Chapter 2.0 SUMMARY OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This Draft EIR assesses the potential environmental impacts of the Lagoon EPB, SRPS, and ISMP Project proposed by the County. This document has been prepared in accordance with the CEQA statutes and guidelines. The County is the lead agency for this CEQA process. Inquiries about the project and the CEQA process should be directed to:

Melanie Beretti, Special Programs Manager
Monterey County, Resource Management Agency
168 W. Alisal St., 2nd Floor, Salinas, CA 93901
Phone: (831) 755-5285
berettim@co.monterey.ca.us

Comments in hard copy may be submitted to the name and address above. The County also accepts comments via e-mail. To submit your comments by e-mail, please send a complete document including all attachments to: **CEQAcomments@co.monterey.ca.us**

2.2 PROPOSED PROJECT OBJECTIVES

In compliance with the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), and the County, and to avoid a jeopardy opinion (JO) issued by NMFS, the proposed project has been developed as a multi-objective, multi-year, multi-organizational effort to improve habitat for threatened and endangered species in the lower Carmel River and Lagoon, improve natural floodplain function, and protect public infrastructure, while maintaining flood protection to existing developed areas. Consideration for how to restore the natural breaching regime in the Lagoon while maintaining current flood protection to low-lying areas has been a cooperative effort between multiple Federal, State, regional, and local agencies, as well as conservation organizations, for more than a decade, and has included evaluating numerous project alternatives to get to the proposed EPB and SRPS options.

Recognizing the challenges associated with the existing development in the low-lying areas that has occurred over the past century adjacent to the Lagoon and the degradation caused by historic farming and breaching activities, the primary objective of the proposed project is to implement a solution to improve the functions and values of the ecosystem in and around the Lagoon by restoring the Lagoon's historic hydrologic, pre-management conditions to the extent feasible to protect and improve habitat for fish and wildlife while maintaining flood protection. In addition, a natural beach in the northerly direction is preferred by the resource agencies to facilitate a longer and more natural flow channel, improving conditions for fish and wildlife within the Lagoon. To accomplish this primary objective, the proposed project would need to meet the following objectives:

- Consistent with the MOU, reduce the necessity for mechanical breaching of the sandbar to the greatest extent practicable;
- Maintain the current level of flood protection for existing public facilities and private structures in the low-lying developed areas located immediately to the north of and within the Lagoon;

- Protect Scenic Road embankment and the California Department of Parks and Recreation's (State Parks') restroom, interpretive, and parking facilities from scour resulting from a northerly-aligned Lagoon outflow channel that may result from a reduction in mechanical breaching;
- Protect the Scenic Road embankment from the increasing risk of erosion resulting from ocean storm surge and high tides, which could increase in severity due to climate change; and
- Allow for interim management of the sandbar while the design and construction of the other project components proceed;
- Design and construct project elements within the timeframe required as outlined in the MOU; and
- Minimize infrastructure that could detract from the function and value of the natural environment.

2.3 SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project area is situated within and adjacent to the Carmel River State Beach and Lagoon, between Highway 1 and the Pacific Ocean in the unincorporated Carmel area of Monterey County, California. The Lagoon is located within the Carmel River Watershed, at the mouth of the Carmel River. Carmel River Beach forms a seasonal barrier between the Lagoon and the Pacific Ocean.

The proposed project involves implementing three project components: 1) EPB; 2) SRPS; and 3) ISMP. The proposed EPB project component would maintain or improve existing flood protection to low-lying homes and public infrastructure along the north edge of the Lagoon, while the frequency of mechanical management of the sandbar is reduced in compliance with regulatory requirements. The proposed SRPS project component would provide protection from erosion along the northern sand cliffs and the undermining of Scenic Road which may result from northerly river flows or large ocean swells. The proposed ISMP project component is intended to provide a short-term (i.e., until the design, environmental review, permitting, and construction of the project is completed) solution to potential flooding issues by implementing select sandbar management actions that allow additional natural function in the Lagoon while still protecting properties and infrastructure, with the understanding that the development of the proposed EPB and SRPS project components would further reduce mechanical management of the sandbar and return the Lagoon, its sandbar, and associated riverine and ocean dynamics to more natural cycles. However, the proposed project recognizes that the need for management in the form of breaching activities may be necessary in emergency situations; annual actions do not qualify as an emergency according to the permitting agencies.

2.4 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Table 2-1 summarizes the impacts of the proposed project. A summary of the cumulative impacts and the proposed project contribution to those impacts, as applicable, is presented in **Table 2-2**. For each impact considered to be significant or potentially significant, the table summarizes the recommended mitigations. **Tables 2-1** and **2-2** are intended to provide a summary of the proposed project impacts and mitigation measures that are described in detail in **Chapter 4, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures**; please refer to that section for complete discussion.

2.5 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

This chapter presents the alternatives analysis for the proposed project. This section sets forth the objectives of the proposed project, summarizes its significant impacts, discusses the alternatives considered but eliminated from further analysis, describes the range of alternatives considered, and compares the impacts of the alternatives evaluated to the impacts of the proposed project.

The State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6(a), state that an EIR must describe and evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project, or to the location of the project, that would feasibly attain most of the project's basic objectives, but that would avoid or substantially lessen any significant adverse effects of the project. An EIR is not required to consider every conceivable alternative to a proposed project. Rather, it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision-making and public participation. The State CEQA Guidelines further state that the specific alternative of "no project" shall also be evaluated. The EIR must evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives and include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the impacts of the proposed project. This chapter is organized into the following sections:

Section 5.1, Introduction and Approach, provides an overview of CEQA requirements pertaining to the identification and analysis of alternatives, and the Chapter organization. This section also includes the objectives of the proposed project and a summary of significant impacts of the proposed project by topical area (**Table 5-1**). The section concludes with the identification of CEQA alternatives evaluated in this Chapter.

Section 5.2, Alternatives Considered but Eliminated*,* discusses the alternatives that were considered, but eliminated from further analysis in this Draft EIR. This section is organized into two parts:

5.2.1 Alternative Components of the Proposed Project Considered but Eliminated

5.2.2 Alternative Projects of the Proposed Project Considered but Eliminated

Section 5.3, Alternatives Analysis*,* describes the alternatives to the proposed project, compares the impacts of the alternatives to the impacts of the proposed project, and also evaluates the alternatives' ability to accomplish the project objectives. This section is organized into four parts:

5.3.1 No Project Alternative

5.3.2 Alternatives Components to Proposed Project

5.3.2.1 EPB Component Alternatives

5.3.2.2 SRPS Component Alternatives

5.3.3 Alternatives Projects to Proposed Project

Section 5.4, Environmentally Superior Alternative*,* identifies an environmentally superior alternative, as required by CEQA.

2.6 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

Based on the comments received during the Notice of Preparation scoping periods, the following key topics and areas of controversy have been identified:

- the proposed EPB project component is not supported by State Parks and the placement of the proposed EPB project component on State Parks property would require legislative action

- alternatives to the proposed project
- impacts to water quality
- technical feasibility of the proposed SRPS and EPB project components
- aesthetic impacts
- flooding impacts on- and off-site
- cultural resources impacts
- wetland and other habitat impacts
- impacts to steelhead
- encroachment into State Parks property
- consistency with applicable planning policies and regulations
- hazardous materials
- public access.

Table 2-1 Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact Statement	EPB	SRPS	ISMP	Project Overall	Mitigation Measure
KEY To ACRONYMS: *NI – No Impact; LS – Less-than-Significant; LSM = Significant Without Mitigation/Less-than-Significant with Mitigation;* *SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact even with Mitigation; BI = Beneficial Impact*					
4.1 Aesthetics					
AES-1: Construction Impacts on Scenic Vistas and Visual Quality of the Surrounding Areas. Proposed project construction would not result in substantial adverse effects on scenic vistas or the visual character of the site and surrounding area.	LS	LS	LS	**LS**	No mitigation measures are required.
AES-2: Operation Impacts on Scenic Vistas and Visual Quality of the Surrounding Areas. The proposed project would result in substantial adverse effects on scenic vistas or the visual character of the site and surrounding area.	SU	LS	NI	**SU**	**Mitigation Measure AES-2: Screening of the EPB Project Component (Applies to EPB project component).** The final design of the EPB project component shall include surface treatments with earth-tone colors and natural appearing materials in harmony with the surrounding landscape, including, but not limited to, earth-tone paints and finishes with low reflectivity. Post-construction, native vegetation of the appropriate habitat types shall be planted along both sides of the EPB project component for the purposes of screening. This effort may be implemented in coordination with the restoration required by **Mitigation Measure BIO-1a** and **Mitigation Measure BIO-2**, as determined appropriate.
AES-3: Impacts due to Permanent Light and Glare during Operations. Operation of proposed EPB project component facilities would not result in a substantial new source of light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	LS	NI	NI	**LS**	No mitigation measures are required.

Impact Statement	EPB	SRPS	ISMP	Project Overall	Mitigation Measure
KEY To ACRONYMS: *NI – No Impact; LS – Less-than-Significant; LSM = Significant Without Mitigation/Less-than-Significant with Mitigation;* *SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact even with Mitigation; BI = Beneficial Impact*					
4.2 Air Quality					
AQ-1: Conflict with or Obstruct Implementation of Applicable Air Quality Plans. The construction and operation of the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.	LS	LS	LS	**LS**	No mitigation measures are required.
AQ-2: Violate any Air Quality Standard or Contribute Substantially to an Existing or Projected Air Quality Violation. The construction and operation of the proposed project would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.	LS	LS	LS	**LS**	No mitigation measures are required.
AQ-3: Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase of Any Criteria Pollutant for which the Project region is Non-Attainment under an Applicable Federal or State Ambient Air Quality Standard. The construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively	LS	LS	LS	**LS**	No mitigation measures are required.

Impact Statement	EPB	SRPS	ISMP	Project Overall	Mitigation Measure
KEY To ACRONYMS: *NI – No Impact; LS – Less-than-Significant; LSM = Significant Without Mitigation/Less-than-Significant with Mitigation;* *SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact even with Mitigation; BI = Beneficial Impact*					
considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard, including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors.					
AQ-4: Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentration. The construction and operation of the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	LS	LS	LS	**LS**	No mitigation measures are required.
AQ-5: Create Objectionable Odors Affecting a Substantial Number of People. The construction and operation of the proposed project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.	LS	LS	LS	**LS**	No mitigation measures are required.

Impact Statement	EPB	SRPS	ISMP	Project Overall	Mitigation Measure
KEY To ACRONYMS: *NI – No Impact; LS – Less-than-Significant; LSM = Significant Without Mitigation/Less-than-Significant with Mitigation;* *SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact even with Mitigation; BI = Beneficial Impact*					
4.3 Biological Resources					
BIO-1: Construction Impacts to Special-Status Species and Habitat. Proposed project construction would not have a substantial effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on special-status wildlife species and their habitat within the Biological Study Area.	LSM	LSM	LSM	**LSM**	**Mitigation Measure BIO-1a: <u>Implement Construction Best Management Practices</u> (Applies to EPB and SRPS project components).** The following BMPs reduce impacts to special-status wildlife species: 1) A qualified biologist will conduct an Employee Education Program for the construction crew prior to any construction activities. 2) Protective fencing will be placed to keep construction equipment and personnel from impacting vegetation outside of work limits. 3) Following construction, disturbed areas will be restored to pre-project contours to the maximum extent possible and revegetated. 4) Activities that involve substantial soil disturbance will be planned and carried out in consultation with a qualified hydrologist, engineer, or erosion control specialist, and will utilize standard erosion control and slope stabilization techniques in satisfaction of Monterey County erosion control guidelines. 5) No firearms or pets on the project site. 6) Removal of trash and construction debris. 7) All excavated, steep-walled holes or trenches more than two feet deep will be covered at the close of each working day and thoroughly inspected before they are filled. 8) Cleaning and refueling of equipment and vehicles shall occur only within designated staging areas. 9) If necessary to work during the nighttime, construction lighting shall be focused and downward directed to preclude night illumination of adjacent habitats 10) Measures will be implemented to reduce the introduction and spread of non-native, invasive species. **Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: <u>Conduct Pre-Construction Surveys for White-Tailed Kite, Nesting Raptors, and Other Migratory Bird Species</u> (Applies to EPB and SRPS**

Impact Statement	EPB	SRPS	ISMP	Project Overall	Mitigation Measure
KEY To ACRONYMS: NI – No Impact; LS – Less-than-Significant; LSM = Significant Without Mitigation/Less-than-Significant with Mitigation; SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact even with Mitigation; BI = Beneficial Impact					
					project components). Construction activities, specifically vegetation and/or tree removal, can be scheduled after September 16 and before January 31. Alternatively, a qualified biologist will be retained by the project applicant to conduct pre-construction surveys for nesting raptors and other protected avian species within 500 feet of proposed construction activities if construction occurs between February 1 and September 15. **Mitigation Measure BIO-1c: <u>Implement Construction-Phase Monitoring</u> (Applies to EPB and SRPS project components).** The Project Proponent shall retain a qualified biologist to monitor all ground disturbing construction activities. **Mitigation Measure BIO-1d: <u>Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Western Pond Turtle</u> (Applies to EPB project component).** A qualified biologist shall survey suitable habitat no more than 48 hours before the onset of work activities at the EPB project component site for the presence of western pond turtle. **Mitigation Measure BIO-1e: <u>Avoid and Minimize Impacts to CRLF</u> (Applies to EPB project component).** Measures for the avoidance and minimization of adverse impacts to CRLF during construction of the EPB and SRPS project components are those typically employed for construction activities: 1) Construction activities shall occur within a work window determined in consultation with the USFWS. 2) During ground disturbing and vegetation removal activities, a USFWS-approved biologist shall survey appropriate areas of the construction site daily before the onset of work activities for the presence of CRLF. 3) After ground disturbing and vegetation removal activities are complete, the USFWS-approved biologist will designate a person to monitor on-site compliance with all avoidance and minimization measures.

Impact Statement	EPB	SRPS	ISMP	Project Overall	Mitigation Measure
KEY To ACRONYMS: *NI – No Impact; LS – Less-than-Significant; LSM = Significant Without Mitigation/Less-than-Significant with Mitigation;* *SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact even with Mitigation; BI = Beneficial Impact*					
					Mitigation Measure BIO-1f: <u>Avoid or Reduce Hydroacoustic Impacts to S-CCC Steelhead</u> (Applies to EPB project component). Measures for the avoidance and minimization of adverse impacts of hydroacoustic impacts to S-CCC steelhead during construction: 1) A vibratory hammer shall be used for pile driving to the greatest extent feasible. 2) If necessary, an impact hammer may be used. If an impact driver is used, a hydroacoustic impact assessment would need to be conducted. **Mitigation Measure BIO-1g: <u>Avoid and Minimize Impacts to S-CCC Steelhead</u> (Applies to EPB and SRPS project components).** The following measures for avoidance and minimization of adverse impacts to S-CCC steelhead during construction of the EPB and SRPS project components are those typically employed for construction activities. 1) Construction activities shall occur within a work window determined in consultation with the NMFS. 2) Implement all applicable CDFW Avoidance and Minimization Measures **Mitigation Measure BIO-1h: <u>Reduce Impacts to CRLF and S-CCC Steelhead</u> (Applies to ISMP project component).** A monitoring and reporting program will be developed in consultation with the USFWS and NMFS. **Mitigation Measure BIO-1i: <u>Avoid and Minimize Impacts to SBB</u> (Applies to SRPS project component).** The following measures for avoidance and minimization of adverse impacts to SBB during construction of the SRPS project component are those typically employed for construction activities. 1) Dune buckwheat plants that are not scheduled for removal as a result of project activities will be protected by exclusionary fencing. 2) Dune buckwheat plants that will be impacted, as well as the duff and/or soils

Impact Statement	EPB	SRPS	ISMP	Project Overall	Mitigation Measure
KEY To ACRONYMS: *NI – No Impact; LS – Less-than-Significant; LSM = Significant Without Mitigation/Less-than-Significant with Mitigation;* *SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact even with Mitigation; BI = Beneficial Impact*					
					underneath the plants, will be hand removed prior to disturbance by a USFWS-approved biologist 3) The removal of obligate host plants will be mitigated by replanting disturbed areas upon the completion of construction activities. 4) A qualified biologist or restoration specialist shall monitor the planting areas annually for three years
BIO-2: Construction Impacts to Sensitive Habitats. Proposed project construction would not have a substantial adverse effect on sensitive habitats (including riparian, wetlands, and/or other sensitive natural communities) within the Biological Study Area.	LSM	LSM	LS	**LSM**	**Mitigation Measure BIO-1a: <u>Implement Construction Best Management Practices</u> (Applies to EPB and SRPS project components); Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: <u>Conduct Pre-Construction Surveys for White-Tailed Kite, Nesting Raptors, and Other Migratory Bird Species</u> (Applies to EPB and SRPS project components; Mitigation Measure BIO-1c: <u>Implement Construction-Phase Monitoring</u> (Applies to EPB and SRPS project components); Mitigation Measure BIO-1d: <u>Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Western Pond Turtle</u> (Applies to EPB project component); Mitigation Measure BIO-1e: <u>Avoid and Minimize Impacts to CRLF</u> (Applies to EPB project component); Mitigation Measure BIO-1g: <u>Avoid and Minimize Impacts to S-CCC Steelhead</u> (Applies to EPB and SRPS project components);** and **Mitigation Measure BIO-1i: <u>Avoid and Minimize Impacts to SBB</u> (Applies to SRPS project component),** summarized above. **Mitigation Measure BIO-2: <u>Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Federal and Coastal Wetlands, Other Waters of the U.S., Waters of the State, Riparian Habitat, and Seasonal Emergent Marsh (Applies to EPB and SRPS project components).</u>** Measures to reduce impacts to Federal and coastal wetlands, other waters of the U.S., waters of the State, riparian habitat, and seasonal emergent marsh: • A 404 permit shall be obtained from the USACE, a 401 permit shall be obtained from the RWQCB, and a coastal development permit shall be obtained from the CCC prior to any ground disturbance or other construction activities. • Impacts shall be avoided to the greatest extent possible.

Impact Statement	EPB	SRPS	ISMP	Project Overall	Mitigation Measure
KEY To ACRONYMS: *NI – No Impact; LS – Less-than-Significant; LSM = Significant Without Mitigation/Less-than-Significant with Mitigation;* *SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact even with Mitigation; BI = Beneficial Impact*					
					• Preparation and implementation of a Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (HMMP).
BIO-3: Construction Impacts to Movement of Native Wildlife and Native Wildlife Nursery Sites. Proposed project construction would not adversely affect native wildlife corridors and wildlife nursery sites.	LSM	LSM	LS	**LSM**	**Mitigation Measure BIO-1a: Implement Construction Best Management Practices (Applies to EPB and SRPS project components); BIO-1e: Avoid and Minimize Impacts to CRLF (Applies to EPB project component); BIO-1g: Avoid and Minimize Impacts to S-CCC Steelhead (Applies to EPB and SRPS project components);** and **Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Federal and Coastal Wetlands, Other Waters of the U.S., Waters of the State, Riparian Habitat, and Seasonal Emergent Marsh (Applies to EPB and SRPS project components),** summarized above.
BIO-4: Operational Impacts to Special-Status Species and Habitat. Proposed project operations would not adversely affect, either directly or through habitat modification, special-status plant and wildlife species and their habitat within the Biological Study Area.	BI	BI	NI	**BI**	No mitigation measures are required.
BIO-5: Operational Impacts to Sensitive Habitats. Proposed project operations would not adversely affect sensitive habitats (including riparian, wetlands, and/or other sensitive natural communities) within and adjacent to the Biological Study Area.	BI	BI	NI	**BI**	No mitigation measures are required.
BIO-6: Operational Impacts to	BI	BI	NI	**BI**	No mitigation measures are required.

Impact Statement	EPB	SRPS	ISMP	Project Overall	Mitigation Measure
KEY To ACRONYMS: NI – No Impact; LS – Less-than-Significant; LSM = Significant Without Mitigation/Less-than-Significant with Mitigation; SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact even with Mitigation; BI = Beneficial Impact					
Movement of Native Wildlife and to Native Wildlife Nursery Sites. Proposed project operations would not adversely affect native wildlife corridors and wildlife nursery sites.					
4.4 Cultural Resources					
CR-1: Construction Impacts on Historic Resources (Extant Buildings and Structures). Construction of the proposed EPB and SRPS project components and implementation of the proposed ISMP project component would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of known and/or unknown historic resources as defined in CCR Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines or historic properties pursuant to 36 CFR 800.5.	LSM	LS	LS	**LSM**	**Mitigation Measure CR-1: <u>Monitoring EPB Installation</u> (Applies to EPB project component).** The construction of the EPB shall be monitored in accordance with the measures identified. • **Worker Educational Awareness Program (WEAP):** Prior to initiation of any construction-related activities, the County shall implement a WEAP. • **Accidental Discovery:** In the event a previously unknown historic resource is uncovered during the course of construction, all work would temporarily cease until such time a qualified professional can evaluate the resource to determine whether the finding is significant. • **Monitoring:** The County shall retain a qualified archaeological professional to monitor ground disturbing activities.
CR-2: Construction Impacts on Historical and/or Archaeological Resources. The construction of the proposed EPB and SRPS project components and implementation of the proposed ISMP project component would	LSM	LSM	LSM	**LSM**	**Mitigation Measure CR-2a: <u>Final Grading Plans</u>. (Applies to EPB and SRPS project components).** The final grading plans for the EPB and SRPS project components shall be prepared in consultation with an archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Qualification Standards and a representative of the OCEN. **Mitigation Measure CR-2b: <u>Archaeological Data Recovery</u>. (Applies to EPB and SRPS project components)**.

Impact Statement	EPB	SRPS	ISMP	Project Overall	Mitigation Measure
KEY To ACRONYMS: *NI – No Impact; LS – Less-than-Significant; LSM = Significant Without Mitigation/Less-than-Significant with Mitigation;* *SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact even with Mitigation; BI = Beneficial Impact*					
not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of known and unknown historical and/or archaeological resources, as defined in CCR Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines.					• Prior to the commencement of any construction related activities, the County will retain an archaeological consultant who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Qualifications Standards. • In consultation with the County and a representative of OCEN, the archaeologist shall design and carry out an Archaeological Testing Program to determine the relationship of archaeological deposits to the proposed construction. • The archaeologist shall report on the results of the Program to the County in a draft and a final Archaeological Testing Report (ATR). • Based on the conclusions of the ATR, the archaeologist shall prepare a draft and final Archaeological Research Design and Treatment Plan (ARDTP) for the County to avoid and mitigate potential impacts to archaeological resources. • The archaeologist shall consult with the OCEN representative during the preparation of the ARDTP to ensure to the degree prudent and feasible, and bearing in mind project goals, that the proposed work is in keeping with OCEN traditions and sensibilities. • Once approved by the County, a data-recovery investigation and/or other treatment consistent with the ARDTP shall be conducted by the archaeologist. At the conclusion of the work, the archaeologist shall submit a draft and final Archaeological Data Recovery Report (ADRR) to the County. • All artifacts determined in consultation between the archaeologist and OCEN representative to be neither burial related nor sacred could be curated together with copies of field notes and relevant reports in a suitable archaeological curation facility, preferably within Monterey County, if approved by OCEN and under agreement that all artifacts be returned to OCEN. The final disposition of non-burial related but sacred artifacts (if any) will be determined by the OCEN representative.

Impact Statement	EPB	SRPS	ISMP	Project Overall	Mitigation Measure
KEY To ACRONYMS: NI – No Impact; LS – Less-than-Significant; LSM = Significant Without Mitigation/Less-than-Significant with Mitigation; SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact even with Mitigation; BI = Beneficial Impact					
					Mitigation Measure CR-2c: <u>Archaeological Monitoring</u>. (Applies to the proposed ISMP project component). A qualified archaeologist shall be on call to quickly assess any potentially significant cultural materials, archaeological resources, or human remains that might be uncovered. **Mitigation Measure CR-2d: <u>Accidental Discovery of Archaeological Resources</u>. (Applies to ISMP project component).** If archaeological resources are unexpectedly discovered during ISMP project component implementation, work shall be halted within 50 meters of the find until it can be evaluated by a qualified professional archaeologist and OCEN monitor.
CR-3: Construction Impacts on Human Remains. The construction of the proposed EPB and SRPS project components and implementation of the ISMP may result in the disturbance of human remains.	LSM	LSM	LSM	**LSM**	**Mitigation Measure CR-2b: <u>Archaeological Data Recovery</u>. (Applies to EPB and SRPS project components)**, summarized above. **Mitigation Measure CR-3: <u>Discovery of Human Remains</u>. (Applies to all project components)**. If human remains are unexpectedly discovered during any construction, work shall be halted within 50 meters and the County Coroner shall be notified in accordance with provisions of PRC Sections 5097.98-99.
CR-4: Construction Impacts on Tribal Cultural Resources. Construction of the proposed EPB and SRPS project components and implementation of the proposed ISMP project component would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in PRC Section 21074.	LSM	LSM	LSM	**LSM**	**Mitigation Measure CR-1 (Monitoring of EPB Installation); Mitigation Measure CR-2a (Final Grading Plans); Mitigation Measure CR-2b (Archaeological Data Recovery); Mitigation Measure CR-2c (Archaeological Monitoring); Mitigation Measure CR-2d (Accidental Discovery of Archaeological Resources); Mitigation Measure CR-3 (Discovery of Human Remains);** and **Mitigation Measure BIO-2 (Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Federal and Coastal Wetlands, Other Waters of the U.S., Waters of the State, Riparian Habitat, and Seasonal Emergent Marsh)**, summarized above.

Impact Statement	EPB	SRPS	ISMP	Project Overall	Mitigation Measure
KEY To ACRONYMS: *NI – No Impact; LS – Less-than-Significant; LSM = Significant Without Mitigation/Less-than-Significant with Mitigation;* *SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact even with Mitigation; BI = Beneficial Impact*					
4.5 Geology, Soils, & Seismicity					
GS-1: Construction-Related Erosion and Loss of Topsoil. Construction of the proposed EPB and SRPS project components and implementation of the proposed ISMP project component would not result in substantial erosion or loss of topsoil.	LS	LS	LS	**LS**	No mitigation measures are required.
GS-2: Construction-Related Soil Collapse and Soil Constraints. Construction of the proposed EPB and SRPS project components and implementation of the proposed ISMP project component would be located on geologic units or soils that are unstable, or that may become unstable during project construction, and potentially result in soil instability or collapse; however, this exposure would not result in a substantial risk to people or structures.	LS	LS	LS	**LS**	No mitigation measures are required.
GS-3: Exposure to Fault Rupture. The proposed EPB and SRPS project components would be located in a seismically active	LS	LS	NI	**LS**	No mitigation measures are required.

Impact Statement	EPB	SRPS	ISMP	Project Overall	Mitigation Measure
KEY To ACRONYMS: NI – No Impact; LS – Less-than-Significant; LSM = Significant Without Mitigation/Less-than-Significant with Mitigation; SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact even with Mitigation; BI = Beneficial Impact					
area, and these components may be affected by fault rupture from an earthquake on local faults; however, this exposure would not result in a substantial risk to people or structures					
GS-4: Exposure to Seismic Ground Shaking and Liquefaction. The proposed EPB and SRPS project components would be located in a seismically active area; however, the proposed project operations would not expose people or structures to a substantial risk of loss, injury, or death involving exposure to seismic groundshaking and liquefaction.	LS	LS	NI	**LS**	No mitigation measures are required.
GS-5: Exposure to Coastal Erosion and Sea Level Rise. The proposed EPB and SRPS project components would not be exposed to substantial soil erosion as a result of sea level rise.	LS	LS	NI	**LS**	No mitigation measures are required.
GS-6: Operation-Related Erosion and Loss of Topsoil/Sand. Operation of the	LS	LS	NI	**LS**	No mitigation measures are required.

Impact Statement	EPB	SRPS	ISMP	Project Overall	Mitigation Measure
KEY To ACRONYMS: *NI – No Impact; LS – Less-than-Significant; LSM = Significant Without Mitigation/Less-than-Significant with Mitigation;* *SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact even with Mitigation; BI = Beneficial Impact*					
proposed EPB and SRPS project components would not result in substantial erosion or loss of topsoil/sand.					
4.6 Greenhouse Gases					
GHG-1: Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Construction of the proposed EPB and SRPS project components and implementation of the proposed ISMP project component would generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, but would not make a considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts due to GHG emissions and the related global climate change impacts.	LS	LS	LS	**LS**	No mitigation measures are required.
GHG-2: Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Operation of the proposed project would generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly. These emissions would not exceed significance thresholds such that they would result in a considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts of GHG	LS	LS	NI	**LS**	No mitigation measures are required.

Impact Statement	EPB	SRPS	ISMP	Project Overall	Mitigation Measure
KEY To ACRONYMS: NI – No Impact; LS – Less-than-Significant; LSM = Significant Without Mitigation/Less-than-Significant with Mitigation; SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact even with Mitigation; BI = Beneficial Impact					
emissions and the related global climate change impacts.					
4.7 Hazards & Hazardous Materials					
HH-1: Use and Disposal of Hazardous Materials During Construction. Construction of the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials during construction.	LS	LS	LS	**LS**	No mitigation measures are required.
HH-2: Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials During Construction. Proposed project construction would potentially cause upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.	LS	LS	LS	**LS**	No mitigation measures are required.
HH-3: Use of Hazardous Materials During Construction Within 0.25-Mile of Schools. Proposed project construction would not result in nor create a significant hazard to the public or the environment due to handling of hazardous materials or hazardous emissions within 0.25	LS	LS	LS	**LS**	No mitigation measures are required.

Impact Statement	EPB	SRPS	ISMP	Project Overall	Mitigation Measure
KEY To ACRONYMS: *NI – No Impact; LS – Less-than-Significant; LSM = Significant Without Mitigation/Less-than-Significant with Mitigation;* *SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact even with Mitigation; BI = Beneficial Impact*					
mile of a school during construction.					
HH-4: Use and Disposal of Hazardous Materials and Accidental Release or Creation of Safety Hazards During Operation. Operation and maintenance of the proposed EPB and SRPS project components would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the: 1) routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, 2) accidental release of hazardous materials, or 3) creation of safety hazards during operations	LS	LS	NI	**LS**	No mitigation measures are required.

Impact Statement	EPB	SRPS	ISMP	Project Overall	Mitigation Measure
KEY To ACRONYMS: *NI – No Impact; LS – Less-than-Significant; LSM = Significant Without Mitigation/Less-than-Significant with Mitigation;* *SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact even with Mitigation; BI = Beneficial Impact*					
4.8 Hydrology & Water Quality					
HYD-1: Construction Impacts to Water Quality due to Discharges. Construction activities involving dewatering of shallow groundwater during excavation for the proposed EPB and SRPS project components would generate water requiring disposal. Compliance with existing regulatory requirements would ensure that water disposal during construction would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, would not cause substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site, and would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality.	LS	LS	NI	**LS**	No mitigation measures are required.
HYD-2: Construction Groundwater Depletion and Recharge. Construction of the proposed EPB and SRPS project components and implementation of the proposed ISMP project component would not deplete groundwater supplies nor interfere substantially with	LS	LS	LS	**LS**	No mitigation measures are required.

Impact Statement	EPB	SRPS	ISMP	Project Overall	Mitigation Measure
KEY To ACRONYMS: NI – No Impact; LS – Less-than-Significant; LSM = Significant Without Mitigation/Less-than-Significant with Mitigation; SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact even with Mitigation; BI = Beneficial Impact					
groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of local groundwater levels.					
HYD-3: Construction Impacts to Water Quality due to Earthmoving, Drainage System Alterations, and Use of Hazardous Chemicals. Construction of the proposed EPB and SRPS project components and implementation of the proposed ISMP project component would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, would not cause substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site, and would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality, including marine water quality, due to earthmoving, drainage system alterations, and use of hazardous chemicals.	LS	LS	LS	**LS**	No mitigation measures are required.
HYD-4: Operational Impacts to Water Quality due to Drainage Pattern Alterations and Discharges. Operation of the proposed EPB and SRPS project	LSM	NI	NI	**LSM**	**Mitigation Measure HYD-4: <u>Implementation of Water Quality Treatment BMPs</u> (Applies to EPB project component).** The project shall adhere to the conditions of the NPDES Permit, including the requirements for stormwater discharge treatment measures and appropriate source control and site design measures. To avoid potential long-term impacts to water quality, the EPB project component will be

Impact Statement	EPB	SRPS	ISMP	Project Overall	Mitigation Measure
KEY To ACRONYMS: *NI – No Impact; LS – Less-than-Significant; LSM = Significant Without Mitigation/Less-than-Significant with Mitigation;* *SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact even with Mitigation; BI = Beneficial Impact*					
components would alter existing drainage patterns, but would not: 1) violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, 2) contribute runoff water which would exceed the existing storm drainage capacity or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff, or 3) would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality.					designed to include water quality treatment BMPs to retain and treat stormwater runoff.
HYD-5: Operational Impacts to Groundwater Depletion, Recharge, and Quality. Operation of the proposed EPB and SRPS project components would not deplete groundwater supplies nor interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater levels, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality.	LS	LS	NI	**LS**	No mitigation measures are required.
HYD-6: Operational Drainage Pattern Alterations. The proposed EPB and SRPS project	SU	LS	NI	**SU**	There are no feasible mitigation measures for impacts to drainage pattern alterations associated with the operation of the proposed EPB project component and, therefore, potential flooding impacts to the CAWD and Mission Ranch

Impact Statement	EPB	SRPS	ISMP	Project Overall	Mitigation Measure
KEY To ACRONYMS: NI – No Impact; LS – Less-than-Significant; LSM = Significant Without Mitigation/Less-than-Significant with Mitigation; SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact even with Mitigation; BI = Beneficial Impact					
components would alter existing drainage patterns, which would not cause substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site, but would increase flooding on- or off-site.					properties and groundwater seepage within the CAWD facility are significant and unavoidable.
HYD-7: Operational Risks due to Location within a 100-Year Flood Hazard Area. The proposed EPB and SRPS project components would be located within a 100-year flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flows.	LSM	LS	NI	**LSM**	**Mitigation Measure HYD-7: Avoid and Minimize Impacts to the Validity of Base Level Elevations Cited on the Currently-Effective FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map Panel (Applies to EPB project component).** In order to reduce potential adverse effects associated with possible impacts to the validity of the base flood elevations cited on the currently-effective FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map Panel for the EPB project component site, the County shall submit design drawings to FEMA showing the existing, pre-developed floodplain conditions and the proposed floodplain conditions after installation of the EPB project component. A FEMA Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) is required to be processed prior to construction of the EPB project component to have FEMA review and determine the precise way in which the flood map would be revised. Following the completion of the proposed project, a FEMA Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) request would need to be processed and the flood map officially updated to reflect the revision.
HYD-8: Operational Risks due to Flooding due to Levee/Dam Failure or Coastal Inundation. During operations, the proposed EPB and SRPS project components may be exposed to flooding due to failure of a levee or dam, sea level rise, and storm surges/tides related to climate change, but this exposure would	LS	LS	NI	**LS**	No mitigation measures are required.

Impact Statement	EPB	SRPS	ISMP	Project Overall	Mitigation Measure
KEY To ACRONYMS: *NI – No Impact; LS – Less-than-Significant; LSM = Significant Without Mitigation/Less-than-Significant with Mitigation;* *SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact even with Mitigation; BI = Beneficial Impact*					
not pose a substantial nor significant risk of loss, injury, or death.					
HYD-9: Operational Risk due to Seiche, Tsunami, or Mudflow. The operation of the proposed EPB and SRPS project components would not expose people or structures to substantial risk from flooding due to a seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.	LS	LS	NI	**LS**	No mitigation measures are required.
4.9 Land Use & Planning					
LU-1: Conflict with Plans, Policies, and Regulations during Construction and Operation. During construction, the proposed project would have one or more components that would conflict, or be inconsistent with, applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations without implementation of mitigation measures identified in this EIR. During operation, the proposed project would have one or more components that would potentially conflict, or be inconsistent with, applicable land use plans, policies, and	LSM	LSM	LSM	**LSM**	Implementation of the mitigation measures identified in this EIR would reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Impact Statement	EPB	SRPS	ISMP	Project Overall	Mitigation Measure
KEY To ACRONYMS: NI – No Impact; LS – Less-than-Significant; LSM = Significant Without Mitigation/Less-than-Significant with Mitigation; SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact even with Mitigation; BI = Beneficial Impact					
regulations without implementation of mitigation measures identified in this EIR.					
4.10 Noise					
NV-1: Construction Ground-Borne Vibration and Noise. Construction of the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to excessive ground-borne vibration and noise level.	LSM	LS	LS	**LSM**	**Mitigation Measure NV-1: <u>Ground-Borne Vibration and Noise Reduction Measures</u> (Applies to EPB project component).** To reduce ground vibration impacts associated with sheet pile driving, measures are recommended for construction of the EPB project component. a. Implement **Mitigation Measure NV-2 (Construction Noise Reduction Measures),** summarized below. b. Prior to initiation of pile driving activities, a Construction Vibration Mitigation Plan (CVMP) shall be developed. c. With the permission of property owners, the contractor or designated representative(s) shall conduct pre-construction monitoring surveys for structures located within potentially affected areas that could exceed applicable thresholds for structural damage. d. Ground-borne vibration levels associated with pile driving activities shall be monitored when pile driving activities occur within 75 feet of existing structures.
NV-2: <u>Construction Noise</u>. Construction activities associated with the proposed EPB and SRPS project components and implementation of the proposed ISMP project component would result in a substantial temporary or periodic (i.e., short-term) increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the proposed	SU	LSM	LSM	**SU**	**Mitigation Measure NV-2: <u>Construction Noise Reduction Measures</u>. (Applies to EPB and SRPS project components).** 1) Prior to initiation of construction, a Construction Noise Mitigation Plan (CNMP) shall be prepared and shall include, at a minimum, the following components: • Identification of noise-reduction measures to be implemented with a noise-reduction goal sufficient to achieve the County's instantaneous noise standard of 85 dBA. • A construction noise complaint and response program. • A construction noise monitoring program sufficient to provide

Impact Statement	EPB	SRPS	ISMP	Project Overall	Mitigation Measure
KEY To ACRONYMS: NI – No Impact; LS – Less-than-Significant; LSM = Significant Without Mitigation/Less-than-Significant with Mitigation; SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact even with Mitigation; BI = Beneficial Impact					
project and would exceed noise level standards and/or result in nuisance impacts at sensitive receptors.					verification that resultant noise levels associated with noise-generating construction activities would not exceed the County's daytime intermittent noise standard of 85 dBA. 2) Advance written notification shall be provided to property owners and building occupants that are located adjacent to construction areas. 3) Noise-generating construction activities shall be limited to between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 6:30 p.m., Monday through Saturday. Noise-generating construction activities shall be prohibited on Sundays and State-recognized holidays. 4) Construction equipment should be properly maintained and equipped with noise-reduction intake and exhaust mufflers and engine shrouds. 5) Lay-down yards and semi-stationary equipment such as pumps or generators shall be located at the furthest practical distance from noise-sensitive land uses. 6) Quieter equipment shall be selected to the extent locally available.
NV-3: Operational Noise. Operation of the proposed project would result in a substantial permanent (i.e., long-term) increase in ambient noise levels, and would exceed noise level standards and/or result in nuisance impacts at sensitive receptors**.**	SU	LS	NI	**SU**	**Mitigation Measure NV-3: <u>Conduct Acoustical Analysis for Operational Noise Levels</u>. (Applies to EPB project component).** Prior to construction of the pump station and control building/emergency generator, an acoustical analysis shall be prepared to assess operational noise levels.
4.11 Public Services, Recreation, & Utilities					
PS-1: Construction Public Services Demand. Construction of the proposed EPB and SRPS project components and	LS	LS	LS	**LS**	No mitigation measures are required.

Impact Statement	EPB	SRPS	ISMP	Project Overall	Mitigation Measure
KEY To ACRONYMS: NI – No Impact; LS – Less-than-Significant; LSM = Significant Without Mitigation/Less-than-Significant with Mitigation; SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact even with Mitigation; BI = Beneficial Impact					
implementation of the proposed ISMP project component would not result in public service demands for fire and police protection services, schools, or parks that would result in the need for new or physically altered facilities to maintain service capacity or performance objectives.					
PS-2: Construction Landfill Capacity. Construction of the proposed EPB and SRPS project components would result in generation of solid waste; however, the solid waste would be disposed at a landfill with sufficient permitted daily and overall capacity to accommodate the proposed project's solid waste disposal needs.	LS	LS	NI	LS	No mitigation measures are required.
PS-3: Construction Solid Waste Policies and Regulations. Construction of the proposed EPB and SRPS project components would potentially conflict with State and local statutes, policies, and regulations related to solid waste.	LSM	LS	LS	**LSM**	**Mitigation Measure PS-3: <u>Construction Waste Reduction and Recycling Plan (Applies to EPB project component)</u>.** The construction contractor(s) shall prepare and implement a construction waste reduction and recycling plan identifying the types of construction debris the EPB project component will generate and the manner in which those waste streams will be handled.

Impact Statement	EPB	SRPS	ISMP	Project Overall	Mitigation Measure
KEY To ACRONYMS: *NI – No Impact; LS – Less-than-Significant; LSM = Significant Without Mitigation/Less-than-Significant with Mitigation;* *SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact even with Mitigation; BI = Beneficial Impact*					
PS-4: Water Supply During Construction. Construction activities associated with the proposed EPB and SRPS project components would require water, but supply is sufficient and would not require new or expanded entitlements.	LS	LS	NI	**LS**	No mitigation measures are required.
PS-5: Public Services Demand During Operation. Operation of the proposed EPB and SRPS project components would not result in public service demands for fire and police protection services, schools, or parks that would result in the need for new or physically altered facilities to maintain service capacity or performance objectives.	LS	LS	NI	**LS**	No mitigation measures are required.
PS-6: Energy Use During Construction and Operation. The proposed project would not include the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy during project construction, operation, and/or maintenance activities that cannot be feasibility mitigated.	LS	LS	LS	**LS**	No mitigation measures are required.
PS-7: Construction or Expansion	NI	LS	LS	**LS**	No mitigation measures are required.

Impact Statement	EPB	SRPS	ISMP	Project Overall	Mitigation Measure
KEY To ACRONYMS: *NI – No Impact; LS – Less-than-Significant; LSM = Significant Without Mitigation/Less-than-Significant with Mitigation;* *SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact even with Mitigation; BI = Beneficial Impact*					
of Recreational Facilities. The construction of the proposed project and operation of the proposed project component would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.					
4.12 Traffic & Circulation					
TRA-1: Construction Traffic. Construction of the proposed EPB and SRPS project components and implementation of the proposed ISMP project component would result in a temporary increase in traffic volumes on regional and local roadways due to construction-related vehicle trips, but would not result in conflicts with any applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for performance of the circulation system.	LS	LS	LS	**LS**	No mitigation measures are required.
TRA-2: Construction-Related Traffic Delays, Safety Hazards, and Access Limitations. Construction activities could	LSM	LSM	LS	**LSM**	**Mitigation Measure TRA-2: <u>Traffic Control and Safety Assurance Plan</u> (Applies to EPB and SRPS project components)**. Prior to construction of the EPB and SRPS project components, the County and/or its contractor shall prepare and implement a traffic control plan or plans for the roadways and intersections affected by

Impact Statement	EPB	SRPS	ISMP	Project Overall	Mitigation Measure
KEY To ACRONYMS: *NI – No Impact; LS – Less-than-Significant; LSM = Significant Without Mitigation/Less-than-Significant with Mitigation;* *SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact even with Mitigation; BI = Beneficial Impact*					
result in temporary traffic delays, safety hazards, and/or disruption of access.					construction.
TRA-3: Construction-Related Roadway Deterioration. Construction truck trips could result in increased wear-and-tear on the designated haul routes, which could result in temporary impacts to performance of the regional circulation system.	LSM	LSM	LS	**LSM**	**Mitigation Measure TRA-3: <u>Roadway Rehabilitation Program</u> (Applies to EPB and SRPS project components).** Roads damaged by project-related construction vehicles shall be repaired to a structural condition equal to that which existed prior to construction activities.
TRA-4: Construction Parking Interference. Construction activities may temporarily affect parking availability.	LSM	LSM	LS	**LSM**	**Mitigation Measure TRA-4: Construction Parking Requirements (Applies to EPB and SRPS project components).** Prior to commencing project construction, the construction contractor(s) shall coordinate with the potentially affected jurisdictions to identify designated worker parking areas that would avoid or minimize parking displacement.
TRA-5: Operational Traffic. Operation and maintenance of the proposed EPB and SRPS project components would result in small traffic increases on regional and local roadways, but would not substantially affect the performance of the regional circulation system.	LS	LS	NI	**LS**	No mitigation measures are required.

Table 2-2 Summary of Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures

#	Topical Section/ Cumulative Impact Issue		Determination of Significance and Discussion of Contribution of the Proposed Project to Cumulative Impacts (if applicable)	Mitigation Measures
4.1	Aesthetics		SU: The proposed project would result in significant cumulative aesthetic impacts due to operation of the proposed EPB project component, and no mitigation measures are available to reduce those impacts to a less-than-significant level. However, it would not contribute to any significant cumulative aesthetic impacts due to lack of impacts from any other cumulative projects.	No mitigation measures are available to reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level.
4.2	Air Quality	Cumulative Projects Contributing to Localized Impacts	LS: Localized air pollutant emissions from cumulative projects may potentially impact sensitive receptors if intense construction activities (i.e., those activities with high air pollutant emissions) from two or more construction projects would occur in close proximity to each other (i.e., within 1 mile). The exact sequence of other projects' construction are outside the control of the County; but as currently envisioned, the construction periods may potentially overlap.	No mitigation measures are required.
		Proposed Project Localized Air Pollutants Impacts	LS: The proposed project would not make a considerable contribution to significant cumulative construction or operational impacts due to localized air pollutant exposures or odors.	
		Cumulative Regional, Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions	LS: The proposed project would not make a considerable contribution to significant cumulative regional emissions of PM_{10}.	
4.3	Biological Resources		LS: The proposed project would not make a considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts to biological resources.	No mitigation measures are required.
4.4	Cultural Resources	Construction Impacts	LS: Construction of the proposed project would not contribute to cumulative impacts related to cultural resources.	No mitigation measures are required.
4.5	Geology, Soils, and Seismicity		LS: The proposed project would not make a considerable contribution to significant cumulative geologic, soil, or seismicity impacts.	No mitigation measures are required.

#	Topical Section/ Cumulative Impact Issue		Determination of Significance and Discussion of Contribution of the Proposed Project to Cumulative Impacts (if applicable)	Mitigation Measures
4.6	Greenhouse Gases		LS: The proposed project would not make a considerable contribution to significant cumulative construction or operational impacts due to greenhouse gas emissions.	No mitigation measures are required.
4.7	Hazards & Hazardous Materials		LS: The proposed project would not make a considerable contribution to significant cumulative construction or operational impacts related to hazards or hazardous waste.	No mitigation measures are required.
4.8	Hydrology & Water Quality	Combined Groundwater Construction and Operation Impacts	LS: The proposed project would not make a considerable contribution to significant cumulative construction or operational impacts related groundwater	No mitigation measures are required.
		Combined Surface Water Construction Impacts	LS: The proposed project would not make a considerable contribution to significant cumulative construction impacts related surface water.	No mitigation measures are required.
		Combined Surface Water Operation Impacts	SU: The proposed project would potentially make a considerable contribution to significant cumulative operational impacts to hydrology and surface water quality due Discharges (HYD-4) and Risks due to Location within 100-Year Flood Area (HYD-7); however, with implementation of Mitigation Measure HYD-4 and HYD-7, the impact would be reduced to less than significant and the proposed project would not make a considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact. There would not be significant cumulative construction flooding impacts to which the proposed project would contribute. However, construction and operation of the EPB project component would result in significant and unavoidable flooding impacts and no mitigation measures are available to reduce those impacts to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, this impact would also be cumulatively significant and unavoidable.	No mitigation measures are required.
4.9	Land Use & Planning		LSM: The proposed project would result in less-than-significant cumulative land use impacts with implementation of the mitigation measures identified in this EIR.	No mitigation measures are required.

#	Topical Section/ Cumulative Impact Issue	Determination of Significance and Discussion of Contribution of the Proposed Project to Cumulative Impacts (if applicable)	Mitigation Measures
4.10	Noise	SU: The proposed project would result in significant cumulative noise and vibration impacts due to construction and operation of the proposed EPB project component, and no mitigation measures are available to reduce those impacts to a less-than-significant level.	No mitigation measures are available to reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level.
4.11	Public Services, Recreation and Utilities	LS: The proposed project would not contribute to any cumulative impacts related to schools, parks, and recreational facilities. The proposed project's contribution to other public services and utilities (fire and police protection, solid waste) would not be cumulatively considerable.	No mitigation measures are required.
4.12	Traffic & Circulation	LS: There would be no significant cumulative construction-related traffic and transportation impacts. The proposed project would not make a considerable contribution to significant cumulative traffic and transportation impacts due to cumulative development.	No mitigation measures are required.