Chapter 3

Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures

Chapter 3
Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures

This chapter discusses the various resources affected by the proposed project. Each resource is addressed in the following sections.

- 3.1, Aesthetics.
- 3.2, Air Quality.
- 3.3, Biological Resources.
- 3.4, Climate Change.
- 3.5, Cultural Resources.
- 3.6, Geology, Seismicity, and Soils.
- 3.7, Hydrology and Water Quality.
- 3.8, Land Use and Recreation.
- 3.9, Noise and Vibration.
- 3.10, Public Services and Utilities.
- 3.11, Transportation and Circulation.
- 3.12, Water Supply and Demand.

The proposed project includes the Pebble Beach Company Project application for development and preservation of several sites within Monterey County's unincorporated Del Monte Forest area, and an amendment of the Monterey County LCP.

Analysis of Proposed Project

In each resource section in this chapter, the Regulatory Setting section describes applicable plans, policies, and regulations, and the Environmental Setting describes the existing conditions for the resources potentially affected by the proposed project in the study area. The study area will vary depending on the resource and is sometimes larger than the project area (e.g., the study area for air quality and transportation extends beyond the project area boundaries).

Also in each resource section, the Impacts Analysis section addresses the methodology used for the analysis, the criteria used to determine the significance of potential impacts, a corresponding discussion of project impacts and mitigation measures, and cumulative impacts and mitigation measures. The methodology for analyzing cumulative impacts has been included below, rather than in each resource section. For each potential impact, a significance determination is made (less than significant, less than significant with mitigation, or significant and unavoidable). If required to reduce a significant impact, feasible mitigation measures are identified.

As described in Chapter 2, Project Description, the Pebble Beach Company Project includes several project elements that occur at different sites categorized by location within the project area (Figure 2-2 and Table 2-1). Each impact discussion addresses project elements individually or collectively as appropriate for specific resources and impacts. Each resource section also summarizes project impacts in a table organized according to project element.

Analysis of Cumulative Impacts

The term *cumulative impacts* refers to "two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts" (CEQA Guidelines Section 15355).

A cumulative impact can result from the combination of two or more individually significant impacts, or the combination of two or more impacts that are individually less than significant but constitute a significant change in the environment when considered together. To analyze the proposed project's contribution to cumulative impacts, CEQA requires the lead agency to identify reasonably foreseeable projects in the vicinity of the proposed project, summarize their effects, identify the contribution of the proposed project to cumulative impacts occurring in the project region, and recommend mitigation measures for any cumulative impacts evaluated as significant (CEQA Guidelines Section 15130[b]).

Cumulative impacts were determined in the following manner:

1. Determine whether there is a significant cumulative impact under future conditions with the proposed project for an issue area; if yes, then
2. Determine if the proposed project would or would not make a considerable contribution to the identified significant cumulative impact.

To provide an adequate discussion of cumulative impacts, the context of the analysis is defined. Each resource topic was assigned a geographic impact zone (CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(b)(3)]). These zones represent the probable area in which project effects could be observed or in some way interact with other cumulative development. The zones are directly related to the nature of the potential impact. For example, the zone for geology, soils, and seismicity is Del Monte Forest. Geology and soils impacts are localized in that they would occur within a specific geographical area (i.e., within the forest).

Two geographic impact zones were identified (Table 3-1):

- **Del Monte Forest.** This zone is limited to Del Monte Forest.
- **Monterey Peninsula and Beyond.** This zone encompasses the Monterey Peninsula and extends beyond Monterey County.

There are two approaches to identifying related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects and their impacts. The list approach identifies individual projects in order to identify potential cumulative impacts. The projection approach uses a summary of projections in an adopted general plan or related planning document to identify potential cumulative impacts. In this document we used the projection approach overall, but also included one project, the Monterey Presidio Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) project, in the analysis of cumulative traffic conditions.

As described in Section 3.11, Transportation and Circulation, the projection approach was also used based on the adopted general plans (including the 2010 General Plan Update for inland areas and the 1982 General Plan for the coastal zone). The 2010 General Plan Update provided daily traffic forecasts for 2008 and 2030 on several roads in the study area, and annualized growth factors were derived and applied to the existing (2011) traffic forecasts to obtain 2030 forecasts. In addition, air quality and noise analysis are based on the cumulative traffic impacts. As noted above, the RPMP project was included in the analysis of traffic, and thus in the analysis of traffic-related air quality and noise impacts as well.

Table 3-1. Cumulative Analysis Approach and Applicable Impact Zone by Resource Area

Resource Topic	Cumulative Analysis Approach	Geographic Impact Zone	
		Del Monte Forest	Monterey Peninsula and Beyond
Aesthetics	Projection	X	
Air Quality	Projection[a]		X
Biological Resources	Projection		X
Climate Change	Projection		X
Cultural Resources	Projection	X	
Geology, Seismicity, Soils	Projection	X	
Hydrology and Water Quality	Projection	X	X
Land Use and Recreation	Projection	X	
Noise and Vibration	Projection[a]	X[b]	
Public Services and Utilities	Projection	X	
Transportation and Circulation	Projection[a]		X
Water Supply and Demand	Projection		X

Note:
[a] Traffic analysis was used overall, but projection also included conditions relative to the Monterey Presidio Real Property Master Plan project.
[b] Includes Del Monte Forest, as well as SR 68.

Projections

General Plan Projections outside Del Monte Forest

The County General Plan was updated in October 2010, but only for the inland areas, which does not include most of Del Monte Forest. Except for a small portion of the SR 1/SR 68/17-Mile Drive intersection, none of the proposed project occurs in the Inland Area, and thus the updated 2010 General Plan does not directly apply to the proposed project area. However, the 2010 General Plan does apply to roadways outside the coastal zone. Thus, where traffic affects the inland areas, the 2010 General Plan policies apply.

The prior General Plan (sometimes referred to as the 1982 General Plan) still applies within the Coastal Zone. Per the 2010 General Plan, "In the interim period between adoption of the General Plan and update of the LCP Land Use Plans, the certified Land Use Plans will continue to govern in their respective areas within the coastal zone."

Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan and Proposed LCP Amendments

The LUP, together with the zoning ordinance and CIP, serve as the LCP, which is the regional planning document for Del Monte Forest (Monterey County 1984, 2000). The existing LUP was used as the baseline to identify potential buildout for the document within Del Monte Forest. However, the potential buildout with the proposed project and the LCP Amendment would be quite different than that technically allowed by the existing LUP, in that the potential residential buildout is much lower than allowable (in concept) and the potential visitor-serving buildout would be somewhat higher (see Proposed Amendments in Chapter 2, Project Description).

The potential buildout of Del Monte Forest, without the project/LCP amendment, would consist of the potential development of existing lots and potential future subdivision where allowed by the existing LUP. According to the County (and the Architectural Review Board September 2011 Construction Activity Summary), as of September 2011, 2,996 lots exist in Del Monte Forest, 96 of which were vacant. Of the existing vacant lots, the largest numbers are located in the Pebble Beach subdivision (26 vacant lots) north and northeast of the Lodge. The next largest group are within the MPCC #1 subdivision (24 vacant lots) between Spanish Bay and Forest Lake, DMF#2 (11 vacant lots), and the Douglas Tract (4 vacant lots), south of Robert Louis Stevenson School. The rest of the vacant lots are scattered across the other Del Monte Forest subdivisions. In addition, the existing LUP allows development of up to 934 additional residential dwelling units in subdivisions. There are 190 existing visitor-serving units at The Lodge at Pebble Beach (including Casa Palmero) and 269 units at The Inn at Spanish Bay. The LUP does not allow for additional visitor-serving uses at these locations. Thus, the existing LUP building projections (without project) are 96 dwelling units on existing vacant lots, 934 additional residential dwelling units in subdivisions, and no additional visitor-serving units.[1]

The proposed project would result in a far lower amount of residential development than technically allowable by the LUP. With the proposed project, additional development would include the existing 96 vacant lots and the proposed project's 90-100 lots[2] in Areas F-2 (16), I-2 (16), J (5), K (8), L (10), U (7), V (14), Collins Residence (4)[3], the Corporation Yard (10) and Area M Spyglass Hill(10). Thus, the additional development with the proposed project under buildout could be up to 100 residential dwelling units. The analysis of impacts of vacant lot development was generic in nature as these lots are scattered in different somewhat isolated locations. The proposed project's location of the 90 to 100 potential future dwelling units was used specifically in the analysis of the proposed project.

Comparing buildout with and without the proposed project under the existing LCP, the proposed project buildout would be up to 835 fewer residential dwelling units and up to 195 visitor-serving units more than buildout without the proposed project (Table 3-2). The cumulative analysis focuses on the impacts of the additional potential buildout under the LCP combined with the impacts of the proposed project.

The proposed project includes the majority of developable land in Del Monte Forest.

[1] Includes vacant PBC lots; based on existing LCP zoning; full buildout is likely not possible due to environmentally sensitive habitat areas or other considerations.

[2] The proposed project has two options for Area M Spyglass Hill. Under Option 1, there would be a new resort hotel and no residential lots. Under Option 2, there would be 10 residential lots and no resort hotel. Thus, there would be 90 potential residential dwelling units under Option 1 and 100 units under Option 2.

[3] Includes 2 existing lots and residences that would be subdivided to include 4 lots and residences.

Table 3-2. Cumulative Projections in Del Monte Forest, With and Without the Proposed Project

	Existing	Existing LCP/ No Project		Proposed Project/LCP Amendment Change With Project			
Component	Existing DU/VSU	Potential DU/VSU Over Existing	Buildout	Project Residential Lots	Potential DU/VSC Over Existing	Buildout	Relative to Existing LCP
Existing Developed Lots	2,900	–	2,900	–	–	2,900	0
Undeveloped (Vacant) Existing Lots[a]	–	96	96	–	96	96	0
Proposed Project Lots	–	–	–	90 to 100[b]	90 to 100	90 to 100	90 to 100
Additional Lots Allowable	–	934[c]	934[c]	–	9[d]	9[d]	-925
Total Residential Lots	*2,900*	*1,030*	*3,930*	*90 to 100[b]*	*195 to 205*	*3,095 to 3,105*	*-825 to -835*
Total Visitor-Serving Units	*459*	*–*	*459*	*–*	*95 to 195*	*554 to 654*	*95 to 195*

Notes:

DU = dwelling units.

VSC = visitor-serving unit.

[a] Does not include vacant PBC lots.

[b] Includes 2 existing residential lots at Collins Residence.

[c] Includes vacant PBC lots, based on existing LCP zoning; full buildout may not be possible due to ESHA or other considerations.

[d] New lots: Area X (8) based on County-issued certificates of compliance; Area Y—assumed limit to 1 lot based on presumption that presence of ESHA may prevent further subdivision.