

# State of Monterey County 1998

Land Use, the Environment, and Infrastructure:  
Status and Recommendations

*Prepared by*

**LandWatch**  
**monterey county**

Pacific Grove, California 93950

Phone: 408.375.3752

Email: [landwatch@mclw.org](mailto:landwatch@mclw.org)

WWW: [www.mclw.org](http://www.mclw.org)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1.0</b>	<b>Executive Summary</b>	
1.1	Findings.....	1
1.2	Recommendations.....	3
1.3	Areas of Future Study.....	4
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Summary of Indicators .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3.0</b>	<b>State of Monterey County 1998</b>	
3.1	Introduction.....	6
3.2	Population and Population Forecasts .....	6
3.3	Development—Approved and Pending Projects.....	7
3.4	Roads and Highways.....	15
3.5	Water Supply .....	16
3.6	Water Quality .....	17
3.7	Wastewater Treatment .....	17
3.8	Air Quality.....	18
3.9	Agricultural Land.....	18
3.10	Nonagricultural Land—Open Space .....	19
3.11	Affordable Housing.....	19
3.12	Schools.....	22
3.13	Economy .....	22
3.14	Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Species.....	24
3.15	General Plans.....	25
<b>4.0</b>	<b>References.....</b>	<b>26</b>

## 1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### 1.1 Findings

#### **Introduction**

*State of Monterey County 1998* is the first annual, comprehensive assessment of land use, the environment, and infrastructure for Monterey County. Prepared by LandWatch Monterey County, a nonprofit, public benefit corporation dedicated to promoting better land use planning, *State of Monterey County 1998* provides an integrated overview of population trends, land use patterns, traffic conditions, and various features broadly affecting the environmental health and economic vitality of Monterey County.

#### **Conclusions**

*State of Monterey County 1998* reveals significant inconsistencies among population projections, infrastructure capacities, and the general plans of Monterey County and the cities. Even if no further projects were approved today, Monterey County would still add 7,520 residential units, 685 hotel units, and about 1.5 million square feet of commercial, industrial, and visitor-oriented development. This growth would severely exacerbate the county's already serious problems of water supply, water quality, and traffic. The current population exceeds existing infrastructure capacity, including roads, water supplies, and schools, in many parts of the county.

Population growth and demand for housing are forcing development beyond the service boundaries of cities into relatively inexpensive farmland, particularly in the Salinas Valley. Low-density, leapfrog development encourages inefficient use of land, increased commuting, and consequently more crowded highways.

At the same time, housing costs throughout Monterey County are among the highest in the nation, creating a serious lack of affordable housing for many residents. Housing data are out-of-date or unavailable, hampering analysis. The most recent Regional Housing Needs plan was completed in 1990. Since then, no agency has prepared a comprehensive review of this report in relation to actual housing construction to assess whether housing needs for the county have been met.

Solving these problems and developing a rational plan to manage growth in a manner that will maintain the quality of life in Monterey County will require much greater cooperation and coordination among Monterey County and the cities. Even if there were agreement on how to address the demand for new infrastructure, the planning, funding, and construction process would take a minimum of five to ten years to complete. Moreover, developing new water supplies, water treatment facilities, and roads is costly. There is little indication that the voting populace will approve additional taxes necessary for these improvements without more consensus on the future direction of growth and development countywide.

#### **Trends**

*State of Monterey County 1998* reveals the following trends:

- **Population Trends.** Monterey County's population is projected to rise dramatically in the next 20 years, increasing 39%, from a current population of 386,200 to a projected population in 2020 of 537,000. In 1997 alone, Monterey County's population grew approximately 4.7%.
- **Urban Sprawl.** Much of this population growth will occur in the Salinas Valley where urban sprawl (commercial, industrial, and residential developments) will replace farmland and open space.

- **Approved and Pending Projects.** Monterey County and the cities have either approved or are considering the approval of 15,400 residential units, 1,145 hotel/motel units, facilities for 6,800 California State University at Monterey Bay (CSUMB) students, and 5 million square feet of commercial/industrial projects in the next five years. Development of 1,226 lots of record on the Monterey Peninsula (included in the 15,400 residential units) depend on the availability of additional water. Buildout of general plans or reuse of Fort Ord is not included in this analysis.

**Table 1—Total Approved/Unconstructed and Pending Projects**

Project Status	Dwelling Units	Commercial/ Industrial Sq. Ft.	Hotel Rooms
Approved/Unconstructed	7,520	1,450,210	685
Action Pending	7,880	3,607,072	460
<b>Total</b>	<b>15,400</b>	<b>5,057,282</b>	<b>1,145</b>

- **Traffic Congestion.** Highway congestion is measured on a scale of Level of Service (LOS) A to F, with F being the worst. The Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan has a goal to attain and maintain LOS C for the roadway network. Short-range goals are to allow no degradation below LOS D for urban roads now operating at LOS D or better; no degradation below LOS C for rural roads now operating at LOS C or better; and no degradation below existing LOS for all other roads.

Of the 14 major highway and road segments evaluated, three are at LOS D, four at LOS E, five at LOS F, portions of one at LOS D and F, and one at LOS E and D. Approved and pending dwelling units, expected growth at CSUMB, and visitor-serving projects would add 167,021 daily trips to already congested highways, an increase of 16% over 1997 daily trips.

In 1995, about 2,600 employed residents, representing 1.6% of total county workforce, commuted to jobs outside Monterey County. By 2020, about 11,000 residents, or 4.9% of the total workforce, are expected to commute to work outside of the county.

- **Water Supply.** The major population areas of the county have serious water supply problems. Population growth on the Monterey Peninsula surpassed the number of people that can be served under California American Water Company's (Cal-Am) production limits in the early 1990s. The Salinas Valley Ground Water Basin is overdrafted by 40,000 to 50,000 acre feet per year, or approximately 10% of the basin's safe yield. In North Monterey County, annual water extractions exceed average annual recharge by 100%. Approved and pending projects would require about 1,400 acre feet per year from Cal-Am and about 700 acre feet per year from other water supplies. CSUMB will require 850 acre feet per year from the Salinas Ground Water Basin.

- **Loss of Agricultural Lands.** Since 1982, the Board of Supervisors has redesignated 1,968 acres of farmland to urban uses. Of the 7,520 dwelling units approved yet unconstructed, 68% will be built on farmland. All these units will be built on farmland within cities. Some of the approved and unconstructed units will be built in the unincorporated area, but none of these will be on farmland. Of the 7,880 dwelling units under consideration but not yet approved, 61% would be built on farmland with 24% in cities and 37% in the unincorporated area. Close to 4.6 million square feet of commercial/industrial development—either approved and unconstructed, or pending—would be built on farmland.

- **Affordable Housing.** A key provision of California Housing Element Law is that each jurisdiction is responsible for providing housing that is affordable to all income groups. Data on low-income housing stocks is not readily available from most public agencies responsible for tracking housing. Preliminary data indicate that the supply of housing for low-income families is extremely limited.
- **Schools.** Of the 24 K-12 school districts countywide, 11 are beyond capacity and only four have facilities funded for construction.
- **General Plans.** The Monterey County General Plan is 16 years old. Most of its area plans are ten or more years old. Five city general plans are ten or more years old, with two of these currently being updated. State law requires planning agencies to "prepare, periodically review, and revise, as necessary, the general plan" [Government Code section 65103 (a)].

On the positive side:

- **Economy.** The gross sales of agricultural products increased by 17% in 1997 to total \$2.2 billion. In 1996, tourism throughout Monterey County was valued at \$1.4 billion, about 2.4% of statewide tourism spending. Retail sales grew by 7%, or \$156 million from 1995 to 1996. Monterey County added 3,800 jobs in 1997. In 1997, \$224 million was spent on the construction of new single-family residences, an increase of \$27 million; \$27 million on the construction of multi-family homes, an increase of \$1 million; and \$67 million on construction of new non-residential, commercial, industrial, and other non-residential developments, a decrease of \$11 million. Most new non-residential development was in Salinas (\$27 million) and unincorporated Monterey County (\$23 million).
- **Wastewater.** Existing wastewater treatment facilities throughout Monterey County have excess capacity.
- **Air Quality.** Air quality has improved in the past ten years. However, additional automobile emissions associated with projected population growth are expected to worsen air quality after 2020 unless additional air pollution controls are implemented.
- **Open Space.** Monterey County has approximately 510,500 acres of open space in federal forests and wilderness areas, over 191,000 acres in military property, 16,000 acres of state parks, 21,000 acres of County and regional parks, and 26,500 acres of land in trusts and other reserves. These lands total 765,000 acres.

## **1.2 Recommendations**

To address these disturbing trends, LandWatch's recommendations are generally aimed at slowing down the random, uncoordinated development throughout Monterey County in order to further assess the appropriate and specific measures that will prevent the deterioration of our quality of life. LandWatch recommends the following actions:

- Monterey County and the cities should enact immediate moratoria on any new subdivisions (greater than 25 units and not already legally vested) and General Plan amendments, until the cumulative impacts identified in this report are analyzed, mitigation measures approved, and General Plans adopted that are consistent with sound planning goals.

- Likewise, the Monterey County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) should not approve any further annexations until this assessment is complete and the problems identified in this report are addressed.
- Monterey County and the cities that have not updated their General Plans in the last five years (Carmel, Greenfield, Sand City, and Monterey) should update them.
- State law requires the County Planning and Building Inspection Department to provide an annual report to the legislative body on the status of the General Plan in its implementation [Government Code Section 65400(b)(1)]. It is a top priority for the County to respond to this legislative requirement immediately.

LandWatch believes these actions are a critical first step in assessing infrastructure constraints and funding requirements for sustainable growth as well as developing coordinated, comprehensive general plans to manage future growth.

### **1.3 Areas of Future Study**

LandWatch encourages further examination of the costs and benefits of growth, considering tax revenues, public services, housing needs, environmental constraints, infrastructure demands, and other planning issues. Areas for future study include:

- Balance between jobs, housing construction, residential zoning, and affordable housing.
- Availability of land within urban areas for in-fill and redevelopment.
- Relationship between zoning, property taxes, and the demand for public services.
- Relationship between tax revenues and planning and community development.
- Distribution of tax revenues among local jurisdictions.
- Per capita water consumption.
- Pollutants in rivers and Monterey Bay.
- Data on affordable housing needs (e.g., quantity and type of houses needed).
- Acreage of wetlands and other environmentally sensitive areas.
- Distribution of rare, threatened, and endangered species.

## 2.0 SUMMARY OF INDICATORS

LandWatch’s Summary of Indicators is Monterey County’s report card on land use, the environment, and infrastructure— a broad qualitative assessment of Monterey County’s planning for growth and preparation to meet the future. The ratings are based on a comparison of established standards, goals, or needs to data compiled in this report. An “A” indicates Monterey County excels in relation to a local, state or federal standard, a “B” indicates we are above average, a “C” is average, a “D” is below average, and an “F” connotes failure

Don’t be misled by attempting to "average" scores across different categories. Each parameter is unique and has its own value. For example, Monterey County generally has excess wastewater treatment, good air quality, large expanses of agricultural land, and plenty of parks and open space. High rankings in these areas do not offset the serious problems we have with roads and highways, water supply, and affordable housing; indeed, these parameters indicate constraints on future development.

LandWatch intends to update and refine this report card each year, noting trends in each category and examining the issues in greater detail.

**Table 2—State of Monterey County Report Card 1998**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Excels</b>				<b>Fails</b>
	A	B	C	D	F
Roads and Highways					X
Water Supplies					X
Water Quality				X	
Wastewater Facilities		X			
Air Quality		X			
Agricultural Land			X		
Open Space	X				
Affordable Housing					X
School Capacity				X	
Up-to-Date General Plan— Cities		X			
Up-to-Date General Plan— County					X

## 3.0 STATE OF MONTEREY COUNTY 1998

### **3.1 Introduction**

State of Monterey County 1998 is the first annual comprehensive assessment of land use, the environment, and infrastructure for Monterey County. Prepared by LandWatch Monterey County, a nonprofit, public benefit corporation dedicated to promoting better land use planning, State of Monterey County 1998 provides an integrated overview of parameters broadly affecting the environmental and economic health of the County in the following areas:

- Population trends;
- Development and land use trends;
- Affordable housing needs;
- Water supplies and water quality;
- Wastewater capacities;
- Air quality;
- Roads, highways, and traffic congestion;
- Economics;
- Schools;
- The status of local General Plans.

*State of Monterey County 1998* includes LandWatch's recommendations. We encourage all Monterey County residents to become familiar with the State of Monterey County and to play an active role in maintaining Monterey County's quality of life.

Most of the data included in this report were compiled from reports prepared by local agencies. However, LandWatch compiled and analyzed Section 3.3 (Approved and Unconstructed Projects and Pending Development), using data from environmental impact reports and local jurisdictions; no current list was available from local agencies.

*State of Monterey County 1998*, as the first report of its kind, establishes baseline data that can be evaluated regularly and compared from year to year. The State of Monterey County will be updated and refined annually, providing residents with the necessary information to track whether conditions are improving or worsening. We anticipate adding new parameters as data become available and plan to conduct more refined analyses as resources allow.

This first year's report was prepared in a short time to provide a context for current land use debates. We welcome your suggestions for future amendments.

### **3.2 Population and Population Forecasts**

The county's population has increased 33% since 1980 (Table 3) and is projected by the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) to grow another 39% by 2020 to a population over 536,000. Buildout of city and County general plans would allow for an increase of 55%, or about 600,000 people. AMBAG's population forecasts show that 83% of the growth will be in cities. The general plans, which typically do not have a time frame for "buildout" (the condition expected to occur when general plans are fully realized and reach their planned maximum population), show that 75% of the growth will be in cities. Depending on whether AMBAG's forecast or the general plans' estimation is accurate, we can expect approximately 17 to 25% of the growth to occur in the County rather than in existing cities where services are available and can be provided most efficiently.



**Table 3—Population Growth, 1980-1998**

Jurisdiction	1980 <sup>(1)</sup>	1998 <sup>(2)</sup>	Percent Increase
Cities	205,400	283,600	38%
Unincorporated	85,044	102,600	21%
Total	290,444	386,200	33%

**Table 4—Population Forecasts, 1998-2020 and 1998 to Buildout**

Jurisdiction	1998	2020 <sup>(3)</sup>	Percent Increase	Buildout <sup>(4)</sup>	Percent Increase
Cities	283,600	408,949	44%	443,664	56%
Unincorporated	102,600	127,660	24%	155,100	51%
Total	386,200	536,609	39%	598,764	55%

### **3.3 Development—Approved and Pending Projects**

The project list (Tables 5 and 6) includes two major categories of projects over 25 dwelling units or 40,000 square feet: (1) projects that have been approved and are unconstructed, and (2) projects with applications filed and legal lots of record where this information is available (pending projects). It includes development at California State University of Monterey Bay (CSUMB) through 2005, since the facility is a project planned and developed by the University alone, without the need for local jurisdiction approval. It excludes buildout of general plans and the reuse of Fort Ord, since these are long term blueprints for growth and development with full implementation occurring over an indefinite period of time, unlike the projects described in this report.

In the Approved/Unconstructed category, local jurisdictions have approved 7,520 dwelling units and 685 hotel/motel rooms. These uses will add 73,934 daily vehicle trips to our roads and highways. (Since residential trips account for working, shopping, and other trips, commercial/industrial trips have been excluded in order to avoid double counting; therefore, future trips are underestimated.) Construction at CSUMB through 2005 will add another 15,650 daily trips. Approved but unconstructed commercial/industrial projects total 1,450,210 square feet. These projects would require 124 acre feet per year from California American Water Company (Cal-Am) and 743 acre feet from water supplies other than the Salinas Valley Ground Water Basin or Cal-Am. CSUMB will require 850 acre feet per year from the Salinas Ground Water Basin by 2005. Water demand was not quantified for projects in the Salinas Valley where project demand would represent a decline over agricultural uses.

In the pending projects category, there are 7,880 dwelling units and 460 hotel/motel rooms in the planning process. These would add 77,437 daily trips to roads and highways. Pending commercial/ industrial projects total 3,607,072 square feet. These projects would require 1,388 acre feet per year from Cal-Am and 74 acre feet from water sources other than the Salinas Valley Ground Water Basin or Cal-Am.

Combining projects in both categories adds up to 15,400 dwelling units, 1,145 hotel/motel rooms, facilities for 6,800 CSUMB students, about 5 million square feet of commercial/ industrial uses for a total of 167,021 new trips, a 16% increase over 1997 levels. They would require 1,500 acre feet per year from Cal-Am and about 700 acre feet per year from other water sources. Aside from 850 acre feet per year for CSUMB, most of the projects requiring water from the Salinas Valley Ground Water Basin would consume less water than the agricultural uses they are replacing; however, once water is committed to urban growth, a long-term entitlement is created, and dry-year demand is increased

**Table 5—Approved and Unconstructed Projects by Jurisdiction**

Project	Jurisdiction	Description Dwelling Units (DUs)	Average Daily Trips (ADT)	Water Acre Feet/Year (AFY)	Reference	Status
Bishop Ranch	County	257 DUs	3,039	162	FEIR, pp.113, 149	Approved/ unconstructed
Canada Woods North and Canada Woods	County	108 DUs; 80,000 sf commercial; golf course	1,037 (DUs)*	147	Final Environ-mental Impact Report (FEIR) pp. 3-2; 4.8-10;4.4-15, 7-34	Approved/ unconstructed
Carmel Valley Ranch	County	64 DUs; 44 visitor-serving	1,036*	31*	DEIR Sept. Ranch	Approved/ under construction
Coast Ranch	County	67 DUs	643*	25*	DEIR Sept. Ranch	Approved/ unconstructed
County Meadows	County	60 DUs	576*	14*	DEIR Triple M Ranch	
Las Palmas Phase II	County	515 DUs	4,944*	123*		Approved/ unconstructed
Mahroom	County	36 DUs	345*	13*	DEIR Sept. Ranch	Approved/ unconstructed
Monterra	County	247 DUs	2,371*	62*	DEIR Canada Woods North	Approved/ unconstructed
Moro Cojo	County	365 DUs	2,891	131	DEIR, pp. 4-6, 8-20	Approved/ unconstructed
Oakhills	County	47 DUs	451*	11	Tentative Maps	Approved/ unconstructed
Quail Meadows	County	65 DUs; 40 visitor serving	921*	43*	DEIR, September Ranch	Approved/ unconstructed

**Table 5—Approved and Unconstructed Projects by Jurisdiction (cont'd)**

Project	Jurisdiction	Description Dwelling Units (DUs)	Average Daily Trips (ADT)	Water Acre Feet/Year (AFY)	Reference	Status
Rancho San Carlos	County	350 DUs; golf course	1,214	272	DEIR, pp. 8-19; 13-31	Approved/ unconstructed
Vista Vente	County	35 DUs	336*	9*	Special Handling Status Report, Monterey County	Under construction
Yanks Air Museum	County	150 hotel rooms; museum; airstrip; retail.	1440 (rooms)	Decline over farm use	Draft Environ- mental Impact Report (DEIR) pp. 3-5, 4-45, 4-72	Approved/ unconstructed
CSUMB Master Plan	CSUMB	6,801 students by 2005 5,800 beds 1,081,000 sf education facilities	15,650+	850	DEIR, pp. 7-10 11-46	FEIR Completed
Calif. Sea Breeze III	Gonzales	317 DUs	3,043*			Approved/ unconstructed
Arroyo Seco	Greenfield	44 acres retail				Approved/ unconstructed
Camino Al Paraiso	Greenfield	96 DUs	922*		City	Approved/ unconstructed
Greenleaf Estates	Greenfield	75 DUs	720*		DEIR Yanks Museum	Approved/ Unconstructed
River View Garden	King City	45 DUs	432*		City	Approved/ unconstructed

**Table 5—Approved and Unconstructed Projects by Jurisdiction (cont'd)**

Project	Jurisdiction	Description Dwelling Units (DUs)	Average Daily Trips (ADT)	Water Acre Feet/Year (AFY)	Reference	Status
Royal Coach Park-III	King City	110 DUs 5 acres commercial	1,056*		City	Approved/ under construction
Marina Dunes Resort Hotel	Marina	65 rooms	624*	91*	FEIR, based on data pp. IV-D5 & IV-B 14	Project modified by CCC
Sea Breeze	Marina	37 DUs	355*	9*		Approved/ Under Construction
Ryan Ranch	Monterey	139,210 sf office/commercial; 2,500 sf office/corporation yard			DEIR Stone Creek Shopping Center	Approved/ unconstructed
Arcadia	Salinas	200 DUs	1,920*	Decline over farm use	City	Approved/ unconstructed
Cambridge Group	Salinas	26 DUs	250*	Decline over farm use	Californian, 4/15/98	Approved/ unconstructed
Creekbridge	Salinas	1,000 DUs	9,600*	Decline over farm use	City	Approved/ part unconstructed
Harden Ranch	Salinas	1,200 DUs	10,440*	Decline over farm use	City	Approved/ part unconstructed
Salinas Auto Center	Salinas	467,000 sf		Decline over farm use	FEIR, pp. 5.1-16, 5.5-1, 5.8-1	Approved/ unconstructed
Westridge Center Hotel	Salinas	250 rooms	2,143*	Decline over farm use	FEIR	Approved/ unconstructed

**Table 5—Approved and Unconstructed Projects by Jurisdiction (cont'd)**

Project	Jurisdiction	Description Dwelling Units (DUs)	Average Daily Trips (ADT)	Water Acre Feet/Year (AFY)	Reference	Status
Williams Ranch	Salinas	1,263 DUs	11,042*	Decline over farm use	City	Approved/part unconstructed
Sterling Center	Sand City	136 rooms	1,306*	12*	DEIR Monterey Bay Shore Hotel p. 182	Approved/unconstructed
Barcelona Estates	Soledad	49 DUs	470*		City	Approved/under construction
California Highlands	Soledad	100 DUs	960*		City	Approved/under construction
Las Jicamas Development	Soledad	53 DUs	371*		City	Approved/under construction
San Vincente Town Houses	Soledad	50 DUs	480*		City	Approved/under construction
Vista Soledad Community	Soledad	683 DUs; 761,500 sf commercial	6,556 (DUs)*	Decline over farm use	DEIR (p. 170)	Approved/under construction
<b>Total</b>		<b>7520 DUs; 685 rooms; 1,450,210 sf commercial/ industrial; 6,801 CSUMB students</b>	<b>73,934 ADT (DUs &amp; hotel rooms), 15,650 ADT (CSUMB) Total - 89,584 ADT</b>	<b>124 AFY (MPWMD), 850 AFY (CSUMB) from Salinas Ground Water Basin); 643 AFY (other)</b>		

\* Calculated using standard trip rates and water demand factors

**Table 6—Pending Projects by Jurisdiction**

Project	Jurisdiction	Description	Average Daily Trips (ADT)	Water Acre Feet/Year (AFY)	Reference	Status
Merrit Mannor	County	88 DUs	845*		County	Application filed
Pajaro Commons	County	53 DUs	509*	13*		
Pebble Beach Lot Program	County	364 DUs; golf course; equestrian center	3,800	340	DEIR, p. 4.7-41 FEIR, p. 12-12	Pending Approval
Rancho San Juan	County	2,893 DUs; 100 rooms; 3,406,392 sf commercial/ industrial/office;	26,464 (DUs); 960 (rooms); 3,390 (other)	Decline over farm use	ADEIR, pp. 5-17, 5-25, 5-161	Application Filed
September Ranch	County	117 DUs	835	61*	FEIR pp. 4-50, 4-94	Pending
Tavernetti Subdivision	County	409 DUs	3,926*	98*	DEIR Rancho Chualar	DEIR pending
Triple M Ranch	County	31 DUs	300	Decline over farm use	FEIR (p. 7, 38, 49, 82)	Pending Coastal Commission Approval
Retail	Del Rey Oaks	57,680 sf	3,078*	5 to 7	MPWMD Report	DEIR circulated
Cannery Row Marketplace	Monterey	41 DUs 143,000 sf commercial	394*	32	MPWMD Report	Application filed
Old Capitol Site	Monterey	70 DUs	672*	8 to 20	MPWMD Report	

**Table 6—Pending Projects by Jurisdiction (cont'd)**

Project	Jurisdiction	Description	Average Daily Trips (ADT)	Water Acre Feet/Year (AFY)	Reference	Status
Senior Housing	Pacific Grove	50 units	330*	8*	MPWMD Report	
Legal Lots of Record-MPWMD	Peninsula cities & County	1226 DUs 556 commercial/industrial lots	10,156 (DUs)*	730	MPWMD Report, 1998 <sup>(5)</sup>	Pending water availability
Mountain Valley	Salinas	901 DUs	9,975	Decline over farm use	ADEIR, pp. 2-1; 4.2-10; 4.4-5; 6-1	Under review; 2nd EIR under preparation
Monterey Bay Shores Resort	Sand City	228 rooms 132 time-share 237 condominiums Conference Center	4,831	94 to 99	DEIR pp. 60, 124	DEIR circulated 1998
Hayes Housing Project	Seaside	400 DUs	3840*	152*	DEIR Monterey Bay Shore Hotel p. 182	Application Submitted
Miravale Subdivision	Soledad	1,000 DUs	9,600*		City	Application filed
<b>Total</b>		<b>7,880 DUs 460 rooms 3,607,072 sf commercial and industrial</b>	<b>77,437 ADT (DUs &amp; rooms)</b>	<b>1,388 AFY (MPWMD); overall decline in Salinas Valley Ground Water Basin; 4 AFY (other)</b>		

\* Calculated using standard trip rates and water demand factors



### **3.4 Roads and Highways**

Highway congestion is measured by transportation agencies as Level of Service (LOS), on a scale of A through F (A represents the best conditions; F represents the worst). The Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan has a goal to attain and maintain LOS C for the roadway network. Short-range goals are to allow no degradation below LOS D for urban roads now operating at LOS D or better; no degradation below LOS C for those rural roads now operating at LOS C or better; and no degradation below existing LOS for all other roads.

Of the 14 major highway and road segments evaluated, three are at LOS D, four at LOS E, five at LOS F, portions of one at LOS D and F, and one at LOS E and D. Route 68, west of Highway 1, has the highest accident rate. There are three fully-funded projects that would improve LOS: Hatton Canyon Parkway, Operational Improvements, and interchange improvements for Highway 101 north of Salinas. The Prunedale Bypass is partially funded (Table 7).

Average daily trips in 1997 were estimated at 1,046,057 and vehicle miles traveled during a typical workday at 8,978,000 miles.<sup>(4)</sup> This number is expected to increase 42% to 12,743,000 miles in 2020. Commuters make fewer than 3% of their work trips on a Monterey-Salinas Transit (MST) bus.<sup>(6)</sup> In 1995, an estimated 2,629 employed residents (1.6% of employed residents) traveled to employment outside the county. This number is forecast to increase 325% to 11,197 residents (4.9% of employed residents) in 2020.<sup>(3)</sup>

### **3.5 Water Supply**

The major population areas of the county have seriously insufficient water supplies. In the early 1990s, population growth on the Monterey Peninsula surpassed the number of people who can be served under Cal-Am's production limits. The Salinas Valley Ground Water basin is overdrafted by 40,000-50,000 acre feet per year, and in North Monterey County annual extractions exceed average annual recharge by 100%. There are no approved or funded projects to fully address these problems.<sup>(3)</sup>

#### **Monterey Peninsula**

Based on existing Cal-Am water productions limits, an estimated population of 96,674 people could be supported within the Cal-Am system. The 1995 population estimate for the service area was 98,898. There are no approved projects to address this shortfall.

#### **Salinas Valley**

The major portion of the Salinas River Ground Water Basin has been overdrafted since the 1940s or earlier. Overdraft conditions have led to seawater intrusion in the northern portion of the ground water basin. Intrusion into the 180-foot aquifer includes the community of Castroville, within two miles of the western Salinas city limits, and less than a mile from the Marina city limits. Intrusion into the 400-foot aquifer is less than one mile from the Marina city limits and the community of Castroville. Monterey County Water Resources Agency estimates that approximately 10% more of the basin's safe yield, or an average of about 40,000-50,000 acre feet per year, is currently pumped from the aquifer than is replaced through ground water recharge. The overdraft indicates that the Salinas River watershed cannot meet the demands of existing urban and agricultural uses without relying on declining reserves. It is estimated that agriculture use accounts for about 92.5% and urban use for about 7.5% of total water pumped. Reclaimed water for irrigation of crops from the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency treatment plant in the Castroville area will slow, but not stop, continued intrusion. There are no approved plans to fully resolve the problem.

**Table 7—Status of Roads and Highways**

Highway	LOS	Accident Rate	Funding Availability <sup>(7)</sup>
Route 1: North of Castroville	F <sup>(7)</sup>	0.95	No funding approved for capacity improvement projects or programs
Route 1: Hatton Canyon	F <sup>(7)</sup>	1.90	Funding available for Hatton Canyon Parkway and Operational Improvement Projects or programs
Route 1: Seaside	E <sup>(7)</sup>	0.83	No funding approved for capacity improvement projects or programs
Route 68: West of Highway 1	F <sup>(7)</sup>	3.10	No funding approved for capacity improvement projects or programs
Route 68: east of Highway 1	E <sup>(7)</sup>	0.92	No funding approved for capacity improvement projects or programs
Route 101: Prunedale	F <sup>(7)</sup>	1.41	Partial funding for Bypass; remaining funding dependent on local tax initiative. Funding available for interchange improvements.
Route 156	F <sup>(7)</sup>	1.09	No funding approved for capacity improvements.
Route 183: North of Salinas	D <sup>(7)</sup>	0.85	No funding approved for capacity improvement projects or programs
Route 218: Highway 1 to Fremont	D <sup>(8)</sup>		No funding approved for capacity improvement Projects or Programs
Del Monte Blvd: portions	D or F <sup>(8)</sup>		No Funding Approved for Capacity Improvement projects or programs
Fremont Blvd: portions	D <sup>(8)</sup>		No funding approved for capacity improvement projects or programs
Blanco Rd.: Reservation Rd. to Davis Rd.	E <sup>(8)</sup>		No funding approved for capacity improvement projects or programs
Davis Road:Blanco Rd. to Rossi and Rossi St. to US 101	E and F <sup>(8)</sup>		No funding approved for capacity improvement projects or programs
Reservation Rd: Marina	E <sup>(8)</sup>		No funding approved for capacity improvement projects or programs

\* Accident rates reported as total accidents (Fatal, Injury and Property Damage) per million vehicle miles traveled. Rates based on 1994-97 data. Source: Caltrans

### **North Monterey County**

The area has significant water supply and quality problems, including falling water levels, seawater infiltration and intrusion, and nitrate ion contamination. The area is severely overdrafted with annual extractions exceeding average annual recharge by 100%. No plans have been approved to address these problems.

### **Marina Coast Water District**

This district indicates that it has sufficient water supply to accommodate 2020 demand as projected by AMBAG.

## **3.6 Water Quality**

Ground water use in the Salinas Valley is adversely affected by nitrate contamination (Table 8). Of 240 wells listed in a 1995 report from the Monterey County Water Resources Agency, 1993 data indicated that 59 wells (25%) had nitrate concentrations exceeding the drinking water standard of 45 mg/l as NO<sub>3</sub>.<sup>(9)</sup>

**Table 8—Nitrate Concentrations in Salinas Valley Wells**

<b>Location</b>	<b># of Wells</b>	<b>Average NO<sub>3</sub> Value-1993 (mg/l)</b>	<b>Average Change 1987-1993 (mg/l)</b>	<b>Percent Change 1987-1993</b>
400-Foot Aquifer	70	10.8	5.2	93%
180-Foot Aquifer	68	19.5	-1.3	-6%
Forebay	39	42.5	-3.1	-7%
Upper Valley	24	67.2	2.6	4%
East Side	39	85.1	-0.2	0%
All locations	240	36.1	0.9	3%
Locations Outside 400-foot Aquifer	170	53.6	-2.0	-4%

## **3.7 Wastewater Treatment**

Existing wastewater treatment facilities throughout the county have excess capacity. A few areas in the County on septic systems are at carrying capacity or have restrictions on further subdivisions and second units.<sup>(3)</sup>

All the major wastewater treatment plants have excess capacity. Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency has capacity to at least 2005, Carmel Area Wastewater District to 2020, City of Gonzales to 2015, City of Greenfield to at least 2015, City of Soledad to 2005-2010, and City of King City to shortly after 2000.

The following areas on septic systems are at or near septic systems carrying capacity: Bolsa Knolls area north of Salinas, Carmel Valley Village area, and Mid-Carmel Valley. There are blanket restrictions on both further subdivisions and second units due to nitrate contamination potential in the following areas: Carmel Valley Village area, Mid-Carmel Valley area, and Prunedale area.

### **3.8 Air Quality**

Monterey County is part of the North Central Coast Air Basin. The Basin currently meets the federal ozone (smog) and particulate matter standards. Because the federal ozone standards were met in 1990, the Basin was redesignated to a federal attainment area in 1997 (clean air area).<sup>(4)</sup>

The Basin continues to violate the California ozone and particulate matter standards that are more stringent than federal standards; however, the number of violations has declined over the years. In 1987, there were 34 days exceeding the State ozone standard; in 1996, there were 21, and in 1997, there were two. None of the 1996 or 1997 violations occurred in Monterey County. Fifty percent of recent violations are the result of transport from the San Francisco Bay Area (i.e., the violations would have occurred even with no emission contribution from the North Central Coast Air Basin).

Emission forecasts for pollutants that form ozone show a decline to about 2010, after which they begin to increase; that is, emission growth begins to overtake emission controls. Thus, ozone levels will increase after 2020 unless additional controls are implemented. Major sources of ozone forming emissions include mobile sources, solvents, Moss Landing Power Plant, manufacturing, and industry.

Most violations of the California standard for particulate matter of ten microns or less in diameter (PM10) have occurred at coastal stations where sea salt is the primary reason for violations. Aside from violations at the coastal Moss Landing air monitoring station, there has been only one violation elsewhere in Monterey County since 1994. PM10 emissions are projected to increase over the years due to increases in vehicle travel.<sup>(10)</sup> Major sources of PM10 include vehicle travel on paved and unpaved roads, windblown dust from open fields, and farming operations.

### **3.9 Agricultural Land**

One of the primary responsibilities of the Monterey County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) is preservation of prime agricultural land. Many policies in the 1982 Monterey County General Plan focus on preserving and protecting farmland, as well (Policies 30.0.1 to 30.0.4). The Plan includes about 325,000 acres of designated Farmland and 830,000 acres of Rural and Permanent Grazing. Since 1982, the Board of Supervisors has redesignated 2,176 acres of farmland to urban uses (residential, commercial, and industrial) and 585 acres of urban uses to farmland for a net decrease of 1,591 acres of farmland. During the same period, there was a net increase in Rural and Permanent Grazing of 14,752 acres.<sup>(11)</sup>

Of the 7,520 dwelling units in the Approved/Unconstructed category, 68% will be built on farmland. All of these units will be on farmland within cities. Some units are Approved/Unconstructed and to be built in the unincorporated area, but none of those will be on farmland. Of the 7,880 dwelling units under consideration but not yet approved (Pending Projects), 61% would be built on farmland with 24% in cities and 37% in the unincorporated area. Close to 4.6 million square feet of commercial/industrial development in both Approved/Unconstructed or Pending categories would be on farmland.

### **3.10 Non-Agricultural Land—Open Space**

Monterey County has thousands of acres in parks, wilderness areas and open space at military facilities.

#### **Federal Forests and Wilderness Acres**

Los Padres National Forest	304,035
Ventana Wilderness	164,503
Bureau of Land Management/Fort Ord	7,000
Bureau of Land Management/other	34,787

#### **Military Land**

Fort Hunter Liggett	165,828
Camp Roberts	16,857
Fort Ord Land to be transferred	8,000

#### **State Parks**

State Parks (20 parks)	16,128
------------------------	--------

#### **Regional and County Parks**

Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District	7,500
Monterey County Parks (including 6,600 acres of Lake San Antonio)	13,707

#### **Land Trusts and Other**

Big Sur Land Trust	15,000
Elkhorn Slough	11,500

### **3.11 Affordable Housing**

#### **Housing Needs**

A key provision of California Housing Element Law is that each jurisdiction is responsible for providing housing that is affordable to all income groups. The Department of Housing and Community Development determines the regional share of the statewide housing need. The Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) is responsible for allocating the region's share of the statewide housing need at the local level. The region is comprised of Monterey and Santa Cruz Counties.

AMBAG completed the last Regional Housing Needs Plan in June 1990.<sup>(12)</sup> In Monterey County, the Plan identifies the need to construct 21,460 residential units between January, 1989 and July, 1996. Of these, 62% should have been "affordable," including 21% allocated to very low-income households, 18% to low-income households, and 23% to moderate-income households (Table 9).

**Table 9—Estimated Housing Need by Affordability Level  
January 1, 1989 to July 1, 1996**

Jurisdiction	Total Construction Need	Very Low Income	Low Income	Moderate Income	Above Moderate Income
Carmel	345	62	57	226	116
Del Rey Oaks	11	11	0	0	0
Gonzales	337	116	108	113	117
Greenfield	696	231	241	224	283
King City	1,218	452	390	376	465
Marina	971	375	285	311	671
Monterey	31	31	0	0	386
Pacific Grove	116	79	36	1	405
Salinas	4,393	1,313	1,241	1,839	2942
Sand City	280	81	55	144	70
Seaside	27	0	0	27	427
Soledad	781	291	195	295	410
Monterey County	4,316	1,587	1,316	1,413	1377
<b>Total</b>	<b>13,522</b>	<b>4,629</b>	<b>3,924</b>	<b>4,969</b>	<b>7669</b>

Monterey County calculates low-and-moderate-income home prices based on a number of assumptions. An “affordable” unit must be priced so that, at maximum, the units are affordable to lower-income households (income up to 80% of Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) or County Planning Area median household income, whichever is less, as adjusted by household size). To calculate affordable ranges, the County assumes a 30-year mortgage, a 7.5% interest rate, a 90% loan/value ratio, \$100/month in property taxes, and standard loan underwriting criteria. The selling prices for affordable ranges have been calculated for very low, low, and moderate income categories based on 1998 HUD incomes for two-person and five-person households. These are as follows:

**Table 10—Low-And-Moderate-Income Home Prices**

Income Level	2-Person Household	5-Person Household
Very-Low-Income	\$61,600 and less	\$91,500 and less
Low-Income	\$62,000 - \$112,200	\$92,000 - \$159,000
Moderate-Income	\$113,000 - \$179,300	\$160,000 - \$203,500

Preliminary research indicates that affordable housing needs, as specified in the Regional Housing Needs Plan, have not been met. From 1989 through 1996, the Construction Research Industry Board’s figures indicate that a total of 9,135 building permits were issued. <sup>(13)</sup> The approved

building permits do not include projects currently pending or construction occurring in 1997. However, no agency tracks the total number of building permits issued for affordable housing within the County.

As a result, LandWatch asked each city and the County for the total number of very low-income, low-income, and moderate-income housing units constructed since 1990. In response, the cities of Monterey and Carmel provided data on constructed affordable housing units broken down by income level; the cities of King City, Gonzales, Greenfield, Salinas, and Soledad compiled information on the total affordable units constructed; and the City of Marina and the County of Monterey Planning and Building Inspection Department were unable to compile information on affordable units constructed. No affordable housing units were built in Del Rey Oaks, Pacific Grove or Sand City. Research shows there is no uniform methodology for local agencies to determine the construction of affordable housing units (Table 11).

The report on the construction of low-income housing units should not be interpreted as a comprehensive study on the total availability of low-income housing units throughout the county. For instance, converted units, rental units, and the housing market are not accounted for within these figures.

**Table 11—Actual Housing Constructed by Income Category  
January 1, 1990 to December 31, 1997**

Jurisdiction	Total Affordable Units	Very-Low-Income	Low-Income	Moderate-Income
Carmel	3	0	3	0
Del Rey Oaks	0	0	0	0
Gonzales	317	0	29	288
Greenfield	232	Not available	Not available	Not available
King City	513	Not available	Not available	Not available
Marina	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available
Monterey	77	50	16	11
Pacific Grove	0	0	0	0
Salinas	412	Not available	Not available	Not available
Sand City	0	0	0	0
Seaside	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available
Soledad	495	Not available	Not available	Not available
Monterey County	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available

Low-income housing can be developed through the assistance of federal, state, and private agencies. Since the data on low-income housing by local jurisdictions is incomplete, LandWatch contacted the Community Housing Improvement Systems and Planning Association (CHISPA), a nonprofit developer of low-income housing in Monterey County, to request a list of projects and dwelling units which they have constructed since 1989 (Table 9). Of the units that were provided by the cities, the CHISPA projects account for 545. CHISPA has constructed a total of 643 units since 1989 (Table 12).

**Table 12—CHISPA Project List 1989-1997**

<b>Project</b>	<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>Type</b>
El Estero	Monterey	1990	26	C
Arroyo Estates	Gonzales	1990	10	D
Sunrise Ranch	Gonzales	1993	20	D
Soledad Townhouses	Greenfield	1991	34	A
Las Ventanas	Greenfield	1991	40	D
Villa Santa Clara	Greenfield	1992	30	B
Oxford Court	Greenfield	1995	40	D
Vista Paraiso	Greenfield	1996	34	D
La Casa Grande	Greenfield	1996	1	B
Tyler Park Townhouses	Greenfield	1996	88	B
Grey Goose Townhomes	Carmel Valley	1994	9	B
Marina Manor	Marina	1995	39	B
Gabilan Hills Townhomes	Salinas	1995	100	B
Harden Ranch Apartments	Salinas	1996	100	B
Roosevelt St. Townhomes	Salinas	1997	22	B
<b>Total</b>			<b>593</b>	

Type of occupants: A Low-income farmworkers, B Low-income families, C Low-income seniors, D Very-low and low-income families, E Low to moderate income families. F low-income earthquake victims

### **3.12 Schools**

Of the 24 K-12 school districts, 13 are at classroom capacity. Of these 13, four have facilities planned and funded for construction. Districts at capacity include Alisal, Chualar, North Monterey County Unified, Santa Rita, Washington Union, Greenfield Elementary, King City Elementary, King City Joint Union High School, Salinas City, Salinas Union High School, Soledad, Spreckels, and Lagunita. Districts with excess capacity (student space available) include Monterey Peninsula Unified (2,000 students), Pacific Grove Unified (500 students), Carmel Unified (200 students), Gonzales Unified (90 students), Graves (20 students), San Antonio (170 students), San Lucas (10 students), Mission (20 students), and San Ardo (20 students). Capacity of new schools include Greenfield High School (800 students), Salinas City - unnamed (650 students), Alisal Union - unnamed (700 students), Santa Rita - unnamed (600 students), Buena Vista Middle School (300 students), and Soledad High School (1,000 students).<sup>(3)</sup>

### **3.13 Economy**

Forecasts indicate that the economic outlook for California and Monterey County is positive, the result of low interest rates, expansion of regional retail centers, increased construction of single-family and multi-family homes, innovative agricultural technology, and leading tourist attractions. Monterey County has strong growth in retail sales, tourism, construction and jobs. However, studies identify infrastructure capacity and water supply as risk elements to the long-term economic well-being of Monterey County.<sup>(14)</sup>

The relationship between private sector growth, taxes, and public sector benefits has not been carefully analyzed for Monterey County and the cities. Although statistics are available for each leading economic sector, no study has compared these to changes in infrastructure, environmental quality, public services, or other factors affecting residents' quality of life. It's important to



analyze how the economic benefits of growth have been distributed, whether job growth has resulted in fewer residents living below the poverty line, whether increased housing construction has created more affordable housing, and if tax revenues from increased retail sales support better planning and community development.

### **Employment and Income**

California's unemployment rate dropped to 5.8% in February 1998, down 0.8 percentage points from February, 1997. For the twelve-month period (February, 1997 to February, 1998), the Monterey County unemployment rate averaged 10.7%, ranging from 6.3% (September) to 18.1% (January). Seasonal fluctuations in agricultural and tourism jobs account for these employment patterns. In this same period, Monterey County employment grew by 3,800 jobs, with the nonfarm industries accounting for 2,900 new jobs. The largest increase occurred in the trade and services divisions as each added 1,100 new jobs. Monterey County median family income for 1997 was \$45,600.<sup>(15)</sup>

### **Agricultural Sales**

Agriculture remains the largest sector of Monterey's economy. Gross sales of agricultural products totaled \$2.2 billion in 1997, a 17% increase from 1996.<sup>(16)</sup> The annual report of the Monterey County Overall Economic Development Program identifies four major problems facing agriculture in California: conversion of farmland to urban uses, soil erosion, salinity, and possible shortage of affordable water. The report identifies that Monterey County's General Plan prohibits the conversion of agricultural land to other uses and that this policy will require strong support from the Board of Supervisors to remain viable.<sup>(17)</sup>

### **Retail Sales**

Monterey County retail sales revenues grew by 7.1% or \$156 million, from 1995 to 1996, to total \$2.36 billion. The significant growth is attributed to substantial increases in tourism, gradual increases in population, and the expansion of national and regional retailers in the cities of Salinas, Seaside and Sand City.<sup>(14)</sup>

### **Tourism**

In 1997, travel and tourism spending in Monterey County increased 7.3% from the previous year, to \$1.5 billion. The total economic impact of travel and tourism in 1997, including direct and indirect spending, produced \$2.4 billion in Monterey County.<sup>(18)</sup> Revenue from Monterey County's Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) increased 12%, to \$32 million, in the 1996-1997 fiscal year. The City of Monterey generated \$12 million in TOT revenue, 38% of the county total. The unincorporated areas of Monterey County generated \$10.54 million of TOT revenue, primarily from Pebble Beach Resorts. In Salinas, the TOT revenue generated \$1 million, up 60% from fiscal year 1995-1996. The Salinas revenue increase is attributed to the growing wine industry, the new sports complex, and new fine dining restaurants.<sup>(14)</sup>

### **Real Estate**

Monterey County home sales totaled 2,248 in 1997 and surpassed home sales in 1996 by 313. The average number of days on the market was 133 days. Countywide, the median home sale price increased by \$19,500 in 1997.<sup>(19)</sup> The most affordable homes of 1997 were found in the Salinas Valley, while the most expensive homes were found in the Monterey Peninsula and South Coast. Between 1996 and 1997, home sale price increased in Carmel, Carmel Valley, and the Monterey/Salinas Highway but remained stable in the other areas of the county (Table 13).

**Table 13—1997 Home Sales in Monterey County**

Area	Current Inventory	No. of Sales	Median Price	Days On Market
Carmel	96	285	533,500	150
Carmel Valley	115	186	488,000	140
Del Rey Oaks	3	21	210,000	64
East Salinas	62	100	126,000	162
Marina	22	101	189,500	116
Monterey	57	152	282,125	103
North Monterey County	155	260	221,000	142
North Salinas	82	248	149,000	100
Pebble Beach	56	147	576,500	249
Pacific Grove	37	158	299,500	90
South Coast	27	30	742,500	240
Seaside	55	131	145,000	83
Salinas Monterey Highway	76	148	369,500	134
South Monterey County	87	69	134,900	184
South Salinas	63	210	174,950	110
Watsonville	0	1	267,000	10
Monterey County Total	994	2248	244,000	133

**Construction Activity**

Residential construction valuations totaled \$300 million in 1997, up \$33 million from 1996. New single-family valuations increased by \$27 million in 1997 to \$224 million, and new multi-family valuation increased by \$1 million in 1997 to \$27 million.<sup>(19)</sup>

In 1997, there was a total of 1710 residential building permits issued, up 214 from 1996. Construction of single-family and multi-family homes throughout Monterey County continued to increase, with most activity occurring in Salinas (838 permits), the unincorporated areas of Monterey County (413 permits), Soledad (195 permits), and Greenfield (95 permits).

Non-residential construction valuations in 1997 totaled \$106 million, down \$8 million from 1996. This includes new, alterations, and additions to commercial, industrial, and other non-residential construction activities. In 1997, new non-residential commercial construction valuations were strongest in Salinas (\$27 million) and the Monterey County Unincorporated Areas (\$23 million). New non-residential construction valuations represent 63% of total non-residential construction in 1997.

**3.14 Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Species**

Monterey County has numerous threatened and endangered species. Their presence requires that impact from development be fully mitigated. A listing of species follows:

Animals: California Brown Pelican, California Clapper Rail, Western Snowy Plover, Bank Swallow, Least Bells Vireo, Tidewater Goby, San Joaquin Kit Fox, Santa Cruz Long-Toed Salamander, Arroyo Southwestern Toad, California Red-Legged Frog, Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp, and Smith Blue Butterfly.

Plants: Adobe Sanicle, Santa Cruz Tarplant, Beach Layia, Menzies' Wallflower, Yadon's Wallflower, Coastal Dunes Milk-Vetch, Tidestrom's Lupine, Pacific Grove Clover, Santa Lucia Mint, Monterey Spineflower, Robust Spineflower, Butterworth's Buckwheat, Sand Gilia, Hickman's Cinquefoil, Seaside Bird's Beach, Dudley's Lousewort, Mexican Flannelbush, and Little Sur Manzanita. Additionally, the native Monterey Pine forests unique to Central California are under severe pressure from pending development and pitch canker.

### **3.15 General Plans**

State law requires planning agencies to "prepare, periodically review, and revise, as necessary, the general plan" [Government Code section 65103 (a)]. The Monterey County General Plan is 16 years old and most of its area plans are ten or more years old. Five city general plans are ten or more years old, with two of these currently being updated. Seven city general plans are ten years old or less.

Monterey County General Plan 1982	City of Monterey General Plan, 1988
Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan (LUP), 1984	Cannery Row Plan, 1988
Carmel Valley Master Plan, 1983	Monterey Harbor Plan, 1987
North County LUP, 1982	Skyline Plan, 1992
Toro Area General Plan, 1983	Del Monte Beach Plan, 1992
North County Area Plan, 1984	Salinas General Plan, 1988, being updated
Carmel Area Local Coastal Program, 1983	Pacific Grove General Plan, 1994
Greater Monterey Peninsula Area Plan, 1984	Gonzales General Plan, 1996
Del Monte Forest Area LUP, 1984	Soledad General Plan Update, 1993
Greater Salinas Area Plan, 1985	Seaside General Plan Update, 1996
South County Area Plan, 1987	Del Rey Oaks General Plan, 1997
Central Salinas Valley Area Plan, 1987	Marina General Plan, being updated
Cachagua Area Plan, 1988	Carmel General Plan, 1988
	Sand City General Plan update 1989
	King City General Plan, Draft 1998 Plan

## 4.0 REFERENCES

- (1) U.S. Census
- (2) California Department of Finance Estimates, January 1, 1998
- (3) "1997 Regional Population and Employment Forecasts," Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments
- (4) "1997 Air Quality Management Plan for the Monterey Bay Region," Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District
- (5) "Final Report: Legal Lot Study of Vacant Parcels and Ten Year Projection of Anticipated Remodels," MPWMD, February 1998
- (6) "Monterey Bay Metropolitan Transportation Plan," AMBAG, 1994
- (7) "Regional Transportation Improvement Program," Transportation Agency for Monterey County, 1998
- (8) Fort Ord Disposal and Reuse Plan, Final EIR, 1996
- (9) "Nitrates in Ground Water, 1987-1993, Salinas Valley, California," Monterey County Water Resources Agency, 1995
- (10) "1996 Report on Attainment of the California Particulate Matter Standards in the Monterey Bay Region," Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District
- (11) "Pros and Cons on Measure E," League of Women Voters of the Monterey Peninsula; Data updated to include Yanks Museum and Chualar II
- (12) "Regional Housing Needs Plan," Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, June 1990
- (13) "Year-to-Date Totals of Residential and Nonresidential Building Permits, 1989 - 1997," Construction Industry Research Board
- (14) "Monterey County Economic Forecast 1998-1999," Stephen A. Nukes & Associates
- (15) California Employment Development Department
- (16) Monterey County Agriculture Commission
- (17) "Monterey County Overall Economic Development Plan", Overall Economic Development Commission, 1997
- (18) "Monterey County Travel-Tourism Industry Report prepared for the Monterey County Travel and Tourism Alliance," Results Consulting, April 15, 1998
- (19) Monterey County Board of Realtors