

4.11 Land Use

4.11.1 Setting

a. Land Use Patterns

The AMBAG region is comprised of Monterey, San Benito and Santa Cruz counties. These counties are located along the Central Coast of California and generally surround Monterey Bay. Monterey Bay is located south of the San Francisco Bay area and north of San Luis Obispo County. San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties are located to the north; Merced and Fresno Counties are located to the east. Monterey County shares a short border segment with Kings County to the southeast.

The combined area encompasses approximately 3.3 million acres, incorporating the Pajaro and Salinas River Valleys, adjacent coastal lowland and surrounding mountains. Terrain within the region is varied. The Santa Cruz, Gabilan and Santa Lucia mountain ranges and the Diablo range are located along the eastern border of the tri-county region. The highest elevation is the Junípero Serra Peak (5,860 feet above sea level), located in Monterey County. AMBAG's planning area is predominantly rural with urban development clustered along the Monterey Bay coastline and in agricultural inland valleys. A summary of the land use setting for each county is described below.

Monterey County

Monterey County encompasses 2.12 million acres and is predominantly rural with the exception of 12 incorporated cities; Carmel, Del Rey Oaks, Gonzales, Greenfield, Pacific Grove, Marina, Monterey, Salinas, Seaside, Sand City, Soledad and King City. Agriculture is the largest land use in Monterey County representing approximately 60 percent (1.27 million acres) of the total land area. The second largest land use consists of public and quasi-public land uses such as parks, military facilities, recreational and community facilities, which makes up 24 percent (about 508,800 acres) of the total land area. Approximately 5 percent (about 106,000 acres) of Monterey County, including the incorporated cities, is developed with residential, commercial and industrial land use categories; of the unincorporated county, approximately one percent is developed. The remaining 11 percent (about 233,200 acres) is in resource conservation or other miscellaneous land uses. Most of the urban development is concentrated in the northern third of the county, near the incorporated cities of Salinas, Marina and Monterey (Monterey County, 2010a).

Santa Cruz County

Santa Cruz County encompasses 285,713 acres and is predominantly rural with the exception of four incorporated cities: Scotts Valley, Santa Cruz, Capitola and Watsonville and the surrounding urbanized unincorporated area. Agriculture represents approximately 14 percent of the total land area (40,000 acres). Residential land is approximately 4 percent (11,428 acres) of the land area; developed non-residential uses comprise approximately 1.5 percent (4,285 acres). Parks, recreation and open space comprise 1.4 percent (4,000 acres); miscellaneous uses comprise 3.6 percent (10,286 acres) of the land area. The remaining acreage is undeveloped (Santa Cruz County, 2013b).

San Benito County

San Benito County encompasses approximately 886,719 acres and is predominantly rural except the incorporated cities of San Juan Bautista and Hollister. Agriculture, which includes grazing, is the

predominate land use in the unincorporated county, totaling approximately 734,826 acres (83.2 percent). Of the remainder, 78,931 acres (8.9 percent) is owned by city, State and Federal governments. Residential land accounts for only 9,668 acres (1.1 percent) of existing land use in the unincorporated county. Remaining lands are undeveloped (San Benito County 2035 General Plan, 2015a).

b. Regulatory Setting

There are numerous State and local laws, regulations, policies, programs, plans, codes and ordinances that regulate land use in the AMBAG region. Local land use changes are regulated by the general plans, specific plans and zoning ordinances of the counties of Monterey, San Benito and Santa Cruz and the cities within each county. City and unincorporated county land which lies within the California Coastal Zone is subject to provisions outlined in each jurisdiction's Local Coastal Program (LCP) as mandated by the California Coastal Act. The Coastal Zone generally consists of all land 1,000 yards inland from the mean high tide line. The LCPs consist of coastal land use plans, zoning and other implementing actions needed to comply with the Coastal Act and include land use regulations related to housing, coastal access, public works and all types of transportation infrastructure and facilities.

State

Sustainable Communities Strategy and Climate Protection Act (SB 375)

SB 375 is a California law passed in 2008 that requires each MPO to demonstrate, through the development of a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), how its region will integrate transportation, housing and land use planning to meet the greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets set by the State. The details of SB 375 are discussed in Section 2.0, *Project Description*.

Office of Planning and Research 2015 Environmental Goals and Policy Report

Governor's Office of Planning and Research's Environmental Goals and Policy Report (EGPR) (Governor's Office of Planning and Research, 2015) contains plans, research and objectives pertaining to land use, development, waste, natural resource conservation, water and air quality. The EPGR works alongside state planning priorities to implement State environmental goals and guide land use decisions. More specifically, the EPGR addresses State planning priorities including efficient infill development and adaptive reuse and mixed use development.

Office of Planning and Research 2017 General Plan Guidelines

The 2017 General Plan Guidelines (Governor's Office of Planning and Research, 2017) is the first comprehensive update to the guidelines since 2003 and addresses numerous new laws, requirements, resources and research that affect long-range planning in California. The 2017 update includes links to external documents and additional resources. This includes guidance for implementing the following legislation: Environmental Justice (SB 1000), Climate Change (SB 379), Sustainable Communities Strategies (SB 375), Flood Management (SB 5), Vehicle Miles Traveled (SB 743), Island or Fringe Communities (SB 244), Tribal Consultation (AB 52) and Local Hazard Mitigation Plans (AB 2140). Beyond State law requirements, the 2017 General Plan Guidelines also provide direction on topics including healthy communities, equitable and resilient communities, economic development, climate change and renewable energy.

Smart Mobility 2010 Framework

The Smart Mobility Framework, formally known as *Smart Mobility 2010: A Call to Action for the New Decade* (Caltrans, 2010), was prepared by Caltrans in partnership with the U.S. EPA, the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, and the California Department of Housing and Community Development to address both long-range challenges and short-term programmatic actions to implement multi-modal and sustainable transportation strategies in California. The Smart Mobility Framework helps guide and assess how well various levels plans, programs, and projects (e.g., RTPs, General Plans, specific development proposals, etc.) meet a definition of "smart mobility". The Smart Mobility Framework is intended to move people and freight while enhancing California's economic, environmental and human resources by emphasizing:

- Convenient and safe multimodal travel
- Speed suitability
- Accessibility
- Management of the circulation network
- Efficient use of land

Planning and Zoning Law

California Government Code Section 65000, et seq., regulates the substantive and topical requirements of general plans. State law requires each city and county to adopt a general plan "for the physical development of the county or city, and any land outside its boundaries which bears relation to its planning." The California Supreme Court has called the general plan the "constitution for future development." The general plan expresses the community's development goals and embodies public policy relative to the distribution of future land uses, both public and private.

Zoning authority originates from city and county police power and from the Planning and Zoning Law, which sets minimum requirements for local zoning ordinances. Zoning ordinances must be consistent with the general plan and specific plans. The consistency requirement does not apply to charter cities other than Los Angeles unless the charter city adopts a consistency rule.

Cortese Knox Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (CKH Act)

The Cortese Knox Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act (CKH Act) is the most substantial reform to local government reorganization law since the 1963 statute that created a LAFCO in each county. The law established procedures for local government changes of organization, including city incorporation, annexation to a city or special district, and consolidation of cities or special districts (Section 56000, et seq.). LAFCOs have numerous powers under the CKH Act, but those of prime concern are the power to act on local agency boundary changes and to adopt spheres of influence (SOIs) for local agencies. The law also states that in order to update an SOI, LAFCOs are required to first conduct a review of the municipal services provided in the county.

Local

The following section focuses on the key plans that regulate land use in the AMBAG region, which are the county and city general plans and Local Coastal Programs, the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans and master plans regulating land dedicated to university campuses. This section outlines the status of those plans.

Monterey County General Plan

The Monterey County General Plan (Monterey County, 2010a) includes 12 planning areas. The planning horizon year is 2030, with full buildout of 10,015 new residential units. One of the primary challenges that the Monterey County General Plan addresses is how to plan future growth when high quality farmlands are in the valley and flatlands, and have been forced to compete with urban developments, while foothills along the valley serve as natural and scenic resources unique to Monterey County (Monterey County, 2010a).

Santa Cruz County General Plan

The Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors adopted the 1994 General Plan and Local Coastal Program in 1994 (Santa Cruz County, 1994). The 1994 General Plan consists of several parts that are organized into three volumes: the General Plan/Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan; a collection of Village, Town, Community and Specific Plans; and the General Plan and Local Coastal Program Environmental Impact Report. The prominent issues that the County focuses on in the 1994 General Plan are: providing adequate services, providing affordable housing, preserving the county's environmental quality and preventing conversions of agricultural lands. The General Plan is consistent with the County's policy of directing a large share of future growth into the incorporated cities, and the unincorporated areas within the Urban Services Line to preserve the character of the rural portion of the county (Santa Cruz County, 1994).

San Benito County General Plan

The San Benito County 2035 General Plan (San Benito County, 2015a) sets a clear direction for the future of the county and includes goals, policies and programs necessary to achieve the community's vision and guiding principles. This plan also addresses issues of sustainability, including environmental protection, economic expansion and diversification and equity. The plan was shaped over a three-year period by an extensive outreach process that engaged residents, businesses, stakeholders, developers and decision-makers (San Benito County, 2015a).

City of Carmel-by-the-Sea General Plan

The City of Carmel-by-the-Sea adopted its General Plan in 2003 (City of Carmel-by-the-Sea, 2003). The City combined its General Plan with its Local Coastal Plan to ensure coordination of these two documents. This General Plan includes the following elements: Land Use and Community Character, Circulation, Housing, Coastal Access and Recreation, Coastal Resource Management, Public Facilities and Services, Open Space/Conservation, Environmental Safety and Noise (City of Carmel-by-the-Sea, 2003).

City of Del Rey Oaks General Plan

The City of Del Rey Oaks adopted the update to its General Plan in 1997 (City of Del Rey Oaks, 1997). This General Plan includes the following elements: Land Use, Housing, Circulation, Conservation and Open Space, Safety and Noise. The overarching goal of this General Plan is to enhance the beauty, health, safety and quality of life for residents (City of Del Rey Oaks, 1997).

City of Gonzales General Plan

The City of Gonzales adopted the Gonzales 2010 General Plan in 2011 (City of Gonzales, 2010). A main focus of the 2010 General Plan is providing a long-range plan with an Urban Growth Area that contains approximately 2,150 acres of new land for urbanization. This General Plan includes the

following elements: Land Use, Circulation, Housing, Community Health and Safety, Conservation and Open Space, Community Services and Facilities, Community Character and Sustainability (City of Gonzales, 2010).

City of Greenfield General Plan

The City of Greenfield adopted the General Plan in 2005 (City of Greenfield, 2005). In addition to the seven elements that are required by State law, this General Plan also includes the following elements: growth management, economic development and recreation. The goals of the Greenfield General Plan are to promote a high quality physical and social environment with rural character, provide a full range of municipal services and support a people-oriented environment for all (City of Greenfield, 2005).

City of Pacific Grove General Plan

The Pacific Grove 1994 General Plan (City of Pacific Grove, 1994) is principal policy document for guiding future conservation and development of the City. This General Plan includes the following elements: Land Use, Housing, Transportation, Parks and Recreation, Natural Resources, Historic and Archaeological Resources, Urban Structure and Design, Public Facilities and Health and Safety (City of Pacific Grove, 1994). The City of Pacific Grove is in the process of updating and adopting a LCP and published the Draft LUP in February 2017 (City of Pacific Grove, 2017).

City of Marina General Plan

The City of Marina General Plan (City of Marina, 2000) was adopted by the City in 2000. The overall goal of the Marina General Plan is the creation of a community which provides a high quality of life for all its residents; which offers a broad range of housing, transportation and recreation choices; and which conserves irreplaceable natural resources. This General Plan includes the following elements: Community Land Use, Community Infrastructure and Community Development and Design (City of Marina, 2000).

City of Monterey General Plan

The City of Monterey adopted the General Plan in 2005 (City of Monterey, 2005). The General Plan goals and policies focus on preserving and enhancing Monterey's aesthetic environment, which the City developed around two central concepts: Monterey's special physical setting and its image as a town. This General Plan includes the following elements: Urban Design, Land Use, Circulation, Housing, Conservation, Open Space, Safety, Noise, Economic, Social, Historic Preservation and Public Facilities (City of Monterey, 2005).

City of Salinas General Plan

The City of Salinas General Plan (City of Salinas, 2002) was adopted in 2002. Since the last comprehensive update in 1988, the city grew substantially and is now the largest city in Monterey County. The major focus of this General Plan is how to protect valuable agricultural resources while promoting a diversified economy. This General Plan includes the following elements: Land Use, Community Design, Housing, Conservation/Open Space, Circulation, Safety and Noise (City of Salinas, 2002).

City of Seaside General Plan

The City of Seaside adopted the existing General Plan in 2004 (City of Seaside, 2004). The City is currently updating the Plan. The main opportunities and challenges that this General Plan focuses on includes: encouraging the development and redevelopment of North Seaside, while revitalizing the central core of the community; establishing a positive and unique identity on the Monterey Peninsula; creating new job and revenue generating development opportunities; protecting natural resources, such as open space and scenic vistas as development occurs encouraging the provision and maintenance of quality development; and improving the overall quality of life. In addition to the required seven elements, this General Plan also includes Urban Design and Economic Development Elements (City of Seaside, 2004).

City of Sand City General Plan

The City of Sand City adopted its General Plan in 2002 (City of Sand City, 2002). The focus of the General Plan is to enhance the features that make this community unique, including that it is walkable, transit oriented and capable of providing an integration of residential and commercial uses. The themes of this General Plan are economic diversification, active redevelopment, enhanced community appearance and image, organized and well-planned growth, elimination of land use conflicts and cohesive residential neighborhoods (City of Sand City, 2002).

City of Soledad General Plan

The City of Soledad adopted its General Plan in 2005 (City of Soledad, 2005). The primary focus of the Plan is to foster a climate conducive for expanded economic development in Soledad, including expanding opportunities for shopping and tourism, providing more and better paying jobs and ensuring affordable housing. In addition to covering the required seven elements, this General Plan also includes the Front Street Improvement Plan and Downtown Specific Plan (City of Soledad, 2005).

City of King General Plan

The King City General Plan (City of King, 1998) was adopted in 1998. The overall goal of the General Plan is to provide for orderly growth and development and to maintain a balanced community. In addition to including the required seven elements, this General Plan also includes an Economic Development Element (City of King, 1998).

City of Scotts Valley General Plan

The City of Scotts Valley adopted its General Plan in 1994 (City of Scotts Valley, 1994). The General Plan focuses on how to handle physical changes within the city that are a result of rapid population increase and local development. In addition to the seven mandatory elements, this General Plan also includes the Parks & Recreation and Public Services & Facilities Elements (City of Scotts Valley, 1994). An update of the General Plan is underway.

City of Santa Cruz General Plan

The City of Santa Cruz 2030 General Plan (City of Santa Cruz, 2012b) was adopted in 2012, and is a comprehensive update of the 1990-2005 General Plan. The General Plan seeks to connect the University of California, Santa Cruz population with the residents of the Santa Cruz community. The 2030 General Plan expresses Santa Cruz community members' desires for the city's physical,

economic, social, cultural and environmental characteristics, and seeks to establish plans for future growth and improvement in the upcoming 25 years (City of Santa Cruz, 2012b).

City of Capitola General Plan

The City of Capitola adopted the General Plan in 2014 (City of Capitola, 2014). The General Plan guiding principles focus on the following topics: community identity, community connections, neighborhoods and housing, environmental resources, economy, fiscal responsibility, mobility and health and safety. In addition to the seven mandatory elements, this General Plan also includes an Economic Development Element (City of Capitola, 2014).

City of Watsonville General Plan

The City adopted the existing Watsonville 2005 General Plan in 1994 (City of Watsonville, 1994). This General Plan addresses the following major issues: population growth, housing growth, agricultural preservation and the provision of adequate and affordable housing. The General Plan includes the following elements: Growth and Conservation, Land Use, Urban Design, Housing, Children, Recreation, Environmental Resources, Circulation, Public Facilities and Public Safety (City of Watsonville, 1994). The City also published a Draft 2030 General Plan in 2012, but the City Council has not adopted the General Plan Update (City of Watsonville, 2017b).

City of Hollister General Plan

The City of Hollister General Plan (City of Hollister, 2005), adopted in 2005, identifies growth as a major factor in the loss of agricultural land. As a result, the 2005 General Plan reduced the size of the city's planning area. Since adoption of the General Plan, further growth has been constrained by inadequate infrastructure, congestion on SR 25, insufficient wastewater capacity issues and a moratorium on major development. The General Plan sets six major goals for the city: encourage pedestrian-friendly mixed-use development downtown; provide core services in every neighborhood; encourage multiple modes of transportation; provide a range of housing styles and affordability levels; provide for an environment that encourages healthy living; and promote economic and environmental sustainability (City of Hollister, 2005). In 2017, the City began the process of updating the General Plan (City of Hollister, 2017).

City of San Juan Bautista General Plan

The City of San Juan Bautista 2035 General Plan (City of San Juan Bautista, 2015) was adopted in 2016. The General Plan's Land Use element sets out a vision for future growth in the city that includes: retention of agriculture and open space around the city's perimeter; reinvestment in existing neighborhoods; continued vitality of the downtown and the city's arts and cultural events; and a focus on infill development, community design and growth management (City of San Juan Bautista, 2015).

Monterey County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans

The four airports within Monterey County are: Monterey Regional Airport, Marina Municipal Airport, Mesa Del Rey Airport and Salinas Municipal Airport. The Monterey County Airport Land Use Commission is in the process of updating the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans (ALUCPs) for Monterey Regional Airport and Marina Municipal Airport. The ALUC published the Draft ALUCPs for these two airports in January 2017. The ALUC published the plan for Salinas Municipal Airport in 1982 and the plan for Mesa Del Rey Airport in 1978. The goals of the ALUCPs are to protect

residents from the negative environmental noise, safety and traffic impacts that can potentially be induced by airports (Monterey County Airport Land Use Commission, 1978, 1982, 2017a, 2017b).

San Benito County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans

The San Benito County Airport Land Use Commission reviews development proposed within the Airport Influence Area of the Hollister Municipal Airport and Frazier Lake Airpark. The ALUC reviews applications in compliance with the policies in the Hollister Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan and the Comprehensive Land Use Plan - Frazier Lake Airpark (San Benito County, 2001 and 2012).

Santa Cruz County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans

The Santa Cruz County Community Development Department is the ALUC with authority in Santa Cruz County. The 1994 General Plan and Local Coastal Program for the County of Santa Cruz and the Watsonville 2005 General Plan serve as the ALUCP for the Watsonville Municipal Airport, which is the only public airport in the County of Santa Cruz. Additionally, in July 2017, the City of Watsonville published Watsonville Municipal Airport Regulations to augment the existing ordinances of the City of Watsonville Municipal Code that regulate land use activities within and near the Watsonville Municipal Airport (Santa Cruz County, 1994; City of Watsonville, 1994 and 2017a).

Fort Ord Reuse Authority Base Reuse Plan

The Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA) is responsible for the oversight of Monterey Bay area economic recovery from the closure and reuse planning of the former Fort Ord military base. The former Fort Ord is located on the California coastline near the Monterey Peninsula consisting of 45 square miles/28,000 acres. FORA prepared the Reuse Plan for the former Fort Ord pursuant to the provisions of Senate Bill 899 to guide the development of the Former Military Reservation. The Fort Ord Reuse Plan is made up of four volumes, which includes a Draft Habitat Management Plan, Business and Operations Plan and the Final EIR (Fort Ord Reuse Authority, 1997).

University of California, Santa Cruz Long Range Development Plan

The University of California, Santa Cruz (UCSC) Long-Range Development Plan 2005-2020 (2005 LRDP) provides a comprehensive framework for the physical development of the UC Santa Cruz campus. The 2005 LRDP supports UCSC's academic, research and public service mission while maintaining the campus's strong traditions of environmental stewardship and sustainability. UCSC chose the 2020 planning horizon to match the original horizon of the City of Santa Cruz's new General Plan, underscoring the interrelatedness of UCSC and the greater community (University of California, Santa Cruz, 2005). The University is in the process of updating the Long-Range Development Plan for the 2020-2040 planning period (University of California, Santa Cruz, 2017).

California State University, Monterey Bay Comprehensive Master Plan

California State University, Monterey Bay (CSUMB) is in the process of updating its campus master plan. In October 2017, the Draft June 2017 version of the Comprehensive Master Plan is undergoing analysis through the production of an EIR in accordance with CEQA. The new Master Plan will build on earlier planning efforts that facilitated the transition of the campus from the former Fort Ord Army Base, to a 21st-century setting for teaching, learning and research. The Plan will consider a wide range of issues encompassing the academic environment, student and residential life,

sustainability, mobility and infrastructure systems and connections with Monterey Bay communities (CSUMB, 2017).

4.11.2 Impact Analysis

a. Methodology and Significance Thresholds

Appendix G of the State CEQA Guideline identifies the following criteria for determining whether a project's impacts would have a significant impact on land use:

1. Physically divide an established community;
2. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; and/or
3. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

Impacts are also considered significant if a specific transportation improvement or land use change would displace homes or businesses. Impacts related to conflicts with habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans are discussed in Section 4.4, *Biological Resources*.

b. Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Land use impacts were assessed based upon a review of the proposed transportation network and SCS land use scenario to determine whether any aspects of the network could physically divide an established community. Conflicts with plans, policies, programs and regulations were assessed based on a review of the proposed SCS land use pattern to determine whether it conflicted with locally adopted plans and regulations that are intended to avoid or mitigate environmental impacts. Due to the programmatic nature of the 2040 MTP/SCS, a precise, project-level analysis of the specific impacts associated with individual transportation and land use projects is not possible. However, this section describes generalized impacts associated with the transportation improvement projects and the land use scenario envisioned by the 2040 MTP/SCS.

Threshold 1: Physically divide an established community
--

Impact LU-1 IMPLEMENTATION OF PROPOSED TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS AND THE LAND USE SCENARIO ENVISIONED BY THE 2040 MTP/SCS WOULD NOT PHYSICALLY DIVIDE AN ESTABLISHED COMMUNITY. THIS IS IMPACT WOULD BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT.

In general, the 2040 MTP/SCS implements roadway projects and transportation improvements that will decrease traffic congestion, increase mobility and improve alternative transportation infrastructure. Construction of additions to existing facilities and new facilities routinely involve temporary disruptions within established communities such as lane or road closures along roads and highways and service delays or detours for bus routes and passenger rail. Local jurisdictions routinely require traffic control plans and related measures to ensure that construction activities accommodate vehicular and pedestrian access, such as designating alternate routes or scheduling disruptive activities late at night or on weekends. With these controls, construction activities would not result in the physical division of established communities.

The 2040 MTP/SCS is intended to improve the system for all modes of transit so vehicles and non-motorized transit can use the streets simultaneously and safely. As a result, while roads may be expanded and widened under the 2040 MTP/SCS, these and/or other planned projects would include improvements to bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Because the existing roads subject to expansion or widening are already part of the communities in which they are located, such projects would not have the potential to divide those communities. The projects are intended to achieve goals of the 2040 MTP SCS to increased mobility and decrease VMT, therefore the projects should result in bring communities closer together rather than dividing them. New road, highway interchanges, bicycle lanes and ADA accessibility projects included in the 2040 MTP transportation system are long-planned projects that are typically included in local circulation elements. As such, they have been anticipated and accommodated in local land use planning and would be integrated into the community infrastructure. These projects are expected to increase community connectivity and mobility and decrease congestion and GHG emissions.

The land use scenario envisioned by the 2040 MTP/SCS would encourage infill, mixed use and transit oriented development within existing urbanized areas. The land use scenario follows adopted city and county General Plans and regulations and promotes infill development in existing communities. This type of development would not divide a community; rather it would promote the development of existing vacant or underutilized properties. This would locate people closer to existing employment, goods and services within established communities. Buildout of the SCS land use scenario would result in more compact development in those established communities. The existing and new road projects contained in the 2040 MTP/SCS originate from either local circulation plans or state projects supported by cities and counties. The projects have therefore been coordinated with and integrated into local plans that support and connect communities consistent with state planning law. Therefore, impacts related to dividing an established community would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

None Required.

Threshold 2: Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

Impact LU-2 THE 2040 MTP/SCS MAY NOT BE CONSISTENT WITH EVERY APPLICABLE ADOPTED STATE AND LOCAL LAND USE POLICY OR REGULATION ADOPTED FOR THE PURPOSE OF AVOIDING OR MITIGATING ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS. THIS IMPACT WOULD BE SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE.

In planning for projected growth in the region, the 2040 MTP/SCS represents a voluntary growth strategy that retains local government land use autonomy. Neither SB 375 nor any other law requires local member agency general plans or land use regulation to implement the land use policies in the 2040 MTP/SCS. Thus, implementation of the 2040 MTP/SCS is dependent on local government policy decisions and voluntary action. The proposed 2040 MTP/SCS includes a list of planned and programmed projects including local and regional capital improvements that have been anticipated or accounted for in local general plans and coastal plans. These plans are summarized above in the Regulatory Setting section.

The vision for the 2040 MTP/SCS is built on a set of integrated policies, strategies and investments to maintain and enhance the transportation system to meet the diverse needs of the region through 2040. The 2040 MTP/SCS was prepared with the specific intent to comply with the SB 375 goal to reduce GHG emissions. The 2040 MTP/SCS was assessed to determine whether the SCS land use pattern and strategies could conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. This review focused on the process used by AMBAG to develop regional growth projections, the transportation network and programs, housing needs estimates and the SCS land use strategies

The 2040 MTP/SCS encourages a multimodal transportation network with emphasis on non-motorized transportation and land use patterns to reduce the distance between trip destinations. This approach is consistent with the general provisions of the Caltrans Smart Mobility 2010 framework.

The 2040 MTP/SCS will help the region reach its GHG emission reduction targets established by the California Air Resource Board (CARB) under SB 375, as discussed in Section 4.8 *Greenhouse Gas Emissions/Climate Change*. The 2040 MTP/SCS encourages infill and TOD development to reduce automobile traffic and commute trip lengths. The 2040 MTP/SCS would surpass the CARB-established goal of a net zero per capita increase in GHG emissions from passenger vehicles and light trucks in 2020 and a five percent reduction by 2035, by instead achieving a GHG emissions reduction of 4.3 percent per capita by 2020 and 6.6 percent per capita reduction in 2035 (see Section 4.8, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions/Climate Change*).

At the local level, the 2040 MTP/SCS builds on and incorporates regional and local planning efforts completed by the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies and local agencies through the general plan process. Other key regional and local examples include:

- Fort Ord Reuse Authority Base Reuse Plan
- University of California, Santa Cruz Long Range Development Plan
- California State University, Monterey Bay Master Plan

The land use scenario envisioned in the 2040 MTP/SCS was developed in close coordination with AMBAG member agency planning staff, the LAFCO within each of the three counties, and builds on the current local general plans. This involved close coordination with each RTPA's Technical Advisory Committee, a Planning Director's Forum. AMBAG held more than 100 one-on-one meetings with local jurisdictions to discuss the land use pattern included in the 2040 MTP/SCS.

The land use scenario envisioned by the 2040 MTP/SCS was modeled using UPlan. UPlan allocates the future population increase across generalized UPlan land use categories. These generalized UPlan land use categories are the result of condensing the land use types from various local general plans into seven calibrated categories. The result is a spatial projection of future, allowable urbanization within each land use type that is broadly consistent with adopted local general plans.

The 2040 MTP/SCS was developed in close collaboration with the three counties and 18 cities that comprise the AMBAG region. Meetings were held with local agency staff to reach agreement on analytical methodology, assumptions, growth projections, place types, opportunity areas, economic development and the transportation network. While cities and counties are not required by SB 375 to make their plans consistent with the MTP/SCS, every effort was made to avoid inconsistencies. These meetings resulted in consensus among the local agencies on a land use pattern and transportation network for the AMBAG. While this consensus suggests that the 2040 MTP/SCS would not conflict with key policies or regulations adopted to avoid or mitigate environmental

impacts, as presented throughout this EIR, the 2040 MTP/SCS would result in significant and unavoidable impacts in several environmental issue areas, including: aesthetics/visual resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, energy, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality (water supply), noise, population and housing, and transportation and circulation. Because the 2040 MTP/SCS would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to these environmental issue areas, some inconsistencies with city or county policies or regulations intended to protect these resources may occur. Therefore, impacts related to consistency with land use plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects would be significant.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures are provided for applicable resources throughout this section of the EIR to reduce impacts. However, impacts for some resources would remain significant and unavoidable with implementation of mitigation measures, such as impacts related to wildland fire hazard or increases in VMT. No additional feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce significant and unavoidable impacts beyond those identified in this EIR.

c. Specific RTP Projects That May Result in Impacts

All proposed projects listed in Appendix B and summarized in Section 2.0, *Project Description*, would associate with Impacts LU-1 and LU-2.

d. Cumulative Impacts

Planned growth in counties neighboring the AMBAG region,, when combined with the projected growth of the AMBAG cities and counties, could have significant cumulative land use impacts related to either the physical division of communities or conflicts with land use goals, plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects. The AMBAG region is adjacent to seven counties: San Mateo, Santa Clara, Merced, Fresno, Kings, Kern and San Luis Obispo. The land between each of these counties and the AMBAG region is undeveloped agricultural land, grazing land, or open space. There are no developed communities or urban growth areas at or near the seven county boundaries adjacent to the AMBAG region. Therefore, the 2040 MTP/SCS would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact related to the physical division of communities.

Each of seven adjacent counties has adopted general plans that direct new growth to existing developed areas, strongly support agricultural land preservation, and are part of other regional MTP/SCSs. These general plans include goals, policies and programs adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects. San Mateo and San Luis Obispo Counties have adopted Local Coastal Plans, each of which includes goals, policies and programs adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects. All of the counties have zoning ordinances. Since the geographic reach of the 2040 MTP/SCS does not extend into the adjacent counties, and the goals, policies, programs and regulations adopted by the seven adjacent counties is geographically limited to each of those seven counties, the potential for cumulative considerable conflict between the subject goals, policies, programs and regulations is minimal. Therefore, the cumulative impacts resulting from the implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS related to conflict with plans, policies and regulations would be less than significant.