Section 6
Other CEQA Required Sections

6.1 Significant Environmental Effects That Cannot Be Avoided

According to Section 15126.2(a) (b) of the State CEQA Guidelines, an EIR shall identify and focus on the significant environmental effects of the proposed project, including effects that cannot be avoided if the proposed project were implemented. Each of the preceding impact sections has identified those significant impacts that cannot be reduced below a level of significance. The significant, unavoidable impacts are summarized in Table 6-2 at the end of this chapter.

The reader is directed to the various impact sections of this EIR for a more detailed discussion of each of these significant, unavoidable impacts.

6.2 Significant Irreversible Environmental Effects

The environmental effects of the 2007 General Plan are summarized in Section 1.0 (Executive Summary) and are analyzed in detail in Section 4.0 (Impacts and Mitigation Measures) of this EIR.

As mandated by the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15127, an EIR for a general plan must address any significant irreversible environmental change that would result from implementation of that plan. Specifically, per the Guidelines (Section 15126.2[c]), such an impact would occur if:

- the project would involve a large commitment of nonrenewable resources;
- irreversible damage can result from environmental accidents associated with the project; and
- The proposed consumption of resources is not justified (e.g., the project results in the wasteful use of energy.)

Approval and implementation of actions related to the 2007 General Plan would result in an irretrievable commitment of nonrenewable resources such as energy supplies and construction-related materials. The energy resource demands would be used for construction, heating and cooling of buildings, transportation of

people and goods, heating and refrigeration, lighting, and other associated energy needs.

Environmental changes with implementation of the 2007 General Plan would occur as the physical environment is altered through continued commitments of land and construction materials to urban and rural development. There would be an irretrievable commitment of labor, capital, and materials used in construction and a permanent loss of open space. Nonrenewable resources would be committed primarily in the form of fossil fuels and would include oil, natural gas, and gasoline used to support the additional development associated with implementation of the 2007 General Plan.

The consumption of other nonrenewable or slowly renewable resources would result from the development of the 2007 General Plan. These resources would include, but not be limited to, lumber and other forest products, sand and gravel, asphalt, steel, copper, lead, and water. Because alternative energy sources such as solar, geothermal, or wind energy are not currently in widespread local use, it is unlikely that real savings in nonrenewable energy supplies (e.g., oil and gas) could be realized in the immediate future.

Development in unincorporated Monterey County as envisioned by the 2007 General Plan would result in the construction of structures, facilities, or infrastructure on lands that are currently undeveloped. Development of lands generally would result in their future and permanent commitment to urban uses.

6.3 Growth Inducement

CEQA requires a discussion of the ways in which the 2007 General Plan could be growth-inducing. State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d) identifies a project as growth-inducing if it fosters economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. New employees from commercial and industrial development and new population from residential development represent direct forms of growth. These direct forms of growth have a secondary effect of expanding the size of local markets and inducing additional economic activity in the area. Examples of development that would indirectly facilitate growth are the installation of new roadways and the construction or expansion of water delivery or treatment facilities.

A project could indirectly induce growth by removing barriers to growth, by creating a condition that attracts additional population or new economic activity, or by providing a catalyst for future unrelated growth in the area. While a project may have a potential to induce growth, it does not automatically result in growth. Growth can happen only through capital investment in new economic opportunities by the public or private sectors.

Typically, the growth-inducing potential of a project is considered significant if it fosters growth or a concentration of population in excess of the existing setting or

baseline. Growth may be induced through the provision of infrastructure or service capacity that would accommodate new development.

By law, Monterey County is required to adopt "a comprehensive, long-term general plan for the physical development of the county" (Government Code Section 65300). The general plan's housing element is required to include

> An identification and analysis of existing and projected housing needs and a statement of goals, policies, quantified objectives, financial resources, and scheduled programs for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing. The housing element shall identify adequate sites for housing, including rental housing, factory-built housing, mobile homes, and emergency shelters, and shall make adequate provision for the existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the community. (Government Code Section 65583)

On a regular basis (generally every 5 to 7 years), the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) is responsible for adopting the Regional Housing Needs Assessment or RHNA that establishes the share of projected future housing growth that the County must accommodate in its general plan. Unincorporated Monterey County's current RHNA housing share is 1,554 dwelling units for the current 2007 - 2014 housing element cycle. The current housing element is based on the prior 2000-2007 share and will be amended as necessary to account for the new allocations. A county that does not amend its housing element to reflect the RHNA share is subject to litigation (Government Code Section 65587).

6.3.1 Conclusion

In order to comply with state general plan law, in particular the housing element statute, the 2007 General Plan must provide sufficient opportunities for new residential growth to accommodate its RHNA share. Based on the definition of growth inducement, a general plan is inherently growth-inducing because it must accommodate at least projected housing demand. The 2007 General Plan and related comprehensive land use plans will provide the framework by which public officials will be guided in making decisions relative to development in Monterey County. However, it is the implementation of land use policies that will incrementally increase demands for public services, utilities, and infrastructure.

6.4 Cumulative Impacts

6.4.1 In General

Cumulative impacts result from individually minor, but collectively significant, impacts occurring over a period of time. State CEQA Guidelines Section 15130 requires that an EIR include a discussion of the potential cumulative impacts of a proposed project. Cumulative impacts are defined as two or more individual effects that, when considered together, are significant. The cumulative impact

from several projects is the change in the environment that results from the incremental impact of the development when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable or probable future developments.

As defined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15355,

> …a cumulative impact consists of an impact which is created as a result of the combination of the project evaluated in the EIR together with other projects causing related impacts. An EIR may determine that a project's contribution to a significant cumulative impact will be rendered less than cumulatively considerable and thus is not significant. A project's contribution is less than cumulatively considerable if the project is required to implement or fund its fair share of a mitigation measure or measures designed to alleviate the cumulative impact.
>
> The following elements are necessary to an adequate discussion of significant cumulative impacts:
>
> Either:
>
> 1. A list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including, if necessary, those projects outside the control of the agency, or
> 2. A summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document, or in a prior environmental document, which has been adopted or certified, which described or evaluated regional or area wide conditions contributing to the cumulative impact. Any such planning document shall be referenced and made available to the public at a location specified by the lead agency.

The determination of a project's cumulative effects involves the identification of the following:

- direct and indirect effects of the proposed action and other projects causing related impacts;
- which resources, ecosystems, and human communities are affected; and
- Whether these effects are cumulatively significant.

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15065(c) states that a mandatory finding of significance is required if the project will make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a cumulative impact. The importance of a project's contribution must be viewed in the context of the cumulative effect. Case law has held that even a small contribution may be cumulatively considerable if the cumulative effect is particularly acute (*Communities for a Better Environment* v. *California Resources Agency* (2002) 103 Cal.App.4th 98)

Because of the broad project objectives associated with the implementation of the 2007 General Plan, the cumulative analysis presented in this EIR does not

evaluate the site-specific impacts of individual projects. Project-level analyses will be prepared by implementing agencies on a project-by-project basis.

6.4.2 Approach to this Analysis

The cumulative impact analysis in this EIR relies upon the projections approach. Unless so stated, it considers the potential for cumulative contributions at both the horizon year of the general plan in 2030 and buildout of the 2007 General Plan estimated to be in 2092. There are numerous uncertainties about the state of the environment in 2030 and 2092, as well as the protective laws and regulations that may be in effect at that time. Accordingly, the following assessment of cumulative impacts is strictly qualitative because of the infeasibility of predicting the timing, design features, and density of future projects. Many future projects will be the subject of separate environmental studies.

For the most part, the area addressed in the cumulative impact analysis is Monterey County, including its incorporated cities. There are a few notable exceptions to this general statement. The air quality analysis is based on the Monterey Bay air basin. The three-county AMBAG region is the area of analysis for transportation and population/housing since those issues have regional effects. Because biological resources analysis in general assesses cumulative impacts that naturally occur over a larger area than a single county, it is also based on a larger geographic area.

The cumulative impact analysis is based on population growth figures published by AMBAG in its 2004 regional forecast of population, housing, and employment (refer to Chapter 3, Project Description). The 2004 forecast is somewhat higher than AMBAG's recently released 2008 regional forecast. Using the 2004 forecast offers a more conservative view of growth potential. Therefore, using the 2004 AMBAG figures in this analysis would not result in understating the 2007 General Plan's potential for cumulatively considerable contributions.

Population growth and the development associated with it are the major factors contributing to direct impacts on land use, agriculture resources, water resources, transportation, air quality, noise, public services and utilities, and population and housing. In addition, growth can cause secondary impacts on these and other areas, such as biological resources. Therefore, using forecast population growth as a basis for analyzing cumulative impacts is the preferred approach when examining a large project area such as a county general plan.

The interpretation of cumulative impacts is such that, in the presence of a severe cumulative impact, a project's contribution may be considerable even if it is only more than one molecule (*Communities for a Better Environment* v. *California Resources Agency* (2002) 103 Cal.App.4th 98). This analysis errs on the side of considerable contributions. Where there is a severe cumulative impact, the conclusion is that the 2007 General Plan would make a considerable contribution if it contributes at all.

The magnitude of the 2007 General Plan's contributions to cumulative impacts is different in 2030 than at buildout in 2092. However, the 2007 General Plan would contribute to the same cumulative effects under the both the 2030 planning horizon and 2092 buildout. The following discussion notes any situations where this general rule is not the case.

6.4.2.1 Non-cumulative Impacts

In each of the following instances the 2007 General Plan's contribution does not rise to the level of being considerable.

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

This is a site specific impact that affects individual development projects and that is adequately mitigated on an individual basis. As discussed in Chapter 4.4, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity, there are numerous state and local regulations that act to reduce geologic and seismic risks to acceptable levels. Project design and building standards avoid the aggregation of individual effects into a significant combined impact. Therefore, there would be no cumulative impact. Soil erosion is the exception to this and is discussed under water quality.

Mineral Resources

By virtue of their location along rivers and in lightly settled portions of the county, the county's mineral resources are not being impacted by overall development and will not have an impact on development.

Cultural Resources

These resources are site-specific and generally of individual value. The exception is where the resource is part of a designated historic district or landscape. In that situation, the cumulative loss of key or contributing resources would lead to eventual loss of the district's or landscape's defining characteristics. There is only one historic districts or landscapes within the lands under county jurisdiction – the town of Spreckles. Otherwise, where such districts exist within Monterey County, they are within cities. City, not county, actions would be the driving force of any potential erosion of those districts.

Spreckles is subject to the county's HR (Historic Review) overlay zone (Monterey County Code Section 21.54.010). This zoning ordinance requires a discretionary conditional use permit prior to structural alterations within the district. The conditional use permit is subject to review by the County's Historic Resources Review Board, as well as the approving authority, in order to ensure that historic integrity is preserved. Therefore, implementation of the 2007 General Plan would not contribute to the loss of those resources.

In addition, the 2007 General Plan has a number of specific policies that will avoid the loss of individual cultural resources. They include the following:

- Policy OS-6.1 provides that important representative and unique archaeological sites and features shall be identified and protected for all parcels with undisturbed natural conditions (i.e., ungraded properties) consistent with State Historic Preservation Office guidelines and definitions employed on a state-wide basis including Phase I, II, and III studies.
- Policy OS-6.2 requires that information on the location and significance of the County's archaeological resources shall be compiled and used in the environment and development review process. The County shall rely on and participate in the state-wide inventory work of the Native American Heritage Commission and the State Office of Historic Preservation. All Phase I, II, and III studies and records of Native Californian consultation shall be filed with appropriate state agencies and local tribes as well as local data source compilations maintained by the County. The County shall work with local tribes to update County GIS maps showing high, moderate and low archaeological sensitivity areas.
- Policy OS-6.3 provides that mew development proposed within moderate or high sensitivity zones, or within 150 feet of a known recorded archaeological and/or cultural site, shall complete a Phase I survey including use of the regional State Office of Historic Preservation Clearinghouse or the Native American Heritage Commission's list of sacred and traditional sites.
- Policy OS-6.5 requires the county to establish policies and procedures that encourage development to avoid impacts to sensitive archaeological sites including:
  - designing or clustering development to avoid archaeological site deposits, historic sites and resources, and Native Californian cultural sites;
  - dedicating permanent conservation easements shall be required where subdivisions and other developments can be planned to provide for such protective easements.
- Policy OS-6.6 requires the county to adopt a uniform set of guidelines to define Phase I, II, and III significance assessment and data recovery programs. Similar guidelines will be created to set standards for requirements for consultation with Native Californian descendents to determine procedures for determining the presence or absence of sacred or traditional sites. These guidelines will address monitoring requirements and participation in cultural resource data recovery programs.

In addition, Monterey County Code Section 21.66.050 establishes Standards for Archeological Resource Areas that require preparation of an archeological resource report prior to development, avoidance of known resources when feasible, and implementation of a mitigation plan when avoidance is not feasible. The mitigation plan must include preservation measures. Further, the existing provisions of CEQA protect sites from adverse impacts.

Public Services and Utilities

With the exception of solid waste capacity, these facilities serve particular areas and impacts to one are individual, not cumulative. The provisions of the 2007 General Plan requiring concurrent provision of services to new development (Policies PS-1.1 [Adequate Public Facility and Services (APFS) requirements] through PS-1.6 [Only those developments that have or can provide adequate concurrent public services and facilities shall be approved]) avoid the potential for cumulative impacts. As discussed in Chapter 4.11, Public Services and Utilities, these facilities will have individual construction and operational impacts. They are not, however, expected to be significant. School impacts are not considered significant provided that school impact fees are paid in accordance with Government Code Section 65995. Solid waste is discussed in the following section.

Parks and Recreation

As discussed in Chapter 4.12, Parks and Recreation, the county's supply of parks and recreation facilities far exceeds its target ratio of 3 acres per 1,000 residents. Development under the 2007 General Plan would not exceed that ratio and therefore, would not result in a cumulative effect on parks and recreation.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

These impacts, with the exception of wildfire hazard, are project- and site-specific and generally of individual concern. The existing provisions of CEQA protect developments from adverse impacts. In addition, as discussed in Chapter 4.13, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, federal, state, and local laws and regulations protect against accidental exposure. Where exposure occasionally occurs, it is individual, not cumulative. Wildfire hazard is discussed in the following section,

6.4.3 2007 General Plan Cumulative Impacts

6.4.3.1 Land Use

There is no cumulative impact on land use, based on the thresholds identified in Chapter 4.1, Land Use. The 2007 General Plan is written to accommodate existing development trends and would not physically divide communities. As discussed in Chapter 4.1, Land Use, instead the 2007 General Plan would center future urban development in existing cities and in Community Areas, Rural Centers, and AHOs where some level of urbanization already exists. Nor would the 2007 General Plan conflict with land use plans. The 2007 General Plan accommodates the existing HCPs in the county. HCPs and NCCPs operate separately from the general plan and future resource conservation plans would be project specific and not conflict with the 2007 General Plan's land uses. Policies BIO-1.2 (Salinas Valley Conservation Plan for kit fox) and BIO-1.5 (Prepare Comprehensive County Natural Communities Conservation Plan by 2030) will

ensure that HCP and NCCP activities are coordinated with land use planning in the future.

Therefore, the project would not make a considerable contribution to a cumulative land use impact.

6.4.3.2 Agriculture Resources

Impact CUM-1 Agricultural Resources.
As discussed in Section 4.2, Agricultural Resources, the Department of Conservation's Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program has documented a steady trend of loss of prime farmland to other uses statewide. Therefore, loss of farmland is a significant cumulative impact in California. In Monterey County, farmland will be converted to urban uses over time, particularly with the expansion of cities in the Salinas Valley. County land use regulations will limit the loss of farmland on the coastal plain, with the exception of lands within the Castroville Community Area. Development and land use activities under the 2007 General Plan would contribute to the cumulative conversion of Important Farmland to nonagricultural uses illustrated by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program's data.

Implementation of 2007 General Plan goals and policies would partially reduce the impacts resulting from conversion of agricultural lands to urban uses by fostering continued agricultural production through policies such as the AWCP, and through specific policies including the following:

- Policy AG-1.1: prohibits activities that would conflict with on-going agricultural activities.
- Policy AG-1.2: requires buffers adjoining new non-agricultural uses.
- Policy AG-1.3: limits subdivisions in agricultural areas to those that would not conflict with agricultural uses.
- Policy AG-1.12: requires the county to develop a mitigation program with the cities.
- Policies AG-3.1- 3.3: authorize the partial exemption of routine and ongoing agricultural use from county regulations.

Further, the identified Community Areas and Rural Centers to which growth is channeled are mostly located on less productive lands. As discussed under the GPI Alternative in Chapter 5, Alternatives, the housing element mandates under California Planning Law require cities and counties to accommodate future housing need based on growth projections and make infeasible any mitigation or alternative that would prohibit all farmland conversion.

Past trends in Monterey County agriculture indicate that agricultural acreage will remain the same as current conditions or decrease slightly over time. Nonetheless, future conversion of Important Farmland, particularly in the Salinas Valley as its cities grow onto adjoining farmland, remains a significant

unavoidable cumulative impact. While the policies of the 2007 General Plan reduce the potential for additional contributions to this impact from county actions, they will not eliminate losses. Accordingly, the 2007 General Plan will make a considerable contribution to this impact.

6.4.3.3 Water Resources

Water Quality

Impact CUM-2. Surface Water Quality
Activities within the county and cities can affect surface water quality by releasing contaminants through point sources or through stormwater runoff. As discussed in the Project Description, AMBAG has projected continued growth throughout the region, including Monterey County, its cities, and those parts of Santa Cruz County that drain into the Pajaro River and its groundwater basin. The growth of the cities and those county areas identified for urbanization would increase the potential for new point sources, expanded point sources (such as wastewater treatment plants), and urban runoff. Rural and agricultural activities can similarly contribute contaminants from runoff. As discussed in Section 4.3, Water Resources, the SWRCB has listed numerous waterways within the county as "impaired waterways" under Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act. Discharges to impaired waterways are regulated under the Central Coast RWQCB's Basin Plan, which includes TMDLs for the impaired waterways. Over time, the Central Coast RWQCB will adopt TMDLs for all impaired waterways in the County. In turn, county and city regulations will be required to limit discharges to the limits set by the TMDLs.

The RWQCB's conditional agricultural waiver program is preventing sediment-laced runoff from agricultural lands. These regulations are or will be in addition to the County's existing grading, slope development, and erosion control ordinances. Further, the 2007 General Plan will impose additional requirements on development that will reduce the release of contaminants to surface waters, including the following:

- Policies OS-3.5 and -3.6: require slope development regulations to be adopted.
- Policy S-3.8: requires the county to provide public education/outreach and technical assistance programs on erosion and sediment control.
- Policy OS-3.9: will establish a program that will address the potential cumulative hydrologic impacts of the conversion of hillside rangeland areas to cultivated croplands.
- Policy OS-5.7, as well as state and County regulation of timber harvesting will also limit potential discharges to streams from forestry activities.

These state and local regulations will mitigate the 2007 General Plan's impact to surface water quality and therefore, the 2007 General Plan's contribution will not be cumulatively considerable.

Impact CUM-3. Groundwater Quality

Most groundwater supplies and demand originate and exist within the county. The major exception is the Pajaro groundwater basin, which Santa Cruz County and the city of Watsonville share with portions of northern Monterey County. The analysis in Chapter 4.3, Water Resources, considers groundwater supplies in each of the county's groundwater basins (including the Pajaro basin, taking into account the influence of the Santa Cruz county jurisdictions) taking into account the demands of incorporated areas as well as the unincorporated county. Accordingly, this cumulative analysis reflects the entire groundwater basin.

As discussed in Chapter 4.3, Water Resources, a number of Monterey County's groundwater basins have high levels of salt (from seawater intrusion into the aquifer) and other contaminants. Chapter 4.3, Water Resources, describes the numerous projects currently underway or planned (i.e., SVWP, CSIP, Watsonville Water Recycling Project, etc.) that are addressing the issue of seawater intrusion. In addition, the following 2007 General Plan policies would limit groundwater overdraft and minimize resultant seawater intrusion:

- Policy PS-2.6: would establish a Hydrologic Resources Constraints and Hazards Database that would help the county track problem areas.
- Policy PS-3.3: will require the county to develop and apply specific criteria for proof of a long term sustainable water supply for new residential or commercial subdivisions, including water quality, effects on wells in the immediate vicinity, existing groundwater conditions, cumulative impacts and planned growth in the area, and other factors.
- Policy PS-3.6: would restrict the drilling or operation of any new wells in known areas of saltwater intrusion as identified by Monterey County Water Resource Agency until such time as a program has been approved and funded which will minimize or avoid expansion of salt water intrusion into useable groundwater supplies in that area.

Nitrates and other groundwater contaminants enter the aquifers from septic systems, municipal wastewater treatment systems, urban runoff, and routine agricultural practices. Regulations promulgated by the Central Coast RWQCB under the NPDES program limit contamination from the first three sources. The RWQCB's conditional agricultural waiver program limits agricultural runoff as a source. Routine fertilizer use, however, remains a contributor. As discussed earlier, agricultural use is expected to remain the same or decline slightly from existing conditions. As a result, routine fertilizer use is not expected to increase with implementation of the 2007 General Plan. The 2007 General Plan does not contain any explicit policies on the topic of groundwater contaminants other than those identified above for water quality.

While existing regulations and the implementation of the 2007 General Plan policies would reduce impacts to groundwater quality, they would not completely eliminate contributions from new development under the Plan. Therefore, implementation of the 2007 General Plan would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to the existing cumulative impact of groundwater quality.

The following proposed mitigation measures will also reduce impacts on groundwater quality:

> **Mitigation Measure WR-1: Support a Regional Solution for the Monterey Peninsula in addition to the Coastal Water Project. This will require cooperation on a long-term, regional solution to groundwater overdraft and other issues. That, in turn, will reduce seawater intrusion.**
>
> **Mitigation Measure WR-2: Initiate Planning for additional Supplies to the Salinas Valley. This will begin the task of bringing long-term water supplies to the Salinas Valley over the buildout 2092 time frame. This would have reducing seawater intrusion and groundwater overdraft among its objectives.**

Mitigation Measures WR-1 and WR-2 hold promise for a long-term solution to the related problems of overdraft and seawater intrusion. Their implementation would reduce, but not eliminate the contribution of 2007 General Plan implementation.

Water Supply

Impact CUM-4. Water Supply
This examines the impacts of the 2007 General Plan on water demand and supply, and the potential to adversely affect groundwater levels. Chapter 4.3, Water Resources, describes the various agency plans that lay out the available water storage, ongoing and future water demand, and existing overdraft conditions within Monterey County, its cities, and the adjoining jurisdictions in the Pajaro Valley. The discussion in Chapter 4.3 considers water supplies by groundwater basin and sub-basin, thereby including affected contributing cities and counties. In the Pajaro basin, this includes Watsonville and a portion of Santa Cruz County.

Cumulative impacts would occur through the existing and projected gaps between water supplies and demand. As discussed in Chapter 4.3, a number of projects are underway or planned that would expand water supplies and reduce overdraft (i.e., Coastal Water Project, CSIP, Watsonville Water Recycling Project, SVWP, etc.). Nonetheless, there will be insufficient supply to support development to the 2030 planning horizon and beyond on the Monterey Peninsula and in the Pajaro Valley. Long term supply in the Salinas Valley will depend upon a future phase of the SVWP to secure additional water from the Salinas River. Mitigation measures WR-1 and WR-2 described above would bring the county together with other agencies to pursue long-term solutions to water supply and maintenance of groundwater levels.

In addition, the 2007 General Plan contains the following policies that would help match water demand to supply and reduce overdraft.

- Policy OS-10.10 would require consideration of sustainable land use strategies (including water conservation and greywater reuse) in the design of future development within Community Areas and Rural Centers.
- Policy PS-2.6 would establish a Hydrologic Resources Constraints and Hazards Database that would help the county to track problem areas.
- Policies PS-3.1 to -3.3 would require proof of availability of a sustainable water supply before new development is allowed. This would slow the growth of demand in the county.
- Policy PS-3.9 would require a program to eliminate overdraft of water basins be developed as part of the Capital Implementation and Financing Plan (CIFP).
- Policies PS-3.13 and -3.14 would establish an ordinance identifying conservation measures to reduce potable water demand and would maximize the use of recycled water as a potable water offset and in agricultural areas where allowed by state regulations.

Nonetheless, future growth planned in the cities (including Watsonville in Santa Cruz County), Community Areas, Rural Centers, Affordable Housing Overlay zones, and wineries will exacerbate the existing water supply and overdraft problems. By 2092 and full buildout, the constraints on the water supply will be even more acute. These policies and mitigation measures WR-1 and WR-2 described above will reduce, but cannot be certain of solving the long-term water supply shortage. Buildout of the 2007 General Plan would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to this cumulative impact.

Impact CUM-5. Indirect Impacts of Water Supply Projects
There are a number of existing and planned projects that are intended to increase water supplies and/or reduce overdraft conditions. These projects would reasonably be expected to have significant environmental impacts. Reasonably foreseeable water supply projects include the desalination plants of the Coastal Water Project and Pajaro/Sunny Mesa Community Services District proposed at Moss Landing. Both of these projects are in the planning stage and no draft EIR has been released for either of them. The SVWP is partially in operation and its impacts are disclosed in and being mitigated under the EIR/EIS prepared for that project by the MCWRA. The CSIP is in operation, as is the Watsonville Water Recycling Plant. Water distribution systems are being installed for both the SVWP and the water from the Watsonville plant. The water distribution pipelines will be installed in agricultural areas and are not expected to have significant effects.

Project impacts would include construction-related air quality emissions, traffic increases, and sediment release; brine disposal during operation (desalination plants); biological impacts (desalination plants); and increased electrical demand (desalination plants). A number of safeguards exist that will act to reduce most of these indirect impacts below the level of significance. For example:

- The Monterey Bay Unified APCD requires construction to follow BMPs to reduce dust. If the construction would exceed the APCD's threshold,

additional measures will be required to ensure that dust does not exceed the threshold. This will avoid contributing to the cumulative impact.

- The EIRs prepared for the desalination plants are expected to require that construction equipment use alternative fuels or other means to reduce their emissions of ozone precursors. Although, depending upon the intensity of construction, there is the potential for a significant impact on air quality from ozone precursors.
- County erosion control regulations and the requirements of the Central Coast RWQCB will prohibit the release of sediment beyond project boundaries. This would avoid contributing to surface water quality impacts.
- Brine from the desalination process is expected to be diluted with cooling water from the Moss Landing power plant and discharged into Monterey Bay. The Central Coast RWQCB will require that brine disposal meet regulatory limits to avoid conflict with the CWA. Therefore, this is not expected to make a considerable contribution to water quality impacts.

Biological impacts, particularly from the release of brine into the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, are unknown at this point, but would potentially be cumulatively considerable. The effectiveness of any future mitigation measures developed in the EIRs to be prepared for the desalination projects is unknown.

Desalination plants typically are large consumers of electrical energy. The power consumption of the proposed plants would potentially result in a significant effect on electrical supply. This would be analyzed in the EIRs to be prepared for the plants.

Taking a conservative view, the indirect impacts of the water supply projects to be built would potentially make considerable contributions to air quality, biological, and electrical energy use.

6.4.3.4 Transportation

Impact CUM-6. Transportation
Development anticipated by the 2007 General Plan and city growth cumulatively would generate additional traffic volumes that would worsen existing deficient performance conditions on Monterey County roadways. The cumulative contribution of the 2007 General Plan to traffic conditions is analyzed and disclosed in Chapter 4.6, Transportation, and therefore is not repeated here.

6.4.3.5 Air Quality

Impact CUM-7. Air Quality
The Monterey Bay Unified APCD's Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) establishes the projections of air quality that would result from development within this air basin. The North Central Coast Air Basin is in attainment for all criteria pollutants except ozone (state standard). The significance thresholds set out in the Monterey Bay Unified APCD's CEQA guide are based on the AQMP

and what would be the limits of allowable emissions that would stay within state and federal attainment requirements. The thresholds are essentially indicators of a project's individual and cumulative impacts.

The 2007 General Plan is generally consistent with the objectives of the North Central Coast Air Basin 2008 AQMP. However, vehicle traffic associated with growth under the 2007 General Plan and winery development under the General Plan's AWCP would exceed thresholds for ozone precursors. Policy C-1.2 of the 2007 General Plan requires adoption of a comprehensive Capital Improvement and Facilities Plan that will identify road improvements needed to reduce congestion and supports use of County traffic impact fee to fund related transportation projects. This ultimately would reduce idling and have a corresponding reduction in mobile-source air quality emissions. However, this will not avoid contributions of ozone precursors along roads that will suffer increased congestion as a result of the 2007 General Plan and city growth, nor would it reduce vehicle miles travelled. Further mitigation is infeasible, as discussed in Chapter 4.6, Transportation.

The 50 wineries proposed under the AWCP component of the 2007 General Plan would together emit VOCs in excess of the individual daily limit of 137 pounds established by the AQMP. As discussed in Chapter 4.7, Air Quality, there is no feasible mitigation for winery VOCs.

Therefore, implementation to the 2030 horizon and buildout of the 2007 General Plan in 2092 would make a considerable contribution to the cumulative impact on air quality.

There is also the reasonable possibility that, at the project level, there may be future individual developments whose construction emissions will exceed the APCD's standards. Such cases are rare in that large projects are practically always subject to discretionary permits that require CEQA review. As part of the CEQA process, future mitigation measures would be developed in cooperation with the Monterey Bay Unified APCD to bring construction emissions below the APCD's standards. This is unlikely to contribute to the cumulative effect on air quality.

Further, odiferous future projects such as composting yards or confined animal facilities that are not proposed as part of the 2007 General Plan, but that would be allowable under its provisions, could be installed. If these are clustered in one or more areas of the county, they will have cumulative effects on local air quality. That these uses might occur under the General Plan establish the possibility of additional considerable contributions at buildout of the 2007 General Plan.

6.4.3.6 Noise

Impact CUM-8. Noise
The EIR does not identify any significant direct noise impacts that would result from implementation of the 2007 General Plan at either the 2030 planning horizon or 2092 buildout. A cumulative noise impact exists when the applicable

noise standard is exceeded by 1 dbA or more. Although a 1 dbA change is unnoticeable, it contributes measurably to a significant effect.

Overall traffic volumes across the county are forecast to be about 45% greater than volumes under 2030 conditions. This generally corresponds to a 1 to 2 dB increase in traffic noise. Table 4.8-3 (Traffic Noise Modeling Results) in Chapter 4.8, Noise, illustrates that there will be cumulative significant noise impacts along a number of road segments. The column entitled "2030 Cumulative with Project minus No Project" and "Buildout minus 2030 Cumulative with Project"reflect those places where the county noise standard is forecast to be exceeded by 1 dbA or more. Keep in mind that because traffic is not limited to residents of the unincorporated county, not all of the cumulative impacts along these roads are attributable to the 2007 General Plan. These results are summarized in Table 6-1 below.

Table 6-1. Cumulative Noise Impacts

Segment	Existing Ldn	2030 Cumulative (with Project) Ldn	2030 Cumulative with Project minus No Project	Buildout minus 2030 Cumulative with Project
Espinosa Rd to E Boronda Rd	74	76	1	0
Chualar Rd to Old Stage Rd	72	75	0	2
SR-183 to SR-156	69	71	2	0
Del Monte Blvd to Imjin Pkwy	75	75	0	2
17 Mile Dr to Skyline Forest Dr	67	67	0	1
Canyon del Rey Blvd to Bit Rd	63	64	0	1
Spreckels Blvd to E Blanco Rd	67	68	-1	3
County Road G-15 to Stonewall Canyon Rd	53	54	0	3
Castroville Blvd to US-101	70	70	0	1
Cooper Rd to S Davis Rd	67	70	0	1
US-101 to Cattlemen Rd	45	48	-1	2
Carlton Dr to SR-68	61	62	0	1
Salinas Rd to San Miguel Canyon Rd	54	58	0	1
Strawberry Rd to Castroville Blvd	63	67	2	0
US-101 to San Lucas Rd	52	55	0	2
Carmel Rancho Blvd to Rio Rd	64	65	0	1
Robinson Canyon Rd to Miramonte Rd	61	62	0	2
Las Palmas Rd to Las Palmas Pkwy	60	61	1	3
Drake Ave to Lighthouse Ave	62	65	0	2
Pacific Ave to Forest Ave	56	57	0	2
Forest Ave to David Ave	56	54	0	1
Washington St to Camino Aguajito	66	67	0	2
Abrego St to Camino Aguajito	64	65	0	1
Soledad Dr to Via Zaragoza	64	65	1	2
Playa Ave to Fremont Blvd	61	62	-1	3
N Del Monte Blvd to SR-1	59	59	-1	3
Reindollar Ave to Reservation Rd	67	68	0	2
Casa Verde Wy to SR-218	65	66	0	3
US-101 to Abbott St	65	65	0	2
San Juan Grade Rd to W Laurel Dr	65	66	0	2

Segment	Existing Ldn	2030 Cumulative (with Project) Ldn	2030 Cumulative with Project minus No Project	Buildout minus 2030 Cumulative with Project
US-101 to N Main St	60	63	0	2
Romie Ln to E Blanco Rd	62	62	0	2
Abbott St to US-101	65	65	-1	2
Davis Rd to N Main St	62	62	0	2
W Laurel Dr to SR-183	62	62	0	1
W Alisal St to SR-68	57	57	0	3
SH 101 to Salinas City Line	67	68	0	2
SR-183 to Commercial Pkwy E	60	61	0	0
Reservation Rd to Cooper Rd	68	69	0	1
Carmel Rancho Ln to Rio Rd	53	53	-1	2
Serra Ave to SR-1	58	58	0	3
Blanco Rd to Reservation Rd	65	68	-1	0
Spreckels Blvd to Abbott St	61	63	0	2
Carmel City Line to SR-1	57	57	0	2
San Juan Rd to Santa Cruz County Line	65	67	0	1
Carmel City Line to SR-1	57	58	0	2
SR-1 to Fruitland Ave	60	63	1	1
Salinas City Line to Russell Rd	57	62	0	3
SR-68 to Harkins Rd	57	60	0	1

As discussed in Chapter 4.8, Noise, there are a number of measures that can be taken to attenuate noise impacts to meet county standards. These measures would be equally useful in attenuating cumulative impacts. Noise attenuation is very specific to the circumstances of the area where noise levels are being exceeded, so identifying specific measures to avoid cumulative impacts is neither practical nor effective. The 2007 General Plan includes a number of policies that will act to reduce these increases when applied to individual projects and avoid contribution to the impact. They include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Policy S-7.1: New noise-sensitive land uses may only be allowed in areas where existing and projected noise levels (*Figures 22 A-H and 23 A-E*) are "acceptable" according to *Table S-2* ("Land Use Compatibility for Community Noise"). A Community Noise Ordinance shall be established that addresses, but is not limited to the following: (1) capacity-related roadway improvement projects; (2) construction-related noise impacts on adjacent land uses; (3) new residential land uses exposed to aircraft

operations at any airport or air base; (4) site planning and project design techniques to achieve acceptable noise levels such as: building orientation, setbacks, earthen berms, and building construction practices; (5) design elements necessary to mitigate significant adverse noise impacts on surrounding land uses; and (6) impulse noise. The use of masonry sound walls for noise control in rural areas shall be discouraged.

- S-7.2: Proposed development shall incorporate design elements necessary to minimize noise impacts on surrounding land uses and to reduce noise in indoor spaces to an acceptable level.
- S-7.4: New noise generators may be allowed in areas where projected noise levels (*Figures 22 and 23*) are "conditionally acceptable" only after a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements is made and needed noise mitigation features are included in project design.
- S-7.5: New noise generators should generally be discouraged in areas identified as "normally unacceptable." Where such new noise generators are permitted, mitigation to reduce both the indoor and outdoor noise levels will be required.
- S-7.6: Acoustical analysis shall be part of the environmental review process for projects when: (a) Noise sensitive receptors are proposed in areas exposed to existing or projected noise levels that are "normally unacceptable" or higher according to *Table S-2* ("Land Use Compatibility for Community Noise") or (b) Proposed noise generators are likely to produce noise levels exceeding the levels shown in the adopted Community Noise Ordinance when received at existing or planned noise-sensitive receptors.
- S-7.7: All discretionary projects which propose to use heavy construction equipment that has the potential to create vibrations that could cause structural damage to adjacent structures within 100 feet would be required to submit a pre-construction vibration study prior to the approval of a building permit. Specified measures and monitoring identified to reduce impacts would be incorporated into construction contracts. Pile driving or blasting are illustrative of the type of equipment that could be subject to this policy.

With implementation of these policies at the project level, the 2007 General Plan will not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative noise impacts.

6.4.3.7 Biological Resources

Impact CUM-9. Biological Resources
Development of natural lands, whether by urbanization, construction of single-family residences in sensitive habitats, or conversion of woodlands or grazing land to intensive agricultural use results in the loss of natural habitats and associated biological resources. Seawater intrusion may also affect special status species through change in habitat. Implementation of the 2007 General Plan will be one of the factors affecting biological resources. In addition, development of

the cities will impact these resources directly through loss of habitat, and indirectly through increased water demand and its relationship to seawater intrusion.

The state and federal Endangered Species Acts (ESAs), as well as related listings of special status species by the Department of Fish and Game and its federal counterparts, provide a projection of those species that are adversely affected by loss of habitat and other impacts resulting from development throughout their local, state or federal range. These species are identified in Chapter 4.9, Biological Resources. Resources subject to cumulative impact are: special status species; sensitive natural communities, riparian habitat and wetlands; wildlife movement corridors; and potential loss or disturbance of nesting migratory birds and raptors. The 2007 General Plan provides a projection of the cumulative impact of future development on these species, habitats, and resources.

There are a number of current laws and regulations that reduce the impacts of development on biological resources. These include the state and federal ESAs, additional regulations such as streambed alteration agreements (DFG) and wetland permitting (Corps of Engineers, Central Coast RWQCB), the county tree protection ordinance, and CEQA as it applies to individual discretionary projects. The 2007 General Plan proposes a number of policies that would reduce the impact of its implementation. These include the following:

- Policy PS-3.6 provides that the County and all applicable water management agencies will not allow the drilling or operation of any new wells in known areas of saltwater intrusion as identified by Monterey County Water Resource Agency until such time as a program has been approved and funded which will minimize or avoid expansion of salt water intrusion into useable groundwater supplies in that area.
- Policy OS-4.3 requires the protection of estuaries, salt and fresh water marshes, tide pools, wetlands, sloughs, river and stream mouth areas in accordance with state and federal laws. This would avoid impacts to special status species dependent on those habitats.
- Policy OS-5.1 promotes the conservation of critical habitat. This would reduce impacts to special status species (as otherwise defined in Section 15380 of the CEQA Guidelines) to the extent that they are covered under the Federal Endangered Species Act and critical habitat has been identified.
- Policies OS-5.3 and 5.4 encourage careful design of new development and the avoidance of State and federally listed plant and animal species and designated critical habitat for federally listed species. This would similarly reduce impacts to state and federally listed species, but not those special status species (as otherwise defined in Section 15380 of the CEQA Guidelines) that are not included on the state or federal endangered species lists.
- Policy OS-5.16 requires biological surveys and mitigation as part of project consideration. These would implement the above policies.

- Policy OS-5.17 requires the county to mitigate los of critical habitat in consultation with state and federal agencies. This would reduce impacts to special status species (as otherwise defined in Section 15380 of the CEQA Guidelines) to the extent that they are covered under the state and federal Endangered Species Acts and critical habitat has been identified.

As discussed in Chapter 4.9, Biological Resources these policies would not avoid significant effects and, by implication, cumulatively considerable contributions.

In addition, this EIR recommends the adoption of a number of mitigation measures to address the impacts of the 2007 General Plan. These include:

- BIO-1.1: Baseline Inventory of Landcover, CEQA-Defined Special Status Species Habitat, Sensitive Natural Communities, Riparian Habitat, and Wetlands in Monterey County. This would identify areas of concern so that they could be avoided in project design. That would reduce the potential for significant effects.
- BIO-1.2: Salinas Valley Conservation Plan to preserve habitat for the San Joaquin kit fox in the Salinas Valley. This would provide long-term protection for the species while authorizing development in particular areas. It would avoid cumulative contributions to impacts on this species before the 2030 planning horizon.
- BIO-1.3: Project Level Biological Survey and Avoidance, Minimization, and Compensation for Impacts to CEQA-defined Special-Status Species and Sensitive Natural communities. This would expand considerations of species beyond those formally listed under the state and federal Endangered Species Acts to approximate the list in Section 15380 of the CEQA Guidelines. This would minimize impacts, including cumulative contributions, before the 2030 planning horizon.
- BIO-1.4: By 2030, prepare an Update to the General Plan to identify expansion of existing focused growth areas and/or to identify new focused growth areas to reduce loss of natural habitat in Monterey County. This would provide similar protections to those of mitigation measure BIO-1.4.
- BIO-1.5: By 2030, prepare a Comprehensive County Natural Communities Conservation Plan (NCCP). This would provide similar protections to those of mitigation measure BIO-1.2, but for multiple species. Depending on the species included in the NCCP, this has the potential to avoid cumulative contributions for all special status species (as otherwise defined in Section 15380 of the CEQA Guidelines) in the county.
- BIO-2.1: Stream Setback Ordinance. This will protect riparian habitats and the species that depend on them.
- BIO-2.2 – Oak Woodlands Mitigation Program. This will protect this habitat and the species that depend upon it.
- BIO-2.3 – Add Considerations Regarding Riparian Habitat and Stream Flows to Criteria for Long-Term Water Supply and Well Assessment. This would

expand the types of permits requiring consideration of habitat and stream flows. This would benefit riparian-dependent and fish species.

- BIO-3.1: Project-Level Wildlife Movement Considerations. This would expand protections to species that are not listed, such as deer, but that would otherwise be affected by development by loss of movement corridors.
- BIO-3.2: Remove Vegetation During the Nonbreeding Season and Avoid Disturbance of Nesting Migratory Birds, Including Raptors, as Appropriate (generally September 16 to January 31). This would expand protections for non-listed, special status birds in keeping with the definition in Section 15380 of the CEQA Guidelines. That would avoid a cumulative contribution.

Together, these would reduce the 2007 General Plan's contribution to cumulative impacts, but in some cases these impacts would still remain considerable. As development continues toward buildout, particularly development of existing lots of record, low-intensity development will cover larger expanses of the county's jurisdiction (federal lands such as Fort Hunter Liggett and Los Padres National Forest and state parks, which provide substantial areas of habitat within the county would not be affected). Similarly, expansion of the cities, which is outside the control of Monterey County, will impact habitats adjoining urban areas. Non-discretionary activities, such as the conversion of grassland to intensive agriculture, will also continue to contribute to the larger impact on these resources. Because the extent and species coverage of the future NCCP is unknown, there is a potential for cumulative impacts on special status species not covered by the NCCP. As a result, there would be a considerable contribution to cumulatively significant biological impacts.

6.4.3.8 Public Services and Utilities

Impact Cum-10. Solid Waste
As discussed in Section 4.11, Public Services and Utilities, future growth anticipated with build out of the 2007 General Plan would exceed landfill capacity, as tracked by the California Integrated Waste Management Board, by buildout in 2092. Landfills serve both city and county dwellers and businesses.

The Integrated Waste Management Act will continue to require reduction, recycling, and reuse to reduce the amount of waste sent to landfills. Future efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions are likely to include regulations requiring the further reduction and recycling of solid waste, including building materials. This should reduce the wastestream requiring disposal in landfills. Nonetheless, existing landfill capacity will be exceeded by 2092. To be conservative, the long-term contribution of 2007 General Plan buildout is expected to be considerable.

Assuming that landfills will be constructed between 2008 and buildout, development of a new or expanded landfill typically results in numerous environmental impacts. Construction impacts typically include air quality emissions from dust and machinery, temporary increases in traffic, and effect on

surrounding biological resources. Landfills are typically located away from sensitive receptors, so noise impacts would be minimal during construction and operations. Operational impacts can include air quality impacts resulting from odors and the release of landfill gases, biological impacts on the area of the expansion or location, traffic impacts from trucks going to and from the landfill, water quality impacts from storm runoff or leaching, and aesthetics impacts resulting from removal of existing vegetation and landfill cover.

Existing air quality regulations and standard traffic control measures would reduce construction impacts. However, depending upon the intensity of construction, there is the potential for significant effects. Similarly, existing regulations of the Monterey Bay Unified APCD would regulate odors and the release of landfill gas such that air quality standards would not be exceeded. Similarly, the Central Coast RWQCB and the California Integrated Waste Management Board would regulate landfill operations so that no runoff escapes the site and landfill design and monitoring wells ensure that no leachate is released to either surface or groundwater. These sets of regulations would reasonably be expected to avoid a contribution to cumulative air and water quality impacts.

Biological impacts, although dependent upon the sensitivity of the area chosen for the expansion or new landfill would potentially be significant and would contribute to cumulative impacts on biological resources. Aesthetics impacts, again dependent upon the visibility of the landfill site, would potentially be significant and contributors to visual impacts.

6.4.3.9 Wildfire Hazard

Impact CUM-11. Wildfire Hazard
Portions of Monterey County, particularly west of the Salinas Valley, are highly susceptible to wildfire. The risk of wildfires is acute in areas of high fuel loading; somewhat less so in moderate fuel loaded areas. As described in Chapter 4.13, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, the 2007 General Plan and the Fort Ord Master Plan contain detailed requirements for and limitations on future development to avoid contributing to fire risk, limiting damage through provision of defensible space, and funding fire suppression services.

In the recent past, the Basin Fire and Indian Fire devastated areas around Big Sur and inland southern portions of the Salinas Valley. These are only the latest of many catastrophic wildfires originating in rugged terrain along the coast. The state parks and National Forest have suffered the brunt of the damage from these fires, primarily because populations are low and communities in the area are small. The 2007 General Plan would encourage development within several Rural Centers that would place additional residents in areas that have the potential for wildfires. In addition, development to 2092 buildout would include existing rural lots of record, some in areas of high or moderate fire hazard; placing new residents in the literal line of fire.

Chapter 4.13, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, describes the voluminous policies and requirements that will be applied to new development under the 2007 General Plan. In the interest of space, the reader is referred to that chapter. These policies, implemented well before 2030 and in place long before 2092, would greatly reduce the potential contribution of the 2007 General Plan to the risk of wildfires. However, the 2007 General Plan cannot eliminate the risk of catastrophic wildfires originating on public lands sweeping across Rural Communities and, more particularly, individual lots of record, despite the best efforts of fire fighters to slow or halt their approach. The 2007 General Plan would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to this risk.

6.4.3.10 Aesthetics, Light and Glare

Impact CUM-12. Aesthetics, Light, and Glare
Future growth in Monterey County and development in surrounding areas would result in the intensification of existing urban uses as well as conversion of open space into urban land uses and the introduction of new sources of light and glare. City growth also would have a cumulatively considerable contribution in this regard. Aesthetics impacts occur as a result of substantial changes in pleasant views. Light and glare are impacts where undeveloped or rural lands adjoin urbanized development or where new sources of light and glare are introduced into a dark environment. The county General Plan and city general plans essentially describe the factors that will change the existing landscape and result in aesthetics, light, and glare impacts. Individual projects under these county and city plans that result in the urbanization of open lands, development on ridgelines, and expansion of urban areas all contribute to the incremental loss of aesthetically pleasing views or the introduction of incompatible light and glare.

Development under the 2007 General Plan would be primarily centered on the existing cities, and the county's designated Community Areas, Rural Centers, and AHOs. For the most part, these would minimize aesthetics impacts caused by the conversion of open lands to urban development by building adjacent to existing development. Nonetheless, particularly in cities in the Salinas Valley where the surrounding land use is agricultural fields, there will be an incremental change in the visual character of the area. Also, buildout of the county's individual lots of record will result in a more expansive distribution of low-intensity development than exists today.

The 2007 General Plan has a number of policies to reduce its contribution to visual impacts. They include the following:

- Policy LU-1.10 will discourage new off-site advertising to enhance public safety and to avoid visual clutter and scenic intrusion. Off site advertising may only be considered in heavy commercial and industrial zoning districts and not abutting residential districts.
- Policy LU-1.13 provides that all exterior lighting is to be unobtrusive and constructed or located so that only the intended area is illuminated, long

range visibility is reduced of the lighting source, and off-site glare is fully controlled (based on design criteria to be developed by the county).

- Policy OS-1.3 restricts new development on ridgelines.
- Policy OS-1.7 will lead to a transfer of development rights program to direct development away from areas with unique visual or natural features.
- Policies OS-1.9 and -1.11 require the establishment of an inventory of viewsheds and encourage project design that protects those views.

Nonetheless, the slow transition of areas away from agriculture and open lands, and the expansion of the urban edge, where light and glare intrude on nearby less-developed lands; will result in a considerable contribution to the cumulative loss of landscape aesthetic quality. Because of California Planning Law requires counties and cities to provide for projected housing needs and the associated urban growth, this contribution cannot be fully avoided.

6.4.3.11 Population and Housing

Impact CUM-13. Population and Housing
The cumulative contribution of population and housing growth in Monterey County will be examined to the year 2030 planning horizon since "buildout" numbers are not available for Santa Cruz and San Benito Counties, the other counties in the AMBAG region. However, the type of contribution at buildout is not expected to differ greatly from the type of contribution in 2030 because these contributions are common to long-term growth, whether the term is 20 years or 80 years.

The AMBAG 2004 regional forecast estimates that by 2030 the total population of Monterey County (including the cities) will total 602,731 persons residing in 187,001 dwelling units. Of this, the unincorporated county would accommodate 135,375 persons (about 22% of the total) and the cities would accommodate 467,356 persons (about 78% of the total). Region-wide (Santa Cruz, Monterey, and San Benito Counties), the population is expected to grow to 991,370 persons by 2030. This would represent a 39% increase between 2000 and 2030, for an annual growth rate of 1.3 %, By comparison, the California Department of Finance currently projects that the State's annual growth rate between 2000 and 2030 will be about 1.5% (State of California, Department of Finance 2007). Growth in Monterey County and its neighboring counties is cumulatively significant. Although the 30-year annual rate of growth is projected to be less than the statewide average, the adverse changes inherent in growth here (e.g., aesthetics, water supply, traffic congestion) and the controversy over Monterey County growth indicate that it is a significant cumulative impact.

As discussed previously in Chapter 4.15, Population and Housing, the 2007 General Plan is growth-inducing by nature of its role in accommodating new housing opportunities under California Planning Law. Because California Planning Law mandates that each city and county plan for its fair share of the regional housing need and that need is based on projections of population growth, there is no feasible mitigation for the resultant increase in population and

dwelling units. Therefore, the 2007 General Plan would make a considerable contribution to this cumulative effect.

There is no cumulative impact with regard to residential displacement or housing replacement. As discussed in Chapter 4.15, Population and Housing, the 2007 General Plan would not result in substantial displacement, nor would it require substantial replacement housing as a result of displacement.

6.4.3.12 Climate Change

Impact CUM-14. Climate Change
Climate change is a global phenomenon driven by myriad individual actions, large and small, in every country. As explained in Chapter 4.16, Climate Change, no individual project within Monterey County is large enough in itself to trigger global climate change. However, most individual projects contribute to the greenhouse gas emissions that fuel climate change. Climate change is a cumulative impact. Accordingly, the climate change analysis in Chapter 4.16 is an analysis of the project's contribution to this cumulative impact. The reader is directed to that chapter and no additional discussion is needed here.

Table 6-2. Significant and Unavoidable Impact Table

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significant after Mitigation
4.2 Agriculture Resources		
Impact AG-1: Implementation of the 2007 General Plan would result in the conversion of Important Farmland to non-agricultural use. **[Also cumulative impact]**	No feasible mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan goals and policies is available.	2030 - Significant Unavoidable Impact. Buildout – Significant Unavoidable Impact.
Implementation of the 2007 General Plan would involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, would result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. **[Also cumulative impact]**	No feasible mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan goals and policies is available.	2030 - Significant Unavoidable Impact. Buildout – Significant Unavoidable Impact.
4.3 Water Resources		
Impact WR-4: Land uses and development consistent with the 2007 General Plan would exceed the capacity of existing water supplies and necessitate the acquisition of new supplies to meet expected demands. **[Also cumulative impact]**	**2030 Mitigation** **WR-1:** Support a Regional Solution for the Monterey Peninsula In Addition to the Coastal Water Project **2092 Mitigation** **WR-1:** Support a Regional Solution for the Monterey Peninsula In Addition to the Coastal Water Project **WR-2:** Initiate Planning for Additional Supplies to the Salinas Valley **BIO-2.3:** Add Considerations Regarding Riparian Habitat and Stream Flows to Criteria for Long-Term Water Supply and Well Assessment. (see Section 4.9 Biological Resources, below).	2030 - Significant Unavoidable Impact (In some portions of the County). Buildout – Significant Unavoidable Impact (In some portions of the County).
Impact WR-5: Land uses and development consistent with the 2007 General Plan would increase the demand for water storage, treatment, and conveyance facilities that could have significant secondary impacts on the environment.	The General Plan and Area Plan goals and policies will apply. Future projects will be subject to CEQA and have specific mitigation measures. As the experience with existing large-scale water supply projects shows, impacts cannot always be mitigated to a less than significant level.	2030 –Significant Unavoidable Impact. Buildout – Significant Unavoidable Impact.

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significant after Mitigation
Impact WR-6: Land uses and development consistent with the 2007 General Plan would increase demand on groundwater supplies in some areas; the associated increased well pumping would result in the continued decline of groundwater levels and accelerated overdraft in portions of the county. **[Also cumulative impact]**	**2030 Mitigation** **WR-1:** Support a Regional Solution for the Monterey Peninsula In Addition to the Coastal Water Project **2092 Mitigation** **WR-1:** Support a Regional Solution for the Monterey Peninsula In Addition to the Coastal Water Project **WR-2:** Initiate Planning for Additional Supplies to the Salinas Valley	2030 - Significant Unavoidable Impact (In some portions of the County). Buildout – Significant Unavoidable Impact.
Impact WR-7: Land uses and development consistent with the 2007 General Plan would increase demand on groundwater supplies in areas currently experiencing or susceptible to saltwater intrusion. Increased groundwater pumping in certain coastal areas would result in increased saltwater intrusion in some areas of the county. **[Also cumulative impact]**	**2030 Mitigation** **WR-1:** Support a Regional Solution for the Monterey Peninsula In Addition to the Coastal Water Project **2092 Mitigation** **WR-1:** Support a Regional Solution for the Monterey Peninsula In Addition to the Coastal Water Project **WR-2:** Initiate Planning for Additional Supplies to the Salinas Valley	2030 - Significant Unavoidable Impact (In some portions of the County). Buildout – Significant Unavoidable Impact (In all of the County).
Impact WR-12: Land uses and development consistent with the 2007 General Plan would allow continued development in 100-year flood hazard areas.	**2092** Extent and locations of future impact are unknown; no mitigation is feasible.	Buildout – Significant Unavoidable Impact.
Impact WR-13: The placement of land uses and structures within Special Flood Hazard Areas would impede or redirect flood flows, resulting in secondary downstream flood damage, including bank failure.	**2092** Extent and locations of future impact are unknown; no mitigation is feasible.	Buildout – Significant Unavoidable Impact.
Impact WR-14: Potential failure of levees or dams would expose people and structures to inundation and result in the loss of property, increased risk, injury, or death.	**2092** Extent and locations of future impact are unknown; no mitigation is feasible.	Buildout – Significant Unavoidable Impact.
4.6 Transportation		
Impact TRAN-1B: Development of the land uses allowed under the 2007 General Plan would create traffic increases on County and Regional roadways which would cause the LOS to exceed the LOS		Less Than Significant Impact.

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significant after Mitigation
standard, or contribute traffic to County and Regional roads that exceed the LOS standard without development.		
	TRAN-1B-a: Circulation Element Policy C-1.2 shall be amended to state: C-1.2 The standard for the acceptable level of service (LOS) is to be achieved by 2026. That LOS standard is to be achieved through the development and adoption of Capital Improvement and Financing Plans (CIFP) and implementing ordinances that: a. Define benefit areas to be included in the CIFP. Benefit areas could include Planning Areas, Community Areas, or the County as a whole. b. Identify and prioritize the improvements to be completed in the benefit areas over the life of the General Plan. c. Estimate the cost of the improvements over the life of the General Plan. d. Identify the funding sources and mechanisms for the CIFP to include, but not limited to, a Traffic Impact Fee (TIF). e. Provide an anticipated schedule for completion of the improvements. f. Coordinate with TAMC regional fee program. g. A TIF shall be implemented to ensure a funding mechanism for transportation improvements to county facilities. The TIF shall be imposed on development in cities for the improvement of major County roads in accordance with the Monterey County 2007 General Plan. The CIFP shall be reviewed every five (5) years in order to evaluate the effectiveness of meeting the LOS standard for County roads. Road segments or intersections identified to be approaching or below LOS D shall be a high priority for	Significant Unavoidable Impact.

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significant after Mitigation
	funding. **TRAN-1B-b:** Circulation Element Policy C-1.8 shall be amended to state: C-1.8 "Development proposed in cities and surrounding jurisdictions shall be carefully reviewed to assess the proposed development's impact on the County's circulation system. The County, in consultation with TAMC and Monterey County cities, shall develop a Traffic Impact Fee that addresses impacts of development in cities and unincorporated areas on major County roads."	
Impact TRAN-1B: Development of the land uses allowed under the 2007 General Plan would create traffic increases on County and Regional roadways which would cause the LOS to exceed the LOS standard, or contribute traffic to County and Regional roads that exceed the LOS standard without development.	No mitigation is feasible.	2030 -- Significant Unavoidable Impact.
Impact TRAN 1-E: Growth in land uses allowed under the 2007 General Plan would result in inadequate emergency access.	**TRAN-1E:** Revise Safety Element S-4.27 on increasing roadway connectivity to enhance emergency access. S-4.27 The County shall continue to review the procedure for proposed development, including minor and major subdivisions, and provide for an optional pre-submittal meeting between the project applicant, planning staff, and fire officials. In addition, the County shall review Community Area and Rural Center Plans, and new development proposals for roadway connectivity that provides multiple routes for emergency response vehicles. At the time of their update, Community Area and Rural Center Plans shall identify primary and secondary response routes. Secondary response routes shall be required to accommodate through traffic and may be existing roads, or may be new roads required as part of development proposals. The emergency route and connectivity plans shall be coordinated with the appropriate Fire District.	2030 – Significant Unavoidable Impact.
Impact TRAN-2B: Development of the land uses allowed under the 2007 General Plan cumulatively with development in incorporated	No mitigation is feasible for County and Regional roadways	2030 – Cumulatively

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significant after Mitigation
cities and in adjacent counties would create traffic increases on County and Regional roadways which would cause the LOS to exceed the LOS D standard, or contribute traffic to County and Regional roads that exceed the LOS standard without development.	outside of the CVMP. **TRAN-2B:** Revise policies in the Carmel Valley Master Plan as follows: Policy CV-2.10. The following are policies regarding improvements to specific portions of Carmel Valley Road: a) Via Petra to Robinson Canyon Road. Every effort should be made to preserve its rural character by maintaining it as a 2-lane road with paved shoulders, passing lanes and left turn channelizations at intersections where warranted. b) Robinson Canyon Road to Laureles Grade. Every effort should be made to preserve its rural character by maintaining it as a 2-lane road with paved shoulders, passing lanes and left turn channelizations at intersections where warranted. c) Carmel Valley Road/Laureles Grade. A grade separation should be constructed at this location instead of a traffic signal. The grade separation needs to be constructed in a manner that minimizes impacts to the rural character of the road. An interim improvement of an all-way stop or stop signal is allowable during the period necessary to secure funding for the grade separation. d) Laureles Grade to Ford Road. Shoulder improvements and widening should be undertaken here and extended to Pilot Road, and include left turn channelization at intersections as warranted. e) East of Esquiline Road. Shoulder improvements should be undertaken at the sharper curves. Curves should be examined for spot realignment needs. f) Laureles Grade improvements. Improvements to Laureles Grade should consist of the construction of shoulder widening, spot realignments, passing lanes and/or paved turn-outs. Heavy vehicles should be	Considerable Impact (most of county).

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significant after Mitigation
	discouraged from using this route. Policy CV-2.12: To accommodate existing and future traffic, the following road improvements are recommended: a) Add a northbound climbing lane between Rio Road and Carmel Valley Road; b) Laureles Grade - undertake shoulder improvements, widening and spot realignment; c) Carmel Valley Road, Robinson Canyon Road to Ford Road - add left turn channelization at all intersections. Shoulder improvements should be undertaken. Policy CV-2.18 : To implement traffic standards to provide adequate streets and highways in Carmel Valley, the County shall conduct and implement the following: a) Twice yearly monitoring by Public Works (in June and October) of peak hour traffic at the following 12 locations: ▪ Carmel Valley Road - ▪ East of Holman Road ▪ Holman Road to Esquiline Road ▪ Esquiline Road to Ford Road ▪ Ford Road to Laureles Grade ▪ Laureles Grade to Robinson Canyon Road ▪ Robinson Canyon Road to Schulte Road ▪ Schulte Road to Rancho San Carlos Road ▪ Rancho San Carlos Road to Rio Road ▪ Rio Road to Carmel Rancho Boulevard ▪ Carmel Rancho Boulevard to SR1 Other Locations - ▪ Carmel Rancho Boulevard between Carmel Valley Road and Rio Road	

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significant after Mitigation

- Rio Road between its eastern terminus and SR1

b) A yearly evaluation report (December) shall be prepared jointly by the Public Works and Planning Departments and shall evaluate the peak-hour level of service (LOS) for these 12 locations to indicate segments approaching a traffic volume which would lower levels of service below the LOS standards established below under CV 2-18(d).

c) Public hearings shall be held in January immediately following a December report in (b) above in which only 100 or less peak hour trips remain before an unacceptable level of service (as defined by CV 2-18(d)) would be reached for any of the 12 segments described above.

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

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

During review of development applications which require a discretionary permit, if traffic analysis of the proposed project indicates that the project would result in traffic conditions that would exceed the standards described above in CV 2-18(d) after the analysis takes into consideration the Carmel Valley Traffic Improvement Program to be funded by the Carmel Valley Road Traffic Mitigation Fee, then approval of the

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significant after Mitigation
	project shall be conditioned on the prior (e.g. prior to project-generated traffic) construction of additional roadway improvements OR an Environmental Impact Report shall be prepared for the project. Such additional roadway improvements must be sufficient, when combined with the projects programmed in the Carmel Valley Traffic Improvement Program, to allow County to find that the affected roadway segments or intersections would meet the acceptable standard upon completion of the programmed plus additional improvements. This policy does not apply to the first single-family residence on a legal lot of record. Policy CV-2.19: Carmel Valley Traffic Improvement Program (CVTIP) a) The CVTIP shall include the following projects (unless a subsequent traffic analysis identifies that different projects are necessary to maintain the LOS standards in Policy CV-2.18(d): ▪ Left-turn channelization on Carmel Valley Road west of Ford Road; ▪ Shoulder widening on Carmel Valley Road between Laureles Grade and Ford Road; ▪ Paved turnouts, new signage, shoulder improvements, and spot realignments on Laureles Grade; ▪ Grade separation at Laureles Grade and Carmel Valley Road (an interim improvement of an all-way stop or stop signal is allowable during the period necessary to secure funding for the grade separation); ▪ Sight Distance Improvement at Dorris Road; ▪ Passing lanes in front of the proposed September Ranch development; ▪ Passing lanes opposite Garland Park;	

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significant after Mitigation
	▪ Climbing Lane on Laureles Grade; ▪ Upgrade all new road improvements within Carmel Valley Road Corridor to Class 2 bike lanes; ▪ Passing lane (1/4 mile) between Schulte Road and Robinson Canyon Road; and ▪ Passing lane (1/4 mile) between Rancho San Carlos Rd and Schulte Road. b) The County shall adopt an updated fee program to fund the CVTIP. c) All projects within the CVMP area and within the "Expanded Area" that contribute to traffic within the CVMP area shall contribute fair-share traffic impact fees to fund necessary improvements identified in the CVTIP, as updated at the time of building permit issuance. d) Where conditions are projected to approach unacceptable conditions (as defined by the monitoring and standards described above under CV 2-18(d)), the CVTIP shall be updated to plan for and fund adequate improvements to maintain acceptable conditions.	
Impact TRAN-2E: Growth in land uses allowed under the 2007 General Plan, cumulatively with development in incorporated cities and adjacent counties, would result in inadequate emergency access.	No additional mitigation beyond 2007 General Plan policies and Mitigation Measure TRAN-1E (described above) is available.	2030 – Cumulatively Considerable Impact
Impact TRAN-3B: Buildout of the 2007 General Plan would increase traffic on County and Regional roadways which would cause the LOS to exceed the LOS D standard, or contribute traffic to County and Regional roads that exceed the LOS standard without development.	No additional mitigation beyond 2007 General Plan policies and Mitigation Measure TRAN-2B (described above) is feasible.	Buildout – Significant Unavoidable Impact.
Impact TRAN-3E: Buildout of the 2007 General Plan would result in inadequate emergency access.	No additional mitigation beyond 2007 General Plan policies and Mitigation Measure TRAN-1E (described above) is available.	Buildout – Significant Unavoidable Impact.

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significant after Mitigation
Impact TRAN-4B: Buildout of the 2007 General Plan cumulatively with development in incorporated cities and in adjacent counties would create traffic increases on County and Regional roadways which would cause the LOS to exceed the LOS D standard, or contribute traffic to County and Regional roads that exceed the LOS standard without development.	No additional mitigation beyond 2007 General Plan policies and Mitigation Measure TRAN-2B (described above) is feasible.	Buildout – Significant Unavoidable Impact.
Impact TRAN-4E: Buildout of the 2007 General Plan, cumulatively with development in incorporated cities and adjacent counties, would result in inadequate emergency access.	No additional mitigation beyond 2007 General Plan policies and Mitigation Measure TRAN-1E (described above) is available.	Buildout – Significant Unavoidable Impact.
4.7 Air Quality		
Impact AQ-1: Buildout of the 2007 General Plan would conflict with applicable Air Quality Management Plans and Standards.		
Impact AQ-3: Net Change in Ozone Precursor (ROG and NOx) and Particulate Matter.	**2030 and 2092 Mitigation** **CC-2 and CC-3.** See these measures under Climate Change, below. **AQ-3:** Implement MBUAPCD Mitigation Measures for Commercial, Industrial, and Institutional Land Uses **AQ-4:** Implement MBUAPCD Mitigation Measures for Residential Land Uses **AQ-5:** Implement MBUAPCD Mitigation Measures for Alternative Fuels	2030 –Significant Unavoidable Impact. Buildout – Significant Unavoidable Impact.
4.8 Noise		
	N-1: A new policy shall be added to the Noise Hazards section of the Safety Element that states the following: S-7.x All proposed discretionary residential projects that are within roadway noise contours of 60 CNEL or greater shall include a finding of consistency with the provisions of the Noise Hazards section of the Safety Element and, where appropriate, a project-specific noise impact analysis conducted before final approval. If impacts are identified, a "reasonable and	Less Than Significant Impact.

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significant after Mitigation
	feasible" mitigation analysis shall be conducted using published Caltrans/Federal Highway Administration guidelines. Any mitigation measures meeting these tests shall be concurrently funded and constructed as part of the roadway improvement.	
	N-2: A new policy shall be added to the Noise Hazards section of the Safety Element that states the following: S-7.x All discretionary projects which propose to use heavy construction equipment within 50 feet of a residence, or pile drivers or blasting within 100 feet of a residence (or similar sensitive use) shall be required to submit a pre-construction vibration study prior to project approval. Any specified mitigation and monitoring shall be incorporated into construction contracts.	Less Than Significant Impact.
	N-3A: A new policy shall be added to the Noise Hazards section of the Safety Element that states the following: S-7.x No construction activities 500 feet of a noise sensitive land use during the evening hours of Monday through Saturday, or anytime on Sunday or holidays shall be allowed prior to completion of a noise mitigation study. Noise protection measures, in the event of any identified impact, may include: ▪ Constructing temporary barriers, ▪ Using quieter equipment than normal, or, ▪ Temporarily relocating affected persons (hotel vouchers). **N-3B:** A new policy shall be added to the Noise Hazards section of the Safety Element that states the following: S-7.x Standard noise protection measures shall be incorporated into all construction contracts. These measures shall include: ▪ Construction shall occur only during times allowed	Less Than Significant Impact.

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significant after Mitigation
	by ordinance/code unless such limits are waived for public convenience; ▪ All equipment shall have properly operating mufflers; and ▪ Lay-down yards and semi-stationary equipment such as pumps or generators shall be located as far from noise-sensitive land uses as practical.	
	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is required.	Less Than Significant Impact.
4.9 Biological Resources		
Impact BIO-1: Potential Adverse Impact on Special-Status Species. **[Also Cumulative Impact]**	*All Special Status Species – Program Level* **Mitigation Measure BIO-1.1:** Baseline Inventory of Landcover, Special Status Species Habitat, Sensitive Natural Communities, Riparian Habitat, and Wetlands in Monterey County **Mitigation Measure BIO-1.2:** Salinas Valley Conservation Plan to preserve habitat for the San Joaquin kit fox in the Salinas Valley *All Special Status Species – Project Level* **Mitigation Measure BIO-1.3:** Project Level Biological Survey and Avoidance, Minimization, and Compensation for Impacts to Non-Listed Special-Status Species and Sensitive Natural Communities. **Mitigation Measure BIO-1.4:** By 2030, prepare an Update to the General Plan to identify expansion of existing focused growth areas and/or to identify new focused growth areas to reduce loss of natural habitat in Monterey County. **Mitigation Measure BIO-1.5**: By 2030, prepare a Comprehensive County Natural Communities Conservation Plan.	2092 -- Significant Unavoidable Impact.
Impact BIO-2: Potential Adverse Effects on Sensitive Riparian Habitat, Other Sensitive Natural Communities and on Federal and State	**Mitigation Measure BIO-1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5** as described above under Impacts to Special Status Species.	2092 - Significant

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significant after Mitigation
Jurisdictional Waters and Wetlands **[Also Cumulative Impact]**	**Mitigation Measures BIO-2.1, 2.2 and 2.3** as described above.	Unavoidable Impact.
4.11 Public Services and Utilities		
Impact PSU-8: Development and land use activities contemplated in the 2007 General Plan may result in a need for new solid waste facilities or non-compliance with waste diversion requirements. Future solid waste facilities would have a significant effect on the environment.	**2092** The County will add the following policy to the 2007 General Plan: Policy PS-5.5 The County will review its Solid Waste Management Plan on a 5-year basis and institute policies and programs as necessary to exceed the wastestream reduction requirements of the California Integrated Waste Management Act. The County will adopt requirements for wineries to undertake individual or joint composting programs to reduce the volume of their wastestream. Specific mitigation measures to reduce the impacts of future solid waste facilities are infeasible because the characteristics of those future facilities are unknown.	Buildout - Significant Unavoidable Impact.
4.12 Parks and Recreation		
	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact.
	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact.
4.13 Hazards and Hazardous Materials		
	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact.
	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact.
	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact.
.	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is	Less Than

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significant after Mitigation
	necessary.	Significant Impact.
4.14 Aesthetics, Light, and Glare		
Impact AES-1: Implementation of the 2007 General Plan would result in a substantial adverse effects on scenic vistas. **[Significant Cumulative Impact]**	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is available.	Significant Unavoidable Impact.
Impact AES-2: Implementation of the 2007 General Plan could result in the degradation of scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. **[Significant Cumulative Impact]**	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is available.	Significant Unavoidable Impact.
Impact AES-3: Implementation of the 2007 General Plan would substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of Monterey County. **[Also Cumulative Impact]**	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is available.	2030 - Significant Unavoidable Impact. Buildout - Significant Unavoidable Impact.
Impact AES-4: Implementation of the 2007 General Plan could create substantial new sources of light and glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	No mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan policies is available.	2030 - Significant Unavoidable Impact. Buildout - Significant Unavoidable Impact.
4.15 Population and Housing		
Impact POP-1: Implementation of the 2007 General Plan would induce population growth in unincorporated Monterey County.	No feasible mitigation beyond the 2007 General Plan goals and policies is available.	2030 - Significant Unavoidable Impact. Buildout - Significant Unavoidable Impact.
4.16 Climate Change		
Impact CC-1: Development of the 2007 General Plan would contribute considerably to cumulative GHG emissions and global climate change as the County in 2020 would have GHG emissions greater than 72 percent of business as usual conditions. **(Cumulative Impact in 2092)**	**CC-11 (Same as BIO-1.9):** By 2030, prepare an Update to the General Plan to identify expansion of existing focused growth areas and/or to identify new focused growth areas to reduce loss of natural habitat in Monterey County and vehicle miles	Buildout - Cumulatively Considerable Impact.

Issues/Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significant after Mitigation
	traveled The County shall update the County General Plan by no later than January 1, 2030 and shall consider the potential to expand focused growth areas established by the 2007 General Plan and/or the designation of new focused growth areas. The purpose of such expanded/new focused growth areas would be to reduce the loss of natural habitat due to continued urban growth after 2030. The new/expanded growth areas shall be designed to accommodate at least 80% of the projected residential and commercial growth in the unincorporated County from 2030 to buildout. **CC-12**: Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan Requirements Beyond 2030 In parallel with the development and adoption **of** the 2030 General Plan, Monterey County will develop and adopt a Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan with a target to reduce 2050 GHG emissions by 80 percent relative to 1990 emissions. At a minimum, the Plan shall establish an inventory of current (2030) GHG emissions in the County of Monterey; forecast GHG emissions for 2050 for County operations and areas within the jurisdictional control of the County; identify methods to reduce GHG emissions; quantify the reductions in GHG emissions from the identified methods; identify requirements for monitoring and reporting of GHG emissions; establish a schedule of actions for implementation; and identify funding sources for implementation.	