fair share of the cost of providing the APFS to serve the development. New development projects would be assessed impact fees to finance capital improvements for Sheriff's facilities. Payment of these fees would ensure that adequate facilities are provided concurrently with growth.

Significance Determination

The 2007 General Plan and Area Plan goals and policies are designed to accommodate growth in Community Areas while ensuring that new development provides adequate Sheriff's facilities and services to future residents. As a result, there would be no substantial impact on health and safety that might occur absent of such facilities.

There are no plans at the current time that describe the design, location, or operational characteristics of future facilities. Therefore, their environmental impacts cannot be determined with any certainty and are examined at only a general level of detail. New facilities and services would serve the Community Areas and Rural Centers (where demand is expected to be greatest) and likely would be located in those areas. Their impacts would be an indistinguishable part of the impacts of the community as a whole. These facilities are typically low-key. For example, traffic is generally insubstantial because it is spread throughout the day. Noise is similarly low because of the limited number of employees and because sirens are seldom, if ever used when vehicles leave the premises (unlike a fire station).

The potential significant adverse environmental effects associated with providing such facilities and services will be evaluated in future site-specific and facility-specific environmental reviews, with incorporation of mitigation as necessary to reduce the magnitude of these potential effects pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21002.

Mitigation Measures

Impacts of these facilities will be generally part of the overall impacts resulting from development within the Community Areas and Rural Centers. No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.

Significance Conclusion

Adequate sheriff's facilities will be provided in a timely manner such that impacts on the public health, safety and welfare are less than significant. Future sheriff's station operations will have a less-than-significant impact on nearby residences and other sensitive uses.

Buildout

Impact of Development with Policies

Increased development at 2092 buildout will increase demand for sheriff's facilities to serve a larger and more dispersed population. As with the 2030 Horizon, there are no plans available for future facilities, but they would reasonably be expected to be built in population centers. The typical impacts would be the same as those described above.

2007 General Plan Policies

The 2007 General Plan and Area Plan policies summarized above identify the public service and safety policies that will be in place to provide adequate sheriff services to future county residents.

Significance Determination

Mitigation Measures

Impacts of these facilities will be generally part of the overall impacts resulting from development within the Community Areas and Rural Centers. No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.

Significance Conclusion

The impact of 2092 buildout on sheriff services would be less-than-significant because additional required services would be developed concurrently to buildout.

Public Schools

Impact PSU-3: Development and land use activities contemplated in the 2007 General Plan may result in the need for new or expanded school facilities. (Less-Than-Significant-Impact) Future schools may affect adjoining land uses. (Significant and Unavoidable Impact)

2030 Planning Horizon

Impact of Development with Policies

Future development anticipated by the 2007 General Plan would result in greater demands for public education facilities, particularly near the proposed Pajaro, Boronda, Castroville, Chualar, and Fort Ord Community Areas. The construction of new or expanded school facilities would be a potentially significant impact, depending on the site-specific situation.

2007 General Plan Policies

The 2007 General Plan establishes a number of policies that encourage new or expanded public school facilities to be provided concurrently with future growth.

Public Services Element

As discussed under Impact PSU-1, Public Services Element Policies PS-1.1 through PS-1.6 set forth general standards for the provision of adequate public facilities. The implementation of Public Services Element Policies PS-1.1 through PS-1.6 would decrease the impact on public schools by requiring that public education facilities be developed concurrently to the development. These new public education facilities would also be required to meet or exceed the required amount by the proposed development. Public Services Element Policies PS-7.1 through PS-7.4, and Policy 7.8 identify specific standards for the provision of educational facilities. These policies address planning and consultation among county officials and the affected school districts to decide on a site that is in or near the areas of development. In addition, these policies also require financial support be provided for the acquisition of future public school facilities to the affected district and for the developed public school facilities to serve as multi-purpose facilities for the community. The required financial support for public school facilities and developing the facilities in or near development areas will decrease the impact on public school facilities from the projected 2030 planning horizon.

Area Plan Policies

One supplemental Area Plan policy concerns public schools:

Greater Salinas Area Plan

Policy GS-1.1 requires that future development within the Butterfly Village portion of the Rancho San Juan Special Treatment Area provide adequate public services, including a school site.

Development Impact Fees

New development projects will be assessed impact fees in accordance with SB 50 to finance capital improvements for public school facilities by the affected school district. Payment of these fees would contribute to the financing of adequate facilities concurrently with growth, in addition to state funding and local school district construction bonds. As discussed above in the regulatory section, Government Code Section 65995(h) provides that payment of development impact fees in accordance with its provisions constitutes “full and complete mitigation of the impacts” of new development.

Significance Determination

Paying school impact fees mitigates the impact of new development on schools under Government Code Section 65995(h). Therefore, the policies of the 2007 General Plan will ensure that this impact will be less-than-significant.

The 2007 General Plan and Area Plan goals and policies are designed to accommodate growth in Community Areas while ensuring that new development provides adequate school facilities and services to future residents. There are no plans at the current time describing the design and operational characteristics of future school facilities. Therefore, their environmental impacts cannot be determined with any certainty and are examined at only a general level of detail. New school facilities and services would serve the Community Areas and Rural Centers (where demand is expected to be greatest) and likely would be located in those areas.

The potential significant adverse environmental effects associated with providing new or expanded school facilities and services would be evaluated in the future site-specific and facility-specific environmental reviews by the pertinent school districts. CEQA requires the districts to incorporate all feasible mitigation measures to reduce the magnitude of these potential effects (Public Resources Code Section 21002).

In practice, school facility construction is usually not subject to County land use regulations (Government Code Section 53094). Accordingly, the pertinent school district will be the lead agency for any CEQA analysis that

is undertaken. The County does not have sufficient information regarding specific locations, sizes, and types of future school facilities to reasonably analyze the potential impacts of specific facilities. That level of detailed analysis would be outside the scope of the 2007 General Plan EIR, which is analyzing the broader impacts of plan implementation.

That being said, there are certain impacts that are typical of school construction and operations. Construction impacts include noise, dust, and traffic during the time necessary to construct the school. Work is typically done during daylight hours, on weekdays. As a result, noise is usually at acceptable levels. Dust would be controlled by implementation of the BMPs required by the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District. Traffic impacts consist of arrival and departure of work crews, and delivery of construction materials. The significance of traffic impacts depends upon the level of congestion on the streets that access the construction site. These impacts are usually localized.

When in operation, schools typically create significant peak-hour traffic congestion from the delivery and pick-up of students and when large events are held and, if associated with a lighted playing field, light and glare impacts. Noise may be bothersome to nearby residents at large campuses during the delivery and pick-up of students, and where playing fields are close to residences during recess or PE (although school noise is seldom in excess of significance thresholds). Noise would also be bothersome if the school included a stadium with a loudspeaker system.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is reasonable at this time because the significance of future impacts would be dependent upon school location, design, and operation features that are unknown at this time. Mitigation measures will be developed by the pertinent school districts at such time as they prepare future environmental analyses for specific school projects.

Significance Conclusion

Development under the 2007 General Plan will result in a less-than-significant effect on schools. Paying school impact fees, as required by state law and proposed Public Services Element policy PS-7.8, mitigates the impact of new development on schools under Government Code Section 65995(h).

New or expanded schools would result in significant, unavoidable effects. Significant traffic, noise, and lighting effects are most likely to occur at larger schools during school activities. At the present, there is insufficient information about future schools to determine exactly where and when significant effects will occur.

Buildout

Impact of Development with Policies

Buildout will result in the need for new schools. Since the adoption of Government Code Section 65995, California voters have consistently passed the necessary state bond measures to maintain SB 50's effectiveness. There is no reason to expect this support to change. As a result, future payment of school fees will continue to mitigate school impacts under the terms of Section 65995.

Although much of the additional development under buildout in 2092 would be the result of development on individual lots, schools will most probably be located in cities and communities, rather than in rural areas. The particular locations, sizes, and designs of these facilities cannot be known at this time. Typical impacts would be the same as described above for the 2030 horizon.

2007 General Plan Policies

The 2007 General Plan and Area Plan policies summarized above identify the public service policies that will be in place to provide adequate public school services to future county residents.

Significance Determination

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is reasonable at this time because the significance of future impacts would be dependent upon school location, design, and operation features that are unknown at this time. Mitigation measures will be developed by the pertinent school districts at such time as they prepare future environmental analyses for specific school projects.

Significance Conclusion

Development under the 2007 General Plan will result in a less-than-significant effect on schools. Paying school impact fees, as required by state law and proposed Public Services Element policy PS-7.8, mitigates the impact of new development on schools under Government Code Section 65995(h).

New or expanded schools would result in significant and unavoidable effects. Significant traffic, noise, and lighting effects are most likely to occur at larger schools during school activities. At the present, there is insufficient information about future schools to determine exactly where and when significant effects will occur.

Libraries

Impact PSU-4: Development and land use activities contemplated in the 2007 General Plan may result in the need for new or expanded library facilities. (Less-Than-Significant Impact.)

2030 Planning Horizon

Impact of Development with Policies

Future growth anticipated by the 2007 General Plan would result in greater demands for library services. These demands would result in the need for new library or expanded facilities, particularly near the proposed Pajaro, Boronda, Castroville, Chualar, and Fort Ord Community Areas. Construction of these new or expanded facilities would have environmental impacts.

The County Free Library system currently has branches in the following communities: Aromas, Big Sur, Bradley, Carmel Valley, Castroville, Gonzales, Greenfield, King City, Marina, Pajaro, Parkfield, Prunedale, Salinas (Buena Vista), San Ardo, San Lucas, Seaside, and Soledad. Most are located in small buildings that are integrated into the communities. The smallest libraries in Bradley and Parkfield are open only two days a week. The Big Sur, Pajaro, San Ardo, and San Lucas branches are open only three days a week. The City of Salinas has its own library system.

2007 General Plan Policies

The 2007 General Plan proposes a number of policies to ensure that new or expanded library facilities would be provided concurrently with future growth.

Public Service Element

As discussed under Impact PSU-1, Public Services Element Policies PS-1.1 through PS-1.6 set forth general standards for the provision of adequate public facilities. Public Service Element Policies PS-1.1 through PS-1.6 would decrease the impact on libraries by requiring library facilities be developed concurrently with development and that the new or expanded facilities exceeds or meets the required services required by the new development. Public Services Element Policies PS-10.1 through PS-10.5 set forth policies that address funding for additional library services and accessibility by future residents. Policies PS-10.1 through PS-10.5 would decrease the impact by pursuing additional funding from the state and private contributions to ensure additional library services are provided.

Area Plan Policies

One supplemental Area Plan policy concerns library services:

Greater Salinas Area Plan Policy GS-1.1 requires that future development within the Butterfly Village portion of the Rancho San Juan Special Treatment Area provide adequate public services, including library services.

Development Impact Fees

New development projects will be assessed impact fees to finance capital improvements for library facilities. Payment of these fees would ensure that adequate facilities are provided concurrently with growth.

Significance Determination

The 2007 General Plan and Area Plan goals and policies are designed to accommodate growth in Community Areas while ensuring that new development provides adequate library facilities and services to future residents. However, there are no plans at the current time for specific library facilities. Therefore, their environmental impacts cannot be determined with any certainty and are examined at only a general level of detail. New or expanded facilities and services would serve the Community Areas and Rural Centers (where demand is expected to be greatest) and likely would be located in those areas.

Future library construction is expected to have typical construction impacts, including noise, dust, and traffic while work is going on. Community libraries of the sort envisioned to serve current and future residents are not typically large construction projects that result in significant effects. In any case, they will be subject to CEQA review and Public Resources Code Section 21002 requires that all feasible mitigation measures be adopted as necessary to reduce the magnitude of these potential effects. Their effects are expected to be less-than-significant.

Because future library facilities are expected to be located within the urbanizing areas their operational impacts will be largely indistinguishable from the overall impacts of the Community Area or Rural Center in which they may be located. Libraries are not typically large facilities or facilities that generate substantial amounts of traffic. Patrons visit throughout the days when they are open, so there are no peak hours of attendance. If located within a Community Area or Rural Center a substantial percentage of their patrons would be expected to walk or bicycle there. Therefore, impacts are expected to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary. Should future CEQA analyses of library construction or expansion

identify potentially significant effects of specific library projects, mitigation will be required at that time.

Significance Conclusion

New and expanded library facilities to serve future populations will have less-than-significant impacts on the environment.

Buildout

Impact of Development with Policies

Buildout will result in the need for new libraries. Although much of the additional development under buildout in 2092 would be the result of development on individual lots, libraries will most probably be located in cities and communities. The particular locations, sizes, and designs of these facilities cannot be known at this time. Typical impacts would be the same as described above for the 2030 horizon and are expected to be less-than-significant.

2007 General Plan Policies

The 2007 General Plan and Area Plan policies summarized above identify the public service policies that will be in place to provide adequate library services to future county residents.

Significance Determination

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary. Should future CEQA analyses of library construction or expansion identify potentially significant effects of specific library projects, mitigation would be required at that time.

Significance Conclusion

New and expanded library facilities to serve future populations will have less-than-significant impacts on the environment.

Public Health

Impact 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. (Less-Than-Significant Impact.)

2030 Planning Horizon

Impact of Development with Policies

Future growth anticipated by the 2007 General Plan would result in greater demands for public health services. These demands would result in the need for new public health facilities such as clinics or hospitals. The sizes and locations of these future facilities are unknown. At the present time, the Monterey County Health Department operates clinics in Marina, Salinas, and Seaside. The Department's public health nurses provide home visitation services as well.

2007 General Plan Policies

The 2007 General Plan proposes a number of policies to ensure that new or expanded public health facilities would be provided concurrently with future growth.

Public Service Element

As discussed under Impact PSU-1, Public Services Element Policies PS-1.1 through PS-1.6 set forth general standards for the provision of adequate public facilities, which would decrease the impact by requiring APFS be provided to future developments. Public Services Element Policies PS-8.1 and PS-8.2 promote a full range of health care programs for county residents and the establishment of needed health care services in areas with high population concentrations. The establishment of health care facilities in areas with high population and promotion of health care programs would decrease the impact by expanding the services. Public Service 8.4 requires nurse staffing be provided at levels that meet the health needs of the County's rural residents. This policy would also decrease the impact of the development by requiring the appropriate nurse staffing be provided.

Significance Determination

The 2007 General Plan goals and policies are designed to accommodate growth in Community Areas and Rural Centers while ensuring that new development provides adequate public health facilities and services to future residents. Future facilities would have construction and operational impacts. There are no plans at the current time for specific facilities and services. Therefore, their environmental impacts cannot be determined with any

certainty and are examined at only a general level of detail. New facilities and services would serve the Community Areas and Rural Centers (where demand is expected to be greatest) and likely would be located in those areas. Physical construction and resource demands associated with future site-specific public health facilities would be addressed in separate environmental reviews at such time as they are being proposed. Public Resources Code Section 21002 requires the incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures in order to reduce the magnitude of any potential effects identified in those later environmental analyses.

Public health facilities are usually located near their clientele, are commensurate in size to the community they will serve, and are most likely to be placed in the urbanized Community Areas and Rural Centers. Typically, these facilities would be health offices or clinics, not full hospitals. Construction impacts would likely include traffic from workers and deliveries, noise from construction, and dust if grading is necessary.

For the most part, operational impacts will be largely indistinguishable from the overall impacts of the Community Area or Rural Center in which the facility may be located. Such facilities typically have a steady stream of visitors during working hours, but do not result in the peak traffic, noise, or lighting impacts typically associated with a hospital.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.

Significance Conclusion

Given the expected size of an office or clinic serving a small community, construction impacts are expected to be less-than-significant. The operations of expected facilities would also be less than significant.

Buildout

Impact of Development with Policies

Buildout in 2092 will result in the need for new public health facilities. Due to the nature of these facilities, they will probably be located in cities and communities where they are accessible to their clients. The particular locations, sizes, and designs of these facilities cannot be known at this time. Typical impacts would be the same as described above for the 2030 horizon and are expected to be less-than-significant.

2007 General Plan Policies

The 2007 General Plan and Area Plan policies summarized above identify the public service policies that will be in place to provide adequate public health care services to future county residents.

Significance Determination

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary. Should future CEQA analyses of health facilities construction or expansion identify potentially significant effects of specific facilities, mitigation would be required at that time.

Significance Conclusion

New and expanded health facilities to serve future populations will have less-than-significant impacts on the environment.

Wastewater

Impact 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. (Less-Than-Significant-Impact)

2030 Planning Horizon

Impact of Development with Policies

Implementation of the 2007 General Plan would result in urban development, which would generate wastewater. The increased generation of wastewater would cause a need for additional wastewater collection and treatment capacity, particularly near the proposed Pajaro, Boronda, Castroville, Chualar, and Fort Ord Community Areas. If sufficient capacity is not available, there is a potential that water quality would be degraded by discharges of untreated or under-treated wastewater.

Development in accordance with the 2007 General Plan AWCP would eventually result in 40 new artisan and 10 new full-scale wineries by 2030. Continuing the earlier assumptions of water use, a typical artisan winery would be expected to produce 90,000 gallons of wastewater annually. This is based on an estimated production rate of 1.5 gallons of wastewater for each gallon of wine (Monterey County Environmental Health Department *Subsurface Disposal System Design Criteria*—1/18/08). Full-scale wineries would produce the following levels of wastewater per year:

Table 4.11-7. Typical Winery Wastewater Production

Type/Size of Winery	Wastewater Production per Winery (gallons per year)
Artisan (25,000 cases)	90,000
Full-scale (75,000 cases)	1.89 million
Full-scale (175,000 cases)	4.4 million
Full-scale (375,000 cases)	9.45 million
Full-scale (750,000 cases)	18.9 million
Full-scale (1.5 million cases)	37.8 million

Daily disposal rates are not estimated because they depend on the level of wine production. Production levels vary depending upon the season, with peak activity during the crush. In all cases, disposal of these volumes of wastewater would require engineered wastewater treatment systems. These systems would be subject to compliance with CCRWQCB standards for water treatment and quality, and County standards for construction.

2007 General Plan Policies

The 2007 General Plan proposes a number of policies to ensure that new public facilities would be provided concurrently with future growth.

As discussed under Impact PSU-1, Public Services Element Policies PS-1.1 through PS-1.6 contain general standards for the provision of adequate public facilities. The policies under Goal PS-1 will require that new development projects in Community Areas and Rural Centers either provide or finance wastewater collection and treatment capital improvements. Such improvements would ensure that adequate facilities are provided concurrently with urban growth and that wastewater discharge complies with established water quality standards.

Public Services Element Policies PS-4.1 through PS-4.8 set forth policies that concern wastewater treatment. These policies address wastewater treatment facilities services, private and public funding, groundwater recharge with secondary or higher treatment reclaimed water, treatment criteria for future wastewater facilities, and septic disposal tanks. These policies create standards for wastewater treatment that would further minimize wastewater impacts on the environment. Moreover, policies under PS-4 encourage developers to contribute their fair share to the funding of future expansions or construction of new wastewater treatment facilities.

Area Plan Policies

Several Area Plan supplemental policies address wastewater.

Greater Salinas Area Plan

Policy GS-1.1 requires that future development within the Butterfly Village portion of the Rancho San Juan Special Treatment Area provide adequate infrastructure, including for wastewater.

Carmel Valley Master Plan

Policy CV-1.8 requires that cluster development be consistent with wastewater application rates of the Carmel Valley Wastewater Study, which generally would require clustering of five units or less on a minimum of 5 acres of land.

Toro Area Plan

Policy T-5.1 encourages higher densities in areas where wastewater treatment facilities can be made available.

Significance Determination

Implementation of the 2007 General Plan would increase wastewater generation and therefore would require new or expanded treatment facilities. The above-listed 2007 General Plan and Area Plan policies will adequately address the need for new or expanded wastewater facilities. There are no plans at the current time for these facilities and services. Therefore, their environmental impacts cannot be determined with any certainty and are examined at only a general level of detail. New facilities and services would serve the Community Areas and Rural Communities (where demand is expected to be greatest) and likely would be located in those areas. Additional facilities would be installed in the Salinas Valley at the wineries that would develop under the 2007 General Plan AWCP.

All of the facilities may include wastewater treatment plants, related ponds, and collection pipelines. When specific facilities are proposed, they would be subject to CEQA review, mitigation of any significant impacts that may be identified would be required where feasible (Public Resources Code Section 21002), and would be required to meet CCRWQCB and County water quality standards.

The details of physical construction and resource demands associated with future wastewater facilities and services are unknown at this time. They may result in construction impacts such as traffic, noise, and dust. Typically, wastewater facilities result in air quality (odor) impacts during operation. Water quality impacts from new wastewater treatment facilities are expected to be minimal as a result of the effluent limitations and discharge specifications that will be imposed by the CCRWQCB as part of the Waste Discharge Requirements. The CCRWQCB typically also restricts overflow and spills. Otherwise, the impacts of new wastewater treatment facilities

would be part of the impacts associated with growth in the Community Areas and Rural Centers, or development of the specific winery.

At the same time, municipal wastewater treatment facilities do not usually generate substantial amounts of traffic, result in light and glare, or result in water quality or flooding impacts (they are subject to permitting by the CCRWQB that will specifically require avoidance of such impacts). Assuming that they will be located in Community Areas or Rural Centers, they would have a limited potential to adversely affect biological resources. Similarly, most of the winery corridor is in agriculture. Prospective winery-related wastewater treatment facility sites would therefore be likely to have low habitat value.

Mitigation Measures

The implementation of the proposed 2007 General Plan policies and existing regulations, particularly those of the CCRWQCB, would ensure that potential impacts from new wastewater treatment facilities would be less than significant. No mitigation is necessary.

Significance Conclusion

Potential impacts would be less than significant.

Buildout

Impact of Development with Policies

Buildout in 2092 will substantially increase the level of development within the County. In particular, there will be more development on individual lots distributed outside the Community Areas and Rural Centers. This will require the construction or expansion of wastewater treatment facilities, including on-site treatment, beyond 2030 levels.

2007 General Plan Policies

The 2007 General Plan and Area Plan policies summarized above identify the public service policies that will be in place to provide adequate wastewater treatment services to future county residents.

Significance Determination

Future policies and treatment standards are unknown; however, we may assume that they will be at least as protective of water quality as current standards. Furthermore, the specific location and size of future wastewater treatment plants are not known at this time. However, the construction or expansion of a treatment plant would have to minimize impacts through the CEQA compliance. PS-4.12 mandates development of Onsite Wastewater Management Plans for areas with high concentrations of development that are served primarily by individual sewage systems. The CCRWQCB's WDR

waiver for on-site systems places further restrictions on their use and operation. These policies and regulations will avoid significant effects from new or expanded facilities. Thus, the expansion or construction of new facilities would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

The implementation of the proposed 2007 General Plan policies and existing regulations, particularly those of the CCRWQCB, would ensure that potential impacts from new wastewater treatment facilities would be less than significant. No mitigation is necessary.

Significance Conclusion

This impact would be less-than-significant.

Storm Water Drainage

Impact 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. (Less-Than-Significant Impact.)

2030 Planning Horizon

Impact of Development with Policies

Future growth anticipated by implementation of the 2007 General Plan, particularly in the Community Areas and Rural Centers, would result in more impervious surface coverage, which would result in additional storm water runoff. An increase in storm water runoff has the potential to degrade water quality by increasing erosion, sedimentation, and siltation in waterbodies. Without new drainage facilities, the runoff would endanger public safety, and threaten water quality. Accordingly, new and expanded stormwater drainage facilities would be required, particularly near the proposed Pajaro, Boronda, Castroville, Chualar, and Fort Ord Community Areas.

2007 General Plan Policies

The 2007 General Plan proposes a number of policies to ensure that new public facilities would be provided concurrently with future growth.

Public Service Element

As discussed under Impact PSU-1, Public Services Element Policies PS-1.1 through PS-1.6 set forth general standards for the provision of adequate public facilities.

Safety Element

Safety Element Policies S-3.1 through S-3.7 address stormwater drainage. Safety element PS-3.1 requires that post-development runoff shall not be greater than pre-development peak flow drainage through the implementation of onsite stormwater detention. Safety element policy 3.3 through 3.7 requires management of stormwater runoff by establishing a County Flood Management Program, maintaining areas with high peak flow that generate erosion in a GIS database, and a Drainage Design Manual. These management policies will decrease stormwater runoff through detention and prevent flooding, which would prevent the endangerment of future residents.

Area Plan Policies

Several Area Plan supplemental policies address storm water drainage.

North County Area Plan

Policy C-4.1 requires that newly developed areas that drain into Merritt Lake and Tembladero Slough be annexed to MCWRA in order to provide for the maintenance of drainage facilities.

Carmel Valley Master Plan

Policy CV-4.2 stipulates that a comprehensive drainage maintenance program be established by the either sub-basins or valley-wide watershed zones. Policy CV-4.3 requires that a fee be imposed for onsite improvements for development projects to help finance the improvement and maintenance of the drainage facilities identified in the Master Drainage Plan for Carmel Valley.

Cachagua Area Plan

Policy CACH-4.1 stipulates that commercial mining, timber, and other resource production operations be designed so that additional runoff, additional erosion, or additional sedimentation would not occur off the project site.

South County Area Plan

Policy SC-5.4 requires that storm water facilities in new urban development be designed to mitigate impacts on agricultural lands located downstream.

Significance Determination

The 2007 General Plan and Area Plan goals and policies are designed to accommodate growth in Community Areas while ensuring that new development provides adequate storm water drainage facilities to future residents. Specifically, Safety Element Policy 3.3 requires that drainage facilities to mitigate the post-development peak flow impact of new development must be installed concurrent with new development. Enforcement of this policy would ensure that storm drainage facilities are provided with new development.

There are no plans at the current time for specific facilities and services. Therefore, their environmental impacts cannot be determined with any certainty and are examined at only a general level of detail. New facilities and services would serve the Community Areas and Rural Communities (where demand is expected to be greatest) and likely would be located in those areas. When specific facilities are proposed, they would be subject to CEQA review; mitigation of any significant impacts that may be identified would be required where feasible (Public Resources Code Section 21002).

Conventional storm drainage facilities have generally consisted of detention or retention basins drainage pipelines, and related facilities such as curbs and gutters. Where basins are not maintained properly, they may harbor disease vectors such as mosquitoes. However, this is not commonly a problem due to the vector control activities of the County's Environmental Health Division. Most, if not all, of the impacts of the facilities would be part of the impacts associated with growth in the Community Areas and Rural Centers. Although these conventional stormwater drainage methods have functioned to manage flooding, these designs have not managed stormwater sufficiently to decrease impacts to water quality. Impacts to water quality occurs when stormwater is discharged into the receiving waterbodies. Therefore, impacts would be significant.

Mitigation Measure

Mitigation Measure 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.

Significance Conclusion

The implementation of LID techniques along with 2007 General Plan policies will reduce the amount of runoff that is produced by developments and impacts to water quality. The encouragement of LID techniques and the

2007 General Plan policies will reduce stormwater impact to a less-than-significant level.

Buildout

Impact of Development with Policies

The 2007 General Plan buildout in 2092 will result in substantial new residential development outside of Community Areas and Rural Centers. Unless regulated, the increase in impermeable surfaces would result in greater runoff and require downstream facilities to control stormwater runoff. The size, location, and operation of these facilities cannot be reasonably identified at this time.

2007 General Plan Policies

The 2007 General Plan and Area Plan policies summarized above identify the public service and safety policies that will be in place to provide stormwater management services to future county residents.

Significance Determination

Typically, such facilities would have the same characteristics and impacts as described above. Assuming that County and state regulations and policies are at least as restrictive as under the 2007 General Plan, the impacts of additional impervious surfaces would be significant to water quality.

Mitigation Measures

The County's adoption of policy PS-3.9, as described above, would reduce impacts to water quality.

Significance Conclusion

With the state regulations, Monterey County policies and adoption of policy PS-3.9 buildout impacts to stormwater would be less than significant.

Solid Waste

Impact 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. (Less-Than-Significant Impact.) Future solid waste facilities would have a significant effect on the environment. (Significant and Unavoidable)

2030 Planning Horizon

Impact of Development with Policies

Buildout of the 2007 General Plan would result in urban development, which would generate solid waste. The increased generation of solid waste would create a need for new or expanded solid waste facilities, such as transfer stations, materials recovery facilities, and landfills—particularly near the proposed Pajaro, Boronda, Castroville, Chualar, and Fort Ord Community Areas. In addition, the increased generation of solid waste would result in non-compliance with State waste diversion requirements.

2007 General Plan Policies

The 2007 General Plan proposes a number of policies to ensure that public services would be provided concurrently with future growth.

Public Services Element

As discussed under Impact PSU-1, Public Services Element Policies PS-1.1 through PS-1.6 provide general standards for the provision of adequate public services. As previously discussed, policies under PS-1 would require the concurrent development of solid waste facilities along with development. Furthermore, the new or expanded facilities must provide an amount that meets or exceed that of the development. Public Services Element Policies PS-5.1 through PS-5.4 set forth policies that address recycling programs that will reduce waste, increase recycle material; promote the recycle of construction debris and new disposal sites. Public Service policies PS-5.1 through PS-5.4 would decrease generated solid waste by increasing recyclable material. Public Services Element Policies PS-6.2 through PS-6.4 address future solid waste disposal sites' location, planning, environmental impacts, surrounding land use. Public Safety policies PS 6.1 and PS 6.5 address the development of future efficient diversion programs and waste handling facilities that are in accordance with State-required diversion and recycling goals. Policies under PS-6 would decrease potential social impacts that would arise from the location of a future solid waste facility.

Area Plan Policies

No Area Plan policies address solid waste.

Landfill Capacity

As shown in Table 4.11-5, approximately 56 million cubic yards of capacity is remaining in the four active landfills in Monterey County. In addition, as noted in the policies listed above, the County is pursuing additional landfill capacity through expansion of existing sites or development of new sites. Accordingly, landfill capacity is expected to be adequate to serve the needs of the 2007 General Plan 2030 planning horizon.

Agricultural Winery Corridor Plan

Development of wineries and tasting rooms under the AWCP would generate solid waste and recycling volumes. Wineries in particular generate by-products of the grape crushing process, such as pomace. Much of these by-products are suitable for composting. As summarized in Table 4.11-5, Monterey County has adequate landfill capacity to meet the short-term and long-term needs of the wine-related facilities developed under the AWCP.

Significance Determination

Implementation of the 2007 General Plan would increase solid waste generation, and therefore would require additional landfill capacity and new or expanded transfer stations and recycling facilities. As summarized in Table 4.11-5, the four active landfills located in Monterey County have adequate capacity to accommodate additional solid waste generated by implementation of the 2007 General Plan.

There are no plans at the current time for new facilities and services. The existing facilities have sufficient capacity to meet the needs of future growth to 2030 and no new facilities would be necessary. Therefore, no significant impacts would result.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.

Significance Conclusion

This impact would be less-than-significant.

Buildout

Impact of Development with Policies

None of the existing landfills have a permitted lifespan that reaches the end of the 2092 buildout period. Accordingly, the combination of waste production from existing and future development would exceed the capacity of current landfills. Landfill siting is traditionally difficult because of the need to find a suitable site and the public controversy that typically accompanies permitting of the site. This becomes more problematic as residential development becomes more dispersed, as will occur at buildout.

2007 General Plan Policies

The 2007 General Plan and Area Plan policies summarized above identify the public service policies that will be in place to provide solid waste services to future county residents.

Significance Determination

There is a reasonable likelihood that future landfill expansion or the permitting of new landfills in the County will be controversial and have significant environmental impacts. However, the County would determine the specific site for a future landfill after considering comments from county residents and complying with CEQA. Although CEQA requires mitigation measures to be implemented, it can be expected that the expansion or construction of new landfill facilities would have significant and unavoidable environmental impacts.

Mitigation Measure

Mitigation Measure 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.

Significance Conclusion

2007 General Plan policies and proposed PS-5.5 policy would not be enough to mitigate impacts to landfill services. This impact would be significant and unavoidable.

4.11.5 Level of Significance after Mitigation

2030 Planning Horizon would increase the population in the county, which would require public utility services prior to development approval. The 2007 General Plan and proposed policies would mitigate impacts to public service utilities. Buildout impacts would be addressed with the existing County policies and any future policies that may exist at that time. CEQA compliance would also be required for all future expansion and new facilities that may be constructed. Thus, 2030 impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level. Buildout impacts in 2092 would also be less than significant, except impacts from future landfills, which would be significant and unavoidable.

