4.7 LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT ISSUE AREAS

The environmental review conducted through the EIR process evaluated the proposed project and determined that there were less than significant impacts to the following resources:

- Agricultural Resources
- Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Paleontological Resources
- Population and Housing
- Public Services and Utilities
- Recreation
- Transportation and Circulation

Most of these issue areas were determined to be less than significant and no mitigation was required; however, a few issue areas in this section include standard mitigation to ensure potentially significant impacts do not occur. Each of these issue areas are described in the following sections.

4.7.1 Agricultural Resources

4.7.1.1 Existing Conditions

Agriculture, predominantly crop farming and livestock grazing, is the largest industry in Monterey County and is vital to the local economy (Monterey County 2014). The County consists of approximately 2.4 million acres of land, of which, approximately 1.3 million acres (54%) are designated as agricultural land by the County. Out of the 1.3 million acres of agricultural land, approximately 1.1 million acres (approximately 82%) are dedicated to grazing land (California Department of Conservation 2012). The most productive farmlands in the County are located in the North County, Greater Salinas, and Central Salinas Valley Planning Areas and the highest earning crops are leaf lettuce, strawberries, head lettuce, broccoli, and nursery crops as of the 2014 crop year (Monterey County 2014). Agricultural land in southern Monterey County primarily consists of grazing activities.

The project site is located in an existing developed neighborhood and is composed of an existing residential lot developed with a single-family residence. The project site is within the LDR land use category and is zoned LDR/1.5-Design Control District, within the Coastal Zone. It is designated as Urban and Built-Up Land by the Department of Conservation's Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) (California Department of Conservation 2015a). Urban and Built-Up Land is identified as being occupied by structures with a building density of at least one unit per 1.5 acres, or approximately six structures per 10-acre parcel; examples include residential, industrial, commercial, institutional facilities, cemeteries, airports, golf courses, sanitary landfills, sewage treatment, and water control structures.

There are no existing agricultural uses or lands under Williamson Act contract in the vicinity of the project site. The project site is surrounded by LDR, recreational, and shoreline designated areas that are also primarily designated as Urban and Built-Up Land and Other Land. There is no Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, or Grazing Land within or adjacent to the project site (California Department of Conservation 2015a). There are small areas of designated farmland adjacent to the Carmel River approximately 4.5 miles southeast of the project site; however, the vast majority of FMMP-designated farmland in the northern portion of the County is located approximately 15 miles inland within the Salinas Valley.

4.7.1.2 Regulatory Setting

Several state laws and regional plans have been enacted to support agricultural production and conservation of agricultural resources and lands, including the California Land Conservation Act (Williamson Act) and County Agriculture Element. These regulations are not directly applicable to the proposed project because no agricultural lands or Williamson Act lands are present onsite or in the project vicinity and because the project location is not well suited or situated to support future agricultural activities.

4.7.1.3 Thresholds of Significance

Pursuant to Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, a substantial impact to agricultural resources would occur if the project would:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in PRC §12220(g)), timberland (as defined by PRC §4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by California Government Code §51104(g))?

d) Result in a loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

4.7.1.4 Impact Assessment Methodology

Impacts to agricultural resources were assessed by utilizing data and maps published by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, California Department of Conservation, and County Agriculture Department, including soil information, farmland mapping, and historical and current agricultural uses at the project site. The project was analyzed for the potential conversion of farmland, loss of productive agricultural soils, incompatible land uses, and inconsistencies with regulations and policies intended to preserve agricultural resources.

4.7.1.5 Impact Assessment and Mitigation Measures

<u>Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.</u>

The project site is designated as Urban and Built-Up Land by the Department of Conservation's FMMP and is surrounded by land that is primarily designated as Urban and Built-Up Land and Other Land (California Department of Conservation 2015a). There is no land designated as Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, or Grazing Land by the California Department of Conservation's FMMP within or in the vicinity of the project site (California Department of Conservation 2015a). Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the conversion of land designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Therefore, *no impact* would occur and mitigation is not necessary.

Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.

The project site is not under Williamson Act contract and does not support agricultural land uses. Additionally, the project site is not surrounded by land that supports agricultural land uses, land that is zoned for or designated for agricultural uses, or land that is under Williamson Act contract. Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, *no impact* would occur and mitigation is not necessary.

Conflict with existing zoning for forest or timberland.

The project site is zoned Low Density Residential/1.5-Design Control District (CZ) by Monterey County and has a Low Density Residential land use designation pursuant to the 2010 Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan. The project site is located within the Del Monte Forest area within Monterey County; however, the project site does not contain forested areas and is not zoned as forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. The nearest forest area, as designated by the Del Monte Forest Area LUP, is located approximately 0.25 mile east of the project site. Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning or cause rezoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant* and mitigation is not necessary.

Result in a loss of forest land or conversion of forest land.

The project site is located within the Del Monte Forest area, where forest land and forest resources are considered significant natural and visual resources. Forest land in the Del Monte Forest area is highly protected for the habitat and visual value that it provides; however, this forest land is not used for agricultural or timber harvest purposes. The project site does not support forest land or forest resources, but does support individual trees that would be removed during construction. Two Monterey cypress trees are proposed for removal. Individual Monterey cypress trees to remain on the site, and trees to be planted as mitigation for the loss of existing trees, would be protected through implementation of mitigation measures BIO/mm-1.1 and BIO/mm-1.2, which include the preparation of a Monterey Cypress Tree Protection, Replacement, Maintenance and Monitoring Plan.

The project site and surrounding areas do not support and are not zoned as forest land. Project development would result in the removal of individual trees; however, mitigation has been identified to reduce impacts to less than significant as discussed above. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the loss of or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant* and mitigation is not necessary.

Involve other changes that would result in the conversion of farmland or forest land.

The proposed project includes the demolition of an existing single-family residence and construction of a new single-family residence on a residential lot in an existing neighborhood. Impacts would be almost entirely limited to the specific project site and implementation of the proposed project would not cause changes that could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, *no impact* would occur and mitigation is not necessary.

4.7.1.6 Cumulative Impacts

Implementation of the proposed project would not contribute to the conversion or loss of designated agricultural land, forest land, or timberland. No Del Monte Forest area forests would be substantially impacted and the nearest agricultural lands are located almost 5 miles away from

the project site. No direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts to agricultural or forest resources would occur as a result of the proposed project.

4.7.2 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases

4.7.2.1 Existing Conditions

Air Quality

Monterey County, along with the Counties of Santa Cruz and San Benito, lies within the NCCAB. Air quality within this basin is monitored by the MBUAPCD. The MBUAPCD sets limits on the quantities of air pollution which may be emitted and has permit authority over new or major modifications to existing stationary sources of air pollution. Control of mobile sources for the Monterey Bay area is exercised at the state and federal levels through the CARB and USEPA.

The MBUAPCD is responsible for measuring pollutant concentrations in the NCCAB. The significance of a given pollutant can be evaluated by comparing its atmospheric concentration to state and federal air quality standards, which are presented in Table 4.7.2-1, below.

Table 4.7.2-1. Ambient Air Quality Standards

Pollutant	Averaging Time	California Standards [1]		National Standards [2]		
		Concentration [3]	Method [4]	Primary [3,5]	Secondary [3,6]	Method [7]
Ozone (O_3)	1 Hour	0.09 ppm (180 µg/m^3)	Ultraviolet Photometry	—	Same as Primary Standard	Ultraviolet Photometry
	8 Hour	0.070 ppm (137 µg/m^3)		0.075 ppm (147 µg/m^3)		
Respirable Particulate Matter (PM_{10}) [8]	24 Hour	50 µg/m^3	Gravimetric or Beta Attenuation	150 µg/m^3	Same as Primary Standard	Inertial Separation and Gravimetric Analysis
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	20 µg/m^3		—		
Fine Particulate Matter ($PM_{2.5}$) [8]	24 Hour	—	—	35 µg/m^3	Same as Primary Standard	Inertial Separation and Gravimetric Analysis
Fine Particulate Matter ($PM_{2.5}$) [8] *(cont'd)*	Annual Arithmetic Mean	12 µg/m^3	Gravimetric or Beta Attenuation	12.0 µg/m^3	15 µg/m^3	Inertial Separation and Gravimetric Analysis
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	1 Hour	20 ppm (23 mg/m^3)	Non-Dispersive Infrared Photometry (NDIR)	35 ppm (40 mg/m^3)	—	Non-Dispersive Infrared Photometry (NDIR)
	8 Hour	9.0 ppm (10 mg/m^3)		9 ppm (10 mg/m^3)	—	
	8 Hour (Lake Tahoe)	6 ppm (7 mg/m^3)		—	—	

Table 4.7.2-1. Ambient Air Quality Standards

Pollutant	Averaging Time	California Standards [1]		National Standards [2]		
		Concentration [3]	Method [4]	Primary [3,5]	Secondary [3,6]	Method [7]
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO_2) [9]	1 Hour	0.18 ppm (339 µg/m^3)	Gas Phase Chemi-luminescence	100 ppb (188 µg/m^3)	—	Gas Phase Chemiluminescence
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	0.030 ppm (57 µg/m^3)		0.053 ppm (100 µg/m^3)	Same as Primary Standard	
Sulfur Dioxide (SO_2) [10]	1 Hour	0.25 ppm (655 µg/m^3)	Ultraviolet Fluorescence	75 ppb (196 µg/m^3)	—	Ultraviolet Flourescence; Spectrophotometry (Pararosaniline Method)
	3 Hour	—		—	0.5 ppm (1300 µg/m^3)	
	24 Hour	0.04 ppm (105 µg/m^3)		0.14 ppm (for certain areas) [10]	—	
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	—		0.030 ppm (for certain areas) [10]	—	
Lead [11,12]	30 Day Average	1.5 µg/m^3	Atomic Absorption	—	—	High Volume Sampler and Atomic Absorption
	Calendar Quarter	—		1.5 µg/m^3 (for certain areas) [12]	Same as Primary Standard	
	Rolling 3-Month Average	—		0.15 µg/m^3		
Visibility Reducing Particles[13]	8 Hour	See footnote 13	Beta Attenuation and Transmittance through Filter Tape	**No National Standards**		
Sulfates	24 Hour	25 µg/m^3	Ion Chromatography	**No National Standards**		
Hydrogen Sulfide	1 Hour	0.03 ppm (42 µg/m^3)	Ultraviolet Fluorescence			
Vinyl Chloride[11]	24 Hour	0.01 ppm (26 µg/m^3)	Gas Chromatography			

[1] California standards for ozone, carbon monoxide (except 8-hour Lake Tahoe), sulfur dioxide (1 and 24 hour), nitrogen dioxide, and particulate matter (PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, and visibility reducing particles), are values that are not to be exceeded. All others are not to be equaled or exceeded. California ambient air quality standards are listed in the Table of Standards in 17 CCR §70200.

[2] National standards (other than ozone, particulate matter, and those based on annual arithmetic mean) are not to be exceeded more than once a year. The ozone standard is attained when the fourth highest 8-hour concentration measured at each site in a year, averaged over 3 years, is equal to or less than the standard. For PM_{10}, the 24-hour standard is attained when the expected number of days per calendar year with a 24-hour average concentration above 150 µg/m3 is equal to or less than

Table 4.7.2-1. Ambient Air Quality Standards

Pollutant	Averaging Time	California Standards [1]		National Standards [2]		
		Concentration [3]	Method [4]	Primary [3,5]	Secondary [3,6]	Method [7]

one. For $PM_{2.5}$, the 24-hour standard is attained when 98% of the daily concentrations, averaged over 3 years, are equal to or less than the standard. Contact the USEPA for further clarification and current national policies.

[3] Concentration expressed first in units in which it was promulgated. Equivalent units given in parentheses are based upon a reference temperature of 25°C and a reference pressure of 760 torr. Most measurements of air quality are to be corrected to a reference temperature of 25°C and a reference pressure of 760 torr; ppm in this table refers to ppm by volume, or micromoles of pollutant per mole of gas.

[4] Any equivalent measurement method which can be shown to the satisfaction of the ARB to give equivalent results at or near the level of the air quality standard may be used.

[5] National Primary Standards: The levels of air quality necessary, with an adequate margin of safety to protect the public health.

[6] National Secondary Standards: The levels of air quality necessary to protect the public welfare from any known or anticipated adverse effects of a pollutant.

[7] Reference method as described by the USEPA. An “equivalent method” of measurement may be used but must have a “consistent relationship to the reference method” and must be approved by the USEPA.

[8] On December 14, 2012, the national annual $PM_{2.5}$ primary standard was lowered from 15 µg/m^3 to 12.0 µg/m^3. The existing national 24- hour $PM_{2.5}$ standards (primary and secondary) were retained at 35 µg/m^3, as was the annual secondary standard of 15 µg/m3. The existing 24-hour PM_{10} standards (primary and secondary) of 150 µg/m^3 also were retained. The form of the annual primary and secondary standards is the annual mean, averaged over 3 years.

[9] To attain the 1-hour national standard, the 3-year average of the annual 98th percentile of the 1-hour daily maximum concentrations at each site must not exceed 100 parts per billion (ppb). Note that the national 1-hour standard is in units of parts per billion; California standards are in units of parts per million (ppm). To directly compare the national 1-hour standard to the California standards the units can be converted from ppb to ppm. In this case, the national standard of 100 ppb is identical to 0.100 ppm.

[10] On June 2, 2010, a new 1-hour SO2 standard was established and the existing 24-hour and annual primary standards were revoked. To attain the 1-hour national standard, the 3-year average of the annual 99th percentile of the 1-hour daily maximum concentrations at each site must not exceed 75 ppb. The 1971 SO_2 national standards (24-hour and annual) remain in effect until one year after an area is designated for the 2010 standard, except that in areas designated nonattainment for the 1971 standards, the 1971 standards remain in effect until implementation plans to attain or maintain the 2010 standards are approved. Note that the 1-hour national standard is in units of parts per billion; California standards are in units of parts per million. To directly compare the 1-hour national standard to the California standard the units can be converted to ppm. In this case, the national standard of 75 ppb is identical to 0.075 ppm.

[11] The CARB has identified lead and vinyl chloride as 'toxic air contaminants' with no threshold level of exposure for adverse health effects determined. These actions allow for the implementation of control measures at levels below the ambient concentrations specified for these pollutants.

[12] The national standard for lead was revised on October 15, 2008, to a rolling 3-month average. The 1978 lead standard (1.5 µg/m3 as a quarterly average) remains in effect until one year after an area is designated for the 2008 standard, except that in areas designated nonattainment for the 1978 standard, the 1978 standard remains in effect until implementation plans to attain or maintain the 2008 standard are approved.

[13] In 1989, the CARB converted both the general statewide 10-mile visibility standard and the Lake Tahoe 30-mile visibility standard to instrumental equivalents, which are "extinction of 0.23 per kilometer" and "extinction of 0.07 per kilometer" for the statewide and Lake Tahoe Air Basin standards, respectively.

Source: CARB 2013.

The NCCAB is designated by the CARB as a nonattainment area for the state ozone standard and respirable particulates standard (PM_{10}). Ozone, the primary constituent of smog, is formed in the atmosphere through complex chemical reactions involving volatile organic compounds (VOC) and nitrogen oxides (NOx) in the presence of sunlight. The primary sources of VOC in the NCCAB are on- and off-road motor vehicles, cleaning and surface coatings, solvent evaporation, landfills, petroleum production and marketing, and prescribed burning. Primary sources of NOx include on- and off-road motor vehicles, stationary sources of fuel combustion, and various industrial processes. The basin also experiences air quality impacts associated with transported Bay Area NOx emissions (MBUAPCD 2013). PM_{10} refers to respirable particulate matter less than 10

microns in size; because of their small size, they can be inhaled deep into the lungs and constitute a health concern (MBUAPCD 2008a).

Monterey County is in attainment with the State carbon monoxide standard but Santa Cruz and San Benito Counties are unclassified. The NCCAB is in attainment with all federal standards as of January 2015, as shown in Table 4.7.2-2 below.

Table 4.7.2-2. Attainment Status for the North Central Coast Air Basin

Pollutant	State Standards [1]	National Standards
Ozone (O_3)	**Nonattainment [2]**	Attainment/Unclassified [3]
Inhalable Particulates (PM_{10})	**Nonattainment**	Attainment
Fine Particulates ($PM_{2.5}$)	Attainment	Attainment/Unclassified [4]
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	Monterey Co. – Attainment San Benito Co. – Unclassified Santa Cruz Co. – Unclassified	Attainment/Unclassified
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO_2)	Attainment	Attainment/Unclassified [5]
Sulfur Dioxide (SO_2)	Attainment	Attainment [6]
Lead	Attainment	Attainment/Unclassified [7]

Notes:

Nonattainment designations are highlighted in **Bold**.

[1] State designations based on 2010 to 2012 air monitoring data.

[2] Effective July 26, 2007, the CARB designated the NCCAB a nonattainment area for the state ozone standard, which was revised in 2006 to include an 8-hour standard of 0.070 parts per million (ppm).

[3] On March 12, 2008, USEPA adopted a new 8-hour ozone standard of 0.075 ppm. In April 2012, USEPA designated the NCCAB attainment/unclassified based on 2009–2011 data.

[4] This includes the 2006 24-hour standard of 35 $\mu g/m^3$ and the 2012 annual standard of 12 $\mu g/m^3$.

[5] In 2012, the USEPA designated the entire state as attainment/unclassified for the 2010 NO_2 standard.

[6] In June 2011, the CARB recommended to the USEPA that the entire state be designated as attainment for the 2010 primary SO_2 standard. Final designations to be addressed in future USEPA actions.

[7] On October 15, 2008, USEPA substantially strengthened the national ambient air quality standard for lead by lowering the level of the primary standard from 1.5 $\mu g/m^3$ to 0.15 $\mu g/m^3$. Final designations were made by USEPA in November 2011.

Source: MBUAPCD 2015.

The existing air quality conditions in the vicinity of a project site are typically characterized by the monitoring data collected in the region. MBUAPCD maintains three air quality monitoring stations (Carmel Valley-Ford Road, King City-415 Pear Street, and Salinas #3) in Monterey County (CARB 2015a). The nearest monitoring station in Monterey County is the Carmel Valley-Ford Road Monitoring Station, located approximately 14 miles southeast of the project site. The monitoring data collected at this monitoring station is provided for the years 2012, 2013, and 2014 in Table 4.7.2-3, below.

Table 4.7.2-3. Ambient Air Quality Monitoring Data for Project Vicinity

Pollutant Standards[1]	2012	2013	2014
Ozone (ppm)[2]			
Number of days standard exceeded (1-Hour)	0	0	0
Worst 1-Hour	0.072	0.072	0.078
Number of days standard exceeded (8-Hour)	0	0	0
Worst 8-Hour	0.060	0.068	0.070
Inhalable Particulates (PM10) µg/m³ [2]			
Number of days standard exceeded	0	0	0
Worst 24-Hour	14.8	33.7	16.3
Carbon Monoxide (ppm)[2]			
Number of days standard exceeded	0	0	0
Worst 1-Hour	1.6	1.7	1.8
Nitrogen Dioxide (ppm)[2]			
Number of days standard exceeded	0	0	0
Worst 1-Hour	0.0420	0.0420	0.0380

Notes:

[1] Monitoring data acquired from the CARB Carmel Valley-Ford Road Monitoring Site.

[2] ppm = parts per million. µg/m3 = micrograms per cubic meter.

Source: CARB 2015a.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change

Climate change refers to any significant change in measures of climate such as temperature, precipitation, or wind, lasting for decades or longer (USEPA 2009). Climate change may result from:

- Natural factors, such as changes in the sun's intensity or slow changes in the Earth's orbit around the sun;
- Natural processes within the climate system (e.g., changes in ocean circulation); or,
- Human activities that change the atmosphere's composition (e.g., through burning fossil fuels) and the land surface (e.g., deforestation, reforestation, urbanization, desertification, etc.).

Human activities, such as fossil fuel combustion and land use changes release carbon dioxide (CO_2) and other compounds, cumulatively termed greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. GHGs are effective in trapping infra-red radiation which otherwise would have escaped the atmosphere, thereby warming the atmosphere, the oceans, and earth's surface (USEPA 2009).

GHGs include any gas that absorbs infrared radiation in the atmosphere. GHGs, as defined in Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), include the following gases: CO_2, methane (CH_4), nitrous oxide (N_2O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF_6).

In California, the main sources of GHG emissions are from the transportation and energy sectors. According to the CARB's 2015 Edition of the California Greenhouse Gas Emission Inventory, California produced 459.3 million metric tons of CO_2 equivalent ($MMtCO_2e$) in 2013 (CARB 2015b). In California, the main sources of GHG emissions are from the transportation and industrial sectors. The transportation sector accounted for 37% of emissions and the industrial sector accounted for 23% of emissions.

The potential effects of future climate change on California resources include increased temperatures, sea level rise, reduced Sierra snowpack and water resources, changes in forests and ecosystems, and increased smog.

4.7.2.2 Regulatory Setting

Federal Policies and Regulations

Air quality protection at the national level is provided through the Federal Clean Air Act (Federal CAA) and subsequent Federal CAA Amendments. The current version was signed into law on November 15, 1990. These amendments represent the fifth major effort by the U.S. Congress to improve air quality. The 1990 Federal CAA standards are generally less stringent than the California Clean Air Act (California CAA). However, unlike the California law, the Federal CAA set statutory deadlines for attaining federal standards. The 1990 Federal CAA added several new sections to the law, including requirements for the control of toxic air contaminants, reductions in pollutants responsible for acid deposition, development of a national strategy for stratospheric ozone and global climate protection, and requirements for a national permitting system for major pollution sources.

In April 2010, the USEPA issued new standards for GHG emissions and fuel economy for light-duty vehicles in model years 2017–2025. In November 2010, the USEPA published the "Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) and Title V Permitting Guidance for Greenhouse Gases," which provides the basic information that permit writers and applicants need to address GHG emissions regulated under the Federal CAA.

State Policies and Regulations

The California CAA was signed into law in September of 1988. It requires all areas of the state to achieve and maintain the California ambient air quality standards by the earliest practicable date. These standards are generally more stringent than the Federal CAA standards; thus, emission controls to comply with the State law will generally be sufficient to comply with the Federal standards as well. The California CAA requires that all APCDs adopt and enforce regulations to achieve and maintain the state ambient air quality standards for the area under its jurisdiction. Pursuant to the requirements of the law, the MBUAPCD adopted the AQMP in 1991 (most recently revised in 2008) (MBUAPCD 2008a), which established control measures for achieving and maintaining attainment with the state ozone standard. The 2009–2011Triennial Plan Revision of the AQMP documented that the air basin continued to attain the 1-hour ozone standard and recommended adoption of five control measures to make progress towards achieving the 8-hour standard.

The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32, Health and Safety Code §38500 et seq.) requires the CARB to design and implement emission limits, regulations, and other measures. These will reduce, by 2020, statewide GHG emissions in a technologically feasible and cost-effective manner to 1990 levels (representing a 25% reduction).

SB 1368 (California Public Utilities Code §8340 et seq.) is an AB 32 companion bill that was signed into law in 2006. It requires the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) to establish a GHG performance standard for base load generation from investor-owned utilities, and the California Energy Commission (CEC) to establish a similar standard for publicly-owned utilities. The bill also requires all imported electricity provided to California to be generated from plants meeting CPUC and CEC standards.

By enacting SB 97 in 2007, California's lawmakers expressly recognized the need to analyze GHG emissions as a part of the CEQA process. SB 97 required the California Office of Planning and Research to develop, and the Natural Resources Agency to adopt, amendments to the State CEQA Guidelines addressing the analysis and mitigation of GHG emissions. Those State CEQA Guidelines amendments clarified several points, including the following:

- Lead agencies must analyze the GHG emissions of proposed projects, and must reach a conclusion regarding the significance of those emissions. (See State CEQA Guidelines §15064.4.)

- When a project's GHG emissions may be significant, lead agencies must consider a range of potential mitigation measures to reduce those emissions. (See State CEQA Guidelines §15126.4(c).)

- Lead agencies must analyze potentially significant impacts associated with placing projects in hazardous locations, including locations potentially affected by climate change. (See State CEQA Guidelines §15126.2(a).)

- Lead agencies may significantly streamline the analysis of GHGs on a project level by using a programmatic GHG emissions reduction plan meeting certain criteria. (See State CEQA Guidelines §15183.5(b).)

- CEQA mandates analysis of a proposed project's potential energy use (including transportation-related energy), sources of energy supply, and ways to reduce energy demand, including through the use of efficient transportation alternatives. (See State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix F.)

The amendments to the State CEQA Guidelines implementing SB 97 became effective on March 18, 2010 (California Natural Resources Agency 2014).

Table 4.7.2-4 lists applicable state, regional, and local land use policies and regulations pertaining to air quality that were adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect and that are relevant to the proposed project. Also included in Table 4.7.2-4 is an analysis of project consistency with identified policies and regulations.

Table 4.7.2-4. Applicable Local Plans and Policies Relevant to Air Quality

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Intent of the Policy in Relation to Avoiding or Mitigating Significant Environmental Impacts	Preliminary Consistency Determination*
County of Monterey Del Monte Forest Area Land Use Plan		
Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan Key Policies		
Goal 2: To maintain and upgrade, where possible, air and water quality.	The intent of this goal is to maintain and improve air and water quality.	Potentially Consistent. The project includes replacing an existing single-family residence with a new single-family residence. Construction and operation of the project would not result in significant impacts to air quality. Impacts to water resources are discussed in detail in Section 4.5 of this EIR.

* Although a preliminary determination regarding project consistency is made, it is the responsibility of the County Planning Commission or Board of Supervisors, the lead CEQA decision makers, to make the final determination regarding consistency issues.

4.7.2.3 Thresholds of Significance

Pursuant to Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, a substantial impact to air quality or GHGs/climate change would occur if the project would:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

c) 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 (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

f) Generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

g) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs?

4.7.2.4 Impact Assessment Methodology

Air Quality

CEQA allows for significance criteria established by the applicable air pollution control district to be used to assess the impact of a project on air quality, subject to the discretion of the lead agency. The MBUAPCD has determined that construction activities that generate direct emissions of 82 pounds per day or more of PM_{10} could contribute substantially to an existing or projected exceedance of PM_{10} air quality standard, and would have a significant impact on local air quality.

Given the low ambient levels of CO, SO_2, and lead in the NCCAB (see Table 4.7.2-3), short-term construction-related CO, SO_2, and lead emissions are not a concern associated with the proposed project.

Generation of GHG Emissions

CEQA allows for significance criteria established by the applicable air pollution control district to be used to assess the impact of a project related to GHG emissions, at the discretion of the CEQA Lead Agency. In February 2014, the MBUAPCD staff recommended that its Board of Directors approve an operational significance threshold of 10,000 metric tons CO_2 equivalent (CO_2e) per year for stationary source projects that rely on operational processes and equipment that are subject to MBUAPCD permitting requirements. For land use projects, the MBUAPCD staff recommended to its board in February 2014 that it adopt a “bright line” significance threshold of 2,000 metric tons CO_2e per year, require that all project GHG emissions be mitigated by 16% compared to unmitigated emissions for the impact to be considered less than significant, or demonstrate compliance with an applicable adopted GHG reduction plan/climate action plan for the impact to be considered less than significant. As of March 2015, the MBUAPCD Board of Directors has not adopted any of the thresholds recommended by its staff (MBUAPCD 2015).

This EIR uses the significance threshold of 2,000 metric tons CO_2e per year to evaluate whether the project's emissions could have a significant impact on the environment.

It should be noted that projects that generate less than the above mentioned thresholds will also participate in emission reductions because air emissions, including GHGs, are under the purview of the California Air Resources Board (or other regulatory agencies) and will be "regulated" either by CARB, the Federal Government, or other entities. For example, new vehicles will be subject to increased fuel economy standards and emission reductions, large and small appliances will be subject to more strict emissions standards, and energy delivered to consumers will increasingly come from renewable sources. Other programs that are intended to reduce the overall GHG emissions include Low Carbon Fuel Standards, Renewable Portfolio standards and the Clean Car standards. As a result, even the emissions that result from projects that produce fewer emissions than the threshold will be subject to emission reductions.

Under CEQA, an individual project's GHG emissions will generally not result in direct significant impacts. This is because the climate change issue is global in nature. However, an individual project could be found to contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact. Projects that have GHG emissions above the noted thresholds may be considered cumulatively considerable and require mitigation.

4.7.2.5 Impact Assessment and Mitigation Measures

Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

The MBUAPCD uses future population projections to generate emission forecasts upon which the AQMP and necessary control measures are based. As of 2014, the population in Monterey County was recorded as 431,344 compared to a total of 415,057 in 2010, resulting in a 3.9% increase in population within the County over four years (U.S. Census Bureau 2014). The AQMP projected a population of 445,309 in 2010 and 483,733 in 2020 in Monterey County (MBUAPCD 2008b). Monterey County's current (2014) population of 431,344 is within the AQMP's projected 2010 population; therefore, because the project would not result in an increase in population or long-term emissions beyond what has been planned for in the AQMP, indirect emissions associated with the project are deemed to be consistent with the AQMP. The proposed project would not directly implicate or conflict with any control measures within the AQMP and would not conflict with or otherwise obstruct implementation of the AQMP. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant* and no mitigation is necessary.

Violate any air quality standard.

The project would generate vehicle emissions from construction equipment and worker trips. Earthwork (i.e., demolition and grading) would generate fugitive dust during construction activities. Construction emissions are typically considered short-term, as they occur only during the construction of the project. The operational phase of the project would not substantially affect emissions above existing conditions at the single-family residence because the type and intensity of use would remain the same. The potential for significant air quality impacts is minimized by the limited nature and scale of the project.

The MBUAPCD has developed criteria pollutant emission thresholds, which meet or exceed state and federal air quality thresholds, and established criteria in the MBUAPCD's 2008 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines to identify the level of construction and operational activity that could result in significant impacts if not mitigated (MBUAPCD 2008b). Per the MBUAPCD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, construction-related impacts to air quality would be potentially significant if a project

would generate PM_{10} emissions of 82 pounds per day (lb/day) or more. It is presumed that the 82 lb/day threshold could be exceeded when earthmoving activities exceed 2.2 acres/day. Construction projects below the screening threshold of 2.2 acres/day are assumed to be below the 82 lb/day threshold of significance (MBUAPCD 2008b).

The project's total estimated construction footprint is approximately 0.55 acre and grading and construction activities are expected to last approximately 18 to 24 months. This level of activity is substantially below the 2.2 acre/day threshold.

There are no extenuating circumstances that would indicate that PM_{10} emissions may approach the 82 lb/day threshold despite the limited area of earthwork. On average, excavation and earthmoving activities generate approximately 38 lb/day/acre of PM_{10} (MBUAPCD 2008b). Based on this estimation, the project would generate a total of 20.9 lbs. of PM_{10} during the entire project lifetime, in a worst-case cumulative scenario (38 lbs/acre × cumulative 0.55 acres/day = 20.9 lbs/day). Therefore, construction-related emissions would be well below applicable MBUAPCD thresholds and impacts would be *less than significant*. No mitigation is necessary.

Result in a net increase of any criteria pollutant.

The project would not emit significant quantities of criteria pollutants during either short-term construction activities or long-term operations. As proposed, the project would result in the disturbance of approximately 0.55 acre, including demolition of the existing residence, grading, and construction of the new single-family residence and ancillary components such as the driveway. This would result in the creation of construction dust, as well as short-term vehicle emissions associated with construction activities; however, construction activities and associated emissions would be short-term and would not cause any growth-inducing effects or cause an exceedance of established population projections to occur, which may indirectly generate additional emission sources. The NCCAB is currently non-attainment for ozone (8-hour standard) and PM_{10}. Implementation of standard dust control measures, such as reducing the amount of disturbed area where possible and watering sand/dirt stockpiles, and standard diesel emission reduction measures, such as maintaining construction equipment in proper working condition and minimizing diesel equipment idling, would reduce the project's contribution to area PM_{10} and ozone precursor emissions. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant with mitigation.*

AQ/GHG Impact 1	
Implementation of the proposed project could result in the generation of emissions as a result of construction activities in an area in non-attainment for ozone (8-hour standard) and PM_{10}, resulting in a potentially significant impact.	
Mitigation Measures (mm) and Mitigation Monitoring Actions (mma)	
AQ/GHG/mm-1.1	*Prior to issuance of demolition, grading, or construction permits, the following Best Management Practices and standard mitigation measures for reducing fugitive dust emissions shall be noted on project grading plans. All measures shall be adhered to during all project construction activities.* *a. Reduce the amount of disturbed area where possible.* *b. Water all sand/dirt stockpiles at least twice daily. Frequency should be based on the type of operation, soil, and wind exposure.* *c. Prohibit grading activities to the extent feasible when wind speeds exceed 15 miles per hour.* *d. Vehicle speed for all construction vehicles shall not exceed 15 mph on any unpaved surface at the construction site.*

AQ/GHG Impact 1	
	e. All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials shall be covered and shall maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard (minimum vertical distance between top of load and top of trailer). *f. Plant appropriate vegetative ground cover in disturbed areas that are planned for habitat restoration as soon as possible.* *g. Cover inactive storage piles.* *h. Install wheel washers at the entrance to the construction site for all exiting trucks.* *i. Sweep streets if visible soil material is carried out from the construction site.* *j. Post a publicly visible sign which specifies the telephone number and person to contact regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond to complaints and take corrective action within 48 hours. The phone number of the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District shall be visible to ensure compliance with Rule 402 (Nuisance).* *k. Limit the area under construction at any one time.*
AQ/GHG/mma-1.1.1	*Prior to issuance of demolition, grading, or construction permits, the applicant shall submit revised grading plans to the County of Monterey Resource Management Agency – Planning Department establishing compliance with this measure.*
AQ/GHG/mm-1.2	*Prior to issuance of the Combined Development Permit, the following Best Management Practices and standard mitigation measures for reducing nitrogen oxides (NO_x), reactive organic gases (ROG) and diesel particulate matter (DPM) emissions from construction equipment shall be noted on project grading plans. All measures shall be adhered to during all project construction and decommissioning activities.* *a. Maintain all construction equipment in proper tune according to manufacturer's specifications.* *b. Diesel-powered equipment shall be replaced by electric equipment whenever feasible to reduce NO_x emissions.* *c. Diesel-powered equipment shall be replaced by gasoline-powered equipment whenever feasible.* *d. Diesel construction equipment meeting the California Air Resources Board Tier 1 emission standards for off-road heavy-duty diesel engines shall be used. Equipment meeting California Air Resources Board Tier 2 or higher emission standards shall be used to the maximum extent feasible.* *e. Catalytic converters shall be installed on gasoline-powered equipment, if feasible.* *f. All on- and off-road diesel equipment shall not idle for more than 5 minutes. Signs shall be posted in the designated queuing areas and or job site to remind drivers and operators of the 5-minute idling limit.* *g. The engine size of construction equipment shall be the minimum practical size.* *h. The number of construction equipment operating simultaneously shall be minimized through efficient management practices to ensure that the smallest practical number is operating at any one time.*
AQ/GHG/mma-1.2.1	*Prior to issuance of demolition, grading, or construction permits, the applicant shall submit revised grading plans to the County of Monterey Resource Management Agency – Planning Department establishing compliance with this measure.*
Residual Impacts	
With implementation of the above mitigation measure, residual impacts associated with inadvertent emissions of criteria air pollutants in an area of nonattainment would be less than significant.	

Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Several sensitive receptors are located within a 0.25-mile radius of the project site. Sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project site include four single-family residences north of the project site along Signal Hill Road and 17-Mile Drive, one single-family residence located south of the project site along Signal Hill Road, and portions of the Cypress Point Golf Course located west and south of the project site.

As described above, the project would not result in the emission of substantial pollutant concentrations and no sensitive receptors would be exposed to significant pollutant concentration as a result of construction or operation of the project. In addition, mitigation is identified to reduce the generation of fugitive dust and construction equipment emissions, which would further minimize effects on sensitive receptors. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant with mitigation* described in AQ/GHG/mm-1.1 and AQ/GHG/mm-1.2.

Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Construction of the proposed project would generate odors associated with construction smoke/dust and equipment exhaust and fumes. Although surrounding sensitive residential and recreational sensitive receptors would be sensitive to any objectionable odors resulting from project construction activities, construction techniques would not be substantially different from any other type of construction project and the number of persons within these potentially affected groups would be minimal. Any effects would be short-term in nature and limited to the construction phase of the project. The project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant* and no mitigation beyond previously described mitigation is necessary.

Generate GHG emissions.

GHG and climate change are national and even global issues that must be considered on a large scale. Most individual activities would not cause an individually significant GHG effect. Therefore, the potential significance of a project's impact on GHGs and climate change must be considered in the context of the project's contribution of GHG in combination with all other sources.

The MBUAPCD has not yet adopted plans for regulating GHGs or addressing climate change, although it maintains an inventory of GHG emissions both basin-wide and by county and has recently proposed a bright line threshold of 2,000 metric tons of CO_2e per year. The proposed project would replace an existing single family residence with a new single family residence, and development and operation of the proposed residence would fall substantially below this threshold.

Because MBUAPCD has not adopted GHG regulations, a screening level analysis was also conducted using the thresholds adopted by the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (SLOAPCD). Based on thresholds in the SLOAPCD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook (SLOAPCD 2012), a project could potentially result in a significant impact associated with GHG emissions if it exceeds the Bright-Line Threshold of 1,150 metric tons of CO_2e per year. This threshold is stricter than MBUAPCD's recently proposed bright line threshold of 2,000 metric tons CO_2e per year. An exceedance of this threshold would require preparation of California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) modeling to quantify emissions and determine impacts.

According to the SLOAPCD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, the relevant 1,150 metric ton significance criterion is equivalent to development of 70 single family residential units in an urban

area (or 49 single-family residential units in a rural area) (SLOAPCD 2012). The project proposes a 0.55-acre total construction footprint for the demolition of an existing single-family residence and construction of one new single-family residence. Based on this equivalency, the GHG emissions from this project would be substantially less than 1,150 metric tons per year.

The proposed project would not generate significant project-related traffic and would not result in a change in land use that would require a substantial change in demand for or use of electricity. The project's individual short-term contribution to overall GHG emissions would be negligible. Therefore, impacts associated with GHG emissions would be *less than significant* and no additional mitigation is necessary.

Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation for greenhouse gases.

California has passed several pieces of legislation in the past few years aimed at dealing with GHG emissions and climate change. Executive Order S-3-05 set a goal to reduce California's GHG emissions to: (1) 2000 levels by 2010; (2) 1990 levels by 2020; and (3) 80% below 1990 levels by 2050. These goals were reinforced in 2006 with the passage of AB 32, which set forth the same emission reduction goals and further mandated that the CARB create a plan, including market mechanisms, and develop and implement rules to achieve "real, quantifiable, cost-effective reductions of greenhouse gases." Executive Order S-01-07 set forth California's low carbon fuel standard, which requires the carbon intensity of the state's transportation fuels to be reduced by 10% by 2020. And Senate Bill 97 (SB 97) required amendments to the CEQA Guidelines to address GHG emissions; the amendments were put into effect on March 18, 2010.

There are no MBUAPCD policies or regulations specifically related to GHG emissions. However, as discussed above, the project would not exceed MBUAPCD's proposed GHG thresholds or adopted GHG thresholds applied by adjacent jurisdictions. The project is not expected to generate significant GHG emissions due to the minimal traffic generated, limited energy use, and the limited nature of the proposed land use. The project would not conflict with the statewide regulations listed above. Therefore, impacts associated with GHG regulations would be *less than significant* and no additional mitigation is necessary.

4.7.2.6 Cumulative Impacts

The cumulative study area for air quality impacts is the NCCAB. The project would contribute criteria pollutants during project construction but would not substantially change emissions during long-term operation over existing conditions. The proposed project, combined with construction of other projects in the area, could cumulatively contribute air emissions due to use of construction equipment, increased traffic trips, and energy use.

Depending on construction schedules and actual implementation of projects in the air basin, generation of fugitive dust and pollutant emissions during construction could result in short-term increases in air pollutants. Analysis conducted specifically for this project concluded that implementation of the proposed project would not significantly contribute to short-term or cumulative long-term operational air quality impacts because it would not exceed thresholds established by the MBUAPCD's AQMP as well as other adopted thresholds. GHG impacts, including those described above, all contribute cumulatively with those produced worldwide, to affect climate change. Compliance with identified air quality mitigation measures would reduce the project's contribution to cumulative GHG emissions, and subsequent climate change. Cumulative effects would be *less than significant* and no additional mitigation is required.

4.7.3 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

According to the State of California, Health and Safety Code, Chapter 6.95, §25501(o), the term "hazardous materials" refers to both hazardous substances and hazardous wastes. Under federal and state laws, certain materials, including wastes, may be considered hazardous if they are specifically listed by statute as such or if they are poisonous (toxicity); can be ignited by open flame (ignitability); corrode other materials (corrosivity); or react violently, explode, or generate vapors when mixed with water (reactivity). The term "hazardous material" is defined in law as "any material that, because of quantity, concentration, or physical or chemical characteristics, poses a significant present or potential hazard to human health and safety or to the environment."

4.7.3.1 Existing Conditions

Past and Present Land Uses in the Project Vicinity

The primary sources of hazardous materials in Monterey County typically consist of agricultural operations, hospitals, heavy industry, laboratories, and utilities (Monterey County 2010). Agricultural operations, in particular, are a significant source of hazardous materials such as pesticides and fertilizers for controlling weeds, fungi, rodents and insects. Production and storage of hazardous materials also poses a potential hazard in the event of a leak or spill which could result in air, water, or soil contamination (Monterey County 2010).

There are no agricultural operations in the vicinity of the project site; however, there are several golf courses which could utilize fertilizers or pesticides that could contribute to soil or water contamination.

Regulatory Database Searches

The California SWRCB GeoTracker database and the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) EnviroStor database were reviewed to identify documented releases of hazardous materials in soil and groundwater within a 0.5-mile radius of the project site. A 0.5-mile search radius from the project site was utilized to consider the potential for migration of shallow groundwater contaminant plumes from typical leaking underground storage tank cases to adversely affect groundwater in the project area.

Based on a review of regulatory agencies' databases, there are no known hazardous waste and substances sites designated by the DTSC, leaking underground storage tank sites designated by the SWRCB, solid waste disposal sites identified by the SWRCB, or cease and desist orders or cleanup and abatement orders located within a 0.5-mile radius of the project site (California Environmental Protection Agency [CalEPA] 2015). Additionally, there are no known sources of hazardous materials storage or release in the vicinity of the project site.

Structural and Building Components

Hazardous materials, such as asbestos-containing materials, lead-based paint, and polychlorinated biphenyls, may occur in older building materials and be released during demolition or renovation of existing facilities. The existing single-family residence and ancillary components located on the project site were built in 1957–1958 and may contain hazardous building materials.

Wildfire Hazards

CAL FIRE maps identify fire hazard severity zones in state and local responsibility areas for fire protection. CAL FIRE has developed two fire hazard severity maps for Monterey County: a Fire Hazard Severity Zones in State Responsibility Areas Map (CAL FIRE 2007) and a Very High Fire

Hazard Severity Zones in Local Responsibility Areas Map (CAL FIRE 2008). The project site is located in an area designated by CAL FIRE as a high fire hazard severity zone in a State Responsibility Area (CAL FIRE 2007). The project site is not located in a very high fire hazard severity zone and is not located in a local responsibility area (CAL FIRE 2008).

Nearby Schools

Schools are considered sensitive receptors for hazardous materials because children are more susceptible than adults to the effects of hazardous materials. There are no schools located within 0.5 mile of the project site. The nearest school is Stevenson High School, located approximately 0.8 mile east of the project site.

Nearby Airports

Airports are considered sources of potential additional hazards due to air traffic operations and the need to maintain safe approach and takeoff zones for aircraft. The project site is located approximately 6.3 miles west of the Monterey Regional Airport and approximately 13 miles southwest of the Watsonville Municipal Airport. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan and is not located within two miles of a public airport, public use airport, or a private airstrip.

4.7.3.2 Regulatory Setting

Hazards and hazardous material management is subject to multiple laws, policies, and regulations at all levels of government. The agencies responsible for enforcing applicable laws and regulations develop and enforce standards for the handling and clean-up of specific materials determined to pose a risk to human health or the environment. The enforcing agency at the local level for the proposed project area is the County Public Health Department, Division of Environmental Health. Enforcement agencies at the State level include two branches of CalEPA, DTSC, and the SWRCB (through its nine RWQCBs).

Federal Policies and Regulations

The USEPA is the Federal agency responsible for enforcement and implementation of Federal laws and regulations pertaining to hazardous materials. In addition, the USEPA provides oversight and supervision for some site investigation/remediation projects. For disposal of certain hazardous wastes, the USEPA has developed land disposal restrictions and treatment standards.

State Policies and Regulations

The project site is located within the jurisdiction of the Central Coast RWQCB. The RWQCB is authorized by the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act of 1969 (“the Porter-Cologne Act”), to implement water quality protection laws. When the quality of the groundwater or the surface waters of the State is threatened, the RWQCB has the authority to require investigations and remedial actions. In addition, the Central Coast RWQCB is the State regulatory agency that oversees the local Leaking Underground Fuel Tank (LUFT) program, which was established to regulate underground fuel tanks. Under the LUFT program, local implementing agencies are required to permit, inspect, and oversee monitoring programs to detect leakage of hazardous materials. The RWQCB has been involved with the regulation of the Marine Terminal Remediation activities.

In California, the DTSC, a branch of CalEPA, works in conjunction with, or in lieu of, the USEPA to enforce and implement specific hazardous materials laws and regulations. California has

enacted its own legislation pertaining to the management of hazardous materials. The Hazardous Waste Control Act created the state hazardous waste management program, which is similar to, but more stringent than, the federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act program. The act is implemented by regulations contained in California Code of Regulations Title 26, which describes required aspects for the proper management of hazardous waste. California has also developed an emergency response plan to coordinate emergency services provided by federal, state, and local agencies under the Emergency Services Act. Rapid response to incidents involving hazardous materials or hazardous waste is an important part of the plan, which is administered by the California Office of Emergency Services. The office coordinates the responses of other agencies, including USEPA, the California Highway Patrol, RWQCBs, air quality management districts, and county disaster response offices.

Local Policies and Regulations

The Monterey County Office of Emergency Services (OES) is an emergency management agency with responsibilities that include coordination of emergency and disaster preparedness planning, response, and recovery with and between local, state, and federal agencies. The County OES is committed to serving the public before, during and after times of emergency and disaster by promoting effective coordination between agencies, and encouraging emergency preparedness of the public and organizations involved in emergency response. Pursuant to State law and local ordinance, the County's Environmental Health Services Division conducts inspections to ensure proper handling, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials and proper remediation of contaminated sites.

Table 4.7.3-1 lists applicable state, regional, and local land use policies and regulations pertaining to hazards and hazardous materials that were adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect and that are relevant to the proposed project. Also included in 4.7.3-1 is an analysis of project consistency with identified policies and regulations. Note that policies related to geologic, soil stability, and seismic hazards are more specifically discussed in Section 4.5 of the EIR, Geology and Soils.

Table 4.7.3-1. Applicable Local Plans and Policies Relevant to Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Intent of the Policy in Relation to Avoiding or Mitigating Significant Environmental Impacts	Preliminary Consistency Determination*
County of Monterey Del Monte Forest Area Land Use Plan		
Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan Key Policies		
Hazards: Land uses and development in areas of geologic, flood, fire, and other coastal hazards shall be carefully regulated through the best available planning practices and sited and designed in order to minimize risks to life and property, and damage to the natural environment.	The intent of this policy is to regulate development in areas of designated hazard risk to minimize risks to life, property, and the natural environment.	Potentially Consistent. The project site is not located in an area identified as being at risk for flooding. The site is located in an area designated as having a high potential for erosion and the project includes the implementation of an erosion control plan and a drainage plan to mitigate associated impacts. Mitigation has been identified requiring implementation of all of the recommendations of the site-specific geotechnical study (Cleary 2010) to reduce the potential for property damage and/or hazards as a result of soil conditions and seismic events. The project site is located in an area identified as a high fire severity zone by CAL FIRE (CAL FIRE 2007). However, the project would involve replacing an existing single-family residence with a new single-family residence. Therefore, the project would not result in a change in land use or increase in susceptibility to fire risk. With implementation of identified mitigation, the project would be consistent with this policy.
Resource Management Element		
HAZARDS		
Policy 38. New development shall be sited and designed to minimize risk from geologic, flood, or fire hazards; to assure stability and structural integrity; and to not threaten the stability of a site, contribute	The intent of this policy is to minimize risk associated with geologic, flood, and fire hazards; to assure stability and	Potentially Consistent. The project site is not located in an area identified as being at risk for flooding. The site is located in

Table 4.7.3-1. Applicable Local Plans and Policies Relevant to Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Intent of the Policy in Relation to Avoiding or Mitigating Significant Environmental Impacts	Preliminary Consistency Determination*
significantly to erosion, geologic instability, or destruction of the site or surrounding areas. Areas that are subject to the highest category of fire hazard in the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection Fire Hazard Rating System shall be considered unsuitable for development, unless it can be clearly demonstrated that design measures can adequately mitigate the fire hazard. Mitigation of hazards shall be demonstrated by detailed technical reports specific to the hazard type in question (e.g., soils, geologic, geotechnical, erosion control, fire hazard, etc.) that are prepared by persons who are appropriately qualified in the hazard field in question (e.g., civil engineers and engineering geologists familiar with coastal processes, geotechnical engineers, etc.) and that are submitted as part of any permit application. All technical reports shall be prepared consistent with County criteria for such reports (e.g., criteria for detail on seismic hazards are contained in the General Plan Safety Element; criteria for detail on fire hazards are based on the fire hazard rating system of the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection; criteria for detail on shoreline hazards are based on Coastal Commission guidelines). All technical reports and analyses shall accompany development applications and/or be part of any required environmental documentation (e.g., that associated with CEQA).	structural integrity; and to not threaten the stability of a site, contribute significantly to erosion, geologic instability, or destruction of the site or surrounding areas.	an area designated as having a high potential for erosion and the project includes the implementation of an erosion control plan and a drainage plan to mitigate associated impacts. The project site is located in an area identified as a high fire severity zone by CAL FIRE, but not the highest category of fire hazard (i.e., very high) (CAL FIRE 2007).The project would involve replacing an existing single-family residence with a new single-family residence. Therefore, the project would not result in a change in land use or increase in susceptibility to fire risk. A site-specific geotechnical study has also been prepared for the project (Cleary 2010), consistent with this section. Mitigation has been identified requiring implementation of all of the recommendations of the geotechnical study to reduce the potential for property damage and/or hazards as a result of soil instability and seismic events. With implementation of identified mitigation, the project would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 45. The fire hazard policies contained in the Safety Element of the Monterey County General Plan and the clearance requirements of the State Forest and Fire Law (Section 4291 of the Public Resources Code) shall be regularly and consistently applied provided they are consistent with all other policies of this LUP. For example, exceptions to the State Forest and Fire Law may be necessary where ESHA is present and/or where prior restrictions (including in Forest Management Plans) dictate otherwise. The County's fire hazard map should be updated regularly, including in accordance with the most current California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection hazard	The intent of this policy is to ensure the implementation of the fire hazard policies contained in the Monterey County General Plan.	Potentially Consistent. The project site is located in an area identified as a high fire severity zone by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE 2007). However, the project would be constructed in accordance with the CBC and the proposed land use would not differ substantially from the existing use. Fire response services would continue to be

Table 4.7.3-1. Applicable Local Plans and Policies Relevant to Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Intent of the Policy in Relation to Avoiding or Mitigating Significant Environmental Impacts	Preliminary Consistency Determination*
rating criteria, as new and more specific information becomes available.		provided to the project site by CAL FIRE. Therefore, the project would not result in a change in land use or increase in susceptibility to fire risk.

* Although a preliminary determination regarding project consistency is made, it is the responsibility of the County Planning Commission or Board of Supervisors, the lead CEQA decision makers, to make the final determination regarding consistency issues.

4.7.3.3 Thresholds of Significance

a) Pursuant to Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, a substantial impact related to hazards and hazardous materials would occur if the project would: Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to California Government Code §65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

4.7.3.4 Impact Assessment Methodology

This impact analysis focuses on potential effects of hazards and hazardous materials associated with the proposed project. The evaluation considers current conditions in the project area, findings of regulatory agency database searches, applicable regulations and guidelines, and proposed project construction and operations.

4.7.3.5 Impact Assessment and Mitigation Measures

<u>Create a significant hazard through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.</u>

Construction of the proposed project would not include the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Construction activities would include the demolition of the existing single-family residence and ancillary components, which have the potential to contain hazardous building materials (such as asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint). However, disposal of any potential hazardous materials would be at a properly permitted facility and would be conducted in accordance with applicable regulations. All removed materials would be hauled offsite for recycling or disposal at the Monterey Regional Waste Management District facility.

Operation of the proposed project consists of single family residential uses and would not include routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant* and no mitigation is necessary.

Create a significant hazard involving the release of hazardous materials.

Hazardous materials in the form of petroleum products, such as gasoline, diesel fuel, lubricants, and cleaning solvents would likely be used to fuel construction equipment and vehicles during construction of the proposed project. Inadvertent spill or release of these materials could adversely affect workers on the site in addition to adjacent ESHA and soil and water resources. Standard mitigation would ensure potential spills are avoided to the extent feasible and impacts of any potential spill minimized to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts associated with the upset or accidental release of hazardous materials would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

HAZ Impact 1	
Implementation of the proposed project has the potential to result in the inadvertent upset or release of hazardous materials used to fuel and maintain construction equipment and vehicles during construction of the proposed project, resulting in a potentially significant impact.	
Mitigation Measures (mm) and Mitigation Monitoring Actions (mma)	
HAZ/mm-1.1	*Prior to issuance of demolition, grading, or construction permits, the Applicant shall prepare a Hazardous Material Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure Plan to minimize the potential for, and effects of, spills of hazardous or toxic substances during construction of the project. The plan shall be submitted for review and approval by the Monterey County Resource Management Agency – Planning Department, and shall include, at minimum, the following:* *a. A description of storage procedures and construction site maintenance and upkeep practices;* *b. Identification of a person or persons responsible for monitoring implementation of the plan and spill response;* *c. Identification of Best Management Practices to be implemented to ensure minimal impacts to the environment occur, including but not limited to the use of containment devices for hazardous materials, training of construction staff regarding safety practices to reduce the chance for spills or accidents, and use of non-toxic substances where feasible;* *d. A description of proper procedures for containing, diverting, isolating, and cleaning up spills, hazardous substances, and/or soils, in a manner that minimizes impacts on surface and groundwater quality and sensitive biological resources;* *e. A description of the actions required if a spill occurs, including which authorities to contact and proper clean-up procedures; and,* *f. A requirement that all construction personnel participate in an awareness training program conducted by qualified personnel approved by the Monterey County Resource Management Agency – Planning Department. The training must include a description of the Hazardous Materials Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure Plan, the plan's requirements for spill prevention, information regarding the importance of preventing spills, the appropriate measures to take should a spill occur, and identification of the location of all clean-up materials and equipment.*
HAZ/mma-1.1.1	*Prior to issuance of demolition, grading, or construction permits, the applicant shall submit a Hazardous Material Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure Plan to the County of Monterey Resource Management Agency – Planning Department establishing compliance with this measure.*

HAZ Impact 1	
HAZ/mm-1.2	*During construction activities, the cleaning and refueling of equipment and vehicles shall occur only within a designated staging area. This staging area shall conform to Best Management Practices applicable to attaining zero discharge of stormwater runoff. At a minimum, all equipment and vehicles shall be checked and maintained on a daily basis to ensure proper operation and avoid potential leaks or spills.*
HAZ/mma-1.2.1	*Prior to issuance of demolition, grading, or construction permits, the applicant shall submit revised project plans to the County of Monterey Resource Management Agency – Planning Department identifying designated staging areas in compliance with this measure.*
HAZ/mm-1.3	*All project-related spills of hazardous materials within or adjacent to the project area shall be cleaned-up immediately. Spill prevention and clean-up materials shall be on-site at all times during construction.*
HAZ/mma-1.3.1	*Throughout project construction, the environmental monitor shall submit regular monitoring reports to the County of Monterey Resource Management Agency – Planning Department establishing compliance with this measure.*
Residual Impacts	
With implementation of the above mitigation measure, residual impacts associated with inadvertent spill or release of hazardous materials would be less than significant.	

Emit hazardous emissions within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

The proposed project is not located within a 0.25-mile radius of a school. The nearest school is Stevenson High School, located approximately 0.8 mile east of the project site. There are no proposed schools located within 0.25 mile of the project site. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not emit hazardous emission or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. No other project-related effects are expected to directly or indirectly impact existing or proposed schools. Impacts would be *less than significant* and no mitigation is necessary.

Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites.

Based on a review of regulatory agencies' databases, there are no known hazardous waste and substances sites designated by the DTSC, leaking underground storage tank sites designated by the SWRCB, solid waste disposal sites identified by the SWRCB, or cease and desist orders or cleanup and abatement orders located within a 0.5-mile radius of the project site (CalEPA 2015). Therefore, *no impact* would occur and no mitigation is necessary.

Result in a safety hazard in the vicinity of an airport.

The project is located approximately 6.3 miles west of the Monterey Regional Airport and approximately 13 miles southwest of the Watsonville Municipal Airport. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan and is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area due to project proximity to an existing airport. *No impact* would occur and no mitigation is necessary.

Result in a safety hazard in the vicinity of a private airstrip.

There are no private airstrips located within 6 miles of the project site. The proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area due to the project proximity to an existing private airstrip. Therefore, *no impact* would occur and no mitigation is necessary.

Interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

The proposed project includes the demolition of an existing single-family residence and construction of a new single-family residence on a residential lot on Signal Hill Road. The project would not require any street closures or detours and would not restrict access to Signal Hill Road. The proposed project would not impair the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, *no impact* would occur and no mitigation is necessary.

Expose people to wildland fires.

The project site is located in an area identified as a high fire severity zone by CAL FIRE (CAL FIRE 2007). However, the project would involve replacing an existing single-family residence with a new single-family residence and would not result in a substantial change in land use or increase in susceptibility to fire risk at the site. The site is located within an existing developed neighborhood and CAL FIRE would continue to provide fire prevention and response services to the project site. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant* and no mitigation is necessary.

4.7.3.6 Cumulative Impacts

Implementation of the proposed project, combined with current and future development, could result in the exposure of people and property to hazardous materials. However, impacts associated with hazardous materials are generally site-specific and not affected by regional development. Additionally, hazardous materials impacts associated with the proposed project are limited to the inadvertent spill or release of hazardous materials used for fueling and maintaining construction equipment and vehicles used during the construction phase of the proposed project. Implementation of mitigation measures would ensure that the project does not result in significant impacts resulting from an inadvertent spill or release of hazardous materials. The proposed project is not expected to contribute to a cumulative impact associated with hazardous resources. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be *less than significant* and no additional mitigation is necessary.

4.7.4 Land Use and Planning

4.7.4.1 Existing Conditions

Land Uses at the Project Site

The project site is located at 1170 Signal Hill Road (APN 008-261-007-000), within the Spyglass Cypress Planning Area of the Del Monte Forest Area Land Use Plan, in the unincorporated community of Pebble Beach, Monterey County, California. The 2.22-acre lot was created by the El Pescadero RHO subdivision and is located within an existing residential neighborhood above 17-Mile Drive, overlooking the Pacific Ocean. The site currently supports degraded dune habitat and a single-family residence designed by eminent southern California architect Richard Neutra. Existing vegetation includes native dune habitat, Monterey cypress trees, eucalyptus and Monterey pine trees, iceplant, and European beach grass.

The project site is zoned LDR and is within the 1.5 D District, within the Coastal Zone.

Surrounding Land Uses

The project site is surrounded by the Cypress Point Golf Course to the south and southwest, and 17-Mile Drive and the Pacific Ocean to the west. Undeveloped dune habitat is located across Signal Hill Road to the east and single family residences are located to the north and south, off 17-Mile Drive and Signal Hill Road. These surrounding uses are shown on Figure 2-2.

4.7.4.2 Regulatory Setting

The Del Monte Forest LUP and County LCP govern land use and development in the project area.

Table 4.7.4-1 lists applicable state, regional, and local land use policies and regulations pertaining to land use and planning that were adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect and that are relevant to the proposed project. A general overview of these policy documents is presented in Chapter 3, Environmental Setting. Also included in Table 4.7.4-1 is an analysis of project consistency with identified policies and regulations.

Table 4.7.4-1. Applicable Local Plans and Policies Relevant to Land Use and Planning

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Intent of the Policy in Relation to Avoiding or Mitigating Significant Environmental Impacts	Preliminary Consistency Determination*
County of Monterey Del Monte Forest Area Land Use Plan		
Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan Key Policies		
Land Use and Development: Land use designations are directive as to the type of use, but uses shall only be allowed provided such use and related development can be accomplished consistent with LUP policies, including resource protection requirements. Development shall be sited and designed in such a manner as to protect and enhance coastal resources, including public recreational access.	The intent of this policy is to ensure development is consistent with the Land Use Plan and that coastal resources and public recreational access are protected and enhanced.	Potentially Consistent. The proposed project would not result in a change in land use and would be consistent with the LUP. The project would not significantly affect coastal resources or public access, consistent with this policy.
Public Access: Visual and physical public access to and along the shoreline and the enjoyment of public recreational values throughout the Del Monte Forest, consistent with the basic purpose of the California Coastal Act, shall be maximized. This LUP shall also seek to ensure that the beauty of the Del Monte Forest Area coast, its tranquility, and the health of its environment will not be marred by public overuse or neglect.	The intent of this policy is to ensure the protection of the Del Monte Forest coastline.	Potentially Consistent. The proposed project would not substantially interfere with public views or access in the project vicinity. Public visual access from Signal Hill Road would be impacted and blocked by the larger proposed residential structure; however, views from this location would be limited. The project would not result in increased use, neglect or impacts to the coastline, consistent with this policy.
Land Use and Development Element		
LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT POLICIES		
Policy 64. Development and use of the land, whether public or private, shall conform to the policies and shall meet resource protection requirements as set forth in this LUP. This includes development on legal lots of record as well as new subdivisions.	The intent of this policy is to ensure the protection of resources.	Potentially Inconsistent. The proposed project would be potentially inconsistent with LUP policies related to the protection of ESHA and historical resources, as further described in Section 4.2 and 4.3 of the EIR (Biological Resources and Historical Resources). Because the project would be potentially inconsistent with several resource protection requirements of the LUP, it is also potentially inconsistent with this

Table 4.7.4-1. Applicable Local Plans and Policies Relevant to Land Use and Planning

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Intent of the Policy in Relation to Avoiding or Mitigating Significant Environmental Impacts	Preliminary Consistency Determination*
		policy. Refer to Section 4.2 and 4.3 for additional information related to the potential inconsistencies.
Policy 65. Figure 5 reflects maximum allowable development densities, including for any proposed subdivision of legal lots of record. Proposed development, including subdivision, shall only be allowed up to the maximum density allowed if such development is (and will be, in the case of the commitment to future development in subdivisions) consistent with all policies of this LUP, including resource protection requirements.	The intent of this policy is to ensure consistency with allowable development densities.	Potentially Consistent. The project site is within the LDR/1.5-Design Control District, within the Coastal Zone designation, and would replace the existing single-family residence with a new single-family residence, consistent with the 1.5 acre/unit allowable density and this policy.
Policy 66. County design review shall be required for all development in Del Monte Forest.	The intent of this policy is to ensure that all development proposed within the Del Monte Forest is reviewed by the County.	Potentially Consistent. The project is subject to design review by the County, consistent with this policy.
Policy 68. New development shall incorporate mitigation measures to avoid, and where unavoidable, to minimize and reasonably mitigate potential adverse environmental impacts.	The intent of this policy is to ensure the protection of resources.	Potentially Consistent. The EIR identifies mitigation measures that would avoid and/or minimize potential significant environmental impacts, consistent with this policy.
Public Access Element		
PUBLIC ACCESS POLICIES		
Policy 125. New development shall be sited and designed to avoid adversely affecting public access areas, including trail access (see, for example, Figure 8). Trail dedications necessary to provide public access connections to existing public access areas consistent with LUP policies shall be required as a condition of development approval. If, due to habitat or safety constraints, development entirely outside existing trail routes is not feasible, the route shall be realigned if otherwise appropriate and LUP consistent. Approved realignments shall be generally equivalent in terms of connectivity, utility, and public use value to the original route.	The intent of this policy is to preserve public access areas.	Potentially Consistent. Implementation of the proposed project includes replacing an existing single-family residence with a new single-family residence on an existing lot. The project would not restrict public access, consistent with this policy.

Table 4.7.4-1. Applicable Local Plans and Policies Relevant to Land Use and Planning

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Intent of the Policy in Relation to Avoiding or Mitigating Significant Environmental Impacts	Preliminary Consistency Determination*
Policy 126. While encouraging maximum public access, this LUP also intends to ensure that the privacy, safety, health, and property of residents are protected through the implementation of the following standards for the siting and design of public access improvements in residential areas. a. Provide adequate separation between shoreline access and residential uses to protect the privacy and security of homes. Specifically, keep the edge of lateral shoreline trails 25 feet, and vertical shoreline access trails 10 feet, from any occupied residential structure if feasible while still providing for adequate public access. b. Maximize the use of appropriate landscaping, fences and grade separation between access routes and residences to protect privacy so long as such measures do not adversely impact access connectivity, utility, and public use value.	The intent of this policy is to encourage public access while maintaining privacy, safety, health and property for residents.	Potentially Consistent. The proposed project would replace an existing single-family residence with a new single-family residence and would not increase public access or uses within or immediately adjacent to the private lot, consistent with this policy.
Monterey County Coastal Implementation Plan		
Part 1 Title 20 Zoning Ordinance		
20.14 – LDR (CZ) DISTRICT		
20.14.060 Site Development Standards. A. Minimum Building Site The minimum building site shall be 1 acre unless otherwise approved as part of a clustered residential development. B. Development Density, Maximum The maximum development density shall not exceed the acres/unit shown for the specific "LDR" district as shown on the zoning map (e.g. "LDR/2" means an "LDR" district with a maximum gross density of 2 acres/unit). C. Structure Height and Setback Regulations The following structure height and setback regulations apply unless superseded by a structure height limit noted on the zoning map (e.g. "LDR/2.5 (24)" would mean a structure height limit of 24 feet), setback requirements when combined with a "B" district, setbacks	The intent of this policy is to establish building standards for lots designated for low density residential use.	Potentially Consistent. The project would involve replacing an existing single-family residence with a new single-family residence on a residential lot within the LDR/1.5-Design Control District, within the Coastal Zone. The lot is approximately 2.22 acres and within the 1.5 acres/unit maximum allowable density. The proposed development would be within minimum setbacks and would include a total construction footprint of 8,058 square feet, which constitutes approximately 8.3% of the project site, consistent with maximum allowable floor area ratios. The maximum

Table 4.7.4-1. Applicable Local Plans and Policies Relevant to Land Use and Planning

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Intent of the Policy in Relation to Avoiding or Mitigating Significant Environmental Impacts	Preliminary Consistency Determination*
shown on a recorded final or parcel map, or setback lines on a Sectional District Map. In a subdivision where a lot or lots have a designated building envelope, the dwelling unit and accessory structures shall be located wholly within the building envelope. 1. Main Structures a. Minimum Setbacks Front: 30 feet Side: 20 feet Rear: 20 feet b. Height: Maximum Height: 30 feet 2. Accessory Structures (Habitable) a. Minimum Setbacks Front: 50 feet Side: 6 feet Rear: 6 feet b. Height: Maximum Height: 15 feet 3. Accessory Structures (Non-habitable) a. Minimum Setbacks Front: 50 feet Side: 6 feet on front one-half of property; 1 foot on rear one-half of property. Rear: 1 foot b. Height Maximum Height: 15 feet c. Agricultural windmills are exempt from the height provisions of this Chapter. 4. Accessory structures used as barns, stables or farm out buildings shall not be less than 50 feet from the front of the property or 20 feet from the side or rear property line or 20		height of the structure would be 30 feet above average natural grade, equal to the established maximum height limits and consistent with this section.

Table 4.7.4-1. Applicable Local Plans and Policies Relevant to Land Use and Planning

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Intent of the Policy in Relation to Avoiding or Mitigating Significant Environmental Impacts	Preliminary Consistency Determination*
feet from any residence on the property. The maximum height shall be 30 feet. D. Minimum Distance Between Structures Main Structures: 20 feet Accessory/Main Structures: 10 feet Accessory/Accessory Structures: 6 feet E. Building Site Coverage, Maximum: 15% F. Floor Area Ratio (Del Monte Forest Only) LDR/1 Zoning Districts: 20% LDR/1.5 Zoning Districts: 17.5% LDR/2 Zoning Districts: 17.5% G. Parking Regulations Parking for all development shall be established pursuant to Chapter 20.58. H. Landscaping Requirements None, except as may be required by condition of approval of a Coastal Administrative or Coastal Development Permit. I. Lighting Plan Requirements: None, except as may be required by condition of approval of a Coastal Administrative or Coastal Development Permit. J. Sign Regulations Signing for all development shall be established pursuant to Chapter 20.60.		
Monterey County Coastal Implementation Plan		
Part 5 Regulations for Development in the Del Monte Forest Plan Area (Chapter 20.147)		
20.147.090 Land Use and Development A. Development Standards 1. All development and use of the land, whether public or private, shall conform to the policies and shall meet resource protection requirements as set forth in the LCP.	The intent of this section is to ensure that land use is consistent with identified land use designations, provided such uses and related development can be accomplished consistent with the LCP,	Potentially Inconsistent. The proposed project would be potentially inconsistent with LUP policies related to the protection of ESHA and historical resources, as further described in Section 4.2 and 4.3 of the EIR (Biological

Table 4.7.4-1. Applicable Local Plans and Policies Relevant to Land Use and Planning

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Intent of the Policy in Relation to Avoiding or Mitigating Significant Environmental Impacts	Preliminary Consistency Determination*
2. New residential driveways and other vehicular surfaces shall be sited and designed: to minimize surface length and width as much as possible and still provide simple and direct access: to minimize runoff (including through use of permeable materials, detention/retention areas, filtration strips, etc.); and to filter and treat runoff (including through vegetative controls as well as engineered collection/treatment units) from such surfaces prior to discharge offsite and/or to sensitive receptors. Circular driveways, parking spaces above the number needed for the specific application in question, and other types of extraneous impervious vehicular surfaces shall not be allowed. Other vehicular surfaces are limited to a minimum required to meet daily parking needs. Development shall be modified as necessary for location and siting where such modifications will result in reduction of driveway length, vehicular surfaces, and other impervious surfaces. This development standard shall not be read to preclude safe bicycle lanes or adequate parking for commercial visitor serving development and access points. 3. Proposed development, including subdivision, shall only be allowed up to the maximum density allowed if such development is (and will be, in the case of the commitment to future development in subdivisions) consistent with all policies of this LCP, including resource protection requirements. 4. County design review shall be required for all development in Del Monte Forest. 5. Environmentally sensitive habitat areas shall be protected from both direct and indirect adverse impacts of development. 6. New development shall incorporate mitigation measures to avoid, and where unavoidable, to minimize and reasonably mitigate potential adverse environmental impacts.	including its resource protection requirements.	Resources and Historical Resources). Because the project would be potentially inconsistent with several resource protection requirements of the LUP, it is also potentially inconsistent with this policy. The driveway would be extend just past the minimum site setback and would be sited and designed to minimize length and provide simple and direct access. It would also be designed to minimize runoff and collect and direct stormwater, consistent with this section. The project is within maximum allowable densities and requires County design review. The project would result in direct and indirect impacts on ESHA; however all feasible mitigation has been identified in the EIR and would be incorporated into the project to reduce impacts to less than significant levels.
20.147.130 Public Access B. Access Requirement 1. Public recreational access opportunities shall be maximally provided consistent with public safety needs and the need to	The intent of this section is to ensure that visual and physical public access to and along the shoreline and the enjoyment of public recreational values throughout the Del Monte Forest are maximized.	Potentially Consistent. The project would not restrict or modify public recreational access opportunities. It would not provide additional or increased public access and would not result in overuse

Table 4.7.4-1. Applicable Local Plans and Policies Relevant to Land Use and Planning

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Intent of the Policy in Relation to Avoiding or Mitigating Significant Environmental Impacts	Preliminary Consistency Determination*
protect public rights, rights of private property owners, and natural resource areas from overuse. 2. Where development includes or is required to provide public access, any land area to which such public access applies shall be dedicated directly or offered in dedication as an easement or in fee to Monterey County as a condition of project approval required to be completed prior to issuance of building or grading permits. The dedication or offer of dedication shall be in accordance with the requirements of Section 20.64.280. The County may designate another public agency or non-profit acceptable to the Board of Supervisors to accept such access dedications if the recipient demonstrates the ability to manage them consistent with the specific objectives associated with the public access area in question and the public trust. The terms of all access dedications may be enforced by the County or their designee, and shall revert to the County if the recipient is unable or unwilling to appropriately manage the public access area in question consistent with its intended purpose in the future. All dedications shall be accompanied by adequate funding to allow the public access objectives and requirements to be fully realized. Direct dedications are the preferred method of implementing these easement and/or property transfer requirements, but offers to dedicate easements and/or property may also be used if a direct dedication is not possible. Dedicated access areas shall not be required to be opened to public use until a public agency or private association agrees to accept responsibility for maintenance and liability of the access area. 3. New development shall include public access except where: (a) it is inconsistent with public safety, military security needs, or the protection of fragile coastal resources, or adequate public access exists nearby; or (b) the new development project does not impact public access. The amount and type of public access provided shall be directly related and proportional to the public access impact identified.		or neglect of public recreational areas, consistent with this section.

Table 4.7.4-1. Applicable Local Plans and Policies Relevant to Land Use and Planning

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Intent of the Policy in Relation to Avoiding or Mitigating Significant Environmental Impacts	Preliminary Consistency Determination*
20.147.130 Public Access C. Development Standards 4. For areas not appropriate for access, public access shall be discouraged. Where such areas are located on private land, the County shall cooperate with landowners to develop effective methods for directing access to appropriate locations. 5. Public viewsheds are an important component of shoreline access and public recreational use. Development shall not block significant public views and shall not significantly adversely impact public views and scenic character, including with specific attention to the 17-Mile Drive corridor and designated public access areas/vista points. 6. Development on sites that could provide for enhanced public access (e.g., filling a gap in relation to adjacent access areas) should be required to provide such access, including through dedication of access easements and/or property. 7. New development shall be sited and designed to avoid adversely affecting public access areas, including trail access (see, for example, LUP Figure 8). Trail dedications necessary to provide public access connections to existing public access areas consistent with LCP policies shall be required as a condition of development approval. A trail may be realigned due to habitat or safety constraints if appropriate and consistent with the LCP. Approved realignments shall be generally equivalent in terms of connectivity, utility, and public use value to the original route. 8. While encouraging maximum public access, this LCP also intends to ensure that the privacy, safety, health, and property of residents are protected through the implementation of the following standards for the siting and design of public access improvements in residential areas: (a) To provide adequate separation between shoreline access and residential uses to protect the privacy and security of homes, the edge of lateral shoreline access trails must be located a minimum of 25 feet, and	The intent of this section is to ensure that visual and physical public access to and along the shoreline and the enjoyment of public recreational values throughout the Del Monte Forest are maximized.	Potentially Consistent. The project would not restrict or modify public recreational access opportunities. The project would not encourage public access on private land and the project site is not needed to provide additional public access, which is available in numerous areas in the immediate project vicinity. The project would not change internal circulation patterns or accessways. The project would result in potentially significant impacts on public views from 17-Mile Drive and other public vantage point. Mitigation has been identified to reduce potential visual impacts to less than significant, including requirements to avoid ridgeline development and to provide additional vegetative screening (refer to Section 4.1, Aesthetic Resources). With implementation of identified mitigation, the proposed project would be consistent with this section.

Table 4.7.4-1. Applicable Local Plans and Policies Relevant to Land Use and Planning

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Intent of the Policy in Relation to Avoiding or Mitigating Significant Environmental Impacts	Preliminary Consistency Determination*
vertical shoreline access trails a minimum of 10 feet, from any occupied residential structure if feasible while still providing for adequate public access. (b) Maximize the use of appropriate landscaping, fences and grade separation between access routes and residences to protect privacy so long as such measures do not adversely impact access connectivity, utility, and public use value. 19. Future development shall be compatible with the goal of retaining and enhancing public visual access. Development shall not block significant public views and shall not significantly adversely impact public views and scenic character, including with specific attention to the 17-Mile Drive corridor and designated public access areas/vista points, and shall be sited and designed to be compatible with the existing scenic character of the area. 24. Residential development and the internal circulation network of the Forest should be planned and developed in a manner that separates visitor and resident traffic as much as possible.		

* Although a preliminary determination regarding project consistency is made, it is the responsibility of the County Planning Commission or Board of Supervisors, the lead CEQA decision makers, to make the final determination regarding consistency issues.

4.7.4.3 Thresholds of Significance

Pursuant to Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, a substantial impact related to land use and planning would occur if the project would:

a) Physically divide an established community?

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

4.7.4.4 Impact Assessment Methodology

The analysis considers the proposed project's potential to conflict with applicable plans, policies, and regulations governing land use decisions in the project area that were adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. This analysis addresses the potential for temporary, indirect impacts on land use during construction, as well as long-term impacts resulting from project siting and operation.

4.7.4.5 Impact Assessment and Mitigation Measures

Physically divide an established community.

The proposed project includes replacing an existing single-family residence with a new single family residence on an existing lot within a developed neighborhood. The proposed project would not physically divide an established community. Therefore, *no impact* would occur and mitigation is not necessary.

Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation.

Section 15125(d) of the CEQA Guidelines requires analysis of a project's potential to conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effects. There are numerous plans, policies, and regulations that either are implicated by relevant significance criteria or were adopted for environmental purposes and thus are evaluated under the appropriate topical sections of this EIR.

This impact analysis evaluates overall project consistency with applicable plans, policies, and regulations pertaining to land use and planning. As shown in Table 4.7.4-1, the proposed project would be potentially inconsistent with various policies related to the protection of ESHA and historical resources. Potential significant impacts associated with those potential inconsistencies are discussed in Section 4.2 and 4.3 of the EIR (Biological Resources and Historical Resources). Numerous other potential inconsistencies would be avoided with implementation of identified mitigation measures that would bring the proposed project into consistency with applicable plans and policies. No additional policy inconsistencies are expected to result from implementation of the project outside of those specifically addressed elsewhere in the EIR.

The proposed land use would not differ from existing uses at the project site and would be consistent with surrounding residential uses within the LDR category. Therefore, impacts relating to land use and planning would be *less than significant* and no mitigation is necessary.

Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

The project site is not located within an adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan area. Therefore, *no impact* would occur and no mitigation is necessary.

4.7.4.6 Cumulative Impacts

The geographic scope of this cumulative impacts analysis is the local project vicinity as well as the Spyglass Cypress Planning Area of the Del Monte Forest Area LUP. If approved as it has been proposed, the project would conflict with numerous adopted land use policies and regulations that are intended to avoid and/or mitigate an adverse environmental impacts. However, all feasible mitigation measures have been identified to ensure consistency and reduce potentially significant environmental impacts to less than significant levels. Remaining inconsistencies and potential environmental impacts resulting from these inconsistencies are discussed elsewhere in this EIR (refer to Sections 4.2 and 4.3 of the EIR, Biological Resources and Historical Resources). With implementation of identified mitigation measures, the project would generally be consistent with applicable plans and policies. The proposed use is also compatible with existing and surrounding land uses and would not result in an incompatible land use at the project site. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to land use and planning area expected to be *less than significant* and no mitigation is necessary.

4.7.5 Mineral Resources

4.7.5.1 Existing Conditions

In accordance with the State of California's Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA) (discussed in Section 4.7.5.2, below), the state geologist, through CGS (formerly known as the California Division of Mines and Geology), is responsible for identifying and mapping the non-fuel mineral resources of the state. Economically significant mineral deposits are classified based on the known and inferred mineral resource potential of the land using the California Mineral Land Classification System, which includes the following four mineral resource zones (MRZs).

- MRZ-1: Areas where adequate information indicates that no significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that little likelihood exists for their presence.
- MRZ-2: Areas where adequate information indicates that significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that a high likelihood exists for their presence.
- MRZ-3: Areas containing mineral deposits, the significance of which cannot be evaluated.
- MRZ-4: Areas where available information is inadequate for assignment to any other zone.

The CGS's classification of lands in the Monterey Bay Production–Consumption Region, within which the proposed project is located, focuses on significant sand, gravel, or stone deposits that are suitable as sources of aggregate (California Department of Conservation 1987). At the end of 1980, the Monterey Bay Production-Consumption Region was estimated to have 3.1 billion tons of aggregate within its resource sector, consisting of more than 715 million tons of sand and gravel and more than 2,366 million tons of stone (California Department of Conservation 1987). Construction-grade aggregate is used in construction to provide bulk and strength to concrete,

plaster, and stucco, and is used in road construction and other building applications. The CGS estimates that the Monterey Bay Production–Consumption Region has 323 million tons of permitted aggregate reserves. The estimated 50-year demand for aggregate in the region is 346 million tons (CGS 2012).

The majority of the Del Monte Forest area, including the project site, is designated as MRZ 3, indicating areas containing mineral deposits, the significance of which cannot be evaluated from available data (California Department of Conservation 1999). There are no known significant mineral resources on the project site, though the project site contains dune sands that have historically been mined in Monterey County.

The Office of Mine Reclamation periodically publishes a list of mines regulated under SMARA that meet provisions set forth under PRC §2717(b). There are a total of 12 active mines in Monterey County; however, there are no mines located within 0.5 mile of the project site (California Department of Conservation 2015b). The Del Monte Quarry, a sand and gravel mine operated by Granite Construction, is the closest mining operation approximately 2 miles east of the project site. This mine is no longer active.

4.7.5.2 Regulatory Setting

State Policies and Regulations

California Department of Conservation

The California Department of Conservation is the primary agency charged with mineral resource protection in California. Several divisions within the California Department of Conservation (the CGS, the Office of Mine Reclamation, the Division of Land Resource Protection, and the Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources) are responsible for managing the development, utilization, and conservation of mineral resources, and the reclamation of mined lands.

Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975

The SMARA (PRC Chapter 9, Division 2, §2710 et seq.) requires the State Mining and Geology Board to adopt state policies for the reclamation of mined lands and the conservation of mineral resources. These policies are found in 24 CCR Division 2, Chapter 8, Subchapter 1. In accordance with SMARA, the State of California established the Mineral Land Classification System to help identify and protect mineral resources in areas that are subject to urban expansion or other irreversible land uses that would preclude mineral extraction. Protected mineral resources include construction materials, industrial and chemical mineral materials, metallic and rare minerals, and non-fluid mineral fuels.

Local Policies and Regulations

Table 4.7.5-1 lists applicable state, regional, and local land use policies and regulations pertaining to mineral resources that were adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect and that are relevant to the proposed project. Also included in Table 4.7.5-1 is an analysis of project consistency with identified policies and regulations.

Table 4.7.5-1. Applicable Local Plans and Policies Relevant to Mineral Resources

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Intent of the Policy in Relation to Avoiding or Mitigating Significant Environmental Impacts	Preliminary Consistency Determination*
County of Monterey Code of Ordinances		
Chapter 16.04 Surface Mining and Reclamation		
SECTION 16.04.140 MINERAL RESOURCE PROTECTION		
This Section protects mineral resource areas that have been classified by the California Division of Mines and Geology or designated by the State Mining and Geology Board, as well as existing surface mining operations that remain in compliance with the provisions of Chapter 16.04, from intrusion by incompatible land uses that may impede or preclude mineral extraction or processing, to the extent possible while remaining consistent with the Monterey County General Plan.	The intent of this ordinance is to protect classified mineral resource areas.	Potentially Consistent. Demolition, construction, and development of the proposed project would occur on previously disturbed and developed areas on a residential lot. The project site does not support known mineral resources and the potential for dune sands located at the site to be mined in the future is extremely low due to site constraints, such as existing land use designations and zoning regulations, surrounding land uses that would be incompatible with mining activities, and LCP requirements for the protection of on-site ESHA.

* Although a preliminary determination regarding project consistency is made, it is the responsibility of the County Planning Commission or Board of Supervisors, the lead CEQA decision makers, to make the final determination regarding consistency issues.

4.7.5.3 Thresholds of Significance

Pursuant to Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, a substantial impact to mineral resources would occur if the project would:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

4.7.5.4 Impact Assessment Methodology

This impact analysis evaluates the potential for the proposed project to result in the loss or availability of locally or regionally important mineral resources classified by the CGS using the California Mineral Land Classification System, and mineral resource maps produced by Monterey County.

4.7.5.5 Impact Assessment and Mitigation Measures

Result in the loss of a known mineral resource.

As discussed previously, the project site is located in an area that is designated as MRZ 3, indicating it is an area containing mineral deposits, the significance of which cannot be evaluated from available data (California Department of Conservation 1999). Although the project site contains dune sands that have historically been mined in the County, all demolition, grading, construction, and development activities associated with the proposed project would occur within previously disturbed and developed areas within the residential lot. Mining potential at the site is severely restricted by applicable LUP and LCP policies and regulations. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant* and no mitigation is necessary.

Result in the loss of a locally important mineral resource recovery site.

Based on a review of all applicable local plans, there are no known mineral resources or recovery sites located within the project site or the immediate vicinity; therefore, implementation of the proposed project is not expected to result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site. Impacts would be *less than significant* and no mitigation is necessary.

4.7.5.6 Cumulative Impacts

Although the project site consists of dune sands that have historically been mined in the County, mining potential at the site is severely restricted by applicable LUP and LCP policies and regulations. There are no known mineral resource recovery sites located on the project site. The proposed project would not include any form of mineral extraction and is not expected to result in short-term, long-term or cumulative impacts to mineral resources. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be *less than significant* and no mitigation is necessary.

4.7.6 Noise

4.7.6.1 Existing Conditions

Existing Noise Environment

Noise, as used herein, is defined as unwanted sound. The effects of noise are generally considered in two ways: 1) how a proposed project may increase existing noise levels and

potentially affect surrounding land uses; and 2) how a proposed land use may be affected by noise from existing and surrounding land uses.

Sound is measured in decibels (dB), and A-weighted decibels (dBA) are an expression of the relative loudness of sounds in air as perceived by the human ear. Generally, a 1 dBA increase in the noise level is the minimum perceptible change the human ear can detect. A 3 dBA change is readily noticeable by most people, and a 10 dBA change would be perceived as twice as loud or approximately a doubling of the noise level.

The most significant and common source of noise in the vicinity of the project site is vehicles traveling on local roadways. Other typical noise sources in the project vicinity include distant traffic, wind and surf along the coastline, birds overhead, dogs barking, landscape and golf course maintenance activities, and occasional aircraft overflights.

Sensitive Receptors

Noise-sensitive land uses are generally defined as locations where people reside or where the presence of unwanted sound could adversely affect the use of the land. Noise-sensitive land uses typically include residences, hospitals, schools, guest lodgings, libraries, and certain types of passive recreational uses, such as parks to be used for reading, conversation, meditation, and similar uses.

Several sensitive receptors are located within a 0.25-mile radius of the project site. Sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project site include single-family residences north and south of the project site along Signal Hill Road and 17-Mile Drive and portions of the Cypress Point Golf Course located south and southwest of the project site.

4.7.6.2 Regulatory Setting

Noise is regulated predominantly at the state and local levels through regulations, policies, and local ordinances. The Federal Noise Control Act of 1972 recognized that noise control protects the health and welfare of the population; however, it gave responsibility for controlling noise sources to state and local governments. The federal law does provide standards for interstate commerce projects (i.e., airports), and the federal government also provides uniform procedures to evaluate highway noise and implement abatement measures through the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). These standards are commonly adapted for state and local use based on prevailing local conditions or special requirements.

The California Government Code, in its State General Plan Guidelines, requires that local governments identify major noise sources and areas containing noise sensitive land uses. Noise must be quantified by preparing generalized noise exposure contours for current and projected conditions. Noise contours for Monterey County are located in the Noise Element of the County General Plan (1982). Land use compatibility noise exposure levels established by the County are shown in Table 4.7.6-1 below.

Table 4.7.6-1. Land Use Compatibility for Exterior Community Noise

Land Use Category	Noise Ranges, Ldn or CNEL (dB)[1,2]			
	I	II	III	IV
Passively used open spaces	**50**	50-55	55-70	70+
Auditoriums, concert halls, amphitheaters	45-50	50-65	65-70	70+
Residential—low-density single-family, duplexes, mobile homes	50-55	50-70	70-75	75+
Residential—multifamily	50-60	60-70	70-75	75+
Transient lodging—motels, hotels	50-60	60-70	70-80	80+
Schools, libraries, churches, hospitals, nursing homes	50-60	60-70	70-80	80+
Actively used open spaces—playgrounds, neighborhood parks	50-67	-	67-73	73+
Golf courses, riding stables, water recreation, cemeteries	50-70	-	70-80	80+
Office buildings, business commercial and professional	50-67	67-75	75+	-
Industrial, manufacturing, utilities, agriculture	50-70	70-75	75+	-

Notes:

[1] Ldn = day-night level; CNEL = community noise equivalent level

[2] Noise Ranges I through IV are defined as follows:

Noise Range I—Normally Acceptable. Specified land use is satisfactory, based on the assumption that any buildings involved are of normal conventional construction, without any special noise insulation requirements.

Noise Range II—Conditionally Acceptable. New construction or development should be undertaken only after a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements is made and needed noise insulation features are included in the design. Conventional construction, but with closed windows and fresh air supply systems or air conditioning will normally suffice.

Noise Range III—Normally Unacceptable. New construction or development should generally be discouraged. If new construction or development does proceed, a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements must be made and needed noise insulation features included in the design. **Noise Range IV**—Clearly Unacceptable. New construction or development should generally not be undertaken.

Source: County of Monterey 1982

Additionally, the Monterey City Municipal code has several ordinances governing noise issues.

4.7.6.3 Thresholds of Significance

Pursuant to Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, a substantial impact related to noise and vibration would occur if the project would result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

4.7.6.4 Impact Assessment Methodology

A "substantial" noise increase is defined as one that would interfere with human activities during the day and/or night (as opposed to an absolute, numerical increase over ambient noise levels). Noise impacts are considered significant if they would conflict with the noise level standards established in the applicable local ordinances and general plan noise elements. Consistency with local noise standards are determined by comparing the applicable noise level standard to published equipment noise levels.

4.7.6.5 Impact Assessment and Mitigation Measures

Generate noise levels in excess of standards.

The County's General Plan establishes normally acceptable, conditionally acceptable, normally unacceptable, and clearly unacceptable community noise exposure levels. Conditionally acceptable noise levels are established to allow noise levels generated by new construction or development only after a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirement is made and needed noise insulation features included in the design. For residential land uses consisting of low density, single-family residences, the County has established a normally acceptable community noise exposure level of 50-55 dB and a conditionally acceptable community noise exposure level of 50-70 dB. For golf course land uses, the County has established a normally acceptable community noise exposure level of 50-70 dB and has not established a conditionally acceptable community noise exposure level for this land use.

Implementation of the proposed project would require demolition and construction activities that are expected to temporarily increase ambient noise in the project area. Demolition activities associated with site preparation are proposed to occur over approximately 3 to 4 weeks, including removal of all existing structures, foundation, and debris, and rough grading of the building pad. Construction and grading activities are expected to last approximately 18 to 24 months and would temporarily increase the ambient noise level in the project vicinity during this time. The increase in noise levels during project construction would vary throughout the 18-24 month period, depending on the construction phase and the types of construction equipment being used. All construction-related noise would be temporary and short-term.

The operation of trucks, backhoes, bulldozers, front-end loaders, compactors, scrapers, and other heavy-duty construction equipment that may be used during the construction phase of the project are expected to generate high noise levels. Typical noise levels generated by construction equipment that may be utilized during construction activities are summarized in Table 4.7.6-2 below. These noise levels are typical values based on the construction equipment that is likely to be used for project construction; therefore, there could be fluctuations in actual noise levels, depending on site-specific conditions and the type and combination of equipment used at the construction site.

Table 4.7.6-2. Default Noise Emission Reference Levels

Equipment Description	Spec. 721.560 L_{max} at 50 feet (dBA, slow)
Backhoe	80
Chainsaw	85
Compactor (ground)	80
Concrete Batch Plant	83
Concrete Mixer Truck	85
Concrete Pump Truck	82
Concrete Saw	90
Dozer	85
Dump Truck	84
Flat Bed Truck	84
Front End Loader	80
Grader	85
Paver	85
Pickup Truck	55
Tractor	84
Vibratory Concrete Mixer	80

Source: FHWA 2015.

Noise produced by construction would attenuate over distance at a rate of approximately 6dB per doubling of distance over hard sites (e.g., pavement) and 7.5 dB per doubling of distance over soft sites (e.g., sand or grass). Construction equipment could result in noise up to 90 dB at 50 feet from the source. Based on the attenuation rates described above, maximum construction noise would be reduced to approximately 82.5 dB at 100 feet, 75 dB at 200 feet, and 67.5 dB at 400 feet from the source.

Given the distance between the project site and the golf course (over 250 feet), and intervening vegetation and topography, the increase in ambient noise levels generated by construction activities is not anticipated to exceed the conditionally acceptable community noise exposure level of 70–80 dB. However, the use of certain construction equipment may exceed the established conditionally acceptable community noise exposure level of 50–70 dB for surrounding sensitive receptor residences, which are located less than 150 feet north and south of the proposed construction area. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project may expose sensitive receptors to noise levels in excess of standards established in the County General Plan.

Construction-related noise impacts would be limited in duration to the proposed construction period. Construction would also not be any different or more intensive than any other residential

construction in the project area. Ambient (existing) noise levels in the project area are generally high, due to traffic on 17-Mile Drive and wind and surf along the coastline. The soft site conditions across the parcel (dune sand) and existing elevated noise levels would reduce the noticeability of construction-related noise. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

NOI Impact 1	
Implementation of the proposed project would require use of construction equipment and vehicles that could exceed noise thresholds for sensitive receptors during the construction phase of the proposed project, resulting in a significant effect.	
Mitigation Measures (mm) and Mitigation Monitoring Actions (mma)	
NOI/mm-1.1	*The following noise attenuation measures shall be implemented during construction activities to reduce construction-related noise effects on adjacent sensitive receptors. The following measures shall be noted on construction plans prior to issuance of demolition, grading, or construction permits and shall be implemented throughout the duration of construction activities:* *a. Construction activities shall be limited to daytime hours between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday. No construction shall be allowed on Sundays or national holidays.* *b. Neighborhood notice. Residents and other sensitive receptors within 300 feet of the project site shall be notified of the construction activities, including the nature of construction activities and schedule, in writing, at least 48 hours prior to the initiation of construction activities. The notice shall include contact information for questions and complaints, including name, phone number, address, and e-mail address.* *c. Construction equipment with internal combustion engines shall have sound control devices at least as effective as those provided by the original equipment manufacturer.* *d. No equipment shall be permitted to have an unmuffled exhaust.* *e. Impact tools, such as jack hammers, pavement breakers, and rock drills, used for project demolition or construction shall be hydraulically or electrically powered wherever possible to avoid noise associated with compressed air exhaust from pneumatically powered tools. Where use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler shall be placed on the compressed air exhaust. External jackets shall be used on impact tools, where feasible.* *f. Stationary noise sources shall be located as far away from nearby receptors as possible, and shall muffle, incorporate noise barriers, or implement other noise control measures to the extent feasible.* *g. Trucks and construction equipment shall be prohibited from idling at the construction site or along streets serving the construction site.*
NOI/mma-1.1.1	*Prior to issuance of demolition, grading, or construction permits, the applicant shall submit revised construction plans to the County of Monterey Resource Management Agency – Planning Department establishing compliance with this measure.*
NOI/mma-1.1.2	*Throughout construction activities, the environmental monitor shall submit regular monitoring reports to the County of Monterey Resource Management Agency – Planning Department establishing compliance with this measure.*
Residual Impacts	
With implementation of the above mitigation measure, residual impacts associated with noise exposure would be less than significant.	

Generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

The proposed project would require site preparation, demolition and construction activities that would generate construction-related noise and vibration associated with the demolition of the existing residence and development of a new single-family residence. However, the project does not propose any significant sources of man-made vibration (i.e., sonic booms, blasting, pile driving). Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. Impacts would be *less than significant* and no mitigation is necessary.

Generate a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels.

All significant sources of noise associated with the proposed project would be generated by construction-related activities and would therefore be temporary. Implementation of the proposed project would replace an existing single-family residence with a new single-family residence; therefore, long-term operation of the project is not expected to result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity compared to existing levels. Impacts would be *less than significant* and no mitigation is necessary.

Generate a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels.

As discussed above, the construction-related activities required for the proposed project would generate a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project. The large parcel provides a natural buffer area, within which construction-related noise can attenuate over the soft site conditions before reaching adjacent sensitive receptors. Construction noise is not expected to exceed conditionally acceptable community noise exposure levels for the golf course; however, it could exceed conditionally acceptable community noise exposure levels for surrounding low-density residential sensitive receptors. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant with mitigation.*

NOI Impact 2
Implementation of the proposed project would generate a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels during construction of the project, resulting in a significant effect.
Mitigation Measures (mm) and Mitigation Monitoring Actions (mma)
Implement NOI/mm-1.1, NOI/mma-1.1.1, and NOI/mma-1.1.2.
Residual Impacts
With implementation of the above mitigation measure, residual impacts associated with noise exposure would be less than significant.

Expose people to excessive noise levels in the vicinity of an airport.

The proposed project is not located within any airport land use plan or within two miles of a public or private airstrip, and would not expose people to excessive noise levels. Therefore, *no impact* would occur and no mitigation is necessary.

Expose people to excessive noise levels in the vicinity of a private airstrip.

The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and would not expose people to excessive noise levels. Therefore, *no impact* would occur and no mitigation is necessary.

4.7.6.6 Cumulative Impacts

Construction activities are not considered cumulatively significant due to their short-term nature, and development of one single-family residence within an existing developed neighborhood would not contribute significantly to existing noise levels. Therefore, cumulative impacts associated with noise would be *less than significant* and no mitigation is necessary.

4.7.7 Paleontological Resources

4.7.7.1 Existing Conditions

Most of the fossils found in Monterey County are of marine life forms and form a record of the region's geologic history of advancing and retreating sea levels. Because of the marine origin of these deposits, the area lacks the large, terrestrial fossils found in other regions such as the dinosaur fossils of the southwestern United States. Most of Monterey County's fossils are micro-organisms such as foraminifera or diatoms, or assemblages of mollusks and barnacles most commonly found in sedimentary rocks ranging from Cretaceous age (138 to 96 million years old) to Pleistocene age (1.6 million to 11 thousand years old).

Fossils are found throughout the County because of the widespread distribution of marine deposits. A review of nearly 700 known fossil localities was conducted by paleontologists in 2001, and 12 fossil sites in the County were identified as having outstanding scientific value (Monterey County 2010). None of these sites are located on the Monterey Peninsula and the closest one is located approximately 5 miles south of the project site.

4.7.7.2 Regulatory Setting

Local Policies and Regulations

Table 4.7.7-1 lists applicable state, regional, and local land use policies and regulations pertaining to paleontological resources that were adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect and that are relevant to the proposed project. Also included in Table 4.7.7-1 is an analysis of project consistency with identified policies and regulations. Additional analysis of project consistency with applicable archaeological and historical resources is provided in Sections 4.3 and 4.4 of the EIR, Historical Resources and Archaeological Resources.

Table 4.7.7-1. Applicable Local Plans and Policies Relevant to Paleontological Resources

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Intent of the Policy in Relation to Avoiding or Mitigating Significant Environmental Impacts	Preliminary Consistency Determination*
County of Monterey Del Monte Forest Area Land Use Plan		
Resource Management Element		
CULTURAL RESOURCES		
Policy 57. The timely identification and evaluation of archaeological, historical, and paleontological resources, and coordination with applicable Native American representatives, is encouraged, so that these resources are given full consideration during the conceptual design phase of land use planning for project development.	This policy is intended to protect paleontological and cultural resources and encourage coordination with Native American representatives to ensure proper consideration of these resources.	Potentially Consistent. Archaeological surveys at the project site did not identify any archaeological resources and the site does not support known paleontological resources and is not identified in an area of paleontological sensitivity. The surveys found no additional factors that would indicate elevated sensitivity at the project site. The County has consulted with Native American tribes affiliated with the project area, consistent with this policy.

* Although a preliminary determination regarding project consistency is made, it is the responsibility of the County Planning Commission or Board of Supervisors, the lead CEQA decision makers, to make the final determination regarding consistency issues.

4.7.7.3 Thresholds of Significance

Pursuant to Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, a substantial impact on paleontological resources would occur if the project would:

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

4.7.7.4 Impact Assessment Methodology

This impact analysis evaluates the potential for the proposed project to result in the loss or destruction of unique paleontological resources. The analysis included a review of existing paleontological sensitivity maps and information to determine the site's sensitivity for paleontological resources.

4.7.7.5 Impact Assessment and Mitigation Measures

Destroy a Unique Paleontological Resource or Geologic Feature

There are no known paleontological resources or unique geologic formations or sites located within the project area and the site is not within any identified sensitive paleontological areas. It is possible that paleontological resources could be discovered in the underlying geologic formation during ground disturbing activities associated with project construction; however, excavation would be limited in scale and almost entirely limited to previously disturbed areas. In addition, the fossils that are most likely to be found at the project site would include micro-organisms such as foraminifera or diatoms, or assemblages of mollusks and barnacles, which are found throughout the County and are not likely to constitute a unique or significant paleontological resource. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant* and no mitigation is required.

4.7.7.6 Cumulative Impacts

As discussed above, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on paleontological resources. Ground disturbance associated with cumulative project development, particularly related past and foreseeable future project proposed in areas of paleontological sensitivity or within sensitive geologic formations, could result in a cumulatively significant impact due to damage or destruction of a unique paleontological resource. The proposed project is not expected to contribute considerably to such an effect because of the limited nature and extent of disturbance, the low paleontological sensitivity of the site, and the location of excavation activities within previously disturbed areas. Cumulative impacts would be *less than significant* and no mitigation is necessary.

4.7.8 Population and Housing

4.7.8.1 Existing Conditions

As of 2014, the population in Monterey County was recorded as 431,344 compared to a total of 415,057 in 2010, resulting in a 3.9% increase in population within the county over 4 years (U.S. Census Bureau 2014). As of 2014, Monterey County supported 140,144 housing units and 125,428 households with an average of 3.2 persons per household. The median household income between the years 2009–2013 within the county was recorded as $59,168 (U.S. Census Bureau 2014).

4.7.8.2 Regulatory Setting

California's Housing Element Law (California Government Code §§65580–65589.8) recognizes that the availability of housing was of vital statewide importance, and that early attainment of decent housing and a suitable living environment for every Californian is a high state priority. The law was enacted to ensure that counties and cities recognize their responsibilities in contributing to the attainment of state housing goals, to establish the requirement that all counties and cities adopt housing elements to help meet state goals, to recognize that each locality is best capable of determining what efforts it is required to take to contribute to attainment of state housing needs, and to encourage and facilitate cooperation between local governments to address regional housing needs.

Local Policies and Regulations

Table 4.7.8-1 lists applicable state, regional, and local land use policies and regulations pertaining to population and housing that were adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect and that are relevant to the proposed project. Also included in Table 4.7.8-1 is an analysis of project consistency with identified policies and regulations.

Table 4.7.8-1. Applicable Local Plans and Policies Relevant to Population and Housing

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Intent of the Policy in Relation to Avoiding or Mitigating Significant Environmental Impacts	Preliminary Consistency Determination*
County of Monterey Del Monte Forest Area Land Use Plan		
Del Monte Forest LUP Key Policies		
Housing: Housing opportunities for persons and families of low to moderate income should be protected and provided, both within the Forest and in outlying areas, as a function of new development within the Forest.	The intent of this policy is to provide and protect housing for low-income populations.	Potentially Consistent. The proposed project would replace an existing single-family residence with a new single-family residence and would have no impact on low-income housing.

* Although a preliminary determination regarding project consistency is made, it is the responsibility of the County Planning Commission or Board of Supervisors, the lead CEQA decision makers, to make the final determination regarding consistency issues.

4.7.8.3 Thresholds of Significance

Pursuant to Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, a substantial impact related to population and housing would occur if the project would:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

4.7.8.4 Impact Assessment Methodology

The project was analyzed for its potential to induce substantial population growth or housing development. The potential need for additional workforce to support project construction is considered in the analysis of the project's potential to "induce substantial population growth…directly," since the project's construction jobs would be the mechanism by which population might be directly attracted to the area.

4.7.8.5 Impact Assessment and Mitigation Measures

Induce substantial population growth.

The proposed project would include replacing an existing single-family residence with a new single-family residence, consistent with the existing use and LDR zoning. The new residence would tie-in to existing utility infrastructure used by the existing residence. The project would not result in a change in land use or extension of roads or other infrastructure that could open up additional areas for development. Construction-related activities would temporarily require additional workforce at the project site; however, it is expected that construction employees required for implementation of the proposed project would already live in the area and would not require relocation. The project would not induce substantial population growth in the project area. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant* and no mitigation is necessary.

Displace substantial numbers of existing housing.

The project includes replacing an existing single-family residence with a new single-family residence at the same location. The project would not displace a substantial number of existing housing; *no impact* would occur and no mitigation is necessary.

Displace substantial numbers of people.

Implementation of the proposed project would not displace people and would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, *no impact* would occur and no mitigation is necessary.

4.7.8.6 Cumulative Impacts

As discussed above, the proposed project would have no impact related to displacing housing units or people, necessitating construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to any cumulative effect related to the construction of

replacement housing. The proposed project would result in the temporary demand for construction workers; however, it is expected that employees would already live locally and would not require relocation. Additionally, the project would not result in the construction or expansion of utilities, but would rely on existing systems that serve the existing single-family residence. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to cumulative population growth or housing development. Cumulative impacts would be *less than significant* and no mitigation is necessary.

4.7.9 Public Services and Utilities

4.7.9.1 Existing Conditions

The Pebble Beach Community Services District (PBCSD) is a multipurpose special district that provides the community of Pebble Beach with fire protection and emergency medical services, wastewater collection and treatment, recycled water distribution, and garbage collection, disposal, and recycling.

Police Protection

The Monterey County Sheriff's Office's Patrol Division has three stations: one in Salinas that patrols all of North County, on in Monterey that covers all unincorporated areas of the Monterey Peninsula, Carmel Valley and coastal areas to the San Luis Obispo County line, and one in King City that provides coverage for South County (Monterey County Sheriff's Office 2015). Monterey County Sheriff law enforcement efforts are augmented by the California Highway Patrol (CHP) and PBCSD. The Monterey County Sheriff's Office provides police protection and law enforcement services to the Pebble Beach area 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. Pebble Beach is located within the Sheriff's Office Beat 6A, which is assigned one patrol vehicle with one deputy at all times. Response times to the Pebble Beach area vary based on the location of the deputy relative to the response location as well as the priority of the call.

In cooperation with the Sheriff's Office and under contract with the PBCSD, the CHP provides additional service to the area for traffic enforcement (PBCSD 2015). Although the CHP primarily handles traffic accidents and traffic enforcement issues in the project vicinity, Sheriff's deputies can also issue citations when they see violations of the California Vehicle Code on both County roads and state highways. Deputies can also issue citations for parking violations of the California Vehicle Code. The County Communications Center is notified of traffic-related calls by the CHP dispatch center. Depending on their position, a deputy may be first to the scene of a traffic accident to handle any necessary traffic control.

Fire Protection and Emergency Services

The PBCSD provides fire protection and paramedic emergency medical services to the project area. Additionally, CAL FIRE provides staff and operational services to PBCSD. Two fire stations serve the community of Pebble Beach: the Pebble Beach Fire Station and the Carmel Hill Fire Station (PBCSD 2015). The Pebble Beach Fire Station is located approximately 1.25 miles northeast of the project site, at 3101 Forest Lake Road in Pebble Beach. District equipment at the Pebble Beach Fire Station includes two Emergency One Fire Engines, an American La France Truck, and a Ford 1-ton Wildland Quick-Attack Fire Apparatus (PBCSD 2015). Full-time personnel stationed at the Pebble Beach Fire Station covering three shifts, 24 hours per day, 7 days per week include five fire captains, six fire apparatus engineers, three firefighter/paramedics, six firefighters, and two fire prevention captains (PBCSD 2015).

Schools

The project site is located in the Carmel Unified School District (Monterey County Office of Education 2015). The Carmel Unified School District is served by two child development centers, three elementary schools, one middle school, two high schools, and one adult school (Carmel Unified School District 2015). As of 2010, the California Department of Finance reported a total population of 22,991 in a land area of 463 square miles within the Carmel Unified School District (California Department of Finance 2012).

The closest school to the project site is the Stevenson School, a private, coeducational pre-kindergarten through 12th grade school for boarding and day students (Stevenson School 2015). Stevenson School is located approximately 0.8 mile east of the project site at 3152 Forest Lake Road, Del Monte Forest.

Water

The MPWMD serves a population of approximately 104,129 across Monterey County including Carmel by the Sea, Del Rey Oaks, Monterey, Pacific Grove, Seaside, Sand City, Monterey Peninsula Airport District, and portions of unincorporated Monterey County including Pebble Beach and Carmel Valley (MPWMD 2015). An Authorization for Water Permit, was signed and dated by MPWMD on July 26, 2011, for use of water provided by Cal Am at the project site.

Wastewater

The PBCSD provides wastewater collection and treatment services for uses in the community of Pebble Beach. Wastewater is conveyed through a 27-inch pipeline to the Carmel Area Wastewater District (CAWD) secondary treatment plant for processing. The CAWD wastewater plant has a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit to accept up to 3 million gallons per day (mgd) (RWQCB 2014). The current design capacity of the CAWD plant is 3 mgd, and PBCSD owns one-third, or 1 mgd, of that capacity.

Stormwater

The MCWRA operates and maintains drainage facilities throughout Monterey County. The stormwater drainage system is composed of approximately 57 miles of drainage ways, eight pump stations, 9 miles of river levees, two large earthen dams, and numerous culverts, tide gates, and concrete structures (MCWRA 2018).

Utilities (Gas, Electricity, and Telephone)

The project area is served by AT&T for telephone service and by PG&E for natural gas and electricity.

Solid Waste

The PBCSD provides weekly collection of solid waste (garbage), green waste, and mixed recyclables through a contract with Waste Management, Inc. (PBCSD 2015). Solid waste is taken to the 470-acre Monterey Peninsula Landfill and Recycling Facility, located in the city of Marina and managed by the MRWMD (PBCSD 2015; MRWMD 2015). The MRWMD site includes the 310-acre Monterey Peninsula Landfill, as well as a materials recovery facility. The MRWMD operates under a Solid Waste Facility Permit that limits the peak traffic volume for incoming waste materials to 2,000 trips per day, and the peak tonnage of incoming waste to 3,500 tons per day (MRWMD 2015). The landfill currently receives less than 1,000 tons per day of municipal solid

waste and has a remaining capacity of approximately 48 million tons (MRWMD 2015). The Monterey Peninsula Landfill is expected to remain open until 2161 (MRWMD 2015).

4.7.9.2 Regulatory Setting

State Policies and Regulations

The CDWR manages California's water resources. The regulations overseen by CDWR regarding water service availability include the Urban Water Management Planning Act and SB 221 and SB 610. The California Department of Health Services (DHS) is responsible for overseeing the quality of water once it is in storage and distribution systems. DHS oversees the self-monitoring and reporting program implemented by all water purveyors, performs inspections, and assists with financing water system improvements for the purpose of providing safer and more reliable service.

The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act provides the authority and method for the State of California to implement its water management program. The act establishes waste discharge requirements for both point and non-point source discharges affecting surface water and groundwater.

Solid waste disposal in California is regulated at the state level by CCR Title 14, Division 7, Chapter 3 (Minimum Standards for Solid Waste Handling and Disposal) and in PRC §40000 et. seq. (the California Integrated Waste Management Act). The California Integrated Waste Management Act requires municipalities to divert (reduce, recycle, or compost) 25% of their solid waste from landfills to recycling facilities by 1995 and 50% of their solid waste by 2000. The California Integrated Waste Management Board (now the Department of Resources, Recycling, and Recovery [CalRecycle]) was created by Assembly Bill 939 and Senate Bill 1322 to oversee, manage, and track waste generated in California.

California Government Code §51178 specifies that the Director of the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection shall identify areas in the state as very high fire hazard severity zones based on consistent statewide criteria and based on the severity of fire hazard that is expected to prevail in those areas. Emergency vehicle response is provided from the central fire station on Forest Lake Road and the fire station located inside the Highway 1 gate over a network of collector or primary roads.

The CPUC regulates investor-owned (private) water, energy, and telecommunications utilities to ensure that they deliver safe, clean, and/or reliable services to customers at reasonable rates. The CPUC does not regulate publicly-owned utilities.

Local Policies and Regulations

The MCWRA covers a large area and is responsible for managing groundwater resources. This agency oversees the development and implementation of water quality, water supply, and flood control projects in Monterey County. Primary responsibilities are management of water supply resources in the reservoir system, including San Antonio and Nacimiento Reservoirs, and permitting and development of the Salinas Valley Water Project.

The MPWMD was formed in 1978 to augment the water supply and manage water resources for communities on the Monterey Peninsula, including Carmel-by-the-Sea, Del Rey Oaks, Monterey, Pacific Grove, Seaside, Sand City, Monterey Peninsula Airport District and portions of unincorporated Monterey County, including Pebble Beach and Carmel Valley. The MPWMD

provides integrated management of the ground and surface water resources within the Monterey Peninsula area, encompassing the waters of the Carmel River and Seaside groundwater basins.

Wastewater treatment and disposal in the County are managed by various entities using a variety of treatment technologies. Much of the unincorporated rural areas utilize onsite wastewater disposal systems (septic systems), which is regulated by the Monterey County Health Department. The majority of development in the more densely populated areas of the County is served by regional or municipal treatment and collection systems. Traditionally, the County has been responsible for wastewater treatment and disposal through its County Sanitation Districts and County Service Areas. The County Sanitation Districts and County Service Areas have historically been difficult for the County to operate in an efficient and cost effective manner. The County recognizes that private operators would more successfully run its wastewater operations. Recently, the County has sold some of the County Sanitation Districts and County Service Areas to a private operator, Cal Am. The County will continue to pursue buyers for existing wastewater facilities under the jurisdiction of a County Sanitation District or County Service Area. Further, the construction, operation and maintenance of all new wastewater facilities will be the responsibility of private service providers.

Table 4.7.9-1 lists applicable state, regional, and local land use policies and regulations pertaining to public services and utilities that were adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect and that are relevant to the proposed project. Also included in Table 4.7.9-1 is an analysis of project consistency with identified policies and regulations.

Table 4.7.9-1. Applicable Local Plans and Policies Relevant to Public Services

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Intent of the Policy in Relation to Avoiding or Mitigating Significant Environmental Impacts	Preliminary Consistency Determination*
County of Monterey Del Monte Forest Area Land Use Plan		
Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan Key Policies		
Water and Wastewater: Development shall be approved only if it can be served by adequate and long-term public water supplies and wastewater treatment capacities. Priority for use of scarce water and wastewater treatment capacity shall be for coastal priority land uses. Wastewater systems which minimize or eliminate ocean pollution, and which provide for reclamation of wastewater for reuse, shall be encouraged and supported.	The intent of this policy is to ensure adequate long-term water and wastewater services.	Potentially Consistent. The project Applicant has an Authorization for Water Permit, signed and dated by MPWMD on July 26, 2011 for use of water provided by Cal Am. The proposed project would tie-in to existing water supply infrastructure. The PBCSD, through its contract with CAWD, would provide wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal. The project would not significantly change water and wastewater demands over existing conditions, and would not exceed available water supplies or wastewater capacity, consistent with this policy.
Land Use and Development Element		
LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT POLICIES		
Policy 88. Where existing or planned water and wastewater facilities can accommodate only a limited amount of development, water and wastewater services shall be assured for coastal-priority visitor-serving and public recreational uses (e.g., The Inn at Spanish Bay and The Lodge at Pebble Beach resort and golf facilities, the Poppy Hills golf course facility, the Spyglass Hill golf course facility, shoreline access areas, etc.) before new residential uses are permitted.	The intent of this policy is to prioritize coastal-priority visitor serving and public recreational uses in areas of limited water and wastewater services.	Potentially Consistent. The proposed project would replace an existing residence with a new residence at the same location. The project would tie into existing facilities and would not substantially change water or wastewater demands or services at the project site. The Applicant has an Authorization for Water Permit, signed and dated by MPWMD on July 26, 2011 for use of water provided by Cal Am and existing wastewater facilities are adequate to

Table 4.7.9-1. Applicable Local Plans and Policies Relevant to Public Services

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Intent of the Policy in Relation to Avoiding or Mitigating Significant Environmental Impacts	Preliminary Consistency Determination*
		accommodate the proposed development, consistent with this policy.
Land Use Support Element		
WATER AND WASTEWATER POLICIES		
Policy 111. Development shall only be approved if it is first clearly demonstrated that the development will be served by an adequate, long-term public water supply, and where such development clearly incorporates all necessary measures to assure no net increase in water demand from Cal-Am sources where extraction is leading to resource degradation, other than development that uses the remaining available Pebble Beach Company MPWMD Water Entitlement from the original 365 AFY granted to Pebble Beach Company (pursuant to its Fiscal Sponsorship Agreement with MPWMD, dated October 3, 1989, as amended), consistent with applicable law for such use.	The intent of this policy is to ensure new development will be served by adequate long-term water supply.	Potentially Consistent. The project Applicant has an Authorization for Water Permit, signed and dated by MPWMD on July 26, 2011 for use of water provided by Cal Am and the proposed project would tie-in to existing water supply infrastructure.
Policy 112. Recycled wastewater shall be used as much as possible to irrigate all golf courses and landscaping areas, to the extent recycled water is reasonably available for such purpose, in order to conserve and make available additional potable water for domestic use. Development associated with golf courses and/or non-residential landscaping shall incorporate measures designed to ensure that such golf courses and/or landscaped areas are irrigated using such recycled water as much as possible.	The intent of this policy is to conserve potable water supplies for domestic use by encouraging use of recycled water for landscaping and irrigation.	Potentially Consistent. The project does not propose any outdoor landscaping or irrigation and would limit potable water use to domestic purposes, consistent with this policy.
Policy 113. In reviewing development applications, the County shall consult with the MPWMD and Cal-Am to determine that an adequate, long-term public water supply is available to serve proposed development.	The intent of this policy is to ensure new development will be served by adequate long-term water supply.	Potentially Consistent. The project Applicant has an Authorization for Water Permit, signed and dated by MPWMD on July 26, 2011 for use of water provided by Cal Am and the proposed project would tie-in to existing water supply infrastructure, consistent with this policy.
Policy 115. Development shall only be approved if it is first clearly demonstrated that there is adequate, long-term public wastewater treatment capacity to serve such development.	The intent of this policy is to ensure adequate long-term wastewater treatment services.	Potentially Consistent. The PBCSD, through its contract with CAWD, would provide wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal services. The proposed

Table 4.7.9-1. Applicable Local Plans and Policies Relevant to Public Services

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Intent of the Policy in Relation to Avoiding or Mitigating Significant Environmental Impacts	Preliminary Consistency Determination*
		project would include replacing and existing single-family residence with a new single-family residence and would not substantially change wastewater service demands. The proposed project would tie into existing facilities and would not result in a change in land use or an increase in demand on public facilities; therefore, no expansion of existing facilities would be necessary.
Policy 116. New development shall employ water conservation techniques to the greatest possible extent. This shall include, among other things, use of water-saving fixtures, retaining native plants, and installing drought-tolerant landscaping.	The intent of this policy is to encourage new development to employ water conservation techniques.	Potentially Consistent. The proposed project would include the construction of a new single-family residence in compliance with the most recent version of the CBC, which requires the use of water conserving plumbing fixtures. Additionally, the project includes implementation of a landscape plan that includes native plantings and that would not require irrigation, consistent with this policy.
Monterey County Coastal Implementation Plan		
Part 5 Regulations for Development in the Del Monte Forest Plan Area (Chapter 20.147)		
20.147.110 Water and Wastewater A. Development Standards 1. Development shall only be approved if it is first clearly demonstrated that the development will be served by an adequate, long-term, public water supply, and where such development clearly incorporates all necessary measures to assure no net increase in water demand from Cal-Am sources where extraction is leading to resource degradation, other than development that uses the remaining available Pebble Beach Company MPWMD Water Entitlement from the original 365 acre-feet per year granted to Pebble Beach Company	The intent of this section is to ensure that development only be approved if it can be served by adequate and long-term public water supplies and wastewater treatment capacities, that priority for use of scarce water and wastewater treatment capacity be for coastal priority land uses, and that wastewater systems which minimize or eliminate ocean pollution, and which provide for	Potentially Consistent. The proposed project would tie into existing facilities and would not result in a change in land use or an increase in demand on public facilities. Therefore, adequate public facilities and services and infrastructure are available for the proposed project. The project Applicant has an Authorization for Water Permit, signed and dated by MPWMD on July 26, 2011

Table 4.7.9-1. Applicable Local Plans and Policies Relevant to Public Services

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Intent of the Policy in Relation to Avoiding or Mitigating Significant Environmental Impacts	Preliminary Consistency Determination*
(pursuant to its Fiscal Sponsorship Agreement with MPWMD, dated October 3, 1989, as amended), consistent with applicable law for such use. 2. New development shall employ water conservation techniques to the greatest possible extent. This shall include, among other things, use of water-saving fixtures, retaining native plants, and installing drought-tolerant landscaping. 3. In reviewing development applications, the County shall consult with the MPWMD and Cal-Am to determine that an adequate, long-term public water supply is available to serve proposed development. 4. The County shall reserve water from any MPWMD and/or Cal-Am allocation for coastal priority uses. 5. Development shall only be approved if it is first clearly demonstrated that there is adequate, long-term public wastewater treatment capacity to serve such development. 6. Wastewater disposal systems which minimize or eliminate Carmel Bay pollution, and which provide for reclamation of wastewater for reuse, shall be encouraged. 7. Recycled wastewater shall be used as much as possible to irrigate all golf courses and landscaping areas, to the extent recycled water is reasonably available for such purpose, in order to conserve and make available additional potable water for domestic use. Development associated with golf courses and/or non-residential landscaping shall incorporate measures designed to ensure that such golf courses and/or landscaped areas are irrigated using such recycled water as much as possible. 8. Septic systems, package treatment plants, and individual water wells shall not be permitted. Development shall utilize public water and sewer services. 9. Development shall only be approved if it is first clearly demonstrated that the additional wastewater discharge associated with such development will not significantly adversely impact coastal resources, including primarily in terms of Carmel Bay.	reclamation of wastewater for reuse, be encouraged and supported.	for use of water provided by Cal Am, which establishes adequate water supplies to serve the continued residential use of the site. The PBCSD, through its contract with CAWD, would provide wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal through its existing infrastructure. The project would retain and increase the use of native species and no landscaping irrigation would be necessary (except for potentially short-term irrigation to ensure the viability of new plantings). No septic system is proposed and the project would not discharge into or otherwise affect Carmel Bay, consistent with this measure.

Table 4.7.9-1. Applicable Local Plans and Policies Relevant to Public Services

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Intent of the Policy in Relation to Avoiding or Mitigating Significant Environmental Impacts	Preliminary Consistency Determination*
10. Where existing or planned water and wastewater facilities can accommodate only a limited amount of development, water and wastewater services shall be assured for coastal-priority visitor-serving and public recreational uses (e.g., The Inn at Spanish Bay and The Lodge at Pebble Beach resort and golf facilities, the Poppy Hills golf course facility, the Spyglass Hill golf course facility, shoreline accessways, etc.) before new residential uses are permitted.		

* Although a preliminary determination regarding project consistency is made, it is the responsibility of the County Planning Commission or Board of Supervisors, the lead CEQA decision makers, to make the final determination regarding consistency issues.

4.7.9.3 Thresholds of Significance

Pursuant to Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, a substantial impact related to public services and utilities would occur if the project would:

a) Have an effect upon or result in the need for new or altered public services or utilities in any of the following areas:

- Fire protection
- Police protection
- Schools
- Parks
- Other public facilities
- Water
- Wastewater
- Stormwater and drainage
- Solid waste

4.7.9.4 Impact Assessment Methodology

The analysis of public services and utilities and the subsequent estimation of impacts at the project site were conducted through a review of existing resources and information. Significant impacts would result if the project would have a significant effect on or result in the need for new or altered police, fire, school, road, solid waste, park, water, stormwater, or wastewater facilities.

4.7.9.5 Impact Assessment and Mitigation Measures

Affect or result in the need for new/altered public services.

As discussed previously, the project site is currently developed with a single-family residence in the unincorporated community of Pebble Beach. The proposed project would include demolishing the existing single-family residence and developing a new single-family residence at the same location, consistent with the LDR designation. Although the proposed residence would be larger than the existing residence, the project would not substantially change the intensity or density of land uses at the site. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in a significant change in land use or a new demand on public services. Police, fire, and emergency response would continue to be provided by the Monterey County Sheriff, the PBCSD, and CAL FIRE. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in a significant impact to schools, parks, or other public facilities in the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, impacts to public services would be *less than significant* and no mitigation is required.

Affect or result in the need for new/altered public utilities.

The proposed project would utilize existing infrastructure and tie-in to existing utilities. The proposed project does not propose a substantial change in the intensity or density of development at the site; therefore, existing utilities and infrastructure would be adequate to continue to serve the single-family development on the site. The Applicant provided an Authorization for Water Permit, signed and dated by the MPWMD on July 26, 2011 for use of water provided by Cal Am, which establishes adequate water supplies to serve the project (which would not be substantially different from past water demands at the site). Stormwater facilities would be developed in accordance with the proposed drainage plan and would direct all stormwater flows to percolate into the on-site dunes and proposed stilling basins, as further discussed in Section 4.6 of the EIR, Hydrology and Water Quality. Therefore, no effect on existing stormwater or drainage facilities would occur. The PBCSD, through its contract with the Carmel Area Wastewater District, would provide wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal. Solid waste, recyclables, and green waste collection and management would be provided by the PBCSD through its contractual agreement with Waste Management Inc., dba Carmel Marina Corporation. Trash would be delivered to the

MRWMD landfill in the city of Marina. Energy would be provided by PG&E. Therefore, the proposed project does not substantially increase development at the site and would not result in the need for new, increased, or altered wastewater, solid waste, or energy facilities and utilities. Impacts would be *less than significant* and no mitigation is required.

4.7.9.6 Cumulative Impacts

As discussed above, implementation of the proposed project would largely continue the existing use of the project site (single-family residential use) and would not result in a change in land use or a new demand on public services or utilities. The project would continue to be served by existing public services and would utilize existing infrastructure and tie-in to existing utilities. The proposed project would not alter or create a new demand for public services or utilities and would not require development of new infrastructure. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts associated with public services and utilities. Cumulative impacts would be *less than significant* and no mitigation is necessary.

4.7.10 Recreation

4.7.10.1 Existing Conditions

The Del Monte Forest, 17-Mile Drive, and community of Pebble Beach are world famous recreational resources that attract visitors from throughout California and around the world. 17-Mile Drive is widely recognized as one of the most scenic drives in the world and is popular with motorists, cyclists, and pedestrians. The entrance fee for the drive is $10 for all non-residents in private vehicles. Pedestrians and cyclists are not charged an entrance fee. The drive includes bike lanes and public coastal access routes. 17-Mile Drive provides numerous recreational opportunities in the immediate vicinity of the project site, including public beaches, famous golf courses, and public outlooks and vistas that provide dramatic views of the Pacific coastline and the Del Monte Forest. Additionally, the Del Monte Forest has an extensive trail system.

Monterey County also supports three day use parks, including Jacks Peak County Park, Royal Oaks Park, and Toro Park, in addition to four campground parks, Laguna Seca Recreation Area, San Lorenzo Park, Lake San Antonio, and Lake Nacimiento (Monterey County Parks Department 2015). The nearest public park is Jacks Peak County Park, which offers approximately 8.5 miles of horseback riding and hiking trails through the forests and ridge top vistas of Jacks Peak, approximately 5.5 miles east of the project site.

4.7.10.2 Regulatory Setting

The Del Monte Forest LUP provides policies for the protection of recreational resources and identifies public access as being one of the key recreational considerations along 17 Mile Drive. “Visual and physical public access to and along the shoreline and the enjoyment of public recreational values throughout the Del Monte Forest, consistent with the basic purpose of the California Coastal Act, shall be maximized. This LUP shall also seek to ensure that the beauty of the Del Monte Forest Area coast, its tranquility, and the health of its environment will not be marred by public overuse or neglect (pg.6).”

Table 4.7.10-1 lists applicable regional, and local land use policies and regulations pertaining to recreation that were adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect and that are relevant to the proposed project. Also included in Table 4.7.10-1 is an analysis of project consistency with identified policies and regulations.

Table 4.7.10-1. Applicable Local Plans and Policies Relevant to Recreation

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Intent of the Policy in Relation to Avoiding or Mitigating Significant Environmental Impacts	Preliminary Consistency Determination*
County of Monterey Del Monte Forest Area Land Use Plan		
Public Access Element		
PUBLIC ACCESS POLICIES		
Policy 125. New development shall be sited and designed to avoid adversely affecting public access areas, including trail access (see, for example, Figure 8). Trail dedications necessary to provide public access connections to existing public access areas consistent with LUP policies shall be required as a condition of development approval. If, due to habitat or safety constraints, development entirely outside existing trail routes is not feasible, the route shall be realigned if otherwise appropriate and LUP consistent. Approved realignments shall be generally equivalent in terms of connectivity, utility, and public use value to the original route.	The intent of this policy is to preserve public access to recreational and visual resources in the Del Monte Forest area.	Potentially Consistent. Implementation of the proposed project includes replacing an existing single-family residence with a new single-family residence on a private lot in an existing neighborhood. The project would not restrict or affect public access to recreational facilities in the project vicinity.

* Although a preliminary determination regarding project consistency is made, it is the responsibility of the County Planning Commission or Board of Supervisors, the lead CEQA decision makers, to make the final determination regarding consistency issues.

4.7.10.3 Thresholds of Significance

Pursuant to Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, a substantial impact related to recreation and recreational facilities would occur if the project would:

a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

4.7.10.4 Impact Assessment Methodology

The analysis of recreational resources was conducted through a review of existing resources, including the County of Monterey Del Monte Forest Area LUP and a Monterey County Parks Department information. Significant impacts would result if the project would affect onsite or nearby recreational resources, or substantially increase the use or demand for parks and recreation opportunities.

4.7.10.5 Impact Assessment and Mitigation Measures

Increase the use of existing recreational facilities.

The proposed project would include replacing an existing single-family residence with a new single-family residence on a privately-owned lot in an existing neighborhood. There are no public recreational resources on the site and no impacts on off-site recreational resources would occur. The project would not result in any increase in local population; therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in an increased demand on existing neighborhood and/or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated. Impacts would be *less than significant* and no mitigation is necessary. Visual resources are discussed in Section 4.1 of the EIR, Aesthetic Resources.

Result in the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

The proposed project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, *no impact* would occur and no mitigation is necessary.

4.7.10.6 Cumulative Impacts

Implementation of the proposed project would not increase the demand on recreational facilities and would not require the construction, expansion, or other modification of recreational facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to cumulative impacts on recreational resources in the project area. Cumulative impacts would be *less than significant* and no mitigation is necessary.

4.7.11 Transportation and Circulation

4.7.11.1 Existing Conditions

Regional transportation within Monterey County, and within the project area, is supported by a system of highways, including U.S. Route 101 and several state routes (State Routes 1, 68, 156, 183, and 218). These roadways provide regional access to the project area and throughout Monterey County.

The Del Monte Forest area has a private road network, including 17-Mile Drive, which is owned and serviced by the Pebble Beach Company. In addition to 17-Mile Drive, five gated entrances provide access into the Del Monte Forest. Residents pay a yearly fee for upkeep of the road system. Visitors in vehicles pay an entrance fee, but there is no fee for pedestrians, bicyclists, or equestrians.

The project site is located approximately 750 feet southeast of the intersection of 17-Mile Drive and Signal Hill Road (refer to Figures 2-1 and 2-2, Project Vicinity Map and Project Location Map). The project site is accessed via Signal Hill Road and 17-Mile Drive. 17-Mile Drive is a famous, scenic, two-lane road that runs through Pacific Grove to Pebble Beach along the Pacific coastline in the Del Monte Forest area. Signal Hill Road is a private, dead-end roadway that extends approximately 0.3 mile east from 17-Mile Drive and provides access to six developed LDR lots.

4.7.11.2 Regulatory Setting

Applicable County regulations and standards for future development are located in the Del Monte Forest Area LUP, and the County of Monterey General Plan. The Del Monte Forest LUP specifies that “the continued development of a multi-modal circulation system within the Del Monte Forest shall be encouraged to provide an adequate level of service with minimal intrusion to the Forest environment, ensure adequate and effective public recreational access, encourage separation of visitor and resident traffic, and provide for a proportionate share of the improvements necessary to impacted areas of Highway 68, which serves as an external access route to the Del Monte Forest (pg.6).”

Table 4.7.11-1 lists applicable state, regional, and local land use policies and regulations pertaining to transportation and traffic that were adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect and that are relevant to the proposed project. Also included in Table 4.7.11-1 is an analysis of project consistency with identified policies and regulations.

Table 4.7.11-1. Applicable Local Plans and Policies Relevant to Transportation and Traffic

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Intent of the Policy in Relation to Avoiding or Mitigating Significant Environmental Impacts	Preliminary Consistency Determination*
County of Monterey Del Monte Forest Area Land Use Plan		
Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan Key Policies		
Circulation: The continued development of a multi-modal circulation system within the Del Monte Forest shall be encouraged to provide an adequate level of service with minimal intrusion to the forest environment, ensure adequate and effective public recreational access, encourage separation of visitor and resident traffic, and provide for a proportionate share of the improvements necessary to impacted areas of Highway 68, which serves as an external access route to the Del Monte Forest.	The intent of this policy is to encourage continued development of a multi-modal circulation system within the Del Monte Forest.	Potentially Consistent. Implementation of the proposed project would not interfere with the level of service on surrounding roadways, create an intrusion to the forest environment, or restrict public recreational access. Impacts to the local circulation system would be a limited to a temporary increase in vehicles and construction equipment travelling on local roadways during the construction phase of the proposed project. Operational traffic would not substantially change over existing conditions, as the project would not change the density or intensity of use at the site.
Land Use Support Element		
CIRCULATION POLICIES		
Policy 103. To preserve both visual and physical access to the coast, the impacts on the road system of the Forest and on Highways 68 and 1 resulting from incremental development in the Forest shall be mitigated in conjunction with, or as a function of, new development.	The intent of this policy is to preserve visual and physical access to the coast.	Potentially Consistent. Implementation of the proposed project would not interfere with visual or physical access to the coast. Impacts to the local circulation system would be a limited to a temporary increase in vehicles and construction equipment travelling on local roadways during the construction phase of the proposed project. Operational traffic would not substantially change over existing conditions, as the project would not change the density or intensity of use at the site. Visual access is discussed

Table 4.7.11-1. Applicable Local Plans and Policies Relevant to Transportation and Traffic

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Intent of the Policy in Relation to Avoiding or Mitigating Significant Environmental Impacts	Preliminary Consistency Determination*
		separately in Section 4.1 of the EIR (Aesthetic Resources).
Policy 108. Applications for development in the Forest shall include an analysis of the traffic generation of such development and an analysis of the probable routes of such traffic. If the decision making body determines that the additional traffic generated by such development will create the need for additional traffic facilities, including changes and/or enhancements, to account for traffic that will exceed Level of Service D, and without regard to any other traffic generated by other sources, the County shall require the applicant to contribute to the County, at the time of construction, the applicant's estimated proportionate share of the cost of those facilities made necessary to which the development contributes.	The intent of this policy is to include analysis of traffic generation for development in the Del Monte Forest.	Potentially Consistent. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in a significant change in traffic generation compared to existing conditions as the land use would remain low-density single-family residential. Traffic generation associated with the proposed project would be limited to construction-related traffic and would be limited in nature and duration.
Policy 109. Non-automobile transportation modes (e.g., trails) shall be considered and, where feasible, included in new development proposals. Appropriate considerations for residential developments include non-vehicular connections to the trail system and to commercial or visitor-serving facilities, including where such connections will facilitate enhanced trail connectivity and/or close trail gaps.	The intent of this policy is to consider non-automobile transportation modes in new development proposals.	Potentially Consistent. Implementation of the proposed project would not interfere or result in impacts to non-automobile modes of transportation, including trails. Adequate trails and non-automobile visitor-serving facilities exist in the project vicinity.
Monterey County Coastal Implementation Plan		
Part 5 Regulations for Development in the Del Monte Forest Plan Area (Chapter 20.147)		
20.147.100 Circulation A. Development Standards 1. 17-Mile Drive shall remain open to the public for recreational use and any entrance fee charged shall be limited to a vehicular access fee (i.e., pedestrian and bicycle access shall remain free) and shall remain reasonable. 2. The vehicular entrance fee as of January 1, 2011 was $9.50, and it was last increased to that amount on April 1, 2010. The entrance fee may be increased over time, as long as it is not increased by more than the increase in the Consumer Price	The intent of this section is to encourage continued development of a multimodal circulation system within the Del Monte Forest that provides an adequate level of service with minimal intrusion to the Forest environment, to ensure adequate and effective public recreational access, to encourage separation of visitor and resident traffic, and to provide for a proportionate share of the improvements necessary to impacted areas of Highway	Potentially Consistent. The proposed project would not restrict access or result in closures along 17-Mile Drive. Implementation of the proposed project would not restrict public coastal access or access or use of non -automobile transportation modes (e.g., trails, or bicycle trails. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in a significant change in traffic generation compared to existing conditions as the

Table 4.7.11-1. Applicable Local Plans and Policies Relevant to Transportation and Traffic

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Intent of the Policy in Relation to Avoiding or Mitigating Significant Environmental Impacts	Preliminary Consistency Determination*
Index (CPI) or more than 5% per year, whichever is less, on a cumulative basis as measured from the date of the last gate fee increase. 3. The recreational and scenic value of the 17-Mile Drive corridor shall be maintained by appropriate siting and design of new development to minimize public view impacts associated with the corridor as much as possible, including through the use of appropriate building setbacks along sections of 17-Mile Drive where such new development will occur. 4. To protect public access to the shoreline and reserve limited highway capacity for coastal priority uses, development in the Del Monte Forest shall be required to identify and appropriately offset all circulation impacts, with preference given to mitigation measures designed to improve public recreational access and visitor-serving circulation. All such development shall either bear the incremental costs of necessary improvements to Highway 68 and the Highway 1 gate required as a result of traffic generated by the development, or pay into a fund that will be administered by the County for the incremental costs of necessary improvements to Highway 68 and the Highway 1 gate required as a result of traffic generated by the development. Approval of any development proposed by the owner of the Del Monte Forest road system (Pebble Beach Company) that is described in the Pebble Beach Company Concept Plan (Section 20.147.095) shall incorporate and/or require as a condition of approval improvements to the Highway 68/1/17-Mile Drive intersection area, including redevelopment of the Highway 1 gate (see LUP Figure 7), and improvements to The Lodge area parking and circulation system (see LUP Figure 9q) that improve circulation consistent with all LCP policies. Such approvals granted to Pebble Beach Company must also incorporate and/or require as a condition of approval all other necessary measures and modifications that are identified during the development review process to adequately address traffic and circulation issues associated with the proposed development.	68, which serves as an external access route to the Del Monte Forest.	land use would remain low-density single-family residential. Traffic generation associated with the proposed project would be limited to construction-related traffic and would be limited in nature and duration. Visual access is discussed separately in Section 4.1 of the EIR (Aesthetic Resources).

Table 4.7.11-1. Applicable Local Plans and Policies Relevant to Transportation and Traffic

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Intent of the Policy in Relation to Avoiding or Mitigating Significant Environmental Impacts	Preliminary Consistency Determination*
6. Circulation changes and/or improvements in the Del Monte Forest shall utilize to the maximum extent feasible existing disturbed areas. 10. Non-automobile transportation modes (e.g., trails) shall be considered and, where feasible, included in new development proposals. Appropriate considerations for residential developments include non-vehicular connections to the trail system and to commercial or visitor-serving facilities, including where such connections will facilitate enhanced trail connectivity and/or close trail gaps. 11. Improved bicycle access and connectivity within the Del Monte Forest, including a safe and usable through route (off-road preferably) from Pacific Grove to Carmel where space and grades permit, as close as feasible to the sea, is encouraged. Development that affects existing bicycle access (e.g., road improvement projects) shall include enhanced bicycle access improvements if such improvements are feasible. 12. To preserve both visual and physical access to the coast, the impacts on the road system of the Del Monte Forest and on Highway 68 and Highway 1 resulting from incremental development of the Forest shall be mitigated in conjunction with, or as a function of, new development. 13. Circulation improvements shall include improved visual access to the sea where needed along Highway 68 and 17-Mile Drive. 14. Applications for development in the Del Monte Forest shall include an analysis of the traffic generation of such development and an analysis of the probable routes of such traffic. If the decision making body determines that the additional traffic generated by such development will create the need for additional traffic facilities, including changes and/or enhancements, to account for traffic that will exceed Level of Service D and without regard to any other traffic generated by other sources, the decision making body shall require the applicant to contribute to the County, at the time of construction, the applicant's estimated proportionate share of		

Table 4.7.11-1. Applicable Local Plans and Policies Relevant to Transportation and Traffic

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Intent of the Policy in Relation to Avoiding or Mitigating Significant Environmental Impacts	Preliminary Consistency Determination*
the cost of those facilities made necessary to which the development contributes.		
2014 Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan		
2. Policy Element: A Framework for Meeting Long-term Mobility Needs		
Access and Mobility. **Goals:** Improve ability of Monterey County residents to meet most daily needs without having to drive. Improve the convenience and quality of trips, especially for walk, bike, transit, car/vanpool and freight trips. *Policy Objectives:* ▪ To improve safe, attractive and affordable access to work, school, goods and other key destinations by walking, bicycling and transit. ▪ Improve travel time and travel time reliability for pedestrian and bicycle trips between key origins and destinations. ▪ Improve travel time reliability and speed consistency for transit, car/vanpool and freight trips between key origins and destinations. ▪ Improve the quality of walk, bicycle, car/vanpool and transit trips. *Performance Measures:* ▪ Percentage of work trips that are 30 minutes or less by mode. ▪ Average work trip travel time.	The intent of this goal is to improve mobility in the County, particularly for walk, bike, transit, car/vanpool, and freight trips.	Potentially Consistent. The proposed project would not restrict access along 17-Mile Drive or other proximate roadways. Implementation of the proposed project would not restrict public coastal access or access or use of non - automobile transportation modes (e.g., trails, or bicycle trails. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in a significant change in traffic generation compared to existing conditions as the land use would remain low-density single-family residential. Traffic generation associated with the proposed project would be limited to construction-related traffic and would be limited in nature and duration. The project would be located within an existing neighborhood and would not result in lengthy trips or development in areas with inadequate or difficult access to key destinations.
Environmental Stewardship. **Goals:** Protect and enhance the County's built and natural environment. Act to reduce the transportation system's emission of greenhouse gases. *Policy Objectives:* ▪ Reduce greenhouse gas emissions consistent with regional targets.	The intent of this goal is to protect and enhance the County's built and natural environment.	Potentially Consistent. The proposed project would not substantially change traffic conditions and has been designed to protect the natural environment (i.e., through utilization of previously disturbed areas to the extent feasible and proposed dune restoration activities). Construction activities would result in a

Table 4.7.11-1. Applicable Local Plans and Policies Relevant to Transportation and Traffic

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Intent of the Policy in Relation to Avoiding or Mitigating Significant Environmental Impacts	Preliminary Consistency Determination*
▪ Avoid or minimize impacts to local, state and federally defined sensitive areas. ▪ Conserve farmland resources. *Performance Measures:* ▪ Projected greenhouse gas emissions in 2020 and 2035. ▪ Impacts to open space (acres). ▪ Impacts to farmland conservation (acres).		temporary increase in GHG emissions; however, construction activities would be limited and significant quantities of GHGs would not be emitted. The project would not result in significant impacts to open space, sensitive habitat, or farmland, consistent with this policy.

* Although a preliminary determination regarding project consistency is made, it is the responsibility of the County Planning Commission or Board of Supervisors, the lead CEQA decision makers, to make the final determination regarding consistency issues.

4.7.11.3 Thresholds of Significance

Pursuant to Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, a substantial impact related to transportation and circulation would occur if the project would:

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

4.7.11.4 Impact Assessment Methodology

The analysis is based on general estimates of construction workers and vehicles associated with construction of the proposed project and review of available maps of transit routes, bike routes, and recreational paths. The analysis focuses primarily on construction-related impacts because most impacts on traffic and transportation would occur during project construction.

4.7.11.5 Impact Assessment and Mitigation Measures

<u>Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy relating to the circulation system.</u>

The proposed project includes the demolition and replacement of an existing single-family residence with a new single family residence. The project would not result in a change in land use or substantially affect existing traffic facilities or conditions. Access to the project site is provided by 17-Mile Drive, a scenic, coastal roadway, and Signal Hill Road, a 0.3-mile, dead-end private roadway. Increased traffic levels generated by the proposed project would be limited to construction activities. Construction would require increased trips on local roadways by construction vehicles and equipment; however, this increase would be limited in nature and duration. The project would not result in impacts to local roadways in the form of restricted access, detours, closures, physical modifications, or other impacts. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project is not expected to conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. Impacts would be *less than significant* and mitigation is not necessary.

Conflict with an applicable congestion management program.

The local roadways surrounding the project site that would be used for site access are not included in a congestion management program. Implementation of the proposed project is not expected to result in a decrease in level of service or otherwise interfere with travel on surrounding roadways. Therefore, impacts are expected to be *less than significant* and no mitigation is necessary.

Result in a change in air traffic patterns.

The project site is not located within two miles of a public or private airport or airstrip, and is not located at an elevation that would affect air traffic patterns. Therefore, *no impact* to air traffic patterns would occur and mitigation is not necessary.

Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature.

The proposed project design does not include modifications to surrounding roadways and the project would not result in a change in land use. The project would include the replacement of an existing paved driveway with a new driveway that connects to Signal Hill Road. There are no design features associated with the proposed project that would increase hazards or incompatible uses. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant* and no mitigation is necessary.

Result in inadequate emergency access.

The proposed project consists of replacing a single-family residence on an existing lot and would not change existing access. The site provides adequate assess for emergency services via Signal Hill Road and 17-Mile Drive, and would not interfere with any emergency evacuation routes or plans. Potential impacts related to emergency access would be *less than significant* and no mitigation is necessary.

Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit.

Transportation and circulation policies relevant to the proposed project exist in regional and local planning documents. These documents generally encourage the development of alternative transportation (such as public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities) as a means to reduce traffic congestion and increase safety. As discussed in detail in Table 4.7.11-1, the proposed project is consistent with these plans because it would not adversely affect existing transportation facilities and would not result in a significant change in traffic generation compared to existing conditions as the land use would remain low-density single-family residential. The project would not restrict access or result in any other impacts to public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant* and no mitigation is necessary.

4.7.11.6 Cumulative Impacts

As discussed above, operation of the proposed project would not result in a change in land use or place an increased demand on the local circulation network. Outside of limited additional short-term construction-related traffic, the project would not result in significant impacts to traffic, roadways, public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities. The project would not change the existing land use or generate permanent additional traffic trips; therefore, implementation of the proposed project is not expected to significantly contribute to cumulative impacts to traffic and transportation. Potential cumulative impacts would be *less than significant* and mitigation is not necessary.

4.7.12 References

California Natural Resources Agency. 2014. 2009 SB 97 Rulemaking, webpage. Available at: http://resources.ca.gov/ceqa/guidelines/documents_uploaded_during_the_rulemaking_process_for_sb_97.html. Accessed: October 28, 2015.

California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2013. Ambient Air Quality Standards. June 4, 2013.

———. 2015a. Air Quality Data (PST) Query Tool. Information for Carmel Valley-Ford Road Monitoring Site. Available at: http://www.arb.ca.gov/aqmis2/aqdselect.php?tab=specialrpt. Accessed October 16, 2015.

———. 2015b. *California Greenhouse Gas Emission Inventory - 2015 Edition*. Available at: http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/data/data.htm. Accessed on October 28, 2015.

California Department of Conservation. 1987. *Special Report 146, Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the San Francisco-Monterey Bay Area, Part II Classification of Aggregate Resource Areas. South San Francisco Bay Production-Consumption Region*. Division of Mines and Geology. Available at: https://ia902602.us.archive.org/35/items/minerallandclass00stin/minerallandclass00stin.pdf. Accessed October 14, 2015.

———. 1999. Generalized Mineral Land Classification Map of the Monterey Bay Production-Consumption Regions South Half. By Susan Kohler-Antablin. Available at: ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/ofr/OFR_99-01/OFR_99-01_Plate-2.pdf. Accessed October 14, 2015.

———. 2012. Table A-20: Monterey County 2010–2012 Land Use Conversion. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Available at: http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp/Pages/Monterey.aspx. Accessed October 7, 2015.

———. 2015a. Monterey County Important Farmland Sheet 1 of 2. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Map published January 2015. Available at: ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2012/mnt12_no.pdf. Accessed October 7, 2015.

———. 2015b. AB3098 List: as of October 2, 2015. Available at: http://www.conservation.ca.gov/omr/SMARA%20Mines/ab_3098_list/Documents/October_2015-3098.pdf. Accessed October 14, 2015.

California Department of Finance. 2012. Land Area, Population and Population Density, April 1, 2010, School Districts in California. Available at: www.dof.ca.gov/.../2010Census_DemoProfile2_SchDist.xls. Accessed October 15, 2015.

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CALFIRE). 2007. Fire Hazard Severity Zones in State Responsibility Area, map. Adopted by CALFIRE on November 7, 2007. Available at: http://frap.fire.ca.gov/webdata/maps/monterey/fhszs_map.27.pdf. Accessed October 12, 2015.

———. 2008. Very High Fires Hazard Severity Zones in Local Responsibility Areas, map. As recommended by CALFIRE on November 4, 2008. Available at: http://frap.fire.ca.gov/webdata/maps/monterey/fhszl_map.27.pdf . Accessed October 13, 2015.

California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA). 2015. Cortese List Data Resources. Available at: http://www.calepa.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/CorteseList/. Accessed October 13, 2015.

California Geological Survey (CGS). 2012. *Aggregate Sustainability in California*. California Department of Conservation. Available at: http://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/information/publications/ms/Documents/MS_52.pdf. Accessed October 14, 2015.

Carmel Unified School District. 2015. Carmel Unified School District, webpage. Available at: http://www.carmelunified.org. Accessed October 15, 2015.

Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). 2014. Adoption of Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR) Order No. R3-2014-0012, (National Pollution Discharge Elimination System [NPDES] Permit No. CA0047996), Carmel Area Wastewater Treatment Plant. Monterey County. Available at: http://cawd.org/documents/Carmel%20WWTP%20combined.pdf. Accessed October 15, 2015.

Cleary Consultants, Inc. 2010*. Geotechnical Investigation: New residence, 1170 Signal Hill Road, Pebble Beach, California*. Prepared for Ms. Massy Mehdipour. March 2010.

County of Monterey. 2010. *2010 Monterey County General Plan*. Adopted October 26, 2010. Available at: http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/planning/gpu/gpu_2007/2010_mo_co_general_plan_adopted_102610/2010_mo_co_general_plan_adopted_102610.htm. Accessed October 2015.

———. 2012a. *Del Monte Forest Area Land Use Plan*. June 22, 2012. Available at: http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/planning/docs/plans/Del_Monte_Forest_LUP_and_CIP_Amendment_Adopted_052212/DMF_LUP_Amended_052212_Complete_Version.pdf. Accessed August 2015.

———. 2012b. *Monterey County Coastal Implementation Plan – Part 5, Regulations for Development in the Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan Area (Title 20, Coastal Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 20.147)*. Certified by the California Coastal Commission on May 9, 2012. Adopted by the Monterey County Board of Supervisors. May 22, 2012. Available at: http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/planning/docs/plans/Del_Monte_Forest_LUP_and_CIP_Amendment_Adopted_052212/DMF_CIP_Part%205_Amended_052212_Complete_Version.pdf. Accessed August 2015.

———. 2014. *2014 Monterey County Crop Report*. Available at: http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/home/showdocument?id=1581. Accessed October 7, 2015.

Federal Highway Administration. 2015. *Construction Noise Handbook: Section 9.0 Construction Equipment Noise Levels and Ranges*. Available at: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/construction_noise/handbook/handbook09.cfm. Accessed October 15, 2015.

Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD). 2008a. *2008 Air Quality Management Plan for the Monterey Bay Region*. Sixth Revision, August 2008.

———. 2008b. *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*. Adopted 1995. Revised February 2008. Available at: http://mbuapcd.org/pdf/CEQA_full%20(1).pdf. Accessed October 14, 2015.

———. 2013. *Triennial Plan Revision 2009-2011*. Adopted by the District Board of Directors on April 17, 2013.

———. 2015. *NCCAB (NCCAB) Area Designations and Attainment Status*. January 2015.

Monterey County Office of Education. 2015. Monterey County School Districts Map. Available at: http://www.montereycoe.org/Assets/superintendent/Maps/Schools%20and%20Districts.pdf.

Monterey County Parks Department. 2015. Monterey County Parks Department Information. Available at: http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/parks/brochures.html. Accessed October 15, 2015.

Monterey County Sheriff's Office. 2015. Organization Information: Patrol Division. Available at: https://www.montereysheriff.org/patrol/. Accessed October 15, 2015.

Monterey County Water Resources Agency (MCWRA). 2003. *Monterey County Floodplain Management Plan*. Updated December 2003. Available at: http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/planning/gpu/2007_GPU_DEIR_Sept_2008/Text/References/Monterey_Co_Floodplain_Management_Plan_2003.pdf

———. 2018. National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP), webpage. Available at: http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/government/government-links/water-resources-agency/programs/floodplain-management/overview#wra. Accessed June 2018.

Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (MPWMD). 2015. MPWMD: The Basics. Available at: http://www.mpwmd.net/who-we-are/about-mpwmd/. Accessed October 15, 2015.

Monterey Regional Waste Management District (MRWMD). 2015. Disposal Information. Available at: http://www.mrwmd.org/programs-services/disposal/. Accessed October 15, 2015.

Pebble Beach Community Services District (PBCSD). 2015. Pebble Beach Community Services District About Us, webpage. Available at: http://www.pbcsd.org/about.html. Accessed October 15, 2015.

San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (SLOAPCD). 2012. *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*. April 2012. Available at: http://www.slocleanair.org/images/cms/upload/files/CEQA_Handbook_2012_v1.pdf. Accessed October 2016.

Stevenson School. 2015. History of Stevenson. Available at: http://www.stevensonschool.org/about_stevenson/historyofstevenson/index.aspx. Accessed October 15, 2015.

Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC). 2014. 2014 Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan. Transportation Agency for Monterey County and Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments. Available at: http://www.tamcmonterey.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/0-2014-Monterey-County-RTP.pdf. Accessed October 2016.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2014. State and County QuickFacts: Monterey County, California. Available at: http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/06/06053.html. Accessed October 15, 2015.

———. 2009. Frequently Asked Questions About Global Warming and Climate Change: Back to Basics. Available at: http://www3.epa.gov/climatechange/Downloads/ghgemissions/Climate_Basics.pdf. Accessed October 18, 2015.

United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (UNIPCC). 2014. Climate Change 2014 Synthesis Report. Available at: http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar5/syr/SYR_AR5_FINAL_full.pdf. Accessed October 18, 2015.