4.1 Aesthetics/Visual Resources

This section evaluates the aesthetics and visual resource impacts of the proposed 2040 MTP/SCS.

4.1.1 Setting

a. Visual Character of the Region

AMBAG’s planning area is predominantly rural, with urban development clustered along the Monterey Bay coastline and in agricultural inland valleys. The specific visual characteristics of Monterey, San Benito and Santa Cruz counties are discussed below.

Monterey County

Monterey County is characterized by a scenic ocean coastline along its western and northern borders, with rugged coastal mountains inland along its eastern boundary. The most substantial visual resources are located along the County’s approximately 100-mile long coastline. Monterey County includes some of the most magnificent ocean shoreline in the world along the Big Sur coast, which is bounded on the east by the very steep Santa Lucia Mountain range. Other scenic resources within Monterey County include the Fort Ord National Monument in western Monterey County and Pinnacles National Park located east of Soledad. Elevations in Monterey County range from sea level at the coastline to nearly 5,700 feet above sea level at Junipero Serra Peak.

The Conservation and Open Space Element of the Monterey County General Plan also identifies the Salinas and Carmel Valleys and Elkhorn Slough as prominent features (Monterey County, 2010a). The 130-mile long Salinas Valley stretches the length of the County and offers the greatest visual expanse within inland Monterey County which includes primarily agricultural areas. Development in the valleys originated with the agricultural industry and is located along major travel corridors such as U.S. 101 (Monterey County, 2008). Cities and towns within the valleys include Castroville, Salinas (the largest city in the County), Gonzales, Soledad, Greenfield, King City and Carmel Valley. Foreground, middleground and background views of agriculture fields/pastures and the surrounding ranges and hills comprise the viewshed. The majority of urban development is concentrated in northern Monterey County, in the lower Salinas Valley and around the Monterey Bay.

San Benito County

In contrast to the other two counties in the Monterey Bay region, San Benito County has no coastline. It is characterized by the Diablo and Gabilan Mountain Ranges and their associated inland agricultural valleys. Elevations range from 80 feet above sea level near Aromas in the northwest portion of the County to more than 5,200 feet above sea level at the peak of San Benito Mountain in the southeast. Prominent elements of San Benito County’s scenic landscape include views of mountains, undeveloped rangelands, large agricultural fields and croplands, natural ridgelines along the Diablo and Gabilan Ranges and annual grasslands (San Benito County 2010b). Agricultural land and rangeland account for approximately 75 percent of all land in San Benito County and commonly form the foreground of scenic views. Urban development is concentrated in the City of Hollister, which is characterized by a commercial downtown with low-density residential areas to the west, south and east and industrial areas to the north (San Benito County 2010b).
Santa Cruz County

Santa Cruz County is characterized by scenic ocean coastlines along its western and southern borders, with rugged coastal mountains inland along its northern and eastern boundary, with visual resources generally similar to those of Monterey County described above. One of the distinct visual features of Santa Cruz County is the extensive forest cover of the Santa Cruz Mountains in the north and northeast, including stands of coast redwoods. The Santa Cruz Mountains are the southern edge of this species’ range in coastal California (Santa Cruz County 1994b). A large portion of the County’s population is located in the mid-County coastal terraces, while the alluvial south County is mainly in agricultural use. The aesthetic character of urban areas in the coastal terraces between the Santa Cruz and Aptos is influenced by coastal vistas and stream valleys running southward from the Santa Cruz Mountains. Elevations in Santa Cruz County range from sea level to more than 3,200 feet above sea level at Mt. Bielawski, which is located near the Santa Cruz-Santa Cruz county line.

b. Primary View Corridors

Monterey County

The following roadway segments within Monterey County have been officially designated as “State Scenic Highways” under the California Scenic Highway System:

- State Route (SR) 1 from San Luis Obispo County to SR 68
- SR 25 from SR 198 to the San Benito County line
- SR 68 from SR 1 in Monterey to the Salinas River
- SR 156 from one mile east of Castroville to U.S. 101 near Prunedale

Portions of other highways traversing Monterey County are in the State’s master plan of highways eligible for “Scenic Highway” designation. The eligible highways are:

- SR 1 from SR 68 to the San Mateo County line
- SR 68 from the Salinas River to U.S. 101 near Salinas
- U.S. 101 from SR 156 northeasterly to the San Benito County line
- SR 198 from U.S. 101 near San Lucas to the Fresno County line

In addition to the designated and eligible State Scenic Highways listed above, the Monterey County General Plan includes existing and proposed County Scenic Routes (Monterey County 2010a). These roadways are shown in Figures 13 through 16 of the Monterey County General Plan. The following roadways are designated as County Scenic Routes:

- Old Stage Road
- San Benancio Road
- Corral de Tierra Road
- Laureles Grade Road
- Robinson Canyon Road

The following roadways in Monterey County are proposed for designation as County Scenic Routes:

- Carmel Valley Road
- Reservation Road
- River Road
- Corral de Cielo Road
- Underwood Road
- Crazy Horse Canyon Road
- San Juan Grade Road
- San Miguel Canyon Road

**San Benito County**

The following roadways in San Benito County have been identified as eligible for inclusion in the California Scenic Highway System:

- SR 25 from the Monterey County line to SR 156
- SR 156 from the Monterey County line to the Santa Clara County line
- SR 198 from the Monterey County line to the Fresno County line
- SR 146 from Pinnacles National Monument to State Route 25
- U.S. 101 from the Monterey County line to SR 156

The Natural and Cultural Resources Element of the San Benito County 2035 General Plan (San Benito County, 2015a) also designates the following roadways as Scenic Highways and describes the widths of the associated Scenic Corridors:

- U.S. 101 (entire length within San Benito County - the Scenic Corridor width includes all land 400 feet on either side of the centerline of the road)
- SR 129 from its intersection with U.S. 101 to the San Benito County boundary (the Scenic Corridor width includes all land within 340 feet on either side of the centerline of the road)
- SR 146 between SR 25 and the Monterey County line (the Scenic Corridor width includes all land 340 feet on either side of the centerline of the road)

**Santa Cruz County**

Although no State Scenic Highways have been designated in Santa Cruz County, the following roadways are eligible for designation as such:

- SR 1 from the Monterey to San Mateo county lines
- SR 9 from SR 1 near Santa Cruz to the Santa Clara County line
- SR 17 from SR 1 near Santa Cruz to the Santa Clara County line
- SR 35 from SR 17 to the Santa Clara County line
- SR 152 from SR 1 to the Santa Clara County line at Hecker Pass
- SR 236 from SR 9 near Boulder Creek to SR 9 northeast of Big Basin Redwoods State Park

In addition to the above scenic routes eligible for State Scenic Highway designation, the Santa Cruz County General Plan and Local Coastal Program (Santa Cruz County, 1994) identifies the following routes as “[valued] for their vistas”:

- SR 1 from San Mateo to Monterey County lines
- SR 9 from SR 1 to Santa Clara County line
c. Regulatory Setting

Federal Regulations

U.S. Department of Transportation Act, Section 4(f)

Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act (DOT Act) of 1966 (49 U.S.C. § 303) was enacted to preserve the natural beauty of the countryside and public park and recreation lands, wildlife and waterfowl refuges and historic sites. Section 4(f) requires a comprehensive evaluation of all environmental impacts resulting from federal-aid transportation projects administered by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) that involve the use, or interference with use, of the following types of land:

- Public park lands;
- Recreation areas;
- Wildlife and waterfowl refuges; and
- Publicly- or privately-owned historic properties of federal, state, or local significance.

This evaluation, called the Section 4(f) statement, must be sufficiently detailed to permit the U.S. Secretary of Transportation to determine that:

- There is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of such land;
- The program includes all possible planning to minimize harm to any park, recreation area, wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or historic site that would result from the use of such lands; or
- If there is a feasible and prudent alternative, a proposed project using Section 4(f) lands cannot be approved by the Secretary; or if there is no feasible and prudent alternative, the proposed project must include all possible planning to minimize harm to the affected lands.

Detailed inventories of the locations and likely impacts on resources that fall into the Section 4(f) category are required in project-level environmental assessments.

In August 2005, Section 4(f) was amended to simplify the process for approval or projects that have only minimal impacts on lands affected by Section 4(f). Under the new provisions, the U.S. Secretary of Transportation may find such a minimal impact if consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) results in a determination that a transportation project will have no adverse effect on the historic site or that there will be no historic properties affected by the proposed action. In this instance, analysis of avoidance alternatives is not required and the Section 4(f) evaluation process is complete.
State Regulations

California Scenic Highway Program

Recognizing the value of scenic areas and view from roads in such areas, the State Legislature established the California Scenic Highway Program in 1963 (Streets and Highways Code Sections 260 et seq). This legislation preserves and protects scenic highway corridors from changes that would diminish the aesthetic value of lands adjacent to highways. The goal of the Scenic Highway Program is to preserve and enhance the natural beauty of California. Under this program, a number of State Routes have been designated as eligible for inclusion as scenic routes. Once the local jurisdiction through which the roadway passes have established a corridor protection program and the Departmental Transportation Advisory Committee recommends designation of the roadway, the State may officially designate roadways as scenic routes. Interstate highways, State Routes and county roads may be designated as scenic under the program. The Master Plan of State Highways Eligible for Official Scenic Highway Designation maps designated highway segments, as well as those that are eligible for designation. Changes to the map require an act of the State Legislature.

As noted, a corridor protection program must be adopted by the local governments with land use jurisdiction over the area through which the roadway passes as the first step in moving a road from “eligible” to “designated” status. Each designated corridor is monitored by the State and designation may be revoked if a local government fails to enforce the provisions of the corridor protection program. While there are no restrictions on scenic highway projects, local agencies and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) must together to coordinate transportation and development projects and ensure the protection of the corridor’s scenic value to the greatest extent possible, including undergrounding all visible electric distribution and communication utilities within 1,000 feet of a Scenic Highway. In some cases, local governments have their own land use and site planning regulations in place to protect scenic values along a designated corridor. At a minimum, each corridor protection program must include:

- Regulation of land use and density of development,
- Detailed land and site planning,
- Control of outdoor advertising devices,
- Control of earthmoving and landscaping and
- Regulation of the design and appearance of structures and equipment.

The Master Plan of State Highways Eligible for Official Scenic Highway Designation requires that proposed realignments and route improvements be evaluated for their impact on the scenic qualities of the corridor. The Plan Area includes numerous designated or eligible State Scenic Highways, which can be seen below in Figure 9.

California Coastal Act

The California Coastal Act of 1976 (Public Resources Code [PRC] § 30000 et seq.) establishes policies guiding development and conservation along the California coast. Section 30001 of the Coastal Act finds:

a. That the California coastal zone is a distinct and valuable natural resource of vital and enduring interest to all the people and exists as a delicately balanced ecosystem.

b. That the permanent protection of the state’s natural and scenic resources is a paramount concern to present and future residents of the state and nation.
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c. That to promote the public safety, health and welfare and to protect public and private property, wildlife, marine fisheries and other ocean resources and the natural environment, it is necessary to protect the ecological balance of the coastal zone and prevent its deterioration and destruction.

d. That existing developed uses and future developments that are carefully planned and developed consistent with the policies of this division, are essential to the economic and social well-being of the people of this state and especially to working persons employed within the coastal zone.

According to the California Coastal Act Policy 30251, the scenic and visual qualities of coastal areas shall be considered and protected as resources of public importance. Permitted development shall be sited and designed to protect views to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas to minimize the alteration of natural land forms, to be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas and, where feasible, to restore and enhance visual quality in development in highly scenic areas such as those designated in the California Coastline Preservation and Recreation Plan prepared by the Department of Parks and Recreation and by local government shall be subordinate to the character of its setting.

**Caltrans Adopt-a-Highway Program**

To improve and maintain the visual quality of California highways, Caltrans administers the Adopt-a-Highway program, which was established in 1989. The program provides an avenue for individuals, organizations, or businesses to help maintain sections of roadside within California’s State Highway System. Groups have the option to participate as volunteers or to hire a maintenance service provider to perform the work on their behalf. Adoptions usually span a two-mile stretch of roadside, and permits are issued for five-year periods. Since 1989, more than 120,000 California residents have kept 15,000 shoulder miles of state roadways clean by engaging in litter removal, tree and flower planting, graffiti removal and vegetation removal.

**Regional and Local Regulations**

**City and County General Plans**

The general plans and zoning ordinances of the cities within the Monterey Bay area regulate design and the built environment within those communities, while the general plans for each county perform the same function within unincorporated areas. In all cases, the general plans and zoning typically prescribe visual resource policies and in some cases, require design review of projects. In general, little direction is provided regarding the design of roadways, which are typically subject to adopted Caltrans or local engineering standards related to safety and capacity, rather than aesthetics.

Local jurisdictions in the Monterey Bay area have policies for the protection of scenic corridors. In the Monterey County General Plan (Monterey County, 2010a), Policy C-5.6 requires “special scenic treatment and design within the rights-of-way of officially designated State Scenic Highways and/or County Road.” The San Benito County 2035 General Plan (San Benito County, 2015a) Policy NCR-8.1 in Natural and Cultural Resources Element states that “[t]he County shall endeavor to protect the visual characteristics of certain transportation corridors that are officially designated as having unique or outstanding scenic qualities”. Additionally, Policy 5.10.2 of the Conservation and Open Space Element in the Santa Cruz County General Plan and Local Coastal Program (Santa Cruz County, 1994) states that the County shall “…require projects to be evaluated against the context of their unique environment and regulate structure height, setbacks and design to protect these resources.
consistent with the objectives and policies of [the General Plan].” Cities within the AMBAG region have similar policies pertaining to scenic corridors, visual character and lighting.

Furthermore, several local jurisdictions have “dark sky” ordinances or other exterior lighting standards intended to reduce light pollution and glare, and to protect the nighttime visual environment. For example, Monterey County has specific design guidelines for exterior lighting to require that exterior lighting be unobtrusive, reduce off-site glare and only light an intended area. The design guidelines establish criteria for the location and direction of fixtures, number of fixtures and design of fixtures (Monterey County, 2016). Chapter 19.31 of the San Benito County Code (Development Lighting) establishes three lighting zones, with Zone I imposing the strictest regulations and Zone III imposing the least restrictive, and outlines specific lighting restrictions within each zone (San Benito County, 2017). In Santa Cruz County, Section 13.10.363 of the County Code requires that all exterior lighting in the Public and Community Facilities District include cut-offs that prevent light from extending beyond the boundaries of the property, while Section 13.10.581 outlines restrictions for illuminated signs (Santa Cruz County, 2017). Many cities also have similar types of ordinances. For example, the City of Seaside’s Municipal Code contains Chapter 17.30.070, Outdoor Lighting, which limits the maximum height, energy efficiency, position and maximum illumination, among other parameters, to reduce lighting and glare impacts.

4.1.2 Impact Analysis

a. Methodology and Significance Thresholds

Environmental assessment of a proposed project’s impacts to the aesthetic and visual resources of a site begins with identification of the existing visual resources on and off that site, including the site’s physical attributes, its relative visibility and its relative uniqueness. The assessment of aesthetic impacts involves a qualitative analysis that is inherently subjective in nature. Different viewers react to viewsheds and aesthetic conditions differently. This evaluation measures the existing visual resource against the proposed action, analyzing the nature of the change.

It is important to distinguish between public and private views. Private views are those views seen from privately-owned land, including views from private residences and are typically enjoyed by individuals. Public views are experienced by the collective public. These include views of significant landscape features such as the Monterey Bay, as seen from public viewing space, not privately-owned properties. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (PRC §21000 et seq.) case law has established that only public views, not private views, need be analyzed under CEQA. See Association for Protection etc. Values v. City of Ukiah (1991) 2 Cal. App. 4th 720 and Topanga Beach Renters Assn. v. Department of General Services (1976) 58 Cal. App. 3d 188. Therefore, for this analysis, only public views will be considered when analyzing the visual impacts of implementing the 2040 MTP/SCS.

Appendix G of the State CEQA Guideline identifies the following criteria for determining whether a project’s impacts would have a significant impact related to aesthetics/visual resources:

1. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista;
2. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and historic buildings within a state scenic highway;
3. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings; and/or
4. Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

b. Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This section describes generalized impacts associated with proposed transportation improvements and the future land use scenario under the 2040 MTP/SCS. Table 5 in Section 4.1.3 summarizes the specific projects that could result in aesthetics 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. In general, however, implementation of proposed transportation improvements and future projects under the land use scenario envisioned by the 2040 MTP/SCS could result in the impacts as described in the following section.

Threshold 1: Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista
Threshold 2: Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and historic buildings within a state scenic highway

Impact AES-1 Proposed transportation improvement projects and land use projects envisioned by the 2040 MTP/SCS may affect public views of scenic vistas and along designated scenic corridors, including state scenic highways. This would be a significant and unavoidable impact.

As discussed previously, there are four officially designated state scenic highways and numerous County-designated scenic view corridors in the AMBAG region. Visual resource impacts from construction on or adjacent to these roadways could include: blockage of views by construction equipment and staging areas; disruption of views by temporary signage; and exposure of slopes and removal of vegetation. These effects would be temporary during the construction phase. In the long-term, implementation of the 2040 MTP/SCS would generally result in modification of existing transportation facilities within existing highway, roadway, or railroad rights-of-way. Further, many of the proposed projects are at-grade with the surrounding environment. As such, most of the road and highway investment are not likely to result in massive obstructions or blockages of surrounding views nor modify or substantially alter existing scenic resources viewed from a scenic vista or state scenic highway. Similarly, land use development envisioned by the 2040 MTP/SCS would be focused primarily in urban infill areas. Scenic vistas and designated scenic highways are generally located in undeveloped, rural areas, such that most future land use development envisioned in the 2040 MTP/SCS would be unlikely to block or substantially alter scenic vistas.

While most transportation and land use projects would not result in significant impacts to scenic vistas or scenic resources within a state scenic highway, some projects have the potential to result in substantial adverse effects. For example, widening projects would occur on SR 25 (a designated scenic highway) between Sunset Drive and Fairview Road and on SR 156 (an eligible scenic highway) at its intersection with U.S. 101. These projects could change existing visual conditions of the area within which they are proposed through modification or removal of existing vegetation or the introduction of structures that could block existing views from the roadway. Proposed overcrossings of SR 1 in Santa Cruz County could also obstruct scenic views from this roadway. In addition, in some areas, higher density infill development could obstruct scenic views of mountains or the coastline from urban-area roadways.
Although some of the 2040 MTP/SCS projects could result in significant impacts to scenic vistas, it should be noted that the 2040 MTP/SCS includes several active transportation projects that would create new viewpoints from which the public could enjoy a scenic vista. Specifically, the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network in Santa Cruz and Monterey counties, the San Benito River Recreation Trail in San Benito County and the Fort Ord Regional Trail and Greenway (FORTAG) in Monterey County would all provide regional multi-use trails in rural and highly scenic areas, such as the Monterey Bay coastline, the rolling hills of the former Fort Ord and the San Benito River. These trails would introduce paving and some signage into scenic areas, but would not include structures or other features that would substantially detract from existing views. Rather, these trails would improve public access to scenic areas, thus creating new public viewpoints from which existing scenic vistas can be viewed.

Development near state-designated scenic highway corridors would be minimized to some extent through compliance with the Caltrans Corridor Protection Program, which requires that the local jurisdiction adopt ordinances, zoning and/or planning policies to preserve the scenic quality of the state-designated scenic highway corridor, or document such regulations that already exist in various portions of local codes. Many local jurisdictions also have their own general plan policies relating to the protection of scenic vistas. These policies may limit the amount or type of development in designated scenic corridors or require special design guidelines when developing in certain areas. However, because scenic vistas and scenic resources are protected unevenly among the various jurisdictions in the AMBAG region, the 2040 MTP/SCS may result in a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista or substantially damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway.

**Mitigation Measures**

For transportation projects under their jurisdiction, TARC, SBtCOG and SCCRTC shall implement, and transportation project sponsor agencies can and should implement, the following mitigation measures developed for the 2040 MTP/SCS program where applicable for transportation projects that would potentially degrade scenic vistas or scenic resources within a state scenic highway. Cities and counties in the AMBAG region can and should implement these measures, where relevant to land use projects implementing the 2040 MTP/SCS. Project-specific environmental documents may adjust these mitigation measures as necessary to respond to site-specific conditions.

AES-1(a) Discouragement of Architectural Features that Block Scenic Views

Implementing agencies shall design projects to minimize contrasts in scale and massing between the project and surrounding natural forms and development. Setbacks and acoustical design of adjacent structures shall be preferentially used as mitigation for potential noise impacts arising from increased traffic volumes associated with adjacent land development. The use of sound walls, or any other architectural features that could block views from the scenic highways or other view corridors, shall be discouraged to the extent possible. Where use of sound walls is found to be necessary, walls shall incorporate offsets, accents and landscaping to prevent monotony. In addition, sound walls shall be complementary in color and texture to surrounding natural features.

**Implementing Agencies**

Implementing agencies for transportation projects include RTPAs and transportation project sponsor agencies. Implementing agencies for land use projects include cities and counties.
AES-1(b) Tree Protection and Replacement

New roadways and extensions and widenings of existing roadways shall avoid the removal of existing mature trees to the extent possible. The implementing agency of a particular 2040 MTP/SCS project shall replace any trees lost at a minimum 2:1 basis and incorporate them into the landscaping design for the roadway when feasible. The implementing agency also shall ensure the continued vitality of replaced trees through periodic maintenance.

Implementing Agencies
Implementing agencies for transportation projects include RTPAs and transportation project sponsor agencies.

Significance After Mitigation
Although identified mitigation would help reduce impacts related to state-designated scenic highway corridors and scenic resources, individual transportation infrastructure projects as well as land use development included in the 2040 MTP/SCS could still result in obstructions to panoramic views and views of important landscape features or landforms (mountains, oceans, rivers, bas, or important man-made structures) as seen from public viewing areas. Given the extent of planned land use development and the potential for site-specific visual obstructions from future land use and transportation projects, impacts related to the obstruction of scenic vistas from public viewing areas and impacts to state-designated scenic highway corridors and scenic resources would be significant and unavoidable. No additional mitigation measures to reduce this impact to less-than-significant levels are feasible.

Threshold 3: Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings

Impact AES-2 Proposed transportation improvement projects and land use projects envisioned by the 2040 MTP/SCS may substantially degrade existing visual character in the AMBAG region. This would be a significant and unavoidable impact.

The proposed MTP/SCS includes improvements to existing facilities such as road widenings, intersection or interchange improvements, auxiliary and transition lanes, highway maintenance and other improvements. The 2040 MTP/SCS would include some new road and highway facilities such as new interchanges, new roadways and overcrossings and road extensions. Most road and highway projects would occur in areas where transportation infrastructure is already a dominant feature of the landscape. Such transportation projects would not likely degrade the existing visual character of the region because transportation infrastructure is already a dominant feature of the landscape in those areas. In less developed areas of the region, adding new transportation infrastructure would add an element of urban character to previously undeveloped lands. New and extended roadways would alter the character of agricultural areas near the cities of Salinas and Soledad, in particular, by converting farmland and introducing paved surfaces. Ancillary facilities constructed along new or existing roads (such as lighting, bus shelters and signs) would further contribute to the trend toward a more suburban visual character. Depending on the design and siting of transportation projects, this could be considered a degradation of the visual character or quality of an area. A complete listing of transportation projects with potential to alter the rural character of the AMBAG region is included Table 5.

The 2040 MTP/SCS emphasizes infill development and development near existing transportation corridors, which are generally located in urbanized areas of cities and unincorporated communities.
Infill development can be favorable in terms of visual character, as it occurs in areas already designated for and receiving growth and precludes growth in undeveloped and/or agricultural and rural areas. However, when compared to existing conditions, the 2040 MTP/SCS land use scenario would intensify the built environment within existing urban areas through the implementation of infill and transit oriented development (TOD) projects, thereby resulting in an overall change in the character of existing urbanized areas to a denser development pattern. In addition, land use projects that do occur in rural or agricultural areas would introduce urban development to areas that were previously undeveloped. Depending on the design and siting of these projects, the resulting change could degrade the visual character or quality of their surroundings.

Projects implemented under the 2040 MTP/SCS would be subject to existing regulations that would help to minimize impacts to visual character. For example, in visually sensitive areas, local land use agencies would apply development standards and guidelines to maintain compatibility with surrounding natural areas, including site coverage, building height and massing, building materials and color, landscaping and site grading. Nevertheless, even with compliance with these standards, the overall visual effect of planned roadway projects and envisioned land use projects would contribute to an incremental, but irreversible transformation in visual character from rural or semi-rural to more urban or suburban throughout the AMBAG region. Therefore, the impact on visual character resulting from implementation of the 2040 MTP/SCS would be significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

For transportation projects under their jurisdiction, TAMC, SBtCOG and SCCRTC shall implement, and transportation project sponsor agencies can and should implement, the following mitigation measure developed for the 2040 MTP/SCS program where applicable for transportation projects that would substantially degrade visual character. Cities and counties in the AMBAG region can and should implement this measure, where relevant to land use projects implementing the 2040 MTP/SCS. Project-specific environmental documents may adjust these mitigation measures as necessary to respond to site-specific conditions.

**AES-2 Design Measures for Visual Compatibility**

The implementing agency shall require measures that minimize contrasts in scale and massing between the project and surrounding natural forms and developments. Strategies to achieve this include:

- Siting or designing projects to minimize their intrusion into important viewsheds;
- Avoiding large cuts and fills when the visual environment (natural or urban) would be substantially disrupted;
- Ensuring that re-contouring provides a smooth and gradual transition between modified landforms and existing grade;
- Developing transportation systems to be compatible with the surrounding environments (e.g., colors and materials of construction material; scale of improvements);
- Protecting or replacing trees in the project area;
- Designing and installing landscaping to add natural elements and visual interest to soften hard edges, as well as to restore natural features along corridors where possible after widening, interchange modifications, re-alignment, or construction of ancillary facilities. The implementing agency shall provide a performance security equal to the value of the landscaping/irrigation installation to ensure compliance with landscaping plans; and
Designing new structures to be compatible in scale, mass, character and architecture with existing structures.

**Implementing Agencies**
Implementing agencies for transportation projects include RTPAs and transportation project sponsor agencies. Implementing agencies for land use projects include cities and counties.

**Significance After Mitigation**
Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce project-specific impacts to the extent feasible. Nevertheless, the incremental alteration of current rural or semi-rural character to a more suburban environment is considered a significant and unavoidable impact. No additional mitigation measures to reduce this impact to less-than-significant levels are feasible.

**Threshold 4:** Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area

**Impact AES-3**

TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS ENVISIONED IN THE 2040 MTP/SCS WOULD RESULT IN INCREASED LIGHTING FROM SECURITY LIGHTING, LANDSCAPE AND STRUCTURE LIGHTING AND LIGHTS ON VEHICLES. LAND USE PROJECTS ENVISIONED IN THE 2040 MTP/SCS WOULD ALSO INTRODUCE NEW OR INTENSIFIED SOURCES OF LIGHTING. THIS LIGHTING MAY ADVERSELY AFFECT VIEWS IN THE AREA AND WOULD BE A SIGNIFICANT BUT MITIGABLE IMPACT.

New or intensified lighting from land use development envisioned in the 2040 MTP/SCS, which is focused on infill and TOD development, would be concentrated in areas with existing sources of light and glare. In these infill areas, such increases may not adversely affect nighttime views because existing sources of light, glare and shadow are already a dominant feature of the urban landscape. However, the intensity of light and glare in these urban areas could increase as a result of infill and TOD projects under the 2040 MTP/SCS, depending on site-specific conditions and lighting design associated with new structures. Exterior lighting in some areas would be limited by compliance with existing lighting regulations, as discussed in the Regulatory Setting. For example, Chapter 19.31 of the San Benito County Code (Development Lighting) (San Benito County, 2017), Section 13.10.363 of the Santa Cruz County Code (Santa Cruz County, 2017) and Chapter 17.30.070 of the City of Seaside’s Municipal Code (City of Seaside 2017) contain limitations to the maximum height, energy efficiency, position and maximum illumination of new lighting fixtures, among other parameters, to reduce lighting and glare impacts. However, not all jurisdictions have adopted dark sky ordinances or similar restrictions, and because the restrictiveness of these regulations varies throughout the region, impacts from land use development on the potential for increased lighting affecting nighttime views would be significant.

Improvements to existing roadways and highways would not significantly increase the amount of light and glare in an area, as these improvements would take place on existing facilities that have existing sources of light and glare. Increases in light and glare from new reflective signage, streetlights, intersection control devices and other improvements would be relatively minor compared to existing conditions. However, the expansion of existing roadways or construction of new roadways would allow a greater volume of vehicles to travel through a given segment of roadway or highway throughout the day, or introduce vehicles into a new area, which would have the potential to introduce new or additional vehicle headlights as new light sources. In addition, some of the new transportation facilities included in the 2040 MTP/SCS would directly introduce
light, including: the replacement of existing lighting at the Monterey Municipal Airport, construction of pedestrian lighting along various City streets and installation of lighting along bike paths in Monterey County. The introduction of light and glare could adversely affect day or nighttime views.

Overall, light and glare impacts from transportation improvements and infill and TOD development envisioned under the 2040 MTP/SCS would be significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

For transportation projects under their jurisdiction, TAMC, SBtCOG and SCCRTC shall implement, and transportation project sponsor agencies can and should implement, the following mitigation measures for transportation projects that would result in light and glare impacts. Cities and counties in the AMBAG region can and should implement these measures, where relevant to land use projects implementing the 2040 MTP/SCS. Project-specific environmental documents may adjust these mitigation measures as necessary to respond to site-specific conditions.

**AES-3(a) Roadway Lighting**

Roadway lighting shall be minimized to the extent possible, consistent with safety and security objectives and shall not exceed the minimum height requirements of the local jurisdiction in which the project is proposed. This may be accomplished through the use of hoods, low intensity lighting and using as few lights as necessary to achieve the goals of the project.

**Implementing Agencies**

Implementing agencies for transportation projects include RTPAs and transportation project sponsor agencies.

**AES-3(b) Lighting Design Measures**

As part of planning, design and engineering for projects, implementing agencies shall ensure that projects proposed near light-sensitive uses avoid substantial spillover lighting. Potential design measures include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Lighting shall consist of cutoff-type fixtures that cast low-angle illumination to minimize incidental spillover of light into adjacent properties and undeveloped open space. Fixtures that project light upward or horizontally shall not be used.
- Lighting shall be directed away from habitat and open space areas adjacent to the project site.
- Light mountings shall be downcast and the height of the poles minimized to reduce potential for backscatter into the nighttime sky and incidental spillover of light onto adjacent private properties and undeveloped open space. Light poles will be 20 feet high or shorter. Luminary mountings shall have non-glare finishes.
- Exterior lighting features shall be directed downward and shielded in order to confine light to the boundaries of the subject project. Where more intense lighting is necessary for safety purposes, the design shall include landscaping to block light from sensitive land uses, such as residences.

**Implementing Agencies**

Implementing agencies for transportation projects include RTPAs and transportation project sponsor agencies. Implementing agencies for land use projects include cities and counties.
AES-3(c)  Glare Reduction Measures

Implementing agencies shall minimize and control glare from transportation and infill development projects near glare-sensitive uses through the adoption of project design features such as:

- Planting trees along transportation corridors to reduce glare from the sun;
- Creating tree wells in existing sidewalks;
- Adding trees in new curb extensions and traffic circles;
- Adding trees to public parks and greenways;
- Landscaping off-street parking areas, loading areas and service areas;
- Limiting the use of reflective materials, such as metal;
- Using non-reflective material, such as paint, vegetative screening, matte finish coatings and masonry;
- Screening parking areas by using vegetation or trees;
- Using low-reflective glass; and
- Complying with applicable general plan policies or local controls related to glare
- Tree species planted to comply with this measure shall provide substantial shade cover when mature. Utilities shall be installed underground along these routes wherever feasible to allow trees to grow and provide shade without need for severe pruning.

Implementing Agencies

Implementing agencies for transportation projects include RTPAs and transportation project sponsor agencies. Implementing agencies for land use projects include cities and counties.

Significance After Mitigation

In the absence of regulations specifically addressing light and glare impacts, the aforementioned mitigation measures would limit the use of reflective building materials and the potential spillage of light both upward and onto adjacent properties from exterior lighting fixtures. As a result, in areas lacking existing dark sky ordinances or similar regulations, or where such regulations are insufficient, the implementation of the identified mitigation measures would reduce impacts related to light and glare to a less-than-significant level.

c. Specific MTP/SCS Projects That May Result in Impacts

Table 5 identifies projects with the potential to cause or contribute to direct or indirect impacts to aesthetics and visual resources such as those discussed above. These projects are representative and were selected based on their potential scope and likelihood to result in the impacts identified above. Additional specific analysis will be required as individual projects are implemented to determine the project-specific magnitude of impact. Mitigation discussed above would apply to these specific projects.
### Table 5  2040 MTP/SCS Projects That May Result in Aesthetic/Visual Resource Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMBAG ID</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Locale</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description/Scope</th>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MON-GRN001-GR</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Apple Avenue Bridge over U.S. 101</td>
<td>Construct new bike/pedestrian bridge parallel to existing overpass.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-GRN005-GR</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Thorne Road Bridge over U.S. 101</td>
<td>Construct new bike/pedestrian bridge parallel to existing overpass.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-MAR157-MA</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>Reservation Road/Beach Road Improvements</td>
<td>Widen roadway with sidewalk and bike lane improvements.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-MRY002-MY</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Del Monte – Washington</td>
<td>Construct pedestrian bridge over Del Monte and traffic signal improvements.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-MYC075-UM</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Chualar</td>
<td>River Road Operational Improvements</td>
<td>Widen shoulders and improve geometrics and install class II bike lanes.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-SCY009-SA</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Sand City</td>
<td>Bike Path Lighting</td>
<td>Install lighting on existing class I path.</td>
<td>AES-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-SNS078-SL</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>Natividad Creek Bike Path</td>
<td>Install new bike path.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-SNS141-SL</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>Laurel Drive Sidewalks</td>
<td>Sidewalk lighting.</td>
<td>AES-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-SOL043-SO</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Soledad</td>
<td>Pedestrian Lighting</td>
<td>Construct pedestrian lighting along various City streets.</td>
<td>AES-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-CT011-CT</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>SR 68 Corridor</td>
<td>Widen existing roadway to 4 lanes between existing 4-lane segment at Toro Park and Corral de Tierra Road (MON-68-4.0/15.0)</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-CT017-CT</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>SR 68 – (Holman Hwy – access to Community Hospital)</td>
<td>Widen Holman Highway SR 68 from CHOMP to SR 1 to 4 lanes and make operational improvements at the SR 68/SR 1 EA interchange. (EA 05-44800) PM 3.8/L4.3</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-CT022-CT</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Prunedale</td>
<td>SR 156 – Corridor Widening Project</td>
<td>Construct new 4-lane highway south of existing alignment convert existing highway to frontage road and construct new at U.S. 156 and 101.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-CT030-SL</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>U.S. 101 – Salinas Corridor</td>
<td>Widen U.S. 101 to 6 lanes within the existing right of way at locations where feasible.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-CT031-CT</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Chualar</td>
<td>U.S. 101 – South County Frontage Roads</td>
<td>Construct Frontage Roads from Harris Road to Chualar, then to Soledad. (EA 05-OH330) PM 3.8/L4.3</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-CT045-SL</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>U.S. 101 – Harris Road Interchange</td>
<td>Construct new interchange on U.S. 101 at Harris Road (PM 83.71).</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-GRN008-GR</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>U.S. 101 – Walnut Avenue Interchange</td>
<td>Relocate and replace existing U.S. 101/Walnut Avenue Interchange and widen to six lanes. (EA 05-OP160) PM 53.4/54.3</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-MAR136-MA</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>SR 1 &amp; Imjin Bridge</td>
<td>Widen NB off-ramp to two lanes.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMBAG ID</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Locale</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project Description/Scope</td>
<td>Potential Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-MAR137-MA</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>SR 1 &amp; Imjin Bridge</td>
<td>Widen SB on-ramp to two lanes.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-SOL002-SO</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Soledad</td>
<td>U.S. 101 – North Interchange</td>
<td>Install new interchange north of U.S. 101 and Front Street.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-SOL003-SO</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Soledad</td>
<td>U.S. 101 – South Interchange</td>
<td>Install new interchange south of U.S. 101 and Front Street.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-PGV010-PG</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Pacific Grove</td>
<td>SR 68 – Bishop to Sunset</td>
<td>Mobility Improvements including sidewalks, lighting, landscaping and roadways overlay.</td>
<td>AES-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-MAR001-MA</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Marina-Salinas</td>
<td>Marina – Salinas Corridor</td>
<td>Widen Davis Road to 4 lanes from Blanco Road to Reservation Road; widen Reservation Road to 4 lanes from Davis Road to existing 4-lane section adjacent to East Garrison at Intergarrison Road; widen Imjin Pkwy to 4 lanes from Reservation Road to Imjin Road, construct new Imjin Parkway interchange at SR 1. Include accommodations for bicyclists, pedestrians and transit; consider high quality transit service along corridor.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-SNS012-SL</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>Boronda Road Widening</td>
<td>Widen to 6 lanes from San Juan Grade Road to Williams Road; install Class II bike lanes and fill sidewalk gaps.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-SNS044-SL</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>Natividad Road Widening</td>
<td>Widen from 2 to 4 lanes.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-SNS050-SL</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>Russel Road Widening</td>
<td>Widen street from U.S. 101 to San Juan Grade Road.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-SNS059-SL</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>Williams Road Widening</td>
<td>Widen from 2 to 4 lanes.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-SNS090-SL</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>Russel Road Extension</td>
<td>Extend 4 lane arterial.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-SNS092-SL</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>San Juan Natividad Collector</td>
<td>Construct an east-west 2 lane collector.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-SNS093-SL</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>Independence Boulevard Extension</td>
<td>Extend as 2 lane collector.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-SNS094-SL</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>Hemingway Drive Extension</td>
<td>Construct 2-lane road.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-SNS095-SL</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>Constitution Boulevard Extension</td>
<td>Construct 4-lane street.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-SNS096-SL</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>Sanborn Road Extension</td>
<td>Construct 4-lane arterial.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-SNS097-SL</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>Williams Russel Collector</td>
<td>Construct new north-south connection.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-SNS-098-SL</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>Alisal Street Extension</td>
<td>Extend as 2-lane collector street with bike lanes.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-SNS099-SL</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>Moffett Street Extension</td>
<td>Extend as 4-lane collector.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### AMBAG ID | County | Locale | Project | Project Description/Scope | Potential Impact
---|---|---|---|---|---
MON-SNS100-SL | Monterey | Salinas | Rossi Street Widening | Widen to 4 lanes. | AES-1

MON-SNS101-SL | Monterey | Salinas | Bernal Drive Extension | Extend as 4-lane arterial. | AES-1

MON-SNS102-SL | Monterey | Salinas | Constitution Boulevard Extension | Construct new 2-lane street. | AES-1

MON-SNS103-SL | Monterey | Salinas | Williams Road Widening | Widen from 3 to 4 lanes. | AES-1

MON-SNS104-SL | Monterey | Salinas | Alisal Street Widening | Widen from 2 to 4 lanes. | AES-1

MON-SNS108-SL | Monterey | Salinas | Laurel Drive Widening | Widen to 6 lanes and add left turn channelization west of Constitution. | AES-1

MON-SNS121-SL | Monterey | Salinas | McKinnon Street Extension | Extend 2-lane collector. | AES-1

MON-FRA004-MA | Monterey | Marina | Patton Parkway (Abrams Road) | Construct a new 2-lane arterial and Class II bike lanes (FORA CIP FO2). | AES-1

MON-FRA010-MA | Monterey | Marina | Crescent Court | Extend existing Crescent Court southerly to join proposed Abrams Drive on the former Fort Ord (FORA CIP off-site 8). | AES-1

MON-FRA018-SE | Monterey | Seaside | Giggling Road | Upgrade/construct new 4-lane arterial (FORA CIP FO7). | AES-1

MON-FRA023-MA | Monterey | Marina | Salinas Avenue | Construct new 2-lane arterial (FORA CIP FO11). | AES-1

MON-FRA025-MA | Monterey | Marina | 2nd Avenue Phase 2 | Construct new arterial road and Class II bike lanes (FORA CIP FO8). | AES-1

MON-FRA026-MA | Monterey | Marina | 2nd Avenue Phase 3 | Construct new arterial road and Class II bike lanes (FORA CIP FO8). | AES-1

MON-FRA027-MA | Monterey | SR 68 Corridor | So. Boundary Rd. Improvements | Reconstruct street, add sidewalks, bike lanes, street lights, etc. | AES-1, AES-2

MON-GON005-GO | Monterey | Gonzales | Fanoe Road | Widen from 4 to 6 lanes and install Class II bike lanes. | AES-1

MON-GON007-GO | Monterey | Gonzales | La Gloria Road Widening | Widen road approximately one-half mile. | AES-1

MON-GRN003-GR | Monterey | Greenfield | Oak Road Bridge over U.S. 101 | Widen bridge for dual left turn lanes. | AES-1

MON-GRN022B-GR | Monterey | Greenfield | Pine Avenue Overcrossing at U.S. 101 | Construct new bridge over U.S. 101 to improve E-W traffic flow. | AES-1

MON-MAR150-MA | Monterey | Marina | 2nd Avenue Extension | Construct new roadway. | AES-1

MON-MAR153-MA | Monterey | Marina | Patton (Abrams) Pkwy Extension | Construct new roadway. | AES-1

MON-MAR154-MA | Monterey | Marina | Imjin Parkway Widening Project | Measure X project to widen Imjin Parkway to 4 lanes from Reservation Road to Imjin Road. | AES-1

MON-MYC147-UM | Monterey | Unknown | Jolon Road Overlay Safety Improvements | Shoulder widening & geometric improvements and installation of 39.2 miles of Class II bikeway. | AES-1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMBAG ID</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Locale</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description/Scope</th>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MON-MYC147-UM</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Castroville</td>
<td>Castroville Improvements/ Blackie Road</td>
<td>Construct new road from Castroville Boulevard to Blackie Road.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-MYC158-UM</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Carmel Valley</td>
<td>CVMP – Carmel Valley Road between Laureles Grade and Ford Shoulder Widening</td>
<td>Shoulder widening.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-MYC162-UM</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Carmel Valley</td>
<td>CVMP – Laureles Grade at Carmel Valley Road Roundabout, Signalization, or Widening</td>
<td>Install signal or widen (prior to grade separation).</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-MYC238-UM</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Moss Landing</td>
<td>Salinas Road Improvements</td>
<td>Widen to four lanes between future Hwy 1 and Salinas Road interchange and existing four-lane section. Widen existing three-lane section of Salinas Road from Werner road to Elkhorn Road to four lanes. Add Class II bike lanes on Salinas Road from SR 1 to Elkhorn Road. Install traffic signal and construct intersection improvements at Salinas Road/Werner Road. Construct traffic signal on Elkhorn Road at Salinas Road. Re-align Salinas Road and Werner Road to intersect Elkhorn Road at a single location with a traffic signal.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-MYC247-UM</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Prunedale</td>
<td>San Miguel Canyon Road at Castroville Boulevard</td>
<td>Signalization of the intersection, roadway widening and striping improvements.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-SCY005-SA</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Sand City</td>
<td>Sand City Rehab in Old Town Area</td>
<td>Install street lighting, reconstruct streets in Old Town area; design shared streets (Woonerfs).</td>
<td>AES-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-SNS006-SL</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>U.S. 101 – Alvin Drive Overpass/ Underpass and Bypass</td>
<td>Construct overpass/underpass and 4-lane street structure.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-SNS008-SL</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>Bernal Drive East Improvements</td>
<td>Widen road, construct sidewalk and retaining wall on north side of road; between N. Main and Rosarita Drive.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-SNS024-SL</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>Elvee Drive</td>
<td>Construct 44’ wide culvert and extend two lanes between Work to Elvee.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-SNS041-SL</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>Maryal Drive Reconstruction</td>
<td>Widen roadway behind Rodeo Grounds (from 36’ to 40’).</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-SNS159-SL</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>Market/ Eucalyptus Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>Traffic signal installation, lighting and sidewalks.</td>
<td>AES-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMBAG ID</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Locale</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project Description/Scope</td>
<td>Potential Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-COG-A54</td>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>Hollister - Gilroy</td>
<td>State Route 25 Corridor Improvement Project</td>
<td>To enhance safety, improve traffic operations and provide additional capacity to reduce congestion for all transportation modes on Highway 25 between San Felipe Road and the San Benito/Santa Clara County line.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-CT-A01</td>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>San Juan Bautista</td>
<td>SR 156 Widening – San Juan Bautista to Union Road</td>
<td>Construct a four-lane expressway south of the existing State Route 156 and use the existing SR 156 as the northern frontage road.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-CT-A17</td>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>Hollister</td>
<td>Airline Highway Widening/SR 25 Widening: Sunset Drive to Fairview Road</td>
<td>Widen to 4-lane expressway with bicycle lanes.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-CT-A44</td>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>Hollister</td>
<td>Highway 25 4-lane Widening, Phase 1</td>
<td>Widen to 4-lane expressway, San Felipe Road to Hudner Lane.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-VTA-A01</td>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>Highway 101/25 Interchange</td>
<td>New interchange at Highway 101 and Highway 25 in Santa Clara County.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-CT-A02</td>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>Hollister</td>
<td>Highway 156/Fairview Road Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>Construct new turn lanes at the intersection.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-COH-A16</td>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>Hollister</td>
<td>Memorial Drive Extension: Meridian Street to Santa Ana Road</td>
<td>Construct 4-lane road extension with bicycle lanes.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-COH-A18</td>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>Hollister</td>
<td>Westside Boulevard Extension</td>
<td>Construct 2-lane road; Nash Road to Southside Road/San Benito Street intersection with bicycle lanes.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-COH-A19</td>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>Hollister</td>
<td>North Street (Buena Vista) between College Street and San Benito Street</td>
<td>Construct 2-lane road with bicycle lanes.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-COH-A55</td>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>Hollister</td>
<td>Memorial Drive North Extension: Santa Ana Road to Flynn Road/Shelton Intersection</td>
<td>Construct new 4-lane road and extension with bicycle lanes.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-COH-A57</td>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>Hollister</td>
<td>Pacific Way (New Road): San Felipe Rd. to Memorial Drive</td>
<td>New 2-lane road from San Felipe Road to future Memorial Drive north extension with bicycle lanes.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-SBC-A04</td>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>Hollister</td>
<td>Union Road Widening (East): San Benito Street to Highway 25</td>
<td>Widen to 4-lane arterial with bicycle lanes.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-SBC-A05</td>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>Hollister</td>
<td>Union Road Widening (West): San Benito Street to Highway 156</td>
<td>Widen to 4-lane arterial with bicycle lanes.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMBAG ID</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Locale</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project Description/Scope</td>
<td>Potential Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-SBC-A09</td>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>Hollister</td>
<td>Fairview Road Widening</td>
<td>McCloskey to SR 25. Widen to 4-lane arterial; construct new bridge south of Santa Ana Valley Road with bicycle lanes.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-SBC-A14</td>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>Hollister</td>
<td>San Benito Regional Park Access Road</td>
<td>Construct new 2-lane roadway from Nash Road to San Benito Street</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-SBC-A50</td>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>Hollister</td>
<td>Hospital Road Bridge</td>
<td>Hospital Road over San Benito River, between South Side Road and Cienega Road. Replace lane low water crossing with 2-lane bridge. Bridge No. 00L0026</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-SBC-A67</td>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>Dunneville</td>
<td>Shore Road Extension</td>
<td>4-lane arterial with Class II bike lanes.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-SBC-A79</td>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>Hollister</td>
<td>Enterprise Road Extension</td>
<td>Extend Enterprise Road westerly from Southside Road toward Union Road.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-SBC-A81</td>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>Hollister</td>
<td>Meridian Street Extension: 185 feet east of Clearview Road to Fairview Road</td>
<td>Construct 4-lane road. Located in the City of Hollister and County with bicycle lanes.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-SBC-A82</td>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>Hollister</td>
<td>Flynn Road Extension</td>
<td>San Felipe Road to Memorial Drive north extension. New roadway construction south of McCloskey Road with bicycle lanes.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-SJB-A07</td>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>Hollister</td>
<td>Third Street Extension</td>
<td>Constructing Third Street to connect to First Street.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-SJB-A08</td>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>Hollister</td>
<td>Lavanigno Drive Construction</td>
<td>Construction of Lavanigno Drive, split lanes with island in the middle; total 4 lanes.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-SJB-A09</td>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>Hollister</td>
<td>Connect Lang Street to The Alameda</td>
<td>Construct and connect Lang Street; 2 lanes.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-SBC-A51</td>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Y Road Bridge</td>
<td>Y Road over San Benito River replace 2-lane Low-Water Crossing with 2-lane bridge. Bridge No. 00L0069</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-SBC-A54</td>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>Near Paicines</td>
<td>Panoche Road Bridge (Bridge No. 43C0027)</td>
<td>Panoche Road, over Tres Pinos Creek, 12 miles west Little Panoche Road. Replace 1-lane bridge with 2-lane bridge. Bridge No. 43C0027</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-SBC-A57</td>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>Cienega Valley</td>
<td>Limekihn Road Bridge</td>
<td>Limekihn Rd over Pescadero Creek, 0.1 Mi S Cienega Rd. Replace 1-lane bridge with 2-lane bridge. Bridge No. 43C0054.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-SBC-A58</td>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>San Juan Bautista</td>
<td>Rocks Road Bridge</td>
<td>Rocks Road over Pinacate Rock Creek, East Little Merrill Road. Replace 1-lane bridge with 2-lane bridge. Bridge No. 43C0053.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-SBC-A86</td>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>Hollister</td>
<td>John Smith Realignment at Fairview Intersection</td>
<td>This project will realign John Smith Road to intersect Fairview Road at St. Benedict Way and add left and right turn lanes into John Smith Road.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-LTA-A48</td>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>Hollister-Gilroy</td>
<td>Commuter Rail to Santa Clara County</td>
<td>Commuter rail from Hollister to Gilroy.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMBAG ID</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Locale</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project Description/Scope</td>
<td>Potential Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC 30SC</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Aptos</td>
<td>Hwy 1 Bicycle/Ped Overcrossing at Mar Vista</td>
<td>Construct a bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing of Hwy 1 in vicinity of Mar Vista Drive, providing improved access to Seacliff and Aptos neighborhoods and schools.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC-SC-P10S-SCR</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Market Street sidewalks and Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Completion of sidewalks and bicycle lanes. Includes retaining walls, right-of-way, tree removals and a bridge modification.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC-WAT-P65-WAT</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>Upper Struve Slough Trail</td>
<td>Construction of 450 foot long pedestrian/bicycle path along upper Struve Slough from Green Valley Road to Pennsylvania Drive. The trail shall consist of a twelve-foot wide by one foot deep aggregate base section with the center eight feet covered with a chip seal. Additional improvements include installing a 130-foot length of modular concrete block retaining wall, reinforcing 160-foot length of slough embankment with rock slope protection and installing a 175-foot long by eight foot wide boardwalk.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC-RTC-24e-RTC</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Soquel</td>
<td>3 – Hwy 1: Auxiliary Lanes from Park Avenue to Bay Avenue/Porter Street</td>
<td>Construct auxiliary lanes and reconstruct Capitola Avenue overcrossing.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC-RTC-24f-RTC</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Soquel</td>
<td>2 – Hwy 1: Auxiliary Lanes from 41st Avenue to Soquel Avenue and Chanticleer Bike/Ped Bridge</td>
<td>Construct auxiliary lanes and a bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing of Hwy 1 at Chanticleer Avenue.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC-RTC-24g-RTC</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Soquel</td>
<td>4 – Hwy 1: Auxiliary Lanes from State Park Drive to Park Avenue</td>
<td>Construct auxiliary lanes.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC-RTC 24r-RTC</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Aptos</td>
<td>94 – Hwy 1: Northbound Auxiliary Lane from San Andreas Road/Larkin Valley Road to Freedom Boulevard</td>
<td>Construct northbound auxiliary lane.</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC-SC-38-SCR</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Hwy 1/San Lorenzo Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>Replace the Highway 1 bridge over San Lorenzo River to increase capacity, improve safety and improve seismic stability, from Highway 17 to the Junction of Hwys 1/9. Reduce flooding potential and improve fish passage. Caltrans Project ID 05-0P460</td>
<td>AES-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d. **Cumulative Impacts**

The analysis in this section examines impacts of the 2040 MTP/SCS on aesthetics/visual resources throughout the AMBAG region and is cumulative in nature. Some types of impacts to aesthetic resources are localized and not cumulative in nature. For example, the creation of glare or shadows at one location is not worsened by glare or shadows created at another location. Rather these effects are independent and the determination as to whether they are adverse is specific to the project and location where they are created. Projects that block a view or affect the visual quality of a site also result in localized impacts. The impact occurs specific to a site or area and remains independent from another project elsewhere that may block a view or degrade the visual environment of a specific site.

There are two types of aesthetic impact that may be additive in nature and thus cumulative: night sky lighting and overall changes in the visual environment as the result of increasing urbanization of large areas. As development in one area, such as a relatively large city adjoining agricultural land like Salinas, increases and possibly expands over time and meets or connects with development in an adjoining ex-urban area, the effect of night sky lighting experienced outside of the region may increase in the form of larger and/or more intense nighttime glow in the viewshed. Although growth envisioned in the 2040 MTP/SCS is primarily focused on infill areas, development outside of those geographies with long-distance views may result in nighttime lighting becoming more visible, covering a larger area and/or appearing in new areas as a result of projected development under the 2040 MTP/SCS.
With regard to the visual environment experienced throughout the cumulative impact analysis area (AMBAG region and adjoining counties), as planned cumulative development occurs over time the overall visual environmental will change. The combination of forecasted development in the AMBAG region and planned development in neighboring counties will result in a different visual environment than currently exists. The cumulative impacts associated with night sky lighting and changes in the visual environment are considered significant and the contribution of the 2040 MTP/SCS to these impacts is cumulatively considerable. Mitigation measures described earlier in this section would reduce these impacts, but not to less-than-cumulatively-considerable levels.