Executive Summary

Introduction

This summary presents the major findings of this Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) including the following:

- A brief overview of the Carmel Valley Traffic Improvement Program (proposed program or proposed project);
- Discussion of the results of analysis of key issues;
- A description of the alternatives considered and their impacts;
- Discussion of areas of known controversy; and
- A summary of impacts and mitigation measures.

Program Overview

Program Location

Carmel Valley, an unincorporated area of Monterey County, is southeast of Monterey and east of Carmel (Figure 2-1). The proposed traffic improvements would occur along Carmel Valley Road extending from just east of Holman Road in the east to Highway 1 in the west, and along Laureles Grade from Carmel Valley Road in the south to SR 68 in the north (Figure 2-2). This area is referred to as the "program area" or "project area" in this EIR. The roads that intersect Carmel Valley Road are also included in the program area at the place of intersection. As illustrated in Figure 2-2, the program area is divided into ten study segments. Table ES-1 describes these segments.

Table ES-1. Traffic Study Segments in the Road Program Area

Segment Number	Roadway	Segment ends
1	Carmel Valley Road	East of Holman Road
2		Holman Road to Esquiline Road
3		Esquiline Road to Ford Road
4		Ford Road to Laureles Grade
5		Laureles Grade to Robinson Canyon Road
6		Robinson Canyon Road to Schulte Road
7		Schulte Road to Rancho San Carlos Road
8		Rancho San Carlos Road to Rio Road
9		Rio Road to Carmel Rancho Boulevard
10		Carmel Rancho Boulevard to Highway 1

Program Background

The Carmel Valley Master Plan (CVMP) that was developed in the 1980s contains a policy (39.3.2.1) that requires that specified road segments in Carmel Valley (as identified in the Carmel Valley Master Plan EIR) meet a designated level of service (LOS) defined by the level of service at the time of the original CVMP traffic study in 1986. Any road segment that does not meet this level of service will cause approval of development that would result in significant traffic impacts in the corresponding area of Carmel Valley to be deferred.

Deferment of approval will be until an EIR is prepared that:

- Contains mitigation to return affected segments to the baseline level of service as defined by the Carmel Valley Master Plan EIR and
- Demonstrates that the proposed development would not impact the level of service along any segment of Carmel Valley Road to the point that the level of service would fall to the next lower level (Monterey County 1986; DKS Associates 2005; DKS Associates 2007).

In 2002, the Monterey County Board of Supervisors issued a resolution (Resolution No. 02-024) providing policy direction to staff and guidance to the Planning Commission to disapprove subdivisions proposed for the Carmel Valley Planning Area. This resolution was based in part[1] on a December 11, 2001 report by the Monterey County Department of Public Works that two segments of Carmel Valley Road (Segment 4 and Segment 7; see *Road Segments Analyzed* below for further discussion of road segments) had exceeded the established level of service threshold. In response to traffic reaching these thresholds and due to

[1] The resolution was also based on compliance with Carmel Valley Master Plan Policy 39.1.6, which requires development in Carmel Valley to be limited pending capacity improvement of SR1 in the area of Carmel-by-the-Sea.

the 1999 elimination of the prior plan to build the Hatton Canyon Freeway, pursuant to CVMP policies, the County Board of Supervisors resolved that residential and commercial subdivisions be denied, pending the following: 1) construction of left turn pockets on Segments 6 and 7 of Carmel Valley Road (from Robinson Canyon Road to Rancho San Carlos Road); 2) the construction of capacity-increasing improvements to State Highway 1 between its intersections with Carmel Valley Road and Morse Drive; 3) and the adoption of updated General Plan/Master Plan policies related to Level of Service on Carmel Valley Road.

Residential subdivisions with applications submitted before October 19, 1999 were allowed to proceed provided they addressed their traffic and other impacts. Scine the implementation of Resolution No. 02-034, approvals of subdivisions have been delayed in the CVMP area. The policy is intended to remain in place until the criteria above are met.

Program Objectives

- To address existing and forecasted level of service deficiencies in the CVMP area; and
- To allow development to proceed in accordance with all CVMP policies.

Program Components

The proposed program includes roadway improvements, a potential change in roadway segment level of service (LOS) standard, and several interim options for one intersection improvement.

Roadway Improvements

The Proposed Program includes the following specific projects within the Carmel Valley Road corridor, which are included in the current CIP:

- Left-turn channelization on Carmel Valley Road west of Ford Road;
- Shoulder widening on Carmel Valley Road between Laureles Grade and Ford Road;
- Paved turnouts, new signage, shoulder improvements, and spot realignments on Laureles Grade;
- Grade separation at Laureles Grade and Carmel Valley Road;
- Passing Lanes in front of the proposed September Ranch development;
- Passing Lanes opposite Garland Park;
- A climbing lane on Laureles Grade; and

- Upgrade all new road improvements within Carmel Valley Road Corridor to Class 2 bike lanes.

The Proposed Program also includes two additional projects that are not included in the current CIP:

- Passing lane (1/4 mile) between Schulte Road and Robinson Canyon Road; and
- Passing lane (1/4 mile) between Rancho San Carlos Rd and Schulte Road.

Analysis in the traffic study has found that these improvements will result in traffic operations at CVMP intersection and roadway segments that meet the established LOS standards, with the exception of Segment 3 through the Carmel Valley Village.

Interim Optional Improvements at Laureles Grade/ Carmel Valley Road Intersection

Without improvement, the intersection of Laureles Grade and Carmel Valley Road would operate at a deficient in both A.M. and P.M. peak periods. The CIP includes a grade separation improvement but the fee program only generates sufficient funding for this improvement by 2022, and thus deficient operations would occur for the interim period without interim improvements.

Two other optional interim improvement measures (improved geometry and traffic signalization) have been developed to improve the LOS and are described below. These options are considered in this EIR as Alternatives to the project.

- **All-way Stop and Modified Geometry** - The intersection would be modified to an all-way stop, provide an additional through lane in the east and westbound directions, and provide right turns (receiving lanes) for vehicles traveling in the southbound and westbound direction. Implementing these modifications would improve the LOS from F (without the CIP improvement) to LOS D in the A.M. and P.M. peak periods.
- **Signalized Intersection** - The intersection meets a traffic signal warrant during both the A.M. and P.M. peak periods. Converting the intersection to a signalized intersection would improve the LOS from F (without the CIP improvement) to LOS C in the A.M. peak period and LOS B in the P.M. peak period. In addition to the listed improvements, all existing substandard facilities (i.e., shoulders, signage, sight distance, etc.) would be upgraded to current standards.

Change in LOS Standard

As described in the traffic study, under all traffic study scenarios, traffic through the Carmel Valley Village would be LOS D and would not meet the LOS standard of C for this segment.

While the traffic study identified several options to improve traffic along this segment (such as left-turn pockets and medians, passing lanes, multiple lanes, or routing traffic through side streets through residential areas), none are considered consistent with the overall direction and policies of in the CVMP Area Plan and policies.

This program includes the proposal to lower the LOS standard from C to D for this segment instead of pursuing physical road improvements that are considered likely to result in substantial disruption of the commercial areas in the center of the Carmel Valley Village.

Subdivision Moratorium Removal

The program analyzed in this EIR includes removal of the subdivision moratorium adopted in Resolution 02-024 once the stipulated conditions are met. The resolution allows the moratorium to be removed once the following awere completed:

- Construction of left turn pockets on Segments 6 and 7 of Carmel Valley Road (from Robinson Canyon Road to Rancho San Carlos Road). These left-turn pockets will be completed in 2007.
- Construction of capacity-increasing improvements to SR1 between its intersections with Carmel Valley Road and Morse Drive. The Transportation Agency of Monterey County (TAMC) completed a northbound climbing lane on SR1 between Carmel Valley Road and Ocean Avenue in 2001 that has improved operations substantially along this portion of SR1.
- The adoption of updated General Plan/Master Plan policies related to Level of Service on Carmel Valley Road. As described above, this program includes adoption of a revised CVMP policy relative to Segment 3 LOS Standard due to a lack of feasible alternatives to maintain the established LOS standard. No other CVMP policies are proposed to be changed.

Upon completion of the left-turn pocket lanes, the conditions will be met, and the moratorium can be lifted, if the Board of Supervisors so determines. This EIR analyzes the lifting of the moratorium in the event that the Board decides to take this action.

Traffic Fee Program

Traffic fees were originally adopted by Monterey County for the CVMP in late 1992 through the adoption of Ordinance No. 3649, which was temporary. This ordinance was extended twice prior to 1995. In 1995, pursuant to Ordinance No. 3833, the County made the traffic fee program permanent. Pursuant to subsequent Resolution 95-140, the County established the current version of the traffic fee program.

An updated traffic fee program was developed as a result of the current traffic study in order to develop a fee program to pay for the current proposed improvements considered necessary to address traffic levels of service.

The costs for the roadway and intersection improvements described above were updated using current data and assumptions. The total costs of the proposed projects at each project's year completion would be approximately $61,557,000.

Based on these adjustments, the updated traffic fee program is summarized in Table ES-2. The updated fees would represent an increase of approximately $2,000 for a market rate unit on an existing lot and approximately $4,000 for new market rate units on a new low. The new rates represent an increase of 18 % over the existing rates.

Table ES-2. Recommended 2009 Impact Fee Structure

	CVMP Area	Expanded Area
Development on Existing Lots of Record (before 8/25/92)		
Market Rate Unit	$13,052	$6,526
Senior Unit	$6,526	$3,263
Caretaker Unit	$13,052	$6,526
2nd Unit / Apartment	$13,052	$6,526
Low / Moderate Income Unit	$0	$0
Development on New Lots of Record (after 8/25/92)		
Market Rate Unit	$26,104	$13,052
Senior Unit	$13,052	$6,526
Caretaker Unit	$26,104	$13,052
2nd Unit / Apartment	$26,104	$13,052
Low / Moderate Income Unit	$0	$0
Commercial		
New Hotel / Motel Unit (per room)	$26,104	$13,052
Existing Hotel / Motel Expansion (per room)	$12,752	$6,376
Commercial Uses (per 1,000 sf)	$6,526	$3,263
Service Centers (per 1,000 sf)	$3,263	$1,632

Source: Appendix G

Required Permits and Other Approvals

Monterey County

As the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Monterey County will certify the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). This EIR is intended to be used solely for the consideration for approval of the proposed program and not used for the approval of individual projects included in the proposed program. However, information in this document may be referenced as applicable in later project-specific environmental reviews.

Other Agencies

The preparation of this program EIR does not relieve the proponents of individual projects listed in the proposed program of the responsibility to comply with the requirements of CEQA (and/or National Environmental Policy Act [NEPA] for projects requiring federal funding or approvals). This EIR represents the first tier of environmental review for the specific projects under the proposed program. The lead agency responsible for reviewing individual projects will determine the level of further, project-level environmental review needed, as project details are refined. The agencies may reference the discussion of regional impacts in this EIR as a basis of their assessment of regional or cumulative transportation impacts.

Project implementation may also require permits from other agencies including the following: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; National Marine Fisheries Service; Federal Emergency Management Agency; California Department of Fish and Game; Regional Water Quality Control Board; and Other agencies not yet identified.

Analysis of Key Issues

This section discusses the key issues of concern relative to the proposed program and the conclusions of this DEIR regarding those issues. This is not a comprehensive discussion of impacts of the proposed program, of which the reader is directed to Table ES-1 at the end of this Executive Summary, and Chapters 3 and 4 of this DEIR.

- **Biological Resources—**Clearing and grading of the project sites for construction of roadway improvements may result in the removal of trees and shrubs that currently provide suitable nesting habitat for migratory birds and/or removal of habitat for special-status wildlife and plant species. Waters and wetlands may be temporarily or permanently affected Proposed roadway improvements could adversely affect and displace special-status fish species due to impacts on aquatic systems and removal of riparian vegetation. With the proposed mitigation, project impacts can likely be mitigated to a less than significant level but in some cases there may be significant and unavoidable impacts.
- **Aesthetics**—Introduction of new visual elements into the foreground could obstruct views of prominent topographic features relative to the existing setting. While most of the improvements are limited in nature, others, such as the grade separation at Laureles Grade / Carmel Valley Road represent a larger intrusion into the setting context. Sensitive natural landforms along the locally designated scenic roadway of Carmel Valley Road could be visibly altered. The project could introduce a new source of light and glare, or move existing sources of light and glare closer to adjacent sensitive land uses. With the proposed mitigation, projects can be mitigated to a less than significant level.

- **Agricultural Resources—**The proposed roadway improvements have the potential to result in the conversion of some Important Farmland (defined as Prime Farmland, Farmland of State Importance, or Unique Farmland) to nonagricultural uses. There is only limited Important Farmland along Carmel Valley Road and Laureles Grade, but some of it could be affected by proposed improvements. This impact is considered potentially significant because Monterey County cannot guarantee that conversion of farmland can be avoided as part of future projects. Mitigation could reduce the impact, but not to a less-than-significant-level for all projects. Therefore, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.
- **Transportation and Circulation—**The program would not generate trips directly, but could allow further growth in the CVMP area that, combined with growth outside the CVMP area could result in the deterioration of LOS at one intersection (Laureles Grade / Carmel Valley Road) and along some Carmel Valley Road segments (Segment 3, 5, 6, and 7) to conditions that violate the established standards. Proposed program improvements and mitigation would reduce these impacts to less than significant, except along Segment 3, which is significant and unavoidable because no allowable mitigation measure has been identified. The program could significantly alter present vehicular circulation and increase delays and roadway hazards temporarily during construction of specific projects, which would be mitigated to a less than significant with implementation of project traffic controls.
- **Noise**—The project would result in increased noise during construction and operation and would expose persons to ground borne vibration during construction. Mitigation is expected to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level. The program's contribution to cumulative traffic noise could be reduced with mitigation, but not to less than significant, and is therefore, considered significant and unavoidable.
- **Air Quality**—The program would result in increased emissions of exhaust, dust, and soil during construction, but would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Construction would also cause significant elevated health risks to sensitive receptors from exposure to emissions, which could likely be mitigated to a less-than-significant level; however, given that construction details for individual projects is not known at this time, it is possible that construction period emissions of toxic air contaminants could be significant and unavoidable.
- **Greenhouse Gases/Climate Change** - Due to growth inside the CVMP and outside the CVMP, vehicle-miles traveled will increase in the CVMP by 2030. The amount of vehicle-related greenhouse gas emissions will also likely increase, at least before taking into account future changes in fuel carbon content and future vehicle efficiency improvements that are likely to be mandated by the state as part of implementation of AB-32. Vehicle-miles traveled with and without program implementation are similar, as are estimated greenhouse gas emissions associated with vehicle travel. Residential greenhouse gas emissions would be higher with the program, as the program allows further subdivision within the CVMP rather than continuation of the current subdivision moratorium. Whether or not

residential (or other) growth in the CVMP results in an increase in global GHG emissions or only displaces those emissions from one location to another is not known due to the difficulty to discern the baseline emissions of future residents. However, as of the writing of this EIR, the agencies with jurisdiction over air quality regulation and GHG emissions such as the ARB and the MBUAPCD have not established regulations, guidance, methodologies, significance thresholds, standards, or analysis protocols for the assessment of greenhouse gas emissions and climate change. Thus, the methodology to establish an appropriate baseline, to develop a project-level inventory for the program, or to evaluate the significance of GHG emission changes has not yet been established that would allow for an appropriate analysis of the impact of the program on climate change.

- **Construction Disruption**—Construction may adversely affect traffic, access, and emergency access (especially on Carmel Valley Road), air quality, and noise. These are likely to be significant, but temporary impacts that can be mitigated to less than significant by proposed mitigation for traffic control plans.
- **Public Services and Utilities**—Construction of the proposed roadway improvements could conflict with existing underground utilities and interrupt service in Carmel Valley. Water service interruptions could also affect fire flows. Construction activities associated with the proposed roadway improvements could increase the amount of solid waste in the service area; however this is considered temporary. With the proposed mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.
- **Cultural Resources—**Individual projects as part of the program have the potential to damage the eligibility or eligibility potential of resources for listing in the NRHP or CRHR. Construction activities present the possibility that previously unrecorded archaeological sites will be disturbed. Long-term use of a specific project area could result in the exposure of buried archaeological resources that were not visible or uncovered during archaeological survey, or construction of the specific project. With the proposed mitigation, impacts would be less than significant in many cases. However, as the exact alignment and location of proposed improvements will only be determined during later design, it is possible that unavoidable cultural resources may be present and mitigation may not be feasible and thus there is a potential for significant and unavoidable impacts.
- **Population/Housing—**A proposed grade separation at Laureles Grade and Carmel Valley Road, if implemented, could potentially require acquisition of new right-of-way from adjacent residential areas resulting in displacement of existing housing and/or residents. With the proposed mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.
- **Growth Inducement—**The proposed program would not directly induce unplanned growth or growth at rates in excess of those supported by the County's original 1982 General Plan and the adopted CVMP. The proposed program would remove the moratorium for growth in the CVMP area by addressing existing and forecasted LOS deficiencies in the program area and allowing development to proceed in accordance with CVMP policies.

Development of the proposed program would thus indirectly contribute to growth in Carmel Valley by removing the obstacle to planned growth and allowing it to potentially proceed to CVMP buildout.

Alternatives Considered

A range of alternative options was identified with the potential to avoid or substantially reduce the significant impacts of the program. The range of alternatives considered was determined to represent a reasonable range for the programmatic level of the analysis and considering the nature of the proposed program and the significant impacts identified for the proposed program.

Alternatives were screened for feasibility, their ability to meet some or all of the project objectives, and their potential to avoid or substantially reduce significant impacts of the program.

The following alternatives are analyzed further in the document. A summary of analysis is provided below.

No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no additional residential or commercial subdivisions, as it is assumed that the existing subdivision moratorium will continue. It is assumed that additional single-family dwellings, visitor-serving units, and commercial developments can be approved within the CVMP land use framework without the need for subdivision up to the growth limits in the CVMP. It is also assumed that previously approved projects will be completed.

Alternative Characteristics

This alternative assumes that Monterey County Board Resolution 02-024 becomes permanent policy for the duration of CVMP buildout to 2030. This resolution does not stop development, but rather land subdivision. Without the program (and thus with a continued moratorium), it is still possible that single-family residential development could occur on certain existing lots of record within the CVMP area. Construction of one single-family residence or a second dwelling unit in a residential zone can be exempt from CEQA review (CEQA Guidelines 15303), although the exemption is not absolute. In the program area, 655 residential units are associated with prior approvals. Based on County data, there are 258.5 remaining vacant lots of record in the program area that meet the criteria of compatible uses and that do not already contain substantive development. It is assumed that one (1) unit per lot would be built in this scenario (DKS Associates 2007). It cannot be known for certain that such residential development will or will not actually occur; however this residential

development is considered possible and thus disclosed as a potential characteristic of the No Project Alternative.

Commercial development is assumed to not be impeded by lack of ability to subdivide land under this alternative and the AMBAG projections for commercial growth by 2030 are assumed for this alternative (the same as the proposed program). Visitor-serving development would include 285 additional units, would be allowed in various locations within Carmel Valley through 2030 under the No Project scenario. It is assumed that the lack of ability to subdivide land does not affect visitor-serving development.

Pursuant to the moratorium resolution and CVMP Policy 39.3.2.1(2006 CVMP Update Policy 2.18), the County cannot approve development that results in a significant impact to CVMP roads unless an EIR is prepared that includes mitigation of operations to acceptable levels, but which may include statements of overriding considerations.

Under this alternative, it is assumed that some traffic mitigation measures would be advanced as projects come forward (particularly for larger-scale visitor-serving and commercial projects), and the current fee program would continue to be implemented to administer traffic mitigation measures such that effects of development are addressed as they occur. This alternative represents a "lesser buildout" alternative as it represents less than 50% of potential residential development than with the proposed program. The scale and timing of traffic improvements was not determined although the overall scale would be less than the proposed program due to the lower amount of fees collected.

Impact Analysis

With the prohibition of subdivision, residential growth would be less and more dispersed throughout the Valley than with the proposed program. Thus, secondary impacts associated with residential growth, such as biological impacts, aesthetic impacts, etc. would be dispersed more widely.

Traffic conditions would have acceptable levels of service except at the Laureles Grade/ Carmel Valley Road intersection and along Carmel Valley Road Segments 3, 5, 6, and 7. Although some traffic improvements would occur with this alternative, the timing and scale of such improvements is unknown, and thus it is possible that traffic conditions may worsen over time.

Impacts related to traffic improvement construction would be similar to those of the proposed program, but on a more limited scale.

Due to the constraint on residential growth, this alternative could result in increased growth pressure in other parts of the County.

Alternative 1—Grade Separation Alternatives 1A and 1B

This alternative would be the same as the proposed program but would include a signal or an all-way stop instead of a grade separation at the intersection of Laureles Grade and Carmel Valley Road.

The intersection of Laureles Grade and Carmel Valley Road would operate at a deficient LOS under the No Project. The proposed program includes a grade separation at the southbound left turn movement, which would improve LOS operations from LOS F to LOS C in both A.M. and P.M. peak periods.

Two alternatives for addressing operations at the intersection of Laureles Grade and Carmel Valley Road without implementing a grade separation are analyzed below as Grade Separation Alternative 1A and Grade Separation Alternative 1B.

The Grade Separation Alternatives 1A and 1B would meet the program objective to address level of service deficiencies in the CVMP area.

Grade Separation Alternative 1A Characteristics

Grade Separation Alternative 1A involves implementation of a signal at Laureles Grade and Carmel Valley Road to address LOS operation deficiencies. The intersection meets the need for a signal warrant during both A.M. and P.M. peak periods. Grade Separation Alternative 1A would convert the intersection of Laureles Grade and Carmel Valley Road to a signalized intersection, improving the LOS operations from LOS F to LOS C in the A.M. peak period and to LOS B in the P.M. peak period.

A generic estimate of a signalized intersection with all features would cost approximately $250,000, which would include signal study, the equipment purchase, installment, maintenance, and operation.

Grade Separation Alternative 1B Characteristics

Grade Separation Alternative 1B involves modification to the Laureles Grade and Carmel Valley Road intersection geometry and traffic control to address LOS operation deficiencies. The intersection would be modified to an all-way stop. An additional through lane would be constructed in the east- and westbound directions and right turn lanes (receiving lanes) would be provided for vehicles traveling in the south- and westbound directions. These modifications would improve the LOS from LOS F to LOS D in the A.M. and P.M. peak periods.

A generic estimate of this alternative is $200,000 assuming that the extra eastbound and westbound lanes would start approximately 300 feet before the intersection. In addition right turn receiving lanes in the northbound and westbound directions would extend for approximately 200 feet.

Impact Analysis

Both alternatives to the proposed grade separation at Laureles Grade and Carmel Valley Road would avoid the use of a grade-separated structure at the project site, thereby eliminating impacts associated with the structure identified under the proposed program. Furthermore, excavation at the project site would be avoided and the construction timeframe and intensity would be reduced. All construction impacts associated with erection of the grade separation would be eliminated in the areas of biological resources; hydrology and water quality; agricultural resources; air quality; noise; public services and utilities; cultural resources; and population and housing. All visual impacts associated with the proposed grade-separated structure would be avoided, although there would be an all-way stop or signal at this location that some individuals might find to be aesthetically different than the present condition.

Both of these alternatives would be more cost effective than the grade separation. In addition, given the failing operations at this intersection at present and the time necessary to collect fees to fund a grade separation, both of these alternatives would improve traffic conditions far sooner than the proposed program.

Alternative 2—Carmel Valley Village Alternative 2A and 2B

This alternative would be the same as the proposed program but would include a multi-lane segment through the Carmel Valley Village or would route Carmel Valley Road traffic on Via Contenta and Ford Drive.

Village Alternative 2A Characteristics

Carmel Valley Village Alternative 2A would widen Carmel Valley Road in the segment near Carmel Valley Village to two (2) lanes in each direction. The feasibility of adding two lanes is unknown, as no evaluation of right-of-way and alignments has been done. For this EIR, this is considered potentially feasible barring further analysis.

Village Alternative 2B Characteristics

Carmel Valley Village Alternative 2B would reroute traffic off of Carmel Valley Road on to Via Contenta and/or Holman Road/Ford Road and back on to Carmel

Valley Road by increasing the speed limits and replacing signage in these locations. The traffic re-routing under this alternative would divert local and regional traffic through residential neighborhoods.

Impact Analysis

While potentially improving traffic conditions on Carmel Valley Road, widening to 4-lanes through the Carmel Valley Village would change the current ambiance and character of the Carmel Valley Village shopping area. Circulation and safety impacts would likely occur with the need to provide for left-turns across two lanes of traffic and the need to provide for safe pedestrian crossings. Widening would also result in the removal of street trees and may require land acquisition or building removal. Such changes are also considered inconsistent with the policies of the CVMP.

Via Contenta, Holman Road, and Ford Road are not designed to carry through traffic. While increasing speed limits along these roads is feasible as well as providing directional signage, this alternative would likely increase safety risks for drivers and residences along this road and would change the residential character of these side roads at present.

Alternatives Considered But Eliminated from Detailed Consideration

The following alternatives were initially considered but dismissed from more detailed impact analysis because they are either considered infeasible, would not meet at least some of the project objectives, or would not avoid or substantially lower the significant impacts identified for the proposed program. Chapter 5 discusses the reason for not being considered in greater detail.

- Alternative A—Zero Growth Alternative
- Alternative B—Four-Lane Alternative
- Alternative C—Rio Road Extension to Carmel Valley Road
- Alternative D—Transit Alternative
- Alternative E—Clustered Land Use Pattern Alternative
- Alternative F—Regional Improvements Alternative
- Alternative G—Policy Change Alternative

Environmentally Superior Alternative

The No Project Alternative would result in a lower level of impacts related to traffic improvement construction and lesser level of impacts related to residential buildout (although this may be offset by residential development elsewhere). The No Project Alternative would result in greater traffic deficiencies compared to the proposed program and would not meet the project objectives. Thus, the No Project Alternative is not considered the environmentally superior alternative.

Based on the assessment of environmental impacts for the feasible alternatives described above, the environmentally superior alternative is Grade Separation Alternative 1A which would meet the project objectives while avoiding the impacts of the proposed grade separation, particularly as the Laureles Grade/Carmel Valley Road intersection is failing now and it will be many years before sufficient fee is collected to build the grade separation.

Areas of Controversy

Development in Carmel Valley has been the focus of public attention and has been discussed at length during the Monterey County Resources Management Agency – Planning Department's General Plan Update process. Intensification of Commercial and Residential development is a particular area of concern that has been raised during project review of prior development projects in Carmel Valley.

Based on prior planning, historical projects that have been processed, and scoping for this EIR, areas of know controversy include the following:

- Traffic Congestion – Concern was raised in scoping comments about increasing traffic congestion due to existing traffic within the Valley, as well as traffic from outside the Valley and tourist traffic. Emergency access was also a concern raised in comment.
- Rural Character – Concern was raised about the compatibility of potential traffic improvements with the rural character of the Valley.
- Land Use Forecasting – The methodology used to forecast potential future land use and traffic generation has been an area of concern as well, in particular as it relates to the treatment of approved but not yet built projects, development on legal lots, future development projects, and the treatment of second units.
- Growth within the CVMP Area – The amount, character, and location of residential, visitor-serving, and commercial growth within the CVMP area has been an area of concern for various parties over the years.
- Natural Resource Impacts – Impacts of traffic improvements and future growth on biological resources and the Carmel River are also key concerns raised in comment

This is not a complete list of every concern raised related to traffic and growth in the CVMP area, but these issues were raised most consistently and most prevalently during the scoping period and during prior planning processes.

Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance

The impacts of the proposed program, proposed mitigation, and significance conclusions are discussed in detail in Chapters 3 and 4 of this DEIR. Table ES-3 summarizes the impacts, mitigation measures, and levels of significance identified in this document.

Table ES-3. Summary of Impacts

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
3.1 Geology, Soils, and Seismicity			
A. Seismic Hazards			
GEO-1: Expose People or Structures to Risk of Rupture of a Known Earthquake Fault	LTS	None Required	–
GEO-2: Expose People or Structures to Risk of Seismic Groundshaking	PS	GEO-2.1: Conduct Project-Level Geotechnical Investigations and Design all Project Facilities to Avoid or Minimize Groundshaking-Related Impacts	LTS
GEO-3: Expose People or Structures to Risk of Earthquake-Induced Liquefaction	PS	GEO-3.1: Conduct Site-Specific Geotechnical Investigations for Liquefaction and Implement Appropriate, Proven Geotechnical Methods	LTS
B. Landslides and Slope Stability			
GEO-4: Expose People or Structures to Risk of Landslide or Slope Failure	PS	GEO-4.1: Conduct Site-Specific Geotechnical Investigations for Slope Stability and Implement Appropriate, Proven Geotechnical Methods	LTS
GEO-5: Destabilize Steep Slopes	SI	GEO-5.1: Implement Recommended Design Criteria of the Geotechnical Investigation Wherever Steep Slopes Would Be Graded or Manufactured	LTS
C. Erosion			
GEO-6: Cause Soil Erosion or Loss of Topsoil and Subsequent Sedimentation	PS	GEO-6.1: Prepare and Implement an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, or Water Pollution Control Plan at the Project Level	LTS
D. Soil Constraints			
GEO-7: Expose People or Structures to Risks Resulting from Expansive Soils and Sediments	LTS	None Required	–

Definitions:
LTS = Less-than-Significant
PS = Potentially Significant
NI= No Impact
SI = Significant Impact
SU = Significant and Unavoidable
LCC – Less than cumulatively considerable
CC – Cumulatively considerable
CCU – Cumulatively considerable and unavoidable

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
GEO-8: Expose People or Structures to Risks Resulting from Land Subsidence or Settlement	PS	GEO-8.1: Conduct Site-Specific Geotechnical Investigations for Settlement and Subsidence and Implement Appropriate, Proven Geotechnical Methods	LTS
E. Hazardous Materials			
GEO-9: Expose People to Untreated Human Waste	NI	None Required	–
GEO-10: Expose People or the Environment to Hazardous Waste Contamination	PS	GEO-10.1: Perform a Phase 1 Preliminary Environmental Site Assessment Before Beginning Construction Activities GEO-10.2: Coordinate Construction Activities with Health Department and Waste Handler	LTS
Cumulative Impacts			
Cumulative Impact GEO-1: Cumulative Impacts of Development on Geologically Hazardous Areas	CC	Project-level mitigation noted above	LCC
Cumulative Impact GEO-2: Cumulative Accelerated Runoff, Erosion, and Sedimentation	CC	Project-level mitigation noted above	LCC
Cumulative Impact GEO-3: Cumulative Significant Hazards to the Public or Environment	CC	Project-level mitigation noted above	LCC
3.2 Hydrology and Water Quality			
A. Alteration of Drainage Patterns			
HYD-1: Potential Alteration of Drainage Patterns	LTS	None Required	–
B. Stormwater Runoff and Drainage Infrastructure			
HYD-2: Potential Increases in Runoff or Exceedances in Stormwater Capacity	PS	H-2.1: Design and Implement Stormwater Management Measures	LTS
C. Water Quality			

LTS = Less-than-Significant
PS = Potentially Significant
NI = No Impact
SI = Significant Impact
SU = Significant and Unavoidable

LCC – Less than cumulatively considerable
CC – Cumulatively considerable
CCU – Cumulatively considerable and unavoidable

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Impact HYD-3: Temporary Impairment of Water Quality Associated with Roadway Construction	PS	H-3.1: Prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan	LTS
HYD-4: Long-Term Impacts Resulting in Impaired Water Quality Associated with the New Roadways	PS	H-4.1: Conduct Site Specific Water Quality Analysis and Treatment	LTS
D. Groundwater Supply			
HYD-5: Potential Interference with Groundwater Recharge	PS	H-5.1: Design and Install Infiltration Devices	LTS
E. Risk of Flooding			
HYD-6: Potential Exposure of People or Structures to Significant Risk from Flooding	PS	H-6.1: Prevention of Risk to People or Structures from Flooding	LTS
F. Risk of Inundation by Seiche, Tsunami, or Mudflow			–
HYD-7: Increased Likelihood of Inundation by Seiche, Tsunami, or Mudflow	LTS	None Required	–
Cumulative Impacts			
Cumulative Impact H-1: Cumulative Impacts to Hydrology and Water Quality	CC	Project-level mitigation noted above.	LCC
3.3 Biological Resources			
A. Impacts on Vegetation			
BIO-1: Potential Disturbance or Loss of Sensitive Vegetation Types	PS	BIO-1.1: Conduct Focused Biological Surveys of Sensitive Vegetation Areas BIO-1.2: Avoid Impacts on Sensitive Woodland and/or Forest Habitats BIO-1.3: Conserve Sensitive Woodland and/or Forest Habitats to Mitigate for Loss of a Potentially Native Stand	LTS

LTS = Less-than-Significant
PS = Potentially Significant
NI = No Impact
SI = Significant Impact
SU = Significant and Unavoidable

LCC – Less than cumulatively considerable
CC – Cumulatively considerable
CCU – Cumulatively considerable and unavoidable

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
BIO-2: Potential Disturbance or Loss of Sensitive Riparian and/or Water/Aquatic Habitat including Wetlands	SU	BIO-2.1: Identify and Document Riparian Habitat	SU
		BIO-2.2: Avoid or Minimize Disturbance of Riparian Habitats	
		BIO-2.3: Compensate for the Loss of Riparian Habitat	
		BIO-2.4: Identify and Delineate Waters of the United States, Including Wetlands	
		BIO-2.5: Avoid or Minimize Disturbance of Waters of the United States, Including Wetland Communities	
		BIO-2.6: Compensate for the Loss of Wetland Habitat	
BIO-3: Potential Disturbance or Loss of Special Status Plant Populations	PS	BIO-3.1: Document Special-Status Plant Species Populations	SU
		BIO-3.2: Avoid or Minimize Impacts on Special-Status Plant Species Populations by Redesigning the Project, Protecting Populations, and Developing a Transplantation Plan (if necessary)	
BIO-4: Potential Disturbance or Loss of Common Vegetation Habitats	LTS	None Required	–
BIO-5: Potential Loss of Protected Trees	PS	BIO-5.1: Redesign Specific Projects or Compensate for Removal of Protected Trees	LTS
BIO-6: Potential Introduction or Spread of Noxious Weeds	PS	BIO-6.1: Conduct a Noxious Weed Survey and Document Noxious Weed Infestation	LTS
		BIO-6.2: Avoid or Minimize the Dispersal of Noxious Weeds Into Uninfested Areas	
B. Impacts on Wildlife			

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
BIO-7: Potential Disturbance or Loss of Special Status Wildlife Species and Their Habitats	PS	BIO-7.1: Document Special-Status Wildlife Species and Their Habitats	SU
		BIO-7.2: Avoid or Minimize Impacts on Special-Status Wildlife Species by Redesigning Specific Projects, Protecting Special-Status Wildlife Habitat, and Developing a Mitigation Monitoring Plan (if Necessary)	
		BIO-7.3: Coordinate with Resource Agencies and Develop Appropriate Compensation Plans for State- and Federally Listed Wildlife Species	
BIO-8: Potential Disturbance and Loss of Common Wildlife Species and Wildlife Migration	LTS	None Required	–
BIO-9: Potential Loss or Disturbance of Nesting Migratory Birds and Raptors	PS	BIO-9.1: Remove Vegetation During the Nonbreeding Season and Avoid Disturbance of Nesting Migratory Birds, Including Raptors, as Appropriate	LTS
BIO-10: Temporary and Permanent Impacts to Steelhead Trout and other Carmel River Fish	PS	BIO-10.1: Assess and Document Habitat for Special-Status Fish Species	LTS
		BIO-10.2: Avoid or Minimize Impacts on Special-Status Fish Species and Their Habitat	
BIO-11: Conflicts with Local Policies or Ordinances that Protect Biological Resources	Significant	BIO-11.1: Review Local County Policies, Ordinances, and Conservation Plans, and Comply with Requirements	LTS
Cumulative Impacts			
Cumulative Impact BIO-1: Cumulative Loss of Biological Resources Including Habitats and Special Status Species	CC	Project-level mitigation noted above	CCU
3.4 Aesthetics			
A. Visual Character and Quality			

LTS = Less-than-Significant
PS = Potentially Significant
NI = No Impact
SI = Significant Impact
SU = Significant and Unavoidable

LCC – Less than cumulatively considerable
CC – Cumulatively considerable
CCU – Cumulatively considerable and unavoidable

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
AES-1: Changes in Visual Character or Quality Related to Roadway Improvements	LTS	None Required	_
B. Scenic Vistas and Corridors			
AES-2: Changes in Views from Adjacent Land Uses and Other Public Viewpoints	PS	AES-2.1: Implement Measures to Reduce Visual Intrusion for Existing Residences and other Public Viewpoints	LTS
AES-3: Degrade Scenic Resources or Visibly Alter Sensitive Natural Landforms along a State Scenic Highway Related to Traffic Improvements	PS	AES-3.1: Implement Measures to Minimize Loss of Scenic Resources and Alteration of Natural Landforms within Scenic Roadway Corridors	LTS
C. Light and Glare			
AES-4: Creation of New Sources of Light and Glare	PS	AES-4.1: Implement Measures to reduce Temporary and/or Permanent Sources of Light and Glare	LTS
Cumulative Impacts			
Cumulative Impact AES-1: Cumulative Degradation of the Existing Visual Character of the Region	CC	Project-level mitigation	LCC
3.5 Land Use			
A. Land Use Compatibility			
LU-1: Potential Conflicts in Compatibility of Proposed Roadway Improvements with Surrounding Land Uses	LTS	None Required	_
B. Plan/Policy Consistency			
LU-2: Conflicts with Land Use Plans, Policies, or Regulations	LTS	None Required	_
C. Division of an Established Community			
LU-3: Potential Division of an Established Community	LTS	None Required	_

LTS = Less-than-Significant
PS = Potentially Significant
NI = No Impact
SI = Significant Impact
SU = Significant and Unavoidable

LCC – Less than cumulatively considerable
CC – Cumulatively considerable
CCU – Cumulatively considerable and unavoidable

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Cumulative Impacts			
Cumulative Impact LU-1: Cumulative Impact on Communities and Local Land Uses	LCC	None required	–
3.6 Agricultural Resources			
A. Convert Farmland to Nonagricultural Use			
AG-1: Direct Conversion of Important Farmland to Nonagricultural Use	PS	AG-1.1: Evaluate the Potential for Direct Farmland Conversion at the Project Level and Avoid, Minimize, and Compensate for Loss of Farmland	SU
AG-2: Indirect Conversion of Important Farmland to Nonagricultural Use	LTS	None Required	–
B. Conflict with Existing Use or Legal Status			
AG-3: Conflict with Existing Williamson Act Contracts	LTS	None Required	–
AG-4: Conflict With Use of Adjacent Lands That Induces Conversion to Nonagricultural Use	LTS	None Required	–
Cumulative Impacts			
Cumulative Impact AG-1: Cumulative Impact on Agricultural Land	CC	Project-level mitigation noted above	CCU
3.7 Transportation and Circulation			
A. Intersection Improvements			
T-1: Substantial Increase in Traffic at Project Intersection Relative to the Existing Traffic Load and Capacity	LTS		LTS
B. Roadway Segment LOS			

LTS = Less-than-Significant
PS = Potentially Significant
NI = No Impact
SI = Significant Impact
SU = Significant and Unavoidable

LCC – Less than cumulatively considerable
CC – Cumulatively considerable
CCU – Cumulatively considerable and unavoidable

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
T-2: Violation (Cumulatively) of the LOS Standard Established by the County for Segment 3 - Esquiline Road to Ford Road	SI	No feasible mitigation identified	SU
C. Roadway Hazards and Emergency Access			
T-3: Potential Alteration of Present Patterns of Vehicular Circulation, Increased Traffic Delay, and Increased Roadway Hazards During Construction of Specific Projects	S	T-3.1: Develop and Implement a Traffic Control Plan	LTS
D. Parking Capacity			
T-4: Cause Inadequate Parking Capacity	LTS	None Required	–
E. Alternative Transportation Plans and Policies			
T-5: Conflict with Alternative Transportation Plans and Policies	NI	None Required	–
Cumulative Impacts			
Cumulative Impact T-1: Result in Traffic that exceeds LOS Standards Established by the County (Segment 3)	CC	No feasible mitigation identified	CCU
Cumulative Impact T-2: Traffic Delays due to Simultaneous Construction	CC	Project-level mitigation noted above	LCC
3.8 Air Quality			
A. Air Quality Plan Consistency			
AIR-1: Consistency with the 2004 Air Quality Management Plan for the Monterey Bay Region	LTS	None Required	–
B. Long-Term Emissions			

LTS = Less-than-Significant
PS = Potentially Significant
NI = No Impact
SI = Significant Impact
SU = Significant and Unavoidable

LCC – Less than cumulatively considerable
CC – Cumulatively considerable
CCU – Cumulatively considerable and unavoidable

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
AIR-2: Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Concentrations of CO	LTS	None Required	–
AIR-3: Generation of ROG and NO_X, CO, and PM10 Emissions in Excess of MBUAPCD Thresholds	LTS	None Required	–
C. Construction Emissions			
AIR-4: Generation Construction Emissions in Excess of MBUAPCD Thresholds	S	AIR-4.1: Limit Construction Activities AIR-4.2: Implement MBUAPCD Mitigation Measures for Construction PM10 Emissions	LTS
AIR-6: Elevated Health Risk from Exposure to Construction-Related Emissions	PS	AIR-5.1: Implement MBUAPCD Mitigation Measures for Off-Road Mobile Source and Heavy Duty Equipment Emissions	SU
D. Odors			
AIR-6: Generation of Objectionable Odors Affecting a Substantial Number of People	LTS	None Required	–
E. Greenhouse Gases/ Climate Change			
AIR-7: Increase in Greenhouse Gas Emissions	LTS – direct Undeterminable for Cumulative	None Required	–
Cumulative Impacts			
Cumulative Impact AIR-1: Cumulative Effect on Air Quality (Less than Considerable Contribution)	LCC	None Required	–
Cumulative Impact AIR-2: Cumulative Elevated Health Risk from Exposure to Construction-Related Emissions	CC	Project-level mitigation noted above	(Potentially) CCU

LTS = Less-than-Significant
PS = Potentially Significant
NI = No Impact
SI = Significant Impact
SU = Significant and Unavoidable

LCC – Less than cumulatively considerable
CC – Cumulatively considerable
CCU – Cumulatively considerable and unavoidable

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Cumulative Impact AIR-3: Increased Greenhouse Gas Emissions May Contribute to Climate Change	Undeterminable	None Required	–
3.9 Noise			
A. Long-Term Program-Related Increases in Traffic Noise			
N-1: Exposure of Noise-Sensitive Land Uses adjacent to Carmel Valley Road to Increased Traffic Noise with Implementation of the Program	S	N-1.1: Implement Noise-Reducing Treatments at the Grade Separation Project	LTS
B. Short-Term Construction Noise			
N-2: Exposure of Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Construction Noise Levels Associated with Roadway Improvements	S	N-2.1: Limit hours of Construction Operations N-2.2: Locate Noise-Generating Equipment as Far as Practicable from Noise-Sensitive Receptors N-2.3: Use Sound-Control Devices on Combustion-Powered Equipment N-2.4: Use Shortest Possible Traveling Routes When Practicable N-2.5: Disseminate Essential Information to Residences and Implement a Complaint Response and Tracking Program N-2.6: Implementation of Additional Mitigation Measures, as Needed and/or Required	LTS
C. Vibration			
N-3: Potential Exposure of Sensitive Receivers to Excessive Groundborne Vibration Levels Associated with Construction of Traffic Improvements	PS	N-2.1, N-2.2, N-2.5, and N-2.6, above	LTS
Cumulative Impacts			

LTS = Less-than-Significant
PS = Potentially Significant
NI = No Impact
SI = Significant Impact
SU = Significant and Unavoidable

LCC – Less than cumulatively considerable
CC – Cumulatively considerable
CCU – Cumulatively considerable and unavoidable

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Cumulative Impact N-1: Exposure of Noise-Sensitive Land Uses adjacent to Carmel Valley Road to Cumulative Traffic Noise that Exceed County Noise Compatibility Standards	CC	Mitigation Measure N-3: Construct Noise Barriers Between Roadways and Residents Such that Traffic Noise Does Not Exceed 60 Ldn in Outdoor Use Areas Mitigation Measure N-4: Use Low Noise Pavement	CCU
3.10 Public Services and Utilities			
A. Fire and Police Services			
PSU-1: Change in Demand for Fire or Police Services Requiring New or Expanded Facilities	LTS	None Required	–
B. Emergency Access			
PSU-2: Result in Inadequate Emergency Access	PS	PSU-2.1: Implement Construction Traffic Control Plan to Ensure that Construction Does Not Obstruct Emergency Response or Evacuation	LTS
C. Wildland Fire Hazard			
PSU-3: Exposure of People or Structures to a Significant Risk of Loss, Injury, or Death Involving Wildland Fires	LTS	None Required	–
D. Water Demand			
PSU-4: Increased Water Demand that Would Exceed Available Water Supplies and/or Require New or Expanded Supplies	LTS	None Required	–
E. Infrastructure Capacities			
PSU-5: Increased Water Demand That Would Exceed Capacity or Require Substantial Expansion of Water Supply, Treatment, Or Distribution Facilities	LTS	None Required	–
F. Wastewater Treatment			

LTS = Less-than-Significant
PS = Potentially Significant
NI = No Impact
SI = Significant Impact
SU = Significant and Unavoidable

LCC – Less than cumulatively considerable
CC – Cumulatively considerable
CCU – Cumulatively considerable and unavoidable

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
PSU-6: Increased Wastewater Flows that Would Exceed Sewer Line or Treatment Plant Capacity	LTS	None Required	–
G. Utility Disruption During Construction			
PSU-7: Utility Disruption During Construction	PS	PSU-7.1: Coordinate with the Appropriate Utility Service Providers and Related Agencies to Reduce Service Interruptions	LTS
H. School Enrollments			
PSU-8: Increased Student Enrollments That Would Cause School Capacities to be Exceeded or Increase Existing Overcrowding in Schools	LTS	None Required	–
I. Recreational Demand			
PSU-9: Increased Use of Existing Parks or Other Recreational Facilities, Resulting in Construction or Expansion of Facilities or Leading to Substantial Physical Deterioration	LTS	None Required	–
J. Open Space			
PSU-10: Diminished Quality or Quantity of Open Space Areas	LTS	None Required	–
K. Landfill Capacity			
PSU-11: Increase in Solid Waste Disposal That Would Exceed Current Permitted Landfill Capacity	PS	PSU-11.1: Develop a Solid Waste Reuse Plan	LTS
Cumulative Impacts			
Cumulative Impact PSU-1: Cumulative Increase in Demand for Utility Infrastructure and Capacities	LCC	None Required	–

LTS = Less-than-Significant
PS = Potentially Significant
NI = No Impact
SI = Significant Impact
SU = Significant and Unavoidable

LCC – Less than cumulatively considerable
CC – Cumulatively considerable
CCU – Cumulatively considerable and unavoidable

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
3.11 Cultural Resources			
CR-1: Potential Demolition, Destruction, Relocation, or Alteration of Historical Resources	PS	CR -1.1: Avoid Historic Architectural and Archaeological Resources CR-1.2: Architectural and Archaeological Resources—Conduct Project-Specific Records Searches, Background Research, and Field Surveys; and Prepare Technical Reports CR-1.3: Architectural Resources—Conform to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings in the Event of Relocation CR-1.4: Architectural and Archaeological Resources—Review Project Design CR-1.5: Archaeological Resources—Recover Archaeological Data CR-1.6: Architectural Resources—Document Historical Resources Through Public Interpretation	SU
CR-2: Potential Disturbance to Previously Unidentified Buried Archaeological Resources	PS	CR-2.1: Conduct Geomorphological Analysis on Specific Project Basis and Conduct Archaeological Test Excavations for Projects that are Determined To Be Located in Highly Sensitive Areas CR-2.2: Archaeological Resources—Stop Work If Buried Cultural Deposits Are Encountered During Construction Activities CR-2.3: Conduct Archaeological Monitoring During Ground Disturbing Activities Within the Specific Project Area During Construction CR-2.4: Archaeological Resources—Stop Work If Human	LTS

LTS = Less-than-Significant
PS = Potentially Significant
NI = No Impact
SI = Significant Impact
SU = Significant and Unavoidable

LCC – Less than cumulatively considerable
CC – Cumulatively considerable
CCU – Cumulatively considerable and unavoidable

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		Remains Are Encountered During Construction Activities	
		CR-2.5: Paleontological Resources—Stop Work If Vertebrate Remains Are Encountered During Construction	
CR-3: Expose Buried Archaeological Resources Due to Long-Term Use and Exposure	PS	CR-3.1: Consult with Qualified Archaeologist to Identify the Resources and Assess the Impacts	LTS
Cumulative Impacts			
Cumulative Impact CR-1: Cumulative Impacts on Known and Undiscovered Cultural Resources	CC	Project-level mitigation noted above	CCU
3.12 Population and Housing			
A. Population Growth			
PH-1: Induce Substantial Population Growth	LTS	None Required	–
B. Cause Displacement of People or Housing			
PH-2: Displace Existing Housing or Population	LTS	PH-1.1: Comply with Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act	–
Cumulative Impacts			
Cumulative Impact PH-1: Cumulative Impacts on Population and Housing	LCC	None Required	–

LTS = Less-than-Significant
PS = Potentially Significant
NI = No Impact
SI = Significant Impact
SU = Significant and Unavoidable

LCC – Less than cumulatively considerable
CC – Cumulatively considerable
CCU – Cumulatively considerable and unavoidable