

Chapter 5

Alternatives to the 2007 General Plan

5.1 Introduction

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, this EIR contains a comparative impact assessment of alternatives to the proposed project. The primary purpose for this section is to provide decision makers and the public with a reasonable degree of feasible project alternatives that could attain most of the basic project objectives, while avoiding or reducing any of the project's significant adverse environmental effects. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 sets forth the following parameters for the analysis of project alternatives:

- an EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project;
- an EIR should identify alternatives that were considered by the lead agency, but rejected as infeasible during the scoping process;
- reasons for rejecting an alternative include:
 - failure to meet most of the basic project objectives;
 - infeasibility; and/or
 - inability to avoid or reduce any of the project's significant environmental effects.

The CEQA Guidelines state that the discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location, which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly. The feasibility of an alternative may be determined based on a variety of factors including, but not limited to: site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and site accessibility and control. This section also identifies the environmentally superior alternative. As required by CEQA, if the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, this chapter identifies an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

As stated in Section 3.0, Project Description, the objectives of the 2007 General Plan are to:

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

This Section provides a qualitative analysis of five alternatives to the 2007 General Plan that is intended to provide a relative comparison between the potential impacts of the 2007 General Plan and each alternative. In some cases, the significance conclusion of an impact may be the same under each scenario when compared to the Thresholds of Significance. However, the actual degree of impact may be slightly different.

The discussion provides a numeric comparison of development under each alternative based upon implementation to the Year 2030. The qualitative comparative analysis will focus on the differences between each alternative and GP2007 based upon development to the 2030 planning horizon. This EIR has provided a methodology for determining the date of potential full buildout, and

assumes that could occur by 2092. However, to determine with any precision when full buildout might occur for the other alternatives would be very difficult and entirely speculative. For example, because the GPI alternative requires voter approval of future amendments the County would not be able to predict whether voters would approve future amendments allowing additional growth to accommodate affordable housing. For another example, the EIR certified for the 1982 General Plan assumed that full buildout could have added about 30,000 additional residential units in the County and assumed that would occur at a relatively early date. Yet 25 years later, actual growth has been closer to 6,000 additional units. Basing a comparison on 30,000 would not provide a meaningful analysis to the public or decision-makers. A comparison of full buildout would likely result in a comparison of the dates into the next century when hypothetical buildout would occur, rather than a realistic comparison of the impacts of those alternatives.

The estimates of new residential development to 2030 under the various alternatives are based on two sources. The 1982 General Plan, GPI, and GPU 4 alternatives' estimates reflect the February 2007 report prepared by Bay Area Economics comparing the effects of those three alternatives in anticipation of placing the GPI on the countywide ballot. The GPU3 estimate is derived from applying the historic residential growth rate (based on AMBAG forecasts) to the available land under that alternative. The TOD estimate is, by the nature of the alternative, the same as the 2007 General Plan.

5.2 Description of Alternatives

The principal criteria for selecting the alternatives studied in the EIR are to comply with CEQA, to describe a reasonable range of alternatives that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic project objectives and avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects of the project, and to ensure that the impact analysis provides sufficient information to the public and public officials to make informed decisions about the 2007 General Plan. An EIR conceivably could analyze an infinite number of alternatives or variations on alternatives. However, CEQA directs EIR preparers to analyze a "reasonable range" of alternatives to the project or project location, including the No-Project alternative.

Monterey County started the process of a comprehensive general plan update in 1999. Since then, there have been multiple versions of a general plan prepared, including a community-based plan prepared as a ballot initiative. This Supplemental EIR examines five alternatives to the 2007 General Plan as presently proposed.

In order to offer decision-makers and the public a comparison of the most recent prior versions of the General Plan update, this EIR examines two alternatives—GPU 3 and GPU 4—that would not otherwise meet all three criteria for being among the range of alternatives. While these two alternatives are potentially

feasible and meet the project objectives, they do not substantially reduce the potential significant effects of the 2007 General Plan.

The five alternatives are listed below with a summary description following the list:

- No Project Alternative (Existing 1982 General Plan)
- 21st Century Monterey County General Plan, February 2004 Alternative (GPU3)
- General Plan Initiative Alternative (GPI)
- 2007 General Plan Alternative (GPU4)
- TOD (Transit-Oriented Development)

The No Project Alternative considers an option to not accept any updates and retain the existing 1982 General Plan. This alternative consists of the 1982 General Plan with an amended Housing Element adopted in 2003. It also includes the existing four Local Coastal Programs (North County Land Use Plan, Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan, Carmel Land Use Plan, and the Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan) and eight Area Plans that are considered subsets of the 1982 General Plan.

The projected level of development under the 1982 General Plan is somewhat uncertain. The 1982 General Plan's EIR estimated that it would accommodate up to 63,735 new dwelling units. More recently, the 2007 report prepared for the Monterey County Board of Supervisors comparing the GPI to the 1982 General Plan estimated that future development would total 13,570 new residential units. (Bay Area Economics 2007)

The focus of growth under the 1982 General Plan is in urban areas (cities). New residential growth is to be concentrated in areas already committed to a degree of residential development and provide for an adequate level of services. Much of this would occur at low or rural density. The Plan also designates four "Area of Development Concentration Study Areas" and establishes an urban reserve overlay area, which would be developed through annexation to an incorporated city. There are ten Special Treatment Areas (STAs) identified in the 1982 General Plan.

GPU3 is the third version of a comprehensive General Plan Update. This version was considered, but not adopted, by the Board of Supervisors in 2004. A Draft EIR was prepared and circulated for this document but not certified. GPU3 consolidates the four Local Coastal Programs into a single new Coast Area Plan. The county's eight Area Plans are incorporated into GPU3, but are amended with their own sets of vision statements, policies, and goals. Estimated new residential development under GPU3 to the 2030 horizon year is 13,675 residential units.

GPU3 establishes eight Community Areas as targets for urban growth. These are unincorporated communities that have already begun to develop at urban

densities, or have been planned for urban development for many years. These include Boronda, Castroville, Pajaro, a portion of Fort Ord, Rancho San Juan, Pine Canyon, San Lucas, and an expanded area of Rancho San Juan. Pine Canyon and the expanded area of Rancho San Juan would be developed in a second phase of Community Plan development. There are also 18 Rural Centers identified in this alternative that could ultimately be converted to Community Areas in the future, based upon a tiered system of phased growth. Policies establishing an agricultural wine corridor are proposed as part of this alternative. GPU3 included 16 Special Treatment Areas or "STAs" (including the 10 existing STAs from the 1982 General Plan).

GPI is a proposed General Plan Initiative that was placed on the June 2007 countywide ballot, but did not pass. It amends part of the existing 1982 General Plan (primarily Chapter IV Area development, and the 2003–2007 Housing Element as well as the North County Coastal Land Use Plan and sections of each of the inland area plans). The remaining coastal plans would not be amended. Estimated new development under the GPI to the 2030 horizon year is 13,973 residential units. (Bay Area Economics 2007)

The GPI limits all new growth in the unincorporated area to five Community Areas: Boronda, Castroville, Pajaro, East Garrison portion of Fort Ord, and Chualar. Growth in Chualar is limited to 100 acres. No Rural Centers would be created. Subdivisions outside Community Areas are significantly constrained. A net increase in lots would require voter approval of a separate countywide initiative. Property owners are permitted to construct single-family residences on legal lots of record.

GPU4 is the 2006 General Plan update adopted by the Board of Supervisors in January 2007. It makes no changes to any of the Local Coastal Programs. GPU4 establishes 6 Community Areas and 11 Rural Centers in locations where populations have developed over the past 20 or more years. GPU4 also proposes 17 Special Treatment Areas (including the 10 existing STAs in the 1982 General Plan) totaling 7,832 acres, plus three Study Areas to be evaluated for possible future designation as STAs. A separate agricultural wine corridor plan (ACWP) would be enacted in conjunction with GPU4.

The estimated development of new residential units under GPU4 to the 2030 planning horizon year is 16,900 dwelling units. (Bay Area Economics 2007)

TOD is an alternative that focuses new development along existing and future transportation corridors. These corridors would be served by high-capacity and high-frequency public transportation. Public transportation in this alternative includes fixed-route bus service, rail, express bus service and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT). Development in these corridors would be concentrated at "nodes" adjoining public transportation stations.

Under the TOD Alternative, new development outside the Community Areas, Rural Centers, and AHOs would be restricted to the first single-family home on existing legal lots of record in the North County, Greater Monterey Peninsula

(along the Route 68 corridor only) Greater Salinas, and Toro (along the Route 68 corridor) Area Plans. The Bradley and Lockwood Rural Centers would be considered third tier development priority areas. They would not be developed until the transit system is funded and built to King City. Otherwise, this alternative would share the same policies as the 2007 General Plan. Areas subject to subdivision restrictions would be designated as “sending” sites under a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program, with cities, Community Areas, Rural Centers, and AHOs identified as “receiving” areas. In effect, development credits could be transferred from the sending areas to the receiving areas, resulting in more intense development at the latter.

Table 5-6, Summary of 2007 General Plan Alternatives, in the discussion of the Environmentally Superior Alternative that follows compares the relative impacts of the alternatives to the impacts of the 2007 General Plan.

5.2.1 Growth Projections under the Alternatives

The residential growth projections to 2030 for most of the alternatives are taken from the 2007 Bay Area Economics report *Analysis of Monterey County General Plans and Quality of Life Initiative* prepared for the County Board of Supervisors. The two exceptions are the GPU3 and TOD alternatives.

Growth to 2030 under GPU3 is estimated on the basis of the 10,567 dwelling units described as potential development in the draft of GPU3 before the Board of Supervisors added more Community Areas, with an additional increment added to conservatively estimate the residential units that might be allowed in the additional Community Areas and un-built lots. This additional 28 percent increment is based on the ratio of development potential for the 2007 General Plan under full buildout to the development potential in 2030.

The Alternatives impacts are not individually analyzed at buildout in 2092. The method of estimating 2092 growth for the 2007 General Plan has been to apply the historic growth rate (expressed in housing units per year) within the unincorporated area of the county. Using this approach, each of the alternatives would add 25,903 residences by 2092. As a result, the relative degree of impact when the alternatives are compared to one another would remain essentially the same as during the 2030 planning horizon.

5.3 No Project Alternative—Existing 1982 General Plan

5.3.1 Description

Under this alternative, the existing 1982 General Plan would be retained as the County’s blueprint for growth. No land use designations would change, and it is assumed that existing undeveloped lots of record ultimately would be built out to their highest use, as envisioned by the 1982 General Plan land use map. The 1982 General Plan is designed to encourage growth in the 12 incorporated cities. The 1982 General Plan includes the STA overlay that allows for unique land use concepts that reflect site-specific constraints or features. Ten STAs are included in the 1982 General Plan and the Rancho San Juan Area of Development Concentration Study Area. In comparison, the 2007 General Plan would establish five Community Areas and seven Rural Centers where populations have developed over the past 20 or more years, while also encouraging growth in the cities.

The 1982 General Plan does not include an Agricultural Winery Corridor, and the development of wine-related facilities would continue in accordance with current practices.

5.3.1.1 Development Comparison-

A comparison of potential new residential development between the existing 1982 General Plan (as amended) and the 2007 General Plan over the planning horizon of 2030 is provided in Table 5-1. Implementation of the 1982 General Plan would result in about 130 more dwelling units than development of the 2007 General Plan to the 2030 planning horizon. For all intents, implementation of the two plans would be approximately the same.

Table 5-1. Comparison: No Project Alternative and Proposed Project to 2030

Category	Existing 1982 General Plan	2007 General Plan	Difference* (No Project vs. 2007 General Plan)
Residential	13,570 dwelling units	13,420 dwelling units	130more dwelling units

* Difference in projected new dwelling units is based on the difference between the estimated housing units within the unincorporated County from 2005 to 2030 for the No Project Alternative and from 2006 to 2030 for the 2007 General Plan.

Source: Bay Area Economics. 2007. *Analysis of Monterey County General Plans and Quality of Life Initiative*. February; Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (2004).

The difference in development potential between the two plans, as well as the difference in goals and policies, will serve as the basis for the analysis of the 1982 General Plan (No Project) alternative. The analysis below is based in part upon the *Analysis of the Monterey County General Plans and Quality of Life Initiative* prepared by Bay Area Economics and dated February 2007.

5.3.2 Environmental Effects

5.3.2.1 Land Use

The existing land use pattern provided in the 1982 General Plan and subsequent amendments would remain in effect. Although not designated as Community Areas per se, the communities of Pajaro, Boronda, and Castroville are designated for high-density residential, commercial, and industrial uses and could proceed consistent with 1982 General Plan policies. Also, the Specific Plans adopted for Fort Ord and Rancho San Juan (Butterfly Village) could proceed in accordance with those plans. As required under State Planning Law (Government Code Section 65300 et seq.), the 1982 General Plan provides for future development to meet anticipated growth. Overall, impacts under the No Project Alternative would be significant and unavoidable.

The 2007 General Plan provides more specific and extensive development policies than the 1982 General Plan. The 1982 General Plan does not include a designation for Rural Centers; however, these areas would remain subject to the policies of the plan with respect to maintaining low densities and provision of services. In contrast, the 2007 General Plan would allow development at a density of 1 to 5 residential units per acre, or up to 10 to 15 units per acre if processed as part of an Affordable/Workforce Housing Incentive Program. The 2007 General Plan would also establish Affordable Housing Overlays(AHOs) allowing higher densities in selected areas. Both plans require that adequate water and wastewater facilities be provided concurrently with development. The 2007 General Plan also states that Rural Centers should have a commercial focal point, and expansion of Rural Centers may be considered only after preparation of a Capital Improvement and Financing Plan.

Accordingly, because, the 2007 General Plan establishes more detailed policies specifying where new growth would be directed and has more specific policies guiding activities for Commercial, Industrial, Agricultural, and Open Space land

use, there is greater assurance that land use conflicts can be avoided or reduced under the 2007 General Plan.

As such, the more detailed policies contained in the 2007 General Plan would better prevent adverse land use impacts such as division of established communities or conflicts with adopted land use plans than would the 1982 General Plan. Therefore, the 1982 General Plan would have greater impacts on land use than the 2007 General Plan.

5.3.2.2 Agriculture Resources

The 1982 General Plan is generally protective of agricultural uses, discouraging “premature and scattered development” and providing that growth areas will be designated only where adequate levels of urban services and infrastructure can be provided. In addition, it includes policies calling for the prevention of non-agricultural uses that could interfere with normal agricultural operations and the establishment of permanent, well-defined buffer areas as part of new non-agricultural development proposals located next to agricultural uses. The buffer areas are to be dedicated in perpetuity and sufficiently large to protect agricultural operations from incompatible development. The 1982 General Plan limits the subdivision of viable, important farm land to divisions necessary to agricultural purposes or when demonstrated to not be detrimental to the agricultural viability of adjoining parcels. The 1982 General Plan also provides that the County is to make every effort to preserve, enhance, and expand viable agricultural uses on important farmland. Nonetheless, the growth projected under the No Project Alternative would convert substantial amounts of farmland to urban uses. This is a significant and unavoidable impact.

The 2007 General Plan contains more specific policies intended to channel development into existing cities, Community Areas, and Rural Centers, in that order. The policies of the 2007 General Plan would focus growth into higher density Community Areas as the first tier for new development, with subsequent growth in Rural Centers (second tier for new development). The 2007 General Plan also provides for agricultural buffers and identifies specific criteria by which to establish those buffers, but does not require that all buffers be permanent or dedicated in perpetuity. Other policies state that agriculture is to be the “the top land use priority for guiding future economic development on agricultural lands” and require the County to establish a program that requires mitigation for the conversion of important farmland that is to be annexed to cities, with specified exceptions. The 2007 General Plan also establishes policies intended to avoid regulatory constraints on “routine and ongoing agricultural activities.” This is meant to encourage continued agricultural activities. Along this line, the ACWP would authorize wineries within its boundaries that would enhance tourism and provide additional income to wine grape growers.

The existing 1982 General Plan, because of its more generalized policy approach would have slightly greater impacts on agriculture resources than the 2007 General Plan, which directs future development to cities or specifically identified

growth areas and requires a mitigation program for annexing important farmlands. Although the 1982 General Plan has a stronger buffer policy (requiring permanent buffers), the policy in the 2007 General Plan is more detailed with regard to the requirements for buffer areas, compensation for loss of agricultural lands and a stronger provision with respect to preventing the subdivision of agricultural lands for non-agricultural purposes. Furthermore, the 2007 General Plan has incentives for the continuation of agricultural uses including numerous policies in the Agricultural Element. Accordingly, the 1982 General Plan would have greater impacts on agricultural lands than the GP2007.

5.3.2.3 Water Resources

The existing 1982 General Plan contains general policies intended to protect water quality and avoid groundwater overdraft. This includes a policy prohibiting “water consuming development in areas which do not have proven adequate water supplies.” The 1982 General Plan lacks goals and policies that stipulate additional erosion control requirements, water conservation measures, or the preparation of a drainage design manual, all of which are found in the 2007 General Plan. The impact would be significant and unavoidable.

The potential effects of the 1982 General Plan on groundwater overdraft would appear to be greater than 2007 General Plan. Although the 1982 General Plan contemplates about the same level of new development during the planning period as the 2007 General Plan, the 1982 General Plan does not include provisions for requiring a sustainable water supply prior to development.

The effects of implementation of the 1982 General Plan would be greater than those of the 2007 General Plan with regard to soil erosion and sedimentation from construction and agricultural land use activities, wastewater disposal (i.e., septic tanks), groundwater overdraft, seawater intrusion, well competition and interference, and levee and dam failure. All of these are existing significant problems that are not addressed in the 1982 General Plan at the level of policy detail found in the 2007 General Plan. In addition, the 2007 General Plan includes several sections in the Public Services Element and Open Space Element that specifically address water quality protection, water consumption, long term water supply, and erosion protection that are not in the 1982 General Plan. Therefore, the 1982 General Plan would have more impacts on water resources than the 2007 General Plan.

5.3.2.4 Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

The existing 1982 General Plan moderates the exposure of persons and property to geologic, soil, and seismic hazards through policies requiring geologic and soils reports prior to subdivision of land and in areas of potential instability. The 2007 General Plan contains more specific and extensive policies that would avoid substantial adverse effects, such as the establishment of a Geologic

Constraints and Hazards Database to identify hazardous areas. Therefore, potential adverse impacts on geology, soils, and seismicity from the 1982 General Plan would be greater than those of the proposed 2007 General Plan.

5.3.2.5 Mineral Resources

Oil production in the southern Salinas Valley and South County is the only mineral resource extraction activity that may be affected by development and land use activities. Economic conditions and legal constraints make it highly unlikely that either the existing 1982 General Plan or the proposed 2007 General Plan would result in the premature termination of oil extraction operations in these areas. Therefore, the 1982 General Plan Alternative would have a less-than-significant effect on mineral resources, as would the 2007 General Plan.

5.3.2.6 Transportation

The existing 1982 General Plan includes general policies encouraging land use patterns that would reduce the need for driving and requiring proposed development to remain “within an acceptable level of service.” The 1982 General Plan does not include any mechanism to require that new development activities fund transportation improvements necessitated by the traffic generated by those activities. As a result, the traffic impacts resulting from the No Project Alternative would be significant.

The 2007 General Plan would establish, with specific exceptions, LOS D as the standard for maximum allowable congestion within the County. The proposed policies would include a commitment to prepare Capital Improvement and Facilities Plans, by benefit area, to finance road improvements. The proposed policies include a prohibition on projects that would result in congestion exceeding LOS D unless improvements are being installed concurrently. Nonetheless, there will be significant impacts on road congestion.

All of the roadways contemplated as AWCP corridors currently operate at acceptable levels of service. The AWCP would accelerate the current pace of development of wine-related facilities, which would result in a corresponding increase in traffic. Absent new wineries, grape production would continue to be exported out of the County creating regional truck traffic during certain times of the year. The AWCP would not eliminate this traffic, but would contain it locally, thus reducing trip lengths. The AWCP would also generate new visitor traffic along the corridor, but that traffic would occur outside the wine industry’s peak periods. Such local traffic would not be expected to be substantial enough to cause roadway performance to operate at deficient levels.

The No Project scenario represents buildout of the County to the year 2092 under the 1982 General Plan currently in effect. 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.

The absence of a fee or mechanism from the 1982 General Plan is expected to result in deficient roadway performance conditions that will worsen with future development activities. The absence of the regional and local fee mitigation measures as well as the increased development and sprawl potential of the 1982 General Plan would lead to the conclusion that the potential adverse impacts on transportation from the 1982 General Plan would be greater than those of the 2007 General Plan.

5.3.2.7 Air Quality

The North Central Coast Air Basin, which includes Monterey County, is not in attainment for the state ozone (O₃) standard. The existing 1982 General Plan includes general policies that encourage development to meet air quality standards. However, these policies are not sufficient to avoid a significant effect on air quality from implementation of the No Project Alternative.

In comparison, the 2007 General Plan contains policies that are consistent with the air quality objectives of the North Central Coast Air Basin 2004 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). Moreover, the 2007 General Plan's policies requiring a Traffic Impact Fee and linking occupancy of new development to related roadway improvements would significantly reduce idling on roadways, which would result in a corresponding reduction in adverse air quality impacts. Additionally, future wineries under the ACWP would introduce new sources of air emissions. These would be subject to permitting by the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District.

The combination of a lack of transportation improvement mechanisms, and absence of more specific air quality protection policies in the 1982 General Plan would result in potential adverse impacts on air quality greater than those of the proposed 2007 General Plan.

5.3.2.8 Noise

The existing 1982 General Plan includes general policies requiring new construction to meet noise standards established in the General Plan and to be enforced through a future noise ordinance. This includes conformity between new development and noise limits established in the 1982 General Plan. The increase in development that would be allowed under the No Project Alternative would result in a significant and unavoidable noise impact, particularly along major roads.

The proposed 2007 General Plan similarly establishes policies and would be implemented through a future noise ordinance. The 2007 General Plan contains policies establishing the contents of the noise ordinance. Its policies also set out standards for requiring acoustical and vibration analyses as part of the environmental review process for projects.

Both the 1982 General Plan and the proposed 2007 General Plan would increase exposure of residents to noise by virtue of allowing additional growth within the County. The 2007 General Plan's policies address noise impacts more comprehensively than do the policies in the 1982 General Plan. Accordingly, potential adverse noise impacts from implementation of the 1982 General Plan would be somewhat greater than those of the 2007 General Plan.

5.3.2.9 Biological Resources

Implementation of the existing 1982 General Plan would result in development with significant impacts on sensitive habitats, wetlands, riparian areas, wildlife movement, and tree preservation. The current trend of conversion of grazing lands, which provide wildlife habitat, to intensive agricultural cultivation, which provides little habitat value, would continue. The policies of the 1982 General Plan encourage the conservation and maintenance of native plant communities near new development and promote the conservation of large contiguous areas of native vegetation to provide wildlife habitat. The policies also call for careful planning of areas that are of value to wildlife to maintain that habitat. Nonetheless, the No Project Alternative would result in extensive new development that would have a significant and unavoidable impact on biological resources.

In comparison, the proposed 2007 General Plan would not substantially increase the rate of conversion of grazing land to more intensive agricultural uses, however, the 1982 General Plan Area Plans have more restrictive policies regarding the conversion of land on steep slopes. Additional policies are proposed in the 2007 General Plan to inventory natural habitats, avoid state and federally listed wildlife species, including designated federal critical habitat, and evaluate and mitigate impacts on special status species or their critical habitat that are not included in the 1982 General Plan. The 2007 General Plan also contains a policy committing the County to develop and implement a future program for mitigating the loss of critical habitat as a result of new projects. Mitigation of losses would also be required under state and federal law. The 1982 General Plan and 2007 General Plan would be somewhat comparable on balance with respect to impacts on biological resources; however, with the imposition of the mitigation measures proposed in this EIR with respect to special status species, kit fox habitat mitigation, stream setbacks, oak woodland protection and raptor protection, the 1982 General Plan would have greater impacts to biological resources than the 2007 General Plan.

5.3.2.10 Cultural Resources

The existing 1982 General Plan includes policies that encourage the conservation of historical resources, including the preparation of a historic inventory. There are no policies for the protection of archaeological or paleontological resources. However, state law is protective of archaeological resources to the extent that it requires consultation with appropriate Native American representatives and proper reburial in the event of the discovery of Native American human remains. Under the current General Plan, protection relies primarily on CEQA compliance. Absent a comprehensive approach, the 1982 General Plan would result in significant effects on archaeological and paleontological resources.

In comparison, the proposed 2007 General Plan includes specific policies to inventory resources, survey in sensitive areas, and protect important representative and unique archaeological sites and features. Similar policies are included in the 2007 General Plan relative to paleontological resources. In addition, the 2007 General Plan contains policies to encourage the conservation of Native American cultural sites, sacred places, and burial sites, including provisions for consultation with tribal representatives. The 2007 General Plan would be more protective of these resources; therefore, the 1982 General Plan would have a greater impact on cultural resources.

5.3.2.11 Public Services and Utilities

Implementation of the existing 1982 General Plan would result in adverse impacts from new or expanded fire protection, sheriff's protection, schools, libraries, medical facilities, wastewater, and solid waste facilities. The 1982 General Plan does not provide for concentrating new development within the unincorporated County within Community Areas and Rural Centers. If desired levels of services were to be maintained, more facilities, albeit smaller, might be required than under the proposed 2007 General Plan. Domestic water supplies are limited in several areas of the County, including the Monterey Peninsula and Pajaro area. The 1982 General Plan includes policies encouraging coordination among water service providers to assure that groundwater is not overdrafted, prohibiting water-consuming development in areas that do not have proven adequate water supplies, and requiring new development to connect to existing water suppliers, where feasible. The 1982 General Plan has not been effective in avoiding this significant effect.

The 2007 General Plan, in comparison, would result in the same impacts from new or expanded services and infrastructure.

With respect to potable water supply, the 2007 General Plan includes policies for the development of a Hydrologic Resources Constraints and Hazards Database to assist in managing conservation and water quality improvement. Additional 2007 General Plan policies will require that all projects be designed to increase the site's predevelopment absorption of rainfall and to recharge groundwater

where appropriate, and to require the management of construction of impervious surfaces in important groundwater recharge areas through discretionary permits. Therefore, potential adverse impacts on potable water supply from the 1982 General Plan would be greater than those of the proposed 2007 General Plan.

5.3.2.12 Parks and Recreation

The existing 1982 General Plan contains policies that encourage park planning, the equitable distribution of County parks, the formation of a self-supporting park system, and facilitating the acquisition and operation of community parks by other agencies. The development of future parks will result in impacts such as traffic, noise, and lighting, depending upon the location and recreational opportunities provided. Parks tend to be built in urbanized areas, so their impacts are not expected to be significant. However, the No Project Alternative would not provide adequate levels of new parks. This would have a significant effect through overuse of existing facilities.

By comparison, the 2007 General Plan includes additional policies, including the establishment of Adequate Public Facilities and Service standards, that will be used to obtain park and recreation facilities along with residential subdivisions and require that Community Area Plans identify adequate park and recreation facility sites. These standards do not, however, establish a specific level of service for parks and recreation facilities, which weakens their effectiveness. The potential adverse impacts on parks and recreation from the 1982 General Plan would be the same as those of the 2007 General Plan. However, Mitigation Measure PAR-1 in this EIR would require the County to enact a general policy establishing a ratio for acreage to population. This would make the impacts of the 1982 General Plan greater than those of the project.

5.3.2.13 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The existing 1982 General Plan does not contain policies that avoid potential impacts from hazardous materials, emergency response, and wildland fire protection. As a result, the No Project Alternative would have a significant effect in these areas of concern.

The 2007 General Plan contains new goals and policies to address these areas, including extensive policies concerning fire hazards and emergency preparedness. Therefore, the 1982 General Plan has greater adverse impacts on hazards and hazardous materials relative to the proposed 2007 General Plan.

5.3.2.14 Aesthetics, Light, and Glare

The existing 1982 General Plan does not contain explicit policies that would reduce aesthetic impacts from implementation. Visual character and light and

glare would experience significant adverse impacts as a result of development under the 1982 General Plan.

In comparison, the 2007 General Plan includes general policies intended to reduce the impacts of development within designated visually sensitive areas. Additional policies restrict ridgeline development, encourage transfer of development rights to direct development away from areas with unique visual features, encourage new development to direct lighting away from sensitive neighbors, and commit to mapping of visually sensitive resources to assist in reducing impacts. New wine-related facilities would alter the visual character of agricultural areas and would introduce new sources of light and glare in those rural areas.

In either case, new development will result in a significant effect from increased light and glare. Because it would not provide protective policies, the aesthetic, light, and glare impacts of the 1982 General Plan would be greater than those of the 2007 General Plan.

5.3.2.15 Population and Housing

The existing 1982 General Plan is a local land use plan that prescribes where and at what intensity future growth will occur. Pursuant to state law, it must provide opportunities for future residential growth to meet anticipated residential demand. As such, the No Project Alternative would induce future growth and result in a significant effect. To the extent that development would displace existing residents, the requirements of state law (Government Code Section 7260, et seq.) would apply to limit the adverse effects.

Neither the No-Project Alternative nor the 2007 General Plan is expected to result in the displacement of substantial numbers of dwelling units or persons. Therefore, the 1982 General Plan's impacts on population and housing would be essentially the same as those of the proposed 2007 General Plan.

5.3.3 Conclusion

The No Project Alternative (Existing 1982 General Plan) would preserve the existing land use patterns, continue existing policies, and maintain the current development potential for the unincorporated areas of the County. This would result in greater environmental impacts as compared to the 2007 General Plan on land use, agricultural resources, water resources, geology and soils, transportation, air quality, noise, biological resources, cultural resources, public services, parks and recreation, hazardous materials, and light and glare. Impacts of the two plans with respect to mineral resources and population and housing are largely the same. With adoption of the proposed mitigation measure for parks and biological resources, the 2007 General Plan would have less impact on parks

and recreation and biological resources than the 1982 General Plan (No-Project Alternative).

The No Project Alternative does not meet any of the objectives of the 2007 General Plan because it maintains the existing 1982 General Plan and does not update its policies or land use map to account for changing economic conditions, land use patterns, socioeconomic changes, or technological advancements.

5.4 21st Century Monterey County General Plan, February 2004 Alternative (GPU3)

5.4.1 Description

The 21st Century Monterey County General Plan February 2004 Alternative (GPU3) is a version of Monterey County's effort to update the existing 1982 General Plan; it was considered but ultimately not adopted by the Monterey County Board of Supervisors.

GPU3 employs the Community Area concept that is incorporated into the 2007 GPU with a few differences. GPU3 establishes eight Community Areas: Boronda, Castroville, Fort Ord (Specific Plan area), Pajaro, Pine Canyon (King City), 4,000 acre Rancho San Juan, Rancho San Juan Expansion, and San Lucas. Growth in Boronda, Castroville, and Pajaro would be facilitated by redevelopment activities, while entirely new communities would be established at Ford Ord and Rancho San Juan. These five areas would be where most of the initial Community Area growth would be concentrated. The Pine Canyon (King City), San Lucas, and Rancho San Juan Expansion Community Areas would be developed later in the life of GPU3 (second phase).

In GPU3, future growth, though on a limited basis, would also occur in areas designated as Rural Centers. Under GPU3, 18 Rural Centers would be designated under a three-tier system. Tier I areas are Rural Centers that could ultimately be converted to Community Areas. There are two Tier I Rural Centers: Bradley and San Ardo. Tier II areas are Rural Centers that could potentially support infill and limited subdivision within their boundaries once infrastructure improvements are completed. The nine Tier II Rural Centers are Aromas, Chualar, Del Monte Forest, Las Lomas, Lockwood, Moss Landing, Mouth of Carmel Valley, Pleyto, and Prunedale. Tier III Rural Centers are areas that are built out and areas where there is no local interest for new subdivisions or intensification of existing land uses. The seven Tier III Rural Centers are Carmel Highlands, Carmel Valley Village, Corral de Tierra/San Benancio, Mid-Carmel Valley, River Road, Spreckles, and Toro Park.

GPU3 includes an Affordable Housing Overlay designation to promote the development of affordable housing. The overlay designation in GPU3 allows for

higher densities (10 to 30 dwelling units per acre) than would otherwise be allowed by the land use designation and zoning requirements. To take advantage of the overlay designation, 100% of a proposed residential development must meet affordability requirements to facilitate the co-location of jobs and housing. The overlay has a potential to apply to 27,891 acres and would be implemented in two phases. Phase I consists of a total overlay potential of 12,285 acres in the following areas: Greater Monterey Peninsula along Highway 68, Lower Carmel Valley, Fort Ord, Rancho San Juan, and Boronda. Phase II consists of a total overlay potential of 6,876 acres in the following areas: Castroville, Pajaro, Pine Canyon (King City), San Lucas, Aromas, Pleyto, Moss Landing, River Road, San Ardo, San Benancio/Corral de Tierra, Spreckles, and Toro Park.

In addition, GPU3 includes a STA overlay to allow for unique land use concepts that reflect site-specific constraints or features. Ten STAs were originally included in the existing 1982 General Plan, and six more (for a total of sixteen) are proposed in GPU3.

GPU3 includes Winery Corridor policies that are similar to the AWCP proposed as part of the 2007 General Plan. Both plans divide the corridor into three segments. The number of wine-related facilities permitted within the corridor was established in the GPU3 Draft EIR. As a result, differences between the two plans are relatively minor and pertain primarily to implementation. Differences include the following: GPU 3 would authorize up to 8 bed and breakfasts associated with wineries, while the 2007 General Plan would instead authorize up to 8 inns. GPU 3 would allow up to 40 single-family homes and an additional 40 guest houses among the wineries; the 2007 General Plan would allow up to 50 single-family homes, 50 guest houses, and 150 workers' residences. Regarding residences, the Monterey County zoning ordinance (Chapter 21.30) actually has a more liberal policy for other farmland properties, authorizing up to three single-family residences, one guest house, and five residences for farmworker families (or housing for up to 12 workers in a group residence) on any parcel.

Finally, GPU3 amends the four Land Use Plans that are part of the four Local Coastal Programs in effect in Monterey County (North County Land Use Plan [includes Moss Landing Community Plan], the Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan, the Carmel Land Use Plan, and the Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan) and consolidates them under a new Coast Area Plan. Amendments to the Local Coastal Programs would be subject to review and final approval by the California Coastal Commission.

5.4.1.1 Development Comparison

A comparison of development potential between GPU3 and the 2007 General Plan during the 2030 planning horizon is provided in Table 5-2. In comparison to projected growth under the 2007 General Plan during the planning horizon, implementation of GPU3 would result in 3,650 fewer new dwelling units.

Table 5-2. Comparison: GPU3 and Proposed Project (2030)

Category	GPU3	2007 General Plan	Difference* (GPU3 vs. 2007 General Plan)
Residential	13,675 dwelling units	10,015 dwelling units	3,650 more dwelling units

*Difference in projected dwelling units is based on the difference between the estimated housing units within the unincorporated County from 2005 to 2030 for GPU3 and from 2006 to 2030 for the 2007 General Plan.
Source: Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (2004).

The difference in development potential between the two plans, as well as the difference in goals and policies, will serve as the basis for the analysis of the GPU3 alternative.

5.4.2 Environmental Effects

5.4.2.1 Land Use

GPU3 provides for substantial growth during its planning horizon. It would provide for growth beyond existing development levels in the Rancho San Juan area and 18 designated Rural Centers that would result in conflicts with nearby land uses. In addition, the Affordable Housing Overlay would allow higher density development in low-density residential and agricultural areas covering up to 27,891 acres, creating the potential for land use conflicts. As a result, GPU3 would have a significant effect on land use.

In comparison, the 2007 General Plan limits development in Rancho San Juan to the approved Butterfly Village and provides for seven Rural Centers. The 2007 General Plan would designate Chualar as a Community Area, allowing urbanization, but otherwise does not have as expansive an urban development pattern as proposed under GPU3. The proposed 2007 General Plan would require an Infrastructure and Financing Study to ensure that growth is properly served with utilities and public services. Growth outside of Community Areas and rural centers would be subject to a residential Development Evaluation System that will be provide a “pass-fail” system of ensuring the development has sufficient services. As a result, although the potential for significant land use impacts is not eliminated by the policies of the 2007 General Plan, it is less than under GPU3.

GPU3 also contains policies designed to limit the unmitigated expansion of cities. GPU3 sets forth a policy that the County will oppose City annexation requests if housing development outpaces job growth and roadway impacts are not properly mitigated. This set of policies may reduce many potential land use impacts from city growth on unincorporated county lands.

Overall, GPU3 envisions substantially more growth than the 2007 General Plan and proposes to accommodate it through a variety of approaches. In terms of

development potential, GPU3 would accommodate 3,650 more new dwelling units than the 2007 General Plan. While GPU3 does contain a rigorous annexation policy that would address city-county land use conflicts, this would not fully address the land use conflicts created in the unincorporated county because of the number of Rural Communities established. In addition, GPU3-proposed amendments to the coastal zone land use plans have the potential to create land use conflicts with the Local Coastal Program. Therefore, GPU3 would have greater impacts on land use than would the 2007 General Plan.

5.4.2.2 Agriculture Resources

Development and land use activities contemplated by GPU3 would result in the conversion of approximately 32,900 acres of Important Farmland. Most of this loss of farmland would occur as a result of the Affordable Housing Overlay, which would affect as much as 27,900 acres. Additional losses would be incurred with development of the 18 Rural Centers and the 4,000-acre Rancho San Juan. GPU3's policy regarding city annexation could indirectly limit the loss of Important Farmland by slowing city growth; however, this policy would only partially offset the conversion within unincorporated areas. Overall, GPU 3 would have a significant effect on agricultural resources.

In comparison, urban development proposed as part of the 2007 General Plan would result in a loss of approximately 5,500 acres of Important Farmland. Therefore, GPU3 would have greater impacts on agriculture resources than would the 2007 General Plan.

5.4.2.3 Water Resources

GPU3 would have significant impacts on soil erosion and sedimentation from construction and agricultural land use activities, wastewater disposal (i.e., septic tanks), groundwater overdraft, seawater intrusion, well competition and interference, and levee and dam failure. GPU3 would prohibit development in 100-year flood plains, establish a Comprehensive Integrated Water Management Plan, require long-term water supplies for new development, and expand the Watershed Permit Coordination Program. GPU3 also has strong policies protecting water resources in the Coastal Areas. GPU3 shares with the 2007 General Plan an increased demand on groundwater resources and potential for exacerbating overdraft conditions. It is unlikely that these policies would be sufficient to solve the water supply and overdraft problems identified in this EIR and therefore, GPU 3 would have a significant and unavoidable impact.

The 2007 General Plan policies, with the exception of the long-term sustainable water requirement, are less stringent. However, the proposed 2007 General Plan would restrict development in floodplains, limits development where there is no long-term sustainable water supply, and would establish groundwater overdraft monitoring systems. It is therefore likely that, on balance given the greater

development potential under GPU3, the significance level of potential GPU3 overall impacts on water resources would be similar to those of the 2007 General Plan.

5.4.2.4 Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

GPU3 includes specific policies that reduce geologic risk by limiting development near fault zones, requiring geologic reports in areas identified as having geologic hazards or constraints, and requiring geotechnical reports for subdivisions in areas of risk. These policies, in concert with building codes and the County Erosion Control Ordinance (Chapter 16.12 of the Monterey County Code), would avoid a significant effect on the environment.

The 2007 General Plan has similar policies to minimize geologic risk and would also work with existing County building codes and ordinances to minimize soil erosion. Based on its greater development area (eight Community Areas and 18 Rural Centers), GPU3 has the potential to expose more persons and property to geologic, soil, and seismic hazards than does the proposed 2007 General Plan. Therefore, potential GPU3 impacts on geology, soils, and seismicity would be greater than those of the 2007 General Plan.

5.4.2.5 Mineral Resources

Oil production in the southern Salinas Valley and South County is the only mineral resource extraction activity that may be affected by development and land use activities contemplated by GPU3. Economic conditions and legal constraints make it highly unlikely that GPU3 would result in the premature termination of oil extraction operations in these areas. Therefore, GPU3 would have the same impacts on mineral resources as those of the proposed 2007 General Plan.

5.4.2.6 Transportation

GPU3 establishes a standard of LOS C for County roads outside Community Areas. If successfully implemented, this would result in less congestion than the proposed 2007 General Plan, which would adopt LOS D as the standard. However, in order to maintain traffic flow at LOS C, extensive road widening would be needed. The widening would likely result in significant indirect effects on noise, biology, agricultural land conversion, and land use. GPU3 would allow more new development during the planning horizon than would the proposed 2007 General Plan and sets a lower congestion threshold (LOS C). It is reasonable to conclude that potential adverse indirect impacts from GPU3 would be greater to those of the 2007 General Plan because the former would allow more residential development in more places. GPU3 would, however, have less traffic congestion than the proposed 2007 General Plan, assuming that financing

would be available for the road improvements needed in order to meet the LOS C standard.

5.4.2.7 Air Quality

The North Central Air Basin is not in attainment for the State O₃ standard. Ozone is the product of NO_x and SO_x emissions mixing in the presence of sunlight. Implementation of GPU3 would allow for 13,675 new dwelling units, as well as other development that will, in turn, result in additional emissions of ozone precursors from vehicle exhaust. This would be a significant effect.

GPU3 would allow an estimated 3,650 more new dwelling units by 2030 than are proposed under the 2007 General Plan. As a result, there would be less traffic congestion once roadways attained LOS C, but potential air quality impacts related to vehicular sources of emission would likely be greater than what would occur under implementation of the 2007 General Plan as a result of more automobiles and presumably more vehicle miles travelled under GPU3. The potential adverse impacts on air quality from GPU3 would be greater than those of the 2007 General Plan.

5.4.2.8 Noise

GPU3 includes strong policies intended to ensure that new development of sensitive receptors will not be exposed to excessive noise (i.e., noise levels exceeding County standards), including noise from roadway improvement projects. However, the policies also prohibit the use of masonry sound walls in rural areas. This prohibition may act to make roadway improvement noise attenuation infeasible where existing rural residences adjoin those roads. As a result, GPU3 would be expected to have a significant effect on noise in rural areas where roads are widened to meet the LOS C congestion standard.

The proposed 2007 General Plan has similar noise policies, with additional policies intended to limit noise and vibration from construction activities. The 2007 General Plan would also discourage the use of masonry walls for noise attenuation in rural areas. Although the 2007 General Plan would probably not require the road widening associated with GPU3, it would allow greater congestion on County roads, and therefore would result in higher noise levels along roads that become more congested.

Implementation of GPU3 would allow for 3,650 more dwelling units than the 2007 General Plan. As a result, the potential for noise impacts would be greater than the 2007 General Plan. Because GPU3 lacks policies limiting construction noise, short-term construction-related noise and vibration impacts would also be expected to be correspondingly less. Accordingly, potential adverse noise impacts from implementation of GPU3 would be less than those of the 2007 General Plan.

5.4.2.9 Biological Resources

Overall, the 8 Community Areas and 18 Rural Centers established under GPU3 would result in new urban development within those areas. In some cases, this development will occur on or near natural habitats inhabited by special status wildlife and plant species, or affect open lands currently used by special status species as foraging habitat or movement corridors. In addition, the road widening needed to maintain LOS C into the future may also affect habitats such as wetlands and riparian areas. At the same time, GPU3 contains strong policies for the protection of biological resources. These include requiring analysis and mitigation of impacts in conjunction with development in Community Areas, limiting development in rural areas to “building envelopes” that minimize effects on critical habitats, and designing new development to avoid sensitive resources where possible. Development on rural lands or in Rural Centers would also be required to comply with setbacks from habitat areas to minimize development impacts. These policies would reduce the potential effects of new development but may not be sufficient to reduce all effects below a level of significance.

In comparison, the biological resources policies of the 2007 General Plan would require inventorying sensitive habitats and avoiding impacts on state and federally listed species and designated critical habitat. The CEQA process would be used to mitigate impacts from individual development projects, as such projects are proposed. The 2007 General Plan also would require preparation and implementation of a program to comprehensively mitigate the loss of critical habitat.

The 2007 General Plan contains less restrictive standards for protection of biological resources than GPU3. With the addition of the proposed mitigation measures to the 2007 General Plan, the two alternatives become more comparable with respect to protecting biological resources. Accordingly, balancing differences in growth with stringency of protection policies, the impacts of GPU3 on biological resources would be similar to that of GPU2007.

5.4.2.10 Cultural Resources

GPU3 includes strong policies for the identification and evaluation of cultural resources, including historical resources and archaeological sites. However, its policies for protecting those resources are vague and largely dependent upon the CEQA process. Previously undiscovered burials would be managed under the state law for the treatment of buried remains. Taken as a whole, the policies in GPU3, CEQA, and state law would avoid a significant effect on cultural resources.

In comparison, the 2007 General Plan has a similar set of policies for archaeological and paleontological resources, with additional policies governing the protection of burial sites. The proposed 2007 General Plan does not have specific policies for the protection of historic resources, but the County’s adopted

Historic Preservation Plan and Historic Preservation Ordinance reduce the need for such policies.

Therefore, the 2007 General Plan would have a less-than-significant effect on cultural resources. GPU3 and the 2007 General Plan would have basically the same potential impacts on cultural resources.

5.4.2.11 Public Services and Utilities

GPU3 contains a rigorous requirement for the concurrent provision of public services and utilities. This would avoid significant effects. In comparison, the proposed 2007 General Plan has similar policies. Because the design and location of future services and utilities are largely unknown, the impacts of the construction and operation of new facilities cannot be reasonably ascertained at this time. These facilities will probably be built within the cities, Community Areas, and Rural Centers that they would serve. As a result, their impacts would be part of the overall impact of urbanization. Both GPU3 and GP2007 includes provisions for mitigation the impacts of construction of new facilities. Therefore, GPU3 impacts on public services and utilities are similar to those of the 2007 General Plan.

5.4.2.12 Parks and Recreation

GPU3 would require the adoption of park development guidelines, a parks inventory, and park acquisition priorities (by area) in conjunction with new park development, thereby ensuring the provision of park and recreational facilities concurrent with new development. These provisions would avoid a significant effect as a result of insufficient parks and the overuse of existing facilities. The 2007 General Plan has practically the same requirements, by comparison, lacking only the specificity of the park acquisition priorities. However, Mitigation Measure PS-1 would revise the 2007 General Plan's policies to clearly establish dedication standards for on-site park facilities to ensure that future subdivision approvals exact parks and recreation facilities or in-lieu fees. Therefore, GPU3's impacts to parks and recreational resources are relatively similar to those that would result from implementation of GP2007, with mitigation.

5.4.2.13 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

GPU3 contains policies addressing potential impacts on hazardous materials that reflect state law for inventory, avoidance, and clean-up of hazardous materials. The policies also require a site contamination study where contamination is suspected. GPU3 also includes policies concerning emergency response and wildland fire protection, including fire service standards, design requirements, and defensible space requirements for new development. However, absent

stronger policy restrictions on development in high hazard fire areas, GPU3 would have a significant effect.

The 2007 General Plan contains similar policies. In addition, it includes detailed policies requiring annexation to fire districts, and addressing emergency evacuation routes, coordination between emergency response agencies, fire flows, fire vehicle access, and fuel modification zones in areas of high and very high fire hazard. These policies would avoid significant effects. Thus, GPU3 with its larger developed area and greater potential for residential development would have greater adverse impacts on hazards and hazardous materials than the 2007 General Plan.

5.4.2.14 Aesthetics, Light, and Glare

Implementation of GPU3 would have significant impacts on scenic vistas, scenic highways, visual character, and light and glare because of the more intense land uses envisioned under this alternative compared to the existing setting. By comparison, the 2007 General Plan would have similarly significant impacts, albeit over a smaller developable area with fewer Rural Centers. Accordingly, potential impacts on aesthetics, light, and glare would be greater under GPU3 than under the 2007 General Plan.

5.4.2.15 Population and Housing

Both GPU3 and the proposed 2007 General Plan are local land use plans that prescribe where and at what intensity future growth will occur. Pursuant to state law, a general plan must provide for sufficient new development to accommodate projected housing demand. As such, both plans would induce future growth by accommodating future development. Neither plan is expected to result in the displacement of substantial numbers of dwelling units or persons. Given its greater potential for development, GPU3's impacts on population and housing would be greater than those of the 2007 General Plan.

5.4.3 Conclusion

The GPU3 Alternative would be the most growth accommodating option of the alternatives, with eight Community Areas and 18 Rural Centers; more so than the 2007 General Plan. GPU3 has greater impacts on land use, agricultural resources, geology and soils, transportation, air quality, noise, hazardous materials, aesthetics, and population and housing than the 2007 General Plan. It has similar impacts on water resources, minerals, biological resources, cultural resources, public services, and parks and recreation. This alternative would not reduce any of the impacts identified for the 2007 General Plan.

As required by CEQA, this alternative meets all of the objectives of the 2007 General Plan. It would update the existing 1982 General Plan policies and land use map to account for changing economic conditions, land use patterns, socio-economic changes, or technological advancements. With respect to providing for the continued viability of the agricultural industry, it includes provides a wine corridor plan, but does not include an Agricultural Element with as many specific policies targeting the enhancement and protection of the agricultural industry.

5.5 General Plan Initiative Alternative (GPI)

5.5.1 Description

The General Plan Initiative Alternative (GPI) would amend parts of the existing 1982 General Plan, the 2003–2007 Housing Element, and the North County Land Use Plan. The GPI would restrict growth in the unincorporated areas of the County by requiring existing infrastructure deficiencies to be addressed before allowing new development and prohibiting any intensification of land use (e.g., subdivision) outside cities or Community Areas with an adopted Community Plan unless approved by initiative countywide vote. In addition, the GPI is designed to limit maximum potential development to the minimum number of housing units identified in the Regional Housing Needs Assessment. The GPI would create five types of land use categories: Cities, Community Areas, Rural Lands, Agricultural Lands, and Public Lands. With the exception of the Community Area designation, the GPI does not contemplate intensifying the level of land use in the four other land use categories and would not establish any Rural Centers.

The Community Area concept in the GPI is similar to that contained in GPU3 and the 2007 General Plan. However, instead of the eight Community Areas included in GPU3, the GPI proposes the same five identified in the proposed 2007 General Plan: Boronda, Castroville, Chualar, Fort Ord, and Pajaro. Future growth in the unincorporated areas of the County would be limited to Community Areas, and any intensification of use or changes to the boundaries of these identified areas would require prior approval of a majority of County voters. Growth in Boronda, Castroville, Fort Ord, and Pajaro would be facilitated by redevelopment and reuse activities; growth in Chualar would occur on existing agricultural lands, which would be limited to no more than 100 acres at a later timeframe in the life of the General Plan. In addition, the GPI emphasizes that future growth in Community Areas must be phased to first occur where infrastructure currently exists. Outside of Community Areas, only existing lots of record could be developed.

The GPI also contains land use restrictions requiring that any future General Plan amendments be approved by a majority of the County electorate, and a directive that the County work with the Monterey County Local Agency Formation

Commission to promote compact, urban development patterns within the existing boundaries of incorporated cities.

The GPI would also amend the existing Housing Element (last updated in 2003) to include more expansive inclusionary affordable housing requirements. The existing 20% affordable housing requirement would be increased to 30% of units by adding two tiers of workforce housing: Workforce I (5%) and Workforce II (5%). In certain situations, the GPI would require that as much as 40% affordable housing be included in proposed residential developments. In addition, the Housing Element would be amended to include a new right-of-first-refusal program for persons living or working in Monterey County who wish to rent or purchase new housing units.

The GPI includes policies concerning farmworker housing on Agricultural and Rural Lands. Housing for farmworkers would be permitted under the GPI's policies on an existing legal lot of record, if housing will support agricultural uses on site; housing is located to minimize interference with agricultural uses and to minimize impacts; housing complies with all health and safety codes; housing is permanently restricted to farmworker housing; a deed restriction has been recorded defining all units as accessory to the agricultural use on site; and all necessary services can be provided to support the farmworker housing.

In addition, the GPI amends the North County Coastal Plan but exempts the Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan, the Carmel Land Use Plan, and the Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan from the major policy changes in the Initiative with respect to land use classifications, growth and housing policies, and the requirement for voter approval to any Plan changes.

5.5.1.1 Development Comparison

A comparison of development potential between GPI and the 2007 General Plan over the 2030 planning horizon is provided in Table 5-3. Development under the GPI would result in approximately 5,901 more dwelling units than the proposed 2007 General Plan.

Table 5-3. Comparison: GPI and Proposed Project to 2030

Category	GPI	2007 General Plan	Difference (GPI vs. 2007 General Plan)
Residential	13,973 dwelling units	10,015 dwelling units*	5,901 dwelling units

*Difference in projected dwelling units is based on the difference between the estimated housing units within the unincorporated County from 2005 to 2030 for GPU3 and from 2006 to 2030 for the 2007 General Plan.

Source: Bay Area Economics. 2007. *Analysis of Monterey County General Plans and Quality of Life Initiative*. February

The difference in development potential between the two plans, as well as the difference in goals and policies, will serve as the basis for the analysis of the GPI alternative. The analysis below is based in part upon the Analysis of the Monterey County General Plans & Quality of Life Initiative prepared by Bay Area Economics and dated February 2007.

5.5.1.2 Land Use

The GPI policies encourage most new development to occur within the County's cities. The GPI would effectively preclude new urban development in Rancho San Juan and San Lucas, and instead concentrate denser development in the five remaining Community Areas. The GPI does not include the land use concept of Rural Centers found in some of the other alternatives. It would require that future General Plan amendments be approved by a majority of the County electorate, which would likely result in fewer amendments and the possibility that future amendments necessary to update the Housing Element would be problematic.

The GPI will result in urbanization within the cities and the Community Areas. As discussed earlier, by law a general plan must include sufficient provisions for growth to accommodate projected housing demand. As a result, the GPI will be growth-inducing. In this regard, it would have a similar significant impact as the proposed 2007 General Plan.

However, the GPI places greater restrictions on land use than the 2007 General Plan, limiting growth in the unincorporated County area to a smaller geographic area than is proposed under the 2007 General Plan. By concentrating growth in cities and existing urbanized areas, there is less likelihood to create conflicts with existing land uses. However, by amending the North County Coastal Plan, there is some potential for inconsistency between the GPI and existing County ordinances, and the potential for the Coastal Commission to determine that this element is inconsistent with the Coastal Act. Nonetheless, the GPI would have less potential to result in conflicts between land uses than the 2007 General Plan.

5.5.1.3 Agriculture Resources

The GPI's development potential is limited to the existing cities, the five Community Areas, and legal lots of record. As a result, it is reasonable to expect that a smaller overall amount of agricultural lands would be converted to non-agricultural uses under the GPI than under the proposed 2007 General Plan. Furthermore, the GPI's voter approval requirement for future General Plan Amendments is likely to make it much more difficult to convert agricultural lands under the jurisdiction of the County to non-agricultural uses. GPI does not have the specific policies addressing mitigation of impacts from the conversion of agricultural land either within the unincorporated County or as a result of annexation of agricultural land to cities as are included in the 2007 General Plan.

However, these county restrictions would not stop future growth in the cities. AMBAG projections indicate that Monterey County's total population will continue to grow in the future. The cities currently hold approximately 75% of the County's population. The GPI would likely direct an even greater proportion of this population growth to the existing cities than has occurred in the past. Future expansions of the boundaries of the Salinas Valley cities, which are surrounded by Prime Agricultural land, will result in the conversion of a significant amount of those lands to urban uses.

For example, according to the Final EIR certified in 2002 for the Salinas General Plan, the City of Salinas has an existing residential density of approximately 9 dwelling units per acre. In order to accommodate the housing growth currently projected by the *2004 AMBAG Population, Housing Unit and Employment Forecasts* to occur between 2005 and 2030 (approximately 17,644 new units), the City will need to develop approximately 1,960 acres of land. This does not include the amount of land needed for roads, commercial development, parks, and other related urban development, nor does it include the development that might otherwise have occurred in the County absent the GPI. Therefore, the GPI will have a significant indirect effect on annexation and the conversion of agricultural lands that adjoin cities. This effect will occur primarily in the Salinas Valley where there is sufficient water supply to serve projected growth to 2030, but it is on the most productive agricultural lands.

By comparison, the 2007 General Plan would authorize more extensive urbanization within the County than does the GPI, particularly in areas designated as Rural Centers. However, the Community Areas and Rural Centers designated in the 2007 General Plan are generally less productive lands and grazing lands. Therefore, development under the GPI and under the 2007 General Plan would result in similar levels of conversion and significant effects on agricultural land. GPI would have greater indirect effects on productive agricultural lands based upon the potential growth that would result in cities.

5.5.1.4 Water Resources

The GPI would direct most new development to the existing cities. Additional development would be accommodated within five Community Areas under the regulatory control of the County. The GPI retains the policies of the existing 1982 General Plan with respect to soil erosion and sedimentation from construction and agricultural land use activities, wastewater disposal (i.e., septic tanks), groundwater overdraft, seawater intrusion, well competition and interference, and levee and dam failure. The Erosion Control Ordinance (Chapter 16.12 of the Monterey County Code) would remain in place.

All of these are significant problems that would also result from development under the 2007 General Plan. While the potential effects of the GPI would be less than those of the 2007 General Plan by virtue of the greater compactness of the urban development contemplated, the GPI lacks many of the comprehensive water resource goals and policies contained in the 2007 General Plan. Moreover,

there is greater total development under GPI to the year 2030 than for GP 2007 with significant reliance of providing housing on lots of record throughout the unincorporated area. This would result in greater impacts to water resources overall although it could be offset by the greater intensity of growth in the few community areas and cities. Taking these factors into consideration, development to the 2030 planning horizon under the GPI would have a slightly greater impact on water resources than would the 2007 General Plan.

5.5.1.5 Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

The GPI would center urban development in and adjacent to the existing cities and five Community Areas. Development would be subject to the policies of the 1982 General Plan, plus existing regulations such as the County Erosion Control Ordinance, state Alquist-Priolo Seismic Zone Act, and California Building Code development standards. Additionally, the GPI would prohibit all development on slopes over 25%, and no new agricultural cultivation on slopes over 15%. These would avoid significant effects from implementation of the GPI.

Compared to the 2007 General Plan, the GPI would reduce the exposure of persons and property to geologic, soil, and seismic hazards by virtue of its more compact development pattern. This is exemplified by elimination of the Rural Centers as development nodes. Further, its restrictions on hillside development reduce the potential for soil erosion to occur and for slope instability to adversely affect development. Therefore, potential adverse impacts on geology, soils, and seismicity from the GPI would be less than those of the 2007 General Plan.

5.5.1.6 Mineral Resources

Oil production in the southern Salinas Valley and South County is the only mineral resource extraction activity that may be affected by development and land use activities contemplated by the GPI. Economic conditions and legal constraints make it highly unlikely that either the GPI or the 2007 General Plan would result in the premature termination of oil extraction operations in these areas. Therefore, the GPI would have the same impacts on mineral resources as the 2007 General Plan.

5.5.1.7 Transportation

The GPI retains all of the policies of the existing 1982 General Plan with respect to circulation. The GPI would require that new development within the urban development boundaries of the Community Areas be phased so that all public infrastructure is completed prior to or concurrent with new development. However, because development would continue within Monterey County under the GPI, albeit primarily within the cities and Community Areas, traffic levels would increase over existing conditions. This will be a significant effect.

The GPI has a stricter concurrency policy than the 2007 General Plan. As a result, development in the Community Areas will be supported by necessary local road improvements as it occurs. However, this will not reduce the impacts on regional roads that are expected to occur as a result of new development, nor will it reduce the indirect impacts on the cities as a greater proportion of the County's growth is directed to incorporated areas. The 2007 General Plan commits the County to developing, in cooperation with the Transportation Agency of Monterey County (TAMC) and other agencies, a regional mitigation fee with the goal of achieving LOS D on the regional roadway system. That fee program has been adopted and is currently in effect.

The GPI does not include an AWCP that would encourage future wineries to locate along the AWCP's three road corridors. Assuming that wineries will continue to be built to process the grapes being produced in the County, the GPI would encourage a more dispersed pattern of winery locations than would the 2007 General Plan. To the extent that clustering wineries along three road corridors would result in greater congestion than would dispersed wineries, the GPI would have less impact than the 2007 General Plan.

The GPI would result in a more compact pattern of urbanization than is proposed under the 2007 General Plan although there would be potential traffic from the sprawl of development on lots of record. Concentration of growth would tend to reduce vehicle miles travelled by reducing the number of traffic generators and destinations. Traffic is likely to be more concentrated in the cities which would increase local congestion, but taken as whole, the potential adverse impacts on transportation on regional and county roads from the GPI would be less than those of the 2007 General Plan.

5.5.1.8 Air Quality

The GPI retains air quality policies from the existing 1982 General Plan and does not set a specific LOS standard for County roads. By virtue of its direct and indirect impacts on traffic and urban development, the GPI can be expected to have a significant effect on air quality.

In comparison, the 2007 General Plan contains policies that are consistent with the air quality objectives of the 2004 AQMP. Moreover, the 2007 General Plan's local traffic impact fee and prohibition on occupancy of new development until all roadways operate at LOS D or better would significantly reduce idling on local roadways, which would result in a corresponding reduction in adverse air quality impacts. However, the extent of new traffic expected to be generated by the 2007 General Plan, combined with other sources of emissions resulting from urban development and the ACWP, will result in a significant effect on air quality.

The GPI would result in a more compact pattern of development than the 2007 General Plan. Compact development patterns tend to result in fewer vehicle trips than in less compact settings although air quality in urban areas may deteriorate.

Compact development patterns allow pedestrian, bicycle, and transit trips to substitute for short automobile trips (Urban Land Institute 2008). Accordingly, the GPI may be expected to have less of an impact on air quality than the 2007 General Plan.

5.5.1.9 Noise

The GPI would result in a compact pattern of development and would carry forward the noise policies of the 1982 General Plan. These are intended to be protective of sensitive receptors, but do not include standards for reducing construction noise. Under implementation of the GPI, noise would be generated primarily by new construction, the operation of new urban development in the Community Areas and cities, and additional traffic on roads (particularly in the rural areas where noise levels are generally low). In general, noise impacts would be significant in locations where new construction in the Community Areas adjoins sensitive receptors, and on the urban/rural interface where new urban development and new or widened roads carrying substantial amounts of traffic abut existing residences.

In comparison, the 2007 General Plan would result in the same types and levels of noise impacts but in more areas of concentrated growth. Noise in urban areas is greater than in less intensely developed areas. On balance, weighing difference in the number of growth centers, against the intensity of growth of the more compact areas, GPI impacts with respect to noise would be similar to that of the 2007 General Plan.

5.5.1.10 Biological Resources.

The GPI retains the vegetation and wildlife policies contained in the existing 1982 General Plan. Compliance with these policies would result in development with significant impacts on sensitive habitats, wetlands, riparian areas, wildlife movement, and tree preservation. Conversion of grazing lands, which provide wildlife habitat, to intensive agricultural cultivation, which provides little habitat value, would continue in the flatter portions of the County. However, the GPI would prohibit new agricultural cultivation on slopes over 15%. This would also act to limit the conversion of hilly grazing land to agricultural use, thereby reducing impacts on wildlife in those areas. Additionally, the GPI policies concentrate new development in the cities and the Community Areas, thereby minimizing the conversion of habitat by urban uses. Conversion on lots of record would potentially be greater, however.

In comparison, the 2007 General Plan would allow development over a more extensive area and would likely result in a greater level of conversion of grazing lands to cultivated agricultural land on steeper lots. There would likely be less development on lots of record that contain potential special status species up to the 2030 timeframe under GP 2007, however. With the addition of the mitigation

measures proposed in this EIR for protection of biological resources that are more protective than the policies in GPI (existing 1982 General Plan policies) the GPI would have more adverse impacts on biological resources than the 2007 General Plan.

5.5.1.11 Cultural Resources

The GPI would retain the 1982 General Plan policies for cultural resources. In addition to these policies, development would be required to comply with the County's adopted Historic Preservation Plan and Historic Preservation Ordinance. The GPI does not contain goals and policies addressing paleontological resources and Native American burial sites. To a certain extent, impacts on burials are reduced by California law regulating the treatment of burials found during construction activities. However, the lack of policies concerning paleontological resources and burial sites creates the potential for these resources to be damaged or destroyed and for a significant impact to occur.

The proposed policies of the 2007 General Plan, by comparison, are more protective of these resources than are the provisions of the GPI. In addition, GPI results in the development of more housing units the year 2030. Therefore, the GPI would have greater impacts on cultural resources as the 2007 General Plan.

5.5.1.12 Public Services and Utilities

Development under the GPI would result in a greater demand for public services and utilities than currently exists. In the future, the GPI's policies would result in a compact development pattern focusing on the five Community Areas and expansion of the existing cities. New demand for services and utilities would be concentrated in those areas. The GPI's requirements that new development in Community Areas be phased to occur first in areas with adequate public services and utilities would further lessen potential development impacts.

Because the GPI would direct a substantial amount of future development to the cities, it would avoid the need for the levels of County services that would be necessary to serve the 2007 General Plan implementation. Accordingly, this is expected to result in fewer adverse impacts from new or expanded fire protection, sheriff's protection, schools, libraries, medical facilities, potable water, wastewater, and solid waste facilities. Therefore, potential adverse impacts on public services and utilities under the GPI would be less than the 2007 General Plan. Both GPI and 2007 General Plan have less restrictive policies for development on lots of record, although projected growth on lots of record under GPI is anticipated to be greater under GPI to the year 2030. Accordingly, on balance, one would conclude that the impacts that would result from the construction of new public facilities would be less for GPI than for the 2007 General Plan.

5.5.1.13 Parks and Recreation

As with public services and utilities, development under the policies of the GPI would push most new development into the cities and the five Community Areas. The development in the cities would increase the need for parks and recreation facilities in those jurisdictions. Typically, that demand would be met by the affected cities through impact fees or other financing mechanisms applied in the course of approving development projects. The same would be true for the County in the Community Areas. As a result, the GPI would not result in a significant effect.

The area of future concentrated development in the unincorporated area is smaller under the GPI than under the 2007 General Plan. Less development in the unincorporated areas would translate to less demand for new parks and recreation facilities. Because future growth and the associated residential development will instead be channeled into the cities, there will be an increase in demand for new city parks and recreation facilities, as well as increased demand on existing facilities. The level of increased demand in the cities would depend upon the amount of growth that would be transferred and is not reasonably predictable. The 2007 General Plan, with mitigation requiring adoption of recreational facilities standards for new subdivision, would somewhat balance this impact.

Accordingly, the potential adverse impacts on parks and recreation from the GPI would be somewhat less than the 2007 General Plan in the unincorporated areas of the County but have greater indirect impact in the cities.

5.5.1.14 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The GPI does not contain policies that adequately address potential impacts on hazardous materials, emergency response, and wildland fire protection. Although the GPI would effectively limit growth in rural areas to existing lots of record, that restriction would not offset the lack of comprehensive wildland fire protection goals and policies. The GPI would have a significant effect in these areas.

The 2007 General Plan contains new goals and policies to address these areas including extensive policies concerning fire hazards and emergency preparedness. Therefore, the GPI would result in potentially greater adverse impacts from hazards and hazardous materials in rural areas than the 2007 General Plan.

5.5.1.15 Aesthetics, Light, and Glare

The GPI would limit future urban growth in a manner that would preserve significant visual resource areas (agricultural fields, ridgelines, natural areas,

etc.) and minimize adverse impacts from new sources of light and glare. Nonetheless, the GPI would result in major new sources of light and glare being built within the cities and the Community Areas. These would adversely affect nearby rural and agricultural areas.

The more compact development pattern, in comparison to development under the 2007 General Plan, would result in fewer adverse impacts on scenic vistas, scenic highways, visual character, and light and glare. Impacts on visual character and light and glare would be significant and unavoidable as result of implementation of the 2007 General Plan. Because it would result in a more compact development pattern, aesthetics, light, and glare impacts of the GPI would be less than those of the 2007 General Plan.

5.5.1.16 Population and Housing

The GPI and the proposed 2007 General Plan are local land use plans that prescribe where and at what intensity future growth will occur. Pursuant to state law, a general plan must provide for sufficient new development to accommodate projected housing demand. As such, both plans would induce future growth by accommodating future development. Neither plan is expected to result in the displacement of substantial numbers of dwelling units or persons. In the near term, the GPI would have similar impacts on population and housing to those of the 2007 General Plan. However, if the voter approval requirement of the GPI resulted in the county being unable to amend its Housing Element to comply with the requirements for housing availability under State Housing Element Law, the County would be placed under legal threat for being out of compliance with that law.

5.5.2 Conclusion

The GPI Alternative would amend the policies of the existing 1982 General Plan to limit growth outside of Community Areas. While this alternative would allow only slightly more growth than the 1982 General Plan which it amends, its stringent land use and transportation infrastructure requirements would effectively curtail future urban expansion in the unincorporated County. The GPI would have a greater impact on cultural resources, hazardous materials and water resources, biological resources and agricultural resources. than the proposed 2007 General Plan. It would have similar impacts with respect to mineral resources, noise, public services and and population and housing. It would have lesser impacts on land use, geology and soils, transportation, air quality, parks and recreation, and aesthetics, light, and glare than the proposed 2007 General Plan.

The GPI Alternative meets three of the five objectives of the 2007 General Plan. It would provide an updated General Plan that reflects the existing physical conditions and constraints in the County and provides a range of comprehensive

policies to guide future residential development based on those conditions and constraints. It does not establish new comprehensive policies and modify existing policies in the existing 1982 General Plan that reflect the latest legal, statutory, scientific, and technical changes and advances. It contains minimal policies with respect to address future employment growth and economic growth in the County in general or more specifically with respect to the agricultural industry. The GPI Alternative would also accommodate forecasted growth, albeit in a different manner than the 2007 General Plan. The GPI Alternative does contain strict limitations on growth outside of designated areas that would limit the County's flexibility in accommodating growth to the planning horizon by requiring that amendment to the General Plan be approved by a majority of the voters.

5.6 2006 General Plan (GPU4)

5.6.1 Description

GPU4 was the basis for the proposed 2007 General Plan that is the subject of this EIR. Accordingly, it shares many of the 2007 General Plan's proposed goals and policies. A discussion of the key differences between GPU4 and the 2007 General Plan follows at the end of this subsection.

GPU4 includes amendments to the seven Area Plans; including them as sections in the General Plan and deleting any Area Plan policies that are otherwise addressed on a County-wide level in the General Plan. This focuses the policies on provisions that are unique to each Area Plan. GPU4 does not propose to amend the County's certified Local Coastal Program or any of its local coastal plans. The 2007 General Plan shares this approach.

GPU4 provides for a range of land uses and densities for the unincorporated areas of Monterey County that are not in federal or state ownership. GPU4 policies encourage most future development to take place within the incorporated cities, with an "urban reserve" designated around each city identifying unincorporated lands that may be available for annexation. Growth areas within the County would be designated where an adequate level of public services is available or "can be assured concurrent with growth and development." The 2007 General Plan shares this approach.

GPU4 provides for limited urban development to occur in selected areas of the unincorporated area of the County. In addition to the previously adopted Carmel Valley and Fort Ord Master Plans, GPU4 establishes six Community Areas where future urban development will be focused. In addition, nine Rural Centers are identified in areas that already contain a concentration of higher intensity uses than are typically found in rural areas. These Rural Centers would evolve into Community Areas over the life of GPU4 should infrastructure and services become available. Urbanization of Rural Centers is intended to be secondary in priority to development in the Community Areas and would be contingent upon

the prior preparation of a Capital Improvement and Financing Plan (CIFP) to ensure that adequate urban services can be provided. There are 17 Special Treatment Areas in GPU4 (including the existing 10 STAs in the 1982 General Plan) and 4 Study Areas. Implementation of GPU4 would result in approximately 8,336 more dwelling units than the proposed 2007 General Plan.

Under GPU4, the CIFP would address benefit areas, the cost of improvements over the life of the general plan, financing/funding sources to accommodate those costs (including a traffic impact fee), a schedule for completion of improvements, and coordination with the TAMC's regional traffic impact fee program, when adopted. GPU4 policy commits the County to reviewing the CIFP every five years after adoption of the General Plan.

GPU4 commits the County to preparing a Residential Development Evaluation System (DES) "to provide a systematic, consistent, predictable, and quantitative method for decision-makers to evaluate residential developments of five or more lots or units in areas of the unincorporated County outside of Community Areas and Rural Centers, and in Rural Centers prior to the preparation of the required Infrastructure and Financing Study." The DES would regulate these developments on the basis of site suitability; infrastructure availability; resource management; proximity to a city, Community Area, or Rural Center; affordable housing; environmental impacts; jobs-housing balance; and other factors. The DES would not be a "pass-fail" system under GPU4. Projects of five or more units in a Rural Center prior to adoption of an Infrastructure and Financing Study would be required to include 35% affordable/workforce housing. Such projects outside of a Community Area or Rural Center would be required to provide at least 50% affordable/workforce housing.

Other goals and policies address such subjects as biological resource conservation; cultural resources preservation; reduction of seismic, geological, and wildland fire hazards; provision of public utilities; and transportation needs. The titles of the elements of GPU4 reflect its comprehensive scope: land use, circulation, conservation/open space, safety, public service, agriculture, and economic development. This is shared with the 2007 General Plan.

In addition to discouraging urban uses outside of cities and Community Areas, GPU4 contains an agricultural element with goals and policies that are intended to be protective of agriculture. These include policies limiting the regulation of "routine and ongoing agricultural activities," authorizing agricultural support uses in agricultural areas, limiting the subdivision of agricultural land, establishing agricultural buffers to separate agricultural uses from urbanization, and committing to adopt a program for mitigating the loss of farmland to urbanization or city incorporation.

GPU4 would require the establishment of a permit process for development on slopes exceeding 25%, or that contain mapped geologic hazards or constraints. A grading permit would be required for the conversion of slopes in excess of 25% to agricultural use. A ministerial permit process would be established for

proposed development on slopes between 15 and 24%, and 10 to 15% on highly erodible soils.

A separate *Agricultural Winery Corridor Plan* (ACWP) that implements General Plan policies is also included in GPU4. The ACWP designates three segments of a winery corridor in the Central Salinas Valley, South County, and Toro areas along River Road, Metz Road, and Jolon Road. GPU4 establishes land use policies to guide the establishment of a defined number of wineries and tasting rooms. Land use policies to guide the development of the Agricultural Winery Corridor include standards that regulate the size and location of wineries. The policies are intended to allow for the development of an Agricultural Winery Corridor that is consistent with the existing agricultural land uses as well as the provisions of the Williamson Act. Under the full development of the AWCP, up to 40 “artisan” wineries, and 10 tasting rooms would be developed, along with 3 restaurants, 5 delicatessens, 8 bed-and-breakfasts, a business cluster, and up to 2 visitor centers. GPU4 specifies the number of each wine-related facility that would be allowed on each of the three segments in order to avoid overcrowding. However, it does not identify specific locations for any facilities within a segment.

5.6.1.1 Differences between GPU4 and the 2007 General Plan

While GPU4 contains many of the same policies as the project, it differs from the 2007 General Plan in the following key areas:

- The 2007 General Plan would commit the County to adopting a Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan within 24 months of adopting the General Plan. The purpose of the plan would be to quantify County greenhouse gas emissions and establish a set of policies and implementation measures that would reduce projected greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels. No such plan is proposed under GPU4.
- The 2007 General Plan would establish five Community Areas rather than the six proposed under GPU4 (San Lucas would be designated a Rural Community under the 2007 General Plan).
- The 2007 General Plan would establish seven Rural Centers rather than the nine proposed under GPU4 (Prunedale, Mouth of the Carmel Valley, San Benancio/Corral de Tierra, and Toro Park Estates/Serra Village would be deleted). In addition, the River Road Rural Center would be reduced in area.
- The 2007 General Plan would limit additional residential subdivision in Carmel Valley to 266 new lots. It would also prohibit the conversion of previously uncultivated land on slopes in excess of 25%.
- The 2007 General Plan includes revisions to the Greater Salinas, North County, and Toro Area Plans that would limit development on properties with residential land use designations to the first single-family residence on

each legal lot of record. In contrast, GPU 4 would allow subdivision of these legal lots when consistent with the plan.

- Under the 2007 General Plan, the DES would be a pass-fail system for sites outside of Community Areas, Rural Centers, and AHOs. The 2007 General Plan would further specify that these developments (as well as development within Rural Centers before adoption of the required Infrastructure and Financing Study) would be required to include at least 35% affordable/workforce housing, or 30% affordable/workforce housing if at least 15% of the housing is for farmworkers.
- The 2007 General Plan proposes specific criteria for development that uses the voluntary TDR program, which GPU4 does not have. These include site suitability; infrastructure availability; resource management; proximity to a city, Community Area, or Rural Center; environmental impacts; proximity to transportation; and avoidance of impacts on productive farmland.
- The 2007 General Plan establishes a voluntary AHO program not found in GPU4 to create an incentive for higher density, affordable housing at particular locations in the County. Three specific AHO districts are identified (Mid-Carmel Valley, Highway 68/Monterey Peninsula Airport, and Reservation Road/Highway 68), and the Community Areas and Rural Centers would be considered AHOs until adoption of their community plans and Infrastructure and Financing Studies. Within an AHO, the residential density would be from 5 to 30 units per acre, with a minimum average of at least 10 units per acre. The 2007 General Plan would require the infrastructure necessary to serve the AHOs to be installed concurrent with development of the affordable housing project.
- The 2007 General Plan would require the Capital Improvement and Financing Plan to be adopted within 18 months of approval of the General Plan.
- Both the 2007 General Plan and GPU4 require the construction of road improvements on impacted roads concurrently with development. The 2007 General Plan would exempt the first single-family residence, non-habitable accessory structure, second unit, and non-discretionary commercial uses from this requirement.
- The 2007 General Plan would prohibit development on slopes greater than 30%, with limited exceptions. Rather than a grading permit for agricultural conversion on slopes exceeding 25%, as in GPU4, the 2007 General Plan would require the County to develop an Agricultural Permit process. The 2007 General Plan sets out a list of criteria (i.e., water quality and supply, biological resources, cultural resources, erosion control, drainage, and flood hazards) that would be weighed to establish whether the agricultural permit might be ministerial.
- The 2007 General Plan would specify that well-defined buffer areas must be provided as partial mitigation for new non-agricultural development located adjacent to important farmland. The criteria for establishing buffers are essentially the same as proposed under GPU4. However, where GPU4

presumes that buffers are not meant to be permanent, the 2007 General Plan would allow permanent buffers as well.

- The 2007 General Plan expands upon GPU4’s provisions for adopting a program to mitigate the loss of important farmland to development or annexation. It further provides that mitigation mechanisms will be based on a graduated value of farmland, with the greatest mitigation for prime farmland. It also includes encouragement for non-profit land trusts to assist in implementing the program through voluntary acquisition of development rights.
- The 2007 General Plan would integrate the AWCP, rather than adopting it separately. The 2007 General Plan would allow up to 10 full-scale wineries within the agricultural wine corridors, in addition to the uses identified in GPU4. These would be limited to up to five wineries on the River Road segment, two on the Metz Road segment, and three on the Jolon Road segment. Each full-scale winery would be allowed to include a tasting room and to hold events without a separate permit.

5.6.1.2 Development Comparison

Table 5-4. Comparison: GPU4 and Proposed Project (2030)

Category	GPU 4	2007 General Plan	Difference (GPU4 vs. 2007 General Plan)
Residential	16,900 dwelling units	10,015 dwelling units*	8,828 more dwelling units

*Difference in projected dwelling units is based on the difference between the estimated housing units within the unincorporated County from 2005 to 2030 for GPU3 and from 2006 to 2030 for the 2007 General Plan.

** Employment is based on the same time periods.

Sources: Bay Area Economics. 2007 *Analysis of Monterey County General Plans and Quality of Life Initiative*. February; AMBAG 2004.

5.6.2 Environmental Effects

5.6.2.1 Land Use

GPU4 would pursue a general policy of encouraging most new development to occur within the cities, including within areas of future annexation. Community Areas and Rural Centers would provide first and second preference for urban density growth within the unincorporated County. GPU4 includes policies intended to avoid land use conflicts between incorporated and unincorporated areas through coordination with the cities and the Local Agency Formation Commission. The Urban Reserve land use designation is one way in which unincorporated areas near the cities will be prepared for future annexation and urbanization. Another way is to authorize buffers between agriculture and

incompatible uses, and to encourage mitigation for the loss of important farmland through annexation or conversion.

GPU4 provides for substantial new development over the existing conditions. This is consistent with state law requiring general plans to contain sufficient growth potential to accommodate future housing needs. This growth would be a significant effect.

GPU4's policies regarding city-centered growth, providing for buffers between agricultural and future urban uses, and encouraging compact form through the Community Areas and Rural Centers, will reduce the potential for conflicts between land uses. The potential for land use conflicts is less than significant.

GPU4 contemplates more extensive urbanization than does the proposed 2007 General Plan. By way of comparison, the 2007 General Plan would not designate Community Areas at Rancho San Juan or San Lucas. San Lucas is instead designated as a Rural Center. Rancho San Juan is a Special Treatment Area. The 2007 General Plan also eliminates GPU4's Rural Center designations for Prunedale, San Benancio/Corral de Tierra, and Toro Park Estates/Serra Village. These changes would reduce the area otherwise designated as either a Community Area or Rural Center under GPU4 by approximately 1,831 acres.

Further, GPU4 would allow more extensive development to occur outside of the urbanizing nodes than the 2007 General Plan. GPU4 would allow the further subdivision of existing lots of record within the Greater Salinas, North County, and Toro Area Plans. The 2007 General Plan would limit development on properties with residential land use designations to the first single-family residence on each legal lot of record. Similarly, by creating a pass-fail DES, the 2007 General Plan would restrict development of five units or more on sites outside of the identified Community Areas, Rural Centers, and AHOs. Therefore, GPU4 has a greater latent residential development potential in these areas than does the 2007 General Plan.

In comparison, the proposed 2007 General Plan would specify that AHO districts are also preferred areas for future development. The 2007 General Plan identifies sites in Mid-Carmel Valley (approximately 13 acres), Highway 68/Monterey Peninsula Airport (approximately 85 acres), and Reservation Road/Highway 68 (approximately 31 acres) as voluntary AHO districts, as well as Community Areas prior to adoption of a community plan and Rural Centers prior to adoption of an Infrastructure and Financing Study. The 2007 General Plan sets out detailed policies for considering the acceptability of AHO projects. By virtue of their increased density, the three AHO districts may conflict with the land use expectations of existing residents of lower-density developments. They may result in localized significant effects from land use conflicts. GPU4 would also propose fewer total wineries than the 2007 General Plan.

GPU4 would have a greater effect on growth than the 2007 General Plan by virtue of allowing more expansive residential growth to occur, particularly on lands outside of the Community Areas and Rural Centers. While development

under GPU4 would result in localized land use conflicts, these would be reduced by the policies discussed above. The more expansive growth under GPU4 would be offset by the additional potential for land use conflict under the 2007 General Plan at the full-scale winery sites and the AHOs. As a result, GPU-4 would have essentially the same effect on land use conflicts as the proposed 2007 General Plan.

5.6.2.2 Agriculture Resources

Under GPU4, a net loss of approximately 5,497 acres of Important Farmland and 6,785 acres of Williamson Act lands would occur. The policies of GPU4 would focus growth into higher density Community Areas as the first tier for new development, along with policies that manage subsequent growth in Rural Centers (second tier for new development). Several of the Community Areas encompass agricultural land, including Boronda, Castroville, Chualar, and Rancho San Juan. For the most part, the Rural Community areas avoid high quality agricultural lands. GPU4 would be accompanied by the ACWP, encouraging wineries and related activities along three corridors. The ACWP would lead to the conversion of Important Farmland depending upon the location of future wineries and other facilities.

GPU4 contains numerous policies in its Agricultural Element intended to minimize the potential impacts of incompatible development on agricultural lands. These include criteria for establishing non-permanent buffers, creating tax incentives for agricultural uses, limiting subdivisions, and a commitment to establish an agricultural land mitigation program. A set of policies limiting County regulation of “routine and on-going” agricultural uses is intended to encourage the continuation and economic viability of agricultural operations. Nonetheless, due to the expected conversion of Important Farmlands and lands currently under Williamson Act contract, GPU4 would have a significant effect on agricultural resources.

In comparison, the proposed 2007 General Plan contains similar policies with regard to agriculture. Notable differences include a stronger buffer policy, a more restrictive policy governing the subdivision of agricultural lands and a more detailed program for mitigating the loss of Important Farmland. The 2007 General Plan would also limit residential development within the Greater Salinas, North County, and Toro Area Plans to the first single-family residence on each legal lot of record. Similarly, by creating a pass-fail DES, the 2007 General Plan would restrict development of five units or more on sites outside of the identified Community Areas, Rural Centers, and AHOs. These policies and development criteria would reduce the 2007 General Plan’s potential to convert important agricultural lands in comparison to GPU4. In addition, by eliminating Rancho San Juan as a Community Area, the 2007 General Plan result in less conversion of agricultural lands to urban uses..

At the same time, the 2007 General Plan would authorize up to 10 full-scale wineries along the AWCP road segments. This would result in a greater potential

for the conversion of Important Farmland than GPU4, depending upon the location of future wineries and other facilities.

Overall, GPU4 would have a somewhat greater impact on agricultural resources than would the proposed 2007 General Plan.

5.6.2.3 Water Resources

GPU4 would direct most new development in the County to its existing cities. Additional development would be accommodated within the Community Areas and Rural Centers. GPU4 includes policies that would require establishment of a permit process for development on slopes in excess of 25% or that have known geologic hazards/constraints (with less restrictive provisions for conversion of previously uncultivated lands to agricultural use) in order to reduce erosion hazards. The County's existing Erosion Control Ordinance (Chapter 16.12 of the Monterey County Code) would remain in place. As a result, impacts on water quality are expected to be less than significant.

With regard to water supply, GPU4 policies require new development to demonstrate the concurrent availability of adequate public facilities and service (including water supply) before approval can be granted. GPU4 would require the County to develop a Hydrologic Resources Constraints and Hazards Database to identify important groundwater recharge areas, areas with limited groundwater, and areas unsuitable for septic tanks. GPU4 policy would prohibit approval of new development (except for the first single-family residence on an existing lot of record) without proof of availability of a "long-term, sustainable water supply, both in quality and quantity" to serve the development. GPU4 establishes criteria that may show proof of a long-term water supply.

In addition, GPU4 requires the County to develop a program as part of the Capital Implementation and Financing Plan that would eliminate overdraft of water basins. Other GPU4 policies would require that all projects be designed to maintain or increase the site's predevelopment absorption of rainfall and to recharge groundwater where appropriate, that the County use its discretionary permit authority to manage the construction of impervious surfaces in important groundwater recharge areas in order to maintain recharge capacity, and that the County encourage the use of recycled water where possible.

Outside of Community Areas, Rural Centers, and AHO districts, GPU4 commits the County to establish a Development Evaluation System to ensure that development of five or more lots or units considers infrastructure availability, among other things. No such provision is made for the first house built on existing vacant lots of record.

Despite its protective policies, development under GPU4 would have a significant impact on water resources, primarily from its contribution to the existing severe cumulative effect on limited groundwater supplies and overdraft conditions.

In comparison, the water resources-related policies of the proposed 2007 General Plan are similar to, but in some cases more restrictive than, those in GPU4. For example, the 2007 General Plan further specifies that the DES is to be a pass-fail system, thereby requiring disapproval of residential developments that cannot show sufficient infrastructure availability. In addition, based on the smaller number of Community Areas and Rural Centers, the 2007 General Plan would authorize future urban development over a smaller area than GPU4, thereby reducing the number of individual wells and making water conservation programs easier to administer. Further, the 2007 General Plan would limit development to the first residence on existing vacant lots of record within the Greater Salinas, North County, and Toro Area Plans. This would reduce the overall development up to the 2030 planning horizon in comparison to GPU4.

At the same time, while reducing water demand in those areas, the 2007 General Plan would increase potential water demand over GPU4 in the following ways. It would establish three AHOs that would offer participating landowners the opportunity to increase residential densities. This potential increase would be tempered by the fact that such projects at the Mid-Carmel Valley and Highway 68/Monterey Peninsula Airport AHOs would be restricted by the restricted water availability within the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District. The 2007 General Plan would authorize up to 10 full-scale wineries within the Agricultural Winery Corridor. These would result in an incremental increase in water use for their operations over what would be allowed in GPU4 in the AWCP. This will be tempered by policies requiring evaluation and approval of the adequacy of all new wells (PS-3.4 and PS-3.5).

Overall, potential implementation of the 2007 General Plan to the 2030 planning horizon would have less impact on water resources than of GPU4 to 2030.

5.6.2.4 Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

GPU4 includes policies that would require establishment of a permit process for development on slopes in excess of 25% or that have known geologic hazards/constraints (with less restrictive provisions for conversion of previously uncultivated lands to agricultural use). The County's existing Erosion Control Ordinance (Chapter 16.12 of the Monterey County Code) would remain in place. Development would also be subject to other existing regulations such as the state Alquist-Priolo Seismic Zone Act, and California Building Code development standards. These would avoid significant effects from implementation of GPU4.

Compared to the 2007 General Plan, GPU4 would have greater exposure of persons and property to geologic, soil, and seismic hazards by virtue of its more extensive development. This includes the additional Community Area and four Rural Centers not included in the 2007 General Plan. Additionally, the 2007 General Plan includes restrictions on residential development within the Greater Salinas, North County, and Toro Area Plans that would reduce the potential for additional subdivisions in those areas.

Additionally, GPU4 would allow more development on steeper slopes without permits than would the 2007 General Plan, since GPU2007 includes a provision governing restricting development on slopes over 30% unless there are no other feasible alternatives. Also, the DES under GPU4 would allow approval of projects with environmental impacts whereas the “pass-fail” aspect of the DES under the 2007 General Plan would encourage denial of such projects. Therefore, potential adverse impacts on geology, soils, and seismicity from GPU4 would be greater than those of the 2007 General Plan, but would still be less than significant.

5.6.2.5 Mineral Resources

Oil production in the southern Salinas Valley and South County is the only mineral resource extraction activity that may be affected by development and land use activities contemplated by GPU4. Concentration of development in the San Ardo and Bradley Rural Communities would meet housing needs without encroaching into mineral production areas. Economic conditions and legal constraints make it highly unlikely that either GPU4 or the 2007 General Plan would result in the premature termination of oil extraction operations in these areas. GPU4 and the 2007 General Plan do not have policy differences that would differentiate their impacts on mineral resources. Therefore, GPU4 would have the same impacts on mineral resources as the 2007 General Plan.

5.6.2.6 Transportation

GPU4 provides that, with the exceptions for Community Areas and Carmel Valley,, LOS D will be the standard level of acceptable congestion within the County. GPU4 commits the County to preparing a CIFP that will address the local road improvements needed to maintain acceptable levels of service, and to adopting a County traffic impact fee addressing development in cities and the unincorporated areas. In addition, GPU4 provides that projects that would reduce traffic flow below the acceptable standard would be required to implement a phasing plan that would allow road improvements to be built concurrently with the development. This is intended to avoid a lag between new traffic generation and the installation of road improvements. The concurrency policy would not apply to the first single-family residence on a lot of record, accessory units, or non-discretionary commercial development. GPU4 commits the County to developing, in cooperation with TAMC and other agencies, a regional mitigation fee with the goal of achieving LOS D on the regional roadway system. Localized traffic congestion will be a significant effect of GPU4.

The proposed 2007 General Plan contains nearly the same transportation policies as GPU4. The following are the exceptions. The 2007 General Plan would mandate adoption of the CIFP within 18 months of the general plan’s adoption and require a review of the degree to which development is approaching buildout

as governed by the individual traffic fee programs. This would reduce the potential for projects to be built without concurrent improvements. The 2007 General Plan would exempt the following types of projects from the phased concurrency requirement of GPU4: first single-family dwelling, accessory dwellings allowed under state law, and ministerial commercial development. As a practical matter, these are largely exempt under GPU4 as well because the County has limited or no discretionary permitting authority over these uses that would allow it to impose the concurrency policy.

GPU4 would propose a more extensive development pattern than the proposed 2007 General Plan. As a result, the potential adverse impacts on transportation from GPU4 would be greater than those of the 2007 General Plan.

5.6.2.7 Air Quality

GPU4 promulgates air quality policies that are consistent with the air quality objectives of the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution District's 2004 AQMP. Moreover, GPU4's local traffic impact fee and prohibition on occupancy of new development until all roadways operate at LOS D or better would significantly reduce idling on local roadways. This would result in a corresponding reduction in adverse air quality impacts. However, the extent of new traffic expected to be generated by the project, combined with other sources of emissions resulting from urban development and the ACWP, will result in a significant effect on air quality.

In comparison, the proposed 2007 General Plan includes the same air quality policies as GPU4. In addition to the air quality policies, however, the 2007 General Plan would require the County to prepare and adopt a Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan within two years of adoption of the 2007 General Plan. While directing Monterey County to reduce its emissions of greenhouse gases to 1990 levels by 2020, the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan will likely include measures that will coincidentally reduce impacts on local air quality. These would probably include programs to reduce motor vehicle use (which would reduce the amount of tailpipe emissions) and to improve the efficiency of water use (which reduces the need to burn natural gas in water heaters). Accordingly, GPU4 may be expected to have a greater impact on air quality than the 2007 General Plan.

5.6.2.8 Noise

GPU4 includes strong policies intended to ensure that new development of sensitive receptors will not be exposed to excessive noise (i.e., noise levels exceeding County standards), including noise from roadway improvement projects. GPU4 also includes policies intended to limit noise and vibration from construction activities. However, the policies prohibit the use of masonry sound walls in rural areas. This prohibition may act to make roadway improvement noise attenuation infeasible where existing rural residences adjoin those roads.

As a result, GPU4 would be expected to have a significant effect on noise in rural areas where roads are widened to meet the LOS C congestion standard.

The proposed 2007 General Plan contains the same noise policies as GPU4. Because GPU4 provides for a more extensive development pattern, particularly with four additional Rural Centers, potential adverse noise impacts from implementation of GPU4 would be greater than those of the 2007 General Plan.

5.6.2.9 Biological Resources

The biological resources policies of GPU4 would require inventorying sensitive habitats and avoiding impacts to state and federally listed species and designated critical habitat. The CEQA process would be used to mitigate impacts from individual development projects, as such projects are proposed. GPU4 also would require preparation and implementation of a program to comprehensively mitigate the loss of critical habitat. These policies would be coordinated with the preparation of Area Plans. The current trend of conversion of grazing lands, which provide wildlife habitat, to intensive agricultural cultivation, which provides little habitat value, would continue under GPU4. All together, GPU4 would have a significant effect on biological resources.

The 2007 General Plan contains many of the the same policies as GPU4, although it would allow development over a less extensive area than GPU4. The proposed mitigation measures identified in this EIR with respect to special status species, stream set-back, kit fox mitigation, protection of woodlands and raptors would provide significantly more protection of biological resources than GPU4. Therefore, based upon the additional conversion of habitat and weaker policies protecting biological resources, GPU4 would have greater adverse impacts on biological resources than the 2007 General Plan.

5.6.2.10 Cultural Resources

GPU4 includes specific policies to inventory archaeological resources, survey in sensitive areas, and protect important representative and unique archaeological sites and features. GPU4 commits the County to adopting a uniform set of guidelines for archaeological assessment and recovery programs and consultations with Native Americans. Similar inventory, survey, and recovery policies are included to protect paleontological resources. GPU4 also contains policies to encourage the conservation of Native American cultural sites, sacred places, and burial sites, including provisions for consultation with tribal representatives. Historic resources are protected by the County's adopted Historic Preservation Plan and Historic Preservation Ordinance. As a result, impacts would be less than significant.

The proposed policies of the 2007 General Plan are identical to those in GPU4. The only differentiating impact factor is that GPU4 would allow more extensive

development. However, the policies would be sufficient to avoid significant impacts. Therefore, GPU4 would have the same potential impacts on cultural resources as the 2007 General Plan.

5.6.2.11 Public Services and Utilities

GPU4 contains a rigorous requirement for the concurrent provision of adequate public services and facilities as development occurs. This would avoid significant effects, except as noted under the water resources discussion. Outside of Community Areas and Rural Centers, GPU4 commits the County to establish a Development Evaluation System to ensure that development of five or more lots or units considers infrastructure availability, among other things. No such provision is made for the first house built on existing vacant lots of record.

The proposed 2007 General Plan has similar policies, although it further specifies that the DES is to be a pass-fail system. This will prohibit new projects that cannot meet the DES criteria, reducing the impact in comparison to GPU4. In addition, the 2007 General Plan would limit development within the Greater Salinas, North County, and Toro Area Plans to a single residence on lots of record. This would reduce the potential for additional subdivisions in those areas in comparison to GPU4 and the necessity of constructing new public facilities to serve those subdivisions. Therefore, GPU4 impacts on public services and utilities are greater to those of the 2007 General Plan.

5.6.2.12 Parks and Recreation

As with public services and utilities, development under the policies of GPU4 would place most new development in the cities and the Community Areas and Rural Centers. Development in the cities would increase the need for parks and recreation facilities in those jurisdictions. That demand would be met by the affected cities through impact fees or other financing mechanisms applied in the course of approving development projects. The same would be true for the County in the Community Areas and Rural Centers under GPU4's Adequate Public Facilities and Services standards.

GPU4 does not contain specific standards for the provision of park and recreation facilities for new development, although there is an existing ordinance requiring compliance under the Quimby Act. This may result in the overuse of other parks and a significant effect on parks and recreation.

The proposed 2007 General Plan contains the same policies as GPU4. Mitigation Measure PAR-1, which would require the County to adopt a general plan policy requiring a specific ratio of park acreage to population, would enable the County to require parks and recreation facilities as conditions of subdivision approval. Therefore, potential adverse impacts on parks and recreation from GPU4 would be slightly greater than those under the 2007 General Plan, as mitigated.

5.6.2.13 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

GPU4 contains policies that address public safety relative to seismic and geologic hazards (including inventorying and requiring geotechnical reports prior to development in areas of risk), flood hazards, hazardous materials, emergency response, and wildland fire protection (including standards for development to achieve an acceptable level of risk). GPU4 also establishes minimum service levels for emergency responders and identifies evacuation routes in case of a disaster. As a result of these policies, GPU4 would not have a significant effect in this area.

The 2007 General Plan contains the same goals and policies as GPU4. Although GPU4 has more extensive development, the additional Community Area and Rural Centers are not in areas that are particularly hazardous. Therefore, GPU4 would result in the same impacts as the 2007 General Plan.

5.6.2.14 Aesthetics, Light, and Glare

GPU4 would limit future urban growth in a manner that would preserve significant visual resource areas (agricultural fields, ridgelines, natural areas, etc.) and minimize adverse impacts from new sources of light and glare. Effective policies include restrictions on ridgeline development, encouragement of “clustered” development in rural areas, and the voluntary transfer of development rights away from areas with unique visual features. Nonetheless, GPU4 would result in major new sources of light and glare being built within the cities and the County’s Community Areas, Rural Centers, and artisan wineries. These would adversely affect nearby rural and agricultural areas. GPU4 would have a significant effect on aesthetics, light, and glare.

The proposed 2007 General Plan contains the same policies as GPU4 on this impact issue. By reducing the number of Community Areas and Rural Centers, the 2007 General Plan reduces the development potential proposed in GPU4, thereby somewhat reducing aesthetics, light, and glare impacts that would have otherwise occurred under GPU4. The AHO areas identified in the 2007 General Plan are located near existing urban areas and would have minimal additions to existing levels of light and glare.

At the same time, the 2007 General Plan would authorize up to 10 full-scale wineries (in addition to the 40 artisan wineries allowed under GPU4) along the River Road, Metz Road, and Jolon Road segments. These would introduce new sources of light and glare to these rural areas.

Based on the above discussion, the impacts of GPU4 would be somewhat greater with respect to light and glare than for the proposed 2007 General Plan.

5.6.2.15 Population and Housing

GPU4 and the proposed 2007 General Plan are local land use plans that prescribe where and at what intensity future growth will occur. Pursuant to state law, a general plan must provide for sufficient new development to accommodate projected housing demand. As such, both plans would induce future growth by accommodating future development. Neither plan is expected to result in the displacement of substantial numbers of dwelling units or persons.

As a result of its additional Community Area, Rural Centers, and allowance of residential subdivisions within the Greater Salinas, North County, and Toro Area Plans, GPU4 would have a somewhat greater growth-inducing impact on population and housing to those would the 2007 General Plan.

5.6.3 Conclusion

The GPU4 Alternative is similar to the proposed 2007 General Plan. GPU4 would have a greater impact on agriculture resources; water resources, geology, soils, and seismicity; transportation; air quality; noise; biological resources; public services and utilities; parks and recreation; ; light and glare and population and housing. GPU4 would have similar impacts to the proposed 2007 General Plan with respect to land use; water mineral resources; hazardous material. and cultural resources. It would have not any impacts that are less than those expected to result from the proposed 2007 General Plan.

The GPU4 Alternative meets all of the objectives of the 2007 General Plan.

5.7 Transit-Oriented Development Alternative

5.7.1 Description

The Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Alternative focuses new development along existing and future transportation corridors. These corridors would be served by high-capacity and high-frequency public transportation. Public transportation in this alternative combines fixed-route bus service with rail, express bus service and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT). Development in these corridors would be concentrated at “nodes” adjoining public transportation stations. Under this alternative, new development outside the Community Areas, Rural Centers, and AHOs would be restricted to the first single-family home on existing legal lots of record in the North County, Greater Monterey Peninsula (along the Route 68 corridor only) Greater Salinas, and Toro (along the Route 68 corridor) Area Plans. The Bradley and Lockwood Rural Centers would be considered third tier development priority areas. They would not be developed until the transit system is funded and built to King City. Otherwise, this alternative would share the same policies as the 2007 General Plan.

For this alternative, the County would develop a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program, expanding on that described in Policy LU-1.8. The TDR program would specifically provide for the transfer of development credits from , North County, Greater Monterey Peninsula (along the Route 68 corridor only) Greater Salinas, and Toro (Route 68 corridor) Area Plans to the TODs as receiving areas. This would include TODs in any of the Community Areas and Rural Centers (with the aforementioned limitation on the Bradley and Lockwood Rural Centers).

TOD is defined as “moderate to high-density development, located within an easy walk of a major transit stop (typically up to ½-mile), generally with a mix of residential, employment, and shopping opportunities designed for pedestrians without excluding the auto. TOD can be new construction or the redevelopment of one or more buildings whose design and orientation facilitate transit use,” according to the Statewide Transit-Oriented Development Study – Factors for Success in California (California Department of Transportation, 2002). Studies have demonstrated that TOD increases transit ridership and reduces Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT) when compared to similar intensities of development in areas that are poorly served by transit.

The public transportation serving the TODs would be a combination of fixed-route bus systems, express bus, and BRT systems connecting major activity centers, and regional and intercity rail systems connecting major activity centers within the region and adjacent regions. The TOD Alternative envisions a tiered public transportation system, as follows:

- Tier 1 – local-serving public transportation comprised of fixed-route bus systems primarily serving intra-city and inter-city travel, and rural communities. This tier forms the finest grained public transportation network and is similar to the existing Monterey-Salinas Transit (MST) system. This tier also includes demand responsive service (e.g., paratransit), and local shuttles operated by private or public employers.
- Tier 2 – sub-regional and regional-serving public transportation comprised of express bus and BRT serving key corridors within cities that will connect cities, community areas, and rural communities to major activity and employment centers. This tier of public transportation travels longer distances and relies on high frequency and high quality (e.g., newer comfortable coaches, stations with amenities) of service resulting in a system that is competitive with the automobile. Express buses and BRT lines would operate within High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes or exclusive transitways within the public right-of-way. Stops and stations are more widely spaced than in Tier 1 in order to minimize delay. This tier would tie into a system of Park and Ride facilities throughout the County.
- Tier 3 – inter-regional-serving public transportation comprised of express bus, BRT, regional commuter rail, and intercity light rail transit connecting major activity centers in Monterey County to centers in adjacent counties including Santa Cruz, San Benito and Santa Clara Counties. Express bus and BRT lines would operate within High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes or exclusive transitways. Rail service would include the following projects

currently being planned or studied by the Transit Agency of Monterey County (TAMC):

- ❑ Extension of Caltrain service from Gilroy to Monterey County, including stops in Pajaro, Castroville, and Salinas.
- ❑ The Monterey Branch line between Castroville and Monterey connecting the planned Caltrain service in Castroville to the Monterey Peninsula, with stations in Monterey, Seaside, Sand City, Marina/CSUMB, and Castroville. The right-of-way may accommodate express bus service, BRT, or light rail.
- ❑ Passenger rail service on the Santa Cruz Branch line extending from Pajaro/Watsonville to Davenport (Santa Cruz County), which would connect to the Monterey County intercity rail service described above.

The three tiers would be linked with inter-modal transit centers at key public transportation junctions. The areas adjoining the inter-modal transit centers would be developed as nodes of transit-oriented development containing a mix of housing types, commercial uses providing everyday services, and jobs.

Primary transit corridors include:

- Route 101 from King City to Salinas (fixed-route and express bus service to the Salinas inter-modal transit center with connection to a series of Park and Ride transit centers along the Route 101 corridor)
- Route 101 from Salinas to San Jose (express bus service with connection to a series of Park and Ride transit centers along the Route 101 corridor)
- Route 68 from Salinas to Monterey (fixed-route, express bus, and BRT service between the Salinas inter-modal transit center and Monterey inter-modal transit center)
- Route 156 from Prunedale to Castroville and Monterey (fixed-route and express bus service with connections to CalTrain and inter-city rail in Castroville)
- Route 1 from Marina to Monterey (express bus and BRT with connections to CalTrain and inter-city rail in Castroville, Marina, and Monterey)
- Route 1 between Watsonville/Pajaro and Monterey (express bus and BRT with connections to Caltrain and inter-city rail along the Route 1 corridor)

This alternative includes transit corridors on County and city roads and streets served by fixed-route bus service, express buses, and limited BRT.

Nodes of TOD would be located along primary transit corridors and centered around inter-modal transit centers and other stops and stations. A target of 30% of growth in unincorporated Monterey County would occur in these nodes (approximately ½-mile radii around transit stops). This target would require higher densities and intensities of land use than currently allowed under the 2007 General Plan. Residential densities would range from a minimum of 15-30 dwelling units per acre in urbanized areas, with at least 50 percent and not more

than 75 percent of the development within the TOD being residential. Commercial uses would require Floor Area Ratios (FARs) ranging from 1.0 to 3.0. Horizontal multi-use (e.g., multiple uses on a floor) and vertical mixed-use (e.g., different types of uses on different floors) development would be encouraged.

Primary TOD nodes would be located in the following areas, but no specific sites have been identified:

- Castroville
- Pajaro
- Former Fort Ord
- Route 68 Corridor

5.7.2 Development Comparison

A comparison of development potential between the TOD Alternative and the 2007 General Plan during the 2030 planning horizon is provided in Table 5-5. The table also identifies the target amount of residential and non-residential development that would occur within transit nodes and corridors.

Implementation of the TOD Alternative is equal to the 2007 General Plan, with a shift of development intensity to transit nodes and corridors.

Table 5-5. Comparison: TOD Alternative and Proposed Project (2030)

Category	TOD Alternative	2007 General Plan	Difference (TOD vs. 2007 General Plan)
Residential	21,666 dwelling units	21,666 dwelling units	0 dwelling units
Target housing in Transit Nodes and Corridors (30%)	6,500 dwelling units		

5.7.3 Environmental Effects

5.7.3.1 Land Use

The TOD Alternative would increase densities at the selected nodes. This would decrease intensity elsewhere in the County. While the development would be consistent with the proposed 2007 General Plan, it may conflict with the existing lower-intensity land uses surrounding the nodes. The conflicts would result from increased activity, noise, and light and glare, as discussed below. Unless the TODs are located in existing urbanized areas, this would be a significant and unavoidable impact. Therefore, the TOD alternative would have greater potential impacts with respect to land use than the 2007 General Plan.

5.7.3.2 Agriculture Resources

The TOD alternative would limit future subdivision of land and development to the first single-family resident on existing lots of record within the North County, Greater Monterey Peninsula (along the Route 68 corridor only) Greater Salinas, and Toro (Route 68 corridor) Area Plans. The TDR component would focus development into the TODs. This would reduce development pressures in the unincorporated area. As a result, this alternative would have a lesser impact on agricultural resources than the 2007 General Plan.

5.7.3.3 Water Resources

The TOD Alternative would not reduce the number of potential water users since it would allow the same number of residences as the 2007 General Plan. However, it would substitute medium- to high-density development for low-density development. The higher densities would result in less area for landscaping and a corresponding reduction in water demand.

The TOD Alternative would reduce the intensity of development on existing lots of record throughout the county. That would result in a marginal reduction in water quality impacts from development, since those impacts are already well regulated by the County grading ordinance and the Central Coast RWQCB's regulations.

In sum, this alternative would have a lesser impact on water resources than the 2007 General Plan.

5.7.3.4 Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

The TOD Alternative would reduce the intensity of development on existing lots of record throughout the county. That would result in a marginal reduction in erosion impacts from development, in comparison to the 2007 General Plan, since those impacts are already well regulated by the County grading ordinance and the Central Coast RWQCB's regulations. The impacts of this alternative on geology and seismicity would be the same as the 2007 General Plan since it would result in the same level of development (although covering a smaller geographical area) and the same level of risk.

5.7.3.5 Mineral Resources

There are no differences with respect to development of mineral resources between the TOD and the 2007 General Plan. Therefore, the TOD Alternative would have the same level of impact as the 2007 General Plan.

5.7.3.6 Transportation

A primary objective of the TOD Alternative is to shift people from single occupant vehicles to alternate modes of travel or, by creating walkable mixed-use nodes, to eliminate the need to travel long distances for some trip purposes. Research indicates that TOD can generate about 50 to 75% of the traffic generated by the same amount of land use in typical suburban development patterns poorly served by transit. Conservatively using the lower end of the range, implementation of the TOD Alternative in 2030 could generate fewer daily trips than the 2007 General Plan, and an associated reduction of about 110,000 vehicles miles of travel (VMT) per day.

The TOD Alternative would result in level of service impacts to county roadways, regional roadways and the state highway system. These impacts would be the result of two conditions:

1. Traffic generated by development of allowed land uses in the TOD Alternative, including traffic generated by the TOD itself, would cause county and regional roadways to exceed the LOS D standard, but to a lesser extent than the 2007 General Plan. In addition, although a TOD generates less traffic than the same amount of conventional development, the higher intensity and density of TOD within a relatively small area can create localized traffic impacts.
2. The TOD Alternative calls for the designation of exclusive transitways and HOV lanes on county, city, and regional roadways in order to make public transportation an attractive and competitive option to the automobile. Exclusive transit facilities and HOV facilities on these roadways would utilize travel lanes normally used by automobiles, thereby, while increasing the person capacity of the facility, the transit facilities reduce their automobile capacity. This reduction in capacity would cause some roadways to exceed the LOS D standard.

The TOD Alternative would create impacts related to transportation infrastructure funding. The public transportation system envisioned in this alternative requires a substantial capital investment in transit infrastructure and fleet vehicles, as well as ongoing operations and maintenance costs. The initial capital costs may exceed the capital costs of adding conventional vehicle capacity (i.e., roadway widening), but the investments are more sustainable over a longer period of time than conventional capacity improvements. This alternative, therefore, may create a transportation funding shortfall that is greater than the shortfall associated with conventional transportation funding.

In conclusion, however, the TOD alternative would reduce traffic generation by design and therefore have significantly less impacts with respect to transportation than the 2007 General Plan or any of the other alternatives.

5.7.3.7 Air Quality

The TOD Alternative would reduce VMT throughout the county by reducing the need for short auto trips by locating residences in proximity to day to day services, and by substituting transit trips for auto trips. Where congestion is increased locally, there may be additional emissions of carbon monoxide in comparison to the 2007 General Plan. However, that impact is dependent upon levels of traffic and time at idle. Because the locations and development intensities of the TODs are not known at this time, whether these localized emissions would exceed the air district standards cannot be determined. Overall, by reducing VMT, the TOD Alternative would result in a reduction in the severity of air quality impacts from traffic in comparison to the 2007 General Plan.

5.7.3.8 Noise

This alternative would have a greater noise impact than the 2007 General Plan as a result of improved train service. Sensitive land uses located along the train corridors would be subjected to higher levels of noise as the frequency of passenger trains increases. Some mitigation of this type of transit noise is typically possible, but without information about the types of trains, their frequency, and routes, it is not possible to quantify or qualify the level of mitigation that might be possible. Similarly, without specific information about these noise generators, it would be speculative to attempt to design effective mitigation at this time.

More frequent bus service and BRT along transit corridors would produce noise impacts, particularly as buses accelerate and decelerate at stops. But, increases in bus noise would be intermittent and limited to corridors that already generate vehicle noise. Further, the TODs themselves would be high-density development nodes that would be expected to have urban levels of ambient noise. The reduction in traffic along these roads would tend to reduce the level of noise being produced by individual passenger vehicles, but that change is unlikely to be noticeable. Vehicle noise impacts would be essentially the same as those of the 2007 General Plan.

However, the combination of increased noise in compact TOD areas, and noise from transit would result in potentially greater noise impacts than the 2007 General Plan.

5.7.3.9 Biological Resources

The TOD Alternative would reduce the intensity of development on existing lots of record throughout the county. That would result in a marginal reduction in impacts on biological resources from development in comparison to the 2007 General Plan.

5.7.3.10 Cultural Resources

The TOD Alternative would concentrate development within a smaller area than would the 2007 General Plan. As a result, the potential to disturb cultural resources and result in a significant impact would be less under this alternative.

5.7.3.11 Public Services and Utilities

The TOD Alternative would concentrate most new development occurring outside of the Community Areas, Rural Centers, and AHOs around transit stations. This would make the provision of public services and utilities easier under the General Plan policies requiring services and utilities for new development, the preparation of financing plans for that development, and concurrent installation of services and utilities as development proceeds. The Pajaro Community Area is subject to flood hazard, which would be increased if densities were increased to accommodate a TOD. However, Safety Element Policy S-3.4 would require compliance with Federal Emergency Management Agency floodplain restrictions. This would ensure that development would not increase flood hazards.

The TOD Alternative would result in few impacts from the construction of public facilities. Potentially, there would also be less construction impacts from expansion of roads. There would be impacts from construction of transit hub facilities, but on balance the impacts from the TOD Alternative with respect to public services and utilities would be less than for the 2007 General Plan.

5.7.3.12 Parks and Recreation

The TOD Alternative would result in the same growth in population, demand for parks recreation facilities, and pressure on existing parks and recreation facilities as the 2007 General Plan. Assuming that the mitigation measure including a parks ratio is included in the TOD Alternative, its impacts would be the same as the 2007 General Plan.

5.7.3.12 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The TOD Alternative would result in the same growth in population as the 2007 General Plan. The potential for exposure to hazards and hazardous materials, with the exception of wildfire hazard, would be essentially the same as the 2007 General Plan, so its impacts would also be the same.

By reducing the potential level of growth on existing rural lots of record within some areas of the county and transferring that potential to the TODs, this alternative would reduce the number of future residences that might be endangered by wildfire. By placing more dwelling units in development nodes,

the alternative would simplify the delivery of fire protection services. This would be a lesser impact than under the 2007 General Plan.

5.7.3.13 Aesthetics, Light, and Glare

The TOD Alternative would result in the same growth in population as the 2007 General Plan, but would increase the number of development nodes beyond the Community Areas, Rural Centers, and AHOs identified in the proposed General Plan. The higher density of development would result in a greater aesthetic impact where TODs are located near rural areas, and a similar increase in light and glare. Policy LU-1.13 of the 2007 General Plan requiring lighting to be unobtrusive would be more effectively applied under the TOD Alternative because it would act to limit light from a limited number of discrete locations, rather than from more intensive development across existing lots of record under the 2007 General Plan. The overall impact would be the same as the 2007 General Plan.

5.7.3.14 Population and Housing

The TOD Alternative would result in the same net growth in population as the 2007 General Plan, but would decrease the number of development nodes by delaying development in the most southern Rural Centers. . Expanded bus and train service, as well as the introduction of BRT, would occur on existing road or rail rights of way and are not expected to result in the displacement of substantial numbers of existing residences. The protections for displaced residents that are discussed above for the 2007 General Plan would similarly apply to the alternative. Therefore, its impacts would be the same as the 2007 General Plan.

5.7.4 Conclusion

The TOD Alternative would further concentrate future development in the unincorporated area into discrete, higher density nodes. While some TODs may overlap the Community Areas and Rural Centers; others may be located in the cities where transit centers would be logically located. This alternative would refocus growth that might have occurred on lots of record by making TODs more attractive to future residents because of the transit improvements, further restricting subdivision in the Greater Monterey Peninsula Area and delaying development of the southernmost Rural Centers in unincorporated County.

The TOD Alternative would reduce impacts on, agricultural resources, water resources, biological resources, air quality, cultural resources, public services and utilities and wildfire hazard relative to the levels described for the 2007 General Plan. It would significantly reduce impacts with respect to traffic as compared to the 2007 General Plan and all of the other alternatives. The impacts on geology, soils and seismicity; mineral resources, parks and recreation; aesthetics, light,

and glare; and population and housing would be essentially the same as the 2007 General Plan. The TOD Alternative would result in greater impacts than the 2007 General Plan in the areas of potential land use conflicts and noise.

The TOD alternative meets all of the objectives of the 2007 General Plan.

5.8 Environmentally Superior Alternative

The qualitative environmental effects of each alternative in relation to the 2007 General Plan are summarized in Table 5-6. The TOD alternative would be the environmentally superior based on the number of reductions to 2007 General Plan impacts.

Table 5-6. Summary of 2007 General Plan Alternatives. .

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

