

# **ADDENDUM**

**TO THE  
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT  
FOR THE  
RANCHO SAN JUAN SPECIFIC PLAN AND HYH PROPERTY EIR  
SCH No. 2002121142**

**Prepared for:  
County of Monterey  
Planning & Building Inspection Department  
168 West Alisal St, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Salinas, CA 93901**

**Prepared by:  
Project Design Consultants  
701 B Street, Suite 800  
San Diego, CA 92101**

**October 5, 2005**



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	1
2.0 BACKGROUND DISCUSSION .....	3
3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION .....	4
3.1 Revised Specific Plan .....	4
3.2 General Plan Amendments .....	8
3.3 Proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendments .....	8
3.4 Relationship to Adopted Specific Plan .....	9
4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES .....	11
4.1 Land Use .....	11
4.2 Traffic and Circulation.....	17
4.3 Landform Alteration/Visual Quality .....	28
4.4 Biology.....	31
4.5 Archaeological/Historical Resources.....	39
4.6 Noise .....	43
4.7 Air Quality .....	47
4.8 Soils and Geology.....	51
4.9 Hydrology/Water Quality .....	54
4.10 Water Resources .....	61
4.11 Agriculture .....	65
4.12 Public Services and Utilities .....	67
5.0 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS .....	75
5.1 Agriculture .....	75
5.2 Air Quality .....	75
5.3 Archaeological/Historical Resources.....	76
5.4 Biology.....	77
5.5 Geology and Soils.....	77
5.6 Hydrology/Water Quality .....	77
5.7 Land Use .....	78
5.8 Landform Alteration/Visual Quality.....	78
5.9 Noise .....	79
5.10 Public Services and Utilities .....	79
5.11 Traffic and Circulation.....	82
5.12 Water Resources .....	82
6.0 EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT.....	84
7.0 GROWTH INDUCEMENT .....	84

**Attachments**

- A Traffic Analysis
- B Supplemental Air Quality Analysis
- C Water Supply Assessment

**TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont.)**

**Figure**

A-1 Land Use Plan .....5

**Table**

A-1 Adopted vs. Revised Specific Plan.....10  
A-2 Comparison of Significant Intersection Impacts between Adopted  
and Proposed Specific Plans (Year 2010).....21  
A-3 Comparison of Significant Roadway Impacts between Adopted  
and Proposed Specific Plans (Year 2010).....22  
A-4 Comparison of Significant Freeway Impacts between Adopted  
and Proposed Specific Plans (Year 2010).....23  
A-5 Comparison of Significant Intersection Impacts between Adopted  
and Proposed Specific Plans (Year 2020).....25  
A-6 Comparison of Significant Roadway Impacts between Adopted  
and Proposed Specific Plans (Year 2020).....26  
A-7 Comparison of Significant Freeway Impacts between Adopted  
and Proposed Specific Plans (Year 2020).....27  
A-8 Urban Runoff Pollutant Sources.....56

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

This Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) SCH No. 2002121142 has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15164. It updates the FEIR which was certified on December 14, 2004. The certified FEIR is available for review at the County of Monterey Planning and Building Inspection Department, which is located at 168 W. Alisal St., 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Salinas, CA 93901.

The Addendum evaluates the proposal to reduce the area of the adopted Rancho San Juan Specific Plan (hereafter referred to as the Adopted Specific Plan) from 2,581 acres to 671 acres (hereinafter referred to as the Revised Specific Plan). Several amendments to the County's General Plan and Zoning Code are also proposed to accommodate changes associated with the Revised Specific Plan.

The 671 acres which comprises the Revised Specific Plan is owned by the HYH Corporation and was addressed in the FEIR as the HYH Property Development. A Vesting Tentative Map (VTM) for the HYH Property Development was approved under the FEIR. As no changes are proposed for VTM or other associated development permits, the original HYH Property Development is not addressed in this Addendum.

The primary purpose of the Addendum is to evaluate the effects of the changes to the Adopted Specific Plan and to determine if Sections 15162-15163 of the CEQA Guidelines require preparation of a Supplemental or Subsequent EIR because any of the following conditions apply:

- Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete, shows any of the following:
  - The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR;
  - Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;

- Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
- Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

Based on the results of the evaluation completed for this Addendum, none of the situations described above apply. As discussed in this Addendum, neither the revisions to the Rancho San Juan Specific Plan nor the circumstances under which it is being undertaken would result in any new significant project impacts not discussed in the FEIR. Furthermore, no substantial increase in the severity of previously identified impacts would occur. In addition, no new information of substantial importance has become available since the FEIR was prepared regarding new significant impacts, or feasibility of mitigation measures or alternatives.

## **2.0. BACKGROUND DISCUSSION**

The Adopted Rancho San Juan Specific Plan and Vesting Tentative Map for the HYH Property, along with associated amendments to the County's General Plan and subdivision and zoning ordinances, were approved on December 14, 2004 by the County Board of Supervisors. Prior to approving these actions, the County Board of Supervisors certified the Final EIR. Within the 30-day period following issuance of a Notice of Determination for the action taken, five lawsuits regarding the adequacy of the FEIR were filed by various interested parties. They were Caltrans, the City of Salinas, Landwatch Monterey County, Save Our Peninsula Committee and the Jarvis Trust.

In its resolution adopting the Specific Plan, the Board of Supervisors recognized the public controversy regarding the wisdom of continuing to have an Area of Development Concentration designated in the Rancho San Juan Area. The Board directed staff to return to the Board within six months with various recommendations, including consideration of the following: 1) the removal of the Area of Development Concentration from the General Plan; 2) amendment or rescission of the Adopted Specific Plan, as appropriate; and/or 3) amendment of the adopted Specific Plan boundaries in response to RSJ land owner requests. In an effort to address the Board's direction and to alleviate the concerns expressed by the public regarding the approved project, the County reduced the scope of the Revised Specific Plan to the HYH property. This reduced scope Specific Plan is the proposed project addressed by this Addendum. The Addendum compares the Revised Specific Plan impacts to the impacts of the Adopted Specific Plan evaluated in the FEIR.

The Adopted Rancho San Juan Specific Plan covers a total of 2,581 acres and allows a variety of land uses including development of up to 4,000 dwellings, a maximum of 2,766,900 square feet of employment space, a maximum of 242,900 square feet of office space, and approximately 527,000 square feet of retail and commercial uses in the Town Center and Neighborhood Centers. A total of five school sites were proposed to be created, and recreation opportunities were to include a 229.6-acre, 18-hole golf course and 86 acres devoted to parks. A total of 610 acres were to be retained in open space.

The Revised Specific Plan would be limited to the 671 acres which comprise the HYH Property. The land uses would include 1,147 residential units including single- and multi-family, 45,000 square feet of retail commercial, 18-hole golf course including 71 guest villas/timeshares, public parks and a wastewater treatment plant. The Revised Specific Plan represents less than one-third (1/3) of the approved residential density and about one-hundredth (1/100) of the approved commercial density of the Adopted Specific Plan.

## 3.0. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

As indicated, the primary action covered by this Addendum is the revision of the Rancho San Juan Specific Plan. In addition, amendments to the County's General Plan and Zoning Code are proposed to accommodate the proposed revisions to the Specific Plan. Each of these aspects are described below.

### 3.1 REVISED SPECIFIC PLAN

The boundaries of the Revised Specific Plan would correspond to the HYH Property VTM. The Specific Plan would allow the following land uses:

- 1,147 residential units;
- 18-hole championship golf course and club house;
- 71 time-share units associated with the golf course;
- 45,000 square feet of retail commercial;
- Parks and open space;
- Fire and sheriff stations; and
- Wastewater treatment plant.

Development of the Revised Specific Plan would occur in a phased manner. It is anticipated that the Revised Specific Plan would be developed in three general phases. Development Unit 1 would include grading over all but the estate residential area along the northern boundary. A total of 439 residential units would be included in this development unit as well as the golf course and 45,000 square feet of commercial development. The first phase of the wastewater treatment plant would also be constructed. This plant would be expanded as part of each subsequent development unit, as required. Development Unit 2 would include 537 residential units, a neighborhood park. Development Unit 3 would include 171 residential units.

Each of the major elements of the Revised Specific Plan is described. Figure A-1, illustrates the land use plan for the Revised Specific Plan.

**Comment:** Figure A-1. Proposed Land Use Plan

#### 3.1.1 RESIDENTIAL

Residential housing opportunities would be provided for a variety of family types and individuals of varying economic means. Residences would account for approximately 233 acres or about 47% of the developable acreage. Residential units would include a range of densities from estate lots at 0.5 - 1.0 dwelling units per acre to attached units at 20 dwelling units per acre.

A total of 1,147 residential lots would be created. Of this total, 739 would be intended for one to two-story, single family, detached homes on lots ranging from 3,000 square feet to one acre. A total of 408 residential units would consist of multi-family development. The largest single-family lots would be located along the central, northern boundary of the property. The other single family lots would be located on approximately 80.7 acres south of the Residential Estates



Figure A-1 Land Use Plan

and also distributed in six locations along the southeastern and southwestern boundaries of the Specific Plan.

Multi-family homes would be located on approximately 11.6 acres near the Neighborhood Commercial-2 areas in the golf resort center and near the proposed soccer field in the southern portion of the Specific Plan area. These units may consist of apartments, condominiums, flats, multiplexes and/or townhouses.

Golf-villas/timeshare units are proposed in the golf resort center. Up to 71 units may be built in this area. The villas would be located within walking distance to and just north of the clubhouse area.

### **3.1.2 GOLF COURSE AND RESORT**

An 18-hole golf course would extend throughout the 671-acre HYH Property with fairways running adjacent to the proposed homes. The golf course area would be characterized by rolling topography, and drainage courses. The golf course would include 7.3-acre maintenance facility, a club house and 71 golf villas/timeshares resort units.

The golf-resort center would include a mixed-use neighborhood commercial center serving the entire development as well as golf course patrons.

### **3.1.3 PARKS AND OPEN SPACE**

Approximately 11.8 acres would be reserved for neighborhood and mini-parks. These parks would be planned to serve the neighborhoods in which they are located. Where soils and drainage characteristics permit, parks may be utilized for storm water detention, and percolation of stormwater run-off.

The Specific Plan would include 367.7 acres of open space which would represent approximately 55% of the overall property. The open space would include conservation open space areas and common open space areas. Conservation open space areas would cover a total of 141.2 acres (38%) of the open space area and include lands with existing natural or nonnative vegetation or lands that would be enhanced or rehabilitated to a more "natural" condition. Common open space consists of areas available for and in support of active recreation and would be comprised of 226.5 acres (62%) of the overall open space. These areas include the parkland, the golf-course areas and support facilities. The golf clubhouse will also designate space to accommodate public meetings and indoor recreation.

### **3.1.4 INFRASTRUCTURE**

#### **Roads**

Access to the property would be provided at two locations. Primary access would be via Stirling Road to the east. Secondary access would be provided via Harrison Road to the west. The project would include offsite construction of Stirling Road from the eastern boundary to San Juan Grade Road; a distance of approximately 3,400 feet. Similarly, offsite roadway

construction would be undertaken to connect the project with Harrison Road; the offsite portion would extend approximately 1,200 feet.

A hierarchy of roadways would be developed within the Revised Specific Plan. A Community Boulevard street with landscaped median would be constructed in the southeast portion of the site. Roadways serving the Residential Low-1 and Residential Estate areas would utilize a more narrow street section and a steeper gradient than the remainder of the community in order to preserve the natural topography of these residential sections. One roundabout would be installed in the golf resort center area adjacent to the Neighborhood Center and the RH-2 residential areas.

### **Wastewater Treatment**

A wastewater treatment plant would be constructed along the northern boundary of the project area to provide wastewater treatment for the proposed development as well as provide reclaimed water for irrigation of the proposed golf course and selected common open space areas. The wastewater treatment facility would include facilities to accommodate storage of the equivalent of 120 days of treated sewage and emergency storage for up to three days of untreated sewage. The proposed wastewater collection system would be 8-inch and 12-inch lines within the development areas to a trunk system in the western access road. The trunk system would be 18-inch and 24-inch lines, which would outfall to the proposed sewer lift station and force main that would deliver to the wastewater treatment facility. The main trunk sewer is proposed to be gravity main, and is expected to vary in depth from 18 to 22 feet of cover over the pipe.

### **Water**

Development within the Revised Specific Plan would draw water from the two existing onsite wells. It is anticipated that the wells would be operated by California Water Service Company, and would interconnect the onsite water system with their existing systems on San Juan Road and on Hitchcock Road, via booster pump or pressure reducer systems, in order to provide service during an emergency.

Proposed water storage would be provided by two proposed steel tanks at the northeast end of the project. Each would have a capacity of 400,000 gallons. The distribution system would consist of 12-inch and 8-inch pipes. The 12-inch pipes would be required to provide adequate fire flow to commercial and high-density, multi-family areas. The remainder of the proposed project would be served by 8-inch lines.

### **Fire and Sheriff Stations**

A fire station is planned to be constructed following approval of the 1,000 dwelling unit. It is anticipated that this station would be located in the northwest corner of the Revised Specific Plan along Harrison Road. A new substation for the County Sheriff is anticipated to be located in an existing building within or near the Revised Specific Plan area.

## **3.2 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENTS**

In response to the December 14, 2004 Board of Supervisors resolution adopting the Rancho San Juan Specific Plan, the Revised Specific Plan includes a proposed General Plan Amendment to adjust the ADC boundary to be coterminous with the Revised Specific Plan boundary.

Other General Plan amendments are proposed to ensure the overall consistency between the General Plan and the Revised Specific Plan. An analysis of the consistency of the Rancho San Juan Specific Plan with the Monterey County General Plan is provided in Appendix C of the Revised Specific Plan. This analysis explains how the Revised Specific Plan is in harmony with the goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan and identifies areas where potential inconsistencies may exist. The proposed General Plan Amendments are as follows:

1. Amendments to the 1982 Monterey County General Plan including the following:
  - a. Goal No. 30
  - b. Policy No. 25.1.1
  - c. Policy No. 26.1.9
  - d. Policy No. 30.0.3
  - e. Policy No. 39.2.1
  
2. Amendments to the Monterey County Greater Salinas Area Plan (GSAP) to including the following:
  - a. Land Use Plan (Figure 13) To Reduce the Boundaries of the Rancho San Juan Area of Development Concentration (ADC) to include only the Butterfly Village Property;
  - b. Policy No. 26.1.4.1
  - c. Policy No. 28.1.1.2
  - d. Policy No. 39.1.4.1
  - e. Policy No. 40.1.1.1
  - f. Policy No. 51.4.1.1
  - g. Part II, Chapter V. Defining Commercial Land Use Designations in the Area Plan
  - h. Certain Guidelines in the Rancho San Juan ADC Development Guidelines and principles adopted pursuant to Policy 26.1.4.1

With the proposed amendments, the Revised Specific Plan will be more fully consistent with the goals, objectives, policies, general land uses and programs described in the GSAP and the Monterey County General Plan.

## **3.3 PROPOSED ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS**

The Zoning Ordinance would be amended to rezone those properties outside the boundaries of the Revised Specific Plan. The land that lies within the original Rancho San Juan ADC per the GSAP but outside the Revised Specific Plan would be zoned for agricultural uses including 40-


acre Farmland (F/40) or Rural Grazing (RG). The area within the Adopted Specific Plan but outside the original ADC would revert back to its original zoning which included Heavy Commercial (HC), Light Commercial (LC), Low Density Residential (LDR) and Permanent Grazing (PG); this area is located along east side of Highway 101.

### **3.4 RELATIONSHIP TO ADOPTED SPECIFIC PLAN**

A detailed comparison of the Revised Specific Plan with the Adopted Specific Plan is provided in Table A-1. In summary, the overall planning concept would change from the creation of a more broad-based mixed use development to a golf course/residential development with limited retail development.. The town center and employment center would be eliminated as would the proposed community park, library site, and all school sites. The Future Development/Interim Agricultural area of the Adopted Plan would also be deleted, as it is outside the revised Specific Plan area.

**TABLE A-1**  
**Adopted vs. Revised Specific Plan**

LAND USE	DENSITY (DWELLING UNIT PER ACRE)	ACREAGE		SQUARE FOOTAGE		RESIDENTIAL UNITS	
		ADOPTED	REVISED	ADOPTED	REVISED	ADOPTED	REVISED
Residential Estate	0.5 to 1	37.6	37.6			34	34
Residential Low -1	1 to 3	77.7	80.7			250	137
Residential Low -2	3 to 5	251.5	71.4			1195	440
Residential Medium -1	5 to 9	74.6	24.2			638	128
Residential Medium -2*	9 to 12	41.6				470	
Residential High -1*	12 to 16	45				667	
Residential High -2	16 to 20	21.8	19.9			399	366
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>549.8</b>	<b>233.8</b>				<b>1,105</b>
<b>COMMERCIAL/MIXED-USE</b>							
Town Center*		38.5		373,100		235	
Neighborhood Center -1 *		10.0		108,950			
Neighborhood Center -2		4.2	4.2	45,000	45,000	42	42
Employment Center *		154.1		2,766,900			
Office Professional*		22.3		242,900			
Live/Work *		14.4		140,000		70	
Hospitality		15.4	3.7			71 guest villas/timeshares <sup>1</sup> 150 hotel rooms <sup>1</sup>	71 guest villas/timeshares <sup>1</sup>
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>258.9</b>	<b>7.9</b>	<b>3,676,850</b>			
<b>PUBLIC FACILITIES AND OPEN SPACE</b>							
Public Facility		40.4	14.3				
School*		87.1					
Fire/Sheriff's Station		1	1.2				
Golf Course		229.6	214.7				
Parks		86.5	11.8				
Open Space		610.6	141.2				
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>1054.2</b>	<b>382.0</b>				
<b>OTHER</b>							
Future Development/Interim Agriculture Reserve*		565.5					
Backbone Circulation Roads Right-of-way		130.2	14.6				
Freeway Right-of-way		21.7	32.7				
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>717.4</b>	<b>437.2</b>				
<b>Total</b>		<b>2,581.0</b>	<b>671.0</b>	<b>3,676,850</b>	<b>45,000</b>	<b>4,000</b>	<b>1,147</b>

 Indicates land uses which have been eliminated from the Revised Specific Plan.

## 4.0. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

The following pages contain a comparative analysis of the potential impacts of the Revised Specific Plan with those identified in the FEIR certified for the Adopted Specific Plan. Each environmental issue area includes a discussion of the existing conditions, the conclusions of the certified FEIR with regard to significant impacts, and the relationship between the impacts of the Revised Specific Plan and the FEIR conclusions. The applicable mitigation measures are also identified. As explained in the Introduction, this comparative analysis has been undertaken, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), to provide a factual basis for concluding that the revisions to the approved project do not require the preparation of a Supplemental or Subsequent EIR.

### 4.1 LAND USE

#### 4.1.1 EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

##### Land Use

No major changes have taken place with respect to the environmental setting described in the certified FEIR with respect to the area covered by the Revised Specific Plan. As discussed in Chapter 5.1 of the FEIR, the subject property is characterized as agricultural/grazing with limited portions of the property covered in native vegetation. Two homes occur within the property along the western boundary. One of the homes also has a large shed and several smaller outbuildings. Major land uses surrounding the property include the Salinas Golf Course and Country Club and a dairy farm on the south, and strawberry fields along portions of the east and western boundaries. Residential areas are located along the west and southwestern boundaries. To the north are areas of open space and agriculture.

##### Land Use Plans and Policies

The land use regulations governing the subject property are the same as described in the FEIR. As indicated in Chapter 5.1, the property is located with the Greater Salinas Area Plan (GSAP) of the County's General Plan which is intended to provide more specific guidance on the land use in this area. The GSAP directs future growth in unincorporated area into areas designated as Areas of Development Concentration (ADC). An ADC clusters residences around natural features to lessen the environmental impacts elsewhere in the region while allowing for a "higher intensity" development with mixed uses.

#### 4.1.2 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

With respect to the subject property, the FEIR identified potentially significant impacts related to agriculture, golf course maintenance, commercial/residential interface and sewage treatment.

<b>Impact:</b> Incompatible land uses relating to agricultural operations
---

The **Adopted Specific Plan** was determined to have significant impacts on potential agricultural land which lies adjacent to the Specific Plan boundary. Dust, pesticides and other activities associated with future agricultural operations could irritate new residents within the Specific Plan area. Complaints from these residents could put pressure on adjacent agricultural activities to modify or relocate their activities. The economic consequences of these imposed changes could have a significant impact on adjacent agriculture.

The Adopted Specific Plan did not require buffers between properties within the Specific Plan because the goal was to encourage the development of the Area of Development Concentration. The FEIR concluded that implementation of the following mitigation measure reduced the impact on adjacent agriculture to below a level of significance. In addition, there was a requirement to provide notice to homebuyers adjacent to ongoing agriculture under the County's Right to Farm Ordinance.

***Mitigation Measure 5.1-1:*** Prior to the approval of a tentative map for any development adjacent to an existing agricultural operation outside of the boundary of the specific plan, the applicant shall submit plans and supporting documentation demonstrating that a 200-foot agricultural buffer will be provided as set forth in Section 7.11 (Agricultural Buffers) of the Rancho San Juan Specific Plan. The plans and supporting documentation shall be subject to review and approval by the Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection Department and Agricultural Commissioner's Office.

With inclusion of agricultural buffers and notice requirements, the FEIR determined the impact of the Specific Plan with respect to compatibility with agriculture on adjoining lands outside the Specific Plan to be not significant.

The **Revised Specific Plan** continues the policy of not requiring internal buffers and requiring buffers between the Specific Plan and properties along the perimeter with ongoing agricultural operations. Buffers are provided through a variety of approaches including incorporation of physical features such as roadways, open space, landscape planting, berms and fences which will serve as an effective separator.

The Revised Specific Plan includes agricultural buffers ranging from 30 to 100 feet. The larger 100-foot buffers are required for properties that abut row crops and are sufficient to address compatibility issues because they incorporate hilly terrain that provides additional physical separation between residential zones and ongoing agricultural activities. The 30 foot buffers are provided adjacent to agricultural lands that are grazing lands. These buffers are sufficient since they abut wooded and hilly areas which provide an additional barrier.

As with the Adopted Specific Plan, notification to potential homebuyers in the deed shall be provided regarding the Right to Farm Ordinance.

These buffers would provide adequate protection against significant land use conflicts between proposed development within the Specific Plan and adjacent agricultural activities. Thus, as



with the Adopted Specific Plan, the inclusion of agricultural buffers and deed notification would reduce potential conflicts with surrounding agricultural uses to below a level of significance.

<p><b>Impact:</b> Incompatible land uses relating to noise associated with the golf course maintenance on nearby residential uses</p>
---

The FEIR concluded that golf course maintenance activities which could occur under the **Adopted Specific Plan** as well as from the existing Salinas Golf and Country Club could cause noise levels in excess of those desired for residential areas. To reduce golf course maintenance noise levels from the proposed course to acceptable levels, the EIR contained the following mitigation measure.

*Mitigation Measure 5.6-1e:* Golf course maintenance operations shall prohibit mowing within 125 feet of any residence between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 6:30 a.m.

However, as the applicant has no control over golf course maintenance activities on the adjacent Salinas Golf and Country Club, potential impacts could occur from maintenance activities within that golf course on adjacent houses within the Revised Specific Plan.

As the maintenance activities within the Salinas Golf and Country Club are beyond the control of the project, the impacts on the approved project would be significant.

The potential impacts under the **Revised Specific Plan** would be the same as the Adopted Specific Plan because the Revised Specific Plan would include the proposed golf course and allow residential development adjacent to the Salinas Golf and Country Club. As with the Adopted Specific Plan, compliance with Mitigation Measure 5.6-1e would reduce impacts to below a level of significance. However, potential impacts from maintenance of the Salinas Golf and Country Club can not be controlled by the proposed project.

As with the Adopted Specific Plan, the impacts from golf course maintenance activities would be significant with respect to the Salinas Golf and Country Club.

<p><b>Impact:</b> Incompatible land uses relating to commercial operations</p>
--

As discussed in the FEIR, noise and outdoor lighting associated with the golf course and/or other commercial areas under the **Adopted Specific Plan** were determined to have a potentially significant direct impact on adjacent residential areas.

The following mitigation measures were identified in the FEIR to reduce commercial noise and lighting impacts.

*Mitigation Measure 5.6-1d:* Prior to issuance of building permits for any commercial or industrial development sharing a property line with a noise sensitive use, a detailed noise study shall be completed by a qualified acoustical consultant to document that adequate

noise attenuation has been included in the building design to assure that noise levels at surrounding sensitive receptors will not exceed levels identified in Table 5.6-1.

**Mitigation Measure 5.1-2:** Prior to approval of a building permit for retail and industrial buildings located within 100 feet of light sensitive areas (e.g. residential, medical care facilities), the project applicant shall submit a lighting study to confirm that light within adjacent light-sensitive property complies with Policy 26.1.20 of the General Plan.

With implementation of the mitigation measures, the FEIR concludes that the Adopted Specific Plan would not have significant land use impacts related to commercial noise and lighting.

The same potential land use impacts from commercial noise and lighting would occur with the **Revised Specific Plan**, but to a lesser extent, because the Revised Specific Plan contains much less commercial development. The golf course would be located within the Revised Specific Plan as would 45,000 square feet of commercial uses. Thus, as with the Adopted Specific Plan, the Revised Specific Plan could have a significant land use impact on nearby residential uses. As with the Adopted Specific Plan, implementation of the mitigation measures 5.6-1d and 5.6-2 would reduce noise and lighting impacts from commercial activities to below a level of significance.

<b>Impact:</b> Equipment noise and odors from wastewater treatment
--

For the **Adopted Specific Plan**, the FEIR concluded that pumping equipment and wastewater treatment may generate odors and noise levels which could impact nearby sensitive land use (e.g. residential). As described in Chapter 5.6 (Noise) of the FEIR, equipment could cause surrounding noise levels to exceed desirable levels and result in a significant land use conflict. Additionally, Chapter 5.7 (Air Quality) of the FEIR, noted that odors may enter the local air stream during ordinary use or from accidental spills.

The following mitigation measures were identified in the FEIR to reduce noise and odor impacts.

**Mitigation Measure 5.6-1d:** Prior to issuance of building permits for any commercial or industrial development sharing a property line with a noise sensitive use, a detailed noise study shall be completed by a qualified acoustical consultant to document that adequate noise attenuation has been included in the building design to assure that noise levels at surrounding sensitive receptors will not exceed levels identified in Table 5.6-1.

**Mitigation Measure 5.7-3:** Prior to approval of a building permit, the MBUAPCD shall review and approve odor control devices in accordance with Rule 216.

As part of MBUAPCD's permitting requirement, an odor impact analysis would be completed to assess the impacts on reasonably foreseeable sensitive receptors. American Society of Testing Materials has developed procedures to assess odor impacts (Standard Methods #679 and E1432). These methods establish a sensory threshold of detection or recognition of odors that is derived from the best-estimate value of a representative sample group. Once a sensory threshold is

established, it would be compared to average or typical concentrations of odor causing pollutants at reasonably foreseeable sensitive receptors.

The FEIR concluded that with implementation of the identified mitigation measures and MBUAPCD's permitting requirements, potential land use impacts associated with noise and odor from the proposed wastewater treatment plant would not be significant.

As a sewer treatment plant is included in the **Revised Specific Plan**, similar equipment noise and treatment odors could impact nearby residential uses. However, implementation of Mitigation Measures 5.6-1d and 5.7-3 would be effective in reducing land use impacts related to the Revised Specific Plan. Thus, as with the Adopted Specific Plan, land use impacts associated with wastewater treatment noise and odors would not be significant with implementation of identified mitigation measures.

<p><b>Impact:</b> Conflict with ADC phasing as designated within local agency plans, regulations or policies.</p>
---

The **Adopted Specific Plan** was consistent with the phasing goals of the ADC. The overall goal of the Adopted Specific Plan was to develop the ADC from west to east and assure that necessary infrastructure would be provided concurrent with need. Thus, the FEIR determined that no significant land use impact with respect to the ADC phasing goals would occur from the Adopted Specific Plan. Consequently, no mitigation measures were identified.

However, the FEIR also noted that if the HYH Property Development preceded the rest of the Adopted Specific Plan, this would conflict with the phasing goal of the ADC to assure that infrastructure is available when needed. As a result, the following mitigation measure was required if the HYH Property developed first.

**Mitigation Measure 5.1-14:** Prior to approval of a tentative map, the project applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the County that public services are adequate to meet the needs of the proposed development. Applicant shall also demonstrate agreement to pay all relevant fees and indicate which service would be provided by a Community Services District.

The **Revised Specific Plan** would be consistent with the ADC goal of phasing development because the project applicant has complied with Mitigation Measure 5.1-14 by demonstrating adequate infrastructure prior to County approval of the VTM for the HYH Property Development.

<p><b>Impact:</b> Inconsistent building lot coverage and building height within local agency plans, regulations, or policies</p>
--

The FEIR concluded that with proposed mitigation, the **Adopted Specific Plan** would not have a significant land use impact relative to building lot coverage and building height. As with

indicated in the FEIR, the following mitigation measure would reduce this potential conflict to below a level of significance by amending the GSAP to allow specific exceptions within the Rancho San Juan Specific Plan Area.

***Mitigation Measure 5.1-8:*** Concurrent with the approval of the Specific Plan, the GSAP shall be amended to add additional text to page 91 allowing exceptions to the height and lot coverage standards, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors for a regulatory Specific Plan designed to create a “sustainable”, “new urbanist”, “neotraditional”, “transit oriented development”, or “smart growth” community or project.

***Mitigation Measure 5.1-9:*** Concurrent with the approval of the Specific Plan, the GSAP shall be amended to add additional text to page 91 allowing exceptions to the height and lot coverage standards, excluding parking and landscaping requirements for Rancho San Juan.

The **Revised Specific Plan** would not conflict with the building and height requirements. No buildings would exceed 35 feet in height. Although building plans for the commercial area have not been prepared, future development would be required to comply with applicable lot coverage requirements.

#### **4.1.3 CONCLUSION**

With respect to land use impacts, the Revised Specific Plan would not require preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR pursuant to Sections 15162-15163 for the following reasons:

- No substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the land use analysis of FEIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
- No substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of land use analysis of FEIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- No new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the FEIR was certified as complete, shows any of the following:
  - No new land use impacts would occur that were not discussed in the FEIR;
  - Land use impacts identified in the FEIR would not be any greater with the proposed project;

- No new mitigation measures or alternatives related to land use impacts previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative mitigation measures or alternatives considered infeasible in the FEIR are now considered feasible; or
- No mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the FEIR would substantially reduce one or more significant land use effects on the environment, but the project proponents declined to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

## **4.2 TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION**

### **4.2.1 EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

Since the traffic study was completed for the FEIR, two primary factors have occurred which affect the results of that study. The first factor is change in background traffic volumes on local roads. The original traffic study for the FEIR used traffic counts which were taken in the year 2001. In the intervening years, traffic models used to evaluate future traffic conditions have changed including the way traffic is distributed within the region. Regional land use distribution has changed in the new Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) model when compared to the model version used to analyze the Adopted Specific Plan in the FEIR. Changes in concentration of homes and jobs affects distribution of traffic, so one would expect to see changes in travel patterns with changes in land uses. The change in land use and re-distribution of traffic in the new model results in substantial changes to baseline traffic volumes (without project scenarios) affecting levels of service prior to addition project traffic. In the “with project” scenarios, changes in the model include an increase in housing and jobs in the City of Salinas, which results in a more southerly-orientation of Specific Plan trips than projected in the Adopted Specific Plan model.

As a result of these two factors, the existing traffic conditions described in the traffic report prepared for this Addendum (Attachment A) shows traffic volumes and levels of service which vary from those described in the existing conditions in the FEIR. In addition to changes in existing conditions, the new AMBAG model introduces changes to cumulative land use projections and the distribution of traffic which vary the 2010 and 2020 baseline conditions described in the future conditions in the FEIR.

### **4.2.2 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

As indicated earlier, in light of the changes in existing conditions and traffic modeling, a new traffic study was prepared for this Addendum to provide a comprehensive evaluation of the potential impacts of the Revised Specific Plan and to confirm that the traffic congestion associated with the Revised Specific Plan would not be substantially greater than the Adopted Specific Plan. The study also evaluated whether the original mitigation measures would remain effective.

The intersections which were assessed in the traffic study for the Addendum were the same ones as addressed in the FEIR. While the intersections of Espinosa Road/Highway 101 and Espinosa

Road/Highway 186 were not addressed in the DEIR, these intersections were evaluated in Exhibit B of the FEIR. Similarly, the traffic analysis prepared for the DEIR did not break Highway 101 into as many segments as the Addendum's traffic study. However, the analysis contained in Exhibit B of the FEIR does break the segments down into segments which are comparable to the Addendum's traffic study.

The **Adopted Specific Plan** was found to generate up to 82,300 average daily trips (ADT); of which, 57,228 ADT would be external to the Specific Plan area on the surrounding road network.

The **Revised Specific Plan** would generate substantially less trips than the Adopted Specific Plan. Based on the traffic study contained in Attachment A, the Revised Specific Plan would generate a total of 14,546 ADT; of which, 13,334 ADT would be external which would represent a reduction of over 76% over the Adopted Specific Plan.

A detailed comparison of the traffic impacts of the Adopted and Revised Specific Plan in the years 2010 and 2020 is contained in Attachment A. The results of this analysis are summarized below.

<p><b>Impact:</b> Substantial increase in Traffic Congestion at Intersections, Roadway, and Highway Segments in Year 2010.</p>
--

### **Intersections (2010)**

The **Adopted Specific Plan** was found to significantly impact 16 intersections, as shown in Table A-2.

The FEIR identified the following mitigation measures intended to reduce traffic impacts in the year 2010.

**Mitigation Measure 5.2-1a:** Prior to approval of any final map (except within the HYH Properties Project) resulting in vehicle trips, the project applicant shall prepare a supplemental traffic report to assess the direct impacts of the trips associated with the proposed development. The report shall recommend off-site transportation improvements which would provide the most relief from identified impacts. The County shall determine the project applicant's fair share amount of traffic improvements described in Table 5.2-17 of the EIR. The project applicant shall use the determined fee amount to construct the traffic improvements identified in the supplemental traffic report to the greatest degree possible, as determined by the County. The project applicant shall post a performance bond equal to the amount of the fair share fees. The traffic improvements to be completed by the applicant shall be identified and the bond posted prior to approval of the final map. The improvements shall be initiated in conjunction with the first building permit is issued. The County may, at its option, accept payment of all, or a portion, of the applicant's fair share traffic fees in lieu of construction of improvements.

In addition to Specific Plan-wide mitigation, the FEIR identifies the following specific mitigation measure for the HYH Property Development because it was exempted from Mitigation Measure 5.2-1a.

**Mitigation Measure 5.2-9:** Prior to issuance of a building permit resulting in vehicle trips, the applicant shall pay an amount not to exceed \$16,017,310 as a traffic fee for regional, and local off-site commercial and residential traffic impacts to be paid on a per unit or per square foot basis at the time of issuance of building permits. Traffic fees are as follows:

**Housing \$14,399,908**

**Market-Rate/Workforce Housing**

- No. Units: 932
- \$/Unit: \$13,674
- Total Fees: \$12,744,547

**Moderate**

- No. Units: 86
- \$/Unit: \$9,259
- Total Fees: \$796,304

**Low Income**

- No. Units: 64.5
- \$/Unit: \$7,039
- Total Fees: \$454,038

**Very Low Income**

- No. Units: 64.5
- \$/Unit: \$6,279
- Total Fees: \$405,018

**Other \$1,617,401**

**COMMERCIAL**

- No. Units: 45
- \$/Unit: \$9,118/1,000 sq. ft.
- Total Fees: \$410,298

**Golf Course**

- No. Units: 1
- \$/Unit: \$342,648
- Total Fees: \$342,648

**Guest Villas**

- No. Units: 71
- \$/Unit: \$12,175
- Total Fees: \$864,455

**Total Traffic Fees: \$16,017,310**

In addition to the above traffic impacts fees HYH shall: 1) construct at its cost or cause to be constructed by a Community Facilities District, all streets and roads within the HYH Property Project, such improvements, by prior agreement, will be owned by the County and maintained by a Community Services District or other suitable or appropriate entity; and 2) fund, either by direct payment of traffic fees or through a Community Facilities District, County acquisition of land or right of way, through negotiation or eminent domain, and construction of all of the off-site road and traffic improvements serving the HYH Property Project. Pursuant to prior agreements, all of these improvements will be owned by the County and maintained by a Community Services District, or if the improvement is to be part of the existing County road system, by the County. All such public roads and traffic improvements shall be constructed in accordance with accepted local engineering standards and Specific Plan standards.

All on-site and off-site roads and traffic improvements constructed by the applicant, to the extent funded directly or indirectly by applicant, shall be eligible for fair share reimbursement from future development benefiting from the facilities, except to the extent that such improvements are funded by traffic impact fees paid by applicant. Applicant shall prepare and execute an agreement that reimburses the applicant for the fair share proportionate costs subject to the approval of the Public Works Director and County Counsel.

The following improvements are among those roads eligible for such fair-share reimbursement:

- Project access improvements on Stirling Road through the development site to its intersection with San Juan Grade Road;
- Signal and intersection improvements at Stirling Road/San Juan Grade Road. This intersection shall operate at acceptable levels of service;
- A northwest project access between the development site and its intersection with Harrison Road;



- Signal and intersection improvements at the intersection of northwest access road and Harrison Road. This intersection shall operate at acceptable levels of service; and
- Emergency access roads as required by the fire department.

The **Revised Specific Plan** would substantially reduce congested intersections by reducing the number of significantly impacted intersections to six, as indicted in Table A-2.

**Table A-2  
 Comparison of Significant Intersection Impacts between Adopted and  
 Proposed Specific Plans (Year 2010)**

INTERSECTION	ADOPTED SP		REVISED SPECIFIC PLAN			
	AM PEAK	PM PEAK	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (AM/PM)	AM PEAK	PM PEAK	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (AM/PM)
	LOS	LOS		LOS	LOS	
1- North Main St. / Russell Rd.	F	F	<b>Yes/Yes</b>	C	C	No/No
2- North Main St. / Boronda Rd.	F	F	<b>Yes/Yes</b>	C	D	No/No
3- North Main St. / San Juan Grade Rd.	E	F	<b>Yes/Yes</b>	D	D	No/No
4- Russell Rd. / San Juan Grade Rd.	C	B	No/No	A	A	No/No
5- Rogge Rd. / San Juan Grade Rd.	F	F	<b>Yes/Yes</b>	F	B	<b>Yes/No</b>
6- Hebert Rd. / San Juan Grade Rd.	F	F	<b>Yes/Yes</b>	C	D	No/ <b>Yes</b>
7- Crazy Horse Canyon Rd. / San Juan Grade Rd.	F	F	<b>Yes/Yes</b>	A	C	No/No
8- Natividad Rd. / Rogge Rd.	B	B	No/No	C	F	No/ <b>Yes</b>
9- Natividad Rd. / Boronda Rd.	F	F	<b>Yes/Yes</b>	F	E	<b>Yes/Yes</b>
10- Boronda Rd. / Highway 101 NB	C	C	No/No	A	C	No/No
11- Boronda Rd. / Highway 101 SB	B	B	No/No	B	B	No/No
12- Crazy Horse Canyon Rd. / Highway 101 NB	F	F	<b>Yes/Yes</b>	A	B	No/No
13- East Laurel Rd. / Natividad Rd.	F	F	<b>Yes/Yes</b>	E	E	No/No
14- East Laurel Rd. / North Main St.	F	F	<b>Yes/Yes</b>	C	D	No/No
15- West Laurel Dr. / Highway 101 NB <sub>(2)</sub>	B	F	<b>No/Yes</b>	B	D	No/ <b>Yes</b>
16- West Laurel Dr. / Highway 101 SB	D	F	<b>Yes/Yes</b>	B	C	No/No
17- North Davis Rd. / Post Rd.	C	F	No/ <b>Yes</b>	C	D	No/No
18- North Davis Rd. / Blanco Rd.	E	F	<b>Yes/Yes</b>	C	D	No/No
19- Boronda Rd. / San Juan Grade Rd.	C	F	<b>No/Yes</b>	B	D	No/No
20- East Laurel Dr. / Davis Rd.	F	F	<b>Yes/Yes</b>	C	D	No/No
23- Espinosa Rd. / SR-183	F	F	<b>Yes/Yes</b>	F	F	<b>Yes/Yes</b>

**Bold face type** indicates significant impact.

Table 26 of the traffic study in Attachment A identifies a series of improvements to affected intersections which include signalization and/or revised lane configurations which would reduce traffic congestion at affected intersections. In accordance with Mitigation Measure 5.2-9 of the FEIR, the County would use traffic fees to help fund these improvements. However, due to the

uncertainty on the adequacy of the traffic fee to fund all of the improvements needed to reduce Year 2010 impacts of the Revised Specific Plan, impacts would remain potentially unmitigated as concluded in the FEIR.

### Roadway Segments (2010)

The **Adopted Specific Plan** was found to significantly impact 15 roadway segments, as shown in Table A-3.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 5.2-1a and 1b and the measures identified in Table 5.2-17 of the FEIR would reduce impacts to roadway segments but, as with intersections, there is no guarantee that these improvements would be implemented prior to year 2010.

The **Revised Specific Plan** would not significantly impact any roadway segments, as illustrated in Table A-3.

**Table A-3.**  
**Comparison of Significant Roadway Impacts between Adopted and Proposed Specific Plans (Year 2010)**

ROADWAY SEGMENT	ADOPTED SPECIFIC PLAN			REVISED SPECIFIC PLAN		
	AM PEAK	PM PEAK	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (AM/PM)	AM PEAK	PM PEAK	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (AM/PM)
	LOS	LOS		LOS	LOS	
A- Crazy Horse Canyon – East of Highway 101	D	D	No/No	D	D	No/No
B- San Juan Grade Rd. – North of Hebert Rd.	D	E	No/Yes	B	B	No/No
C- San Juan Grade Rd. – North of Boronda Rd.	E	F	Yes/Yes	B	B	No/No
D- San Juan Grade Rd. – North of Russell Rd.	E	E	Yes/Yes	B	B	No/No
E- Russell Rd. – East of Highway 101	C	C	No/No	D	D	No/No
F- Espinosa Rd. – West of Highway 101	D	D	No/No	D	D	No/No
G- North Main Street – South of Boronda Rd.	E	E	Yes/Yes	C	D	No/No
H- Boronda Rd. – East of Boronda Interchange	D	E	No/Yes	D	F	No/No
I- Boronda Rd. – East of McKinnon	F	F	Yes/Yes	A	B	No/No
J- Natividad Rd. – North of Boronda Rd.	D	E	No/Yes	D	C	No/No
K- Russell Rd. – West of San Juan Grade Rd.	E	E	Yes/Yes	C	C	No/No
L- Hebert Rd. – Natividad Rd. and Old Stage Rd.	D	D	No/No	B	B	No/No
M- North Main Rd. – South of Russell Rd.	C	C	No/No	B	B	No/No
N- Hall Rd. – East of Willow Rd.	E	E	Yes/Yes	D	D	No/No
O- Blanco Rd. – East of Salinas River Bridge	F	F	Yes/Yes	C	D	No/No
P- Davis Rd. – North of Central Ave.	F	F	Yes/Yes	A	A	No/No
Q- Davis Rd. – South of Blanco Rd.	C	D	No/No	C	C	No/No
R- San Miguel Canyon Rd. – South of Moro Rd.	E	F	Yes/Yes	E	E	No/No
S- San Miguel Canyon Rd. – South of Hall Rd.	E	E	Yes/Yes	B	C	No/No
T- Elkhorn Rd. – North of Hall Rd.	E	E	Yes/Yes	C	C	No/No
U- Salinas Rd. – West of Elkhorn Rd.	D	E	No/Yes	D	D	No/No

**Bold face type** indicates significant impact.

As no roadway segments would be impacted, no mitigation measures would be required.

**Freeway Segments (2010)**

As illustrated in Table A-4, the **Adopted Specific Plan** was determined to significantly impact six freeway segments.

**Table A-4.  
 Comparison of Significant Freeway Impacts between Adopted and Proposed  
 Specific Plans (Year 2010)**

FREEWAY SEGMENT	ADOPTED SPECIFIC PLAN)			REVISED SPECIFIC PLAN		
	AM PEAK	PM PEAK	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (AM/PM)	AM PEAK	PM PEAK	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (AM/PM)
	LOS	LOS		LOS	LOS	
<i>US Highway-101 Northbound</i>						
At Monterey / San Benito County Line				C	E	
North of Crazy Horse Canyon Rd.	C	E	No/Yes	B	E	No/Yes
South of Crazy Horse Canyon Rd. / North of San Miguel Interchange				B	D	
North of SR-156 (West)	D	E	No/Yes	C	F	No/No
South of SR-156 (west) / North of Russell Road				C	E	
North of Boronda Road				B	C	
North of Laurel Road	C	E	No/Yes	C	F	No/Yes
South of Laurel Road				C	F	
<i>US Highway-101 Southbound</i>						
At Monterey / San Benito County Line				D	C	
North of Crazy Horse Canyon Road	E	D	Yes/No	D	C	No/No
South of Crazy Horse Canyon Road / North of San Miguel Interchange				D	C	
North of State Route 156 (West)	D	E	No/Yes	E	D	No/No
South of SR-156 (west) / North of Russell Road				D	D	
North of Boronda Road				C	C	
North of Laurel Road	E	D	Yes/No	D	D	No/No
South of Laurel Road				D	D	

**Bold face type** indicates significant impact.

Implementation of ramp improvements identified in Table 5.2-17 of the FEIR would reduce congestion at these interchanges but would not reduce impacts on the mainline segments for Highway 101. Improvements to the mainline segments are beyond the control of private developers. While the Regional Development Impact Fee Program is intended to provide funds for long-range improvements to US 101, these improvements would not be implemented by 2010.

The **Revised Specific Plan** would significantly impact two freeway segments. Both plans result in one or more of the freeway segments being significantly impacted between Laurel Drive and Crazy Horse Canyon Road. Improvements to the mainline segments are beyond the control of private developers.

Implementation of ramp improvements identified in Table 26 of the traffic study in Attachment A would reduce congestion at these interchanges but would not reduce impacts on the mainline segments for Highway 101. As indicated earlier, improvements to the mainline segments are beyond the control of private developers.

<p><b>Impact:</b> Substantial increase in Traffic Congestion at Intersections, Roadway, and Highway Segments in Year 2020.</p>
--

### **Intersections (2020)**

The **Adopted Specific Plan** was found to significantly impact 15 intersections, as shown in A-5.

Implementation of the improvements identified in Table 5.2-17 of the FEIR would reduce intersection impacts in the year 2020. However, because funding for these improvements was not assured, the impact was considered significant but not mitigable.

The **Revised Specific Plan** would significantly impact 13 intersections.

Table 30 of the traffic study in Attachment A identifies a series of improvements to affected intersections which include signalization and/or revised lane configurations which would reduce traffic congestion at affected intersections. In accordance with Mitigation Measure 5.2-9 of the FEIR, traffic fees would be used to help fund these improvements. However, due to the uncertainty on the adequacy of the traffic fee to fund all of the improvements needed to reduce Year 2010 impacts of the Revised Specific Plan, impacts would remain potentially unmitigated as concluded in the FEIR.

### **Roadway Segments (2020)**

The **Adopted Specific Plan** would significantly impact 13 roadway segments, as shown in Table A-6.

Implementation of the improvements identified in Table 5.2-17 of the FEIR would reduce intersection impacts in the year 2020. However, because funding for these improvements was not assured, the impact was considered significant but not mitigable.

The **Revised Specific Plan** would not impact any roadway segments

As no roadway segments would be impacted, no mitigation measures would be required.

**Table A-5.  
 Comparison of Significant Intersection Impacts between Adopted and  
 Proposed Specific Plans (Year 2020)**

INTERSECTION	ADOPTED SPECIFIC PLAN			REVISED SPECIFIC PLAN		
	AM PEAK	PM PEAK	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (AM/PM)	AM PEAK	PM PEAK	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (AM/PM)
	LOS	LOS		LOS	LOS	
1- North Main St. / Russell Rd.	F	F	<b>Yes/Yes</b>	C	C	No/No
2- North Main St. / Boronda Rd.	C	C	No/No	C	F	No/No
3- North Main St. / San Juan Grade Rd.	E	D	<b>Yes/No</b>	E	E	<b>Yes/Yes</b>
4- Russell Rd. / San Juan Grade Rd.	C	C	No/No	A	A	No/No
5- Rogge Rd. / San Juan Grade Rd.	F	F	<b>Yes/Yes</b>	F	B	No/No
6- Hebert Rd. / San Juan Grade Rd.	F	F	<b>Yes/Yes</b>	A	D	No/Yes
7- Crazy Horse Canyon Rd. / San Juan Grade Rd.	C	F	No/Yes	A	F	No/Yes
8- Natividad Rd. / Rogge Rd.	C	C	No/No	F	F	<b>Yes/Yes</b>
9- Natividad Rd. / Boronda Rd.	F	F	<b>Yes/Yes</b>	E	C	<b>Yes/No</b>
10- Boronda Rd. / Highway 101 NB	B	B	No/No	B	E	No/No
11- Boronda Rd. / Highway 101 SB	B	E	No/Yes	E	F	<b>Yes/Yes</b>
12a- Crazy Horse Canyon Rd. / Highway 101 NB	F	F	<b>Yes/Yes</b>	A	C	No/No
12b- Crazy Horse Canyon Rd. / Highway 101 SB	C	C	No/No	C	B	No/No
13- East Laurel Rd. / Natividad Rd.	F	F	<b>Yes/Yes</b>	F	F	No/No
14- East Laurel Rd. / North Main St.	D	E	No/Yes	C	F	No/Yes
15- West Laurel Dr. / Highway 101 NB(2)	B	A	No/No	B	F	No/Yes
16- West Laurel Dr. / Highway 101 SB	C	E	No/Yes	C	D	No/Yes
17- North Davis Rd. / Post Rd.	C	D	No/No	D	E	No/Yes
18- North Davis Rd. / Blanco Rd.	F	F	<b>Yes/Yes</b>	C	F	No/Yes
19- Boronda Rd. / San Juan Grade Rd.	D	F	No/Yes	C	B	No/No
20- East Laurel Dr. / Davis Rd.	E	D	Yes/No	D	F	No/Yes
23- Espinosa Rd. / SR-183	F	F	<b>Yes/Yes</b>	F	F	<b>Yes/Yes</b>
24- Southern I/C / Highway 101 NB	D	C	No/No	B	F	No/Yes

**Bold face type** indicates significant impact.

**Table A-6.  
 Comparison of Significant Roadway Impacts between Adopted and  
 Proposed Specific Plans (Year 2020)**

ROADWAY SEGMENT	ADOPTED SPECIFIC PLAN			REVISED SPECIFIC PLAN		
	AM PEAK	PM PEAK	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (AM/PM)	AM PEAK	PM PEAK	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (AM/PM)
	LOS	LOS		LOS	LOS	
A- Crazy Horse Canyon – East of Highway 101	D	D	No/No	D	D	No/No
B- San Juan Grade Rd. – North of Hebert Rd.	D	D	No/No	A	A	No/No
C- San Juan Grade Rd. – North of Boronda Rd.	E	E	<b>Yes/Yes</b>	B	B	No/No
D- San Juan Grade Rd. – North of Russell Rd.	E	E	<b>Yes/Yes</b>	B	B	No/No
E- Russell Rd. – East of Highway 101	E	E	<b>Yes/Yes</b>	D	D	No/No
F- Espinosa Rd. – West of Highway 101	D	E	No/Yes	D	D	No/No
G- North Main Street – South of Boronda Rd.	D	E	<b>Yes/Yes</b>	C	D	No/No
H- Boronda Rd. – East of Boronda Interchange	C	D	No/No	E	F	No/No
I- Boronda Rd. – East of McKinnon	E	E	<b>Yes/Yes</b>	A	A	No/No
J- Natividad Rd. – North of Boronda Rd.	D	D	No/No	F	B	No/No
K- Russell Rd. – West of San Juan Grade Rd.	E	E	<b>Yes/Yes</b>	B	B	No/No
L- Hebert Rd. – Natividad Rd. and Old Stage Rd.	C	D	No/No	B	C	No/No
M- North Main Rd. – South of Russell Rd.	C	C	No/No	B	B	No/No
N- Hall Rd. – East of Willow Rd.	E	F	<b>Yes/Yes</b>	D	D	No/No
O- Blanco Rd. – East of Salinas River Bridge	F	F	<b>Yes/Yes</b>	D	D	No/No
P- Davis Rd. – North of Central Ave.	C	C	No/No	A	A	No/No
Q- Davis Rd. – South of Blanco Rd.	D	D	No/No	A	A	No/No
R- San Miguel Canyon Rd. – South of Moro Rd.	E	F	<b>Yes/Yes</b>	E	E	No/No
S- San Miguel Canyon Rd. – South of Hall Rd.	E	E	<b>Yes/Yes</b>	B	C	No/No
T- Elkhorn Rd. – North of Hall Rd.	E	F	<b>Yes/Yes</b>	C	D	No/No
U- Salinas Rd. – West of Elkhorn Rd.	E	E	<b>Yes/Yes</b>	D	D	No/No

**Bold face type** indicates significant impact.

**Freeway Segments (2020)**

The **Adopted Specific Plan** was determined to significantly impact nine freeway segments, as shown in Table A-7.

Implementation of ramp improvements identified in Table 5.2-17 of the FEIR would reduce congestion at these interchanges but would not reduce impacts on the mainline segments for Highway 101. Improvements to the mainline segments are beyond the control of private developers.

The **Revised Specific Plan** would significantly impact seven freeway segments.

Implementation of ramp improvements identified in Table 30 of the Addendum traffic study would reduce congestion at these interchanges but would not reduce impacts on the mainline segments for Highway 101. Improvements to the mainline segments are beyond the control of private developers.

**Table A-7.  
 Comparison of Significant Freeway Impacts between Adopted and Proposed  
 Specific Plans (Year 2020)**

FREEWAY SEGMENT	ADOPTED SPECIFIC PLAN			REVISED SPECIFIC PLAN		
	AM PEAK	PM PEAK	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (AM/PM)	AM PEAK	PM PEAK	SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (AM/PM)
	LOS	LOS		LOS	LOS	
<i>US Highway-101 Northbound</i>						
At Monterey / San Benito County Line	D	F	No/Yes	C	E	No/Yes
North of Crazy Horse Canyon Rd.	D	F	No/Yes	B	F	No/No
South of Crazy Horse Canyon Rd. / North of San Miguel Interchange	D	D	No/No	B	E	No/No
North of SR-156 (West)	D	E	No/Yes	C	F	No/No
South of SR-156 (west) / North of Russell Road	E	F	Yes/Yes	B	E	No/Yes
North of Boronda Road	C	D	No/No	B	D	No/No
North of Laurel Road	C	D	No/No	C	F	No/Yes
South of Laurel Road	C	D	No/No	C	F	No/Yes
<i>US Highway-101 Southbound</i>						
At Monterey / San Benito County Line	F	F	Yes/Yes	D	C	No/No
North of Crazy Horse Canyon Road	F	F	Yes/Yes	D	C	No/No
South of Crazy Horse Canyon Road / North of San Miguel Interchange	E	D	Yes/No	D	C	No/No
North of State Route 156 (West)	E	E	Yes/Yes	E	D	No/No
South of SR-156 (west) / North of Russell Road	F	F	Yes/Yes	D	F	No/Yes
North of Boronda Road	C	D	No/No	C	D	No/No
North of Laurel Road	D	D	No/No	E	D	Yes/No
South of Laurel Road	D	D	No/No	E	D	Yes/No

**Bold face type** indicates significant impact.

### 4.2.3 CONCLUSION

With respect to traffic impacts, the Revised Specific Plan would not require preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR pursuant to Sections 15162-15163 for the following reasons:

- No substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the traffic analysis of FEIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

- No substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of traffic analysis of FEIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- No new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the FEIR was certified as complete, shows any of the following:
  - No new traffic impacts would occur that were not discussed in the FEIR;
  - Traffic impacts identified in the FEIR would not be any greater with the proposed project;
  - While mitigation at some impacted intersections requires a different set of improvements (e.g. lane reconfiguration) due to the change in the baseline condition, these do not constitute new mitigation measures or alternatives related to traffic impacts previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative mitigation measures or alternatives considered infeasible in the FEIR are now considered feasible; or
  - No mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the FEIR would substantially reduce one or more significant traffic effects on the environment, but the project proponents declined to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

## 4.3 LANDFORM ALTERATION/VISUAL QUALITY

### 4.3.1 EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

No changes have taken place with respect to the environmental setting described in the FEIR with respect to the subject property. As discussed in Chapter 5.3 of the FEIR, the majority of the property consists of agricultural or vacant land. Two homes with associated structures are located along the western boundary of the Revised Specific Plan area. The site also contains oak woodlands and detention ponds. The topography consists of rolling hills, with elevations ranging from approximately 50 feet to 300 feet. The property is characterized by a series of ridges and drainage courses throughout.

### 4.3.2 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

<b>Impact:</b>	Development of the Revised Specific Plan area would convert the land from agriculture and open space to urban development
----------------	---

The FEIR concluded that the **Adopted Specific Plan** would change the visual character of the project site by converting the majority of the site from largely agricultural uses to urban development. Although the Specific Plan contained design measures which would assure that



the development would be sensitively designed and sited, the magnitude of the change in visual character resulting from conversion from agriculture/open space to a developed condition was found to have a significant impact on the visual character of the area. No mitigation measures, beyond the design guidelines of the Specific Plan, were identified in the FEIR.

The **Revised Specific Plan** would have less visual impact on the area due to the reduced area of the Specific Plan. As a part of the proposed project, much of the land outside the HYH Property that was in the Adopted Specific Plan would be converted back to agricultural zoning. This would eliminate a large part of the development included in the Adopted Specific Plan including the Town Center and the Employment Park. As the development plan for the HYH Property would be essentially the same as allowed by the Adopted Specific Plan, the visual impact of developing this property in accordance with the Revised Specific Plan would be essentially the same as addressed in the FEIR.

The Revised Specific Plan would include design guidelines for development within the HYH Property which would be similar to the guidelines contained in the Adopted Specific Plan. As with the Adopted Specific Plan, no additional mitigation measures exist to reduce visual impacts to below a level of significance. Although the total area of development would be reduced from the Adopted Specific Plan, the conversion of 671 acres to development would have a significant impact on the visual quality of the area.

<p><b>Impact:</b> Development would result in a substantial modification of the ridgelines and slopes over 30 percent</p>
---

The FEIR concluded that the **Adopted Specific Plan** would have significant impacts on the rolling hills and ridgelines located in the central portion of the Specific Plan area. Based on preliminary grading plans prepared as part of the Specific Plan, it was determined that substantial alteration of these landforms would be required to achieve the development goals of the plan. The FEIR identified the following mitigation measure to reduce landform impacts.

**Mitigation Measure 5.3-2:** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit for development phases, the applicant shall submit a plan for the review and approval of the Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection Department that would minimize grading impacts. Prior to the issuance of grading permits for individual lots with the potential for ridgeline development, the applicant shall submit a plan identifying building envelopes that would minimize additional grading and avoid ridgeline development.

General Plan Policy 26.1.9 was amended as part of the Adopted Specific Plan to exclude properties located within the Rancho San Juan Specific Plan Area from ridgeline development restrictions contained in this policy.

However, the FEIR concluded that this measure along with a series of guidelines to reduce the landform impacts (e.g. contour grading) contained in the Specific Plan would be insufficient to reduce landform impacts to below a level of significance.

The **Revised Specific Plan** would have a significant impact on landforms. The total area of development would be reduced due to the reduction in the area covered by the Adopted Specific Plan and therefore, there would be an overall reduction in the amount of grading and alteration of landforms. However, the Revised Specific Plan would include the area with the most notable landforms. Thus, the impact would be only slightly less than the Adopted Specific Plan.

Application of the design guidelines included in the Revised Specific Plan and the mitigation measure identified in the FEIR would reduce the landform impact of the Revised Specific Plan but not below a level of significance. Furthermore, the amendment to Policy 26.1.9 associated with the Adopted Specific Plan would avoid a conflict with this policy.

#### **4.3.3 CONCLUSION**

With respect to landform alteration/visual quality impacts, the Revised Specific Plan would not require preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR pursuant to Sections 15162-15163 for the following reasons:

- No substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the landform alteration/visual quality analysis of FEIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
- No substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of landform alteration/visual quality analysis of FEIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- No new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the FEIR was certified as complete, shows any of the following:
  - No new landform alteration/visual quality impacts would occur that were not discussed in the FEIR;
  - Landform alteration/visual quality impacts identified in the FEIR would not be any greater with the proposed project;
  - No new mitigation measures or alternatives related to landform alteration/visual quality impacts previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative mitigation measures or alternatives considered infeasible in the FEIR are now considered feasible; or
  - No mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the FEIR would substantially reduce one or more significant landform alteration/visual quality effects on the environment, but the project proponents declined to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

## 4.4 BIOLOGY

### 4.4.1 EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

No changes have taken place with respect to the environmental setting described in the original Draft EIR with respect to the subject property. The Adopted Specific Plan area continues to be predominantly covered by agricultural vegetation. Natural habitat is relatively limited, being comprised of non-native grassland, native grassland, oak woodland and riparian scrub.

With respect to sensitive species, the population of fragrant fritillary has not been disturbed. As the condition of the property has not changed substantially since the surveys conducted for the FEIR, no change in the potential for sensitive wildlife species to occur on the property is anticipated. Potential special-status wildlife species continue to include the following: coast horned lizard, western pond turtle, California horned lark, loggerhead shrike, burrowing owl, yellow warbler, nesting raptors, Monterey dusky-footed woodrat, pallid bat, California mastiff bat, and Townsend's big-eared bat. Previous surveys determined that the California tiger salamander and the California red-legged frog do occur within the Adopted Specific Plan area and that the Adopted Specific Plan area provides suitable habitat for tiger salamander. Although, not observed on the HYH property, the certified FEIR required preconstruction surveys for the California tiger salamander to assure no impacts. There has been no change in the condition of the property which would call these conclusions into question. Two California red-legged frogs were tentatively identified at the large pond in northeastern portion of Adopted Specific Plan area, which was not on the HYH property. Therefore, California red-legged frog is potentially present in the Revised Specific Plan. As with the California Tiger Salamander, preconstruction surveys were required in the FEIR to assure this species would not be impacted.

### 4.4.2 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

<b>Impact:</b> Loss of wetland
--------------------------------

The FEIR concluded that the **Adopted Specific Plan** would have significant impacts on up to 9.6 acres of wetlands. In order to reduce the impact on wetlands, the Specific Plan includes the following mitigation measures.

**Mitigation Measure 5.4-1a:** Prior to any disturbance of land, which would impact wetlands a project applicant shall prepare a Detailed Habitat Restoration Plan to be approved by the County of Monterey and implemented by the applicant. This Plan shall identify the exact amount and location of impacted wetland habitat, identify the appropriate location for replacement or restoration of wetland habitat within the Conservation Areas at an overall ratio of 3:1; of which, at least 1:1 must be comprised of wetland creation. A lower overall ratio may be undertaken with the concurrence of the California Department of Fish and Game, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Regional Water Quality Control Board based on the habitat value of the area to be impacted. The Plan shall specify an appropriate plant palette, and provide specifications for installation and maintenance of the replacement habitat. The Plan shall restore hydrologic

connectivity and create different hydrologic niches that meet many riparian plant species initiation and establishment requirements. The Plan shall require a five-year monitoring program, which will assess progress based on specific success standards identified in the Plan. The Plan shall specify the use of locally-obtained native species, including arroyo willow, as appropriate. The planting program shall be completed prior to issuance of the first building occupancy permit. At the end of five years, survivorship of planted riparian scrub species will be a minimum of 75 percent of the total number initially planted. Target species will comprise a minimum of 70 percent of all scrub species present in riparian scrub habitats. Other perennial native shrub species that colonize the riparian scrub planting areas can be used to calculate the final success criteria.

***Mitigation Measure 5.4-1b:*** Developers shall be responsible for implementing habitat restoration efforts to improve the plant diversity and coverage within disturbed habitat within conservation areas (shown as an Open Space Preserve/Mitigation Area on Figure 9-2b, Alt. 4E Landscape plan, in the Rancho San Juan Specific Plan) as set forth in Section 6.7.3 (Application of Technology/Techniques to Achieve Goal) of the Rancho San Juan Specific Plan. Prior to undertaking any habitat enhancement activities, and enhancement plan shall be prepared by the developer or resource management entity (see Resource Management Entity Mitigation Measure). At a minimum, the plan shall include the following components: planting palette and planting and maintenance specifications. The enhancement plan

shall be submitted for review and approval by the Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection Department. Enhancement efforts within wetlands shall also be subject to review and approval by the California Department of Fish and Game and/or the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, as appropriate.

***Mitigation Measure 5.4-1c:*** Prior to approval of a Final Map for future development projects in or adjacent to riparian habitat, 100-foot buffers shall be provided around wetlands unless reduced buffer widths are determined to be appropriate by the County on a case-by-case basis in consultation with the CDFG and USACOE, and based on protection of riparian habitat. Buffer areas shall be planted with appropriate native plant species. Development shall be restricted in this buffer area except for improvements associated with passive recreational uses, such as pedestrian trails, picnic tables and benches, etc. Any passive recreation improvements within the buffer area shall be sited and designed to avoid direct and indirect impacts to riparian habitat.

***Mitigation Measure 5.4-1d:*** Prior to approval of a final grading plan which would impact jurisdictional waters of the U.S. and/or wetlands, the County of Monterey shall verify that appropriate permits have been obtained (e.g. Individual or Nationwide 404 Permit and Streambed Alteration Agreement).

***Mitigation Measure 5.4-1e:*** To the greatest extent possible, the final design of the golf course shall retain surface drainage channels between golf course lakes to promote continuity in the natural drainage system between holes 12 through 15.

Implementation of these measures was determined to reduce the wetland impacts to below a level of significance.

The **Revised Specific Plan** would reduce the amount of wetlands impacted by development. The reduction in area covered by the Specific Plan would reduce the wetland impacts from 9.6 to 6.5 acres. However, due to the high importance of wetlands, the loss of wetland with the proposed project is considered significant. As with the Adopted Specific Plan, implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the FEIR for wetlands would reduce the impact to below a level of significance.

<b>Impact:</b> Loss of oak trees
----------------------------------

The FEIR concluded that the **Adopted Specific Plan** could have a significant impact on individual oak trees but that all of the oak woodland would be preserved and placed in a Conservation Area. However, estimates of the actual number of individual oaks which may be impacted within the Specific Plan could not be determined until final grading plans were prepared. The FEIR identified the following mitigation measure to reduce the impact on individual oak trees to below a level of significance.

**Mitigation Measure 5.4-2:** Prior to approval of a Final Map which would require removal of three or more oak trees protected by Monterey County (e.g., 6-inches or greater in diameter), a Forest Management Plan shall be prepared as required by Monterey County Zoning Code Section 21.64.260. The Forest Management Plan shall indicate the location of protected trees to be removed for grading and/or construction, as well as protected trees that will not be removed but that are adjacent to grading and/or construction limits (i.e., within twenty feet). All recommendations for tree replanting, protection of trees not proposed for removal, and management measures included in the Forest Management Plan shall be included as conditions of project approval.

**Mitigation Measure 5.4-2b:** Prior to approval of a Final Map which would require removal of three or more oak trees protected by Monterey County (e.g., 6-inches or greater in diameter), a Forest Management Plan shall be prepared as required by Monterey County Zoning Code Section 21.64.260. The Forest Management Plan shall indicate the location of protected trees to be removed for grading and/or construction, as well as protected trees that will not be removed but that are adjacent to grading and/or construction limits (i.e., within twenty feet). All recommendations for tree replanting, protection of trees not proposed for removal, and management measures included in the Forest Management Plan shall be included as conditions of project approval.

The **Revised Specific Plan** would also retain the oak woodland areas in open space. As with the Adopted Specific Plan, individual oak trees would be impacted during development. A Forest Management Plan has already been prepared for the Revised Specific Plan. This Plan along with compliance with the mitigation measure requiring replacement of impacted oak trees would reduce the impact to below a level of significance. In addition, the emphasis placed on protecting existing oak trees and replacing those which are impacted would conform to the SB

1334, which became effective on January 1, 2005. SB 1334 requires County governments to consider the impact of projects on oak woodlands and requires the County to adopt mitigation measures when a project is determined to have a significant impact on oak woodland. Mitigation measures include protection in conservation easement, replacement of impacted oak trees, contribution of funds and/or other measures identified by a county government. Rather than the 6-inch diameter threshold used by the County, SB 1334 includes oak trees with a 5-inch diameter. Consequently, the above mitigation measure would be modified as follows to reflect the reduced diameter threshold for SB 1334.

**Mitigation Measure 5.4-2:** Prior to approval of a Final Map which would require removal of three or more oak trees protected by Monterey County (e.g., 5-inches or greater in diameter), a Forest Management Plan shall be prepared as required by Monterey County Zoning Code Section 21.64.260. The Forest Management Plan shall indicate the location of protected trees to be removed for grading and/or construction, as well as protected trees that will not be removed but that are adjacent to grading and/or construction limits (i.e., within twenty feet). All recommendations for tree replanting, protection of trees not proposed for removal, and management measures included in the Forest Management Plan shall be included as conditions of project approval.

<b>Impact:</b> Loss of mixed native/non-native grasslands and fragrant fritillary
---

#### **Loss of Mixed Native/Non-Native Grasslands and Fragrant Fritillary**

The FEIR concluded that the **Adopted Specific Plan** would result in the loss of up to 44.9 acres of mixed native/non-native grasslands including approximately 20 fragrant fritillary plants. This loss was considered a significant impact. However, implementation of the following mitigation measures was determined to reduce the impact to below a level of significance.

**Mitigation Measure 5.4-3:** Prior to any disturbance of land that would impact mixed native/non-native grassland habitat, a detailed Habitat Restoration Plan shall be submitted and approved by the County of Monterey in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game.

The plant material and location shall in general reflect the conceptual habitat restoration plan illustrated in Figure 5.4-2 and described in the FEIR. The plan shall provide for the replacement or restoration of impacted native grassland at a ratio of 1:1. The Habitat Restoration Plan shall include a focused grassland survey, which shall be conducted at the appropriate time of year by a qualified biologist. This survey shall quantify and map the area of native grassland habitat that would be impacted by the proposed development. The Plan shall specify an appropriate plant palette, and provide specifications for installation and maintenance of the replacement habitat.

At the end of five years, success criteria shall be met if native species in grassland planting areas comprise 70 percent of all species present, or if total plant cover is 90 percent of all plant cover present. Other native species that colonize the perennial

grassland planting areas in addition to planted species will be used to calculate the final success criteria. If the success criteria are not met at the end of the five-year monitoring program, then applicant shall identify and implement additional measures that would achieve success including but not limited to replanting, enhanced maintenance or appropriate compensatory mitigation for the species impacted. Monitoring shall continue annually until the success criteria are achieved.

The Habitat Restoration Plan shall also provide compensation for all fragrant fritillary plants that will be impacted. A survey of fragrant fritillary plants shall be conducted to determine the location and number of impacted plants. The Habitat Restoration Plan shall include a combination of the following actions to compensate for impacts to the fragrant fritillary providing that applicant demonstrates that he has relied upon transplantation first to the maximum extent feasible, then preservation through fee title or conservation easement and last, a voluntary contribution to a rare plant conservation program:

1) Identify on-site locations suitable for transplanting impacted fragrant fritillary plants. The Plan shall describe in detail the transplanting process and monitoring methods, and will identify the entity responsible for implementation and monitoring. Plants shall be derived from the following sources:

- Transplanting existing on-site plants.
- Propagation from seeds from on-site plants or an approved commercial source.
- Bulbs supplied from an approved commercial source.

2) Preserve through fee title acquisition or conservation easement, an existing off-site and currently unprotected population of fragrant fritillary identified by the applicant or recommended by DFG. The conservation easement shall prohibit activities and land uses that could adversely affect the fritillary population (e.g., development, discing, and plowing). The conservation easement shall require the continuation of land uses believed to benefit the population (e.g., grazing and burning). The conservation easement shall be submitted to DFG for review and approval prior to recordation. The preserved area shall be demonstrated to have a population of equal or greater size than the population which would be impacted.

3) Make a voluntary contribution to a rare plant conservation/restoration program recommended by DFG. The fee will be proportionate at a 2:1 ratio to the remaining acres of fragrant fritillary that are required to be mitigated.

Transplanting success shall be achieved if the number of fragrant fritillary plants in restoration areas after 5 years is 110% of the total number impacted. If this goal is not achieved, then applicant shall identify and implement additional measures to achieve success including but not limited to planting additional fragrant fritillary or acquisition of additional off-site population to bring the retention to the 110% criteria. Monitoring of onsite plantings shall continue annually until the success criteria are achieved.

The **Revised Specific Plan** would also impact 44.9 acres of mixed native/non-native grasslands including the population of fragrant fritillary. Consequently, it would have the same level of a significant impact on these resources. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 5.4-3 identified for the Adopted Specific Plan would also reduce these impacts to below a level of significance.

<b>Impact:</b> Impact on wildlife
-----------------------------------

The FEIR concluded that the **Adopted Specific Plan** could have a significant impact on wildlife by encroaching into a drainage course that runs along the northern boundary. Uncontrolled use of pesticides and fertilizers near drainages could have an indirect impact on the health of any resident wildlife. However, implementation of the Conservation Areas identified in the Specific Plan would assure that this area is preserved in a largely natural condition which would reduce impacts to below a level of significance. In addition, controls on the use of pesticides and fertilizers were found to reduce potential indirect impacts to below a level of significance. In order to assure that the drainage would be appropriately preserved, the following mitigation measures were identified in the FEIR.

**Mitigation Measure 5.4-4a:** Prior to approval of any Final Map, all land designated as Conservation Area within the Final Map area shall be placed in an open space easement which prohibits any disturbance or change in the vegetation. The right of way for the Prunedale Bypass shall not be required to be placed in an open space easement as long as the right of way is potentially required.

**Mitigation Measure 5.4-4b:** Prior to approval of final landscaping plans, the County of Monterey shall confirm that development located in or within 100 feet of aquatic and/or riparian habitat includes guidelines to prevent contamination of these habitats by pesticides, herbicides, fungicides, and fertilizers. Landscaping shall include appropriate native plant species and shall not include plantings of non-native, invasive plant species.

The **Revised Specific Plan** would retain the northerly drainage in open space. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 5.4-4a and 4b would reduce the impact on wildlife to below a level of significance.

<b>Impact:</b> Construction impacts on sensitive biological resources
---

The FEIR concluded that construction activities within the **Adopted Specific Plan** could have significant impacts on wildlife through direct loss or by interfering with breeding activities in nearby habitat. In accordance with *Endangered Habitats League v. County of Orange*, 131 Cal.App.4<sup>th</sup>777(2005), the FEIR and this addendum do not limit the threshold of significance to significant loss or harm that would reduce plant or animal communities below statewide or regional self-perpetuating levels, or make a species threatened or endangered. Rather, the thresholds include all of the required factors in mandatory findings on significance (CEQA Guidelines Section 15065(a)). Potentially affected species include: California red-legged frog,



California tiger salamander, coast horned lizard, western pond turtle, California horned lark, tricolored blackbird, loggerhead shrike, burrowing owl, yellow warbler, nesting raptors, Monterey dusky-footed woodrat, pallid bat, California mastiff bat, and Townsend's big-eared bat. The FEIR and this addendum established the following thresholds for evaluating the impacts to biological resources: (1) if the proposed project would have a substantial adverse effect on the biological resources or its habitats as discussed in Section 5.4.2 of the FEIR and/or (2) if the proposed project would result in substantial reduction of the biological resources or its habitats.

The FEIR identified the following mitigation measures to reduce construction impacts to below a level of significance.

***Mitigation Measure 5.4-5a:*** No more than 30 days prior to grading or construction in or within 100 feet of potential habitat areas identified on Figure 5.4-1, the project applicant shall complete a pre-construction survey conducted by a qualified biologist to determine if California tiger salamander or California red-legged frog occur. If either of these species are present, the following actions shall be taken:

- Heavy equipment operators shall be instructed to identify and avoid aquatic and riparian habitats;
- Temporary sediment settling basins and structures such as sediment fencing, straw bales, or other appropriate erosion control measures shall be used to delineate project area boundaries and prevent sediment-laden runoff from entering the drainage channels and riparian corridors;
- Construction activities occurring adjacent to the aquatic and riparian habitats shall occur during summer months when the drainage corridors are dry or nearly dry and rain is unlikely;
- Before construction begins, a qualified biologist shall inform grading equipment operators of the potential presence of the California tiger salamander or California red-legged frog, its protected status, work boundaries, and measures to be implemented to avoid the incidental take;
- A qualified biologist shall monitor grading activities occurring within 100 feet of the aquatic and riparian habitats;
- Food and food-related trash items associated with construction workers shall be enclosed in sealed containers and regularly removed from the project site to deter potential predators;
- Pets shall not be permitted on the construction site;
- All staging areas and all fueling and maintenance of vehicles and other equipment shall occur at least 20 meters (60 feet) from any riparian habitat, pond, stream, creek or other water body to ensure that habitat contamination does not occur from such activities.

If California tiger salamander(s) or California red-legged frog(s) are observed during the pre-construction survey, and/or if the above avoidance measures cannot be implemented, any improvements proposed in or adjacent to the aquatic and riparian habitats shall be done in consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to determine whether incidental take authorization is required, and to establish any additional avoidance measures.

***Mitigation Measure 5.4-5b:*** Prior to the County issuance of a grading permit or approval of the final map, whichever occurs first, the subdivider shall meet all requirements of the federal Endangered Species Act, as applicable to the project authorized by the Combined Development Permit.

No more than 30 days prior to grading or construction in or within 100 feet of riparian, woodland or grassland habitats that would occur during the nesting and/or breeding season of special-status bird species potentially nesting in the area (generally March 1 through August 1), the applicant shall complete a pre-construction bird survey conducted by a qualified biologist to determine if active nests of special-status bird species occur in or adjacent to the proposed construction area. The survey shall include all appropriate nesting areas in the construction zone and within 200 feet of the construction zone. If active nest(s) are found, clearing and construction within 200 feet of the nest(s) shall be postponed or halted until the nest(s) are vacated and juveniles have fledged and there is no evidence of a second attempt at nesting, at the discretion of the biologist.

***Mitigation Measure 5.4-5c:*** No more than 30 days prior to grading or construction in or within 100 feet of grassland habitats that would occur during the nesting season or winter residency period for burrowing owls (generally December 1 through August 31), the applicant shall complete a pre-construction survey for burrowing owls conducted by a qualified biologist. The survey shall include all area in the construction zone and within 200 feet of the construction zone. If active burrows are found in the survey area, the applicant shall prepare a burrowing owl habitat mitigation plan and submit it to CDFG for review and approval. The burrowing owl habitat mitigation plan shall contain mitigation measures contained in the CDFG Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFG 1995). Compliance with this mitigation measure shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Avoidance of occupied burrows during the nesting season (February 1 through August 31);
- Acquisition, protection and funding for long-term management and monitoring of foraging habitat adjacent to occupied habitat;
- Enhancement of existing burrows and/or creation of new burrows; and/or
- Passive relocation of burrowing owls in accordance with the CDFG report on burrowing owls.

The **Revised Specific Plan** could also result in significant impacts to wildlife during construction, although less area will be disturbed than under the approved project. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 5.4-5a, 5b and 5c would reduce the potential impact to below a level of significance.

#### **4.4.3 CONCLUSION**

With respect to biology impacts, the Revised Specific Plan would not require preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR pursuant to Sections 15162-15163 for the following reasons:

- No substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the biology analysis of FEIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
- No substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of biology analysis of FEIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- No new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the FEIR was certified as complete, shows any of the following:
  - No new biology impacts would occur that were not discussed in the FEIR;
  - Biology impacts identified in the FEIR would not be any greater with the proposed project;
  - No new mitigation measures or alternatives related to biology impacts previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative mitigation measures or alternatives considered infeasible in the FEIR are now considered feasible; or
  - No mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the FEIR would substantially reduce one or more significant biology effects on the environment, but the project proponents declined to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

## **4.5 ARCHAEOLOGICAL/HISTORICAL RESOURCES**

### **4.5.1 EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

No changes have taken place with respect to the environmental setting described in the certified FEIR with respect to the subject property. The historical structures located on the property are unchanged. A potentially historic, single-story, national folk-style house remains at 664 Harrison Road. In addition, several historic fences of split-rail construction are located within the project area along the northern and western boundaries of the Salinas Golf and Country Club.

The major historic resources within the Adopted Specific Plan area continue to be the Schock Dairy/Espinosa Adobe, the Natividad Battlefield and the Hebert Ranch including the Red Pony Barn.

No archaeological resources were observed on the subject property. As archaeology sites represent resources that are thousands of years old, no new archaeological resources have occurred on the property since the FEIR was certified. However, as indicated in the FEIR, the potential does exist for buried archaeological resources. This potential continues to exist on the subject property.

#### **4.5.2 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

<b>Impact:</b> Development which damages or destroys significant historic resources
---

The FEIR concluded that the **Adopted Specific Plan** could have significant direct impacts on two major historic resources: Espinosa Adobe, and the Battle of Natividad site as well as an historic split rail fence around the Salinas Golf Course.

The FEIR identified the following mitigation measure to reduce impacts to archaeological/historical resources. However, due to the uncertainty regarding the degree of impact and the potential effectiveness of proposed mitigation, the impact was considered significant and not mitigated.

**Mitigation Measure 5.5-1:** Prior to any activity which could adversely affect potentially significant historical resources, specifically including those named in the text of this section and those which may be identified in connection with a specific project, an historic evaluation shall be conducted to determine the impact of such activities on historic resources. If the impact would be to adversely affect or destroy the resource, the first priority shall be given to avoidance. If avoidance is not feasible, the resource may be protected as specified in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(1) or documented by way of historic narrative, photographs, or architectural drawings.

Implementation of the following mitigation measure was found to reduce potential significant direct impacts on the historic split rail fence to below a level of significance.

**Mitigation Measure 5.5-4:** To avoid damaging or removing the historical split-rail fences along the northern and western boundaries of the Salinas Golf and Country Club, the fences would be incorporated into the design of the proposed project.

The **Revised Specific Plan** would avoid potential impacts on two major historic resources. The Espinosa Adobe and the Battle of Natividad site would be excluded from the Revised Specific Plan area and, thus, not directly impacted. However, future development could impact the historic split rail fence. Mitigation measures set forth in the Adopted Specific Plan would reduce potential impacts to historic resources that would result from construction of the proposed project but not to below a level of significance.

<b>Impact:</b> Disturbance of subsurface cultural, archaeological, historical, or paleontological resources
---

The FEIR concluded the **Adopted Specific Plan** may result in the disturbance of subsurface cultural, archaeological, historical, or paleontological resources which are not detectable on the surface, including human remains, if development is proposed on or near such sites. The FEIR identified the following mitigation measure to reduce potential significant impacts to below a level of significance.

**Mitigation Measure 5.5-2:** The applicant and inspectors shall monitor the site for cultural materials in the soils. If, during the course of construction, cultural, archaeological, historical or paleontological resources are uncovered at the site (surface or subsurface resources), work shall be halted immediately within 150 feet of the find until it can be evaluated by a qualified professional archaeologist. The Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection Department and a qualified archaeologist (i.e., an archaeologist registered with the Society of Professional Archaeologists) shall be immediately contacted by the responsible individual present onsite. When contacted, the project planner and the archaeologist shall immediately visit the site to determine the extent of the resources and to develop proper mitigation measures required for the discovery. In addition, in the event of discovery of human remains, the provisions of CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e) shall be followed.

With the inclusion of monitoring, the FEIR determined the impact of the Specific Plan with respect to disturbance of potential subsurface cultural, archaeological, historical, or paleontological resources would not be significant.

The **Revised Specific Plan** could also result in the disturbance of potential subsurface cultural, archaeological, historical, or paleontological resources, including human remains, if development is proposed on or near such sites. However, less area will be disturbed than under the Approved Specific Plan. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 5.5-2 would reduce the potential impact to below a level of significance.

<b>Impact:</b> Disturbance of views from the Hebert Ranch
---

The **Adopted Specific Plan** would disturb views described in Steinbeck's *The Red Pony*, from the Hebert Ranch towards the Gabilan Mountains and the City of Salinas. Development of new homes would impact views from the Hebert Ranch to the Gabilan Mountains and the City of

Salinas. In order to reduce visual impacts of the proposed residential units and preserve the historical character of the view of the Gabilan Mountains and the City of Salinas from the Hebert Ranch, the Adopted Specific Plan requires the following mitigation measures.

***Mitigation Measure 5.5-3a:*** In order to reduce the visual impacts of the proposed residential units and associated accessory structures, appropriate building materials shall be used including, but not limited to, matted and non-reflective building materials.

***Mitigation Measure 5.5-3b:*** In order to preserve the historical character of the view of the Gabilan Mountains and the City of Salinas from the Hebert Ranch, the applicant shall provide a landscape plan specifically designed to fully screen the proposed residential development. Said screening shall not exceed the height of the proposed structures in order to ensure that the critical view shed is not fully blocked.

With implementation of these mitigation measures, the FEIR concludes that the Adopted Specific Plan would not have significant impacts to the views from the Hebert Ranch.

The **Revised Specific Plan** would also have the potential to adversely impact the view to the Gabilan Mountains and the City of Salinas from Hebert Ranch. However, potential impacts to the views would be reduced to below a level of significance with implementation of Mitigation Measures 5.5-3a and 3b.

### **4.5.3 CONCLUSION**

With respect to archaeological/historical impacts, the Revised Specific Plan would not require preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR pursuant to Sections 15162-15163 for the following reasons:

- No substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the archaeological/historical resources analysis of FEIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
- No substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of archaeological/historical resources analysis of FEIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- No new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the FEIR was certified as complete, shows any of the following:
  - No new archaeological/historical resources impacts would occur that were not discussed in the FEIR;
  - Archaeological/historical resources impacts identified in the FEIR would not be any greater with the proposed project;

- No new mitigation measures or alternatives related to archaeological/historical resources impacts previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative mitigation measures or alternatives considered infeasible in the FEIR are now considered feasible; or
- No mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the FEIR would substantially reduce one or more significant archaeological/historical resources effects on the environment, but the project proponents declined to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

## 4.6 NOISE

### 4.6.1 EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

No changes have taken place with respect to the environmental setting described in the certified FEIR with respect to the subject property. The existing noise sources and levels shown in Tables 5.6-2 and 5.6-3 in the FEIR remain applicable. As discussed in the FEIR, the subject property is exposed to various noise sources, primarily traffic, agriculture (e.g., farm equipment operation) and to a lesser extent golf course maintenance, school and neighborhood noises such as lawn mowers and dogs.

### 4.6.2 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

<b>Impact:</b>	Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies
----------------	---

The FEIR concluded that noise generated by traffic, construction, wastewater treatment and commercial activities could have a significant impact on future noise-sensitive uses (e.g. residential) within the **Adopted Specific Plan**. The FEIR identified the following mitigation measures which could reduce noise impacts to below a level of significance. However, a final determination of the ability of noise attenuation to achieve the desired standard cannot be determined until acoustical studies are completed for specific development plans.

**Mitigation Measure 5.6-1a:** Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy building permit for any residence located along the following roadways:

- Highway 101 (entire segment adjacent to Specific Plan area);
- A Street between Highway 101 off ramp and H Street;
- B Street between Harrison Road and Van Buren Road;
- Main Street between Russell Road and Town Square;
- Van Buren Road between Russell Road and G Street;

- Russell Road between Highway 101 and N Street;
- San Juan Grade Road between Russell Road and Stirling Road;
- Stirling Road between J Street and San Juan Grade Road;
- Harrison Road between B Street and K Street;
- F Street between Russell Road and Main Street;
- J Street between Town Square and K Street;
- K Street, west of J Street; and
- L Street between Town Square and San Juan Grade Road.

In addition to the above roadways, if the Prunedale Bypass is constructed before residences are constructed, the residences will be exposed to noise impacts from the Prunedale Bypass. However, the construction of the Bypass is independent of the Specific Plan and therefore is not a reasonably foreseeable consequence of the project.

An acoustical study shall be prepared for all adjacent noise sensitive uses and implemented by the applicant. The acoustical study shall identify appropriate measures to reduce outdoor noise levels to 60 dBA CNEL. According to the California Land Use Compatibility Noise Guidelines, Community Noise Equivalent Level, 60 dBA CNEL exposure is considered the most desirable target for the exterior of noise sensitive land uses (i.e., "sensitive receptors") such as homes, schools, churches, libraries, etc.

Measures may include, but are not limited to, sound walls and earthen berms; preliminary sound wall locations and heights are approximated in Figure 5.6-8 of the FEIR. Wherever possible, site planning techniques shall be used to avoid or minimize the need for sound walls.

Noise attenuation on K Street may be eliminated if the applicant can demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the County, that K Street will not ultimately carry sufficient traffic to warrant noise attenuation. If future traffic volumes could dictate future noise attenuation, the County may accept an alternate form of security to assure that the noise attenuation does occur when needed.

**Mitigation Measure 5.6-1b:** Prior to issuance of building permits for any residence that would be exposed to outdoor noise levels in excess of 60 dBA CNEL, documentation shall be provided to show that the building meets the interior noise standard of 45 dBA CNEL with windows closed. Alternatively, the applicant can show that based on the buildings location relative to the roadway that it meets the appropriate interior noise standard with open windows. Where interior noise levels would not be less than 45 dBA CNEL, the documentation shall identify architectural or other measures to be taken to assure that noise levels will not exceed 45 dBA CNEL in habitable space within residences.



**Mitigation Measure 5.6-1c:** Prior to issuance of building permits for the wastewater treatment facility, a detailed noise study shall be completed by a qualified acoustical consultant to document that noise attenuation has been included in the facility to assure that noise levels at surrounding sensitive receptors will not exceed levels identified in Table 5.6-1 of the FEIR.

**Mitigation Measure 5.6-1d:** Prior to issuance of building permits for any commercial or industrial development sharing a property line with a noise sensitive use, a detailed noise study shall be completed by a qualified acoustical consultant to document that adequate noise attenuation has been included in the building design to assure that noise levels at surrounding sensitive receptors will not exceed levels identified in Table 5.6-1 of the FEIR.

**Mitigation Measure 5.6-1e:** Golf course maintenance operations shall prohibit greens mowing within 125 feet of any residence and fairway mowing within 200 feet of any residence between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 6:30 a.m. in accordance with Table 5.6-1 of the FEIR.

**Mitigation Measure 5.6-1f:** Prior to approval of any grading or construction permits, such permits shall be conditioned as follows:

- All noise-generating construction activities shall be limited to weekdays between 6:30 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., and Saturdays between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. No construction is allowed on Sundays or on County holidays. Temporary berms or noise attenuation barriers shall be utilized when necessary at the discretion of County Job Inspectors to further reduce noise levels.
- Prior to the commencement of construction activities, a publicly visible sign that specifies project noise mitigation measures and the telephone number of the on-site contractor and person to contact regarding noise complaints shall be posted on the project site. This contact person shall respond to complaints and take corrective action by the end of the same day, if the complaint is received by 12:00 p.m. and within 24 hours, if the complaint is received later than 12:00 p.m. The telephone number of the Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection Department shall be posted on this sign. A preconstruction meeting shall be held with the job inspectors and the general contractor/on-site project manager to confirm that noise mitigation and practices are implemented.

All construction equipment operated on the project site shall be equipped to limit noise generation to a maximum of 85 decibels beyond 25 feet of the equipment. The project proponent shall submit a written roster of equipment anticipated to be used on the project site, including noise generation information on each. Only those pieces of equipment meeting the standards through modifications or enclosures. Stationary sources shall be located away from sensitive receptors to the greatest extent feasible.

Implementation of the above mitigation measures could reduce noise impacts to below a level of significance but development-specific acoustical studies would be required to confirm this. Until these studies adequately demonstrate attenuation, the impact must be considered significant and not mitigated to below a level of significance.

Development of the **Revised Specific Plan** would expose fewer noise-sensitive receptors to unacceptable noise levels because the Revised Specific Plan would cover a smaller land area and reduce the amount of residential development. In addition the reduction in overall land use development would result in a reduction in automobile traffic and bring about a proportionate reduction in the noise contributed by project traffic. As with the Adopted Specific Plan, implementation of Mitigation Measures 5.6-1a through 5.6-1f have the potential to reduce the impacts to below a level of significance. Mitigation measure 5.6-1a would be modified as follows to eliminate roadway segments which are not applicable to the Revised Specific Plan:

**Mitigation Measure 5.6-5a:** Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy building permit for any residence located along the following roadways:

- Prunedale Bypass;
- J Street between Town Square and K Street; and
- K Street, west of J Street.

An acoustical study shall be prepared for all adjacent noise sensitive uses and implemented by the applicant. The acoustical study shall identify appropriate measures to reduce outdoor noise levels to 60 dBA CNEL or less. Measures may include, but are not limited to, sound walls and earthen berms; preliminary sound wall locations and heights are approximated in Figure 5.6-9. Wherever possible, site planning techniques shall be used to avoid or minimize the need for sound walls. If the applicant can demonstrate that the Prunedale Bypass will never be constructed, noise attenuation measures related to the roadway need not be implemented. The requirement to address acoustic impacts for residential units adjacent to the Prunedale Bypass would only apply to the subdivider if the Bypass is completed prior to the construction of the potentially impacted residential units in the Revised Specific Plan.

#### **4.6.3 CONCLUSION**

With respect to noise impacts, the Revised Specific Plan would not require preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR pursuant to Sections 15162-15163 for the following reasons:

- No substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the noise analysis of FEIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
- No substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of noise analysis of FEIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- No new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the FEIR was certified as complete, shows any of the following:
  - No new noise impacts would occur that were not discussed in the FEIR;

- Noise impacts identified in the FEIR would not be any greater with the proposed project;
- No new mitigation measures or alternatives related to noise impacts previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative mitigation measures or alternatives considered infeasible in the FEIR are now considered feasible; or
- No mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the FEIR would substantially reduce one or more significant noise effects on the environment, but the project proponents declined to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

## 4.7 AIR QUALITY

### 4.7.1 EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

As indicated in Attachment B, prepared by the air quality expert who prepared the air quality analysis in the FEIR, no changes have taken place to air quality with respect to the environmental setting described in the FEIR. Although traffic volumes in the local air basin may have increased slightly, the change would not be sufficient to alter the statement in Chapter 5.7 of the FEIR that the state or federal standards were not exceeded for any of the criteria pollutants. Similarly, no major change in other sources of air pollutions (e.g. dust from agriculture, power production or industrial sources) have occurred within the project area. There have also been no changes to the regulatory environment or analysis practices that affect the significance determination of the air quality impacts of the Revised Rancho San Juan Specific Plans relative to the Adopted Specific Plan.

### 4.7.2 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

<b>Impact:</b> Construction emissions
---------------------------------------

The FEIR concluded that the **Adopted Specific Plan** would result in the generation of fugitive dust during grading, excavation, and construction of the site. In addition, construction equipment emissions would add to air quality problems related to ROG. The primary impact would be related to dust (PM<sub>10</sub>) levels. Construction dust generated by development of the Specific Plan area was anticipated to exceed the allowable level established by the MBAUAPCD. The MBAUAPCD established 82 pounds per day as the maximum allowed level for PM<sub>10</sub>. It is estimated that the project could generate up to 187 pounds per day. This projection is based on the assumption that the maximum area of grading at any one time would be 50 acres per day and approximately 15,000 cubic yards (CY) of material would be moved on an average day. Thus, the construction process would result in a significant short-term impact related to PM<sub>10</sub>.

Implementation of the following mitigation measures was determined to reduce short-term air quality impacts related to construction, but not to the level that they would fall under the

MBUAPCD's threshold for PM<sub>10</sub>. Therefore, grading emissions of would be significant and not mitigated.

**Mitigation Measure 5.7-1a:** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, and subject to the review and approval of the Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection Department, project plans shall include a construction dust control plan, to include the following measure to be implemented as necessary to adequately control dust.

- Water all active portions of the construction site at least twice daily, using a recycled water supply if feasible;
- Suspend all excavating and grading operations when wind speeds exceed 15 mph averaged over one hour, if other control activities are inadequate to control airborne dust;
- Apply water two times daily or chemical stabilizers according to manufacturer's specifications to all unpaved parking or staging areas, and unpaved road surfaces;
- Replace ground cover or apply MBUAPCD-approved chemical soil stabilizers according to manufacturer's specifications to all inactive construction areas (disturbed lands within construction project that are unused for at least four consecutive days). Apply non-toxic binders (e.g., latex acrylic copolymer) to exposed areas after cut and fill operations and hydro-seed area;
- Sufficiently water or securely cover all material transported off-site and adjust on-site loads as necessary to prevent airborne dust conditions. Haul trucks shall maintain at least two feet of freeboard;
- Plant vegetative ground cover in, or otherwise stabilize, disturbed areas as soon as grading and construction activities in those areas are completed;
- Cover material stockpiles that remain inactive for more than 72 consecutive hours;
- Install wheel washers at the entrance to construction sites for all exiting trucks. Sweep streets if visible soil material is carried out from the construction site;
- Post a publicly-visible sign which specifies the telephone number and person to contact regarding dust complaints. This contact person shall respond to complaints and take corrective action by the end of the same day if the complaint is received by 12:00 noon and within 24 hours if the complaint is received later than 12:00 pm. The phone of the MBUAPCD shall be visible to ensure compliance with Rule 402 (Nuisance).
- Each developer shall maintain a dumpster onsite. The dumpster shall be emptied periodically whenever debris reaches the rim.
  - a. Construction materials shall be kept out of the street rights-of-way and setback areas at all times.
  - b. Developers shall keep all streets free from dirt, debris and spilled paving materials.
  - c. "Wash-out" areas shall be provided for concrete trucks on all construction sites.
  - d. As soon as earthwork commences, sediment control methods shall be installed in such a way as to filter all stormwater run-off from the track into the drainage areas.

The sediment control system shall remain in place and in good repair until construction is complete, landscaping is installed and landscape areas are established.

- Limit traffic speed on all unpaved roads to 15 mph or less.

**Mitigation Measure 5.7-1b:** Diesel fume exposures necessitate a risk assessment, if there are sensitive receptors adjacent to the construction site. The June 2004 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines prepared by the MBUAPCD define a sensitive receptor as a location where human populations, especially children, seniors and sick persons, are located where there is reasonable expectation of continuous human exposure. Sensitive receptors typically include hospitals and schools. Because there are none of these sensitive receptors in the Revised Specific Plan area adjacent to the construction site and exposure to diesel fumes will not be on a continuous basis but on short, intermittent basis, diesel fume emissions from construction equipment does not create a potential for a significant impact.

However, in order to reduce air pollutant emissions from construction equipment, the project proponent shall, to the extent feasible, use equipment powered by other means other than diesel fuel (CNG, bio-diesel, water emulsion fuel, electric). If diesel-fueled equipment is used, a minimum of 50 percent of the equipment shall use low sulfur diesel fuel. All equipment shall be maintained in a well-tuned condition, and idling time shall be minimized.

In the long-term the **Revised Specific Plan** would reduce the total amount of emissions generated by development of the Specific Plan area because the surface area disturbed by grading would be much less with the Revised Specific Plan. On a daily basis, the construction emissions would be comparable to the Adopted Specific Plan in that an estimated 50 acres of land could be in the process of being graded at any one time. Although the number of days that emissions will be generated will be less, the Revised Specific Plan would still have a significant impact on air quality. As with the Adopted Specific Plan, implementation of the above-mentioned mitigation measures would reduce short-term air quality impacts related to construction, but not to the level that they would fall below the MBUAPCD's threshold for PM<sub>10</sub>. Therefore, grading emissions would be significant and not mitigated

<b>Impact:</b> Motor vehicle emissions would result in significant impacts on regional air quality
--

The FEIR concluded that the traffic generated by the **Adopted Specific Plan** would generate levels of certain air pollutants which would exceed standards established by the MBAUCP. Emissions from project traffic that would exceed standards include ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO and PM<sub>10</sub>.

Implementation of the following mitigation measures, to the extent possible, were concluded to reduce long-term regional air quality emissions, but not below MBUAPCD thresholds.

**Mitigation Measure 5.7-2a:** Provide bicycle paths within major subdivisions that link to an external network. Provide sidewalks to encourage pedestrian movement.

**Mitigation Measure 5.7-2b:** Provide preferential carpool/vanpool parking spaces. Provide for shuttle/mini bus service. Provide bicycle storage/parking facilities. Provide shower/locker facilities.

**Mitigation Measure 5.7-2c:** Provide onsite childcare centers.

**Mitigation Measure 5.7-2d:** Provide transit design features within the development. Develop park-and-ride lots.

**Mitigation Measure 5.7-2e:** Implement a rideshare program. Employ a transportation/rideshare coordinator. Provide incentives to employees to rideshare or take public transportation.

**Mitigation Measure 5.7-2f:** Implement compressed or flexible work schedules and telecommuting programs.

**Mitigation Measure 5.7-2g:** Utilize clean burning fuels in fleet vehicles.

**Mitigation Measure 5.7-5a:** Contribute funding to MBUAPCD sufficient to repower nine existing agricultural pumps to offset NOx emissions.

Mobile source emissions related to traffic associated with the **Revised Specific Plan** would be decreased due to reduction in development intensity with the Revised Specific Plan. This would translate into a proportionate reduction in the amount of motor vehicle emissions related to the project. Further, where the Adopted Specific Plan exceeded the ROG and NOx thresholds of significance the Revised Specific Plan would only exceed the ROG threshold. Implementation of the mitigation measures identified under the Adopted Specific Plan, to the extent possible, would reduce long-term regional air quality emissions, but not below MBUAPCD thresholds. Therefore, ROG emissions would exceed the MBUAPCD threshold even after mitigation, and long-term regional air quality impacts, although reduced would remain significant.

<p><b>Impact:</b> Wastewater treatment odor could create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people</p>
---

The FEIR concluded that implementation of the wastewater treatment facility on the **Adopted Specific Plan** may create offensive odors that could enter the local air-stream during ordinary use or from accidental spills. Implementation of the following mitigation measure was determined to reduce impacts related to the wastewater treatment facility to less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure 5.7-3:** Prior to approval of a building permit, the MBUAPCD shall review and approve odor control devices in accordance with Rule 216.

As part of MBUAPCD's permitting requirement, an odor impact analysis will be completed to assess the impacts on reasonably foreseeable sensitive receptors.

Although designed to accommodate less development, the wastewater treatment plant proposed to serve the **Revised Specific Plan** would have the same potential to generate offensive odors which that could enter the local air-stream during ordinary use or from accidental spills. The previously described Mitigation Measure 5.7-3 would reduce potential impacts to below a level of significance.

### **4.7.3 CONCLUSION**

With respect to air quality impacts, the Revised Specific Plan would not require preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR pursuant to Sections 15162-15163 for the following reasons:

- No substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the air quality analysis of FEIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
- No substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of air quality analysis of FEIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- No new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the FEIR was certified as complete, shows any of the following:
  - No new air quality impacts would occur that were not discussed in the FEIR;
  - Air quality impacts identified in the FEIR would not be any greater with the proposed project;
  - No new mitigation measures or alternatives related to air quality impacts previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative mitigation measures or alternatives considered infeasible in the FEIR are now considered feasible; or
  - No mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the FEIR would substantially reduce one or more significant air quality effects on the environment, but the project proponents declined to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

## **4.8 SOILS AND GEOLOGY**

### **4.8.1 EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

No changes have taken place with respect to the environmental setting described in the original FEIR. The soils and geologic conditions described in the FEIR have not changed. The following soil types continue to occur within the Adopted Specific Plan area: AkF; EeD; EeE; ScG; ShC; ShD; and ShE. As described in the FEIR, the primary development constraint is

associated with loose, near-surface soils in the western portions of the Adopted Specific Plan area. These soils are considered unsuitable to support buildings and pavement in their present condition. Moderately to expansive soils occur over the majority of the property.

Seismic risk on the site is considered average for the area as no active or potentially active faults are located onsite.

#### 4.8.2 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

<b>Impact:</b> Seismic shaking and expansive soil risk to future structures
---

The FEIR concluded that the **Adopted Specific Plan** could result in a potentially significant impact to future development due to the shrink-swell tendencies of some onsite soils, which were found to adversely affect their engineering properties.

The geotechnical assessment of the property, which is included in Appendix I of the FEIR, found that the potential for landsliding to affect the site was negligible. Furthermore, the geotechnical assessment concluded that the project site is generally suitable for the planned development from a geotechnical viewpoint. Grading, compaction, and leveling of the landform would reduce potential impacts to future development.

Therefore, after mitigation, this impact would be lessened to below a level of significance. In addition, high peak accelerations can be expected during a moderate or major earthquake. These events could cause severe ground shaking onsite. The duration of shaking and the frequency component of the vibrational waves would depend on the magnitude and location of the earthquake.

Implementation of the following mitigation measures would reduce soils and geology impacts associated with implementing the Adopted Specific Plan to less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure 5.8-1a:** Prior to approval of a final map, a qualified soils engineer shall prepare a detailed analysis of specific characteristics and capabilities of underlying soils and shall identify potential geologic hazards. The report shall recommend appropriate measures for the design of proposed structures to minimize property damage and safety hazards related to ground shaking and unstable or expansive soils to below a level of significance.

**Mitigation Measure 5.8-1b:** Prior to the issuance of a building or grading permit, detailed ground failure/liquefaction investigations shall be conducted by a licensed geological analyst as part of the soil studies required for Final Tract Maps to identify remedial grading or contour measures, as appropriate. The recommendations of the investigation shall be implemented by the applicant so as to reduce ground failure/liquefaction impacts to below a level of significance.

Although the total area of development would be reduced due to a reduction in the area covered by the **Revised Specific Plan**, the potential for a significant impact to future development due to



the shrink-swell tendencies of some onsite soils remains. Additionally, high peak accelerations can be expected during a moderate or major earthquake. These events could cause severe ground shaking onsite. Implementation of the above-mentioned mitigation measures would reduce soils and geology impacts to less than significant.

The manufactured slopes that would be created in the area of 30% slope would not experience substantial erosion because they would be landscaped and designed to meet County regulations.

#### **4.8.3 CONCLUSION**

With respect to soils and geology impacts, the Revised Specific Plan would not require preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR pursuant to Sections 15162-15163 for the following reasons:

- No substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the soils and geology analysis of FEIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
- No substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of soils and geology analysis of FEIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- No new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the FEIR was certified as complete, shows any of the following:
  - No new soils and geology impacts would occur that were not discussed in the FEIR;
  - Soils and geology impacts identified in the FEIR would not be any greater with the proposed project;
  - No new mitigation measures or alternatives related to soils and geology impacts previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative mitigation measures or alternatives considered infeasible in the FEIR are now considered feasible; or
  - No mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the FEIR would substantially reduce one or more significant soils and geology effects on the environment, but the project proponents declined to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

## 4.9 HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY

### 4.9.1 EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

No changes have taken place with respect to the environmental setting described in the original FEIR. The Adopted Specific Plan continues to drain into three separate drainages identified as the Santa Rita, Merritt and Espinosa Basins. As no development has occurred on the subject property and no substantial development has occurred in the upstream drainage areas of these basins since the hydrology studies were done for the FEIR, runoff volumes have not changed substantially from those assumed in the FEIR.

Similarly, no major changes have occurred with respect to water quality in the vicinity of the Adopted Specific Plan area. In general, water quality is generally good, being characterized as Class I or II irrigation water by the California DWR Standards. Recent water samples collected from on-site wells for NO<sub>3</sub> resulted in concentrations below the California primary drinking water quality standards for NO<sub>3</sub> of 45 mg/l. Water samples were also collected from on-site wells by California Water Supply Company as part of its Water Supply Assessment report, and the laboratory results of these samples show that the water is in compliance with current federal and state drinking water standards. However, a well located in the northern area of the Specific Plan has an arsenic concentration of 8 parts per billion (ppb), which is below the new federal standard of 10 ppb. This well also has iron concentrations below the Secondary Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) of 0.3 parts per million (ppm).

In addition, as concluded in the FEIR, the subject property area and properties downstream continue to experience erosion and sediment transfer/deposition problems due largely to agriculture operations.

### 4.9.2 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

<b>Impact:</b> Downstream flooding from increased runoff
--

Implementation of the **Adopted Specific Plan** was determined to result in an increase in impermeable surface area, which would increase the amount of runoff generated by the Specific Plan area. Uncontrolled, this additional runoff could result in additional downstream flooding.

Implementation of drainage control provisions contained in the Adopted Specific Plan and the following mitigation measure would reduce this impact to below a level of significance.

**Mitigation Measure 5.9-1:** Prior to approval of a tentative map for any development within the Specific Plan, the project applicant shall submit a comprehensive drainage control plan for approval by the County. Retention/detention basins should reduce offsite flows to the 10-year pre-development rate. The Plan shall illustrate how the drainage control measures identified in the Specific Plan shall be implemented. At a minimum, the Plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following elements:

- Retention/detention basins to reduce offsite flows to a level which would not exceed a 10-year storm event;
- Natural drainage swales along roadways designed in accordance with specifications in the Specific Plan (excludes HYH Property);
- Grass swales or other biofiltration basins at discharge points of surface parking lots and roadways;
- Sedimentation and erosion control plans during construction; and
- Permanent landscaping.

The **Revised Specific Plan** would have less impact on downstream flooding. The total area of development would be reduced due to the reduction in the area covered by the Specific Plan, and all but nine (9) acres of the Revised Specific Plan only drains to the Merritt Basin. However, the Revised Specific Plan would still potentially increase impermeable surface area due to the development of residential homes and commercial development as well as roadways. Uncontrolled, this additional runoff could result in additional downstream flooding in the Merritt Basin. However, no flooding impacts from the Revised Specific Plan would occur in the Santa Rita or Espinosa Basins and, application of drainage control provisions included in the Revised Specific Plan combined with implementation of Mitigation Measure 5.9-1 would reduce this impact to below a level of significance. Improvements to existing conditions in the Santa Rita or Espinosa Basins would not occur as they are out of the Revised Specific Plan area.

<b>Impact:</b> Urban runoff impacts on water quality
--

The FEIR concluded that runoff from parking lots, roads and driveways as well as landscaping resulting from the **Adopted Specific Plan** would transport pollutants into natural drainages. Pesticide and fertilizer use associated with individual homeowners as well as common landscape areas would also affect water quality. Construction and subsequent use of roadways serving the development would also generate urban runoff. Parking lots and roadways would impact water quality by allowing automobile products to accumulate on impermeable surfaces and be picked up in first flush rainfall events. Potential urban runoff related to development was considered potentially significant.

Quantification of pollutants which may be carried in urban runoff, is a complex process that is dependent on a number of factors, which makes calculating pollutant load highly imprecise. Although exact quantifications of pollutants is not feasible, Table A-8, prepared by Horner et al in cooperation with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, provides a useful summary of the typical types of pollutants found in urban runoff.

**TABLE A-8**  
**Urban Runoff Pollutant Sources**

POLLUTANT CATEGORY SOURCE	SOLIDS	NUTRIENTS	PATHOGENS	DO DEMANDS	METALS	OILS	SYNTHETIC ORGANICS
Soil Erosion	X	X		X	X		
Cleared Vegetation	X	X		X			
Fertilizers		X					
Human Waste	X	X	X	X			
Animal Waste	X	X	X	X			
Vehicle Fuels and Fluids	X		X	X	X	X	
Fuel Combustion						X	
Vehicle Wear	X			X	X		
Industrial and Household Chemicals	X	X		X	X	X	X
Industrial Processes	X	X		X	X	X	X
Paints and Preservatives					X	X	
Pesticides				X	X	X	
Stormwater Facilities	X				X		

Source: R.R. Homer

The urban runoff will be captured by detention facilities and multi-use retention facilities which are located at key locations within the Project (refer to Section 5.9.3.1 of the FEIR). The reintroduction of drainage discharge water to the atmosphere in the detention and retention facilities enhances biodegradation of pollutants. Chemical degradation also occurs as the urban runoff is held in the detention and retention facilities. As the urban runoff moves through the soils from the detention and retention facilities, natural filtration and removal of the pollutants occur as pollutants bind with soil particles.

Implementation of surface water controls identified in the previously described Mitigation Measure 5.9-1 was determined in the FEIR to reduce urban runoff impacts to below a level of significance.

The **Revised Specific Plan** would have less urban runoff impacts on water quality due to the reduced amount of area it covers. As part of the proposed project, much of the land outside the Revised Specific Plan would be converted back to agricultural zoning. This would eliminate a large part of the development included in the Adopted Specific Plan including the Town Center and the Employment Park. As such, this would result in a reduced amount of urban runoff

impacts over a larger area as compared to the Adopted Specific Plan. To mitigate for impacts associated with the Revised Specific Plan, the same mitigation measure associated with the Adopted Specific Plan would apply. Thus, implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce impacts from urban runoff on water quality to below a level of significance.

<b>Impact:</b> Golf course herbicides, pesticides and fertilizers could pollute surface runoff
--

Implementation of the **Adopted Specific Plan** would result in the use of herbicides, pesticides and fertilizers for the golf course. The FEIR concluded that the use of these chemicals could pose a particular risk to the downstream supply of oxygen in the water which in turn could diminish the ecological balance and adversely affect fish populations and overall water quality.

Implementation of the following mitigation measure was determined to reduce impacts to less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure 5.9-3:** Prior to issuance of a grading permit for the golf course, the applicant shall prepare a Golf Course Management Plan. The Management Plan shall be approved by the County of Monterey and implemented by the golf course operator. The Management Plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following elements:

- The use of a state-of-the-art irrigation system that can (1) calculate the evaporative loss which occurs since the last irrigation cycle; (2) tell each sprinkler head how much to apply to replace the lost water; (3) apply water at a rate that will prevent runoff; (4) regulates pressure at each head to get maximum uniformity of water distribution and; and (5) allow the field staff to make site adjustments to compensate for shade, slope, sun exposure, etc.
- The reintroduction of drainage discharge water to the atmosphere to biodegrade nutrients and pesticides prior to the water entering drainage discharge channels.
- The engagement of an experienced, Certified Golf Course Superintendent capable of effectively managing the golf course using the principles of Integrated Pest Management.
- The use of a computer controlled boom sprayer to apply all approved nutrient sprays and biocides to the golf course.
- The adherence to Federal, State and County Laws concerning the selection, storage, loading, use and disposal of regulated biocides.
- The construction of a state-of-the-art maintenance facility for storage of pesticides and herbicides.
- Pests would be controlled, not eradicated, using a variety of cultural, biological, and mechanical practices. Pesticide applications would be made only when there is no alternative measure of control. Applications would not be made in winds in excess of five miles per hour unless a spray shroud is used.

- Notification of the application of a pesticide would be made in accordance with California State Posting Laws.
- Green waste shall be composted and reused or transported to an appropriate landfill disposal site.
- The drainage system within the golf shall be designed to pick up low flow runoff and direct it into golf course water features to allow natural filtration of water pollutants to occur. Where water features are not proposed, low flow runoff would be directed to biofiltration areas.
- The use of a Certified Pesticide Applicator to apply the recommended biocide to the target pest.

As the **Revised Specific Plan** also includes implementation of a golf course, it would have the same potential water quality impacts associated with the use of herbicides, pesticides and fertilizers. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 5.9-3, as discussed above, would reduce potentially significant impact to below a level of significance.

<b>Impact:</b> Erosion and sedimentation during construction
--

The FEIR concluded that uncontrolled runoff during construction of the **Adopted Specific Plan** could result in erosion and downstream sedimentation. Construction erosion and sedimentation would occur in the event proper drainage control measures are not undertaken (e.g. sandbags, brow ditches, and interim landscaping).

However, erosion control measures contained in the Specific Plan and County's grading policies along with the following mitigation measures were determined to reduce impacts to below a level of significance.

**Mitigation Measure 5.9-4a:** Prior to approval of any grading plan, the project applicant shall submit an erosion control plan which shall include a series of measures aimed at controlling erosion and sedimentation as well as construction equipment byproducts such as gasoline, oil and grease. Interim landscaping shall be instituted on graded areas as soon as practical to control erosion by minimizing the exposure of bare ground. Sediment would be controlled through a variety of practices including, but not limited to, the following:

- Gravel bags, berms, rock dams and/or silt fences;
- Interim desilting basins;
- Minimizing concentrated flows; and
- Dispersion of detention basin water onto pad areas by a pump and sprinkler system.

Construction material staging and vehicle parking areas shall be located away from storm drain inlets and shall be protected from surface stormwater flows by gravel bags, silt fences, fiber rolls and/or earthen berms. Water soluble materials shall be stored in enclosed or

covered storage areas. Waste oil and fuel storage areas shall be bermed and provided with either plastic liner with a sump pump, or spill containment pallets.

**Mitigation Measure 5.9-4b:** Prior to issuance of any grading permit, the project applicant shall prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) in accordance with RWQCB standards.

Though it would cover a smaller area, the **Revised Specific Plan** could also result in uncontrolled runoff during construction which could result in erosion and downstream sedimentation. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 5.9-4a and 4b would reduce the potential impacts to below a level of significance.

<b>Impact:</b> Drainage alteration
------------------------------------

The FEIR determined that development of the **Adopted Specific Plan** would result in an alteration of drainage courses which could have a significant impact if not properly designed to handle anticipated flow. Within the proposed development area, construction of the golf course as well as portions of the developed areas within the Specific Plan would alter the majority of the natural drainage courses by reconstructing them or placing them in an underground storm drain system. Wherever possible, the Adopted Specific Plan encourages runoff to be carried in vegetated surface drainages to encourage groundwater infiltration and filtration of urban runoff pollutants. Smaller drainages would be routed through storm drain pipes.

Implementation of the following mitigation measures were determined to reduce the impact on drainages to below a level of significance.

**Mitigation Measure 5.9-5a:** Prior to approval of tentative map or use permit within the Specific Plan area, the project applicant shall submit hydraulic studies which demonstrate that realigned drainages or underground structures are capable of transmitting 100-year flows.

**Mitigation Measure 5.9-5b:** Prior to approval of a tentative map or use permit within the Specific Plan area, the applicant shall submit a detailed drainage study as set forth in Section 6.4.4 (Storm Water System Design) of the Rancho San Juan Specific Plan. The study shall be submitted for review and approval by the Monterey County Public Works Department, Water Resources Agency, Environmental Health Division and the Planning and Building Inspection Department. The purpose of the study is to determine the best percolation sites for the storm water detention facilities. The study shall include additional soil borings to augment the preliminary boring program that was previously conducted.

**Mitigation Measure 5.5-5c:** Prior to approval of a tentative map, the applicant shall submit a detailed drainage plan as set forth in Section 6.4.4 (Storm Water System Design) of the Rancho San Juan Specific Plan. The plan shall be submitted for review and approval by the Monterey County Public Works Department, Water Resources Agency,

Environmental Health Division and Planning and Building Inspection Department.  
Where feasible, the plan shall include:

- a. Roadside vegetated swales to drain the roadway and adjacent lands and allow for percolation;
- b. Detention facilities to mitigate downstream flows on any hillside portions of the project;
- c. Multi-use detention facilities for stormwater infiltration and water quality enhancement on park and school sites; and
- d. Onsite retention facilities designed to meet the performance requirement in Section 6.4.4 of the Rancho San Juan Specific Plan.

Although reduced in area, the **Revised Specific Plan** would also involve the construction of a golf course as well developed areas that would alter the majority of the natural drainage courses. As with the Adopted Specific plan, only those drainages located within open space areas would be retained in a natural condition. As part of the approval of the HYH Property VTM, the applicant demonstrated adequate compliance with Mitigation Measures 5.9-5a through 5c. Thus, hydrology impacts have been reduced to below a level of significance.

#### **4.9.3 CONCLUSION**

With respect to hydrology/water quality impacts, the Revised Specific Plan would not require preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR pursuant to Sections 15162-15163 for the following reasons:

- No substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the hydrology/water quality analysis of FEIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
- No substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of hydrology/water quality analysis of FEIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- No new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the FEIR was certified as complete, shows any of the following:
  - No new hydrology/water quality impacts would occur that were not discussed in the FEIR;
  - Hydrology/water quality impacts identified in the FEIR would not be any greater with the proposed project;



- No new mitigation measures or alternatives related to hydrology/water quality impacts previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative mitigation measures or alternatives considered infeasible in the FEIR are now considered feasible; or
- No mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the FEIR would substantially reduce one or more significant hydrology/water quality effects on the environment, but the project proponents declined to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

## 4.10 WATER RESOURCES

### 4.10.1 EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

No changes have taken place with respect to the water resources environmental setting described in the original FEIR. Water resources in Greater Salinas continue to be primarily derived from the Salinas River groundwater basin. Water demands within the project site continue to be met by groundwater pumped from at least 19 known wells within the Specific Plan area.

As the land use on the site continues to be dominated by essentially the same uses which are comprised almost exclusively of agriculture, the annual demand of 2,770 acre feet (af) estimated in the FEIR remains applicable.

Groundwater recharge occurs from a variety of sources on the property including rainfall, and irrigation. A total of 2,264 af/yr of water continues to be estimated to the groundwater table as a result of all of the recharge sources. Thus, the annual groundwater consumption would be expected to continue to exceed the amount of recharge on an average annual basis by 506 af/yr.

### 4.10.2 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

<b>Impact:</b> Overdraft of local groundwater supply
--

The FEIR concluded that based on an evaluation of the demand generated by individual land uses allowed by the **Adopted Specific Plan**, development of the Adopted Specific Plan (including agricultural uses but not development within the designated Future Development Area) would generate an annual demand for groundwater of 3,170 af/yr. The Draft EIR estimated a demand of 3,370 af/yr, but during the hearings on the Adopted Specific Plan, the demand for the employment center was reduced by 200 af/yr. The FEIR also determined that (refer to Table 5.10-3 in FEIR) an estimated total of 2,907 af/yr would be returned to the groundwater supply. It was concluded that, based on a comparison of the revised annual groundwater demand (3,170 af/yr) and recharge (2,907 af/yr) at buildout of the Adopted Specific Plan area, water demand would exceed annual groundwater recharge. The demand would exceed the recharge by an estimated 263 af/yr. Although the proposed development would result

in an annual overdraft, the deficit was determined to be 243 af/yr less than the overdraft of 506 af/yr currently occurring within the Adopted Specific Plan area.

Implementation of the following mitigation measures included in the FEIR along with the water conservation aspects of the Adopted Specific Plan were determined to reduce water resource impacts but not to below a level of significance.

***Mitigation Measure 5.10-1a:*** Prior to approval of any tentative map or use permit within the Specific Plan area, a groundwater supply analysis shall be completed. The analysis shall estimate the annual demand for groundwater associated with existing developed areas within the Rancho San Juan Specific Plan area as well as the amount of groundwater consumed by ongoing agricultural operations or other uses unrelated to development pursuant to the Specific Plan. Use of reclaimed water shall not be counted as groundwater demand. The sum of these groundwater demand sources shall be subtracted from the maximum annual allowed consumption of 3,170 af to determine the amount of supply available for the development contained on a proposed tentative map or use permit. If the supply is insufficient to meet the anticipated demand of a proposed development, the project applicant shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the County, that agricultural consumption will be proportionately reduced within the Specific Plan area or a supply of potable water not related to groundwater has been secured; either one of these methods shall be guaranteed in perpetuity.

***Mitigation Measure 5.10-1b:*** Prior to issuance of any building permit, the County shall make a determination that the project is consistent with the water consumption estimates identified in the tentative map application. If the proposed building exceeds the consumption estimates, the applicant shall be required to modify his proposal to reduce water consumption to or below the water consumption estimates before the project can be approved.

In addition, the County shall determine that all appropriate water conservation methods have been included in all proposed buildings. Water conservation methods shall include but not be limited to the following:

- Low flow showerheads and toilets;
- Water-conserving irrigation equipment and procedures;
- Provision of literature to future building occupant(s) emphasizing the importance of water conservation and ways to reduce water consumption through day to day activities; and
- Drought tolerant landscaping.

***Mitigation Measure 5.10-1c:*** Prior to approval of final improvement plans, the County shall determine that all appropriate water conservation methods have been included in the proposed development including but not limited to the following:

- Surface runoff retention basins;
- Drought tolerant landscaping and irrigation; and

- Maximal use of reclaimed water, where available.

The County shall also determine that the long-term maintenance of water conservation methods will be assured.

**Mitigation Measure 5.10-1d:** Commencing one (1) year after construction of water-consuming improvements within a subdivision, the applicant shall submit annual reports on total water consumption which shall include total per unit consumption data. This shall include data on water consumption of the golf course. If either the per unit consumption calculation, estimated consumption for the golf course, or total consumption calculation for the particular subdivision exceeds the proportionate consumption cap established in the EIR, the applicant shall be required to adopt such water conservation sustainability measures available in the Specific Plan Matrix to achieve the appropriate annual consumption. If consumption still does not meet the caps established in the EIR, additional building permits in the non-compliant subdivision shall be withheld or, if the excess consumption is systemic, subsequent tentative maps will not be approved.

If, subsequent to approval of each tentative map, building permits, or at build-out of the Specific Plan, the amount of consumption (either per unit or total) exceeds the amount of water assumed in the EIR, then the Water Resources Agency shall impose some or all of the following measures:

- Water rationing;
- Landscape retrofit;
- Increased water consumption fees; and/or
- Installation of a reverse osmosis unit or its equivalent at the wastewater treatment plant for RSJ.

**Mitigation Measure 5.10-1e:** Prior to approval of a final map, the applicant shall prepare a detailed plan to implement a Water Balance Management System as set forth in Section 6.2.6 (Monitoring Process) of the Rancho San Juan Specific Plan. The plan shall be submitted for review and approval by the Monterey County Public Works Department, Environmental Health Division, Water Resources Agency and Planning and Building Inspection Department. The plan shall provide a means of metering the use of all water (ground water, waste water and storm water) and identify the proposed water conservation features that are to be implemented within the project.

**Mitigation Measure 5.10-1f:** The bylaws of the Community Services District (CSD), or other County entity that is responsible for the providing water services to Rancho San Juan, shall provide for the development and implementation of an ongoing water conservation educational program for the residents as set forth in Section 6.2.6 (Monitoring Process) of the Rancho San Juan Specific Plan. The program shall be subject to review and approval by the Monterey County Public Works Department, Water Resources Agency Environmental Health Division and Planning and Building Inspection Department. The purpose of the program is to help residents understand the relationship

between individual actions and the long-term sustainability of the community's water supply.

**Mitigation Measure 5.10-1g:** Prior to final map recordation, the bylaws of the Community Services District (CSD), or other County entity that is responsible for the providing water services to the area within said map, shall establish the position of Water Coordinator, or equivalent staff position, with the overall charge of maximizing the use of water for the least amount of energy input as set forth in Section 6.2.6 (Monitoring Process) of the Rancho San Juan Specific Plan. The Water Coordinator shall be responsible for all aspects of water use, reuse, treatment, collection, pumping and distribution for all land uses in Ranch San Juan. It shall be the Water Manager's responsibility to meter and monitor water balance levels and to bring any potential problems to the attention of the CSD Board of Directors and the community. The responsibilities of the position shall be subject to review and approval by the Monterey County Water Resources Agency.

**Mitigation Measure 5.10-1h:** The applicant shall submit plans and supporting materials showing how each phase of the development incorporates the sustainable building, construction and/or design features that are required by Section 8.10 (Sustainability Requirements) of the Rancho San Juan Specific Plan. In addition, residential development, with the exception of residential estate homes, shall score a minimum of 38 points by incorporating additional sustainable options. Residential estate homes shall score a minimum of 51 points. Sustainable Options Bonuses (SOBs) are awarded for qualifying affordable housing projects. Public/Semi-Public, Commercial, and Industrial development shall score a minimum of 25 points. Compliance with the sustainable requirements shall be made a condition of tentative map approval. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Monterey County Planning and Building Services Manager shall determine that the project complies with the minimum score as specified in Section 8.10 (Sustainability Requirements) of the Rancho San Juan Specific Plan.

Implementation of the **Revised Specific Plan** would reduce the overall demand on local water resources because development would be limited to the HYH Property. Where the Adopted Specific Plan resulted in a 263 af/yr water deficit, the Water Supply Assessment (WSA) prepared by Cal Water (Attachment C) indicates that no deficit would occur with the Revised Specific Plan. In fact, with the use of reclaimed water on the golf course, a net annual surplus of an estimated 25 af/yr would occur with buildout of the Revised Specific Plan. However, to assure that these assumptions are accurate, Mitigation Measures 5.10 1a-1d shall be applied to development within the Revised Specific Plan. Based on the WSA, in the long term, the impact of the Revised Specific Plan on water resources would not be significant.

#### **4.10.3 CONCLUSION**

With respect to water resource impacts, the Revised Specific Plan would not require preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR pursuant to Sections 15162-15163 for the following reasons:

- No substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the water resources analysis of FEIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
- No substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of water resources analysis of FEIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- No new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the FEIR was certified as complete, shows any of the following:
  - No new water resources impacts would occur that were not discussed in the FEIR;
  - Water resources impacts identified in the FEIR would not be any greater with the proposed project;
  - No new mitigation measures or alternatives related to water resources impacts previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative mitigation measures or alternatives considered infeasible in the FEIR are now considered feasible; or
  - No mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the FEIR would substantially reduce one or more significant water resources effects on the environment, but the project proponents declined to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

## **4.11 AGRICULTURE**

### **4.11.1 EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

The California Department of Conservation has updated its mapping of agricultural land in the vicinity of the project since the FEIR was prepared. Within the Adopted Specific Plan area, the most recent maps identify a different distribution of farmland. Based on this updated information and the change in the Specific Plan area boundaries, the amount of Important Farmland which includes Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Farmland of Local Importance and Unique farmland, with the Adopted Specific Plan area covers approximately 2,025 acres which represents a 31% increase over the estimate in the FEIR based on the earlier information. Similarly, the amount of Important Farmland within the HYH Property increased from 179 acres to 404 acres, or an increase of 225%. The large increase on the HYH Property is largely due to an increase in the amount of area that was planted since the earlier farmland mapping.

#### 4.11.2 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

<b>Impact:</b> Loss of important farmland
---

As concluded in the FEIR, implementation of the **Adopted Specific Plan** would eventually remove important farmland from potential production. The FEIR determined that full buildout of the plan area would commit approximately 1,532 acres (74%) of Important Farmland to non-agricultural use. Implementation of the Specific Plan would result in the loss of strawberry production, as well as a limited amount of row crop and dairy production. Although this loss has already been planned for and acknowledged at an even greater scale in the certified EIR for the Greater Salinas Area Plan under the ADC designation applied to the property, the FEIR considered the loss of farmland from the Adopted Specific Plan to be significant due to the relative scarcity of this resource.

Implementation of the following mitigation measures were determined to reduce the impact but not to below a level of significance since there would still be a net loss of agricultural land.

**Mitigation Measure 5.11-1a:** Prior to approval of the first final map, the landowner shall fund the development of an agricultural compensation program. The program shall provide a mechanism, subject to approval of the County of Monterey Board of Supervisors, for acquiring development credits from owners of important farmlands and/or other means of preserving important farmland (defined as Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Farmland of Local Importance or Unique Farmland) to reduce economic pressure to convert farmlands to development. The program shall provide for an in kind, 1:1 compensation ratio through easement dedication and/or payment of fees to the County; fees shall be equal to the per-acre value of a conservation easement over important farmland.

**Mitigation Measure 5.11-1b:** Prior to approval of each final map based on the second tentative map and all subsequent tentative maps approved, the project applicant shall comply with the agricultural compensation program identified in Mitigation Measure 5.11-1a.

Under the **Revised Specific Plan**, a total of 335 acres (83%) of the Important Farmland would be impacted. This would represent a 400% reduction in the amount of Important Farmland which would have been impacted under the Adopted Specific Plan. In addition, as part of the Revised Specific Plan, much of the land outside the HYH Property would be converted back to agricultural zoning. Although proportionately small in comparison with the Adopted Specific Plan, the loss of agricultural land would represent a significant impact due to the importance of agriculture to the local economy and the number of acres which would be lost. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 5.11-1a would reduce the impact but not to below a level of significance since there would still be a net loss of agricultural land. Mitigation Measure 5.11-1b is no longer applicable as written because no further tentative maps will be approved in the **Revised Specific Plan** area.

### **4.11.3 CONCLUSION**

With respect to agricultural impacts, the Revised Specific Plan would not require preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR pursuant to Sections 15162-15163 for the following reasons:

- No substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the agricultural analysis of FEIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
- No substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of agricultural analysis of FEIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- No new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the FEIR was certified as complete, shows any of the following:
  - No new agricultural impacts would occur that were not discussed in the FEIR;
  - Agricultural impacts identified in the FEIR would not be any greater with the proposed project;
  - No new mitigation measures or alternatives related to agricultural impacts previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative mitigation measures or alternatives considered infeasible in the FEIR are now considered feasible; or
  - No mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the FEIR would substantially reduce one or more significant agricultural effects on the environment, but the project proponents declined to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

## **4.12 PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES**

### **4.12.1 EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

No changes have taken place with respect to the environmental setting described in the Chapter 5.12 of the FEIR. The following discussion is broken down into the individual services.

#### **Wastewater**

The Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency (MRWPCA) is the primary agency responsible for wastewater transmission and treatment in the project region. The Specific Plan area continues to lie outside the MRWPCA and City of Salinas service areas and currently relies on septic systems for wastewater disposal.

### **Energy Utilities**

PG&E would continue to be the source of natural gas and electricity service for the Specific Plan area.

### **Schools**

The Specific Plan area is located in the jurisdiction of three school districts. For grades K through 8, the northeastern portion of the Specific Plan is within the Lagunita Elementary School District. The remainder of the project area, for grades K through 8, is located in the Santa Rita Union School District. The Salinas Union High School District provides education for grades 9 through 12 within the Specific Plan area.

Although enrollments may have changed slightly, with one exception (Lagunita Elementary School), the schools which would serve the Specific Plan exceed their design capacity.

### **Fire Protection**

Two fire districts continue to share the Adopted Specific Plan area. The North County Fire District (NCFD) serves the north, northeast and central areas of the Specific Plan( the HYH portion of the Adopted Specific Plan) while the Salinas Rural Fire District (SRFD) serves the southern, southeastern and southwestern portions of the Specific Plan area.(the area outside of the HYH property)

NCFD's closest fire station continues to be Station 2, located on Pesante Canyon Road, approximately 2.5 miles to the northwestern portion of the project site

### **Solid Waste**

The entire subject property would continue to be served by the Crazy Horse Landfill. After this landfill reaches capacity, the site would be served by the Johnson Canyon Landfill unless alternate sites are identified by the County in the interim.

### **Parks and Recreation**

The closest existing regional park continues to be Manzanita Park located approximately two miles north of the subject property area. The 464-acre park includes a sports complex for soccer, Little League baseball, and other activities as well as hiking and equestrian trails.

### **Library Service**

Conditions at the two branch libraries which currently exist in the project vicinity remain essentially the same as discussed in the EIR.

### **Water**

Refer to Section 5.10 of the FEIR for a discussion of water supply for the subject property.



## Sheriff Services

The Monterey County Sheriff's Office (MCSO) continues to provide police protection services in unincorporated areas of the County, including the project area. The primary station that would serve the subject property area would still be the Central Patrol Station, located at 1414 Natividad Road in Salinas.

### 4.12.2 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

As described in the FEIR, the focus of the impact analysis is on physical changes which may occur from changes in public services and facilities necessary to serve future development within the Specific Plan.

#### Wastewater

<b>Impact:</b>	Construction of a new wastewater treatment facility, and/or the expansion of an existing facility
----------------	---

Implementation of the **Adopted Specific Plan** would result in construction of a new wastewater treatment facility, the construction of which could cause significant biology, historic/archaeology, and hydrology/water quality effects. The wastewater treatment facility is proposed as a phased project, resulting in expansion of the facility over a projected period of 20 or more years. The facility is proposed within an area identified as a wildlife corridor.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 5.5-1 through 5.5-3 along with the following mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure 5.12.1-1a:** Prior to the approval of the first final map within the Specific Plan the applicant shall secure all required permits including: but not limited to, a Waste Discharge Permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board and approval of system design from County Environmental Health Division.

**Mitigation Measure 5.12.1-1b:** Treatment plant capacity shall be increased to accommodate each phase of the project prior to filing of the final map for the respective project phases. A minimum 20 percent excess treatment capacity shall be added to the plant and disposal facilities, as needed, for each phase of the project, to accommodate future increases in wastewater flow rates, based on estimates of future development. In addition, flows shall be metered and records of the flows shall be provided to the RWQCB and Monterey County Health Department for review and approval.

**Mitigation Measure 5.12.1-1c:** Prior to issuance of final permits for the wastewater treatment facility, a mosquito abatement plan shall be submitted to Monterey County Health Department and to the Monterey County Mosquito Abatement District for review and approval to reduce potential impacts from proposed reclaimed water impounds.

**Mitigation Measure 5.12.1-1d:** Prior to issuance of building permits, a drift fence shall be constructed around the construction site to prevent possible wildlife movement through the corridor into the construction site area. Siting and installation of the fence shall be overseen by a biologist with appropriate permits. Pitfall traps and cover boards shall be placed along the inside of the fence line to capture animals dispersing from the work area during grading and construction. The traps shall be monitored daily through the grading and construction period and animals shall be removed from traps and placed on the outside of the fence line in appropriate cover. This measure shall be required during each expansion phase of the facility.

The **Revised Specific Plan** would also include a wastewater system as part of a water balance system that would avoid overdrafting the groundwater table on an average annual basis according to the WSA. A wastewater treatment plant, which is reduced in size and scope to accommodate the reduced demand will be sized and designed to treat wastewater generated by the Revised Specific Plan area, would be constructed on a site located on the northwestern boundary of the site. The wastewater treatment plant would be supported by enough 120-day wet season storage to meet the needs of the Revised Specific Plan area and the 3-day storage requirements for untreated sewage. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 5.5-1 through 5.5-3 along with Mitigation Measures 5.12.1-1a through 5.12.1-1d would reduce impacts to less than significant.

### Energy Utilities

<b>Impact:</b> Construction of a new energy facility(s), and/or the expansion of an existing facility
---

Implementation of the **Adopted Specific Plan** would result in construction of new power lines or pipelines to provide utilities to the Specific Plan area, the construction of which could cause significant effects to biology, archeology, and hydrology/water quality. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 5.4-1 through 5.4-5, 5.5-1 through 5.5-3, and 5.9-1, 5.9-4b, and 5.9-5 would reduce impacts to below a level of significance.

New power lines or pipelines would also be needed to serve the **Revised Specific Plan**. With improvements to the energy infrastructure, energy supply is expected to be sufficient to meet the demand generated by the development of the Revised Specific Plan. With these improvements, similar effects to biology, archeology, and hydrology/water quality could result, albeit on the smaller scale of the Revised Specific Plan. However, the mitigation measures identified for the Adopted Specific Plan would be effective in reducing potential impacts to biology, archeology, and hydrology/water quality related to the Revised Specific Plan. Thus, as with the Adopted Specific Plan, these potential impacts would not be significant with implementation of the identified mitigation measures.

## Schools

<b>Impact:</b> Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered school facilities, need for new or physically altered school facilities
--

The FEIR concluded that implementation of the **Adopted Specific Plan** would result in construction of several schools within the plan area, the construction of which could cause significant biology, historic/archaeology and hydrology/water quality impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 5.4-1 through 5.4-5, 5.5-1 through 5.5-3, and 5.9-1, 5.9-4B, and 5.9-5 would reduce impacts to less than significant.

Implementation of the **Revised Specific Plan** would not involve the construction of new schools within the reduced plan area, the construction of which could cause significant biology, historic/archaeology and hydrology/water quality impacts. As such, the above-mentioned mitigation measures would not apply.

However, the proposed project would result in an increased demand for schools and or classrooms due to the addition of residential units. Future development will be required to pay adopted school fees. Unlike the Adopted Specific Plan, the proposed project would not include the construction of schools located within the plan area. As such, it is anticipated that the demand for a new middle school and elementary school to serve buildout of the Revised Specific Plan would result in development of new schools outside the Revised Specific Plan area. As the potential locations for these schools are unknown at this time, an analysis of the physical changes would be speculative and cannot be addressed in this addendum.

## Fire Protection

<b>Impact:</b> Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities, and/or the need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives
--

The FEIR concluded that implementation of the **Adopted Specific Plan** would impact the two local fire departments serving the project area and result in an increased need for fire protection services. The increased service demand on the local fire departments would result in increased response times as well as the need for additional staff and equipment and would require construction of, at minimum, one new fire facility. Several locations for the future fire station were identified in the Adopted Specific Plan including the location proposed in the Revised Adopted Plan. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 5.4-1 through 5.4-5, 5.5-1 through 5.5-3, and 5.9-1, 5.9-4B, and 5.9-5 would reduce the environmental impacts associated with construction of a new facility(s) associated with implementing the Specific Plan to less than significant.

The **Revised Specific Plan** proposes a location for a future fire station to be constructed to serve the Revised Specific Plan area. As indicated above, the site shown in the Revised Specific Plan was considered as one of the sites in the Adopted Specific Plan. Thus, implementation of Mitigation Measures 5.4-1 through 5.4-5, 5.5-1 through 5.5-3, and 5.9-1, 5.9-4B, and 5.9-5 would reduce the environmental impacts associated with construction of a new facility associated with implementing the Revised Specific Plan to less than significant.

### **Solid Waste**

No mitigation measures would be required, as sufficient landfill space is expected to be available for the project.

### **Parks and Recreation**

<b>Impact:</b> Increased pressure on local park and recreational resources requiring construction of new parks
--

The FEIR concluded that implementation of the **Adopted Specific Plan** would result in the need for 38.9 acres of local parkland and 8.8 acres of regional parkland resources. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 5.4-1 through 5.4-5, 5.5-1 through 5.5-3, and 5.9-1, 5.9-4B, and 5.9-5 would reduce park construction impacts associated with implementing the Specific Plan to less than significant.

The **Revised Specific Plan** would decrease residential units from 4,000 to 1,147 units and decrease the demand for regional and local parks. The Revised Specific Plan, like the Adopted Specific Plan, would not impact the County's regional park system. The demand of the Revised Specific Plan for 2.4 acres of developed regional parkland would not overload the County system, which has an adequate supply, including Manzanita Park and Royal Oaks Park, both in the proposed project vicinity.

The demand for local parks would be met by constructing local parks within the Revised Specific Plan. These parks would be located within the general disturbance area assumed by the FEIR. Thus, the significant physical changes (e.g. archaeology and biology) would be included in the previous discussions of these issues. As discussed earlier, implementation of Mitigation Measures 5.4-1 through 5.4-5, 5.5-1 through 5.5-3, and 5.9-1, 5.9-4B, and 5.9-5 would reduce impacts to less than significant..

### **Library Service**

<b>Impact:</b> Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered library facility(s)
--

The FEIR concluded that the **Adopted Specific Plan** would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with provision of new or physically altered library facility(s), the construction of which could cause significant biology, historic/archaeology and hydrology/water quality

impacts. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 5.4-1 through 5.4-5, 5.5-1 through 5.5-3, and 5.9-1, 5.9-4B, and 5.9-5 would reduce impacts to less than significant.

As with the Adopted Specific Plan, the **Revised Specific Plan** would generate a demand for library services that would exceed the current library in the area. However, in the absence of a specific site, the physical impacts of a new library cannot be determined at this time.

### **Water**

Refer to Section 5.10 of the FEIR for a discussion of water supply for the Revised Specific Plan.

### **Sheriff Services**

<b>Impact:</b> Increased need for police protection service Specific Plan
---

The FEIR concluded that development of the **Adopted Specific Plan** would increase pressure on local police protection service, resulting in lowered response times and the need for additional staff and equipment; however, construction of additional facilities or modifications to existing facilities is not required. Therefore, no physical impacts would occur.

Implementation of the **Revised Specific Plan** would, albeit to a lesser extent, also increase pressure on local police protection service, resulting in lowered response times and the need for additional staff and equipment. Subsequent to the approval of the Adopted Specific Plan, the County and Sheriff have identified one of the existing houses within or near the Revised Specific Plan would likely be used for an additional substation. Use of this existing structure would not result in any significant physical impacts on physical resources. As indicted above, the site shown in the Revised Specific Plan was considered as one of the sites in the Adopted Specific Plan. Thus, implementation of Mitigation Measures 5.4-1 through 5.4-5, 5.5-1 through 5.5-3, and 5.9-1, 5.9-4B, and 5.9-5 would reduce the environmental impacts associated with construction of a new facility associated with implementing the Revised Specific Plan to less than significant.

### **4.12.3 CONCLUSION**

With respect to public service and utility impacts, the Revised Specific Plan would not require preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR pursuant to Sections 15162-15163 for the following reasons:

- No substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the public services analysis of FEIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
- No substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of public services analysis of FEIR due to

the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

- No new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the FEIR was certified as complete, shows any of the following:
  - No new public services impacts would occur that were not discussed in the FEIR;
  - Public services impacts identified in the FEIR would not be any greater with the proposed project;
  - No new mitigation measures or alternatives related to public services impacts previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative mitigation measures or alternatives considered infeasible in the FEIR are now considered feasible; or
  - No mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the FEIR would substantially reduce one or more significant public services effects on the environment, but the project proponents declined to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

## 5.0 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Due to the large size of the Adopted Specific Plan and the potential area of influence, the FEIR relied in part on the growth projections contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Report for Monterey County 21<sup>st</sup> Century General Plan Update (GPU DEIR). While this draft EIR has not been certified, it contains more accurate estimates of future growth because it is the most recently prepared assessment of potential growth in the County and the 12 cities in the County. Furthermore, the DEIR relies on information from completed studies and adopted plans. As no comprehensive evaluation of growth has occurred since the FEIR was certified, the baseline used for the analysis of cumulative impacts remains appropriate for purposes of the Addendum.

### 5.1 AGRICULTURE

The FEIR concluded that the loss of Important Farmland from the **Adopted Specific Plan** combined with the loss of Important Farmland associated with other developments in the region would result in a significant cumulative impact on agriculture. Although the amount of land in agricultural production has increased in recent years, development has removed Important Farmland from future use for agriculture. Additional development is expected to occur in the near future which will further reduce the acreage of Important Farmland. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 5.11-1a and 1b would reduce the cumulative impact but not below a level of significance.

As with the **Revised Specific Plan**, the loss of Important Farmland would combine with other losses throughout the County to result in a significant cumulative impact on agriculture. As with the Adopted Specific Plan, implementation of Mitigation Measures 5.11-1a would reduce the cumulative impact but not below a level of significance.

### 5.2 AIR QUALITY

The North Central Coast Air Basin (NCCAB) within which the **Adopted Specific Plan** area is located experiences unhealthy air due to a variety of emission sources, of which, automobile emissions play a major role. The air basin is designated as a moderate non-attainment area for 1-hour ozone as well as a non-attainment area for the PM<sub>10</sub>. By nature, air quality problems with the exception of CO hotspots, are regional rather than local due to the accumulation of multiple emission sources within individual air basins. Consequently, all development within the NCCAB contributes to the air quality issues related to ozone and PM<sub>10</sub>.

The Adopted Specific Plan would generate short-term and long-term emissions that would exceed the thresholds for the air basin. Based on the anticipated amount of grading to occur on any given day, the PM<sub>10</sub> levels generated from the project would exceed the daily emission standard. This PM<sub>10</sub> contribution combined with grading for other planned projects within the NCCAB would cause the daily emission standard to be exceeded and result in a significant cumulative short-term impact.

Automobile emissions with buildout of the Adopted Specific Plan would exceed emission standards for ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, and PM<sub>10</sub>. These long-term emission levels would combine with long-term emissions from other future development to result in a significant cumulative long-term impact on regional air quality.

Development of the Adopted Specific Plan would adversely impact the level of services at a number of intersections and roadway segments within the project area. Many of these impacts would exceed the traffic flow thresholds established for air quality.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 5.7-2a through 2g would reduce cumulative impacts but not below a level of significance.

As with the overall Specific Plan, short-term levels of PM<sub>10</sub> related to construction within the **Revised Specific Plan** as well as long-term emissions related primarily to automobile trips would combine with other future development in the NCCAB to result in significant cumulative air quality impacts. As with the Adopted Specific Plan, implementation of Mitigation Measures 5.7-2a through 2g would reduce cumulative impacts associated with the Revised Specific Plan but not below a level of significance.

### 5.3 ARCHAEOLOGICAL/HISTORICAL RESOURCES

Significant cumulative impacts would occur with respect to archaeological and historical resources. Development of the **Adopted Specific Plan** area would result in the loss of historic resources which are considered significant. In addition, the potential exists for impacts to undetectable subsurface archaeological resources which may occur within the Specific Plan area.

The physical loss of the Schoch Dairy, Espinosa Adobe, Battle of Natividad site and several structures in excess of 45 years old as well as indirect impacts on the rural context of the Red Pony Barn could combine with the losses of other historic buildings in the region to create a significant cumulative impact.

Should significant subsurface archaeological deposits occur within the development area, the loss of these resources and the associated information could have a significant cumulative impact on archaeological resources when combined with impacts of other future developments on archaeological resources.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 5.5-1 and 5.5-4 would reduce cumulative impacts but not below a level of significance.

Due to the potential presence of subsurface archaeological resources and the effect of the **Revised Specific Plan** on foreground views from the Herbert Ranch, this project could combine with other developments in the area to cumulatively impact archaeological and historical resources in the event that full mitigation cannot be achieved by other developments. As with the Adopted Specific Plan, implementation of Mitigation Measures 5.5-1 and 5.5-4 would reduce cumulative impacts associated with the Revised Specific Plan but not below a level of significance.



## 5.4 BIOLOGY

The **Adopted Specific Plan** would impact several biological resources which are considered regionally significant including wetlands, native grasslands and associated sensitive plants and animals. Although future development within the Adopted Specific Plan area would be required to create new wetlands and grasslands including the fragrant fritillary, the proposed golf course would disrupt the natural drainage channel through the northern portion of the Adopted Specific Plan area as well as disrupt animal movement. Future development in the County will continue to diminish the amount of these resources through direct habitat destruction or indirect effects such as domestic pet harassment, noise and lighting. Thus, the Adopted Specific Plan would result in cumulatively significant impacts on regional biological resources.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 5.4-1a through 1d, 5.4-2, 5.4-3, 5.4-4a and 4b, and 5.4-5b and 5c would reduce the cumulative impact on wetlands to below a level of significance. However, cumulative impacts to oak woodlands, wildlife movement and construction impacts on sensitive species would remain significant.

Impacts of the **Revised Specific Plan** on wetlands, native grasslands and the fragrant fritillary would combine with losses of these resources associated with other development. Due to the sensitivity of these resources, the impact would be considered cumulatively significant. As with the Adopted Specific Plan, implementation of Mitigation Measures 5.4-1a through 1d, 5.4-2, 5.4-3, 5.4-4a and 4b, and 5.4-5b and 5c would reduce the cumulative impact on wetlands to below a level of significance. However, cumulative impacts to oak woodlands, wildlife movement and construction impacts on sensitive species would remain significant.

## 5.5 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

The FEIR determined that the geological hazards which occur within **Adopted Specific Plan** would not interact with any similar conditions associated with other future developments in the area. Thus, no cumulative significant geology or soils impacts would occur as a result of the interaction of the proposed project with other planned development.

As with the Adopted Specific Plan, geology and soils constraints associated with the **Revised Specific Plan** would not interact with other developments to create a significant cumulative impact.

## 5.6 HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY

### 5.6.1 HYDROLOGY

Implementation of the **Adopted Specific Plan** would increase the quantity of surface runoff when combined with similar increases in impermeable surface area with other development in the area. However, the downstream rate of runoff would not be increased substantially as a result of development due to drainage control measures required by the proposed Specific Plan. As the potential hydrology impacts are primarily associated with increased runoff rate rather than

quantity, no significant cumulative hydrology impacts would occur as a result of implementation of the **Adopted Specific Plan**.

Development of the **Revised Specific Plan** would generate urban runoff which would combine with that generated by other development to result in a cumulative significant impact on water quality. Operation of the golf course poses the greatest potential for cumulative impacts due to the use of pesticides and fertilizers. Although best management practices would be conducted as part of the golf course, the potential pollutants from golf course operations cannot be reduced to zero. Thus, significant cumulative water quality impacts would occur which would not be reduced to below a level of significance.

### **5.6.2 WATER QUALITY**

Reduced water quality associated with development of the **Adopted Specific Plan** would combine with urban runoff from other development projects in the area to degrade the quality of surface and ground water. Thus, cumulatively significant impacts to water quality would occur with implementation of the Adopted Specific Plan. Although implementation of Mitigation Measures 5.9-1 and 5.9-3 would prevent significant direct impacts, they would be unable to eliminate all of the potential runoff contaminants. Thus, the Adopted Specific Plan was determined to have a significant and unmitigable cumulative impact on water quality.

As with the Adopted Specific Plan, drainage improvements would be incorporated into development within the **Revised Specific Plan** area that would avoid increased runoff velocities downstream and avoid cumulatively significant impacts.

## **5.7 LAND USE**

As the **Adopted Specific Plan** would be consistent with the land use types encouraged for Areas of Development Concentration, its implementation was determined not to result in any land use precedents which could combine with other developments in the surrounding area to result in a cumulatively significant impact on land use planning. In addition, none of the proposed land uses would combine with other future development in the area to create significant cumulative land use conflicts.

As with the Adopted Specific Plan, development within the **Revised Specific Plan** would be consistent with existing General Plan land use goals and policies. Planned development would not combine with future development within the Revised Specific Plan to create significant land use conflicts. Thus, the Revised Specific Plan would not result in significant cumulative land use impacts.

## **5.8 LANDFORM ALTERATION/VISUAL QUALITY**

### **5.8.1 LANDFORM ALTERATION**

Encroachment into slopes over 30 percent and alteration of major ridgelines within the **Adopted Specific Plan** is limited by the County's General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. As a result, the

County would be required to make specific findings relative to the Zoning Ordinance before projects could impact slopes over 30 percent or major ridgelines. Landform alteration is a function of project specific development activity onsite and would include project-level mitigation as appropriate. Thus, the Adopted Specific Plan would not combine with other development to result in a significant impact on landforms in the area.

As with the Adopted Specific Plan, the **Revised Specific Plan's** landform alteration is a function of project specific development activity onsite and would not combine with other development in the surrounding area o result in a significant cumulative landform alteration impact.

## **5.8.2 VISUAL QUALITY**

Development of the **Adopted Specific Plan** would combine with other projects in the area to result in cumulatively significant visual quality impacts. The Adopted Specific Plan site lies immediately north of the City of Salinas which is highly developed and has already impacted the visual quality and character of the area. Anticipated additional development per the Salinas General Plan will continue to impact the visual quality and character of the area. The Adopted Specific Plan plus anticipated regional development would result in cumulatively significant impacts to visual quality and character of the region. While implementation of the design guidelines included in the Adopted Specific Plan would reduce visual quality impacts, they would not be sufficient to reduce the cumulative impacts to below a level of significance.

Development of the **Revised Specific Plan** likewise combines with other planned development and result in a significant cumulative impact on visual quality.

## **5.9 NOISE**

Traffic associated with buildout of the **Adopted Specific Plan** area would have a cumulatively significant impact on existing homes located along Russell Road, west of San Juan Grade Road, and North Main Street, south of Russell Road. Even though the affected homes already experience unacceptable traffic noise levels, the additional project traffic in combination with other future developments served by these roads would result in substantial increase in the traffic noise for nearby residents and, thus, a significant cumulative noise impact. As mitigation is beyond the control of the project, the impact would be significant and not mitigable.

The addition of **Revised Specific Plan** traffic to local roadways would only exceed significance thresholds on one roadway segment: Harrison Road, north of Russell Road. However, as no existing residences occur along this segment, no significant cumulative impacts would occur from implementation of the Revised Specific Plan.

## **5.10 PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES**

### **5.10.1 PARKS AND RECREATION**

As development of the **Adopted Specific Plan** was determined to meet the recreation requirements imposed by the County's General Plan onsite, no additional demand would be

placed on the existing recreational facilities in the vicinity of the project area that would require construction of additional parks. The FEIR concluded there were sufficient regional parks to accommodate cumulative growth plus project. As the project would not combine with the recreation demand generated by other development, no significant cumulative impacts that would result in park construction would occur as a result of implementation of the Adopted Specific Plan.

As development of the **Revised Specific Plan** would include parks and less development than the Adopted Specific Plan, no significant cumulative impacts would occur with respect to parks and recreation.

### **5.10.2 LIBRARIES**

Development of the **Adopted Specific Plan** was determined to require construction of a new library. The was to be sized to accommodate the needs of residents in the Specific Plan and additional residents in unincorporated County in the vicinity of the Specific Plan. Accordingly, there would be no significant cumulative impacts resulting from the construction of libraries as a result of implementation of the Specific Plan.

Development of the **Revised Specific Plan** in combination with other development in the area may cause library capacity to be exceeded and create the need to construct a new library. As no specific location for a new library is proposed, no assessment can be made of the potential physical impacts associated with the need for a new library.

### **5.10.3 SCHOOLS**

Development of the **Adopted Specific Plan** was determined in the FEIR to require construction of additional schools in the specific plan area. Project level construction impacts were provided in Section 5.12 of the FEIR. The schools were to be sized to accommodate the needs of residents in the Specific Plan and additional residents in the affected school district. As a result, there would be no significant cumulative impacts resulting from the construction of schools as a result of implementation of the Adopted Specific Plan.

Development of the **Revised Specific Plan** would add to the new students generated by other development within the service area of the affected school districts. As indicated in the FEIR, new schools would be required to meet the additional students generated by this and other future projects. As the Revised Specific Plan no longer includes specific school sites, the potential physical impacts associated with new schools can not be determined due to uncertainties associated with future locations of these schools. However, pursuant to CEQA, the environmental consequences of future schools would be analyzed when school locations and design are known.

### **5.10.4 SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL**

As indicated in Chapter 5.12 of the FEIR, landfill capacity is available to projects in the **Adopted Specific Plan** through the year 2045. Cumulative plus project demands would not result in requirement to construct new or modify existing facilities. Accordingly, there are no

significant cumulative solid waste disposal impacts that would occur as a result of the Specific Plan.

As the **Revised Specific Plan** would generate less development and proportionately less trash than the Adopted Specific Plan, adoption of the Revised Specific Plan would not result in a significant cumulative impact on solid waste disposal.

#### **5.10.5 WASTEWATER**

As indicated in Chapter 5.12 of the FEIR, the **Adopted Specific Plan** was to have included a wastewater treatment facility designed to treat the wastewater generated by the Adopted Specific Plan. Consequently, the project would not place any additional demand on existing sewage treatment plants. New anticipated development in the City of Salinas would be accommodated through the regional facility. Additional development in the vicinity of Rancho San Juan would be accommodated either at the regional facility or onsite. Consequently, there would be no significant cumulative plus project impacts related to wastewater treatment.

As with the Adopted Specific Plan, the **Revised Specific Plan** would include a wastewater treatment plant designed to accommodate the demand generated by the Revised Specific Plan. No other development would be allowed to connect with the proposed wastewater treatment plan. Thus, cumulative impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

#### **5.10.6 ENERGY**

There is no indication from energy providers that development within **Adopted Specific Plan** would contribute to a demand for facilities beyond the projected levels. While energy requirements associated with the Adopted Specific Plan would require the construction or modification of new facilities (infrastructure), the impacts of construction would be limited to the project level within Rancho San Juan and would be mitigated to a level that is less than significant. Proposed modifications to energy infrastructure would be phased over the expected twenty-plus years of development of full build-out of the Specific Plan and therefore would not be cumulatively considerable.

As with the Adopted Specific Plan, energy requirements associated with the **Revised Specific Plan** would require construction of new infrastructure which would be mitigated at the project level. Therefore, the impact would not be cumulatively significant.

#### **5.10.7 FIRE PROTECTION**

Development of the **Adopted Specific Plan** would require the construction of additional fire facilities to serve this geographic area. Impacts of construction will be addressed at the project level. Although the additional demand for fire protection services generated by future development in the area combined with demand created by the proposed Specific Plan would result in cumulative demand for fire services. The additional facilities will be sized to accommodate full build-out and anticipated regional needs. Therefore, the impact would not be cumulatively significant.

Full build-out of the **Revised Specific Plan** would require construction of additional fire facilities. Impacts for construction would be mitigated at the project level. As with the Adopted Specific Plan, no additional facilities would be required to accommodate additional cumulative demand for services, since the facility will be sized to accommodate regional needs. Therefore, the impact would not be cumulatively significant.

### **5.10.8 POLICE PROTECTION**

Development of the **Adopted Specific Plan** would not require the construction of additional police facilities to serve this geographic area. Instead a substation was anticipated to co-locate with the fire station. Although the additional demand for police protection generated by future development in the area combined with the demand created by the proposed Specific Plan would result in cumulative demand impacts on police services, the demand would not result in additional construction. Therefore, the impact would not be cumulatively significant.

As with the Adopted Specific Plan, the **Revised Specific Plan** would also create the need for an additional police substation. According to the Revised Specific Plan, a police substation would not co-locate with the future fire station but instead would be located in an existing building within or near the Revised Specific Plan.

## **5.11 TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION**

As discussed in Chapter 5.2, Traffic and Circulation, traffic generated by the **Adopted Specific Plan** would combine with future traffic anticipated by the year 2010 to impact roadway segments and intersections which are already experiencing congestion. This is largely due to the fact that the local street system is already operating over capacity in many locations. All of the segments of Highway 101 which were analyzed would experience a significant cumulative impact from the project traffic in combination with background traffic in the year 2010.

As indicated in the traffic study prepared for the Addendum, the **Revised Specific Plan** would also result in significant impacts when added to other development expected by the year 2010. It should be noted that the traffic study specifically included future traffic from which included development of the Granite Property within the Adopted Specific Plan area because of a pending application for this property. Similar conditions were anticipated when project traffic is added to other traffic generated by the year 2020.

## **5.12 WATER RESOURCES**

The development of areas in unincorporated County and in the City of Salinas would most likely have a direct impact upon groundwater availability in the groundwater basin and specifically in the **Adopted Specific Plan** area. Additional withdrawals of groundwater from within the basin, especially in the immediate vicinity of the Adopted Specific Plan area, would further reduce the available groundwater supply for overall consumption in the general area. As discussed in Chapter 5.10, groundwater levels in the vicinity of the Adopted Specific Plan have been dropping steadily as demand has outpaced recharge. Although development of the Adopted Specific Plan would result in a reduction in overall water consumption over current usage, there

would still be a net annual deficit. Therefore, the Adopted Specific Plan was determined to have a significant cumulative impact on water resources.

The annual demand for groundwater generated by the **Revised Specific Plan** is not expected to exceed the annual recharge due to the groundwater recharge associated with the golf course. Thus, the Revised Specific Plan would not result in a significant cumulative impact on local water resources.

## **6.0 EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT**

### **6.1 POPULATION AND HOUSING**

The FEIR concluded that the **Adopted Specific Plan** would not have an adverse impact to population and housing. Residential uses were anticipated under the GSAP. The Adopted Specific Plan would generate up to 4,000 residential units without displacing any existing housing.

As with the Adopted Specific Plan, no adverse impacts to population and housing are anticipated with the **Revised Specific Plan**. The proposed project would generate up to 1,147 residential units without displacing any existing housing.

### **6.2 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

No public health hazards, health risks, or hazardous material impacts were anticipated with the **Adopted Specific Plan**, with the exception of potential air or water quality impacts related to pesticides, herbicides and fertilizers (see Sections 5.7 and 5.9 for details regarding this potential impact).

Pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers may be stored and used as part of the golf course maintenance. Pursuant to the Golf Course Management Plan requirements and existing laws and regulations, hazardous materials would be stored in compliance with the Monterey County Health Department, Environmental Health Division, and the golf course would possess the necessary equipment for proper cleanup of hazardous materials and waste in an event of an accidental spill. Hazardous waste would be disposed of in accordance with Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations and with the approval of the Monterey County Health Department, Environmental Health Division. Hazardous materials would only be handled by trained personnel in accordance with Occupational Safety and Health Administration's requirements.

Implementation of the Adopted Specific Plan would not involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, nor would it create a significant hazard to the public or environment through the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Implementation of the Adopted Specific Plan would not result in hazardous emissions within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Additionally, the Adopted Specific Plan site is not located on hazardous materials site, and is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport.

Wildland fires are a major hazard in many areas of Monterey County. Extensive acreage of rugged, highly flammable terrain and expanding residential development can significantly increase fire hazard. The California Division of Forestry prepares Wildland Fire Hazard Maps



for each county, rating fire hazards as low, moderate, high, or very high. The Adopted Specific Plan area is located in a low fire hazard zone.

Development of the Adopted Specific Plan area would result in changes to fuel characteristics of the subject property, increase the number of residents and other human activities on the site, and increase the value of structures on the property.

The proposed change in uses, from agricultural to residential and industrial, would help reduce the risk of wildfires which is currently the major cause of fires in the area through the replacement of natural vegetation with structures, irrigated landscape and irrigated fields. However, the increased human activity on the site would also increase the potential for human-caused fires from lawn mowers, barbecues, and other activities. These activities could result in fires in biological conservation areas within the Adopted Specific Plan that could spread to other wildlands and/or developed areas.

The magnitude of the Adopted Specific Plan's area increase in fire potential and demand on fire-fighting activities would place greater demands on fire district firefighters and equipment resources. The potential impact of the Adopted Specific Plan would be offset by the new fire station included as part of the Adopted Specific Plan. This fire station would provide an adequate level of service provided the station is constructed concurrent with need.

As with the Adopted Specific Plan, no public health hazards, health risks, or hazardous material impacts are anticipated with implementation of the **Revised Specific Plan**, with the exception of potential air or water quality impacts related to pesticides, herbicides and fertilizers. Nor would it involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or create a significant hazard to the public or environment through the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Implementation of the Revised Specific Plan would not result in hazardous emissions within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Additionally, the Revised Specific Plan not located on hazardous materials site and is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport.

As with the Adopted Specific Plan, the Revised Specific Plan is located in a low fire hazard zone. While the development could increase the risk of wildfire, the impact would be offset by the new fire station included as part of the Revised Specific Plan. This fire station would provide an adequate level of service, provided the station is constructed concurrent with need.

### **6.3 MINERAL RESOURCES**

No known economic mineral resources are present on the **Adopted Specific Plan area**, therefore, no negative impacts would occur from future development.

As with the Adopted Specific Plan, no known economic mineral resources are present in the **Revised Specific Plan**, therefore, no negative impacts would occur.

## 7.0 GROWTH INDUCEMENT

The FEIR addressed several aspects of growth inducement including: precedent-setting nature, removal of impediments to growth and economic effects. The only aspect of the **Adopted Specific Plan** which was found growth-inducing was related to expansion of public services.

While the expanded services would primarily serve future development within the Adopted Specific Plan, the FEIR found that surrounding land could benefit from the new schools, fire station and library which were anticipated to be constructed within the Specific Plan area. The provision of wastewater treatment associated with the Adopted Specific Plan was not determined to be growth-inducing because the sewer treatment capacity would be allocated to the future development within the Specific Plan area. The provision of water was also not found to be growth inducing because of the existing availability of water to surrounding land from other sources.

The FEIR concluded that the Adopted Specific Plan would not establish a precedent that would facilitate unplanned activities that could significantly affect the environment as the Specific Plan is located in an area of the County which is already designated as an Area of Development Concentration (ADC).

With respect to economic factors, the FEIR concluded that the Adopted Specific Plan would indirectly facilitate development outside the Adopted Specific Plan area through its population/income growth and employment effects. However, due to the inclusion of community-serving commercial uses, the degree of indirect growth inducement was not expected to be significant.

The wastewater plant proposed for the Revised Specific Plan area will not be growth-inducing, because it has been sized to serve the Revised Specific Plan area only and will not be designed in a modular fashion to address future growth as had been proposed for the Adopted Specific Plan.

The growth-inducing effects related to expanded public services associated with the **Revised Specific Plan** would be less than those associated with the Adopted Specific Plan. No new schools or library would be constructed as part of the Revised Specific Plan. A new fire station will be constructed but it will primarily serve the Revised Specific Plan area and existing service needs.

As the intensity and area of development would be reduced, the Revised Specific Plan would continue not to represent significant growth inducement related to precedent-setting or economic factors.

# **ATTACHMENT A**

## **TRAFFIC ANALYSIS**

# **ATTACHMENT B**

## **SUPPLEMENTAL AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS**

**ATTACHMENT C**

**WATER SUPPLY ASSESSMENT**