

MONTEREY COUNTY

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AGENCY
PLANNING & BUILDING INSPECTION DEPARTMENT
168 WEST ALISAL ST., 2nd FLOOR, SALINAS, CA 93901
PHONE: (831) 755-5025 FAX: (831) 755-9516



INITIAL STUDY/ NEGATIVE DECLARATION

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Project Title:	Covered Parking Regulation Revisions
File No.:	PLN060514
Project Location:	Countywide
Name of Property Owner:	Not Applicable
Name of Applicant:	County of Monterey
Assessor's Parcel Number(s):	Multiple
Acreage of Property:	Countywide
General Plan Designation:	Not Applicable
Zoning District:	Not Applicable
Lead Agency:	Monterey County Planning Department
Prepared By:	Megan Edgar, Project Manager Rincon Consultants, Inc.
Date Prepared:	September 24, 2007
Contact Person:	Bob Schubert, Acting Planning and Building Services Manager
Phone Number:	(831) 755-5183

II. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

A. Background Information:

Current Monterey County parking regulations require that all residential developments provide at least one covered parking space for each dwelling unit (Source: IX. 2, 3). This requirement exists regardless of whether the property is located in a rural area (e.g., South County), a more densely developed community (e.g., Castroville), or on a property constrained by environmentally sensitive habitats (e.g., Maritime Chaparral). The Monterey County Planning Commission has expressed concern that these requirements are not taking into account the diverse character of the County and in some cases may conflict with policies intended to minimize the impact of development on environmentally sensitive habitats, viewsheds, and slopes (Source: IX.1).

B. Project Description:

The proposed project is an amendment to Chapter 20.58 (Coastal) and Chapter 21.58 (Non-Coastal) of the Monterey County Code (Regulations for Parking) removing the covered parking requirement for residential development. The overall effect of this amendment would be the elimination of covered parking for residential uses and a subsequent increase in the number of uncovered parking spaces for residential projects. Residential projects that were required to provide one covered parking space for each dwelling unit prior to the effective date of the ordinance would no longer be required to provide covered parking as long as the total number of required parking spaces are constructed. This amendment would allow increased flexibility in providing required parking spaces in locations to ensure consistency with applicable General Plan goals and policies by providing the flexibility to consider the diverse character of the County, the size of the property, as well as the protection of environmental resources

III. PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER APPLICABLE LOCAL AND STATE PLANS AND MANDATED LAWS

Use the list below to indicate plans applicable to the project and verify their consistency or non-consistency with project implementation.

General Plan/Area Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality Mgmt. Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	Airport Land Use Plans	<input type="checkbox"/>
Water Quality Control Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Local Coastal Program-LUP	<input type="checkbox"/>

General Plan. As discussed under Section II (Description of Project) above, the Planning Commission has expressed concern that the County’s covered parking requirements for residential developments do not take into account the diverse character of the County and in some cases may conflict with policies intended to minimize the impact of development on environmentally sensitive habitats, viewsheds, and slopes. The proposed revisions to the residential parking requirement would allow increased flexibility in providing required parking spaces in locations to ensure consistency with applicable General Plan goals and policies by providing the flexibility to consider the diverse character of the County, the size of the property, as well as the protection of environmental resources (Source: IX.1). The consistency of the proposed project with specific General Plan goals and policies and applicable Area Plan and Land Use Plan policies is discussed under Section VI.9 (Land Use and Planning) below. As noted therein, the proposed project is consistent with the 1982 Monterey County General Plan. **CONSISTENT**

Water Quality Control Plan. Monterey County is included in the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board – Region 3 (CCRWCB). The CCRWCB regulates the sources of water quality related problems which could result in actual or potential impairment or degradation of beneficial uses or degradations of water quality. Because the proposed project would not result in a net increase in impervious surfaces, it would not contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of stormwater drainage systems [refer to discussion under Item 8(a, e, f)]. In addition, although the elimination of covered parking would incrementally increase the amount of vehicle deposits being washed into and through drainage systems, this affect would be minor and would be distributed throughout the County. **CONSISTENT**

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED AND DETERMINATION

A. FACTORS

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, as discussed within the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards/Hazardous Materials | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems | | |

Some proposed applications that are not exempt from CEQA review may have little or no potential for adverse environmental impact related to most of the topics in the Environmental Checklist; and/or potential impacts may involve only a few limited subject areas. These types of projects are generally minor in scope, located in a non-sensitive environment, and are easily identifiable and without public controversy. For the environmental issue areas where there is no potential for significant environmental impact (and not checked above), the following finding can be made using the project description, environmental setting, or other information as supporting evidence.

- Check here if this finding is not applicable

FINDING: For the above referenced topics that are not checked off, there is no potential for significant environmental impact to occur from either construction, operation or maintenance of the proposed project and no further discussion in the Environmental Checklist is necessary.

EVIDENCE: The project will have no quantifiable adverse environmental effect on the categories not checked above, as follows:

2. Agricultural Resources: The proposed project consists of revisions to the Monterey County Parking Regulations to eliminate the covered parking requirement for residential projects. The changes would not in themselves accommodate new housing development or development in areas where it could

not otherwise occur. Consequently, the project would not have any direct or indirect effect relating to agricultural resources (Source: IX.1).

3. Air Quality: Because the project would not accommodate new housing development or development in areas where it could not otherwise occur, no additional traffic- or construction-related emissions would be generated. Consequently, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of an Air Quality Management Plan, nor would it violate any air quality standard or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the region is in non-attainment. There would be no impact (Source: IX.1).
4. Biological Resources: The proposed project consists of revisions to the Monterey County Parking Regulations to eliminate the covered parking requirement for residential projects. The changes would not in themselves accommodate new residential housing or development in areas where it could not otherwise occur. Consequently, the project would not result in impacts to sensitive habitats, special-status plant or animal species, or wildlife corridors (Source: IX.1). Impacts to biological resources could be reduced as no structure would be required other than a parking surface.
5. Cultural Resources: The proposed revisions to residential parking requirements would not accommodate new housing development or development in areas where it could not otherwise occur. Consequently, the project would not have any direct effect on historic, archaeological, or paleontological resources (Source: IX.1).
6. Geology and Soils: The proposed revisions to residential parking requirements would not accommodate new housing development or development in areas where it could not otherwise occur. Consequently, the project would not expose people or structures to potential adverse effects including risk of loss, injury, or death from fault rupture, seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, or landslides. Similarly, the project would not result in substantial erosion or loss of topsoil, or expose people or structures to unstable or expansive soils. There would be no impact (Source: IX.1).
7. Hazards/Hazardous Materials: The proposed project consists of revisions to the Monterey County Parking Regulations and would not result in the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. There would be no impact related to hazards or hazardous materials (Source: IX.1).
10. Mineral Resources: The proposed revisions to residential parking requirements would not accommodate new housing development or development in areas where it could not otherwise occur. Consequently, the project would not impact mineral resources (Source: IX.1).

11. Noise: The proposed project consists of revisions to the Monterey County Parking Regulations to eliminate the covered parking requirement for residential projects. The changes would not in themselves accommodate new housing development or development in areas where it could not otherwise occur. Consequently, the project would not have any direct or indirect effect relating to construction noise, transportation noise, or the exposure of sensitive receptors to noise in excess of County Standards. There would be no impact (Source: IX.1).
12. Population/Housing: The project would have no impacts on the local or regional population or housing situation as the proposed project would not involve any action associated with population growth or housing displacement (Source: IX.1).
13. Public Services: The project would not result in increased demand for public services as it would not involve an increase in local population (Source: IX.1).
14. Recreation: No parks, trail easements, or other recreational opportunities would be adversely impacted by the proposed project. The removal of the covered parking requirement would not create demands to justify construction of new facilities (Source: IX.1).
15. Transportation/Traffic: The proposed project consists of revisions to the Monterey County Parking Regulations to eliminate the covered parking requirement for residential projects. The changes would not in themselves accommodate new housing development or development in areas where it could not otherwise occur. Consequently, the project would not generate additional traffic compared to what could currently be generated. No impacts to local traffic, emergency access, or air traffic patterns would result. The proposed revisions would not conflict with adopted transportation policies, plans or programs (Source: IX.1).
16. Utilities/Service Systems: The project would not result in an increase in population, structures or housing. Therefore, it would not require utilities or services (Source: IX.1).

B. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date

Bob Schubert

Acting Planning and Building
Services Manager

V. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take into account the whole action involved, including offsite as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a

previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

VI. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

1. AESTHETICS		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion, Analysis and Conclusions:

Aesthetics 1(a, c) – Less than Significant. The proposed project consists of revisions to the Monterey County parking regulations to eliminate the covered parking requirement for residential projects. The changes would not in themselves accommodate new housing development or development in areas where it could not otherwise occur. However, the changes could result in the elimination of covered parking and a subsequent increase in the number of uncovered parking spaces for residential projects (refer to Section II, Description of Project). The elimination of covered parking could increase the number of parked vehicles visible from County roadways and other public view points [refer also to Item 1(d) below]. This may be considered a detrimental aesthetic impact. However, fewer covered parking facilities (such as carports and garages) would potentially result in less overall obstruction of scenic vistas. As a result, aesthetic impacts may be beneficial in some instances.

Future applicants for all residential projects would be required to comply with General Plan and applicable Area Plan or Land Use Plan scenic resource policies and applicable Zoning Ordinance height and size limits. In addition, individual projects would undergo environmental review on a case-by-case basis. Impacts would therefore be less than significant.

Aesthetics 1(b) – Less than Significant. As discussed under Item 1(a, c) above, the proposed project consists of revisions to the Monterey County parking regulations to eliminate the covered parking requirement for residential projects. The changes would not in themselves accommodate new housing development or development in areas where it could not otherwise occur. Consequently, the project would not have any direct or indirect effect on scenic resources within a state scenic highway. Impacts would be less than significant.

Aesthetics 1(d) – Less than Significant. As discussed under Item 1(a, c) above, the elimination of covered parking for residential projects could increase the number of parked vehicles visible from County roadways and other public view points. Increased glare could occur as a result of cars reflecting sunlight. However, this affect would be similar to cars on the roadway or cars parked in a driveway, and would be distributed throughout the County. The proposed parking regulation revisions would not introduce nighttime lighting, and may reduce nighttime lighting due to the potential reduction of the need for exterior lighting on covered parking structures. Impacts would be less than significant.

2. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion, Analysis and Conclusions: See Sections II and IV.

3. AIR QUALITY		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

3. AIR QUALITY		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
d)	Result in significant construction-related air quality impacts? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion, Analysis and Conclusions: See Sections II and IV.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion, Analysis and Conclusions: See Sections II and IV.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site or unique geologic feature? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion, Analysis and Conclusions: See Sections II and IV.

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i)	Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
ii)	Strong seismic ground shaking? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii)	Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv)	Landslides? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion, Analysis and Conclusions: See Sections II and IV.

7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion, Analysis and Conclusions: See Sections II and IV.

8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion, Analysis and Conclusions:

Hydrology and Water Quality 8(a, e, f) – Less than Significant. The proposed project consists of revisions to the Monterey County Parking Regulations to remove the requirement that residential developments provide covered parking. Although the proposed revisions would allow for additional uncovered parking, the same total number of parking spaces would be required pursuant to Chapter 20.58 (Coastal) and Chapter 21.58 (Non-Coastal) of the Monterey County Code (Regulations for Parking). As a result, there would be no net increase in impermeable surfaces as a result of the project.

Parking spaces accumulate deposits of oil, grease, and other vehicle fluids and hydrocarbons. During storms, deposits located on uncovered parking spaces and covered (carport) parking spaces would be washed into and through drainage systems. Oil and grease contain a number of hydrocarbon compounds, some of which are toxic to aquatic organisms at low concentrations. Although deposits on covered (garage) parking spaces would not immediately wash into and through drainage systems during storms, deposits would eventually be washed into the system via homeowner maintenance/cleaning and/or flooding. As a result, the elimination of covered parking would not significantly increase the amount of these deposits being washed into and through drainage systems. In addition, future applicants for development greater than one acre would require a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. Compliance with the NPDES program would ensure less than significant impacts related to RWQCB water quality standards.

Hydrology and Water Quality 8(b) – No Impact. The proposed project would not involve any direct withdrawals of groundwater, nor would it require domestic water service. As discussed under Item 8 (a, e, f) above, the project would not result in a net increase in impervious surfaces. There would be no impact.

Hydrology and Water Quality 8(c, d) – No Impact. The proposed project consists of revisions to the Monterey County Parking Regulations to eliminate the covered parking requirement for residential projects. The changes would not in themselves accommodate new housing development or development in areas where it could not otherwise occur. Consequently, the proposed project would not alter existing drainage patterns, nor would it alter the course of a stream or river. In addition, the project would not result in a net increase in impervious surfaces [refer to Item 8(a, e, f) above]. This amendment would result in fewer structures. There would be no impact related to flooding, erosion, or overflow of stormwater drainage systems.

Hydrology and Water quality 8(g-j) – No Impact. The proposed project would not result in an increase in population, structures or housing. Consequently, the project would not place housing or other structures within a 100-year flood hazard area. Similarly, the project would not expose people or structures to flooding as a result of the failure of a dam or levee or to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. There would be no impact.

9. LAND USE AND PLANNING	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) 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? (Source: IX.1, 4-16)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion, Analysis and Conclusions:

Land Use and Planning 9(a, c) – No Impact. The proposed project consists of revisions to the Monterey County Parking Regulations to eliminate the covered parking requirement for residential projects. The proposed project would not physically divide a community or conflict with a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

Land Use and Planning 9(b) – Less than Significant. Current Monterey County parking regulations require that all residential developments provide at least one covered parking space for each dwelling unit (Source: IX. 2, 3). This requirement exists regardless of whether the property is located in a rural area (e.g., South County), a more densely developed community (e.g., Castroville), or on a property constrained by environmentally sensitive habitats (e.g., Maritime Chaparral). These requirements are not taking into account the diverse character of the County and in some cases could conflict with policies intended to minimize the impact of development on environmentally sensitive habitats, viewsheds, and slopes (Source: IX.1). When such conflicts occur, project applicants must redesign their projects.

The proposed project involves an amendment to Chapter 20.58 (Coastal) and Chapter 21.58 (Non-Coastal) of the Monterey County Code (Regulations for Parking) removing the requirement that residential developments provide a certain number of covered parking spaces for each dwelling unit, depending on the type of residential use. The overall effect of this amendment would be the potential elimination of covered parking and a subsequent increase in the number of uncovered parking spaces for residential projects.

The proposed project is consistent with the 1982 General Plan, as well applicable Area Plan and Land Use Plan policies. Land use and planning impacts resulting from implementation of the proposed revisions to Chapter 20.58 (Coastal) and Chapter 21.58 (Non-Coastal) of the Monterey County Code (Regulations for Parking) would be less than significant.

10. MINERAL RESOURCES		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion, Analysis and Conclusions: See Sections II and IV.

11. NOISE		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in:					
a)	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion, Analysis and Conclusions: See Sections II and IV.

12. POPULATION AND HOUSING	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion, Analysis and Conclusions: See Sections II and IV.

13. PUBLIC SERVICES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in:				
Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
a) Fire protection? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Police protection? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Other public facilities? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion, Analysis and Conclusions: See Sections II and IV.

14. RECREATION		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion, Analysis and Conclusions: See Sections II and IV.

15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f)	Result in inadequate parking capacity? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion, Analysis and Conclusions: See Sections II and IV.

16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS				
Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion, Analysis and Conclusions: See Sections II and IV.

VII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Does the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (Source: IX.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion, Analysis and Conclusions:

(a) Less than Significant. Based upon the analysis throughout this Initial Study, the proposed revisions to residential parking requirements would not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

(b) Less than Significant. The proposed project consists of revisions to the Monterey County Parking Regulations to eliminate the covered parking requirement for residential projects. The changes would not in themselves accommodate new housing development or development in areas where it could not otherwise occur. As a result, there would be no impact related to agricultural resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology/soils, hazards/hazardous materials, mineral resources, noise, population/housing, public services, recreation, or transportation/traffic. Implementation of the proposed project would result in minor incremental reductions in water quality and the character of the aesthetic environment. As described in this Initial Study, the incremental water quality and aesthetics impacts, when considered in combination with the effects of past projects, current projects, and probable future projects in the County, would result in less than significant impacts.

(c) Less than Significant. All potential impact areas are less than significant or would not result in impacts. The proposed revisions to the residential parking requirement would not create substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

VIII. FISH AND GAME ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT FEES

Assessment of Fee:

For purposes of implementing Section 735.5 of Title 14, California Code of Regulations: If based on the record as a whole, the Planner determines that implementation of the project described herein, will result in changes to resources A-G listed below, then a **Fish and Game Document Filing Fee** must be assessed. Based upon analysis using the criteria A-G, and information contained in the record, state conclusions with evidence below.

- A) Riparian land, rivers, streams, water courses, and wetlands under state and federal jurisdiction.
- B) Native and non-native plant life and the soil required to sustain habitat for fish and wildlife;
- C) Rare and unique plant life and ecological communities dependent on plant life, and;
- D) Listed threatened and endangered plant and animals and the habitat in which they are believed to reside.
- E) All species of plant or animals listed as protected or identified for special management in the Fish and Game Code, the Public Resources Code, and the Water Code, or regulations adopted there under.
- F) All marine terrestrial species subject to the jurisdiction of the Department of Fish and Game and the ecological communities in which they reside.
- G) All air and water resources the degradation of which will individually or cumulatively result in the loss of biological diversity among plants and animals residing in air or water.

De minimis Fee Exemption: The State Legislature, through enactment of Senate Bill (SB) 1525, revoked the authority of lead agencies to determine that a project subject to CEQA review had a “de minimus” (minimal) effect on fish and wildlife resources under the jurisdiction of the Department of Fish and Game. Projects that were determined to have a “de minimus” effect were exempt from payment of the filing fees.

SB 1535 has eliminated the provision for a determination of “de minimis” effect by the lead agency, consequently, all land development projects that are subject to environmental review are now subject to the filing fees, unless the Department of Fish and Game determines that the project will have no effect on fish and wildlife resources.

To be considered for determination of “no effect” on fish and wildlife resources, development applicants must submit a form requesting such determination to the Department of Fish and Game. Forms may be obtained by contacting the Department through the Department’s website at www.dfg.ca.gov.

Conclusion: The project **will not** be required to pay the fee.

Evidence: Based on the record as a whole as embodied in the Planning and Building Inspection files pertaining to PLN060514 and the attached Initial Study / Proposed Negative Declaration, implementation of the project described herein will not affect any of the above named resource in Section VIII.

IX. REFERENCES

1. Planning Commission Staff Report, October 25, 2006, 9:10 A.M.
2. Chapter 20.58 of the Monterey County Code (Coastal Parking Regulations)
3. Chapter 21.58 of the Monterey County Code (Non-Coastal Parking Regulations)
4. 1982 Monterey County General Plan, adopted September 30, 1982.
5. Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan, November 5, 1985.
6. Cachagua Area Plan, November 29, 1988.
7. Carmel Area Land Use Plan, April 14, 1983.
8. Carmel Valley Master Plan, December 16, 1986.
9. Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan, July 17, 1984.
10. Greater Monterey Peninsula Area Plan, December 17, 1984.
11. North County Land Use Plan (Coastal), June 4, 1982.
12. North County Area Plan (Inland), July 2, 1985.
13. Central Salinas Valley Area Plan, October 14, 1986.
14. Greater Salinas Area Plan, January 9, 1985.
15. South County Area Plan, December 15, 1987.
16. Toro Area Plan, December 13, 1983.

X. EXHIBITS

Exhibit A – Ordinance Amending Chapter 20.58

Exhibit b – Ordinance Amending Chapter 21.58