

Comparison of Community General Plan Initiative (CGPI) and 2006 Monterey County General Plan (GPU4)

Description	CGPI – Measure A	GPU4 – Measure C
<p>Coverage</p>	<p>Amends '82 General Plan Land Use Element, North Coast Coastal Plan, and 2003 Housing Element. Excludes Big Sur, Del Monte Forest, and Carmel Local Coastal Programs. Other elements of '82 Plan are unchanged; they could be amended by Board of Supervisors without voter approval.</p>	<p>Updates all elements to the General Plan; excludes all Coastal Programs. Includes Agriculture and Winery Corridor Plan</p>
<p>Areas for Development</p>	<p>5 Community Areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pajaro • Castroville • Fort Ord • Boronda • Chualar <p>Lots of Record</p>	<p>7 Community Areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pajaro • Castroville • Fort Ord • Boronda • Chualar • Rancho San Juan • San Lucas <p>9 Rural Centers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prunedale • River Road • San Benancio/Corral de Tierra • Toro Park Estates • Lockwood • Pleyto • Bradley; San Ardo • Pine Canyon <p>16 Property Owners Requests (611 acres) 16 Special Treatment Areas (391 acres) 8 Study Areas (21 acres) 1,200 dwelling units outside Community Areas and Rural Centers 576 new units in Carmel Valley Lots of Record</p>

<p>Dwelling Units</p>	<p>10,620 units 18% over AMBAG 2030 growth forecasts for unincorporated area.</p>	<p>21,517 units 140% over AMBAG 2030 growth forecasts for unincorporated area.</p>
<p>Affordable Housing – Very Low, Low, Moderate and Workforce Income Housing; Farm worker housing; Accessory Units</p> <p>Calculations are based on Affordable Housing Requirements for each Plan</p>	<p>23% of units allowed under Initiative would be permanently affordable—2,440 units. Units offered first to County residents and workers. Developers must provide</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30% in 4 community areas for residential development of 20 or more units. • 40% for residential developments of 20 or more units on County-owned land in the Fort Ord Community Area (excludes East Garrison) • For less than 20 units, in-lieu fees adopted by the Board of Supervisors <p>Allows farm worker housing in Community Areas and on Rural and Agricultural Lands on legal lots of record. Allows accessory structures and secondary dwellings, (e.g., granny units) on legal lots of record.</p>	<p>16% of units allowed under GPU4 would be affordable—3,380 units. Supervisors have endorsed sale of these units after 15 years at market-rates with share of proceeds returned to County for reinvestment in affordable housing. Final action on ordinance scheduled for April. Developers must provide</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20% affordable housing in community areas and rural centers for residential development of 5 or more units. • 50% in areas outside of community areas and rural centers (approximately 600 dwelling units) • For 3-4 units, in-lieu fees adopted by the Board of Supervisors <p>Allows farm worker housing and accessory units.</p>
<p>Maximum Densities on Rural and Resource Conservation Lands</p>	<p>'82 Plan includes Area Plan land use maps with mapped maximum densities. These densities are frequently lower than the density range by land use category, e.g., Rural Grazing at 10 to 40 acres per unit.</p>	<p>All mapped maximum densities are deleted allowing for more dwelling units per acre in many areas.</p>
<p>Undeveloped Office, Retail and Industrial Land</p>	<p>7,657,000 sq. ft. within Community Areas. 67,222,000 sq. ft. outside Community Areas which can be developed as long as lot divisions are not required.</p>	<p>9,887,000 sq. ft. within Community Areas. 447,667,000 sq. ft. outside Community Areas.</p>
<p>Winery Facilities</p>	<p>'82 Plan allows for winery facilities and requires environmental review (CEQA) for most projects, e.g., wine processing and tasting rooms.</p>	<p>Includes Agriculture and Winery Corridor Plan which facilitates project approval by exempting small wine processing facilities and tasting rooms from environmental review (CEQA).</p>

<p>Level of Service (LOS) defines traffic congestion with LOS A being free-flowing and LOS F being the worst level of congestion with traffic demand exceeding capacity</p>	<p>The '82 Plan has LOS C as the standard (FEIR p. 296). LOS C generally means traffic moves at about 45 mph but is susceptible to congestion due to turning traffic.</p> <p>Many County roads are below LOS D. However, many rural areas have roads at LOS C. New projects in these areas causing LOS to drop below C are required to mitigate to LOS C (Policies 37.1.2 and 39.1.4).</p>	<p>Drops standard to LOS D (i.e., unstable traffic flow with traffic moving at about 40 mph). New projects causing LOS to drop below C would not be required to mitigate to LOS C. DEIR states (p. 4.6-29) that by 2030:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road segments operating at LOS E would increase from 15 to 33 (e.g., Hwy 101, Blackie Rd. to Orchard Lane) • Road segments operating at LOS F would increase from 14 to 30 (e.g., Hwy 1, northbound from Fremont St on-ramp to Hwy 218 off-ramp). <p>GPU4 commits to meeting LOS D on County roads by 2026; however, funding is not identified (Policy C-1.2).</p>
<p>New Daily Trips</p>	<p>129,000 to 132,000 New Daily Trips, a 29% increase over year 2000 daily trips for unincorporated areas.</p>	<p>231,000 to 273,400 New Daily Trips, a 52-61% increase over year 2000 daily trips for unincorporated areas</p>
<p>Agricultural Land Lost ⁽¹⁾</p>	<p>600 acres lost in Community Area. Retains '82 Plan prohibition against development on all other farmland except for property owners' families and farm worker housing. Requires voter approval to change designation of agricultural lands for development (26.1.3.1).</p>	<p>4,900 acres lost. Allows development on farmland when it can be shown that it would not be detrimental to agricultural viability of adjoining parcels. Criteria to show project impact not identified.</p>
<p>Cultivation on Steep Slopes</p>	<p>'82 Plan and zoning ordinance prohibit cultivation on slopes over 25-30%.</p>	<p>Allows cultivation on slopes over 15-30% with a permit. About 505,000 acres of private land are on slopes greater than 25%.</p>
<p>Biological Resources</p>	<p>'82 Plan has policies that protect <i>limited or threatened plant</i> communities, maintain wildlife habitat, and require consultation with the California Native Plant Society and measures that protect rare and endangered plant species and habitats remain unchanged. Limiting development to 5 Community Areas prevents encroachment into in biologically rich resource areas.</p>	<p>GPU4 addresses <i>listed</i> endangered State and federal species only and omits consultation with the California Native Plant Society. State and federal requirements protect listed endangered species.</p> <p>Maintenance of natural areas is <i>encouraged</i>, not required.</p>

<p>Provision of Infrastructure and Development</p>	<p>Roads/Infrastructure: New development shall be phased so that all necessary public infrastructure and services are completed prior to or concurrent with new development [26.1.4 (a)]. '82 Plan provides that developments consistent with the land use plan designations may be denied due to factors such as lack of public facilities and services, infrastructure phasing problems, water availability and sewage problems, or presence of environmental and/or plan policy constraints which cannot be mitigated.</p> <p>Water: New development within Community Areas shall not proceed without establishing that there is a permanently sustainable water supply available. County decision-maker is required to make a finding based on substantial evidence provided by the water supplier (or the landowner if there is no water supplier) that there is a permanent sustainable water supply [26.1.4 (b)].</p> <p>Single family units on lots of record would proceed under '82 Plan provisions.</p>	<p>Roads/Infrastructure: Subdivisions in Rural Centers that are consistent with specific requirements can proceed before preparing an Infrastructure and Financing Study and assuring a funding mechanism (Policy LU 2.29). Projects outside Rural Centers that reduce County roads to below LOS D require phasing programs so that development is concurrent with improvements that maintain LOS D (Policy C-1.2). Policy PS-1.5 allows development to start with only infrastructure phasing plan approved in concept.</p> <p>Water: Development located in an area that does not have a proven long term sustainable water supply that intensifies water use shall not be allowed (PS-2.3). No new development, except for the first single family dwelling, shall be approved without proof, based on specific findings and supported by evidence, that there is a long term, sustainable water supply (PS-3.1). Long term water supply is defined as available water supply that can be extracted from a basin to service the existing and projected development in that basin for 20 years without degrading water quality, damaging the economical extraction of water, or causing significant unavoidable adverse environmental impacts.</p>
<p>Maximum Emergency Response time for Fire, Sheriff and Ambulance</p>	<p>'82 Plan does not address maximum emergency response times.</p>	<p>Maximum emergency response times are 45 minutes for rural areas; 15 minutes for structural coverage in Rural Centers, and 5-8 minutes for structural coverage in Community Areas.</p>
<p>City-Centered Growth</p>	<p>Not a stated goal. Policies would not prevent cities from expanding onto farmland</p>	<p>Stated goal; however, policies would not prevent cities from expanding onto farmland</p>

Environmental Impacts	DEIR on GPU4 (p. 5-22) identified CGPI as the Environmentally Superior Alternative of all those considered – GPU3, GPU4, 1982 Plan and CGPI. All alternatives evaluated would avoid or substantially lessen several of the unmitigated significant environmental effects of GPU4 (FEIR, p. 42). DEIR on GPU4 (p. 5-21) identified the following significant impacts: agricultural resources; water resources; aesthetics, light and glare.	The 1/2/07 staff report identified the following significant unavoidable impacts: Loss of important Farmland; conflicts with Williamson Act contracts; agricultural and resource use soil erosion; groundwater overdraft; saltwater intrusion; roadway level of service on County and regional roads; visual character; light and glare; impacts to special status species; degradation in water quality from increased soil erosion; and erosion hazards.
Right to Vote	Requires voter approval for subdivisions in unincorporated areas outside of Community Areas, expansion of Community Area boundaries and change to designation of agricultural lands for development.	No provisions for allowing Monterey County voters to vote on subdivisions in unincorporated areas.
Initiative/Plan Development	The Initiative is based on the Community General Plan sponsored by 18 non-profit groups. Land use policies were developed at 7 workshops held throughout the county (2 conducted in Spanish) attended by hundreds from the community. Technical consultants developed the Plan based on public initiated policies. The Initiative was developed by representatives from many of the sponsoring groups with assistance from consultants.	The Board of Supervisors developed land use policies at 18 public hearings and workshops in Salinas. The County Planning Commission also conducted multiple hearings. Public comments were provided at public hearings and during review of the Plan. Technical staff developed GPU4 based on policies developed at these public meetings and comments submitted through the review process.
Plan Implementation	Policies and program are defined and complete except for development of Chualar and Pajaro Community Area Plans.	Over 60 policies require future implementation. Many problems (e.g., inadequate roadways) are identified but solutions are deferred.

(1) The DEIR finds, "Given that GPI has a much lower development potential relative to the 2006 General Plan..., it is reasonable to expect that smaller acreages of agricultural lands would be converted to non-agricultural uses..." However, based on the fact that the Initiatives does not have policies with respect to city growth as are proposed in GPU4, "...buildout of GPI would have greater impacts on agricultural resources than the 2006 General Plan." The DEIR does not quantify either the agricultural land converted as the result of development in the 5 community areas proposed under the Initiative or land that would be converted as the result of city growth. None of the policies in the Final GPU4 would prevent cities from expanding on to agricultural land. Additionally, GPU4 states that one of its goals is city-centered growth (Policy LU-2.14) in contrast to the Initiative which only focuses on growth in unincorporated areas. These findings contradict the conclusion in the DEIR. Thus, we find that the actual agricultural land lost under the Initiative would be 600 acres resulting from development within the 5 Community Areas as measured through GIS mapping and 4,900 acres for GPU4 as identified in the DEIR.

References and Sources: Monterey County 2006 General Plan; Monterey County Quality of Life, Affordable Housing, and Voter Control Initiative; Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report, 2006 General Plan; January 3, 2007 County Staff reports; Analysis of Monterey County General Plan & Quality of Life Initiative, Bay Area Economics, Feb. 2006; Room Enough, LandWatch Monterey County, 2002; 2004 Metropolitan Transportation Plan, AMBAG; AMBAG 2004 Population and Housing Forecasts; URBEMIS Model; GIS Mapping; The Nature Conservancy Public and Protected Lands; EIRs for Castroville Community Plan, East Garrison; Boronda Community Plan; Monterey County on-line permitting data. **Documentation available upon request.** Please see our websites: www.sv.ca.lwvnet.org or www.lwvmp.org.