

Revisions to the Recirculated Draft EIR

This chapter includes revisions to the Recirculated Draft EIR (RDEIR) by errata as allowed by CEQA. The revisions are presented in the order they appear in the RDEIR, with the relevant page number(s) and text line(s) indicated with italicized print. New or revised text is shown with underline for additions and ~~strike-out~~ for deletions.

All text revisions are to provide clarification or additional detail. The changes do not result in a need to recirculate the RDEIR a second time. Under the CEQA Guidelines, recirculation is required when new significant information identifies:

- Significant new environmental impact resulting from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented;
- Substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance;
- Feasible project alternative or mitigation measure, considerable different from others previously analyzed, that clearly would lessen the environmental impacts of the project but that the project; or
- The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded (Guidelines sec. 15088.5[a]).

Recirculation of a Draft EIR is not required where the new information merely clarifies, amplifies or makes minor modifications to an adequate EIR (Guidelines sec. 15088[b]).

1 Revisions to the Recirculated Draft EIR

2 Executive Summary – Table ES-1

3 *Page ES-6, line 32-33 is revised as follows:*

4 Geology and Soils – The project would require extensive (approx. ~~200,000~~ 220,000 cubic yards [CY])
 5 of excavation and transport by truck.

6

7 *Table ES-1 has been revised as follows:*

8 Table ES-1. Summary of Impacts

Impact	Proposed Project Level of Significance	130-Unit Alternative Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
3.1 Geology and Soils				
<i>A. Seismic Hazards</i>				
GEO-1: Substantial Adverse Effects Resulting From Fault Rupture	NI	NI	None Required	-
GEO-2: Substantial Adverse Effects Resulting from Earthquake-Induced Ground Shaking	LTS	LTS	None Required	-
GEO-3: Substantial Adverse Effects Resulting from Seismic-Related Ground Settlement	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	GEO-1: Design All Proposed Structures in Accordance with the Requirements of the California Building Code, Current Edition, and Recommendations Contained in the Site-Specific Geologic and Geotechnical Reports	LTS
GEO-4: Substantial Adverse Effects Resulting From Earthquake-Induced Liquefaction	LTS	LTS	None Required	-
<i>B. Landslides and Slope Stability</i>				
GEO-5: Substantial Adverse Effects Resulting from Landsliding	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	GEO-2: Conduct Additional Site-Specific Investigation Relative to Lot 130 and Implement Recommended Grading and Slope Design Criteria of the Site-Specific Geotechnical Reports	LTS
<i>C. Erosion</i>				
GEO-6: Accelerated Soil Erosion and Sedimentation	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	GEO-3: Prepare and Implement an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan	LTS
<i>D. Soil Constraints</i>				

Impact	Proposed Project Level of Significance	130-Unit Alternative Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
GEO-7: Substantial Adverse Effects Resulting from Expansive Soils	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	GEO-1 [see above] GEO-4: Remove Localized Zones of Overly Loose Materials GEO-5: Prepare a Geotechnical Report for Lot 130 Concerning Expansive Soils (130-Unit Alternative only)	LTS
GEO-8: Substantial Adverse Effects Resulting from Loss of Topsoil	LTS	LTS	None Required	-
GEO-9: Effects of Septic Systems on Soils	NI	NI	None Required	-
<i>Cumulative Impacts</i>				
GEO-C1: Cumulative Impacts of Development on Geologically Hazardous Areas	LTC	LTC	None Required	-
GEO-C2: Cumulative Accelerated Runoff, Erosion, and Sedimentation	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	GEO-1 through GEO-5 [see above]	LTC

3.2 Hydrology

A. Alteration of Drainage Patterns

HYD-1: Alteration of Surface Drainage Patterns That Results in Increased Erosion or Siltation	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	<u>Proposed Project and 130-unit Alternative</u> HYD-1: Prepare and Implement a Stormwater Control Plan HYD-2: Prepare and Implement Operation and Maintenance Plan for Stormwater Control Measures HYD-3: Enter into Maintenance Agreement for Stormwater Control Measures BIO-4 BIO-3 : Provide Funding Assurances and Reporting Concerning Restoration Progress and Success <u>Proposed Project Only</u> BIO-7: Monitor Bank Erosion in Project Reach and Restore Riparian Vegetation and River Bank As Necessary	LTS
---	-------------------------	-------------------------	--	-----

B. Stormwater Runoff and Drainage Infrastructure

HYD-2: Result in Increased Stormwater Runoff Due to an Increase in Impervious Surfaces and Topographic Alterations Resulting in Drainage or Flooding Impacts	Potentially significant	Potentially Significant	HYD-1, HYD-2, HYD-3 [see above]	LTS
--	-------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------------	-----

Impact	Proposed Project Level of Significance	130-Unit Alternative Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<i>C. Water Quality</i>				
HYD-3: Degrade Surface Water Quality during Construction and from Operation	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	HYD-1, HYD-2, HYD-3 [see above] HYD-4: Implement a Spill Prevention and Control Program HYD-5: Implement Measures to Maintain Surface Water or Groundwater Quality GEO-3: Prepare and Implement an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan	LTS
<i>D. Groundwater Supply</i>				
HYD-4: Substantially Deplete Groundwater Supplies or Interfere with Groundwater Recharge	LTS	LTS	None Required	-
<i>E. Risk of Flooding</i>				
HYD-5: Place Housing or Structures Within a 100-Year Flood Hazard Area and Expose People or Structures to a Significant Risk of Loss, Injury, or Death Involving Flooding	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	HYD-6: Protect Eastern Slope of Excavated Basin HYD-7: Avoid Encroachment into the 100-year Floodplain for Lot 130 Uses (130-Unit Alternative Only)	LTS
<i>F. Risk of Inundation by Seiche, Tsunami, or Mudflow or Due to Sea Level Rise</i>				
HYD-6: Expose People or Structures to a Significant Risk of Loss, Injury, or Death Involving Inundation Due to Seiche, Tsunami, or Mudflow Hazards or Flooding Associated with Sea Level Rise	LTS	LTS	None Required	-
<i>Cumulative Impacts</i>				
HYD-C1: Cumulative Impacts to Hydrology and Water Quality	Potentially significant	Potentially Significant	HYD-1 through HYD-7, GEO-5, BIO-4 , BIO-3 , BIO-7 [see above]	LTC
3.3 Biological Resources				
<i>A. Impacts to Vegetation</i>				
BIO-1: Loss of Coyote Brush Scrub Habitat	LTS	LTS	None Required	-
BIO-2: Loss of Monterey Pine Stands	LTS	LTS	None Required	--

Impact	Proposed Project Level of Significance	130-Unit Alternative Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
BIO-3: Loss or Disturbance of Special-Status Plant Occurrences	LTS	Potentially Significant	BIO-1: Conduct a Floristic Survey of Coast Live Oak Woodland Habitat in Lot 130 during the Blooming Period for Potential Special-Status Plant Species (130-Unit Alternative only) BIO-2: Measures to Avoid or Minimize Impacts on Special-Status Plant Species Populations Relative to Lot 130 BIO-3: Conduct Mandatory Contractor/Worker Awareness Training for Construction Personnel (130-Unit Alternative only)	LTS
BIO-4: Loss of Riparian Forest and Woodland Habitat	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	<u>Proposed Project and 130-unit Alternative</u> BIO-3 [see above] BIO-4: Provide Funding Assurances and Reporting Concerning Restoration Progress and Success BIO-5: Restore Riparian Forest/Woodland Concurrent with Impact to Compensate for the Permanent Loss of Riparian Forest Habitat BIO-6: Minimize Disturbance of Riparian Forest and Woodland <u>Proposed Project Only</u> BIO-7: Monitor Bank Erosion in Project Reach and Restore Riparian Vegetation and River Bank, as Necessary	LTS
BIO-5: Loss of Coast Live Oak Woodland	No impact	Potentially Significant	BIO-8: Create Coast Live Oak Woodland Habitat to Mitigate Permanent Loss of Coast Live Oak Woodland Habitat (130-Unit Alternative only)	LTS
BIO-6: Loss of Wetlands and Other Waters of the United States and State of California	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	BIO-3, BIO-4 [see above] HYD-1 through HYD-4 [see above] BIO-9a: Create Ponds to Mitigate Permanent Loss of Pond Habitat (Proposed Project only) BIO-9b: Restore or Create Wetland and Pond Habitat to Mitigate Permanent Loss of Waters of the United States and State (130-Unit Alternative only)	LTS
BIO-7: Loss of Protected Trees	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	BIO-10: Compensate for Removal of Protected Trees	LTS

Impact	Proposed Project Level of Significance	130-Unit Alternative Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<i>B. Impacts to Wildlife</i>				
BIO-8: Loss or Disturbance of California Red-Legged Frog Aquatic Habitat and Potential Loss of California Red-Legged Frog Adults, Larvae, or Eggs	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	BIO-3, BIO-5 through BIO-7 [see above] BIO-11: Conduct Formal Site Assessment and Consult with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to Determine if Protocol-Level Surveys are Necessary OR Assume CRLF Presence BIO-12: Restrict Filling of Ponds/Wetlands and Initial Ground-Disturbing Activities in CRLF Habitat to the Dry Season (May 1 to October 15) BIO-13: Conduct a Preconstruction Survey for CRLF BIO-14: Monitor Initial Ground-Disturbing Construction Activities within CRLF Habitat BIO-15: Compensate for the Removal and Disturbance of CRLF Breeding Habitat	LTS
BIO-9: Loss or Disturbance of Southwestern Pond Turtle Aquatic Habitat and Potential Loss or Disturbance of Southwestern Pond Turtles	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	BIO-16: Conduct a Preconstruction Survey for Southwestern Pond Turtles and Monitor Construction Activities within Suitable Aquatic Habitat	LTS
BIO-10: Potential Loss or Disturbance of Breeding or Wintering Western Burrowing Owls and Their Burrows	LTS	LTS	None Required	--
BIO-11: Potential Loss or Disturbance of Tricolored Blackbirds and Their Breeding Habitat	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	BIO-17: Conduct Surveys for Nesting Tricolored Blackbirds BIO-18: Redesign Restoration Plan (Proposed Project) to Replace Lost Tricolored Blackbird Nesting Colony Habitat or Incorporate Tricolored Blackbird Nesting Habitat into the Newly Developed 130-Unit Alternative Restoration Plan (If Developed)	LTS
BIO-12: Potential Loss or Disturbance of Monterey Dusky-Footed Woodrat or Their Nests	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	BIO-19: Conduct Surveys for Woodrat Middens and Relocate Woodrats and Middens Prior to Construction Activity	LTS
BIO-13: Potential Loss or Disturbance of Tree and Shrub Nesting Migratory Birds and Raptors	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	BIO-5 [see above] BIO-20: Remove Vegetation during the Nonbreeding Season and Avoid Disturbance of Nesting Migratory Birds and Raptors	LTS
BIO-14: Potential Loss or Disturbance of Pallid Bat, Hoary Bat, and Non-Special-Status Bats Species	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	BIO-21: Conduct a Survey for Suitable Roosting Habitat and Evidence of Roosting Bats and Avoid Disturbing Them	LTS

Impact	Proposed Project Level of Significance	130-Unit Alternative Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
BIO-15: Temporary and Permanent Impacts to Steelhead Trout and other Carmel River Fish	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	HYD-1 through HYD-6 [see above] BIO-7 [see above] BIO-22: Rescue Steelhead, if Stranded in Site Basin during High-Flow Events	LTS
<i>C. Impact on Wildlife Movement, Wildlife Corridors, and Nursery Sites</i>				
BIO-16: Potential Adverse Impact on Wildlife Movement, Wildlife Corridors, and Nursery Sites	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	BIO-3 through BIO-7 [see above]	LTS
<i>D. Impact Related to Adopted Conservation Plans and Local Policies/Ordinances for the Protection of Biological Resources</i>				
BIO-17: Potential Conflict with Local Policies/ Ordinances	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	<u>Proposed Project Only</u> BIO-7 [see above]	LTS
<i>E. Impact on Wildlife from Increased Presence of Dogs and Cats</i>				
<u>BIO-18: Potential Adverse Impact on Wildlife Increased Presence of Dogs and Cats Associated with Residential Development</u>	<u>Potentially Significant</u>	<u>Potentially Significant</u>	<u>BIO-23: Install Signs Along and Within the Habitat Preserve about Restraining Dogs and Encouraging Cats to be Kept Inside</u>	<u>LTS</u>
<i>Cumulative Impacts</i>				
BIO-C1: Cumulative Loss of Biological Resources Including Habitats and Special Status Species	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	BIO-1 through BIO-22 [see above], <u>BIO-23: Monterey County to Require Dedication on a Portion of the Rancho Cañada Golf Course for a Wildlife Movement Corridor as a Condition of Approval of Future Development on the Remaining Portion of the Golf Course</u>	LTC
3.4 Aesthetics				
<i>A. Visual Character and Quality</i>				
AES-1: Changes in Visual Character due to the proposed Residential Use and Habitat Preserve	LTS	LTS	None Required.	-
AES-2: Changes in Visual Quality due to Changes in Views from Adjacent Land Uses due to the Proposed Residential Use	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	AES-1: Implement Measures to Reduce Light and Glare, and Visual Intrusion to Surrounding Land Uses and Other Public Viewpoints	LTS
<i>B. Scenic Vistas and Corridors</i>				
AES-3: Changes in Views from Existing Scenic Vistas and Corridors	LTS	LTS	None Required.	-
<i>C. Light and Glare</i>				
AES-4: Create a New Source of Light and Glare	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	AES-1 [see above]	LTS
<i>Cumulative Impacts</i>				

Impact	Proposed Project Level of Significance	130-Unit Alternative Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
AES-C1: Cumulative Degradation of the Existing Visual Character of the Region	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	AES-1 [see above]	LTS

3.5 Land Use

A. Land Use Compatibility

LU-1: Land Use Compatibility	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	AES-1: Implement Measures to Reduce Light and Glare, and Visual Intrusion to Surrounding Land Uses and Other Public Viewpoints	LTS
------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	--	-----

B. Plan/Policy Consistency

LU-2: Conflicts with Land Use Plans, Policies, or Regulations	Significant (re: CVMP Policy CV-1.6)	Significant (re: CVMP Policy CV-1.27)	Traffic Mitigation Measures in Chapter 3.7 and Chapter 4.	SU
LU-3: Conflicts with Habitat Conservation Plans	NI	NI	None Required	-

C. Division of an Established Community

LU-4: Physically Divide a Community	LTS	LTS	None Required	-
-------------------------------------	-----	-----	---------------	---

Cumulative Impacts

LU-C1: Cumulative Local Land Use Impacts	Considerable	LTC	Proposed Project Only: Traffic Mitigation Measures in Chapter 3.7 and Chapter 4.	CU (Proposed Project Only)
--	--------------	-----	--	----------------------------

3.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

A. Public Exposure

HAZ-1: Upset and Accident Conditions Involving the Release of Hazardous Materials into the Environment	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	HAZ-1: Follow Cypress Fire Protection District and Other Guidelines for Storage and Handling of Hazardous Materials HAZ-2: Immediately Contain Spills, Excavate Spill-Contaminated Soil, and Disposal at an Approved Facility HAZ-3: Develop and Implement Plans to Reduce Exposure of People and the Environment to Hazardous Conditions During Construction Activities HAZ-4: Test for the Presence of Asbestos or Lead-Based Paint and Remove in Accordance with Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD) Procedures (130-Unit Alternative only) PSU-2: Coordinate with Appropriate Utility Service Providers and Related Agencies to Reduce Service Interruptions	LTS
HAZ-2: Routine Transport, Use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	HAZ-5: Participate in the Local Household Hazardous Waste Collection Program	LTS

Impact	Proposed Project Level of Significance	130-Unit Alternative Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
HAZ-3: Hazardous Emissions or Hazardous Materials, Substances, or Waste Handling Within One-Quarter Mile of a School	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	<u>For the Proposed Project:</u> HAZ-1 through HAZ-3 and HAZ-5 [see above] <u>For the 130-Unit Alternative:</u> HAZ-1 through HAZ-5 [see above]	LTS
HAZ-4: Location of the Project on a Known Hazardous Material Site	LTS	LTS	None Required	-
<i>B. Airport Vicinity</i>				
HAZ-5: Potential Exposure of Hazardous Materials in the Vicinity of an Airport or Airstrip	LTS	LTS	None Required	-
<i>Cumulative Impacts</i>				
HAZ-C1: Cumulative Significant Hazards to the Public or Environment	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	HAZ-1 through HAZ-5 [see above]	LTC
3.7 Transportation and Circulation				
<i>A. Signalized Intersections</i>				
TR-1: LOS Decrease at Signalized Intersections	LTS	LTS	None Required	-
<i>B. Unsignalized Intersections</i>				
TR-2: LOS Decrease at Unsignalized Intersections	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	TR-1: Contribute Fair-Share to Interchange Improvements of Laureles Grade and Carmel Valley Road through the CVTIP Traffic Impact Fee	SU
<i>C. Roadway Segments</i>				
TR-3: Peak Hour LOS Decrease for Two-Lane and Multi-Lane and/or exceed ADT Threshold for Portions of Carmel Valley Road, Rio Road and Carmel Rancho Boulevard	LTS	LTS	None Required	-
TR-4: Peak Hour Segment LOS Decrease for Portions of State Route 1	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	None Required TR-2 Contribute Fair-Share Regional Impact Fee	SU
<i>D. Access, Circulation and Safety</i>				
TR-5: Adequate Sight Distance	LTS	LTS	None Required	-
TR-6: Adequate Project Access	LTS	LTS	None Required	-
<i>E. Transit and Bicycle Travel</i>				
TR-7: Changes to Transit and Bicycle Travel Access	LTS	LTS	None Required	-
<i>F. Construction Traffic</i>				
TR-8: Construction Traffic Decreases LOS	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	TR-23: Develop and Implement a Construction Traffic Control Plan	SU

Impact	Proposed Project Level of Significance	130-Unit Alternative Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<i>Cumulative Impacts</i>				
TR-C1: LOS Decrease at Signalized Intersections	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	None Required TR-2 [see above]	CU
TR-C2: LOS Decrease at Unsignalized Intersections	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	TR-1 [see above]	CU
TR-C3: Peak Hour LOS Decrease for Segments of SR1 and Carmel Valley Road	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	None Required TR-2 [see above]	CU
TR-C4: Exceed Average Daily Traffic Thresholds on Segments of Carmel Valley Road	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	TR-1 TR-2 [see above]	CU
TR-C5: Adequate Sight Distance	LTC	LTC	None Required	-
TR-C6: Adequate Project Access	LTC	LTC	None Required	-
TR-C7: Changes to Transit and Bicycle Travel Access	LTC	LTC	None Required	-
TR-C8: Construction Traffic	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	TRA-23 [see above]	CU
3.8 Air Quality				
<i>A. Air Quality Plan Consistency</i>				
AIR-1: Conflict with the 2012 Air Quality Management Plan	LTS	LTS	None Required	-
<i>B. Long-Term Emissions</i>				
AIR-2: Result in a Long-Term Increase in ROG, NO _x , CO, and PM10 Emissions from Vehicular Traffic and Area Sources	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	AIR-1: Prohibit Wood-Burning Fireplaces	LTS
<i>C. Construction Emissions</i>				
AIR-3: Result in a Short-Term Increase in PM10 Emissions due to Grading and Construction	LTS	LTS	None Required	-
<i>D. Sensitive Receptors</i>				
AIR-4: Result in the Emission of Toxic Air Contaminants from Diesel Truck and Equipment Use during Construction	LTS	LTS	None Required	-
AIR-5: Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial CO Concentrations from Project-Related Traffic	LTS	LTS	None Required	-
<i>E. Odors</i>				
AIR-6: Expose New Sensitive Receptors to Objectionable Odors	LTS	LTS	None Required	-

Impact	Proposed Project Level of Significance	130-Unit Alternative Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<i>Cumulative Impacts</i>				
AIR-C1: Cumulative Effect on Air Quality	LTC	LTC	None Required	-
AIR-C2: Cumulative Elevated Health Risk from Exposure to Construction-Related Emissions	LTC	LTC	None Required	-
3.9 Noise				
<i>A. Long-Term Increases in Noise</i>				
NOI-1: Exposure of Onsite Noise-Sensitive Land Use to Noise	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	NOI-1: Implement Noise-Reducing Treatments at Residences Located Near the Batting Practice Area and Lot 130	LTS
NOI-2: Exposure of Offsite Noise-Sensitive Land Uses to Increased Noise	LTS	LTS	None Required	-
<i>B. Short-Term Increases in Noise</i>				
NOI-3: Exposure of Noise-Sensitive Land Uses to Construction Noise	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	NOI-2: Employ Noise-Reducing Construction Practices	LTS
<i>C. Vibration</i>				
NOI-4: Exposure of Sensitive Land Uses to Vibration from Construction Activity	LTS	LTS	None Required	-
<i>Cumulative Impacts</i>				
NOI-C1: Exposure of Noise-Sensitive Land Uses to Cumulative Traffic Noise that Exceed County Noise Compatibility Standards	LTC	LTC	None Required	-
3.10 Public Services, Utilities, and Recreation				
<i>A. Fire and Police Services</i>				
PSU-1: Increased Demand for Fire and First-Responder Emergency Medical Services	LTS	LTS	None Required	--
PSU-2: Increased Demand for Police Services	LTS	LTS	None Required	--
<i>B. Emergency Access</i>				
PSU-3: Interference with Emergency Access Routes or Adopted Emergency Access Plans	LTS	LTS	None Required	-
<i>C. Wildland Fire Hazard</i>				
PSU-4: Expose People or Structures to a Significant Risk of Loss, Injury, or Death Involving Wildland Fires	LTS	LTS	None Required	-

Impact	Proposed Project Level of Significance	130-Unit Alternative Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<i>D. Water Demand</i>				
PSU-5: Increased Water Supply Demand	<u>Potentially Significant</u> <u>LTS</u>	<u>Potentially Significant</u> <u>LTS</u>	None Required <u>PSU-1: Dedicate Water Rights for the Project; Design for, Meter, and Monitor Water to meet Water Budgets; Implement Remedial Action if Water Budgets Exceeded</u>	<u>LTS</u>
<i>E. Infrastructure Capacities</i>				
PSU-6: Increased Demand for Water and Sewer Infrastructure	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	PSU-2.1: Test Well Supply, Identify Water Treatment and Distribution Facilities, and Avoid Impacts on Biological Resources	LTS
<i>F. Wastewater Treatment Capacity</i>				
PSU-7: Increased Wastewater Treatment Capacities	LTS	LTS	None Required	-
<i>G. Utility Disruption</i>				
PSU-8: Construction-Related Service Disruptions	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	PSU-3.2: Coordinate with Appropriate Utility Service Providers and Related Agencies to Reduce Service Interruptions	LTS
<i>H. School Enrollments</i>				
PSU-9: Increased Student Enrollments	LTS	LTS	None Required	-
<i>I. Recreational Demand</i>				
PSU-10: Increased Use of Existing Neighborhood and Regional Parks	LTS	LTS	None Required	-
<i>J. Open Space</i>				
PSU-11: Quality and Quantity of Open Space Used for Recreation	LTS	LTS	None Required	-
<i>K. Landfill Capacity</i>				
PSU-12: Increased Demand for Solid Waste, Green Waste, and Recycling Disposal Needs	LTS	LTS	None Required	-
<i>Cumulative Impacts</i>				
PSU-C1: Cumulative Increase in Demand for Public Services and Utility Infrastructure and Capacities	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	PSU-1, PSU-2 [see above]	LTC
3.11 Cultural Resources				
<i>A. Historical Resources</i>				
CR-1: Demolition, Destruction, Relocation, or Alteration of Historical Resources	NI	NI	None Required	-

B., C., and D. Archaeological Resources, Human Remains, and Paleontological Resources

CR-2: Ground Disturbing Activities, Such As Grading, Trenching, or Excavation	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	CR-1: Archaeological Resources- Stop Work if Buried Cultural Deposits are Encountered During Construction Activities CR-2: Archaeological Monitoring During Ground Disturbing Activities Within the Project Area During Construction CR-3: Archaeological Resources- Stop Work if Human Remains are Encountered During Construction Activities CR-4: Paleontological Resources- Stop Work if Vertebrate Remains are Encountered During Construction	LTS
CR-3: Erosion or Usage of the Project Area That Could Expose Buried Archaeological Resources Due to Long-Term Use of the Area	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	CR-5: Consult With a Qualified Archaeologist to Identify Resources and Assess Impacts	LTS
<i>Cumulative Impacts</i>				
CR-C1: Cumulative Impacts on Unknown and Undiscovered Cultural Resources	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	CR-1 through CR-5 [see above]	LTC

3.12 Population and Housing

POP-1: Induce Substantial Population Growth In Excess of Adopted Land Use Plans And That Would Result in Significant Secondary Physical Effects on the Environment	Significant (for induced traffic)	LTS	None feasible to avoid all traffic impacts (Proposed Project) None required (130-Unit Alternative)	SU (for traffic for Proposed Project)
<i>B. Cause Displacement of People or Housing</i>				
POP-2: Displacement of Existing Housing or Population	LTS	LTS	None Required	-
<i>Cumulative Impacts</i>				
POP-C1: Cumulative Impacts Related to Population and Housing	Significant (for induced traffic)	LTC	None feasible to avoid all traffic impacts (Proposed Project) None required (130-Unit Alternative)	CU (for traffic for Proposed Project)

3.13 Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change

A. Contribute to Climate Change Impacts

GHG-1: Result in Project-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions, during Construction and Operation, that Could Contribute to Climate Change Impacts and be Inconsistent with the Goals of Assembly Bill 32	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	GHG-1: Implement Best Management Practices for Greenhouse Gas Emissions during Construction GHG-2: Reduce Annual Greenhouse Gas Emissions to below the Efficiency Threshold Using a Combination of Design Features, Replanting, and/or Offset Purchases	LTS
--	-------------------------	-------------------------	--	-----

B. Effects of Climate Change

GHG-2: Result in Significant Exposure of Persons or Property to Reasonably Foreseeable Impacts of Climate Change	Not applicable	Not Applicable	None Required	-
--	----------------	----------------	---------------	---

1 Chapter 2 – Project Description

2 *Page 2-9, line 40, footnote is added as follows:*

3 Amendment of General Plan/CVMP Policy CV-1.6¹ as follows:

4 ¹ In September 24, 2012, the County and Carmel Valley Association entered into a settlement
 5 agreement for the purpose of resolving a case brought by CVA challenging the County's
 6 certification of the EIR for the 2010 General Plan. (Monterey County Superior Court Case No.
 7 M109442.) Under the Settlement Agreement, CVA agreed to dismiss its lawsuit if the County
 8 adopted certain amendments to the General Plan. Those amendments included reducing the
 9 residential unit cap from 266 to 190 in Policy CV-1.6 of the Carmel Valley Master Plan of the 2010
 10 General Plan. On February 12, 2013, the Board of Supervisors adopted the amendment to Policy
 11 CV-1.6 to reduce the unit cap to 190, among other amendments.

12 Approval of the 281 unit project would require amending the Carmel Valley Master Plan to modify
 13 the unit cap. The Settlement Agreement does not restrict County's land use authority or police
 14 power, so it does not prohibit such an amendment. However, under the terms of the Settlement
 15 Agreement, amendment of the unit cap without CVA's written approval could be a "Material
 16 Default" of the agreement. In the event of a Material Default, CVA may request the court to set
 17 aside the Settlement Agreement and reinstitute its lawsuit against the General Plan EIR.

18
 19 *Page 2-14, Lines 25 to 38 are revised as follows:*

20 The 130-Unit Alternative's ~~would reduce the amount of potable water demand on the project site~~
 21 ~~compared to the Proposed Project and compared to existing conditions.~~ proposed water uses are as
 22 follows (see analysis in Chapter 3.10, *Public Services, Utilities, and Recreation*).

- 23 • Residential and irrigation uses at the 130-Unit Alternative site (approximately 70 AFY for an
 24 average year).
- 25 • A proposal to ~~dedicate~~ transfer up to 60 AFY for new connections (subscriber uses) pursuant to
 26 an appropriate right that has yet to be approved by SWRCB, to be served by Cal-Am and to be
 27 used by Cal-Am in the interim to offset its unauthorized diversions until subscription water use
 28 occurs. This water use would be offsite and could be anywhere within the Cal-Am service area.

29 The overall proposed water use would be approximately 130 AFY, including the proposed 60 AFY
 30 water transfer ~~dedications~~. The applicant proposes to dedicate an additional approximately 50 AFY
 31 for beneficial instream uses in the Carmel River beyond the uses noted above, to bring the total
 32 project water use up to 180 AFY. However, the dedication for beneficial instream uses is not
 33 considered a water "use" for the purposes of this RDEIR, since the project would not actually "use"
 34 water that is left for the Carmel River.

35
 36 *Page 2-16, Lines 25 to 33 are revised as follows:*

- 37 • Amendment of CVMP Policy 1.27 as follows:
 - 38 ○ Special Treatment Area: Rancho Canada Village – Up to 40 acres within properties
 - 39 located generally between Val Verde Drive and the Rancho Canada Golf Course, from

1 the Carmel River to Carmel Valley Road, excluding portions of properties in
 2 floodplain shall be designated as a Special Treatment Area. Notwithstanding any
 3 other General Plan policies, Residential development may be allowed with a
 4 density of up to 10 units/acre in this area and shall provide a minimum of ~~20%~~ 50%
 5 Affordable/Workforce Housing. Prior to beginning new residential development
 6 (excluding the first unit on an existing lot of record), projects must address
 7 environmental resource constraints (e.g.; water, traffic, flooding).

8
 9 *Page 2-18, Table 2-5 is revised to add the following under the Monterey Peninsula Water Management*
 10 *District (MPWMD):*

11 Approval of a River Work Permit for any work with the Riparian Corridor

12

13 **Chapter 3.1 – Geology, Seismicity, and Soils**

14 *Page 3.1-4, line 21, is revised as follows:*

15 The project area is located in the Carmel Valley, a broad alluvial flow that drains westward via the
 16 Carmel River into the Pacific Ocean.

17

18 **Chapter 3.2 – Hydrology and Water Quality**

19 *Page 3.2-1, Table 3.2-1 is revised as follows:*

20 BIO-4 ~~BIO-3~~: Provide Funding Assurances and Reporting Concerning Restoration Progress and Success

22

23 *Page 3.2-4, lines 39-40 are revised as follows:*

24 The project lies within the ~~Carmel Valley Aquifer~~ Carmel Valley Alluvial Aquifer system, which
 25 functions as a water supply source for a large portion of the local area (Monterey County Water
 26 Resources Agency 2002 in Balance Hydrologics 2005a).

27

28 *Page 3.2-5, lines 17-20 are revised as follows:*

29 One of the Cal-Am wells is located in the project area. Of the 21 wells that the Cal-Am has along the
 30 Carmel River, the ~~Rancho Cañada~~ well at the Rancho Cañada golf course site is the farthest
 31 downstream. ~~The Rancho Cañada~~ This well was drilled in 1981. At this well, the groundwater is
 32 approximately 15 feet below the surface and pumping occurs at 49 feet below the surface (State
 33 Water Resources Control Board 1995).

34

35 *Page 3.2-6, lines 26 - 34 are revised as follows:*

1 There ~~are~~ have been two significant dams on the Carmel River: Los Padres Dam and San Clemente
 2 Dam. These structures were constructed by Cal-AM for water supply purposes. No flood-control
 3 storage ~~is~~ was allocated in either reservoir, although some flood-control benefits may have been ~~be~~
 4 attributable to the dams early in the flood season when storage space is available as a result of
 5 summer draw down for water supply. The dams have had little effect on reducing peak discharges
 6 downstream late in the flood season once they have become full (Federal Emergency Management
 7 Agency 2009). San Clemente Dam ~~is presently being~~ has been removed as part of habitat restoration
 8 efforts along the Carmel River ~~and will be removed (along with the Old Carmel River Dam) by 2016.~~
 9 There are discussions about the potential future removal of Los Padres Dam as well, but its future
 10 fate is uncertain.

11 *Page 3.2-20, the following text is added after line 38:*

12 **Monterey Peninsula Water Management District Riparian Corridor**
 13 **Regulations**

14 The following rules apply to work in the vicinity of the Carmel River 10-year flow line, including
 15 work to install outfalls into the Carmel River:

16 Rule 11 (Definitions) "RIPARIAN CORRIDOR - shall mean: a. All that area which
 17 comprises the Riverbed and riverbanks of the Carmel River which lies within the
 18 boundaries of the Carmel River Management Zone (Zone No. 3), and b. All those areas
 19 which lie within 25 lineal feet of the Riverbank Assessment Line, excepting however, all
 20 lands which lie outside of the Zone No. 3 boundary, and exempting lawns, Landscaping
 21 and cultivated areas as shown on the spring 1983 aerial photographs taken by California
 22 American Water pursuant to the agreement with the District in accord with Rule 123 A."

23 Rule 20 (Permits), Part D: "Before any individual may undertake any Work or Project
 24 within the Riparian Corridor, including but not limited to channel modification,
 25 riverbank Works, or vegetation removal, such Person shall obtain a prior written River
 26 Work Permit from the District in accord with Rule 126 or meet the emergency River
 27 Work Permit criteria of Rule 126 C, or be expressly exempt from the River Work Permit
 28 requirement pursuant to Rule 126 B."

29 Rule 126 – River Work Permits:

30 "A. REGULAR PROCEDURE: River Work Permits shall be required by any Person who
 31 undertakes riverbank or Riverbed protection, riparian vegetation removal, channel
 32 modification or activities prohibited by Rule 124 within the Riparian Corridor, except
 33 where such activity is expressly exempt from this Permit process in accord with Rule
 34 126 B. Such a Permit must be obtained prior to the commencement or any work or
 35 activity unless that activity is defined as a "minor work" or unless that activity is an
 36 "emergency work". Minor works may be undertaken in accord with the process set forth
 37 in Rule 127 A (4) below. Emergency works may be undertaken in accord with the
 38 process set forth in Rule 127 B.

39 B. PERMIT EXEMPTIONS: This District Board may from time to time, upon advice of the
 40 Carmel River Advisory Committee, designate River Works which shall be exempt from
 41 this Permit process, and therefore not be subject to the prohibitions set forth in Rule
 42 124. District staff shall maintain and distribute a list of such exempt activities.

1 C. EMERGENCY PROCEDURE: Emergency riverbank or Riverbed protection or channel
 2 modification measures are excepted from the prior requirement for a River Work
 3 Permit, provided that the General Manager or District Engineer must first declare such
 4 an emergency to exist or to be imminent. Emergency work Permits shall be processed in
 5 accord with Rule 127 B.

6 When declaring an emergency, the General Manager or District Engineer shall take into
 7 account the high probability of flooding, erosion danger, blockage and structural
 8 damage. During a declared period of emergency, the District must be notified as soon as
 9 possible in writing of the type, location and extent of any emergency works. Application
 10 for approval shall then be made within 10 days after such emergency works were begun
 11 to the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District on forms supplied by the District
 12 and, if required by the General Manager or District Engineer, shall be accompanied by
 13 appropriate plans.

14 D. PROCEDURE WHERE A LIFE OR PROPERTY IS THREATENED: Should an emergency
 15 situation arise that requires immediate bank protection actions to mitigate a clear and
 16 present danger to life or property, such actions may be performed without prior
 17 approval of the General Manager or District Engineer. Protective measures performed
 18 under this subsection shall be limited to those needed to mitigate such clear and present
 19 danger to life or property.

20 Such activity shall immediately be communicated to the District, and within ten calendar
 21 days of the commencement of such actions the type, location, and extent of protective
 22 measures performed under this subsection shall be reported in writing to the District.”

23 *Page 3.2-24, lines 11-15 are revised as follows:*

24 Implementation of **Mitigation Measure BIO-4** ~~BIO-3~~ Provide Funding Assurances and Reporting
 25 Concerning Restoration Progress and Success, and Mitigation Measure BIO-7, Monitor Bank Erosion in
 26 Project Reach and Restore Riparian Vegetation and River Bank As Necessary, described in Chapter 3.3,
 27 *Biological Resources*, would ensure that this impact would be lowered to *less-than-significant* levels.

28 *Page 3.2-25, lines 39-40 are revised as follows:*

29 With implementation of the proposed drainage system approved by MCWRA and with implementation of
 30 **Mitigation Measures BIO-4** ~~BIO-3~~ and **BIO-7**, the Proposed Project would not substantially alter the
 31 existing drainage pattern of the site in a manner which would result in flooding or substantial erosion or
 32 siltation on or off the site and thus would have a less-than-significant impact.

33 *Page 3.2-27, lines 7-8 are revised as follows under Mitigation Measure HYD-1:*

34 The Plan shall be reviewed by a licensed Geotechnical Engineer to ensure conformance with the
 35 Geotechnical Investigation or Engineering Geology Report. The Plan shall be reviewed and approved
 36 by the County prior to recording the final map.

37
 38 *Page 3.2-32, lines 21-23 are revised as follows under Mitigation Measure HYD-5:*

39 If an appreciable spill has occurred and results determine that project activities have adversely
 40 affected surface water or groundwater quality, the Project Applicant will provide a detailed analysis

1 will be performed by a Registered Environmental Assessor to identify the likely cause of
2 contamination.

3 *Page 3.2-33, lines 8-38 are revised as follows:*

4 **Operation**

5 During operation, groundwater recharge¹ may be affected by the Proposed Project. The Proposed
6 Project would include approximately 25 acres of new impervious surface. The remaining portions of
7 the project site would maintain existing groundwater recharge capabilities. Stormwater runoff from
8 small to moderate rainfall events would be routed to infiltration areas onsite, providing recharge of
9 storms up to the 95th percentile event.

10 Stormwater infiltration areas would collect and store stormwater runoff for percolation and release
11 into new outfall pipes in severe storms. Low-impact development stormwater treatment methods
12 such as this would be designed in accordance with the MCWRA and state agency policy and the
13 design would ensure infiltrated groundwater would not cause underlying groundwater to exceed
14 water quality objectives or adversely affect beneficial uses. These areas would promote infiltration
15 and allow for the removal of pollutants as stormwater percolates down through the soil.

16 ~~Annual post-project groundwater recharge at the project site has been estimated to be 33.2 acre-feet~~
17 ~~(Balance Hydrologics 2005a) exclusive of infiltration in pervious areas of the project site, which may~~
18 ~~be substantial. Average annual pre-project groundwater recharge of approximately 34.9 acre-feet~~
19 ~~was estimated using average annual rainfall, irrigation, and evapotranspiration (Balance~~
20 ~~Hydrologics 2005a). This value is only 1.7 acre-feet greater than the estimated recharge of 33.2~~
21 ~~acre-feet for post-project conditions.~~

22 The Proposed Project is anticipated to use groundwater as a supply but would result in a reduction
23 in withdrawals over current usage (see Chapter 3.10, *Public Services, Utilities, and Recreation*). In
24 order to meet the Proposed Project's water demands Cal-Am would use pumped groundwater from
25 onsite wells or a connection to Cal-Am facilitated by dedication of an appropriate amount of the
26 applicant's water right to Cal-Am. Overall annual water use during Proposed Project operation
27 would decrease because existing baseline golf course irrigation (approximately 204 acre-feet per
28 year [AFY] on average) associated with the golf course that would be removed is much higher than
29 the estimated water demand for the Proposed Project (estimated average of 101 445 AFY).

30 The recharge analysis examined the net recharge to the Carmel Valley Alluvial Aquifer under
31 baseline and with-project conditions. The amount of recharge on-site was subtracted from the
32 groundwater pumping to identify the net recharge to the aquifer under both baseline and with-
33 project conditions.

34 Baseline recharge for the project site as well as recharge for the non-impervious portions of the
35 project were both estimated using a soil-water balance approach considering precipitation,
36 evapotranspiration, land cover water demands, changes in soil moisture, and soil permeability
37 conditions. The analysis included both turf/landscaped areas and areas of natural land cover.
38 Climatic data was developed using a combination of the on-site CIMIS weather station data,
39 Monterey weather station data, and Castroville weather station data in order to develop a
40 representative precipitation and evapotranspiration data set for on-site conditions. Baseline and
41 with-project land covers were identified using the GIS analysis that supported the biological

¹ Recharge is determined by the ability of water to infiltrate into the soil.

1 resources assessment. Plant factors for different landscape water demands were identified from
2 literature values. Applied water (irrigation) monthly amounts were estimated by using recent (WY
3 2009 – WY 2014) data on monthly irrigation and applying to prior irrigation data sets (WY 1991 –
4 WY 2008). Using this data, the soil-water balance calculations were done for each year between
5 1991 and 1994 in order to estimate aquifer recharge amounts on-site for non-impervious areas. For
6 project impervious areas, annual post-project groundwater recharge was estimated using the same
7 model used in the Preliminary Stormwater Management Plan (Balance Hydrologics 2005a), but the
8 model was adjusted to use the more recent CIMIS data to more accurately reflect on-site conditions.
9 The results of the analysis described above are presented in Table 3.2-6 (and in greater detail in
10 Appendix H):

Table 3.2-6: Summary of Proposed Project Groundwater Recharge Analysis (Acre-Feet) [NEW TABLE]

<i>Groundwater Pumping</i>					
	Factors	Baseline		Project	
Groundwater Pumping (1)		204.78		100.79	
<i>Groundwater Recharge</i>					
Landcover	Recharge (2)	Landcover (3)	Recharge (4)	Landcover (3)	Recharge (4)
	AFY Per Acre	Acre	AFY	Acres	AFY
Turf	1.07	56.70	60.59	5.90	6.30
Developed Area - Impervious	NA	0.00	0.00	22.59	29.83
Developed Area - Pervious (5)	NA	0.00	0.00	14.46	15.45
Detention Basin (6)	NA	0.00	0.00	1.10	NA
Woodland	1.18	7.10	8.35	22.04	25.92
Scrub	1.04	10.90	11.35	0.50	0.52
Pond	0.47	1.40	0.65	0.00	0.00
Wetland	0.47	0.30	0.14	1.20	0.00
Grassland	0.64	0.00	0.00	8.60	5.49
<i>Subtotal</i>		<i>76.40</i>	<i>81.08</i>	<i>76.39</i>	<i>83.52</i>
<i>Net Groundwater Recharge</i>					
Net Recharge			-123.70		-17.27
					<i>Change with Proposed Project</i>
					<i>106.42</i>
Notes:					
1. Pumping amounts are total irrigation (See Chapter 3.10 and Appendix H).					
2. Recharge estimates for natural and landscape land covers from soil-water balance calculations in Appendix H.					
3. Land cover acreages from GIS analysis for biological resource evaluation. Adjustments made to avoid double-counting areas and to match baseline and project acreage overall.					
4. Recharge estimated by multiplying recharge estimate per acre by land cover acreage, except for analysis of impervious areas for the Proposed Project which were estimated using a modified runoff-infiltration model used by Balance Hydrologics for the Preliminary Stormwater Management Plan.					
5. Pervious areas within the development footprint were treated as if they were turf.					
6. Detention basin is tied to impervious space; to avoid double-counting, no infiltration of direct precipitation in this area was included.					

1 Therefore, with implementation of stormwater infiltration areas for recharge and the estimated
2 minimal change in recharge combined with a reduction in water supply withdrawals, impacts on
3 groundwater supplies would be *less than significant*.

4 From a water supply point of view, the overall increase in net recharge compared to baseline
5 conditions ~~reduction in water use~~ would have a *beneficial* impact on the Carmel River aquifer.

6 The Proposed Project (or the 130-unit Alternative) would also change the relative timing of
7 pumping with the shift from the baseline irrigation pumping (pumping between April and October
8 accounts for about 89% of golf course pumping) to a more even pattern of pumping to support
9 residential use (62% to 68% of pumping between April and October), since residential use has much
10 less irrigated areas and indoor use does not vary with climatic conditions. ICF completed additional
11 analysis of the change in seasonal use. The resultant analysis (see Appendix H) shows that the
12 Proposed Project and the 130-unit Alternative would result in a slight increase in pumping from
13 November to March and a decrease in pumping from April through October with a substantial net
14 overall annual decrease, compared to baseline. The relative increase in pumping levels in November
15 to March compared to baseline levels would be on the order of 1 to 6 AF. As a rough comparison, 6
16 AF per month is equivalent to approximately 0.2 AF per day, which corresponds to about 0.1 cubic
17 feet per second (cfs) of flow. This amount of this change in daily pumping is not expected to result
18 in any substantial change in instream flow conditions. The relative monthly decreased pumping
19 levels in April to October compared to baseline levels is on the order of 4 to 23 AF. As a rough
20 comparison, 23 AF per month is equivalent to approximately 0.74 AF per day, which corresponds to
21 about 0.37 cubic feet per second (cfs) of flow. If anything, the relative shift from a baseline of more
22 pumping in the spring and summer to a project condition of less spring/summer and more
23 fall/winter pumping should be beneficial to instream flows during the critical low flow period in
24 spring and summer.

25 No mitigation is required.

26 *Page 3.2-34, lines 9-25 are revised as follows:*

27 **Operation**

28 Groundwater conditions for the 130-Unit Alternative would be similar to the Proposed Project
29 during operation in regards to groundwater quality but different in terms of groundwater supply.

30 The 130-Unit Alternative would include approximately 14 acres of new impervious surface in the
31 residential element. Lot 130 is not likely to substantially change the amount of impervious space
32 from existing conditions with the maintenance facility. The proposed stormwater treatment areas
33 would be designed to accommodate any potential runoff volumes based on the additional new
34 impervious area and would allow for infiltration.

35 Annual water use during operation of the 130-Unit Alternative would decrease because the golf
36 course baseline irrigation (approximately 204 AFY on average) is greater than the 130-Unit
37 Alternative water demand (estimated average of 130 AFY, including potential water transfers to
38 other Cal-Am users).

39 The recharge analysis examined the net recharge to the Carmel Valley Alluvial Aquifer under
40 baseline and with-130-unit Alternative conditions. The amount of recharge on-site was subtracted
41 from the groundwater pumping to identify the net recharge to the aquifer under both baseline and

1 with-project conditions. The methodology was the same as described above for the Proposed
2 Project.

3 The results of the analysis described above are presented in Table 3.2-7 (and in greater detail in
4 Appendix H):

Table 3.2-7: Summary of Groundwater Recharge Analysis, 130-unit Alternative [NEW TABLE]

	Factors	Baseline		130-Unit Alternative	
<i>Groundwater Pumping</i>					
Groundwater Pumping (1)		204.78		122.21	
<i>Groundwater Recharge</i>					
	Recharge (2)	Landcover (3)	Recharge (4)	Landcover (3)	Recharge (4)
Landcover	AFY Per Acre	Acre	AFY	Acres	AFY
Turf	1.07	56.90	60.80	7.70	8.23
Developed Area - Impervious	NA	3.40	17.10	17.10	22.64
Developed Area - Pervious (5)	NA	0.00	0.00	11.40	12.18
Detention Basin (6)	NA	0.00	0.00	0.84	NA
Woodland	1.18	7.10	8.35	22.04	25.92
Scrub	1.04	10.90	11.35	0.50	0.52
Pond	0.47	1.40	0.65	0.00	0.00
Wetland	0.47	0.30	0.14	1.20	0.56
Grassland	0.64	0.00	0.00	19.26	12.28
<i>Subtotal</i>		<i>80.00</i>	<i>98.40</i>	<i>80.04</i>	<i>82.33</i>
<i>Net Groundwater Recharge</i>					
Net Recharge			-106.38		-39.88
<i>Change with 130-unit Alternative</i>					<i>66.50</i>
Notes:					
1. Pumping amounts are total irrigation (See Chapter 3.10 and Appendix H).					
2. Recharge estimates for natural and landscape land covers from soil-water balance calculations in Appendix H.					
3. Land cover acreages from GIS analysis for biological resource evaluation. Adjustments made to avoid double-counting areas and to match baseline and project acreage overall.					
4. Recharge estimated by multiplying recharge estimate per acre by land cover acreage, except for analysis of impervious areas for the Proposed Project which were estimated using a modified runoff-infiltration model used by Balance Hydrologics for the Preliminary Stormwater Management Plan.					
5. Pervious areas within the development footprint were treated as if they were turf.					
6. Detention basin is tied to impervious space; to avoid double-counting, no infiltration of direct precipitation in this area was included.					

1 Therefore, with construction and operation of stormwater infiltration areas for recharge and
 2 reduced overall water use per year, despite the reduction in gross recharge due to landcover change,
 3 overall there would be a net increase in recharge compared to baseline conditions ~~groundwater~~
 4 ~~depletion would be avoided,~~ and impacts on groundwater recharge and supplies would be *less than*
 5 *significant.*

6 From a water supply point of view, the reduction in water use would have a *beneficial* impact on the
 7 Carmel River aquifer. No mitigation is required.

8 *Page 3.2-34, lines 36-38 are revised as follows:*

9 While the houses in the Rancho Cañada Village Project are unlikely to be flooded, the fill on which
 10 they are built and increases in runoff from new impervious area have the potential to cause a
 11 constriction in the river channel during high flow events, which could raise water levels upstream.

12 *Page 3.2-36, lines 21-24 are revised as follows under Mitigation Measure HYD-6:*

13 No protection should be needed for the downstream portions of the excavated area because rapid
 14 movement of water over a drop is not expected to occur there. To the extent that the upstream
 15 portion of the excavated area is exposed to higher velocities, erosion risks ~~can~~ will be mitigated
 16 through slope protection measures installed by the Project Applicant prior to issuance of a
 17 certificate of occupancy. Such measures ~~that~~ could include rock or turf-reinforced mats.

18 *Page 3.2-36, lines 35-37 are revised as follows:*

19 The 130-Unit Alternative was included in the CSA-50 2014 flood study (Balance Hydrologics 2014b)
 20 which shows that this alternative would not substantially change flooding conditions. In fact, the
 21 130-Unit Alternative would provide flood control benefits to CSA-50. Under the 130-Unit
 22 Alternative, the Project Applicant proposes to raise the Rio Road emergency access road which
 23 would essentially fill in the gap in the area from west of the Project Site to the Val Verde tie back
 24 levee. This will directly address the large potential flood flow path down Rio Road from the river.

25

26 **Chapter 3.3 – Biological Resources**

27 *Page 3.3-9, lines 20-24 are revised as follows:*

28 Riparian vegetation grows sparsely along the banks of all three ponds, which could provide cover to
 29 amphibians. ~~If these ponds were to become substantially ponded again, they would be considered~~
 30 ~~lower quality wildlife habitat due to the relative lack of vegetation along their edges and the absence~~
 31 ~~of emergent vegetation.~~

32 *Page 3.3-10, lines 25-26 are revised as follows:*

33 Riparian woodland near the main entrance to Rancho Cañada Village site is dominated by arroyo
 34 willow in the overstory.

35 *Page 3.3-23, Table 3.3-4. Special-Status Wildlife and Fish Species with Potential to Occur in the Project*
 36 *Vicinity:*

37 California red-legged frog *Rana ~~aurora~~ draytonii*

1 Carmel River provides suitable habitat; ~~the California bulrush wetland ponds 1, 2, and 3~~ may
 2 provide suitable breeding habitat depending on length of inundation. Anecdotal reference to CRLF
 3 sightings in Intermittent Drainage 2 and in a pond on the adjacent CMS biological project site
 4 (Hohenberger 2008).

5 *Page 3.3-32, lines 1 – 5 are revised as follows:*

6 One area within the project area provides potential breeding habitat for CRLF: the California bulrush
 7 wetland (**Figure 3.3-1**). Suitable habitat for CRLF is also present within the Carmel River. Based on
 8 surveys conducted in 2014, Ponds 1, 2, and 3 within the golf course, do not appear to pond water
 9 anymore and do not provide suitable aquatic habitat for contain emergent vegetation necessary to
 10 support a breeding population of CRLF. There are ~~also~~ additional ponds within the golf course but
 11 outside of the project area, that may also provide suitable habitat for CRLF.

12 *Page 3.3-54, lines 25 to 32 are revised as follows:*

13 **Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Measures to Avoid or Minimize Impacts on Special-Status Plant**
 14 **Species Populations Relative to Lot 130 by Redesigning the Project, Protecting Populations,**
 15 **and Implementing a Compensation Plan (If Necessary)**

16 The Project Applicant will implement the following measures to avoid or minimize impacts on
 17 special-status plant species if any occurrences are documented in the surveys on prescribed in
 18 Mitigation Measure BIO-1. This measure is applicable only to Lot 130 included in the 130-Unit
 19 Alternative.

20 The Project Applicant shall present the findings of the special-status plant survey to the County. If
 21 special-status plants are found on Lot 130 that would be affected by the residential design, prior to
 22 construction, the Project Applicant will ~~redesign or~~ modify the Lot 130 residential design Project to
 23 avoid direct and indirect impacts on special-status plant species, if feasible. If the Project Applicant
 24 identified that avoidance or minimization is not feasible, they shall identify the reasons why in
 25 writing to the County who shall make the final determination of feasibility prior to issuance of any
 26 building permit for Lot 130.

27 *Page 3.3-58, lines 32 -36 is revised as follows:*

28 **Mitigation Measure BIO-6: Minimize Disturbance of Riparian Forest and Woodland**

29 Riparian forest and woodland outside of the construction footprint will be protected from
 30 disturbance. Prior to construction, the Project Applicant will secure the services of a qualified
 31 botanist ~~to will~~ erect environmentally sensitive area fencing (orange construction barrier fencing)
 32 around riparian forest and woodland areas near the construction area, to identify and protect these
 33 sensitive resources.

34 *Page 3.3-62, lines 20 -22 are revised as follows:*

35 ~~The policies do not distinguish between native and planted redwood trees; thus even if the removed~~
 36 ~~redwoods are planted, replacement is still required by ordinance.~~

37 *Page 3.3-63, lines 6-15 are revised as follows:*

38 Construction of the Proposed Project would result in the filling of the California bulrush wetland and
 39 ~~ponds 1, 2, and 3~~, which provides potential breeding habitat ~~and aestivation/dispersal habitat,~~
 40 ~~respectively~~, for CRLF (totaling 0.35 acre of wetland breeding habitat). The Proposed Project would

1 ~~also result in the removal of and~~ 1.4 acres of aestivation/dispersal habitat from the elimination of
 2 ponds 1, 2, and 3, which no longer pond water). Construction activities in suitable habitat could
 3 result in the mortality of adults, larvae, or eggs. ~~If CRLF were present in the California bulrush~~
 4 ~~wetland or ponds, filling of these areas would result in the loss of aquatic habitat and the potential~~
 5 ~~mortality of adults, larvae, or eggs.~~ The Project would also create a substantial impediment to CRLF
 6 movement between the Carmel River, across the golf course, and the small (<0.05 acre)
 7 pond/wetland in the CMS Biological Sciences Habitat area where CRLF have been anecdotally
 8 reported. If CRLF are using the school pond/wetland, the Project would block movement to and
 9 from the pond due to the presence of Rio Road and residential development.

10 *Page 3.3-63, lines 41 through Page 3.3-64 line 3 are revised as follows:*

11 While a new detention pond would be created, the detention pond is designed for infiltration to
 12 benefit aquifer recharge (which ultimately benefits the Carmel River and associated CRLF habitat),
 13 the pond will not be designed or managed to retain ponding for breeding habitat but would provide
 14 aestivation/movement habitat.

15 Although the proposed 2006 Restoration Plan would result in an increase in upland habitat for the
 16 CRLF along the Carmel River and would replace lost wetland habitat, the plan does not call for
 17 replacement of suitable breeding habitat ~~for CRLF (i.e., wetlands)~~ to mitigate for the direct removal
 18 of the bulrush wetland ponds on the site and the indirect effect on migration to the CMS
 19 pond/wetland, and thus the Project would have a significant impact related to the loss of suitable
 20 breeding habitat for the CRLF.

21 *Page 3.3-64, lines 13-18 are revised as follows:*

22 The 130-Unit Alternative would not affect any additional CRLF aquatic habitat, but would affect
 23 areas that serve as upland/dispersal habitat. While a new detention pond would be created under
 24 this Alternative, the detention pond is designed for infiltration to benefit aquifer recharge (which
 25 ultimately benefits the Carmel River and associated CRLF habitat), the pond will not be designed or
 26 managed to retain ponding for breeding habitat. Potential direct and indirect impacts from the 130-
 27 Unit Alternative would be the same as those

28 *Page 3.3-65, lines 1 -6 are revised as follows:*

29 **Mitigation Measure BIO-12: Restrict Filling of Ponds/Wetlands and Initial Ground-Disturbing**
 30 **Activities in CRLF Habitat to the Dry Season (May 1 to October 15)**

31 To minimize mortality of CRLF eggs, larvae, and adults, the Project Applicant would condition its
 32 contractor to ~~or its contractor would~~ only perform construction activities that would result in fill of
 33 ponds 1, 2, and 3, and the California bulrush wetland during May 1 through October 15. During this
 34 time of year, CRLF would have left ~~breeding these~~ areas to aestivate underground and would not be
 35 present ~~in ponds~~.

36 *Page 3.3-65, lines 15 -18 are revised as follows:*

37 **Mitigation Measure BIO-13: Conduct a Preconstruction Survey for CRLF**

1 Prior to construction activities, the Project Applicant ~~or its contractor will condition its contractor to~~
 2 obtain the services of a qualified FWS-approved biologist. The biologist will conduct a
 3 preconstruction survey 2 weeks prior to the onset of work for CRLF.

4 *Page 3.3-65, lines 27 -31 are revised as follows:*

5
 6 **Mitigation Measure BIO-14: Monitor Initial Ground-Disturbing Construction Activities**
 7 **within CRLF Habitat**

8
 9 The Project Applicant ~~or its contractor would~~ will condition its contractor to retain the services
 10 of a qualified FWS-approved biologist to monitor initial ground-disturbing construction
 11 activities within CRLF upland habitat. The biologist will look for CRLF during grading,
 12 excavation, and vegetation removal activities.

13 *Page 3.3-65, line 34 is revised as follows:*

14 Any relocation of this ~~ese~~ species would require incidental take authorization through a Biological
 15 Opinion or Habitat Conservation Plan from the FWS.

16 *Page 3.3-65, line 39 through Page 3.30-66 line 1:*

17 The location and size of the compensation aquatic habitat area will be determined in consultation
 18 with FWS through the ESA Section 7 or Section 10 process, but under no circumstances should the
 19 compensation area be calculated on less than a 1:1 ratio (1 acre for each 1 acre lost) and potentially
 20 more if a greater ratio is determined by the FWS.

21 *Page 3.3-66, lines 13-21:*

- 22 ● Onsite in Remnant Golf Course – Given that the project’s effects are on a bulrush wetland to
 23 golf course ponds with a mix of adjacent golf course fairway and disturbed coyote brush
 24 scrub and indirect effects due to blocking access to a pond on the adjacent school property,
 25 it would be appropriate to create a new pond or ponds on the retained portions of the golf
 26 course south of the Carmel River within the proposed restoration areas or retained open
 27 space area as compensation for Project effects. The area south of the river is directly
 28 adjacent to the Palo Corona Regional Park and thus new pond(s) would have good
 29 connectivity to the river and to adjacent undeveloped upland habitat. In this scenario, the
 30 Project Applicant would be responsible to create, manage, and preserve the new pond or
 31 ponds only. The location of the pond(s) relative to the adjacent upland habitat would need
 32 to be approved by FWS.

33 *Page 3.3-66, lines 27-29 are revised as follows under Mitigation Measure BIO-15:*

34 Given the timing concerns noted above, the applicant will be required to create the new aquatic
 35 habitat concurrently with any disturbance to existing aquatic habitat and with any indirect effects to
 36 the potential CRLF aquatic habitat offsite at the CMS pond/wetland site. The compensation pond(s)
 37 will be designed such that they does not provide suitable breeding habitat (i.e., perennial ponding)
 38 for bullfrogs, either through designing the pond to be seasonal or by including a drain in the pond
 39 design so that water can be drained in the late summer or fall to limit bullfrog reproduction.

40 *Page 3.3-71, lines 11 -18 are revised as follows:*

41 **Mitigation Measure BIO-20: Remove Vegetation during the Nonbreeding Season and Avoid**
 42 **Disturbance of Nesting Migratory Birds and Raptors**

1 During construction of the Proposed Project or 130-Unit Alternative, the Project Applicant ~~or its~~
 2 ~~contractor would~~ will condition its contractor to will ensure that construction contractors remove
 3 trees and shrubs only during the nonbreeding season for migratory birds (September 16 through
 4 January 30). In addition, removal of vegetation or filling of ponds or wetlands in the project area will
 5 also take place during the nonbreeding season to avoid impacts on nesting birds in these areas. To
 6 further minimize impacts, one of the following options will be implemented.

7 *The following is added after Page 3.3-79, line 5 as follows:*

8 **E. Impact on Wildlife from Increased Presence of Dogs and Cats**

9 **Impact BIO-18: Potential Adverse Impact on Wildlife Increased Presence of Dogs and Cats**
 10 **Associated with Residential Development (less than significant with mitigation)**

11 **Proposed Project**

12 The Project, once occupied, has the potential to increase the presence of dogs and cats in the habitat
 13 preserve and residential portion of the Project. Uncontrolled dogs have the potential to harass,
 14 injure, or kill wildlife. Cats that are let outside have the potential to harass, injure, or kill wildlife
 15 such as reptiles, birds, and rodents. The presence of trails through the preserve will guide people
 16 through the preserve and confine them to designated areas, thereby minimizing the area in which
 17 wildlife could be disturbed by dogs.

18 It is important to take into account that the current context is not a pristine riparian corridor – it is a
 19 golf course with active human presence in the form of golfers and maintenance workers, including
 20 the turf management activities that include mowing and the use of pesticides and herbicides.

21 While the Project would add residences at the project site and some residents will have cats or dogs
 22 (or both) that have the potential for the effects noted above, the Project would also restore riparian
 23 woodland to acres of golf course and would remove baseline golf course uses which is an
 24 improvement in wildlife habitat conditions compared to the baseline conditions.

25 The new restoration habitat area would serve as a buffer between the existing riparian corridor
 26 along the Carmel River and the residential area which will not be immediately adjacent to the river
 27 and existing riparian corridor. The provision of this new habitat helps to offset the effect not only of
 28 residential pets, but also human presence.

29 Mitigation Measure BIO-23 is recommended as a prudent measure to help control the effect of cats
 30 and dogs on wildlife (and vice-versa). Taking into account the improvement in habitat conditions
 31 along the Carmel River with the change from golf course to riparian woodland, the existing context
 32 of intense human use on the golf course, and the implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-23,
 33 the addition of some residential cats and dogs will not result in an overall significant impact on
 34 wildlife.

35 **130-Unit Alternative**

36 Similar to the Proposed Project, the 130-Unit Alternative has the potential to increase the presence
 37 of dogs and cats in the habitat preserve and residential portion of the Project. Mitigation Measure
 38 BIO-23 is recommended as a prudent measure to help control the effect of cats and dogs on wildlife
 39 (and vice-versa). Taking into account the improvement in habitat conditions along the Carmel River
 40 with the change from golf course to riparian woodland, the existing context of intense human use on

1 the golf course, and the implementation of **Mitigation Measure BIO-23**, the addition of some
 2 residential cats and dogs will not result in an overall significant impact on wildlife.

3 **Mitigation Measure BIO-23: Install Signs Along and Within the Habitat Preserve about**
 4 **Restraining Dogs and Encouraging Cats to be Kept Inside**

5 The Homeowners’ Association (HOA) or other entity that is responsible for maintenance of the
 6 habitat preserve will ensure that signs are installed along and throughout the habitat preserve
 7 that contain the following information to educate pet owners about the potential impacts of
 8 dogs and cats on wildlife.

9 “Please help minimize the harassment, injury, or mortality of wildlife by dogs and cats by following
 10 these measures.

- 11 • Dogs must be on leashes. Please keep control of your dog at all times.
- 12 • Please pick up after your dog.
- 13 • Recognize that keeping your cat inside keeps wildlife safe from cats and cats safe from
 14 wildlife.”

16 **Chapter 3.4 – Aesthetics**

17 *Page 3.4-22, add the following after line 35 under Mitigation Measure AES-1:*

- 18 • The Homeowner’s Association (HOA) or other entity responsible for common landscaping
 19 areas outside of residential units shall ensure that all required planting shall be permanently
 20 maintained in good growing condition and, whenever necessary, replaced with new plant
 21 materials to ensure continued compliance with applicable landscaping requirements.

22 *Page 3.4-23, lines 8-10 are revised as follows:*

23 The development would be partially visible from Carmel Valley Road, a proposed scenic route.
 24 Views south from Carmel Valley Road toward the Rancho Cañada Village subdivision consist of
 25 forested hills and ridges in the background and views of existing semi-rural development in the
 26 foreground.

28 **Chapter 3.5 – Land Use**

29 *Page 3.5-18, lines 14-19 are revised as follows:*

30 Carmel River—The Project would restore approximately 15 acres of riparian habitat adjacent to the
 31 Carmel River that would enhance the function of the river as a riparian migration corridor. In
 32 addition, the project would lower well withdrawals from the ~~Carmel Valley aquifer~~ Carmel Valley
 33 Alluvial Aquifer, thus benefiting Carmel River flows. The Project’s potential impacts related to
 34 hydrology and water quality (see Chapter 3.2, Hydrology and Water Quality) and biological
 35 resources (see Chapter 3.3, Biological Resources) can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

36 *Page 3.5-19, the following text is added after line 18:*

1 Without a general plan amendment, the 130-unit Alternative would be inconsistent with two other
 2 policies concerning affordable housing. The 130-unit Alternative is inconsistent with General Plan
 3 Policy LU-2.13 (which requires 25% affordable housing units and the project only proposes 20%)
 4 and the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance (Ordinance 3768 which requires 20% affordable units on-
 5 site). As discussed above, the physical impact on the environment is related to commutes that would
 6 be longer with less affordable housing considering that the 130-unit alternative would result in
 7 significant unavoidable traffic impacts. Thus inconsistency with these other policies is also a
 8 significant unavoidable impact like the inconsistency discussed above with Policy CV-1.27. The
 9 proposed General Plan amendment would address the level of affordability and resolve the
 10 inconsistency with other General Plan policies. However, while a change in the policies would
 11 resolve the policy inconsistency, it would not avoid the physical effects described in the RDEIR (e.g.
 12 longer commutes for workers from outside Carmel Valley contributing to significant and
 13 unavoidable traffic impacts described in the RDEIR).

14

15 **Chapter 3.7 – Traffic**

16 *Page 3.7-10, Table 3.7-5 is revised as follows:*

17 **Table 3.7-5. Existing Intersection Levels of Service**

Intersection	Peak Hour	Delay ¹ (sec/veh)	LOS ²
7 Carmel Valley Road/Rio Road (unsignalized)	AM	0.5 (33.8)	A (D) (C)
	PM	1.5 (65.8)	A (F)

18

19 *Page 3.7-23, Table 3.7-9 is revised as follows:*

20 **Table 3.7-9 Existing Plus Proposed Project Intersection Levels of Service**

Intersection	Existing		Existing Plus Proposed Project		
	Peak	Delay ¹ (sec/veh)	LOS ^b	Delay ² (sec/veh)	LOS ²
7. Carmel Valley Road /Rio Road ³	AM	0.5 (33.8)	A (D) (C)	8.2	A
	PM	1.5 (65.8)	A (F)	10.7	B

21

22 *Page 3.7-29, lines 37-33 are revised as follows:*

23 ~~Implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-2, while required~~ In response to anticipated traffic
 24 congestion, Monterey County has sponsored RTP Project CT008, SR1-Carmel Operational
 25 Improvement Project which will begin construction in fiscal year 2016-17. The project will
 26 construct a climbing lane on SR 1 between Rio Road and Carmel Valley Road. Although RTP Project
 27 CT008 would help alleviate the impact, it would not reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level
 28 because the TAMC regional fee program does not include any proposed widening of SR1 in the
 29 Carmel Area north of Carmel Valley Road or south of Rio Road. Proposed Improvements between io

1 Road and Carmel Valley Road in the regional fee program would help to address current conditions
2 for that segment.

3 *Page 3.7-30, lines 18-22 are revised as follows:*

4 In response to anticipated traffic congestion, Monterey County has sponsored RTP Project CT008,
5 SR1-Carmel Operational Improvement Project which will begin construction in fiscal year 2016-17.
6 The project will construct a climbing lane on SR 1 between Rio Road and Carmel Valley Road.
7 Although RTP Project CT008 would help alleviate the impact, it **Implementation of Mitigation**
8 **Measure TR-2, while required,** would not reduce this impact to a *less-than-significant* level because
9 the TAMC regional fee program does not include any proposed widening of SR1 north of Carmel
10 Valley Road or south of Ribera Road.

11 *Page 3.7-31, lines 3-10 are revised as follows:*

12 **Mitigation Measure TR-2: ~~Contribute Fair-Share Regional Impact Fee~~**

13 The most recently adopted 2014 RTP and the TAMC *14-Year Investment Plan Transportation*
14 *Plan* both include the following improvement.

- 15 ● ~~RTP Project CT008, SR1—Carmel Operational Improvement. This Project, sponsored by~~
16 ~~Monterey County, will construct a northbound climbing lane on SR 1 between Rio Road and~~
17 ~~Carmel Valley Road to relieve congestion on this facility.~~

18 The Project Applicant will be responsible for contributing its a fair-share impact fee for regional
19 traffic improvements as determined by TAMC in concert with Caltrans and Monterey County.

20

21 **Chapter 3.8 – Air Quality**

22 *Page 3.8-26, line 18 through Page 3.8-27 Line 5 are revised as follows:*

23 As noted above, ICF performed an HRA for the Rancho Cañada Village Project (formerly referred to
24 as the Rancho Cañada Village Specific Plan Project) in 2011 which analyzed exposure to TACs,
25 including DPM, associated with construction-related off-road construction equipment and on-road
26 haul trucks and the 2011 HRA was updated to reflect a 2015 assumed construction start date and to
27 reflect updates in methodology from OEHHA. In addition, the 2011 HRA was updated to account for
28 the correct amount of on-site cut and fill.² Sensitive receptors were analyzed at the Carmel Middle
29 School at two locations, a residential receptor along Carmel Valley Road and three residential
30 receptor locations along Rio Road west of the project site.

31 As shown in **Table 3.8-12**, worst-case construction activities are expected to result in a maximum
32 risk of ~~8.80~~ 8.63 cases of cancer per million and a chronic Health Index score of 0.03 ~~0.11~~ at the most
33 affected closest receptor. This level of exposure and risk is below MBUAPCD's cancer risk and
34 hazard thresholds. Therefore, this impact would be *less than significant*. No mitigation is required.

² As described in the HRA in Appendix F, the 2011 HRA emissions were based on activity data from the Applicant's air quality consultant (Chapin 2007). This activity data only included 100,000 CY of on-site cut and fill, whereas the current project description includes 120,000 CY of on-site cut and fill. As part of the revisions to the RDEIR, ICF revised the emissions estimate for that activity to account for the corrected amount of on-site cut and fill. The activity data (Chapin 2007) correctly used 100,000 CY for the imported fill activity.

1 **Table 3.8-12. Proposed Project Potential Health Risks to Air Quality Sensitive Receptors near the**
 2 **Project Site**

		Cancer Risk (risk per million)	Chronic Non-Cancer Health Index Score
Proposed Project Risk	Off-road	6.35 <u>8.33</u>	0.00 <u>0.02</u>
	On-road	2.46 <u>0.70</u>	0.11 <u>0.02</u>
	Total	8.80 <u>8.63</u>	0.11 <u>0.03</u>
<i>MBUAPCD Threshold</i>		10	1.0
Above MBUAPCD Threshold?		No	No

Notes: The most affected sensitive receptor modeled for total DPM cancer risk was a residential receptor along Rio Road, assuming haul trucks were to import soil using Rio Road. The most affected sensitive receptor modeled for total non-cancer health effects for DPM was for a residential receptor along Carmel Valley Road assuming haul trucks were to import soil using Carmel Valley Road. The total risk shown is the total highest risk to a single receptor and thus does not reflect the addition of risks to different receptors (e.g. the off-road and on-road numbers will not necessarily add up to the total risk because they are for different receptors). The risk numbers shown in the RDEIR were pulled from a prior worksheet that was not finalized and the total risk numbers shown in the RDEIR were additive of risks from different receptors, which would have overstated impacts to the most affected receptor. The risk numbers shown in these revisions to the RDEIR were pulled from the final work sheet and adjusted for the corrected amount of on-site cut and fill.

HRA = health risk assessment.

MBUAPCD = Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District.

3
 4 *Page 3.8-27, line 18 through Page 3.8-28 Line 3 are revised as follows:*

5 **130-Unit Alternative**

6 Similar to the Proposed Project, results from the 2011 HRA were adjusted to a 2015 assumed
 7 construction start date, for the correct amount on on-site cut and fill, and due to updates in
 8 methodology from OEHHA. Additionally, construction of the 130-Unit Alternative would include no
 9 soil import, so the risk presented in the 2011 HRA for truck hauling is not applicable to the 130-unit
 10 Alternative.

11 As shown in **Table 3.8-13**, worst-case construction activities are expected to result in a maximum
 12 risk of 5.38 ~~5.47~~ cases of cancer per million and a chronic Health Index score of 0.01 ~~0.00~~ at the
 13 closest receptor. This level of exposure and risk is below MBUAPCD’s cancer risk and hazard
 14 thresholds. Therefore, this impact would be *less than significant*. No mitigation is required.

1 **Table 3.8-13. 130-Unit Alternative Potential Health Risks to Air Quality Sensitive Receptors near**
 2 **the Project Site**

		Cancer Risk (risk per million)	Chronic Non-Cancer Health Index Score
130 Unit Alternative Risk	Off-road	5.47 5.38	0.01
	On-road	0.00	0.00
	Total	5.27 5.38	0.01
<i>MBUAPCD Threshold</i>		10	1.0
Above MBUAPCD Threshold?		No	No

Notes: The most affected sensitive receptor modeled for total DPM cancer risk was a residential receptor along Rio Road. The most affected sensitive receptor modeled for total non-cancer health effects for DPM was for a ~~residential~~ school receptor along Carmel Valley Road. The 130-unit alternative would not include importation of soil and thus no soil haul truck emissions were included in the HRA for this alternative (unlike the Proposed Project). The total risk shown is the total highest risk to a single receptor and thus does not reflect the addition of risks to different receptors (e.g. the off-road and on-road numbers will not necessarily add up to the total risk because they are for different receptors). The risk numbers shown in the RDEIR were pulled from a prior worksheet that was not finalized and the total risk numbers shown in the RDEIR were additive of risks from different receptors, which would have overstated impacts to the most affected receptor. The risk numbers shown in these revisions to the RDEIR were pulled from the final work sheet and adjusted for the corrected amount of on-site cut and fill.

HRA = health risk assessment.

MBUAPCD = Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District.

3
 4 **Chapter 3.10 – Public Services, Utilities, and Recreation**

5 *Pages 3.10-2, Table 3.10-1 is revised as follows:*

6 **Table 3.10-1. Public Services, Utilities, and Recreation Impact Summary**

Impact	Proposed Project Level of Significance	130-Unit Alternative Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<i>D. Water Demand</i>				
PSU-5: Increased Water Supply Demand	<u>Potentially Significant</u> LTS	<u>Potentially Significant</u> LTS	<u>PSU-1: Dedicate Water Rights for the Project; Design for, Meter, and Monitor Water to meet Water Budgets; Implement Remedial Action if Water Budgets Exceeded</u>	LTS

Impact	Proposed Project Level of Significance	130-Unit Alternative Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance after Mitigation
PSU-6: Increased Demand for Water and Sewer Infrastructure	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	PSU-2.4: Test Well Supply, Identify Water Treatment and Distribution Facilities, and Avoid Impacts on Biological Resources	LTS
<i>F. Wastewater Treatment Capacity</i>				
PSU-7: Increased Wastewater Treatment Capacity	LTS	LTS	None Required	--
<i>G. Utility Disruption during Construction</i>				
PSU-8: Construction-Related Service Disruptions	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	PSU-3.2: Coordinate with Appropriate Utility Service Providers and Related Agencies to Reduce Service Interruptions	LTS

1

2 *Page 3.10-2, Table 3.10-2 is revised as follows:*

3 **Table 3.10-2** summarizes the service, utility and recreation provided in the project area.

4 **Table 3.10-2. Summary of Public Service, Utility, and Recreation Providers in the Project Area**

Public Service or Utility	Service Provider
<u>Water</u>	<u>On-site wells (golf course irrigation)</u> <u>Cal-Am (Rancho Canada Golf Course clubhouse)</u>
Wastewater	Carmel Area Wastewater District
Electricity and Natural Gas	Pacific Gas & Electric Company
Communication Services	AT&T
Solid waste	Monterey Regional Waste Management District
Education	Carmel Unified School District
Police	Monterey County Sheriff's Office
Fire	Cypress Fire Protection District
Parks	Monterey County Parks Department/ Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District / California State Parks

5 *Page 3.10-5, lines 5-9 are revised as follows:*

6 The three 'beat' areas that cover Carmel-by-the-Sea and the Carmel Valley are, Beat 7, Beat 8A, and
 7 Beat B. Together these beats cover the area of Carmel Valley Road from Ocean Avenue east to the
 8 38-mile marker past Laureles Grade. ~~Each beat is manned at minimum with one deputy, with an~~

1 extra two deputies patrolling the entire area between the hours of 10 pm to 8 am. Average response
2 time for Beat 7, 8a, and 8B is 7 minutes. The project area is located in the Beat 7 Area. The North and
3 South boundaries of Beat 7 are both sides of Hwy 1 from Carmel High School to Rocky Point. The
4 East and West boundaries are both sides of Carmel Valley Road from Hwy 1 to Rancho San Carlos
5 Road. The project site is within the jurisdiction of the Coastal Station in Monterey. This is a Sheriff's
6 Office Substation. The nearby Beat areas also encompassed within the Coastal Station jurisdiction
7 are 6A, 6B, 8A, 8B and 9. During the Lincoln (Day) shift which is from 7am-5pm there is one deputy
8 in a patrol vehicle patrolling Beat 7. During the X-Ray (Swing) shift which is from 3 p.m.-1 a.m., there
9 is not a Coastal Station Deputy assigned to Beat 7. There are two deputies (each in a patrol vehicle)
10 assigned from the X-Ray shift at the Central Station in Salinas. They travel to the Monterey Peninsula
11 to cover all the Coastal Station Beat areas. In addition to Beat 7, these two patrol units also cover all
12 the Calls for Service in the other beat areas of 6A, 6B, 8A, 8B and 9. During the Zebra (Midnight Shift)
13 which is from 9 p.m.-7:00 a.m., like the X-Ray shift, there is not a dedicated Coastal Station assigned
14 to Beat 7. There are two deputies (each in a patrol vehicle) assigned from the Zebra shift at the
15 Central Station in Salinas. They travel to the Monterey Peninsula to cover all the Coastal Station Beat
16 areas. In addition to Beat 7, these two patrol units also cover all the Calls for Service in the other
17 beat areas of 6A, 6B, 8A, 8B and 9. During the time frame of Jan-Dec 2013 the average response time
18 was 9 minutes, 7 seconds. This statistic includes both emergency and non-emergency calls for
19 service. However, now with much lower staffing levels and not one unit dedicated to Beat 7 for the
20 Swing and Midnight shift, this response time would be much higher. (Galletti pers. comm.).

21 *Page 3.10-6, lines 5-6 are revised as follows:*

22 Private wells are subject to regulation by the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District
23 (MPWMD), the State Water Resources Control Board, and the Monterey County Health Department.

24 *Page 3.10-6, Table 3.10-3 is revised as follows:*

25 The Golf Club wells have produced between 309 and 522 acre-feet per year (AFY) over the past 24
26 ~~23~~ years (Table 3.10-3) for irrigation of the golf course (Zischke 2015). Cal-Am also has a potable
27 water supply well located on the golf course property.

1 **Table 3.10-3. Existing Rancho Cañada Golf Course Use, 1991 - 2014**

Year	Irrigation (AFY) ¹	Type ²	Precipitation (inches) ³	Precipitation (inches) ³	Type ²
1991	358.4	RY1991	<u>11.9</u>	13.7	<u>WY1991</u>
1992	425.0	RY1992	<u>15.3</u>	18.0	<u>WY1992</u>
1993	440.5	RY1993	<u>25.8</u>	30.2	<u>WY1993</u>
1994	465.9	RY1994	<u>12.0</u>	13.9	<u>WY1994</u>
1995	337.6	RY1995	<u>24.4</u>	28.5	<u>WY1995</u>
1996	457.2	RY1996	<u>18.0</u>	20.9	<u>WY1996</u>
1997	499.8	RY1997	<u>18.7</u>	21.6	<u>WY1997</u>
1998	346.6	RY1998	<u>40.6</u>	47.2	<u>WY1998</u>
1999	309.4	RY1999	<u>17.2</u>	20.2	<u>WY1999</u>
2000	489.3	RY2000	<u>18.0</u>	20.9	<u>WY2000</u>
2001	430.8	RY2001	<u>16.5</u>	19.4	<u>WY2001</u>
2002	522.0	WY2002	<u>13.4</u>	15.6	<u>WY2002</u>
2003	451.9	WY2003	<u>15.8</u>	18.4	<u>WY2003</u>
2004	451.8	WY2004	<u>14.1</u>	16.4	<u>WY2004</u>
2005	379.4	WY2005	<u>26.2</u>	30.5	<u>WY2005</u>
2006	368.8	WY2006	<u>21.3</u>	24.8	<u>WY2006</u>
2007	404.3	WY2007	<u>12.1</u>	14.1	<u>WY2007</u>
2008	443.3	WY2008	<u>12.3</u>	14.4	<u>WY2008</u>
2009	411.8	WY2009	<u>19.7</u>	17.5	<u>WY2009</u>
2010	324.1	WY2010	<u>18.8</u>	23.9	<u>WY2010</u>
2011	309.1	WY2011	<u>19.9</u>	24.5	<u>WY2011</u>
2012	340.6	WY2012	<u>8.9</u>	13.5	<u>WY2012</u>
2013	419.3	WY2013	<u>8.9</u>	13.1	<u>WY2013</u>
2014	442.3	WY2014	<u>5.9</u>	8.9	<u>WY2014</u>
Avg. 1991- 2014 2013	409.6		<u>17.3</u>	20.9	
"Low Use Year"	<u>355.42</u>				
"High Use Year"	<u>451.85</u>				
"Very High Use Year"	<u>482.29</u>				

Notes:

- ¹ 1991 – 2005 from Lombardo, T. (Lombardo 2006: 08/23/06, Exhibit A), based on MPWMD records ("WMCALC" spreadsheets for each year. 2006 – 2014 from J. Zischke. (Zischke 2014a: 09/15/14 and Zischke 2014b: 12/22/14).
- ² RY = Reporting Year = July 1 to June 30; WY = Water Year = October 1 through September 30
- ³ ~~1991-Sep 1994 Precipitation from Weather Station #5795 via Hopkins Marine Station; Precipitation Oct. 1994-2014 from National Weather Service Climatological Station, Monterey, California 93940 (elevation 385'), accessed via web at: http://met.nps.edu/~ldm/renard_wx/~~
- ³ Site precip. for 2009-2016 from CIMIS for on-site Weather Station #210 (<http://www.cimis.water.ca.gov/>); Site precip. for 1991 - 2008 estimated through linear regression using Monterey Weather Station data for 2008 - 2016 compared to site precip. and applying to earlier years. Monterey precip. for 1991 - Sept. 1994 and Oct. 2014 - Sept. 2016 from Hopkins Marine Station, Weather Station #5795; accessed via Web at <http://www-marine.stanford.edu/HMSweb/climate.html>; Monterey precip. For Oct. 94 - Sep.2014 from NWS Climatological Station, Monterey, California 93940 (elevation 385'), accessed via web at: http://met.nps.edu/~ldm/renard_wx/.
- ⁴ "Low use", "high use" and "very high use" years based on 25th, 75th and 90th percentile, respectively. "Low use", "high use" and "very high use" years would have 87%, 110% and 118% of average irrigation amounts. Use years not intended to be predictive; only to present a range of irrigation pumping. The RDEIR utilized "wet", "dry" and "very dry" categories to reflect the range. Review of the irrigation vs. precipitation data indicated a weak correlation. Other factors (temperature, evapotranspiration, timing of precipitation, etc.) appear more related than total precipitation. For these revisions to the RDEIR, it was decided to use "low", "high", and "very high" use scenarios to reflect the range instead.

1 *Page 3.10-8, the following is added after line 19:*

2 **Senate Bill 50**

3 Senate Bill 50 (SB 50), the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998, was signed into law on
 4 August 27, 1998. SB 50 allows governing boards of school districts to establish fees to offset costs
 5 associated with school facilities made necessary by new construction within their respective district
 6 boundaries. Payment of these fees is required prior to the issuance of building permits. Pursuant to
 7 Government Code Section 65995, the payment of these fees by a developer serves to fully mitigate
 8 all potential project impacts on school facilities from implementation of a project.

9 Page 3.10-10, Lines 1 through 9 are revised as follows:

10 In October 2009, the State Water Board issued Order WR2009-0060, a cease and desist order (CDO),
 11 which prescribes a series of significant cutbacks to Cal-Am’s pumping from the Carmel River from
 12 2010 through December 2016. Specifically, it includeds a schedule for Cal-Am to reduce diversions
 13 from the Carmel River, bans new water service connections (with certain exceptions), bans
 14 increased use of water at existing service connections resulting from a change in zoning or use,
 15 establishes a requirement to build smaller near-term water supply projects, and requires reporting
 16 procedures. The CDO stated that if a new water supply cannot be built by the end of 2016, the CPUC,
 17 which regulates Cal-Am as a water utility, may require water rationing and/or a moratorium on new
 18 water permits for construction/remodels.

19 The CDO was amended on July 19, 2016 (Order WR 2016-0016) to grant Cal-Am a five-year
 20 extension. The extension includes a diversion limit of 8,310 AFY and also includes seven milestones
 21 over the next five years that must be met or Cal-Am will face a reduction to the diversion limit by
 22 1,000 AFY per milestone.

23 *Page 3.10-10, lines 18 through 3.10-11, Line 40 are revised as follows:*

24 **Water Rights Context for Rancho Cañada Golf Club and the Project**

25 The Project Applicant has asserted they have both riparian and appropriative water rights and
 26 provided information to the County to support this assertion (Zischke 2014c, Zischke 2014d,
 27 Zischke 2014e, Rancho Canada de la Segunda, Inc. 1992, Zischke 2016)

28 The Applicant has presented substantial evidence of a riparian right through a chain of title (Zischke
 29 2014 c) showing continuity of the project property as connected to the water source (Carmel
 30 River/Carmel Valley Alluvial Aquifer) and the County, as part of a separate project independently
 31 reviewed that chain of title (see discussion below). The County finds that the riparian rights are
 32 valid for use on the project site itself. However, the riparian rights could not be used to support a
 33 water transfer to other off-site properties.

34 An appropriative right requires approval by SWRCB. An Application for an appropriative right has
 35 been submitted to SWRCB in relation to the entire golf course property, of which the project site is
 36 part. The Applicant’s proposal to transfer water as part of the 130-unit Alternative would require
 37 approval of the appropriative right by the SWRCB. The appropriative rights have not been
 38 “perfected” in that they have not been formally recognized by the State Water Resources Control
 39 Board or by a court of law. That does not mean they are not valid. In the end, water rights is a legal
 40 matter, not a CEQA matter, since CEQA is focused on physical impacts on the environment. The
 41 legal matters will be a matter for the Project Applicant and the SWRCB to resolve, but if the SWRCB

1 does not approve the appropriative right, the 130-unit Alternative would ultimately result in less
2 water use due to elimination of the proposed water transfer.

3 Groundwater use on the property that is now used for the golf course reportedly started in
4 approximately 1875 initially for dairy, irrigated pasture, and irrigated vegetable crops. Since 1969,
5 the primary use has been irrigation of the two golf courses, with some use for supporting riverbank
6 vegetation (Rancho Canada de la Segunda, Inc.1992). The golf club has a series of five on-site wells
7 that it presently uses has used historically to draw water for irrigation from the lower Carmel Valley
8 aquifer Carmel Valley Alluvial Aquifer.

9 The Project Applicant provided the County with a chain of title (Zischke 2014c) showing that the
10 property on which the site is located has apparently never been “severed” from the Carmel River,
11 which is a key determination as to whether the project has riparian water rights. The County has
12 previously conducted an independent review of chain of title as part of a prior project. In the fall of
13 2002, the Monterey County Resource Management Agency – Planning Department retained Downey
14 Brand LLP (Sacramento, CA) to perform an independent review of the water rights of September
15 Ranch Development Application (PLN050001) to determine whether valid riparian rights exist. The
16 analysis concluded that the riparian rights were not severed from the property formerly owned by
17 the Hatton Family. The Rancho Cañada Village project site originates from the same chain of title of
18 property formally formerly owned by the Hatton Family. The Rancho Cañada Golf Club holds pre-
19 1914 and riparian water rights to the Carmel Valley aquifer. As documented in Table 13 of Decision
20 1632, State Water Board also recognized that Rancho Cañada holds a superior water right to Cal-Am
21 post-1914 appropriation permits that have been issued to the District stemming from Decision
22 1632. The riparian rights have not been adjudicated, but as a result of the deed mentioned above
23 between Hatton and Pacific Improvement Co., the riparian rights appurtenant to the Rancho Cañada
24 property likely have a priority superior to Cal-Am’s appropriative rights to the Carmel River and
25 Carmel River underflow excluding Cal-Am’s right to extract from the Carmel Valley Basin under its
26 pre-1914 appropriative water rights.

27 The applicant has also asserted that project site has both pre-1914 and post-1914 appropriative
28 water rights in addition to riparian rights. In 1992, Rancho Canada de la Segunda, Inc. the lessee and
29 operator of the Rancho Canada Golf Course, applied for an appropriative right (per Application
30 A03111) to the SWRCB in relation to irrigation use for the golf course in the amount of 700 AFY and
31 ongoing diversion of up to 2.36 cubic feet per second (cfs) (Rancho Canada de la Segunda, Inc. 1992).
32 The 700 AFY amount was later reduced in 2003 to 545 AFY by Rancho Canada de la Segunda, Inc. in
33 order to qualify for a CEQA exemption (for the water right application – not for this project) (SWRCB
34 2011).

35 In 1995, SWRCB made determinations in Decision 1632 regarding potential appropriative rights
36 being sought by MPWMD in relation to the prior Los Padres Dam project. The decision required
37 SWRCB to examine how the potential appropriative rights being sought for that might project would
38 affect existing water right and potential water rights claims of others concerning the Carmel River
39 and the Carmel River Alluvial Aquifer. Table 13 of Decision 1632 recognizes a right to that if the
40 SWRCB were to approve an appropriative right permit for up to 700 AFY for the Rancho Cañada golf
41 course propertyies, those appropriative rights would be senior to any appropriative rights that
42 might have been issued to MPWMD in relation to the Los Padres Dam project. The Project Applicant
43 has also identified a prior 155 AFY reduction in water allocations for instream beneficial purposes,
44 which results in a remaining 545 AFY for the property. A reservation of an amount of water on Table
45 13 of State Water Board Decision 1632 is not the same as obtaining an appropriative water right

1 ~~permit from the State Water Board, which entails a formal approval process. SWRCB did not~~
 2 ~~recognize a right *per se* to 700 AFY for the Rancho Cañada property in Decisions 1632. Instead,~~
 3 ~~under Decision 1632, the SWRCB reserved 700 AFY for a potential future appropriation subject to~~
 4 ~~SWRCB approval of an appropriative right.~~

5 The Project Applicant has submitted an application with the State Water Board for an appropriative
 6 water right permit (Application #A30111). In order for an appropriative water right to be valid, the
 7 State Water Board must follow the public notification, protest, and environmental review process
 8 specified in the California Water Code before issuing a permit for diversion and use of water. The
 9 State Water Board has determined the application is complete, and issued notice of the Application
 10 A30111. To date, a permit has not yet been issued for Application A30111; Application A30111 is
 11 still being processed and considered for the irrigation purposes applied for by Rancho Cañada *de la*
 12 *Segunda*. If the Rancho Cañada Village project is approved (or if an alternative such as the 130-Unit
 13 Alternative is approved), then a change petition will be filed with the State Water Board

14 Given that appropriative rights are subject to a seniority system, the exercise of such rights (if
 15 validated) could be limited in the event of water shortages and in favor of potential senior water
 16 rights. There are numerous challenges concerning the Carmel River and the Carmel River Alluvial
 17 Aquifer given the long-standing effects of groundwater pumping on instream flows supporting
 18 Central Coast steelhead, California red-legged frog, and other resources as well as the situation
 19 concerning Cal-Am. The SWRCB informed Rancho Canada de La Segunda, Inc. in 2011 that the
 20 appropriative rights that they applied for may be conditioned to require the maintenance of
 21 minimum daily instream flows for the Carmel River (SWRCB 2011).³ The SWRCB noted that they
 22 believe that the proposed condition would resolve a number of public trust protests to Application
 23 A03111 and the application could be permitted with inclusion of the condition. Rancho Canada de la
 24 Segunda, Inc. has reportedly not responded to the 2011 SWRCB letter. If the proposed condition
 25 were ultimately required and instream flows cannot be maintained to meet this condition (due to
 26 cumulative ongoing pumping regardless of whether the project would worsen baseline conditions or
 27 not), this may mean that any appropriative use, including any water transferred to parcels not
 28 benefitted by a riparian right, may be subject to interruption. An interruptible water supply may be
 29 insufficient to allow MPWMD to issue water use permits.

30 Prior to any Cal-Am service to the Rancho Cañada Village project, the Project Applicant will seek a
 31 State Water Board determination to either confirm that water diverted under the project site
 32 properties Rancho Cañada's rights are not subject to Ordering paragraphs 2 and 3.(a)(5) of WR
 33 2009-0060, or to modify its order to allow same. Nonetheless, the Project would not necessarily rely
 34 solely on Cal-Am water service, but rather as set forth in Chapter 2, *Project Description*, the water
 35 will be supplied to the Project either through the Cal-Am distribution system, or through the
 36 creation of a separate community services district or mutual water company.

37 If the Rancho Cañada Village project is approved, then the Project Applicant intends to file a change
 38 petition with the State Water Board to change the proposed water use in Application A03111 from
 39 irrigation to residential. If the 130-Unit Alternative is approved by the County, then State Water
 40 Board and MPWMD approvals would be obtained in order to implement both the proposed uses,
 41 including the proposed water transfer. This would entail a change petition to change the purpose

³ The instream flow requirements are based on National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS, 2002) study of requirements for steelhead are as follows: December 1 to April 15 – minimum bypass of 40 cfs at the SR 1 bridge prior to lagoon opening and minimum bypass of 120 cfs at the SR1 bridge after lagoon opening; April 16 to May 31 – minimum bypass of 80 cfs at SR1 bridge; June 1 to November 30 – minimum bypass of 5 cfs at the SR1 bridge.

1 and place of use for approval by the State Water Board (as noted above for the Proposed Project),
2 and the Project Applicant would seek confirmation from the State Water Board that water diverted
3 under Rancho Cañada's rights for new subscriber use does not conflict with WR 2009-0060. Also, a
4 new ordinance by the MPWMD similar to the ordinance allowing transfer of water entitlements
5 from the Pebble Beach Company to other users would need to be approved, which would entail a
6 new rule for issuance of water use permits under this entitlement. (See for example MPWMD Rules
7 23.5 (Pebble Beach Water Entitlement) and 23.6 (Sand City Water Entitlement). The new MPWMD
8 ordinance would dictate the restrictions for issuance of a water use permit to approved
9 developments and existing lots of record.

10 Another water rights issue concerns the disposition of rights between the different owners of the
11 golf course land. The entire golf course is approximately 270 acres. In 2016, the Trust for Public
12 Land (TPL) purchased 140 acres (the Hatton parcel) of the golf course and has been pursuing
13 acquisition of the 50 acre parcel of the golf course owned by the Lombardo Land Group II (although
14 this second acquisition has not yet occurred). The remaining 80 acres are within the Rancho Canada
15 Village project site, which is owned by the Lombardo Land Group I, which is working with the
16 Project proponent. TPL intends that the land be used for park and open space purposes. TPL, in a
17 letter to the County (TPL 2016) identified that there is a pre-existing contractual allocation of water
18 rights between the different property owners and that 180 AFY is allocated to the developer of the
19 Rancho Canada Village project for use at their discretion. TPL, the Rancho Canada project developer,
20 and the Lombardo Land Group II entered into a forbearance agreement to temporarily constrain the
21 exercise of the riparian water rights appurtenant to the remaining golf course property. This
22 agreement will reportedly result in approximately 1,000 AFY (in total) over several years to be
23 dedicated for Carmel River beneficial use. This agreement is temporary and would not constrain
24 project use after the end of the forbearance agreement. The Lombardo Land Group II also sent a
25 letter to the County (Lombardo Land Group II 2016) confirming the same details noted in the TPL
26 letter that are described above. As such, in regards to the TPL acquisition and its potential second
27 future acquisition of the Lombardo Land Group II property, there does not appear to be any legal
28 restriction to the Project Applicant's use of up to 180 AFY for project purposes. The agreement
29 between the different landowners does not in itself validate the legality or amount of a water right;
30 it only resolves any dispute between the parties as to the division of the potential 545 AFY
31 appropriative water right (pursuant to the SWRCB application) among the parties.

32 While this water rights discussion provides useful context, CEQA is solely concerned with
33 determining the nature and extent of physical impacts on the environment that may result from a
34 proposed project. With respect to water supply, CEQA is concerned with whether the proposed
35 supply is physically available, and whether the use of the supply will result in any significant
36 physical changes to environmental resources such as, a groundwater basin, water supply for other
37 users, or biological resources.

38 There is one other circumstance in which a water right analysis may be relevant to a CEQA analysis,
39 and that is if the exercise of a riparian or overlying right would displace existing water uses by
40 virtue of the "seniority" of the riparian or overlying right, so that the existing uses were required to
41 obtain a water supply elsewhere. For this reason, and in order to respond to specific questions from
42 the Court of Appeal in *Save Our Peninsula Committee v. Monterey County Bd. of Supervisors* (2001) 87
43 Cal. App. 4th 99, Monterey County has included this a water rights analysis (as described above) in
44 this Draft Recirculated EIR. This analysis concludes that: (i) substantial evidence indicates that the
45 owners of Rancho Cañada Golf Course have apparent pre-1914 and riparian rights; (ii) any post-
46 1914 appropriative rights will need SWRCB approval and (iii) under either riparian or appropriative

1 water right system, the Project's use of water from the CVA will not injure any senior water right
 2 holders and will not displace junior water users because the Project (or the 130-unit Alternative)
 3 will result in a net reduction of water use (see impact analysis below). In this regard, it should be
 4 noted that Monterey County is not the final arbiter of whether any particular property has riparian
 5 or overlying rights. Such a binding determination may only be a ruling of a court of competent
 6 jurisdiction and/or, with respect to appropriative rights, SWRCB.

7 *Page 3.10-13, the following text is added after Line 9:*

8 **Goal PS-3. Ensure that New Development is assured a Long-Term Sustainable Water Supply**

9 **Policy PS-3.1 Except as specifically set forth below, new development for which a discretionary**
 10 **permit is required, and that will use or require the use of water, shall be prohibited without proof,**
 11 **based on specific findings and supported by evidence, that there is a long-term, sustainable water**
 12 **supply, both in quality and quantity to serve the development. [Exceptions listed in policy not**
 13 **included herein].**

14 **Policy PS-3.2. Specific criteria for proof of a Long Term Sustainable Water Supply and an Adequate**
 15 **Water Supply System for new development requiring a discretionary permit, including but not**
 16 **limited to residential or commercial subdivisions, shall be developed by ordinance with the advice**
 17 **of the General Manager of the Water Resources Agency and the Director of the Environmental**
 18 **Health Bureau. A determination of a Long Term Sustainable Water Supply shall be made upon the**
 19 **advice of the General Manager of the Water Resources Agency. The following factors shall be used in**
 20 **developing the criteria for proof of a long term sustainable water supply and an adequate water**
 21 **supply system:**

22 **a. Water quality:**

23 **b. Authorized production capacity of a facility operating pursuant to a permit from a**
 24 **regulatory agency, production capability, and any adverse effect on the economic**
 25 **extraction of water or other effect on wells in the immediate vicinity, including recovery**
 26 **rates;**

27 **c. Technical, managerial, and financial capability of the water purveyor or water system**
 28 **operator;**

29 **d. The source of the water supply and the nature of the right(s) to water from the**
 30 **source;**

31 **e. Cumulative impacts of existing and projected future demand for water from the**
 32 **source, and the ability to reverse trends contributing to an overdraft condition or**
 33 **otherwise affecting supply; and**

34 **f. Effects of additional extraction or diversion of water on the environment including on**
 35 **in-stream flows necessary to support riparian vegetation, wetlands, fish or other aquatic**
 36 **life, and the migration potential for steelhead, for the purpose of minimizing impacts on**
 37 **the environment and to those resources and species.**

38 **g. Completion and operation of new projects, or implementation of best practices, to**
 39 **renew or sustain aquifer or basin functions.**

1 The hauling of water shall not be a factor nor a criterion for the proof of a long term sustainable
 2 water supply.

3 **PS-3.9. A tentative subdivision map and/or vesting tentative subdivision map application for either**
 4 **a standard or minor subdivision shall not be approved until the applicant provides evidence of a**
 5 **long-term sustainable water supply in terms of yield and quality for all lots that are to be created**
 6 **through subdivision.**

7 *Page 3.10-23, Line 24 to 3.10-28 Line 28 are revised as follows:*

8 **D. Water Demand**

9 **Impact PSU-5: Increased Water Supply Demand (less than significant with mitigation)**

10 **Baseline for Impact Analysis**

11 In order to assess water supply impacts, an existing use baseline must be established. The existing
 12 golf courses uses between 309 and 522 AFY for irrigation (based on 1991 to 2014 data shown in
 13 **Table 3.10-3**), with an average annual use of 410 AFY. The Project will result in the elimination of
 14 one of the two Rancho Cañada golf courses and the baseline irrigation use is considered to be 50% of
 15 the current golf course irrigation use, which on average would be about 205 AFY. Current baseline
 16 use depends on climatic factors and is estimated to range from 164 to 256 AFY, depending on
 17 precipitation (Table 3.10-4).

18 Most irrigation occurs during the drier parts of the year (April through October) and thus a large
 19 portion of the irrigation on the golf course (~~likely in excess of 80%~~) is consumed by the golf turf
 20 through evaporation and transpiration (referred to as evapotranspiration). Based on the
 21 recommendation of MPWMD, the baseline for this RDEIR is the consumptive use of water, as
 22 opposed to the total amount of pumping. Consumptive use of water is defined as the water that is
 23 used under baseline or project conditions and is not returned to the Carmel Valley Alluvial Aquifer.
 24 For irrigated areas, consumptive use is defined as evapotranspiration.

25 Using data from the on-site CIMIS weather station on precipitation and reference
 26 evapotranspiration, irrigation data from the golf course, data on crop plant factors for turfgrass, and
 27 data on site soils, a soil-water balance analysis was completed for the 1991 – 2014 period in order to
 28 estimate evapotranspiration (See calculations in Appendix H). The identified average turf
 29 evapotranspiration factors for different types of years was applied to the irrigation pumping data to
 30 derive the baseline consumptive use as shown in Table 3.10-4.

1 **Table 3.10-4. Baseline Consumptive Water Use for the Rancho Cañada Village Project Site**
 2 **(acre-feet)**

	Average Year	<u>Low-Use (2)</u> Wet Year (84%-80% avg.)	<u>High-Use (2)</u> Dry Year (110% avg.)	<u>Very High-Use (2)</u> Very Dry Year (118%-125% avg.)
Irrigation Pumping (1)	204.8	<u>177.7</u> 163.8	<u>225.9</u> 225.3	<u>241.1</u> 256.0
<u>Consumptive Use (3)</u>	<u>145.1</u>	<u>113.4</u>	<u>170.8</u>	<u>195.0</u>

Notes:

Data presented in Appendix H

1. Baseline irrigation pumping use is assumed to be the water use of one of the two golf courses on-site because with the Project, only one golf course will remain in operation.

2. Assumptions for “low-use”, “high use” and “very high use” year irrigation pumping in Table 3.10-3.

3. Consumptive use determined through a soil-water balance analysis to estimate evapotranspiration. Evapotranspiration for different type of years used same percentiles as used for irrigation pumping in Table 3.10-3 See Appendix B.

3

4 **Proposed Project**

5 ICF developed water demand estimates for different types of housing units using MPWMD fixture
 6 unit methodology (**Table 3.10-5**). MPWMD mandatory water efficiency requirements required by
 7 MPWMD regulation for high efficiency toilets and washing machines were assumed. ICF then
 8 prepared a demand estimate using these fixture estimates and estimates of the Maximum Applied
 9 Water Allowable (MAWA) for common landscape areas and conservative use assumptions (Table
 10 3.10-6). ICF also estimated evapotranspiration for the landscaping water demand (both within
 11 residential lots and common landscaped areas) using the same factors used to determine baseline
 12 consumption use. These estimates were then combined to derive an estimate of project
 13 consumptive use. Consumptive use includes residential indoor use (which is discharged to the
 14 CAWD treatment plant and not returned to the Carmel Valley Alluvial Aquifer) and
 15 evapotranspiration in landscaped areas.

16 The ~~that estimates~~ average project consumptive demand use is estimated as ~~88~~ 115 AFY including
 17 treatment and system transmission losses. The ICF estimate was used for the EIR analysis.
 18 Accounting for ~~precipitation-climatic~~ variation⁴, project consumptive use is estimated to range from
 19 82 to 99 AFY ~~92 to 143 AFY (Table 3.10-5)~~.

20 Based on these estimates, there would be a net reduction in water use ranging from 31 to 96 ~~72 to~~
 21 113-AFY, with an average of 57 ~~90~~ AFY (**Table 3.10-7**). ~~This estimate is based on conservative~~
 22 ~~assumptions for demand, treatment, and system losses, and may understate the amount of the net~~
 23 ~~reductions. Further, the same percentage adjustments were made to the baseline use case for golf~~
 24 ~~course irrigation for wet, dry, and very dry years as for the Project residential demand. Residential~~
 25 ~~demand, particularly for the proposed residential development which has relatively compact~~
 26 ~~development and limited yards would vary far less than golf course irrigation and thus, in dry and~~
 27 ~~very dry years, the estimated Project demand is likely higher than it will actually be.~~

⁴ The variation by climatic conditions for “low use”, “high use” and “very high use” conditions was estimated by using the same factors as noted above in Table 3.10-3, but the variation factor was only applied to landscape uses, as indoor uses were assumed to not vary due to climatic conditions.

1 ~~Given the existing impact of Cal-Am withdrawals on the Carmel River, this net reduction is a~~
2 ~~beneficial impact for both water supply and for biological resources in the river, such as steelhead.~~
3 ~~In addition, wastewater would be conveyed to the Carmel Area Wastewater District's (CAWD) water~~
4 ~~recycling plant for eventual release into the Carmel Valley Lagoon. Presently, during the summer~~
5 ~~and fall months the lagoon waters are at critically low levels, which jeopardize the lagoon's~~
6 ~~steelhead populations. With additional wastewater flows, such as those from the Rancho Cañada~~
7 ~~Village Project, CAWD would have increased opportunity to release more wastewater. Therefore, the~~
8 ~~Project would provide environmental benefits to the steelhead habitat.~~

9 The water source for the Project would be the on-site wells using water rights held by the property,
10 as described above, or a connection to Cal-Am facilitated by dedication of an appropriate amount of
11 the Project Applicant's water right to Cal-Am (See discussion of water rights in an earlier section of
12 this Chapter). ~~The state has reserved 700 AFY for allocation to the Rancho Cañada property, of~~
13 ~~which 545 AFY remain which exceeds the amount needed for golf course irrigation and the Project.~~

1 **Table 3.10-5. Water Demand by Housing Type**

Type of Fixture	FU Value	Condo		Townhouse		SFR- Small		SFR-Medium		SFR-Large	
		No.	FU Count	No.	FU Count	No.	FU Count	No.	FU Count	No.	FU Count
Wash Basins (lavatory sink) each	1.0	2	2.0	2	2.0	3	3.0	3	3.0	4	4.0
Two washbasins in Master Bathroom	1.0									1	1.0
Toilet (ULF, 1.6 gpf)	1.8	2	3.6	2	3.6	3	5.4	3	5.4	4	7.2
Toilet (HET, 1.3 gpf)	1.3	2	2.6	2	2.6	3	3.9	3	3.9	4	5.2
Toilet (UHET, 0.8 gpf)	0.8										
Masterbath (Tub, sep. shower)	3.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	1	3.0	1	3.0
Large bathtub (w/ showerhead)	3.0									1	
Standard bathtub (w/ showerhead)	2.0	1	2.0	2	4.0	2	4.0	2	4.0	2	4.0
Shower, separate stall	2.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0
Kitchen sink and dishwasher	2.0	1	2.0	1	2.0	1	2.0	1	2.0	2	4.0
Kitchen sink and HE dishwasher	1.5										
Laundry/utility sink	2.0		0.0		0.0	1	2.0	1	2.0	2	4.0
Washing Machine	2.0	1	2.0	1	2.0	1	2.0	1	2.0	1	2.0
Washing Machine (HEW, WF 5 or less)	1.0	<u>1</u>	<u>1.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1.0</u>
Bidet	2.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0
Bar sink	1.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0
Entertainment sink	1.0									1	1.0
Vegetable sink	1.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0
<i>Subtotal Interior Fixture Units</i>	-	-	11.6	-	13.6	-	18.4	-	21.4	-	30.2
<i>Landscaping (Interior FUs X 0.5)</i>	-	-	5.8	-	6.8	-	9.2	-	10.7	-	15.1
<i>Subtotal Interior Fixture Units</i>			<u>9.6</u>		<u>11.6</u>		<u>15.9</u>		<u>18.9</u>		<u>27.2</u>
<i>Landscaping (Interior FUs X 0.5)</i>			<u>4.8</u>		<u>5.8</u>		<u>8.0</u>		<u>9.5</u>		<u>13.6</u>
Swimming Pools (per 100 SF)	1.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	<u>3</u>	<u>3.0</u>	4.5	4.5
<i>Fixture Unit Count</i>	-	-	17.4	-	20.4	-	27.6	-	32.1	-	49.8
<i>Acre-Feet/Unit (0.01 AF/FU)</i>	-	-	0.17	-	0.20	-	0.28	-	0.32	-	0.50
<i>Fixture Unit Count</i>			<u>14.4</u>		<u>17.4</u>		<u>23.9</u>		<u>31.4</u>		<u>45.3</u>
<i>Acre-Feet/Unit (0.01 AF/FU)</i>			<u>0.14</u>		<u>0.17</u>		<u>0.24</u>		<u>0.31</u>		<u>0.45</u>

Prepared by ICF using MPWMD Fixture Unit Methodology. All Assumptions about number of fixtures by ICF

Table 3.10-6. Rancho Cañada Village Estimated Water Demand/Use (by ICF)

	Units	AF/Unit (1)	Total	Total
Average Year Direct Water Demand				
Housing				
Condominiums	35	<u>0.14</u> 0.17	<u>5.0</u>	6.1
Townhouses	64	<u>0.17</u> 0.20	<u>11.1</u>	13.1
Small Lot Single Family	67	<u>0.24</u> 0.27	<u>16.0</u>	18.5
Medium Lot Single Family	114	<u>0.31</u> 0.32	<u>35.7</u>	36.6
Large Lot Single Family	1	<u>0.45</u> 0.50	<u>0.45</u>	0.5
<i>Housing Subtotal</i>	<i>281</i>		<u><i>68.3</i></u>	<i>74.7</i>
Active Park (2)	2.6	<u>1.0</u> 2.5	<u>2.6</u>	6.5
Landscape Parkways (2)	3.3	<u>2.3</u> 2.5	<u>7.7</u>	8.3
<i>Landscape Total</i>			<u><i>10.3</i></u>	<i>14.8</i>
Residential Element Subtotal			<u>78.6</u>	89.5
Treatment (15%) and System (7%) Loss			<u>22.2</u>	18.7
Average Year Direct Water Demand			<u>100.8</u>	114.7
<i>Low Use Wet Year (87% 80% of avg.) (3)</i>			<u><i>95.2</i></u>	<i>91.8</i>
<i>High Use Dry Year (110% 110% of avg.) (3)</i>			<u><i>105.2</i></u>	<i>126.2</i>
<i>Very High Use Dry Year (118% 125% of avg.) (3)</i>			<u><i>108.3</i></u>	<i>143.4</i>
Average Year Consumptive Use				
Residential Element Subtotal (from Above)			<u>78.6</u>	
<i>Evapotranspiration Adjustment for Landscaping in Housing Area (4)</i>			<u>-6.6</u>	
<i>Evapotranspiration Adjustment for Shared Park/Parkways (4)</i>			<u>-3.0</u>	
Revised Residential Element Subtotal			<u>69.0</u>	
Treatment (15%) and System (7%) Loss			<u>19.5</u>	
Average Year Consumptive Use			<u>88.5</u>	
<i>Low Use Year (87% of avg.) (3)</i>			<u><i>81.9</i></u>	
<i>High Use Year (110% of avg.) (3)</i>			<u><i>93.8</i></u>	
<i>Very High Use Year (118% of avg.) (3)</i>			<u><i>98.8</i></u>	
Notes:				
1. <u>From Table 3.10-5</u>				
2. <u>Used MWELO MAWA limit for park and parkways.</u>				
3. <u>With consumptive use approach, the total landscape demand is not included, only the evapotranspiration amount (as was done in the baseline).</u>				
4. <u>Only landscaping demand was adjusted for different years. Indoor use was not.</u>				

Table 3.10-7. Rancho Cañada Village Water Impact (Acre-Feet)

	Baseline Consumptive Use	Project Consumptive Use	Net Change
Average Year	145.1	88.5	-56.7
Low Use Year	113.4	81.9	-31.5
High Use Year	170.8	93.8	-77.0
Very High Use Year	195.0	98.8	-96.3
Average Year	204.1	114.7	-90.1
Wet Year	163.3	91.8	-72.0
Dry Year	224.5	126.2	-99.1
Very Dry Year	255.1	143.4	-112.6

Note: This estimate is based on conservative assumptions described in text and Appendix H, and may underestimate the amount of net reduction.

Water for the new homes would be supplied either through the Cal-Am distribution system by assigning a portion of Rancho Cañada’s water rights associated with the project property to Cal-Am for delivery back to the development, or through the creation of independent community services (private or public), contract or dedication to use the existing Rancho Cañada wells on the project property to pump, treat, and purvey the amount of water necessary for the Project. Reduction in water use would be documented through the meters on the wells which are already in place as required by ordinance with MPWMD.

Because the Proposed Project would result in an overall reduction in water use, this impact would be *less than significant* provided the project would result in no more than amount of consumptive water described above. No mitigation is necessary.

Mitigation Measure PSU-1, described below, will require the project to meet the water budgets in this RDEIR, by requiring dedication of adequate water rights for the residential development, designing new development to be water efficient, installation of water meters for the development in accordance with MPWMD regulations, monitoring and reporting of water use to the County and MPWMD, remedial action if the project exceeds established water budgets.

Infrastructure impacts related to a potential new water system are discussed below separately.

The following are recommended as conditions of approval to ensure impacts remain *less than significant*:

- (1) Require a permanent dedication of 143 of the Project Applicant’s water right that reserves its use solely for the Rancho Cañada Village residential development (including the park and preserve) and precludes any future use of this amount by the Project Applicant for golf course irrigation, other use, or transfer. This amount is based on the estimated net demand during a very dry year indicated in **Table 3.10-7**.
- (2) It is thus further recommended that the County, as a condition of approval, require monthly reporting of water use on the golf course to verify that water use does not exceed the estimated remaining amount of the Project Applicant’s water right (402 AF). This amount was determined by subtracting the 143 AF dedication for Rancho Cañada Village from the 545 AFY remaining site appropriation. Based on historic data this appears to be more than adequate for these uses.

130-Unit Alternative

ICF then prepared a demand estimate for the 130-Unit Alternative using the housing type water demand estimates from **Table 3.10-5** and conservative use assumptions similar to those used for the Proposed Project. ~~With the restrictions in water supply at present, the dedication amount can serve as a hard limit on potential water use.~~ As shown in **Table 3.10-8** below, this Alternative would result in a consumptive water use demand of 112 AFY ~~130 AFY~~ including 60 AFY proposed for transfer to other Cal-Am uses. The ICF estimate is used for the EIR analysis. Accounting for ~~precipitation use~~ variation, Project 130-unit Alternative consumptive use is estimated to range from 106 to 120 AFY ~~104 to 162 AFY~~ (**Table 3.10-8**).

Table 3.10-8. 130-Unit Alternative Estimated Water Demand/Use (by ICF)

	Units	AF/Unit (1)	Total	Total
Housing				
Condominiums	12	0.14 0.17	<u>1.7</u>	2.1
Small Lot Single Family	110	0.24 0.28	<u>26.2</u>	30.4
Medium Lot Single Family	7	0.31 0.32	<u>2.2</u>	2.2
Large Lot Single Family	1	0.45 0.50	<u>0.5</u>	10.5
<i>Housing Subtotal</i>	<i>130</i>		<i><u>30.6</u></i>	<i>-35.2</i>
Open Space Irrigation (2)	7.7	2.3 2.5	<u>17.9</u>	-19.3
Residential Element Subtotal			<u>48.5</u>	54.4
Treatment (15%) and System (7%) Loss			<u>13.7</u>	-15.4
Average Year Direct Water Demand			<u>62.2</u>	69.8
<i>Low Use Wet Year (87% 80% of avg.) (3)</i>			<i><u>57.4</u></i>	<i>55.8</i>
<i>High Use Dry Year (110% 110% of avg.) (3)</i>			<i><u>65.9</u></i>	<i>76.8</i>
<i>Very High Use Dry Year (118% 125% of avg.) (3)</i>			<i><u>68.6</u></i>	<i>-87.2</i>
Water Transfer to Other Cal-Am Users			<u>60.0</u>	60.0
Net Water Demand (Average Year)			<u>122.2</u>	129.8
<i>Low Use Wet Year (87% 80% of avg.) (3)</i>			<i><u>117.4</u></i>	<i>103.8</i>
<i>High Use Dry Year (110% 110% of avg.) (3)</i>			<i><u>125.9</u></i>	<i>142.8</i>
<i>Very High Use Dry Year (118% 125% of avg.) (3)</i>			<i><u>128.6</u></i>	<i>162.3</i>
Dedication for Instream Purposes (based on <u>high use average year</u>)			<u>51.4</u>	-50.2
Water Demand + Instream Dedication (based on <u>high use average year</u>)			<u>180.0</u>	180.0
<u>Average Year Consumptive Use</u>				
<u>Residential Element Subtotal (from Above)</u>			<u>48.5</u>	
<i>Evapotranspiration Adjustment for Landscaping in Housing Area (4)</i>			<i><u>-3.0</u></i>	
<i>Evapotranspiration Adjustment for Shared Park/Parkways (4)</i>			<i><u>-5.2</u></i>	
<u>Revised Residential Element Subtotal</u>			<u>40.3</u>	
<u>Treatment (15%) and System (7%) Loss</u>			<u>11.4</u>	
<u>Average Year Consumptive Use</u>			<u>51.7</u>	
<i>Low Use Year (87% of avg.) (3)</i>			<i><u>46.1</u></i>	
<i>High Use Year (110% of avg.) (3)</i>			<i><u>56.2</u></i>	
<i>Very High Use Year (118% of avg.) (3)</i>			<i><u>60.5</u></i>	

<u>Water Transfer to Other Cal-Am Users</u>	<u>60.0</u>
<u>Net Water Demand (Average Year)</u>	<u>111.7</u>
<u>Low Use Year (87% of avg.) (3)</u>	<u>106.1</u>
<u>High Use Year (110% of avg.) (3)</u>	<u>116.2</u>
<u>Very High Use Year (118% of avg.) (3)</u>	<u>120.5</u>
<u>Dedication for Instream Purposes (based on high use year)</u>	<u>59.5</u>
<u>Water Demand + Instream Dedication (based on high use year)</u>	<u>180.0</u>

Notes:

1. From Table 3.10-5
2. Used MWELO MAWA limit for landscaping area.
3. With consumptive use approach, the total landscape demand is not included, only the evapotranspiration amount (as was done in the baseline).
4. Only landscaping demand was adjusted for different years. Indoor use was not.

Based on these estimates (excluding the instream dedication), there would be a net reduction in water use ranging from ~~7-60~~ to ~~75-93~~ AFY, with an average of ~~33-74~~ AFY (**Table 3.10-9**). This estimate is based on ~~conservative~~ the assumptions for demand, treatment, and system losses ~~discussed in this Chapter and in Appendix H, and may understate the amount of the net reductions.~~ Further, the same percentage adjustments were made to the baseline use case for golf course irrigation for low use, high use, and very high use wet, dry, and very dry years as for the Project residential demand. Residential demand, particularly for the ~~proposed residential development which has relatively compact development and limited yards would vary far less than golf course irrigation and thus, in dry and very dry years, the estimated Project demand is likely higher than it will actually be.~~

Similar to the Proposed Project, given the existing impact of Cal-Am withdrawals on the Carmel River, this net reduction is a beneficial impact for both water supply and for biological resources in the river, such as steelhead.

Table 3.10-9. 130-Unit Alternative Water Impact (acre-feet)

	Baseline Consumptive Use	Project 130-unit Alternative Consumptive Use	Net Change
<u>Average Year</u>	<u>145.1</u>	<u>111.7</u>	<u>-33.4</u>
<u>Low Use Year</u>	<u>113.4</u>	<u>106.1</u>	<u>-7.3</u>
<u>High Use Year</u>	<u>170.8</u>	<u>116.2</u>	<u>-54.6</u>
<u>Very High Use Year</u>	<u>195.0</u>	<u>120.5</u>	<u>-74.5</u>
<u>Average Year</u>	<u>204.1</u>	<u>129.8</u>	<u>-74.3</u>
<u>Wet Year</u>	<u>163.3</u>	<u>103.8</u>	<u>-59.5</u>
<u>Dry Year</u>	<u>224.5</u>	<u>142.8</u>	<u>-81.7</u>
<u>Very Dry Year</u>	<u>255.1</u>	<u>162.3</u>	<u>-92.8</u>

Note: This estimate is based on ~~conservative~~ assumptions described in text and in Appendix H, and may underestimate the amount of net reduction. Project 130-unit Alternative use does not include ~~presumed~~ proposed dedication of 50 AFY for instream purposes.

Because the 130-Unit Alternative would result in an overall reduction in water use, this impact would be less than significant provided the project would result in the amount of consumptive water

described above. However, without enforcement and monitoring, there is no guarantee that the project will limit its water use to the amounts estimated above. No mitigation is necessary.

Mitigation Measure PSU-1, described below, will require the project to meet the water budgets in this RDEIR, by requiring dedication of adequate water rights for the residential development, designing new development to be water efficient, installation of water meters for the development in accordance with MPWMD regulations, monitoring and reporting of water use to the County and MPWMD, remedial action if the project exceeds established water budgets.

Infrastructure impacts related to a potential new water system are discussed below separately.

The following are not mitigation measures, but recommended as conditions of approval to ensure impacts remain less than significant:

- It is recommended that the County, as a condition of approval, require a permanent dedication of 87 AF of the Project Applicant's water right that reserves its use solely for the 130-Unit Alternative residential development (including the park and preserve) and precludes any future use of this amount by the Project Applicant for golf course irrigation, other use, or transfer. This amount is based on the estimated net demand during a very dry year indicated in **Table 3.10-8**.
- It is thus further recommended that the County, as a condition of approval, require monthly reporting of water use on the golf course to verify that water use does not exceed the estimated remaining amount of the Project Applicant's water right. Combining the 130-Unit residential dedication (87 AFY) with the water transfer to other Cal-Am users (60 AFY), and the instream dedication (50 AFY using the estimate above), the total dedicated would be 197 AFY. From the 545 AFY remaining portion of the site's appropriation, this would leave up to 348 AFY for use for the remaining golf course and the clubhouse. Based on historical data, this appears adequate to cover these remaining uses.

Mitigation Measure PSU-1: Dedicate Water Rights for the Project; Design for, Meter, and Monitor Water to meet Water Budgets; Implement Remedial Action if Water Budgets Exceeded

The Project Applicant, the Homeowner's Association (HOA), individual property owners, and any other parties responsible for water use for the project shall implement the following measures to ensure that the overall project consumptive use of water does not exceed the amounts estimated in this RDEIR:

- (1) The Project Applicant shall obtain a permanent dedication of 108 AFY (Proposed Project) or 60 AFY (130-unit Alternative) of the water rights associated with the project site that reserves its use solely for the on-site residential development (including the park and preserve) and precludes any future use of this amount for any other use or transfer. These amounts are based on the estimated net demand during a very high use year as indicated in **Table 3.10-7** (Proposed Project) and in **Table 3.10-8** (130-unit Alternative).
- (2) The Project Applicant shall provide MPWMD and the County evidence of SWRCB approval of any appropriative rights in sufficient amounts for any proposed on-site residential uses that would rely on appropriative rights and/or any proposed water transfer prior to issuance of any building or water use permit. If the site residential development would only rely on riparian rights and no water transfer is advanced, then this portion of this measure would not apply.

- (3) The Applicant (if they build parts or all of the development), individual homeowners (for lot development not built by the Applicant), or other parties proposing water uses on-site shall demonstrate to MPWMD and the County at the final design phase (prior to issuance of a building permit or any water use permits) that the project employs all MPWMD mandated efficiency measures, will meter the new development as required by MPWMD and will require reporting on actual water use on-site monthly and annually to MPWMD and the County. All water use on-site shall be conditioned that MPWMD shall retain the ability to mandate feasible and reasonable reductions in water use in the future as necessary to constrain water use to the established water budgets.
- (4) MPWMD and the County shall track building permit and water use permit approvals to assure that the development overall will remain within the water budgets in this RDEIR. If tracking indicates that the project overall trend would result in an exceedance of the established water budgets upon full buildout, then MPWMD and the County shall require conditioning of all future building and water use permits with reductions in water use in order to restore the trend to compliance with the established water budgets. This limitation may ultimately include limitations on residential improvements (such as numbers of fixtures, swimming pools, or other limits), changes in landscaping amounts, types, or irrigation practices, a limit on overall amount of landscaping or other measures.
- (5) If monitoring/reporting indicates that the project is exceeding the estimated water budget in this RDEIR on average over two or more years or the “high use” estimate in any one year, MPWMD and the County shall require responsible parties (HOA, individual property owners, and/or any other entity responsible for water use on the project) to modify landscaping and irrigation practices and/or add additional water efficiency measures to the project as necessary to reduce the water use to the average yearly consumptive use shown in this RDEIR. If triggered, the responsible parties for water use shall implement remedial measures within one year of the exceedance.
- (6) Failure to comply with these requirements will result in a request from the County to MPWMD to impose mandatory limitations on project consumptive water use until compliance is achieved.
- (7) If a separate water system is proposed, the Project Applicant shall be required to obtain all necessary permits for the separate water delivery system and to demonstrate to the County’s satisfaction that the water delivery system can deliver water consistently and perpetually to the project prior to issuance of the first building permit.

Consistency Relative to Long-Term Sustainable Water Supply Goals and Policy in the 2010 General Plan

The focus of a CEQA evaluation of consistency with local land use policies is not to make a final determination of consistency with the policies (which is up to the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors), but rather to identify rather any inconsistencies might give rise to a physical impact on the environment and whether that physical impact is significant or not. An inconsistency with a local land use policy does not inherently result in a significant physical impact on the environment. It depends on the character of the resource affected and the nature and extent of the project impact. Thus, what ultimately matters for CEQA is the physical impact of the environment, which in this case is the impact on water supply.

Water supply impacts are analyzed in this Chapter including the cumulative context of the impact of prior and ongoing withdrawals from the Carmel Valley Alluvial Aquifer and the effects on Carmel River Biota as well as regional water supply conditions in which water is not available for new connections while the regional water supply project is being completed. The significance threshold used for this evaluation is no net increase in withdrawals from the aquifer, which was identified in recognition of the critical state of the Carmel River and the biological resources dependent upon it as well as the current regional water supply condition.

The fundamental intent of the County General Plan Goal PS-3 and associated policies PS-3.1 and PS-3.9 (and other related policies) is that new development must have a long-term water supply in terms of quantity and quality. The analysis shows that the Proposed Project (or the 130-unit Alternative) would not increase consumptive water use, would result in increased recharge to the Carmel Valley Alluvial Aquifer, and would not result in any substantial adverse effect on Carmel River instream flows. In regards to quality, the Proposed Project (or the 130-unit Alternative) would draw water from the same location that Cal-Am already draws water to serve its customers. Regardless of the modality of water delivery for the proposed residential use (Cal-Am distribution system or a separate community services district or mutual water company), the water can be treated to all regulatory standards just like the water being drawn at present from Cal-Am wells on the Rancho Canada golf course property and in nearby adjacent areas. Thus, the water source is of an acceptable water quality.

The proposed water supply for this project was reviewed using the criteria in County General Plan Policy PS-3.2:

- *Water Quality: Water is the same quality as current local Cal-Am wells and is thus of acceptable water quality. See discussion above.*
- *Authorized production capacity of a facility operating pursuant to a permit from a regulatory agency, production capability, and any adverse effect on the economic extraction of water or other effect on wells in the immediate vicinity, including recovery rates: The analysis in this Chapter shows that the on-site pumping levels would be less than baseline pumping levels which will help with groundwater recharge and thus would have no adverse effects to other wells or groundwater level recovery.*
- *Technical, managerial and financial capability of the water purveyor or water system operator: If the project is served by Cal-Am, it has proven capabilities to deliver water. If a separate water system is proposed, the Project Applicant will be required to obtain all necessary permits for the separate water delivery system and to demonstrate to the County's satisfaction that the water delivery system can deliver water consistently and perpetually to the project. With mitigation, the project's water supply can meet this criteria.*
- *The source of the water supply and the nature of the right(s) to water from the source: Please see discussion of water rights above and in Chapter 3.10, Public Services, Utilities, and Recreation. As discussed therein, there are riparian rights associated with the project site and the Project Applicant is seeking to obtain an appropriative right from the SWRCB in order to facilitate the proposed water transfer.*
- *Cumulative impacts of existing and projected future demand for water from the source, and the ability to reverse trends contributing to an overdraft condition or otherwise affecting supply: Cumulative conditions were taken into account when establishing significance criteria for the water supply analysis in this EIR as no net increase in consumptive water use, no net reduction*

in groundwater recharge, and no substantial adverse change in instream flows in the Carmel River. The project's water supply impact will not exceed any of the significance criteria. The project would reduce water use relative to baseline and help to reverse cumulative trends of water supply impacts on the Carmel River.

- Effects of additional extraction or diversion of water on the environment including on in-stream flows necessary to support riparian vegetation, wetlands, fish or other aquatic life, and the migration potential for steelhead, for the purpose of minimizing impacts on the environment and to those resources and species: The project's water supply will not result in a net increase in consumptive water use, no net reduction in groundwater recharge, and no substantial adverse change in instream flows in the Carmel River. Thus, it will not result in any additional extraction or diversion of water impacts on the environment and will not result in impacts to riparian vegetation, wetlands, fish or other aquatic life, or migration potential for steelhead. The project instead should benefit riparian vegetation, wetlands, fish and other aquatic life and help improve spring and summer instream flows.
- Completion and operation of new projects, or implementation of best practices, to renew or sustain aquifer or basin functions: As noted above, the project will not adversely affect aquifer or basin functions and will not hinder other efforts to renew aquifer or basin functions, such as the development of an alternative water supply to Cal-Am's withdrawals in excess of its current water rights or the dedication of water to instream uses by others. The project will instead contribute to sustaining aquifer and basin functions.
- The hauling of water shall not be a fact or nor a criterion for the proof of a long term sustainable water supply: Hauling of water is not proposed.

As indicated above, with proposed Mitigation Measure PS-1 to ensure delivery of the project's water supply (as noted above) and constrain it to a maximum of the amounts estimated in this RDEIR, the Proposed Project (or the 130-unit Alternative) is considered to have a long-term sustainable water supply because it has already met the relevant criteria and/or will be required to meet the relevant criteria prior to issuance of any building permits.

Page 3.10-29, lines 9-14 are revised as follows:

As described above in Impact PSU-5, water for the new homes would be supplied either through the Cal-Am distribution system or through the creation of independent community services (public or private), contract, or dedication to use the existing ~~Rancho Cañada~~ wells to pump, treat, and purvey the amount of water necessary for the Project. The Project Applicant has identified the location of the treatment facilities as within the 2 acre park, and the wells are on-site so the pipeline routing would likely be across the golf course and through the residential development.

Page 3.10-29, lines 24-25 are revised as follows:

Implementation of **Mitigation Measures PSU-2** ~~1~~ would reduce this impact to a *less-than-significant* level

Page 3.10-29, lines 33-37 are revised as follows:

As described above, for the Proposed Project and in Impact PSU-5, water for the new homes would be supplied either through the Cal-Am distribution system or through the creation of independent community services (public or private), contract, or dedication to use the existing ~~Rancho Cañada~~

wells to pump, treat, and purvey the amount of water necessary for the Project or 130-Unit Alternative.

Page 3.10-30, lines 4-21 are revised as follows:

Implementation of **Mitigation Measures PSU-2 1** would reduce this impact to a *less-than-significant* level

Mitigation Measure PSU-24: Test Well Supply, Identify Water Treatment and Distribution

Facilities, and Avoid Impacts on Biological Resources Prior to construction, the Project Applicant ~~or its contractor would~~ will condition its contractor to will test the proposed water supply for the Project (or 130-Unit Alternative) for California Title 22 constituents for potable water supply and will design and fund any necessary treatment and distribution facilities needed to transport treated water to the project site. Testing results will be provided to the County. The design for the new facilities will be submitted to Monterey County for review and approval. The new facilities can be placed within the existing golf course and/or other non-habitat disturbed areas (such as existing roads or golf paths). Under no circumstances will the new facilities result in permanent loss of native vegetation, ponds, or wetlands. All biological mitigation described for construction-related impacts of the Project (or 130-Unit Alternative) will apply to any potential impacts of new facilities (this shall include the following, as applicable to impacts of construction of the new facilities: Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-6; BIO-8 through BIO-21).

No grading for the Proposed Project (or 130-Unit Alternative) will be allowed until the new facilities have been approved by Monterey County and all biological resource mitigation has been approved by the County, USFWS, and CDFW. The Project Applicant will be required to fund all necessary improvements. This mitigation also applies to any new facilities required if the Project (or 130-Unit Alternative) utilizes a connection to the Cal-Am distribution system.

Page 3.10-31, lines 18-19 are revised as follows:

Implementation of **Mitigation Measures PSU-3 2** would reduce this impact to a *less-than-significant* level.

Page 3.10-31, lines 30-33 are revised as follows:

Implementation of **Mitigation Measures PSU-3 2** would reduce this impact to a *less-than-significant* level.

Mitigation Measure PSU-3 2: Coordinate with Appropriate Utility Service Providers and Related Agencies to Reduce Service Interruptions

Page 3.10-32, lines 15-35 are revised as follows:

Impact PSU-9: Increased Student Enrollments (less than significant)

Proposed Project

The Proposed Project could potentially increase student enrollments within the CUSD. A conservative multiplying factor of ~~0.18~~ 0.34 students per household was used to determine the

potential increase of school-age children attending public schools.⁵ Using the estimated build-out population projected, approximately ~~51~~ 96 school-aged children would be generated from the Proposed Project. The introduction of new students would result in placing further demands upon school services. ~~Although CUSD has been experiencing an increase in enrollment, the addition of 51 students to the district would represent a 2.3% increase in total enrollment and additional facilities would not be required. The CUSD levies school developer fees as authorized by SB 50, and the Project Applicant would be legally required to pay these fees. Pursuant to Government Code Section 65995, the payment of these fees by a developer serves to fully mitigate all potential project impacts on school facilities from implementation of a project. Therefore, this~~ This impact is *less than significant*. No mitigation is necessary.

130-Unit Alternative

Similar to the Proposed Project, the 130-Unit Alternative could potentially increase student enrollments within the Carmel Unified School District. A conservative multiplying factor of ~~0.18~~ 0.34 students per household was used to determine the potential increase of school-age children attending public schools.⁶ Using the multiplying factor of ~~0.18~~ 0.34 students per household, the 130-Unit Alternative would generate approximately ~~23~~ 44 school-aged children. The introduction of new students would result in placing less demand upon school services than the Proposed Project due to the decrease in residential units from 281 to 130. ~~Therefore, although CUSD has been experiencing an increase in enrollment, the addition of 23 students to the district would represent a 1% increase in total enrollment and additional facilities would not be required. The CUSD levies school developer fees as authorized by SB 50, and the Project Applicant would be legally required to pay these fees. Pursuant to Government Code Section 65995, the payment of these fees by a developer serves to fully mitigate all potential project impacts on school facilities from implementation of a project. Therefore, this~~ This impact would be *less than significant*. No further mitigation is necessary.

Page 3.10-34, lines 25-26 are revised as follows:

Like the Proposed Project, the end result of the 130-Unit Alternative is that there will be only one golf course instead of two on the ~~Rancho Cañada~~ property.

Chapter 3.12 – Population and Housing

Page 3.12-10, lines 16-19 are revised as follows:

Thus, the 130-Unit ~~a~~Alternative, including only the consideration of the 130 units at the ~~Rancho Cañada~~ project site, would not result in a higher level of housing or population growth in the CVMP area than anticipated in the adopted CVMP.

⁵ Personal communication with Rick Blanckmeister, Chief Business Official, Carmel Unified School District. Telephone conversation with Rich Walter and Heidi Mekkelson – August 29, 2016. Email correspondence - August 30, 2016. Telephone conversation with Heidi Mekkelson – September 9, 2016.

⁶ Ibid.

Chapter 4 – Other CEQA-Required Sections

Page 4-10, lines 23-25 are revised as follows:

In addition, the Proposed Project includes a 84-inch buried pipe to convey DA-27 drainage along the western side of the ~~Rancho Cañada~~ project site to the Carmel River, which would help in management of DA-27 flows that could otherwise result in flooding in CSA-50.

Page 4-13, lines 11 to Page 4-15 Line 8 are revised as follows: Figure 4-2 is deleted; the following text edits are also made:

- Between Rio Road (East) and Rancho Cañada Clubhouse and Between the Clubhouse and Via Mallorca**—Wildlife can currently move from undeveloped areas south of the Carmel River, across the Rancho Cañada golf course between Rio Road (east) and the golf course clubhouse, across the clubhouse access road, and across Carmel Valley Road to undeveloped areas north of the road. The narrowest part (approximately 700 feet) of the corridor is between Rio Road (east) and the clubhouse parking lot. ~~New visitor-serving development could be placed within this corridor as allowed by the 2013 CVMP, which could block this corridor. However, if the~~ With the TPL acquisition of most of the east golf course ~~occurs, then~~ this area ~~would~~ will be used for park and restoration purposes, which would preserve the wildlife corridor.
- Between Rancho Cañada Clubhouse and residences west of Via Mallorca**—Wildlife can currently move from undeveloped areas south of the Carmel River, across the Rancho Cañada golf course between the clubhouse and the residences west of Via Mallorca, and across Carmel Valley Road to undeveloped areas north of the road. The narrowest part (approximately 1,600 feet) of the corridor is between the clubhouse and the residences west of Via Mallorca. ~~New visitor-serving development could be placed within this corridor as allowed by the 2013 CVMP. However, if the~~ With the TPL acquisition of most of the east golf course occurs, then this area would be used for park and restoration purposes, which would preserve the wildlife corridor.

~~The 2013 CVMP allows for development of up to 175 visitor-serving units west of Via Mallorca, but is non-specific as to the location of such development. Although developing within the 100-year floodplain of the Carmel River (as proposed by the Proposed Project) is technically possible, as noted above, it is more likely that visitor-serving development would be placed somewhere between Carmel Valley Road and the 100-year floodplain. If the golf course area were to be preserved, development most likely would occur closer to Carmel Valley Road in the areas west and east of the clubhouse (if the clubhouse were retained). Visitor-serving development often includes additional amenities such as tennis courts, swimming pools, and other services. While unknown how much of the 50-acre area north of the 100-year floodplain might be occupied by the new visitor-serving development and the clubhouse, new development could block or substantially impede wildlife movement through the corridors east and west of the clubhouse.~~

As noted above, the Trust for Public Land has ~~announced its intention to purchased~~ the 140-acre Hatton parcel containing the clubhouse and most of the east golf course and conservation groups are also in conversations with the Lombardo ~~Land Group II family~~ about purchasing an additional 50 acres south of the clubhouse that contains land north and south of the Carmel River (see **Figure 4-1**). If both of these acquisitions were to come to fruition, then the area east of the Proposed Project would be retained as a wildlife corridor. If only the ~~Hatton parcel were~~ Lombardo Land Group II parcel is not acquired by TPL, there is a possibility of development of 50-acre area, but there would remain a wildlife corridor on either side of the 50-acre parcel.

With the proposed restoration and the TPL purchase and conversion of much of the east golf course to park and open space purposes, the two primary wildlife movement corridors east and west of the clubhouse would be preserved and the project would not have a considerable contribution to cumulative adverse effects on wildlife movement corridors.

However, if the two wildlife movement corridors east and west of the clubhouse were substantially impeded by future cumulative development, then the corridor through the CMS habitat would be the only unimpeded corridor in the part of the Mouth of the Valley between Via Mallorca and SR 1. In this context, loss of the corridor through the CMS habitat area from the Proposed Project would be cumulatively *significant*. **Mitigation Measure BIO-23**, would reduce the cumulative impact of cumulative development on wildlife movement corridors to a *less than cumulatively significant level* by ensuring an effective north-south wildlife migration corridor in this part of Carmel Valley.

Mitigation Measure BIO-23 would not be necessary if the TPL acquisition occurs and a wildlife corridor is preserved through the 140-acre parcel.

130-Unit Alternative

The 130-Unit Alternative would make similar contributions to cumulative impacts on biological resources as the Proposed Project. Lot 130 is already developed and would not add to cumulative impacts on wildlife movement. Therefore, impacts and mitigation discussed under the Proposed Project apply to the 130-Unit Alternative. With implementation of mitigation measures described in Section 3.3, *Biological Resources* and **Mitigation Measure BIO-23**, as well as through implementation of the proposed 2006 Restoration Plan, there would be a *less-than-significant* cumulative impacts on wildlife migration corridors.

Mitigation Measure BIO-23: Monterey County to Require Dedication of an Open Space Easement on a Portion of the Rancho Cañada Golf Course for a Wildlife Movement Corridor as a Condition of Approval of Future Development on the Remaining Portion of the Golf Course

If any future development is proposed on the remaining golf course (outside of the area of the Proposed Project or the 130-unit Alternative), Monterey County shall require, as a condition of approval, dedication of an irrevocable open space easement over the specified portion of the land at the Rancho Cañada Golf Course between the Carmel River and Carmel Valley Road as described below in order to maintain a wildlife movement corridor from the Carmel River across the golf course and northward across Carmel Valley Road.

The goal of this mitigation is to preserve a wildlife movement corridor east of the Rancho Cañada clubhouse and wildlife movement from the habitat preserve along the north side of the Carmel River to link up with the movement corridor east of the clubhouse.

A preliminary outline of the easement area is shown in **Figure 4-2**. The area of the easement will include, at a minimum, a portion of the golf course north of the Carmel River that is east of the habitat preserve, south of the Rancho Cañada clubhouse, and east of the Rancho Cañada clubhouse. The easement will exclude the existing footprint of the Rancho Cañada clubhouse, access road, and ancillary facilities. The width of the wildlife corridor to the east of the clubhouse shall be a minimum of 1,000 feet wide from Carmel Valley Road to a point parallel to the southernmost edge of the clubhouse and then shall include a connections to areas south to the Carmel River as shown in **Figure 4-2**.

~~The open space easement may allow for continued golf course use and periodic alteration of the golf course for golf course purposes (including excavation, grading, and realignment of holes and greens). The open space easement will not allow development of the land for residential, visitor-serving, commercial, or institutional uses.~~

~~The easement area and easement language shall be approved by the County prior to issuance of any building permit for any future development on other parts of the golf course. The easement shall be obtained and recorded prior to the start of construction of any future development on other parts of the golf course. The easement will either be held by the County or by a third party qualified to hold open space easements approved by the County the landowner. The easement shall be in perpetuity and will be irrevocable without exception.~~

Page 4-34, Lines 41-42 are revised as follows:

The secondary impacts of such facilities would be reduced to a less-than-significant level by **Mitigation Measure PSU-2 1** (described in Section 3.10).

Page 4-35, Lines 16-18 are revised as follows:

However, **Mitigation Measure PSU-3 2** would reduce the Project's contribution to any cumulative impact to a less-than-considerable level by providing coordination with utility service providers to reduce the potential for service interruptions.

Page 4-36, Lines 13-15 are revised as follows:

With the implementation of **Mitigation Measures PSU-2 1** and **PSU-3 2**, the 130-Unit Alternative would have less-than-considerable contributions to impacts related to water infrastructure and utility disruptions.

Chapter 5 – Alternatives Analysis

Page 5-21, lines 15 to 26 are revised as follows:

The 130-Unit Alternative would result in less residential development at the ~~Rancho Cañada~~ project site compared to the Proposed Project and Alternative 3.

Page 5-23, lines 34-35 are revised as follows:

As described in Section 3.2, Hydrology and Water Quality, the Project is not estimated to increase flooding upstream or downstream of the ~~Rancho Cañada property~~ project site.

Page 5-25, lines 29-31 are revised as follows:

In scoping, comments suggested the following additions to the Project: (1) a Monterey-Salinas Transit (MST) bus stop inside the project area; (2) a stoplight at Via Nona Marie Road and Rio Road; and (3) relocation of the stoplight at the middle school to the entrance to the Rancho Cañada Village.

Page 5-25, lines 32-37 are revised as follows:

As described in Section 3.7, Transportation and Traffic, MST provides bus service along Carmel Valley Road in front of the project site. The 24 line provides service between Carmel Valley Village and the Monterey Transit Plaza with 60-minute headways during weekday peak hours. Lines 91, 92,

and 94 have bus stops in The Crossroads Carmel and the Barnyard and are designed to service seniors and their specific travel and lifestyle needs. Lines 4, 5, 24, and 36 provide service in the shopping area at the mouth of the valley and travel near the project area. A bus stop is located in the project vicinity, on Carmel Valley Road near the Rio Road/Carmel Valley Road intersection.

Chapter 6 – References Cited

Page 6-10 under Chapter 3.8, Air Quality, the following reference is added:

Don Chapin Company. 2007. Rancho Canada Village. Construction Phase Emissions of the Rancho Canada Village Specific Plan. July.

Page 6-11 and 6-12 under Chapter 3.10, Public Services, Utilities and Recreation, the following references are added:

Lombardo Land Group II (LLGII) 2016. Letter on Water Rights re: Rancho Canada Village Project. 10/25/16.

NMFS. 2002. Instream Flow Needs for Steelhead in the Carmel River: Bypass Flow recommendations for water supply projects using Carmel River waters. June 3.

Rancho Canada de la Segunda, Inc. 1992. Application to Appropriate Water by Permit (Application A030111)

SWRCB. 2011. Letter RE: Application 30111 of Rancho Canada de la Segunda, Inc., Carmel River Subterranean Stream in Monterey County. August 23..

Trust for Public Land (TPL) 2016. Letter on Water Rights re: Rancho Canada Village Project. 10/25/16.

Zischke 2014a. Rancho Canada Golf Course Water Use Data. September 15.

Zischke 2014b. Rancho Canada Golf Course Water Use Data and Other Information. December 22.

Zischke 2014c. Chain of Title and September Ranch Excerpt. September 18.

Zischke 2014d. Response to MPWMD Comment Letter, September 16.

Zischke 2014e. Response to TOMP 2008 Comment Letter, September 18.

Zischke 2016. Response to ICF Data Request, October 7.

Page 6-16 under Chapter 4 – Other Required CEQA Analysis, is revised as follows:

———. 2015a. Carmel Canine Sports Center. Available: <http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/government/departments-i-z/resource-management-agencyrma-/planning/current-major-projects/carmel-canine-sports-complex>. Accessed: January 20, 2016.

———. 2015b. Before the Planning Commission in and for the County of Monterey, State of California. February 25. Available: <http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/planning/docs/resolutions>.

Appendix E – Rancho Canada Draft Transportation Impact Study

Table 7 on page 18 is revised by bolding certain conditions for Intersection #1 and #4

Intersection	Peak Hour	Existing		Existing Plus Project		Existing + 130-unit Alternative	
		Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
1.Highway 1/Carpenter Street	AM	19.4	B	19.8	B	19.6	B
	PM	39.9	D	43.3	D	41.2	D
4. Highway 1/Rio Road	AM	25.1	C	25.4	C	25.2	C
	PM	41.4	D	42.6	D	41.6	D

The following text is added near the bottom of Page 18:

The following intersections would operate below the desired service level:

- Intersection #1: The Highway 1/Carpenter Street intersection operates below the C/D cusp Caltrans standard for the State Highway System. Deficient operations would be made slightly worse than under existing conditions with the Project or the 130-unit Alternative, but operations would remain at LOS D.
- Intersection #4: The Highway 1/Rio Road intersection operates below the C/D cusp Caltrans standard for the State Highway System. Deficient operations would be made slightly worse than under existing conditions with the Project or the 130-unit Alternative, but operations would remain at LOS D.

Appendix F – Air Quality

Appendix F.2.2, Health Risk Assessment-Scaling Calculations were revised in two ways: 1) The scaled results presented in the RDEIR (first page in Appendix F2.2) were based on a worksheet that was not finalized; the finalized worksheet was used for calculations for the revisions to the RDEIR; and 2) the scaling calculations presented in the RDEIR were based on the HRA 2011 which has an incorrect assumption for the on-site cut to fill amount based on the Applicant’s air quality report (Chapin 2007). The cut to fill amount was updated to the correct amount and a scaling factor was applied to the HRA results to take into account this change. Thus, Appendix F2.2 is changed as follows:

- 1) The first sheet in the appendix entitled “Health Risk Assessment for both Rancho Canada Village alternatives” is replaced in its entirety by the enclosed new table.
- 2) An additional calculation sheet is added entitled “Adjustment for Cut to Fill Amounts for Revisions to the RDEIR (11/5/16).