

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2.0	SUMMARY	2-1
2.1	Proposed Project Summary	2-1
2.2	Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures	2-2
2.3	Areas of Known Controversy	2-2
2.4	Summary of Alternatives.....	2-5
2.5	Comparison of Alternatives	2-6

Tables

Table 2-1	Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measure Summary	2-3
-----------	--	-----

2.0 Summary

CEQA Guidelines section 15123 requires an EIR to contain a brief summary of the proposed project and its consequences. The summary identifies each significant effect and the proposed mitigation measures and alternatives to reduce or avoid that effect; areas of controversy known to the lead agency; and issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate the significant effects.

2.1 PROPOSED PROJECT SUMMARY

Location and Setting

The project site is an undeveloped 15.64-acre parcel located within the Toro Area Plan and the Las Palmas Ranch Specific Plan, approximately 0.5 miles southeast of the intersection of River Road and State Route 68. Surrounding land uses include residential development to the east and southeast, undeveloped residentially-designated property to the west, resource conservation (open space) that was established as part of the development of Las Palmas Ranch to the south, and cultivated farmland across River Road to the north. .

General Plan and Zoning

The 2010 Monterey County General Plan and 2010 Toro Area Plan (the Toro Area Plan is included in the General Plan) land use designation for the site is Medium Density Residential, 2.61 units/acre. The zoning, consistent with the 2010 Monterey County General Plan and 2010 Toro Area Plan for the site is Medium Density Residential, 2.61 units per acre, with a Design Control Overlay (MDR/2.61D).

The current zoning and land use pattern was established in the Las Palmas Ranch Specific Plan and incorporated into the 1986 Toro Area Plan, and subsequently into the 2010 Monterey Country General Plan and 2010 Toro Area Plan.

Project Description

The proposed project includes a Specific Plan amendment, use permit, and design approval for the construction and operation of an approximately 120,000 square-foot (including non-living space, such as garages, in the “casitas” units) senior assisted living facility consisting of multiple structures and associated site improvements on an approximately 15.64-acre site. The facility would provide assisted living facilities for seniors requiring varying levels of assistance.

2.2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

This draft EIR identifies significant or potentially significant environmental impacts in several areas as identified below. The impacts are presented in a summarized format in Table S-1, with the full text of the mitigation measure. The full text of the environmental setting, project analysis, and impacts and the mitigation measures can be found with Sections 5.0 through 16.0.

Significant Project Impacts

Project-level significant impacts are anticipated in the following areas:

- Aesthetics (impact to scenic vistas; introduction of light and glare);
- Air Quality (air pollutant emissions);
- Biological Resources (impacts to special-status animal species; impacts to nesting birds);
- Transportation & Traffic (impact to intersections); and
- Transportation & Traffic (impact to SR 68).

Significant Cumulative Effects

Significant cumulative impacts are anticipated in the following areas:

- Transportation & Traffic (impact to intersections); and
- Transportation & Traffic (impact to SR 68).

Significant Unavoidable Impacts

Significant unavoidable impacts are anticipated in the following areas:

- Transportation & Traffic (project level impact to SR 68); and
- Transportation & Traffic (cumulative level impact to SR 68).

Growth Inducting Effects

The subject parcel is the last remaining undeveloped property in the Las Palmas Specific Plan with a residential land use designation. Since the remainder of the Las Palmas Specific Plan has been built-out since the 1990s, the proposed project would not be population-inducing and would be consistent with General Plan and zoning designations for the site. Therefore, the project would not have growth inducing effects.

2.3 AREAS OF KNOWN CONTROVERSY

CEQA Guidelines section 15123(b)(2) requires an EIR summary to identify areas of controversy known to the lead agency including issues raised by agencies and the public. The lead agency is aware of potential controversy regarding an increase in traffic on the local

Table 2-1 Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measure Summary

Area of Concern	Significant Impact	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
Aesthetics	Altering existing scenic vistas and visual character of project site.	AES-1	The applicant shall prepare and submit a landscape plan to enhance screening from State Route 68, River Road, Reservation Road, and the adjacent neighborhood and trail.	Less than Significant
Aesthetics	Altering existing scenic vistas and visual character of project site.	AES-2	The applicant shall submit a final plan for colors and materials used for the buildings, which shall be earth toned to blend with the existing vicinity landscape.	Less than Significant
Aesthetics	Altering existing scenic vistas and visual character of project site.	AES-3	The applicant's final improvement plans shall include construction of all new utility and distribution lines on the project site underground.	Less than Significant
Aesthetics	Introduce new sources of light and glare.	AES-4	The applicant shall prepare and submit a lighting plan for the project site.	Less than Significant
Air Quality	Generate construction emissions.	AQ-1	The applicant shall prepare a grading plan with dust control measures for the project site.	Less than Significant
Air Quality	Generate construction emissions.	AQ-2	A construction foreman shall be designated to ensure dust control measures are implemented.	Less than Significant
Air Quality	Expose sensitive receptors to construction dust and diesel exhaust emissions.	AQ-3	All off-road construction vehicles and all construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications	Less than Significant
Air Quality	Expose sensitive receptors to new sources of toxic air contaminants.	AQ-3	"	
Biological Resources	Potential loss or disturbance of American badger.	BIO-1	Conduct pre-construction surveys.	Less than Significant
Biological Resources	Potential loss or disturbance of burrowing owl.	BIO-2	Conduct pre-construction surveys.	Less than Significant
Biological Resources	Potential loss or disturbance of Monterey dusky-footed woodrat.	BIO-3	Conduct pre-construction surveys.	Less than Significant

2.0 Summary

Summary Table page 2

Area of Concern	Significant Impact	Mitigation #	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
Biological Resources	Potential loss or disturbance of western red bat.	BIO-4	Conduct pre-construction surveys.	Less than Significant
Biological Resources	Potential loss or disturbances of nesting birds.	BIO-5	Conduct pre-construction surveys.	Less than Significant
Transportation & Traffic	Add vehicle trips to SR 68.	TRA-1	Schedule shift changes outside morning and evening peak hours.	Significant
		TRA-2	Development shuttle service program.	Significant
Transportation & Traffic (Cumulative)	Add cumulative vehicle trips to vicinity intersections.	CTRA-1	Pay TAMC and Monterey County traffic impact fees.	Less than Significant
Transportation & Traffic (Cumulative)	Add cumulative vehicle trips to SR 68.	TRA-1, TRA-2, CTRA-1	"	Significant
Energy	Increased energy consumption.	ENG-1	Demonstrate how the project is consistent with the energy conservation policies of the Las Palmas Ranch Specific Plan.	Less than Significant

roadway system. Other potential issues were raised by two members of the public (adjoining residents) during the project's NOP process. No issues were raised by other local, state or federal agencies. The only comment letter received from a state agency was from the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). Letters are included in Appendix A, Notice of Preparation and Responses.

2.4 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES

Project alternatives are presented, discussed, analyzed, and compared in Section 17.0, Alternatives.

The following project alternatives were analyzed:

1. Alternative 1: No project/no development;
2. Alternative 2: No project/minimum use;
3. Alternative 3: No project/existing zoning; and
4. Alternative 4: Reduced project.

Alternative 1: No Project/No Development

The "no project/no development" alternative assumes no development would occur on the project site. The project site would continue to be vacant land, partially used for grazing.

Alternative 2: No Project/Minimum Use

The "no project/minimum use" alternative assumes the proposed project would not be constructed or operated on the project site. Instead, this alternative considers the construction of the minimum allowable use on the subject property, which would be one single family dwelling and any accessory structures considered incidental to residential use, such as barns and storage buildings.

Alternative 3: No Project/Existing Zoning

The "no project/existing zoning" alternative assumes the proposed project would not be constructed or operated on the project site. However, considering that the project site is designated for medium density residential development at up to 2.61 units/acre, it is feasible that up to 40 dwelling units could be approved and constructed on the project site. It is also worth noting that types of uses could be considered for this alternative. Based on existing zoning for the project site, the following uses could be established on the project site through the approval of the appropriate permits:

- Public and quasi-public uses including churches, cemeteries, parks, playgrounds, schools, public safety facility, public utility facilities;
- Mobile home park;
- Agricultural employee housing;
- Christmas tree cutting and removal and other uses of similar agricultural nature;

2.0 Summary

- Other uses of a similar nature, density and intensity;
- Transitional Housing; or
- Supportive Housing.

Alternative 4: Reduced Project

The “reduced project” alternative includes a reduced development footprint. For conceptual purposes, Alternative 4 eliminates the casitas from the proposed project. This would result in the loss of 26 living units with 42 beds, representing 30 percent of the total beds of the proposed project, and would result in a proportionate reduction in environmental impacts. Therefore, under this reduced project scenario, development on the project site would include the assisted living facility and memory care living facility, and other associated site improvements.

2.5 COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES

The no project/no development alternative would result in no potential adverse environmental impacts, but would not meet any of the proposed project objectives. The no project/minimum development alternative would result in less environmental impacts than the proposed project, but would not meet any of the proposed project’s objectives. The no project/existing zoning alternative would result in a similar level of impacts as the proposed project; however, and would not meet the objectives of the proposed project. The reduced project would have an overall reduction in intensity of potential impacts based on the overall reduction in development on the project site, but the reduced project alternative would only partially meet the objectives of the proposed project and may prove to be economically infeasible. Therefore, the environmentally superior alternative that would partially meet the objectives of the proposed project would be the reduced project alternative.

This side intentionally left blank.