4.6 Transportation

4.6.1 Abstract

There are about 1,250 miles of County roads in the unincorporated portion of Monterey County, consisting mostly 2-lane and some 4-lane roads that range from Principal Arterials to Local Roads. Tourism is a source of traffic that contributes substantially to County roads, along with commuter traffic, agricultural product and freight movement, intra-regional travel, and inter-regional travel (through-traffic). The county's leading industry, production and shipping of agricultural products, generates high volumes of traffic throughout the county, another major source of circulation system demands. Movement of goods in Monterey County is one of the primary functions of the transportation system and an essential component of the County's economy. Monterey County is served by four public airports, Monterey Peninsula Airport, Salinas Municipal Airport, Marina Municipal Airport, and Mesa Del Rey Airport (King City).

The County of Monterey, the Transportation Agency of Monterey County (TAMC), the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and Monterey-Salinas Transit (MST) are the four agencies responsible for overseeing the transportation needs in Monterey County. These agencies have separate, but sometimes overlapping responsibilities, ranging from maintaining roadway facilities, long-range planning of new and expanded facilities, and providing public transportation. As of 2008, 90 regional and local roadway segments in the County fell below the Level of Service (LOS) standards established in the General Plan or Area Plans.

Implementation of the 2007 General Plan to the 2030 planning horizon and beyond to 2092 would result in significant impacts on transportation infrastructure at three (3) levels:

- **Project-specific Access and Level of Service Impacts on County and Local Roadways—**New vehicle trips generated by growth anticipated under the 2007 General Plan in 2030 and at buildout would result in deficient roadway performance on County roadways and local streets, requiring project-specific environmental assessment. Mitigation is proposed that would reduce the individual impacts of new development to a less than significant level. As described below, cumulative impacts would be significant and unavoidable nonetheless.
- **Cumulative Level of Service Impacts on County Roadways—**New trips generated by growth contemplated by the 2007 General Plan in 2030 and at buildout, along with new trips generated by planned growth in Cities, would cumulatively result in deficient roadway performance on County roadways. Mitigation is proposed that would minimize the impact; of individual projects, however, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable after mitigation.

- **Cumulative Level of Service Impacts on Regional Roadways—**New trips generated by growth contemplated by the 2007 General Plan in 2030 and at buildout, along with new trips generated by planned growth in cities, would cumulatively result in deficient roadway performance on regional roadways (i.e., state and federal highways and major streets within incorporated cities). This also includes regional roads external to Monterey County. Mitigation is proposed that would minimize the impact; however, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable after mitigation.
- **Level of Service Impacts on Roadway Segments within the Winery Corridor—**New trips generated by agricultural and winery growth contemplated by the 2007 General Plan in 2030 and at buildout would result in deficient roadway performance on four roadway segments. Mitigation is proposed that would minimize the impact; however, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable after mitigation.

All other impacts would be less than significant and do not require mitigation.

4.6.2 Existing Conditions

4.6.2.1 Introduction

Monterey County's transportation system has two primary functions:

1. Facilitate mobility and access, for residents, workers and visitors, to community services, the work place, commercial centers, recreation areas and the variety of land uses throughout the County, and
2. Facilitate the transport of goods to, from, and within the County.

The transportation system in Monterey County consists of several components:

- Regional Highways such as; U.S. Route 101 and the State Highways 1, 25, 68, 146, 156, 183, 198, 218;
- Major County Roads such as; Carmel Valley Road, San Miguel Canyon Road, Jolon Road, Blanco Road, Metz Road, River Road, Arroyo Seco Road;
- Arterial and Local Roads, such as; Corral de Tierra Road, Boronda Road, Strawberry Road, Castroville Boulevard, Espinosa Road;
- Regional transit; principally the Monterey-Salinas Transit service;
- Rail services, including; Amtrak (passenger service), future CalTrain (passenger service), and the Union Pacific Railroad (freight);
- Regional and local bike routes, such as; the Monterey Bay Recreational Trail;
- Regional and local pedestrian and hiking trails; mostly found in state and regional parks;

- Public airports, including; Monterey Peninsula Airport, Salinas Municipal Airport, Mesa Del Rey Airport (King City), Marina Municipal Airport;
- Public Harbors, such as Monterey Harbor and Moss Landing.

4.6.2.2 Road and Highway Transportation

There are about 1,250 miles of County roads in the unincorporated portion of Monterey County (**Exhibit 4.6.2**) consisting mostly 2-lane and some 4-lane roads that range from Principal Arterials to Local Roads. Most of these roads were developed to serve agricultural areas, rural communities, or remote wilderness areas in the more mountainous regions of the County. Over the past decades, these roads have shifted from accommodating primarily rural levels of traffic to accommodating urban levels of traffic and commuter traffic, contrary to their originally intended use and design capacities. Consequently, a number of roads function at a below established acceptable levels of service. The same is true of many segments along the nine (9) State Highways that cross the County.

4.6.2.3 Tourism Traffic

Tourism is a source of traffic that contributes substantially to county roads, along with commuter traffic, agricultural product and freight movement, intra-regional travel, and inter-regional travel (through-traffic). An estimated eight million tourists visit Monterey County each year (Source: Monterey County Herald, 4/26/07). Almost all of these tourists traveled by automobile. Of the County's 11,192 hotel and motel rooms, 9,320 are in the Greater Monterey Peninsula area (excluding Big Sur).

Tourism is the county's second largest industry, and the continued expansion of the tourism industry in Monterey County will further exacerbate this source of impact. Present alternatives to the automobile are not attractive to casual weekend travelers or to long-distance tourists. Although visitors comprise a high percentage of commercial airline passengers arriving at Monterey Peninsula Airport (62 percent, according to a 1996 AMBAG study), the relatively low number of airline trips in and out of the Peninsula accounts for only a very small percentage of the annual tourist volume. Monterey Salinas Transit's popular Waterfront Area Visitor Express (WAVE) service is an example of a non-impact transportation mode specifically tailored to tourist demand. However, the increasing demand for access to Monterey County's relatively inaccessible areas such as the Big Sur coastline, along with the over-capacity conditions already in place as a result of resident and commuter traffic, warrants additional measures to facilitate other modes of tourist-oriented transportation.

4.6.2.4 Agricultural Traffic

As the County's leading industry, the production and shipping of agricultural products generates high volumes of traffic throughout the County. This is another major source of circulation system demands. There are two components to this traffic source:

Trucks

A high percentage of local agricultural production is fresh fruits and vegetables, which require speedy transport either directly to wholesalers from the fields or from the field to the processing plant, then to market. Trucks are therefore ever-present on rural roads and moving in and out of towns and cities and contribute to over-capacity conditions. Because of their size and limited maneuverability compared to cars, trucks consume more capacity and demand greater access when entering roads from loading sites or other roads. Their greater weight (up to 40 tons) exerts significant wear and tear on roads, accelerating the need for road repair.

Workers

Agricultural fields are located from the upper limits of northern Monterey County through the Salinas Valley to the southern part of the County (approximately 150 miles). Work is seasonal and crops are regularly rotated creating a moving work place for the workers. As a result, workers in the fields commute from where housing is available, which is generally within the cities. Although buses may be offered for transportation and workers/families may carpool, it is common for there to be a number of individual cars parked in a field that is being harvested.

4.6.2.5 Freight Movement

Movement of goods in Monterey County is one of the primary functions of the transportation system and an essential component of the County's economy. Most goods, particularly agricultural goods and quarried materials, are transported by truck. The Regional Freight Study prepared by the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) in 1995 states that Monterey County was generating about 10,800 truck trips per day at that time. AMBAG's study also projected that the County would generate about 12,800 truck trips per day in 2006. The Regional Freight Study indicates that truck traffic accounted for about 11 percent of the total annual travel in Monterey County. Truck traffic is expected to increase as overall traffic volumes increase throughout the County and the State. The Regional Freight Study by AMBAG forecasts a two (2) percent annual increase in truck traffic in Monterey County through 2015.

The four highways that carry the highest level of truck traffic are Highways 1, 101, 156, and 183. AMBAG estimates that truck traffic is utilizing about 5 to 10 percent of the capacity of these highways. Table 4.6-1 shows the average daily truck volumes on these primary truck routes in Monterey County, as well as the less utilized Highway 198.

Table 4.6-1. Average Daily Truck Traffic on Monterey County Highways

Highway	Average Daily Truck Traffic
Highway 1	up to 3,800
U.S. 101	2,800–12,600
Highway 156	2,300–2,500
Highway 183	1,900–3,300
Highway 198	75–150

Source: 2006 Annual Average Daily Truck Volumes on the California State Highway System, Caltrans.

4.6.2.6 Monterey County Travel Patterns

According to the 2000 Census "journey to work" statistics, Monterey County's employed residents primarily commute to work using automobiles, with a substantial proportion driving alone (68 percent), as shown in Table 4.6-2. Carpooling is relatively high at nearly 20 percent of commuters. The third highest mode of travel is walking, at just over 5 percent. All other modes of travel, including public transportation for commuting, equal less than 5 percent.

Part of the reason for this pattern can be attributed to the manner in which the County has developed. All of the valley cities are surrounded by prime agricultural lands and the 1982 General Plan was designed to focus development towards cities in order to retain agriculture as well as to preserve scenic hillsides. As a result, people must commute from population centers to places where there are goods, services, and/or jobs.

Table 4.6-2. Existing Commute Travel Modes

Mode of Travel	Percent of Commuters
Total Car, Van, or Truck	86.1
Drove Alone	68.3
Carpooled	17.8
Public Transportation	3.0
Walk	5.1
Other	1.2
Work at Home	4.6

Source: United States Census Bureau, 2006 American Community Survey.

4.6.2.7 Road and Highway Capacities

The County's circulation system has a finite carrying capacity, and in some areas, the system's capacity has been exceeded. Traffic conditions for any given road segment can be expressed by a simple formula as the ratio of the volume of traffic using the road to the volume the road segment was designed to accommodate; also known as its volume-to-capacity ratio. Both figures are expressed in terms of Average Daily Traffic Volumes (ADT), that is, the total number of vehicles using the road on an average day. The number of vehicles using the road is either measured (by automated or manual traffic counters) or modeled with a computer-based traffic model. The design capacity is based on engineering standards established by the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual (2000 HCM) and adopted by the County, cities, and Caltrans.

The volume-to-capacity ratio is used as a quantitative measure of the roadway LOS. LOS is a qualitative term describing operating conditions a driver will experience while traveling on a particular street or at an intersection during a specific time interval, and is meant to reflect the degree to which traffic on the road is subject to congestion-related delays. The LOS categories and their pairing with specific ranges of volume-to-capacity ratio are a matter of convention, derived from standards developed by traffic engineers. LOS ranges from LOS A, which is very little delay to LOS F representing long delays and congestion. Table 4.6-3 defines each LOS category that has been adopted by the County as matter of policy and is used by the Public Works Department and Caltrans to identify substandard conditions. The County's current standard for road performance is LOS C under the 1982 General Plan and is proposed to be LOS D under the 2007 General Plan.

Table 4.6-3. Level of Service Definitions

Level of Service	Description
A	Free flow with no delays. Users are virtually unaffected by others in the traffic stream.
B	Stable traffic. Traffic flows smoothly with few delays.
C	Stable flow but the operation of individual users becomes affected by other vehicles. Modest delays.
D	Approaching unstable flow. Operation of individual users becomes significantly affected by other vehicles. Delays may be more than one cycle during peak hours.
E	Unstable flow with operating conditions at or near the capacity level. Long delays and vehicle queuing.
F	Forced or breakdown flow that causes reduced capacity. Stop and go traffic conditions. Excessive long delays and vehicle queuing.

Source: Transportation Research Board, Highway Capacity Manual 2000, National Research Council, 2000.

When the volume of daily traffic on a roadway exceeds its design capacity, the road is said to be over-capacity. An over-capacity roadway can be restored to capacity by one of two methods:

- Reduction in traffic volumes—A reduction in volume is usually achieved by building another road to which traffic will be diverted. This is not actually a reduction, but a redistribution of traffic volumes. Reductions in traffic volume are rarely proposed as a means to address over-capacity roadway conditions.
- Increase in road capacity—An increase in road capacity is usually achieved through road widening. Over-capacity conditions are usually addressed by a proposed addition of new lanes or by construction of new roadways.

Road construction and expansion are most often selected and favored by policy in Monterey County. Although this is a common response that reflects conventional policies, it also reflects the inherent difficulty of implementing "demand management" measures to reduce volumes after traffic has already been generated. Demand management is most effective in preventing increased traffic volumes by precluding the need for trips through a combination of prudent land use planning and highly convenient transit services. Policies in the 2007 General Plan are designed to address this issue.

As in any system that has reached or is reaching capacity, competing interests have begun to vie for limited space on local and regional roads. Trucks crowd the downtown streets of Castroville and South Salinas. Tourist traffic jockeys with commuters on Highway 68 and 156. Long distance commuters in North County share country roads with locals driving to the market. Increasing numbers of all these road users result in impacts that run contrary to the historic rural character of Monterey County's unincorporated towns and heartland. Exhibit 4.6.2 depicts the LOS on the County roadway system. Table 4.6.-4 lists the County roadways that currently operated below acceptable levels of service at LOS E and LOS F. There are 14 segments operating at LOS E and 70 segments operating at LOS F.

Table 4.6-4. Roadways Exceeding Level of Service Standard (Year 2008)

Roadway	Segment
State Roadway Segments Operating at LOS E based on Daily Capacity	
U.S. 101	Crazy Horse Canyon Rd to San Miguel Canyon Rd
SR-1	Rio Road to Carmel Valley Road
County Roadway Segments Operating at LOS E based on Daily Capacity	
San Juan Rd (G-11)	Salinas Rd to San Miguel Canyon Rd
San Juan Rd (G-11)	Aromas Rd to Carpenteria Rd
Abbott St	U.S. 101 to Salinas City Line
Carpenter St	Carmel City Line to Serra Ave

Roadway	Segment
Davis Rd	Blanco Rd to Reservation Rd
Espinosa Rd	SR-183 to US-101
Harris Rd	Spreckels Blvd to Abbott St
Porter Dr	Salinas Rd to San Juan Rd
Salinas Rd	SR-1 to Fruitland Ave
Other Regional Roadway Segments Operating at LOS E based on Daily Capacity	
N Fremont St	Casa Verde Wy to SR-218
Sanborn Rd	U.S. 101 to Abbott St
State Roadway Segments Operating at LOS F based on Daily Capacity	
U.S. 101	The Monterey / San Benito County border to Crazy Horse Canyon Rd
U.S. 101	San Miguel Canyon Rd to John St (8 segments)
SR-1	Salinas Rd to SR-183 (4 segments)
SR-1	Fremont Blvd to Del Monte Ave (2 segments)
SR-1	N Fremont St to Aguajito Rd
SR-1	Holman Hwy to Carpenter St
SR-1	Ocean Ave to Carmel Valley Road
SR-68 (Holman Hwy)	Forest Ave to SR-1 (4 segments)
SR-68 (Monterey-Salinas Highway)	SR-1 to Portola Dr (6 segments)
SR-156	Castroville Blvd to US-101
SR-183	SR-156 to Cooper Rd (3 segments)
SR-218	Fremont Blvd to SR-68 (2 segments)
County Roadway Segments Operating at LOS F based on Daily Capacity	
Salinas Rd (G-12)	Porter Dr to Railroad Ave
Elkhorn Rd (G-12)	Salinas Rd to Hall Rd
Hall Rd (G-12)	Elkhorn Rd to San Miguel Canyon Rd
San Miguel Canyon Rd (G-12)	Hall Rd to US-101 (3 segments)
Blanco Rd	Reservation Rd to Davis Rd (3 segments)
Carpenter St	Serra Ave to SR-1
Ocean Ave	Carmel City Line to Sr-1
Porter Dr	San Juan Rd to Santa Cruz County Line
Rio Rd	Carmel City Line to SR-1
San Juan Grade Rd	Salinas City Line to Russell Rd

Roadway	Segment
Other Regional Roadway Segments Operating at LOS F based on Daily Capacity	
Foam St	Prescott Ave to Lighthouse Ave (2 segments)
Lighthouse Ave	David Ave to Washington St (4 segments)
Del Monte Ave	Washington St to SR-1 (3 segments)
Fremont St	Abrego St to Camino Aguajito
Munras Ave/Abrego St	Soledad Dr to Via Zaragoza
Del Monte Blvd	SR-1 to Broadway Ave (2 segments)
Del Monte Blvd	SR-1 to Reservation Rd (2 segments)
John St	Abbott St to U.S. 101
Davis Rd	W Laurel Dr to W Blanco Rd (2 segments)

Source: Kimley-Horn & Associates, Inc. 2008.

In addition, the Area Plan for Carmel Valley specifies an acceptable LOS of "C" or "D" for Carmel Valley Road depending on the roadway segment (see Impact TRAN-2B for identification of segments and associated LOS standards), as opposed to a LOS "C" that is proposed to be the acceptable level for other Carmel Valley roadways and LOS D in the remainder of the unincorporated County. Integration of this analysis into the 2007 General Plan EIR allows for consistency between documents.

The roadway level of service analysis for the Carmel Valley Master Plan (CVMP) area is based on peak hour (AM and PM peak) information. The reason that CVMP roadway facilities are analyzed in the peak hour as opposed to the daily analysis used for the rest of the County is because the CVMP policies establish LOS standards based on peak hour (CV 2.18-d), and a recent draft traffic analysis of the CVMP and the Carmel Valley Transportation Improvement Program was available (CVMP Traffic Study, July 2007). Integration of this analysis into the 2007 General Plan EIR allows for consistency between documents.

The CVMP analysis of roadway segments is based on industry standard methods for peak hour analysis (2000 Highway Capacity Manual, Transportation Research Board). Two performance measures are used in the CVMP analysis; two-lane roadways are analyzed based on the percentage of time vehicles must travel in groups behind slower vehicles due to inability to pass, while four-lane roadways are analyzed based on the density of vehicles, or how closely vehicles travel together making it difficult to change lanes or pass. These performance measures reflect actual roadway operations and require detailed information about roadway configurations and peak hour travel characteristics.

In comparison, the performance measure used for the rest of the County is the ratio of daily traffic volume to daily roadway capacity, a theoretical planning

measure that estimates whether a roadway will experience peak hour congestion by comparing demand to the number of lanes available.

Table 4.6-5 presents existing roadway levels of service and identifies segments that are currently operating at LOS D or worse within the Carmel Valley Area Plan areas and are therefore deficient.

Table 4.6-5. Carmel Valley Roadway Level of Service (Year 2008)

		Level of Service	
Roadway	Direction	AM Peak	PM Peak
Highway (SR) 1			
Between Ocean Ave & Carpenter St	NB	C	C
	SB	C	C
Carmel Valley Road			
East of Holman	BOTH	A	A
Holman Road to Esquiline Road	BOTH	A	A
Esquiline Road to Ford Road	BOTH	C	B
Ford Road to Laureles Grade	BOTH	C	C
Laureles Grade to Robinson Canyon Road	BOTH	D	C
Robinson Canyon Road to Schulte Road	BOTH	D	D
Schulte Road to Rancho San Carlos Road	BOTH	D	D
Rancho San Carlos Road to Rio Road	EB	A	A
	WB	A	A
Rio Road to Carmel Rancho Boulevard	EB	A	B
	WB	B	B
Carmel Rancho Boulevard to Highway 1	EB	B	A
	WB	A	B

Source: Kimley-Horn & Associates, Inc. 2008 and DKS Associates, 2007

In addition to Monterey County roadways described above, the analysis includes regional roadways external to the County that might be impacted by growth allowed under the General Plan in Santa Cruz, San Benito, and San Luis Obispo Counties. Table 4.6-6 present the existing levels of service for regional roadways external to the county. These external regional roadways were selected because they either represent the extents of the AMBAG model network for which future traffic volumes can be projected.

4.6.2.8 Public Transit Services

The Monterey Salinas Transit (MST) system is an inter-city and intra-city bus service. MST serves a 275 square-mile area of Northern Monterey County and Southern Santa Cruz County providing intercity bus service between Monterey and Salinas, Marina and Watsonville, Salinas and Watsonville, and south from Salinas as far as King City. Inter-city service is provided in Gonzales, Marina, Monterey, Pacific Grove, Salinas, and Seaside. MST offers 37 routes that serve an estimated 352,000 people residing within three-quarters of a mile from established routes. These MST lines connect with Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District routes originating at the Watsonville Transit Center.

MST's rural service is provided to Carmel Valley and seasonally to Big Sur. The Waterfront Area Visitor Express (WAVE) offers locals and tourists service to popular tourist destinations within the City of Monterey.

MST RIDES, Monterey County's paratransit program, provides transportation service for individuals who have a disability that prevents them from using MST's regular fixed route transit services. The MST RIDES program also provides the RIDES Special Transportation (RIDES ST) service for persons living outside of the ADA-required service corridor (up to ¾-mile from any MST fixed route bus line).

MST RIDES serves 14 municipalities in two counties and 10 additional communities in the unincorporated areas of Monterey County. Service coverage spans the Monterey Peninsula, Carmel, Carmel Valley, Salinas, Chualar, Gonzales, Greenfield, Soledad, King City, and the Watsonville Transit Center. As of February 2006, there are 2,145 people certified as ADA Paratransit eligible within the service area. About half of that population resides either in Salinas or Monterey, approximately 38 percent in Salinas, and 13 percent in Monterey.

Table 4.6-6. Regional Roadway Level of Service External to Monterey County (Year 2008)

		Existing Conditions	
Roadway Segment		V/C Ratio	Level of Service
Santa Clara County			
US Highway 101	Cochrane Rd to E Dunne Ave	1.139	F
US Highway 101	Masten Ave to Leavesley Rd/SR-152 West	0.989	E
US Highway 101	Monterey Rd to SR-25	1.071	F
SR-152	SR-156 to Merced County	0.630	C

Roadway Segment		Existing Conditions	
		V/C Ratio	Level of Service
SR-1	Soquel Ave to 41st St	1.368	F
SR-1	Airport Blvd to SR-152	0.876	D
SR-1	Harkings Slough Rd to SR-129	0.608	C
SR-1	SR-129 to Monterey County	0.492	B
SR-17	Santa Clara County to Granite Creek Rd	0.958	E
SR-129 (Riverside Rd)	Lakeview Rd to Carlton Rd	0.847	D
San Benito County			
US Highway 101	Santa Clara County to SR-129	0.912	E
SR-25 (Bolsa Rd)	Santa Clara County to SR-156	1.196	F
SR-156	Salinas Rd to Union Rd	1.706	F
San Luis Obispo County			
US Highway 101	Monterey County to San Miguel Ave	0.300	A

Source: Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

The MST RIDES ST service area includes the unincorporated areas of Prunedale, Castroville, and Aromas for North Monterey County as well as the area along River Road from State Highway 68 to, and including, Las Palmas Ranch II. The MST RIDES ST service area extends one mile on either side of Highway 101 from Salinas to Bradley including the unincorporated communities of San Lucas and San Ardo for South Monterey County. MST RIDES ST services are provided when MST RIDES and MST's regular bus services are in operation. Table 4.6-7 lists each MST bus route. Exhibit 4.6.3 shows MST bus routes in Monterey County.

Table 4.6-7. Monterey Salinas Transit Bus Routes

Route No.	Route Area	Route No.	Route Area
1	Pacific Grove	29	Watsonville-Salinas
1x	Asilomar-Lovers Point Express	36	Laguna Seca-Carmel
2	Monterey-Pacific Grove	37	Laguna Seca-Seaside
2x	Pebble Beach Express	38	Laguna Seca-Monterey
4	Carmel-Carmel Rancho	39	Laguna Seca-Salinas
5	Monterey-Carmel	41	East Alisal-Northridge
6	Edgewater-Ryan Ranch	42	East Alisal-Westridge
7	Monterey-Carmel	43	Memorial Hospital
9	Fremont-Hilby	44	Northridge
10	Fremont-Ord Grove	45	East Market-Creekbridge
11	Edgewater-Carmel Express	46	Natividad
16	Monterey-Marina	48	Salinas-Airport Business Center
20	Monterey-Salinas	49	Northridge
21	Monterey-Salinas	55	Monterey-San Jose Express
22	Big Sur	56	Monterey-Memorial Hospital
23	Salinas-King City	No-route number - service available on demand	Monterey-Peninsula DART
23x	Salinas-King City Express		MST On Call Marina
24	Carmel Valley Grapevine Express		MST Trolley-Monterey
27	Watsonville-Marina		MST RIDES
28	Watsonville-Salinas		

Source: Monterey Salinas Transit. 2008.

4.6.2.9 Transportation

Civilian Aviation Facilities

Monterey County is served by four public airports, Monterey Peninsula Airport, Salinas Municipal Airport, Marina Municipal Airport, and Mesa Del Rey Airport (King City). The Monterey Peninsula Airport is owned and operated by the Monterey Peninsula Airport District. The Salinas Municipal, Marina Municipal (formerly Fritzsche Army Airfield), and Mesa Del Rey (King City) Airports are owned and operated by their respective cities. Additional information on the four public airports is included in Table 4.6-8. Monterey County also contains over thirty private airstrips and agricultural landing fields.

Table 4.6-8. Monterey County Airports

Airport	Runways	General Aviation Aircraft Based at the Airport	Average Aircraft Operations
Monterey Peninsula Airport	2	165	250 per day with 60 scheduled commercial passenger flights
Salinas Municipal Airport	3	229	213 per day
Marina Municipal Airport	1	69	110 per day
Mesa Del Rey Airport	1	31	67 per week

Source: http://www.airnav.com/ 2008.

The Monterey Peninsula Airport District includes portions of Monterey, Pacific Grove, Del Monte Forest, Pebble Beach, Carmel-by-the-Sea, greater Carmel, Del Rey Oaks, Seaside, Sand City, the Monterey-Salinas Highway to Laureles Grade, and the west end of Carmel Valley. The Airport District is not incorporated into the City or the County, nor is it a public utility. According to the Monterey Peninsula Airport District, passenger and airport operations have been declining since it peak in 1978 (from 640,000 passengers annually to 340,000 in 2004).

A small airstrip had been located in the Carmel Valley Village area under the 1982 General Plan. This airstrip is no longer in operation and the property is under private ownership. A prior action by the Monterey County Board of Supervisors changed the land use designation so that this property is now consistent with the surrounding neighborhood. As such, the former airstrip property is designated for low-density residential uses under the 2007 General Plan.

Military Aviation Facilities

Military aviation facilities are located within the boundaries of Fort Hunter Liggett and Camp Roberts to the south.

The Schoonver Tactical Air Strip at Fort Hunter Liggett is a 5,000-foot compacted dirt and rock surface runway capable of supporting C-130 Hercules and C-12 Huron operations. In addition, Fort Hunter Liggett also contains the Doolittle Aircraft Training Area, which is used for Close Air Support training by Navy aircraft from Naval Air Station Lemoore in Kings County.

McMillan Airfield at Camp Roberts is a 3,500-foot long runway with a paved surface capable of supporting C-130 operations. McMillan Airfield is currently used for Unmanned Aerial Vehicle operations and testing.

4.6.2.10 Rail Transportation

Rail transportation historically played a key role in developing and supporting the land uses and major industries in Monterey County. Several of the cities and communities of the Salinas Valley (e.g., King City, Gonzales, Chualar, Soledad, San Ardo, San Lucas, and Bradley) owe their existence and early vitality to the development and economic benefits associated with the construction of the Southern Pacific Railroad through the County in the late 1800s. The agricultural industry of the valley flourished in partnership with the transport of produce by rail to the national market. The tourism industry, which has been the basis of Monterey Peninsula's economy for more than a century, was spurred originally by construction of Southern Pacific's new line in 1879 from Castroville to Monterey, with a special stop at Southern Pacific's own Del Monte Hotel.

Since the 1950s, the primary mode of travel for county residents and visitors alike has been the single-passenger automobile. The heavy flow of agricultural freight that once traveled by railway is now transported by trucks using local streets and the county's arterial roads and highways. The San Francisco to Monterey passenger rail service (the "Del Monte" trains) was discontinued in 1971 following a long period of declining ridership and downgrades in service.

Currently, the Union Pacific Railroad (which acquired the Southern Pacific in 1996) owns and operates most of the rail trackage in Monterey County. The Coast Line enters Monterey County in Aromas, heads west down the Pajaro Valley to Watsonville Junction (Pajaro), turns south, enters the Salinas Valley, and extends down the length of the Valley to the San Luis Obispo County line. Most of the Coast Line is single-tracked.

The Monterey Branch line from Castroville to Monterey passes through the Cities of Marina and Seaside and through Fort Ord and terminates at Cannery Row in Monterey. This 12.9-mile, single-track branch line is inactive and is owned by the TAMC. In several places in Seaside and Monterey, the tracks have been paved over to accommodate the Monterey Bay Coastal Trail, which runs between Marina and Pebble Beach.

Rail service today is limited to four (4) to six (6) freight trains per day running between Los Angeles and the San Francisco Bay Area. Amtrak's Coast Starlight, a passenger line, stops at Salinas once daily, in each direction, on its run between Seattle and Los Angeles. The nearest commuter rail stop to Monterey County is the Caltrain depot in Gilroy in Santa Clara County. Caltrain operates commuter rail service between Gilroy and San Francisco five (5) days a week during the morning and evening commute hours. Caltrain provides frequent daily service between San Jose and San Francisco.

Future Passenger Rail Service Plans

TAMC is planning to extend Caltrain service from Gilroy to Monterey County, including stops in Pajaro, Castroville, and Salinas. Information available on the TAMC website indicates that initial plans for service include up to four (4) weekday roundtrips between Salinas and San Francisco, with new intermediate stops at Pajaro and Castroville. The estimated cost of the extension of service is $101 million, with service beginning as early as 2011. The route is expected to generate an annual ridership of 530,000. The project is currently in the design and engineering stage.

To accommodate commuter rail service, track improvements would be made to the Coast Line between Gilroy and Salinas; stations would be built at Pajaro and Castroville; the existing train station in Salinas (also referred to as the "Intermodal Transportation Center") would be expanded; and a new layover facility would be constructed in Salinas. Under the preferred alternative, the Pajaro station would be located adjacent to Salinas Road and the Castroville station would be located north of Highway 156. Note that the County of Monterey adopted a Community Plan for Castroville in 2007 that envisions residential and commercial development on 145 acres around the proposed train station and includes elements designed to encourage rail ridership.

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission is in the process of negotiating the acquisition of the Santa Cruz Branch line from Union Pacific Railroad, extending from Pajaro/Watsonville to Davenport (Santa Cruz County). The rail line may be used for passenger rail service. Future passenger rail service between Santa Cruz County and the San Francisco Bay Area may result in additional passenger rail service in Monterey County.

TAMC is also studying restoring service to the Monterey Branch line between Castroville and Monterey. These studies of Monterey Peninsula Fixed Guideway Service include sponsoring alternatives analysis, environmental studies, and right-of-way investigations. The route would connect the planned Caltrain service in Castroville to the Peninsula, with stations in Monterey, Seaside, Sand City, Marina/CSUMB, and Castroville. Options under consideration include bus rapid transit (BRT), light rail and express bus service. The project is currently under environmental review, with service anticipated to being in 2014.

Exhibit 4.6.4 depicts the various passenger rail service options in Monterey and surrounding counties being explored by various transportation agencies at the present time.

4.6.2.11 Water Transportation

There are two harbors in Monterey County; Monterey Harbor, and Moss Landing Harbor. Both harbors are classified as small craft harbors, serving commercial fishing vessels and pleasure craft. There are nearly 500 berths, 150 privately owned mooring buoys, and 39 seasonal, rental moorings in the Monterey Harbor.

Nearly 25 percent of the vessels in the Monterey Harbor have commercial uses. Moss Landing Harbor provides 620 berths. The demand for berths exceeds the supply, and waiting periods for berths vary based on the size of the vessel. The estimated waiting periods for small vessels range from three (3) to five (5) years; mid-size vessels, eight (8) to ten (10) years; and up to 15 years for large vessels.

4.6.2.12 Bicycle Transportation

There are approximately 240 miles of bikeways on state, county, and local roads within Monterey County. Caltrans maintains a majority of the bikeways, including the Pacific Coast Route, which is a 120-mile Class III bicycle route that follows the coastline. The remaining bicycle facilities are maintained by the Cities and County and are shown in **Table 4.6-9** by classification and distance.

Table 4.6-9. Bicycle Facilities in Monterey County

Facility Type	Miles of Facility	Description
Class I	27.6	Dedicated bicycle/pedestrian path
Class II	57.4	Striped bicycle lane
Class III	41.0	Signed bike route without lanes
Total	**126.0**	

Source: TAMC 2005 General Bikeways Plan.

Notes: Includes bike facilities in cities and unincorporated county areas.

The largest concentration of bicycle trips is in the northwestern region of the County, which has the highest population density. TAMC estimated 1,436 daily commuter bicycle trips were made by Monterey County residents in 2005. Exhibit 4.6.5 depicts the 2008 Transportation Agency for Monterey County Bicycle Map.

4.6.2.13 Regulatory Framework

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

Caltrans builds, operates, and maintains the State Highway system, including the Interstate Highway system. Caltrans' mission is to improve mobility statewide. The department operates under strategic goals to provide a safe transportation system, optimize throughput and ensure reliable travel times, improve the delivery of state highway projects, provide transportation choices, and improve and enhance the states investments and resources. Caltrans controls the planning of the state highway system and accessibility to the system. Caltrans establishes LOS goals for highways and works with local and regional agencies to assess impacts and develop funding sources for improvements to the State Highway system. Caltrans requires encroachment permits from agencies or new development before any construction work may be undertaken within the state's right-of-way. For projects that would impact traffic flow and levels of services on state highways, Caltrans would recommend measures to mitigate the traffic impacts.

Monterey County Public Works Department

The Monterey County Public Works Department is responsible for capital facility planning and maintaining roads, bridges and related facilities, as well as storm drains within the public right of way, sanitation district collection, treatment, and disposal facilities, County Service Area urban services, and County landfills, within the unincorporated area of the County. The department works with the County Planning Department to review land development applications for compliance with Local and State regulations (private roads, driveways and County maintained roads). The department administers encroachment permits for work performed within County rights of way, such as underground utility work, and driveways and road approaches; permits street closures; and issues transportation permits for County roads.

Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC)

TAMC is an independent agency of local officials who oversee planning and funding of regional transportation improvements throughout Monterey County. The agency is directed by elected officials from each of the 12 incorporated cities in Monterey County and the County Supervisors. TAMC prepares the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and oversees the implementation of its recommended improvements. The RTP plans and programs local, state, and federal transportation funds for the development of transportation projects in Monterey County over a twenty-five year period conforming to State and Federal requirements. The RTP identifies existing and future transportation related needs, includes all modes of travel, and identifies realistic transportation improvements that would be implemented with anticipated available funding.

Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments

AMBAG was established to conduct planning and study of regional land use, transportation, and economic issues of concern to the Counties and Cities in Monterey, San Benito, and Santa Cruz Counties. Although AMBAG is not a regulatory agency, it prepares studies, plans, policy and action recommendations that may be incorporated into regulatory documents. AMBAG is represented by locally elected officials appointed by their respective City Council or Board of Supervisors. In addition to its transportation planning and study functions, and policy recommendations, AMBAG develops and maintains a regional travel demand forecasting model used for the planning of regional transportation facilities and the assessment of development proposals.

Local Agencies

The incorporated Cities of Salinas, Monterey, Carmel, Del Rey Oaks, Gonzales, Greenfield, King City, Marina, Pacific Grove, Sand City, Seaside, and Soledad have each adopted their own General Plans, polices and/or capital improvement programs which regulate development and transportation improvements within their jurisdiction. However, transportation network and circulation related impacts produced by land use decisions transcend City-County boundaries, requiring coordination between Monterey County and local agencies departments related to land use planning and transportation improvements.

4.6.3 Project Impacts

This section describes the CEQA impact analysis relating to transportation for the Project and its alternatives. It describes the methods used to determine the Project's impacts and lists the thresholds used to conclude whether an impact would be significant or not. Measures to mitigate significant impacts accompany each impact discussion.

4.6.3.1 Methodology

Roadway level of service impacts of the 2007 General Plan on Monterey County, and regional roadways are evaluated for the following five analysis scenarios:

- Existing Conditions (Year 2008)
- Existing plus Project (Development to the year 2030)
- 2030 Cumulative Conditions (Cumulative and project development to the year 2030)
- Existing plus Project (Buildout of the General Plan in 2092)

- Buildout Cumulative Conditions (Cumulative and project development to the year 2092)

Each of the scenarios incorporates different land use and roadway network assumptions for Monterey County. These assumptions are described in the next section. For each scenario, projected daily roadway segment traffic volumes are used to calculate the roadway's level of service which are compared to the County's roadway level of service standard. The results are used to identify roadway segments that fail to meet County standards and significant impacts.

Roadway segment level of service is based on the performance measure of the ratio daily traffic volume to daily roadway capacity (V/C Ratio), a theoretical planning measure that estimates whether a roadway will experience peak hour congestion by comparing traffic demand to the number of lanes available. A ratio greater than 1.0 indicates that traffic demand would exceed theoretical capacity and traffic would become gridlocked. In actuality, roadways can accommodate more traffic than the theoretical daily capacity, but the V/C Ratio planning measure is a good indicator of expected peak hour traffic congestion.

This performance measure is a coarse planning tool, but one that is appropriate for a generalized long-range programmatic assessment such as this General Plan. This generalized planning tool is based on the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual and uses general default values. It is intended for broad applications such as statewide or countywide analyses, potential problem identification, and future year analyses. This level of analysis is typically conducted using daily traffic projections and tends to over-estimate traffic impacts.

At the project-specific or small planning area level of assessment, traffic analyses should conducted at the peak hour level, with more detailed and specific operational input to roadway and intersection characteristics (i.e., number of turning lanes, signal timing, etc.).

While the County's level of service (LOS) standard (LOS D) is applied to both peak hour and daily traffic conditions, daily traffic projections are used in the analysis of the 2007 General Plan because the regional transportation planning tool (the AMBAG Travel Demand Forecasting Model) was developed and validated for daily traffic conditions.

4.6.3.2 Analysis Scenarios

Table 4.6-10 summarizes the land use and transportation network assumptions used in each analysis scenario. Additional information describing the assumptions for each scenario and the methodology for developing projections are provided below. Table 4.6-11 compares the population, employment and housing unit projections analyzed in each of the scenarios. Population and

employment forecasts are divided into incorporated and unincorporated portions of the County[1].

Table 4.6-10. Summary of Land Use and Transportation Network Assumptions

Scenario	Unincorporated Land Use	Incorporated Land Use	Transportation Network
Existing (2008)	Existing Roadway Traffic Volumes		
Existing plus Project Buildout	Buildout of 2007 General Plan	2000 AMBAG Data (2004 version)	AMBAG 2000 Base Network Modified to 2008 [1]
Existing plus Project (2030)	Prorated Buildout of 2007 General Plan to 2030	2000 AMBAG Data (2004 version)	AMBAG 2000 Base Network Modified to 2008 [1]
Cumulative 2030	Prorated Buildout of 2007 General Plan to 2030	2030 AMBAG Projections (2004 version)	2008 Modified Network with proposed TAMC and County Projects
Cumulative Buildout	Buildout of 2007 General Plan	Projected Buildout based on 2030 AMBAG Model	2008 Modified Network with proposed TAMC and County Projects
Cumulative 2030 Prior Land Use (No Project)	2030 AMBAG Projections (2004 version)	2030 AMBAG Projections (2004 version)	2008 Modified Network with proposed TAMC and County Projects

[1] The AMBAG 2000 network represents the year 2000 baseline network for which the model was validated. To reflect 2008 conditions, the 2000 network was modified to reflect completed projects on County roads.

[1] To provide for an equivalent comparison, portions of the County that are currently unincorporated but are forecast to be annexed to cities prior to 2030 are included in the incorporated category for all scenarios.

Table 4.6-11. Population, Housing Unit and Employment Projections by Scenario

	Year 2000	Existing plus Project Buildout	Existing plus Project (2030)	Cumulative 2030	Cumulative Buildout
Countywide					
Housing Units	129,571	168,904	143,009	187,022	290,631
Population	401,499	509,692	437,665	602,790	937,373
Employment	222,471	304,388	253,060	335,362	520,531
Unincorporated					
Housing Units	35,252	74,585	48,690	48,690	74,585
Population	95,047	203,240	131,213	135,431	207,458
Employment	65,242	147,159	95,831	97,109	148,431
Incorporated					
Housing Units	94,319	94,319	94,319	138,332	216,046
Population	306,452	306,452	306,452	467,359	729,915
Employment	157,229	157,229	157,229	238,253	372,100

Notes: Year 2008 population, employment and housing unit data not available, Year 2000 data is shown for comparison.
Existing plus Project 2030 and Cumulative 2030 land uses were adjusted to match the published AMBAG 2004 Population, Employment and Housing Unit forecasts.

Existing Conditions

Existing conditions represents approximate 2008 roadway conditions. Traffic volumes were obtained from various sources, including Caltrans, the County and for those regional roadways within incorporated areas, local agencies. Volumes from 2002 and 2006 were obtained where available and adjusted, based on annual growth rates, to represent 2008 conditions.

Roadway classification was based on aerial photographs, the Transportation Research Board's 2000 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) classification criteria, and field observations.

Existing plus Project (Development to the year 2030)

Existing plus Project Conditions represents development forecasted to occur in unincorporated areas of the County by the year 2030. It is a prorated portion of the forecast buildout of unincorporated areas (described below). The amount of total development in unincorporated areas assumed under this scenario matches the amount of development in unincorporated areas projected by the AMBAG 2004 forecast to the year 2030. Employment data for unincorporated portions of the County was obtained from the year 2030 AMBAG forecasts. Unincorporated

County population and employment forecasts in 2030 are from the currently approved AMBAG Travel Demand Forecasting Model (AMBAG Model)[2].

The AMBAG development projections prepared in 2004 (the currently adopted regional forecast) are conservative since AMBAG has recently developed, but not yet adopted, new growth projections (2008) that are significantly lower than their 2004 projections. However, since the new projections have not yet been adopted and the approved AMBAG model remains based on 2004 projections, the 2007 General Plan in 2030 remains consistent with AMBAG adopted population and employment forecasts.

No change to the base model land use was made within incorporated areas. The coastal areas (including Big Sur and the Del Monte Forest) do not include any growth as new development is not expected to occur in these areas.

This scenario utilizes the modified AMBAG base year roadway network reflecting 2008 conditions. No major improvement projects that would affect regional roadways have been constructed following the last revision to the model network. To develop 2030 traffic projections the percent annual growth on each roadway segment between the base model (year 2000) and the Existing plus Project (year 2030) scenario was applied to 2008 traffic volumes over 22 years reflecting growth from 2008 to 2030.

2030 Cumulative Conditions with Project (Cumulative and Project Development to the Year 2030)

2030 Cumulative Conditions represent forecast year 2030 conditions with implementation of the 2007 General Plan. Development in unincorporated portions of the County was determined by the methodology described in the Existing plus Project (Development to the year 2030) scenario described above. Development in incorporated portions of the County, and in adjacent counties including Santa Cruz, San Benito and parts of Santa Clara, was obtained directly from the Year 2030 AMBAG 2004 forecasts. The cumulative roadway level of service analysis includes key roadways external to Monterey County.

The roadway network in this scenario represents a conservative estimation of capital projects that would be constructed by the year 2030. These include the projects adopted in the Transportation Agency of Monterey County (TAMC) regional fee program, and the capacity enhancements proposed by the County to be included in the development of a Countywide traffic impact fee program, as specified in 2007 General Plan Policy C-1.8.

Table 4.6-12 describes the sixteen TAMC fee program projects. In addition to the regional roadways, the TAMC projects include capacity-enhancing projects on County roadways. Table 4.6-13 describes the capacity enhancing projects

[2] AMBAG Model developed using 2004 population and employment growth projections.

identified by the County in the development of a Countywide Traffic Impact Fee Program.

Table 4.6-12. TAMC Regional traffic Impact Fee Program Projects

SR 1 - Sand City / Seaside Widening	Highway 1 (Seaside – Sand City)	Widen Highway 1 to six lanes from Fremont Ave to at least Canyon Del Rey and make interchange and related local road improvements in the vicinity of Canyon Del Rey and Fremont Avenues.
SR 68 - CHOMP Widening	Between Highway 1 and Community Hospital of Monterey Peninsula	Widen Holman Highway 68 from CHOMP to Hwy 1 to 4 lanes and make operational improvements at the Hwy 68 – Hwy 1 interchange.
SR 156 Widening	North Monterey County from Castroville Blvd to the 156/101 Interchange	Widen existing highway to 4 lanes and upgrade highway to Freeway status with appropriate interchanges. Interchange modification at US 156 and 101.
Marina - Salinas Corridor	Between Marina and Salinas	Widen Davis Road to 4 lanes from W Blanco Rd to Reservation Road, Widen Reservation Road to 4 lanes from Davis Road to existing 4 lane section adjacent to East Garrison, Widen Imjin Parkway to 4 lanes from Reservation Road to Imjin Road, reconstruct 12th street (Imjin Parkway) interchange.
Del Monte - Lighthouse Corridor Improvements	City of Monterey	Add eastbound lane from El Estero to Sloat Ave. Intersection improvements to Sloat Ave and Aguajito Ave including addition of left turn lanes and signal operations improvements. Widen Lighthouse Ave to 3 lanes (2 lanes for traffic, 1 lane for transit) and convert to one-way heading east. Widen Foam St to 3 lanes from the Lighthouse split to Drake Ave. Widen Hoffman to 2 lanes between Foam and Lighthouse and make one-way from Foam towards Lighthouse. At David Ave/Lighthouse interchange, add double left-turn onto Lighthouse. Add curved return lane on west-side of Lighthouse/Foam split to allow traffic to flow back onto Foam.
US 101 - San Juan Road Interchange	Counties of Monterey and San Benito	Remove three at-grade intersections (Dunbarton Road, San Juan Road and Cole Road) and construct one interchange near the Red Barn.
US 101 - South County	US 101 north of Soledad	Construct 2-lane frontage roads on west-side of US-101 from Harris Rd/Abbott St interchange to Chualar. Remove existing segment of Abbott St from US-101 to Harris Rd. Additional 2-lane frontage rd on east side of US-101 from Chualar to Harris Rd. Construct an interchange at Chualar.

Westside Bypass	City of Salinas	Construct 4-lane westside bypass around Salinas from Boranda to Davis Rd, including 4-lane Rossi St connector. Includes widening of Davis to 4 lanes from bypass connection to W Blanco Rd.
SR 68 Commuter Improvements	Rte 68 between Monterey and Salinas	Widen SR 68 from existing 4 lane section adjacent to Toro park west to Corral De Tierra.
Harris Road / Eastside Connector	City of Salinas	Construct 4-lane arterial from US 101 to Williams Road and an interchange at Harris Rd / US 101.
G-12 South	Unincorporated Monterey County	Widen San Miguel Cyn Rd to four lanes from just south of Moro Rd through Castroville Blvd. Add climbing lane on southbound San Miguel Cyn Rd just north of Strawberry Rd. Add two-way left-turn lane on San Miguel Cyn Rd between Castroville Blvd and Echo Valley Rd. Add a traffic signal at Echo Valley Rd.
G-12 North	Unincorporated Monterey County	Add a two-way left-turn lane on Hall Rd between San Miguel Cyn Rd and Elkhorn Rd. Widen Elkhorn Rd to four lanes from Hall Rd to Werner Rd.
Gloria Rd / US 101 Interchange	Gonzales	Re-align and reconstruct the Gloria Road / US 101 interchange. A Project Study Report is currently underway.
US-101/South Soledad Interchange & US-101/North Soledad Interchange	South Soledad/North Soledad	Modify South Soledad interchange and construct related ramp improvements to accommodate future widening of US-101 to six lanes as well as the planned SR-146 Bypass from Front Street to Metz Road. Modify North Soledad interchange and construct related ramp improvements to accommodate future widening of US-101.
Walnut Ave / US 101 Interchange	Greenfield	Relocate and replace the existing Walnut Avenue / US 101 interchange. Cost estimate assumes selection of Alternative 3 from the Project Study Report currently being prepared.
First Street / US 101 Interchange	King City	Extension and grade separation over railroad tracks of San Antonio Drive (King City loop road) from Lonoak Road to interchange of First Street and US 101.

Source: Regional Impact Fee Nexus Study Report, Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Table 4.6-13. Countywide Capacity Enhancements Proposed in Countywide Traffic Impact Fee Program

San Juan Road Improvements	North County	Construct traffic signals at the Aromas Road and Carpenteria Road intersections. Widen to four lanes from Pajaro to US-101.
G-12 Improvements	North County LCP	Widen to four lanes on San Miguel Canyon Road between Castroville Boulevard and Hall Road. Perform intersection improvements on Hall Road at Sill Road and Willow Road. Widen to four lanes on Salinas Road between Railroad Avenue and Porter Drive.
G-17 Widening (Reservation Road)	Toro/Greater Salinas	Widen to four lanes on Reservation Road from Davis Road to SR-68. Construct traffic signal at Davis Road.
G-17 Widening (River Road)	Toro	Widen to four lanes from Las Palmas Road to Las Palmas Parkway.
Salinas Road Improvements	North County/North County LCP	Widen to four lanes between future SR-1 and Salinas Road interchange and existing four-lane section. Install traffic signal and construct intersection improvements at Werner Road intersection. Construct signals on Elkhorn Road at Salinas Road and Werner Road intersections. Alternatively, re-align Salinas Road and Werner Road to intersect Elkhorn Road at a single location with a traffic signal.
Castroville Improvements	North County	Extend Castroville Boulevard to Blackie Road. Construct Artichoke Avenue Phases I, II and III from SR-1 to Poole Street. Implement Merritt Street corridor improvements.
San Juan Grade Road Improvements	Greater Salinas	Widen to four lanes from Salinas City Line to Crazy Horse Canyon Road. Install traffic signals at Rogge Road, Hebert Road and Crazy Horse Canyon Road.
Crazy Horse Canyon Road Improvements	North County	Add turn lanes or passing lanes from San Juan Grade Road to US-101.
Hebert Road/Old Stage Road Widening	Greater Salinas	Widen Hebert Road to four lanes from San Juan Grade Road to Old Stage Road and widen Old Stage Road to four lanes from Hebert Road to Natividad Road. Install traffic signal at Natividad Road. Add turn lanes on Old Stage Road from Natividad Road to Williams Road.
Espinosa Road Widening	Greater Salinas	Add turn lanes or passing lanes on Espinosa Road between SR-183 and US-101.

Source: Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Existing plus Project Buildout of the General Plan

Existing plus Project Conditions Buildout of the General Plan represents existing conditions plus full buildout of unincorporated County land allowed under the 2007 General Plan. The number of potential housing units that can be developed in unincorporated Monterey County was determined from the number of vacant residential lots and the assigned zoning within each planning or community area; calculated to be 35,918 new housing units beyond 2006.

Buildout of housing units was converted to an annual rate of development, calculated to be 417 housing units. Dividing the total amount of buildout development by the annual rate of development yielded the number of years to reach buildout, calculated to be 86 years beyond 2006, or the year 2092.

Employment projections are based on the rate of growth in housing units and population by maintaining the employee per housing unit ratio contained in the 2004 AMBAG land use forecasts. In this scenario, no changes were made to the land uses within incorporated areas.

The coastal areas (including Big Sur and the Del Monte Forest) do not include any growth as new development is not expected to occur in these areas.

This scenario uses the modified AMBAG base year roadway network reflecting 2008 conditions. No major improvement projects that would affect regional roadways have been constructed following the last revision to the model network. To develop buildout (year 2092) traffic projections the percent annual growth on each roadway segment between the base model (year 2000) and the Existing plus Project (buildout to the year 2092) scenario was applied over 84 years (2008 to 2092) to existing 2008 traffic volumes.

The traffic projections show traffic volumes on segments of U.S. 101 and SR-1 decreasing between base year and existing plus project conditions. This is due to changes in travel patterns because of upstream or downstream congestion (traffic finding alternative routes) and/or changes in proximity between jobs and housing changing overall commute patterns. As a conservative approach so that the projections do not result in negative growth, the traffic projections were adjusted to maintain a minimum of a 0.1% annual increase for all state highways. This methodology was utilized for all model scenarios.

Buildout Cumulative plus Project (Cumulative and Project Development to the Year 2092)

The Buildout Cumulative plus Project scenario forecasts year 2092 conditions. Development in unincorporated portions of the County was determined by the methodology described in the Existing plus Project (Buildout of the General

Plan) scenario described above. Development in the incorporated portion of the County was projected at three times the rate of development in the unincorporated portion of the County. This 3:1 ratio for development in the incorporated part of the County versus the unincorporated part of the County is based on projected housing unit development out to 2030 in the adopted 2004 and proposed 2008 AMBAG Population, Employment and Housing Unit forecasts. The AMBAG forecasts indicate that the incorporated areas grow at a rate three times that of unincorporated areas.

Employment in the incorporated portions of the County was increased at the same rate as the growth of housing units, based on a methodology to maintain a constant employee per housing unit ratio.

The network used for this scenario is the improved network, which includes the above-mentioned TAMC fee program and projected County improvement projects. No capital roadway projects were assumed beyond those identified for the year 2030 as described above.

To develop buildout (year 2092) traffic projections the percent annual growth on each roadway segment between the base model (year 2000) and the Existing plus Project (buildout to the year 2092) scenario was applied over 84 years (2008 to 2092) to existing 2008 traffic volumes.

4.6.3.3 Study Area

The roadways selected for inclusion in this analysis include all state highways within the County, Major County roads, regional arterials, and local roads with a current volume of at least 3,000 daily trips. This includes 281 segments on 100 different highways and roadways within Monterey County. The roadways included in the study area are shown on Exhibit 4.6.6.

In addition to Monterey County roadways, the analysis includes regional roadways external to the County that might be impacted by growth allowed under the General Plan in Santa Cruz, San Benito, and San Luis Obispo Counties. Regional roadways external to the county studied include:

- Santa Clara County
  - US Highway 101 - Cochrane Rd to E Dunne Ave
  - US Highway 101 - Masten Ave to Leavesley Rd/SR-152 West
  - US Highway 101 - Monterey Rd to SR-25
  - SR-152 -SR-156 to Merced County
- Santa Cruz County
  - SR-1 - Soquel Ave to 41st St
  - SR-1 - Airport Blvd to SR-152

- SR-1 - Harkins Slough Rd to SR-129
- SR-1 - SR-129 to Monterey County
- SR-17 - Santa Clara County to Granite Creek Rd
- SR-129 (Riverside Rd) - Lakeview Rd to Carlton Rd

- San Benito County
  - US Highway 101 - Santa Clara County to SR-129
  - SR-25 (Bolsa Rd) - Santa Clara County to SR-156
  - SR-156 - Salinas Rd to Union Rd
- San Luis Obispo County
  - US Highway 101 – Monterey County to San Miguel Ave

4.6.3.4 Criteria for Determining Significance

This EIR evaluates potential impacts under six thresholds of significance including roadway level of service, air traffic, roadway hazards, emergency access, parking and alternative transportation. These thresholds conform to CEQA impact assessment requirements. Each threshold of significance is described below.

- Roadway Level of Service – The General Plan does not specify the methodology or measure of performance used to determine level of service, which can vary depending on the characteristics and scale of the project. For analysis of the General Plan, the level of service (LOS) for roadway segments is based on the ratio of projected daily traffic volume to the capacity of the roadway (V/C Ratio). This measure is derived from the methodology contained in the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual. It is a planning methodology suitable for evaluating long-range impacts of large areas such as Monterey County. This measure is applied to two of the three tiers of impacts described earlier; Tier 2: county roads and Tier 3: regional roads and major roads in incorporated cities. This measure is not applied to the first tier of impacts-direct impacts-which are impacts specific to individual developments related to access and localized impacts. The LOS standard in the 2007 General Plan is LOS D and can be applied to either average daily traffic or peak hour traffic. For the analysis of the General Plan, the analysis is based on daily traffic volumes.

  The 2007 General Plan would have a significant effect on the street and highway system if the land use development allowed under the General Plan would:

  - Cause an increase in traffic, which would cause a State Highway or County roadway to fall below the County's adopted standard of LOS D, or add any traffic to a County roadway or State Highway that operates below LOS D without the project and the project worsens the LOS based

on the measure of performance. The exception to this criterion is Policy C-1.1 in the General Plan Update which allows a lower LOS standard as:

- established in the community planning process,
- facilities operating below LOS D at the time the 2007 General Plan is adopted if the project does not further degrade the measure of performance, and
- established in Area Plans.

- Air Traffic – Would the development allowed under the General Plan result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks;
- Roadway Hazards – Would the development allowed under the General Plan substantially increase hazards because of a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment);
- Emergency Access – Would the development allowed under the General Plan result in inadequate emergency access;
- Alternative Transportation – Would the development allowed under the General Plan 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.

4.6.3.5 Impact Analysis

This section describes the CEQA impact analysis relating to transportation impacts for the General Plan with development to 2030 and to buildout. It describes the methods used to determine the Project's impacts and identifies the thresholds used to conclude whether an impact would be significant. For each planning horizon and scenario, the roadway level of service impacts are presented in the three tiers described earlier; project-specific localized impacts, County roadways, and regional roadways (State Highways, major city streets, and regional roadways external to the County). Each scenario also presents a discussion of the impacts for the additional significance criteria. Measures to mitigate (avoid, minimize, rectify, reduce, eliminate, or compensate for) significant impacts accompany each impact discussion.

Roadway Level of Service

Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030

Project-Specific Impacts of the Project

Impact TRAN-1A: Development allowed under the 2007 General Plan would cause project-specific impacts on County roadways which would cause roadways to fall below the acceptable LOS standard D. (Less-Than-Significant Impact).

Impact of Development with Policies

Project-specific impacts of new development are localized impacts that affect the immediate surrounding transportation system, including access and circulation necessary for the development to function properly and safely. Direct impacts occur where new development needs to gain access to County roadways and/or where traffic generated by new development causes project-specific deficiencies in roadway or intersection operations in the immediate proximity of the development.

Project-specific impacts would occur with the first phases of development (the first uses to be constructed and occupied that require access to the transportation system). New development would be fully responsible for the implementation of mitigation measures or would be responsible for its fair-share of the mitigation depending on the extent of the impact and the development's contribution to the impact. Under 2007 General Plan policies new development is required to mitigate project-specific local impacts to maintain the County's LOS standard and to provide adequate access and circulation facilities. These policies restrict new development or require phasing of new development so that it is concurrent with transportation improvements.

2007 General Plan Policies

The 2007 General Plan policies summarized below set forth measures to minimize adverse impacts of project-specific localized impacts of development. These measures apply to the project-specific impacts of development, but also to measures that may improve LOS indirectly.

Circulation Element

Policy 1.3 requires developments that degrade roads beyond LOS D to establish a plan for improving those facilities. Policy 1.4 requires circulation improvements that mitigate project-specific localized development impacts to be constructed concurrently with the development or for the development to pay a fair share towards the

improvements. Policies 2.1, 2.2, and 2.7 require land uses to be located with access to transportation facilities and for those facilities to expedite access to the development. Policies C3.5, 4.3, 4.5, and 4.9 require development to design public facilities to accommodate pedestrians, bicycles, and transit thus reducing the impacts caused by automobile traffic.

Land Use Element

Policies LU 1.4 and 1.7 require development to occur only when adequate transportation facilities exist and to encourage phasing and clustering of development to provide for adequate long-range planning of infrastructure.

Area Plan Policies

The Area Plans contain a number of policies related to project-specific localized impacts. The Area Plan policies and mitigations would supplement those contained in the Area Plans, consistent with the 2007 General Plan.

North County Area Plan

The North County Area Plan Policy NC 1.1 requires new commercial development to minimize its traffic impacts through mitigation.

Greater Salinas Area Plan

The Greater Salinas Area Plan Policy GS 1.7 requires new development in the Spence/Potter/Encinal Road Area to study and mitigate its impact on highway access and road capacity.

Central Salinas Valley Area Plan

Central Salinas Valley Area Plan Policy 1.4 requires new development in the Spence/Potter/Encincal Road Area to study and mitigate its impact on highway access and road capacity.

Significance Determination

Project-specific impacts of new development are localized impacts that affect the immediate surrounding transportation system, including access and circulation necessary for the development to function properly and safely. Project-specific impacts occur where new development needs to gain access to county roadways and/or where traffic generated by new development causes project-specific deficiencies in roadway or intersection operations. Project-specific impacts would occur with the first phases of development.

New development is required to prepare a project-level traffic study, or project-level Environmental Impact Report. Impacts to roadway LOS or project access would be identified in these studies and development would be fully responsible for the implementation of mitigation measures or would be responsible for its fair-share of the mitigation depending on the extent of the impact and the development's contribution to the impact. If a roadway already falls below the County's LOS standard, then the development is required to mitigate its impact so that the measure of performance (e.g., volume to capacity ratio, peak hour average delay, etc.) of the roadway does not degrade beyond the level without the development. This is a less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

Impacts are less than significant, therefore no mitigation is necessary.

Significance Conclusion

Implementation of the 2007 General Plan consistent with policies related to project-specific localized impacts (Policy C-1.4, new development is required to mitigate project-specific local impacts to maintain the County's LOS standard and to provide adequate access and circulation facilities. Policy C-1.3 restricts new development or requires the phasing of new development so that it is concurrent with transportation improvements) would have a less than significant impact and no mitigation is required.

County and Regional Roadway Level of Service Impacts (Existing plus Project Development to the year 2030)

Impact 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. (Significant and Unavoidable Impact)

Impact of Development with Policies

The LOS on study area roadways for the Existing plus Project Development to the year 2030 is shown in Exhibit 4.6.7. A detailed analysis of roadway level of service by segment is included in the Appendix.

Table 4.6-13 shows the roadway segments operating at deficient LOS D, LOS E or LOS F under this scenario and compares the segments to their LOS under existing conditions. Some roadway segments experience an improvement in the volume to capacity ratio as a result of the 2007 General

Plan. This is due to a change in traffic patterns in the future causing the redistribution of housing and jobs.

As shown in Table 4.6-13, there are 10 segments that operate at LOS E and 25 segments that operate at LOS F in this scenario. In comparison, under existing conditions, 29 of the segments in Table 4.6-14 currently operate at LOS E or F. The development in the County up to the year 2030 causes an additional six roadway segments to exceed the county's LOS threshold. Impacts of the 2007 General Plan within the Carmel Valley Plan Area are discussed in the next section (Year 2030 Cumulative Conditions with Project).

Table 4.6-14. County Roadway Segments Operating at LOS E or F under Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030

		Existing Conditions		Existing + Project Development to the Year 2030	
Roadway Segment		V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS
Roadway Segments Operating at LOS F					
County Road G11 (San Juan Rd)	Salinas Rd to San Miguel Canyon Rd	0.942	E	1.087	F
County Road G12 (Salinas)	Porter Dr to Railroad Ave	1.236	F	1.226	F
County Road G12 (Elkhorn Rd)	Salinas Rd to Hall Rd	1.339	F	1.185	F
County Road G12 (Hall Rd)	Elkhorn Rd to San Miguel Canyon Rd	1.879	F	1.627	F
County Road G12 (San Miguel Canyon Rd)	Strawberry Rd to Castroville Blvd	1.485	F	1.216	F
County Road G12 (San Miguel Canyon Rd)	Castroville Blvd to US-101	1.486	F	1.130	F
County Road G14 (Jolon)	US-101 to San Lucas Rd	0.582	D	1.062	F
County Road G17 (River Rd)	Las Palmas Rd to Las Palmas Pkwy	0.805	D	1.007	F
Blanco Rd	Cooper Rd to Armstrong Rd	2.146	F	2.100	F
Blanco Rd	Armstrong Rd to Davis Rd	2.292	F	2.242	F
Carpenter St	Serra Ave to SR-1	1.354	F	1.433	F
Davis Rd	Blanco Rd to Reservation Rd	0.958	E	1.021	F
Ocean Ave	Carmel City Line to SR-1	1.229	F	1.271	F
Pine Canyon Rd (King City)	Merrit St to Jolon Rd	0.583	D	1.646	F
Porter Dr	San Juan Rd to Santa Cruz County Line	1.423	F	1.471	F

Roadway Segment		Existing Conditions V/C Ratio	Existing Conditions LOS	Existing + Project Development to the Year 2030 V/C Ratio	Existing + Project Development to the Year 2030 LOS
Rio Rd	Carmel City Line to SR-1	1.161	F	1.219	F
San Juan Grade Rd	Salinas City Line to Russell Rd	1.015	F	1.164	F
San Juan Grade Rd	Russell Rd to Rogge Rd	0.747	D	1.014	F
Roadway Segments Operating at LOS E					
County Road G11 (San Juan Rd)	Aromas Rd to Carpenteria Rd	0.938	E	0.967	E
Abbott St	SH 101 to Salinas City Line	0.896	E	0.878	E
Carpenter St	Carmel City Line to Serra Ave	0.828	E	0.802	E
Espinosa Rd	SR-183 to US-101	0.896	E	0.896	E
Harris Rd	Spreckels Blvd to Abbott St	0.844	E	0.813	E
Hebert Rd	San Juan Grade Rd to Old Stage Rd	0.443	D	0.885	E
Old Stage Rd	Hebert Rd to Natividad Rd	0.488	D	0.933	E
Porter Dr	Salinas Rd to San Juan Rd	0.967	E	0.942	E
Russell Rd	SR-101 to San Juan Grade Rd	0.661	D	0.802	E

Source: Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Table 4.6-15 presents the roadway segments operating at LOS E or LOS F under Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030 conditions and compares the segments to their LOS under existing conditions. Exhibit 4.6.7 presents the segment LOS graphically. A detailed table showing the volume, the volume to capacity ratio and the resulting LOS for each Regional roadway segment is included in the Appendix. There are six (6) regional roadway segments that operate at LOS E and 51 segments that operate at LOS F under this scenario. Under existing conditions, 55 of these Regional roadway segments operate at LOS E or F, so development in the County up to the year 2030 causes an additional two (2) roadway segments to exceed the County's LOS threshold.

Table 4.6-15. Regional Roadway Segments Operating at LOS E or F under Existing plus Project (Horizon Year 2030) Conditions

Roadway Segment		Existing Conditions V/C Ratio	Existing Conditions LOS	Existing + Project Development to the Year 2030 V/C Ratio	Existing + Project Development to the Year 2030 LOS
Roadway Segments Operating at LOS F in the Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030 Scenario					
US Highway 101	County Border to Crazy Horse Canyon Rd	1.044	F	1.067	F
US Highway 101	Crazy Horse Canyon Rd to San Miguel Canyon Rd	0.989	E	1.011	F
US Highway 101	San Miguel Canyon Rd to SR-156	1.441	F	1.474	F
US Highway 101	SR-156 to Pesante Rd	1.106	F	1.131	F
US Highway 101	Pesante Rd to Espinosa Rd	1.106	F	1.131	F
US Highway 101	Espinosa Rd to E Boronda Rd	1.098	F	1.123	F
US Highway 101	E Boronda Rd to W Laurel Dr	1.143	F	1.169	F
US Highway 101	W Laurel Dr to N Main St	1.107	F	1.140	F
US Highway 101	N Main St to E Market St	1.172	F	1.198	F
US Highway 101	E Market St to John St	1.114	F	1.145	F
SR-1	Salinas Rd to Struve Rd	1.546	F	1.582	F
SR-1	Struve Rd to Dolan Rd	1.667	F	1.703	F
SR-1	Dolan Rd to Molera Rd	1.496	F	1.530	F
SR-1	Molera Rd to SR-183	1.426	F	1.458	F
SR-1	Fremont Blvd to Canyon del Rey Blvd	1.006	F	1.027	F
SR-1	Canyon del Rey Blvd to Del Monte Ave	1.071	F	1.094	F
SR-1	N Fremont St to Aguajito Rd	1.411	F	1.443	F
SR-68 (Holman Highway)	Forest Ave to 17 Mile Dr	1.448	F	1.552	F
SR-68 (Holman Highway)	17 Mile Dr to Skyline Forest Dr	1.638	F	1.761	F
SR-68 (Holman Highway)	Skyline Forest Dr to CHOMP Dwy	1.638	F	1.761	F
SR-68 (Holman Highway)	CHOMP Dwy to SR-1	1.638	F	1.742	F
SR-68 (Monterey Salinas Highway)	SR-1 to Olmsted Rd	1.422	F	1.464	F
SR-68 (Monterey Salinas Highway)	Olmsted Rd to Canyon del Rey Blvd	1.422	F	1.431	F

Roadway Segment		Existing Conditions		Existing + Project Development to the Year 2030	
		V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS
SR-68 (Monterey Salinas Highway)	Canyon del Rey Blvd to Bit Rd	1.304	F	1.331	F
SR-68 (Monterey Salinas Highway)	Bit Rd to Laureles Grade Rd	1.304	F	1.307	F
SR-68 (Monterey Salinas Highway)	Laureles Grade Rd to Corral de Tierra	1.525	F	1.552	F
SR-68 (Monterey Salinas Highway)	Corral de Tierra to Portola Dr	1.617	F	1.638	F
SR-156	Castroville Blvd to US-101	1.902	F	1.939	F
SR-183 (Merritt St)	SR-156 to Blackie Rd	1.184	F	1.202	F
SR-183 (Castroville Rd)	Blackie Rd to Espinosa Rd	1.074	F	1.049	F
SR-218 (Canyon del Rey Blvd)	Fremont Blvd to Carlton Dr	1.099	F	1.130	F
SR-218 (Canyon del Rey Blvd)	Carlton Dr to SR-68	1.099	F	1.164	F
Foam St	Prescott Ave to Drake Ave	1.156	F	2.258	F
Foam St	Drake Ave to Lighthouse Ave	1.277	F	2.392	F
Lighthouse Ave	Prescott Ave to Private Bolio Rd	1.637	F	1.045	F
Lighthouse Ave	Private Bolio Rd to Pacific St	1.270	F	1.188	F
Lighthouse Ave	Pacific St to Washington St	1.124	F	1.061	F
Del Monte Ave	Washington St to Camino Aguajito	1.314	F	1.304	F
Del Monte Ave	Camino Aguajito to Casa Verde Wy	1.313	F	1.288	F
Del Monte Ave	Casa Verde Wy to SR-1	1.443	F	1.421	F
Fremont St	Abrego St to Camino Aguajito	1.065	F	1.052	F
Munras Ave/Abrego St	Soledad Dr to Via Zaragoza	1.226	F	1.338	F
Del Monte Blvd	SR-1 to Canyon del Rey Blvd	1.039	F	1.016	F
Del Monte Blvd	Canyon del Rey Blvd to Broadway Ave	1.058	F	1.049	F
Del Monte Blvd	SR-1 to Reindollar Ave	1.081	F	1.029	F
Del Monte Blvd	Reindollar Ave to Reservation Rd	1.929	F	1.838	F
John St	Abbott St to US-101	1.069	F	1.065	F
Davis Rd	W Laurel Dr to SR-183	1.057	F	1.110	F
Davis Rd	SR-183 to W Blanco Rd	2.428	F	2.521	F

Roadway Segments Operating at LOS E in the Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030 Scenario

Roadway Segment		Existing Conditions V/C Ratio	Existing Conditions LOS	Existing + Project Development to the Year 2030 V/C Ratio	Existing + Project Development to the Year 2030 LOS
US Highway 101	John St to S Sanborn Rd	0.897	D	0.918	E
SR-1	Holman Hwy to Carpenter St	0.890	D	0.945	E
SR-183 (Castroville Rd)	Espinosa Rd to Cooper Rd	1.012	F	0.988	E
N Fremont St	Casa Verde Wy to SR-218	0.971	E	0.981	E
Sanborn Rd	US-101 to Abbott St	0.983	E	0.974	E
S Main St	Romie Ln to E Blanco Rd	0.817	D	0.854	E

Source: Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Table 4.6-16 presents compares existing and Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030 roadway LOS on Regional roadways external to Monterey County. Traffic generated by the land uses allowed under the 2007 General Plan will produce inter-county travel between housing and jobs in Santa Cruz, San Benito, and Santa Clara counties, and to a lesser extent San Luis Obispo County. The affects of this inter-county travel is shown in the table.

The Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030 is project level analysis required under CEQA. Under this scenario some of the external roadway segments experience an improvement over existing conditions. This is because the Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030 only considers development of unincorporated Monterey County and does not include growth in incorporated Monterey County, or any growth in adjacent counties. Therefore, in this scenario where only growth unincorporated County is considered, there is a better balance of housing and jobs (both in numbers and proximity) within unincorporated Monterey County than if cumulative growth elsewhere were considered as well. This housing and jobs balance results in trips remaining internal to communities within unincorporated Monterey County and traveling shorter distances. This effect on travel is not found to this extent under cumulative conditions.

Table 4.6-16. Roadway Level of Service of Facilities External to Monterey County under Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030

		Existing Conditions		Existing + Project Development to the Year 2030	
Roadway Segment		V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS
Santa Clara County					
US Highway 101	Cochrane Rd to E Dunne Ave	1.139	F	0.882	D
US Highway 101	Masten Ave to Leavesley Rd/SR-152 West	0.989	E	0.858	D
US Highway 101	Monterey Rd to SR-25	1.071	F	1.007	F
SR-152	SR-156 to Merced County	0.630	C	0.632	C
Santa Cruz County					
SR-1	Soquel Ave to 41st St	1.368	F	1.101	F
SR-1	Airport Blvd to SR-152	0.876	D	0.674	C
SR-1	Harkings Slough Rd to SR-129	0.608	C	0.466	B
SR-1	SR-129 to Monterey County	0.492	B	0.363	B
SR-17	Santa Clara County to Granite Creek Rd	0.958	E	1.005	F
SR-129 (Riverside Rd)	Lakeview Rd to Carlton Rd	0.847	D	0.871	D
San Benito County					
US Highway 101	Santa Clara County to SR-129	0.912	E	0.848	D
SR-25 (Bolsa Rd)	Santa Clara County to SR-156	1.196	F	1.080	F
SR-156	Salinas Rd to Union Rd	1.706	F	1.742	F
San Luis Obispo County					
US Highway 101	Monterey County to San Miguel Ave	0.300	A	0.308	A

Source: Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Impact of Goods Movement on Roadway Level of Service

The county's current truck traffic generation is expected to increase from 12,600 truck trips per day (2006) to 18,600 in 2030. This increase in freight movement is not significant enough to cause widespread capacity-related impacts, but will contribute large vehicle traffic to roadways and highways that are currently, or are projected to fall below the County's acceptable LOS standard and may cause the localized impacts on heavily traveled freight

routes (e.g., Highways 1, 101, 156, and 183) and within industrialized areas where truck traffic originates.

2007 General Plan Policies

The 2007 General Plan policies summarized below set forth measures to minimize adverse impacts on level of service.

Circulation Element

The Circulation element contains a number of policies to mitigate the traffic impacts of the development allowed under the 2007 General Plan. These policies range from establishing performance standards to mechanisms to identify impacts and fund infrastructure improvements to requiring infrastructure for promoting the use of alternatives to the automobile. These policies are described below.

Circulation Element Policy 1.1sets a standard of LOS D on County roads establishing a minimum threshold beyond which mitigation measures are required. Policy1.2 sets standards for how to identify and implement transportation improvements to mitigate significant impacts, and Policy 1.3 requires developments that degrade roads beyond LOS D, or contribute traffic to roadways already exceeding LOS D, to establish a plan for improving those facilities.

Policy 1.4 requires circulation improvements that mitigate development impacts to be constructed concurrently with the development or for the development to pay a fair share towards the improvements. Policies C1.5 and 1.10 require transportation agencies to work together to improve congestion. This would occur through coordination of regional and countywide traffic impact fees, and development of the Regional Transportation Plan.

Policies 1.6 through1.9, and 1.11 address funding of transportation improvements by establishing impact fees, finding alternative funding sources, and prioritizing transportation funding. The County is currently preparing a countywide nexus study for establishing a Countywide Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee.

Policies 2.4 through 2.6 encourage reduction in personal automobile usage in favor of bicycle and transit usage to reduce the LOS impact caused by traffic generation. Policies 3.5, 4.3, 4.5, and 4.9 address the design of public facilities to accommodate pedestrians, bicycles, and transit to provide the necessary infrastructure to accommodate these modes and reduce traffic.

Public transit service, an important strategy in reducing traffic impacts, is addressed in Circulation Element Policies 6.1 through 6.9 by encouraging coordinated service between providers, regular

service for mobility-impaired people, and service to major traffic generating events or uses. Policies 8.1 through 8.4 encourage rail transportation to commercial centers and transit-oriented development to encourage use of public transportation, and to create mixed-use centers where walking and bicycling are viable modes of transportation. Policies 10.1through 10.7 promote bicycle as an alternative mode of travel by providing bike routes and bike parking along major roadways and visitor destinations.

Area Plan Policies

The Area Plans contain a number of policies related to LOS and mitigating traffic impacts. The Area Plan policies and mitigations would supplement those contained in the General Plan, consistent with the 2007 General Plan.

North County Area Plan

The North County Area Plan Policy 1.1 requires new commercial development in proximity to housing so that residents can minimize long distance travel and reduce traffic impacts. Policy 2.1 addresses providing a bypass of Highway 101 north of Salinas to provide additional highway capacity, and improve access to new development to minimize impacts to county and local roads.

Central Salinas Valley Area Plan

Central Salinas Valley Area Plan Policy 1.4 requires new development in the Spence/Potter/Encincal Road Area to analyze and mitigate its road capacity impacts.

Greater Monterey Peninsula Area Plan

The Greater Monterey Peninsula Area Plan Policies 2.1 through 2.5 and 2.7 encourage transit use to decrease peak hour traffic and LOS impacts. These policies also provide for roadway improvements to Highway 68 and its alternate routes to improve existing and future deficiencies.

Greater Salinas Area Plan

The Greater Salinas Area Plan Policy 1.7 requires new development in the Spence/Potter/Encinal Road Area to study and mitigate the impact on highway access and road capacity. Policies 2.1 and 2.2 address congestion on Highway 101 by encouraging the bypass to add capacity and improve access. These policies also specify the need to design and implement an additional bypass road around Salinas (Western Bypass).

Carmel Valley Master Plan

The Carmel Valley Master Plan Policies 2.1, 2.3 through 2.6, and 2.13 through 2.15 encourage alternate modes of transportation including transit, bicycle, and pedestrian access to provide viable alternatives to driving and to reduce traffic impacts. They also consider improvements to Carmel Valley Road which would mitigate existing deficiencies and future LOS impacts. Policy 2.12 provides recommendations for road improvements to Highway 1, Laureles Grade, and Carmel Valley Road to achieve LOS C or LOS D as specified in the plan. Policy 2.19 requires evaluation and monitoring of streets and highways to identify when to implement improvements to meet LOS standards.

Toro Area Plan

Toro Area Plan Policies 2.1 through 2.7 and 2.9 through 2.10. encourage roadway and transit improvements to relieve congestion and identify funding sources from new developments.

Cachagua Area Plan

Cachagua Area Plan Policy 2.6 requires LOS C as an acceptable LOS within the planning area. New development in this plan area is required to meet this standard and mitigate impacts to maintain the standard.

South County Area Plan

The South County Area Plan Policy 1.2 encourages clustered development, which contributes to the mitigation of LOS impacts by creating an environment where people can walk, bicycle, or use transit as an alternative to driving.

2007 General Plan Policies Related to Goods Movement

The 2007 General Plan policies summarized below set forth measures to address the impacts of goods movement on traffic level of service.

Circulation Element

Circulation Element Policies C 2.1 and 2.3 encourages establishing safety standards to guide land use for safe operation of the transportation system, including land uses that support freight movement, and for land uses requiring commodity movement to be given adequate access to transportation facilities. Policies C 4.10 and 4.11 encourage improvement and maintenance of roads that carry significant amounts of freight traffic and provide for off-street loading areas.

Agricultural Element

Agricultural Element Policy 6.1 encourages improvement of the regional transportation system to support the agricultural industry. This would include providing adequate capacity to accommodate increases in truck traffic.

Area Plan Policies Related to Goods Movement

A limited number of Area Plans contain policies related to goods movement. The Area Plan policies would supplement those contained in the General Plan, and are consistent with the 2007 General Plan policies.

Greater Monterey Peninsula Area Plan

The Greater Monterey Peninsula Area Plan Policy GMP 2.3 discourages heavy vehicles from using the Laureles Grade.

Greater Salinas Area Plan

The Greater Salinas Area Plan Policy 2.1 establishes a priority for the improvement of Highway 68 including the construction of alternate passing lanes, which would reduce the impacts of trucks on grades and narrow segments. Policy 2.3 identifies improvements to Laureles Grade such as shoulder widening, passing lanes, and paved turn-outs that increase safety for larger vehicles. At the same time, this policy also discourages use of heavy vehicles on Laureles Grade.

Carmel Valley Master Plan

Carmel Valley Master Plan Policy 2.15 supports consideration for a northbound climbing lane on Laureles Grade.

Cachagua Area Plan

The Cachagua Area Plan Policy CACH 2.5 requires projects that generate heavy vehicles to restore and maintain roads to their existing condition.

Agricultural and Winery Corridor Plan (AWCP)

Policy 3.7 requires that access to facilities in the AWCP shall be designed to meet safe sight distance standards as determined by the Monterey County Public Works department, particularly for uses that generate truck traffic.

Significance Determination

Development and land use allowed under the 2007 General Plan would increase traffic volumes on County roads, Regional roads, and regional roads external to the County. This added traffic would both cause roadway segments to exceed the County's LOS standard, and contribute traffic to roadways that exceed the LOS standard without development, and further degrade the performance measure.

The 2007 General Plan and Area Plans establish policies to mitigate or reduce these impacts. These policies encourage alternative modes of travel including public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian modes to reduce the use of automobiles. They encourage compact, mixed-use, and transit-oriented development in developed areas in patterns that have been demonstrated to reduce traffic. In combination, these policies serve to decrease the number of trips by vehicle and decrease the total length of trips, which in turn minimizes degradation of LOS. The policies in the general plan also provide a funding mechanism, through implementation of a countywide traffic impact fee, and coordination with a regional traffic impact fee. These resources are intended to provide funding for transportation improvements.

Despite development contributions to project-specific local impacts (through project-level mitigation), county impacts (through countywide traffic impact fee), and regional impacts (through regional traffic impact fee) there will remain a funding shortfall for the implementation of the financially constrained capital facilities in the Regional Transportation Plan. Implementation of the mitigation listed above in conjunction with the 2007 General Plan policies, and working collaboratively with cities and regional agencies would contribute to the mitigation of roadway LOS impacts. However, even with the adoption of county and regional impact fees, which fund a limited number of transportation facilities, traffic impacts to County and regional roadways will remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is feasible. Mitigation of the LOS impacts described above would require a substantial number of County and Regional roadway widening, and intersection modifications to provide enough capacity to achieve the County's LOS D standard on all impacted segments, some outside of Monterey County. Additionally, mitigation would include substantial increases in public transportation services.

Many of the mitigations for these roadways segments are infeasible due to physical, topographical, and environmental constraints, as well the social and economic impacts related to the acquisition of commercial and residential property, or loss of access, for roadway capacity-enhancing projects. The foremost constraint, however, is funding of transportation facilities. Federal, state and regional funding are limited, and most of these funds are used to maintain the transportation system. The County

and TAMC are planning to implement Traffic Impact Fees to fund improvement projects, but the amount of the fees are limited for affordability and total fee burden reasons.

The County and regional fee programs will continuously be updated, adding additional priority projects to the programs as initial projects are completed, but the rate of project completion will not be able to outpace the rate of development growth.

Significance Conclusion

Implementation of the 2007 General Plan would have a significant and unavoidable impact on County roads, and Regional roads both within and external to Monterey County. The County has developed a list of capital improvements to be included in a countywide traffic impact fee, as described above. In addition, TAMC has adopted a list of capital improvements to be funded by their adopted Regional Traffic Impact Fee. Neither the County nor TAMC projects fully mitigate the impacts of the 2007 General Plan, but provide significant improvement to County and Regional roadway segments beyond existing conditions and Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030 conditions. Therefore, impacts remain significant and unavoidable.

Air Traffic

Impact 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.

Impact of Development with Policies

The 2007 General Plan increases the allowable amount of development within the County, which would cause an increase in demand for commercial passenger, general aviation, and freight-related air travel. Development of the Agricultural and Winery Corridor Plan (AWCP) will increase the area as a tourist destination, and therefore will contribute to increased commercial and private passenger air travel. Although the increase in air travel related to the AWCP will increase gradually through 2030 as new winery facilities develop over time. However, the General Plan does not require any changes to air traffic patterns.

Further, the 2007 General Plan includes development near airports. Specifically, Policy 2.12 in the Land Use Element allows for the Hwy 68/Monterey Peninsula Airport Affordable Housing Overlay which will increase housing and density in an 85 acre area adjacent to the Monterey

Peninsula Airport. The overlay area is to the south of the airport and not within the approach or departure flight paths of the runways.

2007 General Plan Policies

The 2007 General Plan policies summarized below set forth measures to minimize impacts of air traffic.

Circulation Element

Circulation Element Policies 7.1 through 7.5 promote safe, efficient air facilities. They provide for appropriate land uses around air facilities in order to mitigate noise and safety impacts on land use. The policies also provide for control of the impact of private air facilities on agricultural land use and surrounding areas.

Area Plan Policies

The Area Plans contain policies related to air traffic. The Area Plan policies and mitigations would supplement those contained in the General Plan, consistent with the 2007 General Plan.

Greater Monterey Peninsula Area Plan

The Greater Monterey Peninsula Area Plan Policies 2. 8 and 4.2 require that development under the runway approaches of the Monterey Peninsula and Marina Municipal Airports be low intensity and not interfere with airport operations. It encourages adoption of noise and land use compatibility standards.

Cachagua Area Plan

The Cachagua Area Plan Policy 2.3 requires private airstrips to obtain a use permit to ensure that they do not negatively impact neighboring areas or flight paths from existing airports.

Significance Determination

Development of the land uses allowed under the 2007 General Plan by the year 2030 would result in an increase in demand for air travel. Passenger travel in Monterey County peaked in 1978 with about 640,000 passengers annually. Since that time passenger travel has declined to nearly half of its peak (Monterey Airport District, 2008). Without adding additional capacity at airports, the current passenger level could increase to at least 640,000 passengers annually without impacting airport operations (a 96% increase).

Land use growth proposed in the general Plan and specifically the Hwy 68/Monterey Peninsula Airport Affordable Housing Overlay will not be located within airport flight paths, and will not be design in such a way as to

become an incompatible land use (i.e., high rise buildings). No change in airport location is being proposed in the 2007 General Plan. (Less than Significant Impact).

Mitigation Measures

Impacts would be less than significant, therefore no mitigation measures are necessary.

Significance Conclusion

The development of the General Plan would increase the demand for the air travel. The General Plan contains policies to encourage safe operations of air facilities and land uses surrounding the airports that are consistent with airport operations. Airport passenger demand is significantly less than it was in 1978 and therefore can accommodate substantial increases without increasing the capacity of airports. Impacts of the General Plan policies under Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030 are less than significant.

Roadway Hazards

Impact TRAN 1-D: Growth in land uses allowed under 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. (Less Than Significant)

Impact of Development with Policies

The development of the 2007 General Plan would allow the development of land uses that create hazards to various modes of transportation. This impact would include the provision of access to development that does not meet County design standards (such as inadequate sight distance, roadway curvature failing to meet design speed standards, etc.). This impact also includes the development of land uses that generate types of traffic incompatible with surrounding land uses and transportation facilities (such as industrial uses adjacent to, and gaining access from, local residential streets or schools). Incompatible types of traffic include slow-moving farm vehicles using roadways in urban or urbanizing areas.

As Monterey County develops, residential and commercial development may occur adjacent to or within current rural agricultural areas, increasing the conflict between uses and types of traffic.

2007 General Plan Policies

The 2007 General Plan policies summarized below set forth measures to minimize potential impacts of non-standard roadway design or incompatible land uses.

Circulation Element

Circulation Element policies provide for safety of the transportation network by requiring safety standards, providing for protection against incompatible land uses, and designing or expanding new roads to current standards. Policy 1.2 requires development and adoption of a Capital Improvement and Financing Plan (CIFP) and implementing ordinances that identify mechanisms to improve County roadways to meet design standards and improve safety. Policy 2.3 requires the use of safety standards established by transportation-related agencies to guide new development and transportation improvements. Policy 4.2 ensures that new roads and internal circulation roads are constructed to County standards. Policy 4.8 maintains the County's roadway safety programs that identify and improve hazardous or non-standard roadway designs.

Related to compatibility of land uses, Policy 2.2 protects existing and proposed public transportation facilities from the encroachment of incompatible land uses that would create unsafe development access or traffic conditions, or disallows uses that generate incompatible types of traffic from accessing major streets (e.g., farm equipment accessing major arterial roadways). Policy 7.1 prohibits any land use activities that would interfere with safe operations of aircraft, such as multi-story buildings within flight paths. Policies 7.2 and 7.4 ensures that proposed land uses in the vicinity of public airports are compatible with the airport comprehensive land use plan, and Policy 7.5 requires regulation of private airfields so that they do not impact agricultural lands, existing airport operations, public facilities, or neighboring areas. Policy 9.1 requires land uses in the vicinity of harbors to be compatible with commercial and recreational harbor operations.

Agricultural Element

Policy 6.1 encourages and supports improvement of regional transportation systems to support the needs of the agricultural industry (including safety design features).

Safety Element

Safety Element Policy 4.9 requires that roadways be constructed and maintained in accordance with Monterey County Code or the California Fire Code, which establishes minimum clear widths to

accommodate fire fighting apparatus, large freight vehicles, and emergency service providers.

Area Plan Policies

The Area Plans contain a number of policies related to non-standard design or incompatible land uses. The Area Plan policies would supplement those contained in the 2007 General Plan.

Carmel Valley Master Plan

The Carmel Valley Master Plan Policies 2.10 and 2.11encourage improvements to existing roadways, such as shoulder improvements on sharp curves on Esquiline Road. They also provide for channelization and tapers at access points on Carmel Valley Road for safety improvements.

Toro Area Plan

The Toro Area Plan Policy 2.7 limits new direct access points for single family residences along Highway 68 and limits them along other routes in the planning area in order to mitigate the impact of incompatible land use access onto major traffic corridors.

Cachagua Area Plan

The Cachagua Area Plan Policy 2.1 requires the signing and marking of roadways to alert all users to unusual or dangerous conditions.

Agricultural and Winery Corridor Plan

The AWCP contains development standards to ensure new development provides safe transportation facilities in this rural corridor.

The AWCP development standards include a standard for access design that requires access to facilities where the general public is allowed to meet safe sight distance standards.

Significance Determination

Development of the land uses allowed under the 2007 General Plan by the year 2030 would result in non-standard or hazardous designs and incompatible facilities with adjoining land uses. The General Plan provides for policies to prevent or reduce these impacts by requiring roads to be designed to safety standards. These policies require new development to design facilities to County standards. They also provide for road safety programs (signing, marking, and improved sight distance) to improve overall safety. The 2007 General Plan also has policies to limit incompatible land

uses. Therefore, the impact of roadway hazards with implementation the 2007 General Plan is less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation measures beyond the 2007 General Plan are necessary.

Significance Conclusion

The development under the General Plan would result in non-standard or hazardous transportation facility designs or land uses that are incompatible with public facilities. However, the 2007 General Plan contains policies to ensure that new development provides access and improvements to the county roadway system to meet County standards. It also contains policies to prevent incompatible land uses to avoid transportation conflicts and roadway hazards. Therefore, the impact is less than significant.

Emergency Access

Impact TRAN 1-E: Growth in land uses allowed under the 2007 General Plan would result in inadequate emergency access. (Significant and Unavoidable)

Impact of Development with Policies

The development under the 2007 General Plan would impact the response time for emergency vehicles on roadways projected to exceed the County standard LOS D. This impact would occur in the more developed areas of the County (i.e., North County, Greater Monterey Peninsula, Carmel Valley, and some Community Areas) which experience higher concentrations of roadways operating at LOS E or F.

The development of the Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030 will cause 114 County and Regional roadway segments to exceed LOS D, which would have an impact on emergency vehicle response time.

2007 General Plan Policies

The 2007 General Plan policies summarized below set forth measures to minimize impacts on emergency vehicles.

The General Plan Land Use Element and Public Services Element support limiting growth outside of areas where infrastructure and services are available.

Circulation Element

The Circulation Element contains policies to identify and mitigate impacts to roadway level of service, as well as establish mechanisms to fund transportation projects to improve level of service. These policies are described under the Roadway Level of Service section above.

Land Use Element

Land Use Element Policy 1.4 focuses urban growth in areas where there are adequate levels of service for emergency response to avoid inadequate response because of lack of emergency provider facilities and long distances. Police 1.19 (Evaluation System) would result in a low ranking, if not a failing score, for new subdivisions in remote areas, since these would not comply with General Plan policies regarding water, sewer, and services. Development on existing lots of record are exempted from this policy and these new homes, if constructed in remote areas, would not be expected to receive services in the same timeframe as other new residential development. The General Plan policies include maximum response times that range from 5-8 minutes in urban areas to as high as 45 minutes in rural areas. Nevertheless, because of existing development and future development on lots of record in more remote areas and highway congestion, emergency response time less than the policy maximums may difficult to achieve.

Safety Element

Safety Element Policies 4.9 and 5.15 require roadways to be constructed according to the fire code, which establishes minimum clear widths to accommodate fire fighting apparatus and emergency service providers, and be designed for tsunami evacuation along developed coastal areas where appropriate. Policy 5.14 considers all public thoroughfares, private roads, and deeded emergency accesses as potential evacuation routes, and identifies “Pre-designated Emergency Evacuation Routes”. Policy 5.15 identifies Tsunami Evacuation Routes as any route in an incorporated or unincorporated area leading inland away from the coastline to higher elevations.

Area Plan Policies

The Area Plans contain policies related to emergency vehicle response. The Area Plan policies and mitigations would supplement those contained in the General Plan, consistent with the 2007 General Plan.

Carmel Valley Master Plan

The Carmel Valley Master Plan Policy 4.4 requires secondary emergency road connections for emergency access to mitigate impact of traffic congestion on emergency response.

Significance Determination

Development of the land uses allowed under the 2007 General Plan under Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030 would result in inadequate emergency access due to increases in traffic that result in County and Regional roadways exceeding County LOS standards, and creating traffic congestion that slows emergency response time.

The General Plan policies discussed above address transportation related impacts to emergency response due to congestion, and design. However, even with the adoption of county and regional impact fees, and implementation of proposed transportation improvements at the County and Regional level, traffic impacts to County and Regional roadway level of service will remain significant and unavoidable, and thereby cause an impact to emergency response that significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

As stated in the Roadway Level of Service impacts discussion above, mitigation of LOS impacts would require a substantial number of County and Regional roadway widening and intersection modifications to provide enough capacity to achieve the County's LOS D standard on all impacted segments. Many of the mitigations for these roadways segments are infeasible due to physical, topographical, and environmental constraints, as well the social and economic impacts related to the acquisition of commercial and residential property, or loss of access, for roadway capacity-enhancing projects. The foremost constraint, however, is funding of transportation facilities. The County and TAMC are planning to implement Traffic Impact Fees to fund improvement projects, but the amount of the fees are limited for affordability, and total fee burden. Therefore, no mitigation that improves the LOS on all County and Regional roadways is feasible.

Mitigation Measure TRAN-1E: New Policy C-X.XX on increasing roadway connectivity to enhance emergency access.

C-X.XX: Emergency Response Routes and Street Connectivity Plans. The 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.

Significance Conclusion

The development allowed in the 2007 General Plan would generate traffic that would cause County and Regional roadways to exceed the County's LOS D standard, and contribute to roadways that exceed the standard without development, causing traffic congestion that would impact emergency response time. This is a significant and unavoidable impact.

Alternative Transportation

Impact TRAN 1-F: Development allowed under 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. (Less than Significant)

Impact of Development with Policies

Development under the 2007 General Plan would be concentrated in Community Areas, Rural Centers, and Affordable Housing Opportunity overlays. The land uses and the design of sites and neighborhoods in these areas would be compatible with alternatives to the automobile (e.g., walking, biking and transit) due to size and residential density.

Bicycling, walking, and transit are less attractive alternatives to the automobile when greater distances are involved. Further, lower density development spread over a larger area is effective to serve by transit than higher density, mixed-use communities. The 2007 General Plan allows for a combination of low density spread development patterns and higher density mixed-use development in central locations. Through the policies established in the General Plan, either type of development would design for, and encourage walking and bicycling, and transit use to the extent transit service is provided. This is a less than significant impact.

2007 General Plan Policies

The 2007 General Plan contains policies to encourage alternate modes of travel by providing transit service, pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure and compact, mixed-use development.

Circulation Element

Many of the policies in the circulation element "encourage" shifts to alternate modes of travel (Policies 2.1, 2.2, 2.5, 3.5, 4.3), but some policies require infrastructure and site design that supports transportation choice. Policy 2.7 requires that new development be located and designed with convenient access and efficient transportation for all intended users, and where possible consider alternative transportation modes. This policy ensures that new development provides multimodal facilities so that walking, bicycling and transit are viable options.

Additional infrastructure related policies include Policy 4.4 which considers abandonment of County roads for public uses of the rights-of-way, such as bikeways, or horseback riding and hiking trails. Policy 4.5 requires that new public local and collector roads be designed to discourage through auto traffic and provide for bicycle and pedestrian traffic within the right-of-way. Policy 4.7 requires, where appropriate and sufficient public right-of-way is available, that bicycle paths shall be separated from major roads and highways and be provided between adjacent communities. Policy 4.9 requires that the County to monitor key County-maintained roadways, intersections, bikeways, and pedestrian facilities to observe and analyze the functioning of these roadways, as well as to identify capacity and safety concerns. This policy is important in ensuring adequate multimodal facilities.

Provision of public transportation service is outside the authority of the County, but the provision of infrastructure and facilities, and transit-supportive land use patterns is established by the County. Policies 6.1, 6.2, 6.5, 6.7, 6.8, and 6.9 provide support and encouragement for public transportation services. Policy 6.3 supports the concentration of new development along major transportation corridors and near incorporated cities to make transit services to these areas more feasible. Policy 6.6 requires transit and bus parking facilities at major hotels, motels, convention centers, other tourist-serving areas and events.

The County's policies support rail transportation with the following. Policy 8.1 makes protection of future rail transportation a high priority. This policy would protect existing railroad right-of-way and support acquisition of railroad corridors for inter-city service. Policy 8.3 supports the planning and implementation of passenger rail, light rail, or bus rapid transit service to urban centers, and Policy 8.4 supports and encourages transit-oriented development around existing and future rail, light rail, or bus rapid transit stations.

Bicycle transportation is supported through the following policies. Policy 10.1 requires the establishment of an integrated system of

bicycle routes for Monterey, developed through a comprehensive bicycle plan coordinated private and public interests and agencies (Policy 10.2). Policy 10.3 requires consideration of bike routes in the construction or expansion of roadways within major transportation corridors. Policies 10.4 through 10.7 support bicycle transportation through multimodal and inter-modal integration, and for visitor serving areas.

Land Use Element

Land Use Element Policies 1.2 and 1.3, encourage managing growth in unincorporated areas and discouraging scattered development to minimize the duration of trips, which also supports alternative modes of transportation. Policies 1.4 and 1.7 requires development to occur only when adequate transportation facilities exist and to encourage phasing and clustering of development to provide for adequate long-range planning of infrastructure, including pedestrian, bicycle and transit facilities. Policies 2.15, 2.17, and 2.21 encourage directing growth to urban and community areas, which better supports transit use. These policies also encourage mixed-use development, which generates fewer vehicle trips by clustering uses together.

Open Space and Conservation Element

Open Space Element Policies10.2 and 10.5 encourages alternative modes of travel and encourage mixed land uses to reduce vehicular travel and minimize negative impact on LOS.

Area Plan Policies

The Area Plans contain policies related to alternative modes of travel and associated supportive land uses. The Area Plan policies and mitigations would supplement those contained in the General Plan, consistent with the 2007 General Plan.

Greater Monterey Master Plan

The Greater Monterey Master Plan Policies 2.7 and 2.9 encourage new development to incorporate designs and location for transit and bicycle and pedestrian connections and for new or expanded arterials or highways to accommodate separated bicycle paths.

Carmel Valley Master Plan

Carmel Valley Master Plan policies 2.1 through 2.5, and 2.15 promote alternative modes of transportation by requiring new development and new facilities to provide for transit stops, bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.

Toro Area Plan

The Toro Area Plan policies 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 2.9, and 2.10 provide for additional transit, bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure along new facilities and in new development. Policy 2.10 encourages a study to determine how to increase access to public transit in specific areas.

Cachagua Area Plan

The Cachagua Area Plan policy 2.1 promotes the safety of bicyclists and pedestrians by providing appropriate paving markings.

Significance Determination

Implementation of the policies in the General Plan and Area Plans for development of the land uses allowed under the Existing plus Project Development to the year 2030 would increase pedestrian, bicycle and transit-supportive facilities by both requiring and encouraging the construction of such facilities and land use patterns in new development. These policies provide support for, and do not conflict with, alternative modes of transportation. The transit-supportive land uses identified in the general Plan are consistent with MST's objective to provide transit-oriented development (Designing for Transit: A Manual for Integrating Public Transit and Land Use in Monterey County, MST, 2006).

The land uses allowed under the General Plan, if consistent with policy, would increase the need for transit service with concentrations of development in existing transit-served corridors, community areas, and near incorporated cities. The transit-supportive The increase in demand for transit service is consistent with MST's strategic goals of increasing transit ridership, expanding service, and introducing new services such as BRT in major corridors (Peninsula Area Service Study, 2006 and Business Plan and Short Range Transit Plan, FY 2008 through 2008). Therefore, this impact is less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are necessary.

Significance Conclusion

The policies contained in the General Plan provide both requirements and encouragement of alternative mode infrastructure and facilities, and promote transit-support land use patterns. These polices support and do not conflict with existing facilities, policies, plans and programs. The development allowed under the General Plan will generate demand for pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and demand for transit services. These demands can be accommodated by ensuring development conforms to County policies and

design standards, and are consistent with the goals and strategies of MST, the County's transit service provider. This is a less than significant impact.

Year 2030 Cumulative plus Project

Year 2030 Cumulative Conditions represent forecast year 2030 conditions with implementation of the 2007 General Plan development through 2030 plus development of incorporated Cities through 2030. Cumulative development also includes forecasts of development through the year 2030 in Santa Cruz, San Benito and portions of Santa Clara counties. The transportation network in this scenario includes the TAMC Regional Traffic Impact Fee Program projects and proposed County improvement projects described earlier.

This scenario identifies the impacts of development in unincorporated areas of the County cumulative with development in incorporated areas and adjacent counties by identifying changes in roadway level of service. This analysis of the 2007 General Plan is compared to No Project conditions under the 1982 General Plan.

Because there is no version of the AMBAG model that represents the year 2030 under the 1982 General Plan, the Project is compared to the No Project scenario by comparing the amount of housing, population and employment allowed under each scenario, and indicating whether the impacts of the 2007 General Plan would be greater than, less than, or equal to impacts under the 1982 General Plan.

Project-Specific Impacts of the Development under 2030 Cumulative plus Project Conditions

Impact TRAN-2A: Development allowed under the 2007 General Plan cumulatively with other development to the year 2030 would cause project-specific impacts on County roadways which would cause roadways to fall below the acceptable LOS standard D. (Less Than Significant Impact).

Impact of Development with Policies

Project-specific impacts of new development are described in Impact TRAN-1A. These are localized impacts that affect the immediate surrounding transportation system, including access and circulation necessary for the development to function properly and safely. Some project-specific impacts are exclusively attributable to the development such as access connections between the development site and public roadway system. Other project-specific impacts such as impacts to the public roadway system in the immediate vicinity of the development site are cumulative with other development in the area.

2007 General Plan Policies

The policies related to roadway level of service for development described in the Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030 scenario apply to the Existing plus Project Buildout scenario.

Significance Determination

Project-specific impacts of new development will continue to occur through buildout of the General Plan. As long as General Plan policies remain in effect, new development will be required to prepare a project-level traffic study, or project-level Environmental Impact Report. Impacts to roadway LOS or project access would be identified in these studies and development would be fully responsible for the implementation of mitigation measures or would be responsible for its fair-share of the mitigation depending on the extent of the impact and the development's contribution to the impact along with other cumulative development. If a roadway already falls below the County's LOS standard, then the development is required to mitigate its impact so that the measure of performance (e.g., volume to capacity ratio, peak hour average delay, etc.) of the roadway does not degrade beyond the level without the development. This is a less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

Impacts are less than significant, therefore no mitigation is necessary.

Significance Conclusion

Implementation of the 2007 General Plan consistent with policies related to project-specific localized impacts (Policy C-1.4, new development is required to mitigate project-specific local impacts to maintain the County's LOS standard and to provide adequate access and circulation facilities. Policy C-1.3 restricts new development or requires the phasing of new development so that it is concurrent with transportation improvements) would have a less than significant impact and no mitigation is required.

County and Regional Roadway Level of Service Impacts (2030 Cumulative plus Project)

Impact 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. (Significant and unavoidable impact)

Impact of Development with Policies

The LOS on study area roadways for the 2030 Cumulative plus Project scenario is illustrated graphically in Exhibit 4.6.8. A detailed analysis of roadway level of service by segment is included in the Appendix.

Table 4.6-16 shows the roadway segments operating at deficient level of service under this scenario and compares the segments to their LOS under existing conditions. As shown in Table 4.6-16, there are 5 segments that operate at LOS E and 29 segments that operate at LOS F in this scenario. There are 5 segments that operate at LOS D in Carmel Valley Area Plan where the standard has been established as a LOS C. In comparison, under existing conditions, 17 of the segments in Table 4.6-17 currently operate at LOS E or F. The development in the County up to the year 2030, cumulatively with other development, causes an additional 17 roadway segments to exceed the county's LOS threshold. In the CVMP area, the development in the County up to the year 2030, cumulatively with other development, causes an additional two roadway segments to exceed the county's LOS threshold as defined in the CVMP. Further discussion of impacts of the 2007 General Plan within the Carmel Valley Plan Area are discussed in the next section.

Table 4.6-17. County Roadway Segments Operating at LOS E or F under 2030 Cumulative plus Project Conditions Roadway Segment

		Existing Conditions (2008)		Cumulative + Project 2030	
		V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS
Roadway Segments Operating at LOS F in the 2030 Cumulative plus Project Conditions Scenario					
County Road G12 (Elkhorn Rd)	Salinas Rd to Hall Rd	1.339	F	1.155	F
County Road G12 (Hall Rd)	Elkhorn Rd to San Miguel Canyon Rd	1.879	F	2.575	F
County Road G12 (San Miguel Canyon	Hall Rd to Strawberry Rd	1.122	F	1.252	F

		Existing Conditions (2008)		Cumulative + Project 2030	
		V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS
Rd)					
County Road G12 (San Miguel Canyon Rd)	Strawberry Rd to Castroville Blvd	1.485	F	1.460	F
County Road G12(San Miguel Canyon Rd)	Castroville Blvd to US-101	1.486	F	1.362	F
County Road G14 (Jolon Rd/Interlake Rd)	US-101 to San Lucas Rd	0.582	D	1.075	F
Abbott St	SH 101 to Salinas City Line	0.896	E	1.350	F
Blanco Rd	Reservation Rd to Cooper Rd	2.033	F	2.667	F
Blanco Rd	Cooper Rd to Armstrong Rd	2.146	F	2.500	F
Blanco Rd	Armstrong Rd to Davis Rd	2.292	F	2.650	F
Carpenter St	Serra Ave to SR-1	1.354	F	1.383	F
Carpenteria Rd	San Juan Rd to County Border	0.462	C	1.079	F
Corral De Tierra	SH-68 to Robley Rd	0.682	D	1.010	F
Crazy Horse Canyon Rd	San Juan Grade Rd to US-101	0.449	C	1.077	F
Grant St	Payson Rd to Scott St	0.505	D	2.146	F
Grant St	Scott St to Clay St	0.547	D	2.323	F
Harris Rd	Spreckels Blvd to Abbott St	0.844	E	1.490	F
Hebert Rd	San Juan Grade Rd to Old Stage Rd	0.443	D	1.142	F
Ocean Ave	Carmel City Line to SR-1	1.229	F	1.375	F
Old Stage Rd	Hebert Rd to Natividad Rd	0.488	D	1.133	F
Old Stage Rd	Natividad Rd to Williams Rd	0.163	C	1.062	F
Pine Canyon Rd (King City)	Merrit St to Jolon Rd	0.583	D	1.615	F
Porter Dr	Salinas Rd to San Juan Rd	0.967	E	1.425	F
Porter Dr	San Juan Rd to Santa Cruz County Line	1.423	F	2.558	F
Prunedale North Rd	SR-156 to San Miguel Canyon	0.458	D	1.406	F
Rio Rd	Carmel City Line to SR-1	1.161	F	1.719	F
Russell Rd	SR-101 to San Juan Grade	0.661	D	1.302	F

		Existing Conditions (2008)		Cumulative + Project 2030	
		V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS
	Rd				
San Juan Grade Rd	Salinas City Line to Russell Rd	1.015	F	1.042	F
San Juan Grade Rd	Russell Rd to Rogge Rd	0.747	D	1.058	F
Roadway Segments Operating at LOS E in the 2030 Cumulative plus Project Conditions Scenario					
County Road G12 (Salinas)	Railroad Ave to Elkhorn Rd	0.584	D	0.964	E
Carpenter St	Carmel City Line to Serra Ave	0.828	E	0.906	E
Rogge Rd	San Juan Grade Rd to Natividad Rd	0.661	D	0.979	E
Salinas Rd	Fruitland Ave to Elkhorn Rd	0.499	C	0.967	E
San Miguel Canyon Rd	Tarpey Rd to Hall Rd	0.525	D	0.983	E
Roadway Segments Operating at Deficient LOS D in the 2030 Cumulative plus Project Conditions Scenario					
County Road G20 (Laureles Grade Rd)	Robley Rd to Carmel Valley Rd	0.582	D	0.788	D
Carmel Rancho Blvd	Carmel Valley Blvd to Carmel Rancho Ln	0.619	D	0.679	D
Carmel Rancho Blvd	Carmel Rancho Ln to Rio Rd	0.402	C	0.479	D
Rio Rd	SR-1 to Carmel Rancho Blvd	0.575	D	0.625	D

Source: Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Impact of Development in the Carmel Valley Area Plan

As described earlier in this chapter, the roadway level of service analysis for the Carmel Valley Master Plan (CVMP) area is based on peak hour (AM and PM peak) information. The reason that CVMP roadway facilities are analyzed in the peak hour as opposed to the daily analysis used for the rest of the County is because it is a more project-specific and accurate method of analysis, the CVMP policies establish LOS standards based on peak hour (CV 2.18(d)), and a recent peak hour draft traffic analysis of the CVMP and the Carmel Valley Transportation Improvement Program was available (CVMP Traffic Study, July 2007). At the project-specific or small planning area level of analysis, a peak hour operational analysis should be used to

overcome the inaccuracies and impact over-estimation characteristic of daily V/C Ratio analysis.

The Area Plan for Carmel Valley specifies an acceptable LOS of "C" or "D" for Carmel Valley Road depending on the roadway segment, as opposed to a LOS "C" that is proposed to be the acceptable level for other Carmel Valley roadways and LOS D in the remainder of the unincorporated County. Integration of this analysis into the 2007 General Plan EIR allows for consistency between documents. For Carmel Valley Road, the following LOS standards apply to its segments:

Segment 1: East of Holman Road (LOS C)

Segment 2: Holman Road to Esquiline Road (LOS C)

Segment 3: Esquiline Road to Ford Road (LOS D)

Segment 4: Ford Road to Laureles Grade (LOS D)

Segment 5: Laureles Grade to Robinson Canyon Road (LOS D)

Segment 6: Robinson Canyon Road to Schulte Road (LOS D)

Segment 7: Schulte Road to Rancho San Carlos Road (LOS D)

Segment 8: Rancho San Carlos Road to Rio Road (LOS C)

Segment 9: Rio Road to Carmel Rancho Boulevard (LOS C)

Segment 10: Carmel Rancho Boulevard to SR1 (LOS C)

Table 4.6-18 presents the peak hour level of service for roadways within the CVMP based on the analyses prepared for the traffic studies referenced above. The modeling for these traffic studies assumed a higher amount of development in the CVMP area in 2030 than the analysis of the rest of the County under the 2030 Cumulative plus Project scenario. The CVMP analysis assumes development of 1,188 housing units between 2000 and 2030, more units than assumed in the General Plan estimates to the year 2030. Although analyzed in Table 4.6-17 Highway 1 (SR 1) is not a part of the CVMP, but a regional road that connects to the CVMP and subject to the County's standard of LOS D. Three segments of Carmel Valley Road exceed their LOS D standard under this scenario.

The General Plan daily analysis in Table 4.6-16 shows three roads exceeding the CVMP LOS standard of "C", County Road G20 (Laureles Grade), Carmel Ranch Boulevard, and Rio Road. The General Plan analysis indicates that these roads are significantly impacted.

Table 4.6-18. Carmel Valley Roadway Level of Service under 2030 Cumulative plus Project Conditions

Roadway	Direction	Level of Service	
		AM Peak	PM Peak
Highway (SR) 1			
between Rio Rd & Carmel Valley Rd	NB	B	B
	SB	E	E
between Carmel Valley Rd & Ocean Ave	NB	C	C
	SB	F	F
between Ocean Ave & Carpenter St	NB	D	D
	SB	C	C
Carmel Valley Road			
East of Holman (Standard LOS C)	BOTH	C	C
Holman Road to Esquiline Road (Standard LOS C)	BOTH	C	C
Esquiline Road to Ford Road (Standard LOS D)	BOTH	D	D
Ford Road to Laureles Grade(Standard LOS D)	BOTH	D	D
Laureles Grade to Robinson Canyon Road(Standard LOS D)	BOTH	E	E
Robinson Canyon Road to Schulte Road (Standard LOS D)	BOTH	E	E
Schulte Road to Rancho San Carlos Road (Standard LOS D)	BOTH	E	E
Rancho San Carlos Road to Rio Road (Standard LOS C)	EB	A	B
	WB	B	B
Rio Road to Carmel Rancho Boulevard (Standard LOS C)	EB	B	C
	WB	C	C
Carmel Rancho Boulevard to Highway 1 (Standard LOS C)	EB	B	B
	WB	C	B

Source: Kimley-Horn & Associates, Inc. 2008 and DKS Associates, 2007.

Table 4.6-19 presents the Regional roadway segments operating at LOS E or LOS F under 2030 Cumulative plus Project conditions and compares the segments to their LOS under existing conditions. Exhibit 4.6.8 presents the segment LOS graphically. A detailed table showing the volume, the volume to capacity ratio and the resulting LOS for each Regional roadway segment is included in the Appendix.

There are six regional roadway segments that operate at LOS E and 64 segments that operate at LOS F under this scenario. Under existing conditions, 47 of these Regional roadway segments operate at LOS E or F, so development in the County up to the year 2030, cumulatively with other development, causes an additional 23 roadway segments to exceed the County's LOS threshold.

Table 4.6-19. Regional Roadway Segments Operating at LOS E or F under 2030 Cumulative plus Project Conditions

		Existing Conditions (2008)		2030 Cumulative plus Project Conditions	
Roadway Segment		V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS
Roadway Segments Operating at LOS F in the 2030 Cumulative plus Project Conditions Scenario					
US Highway 101	County Border to Crazy Horse Canyon Rd	1.044	F	1.067	F
US Highway 101	Crazy Horse Canyon Rd to San Miguel Canyon Rd	0.989	E	1.011	F
US Highway 101	San Miguel Canyon Rd to SR-156	1.441	F	1.657	F
US Highway 101	SR-156 to Pesante Rd	1.106	F	1.763	F
US Highway 101	Pesante Rd to Espinosa Rd	1.106	F	1.759	F
US Highway 101	Espinosa Rd to E Boronda Rd	1.098	F	1.503	F
US Highway 101	E Boronda Rd to W Laurel Dr	1.143	F	1.512	F
US Highway 101	W Laurel Dr to N Main St	1.107	F	1.702	F
US Highway 101	N Main St to E Market St	1.172	F	1.583	F
US Highway 101	E Market St to John St	1.114	F	1.566	F
US Highway 101	John St to S Sanborn Rd	0.897	D	1.344	F
US Highway 101	S Sanborn Rd to Airport Blvd	0.745	C	1.120	F
US Highway 101	Airport Blvd to Abbott St	0.615	C	1.190	F
US Highway 101	Chualar Rd to Old Stage Rd	0.654	D	1.312	F
US Highway 101	Old Stage Rd to 5th St	0.646	C	1.357	F
US Highway 101	5th St to S Alta St	0.600	C	1.224	F
US Highway 101	S Alta St to Camphora Rd	0.631	C	1.254	F
US Highway 101	Camphora Rd to Moranda Rd	0.623	C	1.259	F
US Highway 101	Moranda Rd to Front St	0.646	C	1.212	F
US Highway 101	Front St to Arroyo Seco Rd	0.662	C	1.206	F
US Highway 101	Arroyo Seco Rd to El Camino Real	0.592	C	1.069	F

Roadway Segment		Existing Conditions (2008) V/C Ratio	LOS	2030 Cumulative plus Project Conditions V/C Ratio	LOS
SR-1	County Border to Salinas Rd	0.769	D	1.275	F
SR-1	Salinas Rd to Struve Rd	1.546	F	2.137	F
SR-1	Struve Rd to Dolan Rd	1.667	F	2.309	F
SR-1	Dolan Rd to Molera Rd	1.496	F	2.108	F
SR-1	Molera Rd to SR-183	1.426	F	1.96	F
SR-1	Canyon del Rey Blvd to Del Monte Ave	1.071	F	1.155	F
SR-1	N Fremont St to Aguajito Rd	1.411	F	1.443	F
SR-68 (Holman Highway)	Forest Ave to 17 Mile Dr	1.448	F	1.681	F
SR-68 (Holman Highway)	17 Mile Dr to Skyline Forest Dr	1.638	F	1.908	F
SR-68 (Holman Highway)	Skyline Forest Dr to CHOMP Dwy	1.638	F	1.908	F
SR-68 (Monterey Salinas Highway)	SR-1 to Olmsted Rd	1.422	F	1.529	F
SR-68 (Monterey Salinas Highway)	Olmsted Rd to Canyon del Rey Blvd	1.422	F	1.575	F
SR-68 (Monterey Salinas Highway)	Canyon del Rey Blvd to Bit Rd	1.304	F	1.509	F
SR-68 (Monterey Salinas Highway)	Bit Rd to Laureles Grade Rd	1.304	F	1.515	F
SR-68 (Monterey Salinas Highway)	Laureles Grade Rd to Corral de Tierra	1.525	F	1.822	F
SR-68 (Monterey Salinas Highway)	Spreckels Blvd to E Blanco Rd	0.811	B	1.026	F
SR-146 (Front St)	US-101 to East St	0.507	D	1.048	F
SR-146 (East St)	Front St to Metz Rd	0.507	D	1.041	F
SR-183 (Castroville Rd)	Blackie Rd to Espinosa Rd	1.074	F	1.577	F
SR-183 (Castroville Rd)	Espinosa Rd to Cooper Rd	1.012	F	1.509	F
SR-218 (Canyon del Rey Blvd)	SR-1 to Del Monte Blvd	0.739	D	1.052	F
SR-218 (Canyon del Rey Blvd)	Fremont Blvd to Carlton Dr	1.099	F	1.295	F
SR-218 (Canyon del Rey Blvd)	Carlton Dr to SR-68	1.099	F	1.336	F
Foam St	Prescott Ave to Drake Ave	1.156	F	1.775	F
Foam St	Drake Ave to Lighthouse Ave	1.277	F	1.688	F
Lighthouse Ave	David Ave to Prescott Ave	1.022	F	1.003	F
Lighthouse Ave	Prescott Ave to Private Bolio Rd	1.637	F	1.785	F
Lighthouse Ave	Private Bolio Rd to Pacific St	1.270	F	1.252	F

Roadway Segment		Existing Conditions (2008) V/C Ratio	LOS	2030 Cumulative plus Project Conditions V/C Ratio	LOS
Lighthouse Ave	Pacific St to Washington St	1.124	F	1.126	F
Del Monte Ave	Washington St to Camino Aguajito	1.314	F	1.162	F
Del Monte Ave	Camino Aguajito to Casa Verde Wy	1.313	F	1.33	F
Del Monte Ave	Casa Verde Wy to SR-1	1.443	F	1.845	F
Fremont St	Abrego St to Camino Aguajito	1.065	F	1.168	F
Munras Ave/Abrego St	Soledad Dr to Via Zaragoza	1.226	F	1.425	F
Del Monte Blvd	SR-1 to Canyon del Rey Blvd	1.039	F	1.243	F
Del Monte Blvd	Canyon del Rey Blvd to Broadway Ave	1.058	F	1.136	F
Del Monte Blvd	SR-1 to Reindollar Ave	1.081	F	1.443	F
Del Monte Blvd	Reindollar Ave to Reservation Rd	1.929	F	2.498	F
N Fremont St	Casa Verde Wy to SR-218	0.971	E	1.058	F
E Boronda Rd	US-101 to N Main St	0.923	D	1.711	F
John St	Abbott St to US-101	1.069	F	1.071	F
Davis Rd	W Laurel Dr to SR-183	1.057	F	1.061	F
Blanco Rd	S Davis Rd to W Alisal St	0.698	D	1.019	F
Roadway Segments Operating at LOS E in the 2030 Cumulative plus Project Conditions Scenario					
US Highway 101	El Camino Real to Oak Ave	0.545	C	0.888	E
SR-1	Aguajito Rd to Munras Ave	0.854	D	0.916	E
SR-1	Holman Hwy to Carpenter St	0.890	D	0.991	E
SR-218 (Canyon del Rey Blvd)	Del Monte Blvd to Fremont Blvd	0.708	D	0.968	E
Fremont Blvd	N Del Monte Blvd to SR-1	0.854	D	0.997	E
Sanborn Rd	US-101 to Abbott St	0.983	E	0.961	E

Source: Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Table 4.6-20 compares existing and 2030 Cumulative plus Project roadway LOS on Regional roadways external to Monterey County. Traffic generated by the land uses allowed under the 2007 General Plan will produce inter-county travel between housing and jobs in Santa Cruz, San Benito, and Santa

Clara counties, and to a lesser extent San Luis Obispo County. With cumulative development in adjacent counties increases the demand for this inter-county travel. Development allowed under the General Plan, cumulatively with development in incorporated cities in Monterey County and development in adjacent counties, causes nearly every roadway segment to experience an increase in the volume to capacity ratio, and causes four segments to change from LOS D or better to a LOS E or F.

Table 4.6-20. Roadway Level of Service of Facilities External to Monterey County under 2030 Cumulative plus Project Conditions

		Existing Conditions (2008)		2030 Cumulative plus Project Conditions	
Roadway Segment		V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS
Santa Clara County					
US Highway 101	Cochrane Rd to E Dunne Ave	1.139	F	2.076	F
US Highway 101	Masten Ave to Leavesley Rd/SR-152 West	0.989	E	1.447	F
US Highway 101	Monterey Rd to SR-25	1.071	F	1.669	F
SR-152	SR-156 to Merced County	0.630	C	1.029	F
Santa Cruz County					
SR-1	Soquel Ave to 41st St	1.368	F	1.560	F
SR-1	Airport Blvd to SR-152	0.876	D	1.297	F
SR-1	Harkings Slough Rd to SR-129	0.608	C	1.042	F
SR-1	SR-129 to Monterey County	0.492	B	0.815	D
SR-17	Santa Clara County to Granite Creek Rd	0.958	E	0.849	D
SR-129 (Riverside Rd)	Lakeview Rd to Carlton Rd	0.847	D	1.190	F
San Benito County					
US Highway 101	Santa Clara County to SR-129	0.912	E	1.282	F
SR-25 (Bolsa Rd)	Santa Clara County to SR-156	1.196	F	1.883	F
SR-156	Salinas Rd to Union Rd	1.706	F	1.785	F
San Luis Obispo County					
US Highway 101	Monterey County to San Miguel Ave	0.300	A	0.512	B

Source: Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Impact of Goods Movement on Roadway Level of Service

As described earlier, the county's current truck traffic generation is expected to increase from 12,600 truck trips per day (2006) to 18,600 in 2030. This is a cumulative projection, not just trucks generated by land uses in unincorporated Monterey County. This increase in freight movement is not significant enough to cause widespread capacity-related impacts, but will contribute large vehicle traffic to roadways and highways that are currently, or are projected to fall below the County's acceptable LOS standard and may cause the localized impacts on heavily traveled freight routes (e.g., Highways 1, 101, 156, and 183) and within industrialized areas where truck traffic originates see Impact TRAN-1A).

2007 General Plan Policies

The 2007 General Plan policies establish measures to minimize adverse impacts of roadway level of service impacts of development both individually and cumulatively. The policies related to roadway level of service for development described in the Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030 scenario apply to the Year 2030 Cumulative plus Project scenario.

Significance Determination

Development and land use allowed under the 2007 General Plan, cumulatively with development in incorporated cities and adjacent counties, would increase traffic volumes on County roads, Regional roads, and regional roads external to the County. This added traffic would both cause roadway segments to exceed the County's LOS standard, and contribute traffic to roadways that exceed the LOS standard without development, and further degrade the performance measure. Within the CVMP, three segments of Carmel Valley Road are projected to exceed LOS standards, but mitigation measures are proposed in the CVMP Traffic study to improve these impacts to less than significant.

Despite development contributions to county impacts (through countywide traffic impact fee), and regional impacts (through regional traffic impact fee) there will remain a funding shortfall for the improvement of County and Regional roads to achieve the County's LOS standard. Therefore this impact remains significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation of the impacts described above to achieve a LOS D include:

- Widening County and Regional roadway from existing 2-lane facilities to4, 6, or 8-lanes facilities;
- Expand existing intersections to include additional through and turning lanes;

- Install traffic signals;
- Grade-separate intersections of the junction between major streets;
- Widen state highway to accommodate additional travel lanes, provide shoulders, and auxiliary lanes between on and off-ramps; and
- Increase public transportation services by expanding MST's fleet, expand fixed-route services, increase headways, provide park and ride facilities, and implement new services including Bus Rapid Transit, and inter-city rail service.

Many of the mitigations for roadways segments are likely infeasible due to physical, topographical, and environmental constraints, as well the social and economic impacts related to the acquisition of commercial and residential property, or loss of access, and lack of community consensus for roadway capacity-enhancing projects. This construction would result in impacts to other resources, such as biological resources, air quality, noise, aesthetics and agricultural lands. The foremost constraint, however, is funding of transportation facilities. Federal, state and regional funding are limited, and most of these funds are used to maintain the transportation system. The County and TAMC are planning to implement Traffic Impact Fees to fund improvement projects, but the amount of the fees are limited for affordability and total fee burden reasons. Further, another source of funding, voter initiatives to increase sales tax to fund transportation projects, have failed recently, but may be an option in the future.

The County and regional fee programs will continuously be updated, adding additional priority projects to the programs as initial projects are completed, but the rate of project completion will not be able to outpace the rate of development growth.

The following mitigation measures are recommended for implementation by the County to achieve LOS standards within the CVMP area.

Mitigation Measure TRAN-2B: Revise policies in the Carmel Valley Master Plan as follows:

Policy CV-2.10

The following are policies regarding improvements to specific portions of Carmel Valley Road:

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 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.

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.

e) East of Esquiline Road

Shoulder improvements should be undertaken at the sharper curves. Curves should be examined for spot realignment needs.

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.

Policy CV-2.12:

To accommodate existing and future traffic, the following road improvements are recommended:

Add a northbound climbing lane between Rio Road and Carmel Valley Road:

a) Laureles Grade - undertake shoulder improvements, widening and spot realignment;
b) Carmel Valley Road, Robinson Canyon Road to Ford Road - add left turn channelization at all intersections. Shoulder improvements should be undertaken.

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:

a) Twice yearly monitoring by Public Works (in June and October) of peak hour traffic at the following 12 locations:

Carmel Valley Road

1. East of Holman Road
2. Holman Road to Esquiline Road
3. Esquiline Road to Ford Road
4. Ford Road to Laureles Grade
5. Laureles Grade to Robinson Canyon Road
6. Robinson Canyon Road to Schulte Road
7. Schulte Road to Rancho San Carlos Road
8. Rancho San Carlos Road to Rio Road
9. Rio Road to Carmel Rancho Boulevard
10. Carmel Rancho Boulevard to SR1

Other Locations

11. Carmel Rancho Boulevard between Carmel Valley Road and Rio Road
12. Rio Road between its eastern terminus and SR1

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).

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.

d) The traffic LOS standards (measured for peak hour conditions) for the CVMP Area shall be as follows:

1. Signalized Intersections – LOS of "C" is the acceptable condition.
2. Unsignalized Intersections – LOS of "F" or meeting of any traffic signal warrant are defined as unacceptable conditions
3. Carmel Valley Road Segment Operations:
   a. LOS of "C" for Segments 1, 2, 8, 9, and 10 is an acceptable condition;
   b. LOS of "D" for Segments 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 is an acceptable condition.

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 residence on a legal lot of record.

Policy CV-2.19:

Carmel Valley Traffic Improvement Program (CVTIP)

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):

    1. Left-turn channelization on Carmel Valley Road west of Ford Road;
    2. Shoulder widening on Carmel Valley Road between Laureles Grade and Ford Road;
    3. Paved turnouts, new signage, shoulder improvements, and spot realignments on Laureles Grade;
    4. 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);
    5. Sight Distance Improvement at Dorris Road;
    6. Passing lanes in front of the proposed September Ranch development;
    7. Passing lanes opposite Garland Park;
    8. Climbing Lane on Laureles Grade;
    9. Upgrade all new road improvements within Carmel Valley Road Corridor to Class 2 bike lanes;
    10. Passing lane (1/4 mile) between Schulte Road and Robinson Canyon Road; and
    11. Passing lane (1/4 mile) between Rancho San Carlos Rd and Schulte Road.

b) The County shall adopt an updated fee program to fund the CVTIP.

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.

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.

Significance Conclusion

With buildout of the 2007 General Plan, and implementation of mitigation measures determined to be feasible, there would remain significant and unavoidable impacts on County roads, and Regional roads both within and external to Monterey County.

A traffic study of the CVMP has identified impacts and mitigation measures for Carmel Valley Road (described above). These mitigation measures result in impacts to Carmel Valley Road being less than significant except for the segment of Carmel Valley Road in the Carmel Valley Village where the conditions will drop from LOS C (the current standard) to LOS D (the proposed standard) due to the lack of feasible mitigation consistent with the rural character of Carmel Valley to maintain the higher standard.

A traffic study (Kimley-Horn 2008) of SR-1 operations between Rio Road and Ocean Blvd has identified significant existing and cumulative impacts that can only be fully mitigated with widening to 4-lanes along this segment. As this is mostly an existing problem, there are limitations on the use of new development fees to pay to correct an existing problem. Neither TAMC nor Caltrans is currently planning to fund SR-1 widening at this location. Further, there is no community consensus to complete a widening project. Thus, widening of this segment is considered infeasible due to the lack of available funding and a lack of community support and thus impacts to SR-1 between Rio Road and Ocean Boulevard to be significant and unavoidable.

Air Traffic

Impact 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.

Impact of Development with Policies

The discussion of air traffic impacts in the Existing plus Project Development to the year 2030 scenario remains applicable in this scenario.

2007 General Plan Policies

The policies related to roadway level of service for development described in the Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030 scenario apply to the Year 2030 Cumulative plus Project scenario.

Significance Determination

Development of the land uses allowed under the 2007 General Plan by the year 2030 would result in an increase in demand for air travel. Passenger travel in Monterey County peaked in 1978 with about 640,000 passengers annually. Since that time passenger travel has declined to nearly half of its peak (Monterey Airport District, 2008). Without adding additional capacity at airports, the current passenger level could increase to at least 640,000 passengers annually without impacting airport operations (a 96% increase).

Land use growth proposed in the general Plan and specifically the Hwy 68/Monterey Peninsula Airport Affordable Housing Overlay will not be located within airport flight paths, and will not be design in such a way as to become an incompatible land use (i.e., high rise buildings). No change in airport location is being proposed in the 2007 General Plan. (Less than Significant Impact).

Mitigation Measures

Impacts would be less than significant, therefore no mitigation measures are necessary.

Significance Conclusion

The development of the General Plan would increase the demand for the air travel. The General Plan contains policies to encourage safe operations of air facilities and land uses surrounding the airports that are consistent with airport operations. Airport passenger demand is significantly less than it was in 1978 and therefore can accommodate substantial increases without increasing the capacity of airports. Impacts of the General Plan policies under 2030 Cumulative plus Project are less than significant.

Roadway Hazards

Impact TRAN-2D: 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. (Less Than Significant)

Impact of Development with Policies

The discussion of roadway hazard impacts in the Existing plus Project Development to the year 2030 scenario remains applicable in this scenario.

2007 General Plan Policies

The policies related to roadway level of service for development described in the Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030 scenario apply to the Year 2030 Cumulative plus Project scenario.

Significance Determination

Development of the land uses allowed under the 2007 General Plan by the year 2030 would result in non-standard or hazardous designs and incompatible facilities with adjoining land uses. The General Plan provides for policies to prevent or reduce these impacts by requiring roads to be designed to safety standards. These policies require new development to design facilities to County standards. They also provide for road safety programs (signing, marking, and improved sight distance) to improve overall safety. The 2007 General Plan also has policies to limit incompatible land uses. Therefore, the impact of roadway hazards with implementation the 2007 General Plan is less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation measures beyond the 2007 General Plan are necessary.

Significance Conclusion

The development under the General Plan would result in non-standard or hazardous transportation facility designs or land uses that are incompatible with public facilities. However, the 2007 General Plan contains policies to ensure that new development provides access and improvements to the county roadway system to meet County standards. It also contains policies to prevent incompatible land uses to avoid transportation conflicts and roadway hazards. Therefore, the impact is less than significant.

Emergency Access

Impact 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. (Significant and Unavoidable)

Impact of Development with Policies

The discussion of emergency access impacts in the Existing plus Project Development to the year 2030 scenario remains applicable in this scenario.

2007 General Plan Policies

The policies related to roadway level of service for development described in the Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030 scenario apply to the Year 2030 Cumulative plus Project scenario.

Significance Determination

Development of the land uses allowed under the 2007 General Plan under 2030 Cumulative plus Project would result in inadequate emergency access due to increases in traffic that result in County and Regional roadways exceeding County LOS standards, and creating traffic congestion that slows emergency response time.

The General Plan policies discussed above address transportation related impacts to emergency response due to congestion, and design. However, even with the adoption of county and regional impact fees, and implementation of proposed transportation improvements at the County and Regional level, traffic impacts to County and Regional roadway level of service will remain significant and unavoidable, and thereby cause an impact to emergency response that significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures described under the Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030 (MM-2E) are applicable to this scenario.

Significance Conclusion

The development allowed in the 2007 General Plan would generate traffic that would cause County and Regional roadways to exceed the County's LOS D standard, and contribute to roadways that exceed the standard without development, causing traffic congestion that would impact emergency response time. Although mitigation is proposed to identify and expand emergency response routes and increased road connectivity within new

developments, this measure does not mitigate LOS impacts. This is a significant and unavoidable impact.

Alternative Transportation

Impact TRAN-2F: Development allowed under 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. (Less than Significant)

Impact of Development with Policies

The discussion of air traffic impacts in the Existing plus Project Development to the year 2030 scenario remains applicable in this scenario.

2007 General Plan Policies

The policies related to roadway level of service for development described in the Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030 scenario apply to the Year 2030 Cumulative plus Project scenario.

Significance Determination

Implementation of the policies in the General Plan and Area Plans for development of the land uses allowed under the 2030 Cumulative plus Project scenario would increase pedestrian, bicycle and transit-supportive facilities by both requiring and encouraging the construction of such facilities and land use patterns in new development. These policies provide support for, and do not conflict with, alternative modes of transportation. The transit-supportive land uses identified in the general Plan are consistent with MST's objective to provide transit-oriented development (Designing for Transit - A Manual for Integrating Public Transit and Land Use in Monterey County, MST, 2006).

The land uses allowed under the General Plan, if consistent with policy, would increase the need for transit service with concentrations of development in existing transit-served corridors, community areas, and near incorporated cities. The increase in demand for transit service is consistent with MST's strategic goals of increasing transit ridership, expanding service, and introducing new services such as BRT in major corridors (Peninsula Area Service Study, 2006 and Business Plan and Short Range Transit Plan, FY 2008 through 2008). Therefore, this impact is less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are necessary.

Significance Conclusion

The policies contained in the General Plan provide both requirements and encouragement of alternative mode infrastructure and facilities, and promote transit-support land use patterns. These polices support and do not conflict with existing facilities, policies, plans and programs. The development allowed under the General Plan will generate demand for pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and demand for transit services. These demands can be accommodated by ensuring development conforms to County policies and design standards, and are consistent with the goals and strategies of MST, the County's transit service provider. This is a less than significant impact.

Existing plus Project (Buildout of the General Plan)

Buildout of the General Plan represents the combination of existing conditions and forecast 2007 General Plan buildout development within unincorporated Monterey County. The number of potential housing units to be added to unincorporated Monterey County was determined from the number of vacant residential lots and the assigned zoning within each planning area or community area. Employment was derived based on the rate of growth in housing units and population by maintaining the employee per housing unit ratio contained in the 2030 AMBAG model constant. At the annual rate of residential growth derived from the AMBAG 2004 forecasts, buildout of the 2007 General Plan is estimated to occur in the year 2092.

This scenario identifies the impacts of development in unincorporated areas of the County assuming no development in incorporated areas and adjacent counties.

Project-Specific Impacts of the Development under Existing plus Project Buildout

Impact 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. (Less Than Significant Impact).

Impact of Development with Policies

Project-specific impacts of new development are described in Impact TRAN-1A. These are localized impacts that affect the immediate surrounding transportation system, including access and circulation necessary for the

development to function properly and safely. Some project-specific impacts are exclusively attributable to the development such as access connections between the development site and public roadway system. Other project-specific impacts such as impacts to the public roadway system in the immediate vicinity of the development site are cumulative with other development in the area.

2007 General Plan Policies

The policies related to roadway level of service for development described in the Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030 scenario apply to the Existing plus Project Buildout scenario.

Significance Determination

Project-specific impacts of new development will continue to occur through buildout of the General Plan. As long as General Plan policies remain in effect, new development will be required to prepare a project-level traffic study, or project-level Environmental Impact Report. Impacts to roadway LOS or project access would be identified in these studies and development would be fully responsible for the implementation of mitigation measures or would be responsible for its fair-share of the mitigation depending on the extent of the impact and the development's contribution to the impact along with other cumulative development. If a roadway already falls below the County's LOS standard, then the development is required to mitigate its impact so that the measure of performance (e.g., volume to capacity ratio, peak hour average delay, etc.) of the roadway does not degrade beyond the level without the development. This is a less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

Impacts are less than significant, therefore no mitigation is necessary.

Significance Conclusion

Implementation of the 2007 General Plan consistent with policies related to project-specific localized impacts (Policy C-1.4, new development is required to mitigate project-specific local impacts to maintain the County's LOS standard and to provide adequate access and circulation facilities. Policy C-1.3 restricts new development or requires the phasing of new development so that it is concurrent with transportation improvements) would have a less than significant impact and no mitigation is required.

County and Regional Roadway Level of Service Impacts (Existing plus Project Buildout)

Impact 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. (Significant and unavoidable impact)

Impact of Development with Policies

The LOS on study area roadways for the Existing plus Project Buildout scenario is illustrated graphically in Exhibit 4.6.9. A detailed analysis of roadway level of service by segment is included in the Appendix.

Table 4.6-21 shows the roadway segments operating at deficient level of service under this scenario and compares the segments to their LOS under existing conditions. As shown in Table 4.6-21, there are 4 segments that operate at LOS E and 39 segments that operate at LOS F in this scenario. Segments of Carmel Valley Road between SR 1 and Ford Road in the CVMP area are projected to operate at LOS F at buildout of the General Plan. Carmel Valley Road segments between Ford Road and Via Los Tulares will operate at LOS D, exceeding the CVMP LOS standard of LOS C.

In comparison, under existing conditions, 28 of the segments in Table 4.6-21 currently operate at LOS E or F. The development in the County at buildout causes an additional 16 roadway segments to exceed the county's LOS threshold. In the CVMP area, the development in the County up to the year 2030, cumulatively with other development, causes an additional two roadway segments to exceed the county's LOS threshold as defined in the CVMP. Further discussion of impacts of the 2007 General Plan within the Carmel Valley Plan Area are discussed in the next section.

Table 4.6-21. County Roadway Segments Operating at LOS E or F under Existing plus Project Buildout Conditions

Roadway Segment		Existing Conditions		Existing plus Project Buildout Conditions	
		V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS
Roadway Segments Operating at LOS F in the Existing plus Project Buildout Scenario					
County Road G11 (San Juan Rd)	Salinas Rd to San Miguel Canyon Rd	0.942	E	1.447	F
County Road G11 (San Juan Rd)	Aromas Rd to Carpenteria Rd	0.938	E	1.173	F
County Road G12 (Salinas)	Porter Dr to Railroad Ave	1.236	F	1.514	F
County Road G12 (Elkhorn Rd)	Salinas Rd to Hall Rd	1.339	F	1.418	F
County Road G12 (Hall Rd)	Elkhorn Rd to San Miguel Canyon Rd	1.879	F	1.935	F
County Road G12 (San Miguel Canyon Rd)	Strawberry Rd to Castroville Blvd	1.485	F	1.404	F
County Road G12 (San Miguel Canyon Rd)	Castroville Blvd to US-101	1.486	F	1.267	F
County Road G14 (Jolon)	US-101 to San Lucas Rd	0.582	D	1.747	F
County Road G16 (Carmel Valley Road)	SR-1 to Carmel Rancho Blvd	0.833	D	1.084	F
County Road G16 (Carmel Valley Road)	Carmel Rancho Blvd to Rio Rd	0.782	D	1.081	F
County Road G16 (Carmel Valley Road)	Rio Rd to Rancho San Carlos Rd	1.305	F	1.89	F
County Road G16 (Carmel Valley Road)	Rancho San Carlos Rd to Valley Greens Dr	1.434	F	2.055	F
County Road G16 (Carmel Valley Road)	Valley Greens Dr to Robinson Canyon Rd	1.01	F	1.507	F
County Road G16 (Carmel Valley Road)	Robinson Canyon Rd to Miramonte Rd	1.006	F	1.473	F
County Road G16 (Carmel Valley Road)	Miramonte Rd to Laureles Grade	0.946	E	1.122	F
County Road G16 (Carmel Valley Road)	Laureles Grade to Ford Rd	0.933	E	1.43	F
County Road G16 (Carmel Valley Road)	Ford Rd to Esquiline Rd	0.745	D	0.882	D
County Road G17 (Reservation)	Davis Rd to SR-68	0.698	D	1.575	F

County Road G17 (River Rd)	SR-68 to Las Palmas Rd	0.481	C	1.042	F
County Road G17 (River Rd)	Las Palmas Rd to Las Palmas Pkwy	0.805	D	1.5	F
County Road G20 (Laureles Grade Rd)	SR-68 to Robley Rd	0.591	D	1.002	F
Blanco Rd	Reservation Rd to Cooper Rd	2.033	F	2.35	F
Blanco Rd	Cooper Rd to Armstrong Rd	2.146	F	2.408	F
Blanco Rd	Armstrong Rd to Davis Rd	2.292	F	2.592	F
Calle Del Adobe	Boranda Rd to Post Dr	0.359	C	1.125	F
Camino Del Monte	Carmel City Line to Serra Ave	0.531	D	1.542	F
Carpenter St	Serra Ave to SR-1	1.354	F	1.892	F
Crazy Horse Canyon Rd	San Juan Grade Rd to US-101	0.449	C	1.199	F
Davis Rd	Blanco Rd to Reservation Rd	0.958	E	1.135	F
Ocean Ave	Carmel City Line to SR-1	1.229	F	1.5	F
Pine Canyon Rd (King City)	Pine Meadow Dr to Merritt St	0.258	C	1.375	F
Porter Dr	Salinas Rd to San Juan Rd	0.967	E	1.142	F
Porter Dr	San Juan Rd to Santa Cruz County Line	1.423	F	1.846	F
Rio Rd	Carmel City Line to SR-1	1.161	F	1.375	F
Russell Rd	SR-101 to San Juan Grade Rd	0.661	D	1.042	F
Salinas Rd	SR-1 to Fruitland Ave	0.972	E	1.019	F
San Benancio Rd	Harper Canyon Rd to SH-68	0.568	D	1.177	F
San Juan Grade Rd	Salinas City Line to Russell Rd	1.015	F	1.378	F
San Juan Grade Rd	Russell Rd to Rogge Rd	0.747	D	1.37	F
San Juan Grade Rd	Hebert Rd to Crazy Horse Canyon Rd	0.402	C	1.259	F
Roadway Segments Operating at LOS E in the Existing plus Project Buildout Scenario					
County Road G17 (Reservation)	East Garrison Rd to Davis Rd	0.418	C	0.986	E
Corral De Tierra	SH-68 to Robley Rd	0.682	D	0.802	E
Espinosa Rd	SR-183 to US-101	0.896	E	0.979	E
Harris Rd	Spreckels Blvd to Abbott St	0.844	E	0.823	E
Roadway Segments Operating at Deficient LOS D in the Existing plus Project Buildout Scenario					
County Road G16 (Carmel Valley Road)	Holman Rd to Via Los Tulares	Refer to existing conditions analysis		0.548	D
County Road G16(Carmel Valley Road)	SR-1 to Carmel Rancho Blvd			1.084	F
County Road G16(Carmel Valley Road)	Carmel Rancho Blvd to Rio Rd			1.081	F
County Road G16(Carmel	Rio Rd to Rancho San Carlos Rd			1.89	F

Valley Road)					
County Road G20 (Laureles Grade Rd)	Robley Rd to Carmel Valley Rd	0.582	D	0.916	D
Carmel Rancho Blvd	Carmel Valley Blvd to Carmel Rancho Ln	0.619	D	0.758	D
Carmel Rancho Blvd	Carmel Rancho Ln to Rio Rd	0.402	C	0.475	D
Rio Rd	SR-1 to Carmel Rancho Blvd	0.575	D	0.679	D

Source: Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Table 4.6-22 presents the Regional roadway segments operating at LOS E or LOS F under Existing plus Project Buildout conditions and compares the segments to their LOS under existing conditions. Exhibit 4.6.9 presents the segment LOS graphically. A detailed table showing the volume, the volume to capacity ratio and the resulting LOS for each Regional roadway segment is included in the Appendix.

There are nine regional roadway segments that operate at LOS E and 55 segments that operate at LOS F under this scenario. Under existing conditions, 54 of these Regional roadway segments operate at LOS E or F, so development in the County at buildout causes an additional ten roadway segments to exceed the County's LOS threshold.

Table 4.6-22. Regional Roadway Segments Operating at LOS E or F under Existing plus Project Buildout Conditions

		Existing Conditions		Existing plus Project Buildout Conditions	
Roadway Segment		V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS
Roadway Segments Operating at LOS F in the Existing plus Project Buildout Scenario					
US Highway 101	County Border to Crazy Horse Canyon Rd	1.044	F	1.136	F
US Highway 101	Crazy Horse Canyon Rd to San Miguel Canyon Rd	0.989	E	1.076	F
US Highway 101	San Miguel Canyon Rd to SR-156	1.441	F	1.567	F
US Highway 101	SR-156 to Pesante Rd	1.106	F	1.202	F
US Highway 101	Pesante Rd to Espinosa Rd	1.106	F	1.202	F
US Highway 101	Espinosa Rd to E Boronda Rd	1.098	F	1.195	F
US Highway 101	E Boronda Rd to W Laurel Dr	1.143	F	1.243	F
US Highway 101	W Laurel Dr to N Main St	1.107	F	1.234	F

Roadway Segment		Existing Conditions		Existing plus Project Buildout Conditions	
		V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS
US Highway 101	N Main St to E Market St	1.172	F	1.275	F
US Highway 101	E Market St to John St	1.114	F	1.211	F
SR-1	Salinas Rd to Struve Rd	1.546	F	1.683	F
SR-1	Struve Rd to Dolan Rd	1.667	F	1.811	F
SR-1	Dolan Rd to Molera Rd	1.496	F	1.627	F
SR-1	Molera Rd to SR-183	1.426	F	1.550	F
SR-1	Fremont Blvd to Canyon del Rey Blvd	1.006	F	1.094	F
SR-1	Canyon del Rey Blvd to Del Monte Ave	1.071	F	1.165	F
SR-1	N Fremont St to Aguajito Rd	1.411	F	1.534	F
SR-1	Holman Hwy to Carpenter St	0.890	D	1.080	F
SR-1	Carpenter St to Ocean Ave	1.447	F	1.842	F
SR-1	Ocean Ave to Carmel Valley Rd	1.208	F	1.422	F
SR-68 (Holman Highway)	Forest Ave to 17 Mile Dr	1.448	F	1.644	F
SR-68 (Holman Highway)	17 Mile Dr to Skyline Forest Dr	1.638	F	1.877	F
SR-68 (Holman Highway)	Skyline Forest Dr to CHOMP Dwy	1.638	F	1.890	F
SR-68 (Holman Highway)	CHOMP Dwy to SR-1	1.638	F	1.865	F
SR-68 (Monterey Salinas Highway)	SR-1 to Olmsted Rd	1.422	F	1.641	F
SR-68 (Monterey Salinas Highway)	Olmsted Rd to Canyon del Rey Blvd	1.422	F	1.542	F
SR-68 (Monterey Salinas Highway)	Canyon del Rey Blvd to Bit Rd	1.304	F	1.540	F
SR-68 (Monterey Salinas Highway)	Bit Rd to Laureles Grade Rd	1.304	F	1.521	F
SR-68 (Monterey Salinas Highway)	Laureles Grade Rd to Corral de Tierra	1.525	F	1.834	F
SR-68 (Monterey Salinas Highway)	Corral de Tierra to Portola Dr	1.617	F	1.933	F
SR-68 (Monterey Salinas Highway)	Spreckels Blvd to E Blanco Rd	0.811	B	1.123	F
SR-156	Castroville Blvd to US-101	1.902	F	1.871	F
SR-183 (Merritt St)	SR-156 to Blackie Rd	1.184	F	1.442	F
SR-183 (Castroville Rd)	Blackie Rd to Espinosa Rd	1.074	F	1.233	F
SR-183 (Castroville Rd)	Espinosa Rd to Cooper Rd	1.012	F	1.172	F

Roadway Segment		Existing Conditions		Existing plus Project Buildout Conditions	
		V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS
SR-218 (Canyon del Rey Blvd)	Fremont Blvd to Carlton Dr	1.099	F	1.315	F
SR-218 (Canyon del Rey Blvd)	Carlton Dr to SR-68	1.099	F	1.425	F
Foam St	Prescott Ave to Drake Ave	1.156	F	2.725	F
Foam St	Drake Ave to Lighthouse Ave	1.277	F	2.858	F
Lighthouse Ave	Private Bolio Rd to Pacific St	1.27	F	1.191	F
Lighthouse Ave	Pacific St to Washington St	1.124	F	1.061	F
Del Monte Ave	Washington St to Camino Aguajito	1.314	F	1.314	F
Del Monte Ave	Camino Aguajito to Casa Verde Wy	1.313	F	1.337	F
Del Monte Ave	Casa Verde Wy to SR-1	1.443	F	1.469	F
Fremont St	Abrego St to Camino Aguajito	1.065	F	1.087	F
Munras Ave/Abrego St	Soledad Dr to Via Zaragoza	1.226	F	1.450	F
Del Monte Blvd	SR-1 to Canyon del Rey Blvd	1.039	F	1.039	F
Del Monte Blvd	Canyon del Rey Blvd to Broadway Ave	1.058	F	1.049	F
Del Monte Blvd	SR-1 to Reindollar Ave	1.081	F	1.113	F
Del Monte Blvd	Reindollar Ave to Reservation Rd	1.929	F	2.013	F
N Fremont St	Casa Verde Wy to SR-218	0.971	E	1.065	F
S Main St	Romie Ln to E Blanco Rd	0.817	D	1.079	F
John St	Abbott St to US-101	1.069	F	1.178	F
Davis Rd	W Laurel Dr to SR-183	1.057	F	1.233	F
Davis Rd	SR-183 to W Blanco Rd	2.428	F	2.870	F
Roadway Segments Operating at LOS E in the Existing plus Project Buildout Scenario					
US Highway 101	John St to S Sanborn Rd	0.897	D	0.975	E
SR-1	Del Monte Ave to N Fremont St	0.890	D	0.952	E
SR-1	Aguajito Rd to Munras Ave	0.854	D	0.929	E
Foam St	David Ave to Prescott Ave	0.661	D	0.783	E
Lighthouse Ave	Prescott Ave to Private Bolio Rd	1.637	F	0.951	E
Sanborn Rd	US-101 to Abbott St	0.983	E	0.994	E

Roadway Segment		Existing Conditions V/C Ratio	Existing Conditions LOS	Existing plus Project Buildout Conditions V/C Ratio	Existing plus Project Buildout Conditions LOS
N Main St	W Laurel Dr to E Bernal Dr	0.921	D	0.951	E
E Boronda Rd	US-101 to N Main St	0.923	D	0.970	E
S Main St	John St to Romie Ln	0.768	D	0.950	E

Source: Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Table 4.6-23 compares existing and Existing plus Project Buildout roadway LOS on Regional roadways external to Monterey County. Traffic generated by the land uses allowed under the 2007 General Plan will produce inter-county travel between housing and jobs in Santa Cruz, San Benito, and Santa Clara counties, and to a lesser extent San Luis Obispo County. With cumulative development in adjacent counties increases the demand for this inter-county travel. Development allowed under the General Plan, cumulatively with development in incorporated cities in Monterey County and development in adjacent counties, causes nearly every roadway segment to experience an increase in the volume to capacity ratio, and causes four segments to change from LOS D or better to a LOS E or F.

Table 4.6-23. Roadway Level of Service of Facilities External to Monterey County under Existing plus Project Buildout Conditions

Roadway Segment		Existing Conditions V/C Ratio	Existing Conditions LOS	Existing plus Project Buildout Conditions V/C Ratio	Existing plus Project Buildout Conditions LOS
Santa Clara County					
US Highway 101	Cochrane Rd to E Dunne Ave	1.139	F	0.820	D
US Highway 101	Masten Ave to Leavesley Rd/SR-152 West	0.989	E	0.824	D
US Highway 101	Monterey Rd to SR-25	1.071	F	0.964	E
SR-152	SR-156 to Merced County	0.630	C	0.634	C
Santa Cruz County					
SR-1	Soquel Ave to 41st St	1.368	F	1.071	F
SR-1	Airport Blvd to SR-152	0.876	D	0.731	C
SR-1	Harkings Slough Rd to SR-129	0.608	C	0.541	B
SR-1	SR-129 to Monterey County	0.492	B	0.423	B

Roadway Segment		Existing Conditions V/C Ratio	Existing Conditions LOS	Existing plus Project Buildout Conditions V/C Ratio	Existing plus Project Buildout Conditions LOS
SR-17	Santa Clara County to Granite Creek Rd	0.958	E	0.945	E
SR-129 (Riverside Rd)	Lakeview Rd to Carlton Rd	0.847	D	0.926	D
San Benito County					
US Highway 101	Santa Clara County to SR-129	0.912	E	0.809	D
SR-25(Bolsa Rd)	Santa Clara County to SR-156	1.196	F	1.049	F
SR-156	Salinas Rd to Union Rd	1.706	F	1.718	F
San Luis Obispo County					
US Highway 101	Monterey County to San Miguel Ave	0.300	A	0.314	A

Source: Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Impact of Goods Movement on Roadway Level of Service

There are no actual projections of truck traffic to buildout in the year 2092, but using employment growth as a proxy for growth in business that generates the need for freight movement, truck traffic would grow about 20% between 2030 and buildout. Therefore truck traffic would increase from 18,600 truck trips per day in 2030 to 22,200 at buildout.

As described earlier, this increase in freight movement is not significant enough to cause widespread capacity-related impacts, but will contribute large vehicle traffic to roadways and highways that are currently, or are projected to fall below the County's acceptable LOS standard and may cause the localized impacts on heavily traveled freight routes and within industrialized areas where truck traffic originates.

2007 General Plan Policies

The policies related to roadway level of service described in the Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030 scenario apply to the Existing plus Project buildout scenario.

Significance Determination

Buildout the 2007 General Plan would increase traffic volumes on County roads, Regional roads, and regional roads external to the County. This added traffic would both cause roadway segments to exceed the County's LOS standard, and contribute traffic to roadways that exceed the LOS standard

without development, and further degrade the performance measure. Despite development contributions to county impacts (through countywide traffic impact fee), and regional impacts (through regional traffic impact fee) there will remain a funding shortfall for the improvement of County and Regional roads to achieve the County's LOS standard. Therefore this impact remains significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation of the LOS impacts described above (see mitigation measure for Impact TRAN-2B) would require extensive County and Regional roadway widening, and intersection modifications to provide enough capacity to achieve the County's LOS D (or LOS C within Area Plans such as the CVMP) standard on all impacted segments, some outside of Monterey County. Additionally, mitigation would include substantial increases in public transportation services.

The mitigation measures recommended for implementation by the County to achieve LOS standards within the CVMP area under the 2030 Cumulative plus Project scenario are applicable to this scenario. However, segments of Carmel Valley Road and SR 1 in the CVMP area will exceed the CVMP level of standards, and no further mitigation of these facilities is feasible. Therefore this impact will be significant and unavoidable.

Significance Conclusion

Buildout of the 2007 General Plan would have a significant and unavoidable impact on County roads, and Regional roads both within and external to Monterey County. No mitigation is proposed for these facilities and they remain significant and unavoidable.

Air Traffic

Impact 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. (Less Than Significant)

Impact of Development with Policies

The discussion of air traffic impacts in the Existing plus Project Development to the year 2030 scenario remains applicable in this scenario.

2007 General Plan Policies

The policies related to roadway level of service for development described in the Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030 scenario apply to this scenario.

Significance Determination

As described earlier, development of the land uses allowed under the 2007 General Plan would result in an increase in demand for air travel. Passenger travel in Monterey County peaked in 1978 with about 640,000 passengers annually. Since that time passenger travel has declined to nearly half of its peak (Monterey Airport District, 2008). Without adding additional capacity at airports, the current passenger level could increase to at least 640,000 passengers annually without impacting airport operations (a 96% increase).

Land use growth proposed in the general Plan and specifically the Highway 68/Monterey Peninsula Airport Affordable Housing Overlay will not be located within airport flight paths, and will not be designed in such a way as to become an incompatible land use (i.e., high rise buildings). No change in airport location is being proposed in the 2007 General Plan. This is a less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

Impacts would be less than significant, therefore no mitigation measures are necessary.

Significance Conclusion

The development of the General Plan would increase the demand for the air travel. The General Plan contains policies to encourage safe operations of air facilities and land uses surrounding the airports that are consistent with airport operations. Airport passenger demand is significantly less than it was in 1978 and therefore can accommodate substantial increases without increasing the capacity of airports. Impacts of the General Plan policies under Existing plus Project Buildout are less than significant.

Roadway Hazards

Impact 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. (Less Than Significant)

Impact of Development with Policies

The discussion of roadway hazard impacts in the Existing plus Project Development to the year 2030 scenario remains applicable in this scenario.

2007 General Plan Policies

The policies related to roadway level of service for development described in the Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030 scenario apply to this scenario.

Significance Determination

Buildout of the 2007 General Plan would result in non-standard or hazardous designs and incompatible facilities with adjoining land uses. The General Plan policies described earlier to prevent or reduce these impacts or limit incompatible land uses. Therefore, the impact of roadway hazards at buildout of the 2007 General Plan is less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation measures beyond the 2007 General Plan are necessary.

Significance Conclusion

Buildout of the General Plan would result in non-standard or hazardous transportation facility designs or land uses that are incompatible with public facilities. However, the 2007 General Plan contains policies to ensure that new development provides access and improvements to the county roadway system to meet County standards. It also contains policies to prevent incompatible land uses to avoid transportation conflicts and roadway hazards. Therefore, the impact is less than significant.

Emergency Access

Impact TRAN-3E: Buildout of the 2007 General Plan would result in inadequate emergency access. (Significant and Unavoidable)

Impact of Development with Policies

The discussion of emergency access impacts in the Existing plus Project Development to the year 2030 scenario remains applicable in this scenario.

2007 General Plan Policies

The policies related to roadway level of service for development described in the Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030 scenario apply to this scenario.

Significance Determination

Buildout of the 2007 General Plan would result in inadequate emergency access due to increases in traffic that result in County and Regional roadways exceeding County LOS standards, and creating traffic congestion that slows emergency response time.

The General Plan policies discussed above address transportation related impacts to emergency response due to congestion, and design. However, even with the adoption of county and regional impact fees, and implementation of proposed transportation improvements at the County and Regional level, traffic impacts to County and Regional roadway level of service will remain significant and unavoidable, and thereby cause an impact to emergency response that significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures described under the Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030 are applicable to this scenario.

Significance Conclusion

Buildout of the 2007 General Plan would generate traffic that would cause County and Regional roadways to exceed the County's LOS D standard, and contribute to roadways that exceed the standard without development, causing traffic congestion that would impact emergency response time. This is a significant and unavoidable impact.

Alternative Transportation

Impact 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. (Less than Significant)

Impact of Development with Policies

The discussion of air traffic impacts in the Existing plus Project Development to the year 2030 scenario remains applicable in this scenario.

2007 General Plan Policies

The policies related to roadway level of service for development described in the Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030 scenario apply to this scenario.

Significance Determination

As described earlier, implementation of the policies in the General Plan and Area Plans for buildout of the General Plan would increase pedestrian, bicycle and transit-supportive facilities by both requiring and encouraging the construction of such facilities and land use patterns in new development. These policies provide support for, and do not conflict with, alternative modes of transportation. The transit-supportive land uses identified in the general Plan are consistent with MST's objective to provide transit-oriented development (Designing for Transit - A Manual for Integrating Public Transit and Land Use in Monterey County, MST, 2006).

The land uses allowed under the General Plan, if consistent with policy, would increase the need for transit service with concentrations of development in existing transit-served corridors, community areas, and near incorporated cities. The increase in demand for transit service is consistent with MST's strategic goals of increasing transit ridership, expanding service, and introducing new services such as BRT in major corridors (Peninsula Area Service Study, 2006 and Business Plan and Short Range Transit Plan, FY 2008 through 2008). Therefore, this impact is less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are necessary.

Significance Conclusion

The policies contained in the General Plan provide both requirements and encouragement of alternative mode infrastructure and facilities, and promote transit-support land use patterns. These polices support and do not conflict with existing facilities, policies, plans and programs. The development allowed under the General Plan will generate demand for pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and demand for transit services. These demands can be accommodated by ensuring development conforms to County policies and design standards, and are consistent with the goals and strategies of MST, the County's transit service provider. This is a less than significant impact.

Buildout Cumulative plus Project

Buildout Cumulative plus Project conditions represent forecast year 2092 conditions with full implementation of the allowed land uses in the 2007 General Plan and projected growth in incorporated cities through the year 2092. This scenario includes development in adjacent counties (Santa Cruz, San Benito, and Santa Clara) to the year 2030 since growth projections to 2092 for those counties are not available.

This scenario identifies the impacts of development in unincorporated areas of the County cumulative with development in incorporated areas and adjacent counties by identifying changes in roadway level of service. This analysis of the 2007 General Plan is compared to No Project conditions under the 1982 General Plan.

Project-Specific Impacts of the Development under Buildout Cumulative plus Project Conditions

Impact 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. (Less Than Significant Impact).

Impact of Development with Policies

Project-specific impacts of new development are described in Impact TRAN-1A.

2007 General Plan Policies

The policies related to roadway level of service for development described in the Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030 scenario apply to the Existing plus Project Buildout scenario.

Significance Determination

Project-specific impacts of new development will continue to occur through buildout of the General Plan. As long as General Plan policies remain in effect, new development will be required to prepare a project-level traffic study, or project-level Environmental Impact Report. Impacts to roadway LOS or project access would be identified in these studies and development would be fully responsible for the implementation of mitigation measures or would be responsible for its fair-share of the mitigation depending on the extent of the impact and the development's contribution to the impact along with other cumulative development. If a roadway already falls below the County's LOS standard, then the development is required to mitigate its impact so that the measure of performance (e.g., volume to capacity ratio, peak hour average delay, etc.) of the roadway does not degrade beyond the level without the development. This is a less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

Impacts are less than significant, therefore no mitigation is necessary.

Significance Conclusion

Implementation of the 2007 General Plan consistent with policies related to project-specific localized impacts (Policy C-1.4, new development is required to mitigate project-specific local impacts to maintain the County's LOS standard and to provide adequate access and circulation facilities. Policy C-1.3 restricts new development or requires the phasing of new development so that it is concurrent with transportation improvements) would have a less than significant impact and no mitigation is required.

County and Regional Roadway Level of Service Impacts (Buildout Cumulative plus Project)

Impact TRAN-4B: Buildout of 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. (Significant and unavoidable impact)

Impact of Development with Policies

The LOS on study area roadways for the Buildout Cumulative plus Project scenario is illustrated graphically in Exhibit 4.6.10. A detailed analysis of roadway level of service by segment is included in the Appendix.

Table 4.6-24 shows the roadway segments operating at deficient level of service under this scenario. As shown in Table 4.6-24, there are nine segments that operate at LOS E and 59 segments that operate at LOS F in this scenario. In comparison, under Existing plus Project Buildout conditions, 43 of the segments in Table 4.6-24 currently operate at LOS E or F. This indicates that buildout of the County, cumulatively with development in incorporated cities and adjacent counties cause an additional 25 roadway segments to exceed the County's LOS standard.

Table 4.6-24. County Roadway Segments Operating at LOS E or F under Buildout Cumulative plus Project Conditions

		Buildout Cumulative plus Project Conditions	
Roadway Segment		V/C Ratio	LOS
Roadway Segments Operating at LOS F in the Buildout Cumulative Conditions Scenario			
County Road G11 (San Juan Rd)	Salinas Rd to San Miguel Canyon Rd	1.14	F
County Road G12 (Elkhorn Rd)	Salinas Rd to Hall Rd	1.29	F
County Road G12 (Hall Rd)	Elkhorn Rd to San Miguel Canyon Rd	2.97	F
County Road G12 (San Miguel Canyon Rd)	Hall Rd to Strawberry Rd	1.32	F
County Road G12 (San Miguel Canyon Rd)	Strawberry Rd to Castroville Blvd	1.55	F
County Road G12 (San Miguel Canyon Rd)	Castroville Blvd to US-101	1.46	F
County Road G14 (Jolon)	US-101 to San Lucas Rd	1.88	F
County Road G16 (Carmel Valley Road)	SR-1 to Carmel Rancho Blvd	1.30	F
County Road G16 (Carmel Valley Road)	Carmel Rancho Blvd to Rio Rd	1.35	F
County Road G16 (Carmel Valley Road)	Rio Rd to Rancho San Carlos Rd	2.45	F
County Road G16 (Carmel Valley Road)	Rancho San Carlos Rd to Valley Greens Dr	3.13	F
County Road G16 (Carmel Valley Road)	Valley Greens Dr to Robinson Canyon Rd	2.27	F
County Road G16 (Carmel Valley Road)	Robinson Canyon Rd to Miramonte Rd	2.35	F
County Road G16 (Carmel Valley Road)	Miramonte Rd to Laureles Grade	1.85	F
County Road G16 (Carmel Valley Road)	Laureles Grade to Ford Rd	1.94	F
County Road G16 (Carmel Valley Road)	Ford Rd to Esquiline Rd	1.13	F
County Road G16 (Carmel Valley Road)	Holman Rd to Via Los Tulares	1.08	F
County Road G17 (Reservation)	Blanco Rd to East Garrison Rd	1.96	F
County Road G17 (Reservation)	East Garrison Rd to Davis Rd	2.23	F
County Road G17 (Reservation)	Davis Rd to SR-68	1.47	F
County Road G17 (River Rd)	SR-68 to Las Palmas Rd	1.28	F
County Road G17 (River Rd)	Las Palmas Rd to Las Palmas Pkwy	1.01	F
County Road G17 (River Rd)	Las Palmas Pkwy to Pine Canyon Rd	1.21	F
County Road G17 (River Rd)	Pine Canyon Rd to Chualar River Rd	1.51	F
County Road G17 (River Rd)	Chualar River Rd to Gonzales River Rd	1.05	F
County Road G17 (River Rd)	Foothill Rd to Arroyo Seco Rd	1.25	F

Roadway Segment		Buildout Cumulative plus Project Conditions V/C Ratio	LOS
County Road G20 (Laureles Grade Rd)	Robley Rd to Carmel Valley Rd	1.37	F
Blanco Rd	W Alisal St to SR-68	1.29	F
Blanco Rd	SR-68 to Abbott St	1.67	F
Arroyo Seco Rd	Fort Romie Rd to US-101	1.56	F
Blanco Rd	Reservation Rd to Cooper Rd	3.34	F
Blanco Rd	Cooper Rd to Armstrong Rd	3.13	F
Blanco Rd	Armstrong Rd to Davis Rd	3.33	F
Camino Del Monte	Carmel City Line to Serra Ave	1.60	F
Carpenter St	Carmel City Line to Serra Ave	1.55	F
Carpenter St	Serra Ave to SR-1	2.43	F
Chualar Rd	US-101 to Old Stage Rd	1.60	F
Corral De Tierra	SH-68 to Robley Rd	1.33	F
Crazy Horse Canyon Rd	San Juan Grade Rd to US-101	1.71	F
Espinosa Rd	SR-183 to US-101	1.18	F
Grant St	Scott St to Clay St	1.07	F
Harris Rd	Spreckels Blvd to Abbott St	2.13	F
Nashua Rd	SR-1 to Cooper Rd	1.46	F
Ocean Ave	Carmel City Line to SR-1	2.00	F
Old Stage Rd	Hebert Rd to Natividad Rd	1.75	F
Old Stage Rd	Natividad Rd to Williams Rd	3.28	F
Pine Canyon Rd (King City)	Pine Meadow Dr to Merritt St	1.38	F
Pine Canyon Rd (King City)	Merrit St to Jolon Rd	1.14	F
Porter Dr	Salinas Rd to San Juan Rd	1.54	F
Porter Dr	San Juan Rd to Santa Cruz County Line	3.19	F
Prunedale North Rd	SR-156 to San Miguel Canyon	1.65	F
Rio Rd	Carmel City Line to SR-1	2.27	F
Rogge Rd	San Juan Grade Rd to Natividad Rd	1.29	F
Russell Rd	SR-101 to San Juan Grade Rd	2.39	F
Salinas Rd	Fruitland Ave to Elkhorn Rd	1.17	F
San Benancio Rd	Harper Canyon Rd to SH-68	1.27	F
San Juan Grade Rd	Salinas City Line to Russell Rd	2.11	F
San Juan Grade Rd	Russell Rd to Rogge Rd	2.15	F
San Juan Grade Rd	Hebert Rd to Crazy Horse Canyon Rd	1.33	F
Spreckels Blvd	SR-68 to Harkins Rd	1.21	F
Roadway Segments Operating at LOS E in the Buildout Cumulative Conditions Scenario			
County Road G12(Salinas Rd)	Railroad Ave to Elkhorn Rd	0.98	E

Roadway Segment		Buildout Cumulative plus Project Conditions V/C Ratio	LOS
County Road G20 (Laureles Grade Rd)	SR-68 to Robley Rd	0.96	E
Munras Ave/Abrego St	Fremont St to Soledad Dr	0.88	E
N Fremont St	SR-1 to Casa Verde Wy	0.96	E
Grant St	Payson Rd to Scott St	0.99	E
Pajaro St	SR-183 to Geil St	0.85	E
Portola Dr (Toro Park)	Reservation Rd to Creekside Ter	0.79	E
Portola Dr (Toro Park)	Anza Dr to Manolete Dr	0.89	E
San Miguel Canyon Rd	Tarpey Rd to Hall Rd	0.93	E
Roadway Segments Operating at Deficient LOS D in the Buildout Cumulative Conditions Scenario			
County Road G16 (Carmel Valley Road)	Esquiline Rd to Holman Rd	0.522	D
County Road G16 (Carmel Valley Road)	Holman Rd to Via Los Tulares	0.890	D
County Road G16 (Carmel Valley Road)	Via Los Tulares to Cachagua Rd	0.753	D
Carmel Rancho Blvd	Carmel Valley Blvd to Carmel Rancho Ln	0.775	D
Carmel Rancho Blvd	Carmel Rancho Ln to Rio Rd	0.625	D
Rio Rd	SR-1 to Carmel Rancho Blvd	0.754	D

Source: Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Impact of Development in the Carmel Valley Area Plan

The traffic analysis of the CVMP and the Carmel Valley Transportation Improvement Program used to present impacts of the General Plan on 2030 Cumulative Projects did not evaluate impacts of buildout of the General Plan to the year 2092. Therefore, roadway segments within the Carmel Valley Master Plan area are analyzed using the daily level of service methodology used to analyze other roadways in the County. These segments are included in Table 4.6-XX above and Table 4.6-YY below.

Table 4.6-25 presents the Regional roadway segments operating at LOS E or LOS F under 2030 Cumulative plus Project conditions. Exhibit 4.6.10 presents the segment LOS graphically. A detailed table showing the volume, the volume to capacity ratio and the resulting LOS for each Regional roadway segment is included in the Appendix.

There are eight regional roadway segments that operate at LOS E and 84 segments that operate at LOS F under this scenario. Under Existing plus Project Buildout conditions, 64 of these Regional roadway segments operate at LOS E or F, so buildout of the County cumulatively with development in

incorporated cities and adjacent counties causes an additional 20 roadway segments to exceed the County's LOS threshold.

Table 4.6-25. Regional Roadway Segments Operating at LOS E or F under Buildout Cumulative plus Project Conditions

Roadway Segment		Buildout Cumulative plus Project V/C Ratio	LOS
Roadway Segments Operating at LOS F in the Buildout Cumulative plus Project Scenario			
US Highway 101	County Border to Crazy Horse Canyon Rd	1.136	F
US Highway 101	Crazy Horse Canyon Rd to San Miguel Canyon Rd	1.076	F
US Highway 101	San Miguel Canyon Rd to SR-156	1.597	F
US Highway 101	SR-156 to Pesante Rd	2.000	F
US Highway 101	Pesante Rd to Espinosa Rd	2.002	F
US Highway 101	Espinosa Rd to E Boronda Rd	1.556	F
US Highway 101	E Boronda Rd to W Laurel Dr	1.615	F
US Highway 101	W Laurel Dr to N Main St	1.967	F
US Highway 101	N Main St to E Market St	1.796	F
US Highway 101	E Market St to John St	1.831	F
US Highway 101	John St to S Sanborn Rd	1.569	F
US Highway 101	S Sanborn Rd to Airport Blvd	1.402	F
US Highway 101	Airport Blvd to Abbott St	1.495	F
US Highway 101	Spence Rd to Chualar Rd	1.090	F
US Highway 101	Chualar Rd to Old Stage Rd	1.729	F
US Highway 101	Old Stage Rd to 5th St	1.640	F
US Highway 101	5th St to S Alta St	1.531	F
US Highway 101	S Alta St to Camphora Rd	1.576	F
US Highway 101	Camphora Rd to Moranda Rd	1.606	F
US Highway 101	Moranda Rd to Front St	1.442	F
US Highway 101	Front St to Arroyo Seco Rd	1.321	F
US Highway 101	Arroyo Seco Rd to El Camino Real	1.053	F
SR-1	County Border to Salinas Rd	1.374	F
SR-1	Salinas Rd to Struve Rd	2.044	F
SR-1	Struve Rd to Dolan Rd	2.209	F
SR-1	Dolan Rd to Molera Rd	2.040	F
SR-1	Molera Rd to SR-183	1.960	F
SR-1	Imjin Pkwy to Light Fighter Dr	1.094	F
SR-1	Light Fighter Dr to Fremont Blvd	1.091	F
SR-1	Canyon del Rey Blvd to Del Monte Ave	1.330	F
SR-1	Del Monte Ave to N Fremont St	1.023	F

Roadway Segment		Buildout Cumulative plus Project V/C Ratio	LOS
SR-1	N Fremont St to Aguajito Rd	1.534	F
SR-1	Aguajito Rd to Munras Ave	1.114	F
SR-1	Holman Hwy to Carpenter St	1.346	F
SR-1	Carpenter St to Ocean Ave	2.208	F
SR-1	Ocean Ave to Carmel Valley Rd	1.457	F
SR-68 (Holman Highway)	Forest Ave to 17 Mile Dr	2.092	F
SR-68 (Holman Highway)	17 Mile Dr to Skyline Forest Dr	2.411	F
SR-68 (Holman Highway)	Skyline Forest Dr to CHOMP Dwy	2.405	F
SR-68 (Holman Highway)	CHOMP Dwy to SR-1	1.184	F
SR-68 (Monterey Salinas Highway)	SR-1 to Olmsted Rd	2.01	F
SR-68 (Monterey Salinas Highway)	Olmsted Rd to Canyon del Rey Blvd	2.16	F
SR-68 (Monterey Salinas Highway)	Canyon del Rey Blvd to Bit Rd	2.11	F
SR-68 (Monterey Salinas Highway)	Bit Rd to Laureles Grade Rd	2.13	F
SR-68 (Monterey Salinas Highway)	Laureles Grade Rd to Corral de Tierra	2.55	F
SR-68 (Monterey Salinas Highway)	Corral de Tierra to Portola Dr	1.56	F
SR-68 (Monterey Salinas Highway)	Reservation Rd to Spreckels Blvd	1.01	F
SR-68 (Monterey Salinas Highway)	Spreckels Blvd to E Blanco Rd	1.78	F
SR-146 (Front St)	US-101 to East St (on Front St)	1.99	F
SR-146 (Metz Rd)	East St to County Rd G-15	1.05	F
SR-183 (Castroville Rd)	Blackie Rd to Espinosa Rd	1.945	F
SR-183 (Castroville Rd)	Espinosa Rd to Cooper Rd	1.828	F
SR-183 (Castroville Rd)	Cooper Rd to S Davis Rd	1.211	F
SR-218 (Canyon del Rey Blvd)	SR-1 to Del Monte Blvd	1.386	F
SR-218 (Canyon del Rey Blvd)	Del Monte Blvd to Fremont Blvd	1.101	F
SR-218 (Canyon del Rey Blvd)	Fremont Blvd to Carlton Dr	1.753	F
SR-218 (Canyon del Rey Blvd)	Carlton Dr to SR-68	1.822	F
Foam St	Prescott Ave to Drake Ave	2.945	F
Foam St	Drake Ave to Lighthouse Ave	2.864	F
Lighthouse Ave	David Ave to Prescott Ave	1.197	F
Lighthouse Ave	Prescott Ave to Private Bolio Rd	1.893	F
Lighthouse Ave	Private Bolio Rd to Pacific St	1.638	F
Lighthouse Ave	Pacific St to Washington St	1.618	F
Del Monte Ave	Washington St to Camino Aguajito	1.865	F
Del Monte Ave	Camino Aguajito to Casa Verde Wy	1.940	F
Del Monte Ave	Casa Verde Wy to SR-1	2.932	F
Fremont St	Abrego St to Camino Aguajito	1.657	F
Munras Ave/Abrego St	Soledad Dr to Via Zaragoza	2.396	F

Roadway Segment		Buildout Cumulative plus Project V/C Ratio	LOS
Del Monte Blvd	SR-1 to Canyon del Rey Blvd	2.120	F
Del Monte Blvd	Canyon del Rey Blvd to Broadway Ave	1.793	F
Fremont Blvd	N Del Monte Blvd to SR-1	1.621	F
Del Monte Blvd	SR-1 to Reindollar Ave	2.065	F
Del Monte Blvd	Reindollar Ave to Reservation Rd	3.715	F
N Fremont St	Casa Verde Wy to SR-218	2.136	F
Sanborn Rd	US-101 to Abbott St	1.524	F
N Main St	San Juan Grade Rd to W Laurel Dr	1.423	F
N Main St	W Laurel Dr to E Bernal Dr	1.508	F
E Boronda Rd	US-101 to N Main St	2.692	F
John St	Abbott St to US-101	1.469	F
Market St	Davis Rd to N Main St	1.150	F
Davis Rd	W Laurel Dr to SR-183	1.54	F
Blanco Rd	S Davis Rd to W Alisal St	1.997	F
Blanco Rd	W Alisal St to SR-68	1.294	F
Blanco Rd	SR-68 to Abbott St	1.673	F
Roadway Segments Operating at LOS E in the Buildout Cumulative plus Project Scenario			
US Highway 101	Central Ave to Jolon Rd	0.900	E
SR-1	Del Monte Blvd to Reservation Rd	0.932	E
SR-1	Reservation Rd to Del Monte Blvd	0.961	E
SR-1	Remont Blvd to Canyon del Rey Blvd	0.947	E
SR-68 (Monterey Salinas Highway)	Portola Dr to Reservation Rd	0.967	E
SR-146 (East St)	Front St to Metz Rd	0.993	E
Munras Ave/Abrego St	Fremont St to Soledad Dr	0.883	E
N Fremont St	SR-1 to Casa Verde Wy	0.955	E

Source: Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Table 4.6-26 presents Buildout Cumulative plus Project roadway LOS on Regional roadways external to Monterey County. Traffic generated by buildout of the 2007 General Plan will produce inter-county travel between housing and jobs in Santa Cruz, San Benito, and Santa Clara counties, and to a lesser extent San Luis Obispo County. Buildout of the General Plan, cumulatively with development in incorporated cities in Monterey County and development in adjacent counties, causes seven segments to change from LOS D or better to a LOS E or F.

Table 4.6-26. Roadway Level of Service of Facilities External to Monterey County under Cumulative plus Project Buildout Conditions

Roadway Segment		Existing plus Project Buildout Conditions		Buildout Cumulative plus Project Conditions	
		V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS
Santa Clara County					
US Highway 101	Cochrane Rd to E Dunne Ave	0.820	D	1.618	F
US Highway 101	Masten Ave to Leavesley Rd/SR-152 West	0.824	D	1.305	F
US Highway 101	Monterey Rd to SR-25	0.964	E	1.485	F
SR-152	SR-156 to Merced County	0.634	C	1.177	F
Santa Cruz County					
SR-1	Soquel Ave to 41st St	1.071	F	1.586	F
SR-1	Airport Blvd to SR-152	0.731	C	1.392	F
SR-1	Harkings Slough Rd to SR-129	0.541	B	1.171	F
SR-1	SR-129 to Monterey County	0.423	B	0.878	D
SR-17	Santa Clara County to Granite Creek Rd	0.945	E	0.670	C
SR-129 (Riverside Rd)	Lakeview Rd to Carlton Rd	0.926	D	0.957	E
San Benito County					
US Highway 101	Santa Clara County to SR-129	0.809	D	1.019	F
SR-25 (Bolsa Rd)	Santa Clara County to SR-156	1.049	F	2.074	F
SR-156	Salinas Rd to Union Rd	1.718	F	1.988	F
San Luis Obispo County					
US Highway 101	Monterey County to San Miguel Ave	0.314	A	0.585	C

Source: Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Impact of Goods Movement on Roadway Level of Service

As described earlier, the county's current truck traffic generation is expected to increase through buildout of the General Plan. While the increase in freight movement is not significant enough to cause widespread capacity-related impacts, it will contribute large vehicle traffic to roadways and highways that are currently, or are projected to fall below the County's acceptable LOS standard and may cause the localized impacts on heavily

traveled freight routes and within industrialized areas where truck traffic originates.

Comparison with No Project Scenario

The No Project scenario represents buildout of the County to the year 2092 under the General Plan currently in effect (1982). Table 4.6-24 earlier compared the housing, population and employment forecasts between the 1982 and 2007 General Plans. The comparison indicated that buildout of the 2007 General Plan would result in a net increase in daily trips greater than what would be generated at buildout of the 1982 General Plan. Therefore the LOS impacts of buildout of the 2007 General Plan would be greater than those of the 1982 General Plan.

2007 General Plan Policies

The 2007 General Plan policies establish measures to minimize adverse impacts of roadway level of service impacts of development both individually and cumulatively. The policies related to roadway level of service for development described in the Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030 scenario apply to the Buildout Cumulative plus Project scenario.

Significance Determination

Buildout of the 2007 General Plan, cumulatively with development in incorporated cities and adjacent counties, would increase traffic volumes on County roads, Regional roads, and regional roads external to the County. This added traffic would both cause roadway segments to exceed the County's LOS standard, and contribute traffic to roadways that exceed the LOS standard without development, and further degrade the performance measure.

Despite development contributions to county impacts (through countywide traffic impact fee), and regional impacts (through regional traffic impact fee) there will remain a funding shortfall for the improvement of County and Regional roads to achieve the County's LOS standard. Therefore this impact remains significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation of the impacts described above to achieve a LOS D include:

- Widening County and Regional roadway from existing 2-lane facilities to 4, 6, or 8-lanes facilities;
- Expand existing intersections to include additional through and turning lanes;
- Install traffic signals;

- Grade-separate intersections of the junction between major streets;
- Widen state highway to accommodate additional travel lanes, provide shoulders, and auxiliary lanes between on and off-ramps; and
- Increase public transportation services by expanding MST's fleet, expand fixed-route services, increase headways, provide park and ride facilities, and implement new services including Bus Rapid Transit, and inter-city rail service.

Many of the mitigations for roadways segments are likely infeasible due to physical, topographical, and environmental constraints, as well the social and economic impacts related to the acquisition of commercial and residential property, or loss of access, and lack of community consensus for roadway capacity-enhancing projects. This construction would result in impacts to other resources, such as biological resources, air quality, noise, aesthetics and agricultural lands. The foremost constraint, however, is funding of transportation facilities. Federal, state and regional funding are limited, and most of these funds are used to maintain the transportation system. The County and TAMC are planning to implement Traffic Impact Fees to fund improvement projects, but the amount of the fees are limited for affordability and total fee burden reasons. Further, another source of funding, voter initiatives to increase sales tax to fund transportation projects, have failed recently, but may be an option in the future.

The County and regional fee programs will continuously be updated, adding additional priority projects to the programs as initial projects are completed, but the rate of project completion will not be able to outpace the rate of development growth.

The mitigation measures identified for the CVMP are recommended under 2030 Cumulative plus Project Conditions remain applicable in this scenario

Significance Conclusion

With buildout of the 2007 General Plan, and implementation of mitigation measures determined to be feasible, there would remain significant and unavoidable impacts on County roads, and Regional roads both within and external to Monterey County.

Air Traffic

Impact 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. (Less than Significant)

Impact of Development with Policies

The discussion of air traffic impacts in the Existing plus Project Development to the year 2030 scenario remains applicable in this scenario.

2007 General Plan Policies

The policies related to roadway level of service for development described in the Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030 scenario apply to the Year 2030 Cumulative plus Project scenario.

Significance Determination

Buildout of the 2007 General Plan would result in an increase in demand for air travel. As stated earlier, airport utilization can double in annual passengers over current conditions. Additionally, land use growth proposed in the general Plan and specifically the Highway 68/Monterey Peninsula Airport Affordable Housing Overlay will not be located within airport flight paths, and will not be design in such a way as to become an incompatible land use (i.e., high rise buildings). No change in airport location is being proposed in the 2007 General Plan. (Less than Significant Impact).

Mitigation Measures

Impacts would be less than significant, therefore no mitigation measures are necessary.

Significance Conclusion

Buildout of the General Plan would increase the demand for the air travel. The General Plan contains policies to encourage safe operations of air facilities and land uses surrounding the airports that are consistent with airport operations. Airport passenger demand is significantly less than it was in 1978 and therefore can accommodate substantial increases without increasing the capacity of airports. Impacts of the General Plan policies under Buildout Cumulative plus Project are less than significant.

Roadway Hazards

Impact 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. (Less Than Significant)

Impact of Development with Policies

The discussion of roadway hazard impacts in the Existing plus Project Development to the year 2030 scenario remains applicable in this scenario.

2007 General Plan Policies

The policies related to roadway level of service for development described in the Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030 scenario apply to this scenario.

Significance Determination

Buildout of the 2007 General Plan by the year 2030 would result in non-standard or hazardous designs and incompatible facilities with adjoining land uses. The General Plan provides for policies to prevent or reduce these impacts by requiring roads to be designed to safety standards. These policies require new development to design facilities to County standards, and limit incompatible land uses. Therefore, the impact of roadway hazards with buildout of the 2007 General Plan is less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation measures beyond the 2007 General Plan are necessary.

Significance Conclusion

Buildout of the General Plan would result in non-standard or hazardous transportation facility designs or land uses that are incompatible with public facilities. However, the 2007 General Plan contains policies to ensure that new development provides access and improvements to the county roadway system to meet County standards. It also contains policies to prevent incompatible land uses to avoid transportation conflicts and roadway hazards. Therefore, the impact is less than significant.

Emergency Access

Impact TRAN-4E: Buildout of the 2007 General Plan, cumulatively with development in incorporated cities and adjacent counties, would result in inadequate emergency access. (Significant and Unavoidable)

Impact of Development with Policies

The discussion of emergency access impacts in the Existing plus Project Development to the year 2030 scenario remains applicable in this scenario.

2007 General Plan Policies

The policies related to roadway level of service for development described in the Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030 scenario apply to the this scenario.

Significance Determination

Buildout of the 2007 General Plan under Buildout Cumulative plus Project conditions would result in inadequate emergency access due to increases in traffic that result in County and Regional roadways exceeding County LOS standards, and creating traffic congestion that slows emergency response time.

The General Plan policies discussed above address transportation related impacts to emergency response due to congestion, and design. However, even with the adoption of county and regional impact fees, and implementation of proposed transportation improvements at the County and Regional level, traffic impacts to County and Regional roadway level of service will remain significant and unavoidable, and thereby cause an impact to emergency response that significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures described under the Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030 are applicable to this scenario.

Significance Conclusion

The development allowed in the 2007 General Plan would generate traffic that would cause County and Regional roadways to exceed the County's LOS D standard, and contribute to roadways that exceed the standard without development, causing traffic congestion that would impact emergency response time. Mitigation includes developing emergency response route and connectivity plans, and requiring new development to implement these

plans, but will not mitigate LOS impacts on County and Regional roads. This is a significant and unavoidable impact.

Alternative Transportation

Impact 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. (Less than Significant)

Impact of Development with Policies

The discussion of air traffic impacts in the Existing plus Project Development to the year 2030 scenario remains applicable in this scenario.

2007 General Plan Policies

The policies related to roadway level of service for development described in the Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030 scenario apply to this scenario.

Significance Determination

Policies in the General Plan and Area Plans increase pedestrian, bicycle and transit-supportive facilities by both requiring and encouraging the construction of such facilities and land use patterns in new development. These policies provide support for, and do not conflict with, alternative modes of transportation. The transit-supportive land uses identified in the General Plan are consistent with MST's objectives.

Buildout of the General Plan, if consistent with policy, would increase the need for transit service with concentrations of development in existing transit-served corridors, community areas, and near incorporated cities. The increase in demand for transit service is consistent with MST's strategic goals of increasing transit ridership, expanding service, and introducing new services such as BRT in major corridors. Therefore, this impact is less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are necessary.

Significance Conclusion

The policies contained in the General Plan provide both requirements and encouragement of alternative mode infrastructure and facilities, and promote transit-support land use patterns. These polices support and do not conflict with existing facilities, policies, plans and programs. The development allowed under the General Plan will generate demand for pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and demand for transit services. These demands can be accommodated by ensuring development conforms to County policies and design standards, and are consistent with the goals and strategies of MST, the County's transit service provider. This is a less than significant impact.

4.6.4 Agriculture and Wine Corridor Plan

4.6.4.1 Abstract

The 2007 General Plan includes an Agriculture and Winery Corridor Plan (AWCP) intended to strike a balance between the wine grape production and wine processing capabilities within the County and maintain the viability of this industry. In order to encourage the development of the area's wine industry, the plan designates three winery corridors along the Salinas Valley and establishes land use policies and standards for the development of new wine-related facilities within the region.

The full buildout scenario of the AWCP would allow the development of 40 artisan wineries, 10 full-scale wineries and 10 tasting rooms along three corridors that extend through three Planning Areas (Toro, Central Salinas Valley, and South County) and include more than 80 miles of Salinas Valley roadways. The AWCP identifies the following three winery corridors (as shown in Exhibit 4.6.11):

1. **River Road Segment** – Consisting generally of River Road from Highway 68 south excluding the west side of the road between a point 500 feet north of Las Palmas and 1000 feet south of Pine Canyon (Salinas), Chualar River Road, Gonzales River Road, Foothill Road, Fort Romie Road, Paraiso Springs Road, Los Coches Road, Thorn Road, the lower section of Arroyo Seco Road, Elm Road south of Highway 101, Central Avenue from Elm Avenue south to Highway 101, and Hobson Road.
2. **Metz Road Segment** – Consisting generally of Metz Road from the City of Soledad south to Elm Road, and Elm Road from Metz Road to the City of Greenfield.
3. **Jolon Road Segment** – Consisting generally of Jolon Road from Highway 101 near King City south to Highway 101 north of Bradley, Cross Road, Gillett Road, Lockwood-Jolon Road from Cross Road to Gillett Road, and Interlake Road.

The AWCP is designed to expand the tourism and agricultural industries, which will in turn cause an increase in traffic including seasonal employee trips as well as truck trips and visitor trips. Buildout of the 2007 General Plan with implementation of the AWCP would potentially result in significant impacts on transportation if new vehicle trips generated by growth anticipated by the 2007 General Plan results in deficient roadway performance for any County roads identified within the AWCP. This section focuses on that impact.

Since the AWCP is included in the other scenarios described above, all other impacts are addressed.

4.6.4.2 Methodology

To determine impacts of buildout of the 2007 General Plan on Monterey County roadways, existing and projected roadway volumes are compared to Monterey County roadway LOS standards. Because peak visitor traffic associated with wine-related facilities typically occurs on weekends, impacts to County roads within the designated Wine Corridor were analyzed for weekday and weekend conditions. Three different analysis scenarios were prepared and are listed below:

- Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030. This analysis is based on the existing roadway network (2008).
- 2030 Cumulative plus Project Conditions. This analysis is based on the roadway network that includes the TAMC and countywide capacity enhancing projects.
- Existing plus Project Buildout. This analysis is based on the roadway network that includes the TAMC and countywide capacity enhancing projects.

Because the forecasting methodology based on the AMBAG Model only produces weekday traffic projections, a weekday-to-weekend conversion factor was derived based on data from an area with comparable land uses and characteristics.

SR-29 is a north-south highway that runs through agricultural and winery region of Napa County, California, which is known for its established wine industry. This corridor was selected as a comparable because upon implementation of the AWCP the roads within the Monterey County Wine Corridor are expected to experience weekend traffic patterns similar to those of SR-29. The weekday-to-weekend factor was determined by comparing existing weekend traffic volumes along SR-29 to existing weekday volumes, resulting in a calculated weekday-to-weekend ratio. This ratio was used to project weekend volumes from the AMBAG Model weekday forecasts for roads within the Agricultural and Winery Corridor.

For each analysis scenario, the projected roadway segment volumes are compared to the County LOS thresholds, resulting in LOS conditions for each segment.

4.6.4.3 Impact Analysis

Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030

Impact 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. (Less Than Significant With Mitigation).

Impact of Development with Policies

The projected level of service (LOS) on Agriculture and Winery Corridor roadways for the Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030 are shown in Table 4.6-27. This analysis is based on the existing 2008 roadway network. This table compares the 2030 to existing conditions. Two segments exceed the LOS D standard and operate at LOS F during both weekday and weekend conditions. Neither of these segments is deficient under existing conditions.

Table 4.6-27. County and Regional Roadway Segments Level of Service under Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030 Conditions

	Existing Conditions				Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030			
	Weekday		Weekend		Weekday		Weekend	
Roadway Segment	V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS
CENTRAL / ARROYO SECO / RIVER ROAD SEGMENT								
SR-68 (Monterey Salinas Highway)								
Portola Dr to Reservation Rd	0.48	C	0.53	C	0.48	C	0.53	C
Reservation Rd to Spreckels Blvd	0.48	C	0.53	C	0.43	B	0.48	C
County Road G16 (Carmel Valley Road/Arroyo Seco Rd/Elm Ave)								
Carmel Valley Rd to Elm Ave	0.05	C	0.06	C	0.09	C	0.10	C
Arroyo Seco Rd to Central Ave	0.04	C	0.04	C	0.06	C	0.07	C
County Road G17 (Reservation Rd/River Rd/Ft Romie Rd/Arroyo Seco Rd)								
SR-68 to Las Palmas Rd	0.48	C	0.53	D	0.60	D	0.67	D

	Existing Conditions				Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030			
	Weekday		Weekend		Weekday		Weekend	
Roadway Segment	V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS
Las Palmas Rd to Las Palmas Pkwy	0.81	D	0.90	D	1.01	F	1.12	F
Las Palmas Pkwy to Pine Canyon Rd	0.43	C	0.48	C	0.51	D	0.56	D
Pine Canyon Rd to Chualar River Rd	0.42	C	0.46	C	0.49	D	0.54	D
Chualar River Rd to Gonzales River Rd	0.08	C	0.09	C	0.10	C	0.11	C
Gonzalez River Rd to Foothill Rd	0.06	C	0.07	C	0.07	C	0.08	C
Foothill Rd to Arroyo Seco Rd	0.19	C	0.21	C	0.27	C	0.30	C
Ft Romie Rd to Elm Ave	0.20	C	0.22	C	0.21	C	0.23	C
Alta St								
Old Stage Rd to Gonzales City Line	0.44	C	0.49	D	0.44	C	0.49	D
Arroyo Seco Rd								
Fort Romie Rd to US-101	0.28	C	0.31	C	0.37	C	0.41	C
Central Ave								
Elm Ave to US-101	0.05	C	0.05	C	0.07	C	0.07	C
Chualar River Rd								
River Rd to Foletta Rd	0.33	C	0.36	C	0.34	C	0.38	D
Gonzales River Rd								
River Rd to Alta St	0.20	C	0.22	C	0.21	C	0.24	C
Spreckels Blvd								
SR-68 to Harkins Rd	0.48	D	0.54	D	0.47	C	0.53	D
METZ ROAD SEGMENT								
SR-146								
East St to County Road G-15 (on Metz Rd)	0.22	C	0.24	C	0.23	C	0.25	C
County Road G-15 to Stonewall Canyon Rd	0.22	C	0.24	C	0.23	C	0.26	C
County Road G15 (Metz Rd)								
SR-146 to Elm Ave	0.07	C	0.08	C	0.08	C	0.08	C
Elm Ave to Spreckels Rd	0.05	C	0.06	C	0.07	C	0.08	C
County Road G16 (Carmel Valley Road/Arroyo Seco Rd/Elm Ave)								
US-101 to Metz Rd	0.10	C	0.11	C	0.11	C	0.12	C
JOLON ROAD SEGMENT								

	Existing Conditions				Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030			
	Weekday		Weekend		Weekday		Weekend	
Roadway Segment	V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS
County Road G14 (Jolon Rd/Interlake Rd)								
US-101 to San Lucas Rd	0.58	D	0.65	D	1.06	F	1.18	F
San Lucas Rd to Lockwood	0.10	C	0.11	C	0.13	C	0.15	C
Lockwood to County Border	0.02	C	0.02	C	0.02	C	0.02	C
County Road G18 (Jolon Rd)								
Lockwood to US-101	0.06	C	0.07	C	0.08	C	0.09	C
Lockwood-San Lucas Rd								
US-101 to Jolon Rd	0.03	C	0.04	C	0.04	C	0.05	C

Source: Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Impact of Goods Movement

The land uses allowed in the AWCP under the 2007 General Plan will generate the need to move agricultural products throughout the corridor and the region. This movement is primarily through the use of trucks, but also through the use of aircraft. According to the AWCP, currently 65-70% of the grape production is shipped out of Monterey County to wineries elsewhere, whereas only 5% of wines produced are produced as a Monterey appellation. This is because the Monterey wine growing region has a high ratio of vineyards to wineries (over 1,900 vineyard acres to the winery) and grows more grapes annually than can be produced into wine. Therefore, the grapes are sold to wineries in other California regions.

With buildout of the uses allowed in the AWCP, the area will see an increase in wineries and wine producing facilities without a significant increase in the acres of vineyards. The increase in wine producing facilities will increase the amount of trucking that remains internal to the corridor and traveling shorter distances, thus reducing the impact of trucking on regional roadways outside of the corridor. Truck trips are expected to increase within the corridor. This increase in trips is addressed in the roadway level of service analysis described above.

Impact of Special Events

The AWCP allows for special events within the corridor that would attract additional visitors and employees. These special events include industry-wide events that encompass all of the uses within the corridor and promote visitation to the corridor, winery-related events (with up to 150 people per event) such as

fund raising events, dinners and weddings, and private events such as corporate meetings or private parties.

Larger events that would attract 500 or more visitors within the corridor are required to obtain a separate permit that involves review of the event conditions by the Sheriff's Department, Fire and Public Works relative to public health and safety. If this review results in a determination that police officers will be required to maintain order and for traffic control, the event sponsor will be required to arrange and pay for police staff. The event sponsor is also required to submit plans to the county identifying proposed location(s) and availability for off-site parking to support the number of persons anticipated at events.

2030 Cumulative plus Project Conditions

Impact of Development with Policies

The projected level of service (LOS) on Agriculture and Winery Corridor roadways for the 2030 Cumulative plus Project are shown in **Table 4.6-28**. This analysis is based on the future roadway that includes the TAMC and countywide capacity enhancements. This scenario is compared to the Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030 to determine impacts of the AWCP when combined with cumulative traffic.

There is one segment that operates at LOS E (Spreckels Boulevard) and one segment that operates at LOS F (County Road G14) during either weekday or weekend conditions under this scenario. Additionally, one of the impacted segments in the Existing plus Project scenario would meet the County's LOS standard in the Buildout scenario because this two-lane segment of roadway would be widened to four lanes under the County's future capacity enhancements, as described in the methodology section.

Table 4.6-28. County and Regional Roadway Segments Level of Service under 2030 Cumulative Conditions

	Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030				2030 Cumulative plus Project			
	Weekday		Weekend		Weekday		Weekend	
Roadway Segment	V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS
CENTRAL / ARROYO SECO / RIVER ROAD SEGMENT								
SR-68 (Monterey Salinas Highway)								
Portola Dr to Reservation Rd	0.48	C	0.53	C	0.59	C	0.66	C
Reservation Rd to Spreckels Blvd	0.43	B	0.48	C	0.61	C	0.67	C
County Road G16 (Carmel Valley Road/Arroyo Seco Rd/Elm Ave)								
Carmel Valley Rd to Elm Ave	0.09	C	0.10	C	0.08	C	0.09	C

Roadway Segment	Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030				2030 Cumulative plus Project			
	Weekday		Weekend		Weekday		Weekend	
	V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS
Arroyo Seco Rd to Central Ave	0.06	C	0.07	C	0.06	C	0.06	C
County Road G17 (Reservation Rd/River Rd/Ft Romie Rd/Arroyo Seco Rd)								
SR-68 to Las Palmas Rd	0.60	D	0.67	D	0.61	D	0.68	D
Las Palmas Rd to Las Palmas Pkwy	1.01	F	1.12	F	0.48	C	0.54	D
Las Palmas Pkwy to Pine Canyon Rd	0.51	D	0.56	D	0.51	D	0.56	D
Pine Canyon Rd to Chualar River Rd	0.49	D	0.54	D	0.46	C	0.51	D
Chualar River Rd to Gonzales River Rd	0.10	C	0.11	C	0.13	C	0.14	C
Gonzalez River Rd to Foothill Rd	0.07	C	0.08	C	0.08	C	0.09	C
Foothill Rd to Arroyo Seco Rd	0.27	C	0.30	C	0.28	C	0.31	C
Ft Romie Rd to Elm Ave	0.21	C	0.23	C	0.25	C	0.28	C
Alta St								
Old Stage Rd to Gonzales City Line	0.44	C	0.49	D	0.65	D	0.72	D
Arroyo Seco Rd								
Fort Romie Rd to US-101	0.37	C	0.41	C	0.40	C	0.44	C
Central Ave								
Elm Ave to US-101	0.07	C	0.07	C	0.05	C	0.06	C
Chualar River Rd								
River Rd to Foletta Rd	0.34	C	0.38	D	0.48	D	0.54	D
Gonzales River Rd								
River Rd to Alta St	0.21	C	0.24	C	0.20	C	0.22	C
Spreckels Blvd								
SR-68 to Harkins Rd	0.47	C	0.53	D	0.88	D	0.98	E
METZ ROAD SEGMENT								
SR-146								
East St to County Road G-15 (on Metz Rd)	0.23	C	0.25	C	0.68	D	0.75	D
County Road G-15 to Stonewall Canyon Rd	0.23	C	0.26	C	0.25	C	0.27	C
County Road G15 (Metz Rd)								
SR-146 to Elm Ave	0.08	C	0.08	C	0.10	C	0.11	C
Elm Ave to Spreckels Rd	0.07	C	0.08	C	0.17	C	0.19	C
County Road G16								

	Existing plus Project Development to the Year 2030				2030 Cumulative plus Project			
	Weekday		Weekend		Weekday		Weekend	
Roadway Segment	V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS
(Carmel Valley Road/Arroyo Seco Rd/Elm Ave)								
US-101 to Metz Rd	0.11	C	0.12	C	0.12	C	0.14	C
JOLON ROAD SEGMENT								
County Road G14 (Jolon Rd/Interlake Rd)								
US-101 to San Lucas Rd	1.06	F	1.18	F	1.08	F	1.20	F
San Lucas Rd to Lockwood	0.13	C	0.15	C	0.16	C	0.18	C
Lockwood to County Border	0.02	C	0.02	C	0.05	C	0.05	C
County Road G18 (Jolon Rd)								
Lockwood to US-101	0.08	C	0.09	C	0.13	C	0.15	C
Lockwood-San Lucas Rd								
US-101 to Jolon Rd	0.04	C	0.05	C	0.06	C	0.07	C

Source: Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Area Plan Policies

The Agriculture and Winery Corridor Plan (AWCP) policies and design standards summarized below set forth measures to avoid and minimize adverse impacts to roads located in the Winery Corridor.

Agricultural Winery Corridor Plan

The AWCP requires that road improvements within the corridor be designed to retain the rural character of the area and should be limited to enhancing the scenic corridor and promoting safe circulation. AWCP Section 3.5 (parking regulations) establishes parking standards for developments in the planning area, while AWCP Section 3.7 requires that access to facilities shall be designed to meet safe sight distance standards as determined by the Monterey County Public Works department. Development guidelines in Section 3.6 require permits for special events to address off-site parking and traffic control. Section 4.5 (financing plan) includes the establishment of Area Capital Improvement and Financing Plans (CIFP) to fund roadway improvements to enhance safety and to maintain the LOS standard established in the County General Plan.

Significance Determination

Cumulative development and land use activities in the proposed 2007 General Plan within the 2030 planning horizon would result in two roadway segments exceeding the LOS D standard, or adding traffic to roadway segments that are already exceeding the standard. This is considered a significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure 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:

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.

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:

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.

Significance Conclusion

Development of the 2007 General Plan through the year 2030 is projected to result in adverse impacts to county roads within the Wine Corridor. The impacts can be mitigated through implementation of rural highway capacity and safety improvements focused at intersections without the need to widen roadways. These mitigations will be implemented through a combination of project-specific mitigation for individual developments, and through a

Capital Improvement and Financing Plan fair-share funding mechanism. Therefore, this impact is less than significant.

Existing plus Project Buildout of the General Plan

Impact TRAN-5B: Buildout of the 2007 General Plan would create adverse impacts to County roads within the Agricultural Winery Corridor. (Less than Significant).

Impact of Development with Policies

The resulting level of service for each corridor segment is presented in Table 4.6-29. Two segments operate at LOS E on weekdays or weekends and two segments operate at LOS F on weekdays or weekends under this scenario. Under existing conditions, all of these segments operate at LOS D or better, so buildout of the General Plan and AWCP in the year 2092 causes four roadway segments along the corridor to exceed the county's LOS standard. This scenario includes the TAMC and County capacity enhancements described earlier, one of which affects the Wine Corridor. Implementation of these projects would improve the LOS at one of the deficient roadway segments.

Table 4.6-29. County and Regional Roadway Segments Level of Service under Existing plus Project Buildout Conditions

	Existing Conditions				Existing plus Project Buildout			
	Weekday		Weekend		Weekday		Weekend	
Roadway Segment	V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS
CENTRAL / ARROYO SECO / RIVER ROAD SEGMENT								
SR-68 (Monterey Salinas Highway)								
Portola Dr to Reservation Rd	0.48	C	0.53	C	0.6	C	0.64	C
Reservation Rd to Spreckels Blvd	0.48	C	0.53	C	0.6	C	0.62	C
County Road G16 (Arroyo Seco Rd/Elm Ave)								
Carmel Valley Rd to Elm Ave	0.05	C	0.06	C	0.1	C	0.15	C
Arroyo Seco Rd to Central Ave	0.04	C	0.04	C	0.1	C	0.11	C
County Road G17 (River Rd/Ft Romie Rd/Arroyo Seco Rd)								
SR-68 to Las Palmas Rd	0.48	C	0.53	D	1.0	F	1.16	F

	Existing Conditions				Existing plus Project Buildout			
	Weekday		Weekend		Weekday		Weekend	
Roadway Segment	V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS
Las Palmas Rd to Las Palmas Pkwy	0.81	D	0.90	D	0.55	C	0.64	D
Las Palmas Pkwy to Pine Canyon Rd	0.43	C	0.48	C	0.9	D	0.99	E
Pine Canyon Rd to Chualar River Rd	0.42	C	0.46	C	0.9	D	1.00	E
Chualar River Rd to Gonzales River Rd	0.08	C	0.09	C	0.2	C	0.18	C
Gonzalez River Rd to Foothill Rd	0.06	C	0.07	C	0.1	C	0.11	C
Foothill Rd to Arroyo Seco Rd	0.19	C	0.21	C	0.4	C	0.40	C
Ft Romie Rd to Elm Ave	0.20	C	0.22	C	0.2	C	0.26	C
Alta St								
Old Stage Rd to Gonzales City Line	0.44	C	0.49	D	0.5	C	0.51	D
Arroyo Seco Rd								
Fort Romie Rd to US-101	0.28	C	0.31	C	0.5	D	0.55	D
Central Ave								
Elm Ave to US-101	0.05	C	0.05	C	0.1	C	0.09	C
Chualar River Rd								
River Rd to Foletta Rd	0.33	C	0.36	C	0.4	D	0.43	D
Gonzales River Rd								
River Rd to Alta St	0.20	C	0.22	C	0.2	C	0.27	C
Spreckels Blvd								
SR-68 to Harkins Rd	0.48	D	0.54	D	0.5	D	0.56	D
METZ ROAD SEGMENT								
SR-146								
East St to County Road G-15 (on Metz Rd)	0.22	C	0.24	C	0.2	C	0.26	C
County Road G-15 to Stonewall Canyon Rd	0.22	C	0.24	C	0.3	C	0.29	C
County Road G15 (Metz Rd)								
SR-146 to Elm Ave	0.07	C	0.08	C	0.1	C	0.09	C
Elm Ave to Spreckels Rd	0.05	C	0.06	C	0.1	C	0.09	C

	Existing Conditions				Existing plus Project Buildout			
	Weekday		Weekend		Weekday		Weekend	
Roadway Segment	V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS
County Road G16 (Elm Ave)								
US-101 to Metz Rd	0.10	C	0.11	C	0.1	C	0.13	C
JOLON ROAD SEGMENT								
County Road G14 (Jolon Rd/Interlake Rd)								
US-101 to San Lucas Rd	0.58	D	0.65	D	1.7	F	1.94	F
San Lucas Rd to Lockwood	0.10	C	0.11	C	0.1	C	0.14	C
Lockwood to County Border	0.02	C	0.02	C	0.0	C	0.04	C
County Road G18 (Jolon Rd)								
Lockwood to US-101	0.06	C	0.07	C	0.1	C	0.11	C
Lockwood-San Lucas Rd								
US-101 to Jolon Rd	0.03	C	0.04	C	0.1	C	0.06	C

Source: Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Area Plan Policies

The Agriculture Winery Corridor Plan policies mentioned above are applicable to this scenario.

Significance Determination

Buildout by 2092 would result in LOS E/F for four roadway segments within the Winery Corridor. These roads would experience increased congestion due to the changes in land uses and the intensity of land uses. Implementation of the planned County capacity enhancement improve one segment to a LOS D (widening Road G17 from Las Palmas Road to Las Palmas Parkway), but the policies of the AWCP discourage widening roadways to preserve their rural character.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measure TRAN-5A is applicable to this scenario.

Significance Conclusion

Buildout of the 2007 General Plan is projected to result in adverse impacts to county roads within the Wine Corridor. The impacts can be mitigated through implementation of rural highway capacity and safety improvements focused at intersections without the need to widen roadways, thus preserving the corridor's rural character. These mitigations will be implemented

through a combination of project-specific mitigation for individual developments, and through a Capital Improvement and Financing Plan fair-share funding mechanism. Therefore, this impact is less than significant.