Chapter 5
Alternatives Analysis

Alternatives Analysis

In accordance with Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines, an environmental impact report (EIR) must evaluate a "range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project." The discussion of alternatives should focus on "alternatives capable of eliminating any significant adverse impacts or reducing them to below a level of significance, even if these alternatives could impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives or would be more costly." CEQA further directs that "the significant effects of an alternative shall be discussed, but in less detail than the significant effects of the project as proposed." The factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives include site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the Project Applicant can reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to the alternative site.

The decision to select alternative locations needs to be based on whether offsite locations would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. The lead agency also must determine if no feasible alternative locations exist and disclose the reasons for this assessment. The final decision regarding the feasibility of alternatives lies with the decision-maker for a given project who must make the necessary findings addressing the potential feasibility of reducing the severity of significant environmental effects (PRC 21081; see also State CEQA Guidelines 15091).

State CEQA Guidelines define "feasible" to mean "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors." When making the decision as to whether an alternative is feasible or infeasible, the decision-making body may consider the stated project objectives in an EIR in light of any relevant economic, environmental, social, and technological factors.

Proposed Project Goal and Objectives

The Proposed Project has the following goals and objectives.

Economic Goals

- Create Affordable (Inclusionary) and Workforce housing that remains affordable for as long as possible.
- Create a mixed-income community with a range of housing opportunities across the economic spectrum.
- Ensure that new development pays for 100 percent of infrastructure and services needed to support the new neighborhood.

- Establish mechanisms for maintaining and operating private infrastructure.

Environmental Goals

- Create a compact, efficient community that will minimize impacts on the environment.
- Integrate the surrounding native habitats into the open spaces within the community.
- Create buffers around the community that help transition from a native habitat/ecosystem to an urban habitat/ecosystem.
- Encourage multi-modal transportation opportunities, especially bicycle, pedestrian, and transit by creating small blocks, interconnected streets, sidewalks, and bicycle paths and through the use of traffic-calming measures appropriate for a residential neighborhood.

Social Goals

- Create a diverse, mixed-income community with a full spectrum of life-cycle housing opportunities.

Proposed Project

Project Features

The key features of the Proposed Project, as described in Chapter 2, *Project Description*, include the following.

- **Housing**—281 residential units on approximately 40 acres of land, of which 182 would be single-family homes, 64 town homes, and 35 condominiums/flats. Approximately half (50 percent) of the residences (140 units) would be deed-restricted Affordable and Workforce units, and the other units would be market rate.
- **Open Space**—39 acres of permanent open space to include habitat preserve, active recreation areas, and trails.
- **Roads**—local streets, a connection to Carmel Valley Road via Rio Road to the east, and a connection to Rio Road to the west.
- **Flood Protection**—the residential site is within the floodplain; the Project will raise elevations at the residential site by removing soil along the Carmel River and importing soil from off site.
- **Utilities**—connections to public services and utilities.

A project description that describes the Project features in further detail is presented in Chapter 2, *Project Description*.

Impacts of the Proposed Project

State CEQA Guidelines 15126.6 (f) states "alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project." As such, alternatives that do not avoid or substantially lessen significant effects of the Proposed Project need not be analyzed in an EIR.

The analysis in this Recirculated Draft EIR identifies the following environmental effects.

- **Geology and Soils**—The Proposed Project would require extensive excavation and importation of fill. Excavation may result in unstable soils, erosion, and sedimentation. These impacts can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with mitigation identified in Section 3.1, *Geology, Seismicity, and Soils*.
- **Hydrology**—The Proposed Project could result in increases in high flow velocities and changes in the level and character of flood events upstream and downstream and increases in local site drainage. However, by incorporating recommended mitigation measures in Section 3.2, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, these impacts can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
- **Water Quality**—Although the Proposed Project would increase residential runoff, it would decrease the use of hazardous materials currently used for landscape maintenance of the Rancho Cañada Golf Club golf course (pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizer). Construction of the Proposed Project may result in runoff and sedimentation. These construction and runoff effects on water quality are mitigable to less-than-significant levels through the mitigation identified in Section 3.2, *Hydrology and Water Quality*.
- **Biological Resources**—The Proposed Project would remove native and non-native vegetation that may support several special-status species but would also restore native vegetation and wildlife habitat along the Carmel River in areas that are currently golf course. The Proposed Project would also reduce water withdrawals from the Carmel River aquifer that would benefit biological resources that depend on surface flow. Overall, with the proposed 2006 Rancho Cañada Village Restoration and Mitigation Plan and mitigation in Section 3.3, *Biological Resources*, the Proposed Project would result in less-than-significant impacts on biological resources.
- **Visual Aesthetics**—The residential development would change the visual aesthetic features relative to the existing golf course and would add new sources of light and glare. These impacts can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with the mitigation identified in Section 3.4, *Aesthetics*.
- **Land Use**—As discussed in Section 3.5, *Land Use*, the Project would not be consistent with the residential subdivision limit in CVMP Policy CV-1.6. The additional project-related residential units above the limit would contribute to traffic congestion along Carmel Valley Road and other roadway segments above the level of service standards in the 2013 CVMP. Feasible mitigation is not available to reduce all traffic impacts to a less than significant level. Thus, this policy inconsistency would result in a *significant and unavoidable* environmental impact.
- **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**—The Proposed Project could result in public exposure to petroleum and hazardous materials during construction and operation. However, these impacts would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with the mitigation identified in Section 3.6, *Hazard and Hazardous Materials*.
- **Transportation and Traffic**—The Proposed Project would increase local and regional traffic. Some of these impacts can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with mitigation, as described in Section 3.7, *Transportation and Traffic*. However, some of the traffic impacts, including cumulative traffic increases to State Route 1 (SR 1), SR 1 intersections, and certain intersections and segment operations in the CVMP area, cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

- **Air Quality**—The Proposed Project would result in a long-term increase in ROG, NO_X, CO, and PM10 emissions from operational vehicular traffic. However, this impact can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with the mitigation identified in Section 3.8, *Air Quality*.
- **Noise**—Construction noise would be significant, but it can be addressed through the construction best management practices included in the mitigation identified in Section 3.9, *Noise*. New residential units would be exposed to levels above residential standards, but the resultant noise level can be addressed through the mitigation identified in Section 3.9, *Noise*. Traffic noise would increase locally, but this increase would not result in significant impacts on existing land uses.
- **Water Supply**—The Proposed Project would require less water for residential use than is currently withdrawn for landscape irrigation on the existing golf course. As such, the Proposed Project would reduce withdrawals from the Carmel River aquifer, which would benefit both water supply and biological resources.
- **Other Public Services and Utilities**—The Proposed Project would increase demand for other public services, including police and fire protection, schools, landfills, and wastewater treatment. These service and utility demands would be accommodated by existing infrastructure and providers without resulting in the need for new or expanded offsite facilities. New utility extensions on site will be paid for by the new development itself. Proposed Project impacts would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with the mitigation identified in Section 3.10, *Public Services, Utilities, and Recreation*.
- **Cultural Resources**—The Proposed Project could disturb undiscovered buried cultural resources. These potential impacts would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with the mitigation identified in Section 3.11, *Cultural Resources*.
- **Population/Housing**—The Proposed Project would induce population growth by creating housing opportunities in excess of what is currently available. Approval of the Proposed Project would require the County to amend CVMP Policy CV-1.6 to allow for the creation of 305 new residential subdivision units in CVMP. The increase would accommodate the 281 units for the Proposed Project and the 24 units reserved for the Delfino property which would be an increase of 125 housing units in the CVMP area above that allowed by the current plan. The exceedance of Policy CV-1.6 would result in growth inducement beyond local planning policies and this would contribute to significant and unavoidable traffic impacts.
- **Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change**—The Proposed Project would result in increased greenhouse gas emissions, during construction and from operation that could contribute to climate change impacts. However, this impact can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with the mitigation identified in Section 3.13, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change*.
- **Construction Disruption**—Construction may adversely affect traffic, access, and emergency access, air quality, and noise. While these temporary impacts are potentially significant, implementation of mitigation measures included in Chapter 3, *Environmental Analysis*, would reduce them to levels below significance.
- **Contributions to Cumulative Impacts**—In addition to the direct and indirect impacts described above, the Proposed Project would also contribute to cumulative impacts. Cumulative contributions within most subject areas are addressed through project-level mitigation.

However, even with mitigation, contributions of the Proposed Project to cumulative impacts related to traffic and land use cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

Alternatives Analyzed in this Recirculated Draft EIR

The 130-Unit Alternative is described in Chapter 2, *Project Description*, and analyzed in Chapter 3, *Environmental Analysis*, at a level of detail equal to that for the Proposed Project.

Other alternatives considered in this Recirculated Draft EIR are discussed below. These alternatives were initially evaluated for their feasibility and their ability to achieve most of the project objectives while avoiding, reducing, or minimizing significant impacts identified for the Proposed Project. All alternatives were determined to be feasible (or potentially feasible) and would meet at least some of the project objectives (though not necessarily all). The ability of these alternatives to lower substantially the significant impacts identified for the Proposed Project is discussed below. All subject areas are analyzed for each alternative determined to be potentially feasible, although at a much more general level than in Chapter 3, *Environmental Analysis*.

Other alternatives considered but dismissed from further evaluation are discussed at the end of this chapter.

The 2013 CVMP allows 175 visitor-serving units to be located west of Via Mallorca, which includes the Rancho Cañada Golf Club site. Neither the Proposed Project nor any of the alternatives would eliminate the ability to build 175 visitor-serving units. Thus, this is a not a differentiator between the alternatives and is not discussed further in this analysis.

Alternative 1—No Project

CEQA requires analysis of the No-Project Alternative.

Alternative Characteristics

Under the No-Project Alternative, no improvements are anticipated. The site would remain a public golf course on the western portion of the Rancho Cañada Golf Club.

Feasibility

The retention of the site as a public golf course is feasible, in that the site would simply be managed and operated in its current state by the Rancho Cañada Golf Club.

Ability to Meet Project Objectives

By not creating housing units, this alternative would not meet any of the economic or social objectives of the Proposed Project. This alternative also does not meet the Project Applicant's environmental goals for preservation of open space and habitat areas.

According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 (a), alternatives evaluated in an EIR need to attain "most of the basic objectives of the project." According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 (b), discussion of the alternatives can include analysis of alternatives that "would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly."

Therefore, this alternative is considered feasible to avoid or substantially lessen significant effects of the Proposed Project at the site, but would not meet the project objectives or goals.

Direct and Indirect Impact Analysis

- **Aesthetics and Visual Resources**—This alternative would not change site aesthetics. The site would remain in its current state as a golf course.
- **Air Quality**—Air quality would remain unchanged, as no new emission sources would be introduced on the site.
- **Biological Resources**—Existing biological resources would not be disturbed. However, the existing habitat (golf course) would have less biological value than the Proposed Project's open space preserve. In addition, the water requirements for golf turf irrigation would continue to draw on the Carmel River aquifer.
- **Cultural Resources**—No disturbances to cultural resources would occur.
- **Geology, Soils, and Paleontology**—No geology, soils, or paleontology impacts would occur.
- **Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change**—Greenhouse gas emissions would remain unchanged, as no new emission sources would be introduced on the site.
- **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**—No new sources of hazards or hazardous materials would result from this alternative.
- **Hydrology and Water Quality**—The alternative would continue the current level of landscaping chemical application to maintain the golf course. No new sources of runoff would occur.
- **Land Use, Population, and Housing**—There would be no land use impacts. No increase in population or housing would occur beyond background growth.
- **Noise** – No new sources of noise would be introduced.
- **Public Services, Recreation, and Utilities**—No increase in public service demands would result from the maintenance of the golf course. However, the current drawdown of the aquifer would continue for landscape irrigation, which is above that needed for the Proposed Project.
- **Transportation and Traffic**—No new traffic would be introduced.

Cumulative Impacts

Under the No-Project Alternative, 281 residential units would not be located on the west course of the Rancho Cañada Golf Club. Based on the 2013 CVMP, new residential subdivisions are limited to 190 additional housing units, (of which 24 units are reserved for the Delfino property). If no residential units are built at the Rancho Cañada Golf Club site, up to 190 units of the housing demand not met by the Proposed Project could be built elsewhere within the CVMP.

Thus, the No-Project Alternative could result in additional housing development pressure elsewhere in the CVMP. Given current water shortages, the timing of such development is unknown and speculative until such time that water supplies to support new development are provided. The No-Project Alternative does not include any potential water transfer from the Rancho Cañada Golf Club because it presumes continued operation of both existing golf courses.

This impact analysis focuses on the likely impacts resulting from cumulative residential development elsewhere in the CVMP with this alternative.

- **Aesthetics and Visual Resources**—The remaining units likely would be developed primarily in a low-density, rural fashion that is similar to the existing character of the Valley, although some development could occur in medium-density designated areas. However, to accommodate this low-density character for the remaining units, an area larger than 40-acres may be required. Even though the density would be compatible with the character of Carmel Valley, the No-Project Alternative is likely to result in some visual impacts from the conversion of a larger area of previously undeveloped land. Screening and distancing from major roadways likely would largely mitigate these impacts, but permanent visual changes and highly dispersed impacts may still result from this spread of development.
- **Air Quality**— Construction-related effects may be slightly increased due to the larger area that may be developed; however, these impacts could likely be reduced to less-than-significant levels through the implementation of best management practices similar to those proposed in this Recirculated Draft EIR. With more highly dispersed development likely located farther from existing services without potential non-vehicular travel options, overall residential vehicle miles traveled per household may be greater than the Proposed Project but this would be partially offset by a lesser buildout.
- **Biological Resources**—Depending on the exact locations chosen for the development of housing elsewhere, effects on biological resources may result in additional or more severe impacts. Overall, the buildout inside the CVMP area would likely have a larger development footprint and may be located in previously undisturbed areas. The Proposed Project would be located on an area that is previously disturbed and developed, and by concentrating development on approximately 38 acres, impacts on habitat and species loss would be minimized. In addition, whether the 39-acres of open space and habitat preserve planned for the Proposed Project would be created elsewhere because of more dispersed residential development is uncertain.
- **Cultural Resources**—Depending on the exact sites chosen for development, this alternative would have effects similar to those for the Proposed Project if undiscovered resources are encountered during construction.
- **Geology, Soils, and Paleontology**—Although the Proposed Project would require extensive grading and filling to accommodate the development at the golf course, the total footprint of development throughout the CVMP area likely would exceed 40 acres. Despite variations in location, effects on geology and soils would likely be similar to the Proposed Project. Depending on the exact sites chosen for development, this alternative would have effects similar to those for the Proposed Project if undiscovered paleontological resources are encountered during construction.
- **Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change**—The Proposed Project would place 281 units near the mouth of Carmel Valley near commercial areas, a church, and a middle school. In addition, the Proposed Project would provide affordable housing, which is at a premium on the Monterey Peninsula, in relatively close proximity to areas of employment on the Peninsula. Other new units throughout Carmel Valley likely will be more dispersed, which could place them at greater distance from commercial services, public facilities, and employment. A less concentrated pattern of housing development could result in greater vehicle miles traveled than the Proposed Project, which could result in greater greenhouse gas emissions, but it would be

speculative to make a definitive conclusion without knowing exactly where new housing development would actually be located, including affordable housing. In addition, this alternative would result in 91 fewer units than the Proposed Project, which would offset some of the effects of a more dispersed land use pattern.

- **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**—Exposure of the environment and workers to risks from hazards and hazardous materials would likely be similar to that for the Proposed Project.
- **Hydrology and Water Quality**—Depending on the exact locations chosen for the development of housing elsewhere, effects on hydrology and water quality may result in additional or more severe impacts. Overall, the buildout of 190 units at other locations likely would have a larger development footprint and would therefore create impervious areas greater than would the Proposed Project. However, new development likely would not be located within flood zones due to high costs associated with development in potential flood areas, and thus flooding impacts may be reduced under the No-Project Alternative. However, the increase in impervious area could reduce ground water recharge in the Valley or elsewhere and could cause additional water quality impacts associated with increased runoff.
- **Land Use, Population, and Housing**—The No-Project Alternative would not result in the creation of 281 units in a medium- to high-density development, of which 140 units would have been Affordable and Workforce. As noted above, 190 units due to residential subdivision could be developed elsewhere in Carmel Valley, but with only 20% (38 units) being required to be affordable. Furthermore, the Workforce units are not afforded the same provision as Affordable units (20 percent per development) and are least likely to be constructed elsewhere in Carmel Valley in association with smaller more dispersed residential development.
- **Noise**—Depending on the proximity and type of sensitive receptors near areas proposed for housing development, noise effects are unlikely to result in significant impacts under the No-Project Alternative that could not be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
- **Public Services, Recreation, and Utilities**—Overall demand for much of the public services, recreation and, utilities is likely to be similar to that for the Proposed Project. However, depending on the site locations chosen, existing infrastructure may not be in place to serve the developments. This could require additional construction and costs to connect to public utilities, including water, sewer, and telecommunications. Furthermore, potable water may not be available on site as under the Proposed Project, resulting in additional demand from Cal-Am to provide water services. As discussed in Section 3.10, *Public Services, Utilities, and Recreation*, Cal-Am is currently operating beyond its maximum allowed capacity and needs a new source of water to meet current and future demand. As such, the No-Project Alternative may result in significant impacts on water supply and/or housing development will be substantially delayed until additional water supplies are developed.
- **Transportation and Traffic**—The No-Project Alternative would result in the development of 190 units spread throughout Carmel Valley. Regional impacts on traffic and circulation are likely to be similar to but less than the Proposed Project. Even though development would be dispersed, it is highly likely that Carmel Valley Road would remain the primary route of access for new units built in Carmel Valley.

Alternative 2—East Golf Course Alternative

Alternative Characteristics

This alternative would locate the residential area along the East Golf Course east of the Rancho Cañada clubhouse oriented closer to Carmel Valley Road. The habitat preserve area would be located along the Carmel River in the adjacent area to the south. Presuming the need for a similar amount of area, locating the development entirely outside the 100-year floodplain was not considered feasible, as the area outside the floodplain was too narrow to accommodate the 40-acre development. Access would be via a combined access road to the clubhouse from Rio Road or directly from Carmel Valley Road via a new intersection. No connection to Rio Road to the west would be included in this alternative.

This alternative was developed to examine the potential to avoid impacts related to proximity to the middle school, the church, and the residential developments west along Rio Road.

Feasibility

The creation of the Project on the east golf course is feasible, in that the developer owns the entire Rancho Cañada Golf Club, and land is sufficient to construct such a Project and still allow for 18 holes of golf on a remaining course. Furthermore, access can still be provided, either directly or indirectly, via Carmel Valley Road for residents of the future development. The east course is also located in proximity to existing infrastructure that would serve the project area. The water source for the Proposed Project would be useable for this site as well.

Ability to Meet Project Objectives

With the exception of the connection to Rio Road to the west, this alternative would result in the creation of all the key features of the Proposed Project in an alternative location on the Rancho Cañada Golf Club. In doing so, it would achieve the majority of social, environmental, and economic goals set forth by the original Project. However, because the location of the project site is located approximately 0.5 mile farther to the east than is the Proposed Project, pedestrian and bicycle accessibility to the shopping area outside of the neighborhood would be reduced, thus not fulfilling the environmental goal for multi-modal transportation. Thus, the East Golf Course Alternative is considered to meet most, but not all of the Project goals and objectives.

Direct and Indirect Impact Analysis

- **Aesthetics and Visual Resources**—Under this alternative, the housing development likely would be located in the northeastern portion of the east course due to size and environmental constraints on this area of the Rancho Cañada Golf Club. This would place the residential development within 300 feet of Carmel Valley Road, thus resulting in significantly higher visual impacts than under the original Project design. Additional mitigation measures would likely be necessary for this alternative to screen views from the roadway.
- **Air Quality**—This alternative would create identical numbers of residential units and require similar grading and filling. Construction access would not need to be as close to the middle school, and thus exposure to construction diesel particulate matter would be lower for school receptors. Operational air quality impacts would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

- **Biological Resources**—The east golf course contains biological features similar to those of the west course. Ponds, trees, and vegetated areas would be disturbed to accommodate the proposed development, and impacts on these resources would be similar to those for the Proposed Project. Contiguous open space area is important to accommodate a viable habitat preserve. The development of the Project on the east course would limit the space available for the habitat preserve north of the Carmel River. A preserve of size equal to that for the Proposed Project (31 acres) could be implemented under this alternative; however, it would need to be located north and south of the Carmel River. Although the location of this preserved open space would be altered, the impacts (and benefits) of its implementation would also be similar to those of the Proposed Project.
- **Cultural Resources**—This alternative would likely require similar excavation and ground disturbing activities as the Proposed Project, and would therefore have similar cultural resource impacts. No additional resources are known to exist on the east course area of the Rancho Cañada Golf Club.
- **Geology and Soils**—Development of residential units on the east course of the Rancho Cañada Golf Club would have exposure to risks from geology and soils similar to those for the Proposed Project. As with the west course area, portions of the east course are located within the 100-year flood zone, such that similar grading and filling of the development area would be required.
- **Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change**—This alternative would have the same amount of buildout as the Proposed Project, so building energy emissions would be the same. The residential area would be slightly farther from the commercial area at the Mouth of the Valley, which could increase vehicle miles traveled somewhat. Overall, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions are expected to be similar to those of the Proposed Project.
- **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**—This alternative's exposure of the environment and workers to risks from hazards and hazardous materials would likely be similar to that of the Proposed Project.
- **Hydrology and Water Quality**—This alternative would likely have similar hydrology and water quality impacts as the Proposed Project, as encroachment on the floodplain, elevation of the site, site drainage design, and stormwater runoff best management practices also would be required.
- **Land Use, Population, and Housing**—This alternative would have population and housing impacts similar to those for the Proposed Project. The east course of the Rancho Cañada Golf Club is currently zoned, operated, and maintained in a similar manner as the west course. As such, land use effects, including the conversion of a golf course to residential development and zoning conflicts, would be similar to the Proposed Project. The Project land use compatibility context would shift from the middle school, church, and residential adjacent uses to the residential adjacent uses east of the east golf course location.
- **Noise**—As the Project would be far closer to Carmel Valley Road, additional mitigation likely would be required for new residential building design, as noise levels would be substantially higher for the residences built closer to Carmel Valley Road. This alternative would not result in increased traffic noise levels for existing land uses west along Rio Road, however this alternative does not avoid significant impacts as noise level effects in this area were not considered significant under the Proposed Project. Sensitive receptors under this alternative include existing single-family residences located immediately east of this portion of the Rancho Cañada

Golf Club. The Project would expose these existing residences to new sources of noise, both temporarily and permanently. However, these increases in noise levels would be similar to those presented in Section 3.9, *Noise*, and are not likely to result in additional significant impacts.

- **Public Services, Recreation, and Utilities**—Due to existing, adjacent developments, utility infrastructure is located in proximity to the east course location. Similar to the Proposed Project, this alternative would require the extension of existing transmission lines for sewer, electricity, and telecommunications. Because this alternative would result in the same number of residents at buildout, effects on service providers, schools, and recreation would be similar to those for the Proposed Project. Impacts related to water supply would be similarly beneficial.
- **Transportation and Traffic**—This alternative would shift the residential development approximately 0.5 mile to the east. Although this does not preclude alternative means of transportation to the commercial area at the mouth of the Valley, it may discourage residents from bicycling or walking to conduct everyday activities such as grocery shopping. While this would not result in a significant impact under CEQA, it would not fulfill the environmental project goal of creating a community that encourages multi-modal transportation. To preserve the west course of the Rancho Cañada Golf Club, vehicular access would be feasible only via Carmel Valley Road under this alternative. With the inclusion of a traffic signal at the Carmel Valley road/Rio Road intersection (as assumed for the Proposed Project and the 130-Unit Alternative), the traffic impact at this intersection would be less than significant. Because this alternative would result in the same number of residents at buildout, ADT effects and impacts on other intersections and roadways would be similar to the Proposed Project.

Cumulative Impact Analysis

Under this alternative, 281 residential units would be located on the Rancho Cañada Golf Club. As such, cumulative impacts are nearly the same as for the Proposed Project, with one exception. This alternative likely would have less construction-period particulate emissions exposure for the middle school locations, given that the construction location and access are not as close to the school as the for Proposed Project. Because the Project's impacts would be less than significant, however, this difference is not substantial.

Alternative 3—Medium Density Alternative

Alternative Characteristics

This alternative would include 186 residential units on the 40-acre residential site (gross density of 4.5 units per acre). This gross density would be considered medium density (1–5 units/acre) in the 2013 CVMP. The open space area and preserve would be the same as for the Proposed Project.

To ensure that this alternative was economically feasible, this alternative was designed to include as many market-rate units as the Proposed Project (141 units), would require the mandated percentage of affordable units (20 percent or 37 units in this alternative), with only a minimal amount of Workforce housing (4 percent or 7 units). The general amount of infrastructure needed to support this alternative was presumed to be the similar to that for the Proposed Project, although specific housing unit utilities and streets would be less.

Feasibility

This alternative is technically feasible, as the project site is available, utility connections and road connections are available, and water supply exists, as for the Proposed Project.

This alternative includes the same amount of market-rate units as the Proposed Project, but the number of Affordable and Workforce units is less by nearly 100 units. The cost of major infrastructure (site elevation, road connections, park improvements) is likely similar to the Proposed Project, but the cost of certain infrastructure within the residential development (streets, utilities, etc.) will be less. Given that the market-rate units are the primary economic driver, and the subsidized affordable units are reduced substantially with a corresponding decline in certain infrastructure costs, this alternative is considered potentially feasible at this time.

No economic study has been conducted to verify the economic feasibility of this alternative. If this alternative were advanced, an economic feasibility study is suggested to verify the tentative presumption above.

Ability to Meet Project Objectives

By including the same number of market-rate units, this alternative would also meet the economic goals for infrastructure development and maintenance. To do so, however, the number of Affordable and Workforce housing units would decrease by 100 units. Although this medium-density development would reduce the number of available workforce and affordable housing units, approximately 24 percent of the total development would still comprise these mixed-income and inclusionary units. As such, this alternative would satisfy the Project's economic and social goals for creating a community that supports a full spectrum of housing opportunities, but not as well as the Proposed Project would. This Project would provide the same habitat and open space conservation identified in the Proposed Project, therefore fulfilling the original Project's environmental goals.

Thus, the Medium Density Alternative would meet most, but not all of the Project goals and objectives.

Direct and Indirect Impact Analysis

- **Aesthetics and Visual Resources**—Although a similar acreage of the parcel would be developed under this alternative, the reduction in the total number of units on the 40-acre parcel would be slightly more compatible with the rural character of Carmel Valley. Although the reduced density would further lessen visual impacts on the character of the project area, these impacts were considered less than significant for the Proposed Project. Visual effects on scenic vistas would also be reduced, but mitigation described for the Proposed Project would still be applicable to screen views from Carmel Valley Road.
- **Air Quality**—Reduced residential development would result in a reduced site population and Project vehicle trips generated. While this may lessen air quality effects, these impacts are considered less than significant for the Proposed Project. Although the Medium Density Alternative would require less construction, the amount of grading and fill requirements would be similar to the Proposed Project. As such, the alternative would likely result in similar construction-related air quality impacts, and mitigation would still be applicable.
- **Biological Resources**—Although this alternative would result in fewer residential units, it would require the same area of land on the parcel for development and would create similar

areas of open space, habitat preserve, and parks spaces. As such, direct impacts on Biological Resources would be similar to those for the Proposed Project. The slightly decreased water requirement for the reduced density population may further result in an indirect benefit for biological resources associated with the Carmel River.

- **Cultural Resources**—This alternative would have effects similar to those for the Proposed Project if undiscovered resources were encountered during construction.
- **Geology and Soils**—The same area of land would be developed for residential units. Therefore, exposure to risks from geology and soils, including the grading and filling requirements, would be similar to the Proposed Project.
- **Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change**— A reduced residential development would result in a reduced site population and Project vehicle trips generated. This would lessen the local generation of operational GHG emissions. Although the Medium Density Alternative would require less construction, the amount of grading and fill requirements would be similar to those for the Proposed Project. As such, the alternative would likely result in similar construction-related GHG emissions.
- **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**—This alternative would have similar exposure of the environment and workers to risks from hazards and hazardous materials as for the Proposed Project.
- **Hydrology and Water Quality**—Impacts would be similar to, but slightly less than those for the Proposed Project on hydrology and water quality. Because the Medium-Density Alternative would result in a similar development footprint, it would likely result in comparable impervious surface areas as the Proposed Project would. However, the reduced population would not require as much potable water from the Carmel River aquifer. Such changes to water usage are not likely to result in significant effects on hydrology and water quality.
- **Land Use, Population, and Housing**—Any residential development on this parcel would result in similar land use effects, as the area is zoned only for public and quasi-public uses and visitor accommodation. As such, a reduced density alternative would not lessen or avoid land use impacts related to land use designations and zoning. This alternative would create only 186 residential units, 38 of which would be Affordable housing and 7 of which would be Workforce housing. This alternative would not be consistent with the 2013 CVMP quota of 190 units, of which only 166 remain (24 are reserved for Delfino), so this alternative would exceed the quota but by less than the Proposed Project. This alternative would not necessarily displace the potential for 175 visitor-serving units that are allowed on the Rancho Cañada Golf Club, as areas east or west of the clubhouse could be used for visitor-serving units while still allowing for a single golf course. No new significant effects on population or housing are likely to result under this alternative.
- **Noise**—Due to the decreased number of residents under this alternative and fewer trips generated, noise effects along Rio Road to the west of the site would also be slightly lessened. However, this alternative does not avoid significant impacts, as noise level effects in this area were not considered significant under the Proposed Project.
- **Public Services, Recreation, and Utilities**—The reduced population of this alternative would result in slightly lessened demands on public services, recreation, and utilities, including potable water, emergency services, and schools. However, these lessened demands would not likely change the significance of impacts identified under the Proposed Project with mitigation.

- **Transportation and Traffic**—The decreased population supported by this alternative would generate fewer trips along Rio Road, Carmel Valley Road, and regional state routes. Although impacts on LOS and ADT may be slightly lessened, it is unlikely to change the significance of impacts identified under the Proposed Project, as most of the project impacts are contributions of traffic to already failing intersections and roadway segments.

Cumulative Impact Analysis

Under this alternative, 186 residential units would be located on the Rancho Cañada Golf Club.

As noted above, based on the 2013 CVMP, originally adopted in 2010, new residential subdivisions are limited to 190 additional housing units, of which 24 units are reserved for the Delfino property, leaving 166 units. An amendment of CVMP would be required to increase the residential subdivision limit to 210 units (to allow for 186 units in Alternative 3 plus 24 units for Delfino)

Alternative 4—Low Density Alternative

Alternative Characteristics

This alternative would include 40 residential units on the same residential site (gross density of 1 unit/acre). The open space area would be the same as the Proposed Project. This alternative would include 33 market-rate units, 7 Affordable units, and no Workforce units (as they are not mandatory). The percentage of Affordable units in the development would be 20 percent in compliance with Monterey County minimal requirements. This gross density would be considered low density (1 unit/acre) in Carmel Valley, although specific densities within the Village could be medium density in certain locations.

Feasibility

This alternative is technically feasible as the project site is available, utility connections and road connections are available, and water supply exists as for the Proposed Project.

The cost of major infrastructure (site elevation, road connections, park improvements) are likely similar to that for the Proposed Project, but the cost of certain infrastructure within the residential development (streets, utilities, etc.) will be substantially less.

No economic study has been conducted to verify the economic feasibility of this alternative. Given the extensive infrastructure for the project site, this alternative may not be economically feasible.

For the purposes of this Recirculated Draft EIR, this alternative is considered potentially feasible. If this alternative were advanced, an economic feasibility study is suggested to verify the tentative presumption above.

Ability to Meet Project Objectives

This alternative would provide the habitat and open space conservation as identified in the Proposed Project, therefore fulfilling the original Project's environmental goals.

This alternative would change the community dynamic from mixed-income and inclusionary to primarily market rate, to one that is far less economically diverse. Thus, this alternative would result

in a potential loss of Affordable and Workforce housing for Carmel Valley. As such, this alternative would not satisfy some of the Project's economic goals, or any of the Project's social goals.

Thus, while this alternative is feasible, it meets only a few of the Project's goals and objectives and does not meet most of the project objectives.

Although CEQA requires no analysis of alternatives that do not meet most of the project objectives, this alternative was analyzed to disclose what low-density residential use of the site might entail.

Direct and Indirect Impact Analysis

- **Aesthetics and Visual Resources**—Although a similar acreage of the parcel would be developed under this alternative, this low-density development would be more compatible with the rural character of the Carmel Valley. Although the reduced density would further lessen visual impacts on the character of the project area, these impacts were considered less than significant. Visual effects on scenic vistas would also be reduced.
- **Air Quality**—A reduced residential development would result in a reduced population and vehicle trips generated. While this would lessen air quality effects, operational impacts are considered less than significant as for the Proposed Project. Although this alternative would require less construction, the amount of grading and fill requirements would be similar to that for the Proposed Project. As such, the alternative would likely result in similar construction-related air quality impacts in character (but somewhat reduced in scale).
- **Biological Resources**—The project footprint would be similar for both the Proposed Project and this alternative. Therefore, this alternative would not avoid or increase direct impacts on biological resources. The decreased water requirement for the reduced population would further result in an indirect benefit for biological resources associated with the Carmel River.
- **Cultural Resources**—This alternative would have similar effects as the Proposed Project would, if undiscovered resources were encountered during construction.
- **Geology and Soils**—Exposure to risks from geology and soils under this alternative would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.
- **Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change**— A reduced residential development would result in a reduced population and vehicle trips generated, which would result in lower GHG emissions. Although this alternative would require less construction, the amount of grading and fill requirements would be similar to that for the Proposed Project. As such, the alternative would likely result in similar construction-related air quality impacts in character (but somewhat reduced in scale).
- **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**—No additional environmental and worker exposure to risk from hazards and hazardous materials would result under this alternative. This alternative would have effects similar to those for the Proposed Project.
- **Hydrology and Water Quality**—Because this alternative would result in a similar development footprint but would be less dense, it would reduce the amount of new impervious surface areas compared to the Proposed Project and associated stormwater runoff. The reduced population would not require as much potable water from the Carmel River aquifer.
- **Land Use, Population, and Housing**—Any residential development on this parcel would result in similar land use effects, as the area is zoned only for public and quasi-public uses and visitor

accommodation. As such, this alternative would not lessen or avoid land use impacts related to consistency with land use designations or zoning. As a low-density development, the level of compatibility with adjacent land uses would in general be higher, but the Proposed Project, while inconsistent with land use designations/zoning, was not considered to result in significant impacts related to land use compatibility. Also, as a low-density development, this alternative would be more consistent with the general rural character of the 2013 CVMP, but again, the Proposed Project was not considered inconsistent with the 2013 CVMP rural character due to its location, setting, and design. This alternative would be consistent with the2013 CVMP residential quota. No new significant effects on population or housing are likely to result under this Low-Density Alternative.

- **Noise**—Due to the decreased number of residents under this alternative and fewer trips generated, noise effects along Rio Road to the west of the project site would also be slightly lessened. However, this alternative does not avoid significant impacts, as noise level effects in this area were not considered significant under the Proposed Project.
- **Public Services, Recreation, and Utilitie**s—The reduced population of this alternative would result in lessened site demands on public services, recreation, and utilities, including potable water, emergency services, and schools. However, these lessened demands would not likely change the significance of impacts identified under the Proposed Project.
- **Transportation and Traffic**—The decreased population supported by this alternative would generate fewer trips along Rio Road, Carmel Valley Road, and state routes. Although impacts on LOS and ADT may be slightly lessened, this alternative is unlikely to change the significance of impacts identified under the Proposed Project, as most of the project impacts are contributions of traffic to already failing intersections and roadway segments.

Cumulative Impacts

Under this alternative, 40 residential units would be located on the Rancho Cañada Golf Club.

As noted above, based on the 2013 CVMP, originally adopted in 2010, new residential subdivisions are limited to 190 additional housing units, of which 24 units are reserved for the Delfino property, leaving 166 units. With 40 units in the alternative, there would be 126 units remaining for the CVMP area.

Similar to the No-Project Alternative, the 126 units would be spread throughout Carmel Valley and outside the CVMP area on residentially designated sites and result in similar impacts as for the No Project Alternative but on a slightly smaller scale.

Alternative 5—Proposed Project with Rio Road Extension Emergency Access Only

Alternative Characteristics

This alternative would be the same as the Proposed Project, but would have site access only via Rio Road to the east to Carmel Valley Road. This alternative would provide for pedestrian, bicycle, and emergency access along the Rio Road between Rancho Cañada Village and the current terminus of Rio Road at Val Verde Street. Vehicle access would be restricted to emergency access only with a locked gate.

Feasibility

This alternative is feasible because access would be provided via Carmel Valley Road and a secondary emergency access route would be available. Emergency providers would be able to use access from the west or the east so that adequate service ratios can be maintained for the development.

Ability to Meet Project Objectives

This alternative would result in the creation of all the key features of the Proposed Project in the same location on the west course of the Rancho Cañada Golf Club. The restriction of site access to Rio Road would not impede or restrict the attainment of project objectives or goals.

Impact Analysis

- **Aesthetics and Visual Resources**—This alternative would have identical visual and aesthetic impacts as for the Proposed Project with perhaps a slight reduction in road width possible along the emergency road segment to Rio Road.
- **Air Quality**—The number of trips generated from this alternative would be identical to that of the Proposed Project. Residences using vehicles to access the commercial area at the mouth of the Valley would have a slightly longer drive, which would increase operational emissions slightly. Opportunities for non-vehicular travel would be the same as for the Proposed Project. In addition, this alternative would result in similar construction related emissions. As such, air quality impacts are considered similar to those for the Proposed Project.
- **Biological Resources**—This alternative would not avoid or increase impacts on biological resources. Effects similar to those for the Proposed Project would result.
- **Cultural Resources**—This alternative would have similar effects as the Proposed Project would, if undiscovered resources were encountered during construction.
- **Geology and Soils**—Effects on geology and soils under this alternative would be similar to those for the Proposed Project.
- **Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change**—The number of trips generated from this alternative would be identical to that of the Proposed Project. Residences using vehicles to access the commercial area at the mouth of the Valley would have a slightly longer drive, which would increase operational GHG emissions slightly. Opportunities for non-vehicular travel would be the same as for the Proposed Project. In addition, this alternative would result in similar construction-related emissions. As such, GHG emission impacts are considered similar to those for the Proposed Project.
- **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**—No additional hazardous materials effects would result under this alternative. This alternative would have similar effects to those for the Proposed Project.
- **Hydrology and Water Quality**—This alternative would not avoid or increase impacts on hydrology or water quality. Effects similar to those for the Proposed Project would result.
- **Land Use, Population, and Housing**—Effects on land use, population, and housing under this alternative would be similar to those of the Proposed Project.

- **Noise**—A slight decrease in noise levels for receptors along Rio Road west of the project site would result from the prohibition of vehicular site access to the west. However, as discussed in Section 3.9, noise effects in this area were not considered significant under the Proposed Project. Although traffic would be routed through Carmel Valley Road, a significant increase in noise levels is unlikely to result.
- **Public Services, Recreation, and Utilities**—This alternative would close Rio Road to the west to site vehicular access, however access for emergency service providers and recreational access would be maintained. For fire and police departments, a key or code would be provided for the gate that would separate the development from Rio Road. This gate would be constructed to effectively restrict vehicle egress and ingress while allowing for pedestrian and bicycle access. Therefore, no additional effects to public services or recreation would result. Effects on utilities would remain similar to those of the Proposed Project.
- **Transportation and Traffic**—Under this alternative, all site access would be via Rio Road east to Carmel Valley Road. Overall ADT effects would be similar to those of the Proposed Project due to the same amount of traffic generation. This alternative would result in similar traffic effects at intersections as for the Proposed Project in general but would have greater LOS impacts at the intersection of Rio Road and Carmel Valley Road. The 130-Unit Alternative was studied with all access from Rio Road via Carmel Valley Road, and the 130-Unit Alternative had nearly the same trip generation as the Proposed Project (and thus nearly the same as Alternative 5). Presuming the intersection of Rio Road and Carmel Valley Road is signalized, as is presumed for the Proposed Project and the 130-Unit Alternative, impacts at this intersection would be less than significant. This alternative would have the same impacts as would the Proposed Project on Carmel Valley Road segment operations. Likewise, this alternative would have similar impacts on SR 1 operations.

Alternative 6—281-Unit Stemple Property Avoidance Alternative

Alternative Characteristics

A portion of the Proposed Project is on a property not owned by the Project Applicant, referred to as the Stemple Property. The Proposed Project includes the northernmost roadway development on the Stemple property. This alternative, as shown in **Figure 5-1**, would redesign the Project so that it would not include any permanent development on the Stemple Property. This would reduce the area of the development by several acres, would require realignment of the east-west road on the northern side of the development, and would increase the density of the development slightly.

The Lombardo Land Group has an access easement, as shown on **Figure 5-1** on part of the Stemple Property, but this alternative would not use the Stemple Property for new roadways or residences.

Feasibility

In concept, this alternative is feasible as it is similar to the Proposed Project, but in a slightly smaller area.

Ability to Meet Project Objectives

This alternative would meet the objectives of the Project.

Graphics ... 05334.05 FEIS (9-23-2014)

Figure 5-1
Alternative 6 – 281-units Stemple Property Avoidance Alternative

Impact Analysis

This alternative would have virtually the same impacts as those for the Proposed Project as it is expected to have the same number of units and other infrastructure, with only a slight reduction in project area. The residential area would be slightly denser than in the Proposed Project.

- **Aesthetics and Visual Resources**—This alternative would have virtually the same visual and aesthetic impacts as the Proposed Project would. The slight increase in density is not likely to change the visual perception of the Project substantially.
- **Air Quality**—The number of trips generated from this alternative would be identical to that of the Proposed Project. Opportunities for non-vehicular travel would be the same as those for the Proposed Project. In addition, this alternative would result in similar construction-related emissions. As such, air quality impacts are considered similar to those of the Proposed Project.
- **Biological Resources**—This alternative likely would not substantially reduce or increase impacts on biological resources, as the area of reduced impact on the Stemple property is disturbed coyote brush scrub and is unlikely to contain special status plant or wildlife species. Thus, biological impacts would be similar to those for the Proposed Project.
- **Cultural Resources**—This alternative would have similar effects as the Proposed Project would, if undiscovered resources were encountered during construction.
- **Geology and Soils**—Exposure to risks from geology and soils events under this alternative would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.
- **Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change**—The number of trips generated from this alternative would be identical to that of the Proposed Project. Opportunities for non-vehicular travel would be the same as for the Proposed Project. In addition, this alternative would result in similar construction-related emissions. As such, GHG emission impacts are considered similar to those of the Proposed Project.
- **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**—No additional exposure to risks from hazards and hazardous materials would result under this alternative. This alternative would have effects similar to the Proposed Project.
- **Hydrology and Water Quality**—This alternative would not substantially change impacts on hydrology or water quality relative to the Proposed Project although the area of impermeable surfaces may be slightly reduced, depending on design.
- **Land Use, Population, and Housing**—Effects on land use, population, and housing under this alternative would be the same as for the Proposed Project.
- **Noise**—This alternative would have similar noise impacts to those of the Proposed Project. Noise levels would be lower for new houses along the north side of the development and would be higher for some new houses along the south side of the development than for the Proposed Project due to the relocation of roadways. Noise impacts outside the project site would be the same as those for the Proposed Project.
- **Public Services, Recreation, and Utilities**—This alternative would have the same impacts on public services, recreation, and utilities as the Proposed Project would.
- **Transportation and Traffic**—Under this alternative, site access would be the same as for the Proposed Project, but the roadways through the Project would be redesigned to avoid the

Stemple property. Overall traffic generation and access to and from the site would be the same as for the Proposed Project.

Although this alternative would avoid one private piece of property, which may ultimately prove to be necessary unless a willing seller is identified, this alternative would not avoid or substantially reduce a significant environmental impact of the Proposed Project. If this alternative were to be advanced, the impact analysis and mitigation recommended for this alternative would be the same as for the Proposed Project and this Recirculated Draft EIR could be used to comply with CEQA for this alternative.

Environmentally Superior Alternative

The following alternatives are dismissed from consideration as the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

- Alternative 2 (East Golf Course Alternative) does not avoid or substantially reduce any of the significant impacts of the Proposed Project.
- Alternative 4 (Low-Density Alternative) does not meet most of the project goals and objectives. It is not included in the identification of the environmentally superior alternative, which per CEQA, must meet most of the project goals and objectives.
- Alternative 5 (Proposed Project with Rio Road Extension Emergency Access Only) would not avoid or substantially avoid significant direct or indirect impacts of the Proposed Project as it would have virtually the same traffic impacts, presuming that signalization of the Rio Road/Carmel Valley Road intersection is included in the alternative.
- Alternative 6 (Stemple Property Avoidance Alternative) has virtually the same impacts as the Proposed Project has and thus is considered the same for this identification of the environmentally superior alternative.

There are two aspects to the determination of the environmentally superior alternative: (1) direct and indirect impacts related to development at the Rancho Cañada Golf Club itself; and (2) cumulative impacts related to the development at the Rancho Cañada Golf Club plus residential development off site due to housing demand being met elsewhere inside and outside the CVMP.

CEQA requires that if the No-Project Alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative, the EIR must identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other action alternatives as well.

Environmentally Superior Alternative for Direct and Indirect Impacts

Alternative 1 (No-Project Alternative) would have less direct and indirect effects compared with the Proposed Project and with the feasible alternatives analyzed in this Recirculated Draft EIR because it would avoid the physical environmental effects of development on the site. It would also avoid inconsistency with the 2013 CVMP land use designations and zone, and it would avoid the indirect effects related to traffic generation.

The 130-Unit Alternative would result in less residential development at the Rancho Cañada site. As described in the traffic analysis, the 130-Unit Alternative would have lower traffic impacts compared to the Proposed Project because it would generate less daily and peak-hour traffic. As described in the water supply analysis, when including the 60 AF water transfer, this alternative would result in water use greater than the Proposed Project would, but would also result in a reduction in baseline water use, which would be a water supply and biological resource benefit.

Alternative 3 (Medium-Density Alternative) would have fewer direct and indirect effects compared to the Proposed Project because it would have fewer aesthetic impacts, less water demand on-site, and would result in less traffic generation. Alternative 3 would have greater aesthetic impacts and traffic generation but lower water use than the 130-Unit Alternative.

Thus, for direct and indirect impacts, Alternative 1 (the No-Project Alternative) would be the environmentally superior alternative. CEQA requires that if the No-Project Alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative, then the environmentally superior of the action alternatives must be identified. Of the action alternatives, the 130-Unit Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative because it has lower traffic generation than the Proposed Project and Alternative 3 and less aesthetic impacts. While the 130-Unit Alternative would have higher water use (due to the water transfer), this alternative would result in a reduction of water use compared to baseline use and would also dedicate 50 AF for instream beneficial use, and thus water supply effects are not considered to make this alternative environmentally inferior to the Proposed Project or Alternative 3.

Environmentally Superior Alternative for Cumulative Impacts

The No-Project Alternative would have the same CVMP buildout as the 130-unit Alternative (190 units), but in a more dispersed pattern of residential development that would require more land, more vehicular travel, and likely more extensive infrastructure (in particular concerning water supply) than would the Proposed Project, the 130-unit Alternative, and Alternative 3.

The 130-Unit Alternative would result in less residential development at the Rancho Cañada site compared to the Proposed Project and Alternative 3. The remaining allowable 60 units allowed in the CVMP area would occur in other parts of the CVMP provided water supplies could be secured. This alternative, because it would not require an amendment of the CVMP related to allowable residential subdivisions, would result in less overall buildout in Monterey County as a whole compared to the Proposed Project and Alternative 3 and the same amount of buildout as the No-Project Alternative.[1]

Alternative 3 (Medium-Density Alternative) would accommodate more development on-site than the 130-Unit Alternative but less than the Proposed Project. This alternative would require an amendment of the CVMP concerning allowable residential subdivisions (the current CVMP

[1] As discussed concerning growth inducement in Chapter 4, depending on the character of development, the 60 AF water transfer could result in perhaps 120 to 240 new single-family residential units (assuming average water demand per unit of 0.25 to 0.5 AF) or more units (if apartments or condominiums). The water transfer could also remove a constraint to growth for commercial, institutional, or other uses in the Cal-Am service area. However, as concluded in Chapter 4, the proposed water transfer would not induce residential, commercial, or other development that is not otherwise allowable in local land use plans. Since the water transfer would only result in development inside and outside the CVMP that is consistent with local land use plans, the additional amount of growth is not considered further in the assessment of the environmentally superior alternative.

residential subdivision cap would need to be expanded to 210 units to accommodate 24 units for Delfino, plus 186 units for Alternative 3). Thus this alternative would result in less overall buildout in Monterey County compared to the Proposed Project, but more than the 130-Unit Alternative.

The 130-unit Alternative is considered to be the environmentally superior alternative related to cumulative impacts because it would result in less cumulative development in the CVMP (and the County as a whole) than the Proposed Project and Alternative 3 and thus result in less cumulative traffic. The 130-Unit Alternative would result in the same level of residential growth in the CVMP as the No Project Alternative but a more concentrated growth pattern than the No-Project Alternative which would result in a smaller overall development footprint and less cumulative traffic generation.

Environmentally Superior Alternative Overall

The 130-unit Alternative is considered to be the environmentally superior alternative related to direct, indirect and cumulative impacts and is thus considered the environmentally superior alternative overall.

Alternatives Considered but Dismissed from Further Analysis

The following alternatives were considered, but dismissed from further analysis because they were determined to be infeasible, did not meet most of the project objectives, or did not avoid or substantially reduce one or more significant impacts of the Proposed Project.

CEQA defines "feasibility" as follows: "*capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, and technological factors.*" Project objectives and Proposed Project impacts were described above at the beginning of this chapter.

Compliance with Existing Zoning Alternative

The current zoning in the project area is Public/Quasi-Public. The following land uses are permitted under the Public/Quasi-Public zoning: crop and tree farming; grazing of cattle, sheep, and goats; water system facilities; home occupations; public recreational uses; golf courses and country clubs; mineral and natural materials removal; and public/quasi-public facilities such as hospitals, hospices, churches, cemeteries, firehouses, schools, and convalescent homes. This alternative would include one or more of these uses in the 40-acres proposed for housing under the Proposed Project.

This alternative would not meet most of the project objectives because it would not provide housing. Thus, it was dismissed from further evaluation.

Care Facilities Prohibition Alternative

One scoping comment suggested that secondary units, care facilities, and day care facilities should be prohibited from the development and Workforce I and Workforce II units should be limited to one family per unit. The Proposed Project will not have secondary units, but would allow care

facilities and day care facilities. Per County code, dwelling units are limited to one family per unit, and thus the units at Rancho Cañada Village will be limited to one family per unit. Thus, this alternative is the same as the Proposed Project but would prohibit care facilities inside the development.

This alternative is feasible as one could technically prohibit care facilities. In general, this alternative would meet most of the project objectives, as the Project does not hinge on having care facilities within the development.

However, this alternative does not avoid or substantially lessen any of the identified significant or cumulative impacts of the Proposed Project. Prohibition of care facilities in the project area is not likely to substantially lower traffic generation and could actually increase it, as residences would need to seek care facilities in other off-site locations; however, this might be offset by traffic resulting from off-site residences seeking to use a care facility in the project area. At any rate, such a prohibition is not likely to reduce traffic substantially, if at all. Small-scale care facilities would not *per se* result in noticeable significant impacts on neighboring land uses, and would be governed by applicable County regulations and standards.

Flood Control Alternatives

The Project Applicant initially proposed development within the designated floodway along Carmel River. Several Lower Carmel Valley flood control alternatives were considered pursuant to comments made in scoping. A floodwall/levee alternative was developed by ICF International (formerly Jones & Stokes Inc.) to examine potential ways to lower site fill importation volumes. These alternatives are considered below.

Floodway Development Alternative

The original application proposed development in the designated floodway of the Carmel River. This application was rejected by the County due to inconsistency with County policies for flood protection. The application was revised to move development out of the floodway for the currently Proposed Project. This alternative is not considered feasible as it violates County flood control policies

Lower Carmel Valley Flood Control Alternatives

A comment in scoping suggested that flood control improvements should be incorporated into the Project consistent with recommendations for flood control for lower Carmel Valley found in several prior assessments aimed at reducing flood damages to properties along the lower Carmel River. The purpose of these studies was to inform broader efforts at flood control by the Monterey County Water Resources Agency (Monterey County Water Resources Agency 2003).

As described in Section 3.2, *Hydrology and Water Quality,* the Project is not estimated to increase flooding upstream or downstream of the Rancho Cañada property. Mitigation is identified to address certain local drainage, scour/erosion, and stormwater runoff impacts. Thus, while additional flood control improvements might be feasible that could also benefit other adjacent properties, such improvements are not necessary to address the impacts of this Project, and thus would be in excess of mitigation proportionality and nexus allowed by CEQA. For this reason, alternatives seeking to address preexisting flood risk (as opposed to Project-related flood risks) are beyond the scope of this Project and mitigation for this Project.

Floodwall/Levee Alternative

The Proposed Project intends to provide flood control by raising the elevation of the residential site above the elevation of the 100-year flood elevation. This alternative would not raise the elevation of the residential site but would install a tieback levee that would be above the 100-year flood elevation. The levee/floodwall would be constructed along the southern perimeter of Rancho Cañada Village and would transition into the raised tieback levee. This alternative would still require the same amount of excavation in the existing golf course to compensate for the loss of floodplain due to construction of the floodwall/levee but would likely require no fill to be imported from off site for elevating the site, as the golf course excavation would produce ample material (120,000 cubic yards) for levee construction and site leveling. This alternative would likely have a similar effect on flooding and river velocities as the Project would because the floodplain would have a similar cross-section as that for the Proposed Project.

This alternative is nominally feasible, although with the residential development at a lower elevation, pumping may be necessary to drain the project site drainage/runoff that could no longer flow via gravity due to the presence of the floodwall/levee. This alternative would meet most of the Project goals and objectives as it would allow the residential development and the habitat elements to proceed. Site design would need to be altered to accommodate the floodwall/levee footprint.

Overall, this alternative would result in similar impacts as for the Proposed Project within most impact subject areas. The alternative would require less fill than the Proposed Project because of the lower elevation for the residential area. This would lower or eliminate the need for as much importation of fill as the Proposed Project would need from off site and lower or eliminate the associated air emission impacts, but would not necessarily avoid the need for mitigation for diesel emissions. However, as discussed in Section 3.8, *Air Quality*, these impacts can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

Although this alternative would affect the site aesthetics because the levee/floodwall would affect some views from the residential development of the habitat/open space are and the river, this is not considered a significant impact as these residential site views do not exist today (and thus are not part of the baseline), and views can be obtained by a short walk to the habitat/open space areas with ease.

Because the only impact reduced by this alternative (construction emissions) can be readily mitigated through proposed mitigation in this Recirculated Draft EIR, this alternative was not considered further.

Reclaimed Water Reuse Alternative

A scoping comment suggested that the Project should be required to use reclaimed water for site irrigation and for the remaining golf course. This alternative would require the Project Applicant to use reclaimed water to irrigate the remaining golf course and all landscaped areas on the project site.

This alternative would lower the potable water use relative to the Proposed Project. However, because the Project overall would decrease use of the Carmel River aquifer, the Project will not result in a significant impact on the Carmel River aquifer. Thus, this alternative would not avoid or substantially lessen a significant adverse impact of the Proposed Project and was not considered further.

Rio Road Extension Alternative

The adopted 1986 CVMP circulation element (Monterey County 1986) included an extension of Rio Road from its existing terminus eastward and northward to link with Carmel Valley Road. This alternative would meet the project objectives.

This alternative is considered technically feasible as land is available to complete the extension and the Proposed Project could be designed to accommodate a through road. However, the Project Applicant does not control the land west of the project site and thus securing the land, absent public agency involvement, may be problematic and could imperil the logistical feasibility of this alternative.

The CVTIP Traffic Study (DKS Associates 2007) and the associated Supplemental EIR (Jones & Stokes 2007) identified that the Rio Road Extension is not necessary in order to address cumulative traffic impacts along Carmel Valley Road or other local roadways. Thus, the County has no current planning to complete this extension. Lacking a public agency involvement, the Project Applicant would have no choice but to acquire the necessary land through a willing-seller approach were this alternative to be advanced. The Project Applicant has not proposed this alternative, but rather has proposed access to the west and east of the Project site with design of internal development roads to discourage cut-through traffic.

However, this alternative would not avoid or substantially reduce any significant impacts of the Proposed Project. Extension of Rio Road as a through road would likely divert traffic from Carmel Valley Road as motorists may use Rio Road as an alternative route of travel to and from the mouth of Carmel Valley to avoid congestion on Highway 1. This could result in increased traffic impacts relative to the Proposed Project at Highway 1/Rio Road and Rio Road/Carmel Valley Road. In addition, traffic noise would increase west of the project site along Rio Road that might exceed residential standards.

Because this alternative would not avoid or substantially reduce any significant impacts of the Proposed Project and has been determined not to not be necessary as part of the CVTIP circulation program, this alternative was dismissed from further consideration.

Traffic/Transit Improvements Alternative

In scoping, comments suggested the following additions to the Project: (1) a Monterey-Salinas Transit (MST) bus stop inside the project area; (2) a stoplight at Via Nona Marie Road and Rio Road; and (3) relocation of the stoplight at the middle school to the entrance to Rancho Cañada.

As described in Section 3.7, *Transportation and Traffic*, MST provides bus service along Carmel Valley Road in front of the project site. The 24 line provides service between Carmel Valley Village and the Monterey Transit Plaza with 60-minute headways during weekday peak hours. Lines 4, 5, 24, and 36 provide service in the shopping area at the mouth of the valley and travel near the project area. A bus stop is located in the project vicinity, on Carmel Valley Road near the Rio Road/Carmel Valley Road intersection.

Although feasible to place a bus stop inside the development itself, this is not necessary to address any significant impact of the Project that is not otherwise addressed by other mitigation. It is unlikely that, given the proximity to an existing bus stop, the addition of such a bus stop would avoid

or substantially reduce any significant impacts of the Proposed Project, as it is unlikely to change the transport modes of the residents of the project area substantially.

The addition of a signal at the currently unsignalized intersection of Rio Road and Via Nona Marie Road is not necessary to address a significant impact at this location. This site has low traffic volumes at present and would continue to have low volumes in the future that would not result in level-of-service impacts. All road extensions will meet County requirements for safety and thus a signal is not necessary for safety purposes at this location.

The Proposed Project (and the 130-Unit Alternative) already includes signalization of the intersection at Rio Road and Carmel Valley Road. As presented in Section 3.7, *Transportation and Traffic*, the Proposed Project would not have a significant impact on the Rio Road/Carmel Valley Road intersection with the presumed signalization.

Thus, while feasible, these suggestions were not carried forward for further analysis as they do not avoid or substantially reduce significant impacts of the Proposed Project.

Visitor-Serving Development

Prior to the current application, the owner of the property had considered developing a resort/hotel complex in the location of the current Project that included 175 visitor-serving units. The 2013 CVMP allows for developing up to 175 units at the project site.

This alternative is considered feasible as the project site is available, water is available to serve the development, mitigation is available to address project impacts (as for the Proposed Project), and the Project is consistent with the 2013 CVMP.

This alternative would not avoid the land use/zoning inconsistency of the Proposed Project. Project site impacts are likely similar to the Proposed Project.

However, this alternative would not meet most of the project objectives because it would not provide housing, and thus it was dismissed from further consideration.

Chapter 6
References Cited

Chapter 2: Project Description

Monterey County. 1986. *Carmel Valley Master Plan*. Amended November 5, 1996. Monterey County, CA.

Chapter 3.1: Geology and Soils

California Building Standards Commission. 2013. *California Building Code.*

California Department of Conservation. No Date. *California Geological Survey – Alquist –Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act*. Accessed 05/1/16. Available: http://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/ap/Pages/main.aspx#what_is_fault

California Division of Mines and Geology. 2000. Digital images of official maps of the Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault zones of California, Central Coast Region. (DMG CD 2000-04.) CD-ROM.

ENGEO. 2005. Geotechnical Exploration, Rancho Cañada Village, Carmel Valley, California. San Ramon, CA.

———. 2006. Phase One Environmental Site Assessment Update, Rancho Cañada Village, Carmel Valley California. Prepared for Rancho Cañada Community Partners, LLC. Monterey, CA. Project No. 6023.3.004.01. July 31, 2006.

Hart, E. W. and W. A. Bryant. 1997. *Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California – Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act with Index to Earthquake Fault Zones Maps*. (Special Publication 42.) Sacramento, CA: California Division of Mines and Geology.

International Conference of Building Officials. 2009. *International Building Code*.

Monterey County. 1982. *Monterey County General Plan*. Monterey County, CA.

———. 1986. *Carmel Valley Master Plan*. Amended November 5, 1996. Monterey County, CA.

———. 2007. *General Plan Update.* Monterey County, CA.

———. 2010. *Monterey County General Plan.* Monterey County, CA.

U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2014. Web Soil Survey website. Available: http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx. Accessed: October 2014.

U.S. Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. 1978. Soil Survey: Monterey County, California.

Chapter 3.2: Hydrology and Water Quality

Balance Hydrologics, Inc. 2005a. Preliminary stormwater management plan for Rancho Cañada, County of Monterey, California. Prepared for Carlson, Barbee & Gibson, Inc., San Ramon, California.

———. 2005b. Request for conditional letter of map revision, Carmel River, County of Monterey, California.

———. 2005c. *Preliminary Stormwater Management Plan for Rancho Cañada, County of Monterey, California*. Prepared for Carlson, Barbee & Gibson, Inc. San Ramon, California.

———. 2006a. Additional information requested for case number 05-09-2100A444-R, Carmel River, County of Monterey, California. January.

———. 2006b. Additional information requested for case number 05-09-A444-R, Carmel River, County of Monterey, California. May.

———. 2006c. Public notice of regulatory floodway change and changes to the BFEs on the Carmel River per the Conditional Letter of Map Revision request for Rancho Canada (FEMA Case Number 05-09-A444R). June.

———. 2014a. Re: Implications of the revised FEMA floodplain mapping for the Rancho Cañada Village Project, County of Monterey. Letter to Jacqueline Zischke from Edward D. Ballman. September 18.

———. 2014b. *County Service Area 50 Final Lower Carmel River Stormwater Management and Flood Control Report*. Prepared for Monterey County Resource Management Agency. October.

———. 2014c. Response to Comments from Computational Hydraulics and Transport, LLC on the Hydrology and Water Quality Section of the *Rancho Cañada Village Specific Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report*. September 18.

California Department of Boating and Waterways and State Coastal Conservancy. 2002. California beach restoration study. Sacramento, California.

Carmel River Watershed Conservancy, Inc. (CRWC). 2004. Watershed assessment and action plan of the Carmel River watershed, California.

Central Coast Water Resources Control Board (CCWRCB). 2006. Monterey Regional Storm Water Management Program. Last Revised June 1, 2006.

———.. 2011. Water Quality Control Plan for the Central Coast Basin. June. Available: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralcoast/publications_forms/publications/basin_plan/docs/basin_plan_2011.pdf.

———. 2014. Stormwater Technical Guide for Low Impact Development.

Cities of Monterey, Sand City, Del Rey Oaks, Marina, Seaside, and Pacific Grove and the County of Monterey. 2006. Monterey Regional Storm Water Management Program. Revised June 1, 2006. Available: <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/rwqcb3/Public%20Notice/index.htm>. Accessed: September 22, 2006.

Department of Water Resources (DWR). 2003. California's Groundwater, Bulletin 118 – Update 2003.

EIP Associates. 1993. Monterey peninsula water supply project, supplemental draft, environmental impact report/statement II. Monterey Peninsula Water Management District. Volume I.

ENTRIX, Inc. 2008. Final environmental impact statement report for the San Clemente dam seismic retrofit project. Walnut Creek, California. Prepared for California Department of Water Resources and United States Army Corps of Engineers. January. Available: http://scc.ca.gov/webmaster/ftp/pdf/sccbb/2011/1105/20110519Board09_San_Clemente_Dam_Construction_Ex3Vol1.pdf.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 2009. Flood Insurance Study, Monterey County, California, Unincorporated Areas.

———. 1991. Flood insurance study, Monterey County, California, unincorporated areas.

———. 2015. National Flood Hazard Layer Web Map Service (WMS) in Google Earth. Available: https://hazards.fema.gov/femaportal/wps/portal/!ut/p/a0/04_Sj9CPykssy0xPLMnMz0vMAfGjzOINLIx8zcwDgp0tDJyN3A2cQsyNDCBAvyDbUREAWzSTKw!!/

L&S Engineering and Surveying, Inc. 2014. Letter to Jacqueline Zischke regarding Drainage Summary for the Rancho Cañada Village 130-Unit Project Alternative per the Monterey Regional Storm Water Management Program Requirements. September 23.

Monterey County Water Resources Agency (MCWRA). 2003. Monterey County Flood Management Plan. Updated December 2003.

Monterey County. 1982. Monterey County General Plan. Monterey County, CA.

———. 1984. Greater Monterey Peninsula Area Plan. Monterey County, CA.

———. 1986. Carmel Valley Master Plan. Amended November 5, 1996. Monterey County, CA.

Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (MPWMD). 2002. 2002 annual report.

———. 2003. Autumn 2003 report. Monterey, California.

———. 2004. Environmental and biological assessment of portions of the Carmel River watershed, Monterey, California. Executive Summary. December. Available: http://carmelriverwatershed.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/321_CarmelRiver.pdf.

Monterey Regional Stormwater Management Program. 2011. Program Document. Revised June 23. Available: http://www.montereysea.org/docs/program/Final%20MRSWMP_Rev%203_approved%20clean%20doc_TMDL_r2.pdf.

National Engineering Handbook, 2007. Streambank soil bioengineering, Technical Supplement 14I, Part 654, 84 pages. Available: http://directives.sc.egov.usda.gov/OpenNonWebContent.aspx?content=17818.wba

State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). 1995. Order on Four Complaints Filed Against the California-American Water Company. Carmel River, Monterey County. Order No. WR 95-10. July 6, 1995.

Wallace, D., Baumer, D., Dwyer, J., Hershey, F., 2014. Levee Armouring: woody biotechnical considerations for strengthening Midwest levee systems. Restoration of Aquatic Ecosystems symposium, Association of State Wetland Managers, St Paul, Minnesota. Available: https://www.na.fs.fed.us/spfo/pubs/n_resource/flood/levee.htm

Personal Communications

Zischke, Jacqueline. 2015. Email to ICF regarding County Service Area (CSA)-50 Hydrology. January 12.

Chapter 3.3: Biological Resources

Alvarez, J. A. 2004. *Rana aurora draytonii* (California Red-Legged Frog). Microhabitat. *Herpetological Review* 32(2):162–163.

Beedy, Edward (Ted), Ph. D. Wildlife Biologist. 2006. Beedy Environmental Consulting. Nevada City, CA. Phone conversation – June 19, 2006.

———. 1999. Tricolored blackbird (*Agelaius tricolor*). In A. Poole and F. Gill (eds.), *The birds of North America*. No. 423. Philadelphia, PA: the Academy of Natural Sciences and Washington, DC: the American Ornithologists' Union.

Beedy, E. C., and W. J. Hamilton, III. 1997. *Tricolored blackbird status update and management guidelines*. Prepared for U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Migratory Birds and Habitat Programs, and California Department of Fish and Game, Bird and Mammal Conservation Program. Sacramento, CA.

Beedy, E. C., S. D. Sanders, and D. Bloom. 1991. *Breeding status, distribution, and habitat associations of the tricolored blackbird (*Agelaius tricolor*) 1859–1989*. Prepared for the USDI Fish and Wildlife Service, Sacramento, CA.

Bell, M. C. 1990. Fisheries Handbook of Engineering Requirements and Biological Criteria. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Bjornn, T. C. and D. W. Reiser. 1991. Habitat Requirements of Salmonids in Streams. In Influences of Forest and Rangeland Management on Salmonid Fishes and their Habitat. AFS special publication 19: 83-138.

Brode, J. M., and R. B. Bury. 1984. The Importance of Riparian Systems to Amphibians and Reptiles. Pages 30–36 in R. E. Warner and K. M. Hendrix (eds.), *California Riparian Systems Ecology, Conservation, and Productive Management*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Burt, W. H., and R. P Grossenheider. 1980. *A Field Guide to the Mammals*. Third edition. Houghton Mifflin Company. Boston, MA.

California Native Plant Society. 2014. Inventory of Rare and Endangered plants (online editions, v8 01a). Sacramento, CA. http://www.rareplants.cnps.org/.

California Department of Fish and Game. 2007. *Special Animals List.* October. Available: http://www.dfg.ca.gov/wildlife/species/.

———. 2010. *Natural Communities List (Arranged Alphabetically by Life Form)*. September.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2012. *Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation.* http://www.dfg.ca.gov/wildlife/nongame/survey_monitor.html.

———. 2014. *California Natural Diversity Database.* RareFind 5. Sacramento, CA. https://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cnddb/mapsanddata.asp [subscription required].

California Public Utilities Commission. 2000. Monterey Peninsula Long Term Water Supply Contingency Plan, Component Screening Report (Plan B). Prepared for the Water Division by EDAW. San Francisco. November.

California State Water Resources Control Board. 1995. Order on Four Complaints Filed Against the California-American Water Company. Carmel River, Monterey County. Order No. WR 95-10. July 6, 1995.

Carmel Middle School. 2007. CMS Habitat Bird Check List. Last Updated July 2007.

Center for Biological Diversity, Defenders of Wildlife, California State Park Rangers Association, Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society, San Bernardino Valley Audubon Society, and Tri-County Conservation League. 2003. *Petition to the State of California Fish and Game Commission and supporting information for listing of California population of the western burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia hypugaea*) as an endangered or threatened species under the California Endangered Species Act.* Submitted April 7, 2003.

Cook, L. 1996. Nesting adaptations of tricolored blackbirds (*Agelaius tricolor*). Master's thesis, University of California, Davis.

———. 1999. Tricolored blackbird (*Agelaius tricolor*) conservation plan for southern Sacramento County. Unpublished report submitted to Jones & Stokes, in cooperation with the Southern Sacramento County Habitat Conservation Plan.

Environmental Laboratory. 1987. Corps of Engineers wetlands delineation manual. Technical Report Y-87-1. U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Mississippi.

Groeneveld, D. P. and T. E. Griepentrog. 1985. Interdependence of groundwater, riparian vegetation, and stream bank stability: A case study. *USDA Forest Service General Technical Report*.

Hamilton, W. J., III. 2000. Tricolored blackbird 2000 survey and population analysis. Unpublished report prepared for the USDI Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, OR.

Hamilton, W. J., III, L. Cook, and R. Grey. 1995. Tricolored blackbird project 1994. Unpublished report prepared for the USDI Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, OR.

Haug, E. A., B. A. Milsap, and M. S. Martell. 1993. Burrowing owl (Speotyto cunicularia). In A. Poole and F. Gill (eds.), *The Birds of North America*. No. 61. Philadelphia, PA: the Academy of Natural Sciences and Washington, DC: the American Ornithologists' Union.

Hohenberger, Craig. 2008. Habitat Project Director, Carmel Middle School Biological Sciences Project. Telephone conversation with Rich Walter, Jones & Stokes on June 20, 2008.

Huffman and Associates. 1994. An Evaluation of California's Native Monterey Pine Populations and the Potential for Sustainability.

ICF International, 2012. Santa Clara Valley Habitat Conservation Plan. San Francisco, California. Available: http://scv-habitatagency.org/178/Final-Habitat-Plan.

Jennings, M. R., and M. P. Hayes. 1994. *Amphibian and Reptile Species of Special Concern in California.* Final report. California Department of Fish and Game, Inland Fisheries Division. Rancho Cordova, CA.

Jennings, M. R., M. P. Hayes, and D. C. Holland. 1992. A petition to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to place the California red-legged frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*) and the western pond turtle (*Clemmys marmorata*) on the list of endangered and threatened wildlife and plants.

Jones & Stokes. 1994. Final Monterey Pine Forest Ecological Assessment: Historical Distribution, Ecology, and Current Status of Monterey Pine. Prepared for California Department of Fish and Game, Natural Heritage Division. September.

Kondolf, G. M., and R. R. Curry. 1986. Channel erosion along the Carmel River, Monterey County, California. Earth Surface Processes and Landforms.

Mayer, K. E., and W. F. Laudenslayer, Jr. 1988. A guide to wildlife habitats of California. October. California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. Sacramento, CA.

Monterey County. 2010. *Monterey County General Plan Update*. Available: http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/Planning/gpu/GPU_2007/2010_Mo_Co_General_Plan_Adopted_102610/2010_Mo_Co_General_Plan_Adopted_102610.htm.

———. 2013. *Carmel Valley Master Plan Update*. Monterey County, CA.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2013. *South-Central California Steelhead Recovery Plan*. Southwest Regional Office. Long Beach, California http://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov/publications/recovery_planning/salmon_steelhead/domains/south_central_southern_california/south_central_ca_steelhead_draft_recovery_plan_090113.pdf.

Neff, J. A. 1937. Nesting distribution of the tricolored red-wing. *Condor* 39:61–81.

Orians, G. H. 1961. The ecology of blackbird (*Agelaius*) social systems. *Ecology Monographs* 31: 285-312.

Rana Creek Habitat Restoration. 2004. Initial Biological Assessment for Rancho Cañada Village. Prepared for Rancho Cañada Community Partners. April 20.

Remsen, J. V. 1978. Bird species of special concern in California: an annotated list of declining or vulnerable bird species. (Nongame Wildlife Investigations, Wildlife Management Branch alluvial report No. 78–1.) California Department of Fish and Game. Sacramento, CA.

Sherwin, R. 1998. Western Bat Working Group. Developed for the 1998 Reno Biennial meeting. Updated by Rambaldini, D.A. 2005. Western Bat Working Group. Updated for the 2005 Portland Biennial Meeting.

Snider, W. M. 1983. Reconnaissance of the steelhead resource of the Carmel River drainage, Monterey County. California Department of Fish and Game, Admin. Rep. No. 83-3.

Stebbins, R. C. 2003. *Western Reptiles and Amphibians* (3rd ed.). New York, NY:Houghton Mifflin Company.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2002. *Recovery Plan for the California Red-Legged Frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*)*. Portland, OR.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2005. Revised Guidance on Site Assessments and Field Surveys for the California Red-legged Frog.

———. 2014. Quad search (online application). Sacramento, CA. http://www.fws.gov/sacramento/es_species/Lists/es_species-lists_quad-finder.htm.

The Wildlife Society. 1996. General life histories of California and Nevada bats in Natural history and Management of bats in California and Nevada. Symposium presented by The Western Section of the Wildlife Society. November 13-15, 1996. Sacramento, CA.

Williams, D. F. 1986. Mammalian species of special concern in California. (Wildlife Management Division Administrative Report 86-1.) California Department of Fish and Game. Sacramento, CA.

Zander Associates. 2005. Initial Biological Assessment for the Hatton Parcel. Letter report prepared for Rancho Cañada Community Partners. July 20.

———. 2006. Rancho Cañada Village Restoration and Mitigation Plan, Monterey County, California. Prepared for Rancho Cañada Community Partners LLC. October.

———. 2008. Comments on Biological Resources Section, Rancho Cañada Village DEIR, Monterey County, California. Prepared for Rancho Cañada village Partners. March 6.

———. 2014. Biological Resources Review Rancho Cañada Village. Monterey County, California. Prepared for Rancho Cañada village Partners. April 25.

Zander, Leslie. Principal Biologist. Zander Associates. Novato, CA. Letter to Keith McCoy of Ranch Cañada Community Partners, Monterey, CA – July 25, 2006.

Zeiner, D. C., F. Laudenslayer, K. E. Mayer, and M. White. 1988. *California wildlife; volume I: amphibians and reptiles.* California Department of Fish and Game. Sacramento, CA.

———.1990a. *California wildlife; volume II: birds.* California Department of Fish and Game. Sacramento, CA.

———. 1990b. *California wildlife; volume III: mammals.* California Department of Fish and Game. Sacramento, CA.

Chapter 3.4: Aesthetics

California Department of Transportation. 2006. Officially Designated State Scenic Highways. 2006. Available: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/schwy1.html>. Accessed: May 5, 2006.

Federal Highway Administration. 1983*. Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.* (Contract DOT-FH-11-9694). Washington, DC.

Monterey County. 1986. Carmel Valley Master Plan. Amended November 5, 1996. Monterey County, CA.

U.S. Bureau of Land Management. 1980. *Visual resource management program* (Stock No. 024-001-00116-6.) Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service. 1974. *National Forest Landscape Management Volume 2. Chapter 1: The Visual Management System (Agriculture Handbook Number 462).* Washington, DC.

U.S. Soil Conservation Service. 1978. *Procedure to establish priorities in landscape architecture.* (Technical Release No. 65). Washington, D.C.

Chapter 3.5: Land Use

Monterey County. 1986. Carmel Valley Master Plan. Amended November 5, 1996. Monterey County, CA.

———. 2010. Monterey County General Plan. Monterey County, CA.

Chapter 3.6: Hazards and Hazardous Materials

California Department of Toxic Substances Control. 2014. EnviroStor. Available: http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/mapfull.asp?global_id=&x=-119&y=37&zl=18&ms=640,480&mt=m&findaddress=True&city=4380%20Carmel%20Valley%20Road&zip=&county=&federal_superfund=true&state_response=true&voluntary_cleanup=true&school_cleanup=true&ca_site=true&tiered_permit=true&evaluation=true&military_evaluation=true&school_investigation=true&operating=true&post_closure=true&non_operating=true. Accessed: December 19, 2014.

California State Water Resources Control Board. 2014. GeoTracker. Available: http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/profile_report.asp?global_id=T0605300253.

ENGEO. 2004. *Phase One Environmental Site Assessment, Rancho Cañada Golf Club 4860 Carmel Valley Road, Carmel Valley California*. Submitted to Lombardo Land Group-1. Monterey, Ca. Project No. 6023.3.001.01. March 2.

———. 2006. *Phase One Environmental Site Assessment Update, Rancho Cañada Village, Carmel Valley California*. Prepared for Rancho Cañada Community Partners, LLC. Monterey, Ca. Project No. 6023.3.004.01. July 31.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2014. NEPAssist. Obtained here: http://nepassisttool.epa.gov/nepassist/nepamap.aspx?action=searchloc&wherestr=4860%20Carmel%20Valley%20Road%20Carmel%20CA. September, 16, 2014.

Chapter 3.7: Transportation and Circulation

California Department of Transportation. 2002. *Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies*.

———. 2011. *State Route 1/Rio Road to Carmel Valley Road Operation Improvement Project Initial Study with Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration.*

———. 2013. *Transportation Concept Report State Route 68.* October. Available: http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist05/planning/sys_plan_docs/tcr_factsheet_combo/mon_sr68_tcrfs.pdf.

Central Coast Transportation Consulting. 2014. *Rancho Canada Village Draft Transportation Impact Study*. December 2014.

Central Coast Transportation Consulting. 2015. *Rancho Cañada Village Draft Transportation Impact Study.* February.

DKS Associates. 2007. Carmel Valley Master Plan Traffic Study. July. Traffic and Circulation Element. Prepared for Monterey County, CA.

Hexagon Transportation Consultants. 2007. Rancho Cañada Residential Development Traffic Study. July 25, 2007.

Monterey County. 2013. Carmel Valley Master Plan. Amended February 12, 2013. Monterey County, CA.

———. 1990. *Draft Environmental Impact Report, Carmel Valley Road Improvement Plan,* Prepared by Planning Analysis & Development. December.

———. 1995. *Carmel Valley Road Improvement List.*

———. 2009. *Carmel Valley Traffic Improvement Program Partial Revision of the Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report*.

———. 2010. *Monterey County General Plan.*

———. 2011. *Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan*.

———. 2014. *Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies*. Available: http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/home/showdocument?id=3846.

Transportation Agency for Monterey County. 2014. *Regional Transportation Improvement Plan*. Available: http://www.tamcmonterey.org/programs/rtp/pdf/2014_rtp/0-2014-Monterey-County-RTP.pdf.

Transportation Research Board. 2010. Highway Capacity Manual 2010 Edition.. Available at Monterey County Public Works Department.

Chapter 3.8: Air Quality

Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments. 2008. *Monterey Bay Area 2008 Regional Forecast*. Available: <http://ambag.org/sites/default/files/documents/2008%20Forecast%20Report%20-%20Final.pdf>. June.

———. 2014. 2014 Regional Forecast. Available: <http://ambag.org/sites/default/files/documents/FINAL%20Adopted%20Forecast%20and%20Documentation.pdf> June 11.

California Air Resources Board. 2000. Risk Reduction Plan to Reduce Particulate Matter Emissions from Diesel-Fueled Engines and Vehicles. October. Sacramento, CA.

———. 2013a. Ambient Air Quality Standards. Last revised: June 4, 2013. Available: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/aaqs/aaqs2.pdf>.

———. 2013b. Area Designations Maps/State and National. Available: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/desig/adm/adm.htm>.

———. 2014. iADAM Air Quality Data Statistics. Available: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/adam/index.html>.

Central Coast Transportation Consulting. 2015. *Rancho Cañada Draft Transportation Impact Study*. February.

Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District. 2008a. *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines.* February.

———. 2008b. *2008 Air Quality Management Plan for the Monterey Bay Region*. August.

———. 2013. Triennial Plan Revision 2009-2011. April 17. Available: <http://mbuapcd.org/pdf/Final_Triennial_Plan_Revision_041913.pdf>.

Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment. 2015. Air Toxics Hot Spots Program: Risk Assessment Guidelines. Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessment.

Sidor pers. comm. Planner. Monterey County Planning Department. Email conversation with Kate Giberson – December 8, 2014.

South Coast Air Quality Management District. 2013. California Emissions Estimator Model, version 2013.2.2. Available: <www.caleemod.com>.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2014. Monitor Values Report. Available: <http://www.epa.gov/airdata/ad_rep_mon.html>.

Western Regional Climate Center. 2014. Climate Summary for Monterey. Available: <http://www.wrcc.dri.edu/cgi-bin/cliMAIN.pl?ca5795>.

Chapter 3.9: Noise

California Department of Transportation. 2013. *Technical Noise Supplement to the Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol*. September. Available: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/env/noise/pub/TeNS_Sept_2013A.pdf. Accessed: February 9, 2015.

Edward L. Pack Associates, Inc. 2014. Revised Noise Assessment Study for the Planned Rancho Cañada Village Specific Plan Monterey County. San Jose, CA.

Federal Transit Administration. 2006. Transit noise and vibration impact assessment. Washington, D.C.

Monterey County. 1982. General Plan 1982.

Monterey County. 2010. *Monterey County General Plan*. Available: <http://mcdses.co.monterey.ca.us/government/departments-i-z/resource-management-agency-rma-/planning/resources-documents/2010-general-plan>.

Chapter 3.10: Public Services, Utilities, and Recreation

California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2014. Water Rights: What Are Water Rights? Obtained here: http://www.dfg.ca.gov/water/water_rights.html. December 22, 2014.

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. 2007. California Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map Update Project. Adopted 11/2007. Available: http://www.fire.ca.gov/wildland_zones_maps.php

California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery. 2013. On-Line Disposal rate Calculator. Available: http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/LGCentral/Reports/OnLineDisposalRateCalc.aspx?ReportingEntityID=1324&ReportYear=2013&Mode=View. Accessed: September 9, 2014.

Carmel Area Wastewater District. 2014. Treatment and Disposal. Available: http://cawd.org/treatment.html. Accessed: December 2014.

Craig, R. K. 2014. Does the Endangered Species Act Preempt State Water Law? 62 Kansas Law Review 851-891 (May 2014). Published, 05/2014.

Education Data Partnership. 2014. Website. Carmel Unified School District (Monterey County) - Enrollment by Grade – Population Trends - Enrollment Trends for the years 2004/2005 through 2013/14. Last revised March 24, 2014. Available: < http://www.ed-data.k12.ca.us/App_Resx/EdDataClassic/fsTwoPanel.aspx?#!bottom=/_layouts/EdDataClassic/profile.asp?fyr=1314&county=27&Level=05&reportNumber=16#enrollmentbygrade>.

EIP Associates. 1993. Monterey peninsula water supply project, supplemental draft, environmental impact report/statement II. Monterey Peninsula Water Management District. Volume I.

ICF International. 2010. Final Environmental Impact Report for the 2010 Draft Monterey County General Plan. Available: http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/planning/gpu/GPU_2007/FEIR_Information/FEIR_Information.htm. Accessed: September 2014.

Monterey County Sheriff's Office (MCSO). 2014. Patrol Division. Website: https://www.montereysheriff.org/patrol/. Accessed: December 2014

Monterey County. 1982. Monterey County General Plan. Monterey, CA.

———. 2010. Community Wildfire Protection Plan. Available: http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/cob/BOS%20Supplemental_addendum/December%2014,%202010/MCCWPP_November%202010_v2%20-%20FINAL%2012-10-10.pdf. Accessed: December 22, 2014.

Monterey County Sherriff's Office. n.d. website. Home Page. Available: <http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/SHERIFF/>. Accessed: December 2014

Monterey Peninsula Regional Parks District. 2014. History. Available: <http://www.mprpd.org/>. Accessed: September 2014.

Monterey Regional Waste Management District. 2013. Annual Report 2013. Available: http://www.mrwmd.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/mrwmd_annual_report_2013_Final.pdf. Accessed: September 2014.

———. 2014. Monterey Peninsula Landfill. Accessed: September 2014. Available: < http://www.mrwmd.org/programs-services/disposal/monterey-peninsula-landfill/>.

State Water Resources Control Board. 1995. Order on Four Complaints Filed Against the California-American Water Company. Carmel River, Monterey County. Order No. WR 95-10. July 6, 1995.

Zischke, Jacqueline. Attorney at Law. November 23, 2015 – Email correspondence regarding anti-flood culvert with Rich Walter, ICF International.

Personal Communications

Acosta, Jude. Cypress Fire Protection District. Battalion Chief Operations. September through October 2014 – Regarding fire services for the project site with Jillian Burns, ICF International.

Buikema, Barbara. Carmel Area Wastewater District. General Manager. September 11, 2014 – Email correspondence regarding wastewater services for the project site with Jillian Burns, ICF International.

Galletti, Donna. Monterey County-Coastal Station Patrol. Office of the Sheriff-Marshal-Coroner, Public Administrator's Department. November 24, 2014 – Email correspondence regarding police services in Monterey County with Jillian Burns, ICF International.

Lombardo, T. Correspondence with Jacqueline Onciano regarding water supply. August 23, 2006.

Chapter 3.11: Cultural Resources

Archaeological Consulting. 2003. *Preliminary Archaeological Reconnaissance for Rancho Cañada Community Partners Housing Site on a Portion of the Rancho Cañada Gold Club in Carmel, Monterey, CA*. December 13, 2003.

Archaeological Consulting. 2005. *Preliminary Archaeological Reconnaissance for Rancho Cañada Village Extension, Including portions of APN 015-162-016 and APN 015-162-037 in Carmel, Monterey, CA*. June 28, 2005.

Bean, L. J., ed. 1994. *The Ohlone Past and Present*. Chocheno and Rumsen Narratives: A Comparison by Beverley R. Ortiz pages 99-165. Rumsen Seasonality and Population Dynamics by Gary S. Breschini and Trudy Haversat pages 183-203.

Cook, S. F. 1943a. The Conflict between the California Indians and White Civilization, I: The Indian Versus the Spanish Mission. *Ibero-Americana* 21. Berkeley, CA.

———. 1943b. The Conflict between the California Indians and White Civilization, II: The Physical and Demographic Reaction of the Non-Mission Indians in Colonial and Provincial California. *Ibero-Americana* 22. Berkeley, CA.

ENGEO. 2004. Geotechnical Exploration, Rancho Cañada Village, Carmel Valley, California. Prepared for Lombardo Land Group-1. San Ramon, CA.

Hylkema, M.G. 2002. Tidal Marsh, Oak Woodlands, and Cultural Florescence in the Southern San Francisco Bay Region. Pages 233–262 in J.M. Erlandson and T.L. Jones (eds.) *Catalysts to Complexity: Late Holocene Societies of the California Coast*. Los Angeles, CA: Cotsen Institute of Archaeology, University of California, Los Angeles, CA.

Jones, T. L. 2003. Prehistoric Human Ecology of the Big Sur Coast, California. *Contributions of the University of California Archaeological Research Facility* no. 61.

Jones, T. L., N. Stevens, D. Jones, R. Fitzgerald, and M. Hylkema. 2007. Chapter 9: The Central Coast: A Midlatitude Milieu, Pages 125-146 in Terry L. Jones and Kathryn A. Klar, (eds.), *California Prehistory: Colonization, Culture, and Complexity*, Altamira Press, New York.

Jones & Stokes. 2008. Draft Environment Impact Report, Monterey County 2007 General Plan, Monterey County, California. September 2008.

Kroeber, A. L. 1955. Nature of the Land-Holding Group. *Ethnohistory* 2:303–314.

Levy, R. 1978. Costanoan. Pages 485–495 in R. F. Heizer (ed.) *California*. Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8, W.C. Sturtevant, general ed. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.

Mills, W., M. Rondeau, and T. L. Jones. 2005. A Fluted Projectile Point from Nipomo, San Luis Obispo County, California. *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 25:68-74.

Monterey County. 1982. Monterey County General Plan. Monterey County, CA.

———. 1986. Carmel Valley Master Plan. Monterey County, CA.

———. 2010. *Monterey County General Plan.* Monterey County, CA.

Society of Vertebrate Paleontology. 1995. Conformable Impact Mitigation Guidelines. Electronic document, http://vertpaleo.org/The-Society/Governance-Documents/Conformable-Impact-Mitigation-Guidelines-Committee.aspx, accessed September 8, 2014.

Waldron, W., P. Oman, and J. McManus. 1984. New Deposit/Redeposit Record for P-27-000393/CA-MNT-290. Record on File at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, CA.

Chapter 3.12: Population and Housing

Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments. 2014. *Population, Housing Unit, and Employment Forecast*, *Monterey County.* Forecast Results, Carmel-by-the-Sea, and Unincorporated Monterey County Forecasts.

California Department of Transportation. 2013. Monterey County Economic Forecast.

Monterey County. 2003. *County of Monterey Housing Element 2002–2008*. October. Adopted by Board of Supervisors November 4, 2003.

———. 2007. Annual Housing Report – 2007. Prepared by Monterey County Resource Management Agency. Office of Housing and Development. Available: <http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/housing/pdfs/Housing/housingreport_2007.pdf>.

———. 2010. Annual Housing Report – 2011. Prepared by Monterey County Resource Management Agency. Office of Housing and Development. Available: <http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/housing/pdfs/ANNUAL%20HOUSING%20REPORT-%20Final%20March%202,2010.pdf>.

———. 2011. Annual Housing Report – 2011. Prepared by Monterey County Resource Management Agency. Office of Housing and Development. Available: <http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/housing/2011%20ANNUAL%20HOUSING%20REPORT-%20Final%20Draft%20BOS%202-4-11.pdf>.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2000. Census 2000 Summary File.

———. 2010. Census 2010 Summary File.

———. 2014. 2008 – 2012 American Community Survey.

Chapter 3.13: Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change

Published Sources

Air Resources Board. 2008. *Climate Change Scoping Plan*. December. Available: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/document/adopted_scoping_plan.pdf>. December.

———. 2011. Status of Scoping Plan Recommended Measures. Available: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/sp_measures_implementation_timeline.pdf>.

———. 2014. First Update to the AB 32 Scoping Plan. Available: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/document/updatedscopingplan2013.htm>. May.

Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments. 2010. Unincorporated Monterey County (Draft) Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory: 2005 Baseline Report. Salinas, CA. Available: <http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/planning/major/Pebble%20Beach%20Company/Pebble_Beach_DEIR_Nov_2011/Pebble_Beach_DEIR_Admin_Records_Nov_2011/AMBAG/AMBAG_2010_Monterey_County_GHG_Inventory_2005.pdf>.

Bay Area Air Quality Management District. 2011. California Environmental Quality Act: Air Quality Guidelines.

California Coastal Commission. 2013. *Draft Sea-Level Rise Policy Guidance*. Available: <http://www.coastal.ca.gov/climate/slr/guidance/CCC_Draft_SLR_Guidance_PR_10142013.pdf>. October.

California Energy Commission. 2006. *Inventory of California Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990 to 2004.* Available: <http://www.energy.ca.gov/2006publications/CEC-600-2006-013/CEC-600-2006-013-SF.PDF>. December.

———. 2009a. Climate Change Scenarios and Sea Level Rise Estimates for California 2008 Climate Change Scenario Assessment. Available: <http://www.energy.ca.gov/2009publications/CEC-500-2009-014/CEC-500-2009-014-D.PDF>. March.

———. 2009b. Climate Change and Potential Hotspots of Coastal Erosion along the Southern California Coast. Available: <http://www.energy.ca.gov/2009publications/CEC-500-2009-022/CEC-500-2009-022-F.PDF>. August.

———. 2012. Our Changing Climate 2012: Vulnerability & Adaptation to the Increasing Risks from Climate Change in California. Available: <http://www.energy.ca.gov/2012publications/CEC-500-2012-007/CEC-500-2012-007.pdf>.

———. 2014. Cal-Adapt website. Available: <http://cal-adapt.org/sealevel/>.

California Environmental Law Blog. 2014. *U.S. Supreme Court Declines to Hear Dispute over California Low Carbon Fuel Standard*. Available: <http://www.californiaenvironmentallawblog.com/ab-32/us-supreme-court-declines-to-hear-dispute-over-california-low-carbon-fuel-standard/>.

California Natural Resources Agency. 2009. 2009 California Climate Adaptation Strategy. Available: <http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/adaptation/strategy/index.html>.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2007. Introduction. B. Metz, O.R. Davidson, P.R. Bosch, R. Dave, L.A. Meyer, eds., in Contribution of Working Group III to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2007. pp. 97–115. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, U.K. and New York, NY, USA. Available at: <http://www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/ar4/wg3/en/contents.html>.

———. 2013. *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis*. Available: <http://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar5/wg1/>.

Kahrl, F., and D. Roland-Holst. 2008. California Climate Risk and Response. University of California. Berkeley, CA. Available: <http://are.berkeley.edu/~dwrh/CERES_Web/Docs/California%20Climate%20Risk%20and%20Response.pdf>. November.

Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District. 2008. *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines.* February.

———. 2014. MBUAPCD Advisory Committee Presentation on GHG Thresholds. Available: <http://www.mbuapcd.org/mbuapcd/pdf/Advisory_Reports/2014/20140206/10.pdf>. February 6.

Monterey County. 2010. *Monterey County General Plan*. Available: <http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/Planning/gpu/GPU_2007/2010_Mo_Co_General_Plan_Adopted_102610/2010_Mo_Co_General_Plan_Adopted_102610.htm>.

Myhre, G., D. Shindell, F.-M. Bréon, W. Collins, J. Fuglestvedt, J. Huang, D. Koch, J.-F. Lamarque, D. Lee, B. Mendoza, T. Nakajima, A. Robock, G. Stephens, T. Takemura, and H. Zhang. 2013. Anthropogenic and Natural Radiative Forcing. Pages 659–740 in T. F. Stocker, D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S. K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex, and P. M. Midgley (eds.), *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.* Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press.

PRBO Conservation Science. 2011. Projected Effects of Climate Change in California: Ecoregional Summaries Emphasizing Consequences for Wildlife. Version 1.0. February.

San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District. 2012. CEQA Air Quality Handbook: A Guide for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts for Projects Subject to CEQA Review.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2012. *2017 and Later Model Year Light-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Corporate Average Fuel Economy Standards.* 40 CFR Parts 85, 86, and 600. Available: <http://www.nhtsa.gov/fuel-economy>.

Personal Communication

Clymo, Amy. Supervising Air Quality Planner. Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District. Telephone conversation with Shannon Hatcher – January 14, 2015.

Chapter 4: Other Required CEQA Analysis

Carmel Valley Association. 2014. Available: http://www.carmelvalleyassociation.org/issues.html.

Central Coast Transportation Consulting. 2015. *Rancho Cañada Village Draft Transportation Impact Study.* February.

DKS Associates. 2007. Carmel Valley Master Plan Traffic Study. July. Traffic and Circulation Element. Prepared for Monterey County, CA.

Jones & Stokes. 2007. Carmel Valley Traffic Improvement Program Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIR).

Monterey County. 2008. *2010 Monterey County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report.*

———. 2010. *2010 Monterey County General Plan*.

———. 2011. *Final Environmental Impact Report Pebble Peach Company's Del Monte Forest Preservation and Development Plan*. Available here: http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/government/departments-i-z/resource-management-agency-rma-/planning/resources-documents/environmental-documents/archived/pebble-beach-company-proposal.

———. 2014. County Service Area 50 Lower Carmel River Stormwater and Flood Control Program Update.

———. 2015a. *Carmel Canine Sports Center*. Available: http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/government/departments-i-z/resource-management-agency-rma-/planning/current-major-projects/carmel-canine-sports-complex. Accessed: January 20, 2016.

———. 2015b. Before the Planning Commission in and for the County of Monterey, State of California. February 25. Available: http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/planning/docs/resolutions/pc_2015/RESpc_15-016_PLN130417_022515.pdf. Accessed: January 20, 2016.

Monterey County Water Resources Agency (MCWRA). 2015. Board of Directions Planning Committee. August 19. Available: http://www.mcwra.co.monterey.ca.us/bod_committees/Planning/Planning%20Agenda/2015%20Planning%20A/8%20Planning%20Agenda%20and%20Packet%20081915.pdf. Accessed: January 22, 2016.

The Carmel River Watershed Conservancy. 2014. Environmental Management Projects and Programs in the Carmel River Watershed. February 13. Available: http://carmelriverwatershed.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/Projects_Programs_Update_Feb_2014_Final_Draft_140312.pdf. Accessed: January 22, 2016.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 2014. Carmel Lagoon Ecosystem Protective Barrier, Scenic Road Protection Structure, and Interim Sandbar Management Plan Project.

Zander Associates. 2006. Rancho Cañada Village Restoration and Mitigation Plan, Monterey County, California. Prepared for Rancho Cañada Community Partners LLC. October.

Zischke, Jacqueline. Attorney at Law. November 23, 2015 – Email correspondence regarding anti-flood culvert with Rich Walter, ICF International.

Chapter 5: Alternatives

DKS Associates. 2007. Carmel Valley Master Plan Traffic Study.

Jones & Stokes. 2007. Carmel Valley Traffic Improvement Program Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIR).

Monterey County. 1986. Carmel Valley Master Plan. Amended November 5, 1996. Monterey County, CA.

Monterey County Water Resources Agency. 2003. Monterey County Flood Management Plan. Updated December 2003.

Philip Williams & Associates Ltd. 2002. Lower Carmel River Flood Control Project – Final Report. August 9, 2002. Prepared for Monterey County Water Resources Agency.