

ERRATA

Recirculated Portion of the Draft Revised Environmental Impact Report for the September Ranch Subdivision Project (State Clearinghouse No. 1995083033, PC 95062), County of Monterey (February 15, 2006).

All additions to the text are in bold/underline and all deletions from the text are stricken.

Section 4.3.3, Exhibit 4.3-4b **Water Supply and Availability**

Replace the second Exhibit 4.3-4b (included twice) with the attached Exhibit 4.3-4c.

Note: Correction of compilation error.

Section 4.9.2, page 4.9-35 **Biological Resources**

The fourth full sentence has been revised as follows:

“Where tree removal would occur, ~~replacement~~ **dedication** of lost acreage will be at a 3:1 ratio.”

Note: Correction of typographical error. This correction makes the text consistent with the original text at [**Mitigation Measure 4.9-2, page 4.9-24**].

Section 5, page 5-6 **Cumulative Impacts**

The second and third sentences in the third full paragraph have been revised as follows:

“The project’s Forest Management Plan includes mitigation, which requires that lost acreage of Monterey pines and coast live oak be ~~replaced~~ **dedicated** at a ratio of 3 acres for every 1 lost.”

Note: See above.

Section 6, page 6-5 **Alternatives To The Proposed Project**

The first and second sentences in the fourth full paragraph have been revised as follows:

“The No Project Alternative would result in fewer land use and planning, geology and soils, ~~water supply and availability~~, hydrology and water quality, wastewater treatment and disposal, transportation and circulation, air quality, noise biological resources, cultural resources, aesthetics, and public services and utility impacts when compared to the September Ranch Subdivision project. However, this alternative would have greater **water supply and availability** and population, housing, and employment impacts.”

Note: Correction of typographical error.

Section 6, page 6-18

The first sentence in the third full paragraph has been revised as follows:

“This alternative would result in a reduction of 22 market rate residential units and ~~an increase of 7~~ 15 inclusionary housing units, with an overall decrease of ~~12~~ 22 onsite residential units.”

Note: Correction of typographical error.

Section 6, page 6-21

The first sentence in the first full paragraph has been revised as follows:

“Due to the proposed reduction of ~~15~~ 22 units, the Twenty Percent Alternative would result in a decrease in water demand when compared to the September Ranch Subdivision project.”

Note: Correction of typographical error.

Section 6, page 6-22

The last sentence in the second full paragraph has been revised as follows:

“~~However,~~ Since the Twenty Percent Alternative result in locating ~~more units~~ the same number of units in ~~closer~~ proximity to Carmel Valley Road, this alternative is considered to have ~~greater~~ the same noise impacts in relation to the September Ranch Subdivision project.”

Note: Correction of typographical error.

Section 6, page 6-23

The first and second sentences in the fourth full paragraph have been revised as follows:


“When compared to the September Ranch Subdivision project, the Twenty Percent Alternative would result in less geology and soils, water supply and availability, hydrology and water quality, wastewater treatment and disposal, transportation and circulation, air quality, ~~noise~~, biological resources, cultural resources, and public services and utility service impacts. Both the Twenty Percent Alternative and the proposed project would have similar land use, noise, and aesthetic impacts.”

Note: Correction of typographical error.

Appendix C: Hydrogeologic Report

The reference to “Attorney Work Product Privileged and Confidential” in the header portion of the “Project Specific Hydrogeologic Report – September Ranch Project” has been removed.

Note: Correction of typographical error.



Source: Kennedy/Jenks Consultants, November 2004.

