

Recommended Changes to January 2004 Draft GPU

Current Provision	Proposed Change	Comment
Policy Choice LU1 (Page 45 ff)	Reword to state that the GPU will supply land in the unincorporated area to meet the population growth predicted by AMBAG, and that the GPU seeks to focus new unincorporated area growth into the Community Areas of Pajaro, Castroville, Boronda, and the former Fort Ord, since new growth in these Community Areas will accomplish three major public policy objectives: (1) help upgrade and revitalize these areas; (2) minimize fiscal impacts; (3) best protect agricultural and natural resource lands.	The most important achievement of the new GPU should be to establish a new “pattern” for growth, minimizing development in the unincorporated areas, and fulfilling growth needs within the incorporated cities and in the designated Community Areas. Other changes may also need to be made, to conform other provisions of the GPU to the change recommended here.
Rancho San Juan (Pages 47-48)	Pages 47-48 (<u>Material Added is Underlined</u>, Material Removed in Strikeout Form): [Retain Map Designating Area] Rancho San Juan – The map depicts designation of the Rancho San Juan Community Area. <u>A Specific Plan for this area is currently under consideration by the Board of Supervisors. Consideration of the Specific Plan is an outgrowth of two decades of planning for potential urban growth in this area.</u> The 1982 General Plan identified Rancho San Juan as an area of development concentration (ADC) study area. The Greater Salinas Area Plan (GSAP), adopted in 1986, specifically designated 2,000 acres of Rancho San Juan as an ADC in order to provide for the county’s long-term need for residential and economic growth. The GSAP provided policy direction on the types of land uses, rate of growth, and the requirement for a more detailed Specific Plan prior to development of the area. In 2002, the county began preparation of a Specific Plan, consistent with the general policy direction of the GSAP and the overall Guiding Objectives of this updated General Plan. The Specific Plan addresses the ADC area as well as immediately adjacent lands to the south and east that are either vacant or underutilized (see map below). <u>If the Board of Supervisors adopts a Specific Plan for Rancho San Juan,</u>	Development of the Rancho San Juan Area is totally inconsistent with the Twelve Guiding Objectives upon which the GPU is supposed to be based. <u>In addition, if the proposed development of Rancho San Juan is included in the GPU, as per the current text, the environmental analysis done on the Draft GPU document is totally inadequate, and makes the EIR and the GPU legally vulnerable.</u> Admittedly, the County has an obligation to consider the proposed Specific Plan. That is a separate planning matter, and should not be included in the Draft GPU. If and when the Board of Supervisors adopts a Specific Plan for Rancho San Juan, then that plan should be included within the General Plan as an amendment. The language suggested accomplishes this. It does not “preclude” Rancho San Juan (since the Board of Supervisors has a legal obligation to consider the Specific Plan). On the other hand, it makes no commitment in advance of full analysis and public review, either.

	<u>this Specific Plan will be incorporated into the General Plan, and Rancho San Juan will then be considered a "Community Area."</u> The Specific Plan is being prepared generally to conform to the requirements for a Community Plan laid out in this General Plan, and will be treated as a Community Plan for the Rancho San Juan Community Area. During the General 2004 update of this Plan Update process, the Board of Supervisors considered the GSAP policies and mapping of the Rancho San Juan ADC in light of the General Plan's Guiding Objectives. The Board decided that Rancho San Juan continues to be an appropriate location for urban growth, that it should be designated a Community Area, and that the boundary should be expanded to include the former ADC area as well as adjacent lands where urban development has already occurred or where there is potential for urban growth. The ADC designation, therefore, was replaced with the Community Area designation in the 20034 Plan update of this Plan. The Board later decided that an expansion area to the north and east (see map at left) should also be considered to focus new growth away from the prime agricultural lands in the Salinas Valley and to respond to local property owner requests for urban development. In order to ensure that this expansion area is feasible for urban-level development and for the extension of urban infrastructure and services, this area will be incorporated into the Capital Improvement Program and Environmental Impact Report. If the expansion area is found to be feasible for urban development, a Community Plan shall will need to be prepared. In its discussions about Rancho San Juan and the greater Salinas area in general, the Board of Supervisors also considered the possibility of designating the River Road area off of Highway 68 for future urban growth. In the 1982 General Plan, River Road was identified as another area of development concentration (ADC) study area and, in 1983, the county officially designated it as an ADC. This ADC was bounded by Pine Canyon Road on the east, River Road on the north, Highway 68 on the west, and Toro Regional Park on the south, excluding the St. John's College and Marks properties. Also excluded were two prime	Conforming Changes will be needed, including but probably not limited to changes on Pages 31, 36, 46, 47, 53, 62, 86, 121, 246, 250, 252, 494, and 495, and in the GPU Appendices. The following change on Page 63 should also be made: "Redesignate a Tier I Rural Center to a Community Area where there is local community support for urban-level development and public services and infrastructure can be made available. If development of Rancho San Juan does not occur, also consider redesignation of the River Road area from a Rural Center to a new Community Area."
--	---	---

	agricultural parcels located at the southwest corner of Pine Canyon and River Roads. Among the development criteria established for this ADC was a residential density requirement of one unit per gross developable acre. Since adoption of the River Road ADC, several residential developments, such as Las Palmas Ranch and Indian Springs Ranch, have been built at one unit per gross acre densities. During the development of the General 2004 update of this Plan Update in 2002, there was much public debate over the following development options for this area: 1) the existing developed areas should be recognized, but not expanded; 2) the one unit/acre density zoning should be extended farther south along River Road to Parker Road, or 3) the area should be designated a new Community Area with a full mix of urban uses, including medium to high residential densities (7 units/acre and higher), retail and service businesses, offices, community parks and open space, and public water, sewer and other urban-level infrastructure. In its deliberations, the Board of Supervisors considered the inconsistency of allowing more development along River Road at a one unit/acre density in light of the focused growth strategy of the General Plan, the high cost of providing adequate infrastructure and services to such low density development, and the sufficient amount of urban land supply already identified in the designated Community Areas. Ultimately, the Board decided to designate the one unit/acre density areas that have already developed along River Road as a Rural Center (replacing the ADC designation) and to preserve the surrounding Rural Lands at a one unit/40 acre density. The Board also expressed a desire to reconsider the River Road area for a Community Area designation at a later time if development of the Rancho San Juan Community Area does not occur. Areas of Development Concentration (ADC) is a term used in the 1982 General Plan to describe where growth was planned in unincorporated areas. This term has been replaced with the Major Land Group, entitled “Community Areas,” in this updated General Plan.	
Pine Canyon (Page 49)	Delete	These provisions in the draft GPU send a signal that the Pine Canyon area is a desirable area for

		new development. That's not true, and development here would not be compatible with the Twelve Guiding Objectives. It's fiscally irresponsible, as well, and will cause future problems for both the County and the landowners/developers. If specific sites are needed for true affordable housing developments, such sites should be specified, and the housing policies we recommend should be applied.
San Lucas (Page 49)	Delete	These provisions in the draft GPU send a signal that the San Lucas area is a desirable area for new development. That's not true, and development here would not be compatible with the Twelve Guiding Objectives. It's fiscally irresponsible, as well, and will cause future problems for both the County and the landowners/developers. If specific sites are needed for true affordable housing developments, such sites should be specified, and the housing policies we recommend should be applied.
Urban Land Supply Within Community Areas (Page 50)	Delete	The GPU should provide the amount of land needed—not more. Providing more land sends the signal that more development is desired. Since demand for residential housing from outside Monterey County is extreme (as pointed out in the Economic Impact Analysis) it's critically important to send the right signal to the market. The right signal is “land supplies to meet predicted needs, not growth in excess of those needs—and focus the growth in the few Community Areas that we want to sustain and revitalize, and where we can most economically provide the infrastructure.
Affordable Housing Overlay (Page 51)	Delete. Our recommended housing policy is below. It should be added at the appropriate place in the Housing Element:	The so-called “Affordable Housing Overlay” would result in non-focused residential developments that would not meet the Twelve Guiding Objectives, and that would also not produce enough genuinely affordable housing for

	<u>[New]</u> <u>Goal H-2 – Residential Growth Goal</u> <u>Provide significant new affordable housing opportunities in the unincorporated portions of Monterey County, focusing that development in the communities of Boronda, Castroville, Pajaro, and the former Fort Ord; balance new job creation with the creation of new housing opportunities for those who will fill the new jobs; and specifically promote the construction of housing that will be affordable to current Monterey County residents and workers.</u> <u>[New]</u> <u>Policy H-2.1 – Housing Unit Allocation System -- Beginning in the year 2005, Monterey County shall establish an annual “housing unit allocation” for the unincorporated portions of Monterey County, based on new jobs created in the unincorporated portions of Monterey County during the previous year. This housing unit allocation shall be based on AMBAG job data. Each year, the housing unit allocation shall allocate the number of new housing units necessary to provide new housing for the workers in new jobs created in the unincorporated portions of Monterey County during the previous year, and shall not exceed that number. The housing unit allocation shall be divided into segments specifically designated for very low income, low income, moderate income, workforce, and market rate housing, according to the income level of the jobs created in the unincorporated portions of Monterey County during the previous year.</u> <u>Any person wishing to build one or more residential housing units in the unincorporated portions of Monterey County shall be required to obtain a housing unit allocation for each such unit, prior to obtaining a building permit. Housing unit allocations shall be made available for residential housing units created in the very low, low, and moderate income</u> local workers and residents. If the “Affordable Housing Overlay” policy is eliminated, as recommended here, changes will have to be made throughout the GPU. These comments do not identify every change needed. Our recommended alternative would truly achieve affordable housing goals, specifically linking new jobs and housing, and profoundly stimulating affordable housing developments, in the areas where the County can best serve such developments.
--	---

segments only for housing units restricted to remain available to persons in that income category upon each subsequent sale and resale of the unit. The County may make the annual housing unit allocation available on a “first come first served” basis, or on the basis of a competitive system established by the Board of Supervisors. Any unused housing allocation, in any segment, may be carried forward from year to year.

To promote the construction of housing affordable to current residents and workers of Monterey County, projects that meet the following requirements (“exempt projects”) will not be required to obtain a housing unit allocation, prior to obtaining a building permit. However, all housing units constructed within exempt projects for persons in the very low, low, median, and moderate income levels shall be restricted to remain available to persons in the same income category upon each subsequent sale and resale of the unit. Market rate units included within projects that include exempt units shall be required to obtain a housing unit allocation, and shall be given first priority to receive such an allocation. The following projects are “exempt projects”:

- Single family homes on legal lots of record.
- Farm labor housing projects constructed consistent with state law, and specifically including any redevelopment, renovation, and improvement of existing Farm Labor camps, as long as such redevelopment, renovation, and improvement remains within the physical boundaries of the existing site
- Projects under ten acres in size which provide a minimum of 10% very low, 20% at median (not more than 100% AMI), 20% moderate (100-120% AMI) and no more than 20% Workforce I and 10% Workforce II housing, and in which the remaining 20% of units are either moderate or below moderate.

- Projects over 10 acres in size which provide a mix of rental and for-sale housing, and which provide a minimum of 20% very low, 10% low (defined as not more than 60% AMI), 15% median (not more than 100% AMI), 15% moderate, and 40% Workforce housing, with not more than 25% of the total units in Workforce II housing.

All exempt projects except single family homes on legal lots of record and farm labor housing projects constructed consistent with state law must also:

- 1) Be located within a Community Area identified in the General Plan.
- 2) Provide one or more of the following amenities, open to public use: public open space or recreation space, a community center, a community garden, day care facilities, after school centers, or a senior center.
- 3) Provide adequate public services and facilities to serve the project including availability of public water and sewer...
- 4) Be of demonstrably high quality design.

[New]

Policy H-2.2 New Housing Directed to Community Areas – All new urban development in the unincorporated portions of Monterey County shall be directed to the Community Areas of Pajaro, Castroville, Boronda, and Fort Ord.

[New]

Policy H-2.4 Community Area – Specific Plan Requirements – Specific Plans shall be completed for Pajaro, Castroville, Boronda, and Fort Ord prior to the construction of any non-exempt housing development in

	those Community Areas. <u>Exempt projects may be approved in these areas prior to completion of specific plans. Specific plans shall comply with Land Use policies LU-3.7 and 3.8.</u>	
Cities and City Spheres of Influence (Pages 51-52)	Delete	If the County wants to include a discussion of the interrelationship between city and unincorporated area development, that would be fine. However, since this is the County General Plan, it should not make statements about what cities should do. LAFCO is the agency with jurisdiction to oversee the issues discussed in this section. Any “city-county” agreements should be accomplished through the LAFCO process, since LAFCO is an agency that gives equal weight to both cities and the County. “Rural Centers” are <u>not</u> areas in which the County should be attempting to stimulate development. Fiscal, traffic, and natural resource protection policies will all be undermined if landowners and developers are directed towards development in rural areas. The County should be directing new development into the Community Areas, and making it work there! The Commission might well consider a rule that is <i>tougher</i> than the 40-acre minimum, and that essentially <i>maintains existing parcel sizes in the rural areas, unless there is a specific and definable reason to permit subdivision.</i> The Twelve Guiding Objectives call for discouraging “new development” in rural areas—where “new development” means “subdivision.” There are thousands of existing lots of record in the unincorporated area which can be “developed” with a house and other amenities, without the need to create more such parcels
Policy Choice LU2 (Page 52 ff)	Delete	
Policy Choice LU3 (Page 54 ff)	Maintain the 40-acre minimum (<u>at a minimum!</u>) Delete other discussion.	

		through subdivisions. Existing lots provide ample opportunities for persons wanting to enjoy a rural lifestyle. In terms of what makes sense for the <i>public</i>, rural subdivisions should be discouraged because of their impact on traffic, natural resources, and the County's fiscal condition.	
Goal LU-1 (Page 60)	Delete current language. Replace with new. [New] <u>Provide a land supply that will meet, and in no case exceed by more than 20%, the long range (20-year) and short range (5-year) population growth projections for Monterey County established by the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, and phase future growth and development based on the carrying capacity of the infrastructure and environment.</u>	Lynn Burgess of the County GPU Staff has said that a "buffer" of 20% might be appropriate to ensure that land made available by General Plan policies is actually available for development at the time needed. There is <u>no good reason to provide three times as much land as AMBAG projections say is necessary to accommodate predicted population growth</u>. The current draft GPU encourages residential development to meet out of county market demand. This will have terrifically adverse impacts on water, traffic, and fiscal conditions within Monterey County. Changing the amount of land designated for development is one of the most important changes necessary to the draft GPU!	
Policy LU-1.1 (Page 60)	Eliminate	The cities have resisted efforts by the County to tell the cities how to grow. Since the County has no direct jurisdiction over the cities, it is best to remove such language wherever it's found in the County GPU. This is the policy that makes the current draft of the GPU a "big growth" plan. Changing the amount of land designated for development is one of the most important changes necessary to the draft GPU! Make available what's necessary, not three times as much!	
Policy LU-1.2 (Page 60)	Renumber. Restate to conform to Goal LU-1, above: <u>New urban development in the unincorporated portions of the County shall be directed to the Community Areas of Pajaro, Castroville, Boronda, and Fort Ord. Together with existing lots of record in the unincorporated County, these areas provide a land supply that will meet the County's fair share of regional housing needs and accommodate growth over the short and long range.</u>		
Policy LU-2.1 (Page 61)	Eliminate "Rural Centers"	The County should "keep it simple," and "make the tough choices now." Mostly, new growth should go into the cities. Growth that must be	

		accommodated in the unincorporated areas can and should go onto existing lots of record, and into designated Community Areas. Developing “Rural Centers” is contrary to the basic idea of the Twelve Guiding Objectives.” If Rural Centers are eliminated, as recommended in these comments, conforming changes will have to be made throughout the draft General Plan Update. These comments do not attempt to note all the needed changes.
Policy LU-2.4 a. (Page 61)	Reorder. Place “Cities” first in the list	The “first priority” for the future growth of Monterey County should be its cities. Therefore, this Major Land Group should be listed first, in the Urban Areas list. See earlier comment.
Policy LU-2.4 b. (1) (Page 61)	Delete reference to “Rural Centers.”	If Rural Centers are deleted, as recommended, a number of conforming changes must be made throughout the GPU. This list of comments and recommendations does not attempt to specify each change needed. As an example (and an important conforming change) the “Rural Centers” entries must be deleted from the Table on Page 96, which establishes service standards and development policies for the Major Land Groups. As noted elsewhere in these comments, the “concurrency” and “phasing” requirements in the Draft GPU are exceedingly complex, and may be internally contradictory in places. For instance, concurrency is required for Rural Centers in one policy (Rural Centers LU-5.7) and NOT required in another (Rural Centers LU-5.8). Concurrency does not seem to be required for Rural Lands (Rural Lands, LU-6.1 and LU 6.3) or for Agriculture Lands (Ag Lands, LU-7.4). All the references must be conformed and made internally consistent.

Policy LU-2.4 b. (2) (Pages 61-62)	Restate the language relating to “Rural Lands,” as follows: Rural Lands – This category is characterized by <u>low density residential development and estate lots, small-scale farming, and grazing and mineral extraction activities, pockets of low-density residential development, individual homes on large lots, and small groupings of visitor-serving uses or commercial businesses that serve the local area. These lands have rural levels of areas have inadequate public infrastructure and services to accommodate further subdivision or intensification of land uses on existing lots beyond the first single family home or small scale neighborhood serving commercial uses.</u>	Combines aspects of “rural lands” with “rural centers,” which are recommended to be eliminated as a separate category.
Policy LU-3.1 (Page 62)	Definition Description of Community Areas – Community Areas are defined as unincorporated lands that are served, or are planned to be served, with a full range of urban services, such as public water and sewer, an extensive road network, public transit, safety and emergency response services, parks, schools, trails and open space. Community Areas include a balanced mix of medium to high-density residential uses, retail and service businesses, offices and industrial development. <u>In combination with existing lots of record, they are located and sized to accommodate the full share of the 20-year population projections for the unincorporated portion of the County, with an additional 25% increment of land to assure adequate choice and selection of site locations for new development.</u> Delete Rancho San Juan Specific Plan area. Delete b. “Second Phase” Community Areas Eliminate d and e	Development beyond the Community Areas is not necessary.
Policy LU-3.2 (Page 62)		See earlier comments
Policy LU-3.5 d and e (Page 63)		These recommended strategies are inconsistent with the Twelve Guiding Objectives, and should be removed.
Policy LU-3.6 (Pages 63-64)	Prioritize County Investment in Communities – The County shall establish as a priority target <u>its</u> investments to support the infill and redevelopment and expansion of Community Areas as a priority. The County shall focus investment in Community Areas in order to maximize the County’s goals for creating compact, livable communities	Eliminates language referring to “second priority” areas. There is no reason to plan for contingencies that would work against the Twelve Guiding Objectives.

	that provide a broad mix of housing types, opportunities to live and work in the same community, retail services meeting the daily needs of local residents, fiscally supporting urban services and infrastructure, as well as open space corridors, trails and pedestrian amenities. Of the designated Community Areas, the five identified as the first phase in Policy LU-3.2 Fort Ord shall be given the highest first priority, with Fort Ord given the highest priority due to its ability to provide workforce housing in proximity to the major employment center on the Monterey Peninsula. The planning for second priority for planning comprises the remaining Community Areas identified as the second phase in Policy LU-3.2 shall occur in the following priority order: Rancho San Juan (Specific Plan area), Castroville, Pajaro, and Boronda. The potential Community Areas of Pine Canyon, San Lucas and expanded Rancho San Juan shall be the next priority areas for planning, if they are found to be feasible for urban level development and extension of urban infrastructure and services. If any second phase Community Areas are found to be infeasible, they shall be considered for redesignation to a Rural Center.	
Policy LU-3.7 (Page 64)	Phasing Based On Adequate Roadway and Other Infrastructure Capacity – New development within Community Areas shall be phased in accordance with infrastructure improvement funding and construction program incorporated into each Community Plan, except as provided for in Policy LU-10.2. Projects that provide <u>affordable and workforce housing consistent with the requirements of Policy H-2.1 are expected to reduce traffic on the regional road network and may proceed prior to adoption of any county road impact fee program pursuant to Policy LU-10.2, and in advance of Specific Plans and infrastructure improvement and construction programs (See Policy LU-3.8). Urban development in the Community Areas of Pajaro, Castroville, Boronda, and Fort Ord shall be mitigated by a road impact fee program prepared as part of the Community Plan for each Community Area, and these areas shall be given the highest priority for outside. This program shall cover road and other infrastructure and service improvement needs within each Community Area. Community Area development within the first phase</u>	Provides incentives for the construction of affordable housing inside Community Areas.

	Community Areas (see Policy LU-3.2) may proceed in advance of improvements to the regional road corridors listed in Table C-1 and the local County roads listed in Table C-2. However, Community Area development shall be required to participate in any applicable regional or local road impact fee program that is adopted for these improvements. Roads and other infrastructure improvements needed to serve Community Areas shall be given the highest priority for funding and construction throughout the unincorporated area. To ensure proper correlation with the Circulation Element, development within the Expanded Rancho San Juan Community Area may commence only after funding and construction of the Prunedale Bypass. Development within the Pine Canyon and San Lucas Community Areas may commence only after a determination that there is housing needed relative to job creation within the Central Salinas Valley and South County Planning Areas. Prior to development of the San Lucas Community Area, this area shall also need to be annexed into a local fire district. Interim uses in accordance with Policy LU-3.10 are permitted.	
Policy LU-3.8 (Page 64)	Community Plans - A Community Plan or Specific Plan shall be prepared for each Community Area, using private or public funding or both. The Specific Plans shall seek to preserve and enhance the quality, integrity and community identity of the existing unincorporated community, and encourage a full mix of urban uses in a compact, livable design. Preparation of the <u>Community Specific Plans</u> shall be directed and administered by the County and adopted by the Board of Supervisors and processed concurrently with any General Plan amendments related to them. <u>Community Specific Plans</u> shall include an impact fee and construction program for roads and other infrastructure and shall meet strive to achieve the design criteria in Policy LU-3.9. Specific Plans may be prepared in lieu of Community Plans for Fort Ord and Rancho San Juan and shall comply with the same design criteria as for Community Plans in this General Plan. Community Plans shall be prepared first for Fort Ord, Castroville, Pajaro, and Boronda. Upon completion of plans for these areas, Community Plans shall then be prepared for Pine Canyon, San Lucas, and expanded Rancho San Juan, if	Specific Plans are clearly defined in the State's General Planning and Zoning Law, and it is recommended that this term be used, instead of "Community Plan." If this recommendation is accepted, conforming changes will be necessary throughout the GPU. These comments do not identify every change needed.

	these areas are found to be feasible for urban development in the order prescribed in Policy LU-3.6 above. Community Plans shall be adopted by the Board of Supervisors and processed concurrently with any needed General Plan amendments. The Rancho San Juan Specific Plan currently being prepared shall be treated as the Community Plan for the Rancho San Juan Community Area	
Policy LU-3.9 (Pages 64-65)	Design Criteria and Permitted Land Uses for Community Areas – The County shall assure that Community Plans and Specific Plans for Community Areas incorporate Community Plans and Specific Plans for Community Areas shall strive to achieve <u>shall incorporate</u> these design criteria and other design requirements which will help to create healthy and balanced communities: a. Compact, mixed use development pattern with urban-level services and infrastructure; b. Diversity of housing types, including housing at least 40% of the units priced to assure that at least 40% of the units meet the needs of the local workforce, <u>with 20% priced to be affordable to individuals or families who earn not more than 100% of the Area Median Income.</u> c. Balanced mix of uses, containing neighborhoods, schools, parks, open space, retail establishments and workplaces; d. Mix of medium to high residential densities, with a minimum of 7 units per acre and a maximum of 30 units per acre. At least 50% of residential areas shall be planned at an average density of 10 units per acre or higher within each Community Area; e. An Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) allowed in addition to the principal residence on single family residential lots; f. Residential development at a density lower than 7 units per acre, where allowed, is subject to agricultural and open space mitigation fees or participation in a purchase/transfer of development rights program to offset the inefficient use of land resources; g. Flexibility in road design and level of service standards to create a transit-friendly and walkable community design, yet maintain appropriate access for emergency vehicles h. Innovative parking design to reduce amount of surface parking and encourage shared parking and other creative	Effective “policy” statements are direct, and do not use language like “strive to.”

	options; i. Trails and related amenities required included so that development is more conducive to bicyclists and pedestrians; j. Transit-oriented facilities and design features used that encourage transit use and reduce the need for automobile trips; k. Connection to regional and sub-regional infrastructure systems; l. Public infrastructure and services in place concurrent with new development (see definition of “Concurrency”) and no reduction of levels of service for adjacent development below the standards in Table PS-1 in the Public Services Element, based on a road construction plan and local impact fee program; m. No reduction of levels of service for adjacent development below the standards in Table PS-1 in the Public Services Element; n. One hundred percent of the funding to construct and maintain needed infrastructure and services is provided within the community, as documented in a Capital Improvement Program, although certain regional or sub-regional facilities may be funded by Caltrans or other sources; o. Best available technology and best management practices for energy and water conservation provided in all development and infrastructure; and p. Environmental impacts mitigated to the extent feasible through a master EIR and design standards incorporated to minimize negative impacts.; q. Incentives for transfer of TDR credits into Community Areas.	
Policy LU-3.9 b (Page 65)	Reward: Diversity of housing types, including at least 40% of the units priced to meet the needs of the local workforce, <u>and restricted to ensure that such housing will continue to be available to persons in the local workforce upon each subsequent sale and resale.</u>	It is critically important that housing initially “priced” for the local workforce will continue to be available to the local workforce, as subsequent sales and resales of that housing occur. A provision to this end is included in the recommended housing policy.

Policy LU-3.9 f (Page 65)	Eliminate	Community Areas should not be “underdeveloped.” These are the areas where new growth should be focused, so the land needs to be used efficiently.
Goal LU-4 (Page 66)	Renumber. Make the “Cities” the <u>first</u> Major Land Group listed, followed by ‘Community Areas.’ The current draft has this reversed.	Most new development is to go into the “Cities.” Therefore, that Major Land Group should be listed first, followed by “Community Areas.”
Policy LU-4.1 (Pages 66-67)	Delete	See earlier comments. However valid these ideas, it is not really appropriate for the County’s General Plan to tell the cities how they should grow. These kinds of requirements can actually be imposed by LAFCO, by making them a requirement for annexation.
Policy LU-4.3 (Page 67)	Incorporate LU-4.1 policies into this statement.	It is not presumptuous for the County to indicate what it hopes LAFCO will do with reference to these issues, because LAFCO is legally charged with making decisions about these matters. It’s different when the County says that “City growth should occur in accordance with the following...”
Policy LU-4.4 (Page 67)	Eliminate	The “County” sends representatives to LAFCO, but the Board cannot direct their vote. The Policy in LU-4.3 is enough, if expanded to include the concerns listed in LU-4.1.
Goal LU-5 (Page 68)	Delete entire section, including the goal and policies.	Keep it simple! If the County General Plan is to be true to the Twelve Guiding Objectives, then the County should not be planning for new subdivisions and new growth outside of the Community Areas.
Policy LU-6.3 (Page 73)	Delete reference to Affordable Housing Overlay Area. It would be <u>better</u> to eliminate any reference to new subdivisions of Rural Lands, but that would require a change in the 40-acre minimum subdivision policy. If the Commission adopts our recommendation to allow subdivisions in Rural Lands only to achieve a limited set of specific objectives, then this policy will need to be reworded consistently.	Conforming change
Policy LU-6.8 (Page 74)	Reword: The County shall discourage General retail and service businesses within Rural Lands shall be sited <u>only except</u> on small commercial-designated sites located at key crossroads.	This is a small but clear example of how to modify the Plan to “make the tough choices now.” The current language does not really establish a “policy” about the commercial development of

		rural lands, and would let anyone propose anything, since the language says only that the County should “discourage” (as opposed to “prohibit”) dispersed commercial developments in the county’s rural areas. If it’s better to locate rural commercial developments on small commercially zoned parcels at key crossroads, then the General Plan policy should say that in a clear and definitive way. The policy language for agricultural lands (LU-7.11) is an example of how the policy should be stated.	Unless the language is changed, the County’s discretion is undermined.	Change “Agriculture” lands to “Agricultural” lands throughout, to conform to normal grammatical usage (These comments do not change every reference). “Discourage” is not a “policy” word, and does not guide any specific result. This kind of language should be eliminated. The specific policies in the Plan will determine exactly what uses will be permitted where, and under what conditions. This language is not needed in a “description” of agricultural lands.
Policy LU-6.9 (Page 74)	Bed and Breakfast Facilities - Bed and breakfast uses shall may be allowed with a use permit and considered a compatible land use in Rural Lands, provided that the facilities are designed to blend with the rural environment and that all impacts generated by guests and employees are mitigated.			
Policy LU-7.1 (Pages 74-75)	Description of Agriculture <u>Agricultural</u> Lands - Agricultural Lands are unincorporated areas that have a special combination of the best soils, favorable growing climate, large landholdings, and generally adequate water supplies to support long-term commercial agricultural operations. Predominant uses are farming, grazing, agricultural processing plants and other agricultural support facilities. Non-farm residences are discouraged, except for limited residential clustering on less intensive grazing lands where the remainder parcel is placed in a permanent conservation easement. The Agriculture Lands category also comprises includes some pockets of industrial <u>lands designated for</u> industrial use. lands, with primarily agriculture industrial uses. In the future, Only agriculture-related industrial uses may be developed in the future <u>on such lands</u>, except on parcels designated Heavy Industrial where general industrial uses <u>currently exist</u>. <u>On those parcels, currently existing general industrial uses may continue to be the principal use.</u> This category also includes mineral extraction operations (oil, rock, sand and gravel).			
Policy LU-7.3 (Page 75)	Agriculture Conservation Programs – The County shall establish and maintain programs to enhance the long-term			Reword for clarity

	viability of agriculture, such as Right-to-Farm notification, Transfer of Development Rights and Purchase of Development Rights programs, Williamson Act contracts, conservation easements, agricultural buffers, and mitigation for farmland conversion to urban development. Agricultural conservation <u>buffers and easements</u> or other conservation requirements shall <u>may be provided by willing property owners, although they may be or may be imposed as a condition of approval for cluster subdivisions or other non-agricultural uses.</u>	
Policy LU-7.7 (Page 76)	Subdivisions Within Agriculture Lands – The County shall not <u>permit</u> subdivisions within Agriculture Lands <u>only</u> when a proposed subdivision can be demonstrated <u>to these divisions</u> that preserve the long-term agricultural viability of the site, and do when the proposed subdivision will not negatively impact the agricultural viability of adjoining parcels, consistent with the minimum parcel size requirement of the underlying land use designations. Cluster developments, meeting all the requirements of pursuant to any cluster subdivision program developed under Policy LU-9.9, are an exception to the minimum parcel size requirement; however, such developments shall be required to demonstrate the same long-term agricultural viability of the remainder parcel on-site and adjoining parcels as a conventional subdivision.	Reword for clarity
Policy LU-7.10 (Page 76)	Bed and Breakfast Facilities – Bed and breakfast uses shall <u>may</u> be allowed with a use permit and considered a compatible land use in Agriculture Lands provided that the facilities are designed to blend with the environment and that all impacts generated by guests and employees are mitigated.	If discretion is going to be exercised, the proper word is “may.” Where the result is predetermined by the policy, the proper word is “shall.” It is confusing to say that something “shall” be done, subject to a discretionary permit.
Policy LU-7.12 (Page 77)	Non-Soil Dependent Uses – The County shall disallow new greenhouses, mushroom farms, and similar agriculture enterprises that are not on-site soil dependent or that degrade soil capabilities on Prime Farmlands and Farmlands of Statewide Importance, except as provided within Special Treatment Areas. This policy shall not limit uses accessory to soil dependent uses.	Retain this policy. Contrary to testimony before the Planning Commission, this policy statement does not “disallow greenhouses.” The policy prevents the construction of greenhouses that degrade prime soils. (If you’re going to build a greenhouse with a concrete floor, that doesn’t have to go on lands containing agricultural soils).
Policy LU-7.15 (Page 77)	Farm Equipment Storage Facilities – Farm equipment storage facilities, <u>including facilities that serve off-site agricultural operations, not a part of the same farming or</u>	If discretion is going to be exercised, the proper word is “may.” Where the result is predetermined by the policy, the proper word is “shall.” It is

	<u>ranching operation, shall</u> may be allowed, subject to approval of a discretionary permit, within agricultural land use designations and shall be sited to minimize the conversion of viable agricultural lands. Such facilities are defined as buildings and land used to provide storage of a range of farm equipment, such as trucks, trailers, buses, harvesters, tractors, plows, fertilizer spray rigs and water tenders, used in off-site agricultural activities. Farm Equipment Storage Facilities that serve off-site agricultural operations, not a part of the same farming or ranching operation, shall be considered with a use permit application.	confusing to say that something “shall” be done, subject to a discretionary permit.
Policy LU-9.4 (Page 79)	House Size Limitations – If a local Land Use Advisory Committee (LUAC) finds that limitations on the size of single family homes within its Planning Area is are warranted in order to preserve community character and conserve the significant environmental resources of the area, the <u>LUAC may</u> County may give direction to the LUAC to develop recommended size standards for inclusion into the County’s zoning ordinance. These size limitations may apply within the <u>Rural Centers and Rural Lands Major Land Groups</u>. The County shall review and consider the LUAC recommendations in the same manner as other ordinance amendments.	Makes clear that LUACs are able to make recommendations on House Size Limitations (which, of course, the Board of Supervisors can either approve or not, as they ultimately determine is best).
Policy LU-9.7 (Page 80)	Lot Mergers—The County does not support the involuntary merger of legal lots of record rendered substandard in size by this General Plan, and merger of such parcels shall not be required absent an immediate threat to health and safety. Lot mergers resulting from voluntary participation in a transfer of development rights program or other voluntary means consistent with the Subdivision Map Act may be allowed.	This is a complicated area, and the Board of Supervisors should retain full legal discretion to handle lot merger issues on a case by case basis.
Policy LU -9.9 (Page 80)	Residential Cluster Development – The County shall <u>may</u> develop a residential cluster subdivision program for subdivisions in Rural Lands and Agriculture Lands as an alternative to conventional subdivisions where the clustered subdivision will not increase the number of currently existing parcels, and where clustering: 1) would achieve greater permanent protection of agricultural land or significant environmental resources; or 2) would protect the most valuable farmland from non-agricultural uses; and where clustering 3) would will not result in land use	The current provisions would appear to promote new residential development in rural and agricultural areas. That would directly contradict the Twelve Guiding Objectives. The provisions recommended here will allow the County to achieve the benefits of clustering without opening up the County’s vast rural and agricultural land base for residential development.

conflicts between the clustered homes and adjacent agricultural uses; ~~and 4) would not~~ or overtax the County's ability to provide adequate infrastructure and services within rural or agricultural areas. Any such residential clustering program shall provide that residential clusters will should be directed away from prime farmland and environmentally sensitive areas; ~~should be designed to limit the size of the clustered lot area in order to better protect the resource land; and should be monitored on an ongoing basis to assess the cumulative impacts of multiple cluster developments by Planning Area to ensure adequate infrastructure and services are available. Cluster subdivisions within Agriculture Lands shall also comply with the provisions of Agriculture Element Policy AG-1.6. All cluster subdivisions shall meet the following design criteria:~~

- ~~a. Alternative subdivision option available to property owners on voluntary basis;~~
- ~~b. Overall gross density same as conventional subdivision;~~
- ~~c. Maximum of 10% of the property may be used for the residential cluster, including clustered lots and all associated infrastructure and agricultural buffer (as needed), with remainder of parcel placed in permanent agriculture conservation or open space easement. A permanent agriculture conservation easement is required for all cluster subdivisions within Agriculture Lands;~~
- ~~d. Maximum of three clustered lots per subdivision, with no more than one single-family home allowed per lot;~~
- ~~e. Clustered lots are each between 1 acre and 2.5 acres in size;~~
- ~~f. Clustered lots must be sited: 1) away from Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance or Unique Farmland (as defined by the State Department of Conservation FMMP); 2) away from environmentally sensitive lands; 3) outside of hazardous areas (as defined in the Health and Safety Element); 4) outside of scenic viewsheds and stream setbacks; 5) on slopes less than 30%; and 6) within one-half mile of a public roadway;~~
- ~~g. The applicable public facility standards in Public Services Element Table PS-1 shall be met. Monterey County General Plan Draft Land Use Element~~
- ~~h. Clustered lots must be designed compatible with the~~

	character of the rural area, using variable lot sizes and configurations that blend with the natural features of the site and that minimize grading. i. A Right to Farm notice must be recorded for each clustered lot to protect nearby farmers from potential nuisance claims. j. Once 30 residential lots have been created through cluster subdivisions within a single Planning Area, the county shall conduct a fiscal impact analysis of providing adequate public infrastructure and services throughout the Planning Area. This analysis shall also identify what infrastructure or service improvements need to be made, if any, and the financing mechanism required to achieve the standards of Table PS-1. The improvements will need to be constructed and a financing plan established prior to the approval of further cluster subdivisions within the Planning Area. & Fiscal Impact Analysis is a commonly used method to estimate a local government's ability to afford services. It describes the capital costs and operating fiscal impacts associated with growth.		
Policy LU-9.10 (Page 81)	Transfer of Development Rights – The County shall develop a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program aimed at reducing the potential number of new dwelling units on small parcels in rural areas and promoting permanent conservation of agriculture and open space lands outside of urban areas. This program shall be designed to encourage landowners with substandard-sized lots in Agriculture Lands and Rural Lands (“sending areas”) to transfer a TDR credit from such lots to Community Areas, Cities, and City Spheres of Influence (“receiving areas”). This program shall be voluntary and include incentives to encourage participation. The County shall incorporate incentives into Community Plans to encourage developers to purchase available TDR credits and transfer them into Community Areas. The County shall coordinate with cities through city/county agreements to provide similar incentives within Cities and their Spheres of Influence. In the development of this countywide TDR program, the County shall consider allowing development credits from the Big Sur Transfer of Development Credits program to be transferred to Community Areas, pursuant to Big Sur Policy LU-52. The	The Board should retain maximum discretion to design the most effective TDR program possible. It would be premature to outline program elements in advance.	

	County shall monitor transactions and easements to assure consistency with the overall Objectives of this Plan. Sending areas shall be prioritized and phased into the program based on the size of the receiving areas available, in order to ensure a viable program. In order for Untill city/county agreements are approved to add Cities and their Spheres of Influence as receiving areas, a sending area parcel to shall qualify for a TDR credit, only if it must by meeting all of the following criteria: a. Legal lot of record at least one acre in size; b. Substandard parcel size, relative to the applicable minimum parcel size standard of this General Plan; c. An underlying zoning district that permits a single-family residence as a principal use; and d. No Williamson Act contract, agricultural conservation easement or open space easement in effect.	
Policy LU-9.17 (Page 83)	Change slope restriction to 25%. Eliminate the word “historically,” and rephrase as follows: “There shall be no cultivation of land on slopes greater than 25%, unless such land was in legally-permissible cultivation prior to January 1, 2004. “Legally-permissible cultivation” means the disturbance of the soil for the purpose of planting or growing of harvestable crops that was done in compliance with all laws applicable at the time. It does not include grazing of livestock, or the cutting or removal of native grasses or vegetation.”	This is an area of the draft General Plan Update in which existing environmental protection standards appear to be weakened. The 25% slope standard is far more protective of the natural environment, and should be utilized in this policy. The word “historically” should be deleted because it further weakens the existing slope protection ordinance by appearing to grant exceptions for anyone who might claim to have cultivated the steep slopes at sometime in the past, and could even allow slopes up to 50% or greater to be impacted. The economic benefits of winery development are unquestionable. However, the Winery Corridor policy contained in the current GPU draft suggests an extremely extensive development for areas of the county that are rural, agricultural, and have incredible scenic beauty. The policy, as currently written, would allow the greatest part of this proposed development, including extensive commercial development, to move forward without even a public hearing process. Furthermore, the policies seem designed
Policy LU-9.19 (Pages 84-85)	Designated Winery Corridors – The County shall <u>General Plan</u> designates three winery corridors within the Salinas Valley, with a two-pronged goal: 1) to achieve a balance between the wine grape production and wine processing capacity within the county, and 2) to enhance the marketing capabilities of the industry to promote local Monterey County wines. The three designated winery corridors are: 1) Central/Arroyo Seco/River Road Corridor, 2) Metz Road Corridor, and 3) Jolon Road Corridor (See Maps LU-3A and 3B at the end of this Element).	

	The County anticipates that the following uses may be developed W within the three designated winery corridors; the following criteria shall apply to winery development based on the environmental analysis conducted for this General Plan: a. Up to 40 artisan wineries; subject to an administrative permit; and 10 full-scale wineries; subject to a use permit; may be constructed b. A maximum of 40 five-acre or larger sized lots may be created for such artisan wineries, as follows: (1) Up to 24 such lots may be located within the Central/Arroyo Seco/River Road Corridor; (2) Up to four such lots may be located within the Metz Road Corridor; and the remaining (3) Up to 12 such lots may be located within the Jolon Road Corridor; (2) The creation of a five-acre lot or any lot smaller than the zoning minimum parcel size will not be permitted unless the remaining parcel still conforms to the minimum parcel size of the underlying zoning district; (3) For any new five-acre or larger lot created that is less than the minimum parcel size of the underlying zoning district, the only allowable use of such lot shall be a bonded and licensed artisan winery; (4) One residential unit and one guest house up to 600 square feet in size may be approved as an accessory use with each new artisan winery, subject to the same discretionary permit requirements as the associated principal use; and (5) All owners of the original parcel and new lot created shall record a deed restriction providing that, if after five years from recordation of a final parcel map creating a lot that is less than the minimum parcel size of the underlying zoning district, actual construction of an artisan winery has not commenced, such owners shall petition the County to revert lot to acreage pursuant to the Reversion to Acreage provisions of the Subdivision Map Act, or that the County may revert the lot to acreage upon learning that the lot no longer meets the criteria. The discretionary permit for the	to exclude the need for CEQA analysis of developments that might very well have a mammoth environmental impact—and the CEQA analysis done at the GPU stage is clearly not detailed, and sufficient really to let the public (or the Board of Supervisors) know what the impacts of the proposed policies would be. The only legally appropriate way to proceed is to require the preparation (and environmental review) of a comprehensive winery corridor development plan. Following the recommendations made here will make sure that the County does not inadvertently allow developments that will undermine the beauty that makes the designated corridors attractive in the first place.
--	--	--

	artisan winery shall be processed concurrently with any preliminary subdivision map creating a lot that is less than the minimum parcel size of the underlying zoning district. c.-Up to five new full-scale wineries may be located within the Central/Arroyo Seco/River Road Corridor, as follows: (1) Up to two such wineries may be located within the Metz Road Corridor; and (2) Up to three such wineries may be located within the Jolon Road Corridor. d. Up to three wineries (existing as of the date of adoption of this General Plan Update) located within the Central/Arroyo Seco/River Road Corridor may add a winery-tasting facility, with a maximum size of 2,500 square feet, to the existing operation; one winery (existing as of the date of adoption of this General Plan Update) located within the Jolon Road Corridor may add a winery-tasting facility, with a maximum size of 2,500 square feet, to the existing operation. Such winery-tasting facilities shall require an administrative permit. e. Up to five new stand-alone winery-tasting facilities, with a maximum size of 2,500 square feet, may be located within the Central/Arroyo Seco/River Road Corridor; up to two such facilities may be located within the Metz Road Corridor; and up to three such facilities may be located within the Jolon Road Corridor. Such facilities shall require an administrative permit. f. d. The following <u>uses</u>, <u>to be</u> <u>are</u> allowed on the same site as a winery or other visitor-serving use (e.g., produce stand) within the designated corridors: • A restaurant • A delicatessen • A tasting room • <u>One residential unit and one guest house up to 600 square feet in size</u> <u>The County shall prepare a Comprehensive Winery Corridor Development Plan, subject to full environmental review, prior to any new winery development within the designated</u>
--	--

	<u>Winery Corridors.</u> <u>Individual winery developments within the designated Winery Corridors, including any associated uses and any proposed land division, shall be subject to a use permit.</u> <u>The County shall closely monitor development within the designated Winery Corridors, and every five years, beginning on the date that the Comprehensive Winery Corridor Development Plan is adopted, the Board of Supervisors will assess whether such development is causing environmental or other impacts that require modification of the General Plan, or any other action to protect the public health, safety, and welfare.</u> <u>(1) A total of three new restaurants, with no more than one in each designated corridor; and</u> <u>(2) A total of five new delicatessens, with no more than three located within the Central/Arroyo Seco/River Road Corridor and no more than one delicatessen within each of the remaining two designated corridors.</u> <u>A monitoring program will be conducted at five-year intervals. This program will assess if the impacts were correctly anticipated and mitigated in the environmental analysis conducted for this Plan and, if not, what additional measures should be taken.</u> <u>This policy is not intended to limit the overall development of wineries in the County. Wineries outside of the designated winery corridors may be and additional wineries within the corridors (beyond those specifically listed in this policy) are allowed, consistent with the policies of this General Plan, subject to conformance with the all regulations of the underlying zoning district.</u>	
Goal LU-10 (Page 85)	Eliminate Goal and associated policies.	See comments at the very beginning of these recommendations.
Goal LU-11 (Page 87)	Eliminate Goal and associate policy	This "Special Treatment Area" concept is definitely a concept that will have some landowners receiving "special treatment." In fact, this is how an otherwise effective General Plan can be made susceptible to political cronyism and

		personal influence. It is imperative that the General Plan establish policies that reflect the public interest, and that <i>treat everyone equally</i>. The “Special Treatment Area” policy invites special privileges for those with special relationships. There is no policy in the current draft more worthy of rejection.
Provisions relating to development phasing, tiering, concurrency, etc. (Throughout the GPU)	Reduce the complexity contained in the current draft. Do so by directing growth into designated Community Areas, and by requiring infrastructure to be provided concurrently, subject to the incentive exceptions for affordable housing, outlined in the recommended affordable housing policy.	The proposed Monterey County General Plan Draft limits the location and timing of new development based on a dizzying gauntlet of requirements (phasing, tiering, planning, concurrency, etc.). We believe that the “system” currently found in the GPU can be summarized as outlined below—though the system is so complex that we may not have completely described it. This complex system will be extremely difficult to administer. We recommend replacing this system with a simple system—new unincorporated growth will be directed to a limited number of Community Areas; and an infrastructure concurrency requirement will require adequate services and infrastructure prior to development, but including an incentive exception for affordable housing projects, as outlined in our proposed Housing Policy. Here is the complex system required by the current draft: First Up: In the proposed Affordable Housing Overlay Areas (Land Use Map 5) housing can proceed in Community Areas and Rural Centers identified on the Map in two phases in advance of the completion of Community Plans (for Community Areas) and Infrastructure and Financing Plans (for Rural Centers. Development

in Affordable Housing Overlay Areas gets to proceed in advance of Community Plans, etc., because they are expected to reduce traffic! (Policy LU-1.3). Phase I Affordable Housing Overlay Areas can proceed in advance of the adoption of a regional road impact fee program. (See Policy LU-10-2.)

Next Up: Proposed Tier I Community Areas are deemed appropriate for urban development in the immediate future totaling 8,830 acres for a total of 10,567 new housing units. [Keep in mind the County's housing needs allocation between now and 2008 is only for about 2500 units and for the twenty year period – about 7500 units.] These developments can proceed in advance of improvements to regional corridors, but must pay impact fees. (Policy LU-3.7.) Community Plans must be completed before they can develop to full potential except as follows. Prior to completion of Community Plans and construction of needed infrastructure and services, development in these areas is limited to: 1) land divisions to create parcels no smaller than 40 acres; 2) development on existing lots; 3) development under adopted redevelopment plans; and 4) Affordable Housing Overlay Areas per Map LU-5 -- all with the requirement that project-related services/infrastructure are adequate.

Up Third: Proposed Tier II Community Areas are deemed appropriate for urban development if found to be feasible for urban development and infrastructure. These areas add 2,626 acres for a potential of 6,068 new units in the following areas:

- Pine Canyon
- Expanded Rancho San Juan
- San Lucas

Up Fourth: Rural Centers can develop if an infrastructure and financing study is completed – but the Plan no longer contains the required voter approval to upgrade services prior to

		development. Until then, new subdivisions above 1 unit per 40 acres are prohibited. However, Affordable Housing Overlay Areas can proceed per Land Use Map 5 areas in advance of Infrastructure and Financing Plans if services are available for the project. • Tier 1 – Rural Centers that have the potential to become Community Centers within the 20-year time-frame, including Bradley and San Ardo. • Tier II – Rural Centers that have some infill potential and limited subdivision potential once infrastructure improvements are completed, including Aromas, Chualar, Del Monte Forest, (Tier IIA) and Las Lomas, Lockwood, Moss Landing, Mouth of Carmel Valley, Pleyto, Prunedale (Tier IIB). • Tier III – Rural Centers are built out or little interest in more development including Carmel Highlands, Carmel Valley Village, Corral de Tierra/San Benancio, Mid-Carmel Valley, River Road, Spreckels, Toro Park Last: Residential Cluster Areas in Ag and Rural Lands (no numbers specified).
		These changes will strengthen the requirement that transportation infrastructure be in place prior to or concurrent with new development.
Policy C-1.4 (Pages 118-119)	Policy C-1.4 Performance Standards – - Average Daily Traffic (ADT) volumes representing functional capacity shall be determined for each roadway segment based on the functional classification of the road, as well as capacity analysis consistent with the Highway Capacity Manual. - Level of Service (LOS) standards shall be used to determine acceptable levels of peak hour travel for all County roadway system segments. [Deleted review and reconsideration of LOS during the five-year review]. Level of service standards must be maintained by new	

	development and mitigation measures implemented at the time of construction of the first residential unit or commercial/industrial building, using peak hour and daily traffic volumes, consistent with subsection c below. c. New development shall be phased per the policies of the Land Use Element to ensure adequate road capacity. Level of service standards shall be defined for the Major Land Groups as follows [Deleted Rural Centers and Affordable Housing Overlay Areas]: (1) Rural Lands: The Level of Service standard shall be LOS C on County roadway segments in the Rural Lands Major Land Group, pursuant to Table PS-1. New development in Rural Lands shall be phased pursuant to LU-5.3. (2) Agriculture Land: The Level of Service standard shall be LOS C on County roadway segments in the Agriculture Lands Major Land Group, pursuant to Table PS-1. New development in Agriculture Lands shall be phased pursuant to LU- 7.4. (3) Community Areas: The Level of Service standard for roads within Community Areas shall be LOS D, except where lower standards are determined through Specific Plans. New development in Community Areas shall be phased pursuant to LU-3.7	
Policy C-2.5 (Page 121)	Community Plans and Road Improvements - As part of the development of Community Plans, the County shall identify needed road improvements to accommodate planned land uses, potential funding sources, and the projected level of service for roads within each Community Area. Lower levels of service on state highways and regional corridors under the jurisdiction of TAMC shall not impede development in the Community Areas of Fort Ord, Rancho San Juan, Castroville, Boronda, and Pajaro. Lower levels of service on local roads under the County's jurisdiction also shall not impede development in these initial five Community Areas.	Both Rancho San Juan (which we recommend be eliminated from the General Plan at this time) and the proposed development on the former Fort Ord are essentially "new" developments. Development in these locations should not proceed without appropriate infrastructure. Unless the recommended deletions are made, the development of Rancho San Juan and the Fort Ord Community Area will lead to massive traffic and congestion problems, affecting current workers and residents.
Policy C-2.6 (Pages 121-122)	Transit/Pedestrian and Transit-Oriented Development —The	Eliminate. Other provisions of the General Plan

	County shall support the development of Pedestrian (POD) and Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) projects within Community Areas and Affordable Housing Overlays Overlay areas. Potential for POD and TOD projects shall be considered within a 1/2-mile radius around intermodal stations, Monterey County General Plan—Draft Circulation rail stations, bus stations, and key transit corridors. Zoning within TOD/POD/TOD areas shall allow for a higher density and intensity of development, allow mixed use development, and reduced building setback requirements. TOD/POD/TOD shall be a component of the Community Area Plan planning process for each Community Area.	are adequate.
Policy C-3.10 (Page 124)	Truck Bypasses—Truck bypass or diversion projects shall be designated and developed in order to channel through truck traffic around Community Areas or sensitive land uses. Sensitive land uses include, but are not limited to, residences, day-care centers, and health and educational facilities.	Eliminate. Maps also need to be amended to delete these environmentally-damaging and growth inducing proposed new roads.
Policy C-4.5 (Page 126)	Winery Corridors – After adoption of a Comprehensive Winery Corridor Development Plan, the County shall improve those Roadways designated as Winery Corridors <u>as necessary shall be improved</u> to accommodate the <u>any</u> projected increase in visitor and truck traffic due to development of the winery industry along these roads, <u>provided, however, that the Future future</u> development of these corridors shall be limited to operational and safety improvements, <u>and that the Comprehensive Winery Corridor Development Plan shall not permit winery developments that would require capacity improvements, and must All</u> improvements shall protect the scenic beauty of the roads, <u>and shall be sensitive to be</u> designed to <u>maintain</u> existing speeds limiting speeds, maintaining agricultural operations, and accommodating, accommodate equestrians, and bicyclists, and pedestrians. Class I bicycle facilities shall be incorporated wherever feasible and appropriate. Development of wineries and related uses shall also comply with Land Use Element Policies LU-6.3 and LU-7.4.	One reason to require a Comprehensive Winery Corridor Development Plan is to ensure that the new development of the winery corridors does not lead to significant circulation problems.
Policies C-4.6 and C-4.7 (Page 126)	Emergency Access - The County shall encourage adequate access for emergency evacuation in Rural Centers, Rural Lands, and Agriculture Lands in the event of an earthquake, wildland fire, flood, or other disaster by requiring the most	This list of recommended changes does not catch all references to “Rural Centers,” but if our recommendation to eliminate Rural Centers is adopted, these policies should be changed to

	efficient use of roadways for emergency vehicles and emergency access. Emergency roadway connections shall be developed where distance to through streets is excessive, or a where a second means of emergency ingress or egress is critical. Coordination - Traffic and roadway planning initiatives in Rural Centers, Rural Lands, and Agriculture Lands will be coordinated with emergency management agencies including the development and maintenance of an emergency evacuation plan for use in the event of severe weather or catastrophic event. Retain	conform.
Goal C-9 – Trails (Pages 130-131)		We favor retention of the Trails provisions found in the current draft GPU.
Policy C-10.1 (Pages 131-132)	Funding Priorities – The County shall prioritize improvements to the roadway system, ensuring that allocation of funding for transportation maintenance and improvement projects serving anticipated growth within Community Areas will be available. The County shall also give high priority to improvement of existing roadways, the completion of transportation projects that are already underway, and planned or programmed transportation projects consistent with this policy and identified within the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The following projects will be given top priority. County supports the following improvements <u>projects</u>: Internal County traffic: • Highway 68 Bypass <u>or other improvements that will improve circulation on the current Highway 68 corridor</u> • Highway 156 widening • Salinas Westside Bypass with Blanco Road widening Regional Traffic: • Highway 101 Prunedale <u>Improvement Project Bypass</u> • Highway 1 widening <u>operational and safety</u>	This restatement will provide significantly more funding to deal with the major existing traffic problems affecting the current workers and residents of Monterey County, in lieu of constructing a brand new road to handle new traffic generated by commuting from the Silicon Valley.

	<u>improvements</u> from Castroville to Santa Cruz County line	
[New] Incorporation Of Alternative Transportation Strategies In Project Design	The County shall compile and maintain a “list of alternative transportation strategies.” This list shall include project and community design standards and techniques that have been demonstrated in Monterey County, or in other jurisdictions, to be effective in achieving any of the following objectives: • Reducing automobile use, and especially reducing single vehicle automobile trips • Encouraging and supporting the use of transit • Encouraging the use of bicycles and walking, for recreational purposes and as a primary mode of transportation. The list of alternative transportation strategies maintained by the County shall be updated and revised on an annual basis, to add additional standards and techniques that have been demonstrated, within Monterey County, or in other jurisdictions, to be effective in achieving the above objectives. All residential, commercial, industrial, and office developments within the unincorporated area shall utilize and incorporate all applicable techniques from the list of alternative transportation strategies, and the utilization and incorporation of the applicable standards and techniques into the development shall be made a condition of project approval. If the County finds that a technique on the list is not applicable to a particular development project, that finding must be supported by one or more facts found in the administrative record.	This recommended provision will help, incrementally, provide alternative transportation options, as new development proceeds.
[New] Conditions Recommended By TAMC and Monterey Salinas Transit	When an application is filed for a residential, commercial, industrial, or office development within the unincorporated area, the County shall promptly provide the Transportation Agency for Monterey County and Monterey Salinas Transit with a copy of the plans and specifications, and shall request these agencies to recommend changes or conditions that can achieve any of the following objectives:	Again, this recommended provision will help, incrementally, provide alternative transportation options, as new development proceeds.

	• Reducing automobile use, and especially reducing single vehicle automobile trips • Encouraging and supporting the use of transit • Encouraging the use of bicycles and walking, for recreational purposes and as a primary mode of transportation. Recommendations from the Transportation Agency for Monterey County and Monterey Salinas Transit shall be incorporated into the project, and shall be made conditions of project approval, unless the County determines that the recommendations would be ineffective in achieving one or more of the above objectives, or that the benefits provided by imposing the requirement would be disproportionately small, compared to the cost or difficulty of implementing or carrying out the requirement.	
[Alternative Provision For Concurrency]	New residential, commercial, industrial, or office developments shall mitigate any transportation impacts caused by the development. If a proposed development would cause any road segment or intersection identified in the Circulation Element of the General Plan to experience an unacceptable level of service, or if the development would cause additional traffic impacts on any such road segment or intersection already experiencing an unacceptable level of service, the project shall not be approved; provided, however, that the project may be approved, despite the above, if all the following are accomplished: • A transportation or traffic mitigation measure is identified that will eliminate the unacceptable level of service on all affected road segments and intersections; • The installation, construction, or completion of that transportation or traffic mitigation measure is made a condition of project approval; and • The identified transportation or traffic mitigation measure is actually constructed prior to or concurrently with construction of the project. When any transportation facility is proposed, including any new expressway, highway, freeway, road, or street, and the proposed transportation facility would be constructed	This provision is a much simpler way to provide for “concurrency.” New roads often lead to the subsequent development and loss of commercially productive agricultural lands. This provision would prevent
[New] Protection For Agricultural Lands As		

New Roads Are Constructed	adjacent to or through land that this General Plan has designated for commercial agricultural use, it shall be a condition of project approval that prior to construction of the transportation facility a permanent agricultural land conservation easement shall be granted to a nonprofit or governmental agency; the conservation easement shall cover all those parcels containing agricultural land which are immediately adjacent to the proposed transportation facility, and shall require that such lands be maintained in permanent agricultural use.	that result.
[New] Proven Long-Term Water Supply: Reliance on Wells in Areas Experiencing Groundwater Overdraft	A water supply shall not be considered a “proven long-term water supply” if the water proposed to be supplied comes from a groundwater aquifer in which groundwater overdraft conditions exist, or in which such conditions can reasonably be expected to exist after the completion of approved but not yet constructed projects.	This policy completed the set of policies relating to “proven long-term water supplies.” It should be inserted into the GPU as PS-3.8, with other policies renumbered accordingly